

memorandum

DATE: September 1, 2020
TO: Rochester Hills Planning Commission
FROM: Jill Bahm & Eric Fazzini, Giffels Webster
SUBJECT: Zoning Issue Discussion – Multiple Family Development Parking Comparison

Barrington Park

148 units on 15.6 acres (9.5 units/acre); all units 3-bedroom

Current ZO Required	Provided
333 spaces	686 spaces
148 units x 2 spaces/3-bd = 296 spaces	296 garage
0.25 visitor spaces/unit = 37 spaces	296 garage approach (driveway)
4 ADA	94 guest/parallel

Link to plans: <http://atlas.rochesterhills.org/DevelopmentProjects/BarringtonParkmoreinfo.pdf>

Draft Ordinance Required	Draft Ordinance Effect
370 spaces	Increase of 37 visitor spaces required; would meet the draft ordinance as 94 guest/parallel (visitor) spaces were provided
148 units x 2 spaces/3-bd = 296 spaces	
<u>0.5</u> visitor spaces* /unit = 74 spaces	

*Spaces located within garages, carports, or on driveways shall not be counted towards the visitor space minimum parking requirement

Planner Comments: We observed that Barrington Park had ample parking provided during two site visits. Each unit has 4 tandem parking spaces, 2 spaces within each garage and 2 driveway spaces. The 94 guest/parallel spaces are provided as on-street spaces spread out over the entire development such that one row of on-street spaces is in front of each building as would be seen in a typical urban setting. This provides on-street visitor parking in a balanced manner related to the location of each building and eliminates the need for separate visitor parking lots within the development. Additional on-street spaces are available on the sides of buildings that were not counted towards the 94 spaces provided.



Cedar Valley (FB)

99 units on 6 acres (16.5 units/acre); Building A: 43 units and Building B: 56 units

Current ZO Required	Provided
149 spaces	157 spaces
99 units x 1.5 spaces/2-bd = 149 spaces	All spaces provided within parking lot (no garages/driveways)
No FB visitor requirement	
9 ADA	85 carport spaces (within parking lot)

Link to plans: <http://atlas.rochesterhills.org/DevelopmentProjects/Cedarvalleymoreinfo.pdf>

Draft Ordinance Required	Draft Ordinance Effect
199 spaces	Increase of 50 visitor spaces required; would be deficient by 42 spaces (199-157) as the FB does not currently require visitor spaces
99 units x 1.5 spaces/2-bd = 149 spaces	
<u>0.5</u> visitor spaces* /unit = 50 spaces	

*Spaces located within garages, carports, or on driveways shall not be counted towards the visitor space minimum parking requirement

Planner Comments: Cedar Valley is in the form of a typical suburban multiple family development with parking provided exclusively within parking lots and carports surrounding buildings. Not providing spaces within garages or driveways associated with units increases the distance people walk from their car to each unit as the site plan does not indicated spaces “owned” or reserved for units, but rather all spaces within the parking lot area are shared between all units and visitors. The development would be deficient of the draft ordinance by 50 spaces as no visitor-specific spaces were required or provided. The development could address this by providing more parking spaces and/or reducing the number of units.



Source: <https://www.apartmentfinder.com/Michigan/Rochester-Hills-Apartments/Cedar-Valley-Luxury-Apartments-rh2f5m0>

Redwood Living

119 units on 30 acres (4 units/acre); all units attached side-by-side

Current ZO Required	Provided
203 spaces	264 spaces
119 units x 1.5 spaces/2-bd = 179 spaces	Each unit has 4 tandem spaces, 2 garage + 2 driveway
0.2 visitor spaces/unit = 24 spaces	
On-street parking prohibited by developer	
	3 small parking lots in south phase (17 spcs)

Link to plans: <http://atlas.rochesterhills.org/DevelopmentProjects/RedwoodatRHmoreinfo.pdf>

Draft Ordinance Required	Draft Ordinance Effect
239 spaces	Increase of 43 visitor spaces required beyond 17 spaces provided in south phase (60-17); additional parking lots and/or on-street parking would be required to meet the draft ordinance
119 units x 1.5 spaces/2-bd = 179 spaces	
<u>0.5</u> visitor spaces* /unit = 60 spaces	

*Spaces located within garages, carports, or on driveways shall not be counted towards the visitor space minimum parking requirement

Planner Comments: It is unclear why the development was designed to prohibit on-street parking in areas that are not adjacent to driveways or fire access areas. The site plan indicates internal streets that are 26 feet wide. This is typically close to a sufficient width to accommodate on-street parking on one side of a street while maintaining two-way access (ex. Orion Township allows one side on-street parking on 27-foot wide roads).

