

January 5, 2023, Parking Reimagined Open House Chat Log

- 19:03:02 From Mayland : <https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/planning-development/zoning-ordinance/parking-reimagined>
- 19:23:43 From James Hart : It is unfortunate that there is no tradeoff requiring increased open space or tree save in exchange for a parking reduction. There should have been at least that option advertised. If it is not required, it will never happen.
- 19:24:31 From cynthia shang to AUSTIN GASTRELL(Direct Message) : I don't have the ability to raise my hand but I would like to ask a question. Can I be after Cheryl?
- 19:24:55 From AUSTIN GASTRELL to cynthia shang(Direct Message) : Ok I will call on you after cheryl
- 19:25:04 From Alexis Glenn : The car parking minimums overall are too high, especially in tier 1, which is 80% of the county. In tier 2 and 3, you acknowledged that lower minimums in those tiers facilitate more multimodal transportation. Keeping 80% of the county at a high minimum parking rate exacerbates car dependence and discourages trips that could otherwise be made on foot, bike, or bus. We have more homes for cars than for people. Meanwhile, bicycle parking requirements are too low. Creating more space for secure bike parking encourages greener transportation, frees up land for housing or green space, and most importantly, is more equitable.
- 19:25:06 From cynthia shang to AUSTIN GASTRELL(Direct Message) : Thanks
- 19:26:06 From James Hart : I have a concern that a reduction in loading spaces ignores the functional interrelationship with the disabled spaces. Even if the loading spaces are waived (and way too many are) there still will be deliveries all day long, and in many locations they end up blocking the disabled spaces which are often near the door. The delivery trucks have to part somewhere. Deliveries also seem to have increased over time.
- 19:26:40 From iPad : Agreed, Jim. While the proposal mentions environmental benefits, there are none required.
- 19:27:39 From Aaron Wilkowitz : But just imagine how many trees will be saved by NOT requiring developers to cut them down to build as large of a parking lot! :)
- 19:28:24 From iPad : Just last week, I could not park in a handicapped space because a delivery truck was blocking it. How can the county provide enforcement. Fairfax County can't even enforce traffic laws.
- 19:29:07 From Donna Jacobson : If buildings are replacing parking lots, the trees will still be cut down. There needs to be some type of requirement for green spaces/trees as a result of the reduction in MPRs.

- 19:29:25 From James Hart : Third, a requirement of 1.3 spaces for each apartment seems wildly unrealistic and low especially for spaces nowhere near metro. Parking shortages are very stressful for the residents and a formula of 1.3 seems to create instant conflicts. Even if you are at the metro doorstep, you still have to drive to the grocery store, to the courthouse, to the government center, to parks and schools, to many destinations. Those folks need cars (and with all due respect, the geometry in Fx Co is much more spread out than Arlington, and mostly further from metro). 1.3 is unrealistic social engineering, and those folks need cars, and need to park.
- 19:29:34 From iPad : Aaron, there are no tree save requirements in this fairy tale.
- 19:33:05 From Aaron Wilkowitz : James - we need to densify around the metros around here to get them to closer to ARL. But I don't think you need a car in most parts of metro-centered Tyson's & in RTC. My parents live in large apartment in Tysons and their parking garage is half empty - what a waste!
- Adrienne - don't mean to live in a fairy tale, our oversized parking lots are a part of the sprawl today that are responsible for a lot of trees being destroyed.
- 19:34:27 From Alexis Glenn : Folks should come to the neighborhoods around the Huntington Metro, we've got single-family homes, duplexes, rowhomes, garden apartments, mid-rise apartments, and high-rise apartments and a whole lot of always partially empty parking lots and garages, and no shortage of public street parking. Not as many people are driving and parking cars as you think.
- 19:36:12 From James Hart : Responding to Aaron W: Unless you require trees to be saved with a quid pro quo for a reduction (and maybe we should) or even a sliding scale, no additional trees will be saved. This proposal is about the cash, the money, the profits, not the environment. Trees could be saved voluntarily today, and the honor system is not enough. Promises of additional tree save from this amendment are illusory, sickening phony baloney from politicians, the land is too valuable. The building footprints still will be maxed out if the ordinance allows it. Tree save needs to be actually mathematically required, not just boasted about as a political accomplishment. And anecdotal observations about empty parking lots at weak retail sites and obsolete offices do not translate to overcrowded apartments.
- 19:37:30 From Donna Jacobson : I think Fairfax County has had 23 pedestrian deaths so far this year and 7 of them have occurred in Annandale. To me that indicates that changes need to be made prior to Annandale being a "walkable community".
- 19:37:51 From iPad : Ditto to Jim Hart. This proposal is about the future, not any past developments.
- 19:38:13 From Alexis Glenn : ^^^what Donna said.
- 19:41:28 From Sheila Dunheimer : In the following sec6. Adjustments to Minimum Required Off-Street Parking, B. Shared Parking Options
Current verbiage only mentions "located within 1000' walking distance".

1. Are there any of the following:
 - MAXIMUM DISTANCES BETWEEN LAND USES TO PARKING SPACES, &/or
 - PEDESTRIAN CONNECTION REQUIREMENTS
 Some other jurisdictions' examples:
 - o 300' between the dwelling unit entrances and shared spaces
 - o 500' between the principal building entrances for all other sharing uses.
2. What % (sometimes this can be up to 20% of the spaces) will be allowed to be greater than 500' but less than 1000' from the principal entrances?
3. CLEAR, SAFE PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIONS must be provided.
 - o Pedestrians should NOT be required to cross an arterial street except at a signalized intersection along the pedestrian pathway.
4. What % (sometimes this can be up to 50% in jurisdictions) of nonresidential spaces may be provided at GREATER DISTANCES' if dedicated shuttle bus or van service is provided from a remote parking facility?

