

Senate Local Government & Housing
04/25/2024 Upon Adjournment
HB24-1304 Minimum Parking Requirements
Typed Text of Testimony Submitted

Name, Position, Representing	Typed Text of Testimony
<p>Samuel Koenig For themselves</p>	<p>I want to express my strong support for the statewide legalization of accessory dwelling units (ADUs). This initiative is a crucial component of broader, common-sense housing solutions that can alleviate the affordability crisis many Coloradans are currently facing.</p> <p>As we anticipate welcoming 2-3 million new residents over the next two decades, primarily in the Front Range, the need for innovative housing solutions becomes even more urgent. ADUs offer a unique opportunity to increase housing stock using existing residential properties, without the need for extensive new infrastructure or encroaching on undeveloped land.</p> <p>The benefits of ADUs are manifold:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increased Affordability: By integrating additional living spaces into existing neighborhoods, ADUs provide more affordable housing options to residents at risk of being priced out of their communities. 2. Reduced Urban Sprawl: ADUs utilize existing spaces within urban boundaries, thus preserving our cherished natural landscapes and reducing the need for costly new infrastructure. 3. Community and Family Stability: ADUs allow homeowners to provide living spaces for family members or generate additional income, enhancing financial stability and keeping families together. <p>Local restrictions currently limit the ability of many Coloradans to benefit from ADUs. By supporting legislation that facilitates the broader adoption of ADUs, we can take a significant step toward ensuring that all residents—your neighbors, community members, and even your children or grandchildren—can afford to remain in the state they love.</p>

	<p>I urge you to support this legislation as a practical, environmentally responsible, and economically beneficial solution to our state’s housing challenges.</p> <p>Thank you committee</p>
<p>Samuel Koenig For themselves</p>	<p>I am writing to advocate for the statewide reduction of parking minimums, a crucial step towards more sustainable and efficient urban planning in Colorado. As we anticipate a population increase of 2-3 million over the next two decades, revising these outdated requirements is imperative.</p> <p>In Englewood, CO, along our main corridor with frequent transit, prime real estate is predominantly occupied by used car lots and auto body shops. This is not due to market demand but because these are some of the few businesses that can comply with the strict minimum parking requirements on such small lots. This misuse of space highlights the inefficiency of one-size-fits-all parking mandates, which often exceed actual needs and stifle more diverse development.</p> <p>The benefits of reducing parking minimums are clear:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Flexibility: Allows cities and developers to tailor parking to actual needs rather than arbitrary standards. 2. Urban Livability: Promotes walkable, bike-friendly communities, reducing dependence on cars. 3. Economic Efficiency: Lowers development costs, potentially reducing housing and business expenses. <p>By reforming parking regulations, we can facilitate more rational land use and vibrant urban growth. I urge you to support legislation that reduces parking minimums, fostering cities that are not only more adaptable but also more livable for future generations.</p> <p>Thank you for considering and I urge you to vote to remove arbitrary government parking minimums</p>
<p>Zachary Mettler For themselves</p>	<p>I am a graduate of both a Bachelor's in Architecture and a Master's in Urban Planning, and have a professional background as a Planner and a Main Street advocate and urban designer. I believe cities should not enforce parking minimums and instead should allow the</p>

	<p>reasonable natural market dictate how much parking they believe they need to create an attractive product. We should be designing for people first, not vehicles. This is one piece of a very complex pie, and I do believe in unintended consequences and that there may be a few bad apples who abuse the system, but the vast majority of impacts this bill will have will be positive, and most of the time probably not that impactful since developers have been building for attractive economically feasible projects for decades. This is a perfect bill for the new decade and the 21st century.</p>
<p>Jeany Rush Against themselves</p>	<p>TO: HOUSE TRANSPORTATION HOUSING & LOCAL GOVERNMENT, HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, SENATE LOCAL GOVERNMENT & HOUSING</p> <p>RE: HB24-1304 MINIMUM PARKING REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>FROM: JEANY RUSH, COLORADO SPRINGS CONSTITUENT 4-25-24</p> <p>VOTE: NO NO</p> <p>This bill simply put, reaches over governmental rights to our property rights on too many levels. It becomes anti-Free Republic agendas, and absolutely communist in its core.</p> <p>There is no need for states, to determine local real estate rule and more. You have once again overstepped your authority, and should not be submitting any of this</p>
<p>Derek Parks For themselves</p>	<p>Dear committee members,</p> <p>I am writing to advocate for the elimination of parking minimums statewide. The imposition of these requirements not only adds significant financial burdens but also contributes to urban sprawl, increases housing costs, and diminishes walkability.</p> <p>Firstly, let us consider the financial implications. It's estimated that each parking space costs approximately \$25,612 to construct. This cost is passed on to residents, driving up the overall cost of housing. By eliminating parking minimums, we can lower housing costs for renters and homeowners.</p> <p>Moreover, the presence of parking minimums exacerbates urban sprawl. When developers are required to provide a certain number of parking spaces per unit, it encourages the construction of larger, spread-out developments. This leads to increased dependence on</p>

