

## 4.4 Parking and Transportation

This section considers the impacts of the proposed Land Use Code changes on parking and transportation. We evaluated the potential parking impacts associated with the proposed Land Use Code changes by considering the existing availability of on-street parking relative to the expected increase in demand for on-street parking under each alternative.

The analysis of the potential impacts to transportation in the EIS for the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan (City of Seattle 2015 and Seattle 2016) is incorporated by reference into this EIS. Section 3.7 of the Comprehensive Plan EIS thoroughly analyzed the potential impacts to transportation, including circulation and transit, from a projected growth of 70,000 households in the city through 2035, including approximately 8,400 households in areas outside of designated urban villages. Since the study area, potentially affected resources, and timeframe for this EIS all fall within what was considered in the Comprehensive Plan EIS, we considered the potential impacts to the transportation network in the context of the changes analyzed in the Comprehensive Plan EIS.

### 4.4.1 Affected Environment

The following sections describe the existing transportation network and parking conditions in the study area.

#### **PARKING**

The City regulates both on-street and off-street parking. We regulate off-street parking by setting parking minimums and parking maximums in the Land Use Code that vary by land use and geography. We regulate on-street parking within the right-of-way by issuing on-street permits, charging by the hour, setting time


limits, and defining load zones. Seattle's target for on-street parking occupancy is 70-85 percent utilization. The primary way we manage parking in single-family zones is to designate Restricted Parking Zones (RPZ).

RPZs have time-limited parking available to the public. Residents with eligible addresses can apply for a permit to use the curb parking in their neighborhood without time limits. The RPZ program was created to help ease parking congestion in residential neighborhoods around significant demand generators, while balancing the needs of all people to be able to use the public streets. Exhibit 4.4-1 identifies RPZs in the study area. A new RPZ may be considered if an area meets the following criteria:

- There must be a significant degree of parking by non-residents:
  - » 75 percent of parking spaces must be occupied
  - » at least 35 percent of the occupied spaces must be occupied by vehicles not belonging to residents
- A "traffic generator" needs to be identified. This means a large institution (such as a hospital or university), a business district, or high capacity transit stop that creates significant demand for long-term parking which spills onto nearby residential streets.
- At least 10 contiguous blocks (or 20 blockfaces) must be affected by the traffic generator

SDOT also considers other strategies, such as adding parking on both sides of a street where possible, or utilizing transportation demand management programs to manage parking.

Exhibit 4.4-1 Restricted Parking Zones in the Study Area



### On-Street Parking Types

---

Blocks with restricted parking impose limits on the amount of time that a vehicle can be parked in a space. Blocks with unrestricted parking do not have any imposed time limits. Blocks with no parking allowed do not allow parking for any vehicles.

## Parking Analysis Area

To understand the affected environment related to parking, and to inform the analysis of potential impacts from the proposed changes to the Land Use Code, we selected four study locations that provide a representative sample of neighborhoods where ADUs could be constructed. (See Appendix B for more details on the study locations.) We identified these four study locations by their general geographic location in the city: northeast, northwest, southeast, and southwest. The study locations represent a range of conditions found in single-family zones and include areas that vary by lot size; the presence of alleys, driveways, and sidewalks; and proximity to transit. We identified blocks with unrestricted parking, restricted parking, and no parking allowed. Since these areas represent a range of conditions and geography within Seattle, they provide a representative sample for the overall parking conditions throughout the study area. Our analysis focused on unrestricted parking spaces and their utilization. In residential areas, peak parking demand usually occurs overnight on a weeknight. As a result, we used weeknight overnight parking data to estimate parking utilization. For residential areas near neighborhood retail centers, peak on-street parking demand usually occurs on weekend afternoons.

This analysis relies on parking data previously collected by the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) and data collected specifically for this project. For the northeast and northwest study locations, we collected data on parking supply and utilization for each block face generally using the methodology for data collection described in [Tip 117 \(SDOT SDCI 2011\)](#). SDOT collected parking supply and utilization data for the southeast and southwest study locations. While the study locations are not near large retail areas, we measured parking utilization on Saturdays to confirm that weekday overnight parking demand was the peak. The data we used for each of these geographic study locations included the following:

- **Northeast and Northwest.** We collected weekend overnight parking data on a Friday and a Saturday.
- **Southeast.** We used parking data collected for a 2016 SDOT parking analysis that did not include weekend parking data (SDOT 2016).
- **Southwest.** We used SDOT data collected in September 2017 on a Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday (SDOT 2017b).

