City of La Crosse, Wisconsin

City Hall
400 La Crosse Street
La Crosse, WI 54601

Meeting Agenda

Neighborhood Revitalization Commission

Wednesday, April 10, 2024 | **6:00 PM** | **City Hall - Grandad Room**

Members of the public will be able to attend the meeting in person in the Grandad Room at City Hall located at 400 La Crosse St in La Crosse or online via video conferencing with the links below.

Join Zoom Meeting:
https://cityoflacrosseorg.zoom.us/j/82155464093pwd=aGw1NWRRUE4xM1RxajJxaTM0QkNUQT09

Meeting ID: 821 5546 4093
Passcode: 543969

Participate by phone: 1-312-626-6799

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes

Approval of the March 6, 2024 meeting minutes.

Agenda Items:

1. 24-0498 Discussion: Off-street over-parking, review of previous NRC work on off-street parking requirements, options to eliminate or reduce off-street over-parking, community outreach role for each Commissioner.

Attachments: 2024 Off-Street Parking
NRC Narrative- Elimination of Off-Street Parking
Memorandum to NRC-Feedback 4-30-21
2020 NRC Statement to Eliminate Off-Street Parking Requirements
2021 NRC Statement to Eliminate all Off-Street Parking Requirements
Cities Parking Comparison-Sam Deetz
The Benefits of Parking Reform in a Small University City-University of Illinois
Minneapolis Land Use Reforms Offer a Blueprint for Housing Affordability-Pew
Reimagining Parking-NLC
2024 Parking Deregulation Options

Adjournment

Notice is further given that members of other governmental bodies may be present at the above scheduled meeting to gather information about a subject over which they have decision-making responsibility.

NOTICE TO PERSONS WITH A DISABILITY
Requests from persons with a disability who need assistance to participate in this meeting should call the City Clerk's office at (608) 789-7510 or send an email to ADAcityclerk@cityoflacrosse.org, with as much advance notice as possible.

Neighborhood Revitalization Commission Members:
CM Jennifer Trost, CM Larry Sleznikow, Jessica Stanton, Jim Bagniewski, Greg Clark, Ralph Geary, Robert McDonnell, Sean Hurtubise, Steve Nicolai, Will Kratt

City of La Crosse, Wisconsin

City Hall
400 La Crosse Street
La Crosse, WI 54601

Text File

File Number: 24-0498

Agenda Date:

Version: 1

Status: Agenda Ready

In Control: Neighborhood Revitalization Commission

File Type: General Item

Agenda Number: 1.

NRC Agendas With Actions to Eliminate Requirements for Off-Street Parking

Agenda Date	Agenda Item #
4/30/2018	18-0633
2/3/2020	20-0201
3/2/2020	20-0337
9/28/2020	20-1389
11/2/2020	20-1567
1/4/2021	20-1795
2/1/2021	
3/29/2021	21-0456
5/3/2021	21-0456
6/28/2021	
8/30/2021	21-1267
1/5/2022	22-0031
2/2/2022	22-0031; 21-0456

NRC Agendas With Actions to Eliminate Requirements for Off-Street Parking

Agenda Topic
Discuss parking reform
Discussion on eliminating parking minimums from the municipal code
Proposed Municipal Code Revision to Eliminate off-street parking minimums for multifamily dwellings
Review and Discussion of the Downtown Parking Study and Analysis of Expanded Areas
Discussion and possible action on parking minimums and maximums and NRC Statement to eliminate Off-Street Parking Requirements
Review, discussion and possible action on the draft ordinances/statement to eliminate Off-Street Parking Requirements
Update on the Ordinance to eliminate Off-Street Parking
Update/Discussion of the Ordinance to Eliminate Off-Street Parking Requirements
Draft Ordinanance to Eliminate Off-Street Parking Requirements
Update on Off-Street Parking Requirements Elimination Ordinance
Review of draft ordinances for the elimination of off-street parking requirements
Review of Draft Ordinance regarding the elimination of off-street parking requirements in the commercial zoning districts; update on Multi-family park
Review of Draft Ordinance commercial zoning districts;Review of Draft Ordinance Multi-family parking

NRC Agendas With Actions to Eliminate Requirements for Off-Street Parking

Agenda Attachments

La Crosse Municipal Code Parking Minimums; NRC Parking Examples: Infill Development; Parking Benefit Districts; Unbundling Fees, Maximums
La Crosse Municipal Code Parking Minimums
2020 NRC Proposed Parking Code Revision
Final Report.pdf
2020 NRC Statement to Eliminate Off Street Parking Requirements
2021 NRC Statement to Eliminate Off-Street Parking Requirements; Draft 115-393 Off-street Parking Minimums 12-31-20
Memorandum to NRC-Feedback; Draft 115-393 Off-street Parking Elimination 3-1-21; Draft NRC Narrative-Elmination of Off-Street Parking Requirements
Memorandum to NRC 4-30-21; Memorandum to NRC 3-26-21; Draft 115-393 3-1-21; Draft NRC Narrative
Draft 115-0393 Off-street Commercial Parking Elimination; 2Draft 115-393 Off-street multi-family Parking Elimination 8-26-21
115-393a Off-street Commercial Parking Elimination 1-4-22
Draft 115-393 Off-street Commercial Parking Elimination 2-2-22; Draft TDM Ordinance 2-1-22; Draft 9-21-22, 3-1-21, Memo 4-30-21, Draft NRC Narrative

NRC Rationale for Elimination from City Code of
Mandated/Legislated Numbers of Parking Spaces

Best use of limited land

The City of La Crosse is obligated to make the highest and best use of the limited land between the river and the bluffs. While we know that many people have concerns about the availability of parking, automatic or pre-determined parking requirements in the municipal code, regardless of the actual need, unnecessarily constrain housing and economic development, and therefore directly limits the city tax base. Removing these constraints creates the opportunity to build more capitally efficient buildings such as additional dwellings, businesses, or service providers.[1] The true costs of parking are often hidden because of the indirect ways that most of us pay for them such as lower wages, higher taxes, and prices of goods, services or rent. For instance, the cost of parking makes up about 17-20 percent of a housing unit's rent.[2] More parking for cars means fewer places for people.

