1. Introduction

This report attempts to provide guidance to the City of Champaign’s Planning Department as it undertakes its first comprehensive review of the Zoning Ordinance since 1996. Specifically, this report seeks to build a foundation of evidence upon which the Planning Department can make thoughtful and informed decisions about changes to its parking regulations. By comparing the range of parking policies employed in peer cities and analyzing the effect of Champaign’s parking regulations on recent real estate development, this report is able to offer recommendations for policy changes that support repeatedly stated planning visions: a Champaign that is more walkable, a Champaign that is less dependent on the automobile, and a Champaign that is more affordable.

Parking is by some estimates the greatest single land use in American cities today, yet most planners have never been trained in planning for parking. Instead, planning for parking is mostly an afterthought. Planning departments rely on outdated methods to calculate required parking or simply copy other jurisdictions, and the wisdom of requiring parking at all buildings is never seriously questioned. Champaign’s recent planning efforts recognize the ill effects that parking and parking policy can sometimes produce, but parking regulatory reform—and specifically, the minimum parking requirement—has never been discussed in as much depth as this report hopes to do.

Part 2 recounts the results from a comprehensive survey of the parking policies in over twenty of Champaign’s peer cities. When the Planning Department presents potential regulatory reform before City Council, it typically compares its recommendations to approaches taken by similar communities around the state or nation. For this peer city survey, municipal parking policies were compared along four broad categories: off-street parking supply mandates (i.e. minimum and maximum parking requirements), opportunities to reduce off-street parking on particular properties, regulations governing the location of parking with respect to buildings, and the provision of public parking. Peer cities are
divided into five typologies, each representing a generally coherent development pattern. The survey reveals that peer cities share far more similarities in their approach to parking than differences. The reasoning behind these differences is sometimes discernible, while at other times it seems little more than arbitrary.

Part 3 is the heart of the report and measures the success of Champaign’s parking policy in achieving recent planning visions and goals. This section begins with a summary of the parking discussions, recommendations, and enacted policies found in several planning documents, beginning with the most recent Zoning Ordinance and including area plans, transportation plans, and the recent comprehensive plan. Collectively, these documents evince a planning philosophy that parking is necessary to the vitality of Champaign, but that an oversupply of parking can damage the community. The next subsection briefly discusses the costs of providing parking, including both the land consumed by parking and the money necessary to construct parking. Subsequently, the report introduces a theoretical framework for analyzing how minimum parking requirements (the main operating factor in Champaign’s parking policy) impact costs of developing and occupying property. Specifically, the report claims that minimum parking requirements harm some Champaign properties by requiring parking in excess of an amount that makes financial sense, and are useless when applied to other Champaign properties where developers choose to exceed minimum requirements. Finally, the results of two studies testing this theoretical framework are shared.

Part 4 presents recommendations for regulatory reform. Recent planning has already hinted that parking policy will receive substantial attention during the Zoning Ordinance update process. Four categories of potential reform are discussed, most relating to minimum parking requirements. These include the elimination of minimum parking requirements across the board, the elimination of minimum parking requirements for certain geographic areas or types of development, the reduction (but not total elimination) of minimum parking requirements, and other minor changes that can have marginal positive impacts on development. Some Champaign planning documents have mentioned the possibility of setting maximum parking requirements, but these are beyond the scope of the studies conducted and are not discussed herein. Instead, granting flexibility to property owners in their ability to provide parking is likely the best way for Champaign to align its parking policies with its parking goals.

2. Peer City Parking Survey

Champaign’s parking policies do not substantially differ from the policies in place in its peer cities. In this study, peer cities are those cities that have a population somewhere between approximately double Champaign’s (2010 population of 81,055) and approximately half. This definition
encompasses twenty-six Illinois municipalities ranging in size from Urbana (Champaign’s neighbor; 2010 population of 41,250) to Aurora (the state’s largest non-Chicago municipality; 2010 population of 197,899).

Arranging these cities simply by size does not produce a meaningful analytical framework. Anybody familiar with Illinois knows that Arlington Heights, Decatur, and Evanston function very differently, even though the largest of the three has fewer than 2,000 more residents than the smallest. Viewing these communities through the lenses of primary growth period and regional role reveals an intuitive set of typologies to which each of these peer cities belongs. Five distinct peer city typologies were identified:

- **Pre-war Chicagoland Subcenter**: A city that developed as a secondary employment and residential hub in the Chicagoland region before the rise of automobility that came after World War II.
- **Pre-war Bedroom Community**: A city that developed as a residential community for Chicagoland workers before the rise of automobility that came after World War II.
- **Post-war Chicagoland Subcenter**: A city that developed as a secondary employment and residential hub in the Chicagoland region following the rise of automobility that came after World War II.
- **Post-war Bedroom Community**: A city that developed as a residential community for Chicagoland workers following the rise of automobility that came after World War II.
- **Downstate Center**: A city that developed as an employment hub outside the Chicagoland region.

Classifying the cities according to typology allows for comparison across different types of parking policies. It would be reasonable to expect that different typologies might exhibit different parking policies as a class, but it could also be that parking policies have trended towards uniformity as both planning and automobility have become more present in Illinois cities.

The methodology for comparing the parking policies of these cities is straightforward. First, the set of parking policy tools that are generally available to a city through both its regulatory powers and its role as a direct provider of on-street and off-street parking is identified. These tools largely align with those identified in the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning’s “Parking Strategies to Support Livable Communities”. Next, each city’s zoning ordinances and parking information was checked to see which of these tools it employs. Interestingly, nearly every city features parking information prominently on its website or even has its own dedicated parking division, indicating the high level of importance these peer cities assign to vehicle storage.

The results of this study cannot be summarized with specificity, because the infinite possible permutations of even one type of parking policy defy categorization. For example, a few more than half
of the cities studied ease their parking requirements for the adaptive re-use of at least some structures. However, some of these cities condition this reduced requirement on the age of the structure, while others condition it on the prior and/or proposed use of the structure. Still another allows it only by (an apparently standardless) administrative discretion.

However, difficulty of categorization does not preclude qualitative description of the trends present in peer city parking policies. Indeed, it is this qualitative description that should prove most useful to Champaign as it reviews its regulatory approach to parking management. A full presentation of the options available to planning staff will hopefully induce a more creative approach to parking reform than a simple tweaking of existing rules.

2.1 Minimum and Maximum Parking Requirements

The only parking policy found in all twenty-six peer cities is the minimum parking requirement. Each city imposes a minimum parking requirement on all or nearly all land uses within its boundaries. Exemptions and reductions are available in limited circumstances—most typically for non-residential uses in a downtown area—in a few of these cities, but for the most part regulations mandating a certain amount of parking are omnipresent. Required parking schedules skew towards an unexplained precision and complexity when assigning parking multipliers to land uses. For example, the City of Rockford assigns Animal Shelters, Boarding Kennels, and Veterinarian Offices to Parking Group J (requiring 2 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of floor area). However, Animal Sales and Grooming businesses are assigned to Parking Group K (requiring 3.3 spaces for the same amount of floor area) along with Financial Services, Employment Agencies, and several other general office uses. What is the basis of the distinction between Animal Sales and Grooming businesses and other animal-oriented land uses? The Zoning Ordinance does not say. Nor does it inform the reader why the City of Rockford decided to enumerate over fifty different land uses and sort them into twenty-two different Parking Groups. The Rockford example is not a particularly egregious example of the overscheduling of parking; most peer cities’ ordinances are much the same.

Peer cities manage to exhibit some slight variation in their presentation of minimum parking requirements. The main point of variation appears when a city sets its parking “bases”, the factor by which the minimum requirement is calculated. In all peer cities, at least some land uses have a base tied to the square footage of the building. Some cities set the gross floor area (GFA) as the base while others calculate required parking from usable floor area (UFA). Additionally, cities disagree on whether floor area bases should have standard numerators or standard denominators. One city might standardize the parking numerator, requiring a medical office to provide 1 parking space per 333.33 ft² GFA and a retail
store to provide 1 parking space per 250 \text{ ft}^2 \text{ GFA}. Another city might instead standardize the parking denominator, requiring a medical office to provide 3 parking spaces per 1,000 \text{ ft}^2 \text{ GFA} and a retail store to provide 4 parking spaces per 1,000 \text{ ft}^2 \text{ GFA}. The parking schedules in the two cities would require identical parking for the same building, but they present the requirement differently. Does one of these standardization patterns lend itself to clearer comparison between different parking requirements than the other? If so, cities may be obfuscating the issue of whether their zoning codes really demand such complexity.

Sometimes cities find that square footage, however presented, forms an inadequate base for calculating required parking. Instead, more discrete bases are used. A typical base is the amount of workers present on a site, or the amount of students attending a school. Of course, here too there is disagreement between cities on the appropriate rate to apply. For instance, the City of Urbana requires a religious institution to provide 1 parking space for every 5 seats in the principal sanctuary, while the City of Aurora finds it can get by with a requirement 20\% less onerous. In some cases, cities decide that one base cannot properly capture the parking needs of certain land uses and that two or more are needed. The City of Peoria requires airport parking on the combined bases of airplane tiedowns and passenger departures, and calculates swimming pool parking through the surface area of shallow water, deep water, and pool-adjacent deck. Complex requirements such as Peoria’s represent an admirable attempt to find the “right” number for each land use, but unfortunately the logic behind their final output remains frustratingly hidden.

In contrast to the ubiquity of minimum parking requirements, maximum parking requirements are seldom found in peer city zoning ordinances. Only two of Champaign’s peer cities cap the number of parking spaces at a building, and they each do so only under very limited circumstances. In the Village of Orland Park, minimum parking requirements appear to function not just as a floor above which developers may provide more parking, but as a cap as well. Each land use must provide precisely the amount of parking the ordinance’s schedule requires; no more, no less. However, the Village’s Development Services Department may authorize up to a 20\% increase in the number of spaces provided on a lot if an applicant proposing a commercial use demonstrates need for such an increase. The City of Evanston has adopted even more limited maximums. The sole parking caps found in this community apply to single family homes, which are limited to four parking spaces (not counting any spaces that are accessible via alley).

