PLAN COMMISSION
Wednesday, July 12, 2017
7:00 P.M.
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, James C. Lytle City Council Chambers

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: May 10, 2017

3. OLD BUSINESS

   A. Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment Determination of the Front Yard
      A Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment pursuant to City Code Title 6, Zoning to codify staff authority to determine the front lot line of a corner lot.

   B. Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Parking Requirements
      A Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment pursuant to City Code Title 6, Zoning, to update Chapter 16 – Off-Street Parking and Loading, to establish parking requirements in TOD areas.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

5. ADJOURNMENT

The next regular meeting of the Plan Commission is scheduled for WEDNESDAY, August 9, 2017 at 7:00 P.M. in JAMES C. LYTLE CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS of the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center.

Order of agenda items is subject to change. Information about the Plan Commission is available online at: http://www.cityofevanston.org/plancommission. Questions can be directed to Meagan Jones, Neighborhood and Land Use Planner, at 847-448-8170 or via e-mail at mmjones@cityofevanston.org.

The City of Evanston is committed to making all public meetings accessible to persons with disabilities. Any citizen needing mobility or communications access assistance should contact the Community Development Department 48 hours in advance of the scheduled meeting so that accommodations can be made at 847-448-8683 (Voice) or 847-448-8064 (TYY).

La ciudad de Evanston está obligada a hacer accesibles todas las reuniones públicas a las personas minusválidas o las que no hablan inglés. Si usted necesita ayuda, favor de ponerse en contacto con la Oficina de Administración del Centro a 847/866-2916 (voz) o 847/448-8052 (TDD).
MEETING MINUTES
PLAN COMMISSION
Wednesday, May 10, 2017
7:00 P.M.
Evanston Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, James C. Lytle Council Chambers

Members Present: Jim Ford (Chair), Simon Belisle, Carol Goddard, Andrew Pigozzi, Jolene Saul

Members Absent: Patrick Brown, Terri Dubin, Peter Isaac, Colby Lewis,

Associate Members Present: none

Associate Members Absent: Scott Peters

Staff Present: Meagan Jones, Neighborhood and Land Use Planner
Scott Mangum, Planning and Zoning Administrator

Presiding Member: Jim Ford, Chairman

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

Chairman Ford called the meeting to order at 7:15 P.M.

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: March 22, 2017

Commissioner Pigozzi made a motion to approve the minutes from March 22, 2017. Commissioner Saul seconded the motion.

A voice vote was taken and the minutes were approved, 3-0 with two Commissioners abstaining.

3. NEW BUSINESS

A. TEXT AMENDMENT 17PLND-0015
Generators
A Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment pursuant to City Code Title 6, Zoning, to establish regulations for allowed location of generators.

Ms. Jones provided a brief presentation on the additional research performed by staff and updates made to the proposed text amendment. The changes made to the proposal included separating generator regulations into their own subsection, adding a required testing window for stand-by generators and providing for additional
consideration of setbacks for mobile generators.

Chair Ford opened the hearing to Commissioner questions and comments. Questions and comments included:

- Clarification that the use of generators is an accessory use to a primary structure on a property and that no size limitation is included.
- Landscaping requirements given the amount of heat given off by generators. Ms. Jones stated that in some cases staff can require additional screening or a change in screening, specifically for larger projects.
- Standards a Zoning Administrator may use for requiring additional setback requirements and why additional consideration for portable generators. Mr. Mangum stated that portable generators have a bit more flexibility in where they can be moved and can be louder than permanently installed generators.
- Concerns over the testing window and if the window could be expanded.

Chair Ford opened the hearing to questions and comments from the public. One member of the public spoke who brought up concerns regarding the short testing period proposed, state and federal regulations that supersede local regulations (NFPA and others), and specifics for the various uses for the generators.

Additional discussion amongst the Commission centered on the time period allowed for stand-by generator testing and what possible additional parameters, if any, were needed for determining the location of the generators.

Commissioner Pigozzi moved to recommend approval of the item with the provision of expanded testing hours of 10:00 AM to 3:00 P.M. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Goddard. A roll call vote was taken and the motion was approved unanimously 5-0.

B. TEXT AMENDMENT

Public Notice Requirements

A Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment pursuant to City Code Title 6, Zoning, to establish responsibility for mailed noticing requirements for Planning and Zoning cases.

Ms. Jones provided a brief overview of the proposed text amendment, explaining that this is an amendment that staff is revisiting. The original ordinance that was approved provided for the use of a third party mailing service to mail required notices for planning and zoning cases. The approved ordinance only included cases requiring a 500 ft. or 1,000 ft. mailing radius. The proposed amendment would amend the zoning ordinance to include cases requiring a 250 ft. mailing radius and adds a provision that would allow staff to send mailed notices for planning and zoning cases if needed.

Chair Ford opened the hearing to Commissioner questions and comments. Questions
and comments included:

- Examples of when staff would need to handle the mailings themselves.
- How use of the third party system has been received. Ms. Jones stated that the Blueprint Shoppe was the vendor awarded the mailed noticing contract and that at the time of the meeting, there have been approximately 8 cases that that have used that vendor’s services.
- Approximate costs for sending the mailings out. Ms. Jones provided an example and stated that additional cost comes from these minor, fence, and family necessity variation cases requiring two mailings, one for notice of receipt of an application and a second providing notification of staff decision of that case.
- Concern over shifting cost to an applicant who may not be able to handle the additional cost, especially in the case of family necessity variations.
- Necessity of a 250 ft. radius for minor variations.

There was additional discussion on how to provide some acknowledgment of possible financial hardship, be it within the zoning ordinance or variation application. Commissioner Saul expressed the need to have uniform standards for determining the hardship.

Commissioner Pigozzi made a motion to recommend approval of the text amendment with an added provision recognizing financial hardship. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Saul. A roll call vote was taken and the motion was approved unanimously 5-0.

C. TEXT AMENDMENT 17PLND-0030

Determination of Front Yard
A Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment pursuant to City Code Title 6, Zoning, to establish regulations to establish staff authority to determine the front yard of a parcel.

Ms. Jones provided a brief overview of the proposed text amendment, explaining that the amendment came from an aldermanic request. Currently, per Ordinance, the front lot line and front yard of a parcel is determined by the owner of the property. This can, from time to time, cause issues on corner lots where setbacks can have greater effects on neighboring properties. The proposed amendment would establish the Zoning Administrator’s authority to determine the front lot line and front yard, giving consideration to any existing improvements on the lot as well as proportions of the lot line dimensions and pattern of existing development within the neighborhood.

The Commission discussed the following:
- The general intent of the amendment and
- Grandfathering in of existing properties, giving consideration to the history of a property and previous zoning interpretations by staff.
- If the stated considerations of existing improvements, proportions of lot line
dimensions and pattern of existing neighborhood development are defensible and sufficient for constraining the Zoning Administrator’s discretion.

The Commissioners further discussed concerns about the amendment being too general and how to better define the considerations taken when determining the front lot line and front yard for a property. This included placement of existing entrances to primary structures, locations of existing accessory structures or mechanical equipment and historical information on past determinations for the property. Mr. Mangum asked for direction on how the Commission would prefer to see these considerations addressed within the ordinance be it a more specific list of standards or if there are additional factors to consider such as a record of Commission concerns.

Commissioner Saul made a motion to send the item back to staff for further clarification. Commissioner Pigozzi seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a voice vote 4-1.

4. DISCUSSION
   A. Regulations for Drone Use
      Discussion, per City Council referral, on the establishment of regulations for drone use within the City of Evanston.

Ms. Jones stated that Legal staff was drafting an ordinance to regulate the use of drones. Currently there are no zoning regulations related to drones and the proposed ordinance would not be governed by the zoning code. Ms. Jones clarified that the proposed ordinance is scheduled for the May 22, 2017 City Council agenda. The Commissioners agreed that the item does not appear to have land use implications and would not be under the purview of the Plan Commission.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mayor Haggerty spoke, thanking the Commission for its work and thoughtful discussion on the items before them.

One resident spoke regarding the front yard determination and drone use. He asked if front yard determination affects the address of a property or vice versa. He also shared his opinion regarding the prevalence of drones.

5. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Goddard made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Belisle seconded the motion.

