Editorial

Parking Behavior and Policy

Angel Ibeas , Luigi dell'Olio, and Jose Luis Moura

University of Cantabria, Cantabria, Spain

Correspondence should be addressed to Angel Ibeas; angel.ibeas@unican.es

Received 24 December 2017; Accepted 26 December 2017; Published 23 January 2018

Copyright © 2018 Angel Ibeas et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Parking policies can play a key role within the broader context of managing transport demand. Private vehicles can spend over 90% of their time parked with considerable consequences for land use and economic activities in urban areas. Drivers cruising for parking have important impacts on traffic congestion, air pollution, and accidents; studies such as Shoup [1] indicate that about a 30% of circulating traffic in cities is looking for somewhere to park. However, research in the field of user behaviour when choosing parking has been limited and management policies have often been developed on an ad hoc basis, ignoring theoretical models or available empirical evidence.

In recent decades, a lot of researches into user behavior have been developed in parking choice. In the international literature, important studies are shown that have become a reference for parking management and behavior. Hensher and King [2] reported an important contribution to this research line with the study of the behavior of users of the CBD in Sydney in view of a change in the parking policy (introduction of rates and maximum duration of parking). Additionally, Hess and Polak [3] developed a model in which parking alternatives included the study of illegal parking, to show how it varied if the characteristics of the other types of parking changed. As stated by Shoup, we can no longer continue with the belief that street parking should be free as all urban land areas have a cost for the citizen [4].

These papers generated an important research base on which, during the last years, numerous researches have been developed. Some examples of the latest research carried out in this field are Ibeas et al. [5], where they studied the users' behavior when building an underground parking garage in Santoña (Spain), or Ahmadi Azari et al. [6], who studied how

the different parking pricing policies influenced the choice of parking in Montreal, Canada.

This special issue publishes quality papers which can contribute to the understanding of user choice when parking and to the development of parking management policies to help in achieving more sustainable mobility in urban areas.

The special issue is focused on the behaviour of users when choosing the type and location of a parking spot with special emphasis on the evaluation of different parking policies. It is about improving our theoretical knowledge of user choice processes when parking, as well as about the different policies that can significantly influence these decisions.

*Angel Ibeas
Luigi dell'Olio
Jose Luis Moura*

References

- [1] D. C. Shoup, "Cruising for parking," *Transport Policy*, vol. 13, no. 6, pp. 479–486, November 2006.
- [2] D. A. Hensher and J. King, "Parking demand and responsiveness to supply, pricing and location in the Sydney central business district," *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 177–196, 2001.
- [3] S. Hess and J. W. Polak, "Mixed Logit modelling of parking type choice behaviour," *Transportation Statistics*, JD Ross Publishing, 2009.
- [4] D. C. Shoup, *The High Cost of Free Parking*, Planners Press, Chicago, Ill, USA, 2005.
- [5] A. Ibeas, L. Dell'Olio, M. Bordagaray, and J. D. D. Ortúzar, "Modelling parking choices considering user heterogeneity,"

Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice, vol. 70, pp. 41–49, 2014.

- [6] K. Ahmadi Azari, S. Arintono, H. Hamid, and R. A. O. K. Rahmat, “Modelling demand under parking and cordon pricing policy,” *Transport Policy*, vol. 25, pp. 1–9, 2013.