

Pender County Planning and Community Development

Planning Division

805 S. Walker Street
PO Box 1519
Burgaw, NC 28425



Phone: 910-259-1202
Fax: 910-259-1295
www.pendercountync.gov

MEMORANDUM

To: Pender County Planning Board

From: Planning Staff

Date: July 1, 2014, Tabled till August 5, 2014

RE: Discussion Items— Parking Relief

Planning Board,

Please find eight (8) parking relief concepts below. These concepts have been transcribed in an effort to provide greater flexibility for developers while balancing the needs of the community. The Planning Board has requested that Planning Staff provide the Board with options in determining ways to alleviate some of the issues associated with existing standards.

Staff recommends considering the following options while thinking about the following context: Many developments have the potential to encounter the issue of needing only a few parking spaces, making paving a burdensome endeavor. In addition, a number of these solutions could solve and further the Comprehensive Land Use Plan if implemented in conjunction with one another. *For example: A Shared Parking/District/Land Use Based solution 2 & 5 would be a more specific way to facilitate mature, Comprehensive Land Use Plan based development while allowing greater flexibility within the Ordinance.*

1. **5 or fewer reduction:** In every district, parking lots requiring 5 spaces or fewer may be surfaced with gravel :
 - a. **Pros:** A more rural character can be achieved, certain types of gravel are considered pervious surfaces, lower cost for the developer, ease of transition and repurposing of the parking areas for new and or different uses,
 - b. **Cons:** Gravel generally is not as durable and long lasting as asphalt, the development can erode, this is indiscriminate as it pertains to the various zoning districts (GB vs. RA etc), the threshold is arbitrary. The end result may not accommodate the needs of the development.

- c. **Needs:** Standards on installation of the gravel (minimum standards for installation), parking should be located to the side and/or rear of the property (with consideration of existing vegetation)
2. **Shared Parking:** Adjacent uses shall share parking spaces when two or more uses have different peak hours and/or excess parking:
 - a. **Pros:** Less impervious coverage, maintenance of rural character, reduced cost burden for developers, fewer vehicle trips
 - b. **Cons:** Enforcement may be tricky during changes of use etc.
 - c. **Needs:** A shared parking permit should be established to ensure compliance. The spaces should be designated and allocated in a logical manner to ensure ease of ingress and egress. Pedestrian pathways should be established to safely connect the parking areas. Comfortable walking distance should be considered (generally from 100 -1,600' per depending on the use <http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm89.htm>). This can be implemented in conjunction with other parking policies to ensure that a well-rounded parking strategy is employed.
3. **Urbanizing /Rural/Commercializing District(s):** Surfacing should be based on the Land Use Plan and the surface should be dependent on the character of the particular area(s)
 - a. **Pros:** Uniformity in design can be achieved, this can be used as an economic development incentive moving forward, the County has already set forth areas designated as rural growth, suburban growth etc. This option more readily follows the intent of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan
 - b. **Cons:** Expansion concerns and demand for particular areas may change
 - c. **Needs:** The specific Commercial/Industrial/Rural character and other areas should be designated specifically. It may be vital to try a demonstration area first in order to implement. It may be possible to start character areas utilizing existing sites (Cedar on the Green)
4. **Temporary surfacing relief (Ghosting):** A temporary permit could be utilized for a period of time to see if the business will be successful/needs more resources:
 - a. **Pros:** Potentially reduced cost for the developer
 - b. **Cons:** Temporarily, the surface may not be adequate for the development, potential enforcement issues
 - c. **Needs:** The site would need to be observed and monitored (by staff/consultant etc) to determine utilization rates and actual demand during the temporary surfacing period. The cost would need to be placed on the applicant up-front to ensure staff resources are available. Ghosting could be applied to particular uses or parking lot sizes (10 or fewer can attempt this option etc.) The space would need to be allocated but the surface would be contingent upon the site analysis.

5. **Parking Study Reduction:** The applicant should submit documentation indicating how much parking should be on-site using sample sites and transportation data
 - a. **Pros:** Existing option in the ordinance, provides data for future developments, allows for deviations above or below the established minimums
 - b. **Cons:** May add additional cost to developments, this does not address surfacing issues
 - c. **Needs:** This option could be amended to include an addendum to address the surface of the lot.

6. **Threshold Exemption:** Uses requiring X or fewer parking spaces will not be reviewed for minimum parking
 - a. **Pros:** Ease of enforcement, relief for smaller operations
 - b. **Cons:** The development/landscape may erode if proper surfacing is not installed,
 - c. **Needs:** A parking maximum should be considered in these cases, as developments may decide to install parking significantly above the existing minimums.

7. **Parking Based on Use Intensity:** Parking surface shall be determined based on the amount of generated vehicular trips on the property.
 - a. **Pros:** Relieve the cost burden for some developers while ensuring that intense uses are developed with the proper surfacing
 - b. **Cons:** Must account for low intensity uses that have very large parking lots (significant amounts of gravel), standardization is difficult and the best result would be based off of County specific data.
 - c. **Needs:** ITE Data, close evaluation, determine the thresholds for low, medium and high turnover

8. **Removing Minimum Parking Standards: Remove minimum parking standards and allow the developer to determine how much parking to place on site.**
 - a. **Pros:** Ease of enforcement, no additional costs are placed on the developer
 - b. **Cons:** Design may be hampered, ADA accessibility, surfacing issues, a lack of standards may affect nearby properties and the community's appearance.
 - c. **Needs:** Design should be reviewed in this circumstance to ensure that pedestrian safety and vehicular movement is accounted for properly.