



## STAFF REPORT

**To:** Honorable Mayor and Members of Town Council  
**From:** Dan Sailer, Assistant Public Works Director  
**Title:** A Resolution Approving the Town of Castle Rock On-Street Parking Policy

---

### Notification and Outreach Efforts

The attached policy (**Attachment A**) was open to public review and formal comment for a period of 45 days. The policy was posted on the Town's website along with a formal comment form. Public notification was provided on the Town's social media outlets along with a formal press release.

The news release was sent to HOA representatives, local media outlets, Town staff, and more than 2,000 online subscribers on April 25. It was also posted to the Town's Facebook and Twitter accounts. The Town did a second Facebook post on May 30 to advertise the close of the public comment period. The Town has 13,113 "followers" on Facebook and 7,099 "followers" on Twitter.

A total of 24 formal on-line feedback forms were provided. The attached map (**Attachment B**) summarizes the address locations provided on the form, along with a summary of position on the policy: 1) supports the policy, 2) neutral on the policy, and 3) does not support the policy. While not a statistically valid response to represent the overall general public of the Town, the relatively equal distribution of responses across the three positions provides an indication that the policy is fairly well balanced. Based on the formal feedback provided, only a minor clarification was made to denote that parking spaces that are marked (either parallel, diagonal, or 90-degree) are not affected by this policy. The raw feedback provided is attached (**Attachment E**).

Feedback on the various Town social media sites was also provided. The Town posted twice on Facebook. The first post was the news release on April 25. The second reminder was on May 30. In all, the posts reached 7,588 people. There were a total 42 "likes, comments and shares" between the two posts.

While not considered formal feedback, the prevailing feedback was around growth and HOA rules. Two folks commented about the lack of parking Downtown. One suggested that HOA regulations should not supersede Town Code. One other liked the free parking Downtown at Town Hall and in the County parking garage. Others simply "tag" friends to make sure they know about the opportunity to provide feedback. The social media posts received are attached (**Attachment F**).

## History of Past Town Council, Boards & Commissions, or Other Discussions

This item was discussed with the Public Works Commission at their August meeting. The Commission reviewed the various options that were considered by Town Staff and concurred that allowing parking as an amenity along streets where demand exists is a value received by the majority of the public. The Commission unanimously recommended to Town Council to approve the policy as drafted.

### Discussion

The Municipal Code (Code) deals with on-street parking in various sections, but the primary Code elements related to this aspect are the following:

#### **17.54.130 On-street parking**

*All persons shall comply at all times with all parking regulations promulgated by the Town. In addition, no person shall keep, maintain, store or park any trailer of any type, boat or detached pickup camper in violation of Chapter 10.20, CRMC. (Ord. 2012-18 §1).* Chapter 10.20 is titled **Abandoned, Junked or Wrecked Vehicles** and limits vehicle parking to 72-hours without being moved before they are defined as abandoned and can be fined or towed.

#### **10.08 Restricted Parking**

This Code section designates certain restrictions along streets within the downtown area. It also deals with aspects of restricting parking during special events. The titles of this section are:

- 10.08.010 Area designated
- 10.08.020 Authority to set parking restrictions and parking restrictions
- 10.08.030 Repealed
- 10.08.040 Repealed
- 10.08.050 Special event parking restrictions
- 10.08.060 Applicability
- 10.08.070 Enforcement
- 10.08.080 Violation; penalty

Section 10.08.020 Authority to set parking restrictions and parking restrictions is listed in full as follows:

- A. The Town Manager or his or her designee shall determine and set the time limits, charges and days and hours of operation for parking meters, not to exceed five (5) consecutive hours, and this determination shall be based upon study and investigation as a public convenience and safety requirement.
- B. The Town Manager or his or her designee shall issue permits for parking in the public rights-of-way outside of the roadway.
- C. The Town Manager or his or her designee has the authority to establish, regulate and enforce on-street parking, specifically:
  1. Establish parking restrictions, limitations, regulations or prohibitions;
  2. Keep records of all streets and places with parking restrictions and posted signs;
  3. Establish construction zones for special parking;
  4. Designate special parking zones for taxicabs, television, press and radio cars or other special parking zones;

5. Designate location of angle parking; and
  6. Issue permit placement of parking restriction signs.
- D. Special rules for access and time limits may be established for:
1. Handicapped parking;
  2. Emergency access lanes;
  3. Permits for parking in truck loading zones;
  4. Prohibited parking during street cleaning, etc.
  5. Restricted press or radio parking zones;
  6. Street closures by contractors; and
  7. Special event parking restrictions and permits pursuant to Section 10.08.050 below. (Ord. 2007-16 §1, 2007)

There is not a section of the Code that generally prohibits or restricts on-street parking along local residential or collector classification streets where sufficient width is available to accommodate parking.

