

**University District Zoning and Planning Regulatory Review  
Task Force Meeting #3**

Tuesday, September 23, 2008  
12 Morrill Hall  
100 Church St SE  
8:00 AM – 9:30 AM

**MEETING NOTES**

Task force members present: Bill Dane, Merrie Benasutti, Katie Fournier, Jo Radzwill, Florence Littman, Ron Lischeid

Others present: Wokie Freeman, Haila Maze, Jessica Thesing, Diane Hofstede, Jan Morlock, Tim Drew, Mick Ramolaa, Joe Bernard, Robb Clarksen

**Welcome and Introductions**

- Task force members and other attendees introduced themselves

**Parking Issues**

- Potential table of strategies and recommendations presented, based on discussion of parking issues at last meeting; comments on each section follow
- Parking requirements
  - A number of “mini dorm” style developments have too little on-site parking – e.g. only 4 spaces required for 20-bedroom four-plex
  - Don’t want to create scenario where entire backyard is covered with parking, particularly paved
  - Possibly encourage use of permeable pavers?
  - Currently, impervious surface maximums in zoning code would ensure that some of lot would need to be unpaved
  - Need to look at impacts on stormwater runoff, and costs to developer
  - Encourage underground parking where feasible, usually more likely in larger developments due to expense (\$30,000-40,000/space)
  - Consider reducing minimum parking space size to reflect increasing presence of smaller, more fuel efficient vehicles
  - Need to model “worst case scenario” impact on property’s paving situation if propose ordinance change to amend requirement
  - Possibly restrict how many residents allowed to bring cars; however may have significant enforcement issues
  - This requirement may create incentives for developers to go with larger buildings rather than smaller ones, because harder to meeting requirements
  - Consider tying parking requirements to transit access, possibly through an overlay district; challenging because some areas – though well served by transit – don’t have all neighborhood services (e.g. groceries) needed to make it convenient to not have a car

- On-street parking
  - Critical parking is resident-driven process; starts when they pick what streets and what level of restrictions:
    - No parking except by permit;
    - No parking on certain days or hours; or
    - 1 hour/2 hour parking except by permit
  - Residents need to get 75% of residential units to sign off on petition; this can be very challenging to meet, especially for a larger area
  - Permits cost \$35 each first year, \$25/year in subsequent years
  - Each licensed driver can get two permits – seems too high, but requires ordinance change to lower this requirement
  - Can also get visitor, utility, and special event permits as needed
  - Doesn't supersede any other parking requirement, such as snow removal or loading zones
  - No overnight parking on streets at all? May be difficult to do here
  - Trade off for residents: gets cars off your street, but can be inconvenient
  - Critical parking zones can effectively push parking out farther from area
  - U students willing to walk/bike long distances to get to free parking spaces
  - May be able to limit number of permits issued for certain types of development
  - City doesn't institute critical parking areas without resident initiative – legal/constitutional issue
  - Comment that 75% petition requirement may be insurmountable for some areas due to high number of transient residents
  - It is possible to remove a critical parking area if no longer wanted, also by petition
  - Possible alternative: limit parking to one side of the street; much easier to implement with less red tape, opens up road for travel, emergency access (done on some streets in Marcy Holmes)
  - Look at other areas of the city to see how they are handling parking
  - Consider how recommendations here will be perceived by rest of city; will need to build support to get Council approval
  - Will need to tie this discussion in with those on zoning and site plan review, since all related
  - Can we require developments to have vans, zipcars, etc.?
- Commuter parking
  - Remote lots must be secure or will not be attractive option; unattended cars can be a target for thieves
  - Overnight parking is a target, regardless of where it is located; presence of people helps somewhat, though people may also be at risk of robbery
  - However, cars in neighborhoods can be a target for thieves as well
  - How can park and rides be incentivized so people will use them?
  - Need to ensure places/events give bus instructions as well as car instructions on how to get to them; what will stadium do? (several work groups are underway)

- Need to improve pedestrian environment for areas, to make walking (including walking to transit) an attractive option
- Some options are already working fairly well for U students/employees:
  - U Pass/Metropass steadily increasing users, despite price hike
  - Zip Car is working fairly well
  - Biking is growing; have been adding bike racks (> 7,000 now on campus), bike lockers, and showers/facilities for bikers
  - Will be adding bike facilities to Oak Street Ramp soon, with larger one planned for Stadium Village LRT station (like Hawthorne Ramp downtown)
  - President of U is very interested in all of this
- Van pool program has not been popular/successful to date
- Como lot was used for a while as remote parking/park and ride, but was unsuccessful (commuters parked on neighborhood streets instead); now used as a contract lot, very underutilized – may be in path of Grand Rounds corridor
- Past efforts with remote/park and ride lots generally not successful

### **Rezoning Discussion**

- Topic introduced briefly
- Map included in packet shows that much of lower density residential areas in neighborhoods have already been down-zoned in previous rezoning studies
- Question: what areas to focus on?
- Will be discussed more in depth at next task force meeting

### **Next Steps**

- Next meeting will be Tuesday, October 14, same time and place
- Will discuss zoning and related topics
- Parking issue will be pulled into upcoming discussions as relevant; future meetings will focus on reaching agreement/consensus on main points