A voice vote was taken and the motion was approved by voice call 5-0. The meeting was adjourned at 8:32 pm.
Respectfully Submitted,
Meagan Jones
Neighborhood and Land Use Planner
Community Development Department
Plan Commission

CASE# 17PLND-0030

Zoning Text Amendment

Regulations to Codify Staff Authority to Determine the Front Yard of a Corner Lot
To: Chair and Members of the Plan Commission
From: Johanna Leonard, Director of Community Development
Scott Mangum, Planning and Zoning Administrator
Meagan Jones, Neighborhood and Land Use Planner
Subject: Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment
Regulations to Codify Staff Authority to Determine the Front Yard of a Corner Lot
17PLND-0030
Date: June 27, 2017

Request
Staff recommends amending the Zoning Ordinance to codify staff authority to determine the front lot line of a corner lot.

Notice
The Application has been filed in conformance with applicable procedural and public notice requirements.

Analysis
Update Since May 10, 2017 Meeting
At the May Plan Commission meeting, the Commission began review of the proposed text amendment to codify staff authority in determining the front lot line of a corner lot. Over the course of the discussion, Commissioners raised concern that the language of the amendment may be too general and needs more specific guidelines outlined for reference.

Staff considered the Commissioner comments and conducted additional research on possible language to include within the text amendment. The zoning codes of Chicago, Skokie, Niles, Highland Park, and Des Plaines were reviewed as well as definitions from a number of communities in the American Planning Association’s (APA) A Planner’s Dictionary. It was found that there were different approaches to determine the front lot line, including: length of lot lines (shortest to be the front lot line), principal building orientation and entrance and other existing setbacks on the same block. Alternately, in many jurisdictions property owners largely hold the authority to make the determination; however, there were several instances where the authority went to the Zoning Administrator or Department Director.
**Background**

Per Aldermanic request, staff was asked to look at revising the authority in place to determine front lot lines of parcels within the City. Currently, the front lot line is considered, by definition, to be the street lot line. In the cases of corner lots or through lots with more than one street frontage, the front lot line is determined by the property owner. Section 6-4-1-9(A)4 explains in further detail how the front lot line is determined:

Determining of Front Lot Line for Vacant Through Lots, or Corner Lots: On a vacant through lot, or corner lot, any street lot line may be established as its front lot line; except that where two (2) or more through lots are contiguous, and a front lot line has been duly established on at least one (1) such lot, the same street lot line shall thereafter be deemed to be the front lot line of all such contiguous lots. On a through lot, a front yard shall be provided along both street lot lines.

In some cases, the location of a parcel’s front line can increase the effects a building or larger development has on neighboring properties. This can be more evident in zoning districts which allow for denser development and accessory structures (such as garages) or open parking that can be located closer to side and rear property lines.

**Proposal Overview**

Staff is proposing to amend zoning regulations to give staff the authority to determine the front lot line for parcels. Specifically staff will amend the zoning ordinance as described below:

**Section 6-18-3. – Definitions**

| LOT LINE, FRONT: | A lot line that is a street lot line. Any street lot line of a corner lot may be established by the Zoning Administrator as the front lot line. |

**Section 6-4-1-9. – Yards.**

(A) General Yard Requirements: The following provisions set forth the requirements for required yards and for determining or interpreting unusual yard situations:

4. Determining of Front Lot Line for Vacant Through Lots, or Corner Lots: On a vacant through lot, or any corner lot, any street lot line may be established as its front lot line; except that where two (2) or more through lots are contiguous, and a front lot line has been duly established on at least one (1) such lot, the same street lot line shall thereafter be deemed to be the front lot line of all such contiguous lots. On a through lot, a front yard shall be provided along both street lot lines. The Zoning Administrator has the authority to determine the front lot line for a corner lot giving consideration including, but not limited to, the following:
a) If a building exists on the lot, previous determination of the front yard, conformance to existing required setbacks, existing principal building orientation, and location of building entrances;
b.) Proportions of the lot line dimensions, with preference for the front lot line being the shorter lot line abutting a street;
c.) Pattern of existing development within the neighborhood, specifically of adjacent lots; and
d.) The property owner’s expressed desire.

Standards of Approval
The proposed Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment to codify staff authority to determine the front line of a parcel meets the standards for approval of amendments per Section 6-3-4-5- of the City Code. The proposal is consistent with the objective of the Comprehensive Plan to maintain the appealing character of Evanston’s neighborhoods and policy action of encouraging new developments to complement existing street and sidewalk patterns.

Enabling staff to have the authority to determine the front lot line of a parcel will assist in preventing buildings and other developments from having a negative effect on adjacent properties. The proposed text amendment will not have any adverse effects on the values of the properties in the area but will instead seek to maintain or enhance the values of the properties.

Recommendation
Staff believes the proposed text amendment to codify staff authority to determine the front lot line of parcels meets the standards of approval as outlined above. Staff recommends the Plan Commission make a positive recommendation to the City Council regarding for the proposed text amendment.

Attachments
- Ordinance 45-O-17
- Research on Front Lot Line Determination
AN ORDINANCE

Amending Evanston City Code Section 6-4-1-9(A)(4) and 6-18-3, “Definitions,” Granting the Zoning Administrator Authority to Establish the Front Lot Line

NOW BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EVANSTON, COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS:

SECTION 1: Subsection 6-4-1-9(A)(4) of the Evanston City Code of 2012, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

4. Determining of Front Lot Line for Vacant Through Lots, or Corner Lots: On a vacant through lot, or corner lot, any street lot line may be established as its front lot line; except that where two (2) or more through lots are contiguous, and a front lot lien has been duly established on at least one (1) such lot, the same street lot line shall thereafter be deemed to be the front lot line of all such contiguous lots. On a through lot, a front yard shall be provided along both street lot lines. The Zoning Administrator has the authority to determine the front lot line for a corner lot giving consideration including, but not limited to, the following:

a) If a building exists on the lot, previous determination of the front yard, conformance to existing required setbacks, existing principal building orientation, and location of building entrances;

b) Proportions of the lot line dimensions, with preference for the front lot line being the shorter lot line abutting a street;

c) Pattern of existing development within the neighborhood, specifically of adjacent lots; and

d) The property owner’s expressed desire.

SECTION 2: The definition of “Front Lot Line” in Section 6-18-3, “Definitions,” of the Evanston City Code of 2012, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

LOT LINE, FRONT: A lot line that is a street lot line. Any street lot line of a corner lot
may be established by the owner as the Zoning Administrator as the front lot line.

SECTION 3: The findings and recitals contained herein are declared to be prima facie evidence of the law of the City and shall be received in evidence as provided by the Illinois Complied Statues and the courts of the State of Illinois.

SECTION 4: All ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

SECTION 5: This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage, approval and publication in the manner provided by law.

SECTION 6: If any provision of this ordinance or application thereof to any person or circumstance is ruled unconstitutional or otherwise invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of this ordinance that can be given effect without the invalid application or provision, and each invalid provision or invalid application of this ordinance is severable.

Introduced: ________________, 2017

Adopted: ________________, 2017

Approved: ____________________________, 2017

__________________________, 2017

Stephen H. Hagerty, Mayor

Attest: ____________________________

Approved as to form:

Devon Reid, City Clerk

W. Grant Farrar, Corporation Counsel
The purpose of this memo is to provide information on how communities determine the front yard for properties that are located at the intersection of two streets. With the understanding that these case studies will provide, the City of Evanston will be able to develop a range of criteria that can be used to establish front lot lines for corner lots.

Background

Existing zoning ordinance:

By definition, the street lot line is considered the front lot line. In the cases of corner lots or through lots with more than one street frontage, the front lot line is determined by the property owner. Section 6-4-1-9(A)4 explains in further detail how the front lot line is determined:

Determining of Front Lot Line for Vacant Through Lots, or Corner Lots: On a vacant through lot, or corner lot, any street lot line may be established as its front lot line; except that where two (2) or more through lots are contiguous, and a front lot line has been duly established on at least one (1) such lot, the same street lot line shall thereafter be deemed to be the front lot line of all such contiguous lots. On a through lot, a front yard shall be provided along both street lot lines.

Proposed text amendment to zoning ordinance:

Section 6-18-3. – Definitions

LOT LINE, FRONT: A lot line that is a street lot line. Any street lot line of a corner lot may be established by the owner Zoning Administrator as the front lot line.