*The Town of Castle Rock Transportation Design Criteria Manual (Manual)* is the engineering criteria document that guides new street development. Within this document, public streets are classified based on use generally by access as follows:

- Local (Residential): These are low volume roads with lower speeds where the number of accesses to properties is prevalent. This classification of street is meant to allow for on-street parking along both sides when the width can accommodate a 20-foot clear width for a Fire lane. Restrictions to one-side or both sides may be necessary to maintain this 20-foot clear width.
- Collector (Minor and Major): This classification is the next step up from a Local. These roads are “collecting” higher volumes of traffic from Locals. The speeds are typically higher, and the number of access points to properties is less than on Local classification roads. The Manual prohibits on-street parking along this classification due to lack of width between the travel lanes and required on-street multi-use/bike lane or turn lanes. Some older Collector roads do not have designated on-street multi-use/bike lanes. These older streets such as Red Hawk Drive can typically accommodate on-street parking.
- Arterial (Minor and Major): This classification is provided to roadways such as Plum Creek Parkway where the function is to process the highest volume of traffic at higher speeds. As such, the number of access points to these roadways is the lowest in number to minimize delays and accident potential. These roadways are not typically wide enough to accommodate on-street parking without vehicles encroaching into an adjacent dedicated travel lane. Because speeds are much higher and the volume of traffic is also much greater, on-street parking is typically prohibited to maximize safety.

Photos of typical examples of each of these three classifications are provided for reference (***Attachment C***).

#### Neighboring Jurisdictional Review

The Public Works Department reached out to Lone Tree, Parker, and the City of Castle Pines to inquire as to any formal code or policy that they have taken regarding the

restriction or prohibition of parking on their public streets. The following is a summary of each jurisdiction's positions:

- Lone Tree: They do not have a formal code or policy that prohibits on-street parking along residential or collector classification streets. Where the width of the street is not wide enough to allow for on-street parking and a designated travel lane parking is prohibited. They have received some complaints next to one of their busier parks where parking is allowed. These complaints are usually that people do not want the parking adjacent to the park because they are concerned about kids coming out from between the cars. Lone Tree has not prohibited parking based on this concern.
- City of Castle Pines: If a street has adequate width to accommodate on-street parking and an adjacent through lane then they don't prohibit parking as long as vehicles move within 72-hours. They do not have a formal code or policy that prohibits or restricts on-street parking.
- Town of Parker: Similar to Lone Tree and the City of Castle Pines the Town of Parker does not have a formal code or policy that prohibits or restricts on-street parking. They allow for on-street parking if adequate width exists and an adjacent lane is not encroached into. Parking prohibitions are typically associated with sight distance issues to improve traffic operations in case specific situations.

#### Typical Requests to Prohibit On-Street Parking

While the frequency of requests to prohibit on-street parking is not available, these types of requests seem to center around a few themes:

- "The public is not respectful of my private property." This type of comment typically occurs along local residential streets adjacent to parks or schools. In these cases residents have complained that people have left trash that finds its way onto their property, or that people trespass on their private property. Through discussions with stakeholders where restrictions have been considered, they typically have a counter position in that people that utilize the public street to park are respectful of the public space and feel it's a beneficial amenity.
- "I'm concerned about the safety of children "darting" out between vehicles." This type of comment typically comes from single family residential property owners regardless of the adjacent use of the on-street parking. While this is a concern along any public street, defining this risk in a quantified way is difficult. As the density of pedestrians and adjacent traffic volumes increase, the probability of an accident to occur also increases due to exposure. However, an accident trend has not been identified on any particular street that supports an overall general prohibition of parking.

Some stakeholders have also mentioned that they are concerned about the negative image of a surrounding area that on-street parking creates. In addition some comments have been received related to the concern that on-street parking has on property values. While these items are worth considering in the context of this issue, quantifying

these two variables to prove that these concerns are true would be extremely difficult to do. A report was not found that proved these variables have any impact on the concerns raised. The reverse is actually a concern for some buyers/sellers related to property value in that not enough parking is viewed as a negative. In reality, on street parking is not considered in property appraisals and has no effect on property valuation.

