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Why Is Carsharing Important to Cambridge?

• More mobility
• More sustainable transportation
• Fewer cars
• Easier parking
• Less traffic
• Less pollution

Better quality of life for everyone
Less Competition for Parking

• 1 carshare cars = 9 to 13 private cars

Sources:
TPT Permit data and 2000 Census, 2013 ACS Estimate
More Sustainable Commutes

Journey to Work: Persons Employed in Cambridge

- Drive alone
- Sustainable Modes Combined

Source: US Census, American Community Survey

Source: 2010-2012 ACS JTW
Cambridge has 280 Zipcars in 82 Locations
Community Process

- 9 Neighborhood Meetings: Sept – January
- Presentation, then group discussion
- Online survey
Comments from Neighborhood Meetings

• “Can you please put carshare on-street and off-street in residential areas? That would be useful.”
• “When my car dies, I won’t get another. I’ll do carsharing and use cabs.”
• “With a two-car driveway, we keep thinking about getting a car, but we have been putting it off because of carsharing options.”
• “We know so many people who are car-free even with kids.”

Questions and Concerns

• “Will allowing carshare vehicles to park on residential property make it harder for me to find on-street parking?”
• “Will landlords raise parking fees, pushing more cars onto the street?”
• Noise and bad driver concerns
Survey: Would you like carshare vehicles to be located in residential areas in Private off-street parking spaces?

- Yes: 85%
- No: 11%
- Maybe, if: 4%

Cambridge Residents Only
Responses: 1070
Survey: Would you like carshare vehicles to be located in private off-street parking spaces in residential areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Cambridge</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeport</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Cambridge</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Cambridge</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Four</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Nine</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Cambridge</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agassiz</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington-Harrington</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alewife</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strawberry Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Highlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: Cambridge Residents Only
Responses: 1014

City of Cambridge Survey, February 2015
Survey: What is the farthest you would walk to use a carshare vehicle?

**Current Members**
- 10 mins: 45%
- 7 mins: 19%
- 5 mins: 12%
- 2 mins: 2%
- 15+ mins: 12%

**Non-Members**
- 10 mins: 27%
- 7 mins: 16%
- 5 mins: 12%
- 15+ mins: 6%
- 6 mins: 6%
- Would not be a member: 33%

From: Cambridge residents
Responses: 945

From: Cambridge Residents
Responses: 125

City of Cambridge Survey, February 2015
Why Are Zoning Changes Needed?

- Carsharing is not clearly defined or regulated
- Unclear regulations have impeded growth of carsharing
- Especially restrictive in areas where it would be most convenient to residents
# Issues in Current Zoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Use Types</th>
<th>Regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>• Regulated by Article 6.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not for “automobile sales,” “dead storage,” “repair work,” “dismantling or servicing”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Accessory” or “principal use”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minimum and/or maximum accessory parking required for other uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales place for new and used car, rental agency for autos, trailers and motorcycles</td>
<td>• Business Use in Table of Use Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Only allowed in specific commercial districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Different restrictions for outdoors (more limiting) and indoors (less limiting)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Where does carsharing fit?*
Issues in Current Zoning

*Intent of Parking Regulations*  
*(current Article 6.000, emphasis added):*

“... The parking and bicycle parking standards contained herein are intended to encourage public transit, bicycle usage and walking in lieu of automobiles where a choice of travel mode exists. It is also the purpose of this Article to allow flexibility in providing required parking through shared or off site arrangements in order to accommodate the automobile in the urban environment in a less disruptive way.”
Zoning Petition Overview

*Petition approach:*

- **Parking is parking.**
- **Carsharing** can occupy off-street parking ...
- ... with **general and specific limitations**
  depending on the type of parking facility.
# Zoning Petition Overview

**Petition details:**

| **6.24.1 Intent** | • Increasing mobility options for Cambridge residents, employees and visitors  
|                   | • Reducing reliance on automobile ownership and use  
|                   | • Lessening total demand for parking spaces  |
| **6.24.2 Definitions** | • Carsharing Vehicle and Carsharing Organization  
|                   | • Consistent with M.G.L. Chapter 90  
|                   | • Distinguishes between carsharing and traditional rental car agency  
|                   | • Carsharing Vehicles *may or may not* be part of Carsharing Organizations |
# Zoning Petition Overview

**Petition details:**

| 6.24.3 General Limitations | • Parking facility must be lawful  
|                           | • Carsharing Vehicles must be registered  
|                           | • No sales, servicing, dead storage, repair, &c.  
|                           | • No on-site personnel (unless allowed as a principal use, e.g. office)  
|                           | • All owners must agree (e.g., condos)  |

| Other possible considerations (not in petition) | • Registration of spaces with Cambridge TP&T  
|                                                | • Signage limitations (aside from Article 7.000)?  
|                                                | • Access/egress for users?  |
# Zoning Petition Overview

**Petition details:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.24.4 Principal Use Parking (e.g., pay garages &amp; lots)</strong></td>
<td>• No specific limitations on carsharing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **6.24.5 Accessory Parking (e.g., parking for employees, customers, residents)** | • Carsharing can use required accessory parking, provided all occupants can access (subject to terms of membership)  
• Commercial uses: no limitation on number  
• Residential uses:  
  • Limited to 30% of total spaces or two spaces (whichever is greater)  
  • None allowed on single-family lots  
  • Planning Board may allow more by special permit |
Discussion
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