Section 6-4-1-9. – Yards.
(A) General Yard Requirements: The following provisions set forth the requirements for required yards and for determining or interpreting unusual yard situations:

4. Determining of Front Lot Line for Vacant Through Lots, or Corner Lots: On a vacant through lot, or any corner lot, any street lot line may be established as its front lot line; except that where two (2) or more through lots are contiguous, and a front lot line has been duly established on at least one (1) such lot, the same street lot line shall thereafter be deemed to be the front lot line of all such contiguous lots. On a through lot, a front yard shall be provided along both street lot lines. **The Zoning Administrator has the authority to determine the front lot line for a corner lot giving consideration to any existing improvements on the lot and the proportions of the lot line dimensions, as well as to the pattern of existing development within the neighborhood.**

---

**Case Studies**

Zoning ordinances of communities within a 15-mile radius of Evanston were analyzed, resulting in the following case studies.

1. City of Chicago
   (Source: [https://secondcityzoning.org/resources/Chicago-Zoning-Ordinance.pdf](https://secondcityzoning.org/resources/Chicago-Zoning-Ordinance.pdf))

Chapter 17-2 | Residential Districts, 17-2-0300 | Bulk and Density Standards

Definitions: **17-17-0260 Front Property Line**

That property line that abuts or is along an existing or dedicated public street, or when no public street exists, is along a public way. On lots with multiple street frontages, the property owner may select either street property line as the front property line.

**17-2-0305 Front Setbacks:**

17-2-0305-B: In lieu of complying with the fixed front setback standards of Sec. 17-2-0305-A, buildings and structures in R districts must be set back from the front property line a distance equal to the average front yard depth that exists on the nearest 2 lots on either side of the subject lot or 20 feet, whichever is less. **The decision to comply with fixed front setback standards of Sec. 17-2-0305-A or the average front setback standards of Sec. 17-2-0305-B is left to the builder/property owner except in the case of lots with lot frontage on a primary boulevard, as defined in Sec. 17-17-02124, where buildings and structures must be set back from the front property line a distance equal to the average front yard depth that exists on the nearest 2 lots on both sides of the**
subject lot; there is no maximum depth to the required setback along a primary boulevard as defined in Sec. 17-17-02124. (See Sec. 17-17-0306 for rules governing the measurement of front setbacks)

17-2-0305-C:

2. When the subject lot is a corner lot, the average setback will be computed on the basis of the nearest 2 lots that front on the same street as the subject lot.
3. When the subject lot abuts a corner lot fronting on the same street, the average setback will be computed on the basis of the abutting corner lot and the nearest 2 lots that front on the same street as the subject lot.

Fig 1: Shows the application of front lot determination as applied to corner lots as per Section 17-2-0305-C.2. of the Chicago Zoning Ordinance (page 2-9)

2. City of Highland Park
(Source: https://www.municode.com/library/il/highland_park/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=HIGHLAND_PARK_CODE_1968)
Front Lot Line: With respect to any lot other than a lot-in-depth, the lot line thereof coextensive with the right-of-way line of any adjacent and abutting street. The front lot line of a lot-in-depth shall be the lot line adjacent to and most perpendicular to the stem.

Front Yard: Upon any lot, other than a lot-in-depth, that yard adjacent to any front lot line and maintained, except as otherwise set forth in this Code and except for ingress and egress drives and sidewalks traversing the same in a fashion other than parallel to the front lot line it abuts, as open space. Front yards are measured by a line at right angles to the front lot line, or by the radial line in the case of a curved front lot line.

Sec. 150.711. - Established Setbacks - Single Family Districts.

In any single family residential zoning district, if the Established Building Setback is greater in depth than required for front yards for such zoning district, no new structure or addition to an existing structure shall be erected closer to the street than the Established Building Setback; provided, however, that when a lot has more than one front lot line, the Established Building Setback regulations shall not apply on the side of the lot with the longest front lot line, unless either (1) the lot depth of the lot, measured on that side, is greater than 125 feet, or (2) the lot is a through lot. In no event shall the Established Building Setback be less than the required front yard for the zoning district.

Definitions, General: 12-13-1

LOT LINE, FRONT: That boundary of a lot which is along an existing or dedicated public street, or where no public street exists, is along a private street or public way. The owner of a corner lot may determine either street lot line as the front lot line.

Definition of terms: 12-13-3

YARD, FRONT: A yard extending along the full length of the front lot line between the side lot lines. On corner lots, the front lot line shall be the lot line faced by the front door.

Residential District regulations: 12-7-2

According to Table 2 of 12-7-2, Residential Districts Bulk Matrix,

1. Where a lot is located at the intersection of 2 or more streets, the required front yard shall be observed on each street, provided, however, that the buildable width of such lot
shall not be reduced to 30 feet for the R-1 district. No accessory building shall project beyond the front yard line on either street.

4. Village of Niles
(Source: https://www.municode.com/library/il/niles/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=COOR_A PBZOOR_S4REDI_4.3DIST)

Niles, Illinois - Code of Ordinances, APPENDIX B - ZONING ORDINANCE, SECTION - 2., 2.4 - RULES OF MEASUREMENT
M. Lot Line. A lot line is the property line of any lot. Lot lines are located as follows.
1. Front Lot Line
   a. The front lot line of an interior lot is the lot line that abuts a street.
   b. The front lot line of a corner lot is the shortest lot line that abuts a street.
   c. The front lot line of a through lot is established as follows:
      i. For through lots where a front lot line has been previously established on one or more lots located on the same blockface, the street designated as the front lot line of the through lots in such blockface is the front lot line. Previously established means one or more structures along the blockface have established front entrances along that lot line.
      ii. For through lots where a front line has not been previously established on one or more lots on the same blockface or where all lots have not established front lot lines along the same street, the front lot line will be designated by the Director of Community Development.

2. Corner Side Lot Line: The lot line that is perpendicular or approximately perpendicular to the front lot line, which is the longer abutting street lot line of a corner lot.
Q. Yards and Setbacks. A yard is the open space area between a principal building and the adjoining lot line. A required setback may be equal to or lesser than a yard and is the required minimum distance a principal building must be located from a lot line, which is unoccupied and unobstructed by any portion of a principal building or accessory structure, unless permitted by this Ordinance. A setback extends along a lot line for the minimum depth specified by the zoning district in which such lot is located. The minimum yard space required for one structure shall not again be considered as yard space for another adjoining structure.

No lot shall be reduced in area so that the yards or other open space become less than required by this ordinance.

a. Front Yard and Setback. A front yard is located between a principal building and the front lot line. A front setback is the required minimum distance per the zoning district that a principal building must be located from the front lot line. The front yard and setback extends the full width of the lot between side lot lines measured perpendicular to the front lot line.

b. Interior Side Yard and Setback. An interior side yard is located between a principal building and the interior side lot line. An interior side setback is the required minimum distance per the zoning district that a principal building must be located from the interior side lot line. The interior side yard and setback extends along the interior side lot line between the front and rear setback lines, measured perpendicular to the interior side lot line.

c. Corner Side Yard and Setback. A corner side yard is located between a principal building and the corner side lot line. A corner side setback is the required minimum distance per the zoning district that a principal building must be located from the corner side lot line. The corner side yard and setback extends along the corner side lot line between the front setback line and the rear lot line, measured perpendicular to the corner side lot line.
Fig 3 shows provision of setbacks for corner lots (Niles, Illinois - Code of Ordinances, APPENDIX B - ZONING ORDINANCE, SECTION - 2.4 - RULES OF MEASUREMENT)

5. Village of Skokie
(Source: https://www.municode.com/library/il/skokie/codes/zoning?nodeId=SUHITA_CH118ZO_ARTIIIDIRE_DIV1.1GEPR_S118-57FE)

Skokie, Illinois - Zoning, ARTICLE II. - DEFINITIONS

Lot line, front: a boundary of a lot that abuts an existing or dedicated public street, or, where no public street exists, is along a public way. On a corner lot, the lot line having the shortest length abutting a street shall be the front lot line.

Yard means an open area on a lot which is unobstructed from the center of the earth to the sky, except as otherwise provided in this chapter.

Yard, corner side, means a side yard which abuts a street.
**Yard, front**, means a yard extending along the front lot line, which is bounded by the side lot lines, the front lot line and the front yard line.

**Yard line** means a line in a lot that is parallel to the lot line along which the applicable yard extends and which is not nearer to such lot line at any point than the required depth or width of the applicable yard.

Sec. 118-74. - Reduction of lot area; front yards.

Along public rights-of-way, the requirements for a front yard shall be as follows:

(1) The required front yard is as set forth for the zoning district in which the lot is located.