## Parking Supply

Parking supply is defined as the number of unrestricted on-street parking spaces. Exhibit 4.4-2 shows the number of blocks in each study location, the total supply of unrestricted on-street parking in the study location, and the average number of on-street parking spaces per block. Block length, driveways per block, and parking restrictions vary throughout the city. The average number of on-street parking spaces per block across all study locations is 22, ranging from 18 in the northwest study location to 27 in the southwest study location.

**Exhibit 4.4-2** Parking Supply in Each Study Location

Study location	Blocks	Total on-street parking spaces	Average number of on-street parking spaces per block
Northeast	108	2,403	22
Northwest	118	2,115	18
Southeast	14	327	23
Southwest	99	2,682	27
<b>Total</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>7,527</b>	<b>22</b>

## Parking Utilization

Parking utilization is defined as the number of parked vehicles, divided by the number of unrestricted on-street parking spaces. We calculated parking utilization per block by dividing the number of parked vehicles observed per block by the total number of spaces per block. We assumed that existing and future ADU residents park on street, and that there is some amount of parking utilized by visitors to the area. Exhibit 4.4-3 shows parking utilization rates in each study location for weekday and weekend observations. Weekend parking utilization data was not available for the southeast location. Where both datasets were available, weekday and weekend utilization rates in each study location were similar and varied by three to seven percentage points. Weekday utilization rates were higher in the northeast, northwest, and southeast study locations and lower in the southwest study location.

## Parking Terminology

**Parking supply** is the number of unrestricted on-street parking spaces.

**Parking utilization** is the number of parked vehicles observed, divided by the number of unrestricted on-street parking spaces.

**Parking availability** is the total number of parking spaces available per block.

**Exhibit 4.4-3** Existing Parking Utilization

Study location	Weekday utilization	Weekend utilization
<b>Northeast</b>	53%	46%
<b>Northwest</b>	63%	57%
<b>Southeast</b>	78%	n/a <sup>1</sup>
<b>Southwest</b>	51%	54%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>52%<sup>2</sup></b>

- 1 Weekend parking data was not collected.  
2 Total excludes southeast study location.

Exhibit 4.4-4 shows weekday parking utilization rates per block for each study location. Overall, 57 percent of blocks across the study locations had utilization rates above 50 percent. Compared to others, the southeast study location had a higher share of blocks with utilization rates of at least 75 percent.

**Exhibit 4.4-4** Distribution of Parking Utilization Rates by Block during the Weekday

Study location	Utilization			
	Less than 50%	50-75%	75-90%	More than 90%
<b>Northeast</b>	53%	37%	7%	3%
<b>Northwest</b>	31%	44%	17%	8%
<b>Southeast</b>	14%	36%	21%	29%
<b>Southwest</b>	49%	28%	13%	10%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>8%</b>

### Parking Availability

Parking availability is defined as the total number of parking spaces available per block. We calculated parking availability by subtracting the estimated future parking demand from total on-street parking supply. The result represented the existing capacity for additional on-street parking per block. While parking utilization rates generally suggest the number of

parking spaces available, calculating parking availability is necessary to determine the potential impact of additional on-street parking demand. Exhibit 4.4-5 shows the percentage share of blocks in each study location by the number of available on-street parking spaces. Twenty-one percent of blocks in the southeast study location showed over capacity in our analysis, meaning that existing parking demand exceeds supply, the most of any study location. Across all study locations, 9.8 percent of parking spaces are available per block on average (including blocks at or over capacity).

**Exhibit 4.4-5** Percentage Share of Blocks by Number of Available Parking Spaces and Study Location

Study location	Average parking availability per block	Parking spaces available by block						
		Fewer than zero <sup>1</sup>	0	1-5	6-10	11-15	15-25	> 25
<b>Northeast</b>	10.6%	0%	2%	20%	30%	27%	20%	1%
<b>Northwest</b>	6.7%	1%	4%	46%	24%	20%	4%	1%
<b>Southeast</b>	5.1%	21%	7%	36%	21%	0%	7%	7%
<b>Southwest</b>	13.2%	4%	4%	25%	16%	10%	24%	16%
<b>Overall</b>	9.8%	2%	4%	31%	23%	18%	15%	6%

<sup>1</sup> Parking capacity on a block is estimated based on an assumed vehicle length and assumed buffers around fire hydrants, driveways, and at intersections. Occasionally, vehicle owners are able to fit more vehicles into a block than the estimated capacity, either legally or illegally. This demonstrates strong demand for parking on that block.