What emerges from these regulations is a pattern of both stark uniformity and bewildering diversity. Peer cities are united in their rejection of maximum parking requirements as a planning tool.
Similarly, peer cities display uniformity in their application of minimum parking requirements to nearly every land use category and zoning district. Within the context of these minimum requirements, however, cities display a staggering range of bases and rates. No peer city zoning ordinance explains how the (usually high) level of regulatory complexity was reached, and unless Illinois planners are outliers among their colleagues in other states, it seems likely that the unspoken foundation is either various parking generation studies or the ordinances of other nearby cities. Champaign does not stand out among its peers in setting a floor for parking, doing so with great intricacy, and foregoing the opportunity to set a ceiling as well.

2.2 Opportunities to Reduce Parking

As mentioned above, peer cities cloud the simple planning tool that is the minimum parking requirement with variations based on the use of a parcel. Recognizing the diversity of uses, neighborhoods, and circumstances in their cities, hardly any planning department applies the resultant parking schedule unvaryingly. Rather, most cities offer one or more ways for a property owner to reduce the amount of parking she must provide. Among the surveyed cities, four mechanisms for reducing a property’s required parking are employed: zone-based reductions, collective parking allowances, waivers for adaptive reuse of buildings, and fees in lieu of parking. These are each discussed in turn below.

2.2.1 Zone-Based Reductions

Planners apply zone-based reductions in required parking to those neighborhoods where the burden imposed by minimum parking requirements is most evident. Approximately half of the cities surveyed have designated at least one district where minimum parking requirements are reduced or removed. These appear to come in two flavors: some zone-based reductions apply a blanket reduction across all uses within a particular geographic boundary, while other zone-based reductions apply to certain uses within designated zoning categories.

The Village of Orland Park provides a good example of the first category of zone-based reductions. In 2006, the Village created the Village Center District to promote pedestrian scale and civic character in its historic core. The Village offered this vision for its new zoning district:

The VCD District [sic] will offer a diverse mix of uses along intimate pedestrian scaled streets and buildings within compact, walkable blocks. Small-scale commercial uses will serve the district, and more residents will be attracted to live within walking
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distance of the 142nd Street train station. A fine grid of streets will connect the Village Center, the Downtown area around the train station, the Orland Crossing area, the Public Library, McGinnis Slough, Humphrey Woods, and the Old Orland Historic District. New development on infill or vacant sites will strengthen the intimate character of the area, and civic buildings and open spaces will continue to be key focal points in the district.

Further announcing that “Large surface parking lots are not appropriate to the scale and character of this district”, the Land Development Code reduces the required minimum number of parking spaces for all land uses located in the VCD by 25%. Similar provisions exist in the City of Aurora’s FoxWalk overlay district covering the historic downtown that hugs the Fox River. The City of Naperville takes a slightly different approach. Its downtown overlay district does not reduce minimum parking requirements for any use, but any use within the district may pay a fee in lieu of providing required parking. In-lieu fees are discussed in more detail further on.

The City of Champaign follows the more common approach to zone-based reductions. Champaign’s most permissive zoning district is its CB (Central Business) district, which allows the greatest number of uses and imposes the fewest density controls. Both downtown and the campustown commercial strip are zoned CB. CB zoning allows all permitted non-residential uses to operate without providing any parking. Additionally, recently created overlay zones allow for slight reductions in required parking for campustown residential uses, although downtown residential projects are still subject to the full requirements. Several cities such as the Village of Skokie, the City of Waukegan, and the City of Urbana employ similar zone-based reductions that only extend to some permitted land uses operating within a particular district.

As for those cities that have not designated zones with reduced minimum parking requirements, most fall into the category of “Post-war Bedroom Community”. This is not a surprising outcome. Many of these municipalities lack much in the way of an identifiable center, let alone one with the “small scale” buildings and “fine grid of streets” found in Orland Park. Having grown nearly entirely during the age of the automobile, it comes as no surprise that there is not an area of town where minimum parking requirements are viewed as more burdensome than other areas.

2.2.2 Collective Parking Allowances

Half of Champaign’s peer cities allow for the collective provision in some instances, as Champaign does. Collective parking (also referred to as shared parking) allowances remove the
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requirement that each building be exclusively tied to a clearly identifiable set of parking spaces. In many instances, collective parking allowances are used to reduce the amount of parking required by two or more buildings by allowing some of their parking to overlap. Four different types of collective parking requirements exist. The first, employed by a few municipalities, does not allow for any reduction in required parking, merely allowing the fully required parking to be provided collectively. The other three methods provide opportunities for reduced parking requirements and are best explained through a hypothetical comparison.

Consider the case of a developer attempting to minimize costs by sharing parking between a 5,000 ft² restaurant and a 30,000 ft² grocery store in three locations: Springfield, Champaign, and Urbana. All three cities require the same amount of parking for each building provided in isolation: 50 spaces for the restaurant (1 space per 100 ft²) and 100 spaces for the grocery store (1 space per 300 ft²). However, the different shared parking regulations in each city produce three distinct regulatory results.

In Springfield, the developer’s appeal for shared parking rests on the standardless discretion of the city traffic engineer. The developer cannot count any parking space towards both buildings without this administrative approval and may well be required to build all 150 spaces.

In Champaign, the developer will fare slightly better. Champaign has articulated a formula for calculating peak usage at different uses, so the shared parking need only be extensive enough to provide for the maximum assumed peak usage between the two uses. In this example, Champaign assumes that peak usage occurs on weekends between 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM, where the grocery store’s parking lot will be at maximum capacity and the restaurant’s at 70%. Accordingly, the developer is required to provide only 90% of the non-shared total parking, or 135 spaces.

In Urbana, the developer is granted the most flexibility in sharing parking. Urbana’s parking regulations allow shared parking between non-residential uses down to 85% of the non-shared total. The shared parking regulations do not attempt to predict peak usage between different land use categories. Therefore, the developer is only required to build 128 parking spaces.

In certain cases, the Champaign system would allow for lower shared parking requirements than Urbana’s single factor calculation. For example, a residential development and an office building, each required to provide 25 spaces in isolation, would be required to provide 43 shared spaces in Urbana but only 40 in Champaign due to their diametric peaks. However, the number of overlapping peaks in the Champaign shared parking schedule means that most shared parking requirements will be lower in Urbana than Champaign. In any event, no Illinois city allows developers to share parking between adjacent buildings according to the developer’s understanding of their clients’ usage patterns.
2.2.3 Waivers for Adaptive Reuse of Buildings

Minimum parking requirements pose a particularly pernicious problem for properties that are no longer best suited for their original use. Donald Shoup explains the issues that arise from applying the same set of parking policies to new and old properties alike:

The usual interpretation of a parking requirement is that it specifies the number of parking spaces that a new building must provide; that is, the land-use decision comes first, and the required parking depends on the use. This assumes, however, that an entirely new building is going up. For older buildings, which often cannot provide more on-site parking, the situation is reversed. Here the parking requirements limit the uses a city will allow because the building’s use must conform to the available parking.3

In response, some cities have loosened their minimum parking requirements for existing buildings. None of these waiver provisions extend to all instances of adaptive reuse. Instead, the availability of these waivers is limited by one or more of the following factors: date of construction, original use, new use, expansion of building footprint, and zoning district(s). Additionally, some cities provide waivers as of right, while others rely on administrative discretion.

The City of Champaign’s ordinance is an archetypical example of parking waivers for adaptive reuse. Champaign offers two avenues for adaptive reuse waivers. The first is open to structures either designated as historic structures or located within a historic district. These may have their required parking reduced by up to 50%, subject to the Zoning Administrator’s discretion and tempered by a few considerations (e.g. practicality of adding new parking spaces). The second attaches as of right to apartment units converted after 1990 in structures built before 1990 and currently zoned CB, entirely eliminating the parking requirement for such units. Taken together, the amount of structures eligible for either type of waiver is rather limited, but such waivers represent a commitment to the land use flexibility that is so important in adaptive reuse and historic preservation.

2.2.4 Fees In Lieu of Parking

The most infrequently available tool for reducing a property’s required parking is the in-lieu fee. In an attempt to consolidate parking, some cities give developers the option to pay a fee in lieu of providing the required parking.4 The revenue collected from in-lieu fees is typically directed towards the provision of public parking facilities.

The City of Champaign does not offer developers the option of substituting an in-lieu fee for required parking. Only three of its peer cities do: Skokie, Oak Park, and Naperville. Each of these
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communities handles in-lieu fees slightly differently. Skokie presets the in-lieu fee at $9,000 per space, Naperville relies on a calculation involving the property's projected net parking demand and gross parking demand, and Oak Park handles each property independently through an administrative process. The availability of the in-lieu fee varies too. Skokie limits it to certain land uses, while Naperville foregoes land use and instead restricts in-lieu fees to properties within a predefined geographic area. Oak Park places no restrictions on which properties may apply to replace required parking with a fee. All three fee systems share an important similarity, however. All revenue goes towards the construction and maintenance of public parking.

2.3 The Location of Parking

In addition to regulating the supply of parking on a property, cities have the ability to regulate the location of parking. Location-based regulations take two forms. The first type controls the respective siting of buildings and parking spaces on the same parcel. In most examples of this type of regulation, zoning mandates that developers build parking in the rear of a building rather than in front of it. The second—and more common—type defines the maximum allowable distance between a property and its required parking.

2.3.1 Rear Parking Requirements

Rear parking requirements are popular in communities that are unhappy with the degraded urban form that often results when the location of parking is less regulated. At the dawn of the automobile age, commercial districts were oriented towards pedestrians and streetcar riders. Off street parking was minimal, and so building facades presented a street wall that was pulled up to the sidewalk and uninterrupted by curb cuts for parking lots. As automobile ownership increased, retailers began to orient their properties towards drivers rather than walkers. Parking lots began to spring up alongside buildings, eventually moving to the front to maximize motorist convenience. The pedestrian experience declines significantly as buildings spread out and retreat from the street. Attempting to reverse this trend, some cities limit curb cuts and front parking lots with rear parking requirements.

Only a few cities make any attempt to push parking to the rear of buildings, and none of those require rear parking at all new properties. Instead, zoning ordinances circumscribe the applicability of rear parking requirements to districts the cities intend to develop as pedestrian-friendly commercial areas. Champaign has established two adjacent districts that impose rear parking requirements, as has Peoria. Bloomington and Oak Park have each established one such district.

