

Clifton Heights Business Association Parking Committee

Agenda
11-16-17

University Impact Area Solutions Study (UIASS) Parking Suggestions:

- Highest Priority:
 - “Allow multi-family residential parking to be rented to nearby tenants while also improving the landscaping standards for parking lots.” (Easiest Difficulty) **NO FURTHER DISCUSSION**
 - Issues to Address:
 - Don’t want to allow commercial parking lots in neighborhood, but do want to facilitate getting cars off the street.
 - Plan:
 - Parking lot must be owned by a residential property owner within ¼ mile of the lot;
 - Cars renting spaces must also live within ¼ mile of the lot **by street grid**;
 - If proposed parking lot is being facilitated by demolition of an existing building, there must be a review process (specifics TBD);
 - If parking lot owner wants to allow others to rent spaces in their lot besides their own tenants, they must bring the parking lot up to current code as it would constitute a change of use.
 - *EXAMPLE: Landlord owns a property at 2348 A Street with no parking. Landlord buys a vacant lot 4 lots down for the purpose of providing parking to his nearby property. 2348 Street only has 2 units and therefore only needs to use 2 spaces. Landlord can fit 5 spaces on the vacant lot and can therefore rent 3 of those spots to any individual living within ¼ mile of the new parking lot.*
 - “Consider changes to on-street parking restrictions, such as eliminating the ‘No Parking’ provision from 7am – 9am and 4pm – 6pm on Calhoun & McMillan.” (Medium Difficulty) **IN PROGRESS**
 - Status:
 - Discussing with other NBDs to see if they want to collectively address this issue;
 - Madisonville, Walnut Hills, College Hill on board;
 - Create an online petition for impacted business owners?
 - **DOTE has agreed to remove restrictions on Calhoun, but not McMillan at this time. The reason given is Calhoun is 40 ft wide and McMillan is 36. They haven’t ruled out the possibility, but want to see how traffic is impacted on Calhoun first and then do a traffic study at a later date on McMillan if results warrant it.**
 - Also explore the “No Parking ANYTIME except Truck Loading 9am-4pm and 6-9pm” (locations: Keystone, DuBois, Modo Yoga, Waffle House, and Rue 21). Change to Truck Parking with 15 or 20 min limits.
 - **DOTE has agreed to address Truck Loading signage. Wants CHBA to present its suggestions.**
 - “Explore ways to make parking viable on 25 foot wide lots (current Code requirements are 35 foot wide lots for turnaround purposes).” (Medium Difficulty) **NO FURTHER DISCUSSION**
 - Status:
 - Mike Morris drafted 5 options initially (attached).
 - The Committee unanimously preferred the 4th Option (5 spaces, with buffer, 30 deg angled parking, and 12 ft apron). This option provided adequate setbacks and apron width while maximizing parking spaces.

- There was concern that this layout might not physically operate effectively due to car lengths.
- After discussion, the committee agreed to move forward with an amended 4th Option that would place 2 “standard” spaces at rear of lot side-by-side and then 3 “compact” spaces at 30 deg angles. It would also add a 3 ft buffer on the right side (left side already buffered in initial drawing).
- Look at ways to incorporate fencing and knee walls as screening in addition to the landscaping solution modeled in the options presented.
- The group tentatively agreed on a way to layout corner parking lots. The parking lot could only extend as far as the front of the immediately adjacent building at one corner and only 20 ft past the rear most part of the other immediately adjacent building.
- The Committee agreed that we should refer to the proposed plans as “driveways” and not parking lots as those are treated differently in the Code.
- Mike Morris submitted a plan with 2 proposed layouts (one for if the adjacent property is owned by the applicant and one for if the applicant has a property in the rear).
 - Committee agreed that those 2 layouts should be considered final with the exception of removing all dimensions on the plans and adding a narrative description minimum thresholds (space length & width, buffers, etc)
- Mike Morris to also draft a layout for corner lots. This layout would also have no dimensions listed, but a narrative describing how “parking areas must not extend past the front of either adjacent building AND more than 20 feet past the rear of either adjacent building.
- **Committee approved Mike Morris’ plans (attached).**
- **Next Steps:**
 - **Mike & Jack to present to CUF Board.**
 - **Plan is to submit both proposals to Alex Peppers in City Planning and ask for his advise on how to move forward with our recommendations.**

- High Priority:

- “Consider revising parking standards for multi-family buildings for new development from regulating parking spaces per unit to parking spaces per bed.” (Medium Difficulty) **IN PROGRESS**
 - Status:
 - Committee initially agreed that required parking counts on new construction should be 80% of beds. After further discussion, the current thinking is 65% of beds might be reasonable.
 - After further conversation, there was a desire to revisit the topic and to try to differentiate between projects in the business district and in the residential part of the neighborhood. For example, we could use the underlying zoning as a guide:
 - Original proposal, SF & RM Districts would have a 50% of beds parking mandate. **Committee agreed this would be too onerous on potential single family builders / homeowners.**
 - **New Proposal: In SF & RM districts, parking requirement would be 1 space / unit for all new construction with less than 2 units. For 3+, requirement would be 50% of beds.**
 - **CC districts would have different mandates for retail and housing:**
 - **Residential: 65% of Beds**

- Retail – copy CNP & CCP language “First 4,000 sf of gross floor area of existing and new commercials uses are exempt” ... then depending on use there is an already established prescribed spaces per sf calculation.
- Rationale (Different Residential Space/Bed Calculation for SF/RM & CC Districts):
 - SF & RM districts have a maximum height of 35-45 feet and therefore can’t result in the same level of density as the CC districts which allow 85 feet. By already limiting that density, you limit the amount of cars that could be brought in relative to the already existing on street parking immediately adjacent to the property in question. In short, the larger density projects that can happen in CC districts can’t rely on on-street parking, but SF & RM can more easily and therefore different percentages of spaces per bed are warranted.
- Rationale (Retail Parking Calculation):
 - Preserves the ability of smaller infill projects to minimize parking requirements while still ensuring that larger developments would be required to provide ample parking.
- Next Steps:
 - Mike & Jack to present to CUF.
 - Plan is to submit proposal to Alex Peppers in City Planning.

onging Analysis - Current Parking Code vs Proposed (CHBA Parking Committee)

	Current	Proposed
Residential Uses		
Single Family		
SF20 to SF4	2/unit	1/unit (if < 2 units) ; 50% of Beds (if > 3 units)
SF2,RM	1/unit	1/unit (if < 2 units) ; 50% of Beds (if > 3 units)
O, C, IR	1/unit	1/unit (if < 2 units) ; 50% of Beds (if > 3 units)
Attached Single Family	1/unit	1/unit (if < 2 units) ; 50% of Beds (if > 3 units)
Rowhouse Single		
Family	1/unit	1/unit (if < 2 units) ; 50% of Beds (if > 3 units)
Two-Family	1/unit	1/unit (if < 2 units) ; 50% of Beds (if > 3 units)
Multi-Family		
RM2, RM1.2, OL	1.5/unit	65% of Beds
RM0.7,OG,C,IR	1/unit	65% of Beds
Commercial Uses		
CNP,CCP	1st 2,000 sf of Existing AND New Exempt	1st 4,000 sf of Existing AND New Exempt
CCM,OL,OG,IR	1st 2,000 sf of Existing Exempt	1st 4,000 sf of Existing AND New Exempt
	All Other Calculations Are By Specific Use	All Other Calculations Are By Specific Use

Any other parking related issues to address?

- UC & FCC Game Day Parking
 - Status:
 - Meet with UC, FCC, and Police to propose continuing the elimination of on street parking 3 hours prior to game time, but no longer eliminate on street parking after the start of games.

- Business District Specific Recommendations
 - o Exemptions for Infill Construction (refer to Downtown / OTR language): **IN PROGRESS**
 - First 5,000 sf of commercial space is exempt... any space over 5,000 sf would have a 1 space / _____ sf requirement.
 - First 4 units (or by bed) would be exempt from parking requirements.
 - Rationale: Encourages smaller infill projects while putting in place controls on larger developments.
- “No Parking Anytime Except Truck Loading 9am-4pm and 6-9pm” **IN PROGRESS**
 - o Signs are currently in front of Keystone, Modo Yoga, Waffle House, DuBois, and Rue 21.
 - o Signs are confusing and need to be changed to short term truck loading zones.
 - o **DOTe agrees and would like to see CHBA submit recommendations.**
 - o **Review all Truck Loading Signage in district.**
- Parking Permit Program
 - o Jack Martin memo (7/3/17)
- **Parking Meters**
 - o **Meter Locations and Times have not been revisited in 5 years. Review Map**
 - o **Any interest in adding meters? Moerlein & North side of McMillan between Scioto and Ohio.**

Means of Change?

- Zoning Overlay – could roll in other UIASS issues such as signage.
- Current Draft of Land Development Code.