	<p>cars, longer commute times, and a less connected community. By removing parking minimums, we can encourage more compact and sustainable development patterns, promoting walkability and reducing the need for excessive car usage.</p> <p>Numerous cities have already taken steps to eliminate parking minimums with positive outcomes. For instance, Minneapolis and St. Paul have seen rents stabilize mainly through using through one weird trick, removing parking minimums.</p> <p>In light of these benefits, I urge you eliminating these BIG GOVERNMENT requirements, we can foster more sustainable, vibrant, and affordable communities for all residents by giving FREEDOM to let the market place decide. If developers feel they need parking they can build it.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter.</p> <p>Sincerely, Derek Parks</p> <p>Sources:</p> <p>https://ehq-production-us-california.s3.us-west-1.amazonaws.com/542132a22d43b3af28d0f36c81982cbd05964375/original/1678210082/af836713c02c02aadc0366a98bdcd15e_Parking_Structure_Cost_Outlook_For_2022.pdf?X-Amz-Algorithm=AWS4-HMAC-SHA256&X-Amz-Credential=AKIA4KKNQAKICO37GBEP%2F20240425%2Fus-west-1%2Fs3%2Faws4_request&X-Amz-Date=20240425T150557Z&X-Amz-Expires=300&X-Amz-SignedHeaders=host&X-Amz-Signature=f6a3cb155d168b8fe75d8f0a1e9cc6abd65f3fba61732292750da7a7e4877f40</p> <p>https://brownpoliticalreview.org/2024/04/how-minneapolis-stabilized-rents/</p>
--	--

Andrew E. Hayes, P.E.
Director of Public Works

Scott Hobson
Land Use Administrator



211 East D Street
Pueblo, CO 81003

**Department of Public Works
Department of Planning and Community Development**

April 25, 2024

Senate Committee on Local Government & Housing
200 E. Colfax Avenue
Denver, CO 80203

Subj: City of Pueblo Opposition to HB24-1304 – Minimum Parking Requirements

Honorable Members of the Senate Committee on Local Government & Housing:

We are writing to express the strong opposition of the City of Pueblo to the proposed HB24-1304, which prohibits local governments from enacting and enforcing minimum parking requirements such requirements for residential and commercial properties. While the bill may aim to streamline development processes, its implications for local decision-making, public safety, and quality of life in our community are deeply concerning.

The essence of our opposition stems from the belief that this bill undermines the fundamental principles of local governance and community engagement. By relinquishing control over parking requirements to developers and presuming that they will prioritize the long-term well-being of the public, HB24-1304 effectively disenfranchises residents and diminishes their ability to influence decisions that directly impact their neighborhoods and daily lives.

One of the most pressing concerns is the potential for overcrowded streets resulting from unchecked development. Overcrowding poses significant challenges, particularly in terms of public transit access, emergency vehicle access, pedestrian safety, and overall quality of life. Pueblo, like many communities across the state, faces unique challenges regarding public transit infrastructure. As it stands, the state of public transit in Colorado, and specifically here in Pueblo, is far from adequate to support a significant reduction in reliance on personal vehicles.

It is worth noting that Colorado currently ranks 44th in the nation for state investment in local and regional transit. Rather than dismantling parking requirements, the state should prioritize efforts to enhance the safety, reliability, and accessibility of public transit options. By investing in robust public transit infrastructure, we can offer viable alternatives to private vehicle usage and alleviate the strain on our roadways.

In conclusion, HB24-1304 jeopardizes the autonomy of local governments, disregards the input of residents, and threatens public safety and quality of life in Pueblo. We urge the esteemed members of the Committee to carefully consider the implications of this bill and prioritize the preservation of local decision-making authority and the well-being of our communities.

Thank you for your attention to this critical matter. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you need any additional information. We can be reached by e-mail at ahayes@pueblo.us and shobson@pueblo.us or by phone at 719-553-2295.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Andrew Hayes", written over a white background.

