

2. DISCUSSION REGARDING POTENTIAL CHANGES IN MINIMUM PARKING REQUIREMENTS

Ms. Hudson – You received your agenda packet and you have the staff report as well as the existing zoning for the parking requirements and then there was also included in there the recommended changes. I just wanted to go over a couple of things. This is really just more of a discussion, because there's really not a lot of a PowerPoint that I could do on this. I know Councilmember Peacock had some images from some of the larger parking lots that we have – University North Park, Ed Noble Parkway, and places like that. But we are looking at going from the required minimum to a recommended from what's already in the Zoning Ordinance right now. At this point, going from a required to a recommended, we can kind of look at this as a transitional stage. At the last meeting when we were talking about the parking, there was also the discussion about the EDC that's currently going on and how, in the future, we might look for additional solutions for stormwater runoff and accommodating some different requirements within these parking lots moving forward. I know one of the other things that we're looking at is the recent changes – we can't ignore 2020 and how we've all gone to pick up our groceries now instead of going in and shopping and stuff like that. We run a bus system now, so that's a change. We've got the scooters, we've got Uber, we've got Lyft, which we had those before, and also, of course, bicycles and walking and stuff like that. There are a lot of changes going on. This reduction in the parking requirement could bring us to allow additional development on lots. There are some developments that are already platted as a single lot, so if they want to come back in and actually sell a piece of property we'd have to be looking at replatting. But if they were just going to do a lease pad site they could do that, and I think that's what Scooters did, if everybody has seen Main Street. We could have more development. We could have some mixed use coming into some of these larger parking lots and getting residents closer to some of those amenities that we already have in place. I'm thinking Main Street, University North Park – just those areas that are very developed. Another thing that we're looking at is the cost to build. When we have some of the smaller businesses developers that come in and we have that parking requirement in place – it's a lot of money to buy that land to accommodate the parking requirements that we have. So this might help us bring in some of the smaller businesses, local developers, local businesses and stuff like that. There's a lot of positives. In doing some of this research, I was reading an article and I thought this was interesting, and I think it was a bit extreme, but I think they could have done something else. But in one of the cities where they were looking at the parking requirements, they actually lost a lot of their older buildings because they could not reuse them and then also meet that parking requirement that they had in place. So that's kind of sad. I already mentioned the runoff issues – the stormwater and stuff like that. We don't have to look very far, like I said, to see how the local retailers are bringing your groceries out to you. I have to say I finally did that. It was the first time I'd done it, so it was probably faster. If you're used to doing it and you log in and everything – 4 minutes to get my groceries and I was gone. So it was pretty cool. I thought that was awesome. I guess in closing I just want to say a developer knows what they need. They know what they need to get the customers in there, get them serviced, and get them out. I know that there's probably the concern

of what if we have somebody come in and they just do not put enough parking in? Well, that's going to be a detriment to their business; they know what they need. We also might be facing people come in and they still put in that parking amount that's already required in here right now. It may be a little bit of time before people come in and say, oh, I don't have to put 50 in; I can put 35, and then I can still do something else with that other area. I'm excited about it. I think it's a good step forward.

Mayor Clark – Have we heard any complaints about this change?

Ms. Hudson – I have heard nothing.

Councilmember Holman – It looks like the only two that I don't – or I guess three – is there would still be 2 parking spaces required for single and two-family dwellings, and one each – or one parking space for each bedroom in a fraternity or sorority.

Ms. Hudson – Right.

Councilmember Holman – And then two parking spots per mobile home.

Ms. Hudson – Correct. We kept those in there, but it's up for discussion if you guys are not comfortable with that. But the single family, two-family – I think that's important. I really think the fraternity and sorority, because those are centrally located around our core area and they're right in the residential neighborhoods, so until we can figure something else out, I think we need to keep that in place. And the mobile homes – the subdivisions of the mobile home parks, they're pretty tight anyway, so I think we need to keep that in as well.

Councilmember Holman – One parking space for each bedroom in a fraternity or sorority seems reasonable to me living over there. I don't really see any of their parking lots empty, except when they're not there. But during the school year, they don't have extra parking in their spots, I noticed. Don't really know about mobile home parks, if that's an issue at all. And in single family homes and duplexes mostly all have a driveway. I think the biggest concern has been commercial strip malls, big box stores having seas of parking lots.

Councilmember Peacock – And on the flip side of that, I don't think we want to do anything that negatively impacts neighborhoods. So we don't want to create a condition that people are just parking wherever they can on neighborhood streets.

Councilmember Holman – Agree. I guess the rest of it is all required marked out, minimum recommended. So we'll still recommend 1.2 for apartments, hotels.