Choice to provide parking still remains

This ordinance does not eliminate existing parking nor does it prevent new parking. Instead, it removes specific numbers of mandated requirements put into place a decade ago. It gives landowners and neighborhoods the flexibility to make their own determinations for parking spaces rather than forcing investors, developers or lenders to choose between scaling down or abandoning a project, spending more, or taking the time to seek variances. Other more appropriate or sensitive market factors will be able to determine parking needs such as bank loan conditions, anticipated user demand, fuel and energy prices, declining car ownership, or growth of ride-share services.

Flexibility for the future

We can't change the past, but we don't want to be bound by policies that no longer serve the interests of the city. Minimum parking requirements came into widespread use in the 1970s and we now see how this outdated policy holds cities back rather than allowing growth.[3] The old requirements were top-down decisions that replaced independent decisions by residents, neighborhoods, developers, lenders, and buyers. This new ordinance aligns with the goals of the city's many plans for the future including the Strategic Plan for Sustainability, Comprehensive Plan, Transportation Vision Memo, Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, Multi-Family Housing Design Standards, Commercial Design Standards, and Overlay Districts. COVID has also shown that behaviors can change and that we need to examine our assumptions about the necessities of individual car use.

---

[1] Research Institute for Housing America, "Quantified Parking: Comprehensive Parking Inventories for Five US Cities," May 2018.

[2] C.J. Gabbe and Gregory Pierce, "Hidden Costs and Deadweight Losses: Bundled Parking and Residential Rents in the Metropolitan United States," *Housing Policy Debate*, 2017; Todd Litman, "Socially Optimal Transport Prices and Markets," Victoria Transport Policy Institute, October 2020.

[3] Erik Ferguson, "Zoning for Parking as Policy Process: A Historical Review," *Transport Reviews* 24.2 (2004): 177–194

Part of a trend in policy

By removing required parking minimums, La Crosse is part of a state-wide and national trend. Currently in downtown La Crosse, off-street parking requirements are already waived for private development. In Wisconsin and nearby, Ashland, Winona, Stevens Point, and Fitchburg have partially or entirely eliminated parking minimums in the last 5 years.[4] Since 2016, Minneapolis, Hartford, CT, Buffalo, NY, San Francisco, Portland, OR and also mid-sized cities like South Bend, Indiana have eliminated all required off-street parking spaces.[5]

No shortage of parking, transportation preferences are changing

While we can't change the restrictions that developers or landlords had to meet in the past, we can do better in the future. The future points to a decline in car culture as a life-style preference for both young and old. We have no evidence of inadequate parking in La Crosse but plenty of evidence of excess parking availability and increasing preferences for multimodal lifestyles. Over 160,000 Wisconsin households do not have a personal car.[6] Ownership of a car is prohibitively expensive for many families with low incomes. Many young adults from Wisconsin say they prefer to live in areas with good public transportation and a growing number of people are forgoing car ownership.[7] Nationwide, the number of 16-year-olds holding a driver's license has fallen from 43 percent in 1987 to just 26 percent in 2017.[8] The timing of this new ordinance reflects the downward trend in the desirability of cars among millennials and the projected aging of the regional population.[9]

The final report of the "*Downtown Parking Study Update & Analysis of Expanded Areas*" completed by Rich & Associates Parking Consultants in July 2020 shows that, on a "typical" weekday, no place under study ever reached parking occupancy capacity, even at peak demand. The four areas studied, the densest in the city, had ample parking at all times. We have no evidence of parking shortages in the evenings or at night.

---

[4] "More Cities Than Ever are Eliminating Parking Minimums," Strong Towns, November 23, 2018. https://www.strongtowns.org/journal/2018/11/23/a-map-of-cities-that-got-rid-of-parking-minimums-updated?rq=parking%20minimums

[5] "San Francisco Eliminates Parking Minimums," *Streetsblog* USA, 17 December 2018; "In South Bend, Pete Buttigieg challenged a decades-old assumption that streets are for cars above all else," *Washington Post*, 16 January 2021.

[6] "U.S. Census Bureau, 2014-2018 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates - Table DP04." Data.census.gov, United States Census Bureau, data.census.gov/cedsci/ table?g=0400000US55; "Blueprint 2050: A 21st Century Transportation System for Wisconsin," 1000 Friends of Wisconsin, December 8, 2020, p.15

[7] Fisher, Emma, and Peter Skopec. "Millennials on the Move: A Survey of Changing Transportation Trends and How They Can Help Wisconsin Thrive." WISPIRG, Feb. 2019, https://wispirg.org/reports/wip/millennials-move

[8] Kane, Joseph. "Banning Cars Won't Solve America's Bigger Transportation Problem: Long Trips." Brookings Institute, 6 Jan. 2020, www.brookings.edu/blog/the-avenue/2020/01/06/ banning-cars-wont-solve-americas-bigger-transportation-problem-long-trips/?utm_ campaign=Brookings Brief.

[9] La Crosse County *ECONOWATCH*, Fall 2019. https://lacrosse.extension.wisc.edu/files/2019/08/Econowatch-Fall-2019-August_2_2019.pdf

GRAND RIVER • GREAT CITY
La Crosse • Wisconsin

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

400 LA CROSSE STREET | LA CROSSE, WI 54601 | P: (608) 789-7512

Memorandum

To: Neighborhood Revitalization Commission
From: Tim Acklin, AICP
CC:
Date: **April 30, 2021**
Re: Update on the Ordinance to eliminate off-street parking requirements.

To date I have feedback from eight Neighborhood Associations, the Apartment Association of the La Crosse Area, and have conducted multiple interviews with individuals who are local developers or landlords. I have one remaining neighborhood association scheduled to talk to.

To date I have heard the following:

Apartment Association of the La Crosse Area
"We are in favor of keeping the requirement of one parking stall per bedroom for many reasons."

- Safety of our tenants.
- Tenants want off street parking. It makes rental properties with off street parking more desirable.
- On street parking in front of the premises should be kept for guests of the tenants within the buildings.
- The paid commuter parking areas around UW-L and WTC are not being used and those people are parking within the neighborhoods and walking further to campus, thus creating more parking congestion.
- Those that have off street parking lots are spending time having illegally parked cars towed, which is creating frustration for all involved.
- We don't want to see taxpayer money (TIF and other) being spent to subsidize a development or parking ramp or lot for a development.
- The parking study that was done looked at parking in the Goosetown neighborhood on a weekday afternoon when students have typically taken their cars to school or work or are not home. This was a really poor time to analyze the neighborhood.