Andrew E. Hayes, P.E.
Director of Public Works

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Scott Hobson", written over a white background.

Scott Hobson
Land Use Administrator



City of Golden

911 10TH ST. GOLDEN, CO 80401
TEL: 303-384-8000
FAX: 303-384-8001
WWW.CITYOFGOLDEN.NET

4/25/24

Don Cameron
Lisa Vitry
Legislative Subcommittee
City of Golden

RE: HB24-1304 Minimum Parking Requirements - Concerning parking requirements within metropolitan planning organizations.

Dear Honorable Senator,

The City Council of Golden is expressing its opposition to HB24-1304 Parking Minimums unless amended. We are part of the DRCOG MPO and would be covered by this bill. While Golden is adjacent to Denver Metro and part of the MPO, it faces unique geographical challenges more in line with a historic mining town than other suburban entities. Importantly we have already pushed the limits on parking minimums with a recent update to our zoning code. Specifically, for affordable units, we reduced the parking minimum to one parking spot per unit, instead of a more typical one parking spot per bed. We did this partly based on local data gathered which clearly showed, for AMI levels of 60% and lower, that our old rules were too restrictive, and parking is readily available. We believe there is data to support reduced minimums, but not elimination of minimums, for affordable housing on the low end. And we agree with CML that our state, including the MPOs, do not have adequate regional or even local transit to address housing with income levels up to 100% or even more of AMI.

While we could easily just defend our position based on our desire for “local control” of zoning and land use, we want to reiterate that historical parking minimums could well be wrong in their use and application, and they do impact land and development costs, which impact affordable housing. However, eliminating minimums all together is the wrong answer. This “one size fits all” approach and potential loss of grant funding as indicated in the bill will crush our ability to attract affordable housing development with our severe geographical constraints. Even a well-meaning developer who is not constrained but chooses to build a reasonable number of parking spaces will not find opportunities in Golden. And, more importantly, the separation of apartment rents from vehicle parking rent will very clearly push people to park on our limited access public streets. Golden already has a complex residential parking system to deal with historical properties with no offstreet parking. This proposal will simply increase the areas in the city that are over-subscribed for parking and thereby affect safety.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Respectfully,

Don Cameron
Ward 3 Councilor

Lisa Vitry
District 1 Councilor

Market-Driven Parking Supply Can Help Colorado Families

EMILY HAMILTON

Senior Research Fellow, Urbanity Project, Mercatus Center at George Mason University

Colorado Senate, Local Government and Housing Committee
HB24-1304 Minimum Parking Requirements

April 25, 2024

Thank you Chair Exum, Vice Chair Gonzales, and members of the committee. I am Emily Hamilton, a senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University, where I am codirector of the Urbanity Project. I am also a Colorado native, born and raised in Grand Junction.

When parking mandates require developers to dedicate more real estate to parking than they otherwise would, housing costs go up and our cities become increasingly spread out. These parking rules also impede transportation, making it more difficult for people to get around on foot, bicycle, or public transit. Allowing developers to decide how much parking to build based on market demand would encourage more types of new construction, including both more housing in existing walkable neighborhoods and more walkable greenfield development. The text of House Bill 24-1304 ably summarizes research on the consequences of parking requirements for housing affordability, transportation choices, and environmental impacts.

We have seen that where local policymakers have eliminated parking mandates, real estate developers have still provided needed off-street parking, because most Americans drive and are willing to pay for convenient car storage. However, some subsets of the population have different transportation preferences and patterns. Local parking mandates homogenize development, preventing the market from serving people with a wide range of needs and tastes for housing and transportation. Three types of Coloradans would benefit from opportunities to live in places with less parking:

1. Single parents
2. People who prefer walkability to driveability
3. Children and adults who cannot drive

1. Benefits to Single Parents

Across Colorado and the United States as a whole, parking mandates for multifamily housing generally vary depending on the number of bedrooms per unit. For example, in Grand Junction, a one-bedroom

For more information or to meet with the scholar, contact
Mercatus Outreach, 703-993-4930, mercatusoutreach@mercatus.gmu.edu
Mercatus Center at George Mason University, 3434 Washington Blvd., 4th Floor, Arlington, Virginia 22201

The ideas presented in this document do not represent official positions of the Mercatus Center or George Mason University.

apartment must have one off-street parking spot, a two-bedroom apartment must have one and a half, and an apartment with three or more bedrooms must have two.