Ms. Hudson – And that will give people a guideline of which direction they can go. As I said, they may go less; they may stay with that.

Councilmember Holman – This is pretty good to me. I think it's what we've been trying to get towards.

Councilmember Studley – I know we've seen a lot of businesses, more in residential neighborhoods, so what if it is in a residential neighborhood and they didn't do the recommended parking, and then you're going to be parking on the streets in front of houses and stuff like that?

Ms. Hudson – I think we'll be back here at this table if that happens. We'll hear from the neighborhoods.

Councilmember Studley – I mean is there something that we could do, like if it's in a residential neighborhood that they would still be required instead of a recommended?

Councilmember Peacock – I think it would still have to come to Council for a zoning change at that point, probably.

Mayor Clark – I'm thinking of the coffee shop that we just approved by the courthouse.

__ -- I'm thinking of the one over here – the little house that was a church that was now a business.

Ms. Hudson – We would have to determine the areas that would be the residential that we would – I guess really it would be the core area that we're most concerned with, so we could ...

Councilmember Peacock – Correct me if I'm wrong, but we're still looking at minimums and maximums with our Engineering Design Criteria.

Ms. Hudson – That is what they're still working on.

Councilmember Peacock – So I think in terms of that conversation, I think maximums would definitely come into play there, and we could structure it in such a way that you wouldn't be able to provide, say, more than 2 parking spaces for your neighborhood business if that were the situation. I think there's ...

Ms. Hudson – That is later.

Councilmember Peacock – That is later. The devil is in the details, obviously. I think getting that process fully flushed out and getting all the feedback on that is going to be really important.

Councilmember Hall – So I'm completely onboard when applying to commercial and all of that. But on the draft, single and two-family dwellings, I'm wondering specifically how this overlays with Center City Form-Based Code.

Ms. Hudson – The Center City Form-Based Code has their own.

Councilmember Hall – Okay, so this exempts that.

Ms. Hudson – Right.

Councilmember Hall – And is a two-family dwelling – that's what we're calling a duplex? So there are duplexes that – that's my only heartburn, is we define a duplex that can have 8, 10, 12 bedrooms and the way I look at this, it would be now they only need 2 parking places per unit. So instead of requiring parking for the bedrooms, but if Center City is exempted, I feel better about that. But it's also going to apply to ...

Ms. Hudson – South of Boyd.

Councilmember Hall – I mean, just outside the boundary in the core, where we're seeing continued density that we're calling a duplex that we've all had heartburn over. So that's my only sort of concern.

Ms. Hudson – All of the duplexes that we've seen so far – granted, they could be 5 on each side – 5 bedrooms on each side, so 10 bedrooms. We're still looking at about 8 parking spaces for some of the older ones that we had, and the newer ones that we're seeing, they've got 12, 14 parking places in the back off of the alley on most of those. Again, it goes back to the kids – you know, the parents come in and they're like you're going to live here but where are you going to park. I don't want my daughter walking. So I think there's that control mechanism there, too.

Councilmember Hall – For the developer to understand why they might need more parking. I just have a little tinge there of ... but we can come right back to the table.

Councilmember Holman – I think part of the goal, too, is to make it so that if somebody did open a – apply and get approved to open a commercial business in a residential area, that the parking minimum wouldn't require them to buy the lot next to them and tear the house down and build a parking lot. Trees, too. We've seen project after project over the years where they've removed trees so they could meet the parking threshold. But they're like I don't really need this parking, but this is how many I've got to have for the building, so I can't fit it in without getting this tree out of here. So that, but then I agree – part of me is just like you build these bedrooms and you're only allowed to have this many parking spaces and we're going to enforce the parking restriction on the streets, so you move in here you know that's the situation. Move into it or don't move into it, but that's the situation. I have the same concern if there's only 2 parking spots and 10 bedrooms. Let's eliminate the on-street parking and enforce it, if that becomes a thing.

Councilmember Hall – Overall, I'm really feeling positive about moving in this direction.

Councilmember Holman – That is true. Over the years, I've had several developers say I don't think I need this many, but ...

Councilmember Hall – I've said before I drank the Peacock Kool-Aid of there's going to be less cars in our future anyway.

Mayor Clark – Any other questions or comments for Ms. Hudson.

Councilmember Peacock – I've got a comment. I just want to say that you guys did a fabulous job on the staff report. Very concise.

Ms. Hudson – It will be the same steps for this one as the small cell, so August 12th and then for City Council in September.

Mayor Clark -- I will second the compliments. I think we're on the right track and being very forward-thinking in planning for our community. So well done. Alright. That's it. This meeting is adjourned.