

**From:** [J. Sid DelCardayre](#)  
**To:** [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#)  
**Subject:** Oppose RES 2021-R027 Eliminate Parking Minimums  
**Date:** Thursday, April 6, 2023 5:34:21 PM

---

**CAUTION:** This message is from an external sender - Do not open attachments or click links unless you recognize the sender's address and know the content is safe.

## Richmond Planning:

I oppose the elimination of parking minimums. I am not simply speaking as a Fan District NIMBY, but want to inject some logic into the discussion.

1. The resolution states that it will “facilitate cost savings for developers...that may be passed on to the consumers.”
  - a. As a small developer of two properties which received parking variances, I do not believe that much (if any) cost savings is passed on to the consumers. It only allows for the logistics/requirements of parking to be reduced/ignored, and for the cost proposal to be more easily funded by the bank.
  - b. Although the rents may initially start low in order to lease-up the property asap, I am quite certain that many/most developers are going to push to get the maximum rent possible for their apartments or commercial spaces. That’s how supply-demand works!
  - c. Any “savings” on parking by the developers will then turn out to be costs to the consumer later when they have to rent a parking space or use ride-share, etc. to get to and from the facility.
  - d. If there are not written requirements to pass ‘cost savings’ to the consumer via rent or transport credits, then it will not happen, even in the short term.
2. The resolution states it will “reduce community dependence on automobile transportation.”
  - a. Based on the most recent GRTC data, their fixed routes provided 718,426 ‘rides’/month (including Henrico, which makes up 10%). Assuming most are round trips, and occur on about 5.5 days per week, this equates to about 15,762 people-per-day using GRTC fixed-route service (this is being generous). This is about 7% of the population of Richmond city, and only 1% of the Metro Planning Area. Is that enough of the population, EVEN IF WE DOUBLE THE RATE, to justify eliminating parking for the other VAST majority of the citizens that own/use vehicles?
  - b. The idea that eliminating parking will reduce dependence on automobiles is a fallacy because of how spread out the region is. About 83% of the Metro population lives OUTSIDE the city. Don’t we actually NEED parking for them to come into the city to work, shop, eat, etc.?

- c. What about all the places in the Metro area OUTSIDE Richmond which City residents want/need to access that CAN NOT be accessed by using GRTC?
- d. If these citizens use ride-share doesn't that INCREASE dependence on automobile transportation?
- e. The idea that eliminating parking requirements is also a fallacy because it presumes that people will shift to ride-share or GRTC. While it may increase ride-share use, we can't improve the GRTC routes, density, and efficiency by pushing up from below. It needs to be changed from the top down so that people WANT to ride, not by FORCING them to ride.

I hope you will oppose this resolution. I have sent this letter to Ms. Jordan and will speak at the meeting on 4/17/23 if you need clarification.

Thank you,

**Sid**

***Mobile: 804-387-1600***

***J. Sid del Cardayre  
1832 Park Ave.  
RVa. 23220***