Neighborhood Associations

- Have the cities of similar size cited in the study been contacted to find out how it is going with them? What is happening to their trends in public transportation? Has it been better utilized? Is the investment paying off?
- Are there specific counts for each neighborhood or just the study areas?
- Effort may stop students from bringing their cars. Would need better public transportation.

ANDREA TRANE, DIRECTOR OF PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
TIM ACKLIN, AICP, SENIOR PLANNER
LEWIS KUHLMAN, AICP, ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNER
JACK ZABROWSKI, ASSOCIATE PLANNER
ERIN DUFFER, PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANT
VACANT, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATOR
DAWN REINHART, NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSING DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATE
TARA FITZGERALD, PROGRAM COORDINATOR
KEVIN CLEMENTS, HOUSING SPECIALIST
KEVIN CONROY, HOUSING REHABILITATION SPECIALIST

400 LA CROSSE STREET | LA CROSSE, WI 54601 | P: (608) 789-7512 | F: (608) 789-7318

- Would like to see a check in 5 years to see what impact this ordinance had. Should include a sunset clause and re-evaluation.
- Why do we need a change?
- Will this make it easier to convert homes to multi-family.
- Change Ordinance to also eliminate the ability to pave over your back yard for parking
- This seems like it would be a convenience to homeowners and an inconvenience to students.
- Provide secure outdoor bike storage could be a reduction in the existing requirement.
- Worried about building cheaply and putting the burden on the city streets and surrounding property owners.
- Needs to be in sync with the on-street parking programs and the Parking Utility. Needs to be partnered with the Parking Utility, MTU, and others to be successful.
- Could lead to less car dependency.
- Will existing buildings be allowed to eliminate parking?
- Existing owner-occupied homes on small lots with no off-street parking worried about being able to park near home.
- Instead of city-wide, keep requirements in single family zoning. Eliminate in areas with higher density zoning and development. Keep in Traditional Neighborhood Developments.
- Why the 5,000sqft threshold for TDM plans?
- Concerned about capacity of the streets.
- Won't bring visitors or shoppers to La Crosse if no parking.
- Will this require metering and/or time restrictions on other streets if people now have to park further away.
- Worried about the market dictating it correctly. Current properties removing parking. Needs to be a threshold that requires parking review.
- Whole city not the same. Different needs in different parts of the City
- Surrounding citizens should have a say if a development is proposing no parking. Notify like rezonings.
- What about the required handicapped spaces for new developments.
- Winter parking concern and alternate side parking. How does this affect that policy?
- No sidewalks in our neighborhood now. Have to walk in the street and would have to walk around a car.
- People should be required to do something.
- Should be required to provide a place to plug in a car. Electric cars.
- Would be hard to see to turn with more cars on the streets.
- Would love to have a "no-car" city. Very forward looking. It is a big step. Should be gradual. Also need to have good public transportation.
- Would be hard with alternate side parking.
- Should be evaluated on a project by project basis.
- Would increase the competition for off-street parking.
- All are paying for the streets. Should not compete for them.
- Provide an opportunity for difference in land use.
- Drastic move. Will clog the streets. Can we meet in the middle and only require half the requirements?
- Currently an outdated requirement. May not be so drastic.
- Do we let our problem areas guide this policy?

- This does not eliminate parking. Would allow opportunities to develop more tax base.
- Could support eliminating requirements, but would need an increase in alternate forms of transportation.
- Provide opportunities for an increase in green space and better density.
- More cars on the streets does not make a good neighborhood.
- Better for cars to be parked on the street than making a tooth for a surface lot.
- Will drive all the cars to the streets and make it difficult for bikes.
- This will crowd the streets. Hard to find on-street parking as it is.
- Will be a step back for parking.
- Bad timing of survey to not be done during peak time of students.
- Non-student tenants. What will be the impact to them? Will it exasperate their existing struggles?
- Needs to be a harder look at how the study was broken down.
- How does this policy impact neighborhoods?
- The pay to park program will impact car usage. Parking to cheap now.
- 8-story buildings on Cass Street already do not have enough parking. People parking blocks away now. Policy would push them farther away.
- Hard to park on streets now. Not sure why there is a perception that there is a lot on available on-street parking.
- Require an electric plug in for cars as part of developments.
- Policy to be used in conjunction with Accessory Dwelling Units to convert surface parking to tax base.
- On-street parking opportunities near Aquinas High School, Lincoln Middle, and Elliot Arms not a reality. Any new building would make this area even more swamped with cars.
- More cars parked on the street would make it undesirable to come to La Crosse if visitors for tenants can't find a place to park.
- Need to coordinate this policy with the Police Department and other parking policies.
- Agree with the goal for the City to be greener and create healthier neighborhoods.

Individual Interview comments

- Land is valuable. Concept to allow for more tax base instead of parking is great.
- More likely to work for developments near parking ramps.
- Would not develop without parking
- No parking at all would be difficult. Could still work with a .5-.8 to 1 ratio.
- Could work depending on walkability of area
- Quality of Mass Transit important. Opportunity to MTU to be profitable and have greater use. Maybe require those developments who want little to no parking to buy bus passes for their tenants.
- Could work if close proximity to jobs.
- Would need more electric charging stations and planning for autonomous vehicles to encourage less dependency on cars.
- Should be looked at on a development by development basis for less or no parking.
- Would there still be an assessment for the properties in the DT Parking District?
- Landlords would start charging for parking.
- Underground parking even more that the 17-20% cited in the narrative.