2.3.2 Off-Site Parking Allowance
When his lot size is small, a property owner may have trouble finding room for required parking on-site. A requirement that all parking be on the same lot it serves may therefore reduce the intensity of the use or require additional land assembly. To ease this burden, many cities allow property owners to meet their minimum parking requirement with spaces located on a separate lot within a specified radius.

All but six of Champaign’s peer cities allow off-site parking in at least some circumstances. Typical limitations on applicability include land use (e.g. only commercial uses may provide off-site parking, not residential) and zoning district. However, the majority of the cities allowing off-site parking do so with no regard to land use or zoning. The range in off-site radii is substantial; Evanston permits off-site parking up to 1,000 feet away from the primary lot, while several cities limit the range to 300 feet. Limits of 400, 500, 600, and 800 feet are also present in peer city zoning ordinances. Cities also vary as to how they calculate distance. Some measure from lot line to lot line, while others measure the distance between the parking lot and the building’s primary entrance.

Interestingly, the presence of an off-site parking allowance somewhat correlates with the city typology. Cities classified as Pre-war Chicagoland Subcenters and Downstate Centers uniformly allow for off-site parking in at least some circumstances. This likely stems from the historically small lot sizes and high built density in the walkable commercial cores that developed in these communities before the automobile. The maximum radius allowed also appears tied to block size in some of these cities. For instance, Champaign’s 600 foot allowance accommodates one standard block face and two street widths. In stark contrast, only half of the Post-war Bedroom Communities allow for off-site parking. Commercial and residential uses alike in these communities were developed under a low density, automobile-oriented paradigm. Thus, there were few to no historic building patterns to nudge the ordinance drafters towards greater flexibility in parking location.

2.4 Public Provision of Parking

The final component of municipal parking policy is the city’s direct provision of parking. Every city surveyed provides public parking to at least some extent. Most commonly, street parking in residential districts located away from the core and composed of single family homes is free and untimed. This is unsurprising; the low density of these neighborhoods and the wide street widths typically employed ensure that demand for parking never approaches the available supply. Meaningful comparisons between public parking policies is therefore most useful when looking at the approach taken by peer cities in high parking demand areas. This part of the study compared three factors: The
provision of public off-street parking, the method of restricting access to short-term on-street parking, and the presence of residential parking permits.

2.4.1 Public Off-Street Parking

Nearly every city surveyed provides at least some public off-street parking in high-demand areas. The only cities that do not are a few Post-war Bedroom Communities that developed without anything resembling a core or walkable district. Public parking spaces are provided in both surface lots and garages, with the latter being more common in larger cities and those with historically denser cores. The City of Evanston is the largest provider of public parking in the survey, offering over 3,500 spaces throughout multiple districts. In comparison, the City of Champaign maintains over 1,000 spaces downtown and a few hundred more in the University District. Some communities do not charge for parking or support validation programs. Those communities that do charge do not appear to engage in revenue maximizing behavior. In all cases, peer cities offering public off-street parking spaces do so as a public good or business development strategy rather than for revenue purposes.

2.4.2 Short-Term On-Street Parking

In addition to providing off-street parking, most peer cities open up some of their public right-of-ways to on-street parking. Curbside parking can be managed through time limits, meter fees, or both. Some cities employ more than one of these strategies on different streets. Cities set temporal and monetary limits on parking space occupancy so that nearby businesses may benefit from customer turnover.

The most common approach to street parking management is free but time-limited. This management approach is present in all peer city typologies and does not seem to cluster more or less strongly in any one category. Free, time-limited parking is attractive to cities that think drivers are unwilling to bear even the slightest monetary cost associated with providing and enforcing parking. While free parking is very attractive to drivers, the enforcement of time limits can be difficult.

A less frequently used parking management approach is the converse of the previous one. The duration of street parking is not limited, but drivers must pay a meter for the time they occupy a space. Only four cities employ paid, time-unlimited parking policy, all of which (Aurora, Joliet, Waukegan, and Springfield) have fairly dense cores with both retail and employment. Installing meters requires greater physical infrastructure than time limits, but is much easier to enforce and can sustain the costs of enforcement in some cases.

Finally, Champaign and many of its peer cities manage street parking through both meter fees and time limits. The rationale behind the use of dual limiting factors is unclear. One plausible suggestion
is that time limits allow cities to charge a price less than the market would otherwise bear by chasing off potential overconsumers. However, none of the cities surveyed announced the reasoning behind their particular scheme for regulating street parking.

2.4.3 Residential Parking Permits

Finally, several peer cities manage long-term street parking through a residential permit system. Permits are typically available to residents upon demonstration of a mailing address within a particular zone, and can be awarded with or without cost. Permits are found almost exclusively in neighborhoods developed before or shortly after World War II, when buildings generally lacked the amount of parking found in more contemporary construction. However, some permit systems also seem geared to prevent street parking by riders using Metra stations in certain low-density neighborhoods. Champaign’s residential permit program seems unique among peer cities in that it targets a high density district housing an almost exclusively student population.

3. Measuring the Effects of Champaign’s Parking Policy

3.1 Background

Observing the proliferation of auto-oriented development in communities around the country shortly after World War II, Lewis Mumford opined that “the right to have access to every building in the city by private motorcar in an age when everyone possesses such a vehicle is the right to destroy the city.” Nearly every building constructed in Champaign over the past several decades provides at least some parking on site. Champaign is far from destroyed; the city has never lost population between censuses, and the most recent census showed population growth of 20% from the 2000 level. The community has a burgeoning dining scene, has recently added civic events such as the Illinois Marathon, and enjoys a high level of satisfaction among residents. Nevertheless, Mumford’s quote still rings somewhat true. The north Prospect Ave. shopping district experiences crushing levels of congestion at times, and low density development has leapt over I-57 onto acreage that was once fertile farmland. Champaign has many strong neighborhoods and excellent transit coverage, yet the car remains a practical necessity for accessing most parts of town with reasonable comfort and convenience. Ubiquitous automobile access has certainly not destroyed Champaign, but Champaign is less pleasant than it could be if the automobile’s primacy were not so unchallenged. These circumstances raise a compelling question: To what extent are Champaign policies—especially its parking policies—responsible for the automobile-induced harm it has suffered?

3.1.1 Champaign Policies and Plans
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The City of Champaign last updated its Zoning Ordinance in 1996. Since then, numerous plans have addressed the interdependent areas of parking, transportation, land use, and development. Some of these plans address specific neighborhoods (e.g. the Downtown Plan), while others address specific subject matters (e.g. the Transportation Master Plan). Below is a summary of each of these plans, with special attention paid to their recommendations for future parking policies.

### 3.1.1.1 Zoning Ordinance (1996)

The many rules and regulations in the Champaign Zoning Ordinance are undergirded by a strong sense of purpose. Section 37-2 of the Municipal Code proclaims that “the purpose of this chapter is to implement the policies of the City of Champaign Comprehensive Plan as adopted from time to time by the City Council.” Over thirty such policies are listed. One refers specifically to parking: “To require adequate off-street parking and loading facilities in order to meet the parking demands of employees, residents, and visitors.” Much like most other resources, demand for parking is not fixed but rather changes according to the supply and price of parking. The Zoning Ordinance fails to explicitly define what “adequate” means in the context of elastic demand, but the imposition of the minimum parking requirement suggests that the answer is something along the lines of “enough to meet the peak demand for free parking.”

All development is guided by this parking policy, but the parking policy is not the only goal that the Zoning Ordinance has for development. Other notable goals include:

- “To promote more efficient use of land and compact development with regulations that allow a creative approach to site planning.”
- “To encourage infill development and the redevelopment of vacant or underutilized parcels.”
- “To allow a variety of housing choices and promote affordable housing opportunities.”

Still other goals refer to the preservation of historical buildings, the promotion of visual aesthetics through urban design and landscaping, and the discouragement of practices that lead to flooding and reduced water quality.

### 3.1.1.2 Downtown Plan (2006)

Prior to the 2006 Downtown Plan, the City’s 1992 Downtown Area Comprehensive Plan leveraged capital improvement planning and marketing and organizational strategies to jumpstart the

---

7 Champ. Mun. Code § 37-2(h)
8 Champ. Mun. Code § 37-2(m)
district’s revitalization. Historically, downtown Champaign has been one of the most walkable and transit accessible neighborhoods in the city, but only recently has it begun to shake off the negative effects of overaccommodation of the automobile. Attempting to continue this positive trend, the 2006 plan envisions that in 2015 “Downtown Champaign will be a vibrant, walkable downtown, built on its urban character, connected to surrounding neighborhoods, and easily accessible as a regional destination.” The plan is hopeful that development will continue downtown, with structures taking the place of existing surface parking. Urban design is crucial, with suburban-style building typologies highly discouraged.

Recognizing the importance of transportation to downtown’s success, the plan dedicates an entire chapter to the topic. Multimodal accessibility is stressed. Regarding parking, the plan notes that the issue is complex because “in many respects the goals for a dense and vibrant downtown are generally incompatible with the goals of providing abundant parking in close proximity to destinations.” The plan admits that the balancing of these goals is difficult. Nevertheless, the plan represents a retreat from the decades of downtown changes that were exclusively tailored to people arriving by automobile. The elimination of building stock to provide parking for other buildings appears to be a mistake that the Downtown Plan sincerely wishes to remedy.

3.1.1.3 Champaign Moving Forward: City of Champaign Transportation Master Plan (2008)

Champaign Moving Forward is the guiding document for policy decisions affecting the evolution of Champaign’s transportation system. The plan places a focus on the City achieving a more complete system where facilities are provided for motorists, transit users, bicyclists, and pedestrians. The plan also provides a “complete street” policy and outlines many implementation strategies for achieving the goals of the plan.

Champaign Moving Forward tested three conceptual land use and transportation frameworks in developing its recommendations. The preferred option—“Connected Neighborhoods and Nodes”—envisions a community that supports choice, both in terms of neighborhood typology and transportation options. A key feature of this vision is redirecting job and housing dispersal from the fringe to a series of mixed-use, higher density nodes. The plan asserts that the traditional method of setting minimum parking requirements does not support the “Connected Neighborhoods and Nodes” vision because land uses within nodes have different peak demands and can share parking, improved non-automotive transportation options will reduce demand for parking, and excess parking creates negative visual and
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functional aspects. The plan does not call for the outright elimination of minimum parking requirements, but recommends that minimum rates be reduced within nodes. Additionally, the plan raises the possibility of establishing parking maximums in conjunction with minimum rates. Finally, the plan also recommends that each node determine peak parking demand through a shared parking study.

