CONVENTIONAL PARKING STANDARDS

Various professional organizations, such as the Institute of Transportation Engineers and the American Planning Association, publish recommended minimum parking standards such as those shown in Table 2-1. This provides an index or parking ratio value (a reference value used to calculate the number of parking spaces required at a particular location) based on some reference unit, such as dwelling units, employees, or building floor area.

These values are unconstrained (they assume that parking is cheap to supply) and unadjusted (they are not adjusted to reflect specific conditions), and so generally reflect the highest level of parking supply that may be required. In most situations, these standards are excessive and can be adjusted down-

Table 2-1
Typical Minimum Parking Standards

Land-Use Category	Unit	Index (85th Percentile)	Peak Parking Period
Single-family housing	Dwelling unit	2.0	Evening
Multifamily housing	Dwelling unit	1.5	Evening
Elderly housing	Dwelling unit	0.5	Weekday
Hotel	Guest room	1.0	Weekday-evening
Hospital	100 square meters per bed	5/2.6	Weekday-day
Health spa	100 square meters GLA	6.8	Weekday
Retail/shopping center	100 square meters GLA	5.0	Saturday-day
Office building	100 square meters GFA per employee	3.3/0.9	Weekday-day
Light industry	100 square meters GFA per employee	2.2/1.0	Weekday-day
Heavy industry	100 square meters GFA per employee	1.7/0.6	Weekday-day
Fast food restaurant	Seat	0.85	Weekday
Church/synagogue/mosque	Seat	0.2	Sunday/Saturday/Friday
Movie theater	Seat	0.25	Saturday-evening

GLA = gross leasable area; GFA = gross floor area.

Illustration of typical minimal parking standards developed by planning organizations. The index is used to calculate the number of parking spaces that should be supplied at a particular location. These "unadjusted" values reflect the maximum amount of parking that is usually required and can often be reduced based on various factors and management strategies described in this book.

Sources: Davidson and Dolnick, 2002; Stover and Koepke, 2002.