Parking Minimums - Enclosed Materials

Original information provided at 09/15/2020 Planning Commission meeting
- City Survey
- City of Roseville Parking Reduction/Maximum Options
- West St. Paul Parking Variance History

Questions/Request stated during the 09/15/2020 meeting
- Including staff answers/updates

Email correspondence with adjacent community City Planners
- South St. Paul,
- Inver Grove Heights,
- Roseville

Email correspondence with West St. Paul business/rental owners
- FoodSmith
- The Winslow (Darts apartment)
- 252 Rooftop Apartments

Parking/Informational Articles
- General Parking Reform
- Planning Advisory Service Publication – Parking Standards
- Smart Parking Model Ordinance
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>West St Paul</th>
<th>North St Paul</th>
<th>Richfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking Requirements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use</strong></td>
<td><strong>Minimum Parking Requirement</strong></td>
<td><strong>Same Parking</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Home</td>
<td>2 stalls/unit</td>
<td>2 stalls/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family BSC</td>
<td>2 stalls and 1 private garage per unit</td>
<td>2 stalls and 1 private garage per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Family Dwelling</td>
<td>1 enclosed stall/unit</td>
<td>2 stalls/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Family Dwelling</td>
<td>3.5 stalls/unit</td>
<td>3 stalls/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+ Dwelling</td>
<td>2 stalls/unit</td>
<td>5 stalls/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic field</td>
<td>2 stalls/unit</td>
<td>2 stalls/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking Rules</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stalls/dwelling</strong></td>
<td>2 stalls/unit</td>
<td>2 stalls/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stalls/unit</strong></td>
<td>2 stalls/unit</td>
<td>2 stalls/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enclosed</strong></td>
<td>1 stall/unit</td>
<td>1 stall/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enclosed/unit</strong></td>
<td>1 stall/unit</td>
<td>1 stall/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service stall</strong></td>
<td>1 stall/unit</td>
<td>1 stall/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bays</strong></td>
<td>1 stall/unit</td>
<td>1 stall/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shops</strong></td>
<td>1 stall/unit</td>
<td>1 stall/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retail</strong></td>
<td>1 stall/unit</td>
<td>1 stall/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office</strong></td>
<td>1 stall/unit</td>
<td>1 stall/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial</strong></td>
<td>1 stall/unit</td>
<td>1 stall/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>1 stall/unit</td>
<td>1 stall/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1 stall/unit</td>
<td>1 stall/unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1019.05 Reductions to Minimum Requirements

The off-street parking reductions described in this section may be utilized jointly or separately except as indicated otherwise.

A. Modification Request: An applicant may request a modification of the minimum required number of parking spaces by submitting a study of anticipated parking demand. Parking studies shall be prepared by a professional engineer with expertise in traffic and parking analysis, unless an equally qualified individual is authorized by the Community Development Department.

B. Transit Service: Parking may be reduced by 10% for any parcel located within one-quarter of a mile of a transit stop. To qualify, the transit stop must be served by regular transit service on all days of the week and adequate pedestrian access must be available between the transit stop and the parcel. Regular transit service shall operate at least twice hourly between 7:30 a.m. and 6:30 p.m. on weekdays and once hourly after 6:30 p.m. Regular transit service shall operate on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays.

C. On-Street Parking: Parking may be reduced on a one-for-one basis through the use of on-street parking adjacent to the parcel. To qualify, adequate pedestrian access must be available between the principal structure and all on-street parking spaces. On-street parking reductions may be approved by the Community Development Department, subject to a determination by the City Engineer that adequate off-street parking will be available to accommodate vehicles during snow removal and other periods of parking restrictions.

D. Travel Demand Management: In those instances where no transit or on-street parking reductions are available, parking minimums may be reduced by 5% through the implementation of a travel demand management plan. Such a plan shall be filed with and approved by the Community Development Department and may be subject to an annual review.

1019.06 Parking Area Maximums

The maximum number of parking spaces for any building or use shall not exceed the amount determined in this section.

A. Minimum parking requirement of 20 or fewer spaces shall not have more than 175% of the number of spaces identified in Table 1019-1.

B. Minimum parking requirement of more than 20 spaces and less than 51 spaces shall not have more than 150% of the number of spaces identified in Table 1019-1.