## TRANSPORTATION

The Transportation Element of the City’s Comprehensive Plan guides transportation investments to equitably serve the City. The Comprehensive Plan EIS describes existing transportation systems for automobiles, transit, bicycles and pedestrians in Seattle. Because the proposed Land Use Code changes evaluated in this EIS would affect an area included in the study area for the Comprehensive Plan EIS, we incorporate that information by reference in this EIS and summarize the pertinent details below. See Section 3.7 — Transportation, of the Comprehensive Plan EIS for details.

The City has also adopted plans for individual travel modes that include strategies and identify projects to improve transportation choices in the city. These include the Pedestrian Master Plan, the Bicycle Master Plan, and the Transit Master Plan. This section describes the existing transportation bicycle, transit, and vehicle network and describes transit services in Seattle.

## Pedestrian Network

The City's pedestrian network is composed of sidewalks, crosswalks, staircases, pedestrian bridges, curb ramps and trails. The 2017 Pedestrian Master Plan (PMP) is a 20-year blueprint to achieve the City's vision of Seattle as the most walkable and accessible city in the nation. The PMP states that Seattle has approximately 5,500 marked crosswalks, 33,600 blockfaces of sidewalks, and 27,300 curb ramps (SDOT 2014). The study area contains approximately 1,000 marked crosswalks, 9,700 blockfaces of sidewalks, and 10,000 curb ramps.

Across the study area, about 30 percent of blockfaces have unimproved sidewalks. These locations tend to be in northwest and northeast Seattle north of NE 85th Street, near the southwest city boundaries in the West Seattle Sector, in sections of the Duwamish Sector and the edges of the Southeast Seattle Sector. Exhibit 4.4-6 identifies blockfaces within the study area that have unimproved sidewalks and highlights those areas that are included in the Priority Investment Network described below.

The PMP designates a Priority Investment Network to prioritize the City's pedestrian improvement investments, with a focus on connections to schools and frequent transit stops. The prioritization identifies areas most in need based on areas with high potential pedestrian demand, equity, and corridor function. Exhibit 4.4-7 shows the Priority Investment Network throughout the study area. The portions of the Priority Investment Network located outside the study area also benefit people walking to and from areas in single-family zones (the study area) by connecting those neighborhoods to local business districts, schools, transit stops, and bicycle facilities.

Exhibit 4.4-6 Unimproved Sidewalks in the Study Area





Exhibit 4.4-7 PMP Priority Investment Areas in the Study Area



## Bicycle Network

The City has more than 300 miles of bicycle facilities, including off-street facilities, protected bike lanes, neighborhood greenways, and shared street bicycle facilities ("sharrows"), and signed routes. Bicycle facilities exist throughout the city, of which approximately 100 miles are located within the study area (see Exhibit 4.4-8). The Seattle Bicycle Master Plan (BMP) identifies projects and programs to be implemented from 2014 to 2033 to achieve the vision that riding is a bicycle a comfortable and integral part of daily life in Seattle for people of all ages and abilities (SDOT 2017b). Exhibit 4.4-9 identifies planned bicycle facilities, with approximately 100 miles of protected bicycle lanes and nearly 250 miles of neighborhood greenways planned for throughout the city.

Exhibit 4.4-8 Existing Bicycle Network





Exhibit 4.4-9 Planned Bicycle Network



## Transit Services

Seattle receives public transit services from King County Metro, Sound Transit, Community Transit, and the City of Seattle. Exhibit 4.4-10 shows the existing transit network. The Transit Master Plan (TMP) is a 20-year plan that outlines the investments needed to meet Seattle's transit demand through 2030 (SDOT 2016a). The City has designated 10 High Capacity Transit (HCT) Corridors and eight Priority Bus Corridors, along with Link light rail and the streetcar system. These corridors are prioritized for capital investments to ensure mobility within Seattle, one of the objectives outlined in the TMP.