While perceptions are not inherently right or wrong, they can compete with the general demand to use the public space within the Right-of-Way for parking. On-street parking has been shown in various studies to have benefits associated with “traffic calming” in that speeds are typically lower along streets where a higher density of on-street parking exists.

### Residential Permit Parking Program

A residential permit parking program is an alternative that provides residents adjacent to public streets a parking preference over all other stakeholders. These are typically utilized in areas where demand for on-street parking is great. Residents in these cases typically feel that their quality of life is negatively impacted. In some cases where residences don’t have a driveway or garage, on-street parking is their only option. The Craig and Gould area near downtown is the only area in Town where zoning does not require off-street parking accommodations.

The following table provides a summary review of Colorado municipalities with residential parking permit programs.

City	Managing Department	Permit Fee	General Concept
Denver	Parking Division	No	Restricted hours along streets. Permit allows residents on block to park and not be subject to these hours.
Boulder	Parking Services	\$17/permit	Restricted hours along streets. Permit allows residents on block to park and not be subject to these hours. Permits available to residents, visitors, employees and commuters. Businesses have \$75 fee for 3 permits
Colorado Springs	Unknown	Unknown	Residents allow property holders to park a specified number of vehicles on the street in "No Parking" zones. Options also exist for permits along streets with restricted hours.
Fort Collins	Parking Services	Unknown	Restricted hours along streets. Permit allows residents to park an not be subjected to these hours.
Aspen	Parking Department	No*	Restricted hours along streets. Permit allows residents to park an not be subjected to these hours. Permits available to residents, business and commuters. Free for first two permits. Cost unknown after two. Day passes are \$8/day.
Durango			Under development

<b>Littleton</b>	Police Department	No	Restricted hours along streets. Permit allows residents on block to park and not be subject to these hours. Guest permits available.
<b>Telluride</b>	Marshall's Office	Unknown	Restricted hours along streets. Permit allows residents on block to park and not be subject to these hours.
<b>General Note: While most concepts are similar in nature, nuances seem to exist with each jurisdiction.</b>			

A residential parking permit program would require active administration. It could be developed for specific areas of Town or apply town wide. In either case this would be an increased service level that will require further program development should this option be desired. Overall program costs would need to be developed along with public outreach to assist with program policy elements like permitting fees and enforcement.

Code vs. Policy

A formal Town position could be taken either as a formal amendment to the Code, or as a formal Town policy approved by resolution by the Town Council. A change to the Municipal Code would be required by Ordinance with two Town Council readings. A policy provides the most flexibility for Town Council to adjust in the future should changes be desired.

Townhome and Multifamily Parking Requirements of Colorado Municipalities

Development Services staff conducted a comparison of off-street parking requirements by some Colorado Municipalities associated with townhome and multi-family developments. The attached summary tables (**Attachment D**) provide this summary comparison for both traditional townhome and multi-family developments and independent living facility requirements. Castle Rock has very similar parking requirements in both instances. This indicates that current Town off-street parking requirements appear to be competitive with surrounding communities.

Options Considered

A couple additional options were considered:

- Prohibit on-street parking adjacent to parks, schools, etc.: This is the opposite side of the recommended policy. While this may satisfy those that feel parking diminishes the look and feel of an adjacent area, we believe that this is likely the minority opinion and that public streets are a public amenity that should accommodate parking as a use if demand for it exists.
- Take prohibitions/restriction requests on a case by case project and require a quantified number of stakeholders to agree to the change: This option is the most democratic approach. The challenges with this option are identifying the stakeholders that are other than adjacent property owners to allow for their discussion and vote. For example if a local residential street adjacent to a park is being requested to have parking prohibited, does the Park's Department

represent the users of the park that generate the parking demand? If not, how are the respective stakeholders that park on the street identified and brought into the project for voting? Based on these challenges being extremely difficult to overcome, we do not feel this is a viable option.

- Establish a new residential parking permit program: This provides preferences to adjacent residences where on-street parking demand is high. Because this would be a new service level, program costs and development would need to occur if this alternative is desired. This alternative could be tailored to certain areas of Town such as neighborhoods where zoning does not require off-street parking accommodations, or town wide. Since this provides preferential treatment to limited users, we believe that a fairness issue could exist.