In cases where couples or roommates live in an apartment with more than one bedroom, higher parking mandates may reflect higher car ownership and car storage that renters value. However, when one or more of the bedrooms is for children, who do not have cars, these higher parking mandates burden renters and force them to pay higher housing costs that include the cost of unused parking spots. In Denver, where one-quarter of single-parent households live in multifamily housing and have either one car or no car,¹ parking mandates often take away a household's option to only pay for the parking they use.

2. Parking and Walkability

People have a wide range of neighborhood preferences—some residents prioritize space and quiet while others prioritize proximity and convenience. Land use regulations like parking requirements prevent the market from serving these diverse preferences. A recent Pew survey found most adults in the US prefer to live in a large house, with schools, stores, and restaurants driving distance away. However, 42 percent of respondents said they would prefer to live in a neighborhood with smaller houses spaced closer together, with schools, stores, and restaurants within walking distance.²

While walkability may be the preference of a minority of adults, these people are highly underserved in Colorado today. We can see this in Fort Collins where, if we apply the national walkability preference of 42 percent, we would expect about 60,000 residents to prefer walkability to more space. However, only about 6,000 Fort Collins residents live in walkable neighborhoods,³ in part because parking requirements and other land use regulations prevent the market from delivering walkable options. Allowing the market to provide more types of development, including more variation in the quantity of parking paired with new commercial developments and new housing, would put Colorado on a path toward more people living in places that reflect their preferences.

3. Parking Mandates Harm People Who Can Not Drive

One subset of people likely to have a higher preference for walkability includes people who cannot drive due to their age or disability. More than one million Coloradans—nearly one-fifth of the state's population—are under the age of 16.⁴ As land use regulations and economic trends have led to more families living in less walkable places, children have become increasingly reliant on their parents to drive them where they need and want to go. While nearly half of kids walked or biked to school in 1969, only one-tenth do today.⁵

¹ US Census Bureau, American Community Survey 2022, via Steven Ruggles, Sarah Flood, Matthew Sobek, Daniel Backman, Annie Chen, Grace Cooper, Stephanie Richards, Renae Rogers, and Megan Schouweiler, IPUMS USA: Version 14.0 (dataset), Minneapolis, MN, 2023, <https://doi.org/10.18128/D010.V14.0>.

² Ted Van Green, "Majority of Americans Prefer a Community with Big Houses, Even If Local Amenities Are Farther Away," Pew Research Center, August 2, 2023.

³ Walk Score, "Living in Fort Collins," accessed April 22, 2024, https://www.walkscore.com/CO/Fort_Collins.

⁴ American Community Survey 2022, IPUMS US, 2023.

⁵ Federal Highway Administration, "National Household Travel Survey," 2022, last modified December 22, 2023, <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policyinformation/nhts.cfm>.

Critics of this trend point out that children’s increased dependence on their parents to move around their environment may have negative consequences for their physical and mental health.⁶ A growing share of parents is seeking to raise their kids in an environment where the kids have the freedom to move throughout their neighborhoods and cities more independently, similar to the children of the Baby Boomer or Gen X generations. However, raising “free range” children requires families to live where children have access to destinations without driving. Many families struggle to find housing in walkable, bikeable neighborhoods in their cities at prices they can afford.

At the other end of the age spectrum, a growing number of elderly Americans can no longer drive or have chosen to stop driving. Due to the mobility needs of this population, the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) is an important advocate for places that are safe and pleasant for people who get around on foot. Parking requirements stand in the way of this objective when they lead to long and unpleasant walks between destinations.

Conclusion

It is well documented that parking mandates increase housing costs and lead people to drive more and use other forms of transportation less. In particular, rules that prevent developers from providing housing and neighborhoods with little parking have particularly burdensome consequences for people who have few cars or do not drive at all. Some of these residents include single parents, people who have a strong preference for living in a walkable environment, and people who cannot drive because of their age or disability. Allowing the market to serve these groups would allow them to economize on parking and live in places that better meet their needs.

⁶ Jonathan Haidt, *The Anxious Generation: How the Great Rewiring of Childhood Is Causing an Epidemic of Mental Illness* (New York: Penguin Press, 2024); Timothy P. Carney, *Family Unfriendly: How Our Culture Made Raising Kids Much Harder Than It Needs to Be* (New York: Harper Collins, 2024); Lenore Skenazy, *Free-Range Kids: How Parents and Teachers Can Let Go and Let Grow* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2021).