SDOT identifies transit service that meets certain levels of frequency:

- 10-minute or "very frequent" service: at least one route serves this stop with an average of six trips per hour in each direction between 6:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. and no individual hour with fewer than four trips
- 15-minute or "frequent" service: at least one route serves this stop with an average of four trips per hour in each direction between 6:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. and no individual hour with fewer than three trips<sup>1</sup>
- Other stops throughout the city provide some level of transit service, ranging from frequency slightly less than described above to only a few trips per day

SDOT considers light rail stations to provide 10-minute service and streetcar stations to provide 15-minute service.

---

<sup>1</sup> If a stop meets the 10-minute definition, it also meets the 15-minute definition.

Exhibit 4.4-10 Existing Transit Network





Exhibit 4.4-11 lists the percentage of study area parcels in single-family residential use within quarter- and half-mile walking distances of transit stops according to their frequency. Almost half of the households in the study area are within a half-mile walk of very frequent service, where transit comes on average every 10 minutes throughout the day. Likewise, almost half of households are even closer (within a quarter-mile walk) of transit service with 15-minute frequency. Overall, nearly the entire study area is within a short walk of a bus stop, though frequency at some stops could range from a few buses an hour to a just a few buses total in a day. Exhibit 4.4-12 shows areas within quarter- and half-mile walking distances of transit according to frequency.

**Exhibit 4.4-11** Study Area Parcels by Proximity to Transit

	Number of parcels	% of study area parcels
<b>In study area and in single-family residential use</b>	138,531	100%
<b>Very frequent transit service</b>		
Within a quarter-mile walk of transit with 10-minute service	30,496	22%
Within a half-mile walk of transit with 10-minute service	68,608	50%
<b>Frequent transit service</b>		
Within a quarter-mile walk of transit with 15-minute service	65,947	48%
Within a half-mile walk of transit with 15-minute service	100,880	73%
<b>Any transit service</b>		
Within a quarter-mile walk of any transit stop	116,126	84%
Within a half-mile walk of any transit stop	135,949	98%

Exhibit 4.4-12 Walking Distance to Transit



## Roadway Network

Seattle has about 1,540 lane-miles of arterial streets, 2,410 lane-miles of non-arterial streets, 122 bridges, and 1,070 signalized intersections. Much of Seattle's transportation network is constrained by the waterways in and around the city. The Ship Canal divides north Seattle from the rest of the city and has only six crossing points: the Ballard Bridge, the Fremont Bridge, State Route (SR) 99, Interstate 5 (I-5), the University Bridge, and the Montlake Bridge. Likewise, West Seattle is separated by the Duwamish Waterway and accessible via the West Seattle Bridge, Spokane Street Bridge, the 1st Ave S Bridge, and the South Park Bridge.

I-5 runs north-south throughout the city, serving both local and regional travelers. SR 99 also runs north-south through the city and tends to serve more locally focused trips. To the east, there are two bridges across Lake Washington: SR 520 and Interstate 90 (I-90). Other key state routes within the city include SR 522 connecting to the northeast and SR 509 connecting south to Sea-Tac Airport. City arterials generally follow a grid pattern. The City has designated a major truck street network throughout Seattle that carries a substantial amount of freight traffic. The state routes, interstates, and major arterials linking freight destinations are part of this network.

## 4.4.2 Impacts

### Parking Analysis Methodology

We evaluated the potential parking impacts associated with the proposed Land Use Code changes by comparing the existing availability of on-street parking with the expected increase in demand for on-street parking under each alternative. To evaluate the change in demand, we first estimated the vehicle ownership rates for residents in ADUs. Next, we used the results of the housing analysis in Section 4.1, Housing and Socioeconomics, to determine the expected number of new ADUs in the study locations. We then applied the vehicle ownership rates, assumed each vehicle would park on the street, and evaluated the resulting change in parking availability. Our analysis focused on the expected outcomes in each study location and then evaluated the results in the context of the entire EIS study area.

## Vehicle Ownership for ADU Residents

Data about the demographics and travel characteristics for current ADU residents in Seattle was not available; therefore, to estimate the characteristics of Seattle's ADU residents, we reviewed:

- A 2013 survey that Portland State University (PSU) conducted of ADU owners in three Oregon communities (Portland, Eugene, and Ashland) that provided details about the characteristics of their ADU residents (Horn et al 2013). For this analysis, we utilized only the results from Portland, because Portland's land use and transportation characteristics resemble Seattle's more closely than those of Eugene or Ashland.<sup>2</sup>
- The 2012-2016 American Community Survey (ACS) for Portland and Seattle.

