



CITY OF RICHMOND

Department of Planning & Development Review *Staff Report*

CPCR 2016-89: To declare an intent to amend the official zoning ordinance for the purpose of removing parking lots and parking areas as a principal use and reducing the off-street parking requirements for dwelling, hotel and motel uses within the B-4 and B-5 Central Business Districts.

To: City Planning Commission
From: Land Use Administration
Date: December 5, 2016

PETITIONER

City of Richmond
900 East Broad Street
Richmond, VA 23219

LOCATION

Citywide

PURPOSE

To declare an intent to amend the official zoning ordinance for the purpose of reducing off-street parking requirements for hotel and residential uses as well as removing parking areas and parking lots as a principle use within the B-4 and B-5 districts.

SUMMARY & RECOMMENDATION

This Resolution would revise the City's Zoning Ordinance for two central business districts, the B-4 and B-5, to remove parking lots and parking areas as a principle use within the district. The amendments also reduce the residential and hotel parking requirements within these two districts.

If the Commission agrees that it is appropriate to move forward with the development of proposed amendments, it will be necessary for the Commission to approve a Resolution of Intent to Amend the Zoning Ordinance. This is the first step for any change to the text of the Zoning Ordinance. The amendment process would include the conduct of appropriate public hearings once the draft ordinance containing the text amendments is introduced. A draft of the resolution and proposed amendments are included in the agenda package for consideration.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Background

In the Spring of 2016, the Planning Commission discussed their concern about the development of new surface parking lots within downtown, specifically regarding the new lot installed on the parcel between the Dominion Arts Center and the 600 block of East Broad Street. The Commission asked Staff to investigate surface parking in the Downtown and

report back with recommendations that would address surface parking without impeding economic development. Concurrently, the Department of Planning & Development review has been conducting the Pulse Corridor Plan to develop transit-oriented development strategies for the areas along the Pulse BRT route, including downtown. The Pulse Corridor Plan closely examines the form and function of future development, particularly infill development in the Downtown. The proposed amendments match the recommendations presented to the public as part of the Pulse Corridor Plan in November 2016.

Master Plan

The Downtown Master Plan has very specific recommendations regarding “reconsidering parking requirements for urban buildings” and particularly the Downtown (3.7).

A key implementation step of the plan is that “the Downtown parking system should be reformed. While the existing system is quite progressive, allowing for parking reductions and waivers in mixed-use, walkable districts, the calculation standards must be reformed and Downtown’s existing parking supply must be better maintained. Underground parking is recommended in the core. Minimum parking requirements for buildings should be abolished. Shared parking systems should be encouraged, in which different businesses with different peak hours of use can share parking spaces. These parking spaces can be created and maintained by a centralized parking authority. The location, rates, and quantity of these shared parking spaces will be determined by market forces” (3.8).

The plan also has specific language regarding surface parking lots, stating that “surface parking lots, while they provide low cost vehicle storage, are detrimental to the walkability of Downtown streets. The long-term goal of Downtown development should be to transform all sizable surface lots to underground or above-ground structured parking with liner buildings” (7.6).

The Downtown Plan also anticipates the tradeoff of reducing surface parking lots and parking requirements as “urban areas with high levels of transit accessibility and walkability, such as the future vision for Downtown, are expected to have fewer parking spaces and/or more expensive parking spaces, compared to areas that are less urban and have lower levels of transit and walkability. This means that residents in the study area should not expect to have the level of parking accessibility that residents and employees in lower-density, less-urban parts of Richmond experience. The trade-off is that Downtown residents will have much higher access to transit and will enjoy a vibrant, walkable community” (5.29).

Existing and Proposed Zoning

Currently, parking lots and parking areas are permitted as a principal use within the B-4 and B-5 districts, provided that any card reader or other access control device at an entrance to a parking area or parking lot shall be provided within not less than one stacking space situated off of the public right of way. The proposed amendments eliminate parking lots and parking areas as a principal use within the B-4 and B-5 districts; parking areas and parking lots would instead be permitted as an accessory use customarily incidental and clearly subordinate to uses permitted in the district. Parking lots and parking

areas as an accessory use would be subject to the same provision for access control devices currently in the ordinance. The amendments also propose adding parking lots and parking areas, subject to the existing access control provision, to the enumerated principal uses permitted by conditional use permit.

If these amendments are adopted, existing parking lots and parking areas that are a principal use of property would be becoming non-conforming. Parking decks and parking garages continue to be a permitted principal use, subject to existing screening and principal street frontage requirements.