- Should start out as pilot program. Willing to be the first.
- No one will likely build with no parking.
- 1 to 1 is hard to make work on some redevelopment sites, especially with building costs going up.
- Incentivize other forms of transportation.
- Current requirements have made several potential developments not possible. I look forward to doing multiple larger scale developments in the multi-family area if this new agenda is to pass through. The positives are updated housing, increasing the city's tax base, and very possibly encouraging students/members of the city to use various other modes of transportation that would be beneficial to the city as well as to the environment (i.e. busing, bicycles, on foot). I also think this new proposal would uplift the overall look of the city, specifically the student housing areas that I am more personally involved in. It could open up the possibility of developers to use smaller spaces more effectively, develop areas currently not looked at heavily, and maybe increase business interest into new areas. I also understand the down side to this possible change. Alternate-Side parking may be a problematic area. Snow removal may also see some issues. Over the past 20 years of being involved in the student housing area; however, I have not noticed a big issue with street parking availability but that would be something to consider as a potential negative.
- Good rationale in the narrative.
- Having some guidelines would be better. Use the TDM plan to justify having less or none. Have some ability to require some parking.
- Who in town can do a TDM Plan?
- Define “substantial renovation” in (C2)
- Concerned about some landlords only caring about themselves and developing no parking and pushing it all to the streets making a terrible situation for others.
- More worried about smaller developments than larger ones. Like 6-8plexes. Easier to not provide parking.
- .8 to 1 ratio rather than a 1 to 1 for student developments. Less than that requires a TDM. Becomes a negotiation then. Don’t need 1 to 1.
- I can give you my take on the subject, although it is just my opinion based on what I have seen over a 20 + year career. It is a balancing act. If you have too few spots your tenants will look elsewhere. The people who don't get a spot become unhappy. The fewer spots you have the more turnover. I would bet that 90 plus percent of people between the ages of 18 and 70 need and want their car. I understand the idea of how a large metro area would want to head that way. The concept of density shooting through the roof at the core and the tax base expanding with it. The biggest obstacle is the reality of what the tenants want. Twenty years ago, I built buildings with an 80% parking ratio. Then I built buildings with 100% ratio. I can say without a doubt that the need and desire for parking has grown over the years. I would not invest my money into a building with less than 85 to 90% parking. To serve my customers I need to provide what they want and our looking for. The progression is for each building to be better than the last and provide more amenities. Taking the parking spot away (not providing) would be going the other way in a big way. I do see the strong pull to do so as it would in theory increase your density and really give the appearance of a great investment for both the city and

the landlord. Yet I believe that in reality it would lose in the long run. I just don't see the trend reversing itself.

Staff Takeaways/themes

1) Overall people are on board with opportunities to reduce the number of single occupancy trips of vehicles and dependency on the car.
2) Concerns have been expressed over the data and findings from the Parking Study. Issues raised have been with the hours where parking counts were conducted. They were done during student peak times in the evening and early morning hours. Also, looking at the study boundaries it was felt that some areas with high volumes of on street parking were not factored into its findings.
    a. Staff spoke with the consultants who prepared the parking study about these concerns. Scope of the plan was to analyze parking during daytime hours in order to evaluate daytime parking programs. The findings in the study that suggest that there is an overabundance of parking is not a general statement about the city as a whole, only for certain areas.
3) Policy change may work/be supported with other policy implementation and an improved/efficient public transportation system.
4) Developers/landlords saw the benefit of being able to provide more units instead of parking. However, they were either opposed to reducing the one-to-one ratio or only in favor of reducing it, not eliminating it.
5) All developers/landlords indicated that they would still provide off-street parking as part of their development.
6) Neighborhood Associations geographically located in the higher density, central core of the city were strongly opposed to the elimination of off-street parking requirements. They felt there was already a parking congestion problem on the streets. The neighborhood associations around the periphery of the city limits, or with little to no large multi-family or commercial developments, were supportive of the vision but overly cautious of how it would affect other areas of the city.

Staff Recommendations

1) The parking study should not be used as supporting evidence for this policy decision. The scope was not designed to provide the data. A large timeframe of the day that is considered high/peak volume of on-street parking (10pm-3am) was not included. This study was design for daytime parking hours only and its findings of an overabundance of parking should not be considered as a general statement across the whole city.
2) There was a considerable amount of opposition, particularly for the elimination of the (1:1) ratio for multi-family development, from the neighborhood residents and the Apartment Association of the La Crosse Area. Should the NRC still want to pursue this change perhaps the ratio is reduced from (1:1) to a range of (.6-.8:1).
3) The NRC may also consider this policy on a geographic basis. A boundary could be established in parts of the city where the ratio is reduced for multi-family rather than a complete elimination.
4) Should the ordinance be submitted to the Council in its current form staff feels that there was enough opposition to prevent any form of this effort from moving forward. A compromise of some sort is encouraged, whether it includes a ratio reduction, property owner notification if a development is only providing a certain percent of parking, all off-street parking requirements are mandatory if development is a certain size, establishment of zones where complete elimination is permitted, or a combination of any of the above.

Neighborhood Revitalization Commission
Proposed Elimination of Minimum Off-Street Parking Requirements
for Multifamily Residential Dwellings
and Revision to Municipal Code
November 2, 2020

Proposal: Eliminate subsection (j) of section 115-512 of Division 3.

> Sec. 115-512. – Parking lot design and parking standards.
> ~~(j) The minimum off-street parking requirement for all multifamily housing is one space per bedroom~~.

The 2020 La Crosse parking management report shows that, on a "typical" weekday, no place under study ever reached parking occupancy capacity, even at peak demand. The four city areas studied had ample parking at all times.

Based on the final report of the "*Downtown Parking Study Update & Analysis of Expanded Areas*" completed by Rich & Associates Parking Consultants in July 2020, the NRC recommends eliminating off-street parking requirements from Municipal Code, beginning with off-street parking requirements for multifamily dwellings. Because current Municipal Code clearly results in mandated off-street parking that is significantly greater than needed, that code unnecessarily allocates urban space for parking that would find a better and higher use as a part of residential structures. Eliminating minimum requirements for off-street parking for multifamily housing would allow future developers and property owners to better allocate space for residential needs. They would be able to choose for themselves how much parking is needed to attract and accommodate residents, thus allowing for increased numbers, density, availability, and affordability of housing units.

The four areas studied in the report had parking availability far in excess of demand:

Downtown

Total parking occupancy peak was 45 percent of capacity. (Section A, p. 7, 9, 11, 12, 14)

Universities

On-street parking occupancy peak was 40 percent of capacity. (Section B, p.12)
Non-university, off-street parking occupancy peak was 53 percent of capacity. (Section B, p. 19)
Non-residential private parking occupancy peak was 51 percent of capacity. (Section B, p. 20)
Residential building parking occupancy peak was 66 percent of capacity. (Section B, p. 20)

Gundersen-Mayo

On-street parking occupancy peak was 36 percent of capacity. (Section C, p. 9)
Non-medical/university off-street parking occupancy peak was 37 percent. (Section C, p. 15)
Residential building parking peak was 51 percent of capacity. (Section C, p. 16)

Northside

On-street parking occupancy peak was 26 percent of capacity. (Section D, p. 5)

Study Methodology

Rich & Associates Parking Consultants analyzed parking supply and demand in the Downtown District, the University District, the Gundersen-Mayo District and the Northside District. The consultants did a block-by-block inventory of the number of parking spaces and used counts of on-street and off-street occupancy of those spaces in two-hour increments from 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. The occupancy counts happened in October 2019 and early March 2020 and combined into a "composite" weekday for the Downtown, University, and Northside districts. Counts for Gundersen-Mayo happened only in October 2019.