(2) If 40 percent or more of the lots fronting 1 side of a street within a block have established building setbacks of a depth other than required for a front yard in the zoning district in which the lot is located, the front yard depth for each remaining lot, except for corner lots, shall be as follows:

   a. Extend a line from the closest front corner of the nearest principal building adjacent to 1 side of the lot to the closest front corner of the nearest principal building adjacent to the other side of the lot.

   b. Extend a line, at a point equidistant between the side lot lines, the shortest distance between the front lot line to a point where such line intersects the line mentioned in subsection (b)(2)a of this section.

   c. Extend a line at such point of intersection to the side lot lines, parallel to the front lot line. This line is the required setback line.

   d. If no principal building exists on 1 side of the lot to the end of the block, then extend the line described in subsection (b)(2)a of this section to the point of intersection of the closest side lot line and front yard lot line of the corner lot on such street frontage.

(3) On a through lot, either of the lot lines abutting a street right-of-way line in a given block may be established as the front lot line. However, when the front lot line of a lot in a block containing through lots has been established by an existing building, such front lot line shall be the front lot line for the remaining lots in the block.

(Zon. Ord., § 7.9; Ord. No. 05-8-C-3375, § 1, 8-1-2005)
Findings:

Determination of front lot line

From the above case studies, the following criteria are used to determine the front lot line:

- On lots with multiple street frontages, the property owner may select either street property line as the front property line.
- The front lot line of a corner lot is the shortest lot line that abuts a street.
- In Chicago, Highland Park and Des Plaines, the property owner or builder/developer is given the authority to decide which of the abutting street property lines can be chosen as front property line.
- In Niles and Skokie, the shortest property line abutting a street is chosen as the street property line.
- With respect to regulations to establish staff authority to determine the front yard of a parcel, the Village of Niles gives the authority to the Director of Community Development in case of a conflict.
- In general, the other cities enforce in their zoning ordinances that the Director of Community and Economic Development or the Zoning Administrator or staff in a similar position are authorized to administer and enforce the zoning ordinance as required.
Lot front - The side of a lot that abuts a public street is the front of the lot. For corner lots, the shortest side fronting upon a street shall be considered the front of the lot. Where buildings exist on the lot, the frontage may be established by the orientation of the buildings, or of the principal entrance, if building orientation does not clearly indicate lot frontage. Where no other method determines conclusively the front of a lot, the administrator shall select one frontage on the basis of traffic flow on adjacent streets, so that the lot is considered to front on the street with the greatest traffic flow. (Blacksburg, Va.)

Lot line, front - In the case of an interior lot, a line separating the lot from a street or place; and in the case of a corner lot, a line separating the narrowest frontage of the lot from street. (Perryville, Mo.)

That boundary of a lot which abuts an existing or dedicated public street, and in the case of a corner lot, it shall be the shortest dimension on a public street. If the dimensions of a corner lot are equal, the front lot line shall be designated by the owner and filed with the city. (Mora, Minn.)

The boundary of a lot which abuts an existing or proposed public street, and in the case of a corner lot, it is the shortest dimension on a public street. If the dimensions of a corner lot are within 10 percent of being equal, the front lot line is that street line designated by the owner and filed in the office of the building official. (Hopkins, Minn.)

In the case of an interior lot, a line separating the lot from the street or accessway; in the case of a corner lot, a line separating the narrowest frontage of the lot from a street or accessway; and in the case of a flag lot, the lot line closest to and most nearly parallel with the street which serves the lot. (Multnomah County, Ore.)

Setback, front, on corner lot - The front setback of a corner lot shall be measured from the side of the lot designated as the “front.” On a corner lot only one street line shall be considered as a front line, which shall be the shorter street frontage. (Henderson, Nev.)
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Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment

Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Parking Requirements
To: Chair and Members of the Plan Commission

From: Johanna Leonard, Director of Community Development
Scott Mangum, Planning and Zoning Administrator
Katie Knapp, Transportation and Mobility Coordinator
Meagan Jones, Neighborhood and Land Use Planner

Subject: Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment
Reduction of Parking Requirements in TOD Areas & TOD Parking Study

Date: July 7, 2017

Recommendation
Staff recommends approval of the Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment to reduce the parking requirements for residential uses in TOD areas, based on the Evanston Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Parking Study completed by Sam Schwartz Engineering and Duncan Associates. The proposal would modify the parking requirements for residential developments in TOD areas to more accurately reflect vehicle ownership rates. Specifically:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Requirements (per dwelling unit)</th>
<th>Existing (In TOD and outside TOD)</th>
<th>Proposed In TOD Areas</th>
<th>Proposed Outside TOD Areas (no change)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-family Dwelling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family attached and two-family dwellings</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio-1BD</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2BD</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3BD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background
The City applied for and was awarded a grant from the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) through its 2015 Community Planning Program to examine parking regulations in Metra and CTA transit-served areas. The grant award did not require any financial commitment from the City other than staff time to assist with the project.
The RTA staff and its consultants (Center for Neighborhood Technologies (CNT), Sam Schwartz Engineering and Duncan Associates) were assigned to prepare a TOD Parking Study evaluating parking requirements, parking demand and parking usage in Transit Oriented Development (TOD) areas across the City as well as local and national parking regulation trends and statistics to determine if any changes to the current parking requirements need to be made in the zoning ordinance. The revised draft study (attached) identifies short-term and long-term improvements to encourage transit use, track parking space use and adjust parking requirements in the areas around transit stations. The Evanston TOD recommendations would be used for Zoning Ordinance amendments, evaluation of city processes related to parking and during evaluation of proposed private developments.

**TOD Study Findings**

Evanston is well-served by both CTA and Metra rail lines, with a combined total of 11 transit stations. The City has made concerted efforts in encouraging denser, more walkable development near these transit stops in recent years, pushing for increased inclusion of car-sharing spaces, bicycle parking, Divvy expansion in the City and sponsorship or contributions to Divvy program. When looking closely at parking requirements in TOD areas, it was recognized that while the current parking requirements may be well suited in more residential areas away from transit stops, they often lead to underutilized parking spaces in TOD areas. This is also evidenced by a recent development, E2 located at 1881 Oak Avenue, requesting and being approved for an adjustment to their planned development which allows up to 25% of the existing parking spaces to be leased by the public. Currently, the average utilization of the parking spaces for that development, which was constructed with one space per unit, is less than 50%.

Based on the local and national research, as well as statistics and analysis of parking data within Evanston’s designated TOD areas (as outlined by the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, which range from 1/8 to 1/4 of a mile from transit stops), the study concludes that actual parking and transportation usage in Evanston’s TOD areas mirror national trends of reduced personal car ownership and usage; however, the current parking requirements do not reflect changes in multi-modal transportation trends nor actual parking usage observed in recent residential and mixed-use developments located within those TOD areas.

**Study Recommendations:**

Based on the analysis of the existing regulations, parking data, and broader TOD trends in peer and larger cities, the Study includes a list of recommendations for the City to consider which are summarized below:

**Short term projects:**

- Modify parking requirements based on the number of bedrooms in a unit, taking into account the average number of vehicles owned per bedroom (0.55 per bedroom, as proposed below).
• As an alternative to implementing parking requirements per bedroom, for simplicity the City could eliminate the reference to unit size in the Zoning Ordinance and require 1.0 space per unit for residential developments, regardless of unit size.

• Allow developers to propose further reductions on a case-by-case basis. These reductions must be supported by parking studies and market research, as well as Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies/programs. These can include providing car-share vehicles, bike share stations, transit passes, or other incentives.

• Require a multi-modal transportation study for all developments within a TOD.

• Require all developments that are granted a variance to provide vehicle ownership data to the City on an annual basis, up to five years after the occupancy permit is issued, to ensure the parking demand does not exceed the supply or negatively impact the adjacent streets.

• For developments over 100 units that request a parking variation, a transportation demand management plan must be provided that establishes mode split goals that align with the City’s goals and how they will be achieved.

• Encourage shared parking approaches to further reduce residential parking requirements in mixed-use developments if parking will in fact be shared.

• Consider establishing and implementing an impact fee, escrow payments, or fee-in-lieu of parking policy for incoming development reviews and proposed construction projects.

**Long term projects:**

• Conduct a comprehensive parking study of off-street facilities, both public and private, to determine future parking needs within key TODs and availability of supply.