3.1.1.4 University District Action Plan (2008)

Similar to downtown, Champaign’s University District is a neighborhood with a rich history of walkability and transit accessibility that was deadened by increasing intrusion by automobiles. By the time the University District Action Plan was adopted, several initiatives had already made the University District less a place for cars and more a place for people. A road diet along Green Street included attractive streetscaping for pedestrians, and new high density development supported increased retail and dining options, a full service grocery store, and improved transit service. The plan represents an attempt to further advance the City Council Goal that “Our Community Has a Vibrant Center City — Downtown to Campustown.”

The plan’s “Transportation and Parking” section leads off with an admission that “one of the largest struggles in the transportation system today is balancing the need for parking with the vibrancy of the area.” The plan recognizes that parking will rarely be as convenient in Campustown as in a regional shopping center, but that this will be more than made up for by the unique flavor of the district. Among the actions recommended by the plan is an evaluation of the effects of reducing minimum parking requirements for new residential development in the campus core area. The plan highlights the role of not only the Planning Department in making this determination, but property owners and business tenants as well.

3.1.1.5 Downtown Parking Plan (2009)

The Downtown Parking Plan represents an effort to maintain a public parking system that supports the vision for a vibrant and walkable downtown with strong urban character and regional accessibility. The plan lays out four focus areas: providing a balanced public parking system, managing parking with a focus on customer service, supporting the 2006 Downtown Plan, and supporting alternatives to driving and parking downtown.

Many of the plan’s recommendations are geared towards better management of on-street parking spaces. However, the focus area concerning the Downtown Plan discusses the intersection between off-street parking and development. The plan suffers from mixed messages; one guiding
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principle calls for existing surface lots to be redeveloped while allowing the existing parking supply to absorb increased demand, while another guiding principle calls for new mixed-use developments to increase the parking supply with structured parking. The plan makes no direct comment on the merits of applying the Zoning Ordinance’s minimum parking requirement to new residential land uses.

3.1.1.6 Green Street Zoning Update (2009)

As redevelopment along the recently rejuvenated Green Street continued, City Council passed two bills changing the zoning of properties along the corridor. The first of these rezoned parcels along Green Street from CG-Commercial General to the more permissive CB-Commercial Business category. The second bill established a new overlay zoning district (CCO-Campus Commercial Overlay) over all parcels fronting Green Street between the railroad tracks and Wright Street as well as some parcels on other streets close to campus.

The implications for parking and development are wide-ranging. New development within the overlay zone is subject to a host of form-based restrictions geared towards improved urban design, including maximum setbacks, restrictions on the locations of parking lots, and minimum building frontage requirements. Those lots that were rezoned from CG to CB gained the ability to host commercial land uses without following any minimum parking requirement, although the base residential minimum parking requirement rate remains the same between the two zones. However, the CCO district subtracts ten parking spaces from the otherwise required parking. In essence, this means that a building with ten two bedroom apartments could be built on Green Street without providing parking, while an identical building constructed downtown would still have to provide ten parking spaces. The Green Street Zoning Update represents a first step towards fulfilling the University District Action Plan’s recognition that Green Street is not best served by providing ample parking.

3.1.1.7 Midtown Zoning Update (2011)

Following the rezoning of Green Street, City Council adopted a similar rezoning for Midtown Champaign. This district is currently built at a low density, and the built environment is dominated by surface parking lots and auto-oriented uses. The City views Midtown as an important link between Downtown and Campustown, but its potential was being limited by the existing zoning.

Just as with the Green Street Zoning Update, parcels in Midtown were upzoned from a variety of commercial and light industrial zones to the more permissive CB-Central Business. Additionally, a new overlay district (MCO-Midtown Commercial Overlay) containing form-based elements and certain
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exemptions and incentives was applied to most of the new CB parcels. These closely mirrored the features found in the CCO district, including the waiver of the requirement for the first ten parking spaces mandated on-site.

3.1.1.8 Comprehensive Plan (2011)

Champaign’s most recent comprehensive plan, entitled Champaign Tomorrow, is notable for being the City’s first such document drafted entirely in-house. The plan’s broad based visioning for future land use and transportation policy is impressive. Following significant public input, the comprehensive plan assembled six guiding principles for Champaign: Growing City, Sustainable City, Complete Neighborhoods, Community Identity, Healthy Community, and Complete Public Facilities. The plan’s Future Land Use chapter serves as an implementation guide for these visioning areas.

Parking policy appears throughout Champaign Tomorrow. The Sustainable City section calls for the establishment of maximum parking requirements based on non-automobile transportation factors and existing on-street parking. Campustown and Downtown are highlighted as neighborhoods where private off-street parking should be discouraged. Introducing the concept of “centers”—similar to the nodes discussed in other plans—the document calls for maximum parking requirements a second time. The Future Land Use chapter also pays attention to the design of parking, stressing that large parking lots are damaging to the preferred urban form and that parking should be located behind buildings when possible. In addition to specific recommendations about parking policy, the plan also repeatedly discusses the benefits of improving walkability within both older and newer neighborhoods.

3.1.1.9 Overall Summary of Planning Documents

Taken together, the plans represent a fairly coherent vision for the future of Champaign’s built environment. The car will remain an important feature of transportation in Champaign, but other modes of transportation should receive equal planning attention. Infill development will advance stated goals of increased sustainability and walkability, but the current regulatory approach to parking burdens infill development. The core neighborhoods of Downtown, Midtown, and Campustown have a unique character that should not emphasize the automobile, but planning must ensure that these neighborhoods still accommodate both through traffic and parked cars. Champaign’s recent planning visions for parking resemble a doctor’s approach to medicine: parking is beneficial when provided at the appropriate dosage, but too much of it can damage the body of the city.

3.1.2 How Much Does Parking Cost?

Every property constructed in Champaign incurs certain costs. Fire suppression systems must be installed, walls must be insulated, and toilets must be hooked up to pipes. All of these features are
required by building code and carry costs. Parking, whether required or provided in excess of requirements, carries costs too. Unlike the costs of most property improvements, however, parking costs consist of a land consumption dimension as well as a monetary dimension.

The land consumption of a parking space is defined in the Zoning Ordinance. The City of Champaign regulates the dimensions of parking spaces and parking modules to ensure a free and safe flow of traffic within parking lots. While every parking lot is different and property owners are free to provided larger spaces and wider aisles than required, the ordinance gives a fairly good idea of the minimum land consumption of a parking space.

A standard non-parallel parking space must be at least 8’9” wide and 18’6” deep, an area of approximately 162 ft². Comprehensive statistics for the community are not available, but a perusal of apartment listings in Champaign suggests that this square footage is comparable to that of most apartment bedrooms, if not a little larger. Of course, a parking space is worthless without an aisle from which to access it. Champaign permits four different parking aisle widths, each of which is tied to the angle of the parking with respect to the aisle orientation. The most efficient arrangement angles parking at 45 degrees. Parking spaces in this alignment each take up 215 ft² when their share of the access aisle is factored in. Parking modules of 60 degrees, 75 degrees, and 90 degrees are progressively less efficient, with parking modules at 90 degrees dedicating 263 ft² to each parking space.

Even these calculations do not fully encapsulate the land consumption of a parking space. The Zoning Ordinance requires all parking lots with more than two spaces to be separated from the right-of-way by a buffer of several feet, and all lots must be surrounded by a curb or barrier. Structured and underground parking spaces also each account for their share of the walls surrounding them. Access driveways, too, add to the land consumption of parking lots. The amount of space an individual space takes up is therefore somewhat site dependent, but in all cases it exceeds the amount calculated in the Zoning Ordinance’s table of dimensions. A good rule of thumb is that a typical surface parking lot has about 330 ft² per parking space for the space itself and the circulation of cars, while the number for structured and underground parking is around 300 ft².

This being the case, Champaign’s minimum parking requirements ensure that supermarkets, copy shops, garden supply stores, dry cleaners, and many other land uses requiring one parking space per 300 ft² of floor area will have a parking lot at least as large as the building itself. Meanwhile, banks, dental clinics, bars, and restaurants must build parking lots that are significantly larger than the buildings
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they serve.\textsuperscript{19} When required parking space dimensions are paired with required numbers of parking spaces, the resulting parking lots can get very large very quickly.

In many parts of Champaign, land is cheap enough that property owners are content to build surface parking. Surface parking carries construction and maintenance costs, but these may be driven fairly low depending on the quality level a property owner is comfortable maintaining. Near the core land values are higher, and property owners sometimes find it is in their best financial interest to minimize the land consumption of their parking by providing it in an above- or underground structure. Not surprisingly, these land savings require a tradeoff in construction costs.

In general, parking structure costs vary according to land value, localized construction costs, site-specific features, and the placement of spaces above ground versus below. In 2001, the middle 50% of parking garages constructed in the United States cost between $12,000 and $15,600 per space.\textsuperscript{20} How does Champaign stack up against the national average? The parking garage in downtown Champaign offers an opportunity to analyze the cost of building structured parking in this community.

In 2007, City Council approved a planned development agreement with the mixed use M2 project. Constructed on a CB parcel, the building was not required to provide parking for its retail and office uses but was required to do so for its condominiums. The planned development agreement waived the private obligation to construct residential parking, and in return the City agreed to construct a public parking garage adjacent to M2. The parking garage was to provide 600 parking spaces if funding allowed, and 500 if funding was tight. The first round of bidding produced two bidders, each of which produced a bid for the 500 and 600 space options.\textsuperscript{21} The cheapest bid for the smaller garage was $10,140,000 ($20,280 per parking space), while the cheapest bid for the larger garage was $11,200,000 ($18,667 per parking space). Council rejected these bids. A second round of bidding produced a third qualified bidder, who won the contract for a 600 space parking garage at a cost of $10,590,000 ($17,650 per space).\textsuperscript{22}

The price of parking in the downtown garage puts these costs in perspective. Currently, drivers pay $0.75 per hour to park in the garage. Daily fees are capped at $7.50, and the garage is free to use all days on weekends and six hours per day on weekdays. Assuming that a car spent an entire month inside the garage, the driver could expect to pay roughly $160 upon exiting. That monthly rate, far higher than
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any parking rental rate available in Champaign, would retire the construction cost of a single parking space in 110 months, or a little over nine years. Of course, the deck is not fully occupied at all times, and so revenues are significantly below this. In FY08/09, parking deck revenues were $27,357, less than twice the construction cost for a single space. The resultant bleak forecast for recovering the garage’s costs through driver fees gets even gloomier when maintenance, lighting, and other costs are factored in. The parking deck’s expenses over the same period were over $60,000.