Neighborhood Revitalization Commission
Proposed Elimination of Off-Street Minimum Parking Requirements
for Dwellings, Commercial Establishments, Non-profit Entities, and Service Providers
and Revision to Municipal Code
January 4, 2021

The 2020 La Crosse parking management report shows that, on a "typical" weekday, no place under study ever reached parking occupancy capacity, even at peak demand. The four areas studied, the densest in the city, had ample parking at all times.

Based on the final report of the "*Downtown Parking Study Update & Analysis of Expanded Areas*" completed by Rich & Associates Parking Consultants in July 2020, the NRC recommends eliminating all off-street minimum parking requirements from Municipal Code for dwellings, commercial or retail establishments, non-profit entities, or service providers. Because current Municipal Code clearly mandates off-street parking significantly greater than the need, the code unnecessarily allocates urban space for parking that would find a better and higher use as additional dwellings, businesses, or service providers. Eliminating minimum requirements for off-street parking would allow developers, businesses, and property owners to better allocate space for dwellings, commerce, or services rather than cars. They would be able to choose for themselves how much parking is needed to attract and accommodate residents, customers, clients, or other users thus allowing for increased numbers, density, availability, and affordability of housing, businesses and service providers.

Section 115-343-Residential uses

The following residential and quasi-residential uses shall be conditional uses and may be authorized as provided herein:

(9) Notwithstanding the residence requirements of article III of this chapter, a dwelling unit in the Single Family Residence District (R-1) or the Residence District (R-2), may provide family day care home services by a person other than a resident provided, no other dwelling unit on the same parcel is licensed as a family day care home. All other requirements or conditions, however, as defined in section 115-1 shall apply along with the following:
Proposed Elimination: ~~c. *Minimum parking* shall be one space per staff person, one space minimum.~~

Section 115-343-Off-street parking
Proposed Elimination: ~~(k) The number of *parking* spaces required as shown in the following list:~~

~~1. Uses, *minimum parking* requirements, units of measurement:~~

~~One-family Dwellings and Mobile Homes, two *parking* spaces for each dwelling unit. Two-family Dwellings, two *parking* spaces for~~

~~each dwelling unit; provided, however, should any dwelling unit contain three or more bedrooms there shall be provided one additional *parking* space for each additional bedroom or enclosed room which may be utilized for sleeping purposes, whichever number is larger. Multifamily Dwellings, 1.5 *parking* spaces for each dwelling unit; provided, however, should any dwelling unit contain three or more bedrooms there shall be provided one additional *parking* space for each additional bedroom or enclosed room which may be utilized for sleeping purposes, whichever number is larger; provided, however, the maximum number of *parking* spaces required for Multifamily Dwellings shall not exceed four per dwelling unit.~~

~~Hotels, motels and tourist homes, one *parking* space for each dwelling unit or guest room, plus one *parking* space for each three employees.~~

~~Boardinghouses, one *parking* space for each two beds plus one *parking* space for each three employees.~~

~~Private clubs and lodges (without sleeping facilities), one *parking* space for each 150 square feet of floor area.~~

~~Private clubs and lodges (with sleeping facilities), one *parking* space for each guestroom, plus one *parking* space for each three employees.~~

~~Fraternities, sororities and dormitories, one *parking* space for each three beds (exclusive of those beds occupied by persons enrolled in an institution of learning, prohibited by administrative order of that institution from bringing motor vehicles onto such premises).~~

~~Hospitals, one *parking* space for each two beds, plus one *parking* space for each three employees.~~

~~Sanitariums, rest and nursing homes, one *parking* space for each five beds, plus one *parking*space for each three employees.~~

~~Medical and dental clinics, three *parking* spaces for each doctor.~~

~~Funeral Homes, six *parking* spaces for each chapel or parlor, plus one *parking* space for each funeral vehicle kept on the premises.~~

~~Places of assembly and recreation, including stadiums, arenas, auditoriums, (other than church, college or institutional school) convention halls, theaters, places of worship, and other similar places of assembly, one *parking* space for each five seats.~~

~~Schools (including nursery, elementary and junior high), one *parking* space for each two employees.~~

~~High schools, one *parking* space for each two employees, plus one *parking* space for each student authorized by school officials to drive private automobiles to school to attend regularly scheduled classes.~~

~~Colleges and universities, one *parking* space for each two employees, plus one *parking* space for each three full-time students allowed private automobiles and who are not residing in school approved dormitories or fraternities and sororities.~~

~~Business, professional and trade schools, one *parking* space for each two employees plus one *parking* space for each three students based on the maximum number of students attending classes on the premises at any one time during any 24-hour period.~~

~~Financial institutions, business, government and professional offices, one *parking* space for each 300 square feet of floor area.~~

~~Retail stores or personal service establishments (except those listed separately), restaurants, bars, places of entertainment and similar establishments, one *parking* space for each 150 square feet of floor area.~~

~~Drive-in banks, self-service automobile laundries, or similar drive-in establishments, three stacking places per teller or customer window. Automobile Laundry (excluding self-service automobile laundries), 20 stacking spaces for each wash rack, plus one *parking* space for each three employees.~~

~~Bowling alleys, five *parking* spaces for each alley, plus such additional spaces as are required for affiliated uses - bars, restaurants, and the like.~~

~~Manufacturing and processing plants, laboratories, wholesale houses, one *parking* space for each two employees and one *parking* space for each vehicle used in the conduct of the enterprise.~~

~~Day care centers licensed by the Wisconsin Department of Children and Families which for compensation provide care and supervision for four or more children under the age of seven for less than 24 hours a day shall provide off-street *parking* at the rate of two *parking* sites for the first ten children and one additional site for each ten additional children or part thereof. One *parking* space shall also be provided in addition for each two employees.~~

~~2. Uses not listed.~~

~~In the case of structures or uses not mentioned, the provisions for a use which is similar shall apply.~~

~~For the above uses, *parking* spaces required on an employee basis shall be based on the maximum number of employees on duty or residing, or both, on the premises at any one time.~~