**Parking & Transportation Committee Review**

In August of 2016, staff brought forth the study and a proposed text amendment that would reduce the parking requirements for multifamily residential developments located within in designated TOD areas to the Parking & Transportation Committee. The current and then proposed parking requirements, as well as parking incentive per the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance are outlined in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Requirements (per dwelling unit)</th>
<th>Existing (In TOD and outside TOD)</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Existing IHO parking incentives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In TOD Areas</td>
<td>Outside TOD Areas (no change)</td>
<td>In TOD Areas (no change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family Dwelling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family attached and two-family dwellings</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multiple-family dwellings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing (In TOD and outside TOD)</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Existing IHO parking incentives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In TOD Areas</td>
<td>Outside TOD Areas (no change)</td>
<td>In TOD Areas (no change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family Dwelling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family attached and two-family dwellings</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple-family dwellings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio-1BD</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2BD</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the Committee’s initial review of the TOD Parking Study and proposed amendments the Committee provided feedback which centered largely on the following items:

- Concern of reducing the parking to proposed extent of 1 space per dwelling unit
- Additional information on the number of vehicles registered at TOD developments in comparison to actual parking utilization.
- Additional information on the number of vehicles registered in Evanston compared with the number of households within Evanston.
- Possibility of an impact or escrow fee in lieu of providing required parking.
- Possibility of starting with a pilot TOD parking area to gather data on effectiveness.
- Projection of vehicle ownership in the future.

In addition to the proposed revisions to vehicle parking in TOD areas, there were proposed bike parking revisions, however, no discussion on this item occurred during that August meeting. Bike parking regulations will be brought before the Commission at a future date to be determined.

Proposal Summary
Based on the TOD Study findings and recommendation and comments from the Parking & Transportation Committee, staff is proposing to modify the parking requirements for residential developments in TOD areas to more accurately reflect vehicle ownership rates. The current and proposed parking requirements, as well as parking incentive per the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance are outlined in the table below:
Staff believes the proposed revised TOD parking requirements are consistent with the City’s goal to be a community that offers safe affordable and easily accessible alternatives to the automobile, promoting public transportation ridership as an alternative to automobile use and aiding in the promotion of higher-density residential and mixed-use development in close proximity to transit stops.

Following the review and recommendations of the Commission, staff will update the proposed Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment and present it to the Planning & Development Committee and the City Council.

Attachments
TOD Parking Study
[Link to TOD Area maps from Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (IHO)]
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Introduction
The City of Evanston has put forth a concentrated effort toward decreasing the community’s reliance on the automobile through increasing the density of the city within a short walk to transit. Evanston has excellent access to transit with ten transit stations along the CTA Purple line, the Metra Union Pacific-North line and a connection to the CTA Red and Yellow lines. The community’s planning efforts have paid off with significantly lower automobile ownership than its surrounding suburban counterparts and increasing development and commercial activity around transit stations.

But while the driving and parking characteristics of the community have evolved and continue to change, especially in areas adjacent to transit, Evanston’s residential parking requirements do not reflect the influence of transit, lower vehicle ownership and actual parking demands by residents. Through zoning updates, the City hopes to encourage increased multi-modal travel by residents, businesses and visitors within Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) areas – areas with mixed-use development in proximity of a transit station. The City also hopes to balance parking supply with demand and eliminate unnecessary parking requirements in these TOD areas.

To study this particular issue, Evanston was awarded funding from the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) through its 2015 Community Planning Program which, among other goals, aims to support zoning updates that encourage transit-friendly development. The intent of the funding was to support an examination of the City’s parking regulations to determine the appropriate amount of off-street parking required in its TOD areas.

As such, the purpose of this study is to provide the City with research and parking data to help determine adjustments needed to the Zoning Ordinance that better reflect actual private, off-street parking needs in TOD areas. The following report summarizes our parking analysis and provides recommendations to implement TOD area parking requirements.

What is Transit-Oriented Development and how does parking fit in?
Transit-oriented development, commonly referred to as TOD, is typically defined as compact, higher-density, mixed-use development in proximity of a transit station. Within a TOD, a resident has the ability to walk, bike or take transit to work, and meet a combination of convenience and lifestyle needs within a short walk of home. When communities add TOD, they become less reliant on automobiles and the benefits accrue at multiple levels. For example, TOD:

- **Can lower the cost of living by helping households live with fewer cars.** TOD provides the opportunity for households to own fewer cars, drive them less, and generate savings on transportation that can be spent at local businesses or on other needs. Across Evanston, the typical household owns 1.36 cars. According to the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT), the cost of owning and driving those cars means that the household cost of transportation is $10,070 per year.\(^1\) But in downtown Evanston, a typical household owns 1.15 cars and the cost of transportation is $8,860 per year, or 12% less.

---

\(^1\) Center for Neighborhood Technology, Housing + Transportation Affordability Index, 2016. [http://htaindex.cnt.org/map/](http://htaindex.cnt.org/map/)
**Can connect households with jobs.** When commuters can easily access a rail station from their home, it greatly expands the number of jobs they can reach within a 60-minute commute. For example, households in downtown Evanston can reach 1.3 million jobs, or 30% of the regional total, within a 60-minute transit ride, in addition to 9,534 jobs at Northwestern University.²

**Can reduce vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gases.** When households can live close to transit, they can drive less, reduce traffic congestion, and can produce fewer greenhouse gases (GHGs) from their transportation behavior. According to the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT), in downtown Evanston, the typical household drives 14,436 miles per year and generates 4.49 metric tons of GHGs per year, compared to 15,900 and 6.06 metric tons citywide.³

**Can increase property values.** TODs increase tax revenues near transit stations by promoting high intensity development in areas of significant transit investment. For example, a three-story development in a downtown can generate up to 100 times more property tax revenue per acre than a single family home on an equivalently sized parcel.⁴

**Can increase and stabilize property values.** In addition to the increased tax increment that TOD may generate, it can also preserve home values during market fluctuations. During the real estate downturn between 2006 and 2011, CNT has found that while the average sales price for residential properties in the Chicago region declined by nearly a third during this period, residential properties near transit were most resilient to the recession. The average sales price for a property within a ½-mile of all Metra and CTA rail stations outperformed the regional average by 29.7%.⁵

**Can Attract more development to the downtown core.** When parking requirements are decreased, developers are no longer required to purchase additional land to construct unnecessary parking assets. This increases the amount of services that are able to locate in a centralized area, encourages cross-shopping since patrons are more likely to stop in other stores while completing their errands, and promotes sustainable development in the downtown core area.

**Is aligned with the region’s mobility goals.** Data provided by the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP) indicates that while single occupancy vehicle (SOV) trips still represent the majority of work trip taken in the region, SOV mode share in the region has not increased since 2000⁶, which can be seen in **Figure 1**.

---

³ CNT, H+T Index, 2016.
One of the main goals included in CMAP’s regional plan (GOTO 2040) is to make an effort to reduce the number of SOV trips and increase the volume of transit ridership to reduce congestion, discourage sprawl, increase land conservation, and centralize planning efforts. Currently, weekday ridership on the region’s transit system is about two million, or approximately 9 percent of the total trips taken each weekday. CMAP’s goal is to increase transit ridership’s share to 13.5 percent of trips made each weekday — or approximately four million trips by 2040. In order to increase transit ridership, it is essential to increase the volume of housing that is transit accessible by creating and leveraging TOD developments within the region. Today, approximately 68% of residents can walk to transit stations from their home, while 76% of residents can walk to transit from their place of work. CMAP’s GOTO 2040 plan establishes a goal of increasing those “walk-to” rates to 75% and 80%, respectively.\footnote{Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP), GOTO 2040 Comprehensive Plan: Increase Commitment to public transit. http://www.cmap.illinois.gov/documents/10180/17842/GO-TO-2040-short-plan_10-7-2010_FINAL.pdf/2840498d-96fa-43fa-9784-9c8f364b4547}

These benefits accrue as a community becomes less dependent on automobiles. Municipalities maximize these gains when they prioritize allocating space towards housing units, retail and office space, rather than parking stalls to store automobiles. All too often, however, minimum parking requirements require new development to add parking that is not needed. When that parking sits underutilized, it generates opportunity costs that can set communities back in maximizing TOD. Excessive parking requirements can:

- **Make market rate housing more expensive.** In the Chicago region, the cost to construct a parking space can vary between $4,200 in a surface lot and $37,300 in an indoor, underground parking garage.\footnote{Donald Shoup, High Cost of Minimum Parking Requirements – numbers have been inflation adjusted for the Chicago market, 2012-5 –(Original Source: Rider Levett Bucknall, Quarterly Construction Cost Report, Third Quarter (2012))} Developers pass on the costs to renters and owners and a stall can increase the asking price of a unit by as much as 12.5%.
● **Reduce the number of affordable housing units.** In a subsidized housing development, every dollar spent building parking spaces is a dollar not spent providing housing for people. In one case study, to provide housing without parking at an $80,000 purchase price, aimed at a family earning $30,000, a non-profit developer would need a $4,000 subsidy. But requiring two parking spaces would increase the funding gap in this case study project to $26,251. Keeping the cost of construction constant, those limited subsidy dollars could fund 6.5 times as many units if allocated entirely towards housing, rather than towards parking.