The downtown parking garage is not a perfect representative of the majority of parking structures built in Champaign, but it is a useful example nonetheless. Its fixed costs are likely higher than those for garages tied to individual buildings, because it was built to a high standard as a civic amenity and has fare collection mechanisms where other garages do not. It is larger than other garages, however, and so its fixed costs can be diffused over a larger number of spaces. The downtown parking garage is entirely above ground, meaning that its spaces likely cost less to construct than those provided underneath campus apartment buildings. In a world where the average new car is worth $30,000 and depreciation renders the value of used cars significantly lower, the downtown garage provides a strong indicator that structured parking may well be as expensive as the cars it houses.

3.1.3 Too Much, Just Right, or Nothing at All

The main feature of Champaign’s regulatory approach to parking is the minimum parking requirement. This requirement is occasionally waived for specific properties, land uses, or zones, and maximum rates exist for very limited zoning categories, but in general nearly all conceivable uses of nearly all developable properties are subject to a minimum parking requirement. Parking carries costs, sometimes quite high. Even without explicitly weighing these costs, the City of Champaign has decided that existing parking policies have resulted in too much parking within the community. This begs the question: What is the effect of the minimum parking requirement on properties in Champaign? Does it help the property in some way, or does it impose costs that outweigh the benefit provided? Conceptually, we can identify three possible answers. A minimum parking requirement may harm a property by requiring too much parking, it may get the amount of parking needed on site just right, or it may undershoot the actual amount of parking needed and thus have no effect at all. Each possibility is discussed in turn below.

3.1.3.1 Minimum Parking Requirements as Too Much Parking
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Minimum parking requirements mandate too much parking when the value added by a required parking space is less than the construction, maintenance, and opportunity costs of providing that space. This is a surprisingly common outcome. When the US Census Bureau surveyed property owners and managers about the government regulations they found most burdensome, the respondents placed parking requirements second only to property taxes. Developers respond to this circumstance in a number of ways.

One strategy is to cut costs elsewhere in the project. A developer may wish to provide only a little parking and direct costs towards other amenities she thinks tenants will find more valuable. Required to build a greater amount of parking that fails to pay its own way, the developer may install lower quality fixtures and finishes in the building. Landscaping and maintenance budgets may be cut as well. The costs of the required parking are borne by the residents in the form of reduced amenities elsewhere.

A mirror of the first strategy is to raise the rent or sale price for the property. The developer’s preferred amenity package is not cut, and the costs of providing required parking are passed through to the tenant. Whereas the “cut costs” strategy would be chosen by a developer renting to a market that cannot bear the combined costs of required parking and preferred amenities, the “raise prices” strategy may be employed by a developer in a market that has the ability to absorb higher housing costs. Often the costs of parking will be bundled directly into the price paid by the customer, who remains none the wiser of how much of their check goes towards parking that appears to be free.

A third strategy is to reduce the scale of development. Cities directly control the scale of development through zoning tools such as FAR maximums, height limits, and density restrictions. However, parking requirements sometimes serve as the limiting factor on development scale instead. Suppose a parcel is nominally zoned for development up to 20 apartments. A developer may find that the site is not big enough for both 20 apartments and the required parking spaces. If providing the spaces in a structure is financially or physically infeasible, the developer will be forced to reduce the number of apartments until both they and the required parking can be placed on site. This lowers the number of residents that can be accommodated on site, reducing the rent recovered by the property and, by extension, the property tax revenues therefrom. At the extremes, a parking requirement’s burden on development can be so great that the development never occurs at all.

It is important to restate that all three of these strategies only occur in situations where minimum parking requirements mandate parking in excess of what the developer would provide on his
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or her own. They will not be employed in a situation where the developer does not feel burdened by the imposition of a minimum parking requirement. Short of asking the developer, the best way to determine whether the minimum parking requirement required too much parking for a particular property is to compare the property’s required amount of parking to the provided amount. If the numbers are equal, a strong presumption arises that the developer built only to the minimum due to legal requirements and would have built less parking if so allowed. The other possibility in the case of a requirement/provided equivalence is that the minimum parking requirement precisely predicted the amount of parking the developer wanted to provide. That possibility is discussed below.

3.1.3.2 Minimum Parking Requirements as the Exactly Correct Amount of Parking

The conclusion that a developer’s provision of exactly the amount of parking required by zoning rests on a tenuous assumption about the accuracy of the minimum parking requirement. Presumably, no person knows better than the developer herself how much parking is necessary to make her project succeed. This knowledge likely comes from experience with owning or managing properties in a wide variety of locations with different tenant mixes. Given the primacy of the financial bottom line in the property investment decision, it seems reasonable to assume that a developer’s assessment of parking needs is well-informed.

In contrast, minimum parking requirements are significantly less well-informed. In large part, this is a natural result of the resources available to a planning office and the demands placed on them. Planners are typically not trained to conduct parking demand studies. Even if they were, such studies are time-intensive and likely not an efficient use of department resources. Additionally, zoning ordinances are drafted to be broadly applicable. The whole point of promulgating a zoning ordinance is to set the same development rules for categories of properties, rather than analyzing each property individually. Therefore, planners not only lack the resources to assess parking needs for each property, but doing so is outside the scope of their profession.

Accordingly, it seems exceedingly unlikely that the amount of parking required for a project will line up exactly with the amount of parking a developer feels is most beneficial. A developer dedicates significant attention to the parking needs of the property, while the planning department generally does not. The blanket nature of minimum parking requirements means that they are likely precisely correct for any individual property.

3.1.3.3 Minimum Parking Requirements Irrelevant to the Amount of Parking

The third conceptual possibility for the effect of minimum parking requirements on a property applies to those sites where a developer feels that her site needs more parking than is required. Perhaps
the site is located on the edge of town, or perhaps the developer expects to attract a clientele arriving exclusively by automobile. Where zoning regulations require one parking space for a two bedroom apartment, the developer wishes to provide one parking space per bedroom, plus some guest parking besides. Most zoning ordinances do not cap the number of parking spaces that may be built, and so developers are free to exceed the minimums when they think doing so adds value to their property.

Under these circumstances, the uselessness of the minimum parking requirement as a planning tool is readily evident. The amount of parking provided by a developer wishing to exceed the minimum requirements would be the same whether or not requirements are even on the books. This conclusion holds true irrespective of the costs of the parking, the form in which it’s provided, and any other potentially valid planning criticisms a third party could level at this property. When minimum parking requirements establish a supply floor and a developer wishes to float above it, the floor may as well not be there at all.

3.2 Local Parking Studies

How does this theoretical framework hold up when applied to actual development patterns? Two local parking studies seem to support it. The first study focuses on the University District, Champaign’s most densely built neighborhood. Space is at a premium in the University District, so it is the most likely neighborhood where the burdens of a minimum parking requirement would appear if they exist. The second study focuses on commercial development. Recently, most commercial development in the community has been built on the fringe, and commercial developer and tenants alike generally seek to serve a customer base arriving by automobile. Accordingly, this set of buildings seems the most likely in which the irrelevance of parking regulations to development decisions would be detected if it exists. The results are presented below.

3.2.1 University District Study

The University District study area includes buildings south of University Ave., west of Wright St., north of Gregory St., and east of the Illinois Central railroad tracks. The University District was chosen as for study for several reasons. First, the district has enjoyed significant new construction since the last major rezoning in 1996. In addition to providing a relatively large and accessible data set (building permits can be more difficult to find in other districts), the University District has been the site of some of Champaign’s most innovative recent construction projects. Additionally, the district has often been understood to have a unique population and land use mix which demand special attention when setting policy. Finally, the University District has the highest residential density of any Champaign
neighborhood. Because the costs of providing parking rise as density increases, the University District is
the most likely neighborhood where minimum parking requirements might exert a burden.

The University District is the combination of two component parts: the University District Recent
Development Study and the University District Residential Parking Survey.

3.2.1.1 Recent Development Study

The University District Recent Development Study measures the supply of parking at post-1996
developments against the amount of parking mandated by minimum parking requirements. Supply,
along with price and occupancy, are key factors in understanding parking demand in the University
District. The study considered 48 developments constructed since 1996. Residential buildings were most
prevalent, while commercial, institutional, and mixed use buildings rounded out the sample.

Building permits for each development were reviewed to calculate the amount of parking
required under the zoning that existed at the time of construction. Subsequently, the number of parking
spaces at each building was counted and compared to the number required by the Zoning Ordinance. In
the case of the three planned developments in the University District, the study considers as “required
parking” the amount of parking that would have been required had the projects not been granted
waivers. Additionally, the study only considers buildings that have been or are being constructed. Thus,
for example, the sample includes the residential towers at 310 E. Springfield Ave. and 309 E. Green St.
but excludes the proposed Burnham townhouses and 311 E. Green St, even though the latter two are
included in approved planned development proposals.

Developments included in the sample vary significantly in terms of required parking. Approximately 20% (10 of 48) of projects were not subject to any parking requirement. Another 40% (19 of 48) of projects were small scale residential buildings requiring between 1 and 50 parking spaces. A third of projects (16 of 48) were larger, requiring between 51 and 200 parking spaces, while three
buildings required in excess of 200 parking spaces.

Altogether, the Zoning Ordinance required these developments to provide 2,588 parking spaces.
In actuality, these developments provided 2,569 parking spaces, nineteen fewer than required. Of the
forty-eight buildings constructed, twenty-eight did not provide more parking than required. Three of
these actually provided less parking, taking advantage of parking waivers granted during the planned
development process. Another fifteen developments provided only one, two, or three spaces more than
required by the Zoning Ordinance. Only five developments provided four or more parking spaces than
required.
Those developers seeking parking waivers or merely meeting the minimum requirement are likely motivated by a perception that parking is a low-value amenity for University District buildings compared to other potential uses of their land and finances. Discerning the motives of developers providing parking in excess of minimum requirements is slightly more difficult, but three possible explanations come to mind.