		Madison	Milwaukee	Oshkosh	Platteville	Superior	Whitewater	Faribault
	Single-family mins	1/du	Exempt	2/du	2/du	Exempt	2/du	2/du
	Two-family mins	1/du	Exempt	2/du	same as multi-family	1/du	2/du	2/du
	Mobile homes	1/du	Exempt	2/du	2/du	Exempt	2/du	2/du
Multi-family mins	Studios	1/du	0.67/du or 1/du	1/du	1/du	1/du	0.65-0.8/bedroom	1/du
	1 bedroom	1/du	0.67/du or 1/du	1/du	1/du	1/du	0.65-0.8/bedroom	1/du
	2 bedrooms	1/du	0.67/du or 1/du	1/du	1.5/du	1/du	0.65-0.8/bedroom	2/du
	3 bedrooms+	1/du	0.67/du or 1/du	1 + 0.5/bedroom over	0.75/bedroom	1/du	0.65-0.8/bedroom	2/du
	Parking maximums	All uses	No	Most uses	No	None	Total impervious surfa	No
	Exempted areas	Downtown/TOD/Mixe	Downtown	Downtown	No	Commercial/Industria	University/Downtown	None
	Links	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code
	Transit reductions	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
	Bike parking reductio	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Tree Preservation red	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Structured parking re	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Fee in lieu	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
	Existing buildings exe	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
	Count on-street parki	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Count public parking	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
	Motorcycle parking	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Proximity to bike trail	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Bikeshare	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Carshare	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Carpool spaces	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	EV Chargers	No	No	No	No	No	No	No

		Rochester	Champaign	Urbana	Des Moines	Iowa City		
	Single-family mins	1/du	2/du	2/du	1/du	1/du or 2/du		
	Two-family mins	1/du	2/du	2/du	1/du	1/du or 2/du		
	Mobile homes	1/du	2/du	2/du	1/du	1/du or 2/du		
Multi-family mins	Studios	0.5/du	0.25/br or 0.5/br	0.7/bedroom	1/du	1/du		
	1 bedroom	0.5/du	0.25/br or 0.5/br	0.7/bedroom	1/du	1/du		
	2 bedrooms	0.5/du	0.25/br or 0.5/br	0.5/bedroom	1/du	2/du		
	3 bedrooms+	0.5/du	0.25/br or 0.5/br	0.5/bedroom	1/du	3+/du		
	Parking maximums	Most uses	No	No	District based	District based		
	Exempted areas	Medical campus/othe	University/Downtown	Downtown	Downtown	Downtown		
	Links	UDC	PRN Info	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code		
	Transit reductions	No	No	No	No	No		
	Bike parking reductio	No	No	No	No	No		
	Tree Preservation rec	No	No	No	No	No		
	Structured parking re	No	No	No	No	No		
	Fee in lieu	No	No	No	No	No		
	Existing buildings exe	No	No	No	No	No		
	Count on-street parki	No	No	No	Yes	No		
	Count public parking	No	No	No	No	No		
	Motorcycle parking	No	No	No	Yes	No		
	Proximity to bike trail	No	No	No	No	No		
	Bikeshare	No	No	No	Yes	No		
	Carshare	No	No	No	Yes	No		
	Carpool spaces	No	No	No	No	No		
	EV Chargers	No	No	No	No	No		
						*See variations by zone		

			Appleton	Barnevald	DeForest	Eau Claire	Gilman	Green Bay
	Single-family mins		2/du or 3/du	2/du	2/du	2/du	Exempt	2/du
	Two-family mins		2/du or 3/du	2/du	2/du	2/du	Exempt	2/du
	Mobile homes		2/du or 3/du	2/du	2/du	2/du	Exempt	1/du
Multi-family mins	Studios		1.5/du	1.5/du	Exempt	1/du	Exempt	1.25/du
	1 bedroom		1.5/du	1.5/du	2/du	1/du	Exempt	1.25/du
	2 bedrooms		1.5/du	1.5/du	2/du	2/du	Exempt	1.25/du
	3 bedrooms+		2.5/du	1.5/du	2/du	1/bedroom	Exempt	1.25/du
	Parking maximums		No	No	Residential	Nonresidential uses	No	No
	Exempted areas		Downtown	Housing for the elder	None	None	Citywide	Downtown
	Links		Municipal Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code
	Transit reductions		No	No	No	Yes	No	No
	Bike parking reductio		No	No	No	Yes	No	No
	Tree Preservation rec		No	No	No	No	No	No
	Structured parking re		No	No	No	No	No	No
	Fee in lieu		No	No	No	No	No	No
	Existing buildings exe		No	No	No	No	No	No
	Count on-street parki		No	No	No	No	No	No
	Count public parking		No	No	No	No	No	No
	Motorcycle parking		No	No	No	No	No	No
	Proximity to bike trail		No	No	No	No	No	No
	Bikeshare		No	No	No	No	No	No
	Carshare		No	No	No	No	No	No
	Carpool spaces		No	No	No	No	No	No
	EV Chargers		No	No	No	No	No	No

		Highland	Kenosha	La Crosse	Menomonie	Monona	Ridgeway	River Falls
	Single-family mins	2/du	1/du or 2/du	2/du	2/du	Exempt	2/du	2/du
	Two-family mins	2/du	1/du or 2/du	2/du + 1/bedroom ov	2/du	Exempt	2/du	2/du
	Mobile homes	2/du	1/du or 2/du	2/du	2/du	1/du	2/du	2/du
Multi-family mins	Studios	2/du	2/du	1.5/du	2/du	1/du	2/du	2/du
	1 bedroom	2/du	2/du	1.5/du	2/du	1.5/du	2/du	2/du
	2 bedrooms	2/du	2/du	1.5/du	2/du	2/du	2/du	2/du
	3 bedrooms+	2/du	2/du	1.5/du + 1/bedroom c	2/du	2/du	2/du	2/du
	Parking maximums	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Exempted areas	Housing for the elder	Downtown	Downtown/Commerc	None	None	Housing for the elder	None
	Links	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code
	Transit reductions	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Bike parking reductio	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Tree Preservation rec	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Structured parking re	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Fee in lieu	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Existing buildings exe	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Count on-street parki	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Count public parking	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Motorcycle parking	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Proximity to bike trail	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Bikeshare	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Carshare	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Carpool spaces	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	EV Chargers	No	No	No	No	No	No	No

