

MEMORANDUM

To:	Ben Jarvis Associate Planner City of Santa Clarita	Date:	March 6, 2013
From:	Paul W. Wilkinson, P.E. Principal LLG, Engineers	LLG Ref:	2.113260.1
Subject:	Supplement to November 2012 Report "Next Steps" Parking Study Downtown Newhall Specific Plan (DNSP) City of Santa Clarita, California		

Engineers & PlannersTraffic
Transportation
Parking**Linscott, Law &
Greenspan, Engineers**2 Executive Circle
Suite 250
Irvine, CA 92614
949.825.6175 T
949.825.6173 F
www.llgengineers.comPasadena
Irvine
San Diego
Woodland Hills

As requested, this memo provides additional information as a supplement to LLG's "Next Steps" Parking Study (dated November 2012) for the Downtown Newhall Specific Plan (DNSP) area. This supplement provides a brief overview of the Surveyed Plus Shared parking calculation methodology recommended and applied in that report. It also quantifies the potential parking impacts within the Main Street Subarea due to changes in our prior inventory of existing parking supply. Those changes relate to the possible loss of two off-street parking areas now facilitated by the City, with the further consideration of possible added spaces at a third location within the study subarea.

Briefly, our November 2012 study presented an extensive inventory of parking supply and demand in a 22-block subarea of the DNSP, with added focus to a 15-block Main Street Subarea. Existing parking supply, peak parking demands, and functional parking surpluses (the calculated difference between peak demand, in spaces, and actual parking space supply) were identified. Additionally, review and analysis of the collected data resulted in a suggested methodology that could permit those parking surpluses to support the incrementally added parking needs of reuse/re-occupancy of unoccupied commercial floor area, and/or new commercial floor area, within the Main Street Subarea. This strategy could allow floor area re-occupancy and expansion, within the constraints of existing surplus parking spaces, in the absence of the Park Once Parking Structures otherwise anticipated by the DNSP.

The strategy in doing so is sometimes referred to as a Surveyed Plus Shared methodology, where:

1. The parking support needs of existing occupied commercial floor area within the Main Street Subarea are established using the actual peak parking demands observed during the field study of that survey area.
2. Those peak parking demands are further increased by 10% for conservancy and to add a contingency for locational aspects, convenience, and related considerations. In essence this approach answers the question: If the subarea were to maintain its current condition in terms of commercial floor area types and occupied floor area quantities, how many parking spaces would

Philip M. Linscott, PE (1924-2000)
Jack M. Greenspan, PE (Ret.)
William A. Law, PE (Ret.)
Paul W. Wilkinson, PE
John P. Keating, PE
David S. Shender, PE
John A. Boarman, PE
Clare M. Look-Jaeger, PE
Richard E. Barretto, PE
Keil D. Maberry, PE

the city need to preserve for the subarea to function with a reasonable parking balance at peak times? Taken together, these first two elements establish the Surveyed component of the Surveyed Plus Shared methodology.

3. The actual peak parking demands plus the 10% contingency represent the design-level parking needs of existing commercial development and occupancy in the Main Street Subarea. Comparing these design-level needs to the inventoried supply isolates the potential surplus spaces that might be used (subject to ownership, parking agreements and other considerations) to support re-occupancy of vacant commercial floor areas and/or net added new floor area in the Main Street Subarea. By example, the LLG study inventoried a total of 1,017 on-or-off-street parking spaces in this subarea, and actual peak parking demands for 654 of those spaces. By adding 10% to that observed peak demand, the design-level need calculates to 724 spaces. A comparison of the design-level need against the actual supply leads to a functional surplus of 293 spaces that might be used to support the additive parking needs of re-occupied vacant and/or net added new floor area.
4. The Plus Shared component of the Surveyed Plus Shared methodology comes from a parking-code-like treatment of vacant commercial floor area to be re-occupied in the Main Street Subarea, and/or net new floor area to be added within that subarea. This component does not automatically use established city code ratios, which in LLG's view would probably overstate the realistic peak parking needs in the DNSP setting. Instead, ratios used in the calculation are from the Shared Parking report published by the Urban Land Institute (ULI), as are time-of-day profiles that recognize that all land use types do not necessarily experience their peak parking needs at the same time of day.
5. The methodology would be further applied by evaluating the Shared Parking needs of re-occupied vacant floor areas and/or net added new commercial floor areas on a project-by-project basis. The city could track those accumulating needs, and use the surplus spaces identified in Step 3 as the basis to off-set the parking needs of those added occupancies, especially if those uses were not adding to the local area parking supply as their individual occupancies occurred.

