LESS PARKING, MORE CITY

The process and lessons of Mexico City’s Off-Street Parking Reform
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ITDP’s VISION

Problem Identification & Global Research of best practices

Aligned with ITDP’s Objectives

Strategic Priority
ITDP’s VISION

• ITDP Mexico’s office developed a Parking Policy position which created synergy with Travel Demand Management (TDM), Mass Transit & Transit Oriented Development (TOD)

• Parking-management was a crucial topic in the research and advocacy programs of TDM and TOD funded by the UK’s Prosperity Fund

• ITDP Mexico became a regional reference in parking-management policies through research, workshops and communication strategies
STAKEHOLDERS MAPPING

Mexico City Government

Real Estate Developers

Civil Society Organizations, Advocacy Groups & Architects’ Groups

Arquine
• Strong relations were developed with key decision-makers inside Mexico City’s 2012-2018 administration to raise awareness

• International and local case studies to show best practices
Ministry of Urban Development (SEDUVI) engaged
Trust relationship -> access to information
Asked us to do an in-depth study and proposals

CITY-WIDE PARKING STUDY included:

• Current policy detailed analysis
• Demographics and general mobility implications
• Parking supply and demand (on and off-street)
• Real estate development trends
• Construction costs analysis
• Interviews with stakeholders
• Traffic simulations
• International best practices review
RESEARCH - KEY FINDINGS

Urban Development Law

Building Code

On-Street Parking Regulations

Mobility Regulations

Public Parking Facilities Regulation (Garages)

Mobility Law

Urban Development Programs

Retail and local commerce law
RESEARCH - KEY FINDINGS

Parking policy was based on the usual FALSE assumptions:

• Increased parking mitigates urban, economic, environmental and traffic impacts of real estate development

• Parking supply as a public service

• Parking should grow as driving grows

• There is no relationship between parking demand and transit coverage/services

• There is no relationship between off-street and on-street parking management

• Parking supply should be treated independently on a building-by-building approach
RESEARCH - KEY FINDINGS

GRAPH 3: PERCENTAGE OF BUILT SURFACE AREA REQUIRED FOR PARKING IN A 750 M² OF PROFITABLE LAND USE PROJECT ACCORDING TO THE CURRENT REGULATION

Condominios (con elevador)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Cajones por vivienda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hasta 65 m²</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 a 120 m²</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 a 250 m²</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Más de 250 m²</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M² construidos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Proportion of Built Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centro comercial</td>
<td>1 cada 40 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oficinas</td>
<td>1 cada 30 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurantes (más de 200m³)</td>
<td>1 cada 10 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant (alcoholic beverages sold)</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant (alcoholic beverages not sold)</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking Institutions</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices (private)</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium and Medium High Education</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices (government)</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Red: Profitable-Use Area
- Gray: Parking Area
GRAPH 6: CARS PER HOUSEHOLD COMPARED TO THE MINIMUM PARKING REQUIREMENT

Multi-Family Housing

Single-Family Housing

1-3 rooms
4-5 rooms
6+ rooms
1-4 rooms
5-7 rooms
8+ rooms

Average Vehicle Ownership
Minimum Parking Requirement
251 Real Estate projects analysed

- Residential
- Office
- Retail
- Mixed-use.

IMPACTS IN....

- Parking supply
- Optimal land use
- Market VS. Minimums
- Relation to transit and location
Graph 14: Distribution of Projected Built Areas (m²)

- 42% Parking
- 32% Housing
- 15% Offices
- 9% Commerce
- 2% Equipment
- m² of Parking
- m² of Equipment
- m² of Commerce
- m² of Offices
- m² of Housing
### Table 17: Average Utilized As-Of-Right Urban Potential Per Project's Main Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>% of Utilized Constructive Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use with Housing</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Housing</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use Without Housing</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>81.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESEARCH – KEY FINDINGS

Minimums vs. Market (demand)

TABLE 19: AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF PARKING SPACES ABOVE THE MINIMUM PER PROJECT’S LAND USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>% of Parking Spaces Above the Minimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>22.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>11.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Housing</td>
<td>9.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>8.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use with Housing</td>
<td>7.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use without Housing</td>
<td>5.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESEARCH - KEY FINDINGS

Minimums = Demand? ------- FALSE
Minimums < Demand? ------ FALSE
Graph 7: Relevance of Requiring Parking in New Buildings

- Minimums impact the cost of development
- Minimums are irrelevant
- Desirable Supply per Project
- Minimum Requirement

Various Contexts

Amount of Parking Spaces
The possibility of the existence of a relationship that could surpass the amount of parking spaces required by regulation and location with respect to mass transit was also analyzed.

