



# MEMORANDUM

PLANNING DIVISION  
COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

---

To: Salt Lake City Planning Commission

From: J.P. Goates, Principal Planner 801-535-7236  
Nick Norris, Planning Manager 801-535-6173

Date: July 1, 2015

Re: Staff update for PLNPCM2015-00430 related to Off Street Parking in Zoning Ordinance Chapter 21A.44

---

The purpose of this memo is to provide the Planning Commission an update regarding petition PLNPCM2015-00430 and changes to off street parking requirements in Zoning Ordinance Chapter 21A.44 pertaining to the CB, CN, RMU, R-MU-35, R-MU-45 and MU zoning districts..

Planning staff has done research on the current practices in the development community, projects that have been recently built, demographic research, transportation division interviews, and contemporary practice in other cities. While no one party agrees on the ideal solution to the off street parking requirements for residential development, we have anecdotal evidence as to what the market is demanding and what is being built.

## *Preliminary Findings*

Demographic research from the American Community Survey for Salt Lake City suggests that access to at least one vehicle per household remains high. Vehicle access has declined slightly since 2009— which indicates a trend in the direction of requiring less parking (refer to chart on page 2). However, just 4.4% of owner occupied residences have do not own a car.

The non-owner occupied households in Salt Lake City have a much lower percentage of households with no vehicle, at 20.3%. This statistic may be a function of income, household size and location, among others. In the context of Salt Lake City, apartments generally have good access to transit, jobs, and services which requires less parking such as RMU zoned residences (see Cowboy Partners interview). Higher income households further from transit, jobs and services generally will have higher vehicle ownership and require more parking.

| 2009                         | Occupied HU |        | Owner Occupied |        | Renter Occupied |        |
|------------------------------|-------------|--------|----------------|--------|-----------------|--------|
| <b>VEHICLES AVAILABLE</b>    |             |        |                |        |                 |        |
| No vehicle available         | 10.90%      | +/-0.8 | 3.30%          | +/-0.6 | 18.80%          | +/-1.4 |
| 1 vehicle available          | 40.40%      | +/-1.1 | 31.50%         | +/-1.4 | 49.50%          | +/-1.7 |
| 2 vehicles available         | 34.60%      | +/-1.2 | 44.20%         | +/-1.6 | 24.70%          | +/-1.6 |
| 3 or more vehicles available | 14.10%      | +/-0.7 | 21.00%         | +/-1.2 | 7.00%           | +/-0.8 |

| 2013                         | Occupied HU |        | Owner Occupied |        | Renter Occupied |        |
|------------------------------|-------------|--------|----------------|--------|-----------------|--------|
| <b>VEHICLES AVAILABLE</b>    |             |        |                |        |                 |        |
| No vehicle available         | 12.40%      | +/-0.8 | 4.40%          | +/-0.6 | 20.30%          | +/-1.4 |
| 1 vehicle available          | 40.40%      | +/-1.2 | 31.50%         | +/-1.5 | 49.10%          | +/-1.8 |
| 2 vehicles available         | 33.30%      | +/-1.1 | 43.70%         | +/-1.5 | 23.00%          | +/-1.7 |
| 3 or more vehicles available | 13.90%      | +/-0.7 | 20.50%         | +/-1.2 | 7.50%           | +/-0.9 |

Some of the recent projects in the applicable districts have been researched and found to be parked at the following ratios:

#### CB and CN Districts

- 1700 S 900 E “BlueKoi” luxury apartments — 2 stalls per unit
- 21st & View St. apartments —1 stall per unit w/on street for commercial
- 1321 S 500 E townhomes — 2 per unit
- 700 S 900 W apartments — 1.5 per unit surface parking
- 9th S Lincoln mixed use apartments — .86 per unit

#### MU and RMU Districts

- Liberty City Walk apartments — 1 per unit (36%) utilized
- Seasons at Library Square — .9 per unit
- Cityscape Apartments — 1 per unit

#### R-MU-35 and R-MU-45 Districts

- No new projects have been built in these zones. These districts are new to the ordinance and are intended to fill the density gaps between what is allowed in the CB and CN and potential for more intense use as per community master plans.