The above Surveyed Plus Shared approach was carried out in *Table 6-5.1* of LLG's November 2012 report. That table leads to the conclusion that up to 94,000 sf of re-occupied and/or net new added retail floor area could be supported in the subarea before fully consuming the 293-space functional surplus derived in the study. The report suggests that this amount could include the estimated 30,778 sf of then-vacant floor area in the study subarea, plus another 63,222 sf of net added retail floor area.

These findings are further summarized in the attached *Table 1* under the Baseline heading.

Re-entering the series of tables and calculations of LLG's November 2012 report further addresses two possible parking supply variation scenarios of interest to the city. These are also addressed in the attached *Table 1*.

Variation 1 presumes the loss of 34 parking spaces within Block F as well as the further loss of 59 spaces in Block T. In combination, these parking reductions would reduce the overall supply in the subarea to 924 spaces, and the functional parking surplus to 200 spaces. Re-calculating the potential for re-occupied and/or net new retail floor area indicates a revised parking balance at 64,000 sf (inclusive of the 30,778 sf of vacant floor area in the study subarea).

Variation 2 presumes the same loss of 34 parking spaces within Block F as well as the further loss of 59 spaces in Block T. Further, Variation 2 presumes a possible addition of 15 net new parking spaces within and/or adjoining Block U. In combination, these parking supply changes would reduce the existing overall supply in the subarea to 939 spaces, and the functional parking surplus to 215 spaces. Re-calculating the potential for re-occupied and/or net new retail floor area indicates a revised balance at 69,000 sf (inclusive of the 30,778 sf of vacant floor area in the study subarea).

We appreciate the opportunity to provide this supplement to the LLG report dated November 2012. Please call us at (949) 825-6175 if you have any questions on its content.

cc: File

Attachment

Table 1
Surplus Parking Spaces Versus Re-Occupied/Added Retail Floor Area Potential
Main Street Subarea Focus
Downtown Newhall Specific Plan

	Parking Demand		Parking Supply/Design-Level Surplus ³		
	Actual Peak ¹	Design Level ²	Baseline ⁴	Variation 1 ⁵	Variation 2 ⁶
Parking Characteristics:					
Public spaces, on-street	173	192	285/93	285/93	285/93
Public spaces, off-street	123	135	181/46	122/(13)	137/2
Private spaces, off-street	358	397	551/154	517/120	517/120
Total Spaces:	654	724	1,017/293	924/200	939/215

	Retail Floor Area ⁷		
	Baseline	Variation 1	Variation 2
Re-Occupied/Added Retail Floor Area Potential Due to Surplus Spaces	94,000 sf	64,000 sf	69,000 sf

¹ Represents the highest actual parking demand regardless of survey date. See Table 5-5 of LLG study (dated November 20, 2012).

² Reflects actual peak plus 10%.

³ Design-Level surplus = indicated supply minus Design-Level parking demand.

⁴ Reflects actual inventoried supply presented in Table 5-5 of LLG study.

⁵ Reflects actual inventoried supply minus 34 spaces in Block F as well as 59 spaces in Block T.

⁶ Reflects parking losses in Variation 1 plus an estimated 15 added spaces within and/or adjoining Block U.

⁷ Converts the total space surplus for baseline, Variation 1, and Variation 2 to their potential to support re-occupied/added retail floor area based on the methodology of Table 6-5 of the LLG study.