● **Reduce the amount of space for non-parking uses.** Between the stall itself, the turning radius, and lanes and ramps, each parking spot requires about 350 square feet. Within a ten unit building, 20 parking spaces would require 7,000 square feet of space. That space could be reallocated towards five new units at 1,000 square feet apiece, twenty bicycle spaces at 12.5 square feet apiece, up to 10 more ADA spaces, and three parking spaces dedicated to shared vehicles, with 700 square feet to spare.

● **Encourage people to own more cars and drive more.** When parking is provided, residents are more likely to use an automobile than to consider taking healthy, active modes of transportation. Vehicle trip generation rates increase when the supply of parking spaces increases. Residents of neighborhoods with standard parking minimums are 28% more likely to drive to work than in similar neighborhoods without them.

● **Disproportionately burden the poor, old, young, and disabled, who subsidize transportation for the relatively more affluent.** Parking minimums typically require that a development provide the same number of spaces for every unit, even when the tenant might be less likely to own a car. Tenants that do not own cars but pay for parking bundled within their rent effectively help subsidize parking for those who do use it.

### Parking in Evanston TODs

Evanston has eight TOD areas defined by its Inclusionary Housing Ordinance that are generally described as the area within 1/8 of a mile from a transit rail station plus all property within ¼ of a mile of the station along the main commercial corridors. The TOD areas, shown contiguous in [Map 1](#), consist of:

- Central-Evanston (CTA Purple)
- Central Street (UP-N)
- Noyes-Foster (CTA Purple)
- Davis Street (CTA Purple, UP-N)
- Dempster Street (CTA Purple)
- Main Street (CTA Purple, UP-N)
- South Boulevard (Purple)

---


Howard Street (CTA Purple, Red, Yellow)

*Map 2* shows Evanston population by census tract.

This section discusses the details of Evanston’s Zoning Ordinance with regard to current residential parking requirements, notes recently approved Planned Development parking development allowances and compares the actual parking demand in TOD areas. It also discusses the availability of public parking and the role of TOD in Evanston’s decreasing vehicle ownership rates.

**Evanston Zoning Ordinance Requirements**

There is currently one parking requirement for all new residential projects in Evanston, including ones close to transit, as specified in City’s Zoning Ordinance. As stated in 6-16-2 of the City Code, “each principal building or use shall provide the minimum number of off-street parking spaces as identified in Table 16-B”. Required off-street parking facilities shall be used solely for the users of the building. The parking requirements listed in Table 16-B for typical residential developments in Evanston are as follows:

- Single-family detached dwellings: 2.00 parking spaces per unit
- Single-family attached dwellings: 1.50 parking spaces per unit
- Multi-family attached dwellings (1 bedroom): 1.25 parking spaces per unit
- Multi-family attached dwellings (2 bedrooms): 1.50 parking spaces per unit
- Multi-family attached dwellings (3 or more bedrooms): 2.00 parking spaces per unit

The City allows for required parking to be provided off-site, either in a lot owned privately and located less than 1,000 feet from the property (when ten or more spaces are required), or leased from the City in a public facility located not more than 1,000 feet from the property and not located in a more restrictive zoning district (if not R1 through R4).

There are no residential parking requirement exemptions in the City’s Zoning Ordinance, but they can be requested by variance, or as a development allowance for Planned Development projects. Shared parking is allowed for certain nonresidential uses and a general 20% parking reduction for nonresidential uses is allowed in the Downtown districts. Furthermore, the first 2,000 square feet for nonresidential uses in business districts, and the first 3,000 square feet for nonresidential in the Downtown districts are exempt from the parking requirements.

*Map 3* shows the TOD areas overlaid on the City’s land use map.

**Existing Public Parking Facilities in Evanston**

As previously mentioned, the City allows part or all of the required parking spaces to be leased from the City to serve the subject property as long as the spaces are located within 1,000 feet of the property and the development is not in R1 through R4. There are over 30 public surface lots in the community, including City, CTA and privately owned public lots. Public surface parking consists of approximately 1,975 free, metered and permit parking spaces. Three public parking garages are located in the Davis Street TOD area containing a total of 3,583 parking spaces. Public surface lots and garages are shown in three separate maps numbered *Map 4, 5, and 6* corresponding to the North, Central and South portions of Evanston.
Occupancy counts provided by the City at all three garages in 2014 show these garages to be approximately 59% occupied overall at peak times on weekdays and 43% occupied on weekends. The demand of the public parking garages is shown in Table 1.

### Table 1
**Public Parking Garages: Supply and Utilization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Parking Garage</th>
<th>Capacity (spaces)</th>
<th>Weekday Utilization</th>
<th>Weekend Utilization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum Peak</td>
<td>Average Peak (2:00pm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800 Maple St. Self Park</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,020 (73%)</td>
<td>815 (58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church St. Self Park</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>527 (89%)</td>
<td>312 (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman Plaza Self Park</td>
<td>1,347</td>
<td>990 (73%)</td>
<td>863 (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,347</td>
<td>2,537 (76%)</td>
<td>1,990 (59%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ACS Car Ownership Changes
According to the 2014 American Community Survey, vehicle ownership rates in Evanston is approximately 1.36 vehicles per household (Cook County, including the City of Chicago, has an ownership rate of 1.42 vehicles per household). However, these ownership rates are much less in areas around transit.

- Vehicle ownership rates of census tracts that include all TOD areas in the City are 9% lower than Evanston’s already-low car ownership rate.
- In the area around the Davis Street TOD, car ownership is 15-16% lower than the City overall.
- Over the five years prior to 2014, car ownership, as measured by the average number of vehicles available per household, has declined almost 10% throughout the City.
- Car ownership in tracts that contain a TOD is less than 12% than it was five years ago, and 4% less than one year ago.

These numbers clearly demonstrate the downward trend of car ownership in Evanston’s TOD areas.

### TOD Planned Development Parking Demand
In a traffic study completed for the development at 1620 Central Street by Kenig, Lindgren, O’Hara, Aboona, Inc. (KLOA), parking utilization counts were provided at four TOD developments in Downtown Evanston. The locations of these developments and a summary of the parking data is shown in Table 2. Peak parking demand at the four locations ranged from 0.9 vehicles per unit to 1.05 vehicles per unit, with an average peak demand of 0.94 vehicles per unit.
### Table 2
**Actual TOD Parking Characteristics**
*Summary of Parking Survey Results (by KLOA, Inc.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Closest Station</th>
<th>Transit to Station</th>
<th>1 BR</th>
<th>2 BR</th>
<th>3 BR+</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>Average Unit Size</th>
<th>Parking Supply (spaces per du)</th>
<th>Peak Parking Demand (spaces per du)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optima Towers</td>
<td>1580 Sherman Ave</td>
<td>CTA - Davis Metra - Evanston (Davis Street)</td>
<td>0.2 miles</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optima Views</td>
<td>1720 Maple Ave</td>
<td>CTA - Davis Metra - Evanston (Davis Street)</td>
<td>0.2 miles</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optima Horizons</td>
<td>800 Elgin Road</td>
<td>CTA - Davis</td>
<td>0.3 miles</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Reserve</td>
<td>1930 Ridge Ave</td>
<td>CTA - Foster</td>
<td>0.2 miles</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.94</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recently Approved Parking Development Allowances for Planned Developments

It is the purview of City Council to approve development allowances regarding parking requirements. The Plan Commission makes recommendations to City Council on parking for Planned Developments. Given the decreasing ownership rates and the resulting decrease in parking demand, the City has recently approved several developments near transit with reduced parking requirements. Each of these variations is described below and also shown on Maps 4, 5, and 6.