The first is that some developers may regard a building’s handicap accessible parking requirement as an addition to the baseline parking requirement rather than a replacement. For instance, if a building requires ten parking spaces, one of which must be handicap accessible, some developers will provide ten parking spaces (nine standard + one accessible) while others will provide eleven parking spaces (ten standard + one accessible). This explanation appears to account for the majority of the twenty developments that exceed minimum requirements.

Parking overages also occur in developments where parking can only be increased in large increments. For instance, 309 E. Green exceeds its minimum parking requirement by 20 spaces. Each of the building’s standard garage decks contains 36 spaces. Because the developer could only add parking spaces in intervals of 36, 309 E. Green provides more parking than requirements mandate. This rationale seems to account for overages at a few buildings that have underground garages as well.

A third possible explanation for exceeding minimum parking requirements is a genuine desire to provide more parking. There is only one building for which this appears to be the most likely rationale: the Cohen Center for Jewish Life at 503 E. John St. Though no parking was required for this development, it contains 26 off-street parking spaces. This overage makes it a substantial outlier among the sample, both in terms of proportional overage as well as total number of spaces over minimum.

Given these development patterns, it seems likely that minimum parking requirements distort the supply of parking above the number that would be provided with a lower or abolished minimum. No residential or commercial development appears to have viewed parking as an asset that adds enough value to the project to justify exceeding the minimum requirements. In many cases, physical and financial constraints on parking appear to be the limiting factor on development rather than other Zoning Ordinance provision such as FAR.

### 3.2.1.2 Residential Parking Survey

The University District Residential Parking Survey measures the price and occupancy of parking spaces at all privately owned residential buildings, regardless of building age. Price and occupancy, along with supply, are key factors in understanding parking demand in the University District. The survey examines parking at residential properties leased by Bankier Apartments, Burnham 310, Campus
Property Management, Green Street Realty, Johnson Rentals, JSJ Management, JSM Apartments, MHM Properties, Ramshaw Realty, Roland Realty, and University Group Apartments, as well as private dormitories.

Participants are asked to answer the following questions each of their rental properties in the University District:

1. Does this property have parking on-site? (Y/N)

2. Does a standard lease at this apartment include at least one parking space? (Y/N)
   a. If yes, how many spaces are assigned?
   b. If no, what is the monthly rate for parking rental?

3. May non-residents lease parking at this property?

4. Please try to estimate the occupancy level of this property's parking lot during the school year. The occupancy estimate should count as "unoccupied" any spaces that are leased or assigned but are not regularly used by a car. (0%-50%=Low; 51-90%=Medium; 91%-100%=High)

Additionally, participants are asked to comment generally on whether the demand for parking has shifted over the past five years.

The survey shed substantial light on the parking rental practices present in the University District today. First, parking rental policies at each building fall into one of three typologies: “bundled parking”, “unbundled parking”, and “no parking”. A property offers bundled parking when it includes or assigns parking in a standard lease. This practice is most common at houses, likely because these properties are rented by groups of friends who decide how much parking they wish to use. However, some apartment buildings offer bundled parking as well. These buildings are clustered along the northern and western edges of the University District, suggesting that landlords bundle parking to ensure that every apartment lease produces some revenue for parking that cannot be captured through a separate rental. A property offers unbundled parking when it does not include parking in a standard lease, giving renters the option of paying for parking or not. This is the practice at the majority of University District apartment buildings. Survey participants report that they typically offer parking leases only to residents at the beginning of the school year, then open leasing to non-residents after a month or two. Finally, some properties offer no parking at all. This is most common among University of Illinois dormitories. Very few private buildings offer no parking at all. Presumably, residents of these buildings either do not wish to use a parking space or do not mind leasing an off-site space.
Additionally, despite the upward distortion of the parking supply by the Zoning Ordinance, the majority of the University District remains a place where market fluidity exists for parking. As expected, landlords set parking prices commensurate with a space’s location and quality (e.g. covered, secured, etc.). Participants report that parking occupancy is generally close to 100%. Landlords adjust their prices yearly to maximize revenue. Because most University District parking is unbundled (and therefore available to both residents and non-residents) and subject to demand-sensitive price changes, the University District remains an area of the city where parking is paid for primarily by people who wish to use it.

A caveat to the above observation is the hypothesis that the supply of parking in the district may be artificially inflated to the point that non-parkers are mildly subsidizing the parking of their automobile-owning neighbors. Many University District apartment buildings have structured or underground parking, a phenomenon even more common among newer buildings. As previously mentioned, parking of this type is especially expensive to provide. Conservatively assuming a $15,000 cost of construction, even the highest monthly parking rate ($90 per month) in the University District would not retire construction costs for a structured parking space for nearly 14 years. Most parking rates are significantly lower than that rate, as well. It could well be that the parking supply has been inflated to a level such that landlords are unable to charge a price for parking that covers the construction and maintenance costs of parking, with the result that some of these costs are passed on to every tenant in their apartment lease. This is a point that merits careful consideration in future parking plans for this district.

3.2.2 Commercial Development Study

The Commercial Development Study measures the supply of parking at post-1996 commercial developments against the amount of parking mandated by minimum parking requirements. Unlike residential buildings in the University District, commercial developments typically provide free parking to workers and customers. Accordingly, the supply of parking gives the strongest indication of what the developer feels the parking needs of the building are. Developers can be expected to provide sufficient parking to meet the demand for free parking at their buildings, so no meaningful information can be drawn from comparing the price of parking at different locations. Occupancy rates could potentially prove of some use, but collecting such rates was infeasible with limited manpower and no funding. Additionally, the peak-oriented nature of commercial parking construction suggests that occupancy rates are only useful in the context of setting maximum parking requirements. The study considered 49 commercial developments constructed since 1996. These were selected at random from a set of slightly
over 110 building permits in the same period. The random sample encompasses development of a variety of sizes and in a variety of locations. As in the University District Recent Development Study, building permits for each development were reviewed to calculate the amount of parking required under the zoning that existed at the time of construction. Subsequently, the number of parking spaces at each building was counted and compared to the number required by the Zoning Ordinance. In the rare case of mixed-use developments, only parking required of and provided for commercial uses was counted.

Developments included in the sample vary significantly in terms of required parking. The size of commercial developments ranges widely, and different parking rates act as a multiplier such that surveyed properties had parking requirements ranging from zero spaces to 677. Less than 10% (3 of 49) of projects were not subject to any parking requirement. Of surveyed properties, roughly a third (16 of 39) were required to provide between 1 and 19 parking spaces, while the same number of buildings were required to provide between 20 and 49 parking spaces. 18% of projects (9 of 49) were larger, requiring between 50 and 99 parking spaces, while five buildings required in excess of 100 parking spaces.

In sum, these developments were required to provide 2,462 parking spaces. The actual number of spaces provided far outstripped requirements, totaling 3,324. This represents an average per-building overage of approximately 35%. Parking provided in excess of requirements is not distributed evenly, however. Ten of the properties surveyed provide as much or less parking than base regulations require. In those cases where parking is underprovided, it is sometimes unclear whether the property is subject to a shared parking agreement or error (on the part of the Zoning Administrator, the developer, or this survey) is responsible for the discrepancy. Of the 80% of properties that do provide parking in excess of requirements, nearly all provide at least 20% more parking than is required. Most surprisingly, over a third of all properties surveyed provide at least 150% of required parking. Perhaps the most visible example of these is the WalMart at 2610 N. Prospect Ave. (677 spaces required, 1,017 spaces built), but many of the largest proportional overages are at small office buildings.

Thus, in a result nearly opposite from the one seen in the University District, commercial development hardly seems affected by the presence of the minimum parking requirement. Whereas an equivalence between required parking and provided parking in the residential context seems to indicate that the developer would provide less parking if possible, the majority of equivalencies found in commercial development occur in the CB district, where no parking is required anyway. Meanwhile, the vast majority of commercial developers build parking well in excess of requirements.
The reasoning behind the decision to overprovide parking is fairly obvious. Attempts to reach out to developers were unsuccessful, but the limited literature on the subject of commercial parking planning suggests that developers and construction lenders use their own parking formulas when projecting a property’s parking needs. These formulas typically exceed regulatory minimums. Some commercial tenants view excess parking as an amenity that adds value; even if the spaces never get used, they demonstrate to passing drivers that parking at this building is always easily accessible. Finally, most commercial development in Champaign has occurred on the fringes of the community, where automobile travel is far easier than other modes. It is small wonder that developers of fringe parcels leverage cheap land prices to ensure that their parking lots are never overcrowded.

In short, minimum parking requirements appear to be irrelevant to most recent commercial development in Champaign. It is possible that some forms of commercial development or redevelopment are stunted by the requirement. For instance, it is conceivable that some developers might wish to build commercial buildings on small lots in the CG zone but are unable to find space for the required parking. Evidence for this is difficult to uncover, since no paper trail exists for projects deemed futile from the outset. Regardless of whether minimum parking requirements stunt some commercial development, however, it seems apparent that they add do nothing of value for the many properties where developers choose to build ample parking on their own.

4. Recommendations for Regulatory Reform

Analysis of the effects of Champaign’s current parking regulations suggest that reform is necessary. In the University District, minimum parking requirements distort the supply of parking upward, imposing higher costs on residential tenants irrespective of their decision to park a car in the district. Meanwhile, the artificial upward distortion of the parking supply destroys landlords’ ability to charge a market rental price for parking that recovers construction costs in a timely fashion, shifting part of the costs of parking onto all residents in a building. In contrast, the minimum parking requirements applied to commercial development outside of the core appear to serve no useful purpose as developers consistently provide parking in excess of the required minimum amount. When a policy harms some type of development and has no effect on other types, it is overdue for reform.

A growing number of communities are experimenting with maximum parking requirements either in place of or in concert with minimum parking requirements. Discussion of maximum parking requirements has cropped up at various times among Champaign planning staff, city councilors, and plan commissioners. Maximum parking requirements may well be the best way to limit the extreme oversupply of parking that plagues parts of Champaign, particularly commercial areas north of Interstate
74. However, a recommendation for maximum parking requirements would be beyond the scope of this study. Acknowledging that problems exist with the current system of mandating a floor for the parking supply, it does not necessarily follow that imposing a ceiling is the appropriate response. Any decision to set maximum parking requirements should only come after a close analysis of best practices elsewhere.