R-squared = 0.0008

The coefficient is not meaningful.
RESEARCH - KEY FINDINGS

False mitigation of real estate development impacts

1.2 million m² of corporate offices will be built in Mexico City

VS

» 40,000 parking spaces
» 7 billion $MXN
» 80,000 car trips
» 38,000 fuel lt/day
» 89 CO₂ tons/day

TARGET: Aprox 40,000 citizens/day

VS

» 4 BRT (Metrobús) lines of 20 km/each
» Same cost
» Sustainable mobility, TOD, equitable

TARGET: Aprox 600,000 - 700,000 citizens/day
INITIAL PROPOSAL

CONSIDERATIONS FOR POLICY DESIGN

1. Minimums were above demand on average

2. In terms of road capacity, we knew that the maximum should be lower than the minimum. Specifically in congested areas as some of the traffic simulations conducted showed us

3. Technical viability ≠ Political viability

4. The new policy had to be based on changing the vision on parking as a mitigation strategy to an impact generator and TDM tool

5. We know eliminating minimums (and setting maximums) needs to be followed by further changes that will align all the parking policy instruments

6. Policy design process demanded participation from all the stakeholders to ensure its success
INITIAL PROPOSAL

MAXIMUMS = 100% OF ACTUAL MINIMUM

Current minimum

Maximun

$
INITIAL PROPOSAL

Proposed parking construction fee per space added on each decile of the new maximum

10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

$0 $0 $0 $2,000 $4,000 $8,000 $10,000 $12,000 $14,000

Total parking construction fee collected

Savings of not adding parking
COMMUNICATION IS PARAMOUNT

• Communication strategy along the whole process
• Key findings = Key messages platform
• Different audiences, different phrasing
• Talk, talk, and then... talk about it
• Approach the media -> workshops, training, interviews, etc...
• Take your findings anywhere, feedback will come from unusual places

BRANDING

“LESS PARKING, MORE CITY”
COMMUNICATION IS PARAMOUNT

LESS PARKING, MORE CITY
CASE STUDY IN MEXICO CITY
How it became a reality?

- 3 years passed between the initial white paper was given to the government and the official elimination of minimums and adoption of maximums.
- Along the way some political windows for implementation were not exploited.
- Government teams changed, creating the need to restart advocacy and engagement; but greater coordination between SEDUVI and SEMOVI was generated.
The new alliance got the Mayor’s attention and he finally announced a deadline for a new parking policy in Mexico City.
POLICY DELIVERY

Along came the expected political will, traction with stakeholders and media coverage, including international media.

Immediate interest by developers and investors was generated and final negotiations were conducted.
POLICY DELIVERY

FINAL VERSION - JULY 11th 2017 BY THE MAYOR MIGUEL ANGEL MANCERA
1.2.2. CAJONES DE ESTACIONAMIENTO PARA VEHÍCULOS MOTORIZADOS

I. La cantidad máxima permitida de cajones de estacionamiento para vehículos en una edificación, estará en función del uso y superficie de la misma, de conformidad con lo previsto en la Tabla 1.2.2.1. y de acuerdo a la zona en la que se ubique el predio según el Plano 1. Zonas para la Aplicación de Aportaciones por la Construcción de Cajones de Estacionamiento para Vehículos Motorizados de este Acuerdo:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uso</th>
<th>Número máximo de Cajones de Estacionamiento para Vehículos Motorizados</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suelo Urbano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitacional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivienda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unifamiliar y Plurifamiliar (con o sin elevador)</td>
<td>Para cualquier superficie por unidad habitacional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comercial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central de abastos</td>
<td>1 por cada 100 m² construidos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercado</td>
<td>1 por cada 200 m² construidos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodega de productos perecederos</td>
<td>1 por cada 200 m² construidos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodega de productos no perecederos y bienes muebles</td>
<td>1 por cada 200 m² construidos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depósito y comercialización de combustible</td>
<td>1 por cada 200 m² de terreno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasolineras y Verificentros</td>
<td>1 por cada 150 m² de terreno</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POLICY DELIVERY

MAIN POINTS OF PARKING POLICY REFORM IN MEXICO CITY

1. Minimums abolished

2. City-wide maximums a little bit higher than the previous minimums

3. An incremental fee per parking space built between 50% and 100% of the maximum will be charged and funds will go to mass-transit improvements
1. Ensure transparency and efficiency in the process

2. Continual monitoring and evaluation of impacts to adjust both the maximum and the fee over time

3. Continue policy reform to modify the rest of the regulations that influence parking supply and demand

4. Synergies with Mass Transit, TOD, Affordable Housing, Active Transportation, etc...