

From: [Molly Escalante](#)
To: [Oliver, Alyson E. - PDR](#)
Subject: Comment on Parking ORD. 2023-101
Date: Friday, April 14, 2023 11:08:19 AM

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.

Good morning,

I am writing to express strong opposition to eliminating parking minimums in the city. See below for specific concerns:

- Over the last 2+ years, the lack of parking in Scott's Addition has been a significant deterrent to visiting businesses in that area. Parking lots reserved for specific businesses are regularly filled by people visiting other establishments. Parking regulations do not appear to be enforced with regularity. Further, traffic congestion, speeding, and lack of traffic signals pose safety risks to pedestrians.
- The Libbie/Grove/Patterson corridors have seen a surge of new development which has significantly increased traffic in the area and parking is very limited at peak usage hours. Overflow parking is spilling into restricted lots and onto residential streets in neighborhoods that rely on street parking and do not have parking reserved for residents. Cars and delivery vehicles regularly idle or park in active driving lanes on Grove Ave while drivers run into businesses. This congestion was created with current parking requirements in place. It's clear that the available parking and transportation infrastructure could not support the influx in usage had parking requirements been eliminated for new developments at the time they were constructed.
- The public transportation infrastructure in Richmond does not currently support a reduced dependence on personal transportation/cars, particularly for families with children. If this is a goal for the city, significant improvements to the transportation system (including complete point-to-point transportation that is safe and efficient) and an increase in the number of large/underground parking structures is needed *before* parking is eliminated in core high-frequency areas.
- Support for the ordinance notes that developers may share the cost savings from eliminating parking requirements by passing savings on to city residents in the form of lower cost housing/rent, however it does not appear that passing on the cost savings is required or enforceable under the ordinance. How will the ordinance ensure that the cost savings are not used to increase profitability for developers?

I urge the city council to take broad consideration of constituents on this matter and not to overly rely on the input of private developers to determine the outcome.

Best,
Molly Escalante
1st District resident