		Stevens Point	Waukesha	Wausau	West Allis	Brainerd	Crookston	Duluth
	Single-family mins	2/du	2/du	2/du	Exempt	2/du	2/du	Exempt
	Two-family mins	1/du	2/du	2/du	Exempt	same as multi-family	2/du	Exempt
	Mobile homes	2/du	2/du	2/du	Exempt	same as multi-family	2/du	Exempt
Multi-family mins	Studios	1.25/du	1.1/du	1.5/du	Exempt	1/du	1.5/du	Exempt
	1 bedroom	1.5/du	1.6/du	1.5/du	Exempt	1.5/du	1.5/du	Exempt
	2 bedrooms	1.75/du	2.1/du	1.5/du	Exempt	2/du	1.5/du	Exempt
	3 bedrooms+	2/du	2.1/du	2/du	Exempt	2.5/du + 0.5/bedroom	1.5/du	Exempt
	Parking maximums	All uses	No	All uses	All uses	Nonresidential uses	No	Some uses
	Exempted areas	Downtown	Downtown	Downtown	Citywide	Most nonresidential	None	Citywide
	Links	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Municipal Code	PRN info
	Transit reductions	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Bike parking reductio	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No
	Tree Preservation rec	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Structured parking re	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Fee in lieu	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Existing buildings exe	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Count on-street parki	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Count public parking	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Motorcycle parking	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Proximity to bike trail	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Bikeshare	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Carshare	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Carpool spaces	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	EV Chargers	No	No	No	No	No	No	No

		Glencoe	Mankato	Marshall	Minneapolis	Moorhead	Morris	Northfield
	Single-family mins	Exempt	2/du	2/du	Exempt	2/du	1/du	2/du
	Two-family mins	Exempt	2/du	2/du	Exempt	2/du	1/du	2/du
	Mobile homes	Exempt	2/du	2/du	Exempt	2/du	1/du	2/du
Multi-family mins	Studios	2.5/du	2/du	1.25/du	Exempt	1.5/du	1.5/du	2/du
	1 bedroom	2.5/du	2/du	1.25/du	Exempt	2/du	1.5/du	2/du
	2 bedrooms	2.5/du	2/du	2.25/du	Exempt	2/du	1.5/du	2/du
	3 bedrooms+	2.5/du	2/du	2.25/du	Exempt	2.5/du	1.5/du	2/du
	Parking maximums	No	No	No	Surface parking	No	No	Most uses
	Exempted areas	All non multi-family	Downtown	Downtown	Citywide	Downtown	None	None
	Links	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Municipal Code	Zoning Code
	Transit reductions	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Bike parking reductio	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Tree Preservation rec	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Structured parking re	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Fee in lieu	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
	Existing buildings exe	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Count on-street parki	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
	Count public parking	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Motorcycle parking	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Proximity to bike trail	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Bikeshare	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Carshare	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Carpool spaces	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	EV Chargers	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
						*University housing has reduced requirements		

		Roseau	St. Cloud	St. Paul	Willmar	Winona	Ames	Cedar Falls
	Single-family mins	2/du	2/du	Exempt	No specific min	2/du	1/du or 2/du	2/du
	Two-family mins	2/du	2/du	Exempt	No specific min	2/du	1/du or 2/du	2/du
	Mobile homes	2/du	2/du	Exempt	No specific min	2/du	2.25/du	2/du
Multi-family mins	Studios	1.5/du	2/du	Exempt	No specific min	2/du	varies	2.2/du
	1 bedroom	1.5/du	2/du	Exempt	No specific min	2/du	varies	2.2/du
	2 bedrooms	2/du	2/du	Exempt	No specific min	2/du	varies	2.2/du
	3 bedrooms+	2/du	2/du or 3/du	Exempt	No specific min	2/du	varies	2.2/du + 1/bedroom c
	Parking maximums	No	No	Surface parking	No	No	No	No
	Exempted areas	Commercial uses	Downtown	Citywide	None	Downtown	Downtown/University	Downtown
	Links	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	PRN Info	UDC	Zoning Code	Zoning Code
	Transit reductions	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Bike parking reductio	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No
	Tree Preservation rec	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Structured parking re	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Fee in lieu	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
	Existing buildings exe	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Count on-street parki	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Count public parking	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Motorcycle parking	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Proximity to bike trail	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Bikeshare	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Carshare	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Carpool spaces	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	EV Chargers	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
			*University housing h	*A TDM plan may be required		*University housing h	*University housing has reduced requireme	

		Cedar Rapids	Davenport	Decorah	Dubuque	Grinnell	Indianola	Lamoni
	Single-family mins	2/du	2/du	2/du	2/du	2/du	2/du	1/du
	Two-family mins	2/du	2/du	2/du	2/du	2/du	2/du	1/du
	Mobile homes	2/du	2/du	2.1/du	2/du	2/du	2/du	1/du
Multi-family mins	Studios	1/du	1.5/du	1/du	1.5/du	1.5/du	1/du	1/du
	1 bedroom	1/du or 1.5/du	1.5/du	1.5/du	1.5/du	1.5/du	1/du	1/du
	2 bedrooms	1.25/du or 2/du	1.5/du	2/du	1.5/du	1.5/du	2/du	1/du
	3 bedrooms+	1.5/du or 2.5/du	1.5/du	2/du	1.5/du	1.5/du	1/bedroom	1/du
	Parking maximums	District based	No	No	Downtown surface pa	No	No	No
	Exempted areas	Downtown	Downtown/other	Downtown	Downtown	Downtown	Downtown	College/commercial
	Links	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Municipal Code
	Transit reductions	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Bike parking reductio	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Tree Preservation rec	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Structured parking re	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Fee in lieu	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Existing buildings exe	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Count on-street parki	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Count public parking	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Motorcycle parking	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Proximity to bike trail	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Bikeshare	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Carshare	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Carpool spaces	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	EV Chargers	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
		nts						