The other amendments concern off-street parking and loading requirements for multi-family dwelling uses, as well as tourist homes, hotel or motel uses. Currently, within the B-4 and B-5 districts, off-street parking is not required except for dwelling uses, hotels, and motels. The proposed amendments reduce parking requirements of these uses to encourage contextual, small scale infill development; to encourage the adaptive reuse of historic buildings for dwelling, hotel, and motel uses; and move to a demand-driven market for off-street parking and loading within the B-4 and B-5 downtown business districts.

Currently, the off-street parking regulations governing the number of spaces required for a particular use requires 1 parking space per guestroom up to 100 rooms, plus 1 per every 2 guestrooms over 100 rooms. The amendments propose reducing this requirement to 1 parking space per every 4 guestrooms; this is equivalent to the current dwelling use parking requirement for the district. Reducing this requirement would allow hotels and motels to reduce the amount of parking they are required to provide, through on-site construction or through off-premise leasing, within the B-4 and B-5 districts.

Proposed changes to the off-street parking regulations:

(7)	Tourist home, hotel, or motel:		
	a.	RO-3, HO, B-4, B-5 , B-6, B-7, RF-1, RF-2, CM and DCC districts (Ord. No. 2006-168-189, § 2, 7-10-06; (Ord. No. 2010-19-31, § 3, 2-22-2010)	1 per guestroom up to 100 rooms, plus 1 per every 2 guestrooms over 100 rooms

	<u>b.</u>	<u>B-4, B-5</u>	<u>1 per every 4 guestrooms</u>
	c.	All other districts	1 per guestroom

Currently the off-street parking requirement for multi-family dwelling uses within the B-4 and B-5 districts, as well as a number of other business districts, is None for 1 to 3 units; otherwise, 1 per 4 dwelling units where such units are contained within the same building as a non-dwelling use. The proposed amendments create a new category for the B-4 and B-5 as central business districts, and propose the new parking requirement to be None for 1 to 16 dwelling units; 1 per 4 dwelling units over 16 units, regardless of whether such units are contained within the same building as a non-dwelling use. Additionally, within the B-4, the amendments propose to have no parking required for dwelling units when such units are contained within the same building as a non-dwelling use.

Proposed changes to the off-street parking regulations are in the table that follows.

(4.1)	<p>Dwelling unit: (Ord. No. 2008-2-55, § 2, 3-24-2008)</p> <p>a. Ord. No. 2006-168-189, § 2, 7-10-06) (Ord. No. 2008-2-55, § 2, 3-24-2008)</p> <p><u>b.</u></p> <p><u>c.</u></p> <p>d. (Ord. No. 2008-2-55, § 2, 3-24-2008)</p>	<p>In B-1, B-2, B-3, B-4, B-5 and UB districts where such units are contained within the same building as a non-dwelling use</p> <p>(Ord. No. 2006-168-189, § 2, 7-10-06) (Ord. No. 2008-2-55, § 2, 3-24-2008)</p> <p><u>In B-4 and B-5 districts</u></p> <p><u>In B-4 district where such units are contained within the same building as a non-dwelling use.</u></p> <p>In UB-2 district where such units are contained within the same building as a non-dwelling use. (Ord. No. 2008-2-55, § 2, 3-24-2008)</p>	<p>None for 1 to 3 units; otherwise, 1 per 4 dwelling units. (Ord. No. 2008-2-55, § 2, 3-24-2008)</p> <p><u>None for 1 to 16 dwelling units; 1 per 4 dwelling units over 16 units</u></p> <p><u>None</u></p> <p>1 per 2 dwelling units (Ord. No. 2008-2-55, § 2, 3-24-2008)</p>
-------	--	---	---

	<p>e.</p> <p>(Ord. No. 2008-2-55, § 2, 3-24-2008; Ord. No. 2010-19-31, § 3, 2-22-2010)</p>	<p>In B-6, B-7, RF-1 and RF-2 districts</p> <p>(Ord. No. 2006-197-217, § 4, 7-24-06) (Ord. No. 2008-2-55, § 2, 3-24-2008)</p> <p>(Ord. No. 2008-36-57, § 3, 3-24-2008; Ord. No. 2010-19-31, § 3, 2-22-2010)</p>	<p>1 per dwelling unit (see section 114-446.3)</p> <p>(Ord. No. 2008-2-55, § 2, 3-24-2008; Ord. No. 2010-19-31, § 3, 2-22-2010)</p>
--	---	---	--

Staff Contact: Kathleen Onufer, Executive Staff Assistant (804) 646-5207