19:42:25 From Aaron Wilkowitz : James, I'm not particularly opposed to tree requirements. Let's reduce parking minimums, and add some tree saving minimums. I'm not sure it belongs in this part of the code. Donna, agreed

Adrienne - agreed it's about the future, let's make that future have less sprawl!

19:43:32 From iPad : From your proposal..."The decisions we make to require and build parking impact the quality of life in our community. These decisions must be balanced between providing space for automobiles and supporting County goals related to equity, affordability, environment stewardship, community design, and economics." There are no requirements for environmental benefits in return for a gift to developers. That's the only economic benefit I can find.

19:45:12 From Aaron Wilkowitz : Adrienne, fewer parking spots help the environment, full stop. <https://www.itdp.org/2022/09/20/to-tackle-climate-change-cities-need-to-rethink-parking/>

19:47:04 From iPad : We disagree, Aaron. The county ruled out requiring new tree canopy in return for fewer parking spaces. The word "sprawl" is not an appropriate descriptor of Fairfax County.

19:49:28 From Donna Jacobson : Under this amendment everything is a potential benefit but nothing is a required benefit of reducing MPRs.

19:52:10 From Susan Jollie : And very theoretical benefits given the financial motivation of developers once the give away is a right as opposed to a proffer to gain approval.

19:53:14 From Susan Jollie : Aaron --where do you live?

19:57:38 From Jehanne Arslan : Aaron - this evening I had to drive several times through the parking lot @ South Lakes shopping center in Reston before I could park. ???Isn't this center eligible for the density and transit related reductions?

20:02:19 From Aaron Wilkowitz : Susan - I live by West Falls Church metro (and love living there & love FFX county!!)

Jehanne - I'm sorry to hear that. I'm not sure if that area is in the reduction area. I'd rather we occasionally not have quite enough spaces than far more often having way too many spaces.

20:06:35 From Jehanne Arslan : People driving around looking for parking in a suburban setting when there are no ready alternatives isn't a recipe for neighborhood economic viability .

20:07:00 From iPad : Agreed, Jehanne

20:08:04 From Susan Jollie : And it increases air pollution. No green space trade-off requirement and no true environmental "benefits."

20:08:43 From Jehanne Arslan : ??? Reductions in MF housing MPR...won't that negatively impact residents' ability to have home based businesses ? Wasn't that one of the zMOD initiatives?

20:09:04 From Sheila Dunheimer : There are still TOO MANY options proposed that allow for ADDITIONAL reductions by the Director & Board that essentially IGNORE newly reduced requirements as well as public and technical input:. For example:

- Proposed changes include 'potential expanded capabilities for the Director (& BOARD) to approve PARKING ADJUSTMENTS...currently capped at 30% will be raised to 60%...with adjustments GREATER THAN 60% possible... -Any other reduction request NOT APPROVED by the Director CAN STILL BE APPROVED BY THE BOARD:
- Many adjustments will occur in conjunction with land use ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE BOARD, and
- The BOARD will continue to consider these requests AFTER TECHNICAL INPUT IS PROVIDED BY STAFF.

-ALLOWABLE ADJUSTMENTS based on transit proximity START at 10% and provides for options for GREATER than 10% reductions...

20:10:05 From iPad : Jehanne, we are hopeful the Supreme Court throws out ZMOD next week!

20:10:28 From Jehanne Arslan : THANK YOU TAMMI - great comments

20:11:03 From April Georgelas : Please provide this Recording and Chat Comments to Public asap. Thanks....April

20:12:21 From Aaron Wilkowitz : Jehanne - I don't think we want a situation where parking is way too low. I'm not suggesting we remove these minimums. But I am willing to accept that people have to wait a few minutes during peak hours if it means we don't have so much empty black top parking lots for 20+ hours a day.

Susan - our land being covered in parking spaces is what increases pollution & carbon emissions.

- 20:12:34 From Donna Jacobson : In Annandale there was a post on Nextdoor that a resident was willing to pay for a parking space because she could not consistently find one.
- 20:13:37 From Jehanne Arslan : Aaron...do you envision a 'stacking lane' for ppl waiting to park ? What?
- 20:17:30 From Aaron Wilkowitz : Donna - I don't think it's the end of the world if some people are paying for parking, especially if it's for their second, third, fourth car. "Free" parking isn't free - it drives up the cost of homes. So you're either paying for the parking in the housing price - or you're paying for the extra space
- Jehanne - Optimally some people will respond to a full parking lot by not driving + parking in particularly busy parking spaces during peak hours.
- To improve the environment, we have to change people's behavior. People need fewer cars, drive them less, and drive (and park) them during off-peak.
- 20:17:53 From April Georgelas : Please provide and post a Transcript of this Meeting asap for Public Review. Thanks.....April
- 20:18:29 From Jehanne Arslan : CVS has just incorporated 'Minute Clinics. Safeway has absorbed QUEST DIAGNOSTICS ...talk a huge increase in parking demand
- 20:18:48 From Jehanne Arslan : *talk about*
- 20:19:20 From Cheryl Sim : Clyde -- thank you for articulating the issue so well!
- 20:20:20 From Susan Jollie : Are the studies Mike is citing publicly available? Specifically I request that staff provide the studies relating to the Annandale Redevelopment District. There does not seem to be sufficient data with respect to the specific districts-- so it is in fact one size fit all.
- 20:29:33 From Sheila Dunheimer : Parking for Assisted Living Facilities should NOT be reduced. Current industry parking ratios/residents and employees are already considered too low within this industry because the ratios don't reflect the residents' changing demographics - they are staying in their homes longer so older & sicker when they move to these facilities. Therefore parking spaces are needed to accommodate the required daily therapists/medical services' visits not supplied with their daily services.