		Marcus	Mason City	Mt. Vernon	Orange City	Oskaloosa	Sioux Center	Storm Lake
	Single-family mins	Exempt	1/du or 1.5/du or 2/du	2/du	1/du	2/du	2/du	2/du
	Two-family mins	Exempt	1/du or 1.5/du or 2/du	2/du	1.5/du	2/du	2/du	2/du
	Mobile homes	Exempt	1/du or 1.5/du or 2/du	2/du	1/du	2/du	2/du	2/du
Multi-family mins	Studios	Exempt	1/du or 1.5/du or 2/du	1.5/du	1.5/du	1.5/du	1/du	1.5/du
	1 bedroom	Exempt	1/du or 1.5/du or 2/du	1.5/du	1.5/du	1.5/du	1/du	1.5/du
	2 bedrooms	Exempt	1/du or 1.5/du or 2/du	2/du	1.5/du	2/du	2/du	2/du
	3 bedrooms+	Exempt	1/du or 1.5/du or 2/du	2.5/du	1.5/du	2.5/du	1/bedroom	2/du
	Parking maximums	No	Retail/office uses	No	No	No	No	No
	Exempted areas	Downtown, residentia	All retail/office	Downtown	Downtown	Downtown	Downtown	Downtown
	Links	PRN Info	PRN Info	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code
	Transit reductions	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Bike parking reductio	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Tree Preservation rec	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Structured parking re	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Fee in lieu	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Existing buildings exe	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Count on-street parki	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Count public parking	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Motorcycle parking	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Proximity to bike trail	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Bikeshare	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Carshare	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Carpool spaces	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	EV Chargers	No	No	No	No	No	No	No

		Waverly	Bloomington	Carbondale	Charleston	Chicago Heights	DeKalb	Ford Heights
	Single-family mins	2/du	1/du	2/du or 3/du	2/du	2/du	2/du	1/du
	Two-family mins	2/du	same as multi-family	2/du or 3/du	2/du	2/du	2/du	1/du
	Mobile homes	2/du	2/du	2/du or 3/du	2/du	2/du	2/du	1/du
Multi-family mins	Studios	1/du	1.5/du	1.5/du	1.33/du	0.75/du	1.33/du	0.5/du
	1 bedroom	1.5/du	1.5/du	1.5/du	1.33/du	1/du	1.33/du	1/du
	2 bedrooms	2/du	2/du	2/du	2.66/du	1.5/du	2.33/du	1/du
	3 bedrooms+	2/du	2/du	3+/du	1.33/bedroom	2/du	0.33 + 1/bedroom	1/du
	Parking maximums	No	No	No	No	Residential	No	Residential
	Exempted areas	Downtown	Downtown	Downtown	Downtown	None	Downtown	Commercial
	Links	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	Zoning Code
	Transit reductions	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Bike parking reductio	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
	Tree Preservation rec	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Structured parking re	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Fee in lieu	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Existing buildings exe	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Count on-street parki	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Count public parking	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Motorcycle parking	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Proximity to bike trail	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Bikeshare	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Carshare	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Carpool spaces	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	EV Chargers	No	No	No	No	No	No	No

		Normal	Peoria	Polo	Albion	Ann Arbor	East Lansing	Jackson
	Single-family mins	1/du	2/du	1/du	2/du	Exempt	2/du	2/du
	Two-family mins	1/du	2/du	1/du	2/du	Exempt	2/du	2/du
	Mobile homes	1/du	2/du	1/du	2/du	Exempt	2/du	2.33/du
Multi-family mins	Studios	1.5/du	1.5/du	0.75/du	1/du	Exempt	0.75/du	1.5/du
	1 bedroom	1.5/du	1.5/du	1/du	1/du	Exempt	1/du	1.5/du
	2 bedrooms	2/du	1.5/du	1.5/du	1.5/du	Exempt	1.5/du	1.5/du
	3 bedrooms+	2/du	1.5/du	1.5/du	1.5/du	Exempt	2.5+/du	1.5/du
	Parking maximums	Single-family/two-fam	No	No	No	All uses	Most uses	All uses
	Exempted areas	Downtown	Nonresidential	None	None	Citywide	Downtown	Downtown
	Links	Zoning Code	UDC	Zoning Code	Zoning Code	PRN Info	Zoning Code	Zoning Code
	Transit reductions	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Bike parking reductio	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
	Tree Preservation rec	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Structured parking re	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Fee in lieu	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Existing buildings exe	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Count on-street parki	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
	Count public parking	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Motorcycle parking	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Proximity to bike trail	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Bikeshare	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Carshare	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Carpool spaces	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	EV Chargers	No	No	No	No	No	No	No

		Kalamazoo	Mt. Pleasant	Ypsilanti
	Single-family mins	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt
	Two-family mins	Exempt	Exempt	Exempt
	Mobile homes	Exempt	Exempt	1.6/du
Multi-family mins	Studios	Exempt	Exempt	1.6/du
	1 bedroom	Exempt	Exempt	1.6/du
	2 bedrooms	Exempt	Exempt	1.6/du
	3 bedrooms+	Exempt	Exempt	1.6/du
	Parking maximums	All uses	No	Nonresidential
	Exempted areas	Citywide	Citywide	Downtown
	Links	Zoning Code	PRN Info	Zoning Code
	Transit reductions	No	No	Yes
	Bike parking reductio	No	No	Yes
	Tree Preservation rec	No	No	No
	Structured parking re	No	No	No
	Fee in lieu	No	No	Yes
	Existing buildings exe	No	No	No
	Count on-street parki	No	No	No
	Count public parking	No	No	No
	Motorcycle parking	No	No	No
	Proximity to bike trail	No	No	No
	Bikeshare	No	No	No
	Carshare	No	No	Yes
	Carpool spaces	No	No	Yes
	EV Chargers	No	No	Yes

Proposals for the deregulation of Off-street Parking Requirements

Option 1:
Eliminate all off-street parking requirements for residential uses/zoning.

Option 2:
Reduce all off-street parking requirements for residential uses/zoning based off of criteria met.

- Would need to determine the following:
  - What criteria that would need to be met to reduce the parking ratio?
  - How much does it get reduced by?

Example.
If project is located within one block of a bus stop the ratio is reduced by .2.
So now the requirement would be reduced from 1 parking pace per bedroom to .8.

Option 3:
Eliminate all off-street parking requirements for residential uses/zoning except for the area bounded by 7th Street, the marsh, East Ave, and Main Street.

- This is based off of feedback that was originally gathered stating that this area has the most issues concerning parking.
- This option could also include a provision to reduce parking within this boundary similarly as described in option 2.

Option 4:
Eliminate all off-street parking requirements for residential developments that are 8 units or less in density. Anything above that would have to meet the 1 to 1 ratio.

- This option could also include a provision to reduce parking for developments over 8 units as described in option 2.
- Number of units or bedrooms is up for debate.