C. Minimum parking requirement of 51 spaces or more shall not have more than 125% of the number of spaces required as identified in Table 1019-1.

D. Additional parking may be provided, if it does not increase impervious surface area beyond that which would be created by meeting the maximum parking requirement. (Examples of additional parking include, but are not limited to, under structure parking, roof top parking, or structured parking above a surface parking lot.)
E. An applicant may request a modification of the maximum allowed number of parking spaces by submitting a study of anticipated parking demand. Parking studies shall be prepared by a professional engineer with expertise in traffic and parking analysis.

1019.07 Shared Parking

Shared off-street parking facilities are allowed to collectively provide parking in any district for more than one structure or use, subject to the conditions established in this section:

A. The uses must have their highest peak demand for parking at substantially different times of the day or week or an adequate amount of parking shall be available for all uses during shared hours of peak demand. A parking plan shall address the hours, size, and mode of operation of the respective uses.

B. The minimum spaces required under a shared parking plan shall be based on the following:

1. For those uses parking at substantially different times of the day or week, the number of spaces required for the uses that require the most parking; and

2. For those uses parking at the same hours of peak demand, the minimum shall be 1.5 times the number of spaces required by the use(s) that require the most parking.

C. Shared parking facilities shall be protected by a covenant running with the land and recorded with the County in a form approved by the City Attorney. Such a covenant shall not be revoked without consent of the City. A certified copy of the recorded document shall be provided to the Community Development Department prior to the use of the shared parking arrangement.

1019.10 Bonuses

If 50% or more of all required off-street parking spaces are provided above- or under-ground structured parking, the following bonuses shall apply:

A. For each structured parking space, 300 square feet shall be added as lot area for the purpose of determining allowable density up to a 20% increase.

B. The height added to the principle structure by any floor that is totally used for parking in or under the principle structure shall not be included to determine the size of the required yards.
## WSP Parking Variance History

### Commercial Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>% to Code</th>
<th>Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>886 Smith Avenue</td>
<td>Restaurant w/ On-Sale</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9 Stalls</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>Adding an outdoor patio with 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>973/975 Smith Ave</td>
<td>Restaurant w/ On-Sale and Outdoor Seating</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Change of Use - Retail to Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1445 Robert St</td>
<td>Menards - Hardware Store</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>Addition of Security Gate for Lumber Yard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Residential Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>% to Code</th>
<th>Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>68 Moreland Ave E</td>
<td>Self Storage</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>*Not true variance - Code used was &quot;warehouse&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1631 Marthaler Ln</td>
<td>Senior Independent Living</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>240 Thompson Ave E</td>
<td>Market Rate Apts</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>859 Robert St</td>
<td>Affordable Apts</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>100 Signal Hills Ave</td>
<td>Affordable Senior Apts</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>*Didn’t include family building since it met 2:1 code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1571 Robert St</td>
<td>Market Rate Apts</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions and requests for additional information as a result of the Planning Commission meeting on 09/15/2020

When was the last time the City of West St. Paul updated their parking requirements/minimums?
- Required parking for restaurant uses was updated in 2010,
- Required parking for retail and service establishments was updated in 2007

When was the last time other cities have updated their codes? Want to ensure that all information presented is current and up to date.
- South St. Paul last updated their parking in 2007
- Richfield last updated in 2013
- Inver Grove Heights updated in 2008
- Roseville updated in roughly 2010

What trends and/or variance requests are other cities seeing?
- Emailed South St. Paul, Roseville, and Inver Grove Heights City Planners on 09/18/2020, see attachments for detail

Communicate with WSP businesses and see how they feel about their parking situation. If they were granted a variance, are they successful? Would they have done it differently? If a business did not request one, do they feel that they have too much or not enough parking?
- Emailed Ann from FoodSmith on 09/16/2020 – See attached email.
- Emailed Realestate Equities about The Winslow parking on 09/16/2020 – See attached email.
- Emailed Debbie of Westview apartments, owners of 252 Marie Ave., a mixed use building that was completed in 2018 – see attached email.

Would like to see information and parking counts for cities outside of MN.
- See attached articles for detail.
Melissa,

We are actually undertaking an update of our parking minimums as well. Our requirements seem to be “too high” across the board and are not reflective of what is actually needed, per our business community.