Instead, the following recommendations speak only to the minimum parking requirements currently in place. Recommendations are ordered according to how significantly they would alter parking policy. First, and most different from current policy, is the recommendation to eliminate minimum parking requirements in their entirety. Next is the recommendation to eliminate minimum parking requirements only in certain geographical areas or for certain uses. Third is the recommendation to maintain the presence of minimum parking requirements, but reduce them from current scheduled levels. The final category of recommendations includes those that leave minimum parking rates alone but increase flexibility for properties looking to provide less parking.

4.1 Elimination of Minimum Parking Requirements

The City of Champaign should give serious consideration to the total elimination of their minimum parking requirements. Minimum parking requirements harm some types of development and do not influence others at all. The arguments in favor of maintaining minimum parking requirements are not convincing in light of this planning tool’s demonstrated results in Champaign.

Proponents of the status quo often cite spillover concerns as justification for minimum parking requirements. Without minimum parking requirements, the argument goes, cars carrying customers or residents of one property will occupy spaces at a neighboring property, harming visitors to the second property. It is true that spillover is an undesirable outcome, and that if the supply of parking is kept above the peak demand for free parking then spillover will not occur. However, spillover concerns do not justify the existence of minimum parking requirements for several reasons. First, property owners are perfectly capable at preventing spillover without government interference. Many developers and construction lenders decide to provide ample parking irrespective of minimum parking requirements. Such projects can be found all over Champaign, from the big box retailers on North Prospect Ave. to the downtown hotel project. Secondly, spillover’s harmful effects stem from enforcement issues. If a property owner finds that his neighbor’s tenants or customers are parking in his lot, it is his responsibility to assert his control over his property, not the City’s. Finally, spillover is only an issue during peak usage periods. The capital costs of parking are significant, and building a peak-oriented system that almost always carries excess capacity may well be fiscally inefficient.
Another concern sometimes voiced by proponents is that the elimination of minimum parking requirements will lead to the construction of properties that lay vacant due to a lack of parking. This argument is well-intentioned, but it is better leveled against a proposal to enact maximum parking requirements. It bears repeating that the mere elimination of minimum parking requirements will not force anyone to provide less parking. Property owners who find their value flagging due to a lack of parking have ample ability to remedy their woes on their own. Furthermore, this argument begs a converse argument that undercuts the logic of the first. If the City has a responsibility to maintain high property values through the mandated oversupply of parking, why does it not have an equal responsibility to reduce the costs that stunt or outright prevent development where the costs of required parking outweigh the benefits? A lack of minimum parking requirements is only a contributing factor to the lower property value of a building that lacks sufficient parking. In contrast, the harm caused by a required oversupply of parking on development in dense, walkable areas is both direct and calculable.

Likely the biggest obstacle to eliminating minimum parking requirements is political pressure from voters. Drivers have grown accustomed to parking for free near the entrance of almost all buildings and are wary of any potential changes to this system. This phenomenon is not unique to Champaign, but rather prevails in nearly all American communities. As such, attempts to eliminate minimum parking requirements will likely engender some opposition based on the premise that such a policy move would make driving and parking in town much more difficult. This premise is faulty for at least two reasons. First, the pace of development is slow, and any change of urban form driven by a shift in parking policy will be incremental and easily adapted to. Second, eliminating minimum requirements is not the same as imposing maximums. Many developers will still choose to provide ample free parking even in the face of no minimum parking requirement. To properly respond to citizen concerns about parking reform, city officials should stress the distinction between arguments for parking and arguments for requiring parking. Opponents may well be right when they say it is a good idea for apartment buildings or office buildings to provide a certain amount of parking, but this argument does not necessarily translate into an argument that all apartment buildings and office buildings should be **required** to provide a certain level of parking. With forethought and proper messaging, city staff can engage citizens and elected officials in a thoughtful discussion about this distinction.

---

26 See, e.g., comments of plan commissioner Brian DeMuynck at Aug. 15, 2012 meeting of Champaign Plan Commission
The prevailing local development paradigm produces ample parking at most buildings. Removing parking requirements would not change this fact for the vast majority of buildings in Champaign because developers and tenants view parking as an asset. However, there are some buildings for which the provision of minimally required parking spaces is a burden. In these cases, minimum parking requirements raise the costs of housing or doing business. Off-street parking is provided for “free” because its costs are bundled into building operating costs, and so everyone using the building pays for the higher costs whether they made use of the parking or not. If minimum parking requirements are eliminated, these costs will only be imposed by private development decisions, not government mandate. This admittedly bold step in parking reform would not affect most buildings, but it would offer an important avenue by which developers and tenants could save on land and construction costs by eschewing parking in excess of their actual needs.

4.2 Elimination of Minimum Parking Requirements for Specific Districts or Zones

While eliminating minimum parking requirements is the best method of parking reform to achieve council goals of compact and infill development, reduced auto dependency, and housing affordability, officials may be wary of making such a drastic change. Accordingly, they may instead take more limited steps towards parking reform. One such set of reforms would eliminate minimum parking requirements, but only for specific neighborhoods or particular land uses.

4.2.1 University District

The most obvious candidate for targeted elimination of minimum parking requirements is the University District. As previously discussed, the University District has already received extensive planning directed towards improving walkability and decreasing automobile demand. Significantly, both the Campustown Commercial Overlay and Midtown Commercial Overlay Districts both reduce the amount of parking required at residential uses from typical residential parking minimums. The vast majority of the University District’s residents are University of Illinois students, for whom driving to class and the Green Street commercial corridor is far less convenient than biking or walking. The densest neighborhood in Champaign, the University District possesses robust transit, cycling, and pedestrian infrastructure. For all of these reasons, demand for parking is lower in the University District than anywhere else in Champaign.

Additionally, research results show that minimum parking requirements impose higher costs on residents of the University District through the construction of expensive structured parking or the dedication of scarce land to surface parking lots. Developers in the University District consistently build only as much parking is required, indicating that they do not feel their customers see parking as a
benefit that adds much value. The parking supply is so distorted that the costs of structured parking cannot be recovered through parking rents alone in a reasonable time. Every tenant leasing an apartment in a building with required parking is likely paying for part of that parking whether they use it or not. Removing minimum parking requirements in the University District would end the trend of forcing the parking supply to outstrip the demand for parking.

If minimum parking requirements are eliminated in the University District, a number of changes would likely occur. First, apartment buildings built after the ordinance change would provide less parking or none at all. This would give residents more choice in picking a building with no parking, some parking, or ample parking. If demand began to pick up relative to supply, parking costs would increase, but this would merely represent a shift towards parkers bearing the full costs of their resource use. Finally, because redevelopment is slow and incremental, the City will retain the ability to thoughtfully respond to any changes brought on by a shift in parking policy. For example, if demand for street parking increases, the City can set parking permit prices higher to prevent overcrowding.

Because of its relatively low demand for parking, its unique non-automotive transportation advantages, and the higher costs imposed on its residents by minimum parking requirements, the University District is a recommended area for the complete elimination of minimum parking requirements.

4.2.2 Nodes

For much the same reasoning as above, the City may additionally pursue the elimination of minimum parking requirements in the nodes identified in Champaign Moving Forward. Nodes are intended to be developed with a higher level of resident density, employment density, or both. Citizens will not need a car to move with the nodes, and moving between nodes without a car will be easier as this development pattern supports increased transit service levels. Additionally, development at nodes will likely still provide some parking. The absence of a parking requirement is not a ban on parking, and so node developers will still seek to build as much parking as they think adds value to their properties. The node is an ideal candidate for letting the market dictate a lower amount of parking around dense development than current regulations require.

4.2.3 Residential Land Uses

The City may eliminate parking requirements for a specific land use as well as a specific geographic area. Specifically, while most of Champaign’s recent parking reforms have loosened requirements for commercial and institutional uses, it makes equal sense to remove parking requirements for residential uses.
The transportation role of residential land uses differs from the role of other land uses. A commercial use is a *destination* for a large and often variable set of workers and customers, some of whom may wish to arrive by automobile, others of whom may not. In contrast, a residential use is a *point of origin* for the residents of the building. Consider a citizen who chooses not to own a car. Under the current parking regulatory regime, this person has some choice in patronizing businesses that do or not provide parking. However, she has very little choice in choosing a dwelling that does not have at least one parking space. Therefore, while this citizen has some modicum of choice to avoid paying indirect parking costs on shopping and work trips, she has no ability to avoid paying those costs at her own home. Requiring parking at residences imposes parking costs on all residents of affected buildings.

The silliness of residential parking requirements comes into focus when considering the different geographic character of otherwise identical residences. If a developer wanted to construct twenty two-bedroom apartments adjacent to Illinois Terminal, a location with unsurpassed walkability and transit access, the Zoning Ordinance would require him to provide twenty parking spaces. If the developer instead decided to build twenty two-bedroom apartments on the fringe of town, he would be required to provide the same twenty parking spaces as the downtown site. The parking demand at each property would be very different, but regulations force the requirement to be the same. Removing minimum parking requirements would allow the parking gradient to follow the density gradient that already flows from the city’s core to its edges.

Further buttressing the argument for elimination of residential parking requirements is the fact that the vast majority of residential properties in Champaign front onto a street allowing street parking. Residential parking requirements often carry the implicit assumption that off-street parking should be able to accommodate service and delivery vehicles. These vehicles are an important feature of a well-functioning community, and spaces should absolutely be made for them. However, the City’s street width standards provide enough room for these vehicles to park on the street, and parking demand is low enough in most places that service vehicles will not crowd out residents. Indeed, there is often enough room for the residents of a neighborhood street’s properties to park on the street without overcrowding the street space. It seems silly to require a duplicate parking infrastructure off street when the City has already chosen to provide substantial amounts of on-street parking in front of most residences.

Removing residential parking requirements will not produce a landscape where no residences provide parking. Development is incremental, and developers will respond to the fact that most tenants and homebuyers want to have some amount of parking at home. However, developers freed from
current regulatory restraints will find that they are much more able to meet the actual parking demands of Champaign residents. A greater range of options can be expected to appear, with some residences containing little or no parking. These will almost certainly be built in neighborhoods that are already walkable or along roads with good transit access. Eliminating minimum parking requirements for residential uses can only help the City achieve its goals of making housing more affordable by allowing residents to avoid the costs of unwanted parking.