### Other discussions

An interview with Cowboy Partners revealed that the builder would not park any product in a CB, CN, RMU-35, RMU-45 type district at less than 1 stall per dwelling due to concern of not being able to lease the unit. Cowboy Partners is one of the largest builders and operators of apartments in the City and has built projects in the Gateway area, East Downtown, and Sugar House areas. They currently have projects under construction in Downtown and several projects in the planning stages around Trolley Square.

### *Summary of Findings*

Planning staff feels that while goals set by the City and Region have aimed to reduce automobile use, the reality remains that a continually high percentage of residences have access to at least one vehicle and in the CB and CN districts the likelihood of residential households to own at least one vehicle is high. Many of the community nodes in our city abut or are generally adjacent to low density residential neighborhoods and the parking characteristics for residences at these nodes are thought to be similar to the surrounding residences. This demand is also compounded by commercial uses and mixed use projects. Overflow parking onto residential streets is the primary concern among residents adjacent to successful community business nodes. Based on staff research, the development community has proposed only one project in any of these districts with less than 1 stall per residential dwelling.

The existing MU and RMU districts are geographically located either immediately adjacent to the central business district of downtown Salt Lake City and/or have direct access to frequent, reliable transit. These districts generally do not abut single family neighborhoods and on street parking is abundant on wide streets with little or no impact to residences. Development has been occurring in the RMU district with high densities and no more than one stall per unit without notable concern. Much of the new development in the TSA district is at one or just under one stall per unit.

The RMU-35 and RMU-45 districts currently only exist in two specific locations in the City and there has been no new development to base any conclusions upon. However, the intent of these districts is to provide options for more intense development that fit into CB or CN type locations under community master plan future land uses. These districts could pose the same issues as the CB and CN when integrated into single family neighborhoods. The likelihood that developers would build projects with less than 1 stall per unit is low and community concern with overflow parking may be high.

While goals set by the City and Region have aimed to reduce automobile use, the reality remains that a continually high percentage of residences have access to at least one vehicle. In districts without immediate access to jobs and services regardless of commuting choices, household size and vehicle ownership warrants the storage of one vehicle at a minimum. Research shows that it makes sense to remove the parking requirement of 1/2 stall per unit in the CN, CB, R-MU-35 and R-MU-45 zoning districts.

It should be noted that this change will not likely, on its own, address the issue of spillover parking. Spillover parking is best addressed through comprehensive parking management strategies and not simply by changing off street parking requirements. The City's Transportation Division is currently working on a parking study that will include parking management strategies. It is anticipated that the consultant working on the parking study will be making a presentation to the Planning Commission during the July 29, 2015 meeting.

### *Additional Findings*

As part of the research staff has conducted, we have found additional issues that also have immediate need to be addressed in Chapter 21A.44 . Parts of the chapter also have been in need of reformatting for clarity. These items are either a result of interview findings or other City initiatives that require attention. Some of these issues are considered "fine tuning" items by the Planning Division, while others are a change in regulation. The fine tuning items were initiated by the Mayor earlier this year. Combining these issues into the petition initiated by the Commission results in a better utilization of staff resources and reduces the chances of two separate petitions having conflicting outcomes. These additional changes are summarized below:

- Reformat district specific minimum and maximum off street parking sections. This does not change the regulations but does make them easier to read and follow.
- Lift Maximum allowance for M-1 and M-2 West of Redwood. This is a change in regulation that is in response to some of the issues the City is hearing regarding new development or new businesses looking to locate in the industrial areas. These areas currently have few transportation options and are not well served by transit. The parking maximums have had a negative impact on economic development activities in this part of the City.
- Change calculation language for parking maximum. This does not change how the parking maximum is calculated, but does clarify how to calculate it. The current language has caused confusion for developers, business owners and in the administration of the ordinance.

- Change TDM maximum strategy to clarify allowable increase. This change would clarify how the TDM maximum is calculated. It would reduce the maximum allowed parking that could be provided.

### *Next Steps*

At the direction of the Planning Commission, the Planning Division will continue to work on proposed changes to the parking ordinance as it relates to the minimum parking requirements for mixed use projects in the CN, CB, R-MU-35 and R-MU-45 zoning districts. Planning staff will also work on text changes to address the issues listed in the “additional findings” section of this report. Public outreach will continue to verify the research and findings identified to date through open houses and meetings with interested parties. The matter will be brought back to the Planning Commission after the proposed changes are refined and adequate public outreach takes place. .