A few things I’d note:

- Most of the apartment developers that we talk to want to park their buildings at one (1) stall per bedroom, with a maximum of two (2) stalls per unit. Our Code currently requires two (2) stalls per unit regardless of unit size. This has caused problems since the trend seems to be apartment buildings that are primarily studio and 1-bedroom apartments.
  - We have a couple of apartment developers who are currently undertaking PUD developments in order to secure a 1-stall per bedroom parking arrangement.
  - We are looking at amending our Code to formalize this format for parking requirements.

- Our parking requirements for commercial/retail uses and offices are pretty steep, especially considering that we have on-street parking in almost all of our commercial areas.
  - We do allow off-site parking with a long-term lease so a lot of our businesses manage that way.
  - We do see an occasional parking variance.
  - Mom and pop businesses are generally the ones that struggle to provide parking or have to seek a variance.
  - The “big dogs,” such as financial institutions, generally just build the required parking. We then end up with giant empty parking lots that are never used. We have these next to most of our banks. It’s not a great use of land.

- Our requirement for assembly spaces and restaurants is one stall per three seats. This seems to work alright although it can make it challenging to convert old commercial spaces into restaurants which is something we want to encourage.

- Our requirements for industrial businesses seem to be working just fine.

- We are not planning on doing anything in the vein of Minneapolis with their “maximum parking requirements.” We are looking to adjust our minimums but we still want to allow our
businesses to provide as much parking as they feel that they need to provide in order to be successful.

- I like to stress this when I’m giving Staff presentations about parking requirements. I feel that policymakers often forget that businesses like having on-site parking for their customers and, in general, they want to build parking regardless of what the Code says. A lot of parking will still get built whether or not a governmental mandate is in place.

South St. Paul has gone about 15 years without seeing new multi-family development and has gone many decades without seeing much significant new commercial development (although this appears to be changing as of the last few years). Historically, most of our new commercial businesses have been adaptive reuses of existing commercial buildings that were built prior to the 1970’s. One of our goals in reassessing our parking ordinance is to make adaptive reuse easier. Another is to allow commercial and multi-family redevelopment to occur in a manner that doesn’t damage our existing neighborhoods by requiring excessive building demolition to clear the way for large/unneeded parking lots.

Michael

Michael Healy
City Planner/Zoning Administrator
P (651) 554-3217
City of South St. Paul | 125 3rd Avenue North | South St. Paul, MN 55075
www.southstpaul.org

From: Melissa Sonnek
Sent: Friday, September 18, 2020 8:27 AM
To: Michael Healy
Subject: Parking Minimums Survey

Michael,

West St. Paul is in the introductory stages of updating our minimum parking requirements, so of course a survey of other cities is a part of the process. I was able to navigate the codes and I find information on what SSP’s minimums are. However, I am curious to know what trends the city is seeing around parking, with redevelopment, variances, or other related items.

If you have a few minutes, I would appreciate any insight on this.
Thank you,

Melissa Sonnek
City Planner
Office: 651-552-4134
1616 Humboldt Avenue
West St. Paul, MN 55118
Hi Melissa,

Our parking requirements have not been amended for over 20-years. We do not see a lot of redevelopment in IGH, more new construction. Our Northwest area (where most of our new construction is taking place) is developed by PUD and allows for flexibility from our normal parking standards. It may be worth while to review Section 10-13J-6 for some alternative parking standards. [https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/invergrovehtsmn/latest/invergrovehts_mn/0-0-0-18683](https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/invergrovehtsmn/latest/invergrovehts_mn/0-0-0-18683)

If you have any additional questions please let us know.

Regards,

Heather

---

Allan and Heather,

West St. Paul is in the introductory stages of updating our minimum parking requirements, so of course a survey of other cities is a part of the process. I was able to navigate the codes and find information on what IGH’s minimums are. However, I am curious to know what trends the city is seeing around parking, with redevelopment, variances, or other related items. Also, approximately when was the last time your parking codes were updated?

If you have a few minutes, I would appreciate any insight on this.