The first issue with prohibiting on-street parking outright is that streets of this width appear to drivers as being wide enough to park on, and without adequate No Parking signs and enforcement, on-street parking could occur in developments that were not approved as such. The second issue is that with only three small parking lots in the south phase of the development and on-street parking prohibited, there would likely be insufficient parking for visitors as the vast majority of parking spaces would be “owned” by each unit and not open to all visitors as discussed with the Tisbury Square development in Troy. This leaves only 17 spaces open to visitors for 119 units, with no visitor parking areas provided in the north phase of the development. There are several areas where on-street parking could have been provided.



Sample Redwood street cross-section image

Rochester University Townhomes

70 units on 8 acres (8.75 units/acre); all units attached side-by-side

Current ZO Required	Provided
158 spaces	280 spaces
70 units x 2 spaces/3-bd = 140 spaces	Each unit has 4 tandem spaces, 2 garage + 2 driveway
0.25 visitor spaces/unit = 18 spaces	
On-street parking prevented by driveways	Connected to Church of Christ parking lot

Link to plans: <http://atlas.rochesterhills.org/DevelopmentProjects/RochesterUniversityTownhomesmoreinfo.pdf>

Draft Ordinance Required	Draft Ordinance Effect
175 spaces	35 visitor-specific spaces within the development area would be required to meet the draft ordinance
70 units x 2 spaces/3-bd = 140 spaces	
0.5 visitor spaces* /unit = 35 spaces	

*Spaces located within garages, carports, or on driveways shall not be counted towards the visitor space minimum parking requirement

Planner Comments: There would likely be insufficient parking for visitors as all parking spaces within the development and near the townhomes are garage and driveway spaces that would be “owned” by each unit and not open to all visitors as discussed with the Tisbury Square development in Troy. The site would need to be redesigned in order to meet the draft ordinance visitor-specific parking requirement that excludes garage and driveway spaces from being counted.

The site plan indicates internal private streets that are 27 feet wide. This is typically close to a sufficient width to accommodate on-street parking on one side of a street while maintaining two-way access. However, driveways and garages for all units are such that they effectively prevent on-street parking as on-street parking would block driveways, except for a few areas along internal streets that are not adjacent to driveways. The development, specifically the location of driveways, would need to be redesigned in order to accommodate on-street parking. A redesign, to some extent, would have been beneficial as the existing parking lot connected to the south end of the of the development is not a convenient or walkable distance for units north of University Park Circle South.



Emerson Townhomes

6 Unit building - Front Elevation

ILLUSTRATIVE FRONT ELEVATION

Tienken Traillofts (FB)

12 units on 0.785 acres; 3 buildings

Current ZO Required	Provided
18 spaces	19 spaces
12 units x 1.5 spaces/2-bd = 18 spaces	All spaces provided within parking lot (no garages/driveways)
No FB visitor requirement	
No on-street parking	9 carport spaces (within parking lot)

Link to plans: <http://atlas.rochesterhills.org/DevelopmentProjects/TienkenTrailloftsmoreinfo.pdf>

Draft Ordinance Required	Draft Ordinance Effect
24 spaces	Increase of 5 visitor spaces required (24-19) as the FB does not currently require visitor spaces. Carport spaces would be prohibited as visitor.
12 units x 1.5 spaces/2-bd = 18 spaces	
0.5 visitor spaces* /unit = 6 spaces	

*Spaces located within garages, carports, or on driveways shall not be counted towards the visitor space minimum parking requirement

Planner Comments: The development would be deficient of the draft ordinance by 5 spaces as no visitor-specific spaces were required or provided. The development could address this by providing more parking spaces and/or reducing the number of units. No on-street parking is available. Given the lack of on-street parking available, it would have been beneficial to provide shared off-site parking with either the dentistry site to the west or the AT&T site to the east. Additionally, a connection to the Bedford Square internal road to the north may have also been beneficial for parking and access. However, any parking shortfall issues will likely be minimal given the development is only 12 2-bedroom units and no garage or driveway spaces are provided. It is unclear if carport spaces could be reserved.