These reports provided details about vehicle ownership levels and household characteristics. The complete methodology for estimating vehicle ownership levels for ADU residents is outlined in detail in Appendix B. Based on this analysis, we determined that each additional ADU would generate between 1.0 and 1.3 additional vehicles using on-street parking under all alternatives. For purposes of analysis, we assumed that all ADU residents would park on the street even though Alternatives 1 and 3 would require off-street parking for new ADUs.

## Number of Anticipated ADUs in the Study Locations

Based on the parcel typology described in Section 4.1, Housing and Socioeconomics, we classified parcels in each study location according to their ADU eligibility status. This classification reflects Land Use Code regulations for development in single-family zones, requirements for vehicle access, and lot size and configuration. We considered any parcel of type A, B, C, or D to be "eligible" to have an ADU and any parcel of type Z to be "ineligible." To estimate parking demand for each alternative, we drew on the 2018-2027 ADU production estimates generated using the pro forma analysis and behavioral models described in Appendix A. Those estimates indicated that between ~~1.5~~ 1.63 and ~~3.0~~ 4.64 percent of parcels in each study location could have an ADU, depending on the characteristics of each parcel type. In our parking analysis, we applied

---

<sup>2</sup> [A more recent survey of ADU owners and residents in Portland, Oregon, confirms that an assumption that ADU residents generally own one vehicle is reasonable. When ADU residents who are renters were asked about vehicle ownership, 70 percent of respondents \(100 of 142\) had one vehicle, while the remaining 30 percent were split evenly between no vehicle ownership and ownership of two or more vehicles \(Gebhardt 2018\).](#)

the higher end of ~~this the~~ range of ADU production rates (~~3.0 percent~~) for all eligible parcels. Because several development standards would vary across alternatives, including the number of ADUs allowed on a lot, we made the following assumptions about the number of lots that would have ADUs under each alternative:

- **Alternative 1 (No Action):** 3 percent of eligible parcels would have 1 ADU.
- **Alternative 2:** ~~3.5~~ 5 percent of eligible parcels would have 2 ADUs.
- **Alternative 3:** ~~1.5~~ 2 percent of all eligible parcels would develop 1 ADU and ~~1.5~~ 2 percent would develop 2 ADUs.
- **Preferred Alternative:** 5 percent of eligible parcels would have 2 ADUs.

These rates let us estimate how many new ADUs would be created in our study locations under each alternative. Exhibit 4.4-13 shows the estimated number of parcels in each study location eligible for an ADU based on the parcel typology. The northeast study location would have the most eligible parcels (1,141) and the southeast study location the fewest (127). Exhibit 4.4-13 also shows the number of ADUs anticipated under each alternative.

**Exhibit 4.4-13** ADU-Eligible Parcels in Each Study Location

Study location	Number of ADU-eligible parcels	Anticipated number of ADUs produced			
		Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
Northeast	1,141	34	<del>68</del> 114	<del>51</del> 69	<u>114</u>
Northwest	952	29	<del>58</del> 96	<del>42</del> 57	<u>96</u>
Southeast	127	4	<del>8</del> 12	<del>6</del> 9	<u>12</u>
Southwest	787	24	<del>48</del> 78	<del>36</del> 48	<u>78</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,007</b>	<b>91</b>	<b><del>182</del> 300</b>	<b><del>135</del> 183</b>	<b><u>300</u></b>

## Parking Analysis Results

We calculated the expected change in parking availability in each study location using the number of ADUs anticipated under each alternative and the anticipated rate of vehicle ownership per ADU. We then compared this increase in parking availability to the existing parking supply in each study location, as shown in Exhibit 4.4-14.