- **835 Chicago Ave** – 1.09 spaces per dwelling unit (Main Street (CTA Purple, UP-N))
- **1571 Maple** – 1.13 spaces per dwelling unit, all but 12 of which are provided within the 1800 Maple St Self Park facility. Two on-site car-share spaces are designated. (Davis Street (CTA Purple, UP-N))
- **1620 Central Street** – 1.15 spaces per dwelling unit (Central-Evanston (CTA Purple), Central Street (UP-N))
- **1700 Central Street** – 1.0 space per dwelling unit. One car-share space is designated. (Central-Evanston (CTA Purple), Central Street (UP-N))
- **824-828 Noyes Street** - 0.8 spaces per dwelling unit. (Noyes-Foster (CTA Purple))
- **831 Emerson Street** - 0.7 spaces per dwelling unit. Two car-share spaces are designated. (Noyes-Foster (CTA Purple))

**Vehicle Ownership**

At the request of the City, vehicle ownership rates in applicable TOD buildings were analyzed. Specific addresses for applicable residential and mixed-use buildings were determined with staff, and registered vehicle counts by address were obtained from the Secretary of State. Table 3 shows a breakdown of each building unit count based on number of bedrooms and the associated registered vehicle count. An average vehicle ownership rate among the data set was determined to be .94 vehicles per unit, as opposed to the 1.15 vehicle ownership rate that exists outside of the TOD area.
### Table 3
**Summary of Vehicle Ownership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Closest Transit Station</th>
<th>Miles to Station</th>
<th># of Spaces</th>
<th>1 BR</th>
<th>2 BR</th>
<th>3 BR</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>Vehicles per du¹</th>
<th>Vehicle per br¹</th>
<th>Parking Supply per du¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1717 Ridge</td>
<td>1717 Ridge Avenue</td>
<td>CTA - Davis Metra - Evanston (Davis Street)</td>
<td>0.2 mi</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMLI</td>
<td>705-749 Chicago Ave</td>
<td>CTA - Main Metra - Evanston (Main Street)</td>
<td>0.2 mi</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Station</td>
<td>1720 Central Street</td>
<td>Metra – Evanston (Central Street)</td>
<td>0.1 mi</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optima Towers</td>
<td>1580 Sherman Ave</td>
<td>CTA - Davis Metra - Evanston (Davis Street)</td>
<td>0.2 mi</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optima Views</td>
<td>1720 Maple Ave</td>
<td>CTA - Davis Metra - Evanston (Davis Street)</td>
<td>0.2 mi</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optima Horizons</td>
<td>800 Elgin Road</td>
<td>CTA - Davis</td>
<td>0.3 mi</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Reserve</td>
<td>1930 Ridge Ave</td>
<td>CTA - Foster</td>
<td>0.2 mi</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640 Maple</td>
<td>1640 Maple Avenue</td>
<td>CTA - Davis Metra - Evanston (Davis Street)</td>
<td>0.1 mi</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1572 Maple</td>
<td>1572 Maple Avenue</td>
<td>CTA - Davis Metra - Evanston (Davis Street)</td>
<td>0.1 mi</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman Plaza Condominiums</td>
<td>807 Davis Street</td>
<td>CTA - Davis Metra - Evanston (Davis Street)</td>
<td>0.2 mi</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>831 Emerson*</td>
<td>831 Emerson</td>
<td>CTA - Foster</td>
<td>0.2 mi</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2*</td>
<td>1881 Oak St</td>
<td>CTA - Foster</td>
<td>0.3 mi</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>824 Noyes*</td>
<td>824 Noyes</td>
<td>CTA - Noyes</td>
<td>0.1 mi</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1571 Maple*</td>
<td>1571 Maple</td>
<td>CTA - Davis Metra - Evanston (Davis Street)</td>
<td>0.2 mi</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620 Central*</td>
<td>1620 Central Street</td>
<td>Metra – Central Street</td>
<td>0.2 mi</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago &amp; Main*</td>
<td>835 Chicago</td>
<td>CTA - Main Metra - Evanston (Main Street)</td>
<td>0.1 mi</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Source: Illinois Secretary of State, 2015 data set. *Approved or recently constructed developments with no official number of registered vehicles.

**E2 Development 94% occupied with peak parking utilization rates ranging from 36% to 46% during a timeframe surveyed by KLOA.**
Peer & Large City Comparison

A number of cities across the United States are making adjustments to their parking requirements to reflect the changes in parking demand around transit stations. As part of this study, the project team conducted a review of the requirements in several peer cities across the country, as well as a few larger cities with applicable TOD parking ordinances (see Appendix).

Table 4
Comparison of Multi-Family Residential Parking Requirements in Peer and Large Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Residential</th>
<th>TOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min (low)</td>
<td>Min (high)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evanston, IL</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto, CA</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, MA</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder, CO</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena, CA</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis, MN</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings

The existing parking and transportation characteristics in Evanston’s Transit Oriented Development areas mirror those expected of land use with close proximity to transit access and, in many cases, an easy walk to a mix of uses like commercial and office. Residents own fewer cars and drive less. Providing off-street parking for residential uses within these TODS, as well as all areas of the City, is a requirement in Evanston, as it is with almost all American cities. But while parking characteristics within these TOD

---

areas are very different than the City overall, these existing parking requirements for new residential developments do not consider such differences within the Ordinance.

Based on surveys completed in four TOD developments in Evanston, the average peak parking demand is 0.94 vehicles per unit, with a range between 0.90 and 1.05 vehicles per unit. However, the supply of these developments averaged to be 1.29, ranging between 1.16 and 1.49. Similarly, according to data provided by the Illinois Secretary of State, vehicle ownership at ten Evanston TOD developments averages 1.07 vehicles per unit while the supply per unit averages 1.31. This demonstrates that the existing ordinance, which requires between 1.25 to 2.0 spaces for every unit, overstates the actual parking demand of these developments. When the supply of parking is overbuilt in this manner, it induces the demand for parking for these developments as residents are less likely to pursue alternative transportation modes if they are offered a parking space free of charge or at a discounted rate.

To better reflect the demand, the City has approved reduced parking at development near transit as a result of the decreasing vehicle ownership rates and associated decrease in parking demand, with recently approved development allowances ranging from 0.72 to 1.15 spaces per dwelling unit. However, this reduction is now required to be completed through a planned development or variance process that takes time and uncertainty to complete. This lengthy process can be a significant deterrent to new development.

The Peer City comparison demonstrates that cities are taking different approaches towards residential parking requirements for TOD. For smaller units (1 bedroom or less), the range is zero to 1.125 spaces per dwelling unit, and for larger units (2+ bedrooms) the range is zero to 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit. Evanston’s requirements, in comparison, are higher than all peer cities reviewed. Among the larger city comparisons, TOD parking minimums ranged from 0 to 0.85 spaces per dwelling unit. The conclusion is that cities are making changes to their ordinances to reflect the reduced demand of vehicles of TODs.

**Recommendations**

Based on the findings of this study, the City of Evanston’s parking requirements overstate the amount of parking that new residential developments near transit must build. The City of Evanston should create separate parking requirements for new developments located within TOD areas as defined by the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance. As such, the following recommendations are offered:

- Adopt lower parking requirements based on the number of bedrooms in a unit. The average number of vehicles owned per bedroom was recorded at 0.56, which was used to guide the recommendations presented in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of bedrooms</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio/1 BR</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 BR</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 BR</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Specifying parking requirements by bedroom count rather than using a flat-rate per dwelling unit is more administratively complex, but is likely to more accurately reflect vehicle ownership rates. Renters or owners who live in a studio or one-bedroom apartment are more likely to be individuals who can satisfy their daily commute and activities via public transit or shared mobility services. Renters or owners of a two or three-bedroom unit, on the other hand, are more likely to be families or larger households who may not be able to complete all of their trips without owning or sharing a vehicle. The bedroom-based approach may also have the collateral benefit of making smaller units more affordable, thereby helping satisfy another city goal.