Thank you,

Sincerely,

Melissa Sonnek
City Planner

Office: 651-552-4134
1616 Humboldt Avenue
West St. Paul, MN 55118

[www.wspmn.gov](http://www.wspmn.gov)
Melissa,

The trends we are seeing tend to be around larger commercial developments and multi-family residential. In both cases it is safe to say our minimum requirement may be on the high side of what is occurring in other areas of the metro. In these cases we have supported parking studies consistent with Section 1019.05A that provide specific parking demand details of a particular development type. Staff reviews the information and in most cases has approved these studies that seek reduced parking for a development site. Because the Code allows a development to provide specific parking data and analysis the staff has not had to consider any variances to our parking standards.

Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Bryan and Thomas,

West St. Paul is in the introductory stages of updating our minimum parking requirements, so of course a survey of other cities is a part of the process. I was able to navigate the codes and I find information on what Roseville’s minimums are. However, I am curious to know what trends the city is seeing around parking, with redevelopment, variances, or other related items. Also, approximately when was the last time your parking codes were updated?

If you have a few minutes, I would appreciate any insight on this.

Thank you,

Sincerely,

Melissa Sonnek
City Planner

Office: 651-552-4134
1616 Humboldt Avenue
West St. Paul, MN 55118
Hi Melissa,

Thanks for reaching out!

We are very happy and satisfied with our parking situation at FoodSmith. It was a little challenging in the beginning with customers and our neighbors getting used to our new layout, but now that the newness has worn off I think people are pretty used to it. Our customers with disabilities really appreciate having exclusive access to our ramp and front door. And our takeout customers seem to like being able to pull into our 5-minute short term stall.

There is ample parking directly on the street and when our customers park on the street there still seem to be plenty of spots remaining for other cars belonging to those who might live in the neighborhood or visiting another business.

I think if the building we purchased would have come with a larger parking lot we certainly would have continued to use it as a parking lot, but I think given the nature of the older buildings along Smith Avenue, and the dense urban setting, it doesn't make sense to require an old building to "find" more space for more parking...kind of like fitting a square peg into a round hole!

The only thing I would mention as far as concerns goes is that we were required to place our 1 handicap stall as close to the handicap ramp as possible. This means it's the stall closest to the sidewalk and street. As a result, the 1 short-term parking stall we were required to have is immediately adjacent to our patio and patio railing. It's so close in fact that I'm just waiting for the day when a car smashes into the concrete patio and potentially takes out the patio railing (potentially injuring patrons). In my humble opinion, it would have been nice for there to be an allowance for more of a "common sense/safety" approach to the placement of the disability stall (and accompanying cross-hatch loading stall), as opposed to a hard and fast rule that the disability stall absolutely needs to be closest to a ramp. In our case, it would have created a much safer situation all around if we could have placed the handicap stall and loading stall adjacent to our patio. And then left our short-term stall closest to the street.

At any rate, overall we are very happy and we think our patrons are too!
We've not had any complaints.

Thanks again for the opportunity to weigh in!

Best regards,
Ann
Hey Melissa,

I am sorry for my delayed response and I hope that you had a great weekend!

To answer your question, yes. We are very satisfied with our parking and have had no issues with our parking count both underground and surface. I think that we could do with less, however, it seems like the perfect number as of right now.

Thanks,

Ian Schwickert | Development Associate

579 Selby Avenue, St. Paul, MN 55102
c 507.380.7326 d 651.389.3833 f 651.389.3834
REEapartments.com

From: Melissa Sonnek
Sent: Wednesday, September 16, 2020 2:58 PM
To: Ian Schwickert
Subject: Parking Survey

Ian,
I realize this may be premature, as the Winslow has only just recently opened. However, our Planning Commission has started looking a little more seriously at updating our parking requirements, as in reducing them. So being one of the bigger redevelopment projects, I wanted to get your thoughts on the topic.

Are you happy/satisfied with the parking you have on site? If possible, would you have incorporated more or less parking?

Please share any other noteworthy thoughts/ideas around this topic.
Thank you for your time!

Sincerely,

Melissa Sonnek
City Planner

Office: 651-552-4134
1616 Humboldt Avenue
West St. Paul, MN 55118
Good morning Melissa, I ask Jim what he thought his reply was that parking requirements for the new Rooftop 252 were excessive. The building design was driven by those requirements, we would have had more higher-demand one bedrooms and efficiencies if the requirements were less. Hope this helps.

Stay safe & healthy

Thank you
Debbie Brookins
Rental Manager
Westview Park Apartments