**Exhibit 4.4-14** Results by Study Location

	ADUs produced	Vehicles added	Existing conditions		After ADU production	
			Spaces available	Parking utilization	Spaces available	Parking utilization
<b>Northeast Study Location</b>						
<b>Alternative 1</b>	34	39	1,140	53%	1,101	53%
<b>Alternative 2</b>	<del>68</del> <u>114</u>	<del>78</del> <u>131</u>	1,140	53%	<del>1,062</del> <u>1,009</u>	<del>56%</del> <u>58%</u>
<b>Alternative 3</b>	<del>51</del> <u>69</u>	<del>59</del> <u>79</u>	1,140	53%	1,081	<del>55%</del> <u>56%</u>
<b>Preferred Alternative</b>	<u>114</u>	<u>131</u>	<u>1,140</u>	<u>53%</u>	<u>1,009</u>	<u>58%</u>
<b>Northwest Study Location</b>						
<b>Alternative 1</b>	29	35	793	63%	758	64%
<b>Alternative 2</b>	<del>58</del> <u>96</u>	<del>70</del> <u>116</u>	793	63%	<del>723</del> <u>677</u>	<del>66%</del> <u>68%</u>
<b>Alternative 3</b>	<del>42</del> <u>57</u>	<del>51</del> <u>69</u>	793	63%	<del>742</del> <u>724</u>	<del>65%</del> <u>66%</u>
<b>Preferred Alternative</b>	<u>96</u>	<u>116</u>	<u>793</u>	<u>63%</u>	<u>677</u>	<u>68%</u>
<b>Southeast Study Location</b>						
<b>Alternative 1</b>	4	5	72	78%	67	80%
<b>Alternative 2</b>	<del>8</del> <u>12</u>	<del>10</del> <u>15</u>	72	78%	<del>62</del> <u>57</u>	<del>81%</del> <u>83%</u>
<b>Alternative 3</b>	<del>6</del> <u>9</u>	<del>8</del> <u>12</u>	72	78%	<del>64</del> <u>60</u>	<del>80%</del> <u>82%</u>
<b>Preferred Alternative</b>	<u>12</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>78%</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>83%</u>
<b>Southwest Study Location</b>						
<b>Alternative 1</b>	24	24	1,311	51%	1,287	52%
<b>Alternative 2</b>	<del>48</del> <u>78</u>	<del>49</del> <u>80</u>	1,311	51%	<del>1,262</del> <u>1,231</u>	<del>53%</del> <u>54%</u>
<b>Alternative 3</b>	<del>36</del> <u>48</u>	<del>37</del> <u>49</u>	1,311	51%	<del>1,274</del> <u>1,262</u>	<del>52%</del> <u>53%</u>
<b>Preferred Alternative</b>	<u>78</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>1,311</u>	<u>51%</u>	<u>1,231</u>	<u>54%</u>

## Transportation Analysis Methodology

Our methodology for evaluating potential impacts to transportation considered how overall population changes anticipated under each alternative would affect the service levels of the existing transportation networks. Generally, we anticipate an impact if a transportation network would not be able to accommodate an increase in demand or if development were to displace established transportation routes. We determined impacts by comparing expected population changes and impacts relative to those considered in the Comprehensive Plan EIS. The Comprehensive Plan EIS thoroughly analyzed the potential impacts to the road, bicycle, pedestrian, and transit networks from a projected growth of 70,000 households in the city through 2035, including approximately 8,400 households in areas outside designated urban villages. Any population change associated with ADU production under all three alternatives in this EIS would fall within the growth considered in the Comprehensive Plan EIS. In other words, the proposed Land Use Code changes are not anticipated to induce new growth in the city, but rather increased ADU production would help meet existing and future demand for housing. The proposed Land Use Code changes would not result in development outside single-family zones; therefore, no displacement of established transportation routes would occur, and we do not discuss it further in this analysis.

## Impacts of Alternative 1 (No Action)

### Parking

Assuming three percent of eligible parcels would have one ADU constructed under Alternative 1 (No Action), 91 ADUs would be created and 104 new vehicles added across all four study locations. In the southeast study location, we estimated that four new ADUs would generate five new vehicles that would occupy six percent of the available parking spaces. This would reduce the parking supply from 72 to 67 available spaces. Due to their size, we expect the northeast, northwest, and southwest study locations to have more total parcels with ADUs, but new vehicles from ADU residents would occupy a smaller percentage of available parking spaces than in the southeast study location (four percent for the northeast and northwest locations; two percent for the southwest). Under Alternative 1 (No Action), increased parking demand resulting from ADU production in the four study locations would not exceed or approach existing on-street parking availability.