- As an alternative to implementing parking requirements per bedroom, for simplicity the City could eliminate the reference to unit size in the Zoning Ordinance and require 1.0 space per unit for residential developments, regardless of unit size. While the average number of vehicles owned per unit was recorded at 1.11, actual demand surveys show a peak of 0.94 vehicles per unit. Furthermore, the proposed requirement of 1.0 will encourage even lower vehicle ownership, and continue to allow for a more walkable, transit-oriented environment. It should also be noted that the City is already allowing for a 1.0 space per unit supply through recently approved Planned Developments. Allow developers to propose further reductions on a case by case basis. These reductions must be supported by parking studies and market research, as well as Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies/programs that the developer must demonstrate will reduce automobile ownership. These can include providing car-share vehicles, bike share stations, transit passes, or other incentives to reduce the need for vehicles and should be monitored through reports submitted on a regular basis (between one and five years). It is recommended that the character and standards of these TDM strategies be guided by the TDM zoning ordinance in Cambridge Massachusetts.

- Require a multi-modal transportation study for all developments within a TOD. This study can include, but is not limited to examining the transit, bus, driving, parking, ridesharing, carsharing, pedestrian, and bicycle network.

- Require all developments that are granted a variance or development allowance to provide vehicle ownership data to the City on an annual basis, up to five years after the occupancy permit is issued, to ensure the parking demand does not exceed the supply or negatively impact the adjacent streets.

- For developments over 100 units that request a parking reduction, a transportation demand management plan must be provided that establishes mode split goals that align with the City’s goals and how they will be achieved. This should be included with the traditional traffic and parking study that new developments are required to complete.

- Encourage shared parking approaches to further reduce residential requirements in mixed-use developments if parking will in fact be shared.

- Consider establishing and implementing an impact fee, escrow payments, or fee-in-lieu of parking policy for incoming development reviews and proposed construction projects. This should begin with a pilot area in order to measure the impacts created from reducing the parking requirement, followed by a period of analysis to decipher best practices for implementation.

- In addition to the changes to the parking requirements, the City should conduct a comprehensive parking study of off-street facilities, both public and private, to determine future parking needs within key TODs and availability of supply to accommodate.
Appendix

Cities used to compare parking and review parking requirements shown in Table 4 in the report include:

- Chicago, IL
- Palo Alto, CA
- Cambridge, MA
- Boulder, CO
- Pasadena, CA
- Berkeley, CA
- Minneapolis, MN
- Portland, OR
- Arlington, VA

Chicago, IL

**Population:** 2.7 million

**Overview:** Evanston’s neighbor to the south.

**Transit:** The Chicago Transit Authority operates the nation’s second largest public transportation system with eight rapid train routes including the three that service Evanston. Metra operates 11 commuter rail lines through Chicago, including the Union Pacific North that serves Evanston.

**Parking Regulation:** In September 2015, the City approved a TOD ordinance that allows a 100% reduction of parking requirements in B (Business districts intended to accommodate retail, service and commercial uses), C (Commercial districts intended to accommodate retail, service and commercial uses), and D (Downtown) districts if there are enough other transportation options provided in the area. TOD is defined as an area within ¼-mile of a CTA or Metra rail station and within ½-mile of a CTA or Metra rail station and on Pedestrian or Pedestrian Retail Street.

Palo Alto, CA

**Population:** 67,000

**Overview:** A higher income community in Northern California, home to Stanford University and many tech businesses.

**Transit:** Train service is available via Caltrain commuter rail with two regular stops and one special event stop at Stanford.

**Parking Regulation:** Their zoning ordinance allows for a reduction of 20% of the total spaces required by ordinance for residential uses located within a designated Pedestrian/Transit Oriented area or in close proximity to other “public transportation facilities serving a significant portion of residents, when such reduction will be commensurate with the reduced parking demand created by the housing facility.” If the development has a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan, additional parking reductions can be applied to land uses based on type of land use and TDM, but maximum parking reduction is 30% for market rate housing, 40% for affordable housing and 50% for housing for the elderly.
Cambridge, MA
Population: 110,000
Overview: A city with many neighborhood centers that borders Boston and is home to a number of universities including Harvard University and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Transit: One rapid transit line with five stations extends through Cambridge, as well as a connection to an additional rapid transit line and commuter rail service to Boston.
Parking Regulations: Cambridge zoning regulations do not offer any specific discounts for proximity to transit, though it permits developments to reduce the amount of parking based on proximity to transit through a parking study determining demand. Implementation of a TDM plan is required as part of the approval process.

Boulder, CO
Population: 105,000
Overview: A city often top ranked for well-being and quality of life and home to the main campus of University of Colorado.
Transit: Boulder has an extensive bus system that services nearby cities and the Denver airport.
Regulation: Boulder has no parking minimums for land uses MU-4 (Mixed Use 4) and RH-7 (Residential – High 7), which are both intended as high density residential uses close to transit with a pedestrian oriented pattern. A parking maximum is instead in place for 1.0 space per dwelling unit. City code also has special trip generation requirements for these land uses.

Pasadena, CA
Population: 140,000
Overview: A city in Los Angeles County, home to many scientific and cultural institutions including Caltech, and has been recently at the forefront of the parking discussion.
Transit: Rapid transit in Pasadena is provided via six stations along the LA Metro Gold Line, which originates in LA and extends several communities beyond Pasadena.
Parking Regulation: Pasadena has parking requirements for developments within ¼-mile of a rapid transit station or within their Central Transit-Oriented Area. Requirements are minimum of 1.0 space and maximum of 1.25 space for units less than 650 sf and minimum of 1.5 spaces and maximum of 1.75 spaces per unit over 650 sf. Parking requirements may be further reduced with a parking demand study. On-street permits are not allowed for people that live in these developments.

Berkeley, CA
Population: 120,000
Overview: A city in the San Francisco Bay Area with many distinct neighborhoods, the densest of which surrounds the University of California Berkeley.
Transit: Berkeley is served by three rapid transit stations with connecting service throughout the Bay Area, and one regular stop on Amtrak commuter rail service between Auburn and San Jose.
Parking Regulation: City parking regulations do not specifically contain requirements related to proximity to transit. New residential development within a designated area (Car-Free Overlay) south of the UC Berkeley campus are not required to provide any off-street parking, and existing parking within this area may be reduced subject to approval of a Use Permit. Occupants of residential properties within this car-free overlay may not receive residential parking permits. The Zoning Officer or Board may approve parking waivers or modifications for other residential development in the R-S (Residential Southside) zone based on a determination that additional or new on-site parking would be detrimental.
Minneapolis, MN
Population: 407,000
Overview: Minneapolis, along with its Twin City Saint Paul, makes up the second-largest economic center in the Midwest, behind Chicago.
Transit: Minneapolis has two light rail lines, one commuter rail line and over 100 bus routes that carry over 85 percent of the system’s daily passengers.
Parking Regulation: Minneapolis distinguishes between high and moderate frequency transit service: moderate frequency is defined as 15-30 minute midday service, while high frequency is defined as midday service every 15 minutes or less. The City has ordinance that allows for the elimination of off-street parking requirements for multi-family residential buildings located within 350 feet of a high-frequency bus route or rail station. Depending on the size of the building, a 50 to 100 percent reduction is allowed within a TOD area ¼-mile around a high frequency bus route or ½ mile from a rail station. The City has ordinance that allows for a 10 percent reduction of off-street parking requirements for multi-family residential buildings located within 350 feet of a moderate-frequency bus route or rail station.

Portland, OR
Population: 620,000
Overview: Portland is known to be one of the most environmentally conscious cities in the country with high walkability, bicycle connections and well-planned transit-oriented development.
Transit: Portland’s transit system is extensive, consisting of five light rail lines, two streetcar lines, 80 bus routes and commuter rail.
Parking Regulation: The City of Portland sets parking maximums based on intensity of development and proximity to transit service. Areas where high intensity development is present/anticipated or areas well served by transit have lower maximums than areas with lower development density or where transit is less frequent. Specifically, the city planning and zoning code calls for the lowest maximums in areas that are within a ¼-mile walk from a frequently served bus stop or within a ½-mile walk from a frequently served rail station.

Arlington, VA
Population: 230,000
Overview: Arlington County is located within the Washington metropolitan area. It is headquarters to many departments and agencies of the federal government, as well as home to many national memorials.
Transit: Arlington is accessible to the nation’s capital through a rapid transit system called Metrorail which is administered and operated by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA). Additionally, the Arlington Transit system operates within Arlington County, supplementing Metrobus with cross-County routes and neighborhood connections to Metrorail.
Parking Regulation: Washington Governing regulations do not specifically contain residential parking reductions for proximity to transit (Metro) stations. Reductions and exemptions are provided for parking requirements related to a variety of commercial uses.
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