For purposes of analysis, we assumed that on-street parking utilization would not become an issue until parking utilization exceeded 85 percent. None of the four study locations would exceed the 85-percent threshold under Alternative 1 (No Action). As described above, the four study locations provide a representative sample with which to compare the potential impacts to the larger study area for this EIS. Since none of the study locations exceed the 85 percent threshold, we conclude that ADU production would not have an adverse impact on the availability of on-street parking throughout the study area.

Although none of the four study locations exceed the 85 percent threshold, there are likely some specific blocks within the study area where on-street parking utilization currently exceeds parking supply and would be more sensitive to changes in local population. The degree of the deficiency and impacts experienced in any given neighborhood depends on many factors including the choices an individual makes about parking on- or off- the street when there are existing off-street parking spaces provided (i.e., in a driveway or a garage that are required or provided by choice). The city will continue to respond to changes to parking supply in specific areas that currently have or are projected to have high parking utilization.

## Transportation

As described previously, the study area, potentially affected resources, and timeframe for this EIS all fall within what was considered in the Comprehensive Plan EIS. Therefore, the impacts to the transportation system would not differ from those described in the Comprehensive Plan EIS, which found that there would not be significant impacts to the transportation network. Further, the City has identified plans to improve the transit, pedestrian, and bicycle network through its Move Seattle, Pedestrian Master Plan, Bicycle Master Plan, Transit Master Plan, and other planning efforts. These plans are being implemented and are expected to continue to be implemented under all alternatives.

## Impacts of Alternative 2

### Parking

In Alternative 2, we assumed that ~~three~~ five percent of eligible parcels would have two ADUs, yielding ~~182~~ 300 ADUs and ~~207~~ 342 new vehicles across all study locations. Like Alternative 1 (No Action), we estimate that the share of available parking used to satisfy the increase in parking

demand that new ADU residents would generate would be highest in the southeast study location (44 21 percent). The overall utilization of available parking spaces under Alternative 2 would range from ~~four six~~ to 44 21 percent across all four study locations. Under Alternative 2, increased parking demand resulting from ADU production in the four study locations would not exceed existing on-street parking availability.

For purposes of analysis, we assumed that on-street parking utilization would not become an issue until parking utilization exceeded 85 percent. None of the four study locations would exceed the 85-percent threshold under Alternative 2. As described above, the four study locations provide a representative sample with which to compare the potential impacts to the larger study area for this EIS. Since none of the study locations exceeds the 85 percent threshold, we conclude that ADU production would not have an adverse impact on the availability of on-street parking throughout the study area.

Although none of the four study locations exceed the 85 percent threshold, there are likely some specific blocks within the study area where on-street parking utilization currently exceeds parking supply and would be more sensitive to changes in local population. The degree of the deficiency and impacts experienced in any given neighborhood depends on many factors including the choices an individual makes about parking on or off the street when there are existing off-street parking spaces provided (i.e., in a driveway or a garage that are required or provided by choice). The City will continue to respond to changes to parking supply in specific areas that currently have or are projected to have high parking utilization.

## **Transportation**

As described previously, the study area, potentially affected resources, and timeframe for this EIS all fall within what was considered in the Comprehensive Plan EIS. Therefore, the impacts to the transportation system would not differ from those described in the Comprehensive Plan EIS, which found that there would not be significant impacts to the transportation network. Further, the City has identified plans to improve the transit, pedestrian, and bicycle network through its Move Seattle, Pedestrian Master Plan, Bicycle Master Plan, Transit Master Plan, and other planning efforts. These plans are being implemented and are expected to continue to be implemented under all alternatives.

## Impacts of Alternative 3

### Parking

In Alternative 3, we assumed that ~~1.5~~ two percent of eligible parcels would have at least one ADU and ~~1.5~~ two percent of eligible parcels would develop two ADUs. This would yield a total of ~~135~~ 183 ADUs and ~~155~~ 209 new vehicles across all study locations. The results under Alternative 3 were ~~nearly identical~~ similar to Alternative 1 (No Action). The share of available parking spaces used to satisfy new parking demand from ADU residents would range from ~~three~~ four percent in the southwest study location to ~~11~~ 17 percent in the southeast study location. Under Alternative 3, the increased parking demand resulting from ADU production in the four study locations would not exceed the existing on-street parking availability.

For purposes of analysis, we assumed that on-street parking utilization would not become an issue until parking utilization exceeded 85 percent. None of the four study locations would exceed the 85-percent threshold under Alternative 3. As described above, the four study locations provide a representative sample with which to evaluate the potential impacts to the larger study area for this EIS. Since none of the study locations exceeds the 85 percent threshold, we conclude that ADU production would not have an adverse impact on the availability of on-street parking throughout the study area.

Although none of the four study locations ~~do not~~ exceeds the 85 percent threshold, there are likely some specific blocks within the study area where on-street parking utilization currently exceeds parking supply and would be more sensitive to changes in local population. The degree of the deficiency and impacts experienced in any given neighborhood depends on many factors including the choices an individual makes about parking on or off the street when there are existing off-street parking spaces provided (i.e., in a driveway or a garage that are required or provided by choice). The City will continue to respond to changes to parking supply in specific areas that currently have or are projected to have high parking utilization.

### Transportation

As described previously, the study area, potentially affected resources, and timeframe for this EIS all fall within what was considered in the Comprehensive Plan EIS. Therefore, the impacts to the transportation

system would not differ from those described in the Comprehensive Plan EIS, which found that there would not be significant impacts to the transportation network. Further, the City has identified plans to improve the transit, pedestrian, and bicycle network through its Move Seattle, Pedestrian Master Plan, Bicycle Master Plan, Transit Master Plan, and other planning efforts. These plans are being implemented and are expected to continue to be implemented under all alternatives.

## **IMPACTS OF THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE**

### **Parking**

Like Alternative 2, in the Preferred Alternative we assumed that five percent of eligible parcels would have two ADUs, yielding 300 ADUs and 342 new vehicles across all study locations. Like Alternative 1 (No Action), we find that the share of available parking used to satisfy the increase in parking demand new ADU residents generate would be highest in the southeast study location (21 percent). The overall utilization of available parking spaces under the Preferred Alternative would range from six to 21 percent across all four study locations. Under the Preferred Alternative, increased parking demand resulting from ADU production in the four study locations would not exceed existing on-street parking availability.

For purposes of analysis, we assumed that on-street parking utilization would not become an issue until parking utilization exceeded 85 percent. None of the four study locations would exceed the 85-percent threshold under the Preferred Alternative. As described above, the four study locations provide a representative sample with which to compare the potential impacts to the larger study area for this EIS. Since no study locations exceeds the 85 percent threshold, we conclude that ADU production would not have an adverse impact on the availability of on-street parking throughout the study area.

Although none of the four study locations exceeds the 85 percent threshold, there are likely some specific blocks within the study area where on-street parking utilization currently exceeds parking supply and would be more sensitive to changes in local population. The degree of the deficiency and impacts experienced in any given neighborhood depends on many factors, including an individual's choice to park on or off the street when off-street parking spaces exist (i.e., in a driveway or a garage that are required or provided voluntarily). The City will continue to respond to changes to parking supply in specific areas that currently have or are projected to have high parking utilization.

## Transportation

As described previously, the study area, potentially affected resources, and timeframe for this EIS all fall within what was considered in the Comprehensive Plan EIS. Therefore, the impacts to the transportation system would not differ from those described in the Comprehensive Plan EIS, which found that there would not be significant impacts to the transportation network. Further, the City has identified plans to improve the transit, pedestrian, and bicycle networks through its Move Seattle, Pedestrian Master Plan, Bicycle Master Plan, Transit Master Plan, and other planning efforts. These plans are being implemented and are expected to continue to be implemented under all alternatives.

### **4.4.3 Mitigation Measures**

The analysis in this section identifies minor adverse impacts that may occur on specific blocks within the study area where on-street parking demand exceeds supply, but it does not identify these as potential significant adverse impacts, meaning no mitigation measures are required. However, the City will continue to monitor for any changes to parking supply in specific areas that are currently or projected to exceed available supply. If issues are identified, the City will rely upon use of regulations in its municipal code, including Vehicles and Traffic (Title 11) and Land Use Code (Title 23), and continued implementation of RPZs in areas that meet the eligibility requirements. Further, the City will continue to implement plans to improve the transit, pedestrian, and bicycle network.

### **4.4.4 Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts**

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts are anticipated from any of the alternatives considered in this EIS.

« intentionally blank »