4.3 Reduction of Minimum Parking Requirements

The arguments for reducing minimum parking requirements rather than eliminating them are much the same. Reducing minimum parking requirements rather than eliminating them entirely is an appropriate intermediate step for a city that recognizes the problems with its existing parking schedules but feels that a shift to an unregulated parking supply is too extreme. The City of Champaign has already adjusted the parking requirements for several land uses and neighborhoods downwards, so officials are obviously already comfortable with this type of parking reform. However, while reducing minimum parking requirements is a laudable step towards the land use and transportation goals identified in recent planning efforts, two large caveats remain.

The first is that reduced parking minimums still suffer from the inaccuracy that current minimums do. Rates are set either by copying peer cities or using flawed ITE data, neither of which can capture the complexity of localized parking demand. Setting a lower rate is good, but what is the right rate to change to? The procedural problems of adjusting rather than eliminating minimum parking requirements can be seen in the ad-hoc nature of some of Champaign’s recent parking rate reductions. For example, the minimum parking requirement for libraries was adjusted slightly downwards when the main library building was expanded and renovated, while the requirement for grocery stores was similarly tweaked when the County Market on Springfield Ave. was proposed as part of the Burnham planned development. Planning memos in support of these changes based their recommendations off the numbers found in peer city ordinances, but there was no evidence that one number was any less or more arbitrary than another. Instead, the number was set at a rate that fit the proposed project. This is a less than optimal way of translating purported parking demand into parking supply requirements.

The second caveat is that reduced parking rates will suffer from the same “too much or nothing at all” problem that plagues current requirements. Suppose all minimum parking requirements were set at half of what they are now. Many developers would continue to provide more parking than the ordinance requires, effectively rendering it useless. Meanwhile, there might be properties for which the
lower requirements are still too burdensome, resulting in stunted development or higher costs for tenants and customers.

Opposition to parking reform should be expected, and reducing the minimums rather than eliminating them outright is almost certainly more politically palatable. As such, Champaign should certainly consider setting reduced rates before making the leap to an unregulated parking supply. However, officials and staff should be well informed of the problems with minimum parking requirements of any rate, and should set as a goal the revisiting of the ordinance in the future to continue to eliminate its burden on development.

4.4 Minor Changes

If the City decides to eschew changes to minimum parking requirements entirely, it still has opportunities to positively reform its parking regulations. These proposals cannot be expected to have more than a marginal effect on development patterns, but will still contribute towards council goals of walkability and decreased automobile dependence.

4.4.1 Free spaces for downtown residential land uses

As mentioned above, parking is plentiful along the majority of Champaign’s streets. Most residences front a street that offers free street parking but still provide ample off-street parking for themselves in driveways and garages. While this parking is nominally public and open to anyone, the City has demonstrated a willingness to elevate the interests of adjacent residents above others who might wish to use the street space as remote parking or remove parking spaces for bicycle lanes. In doing so, the City confers a de facto property interest in street parking on the adjacent property owners, whether or not they utilize street parking.

Downtown residents do not receive a similar property interest in public parking. While the City maintains well over a thousand off- and on-street parking spaces downtown, downtown residents must pay for parking the same as any visitor or worker must. Champaign inequitably subsidizes the parking of residents away from the core but not those in the core. This provides a competitive disadvantage for downtown infill housing, something the City continues to pursue.

Because downtown public parking facilities remain underused, the City has the ability to equalize the parking subsidy between downtown and other residents by dedicating a parking space to each downtown dwelling unit. Spaces could be deeded to property owners, but a lease system is preferable as it allows the City to maintain flexibility in the disbursal of its property. These spaces could be tied to the parking facilities closest to each unit, or they could be consolidated in the underused downtown garage. Alternatively, the City could instead offer a free parking pass to downtown residents
rather than selecting specific spaces. In either case, the City would somewhat equalize the balance of the parking subsidies it currently grants to residents of different neighborhoods.

If it chooses this reform, the City may also choose to count these spaces against the required parking for residential uses in the CB district.

4.4.2 In-lieu fees

Another potential reform benefitting infill development is the establishment of an in-lieu fee system. Although visitors accustomed to free parking in front of every building may feel otherwise, downtown Champaign has a wealth of parking. New commercial spaces are not required to add to this already large supply of parking, but new residential uses are. By allowing residential uses to meet this parking requirement through a payment towards future public parking, downtown Champaign could add new residents while thoughtfully managing its parking supply. Residential development could also deliver improved urban design under the in-lieu fee system as parking can be concentrated rather than dispersed. The specifics of an in-lieu fee proposal are beyond the scope of this report, but such programs are already managed with great success in peer cities of similar size.

4.4.3 Expanded waivers for adaptive reuse

Finally, Champaign could expand the applicability of its waivers for the adaptive reuse of structures. Champaign currently offers two avenues for adaptive reuse waivers. The first is open to structures either designated as historic structures or located within a historic district. These may have their required parking reduced by up to 50%. The other eliminates parking requirements for apartments created within CB zoned structures built before 1990. Admirably, these waivers recognize the value of adaptive reuse and the burdens that parking requirements can place on repurposed structures. The best way to support adaptive reuse is to expand the class of buildings to which parking waivers may apply. For example, instead of only offering waivers to apartments renovated in pre-1990 structures, the ordinance could extend a waiver to any building repurposed after reaching a designated age. Enacting such a policy would decrease development risk, as buildings could be leased or sold for a wider range of land uses. Meanwhile, setting a minimum age for waivers ensures that developers will not “cheat the system” by building a land use that requires little parking and then immediately seeking a land use change and parking waiver upon the completion of construction.
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FLEXIBLE PARKING POLICY FOR CHAMPAIGN

University District Recent Development Study
University District District Residential Parking Survey
Contemporary parking policy: inflexible

• Most common element of parking ordinances is a minimum parking requirement for every land use

• Even property owners who expect or desire a clientele that primarily walks, bikes, or takes transit must provide ample parking

• Exemptions, both geographic and use-based, are narrowly given

• In many cases, minimum parking regulations are the limiting factor on development
What are flexible parking policies?

Parking policy is **district flexible** when it applies context-specific regulations and incentives in different types of neighborhoods.

Parking policy is **site flexible** when it gives developers more choice in providing transportation access to their property.
What are flexible parking policies?

District Flexible Strategies
- Parking regulations tied to geography rather than use
  - Considers access to transit, biking, and walking infrastructure
- Form-based codes regulating location of parking
- Provision of public parking lots/garages

Site Flexible Strategies
- Reduced or abolished minimum parking requirements
- Fees in-lieu of parking
- Waivers for change of land use
- Off-site parking allowances
- Collective parking
## Champaign Zoning Ordinance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Policies by Type</th>
<th>Presence in Ordinance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inflexible</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum parking requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum parking requirements</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District Flexible</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention to localized factors</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form-based parking codes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of public parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Flexible</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced/abolished minimums</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees in-lieu of parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waivers for change of use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-site allowance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are flexible parking policies right for Champaign?

Recent city plans & actions indicate a move in this direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The expectations of parking supply and location should be different in downtown than in suburban areas”</td>
<td>“Develop a revised set of parking standards . . . which establishes reduced parking requirements within nodes”</td>
<td>“Parking requirements that recognize . . . transit service, availability of active commute modes, [and] off-site and on-street parking”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Establishment of Midtown Commercial Overlay District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expansion of CB Residential Off-site Parking Allowance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Establishment of Urban Neighborhood Districts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revision of Shared Parking Calculation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Establishment of Campus Commercial Overlay District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction of Parking Requirements for Groceries &amp; Retail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Elimination of Parking Requirements in Campus Core</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Revision of Multifamily Parking Requirement Calculation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Reduction of Parking Requirements for Historic Buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Reduction of Parking Requirements for Nursing Homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Reduction of Parking Requirements for Religious Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Reduction of Parking Requirements for Libraries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction of Parking Requirements for Industrial Uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Setting parking policies

**Outdated Practices**
- Consult ITE Parking Generation Handbook
- Copy regulations from peer cities
- Apply same parking standards across different zones

**Preferred Practices**
- Assess local parking supply, usage, and prices
- Apply different parking standards across different zones
- Consider localized factors e.g. transit accessibility
Setting parking policies

Outdated Practices
• Consult ITE Parking Generation Handbook
• Copy regulations from peer cities
• Apply same parking standards across different zones

Preferred Practices
• Assess local parking supply, usage, and prices
• Apply different parking standards across different zones
• Consider localized factors e.g. transit accessibility
University District
Recent Development Study
&
University District
Residential Parking Survey
Underlying Questions

What is the impact of inflexible parking requirements on recent University District developments?

§ 37-331 ‘Purpose’: “... to alleviate traffic congestion by providing parking facilities with adequate capacity for employees, residents, and customers”

What is the “adequate capacity” for Univ. Dist. parking?

A free parking space for anybody who wants one?
A parking space for anybody paying a market price?
A limited amount of spaces to achieve a desired mode share?
Parking Demand Factors

PRICE

SUPPLY

OCCUPANCY

UNIVERSITY DISTRICT PARKING DEMAND
University District Recent Development Study

- PRICE
- SUPPLY
- OCCUPANCY

UNIVERSITY DISTRICT PARKING DEMAND
University District Recent Development Study

• Analyzes the provision of parking at recent developments in the University District
• 48 developments reviewed:
  • Projects constructed after 1996 rezoning
  • Both as-of-right projects and planned developments
  • Mostly residential, along with some commercial and mixed use
University District Recent Development Study
Zoning Summary

Developments were constructed/renovated in the following zones:
- **MF2**: Multifamily Medium Density
- **MF3**: Multifamily High Density / Limited Business
- **CG**: Commercial General
- **CB**: Central Business
- **CB-CCO**: Central Business (Campus Commercial Overlay)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Minimum Parking Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial (ft²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-CCO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Developments were constructed/renovated in the following zones

- **MF2**: Multifamily Medium Density
- **MF3**: Multifamily High Density / Limited Business
- **CG**: Commercial General
- **CB**: Central Business
- **CB-CCO**: Central Business (Campus Commercial Overlay)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Minimum Parking Requirements</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial (ft²)</td>
<td>Residential (0.5/bedroom)</td>
<td>Residential Waiver (10 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-CCO</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What’s Been Built?

Planned Developments seeking parking waivers:
- Burnham Redevelopment
- 309 E. Green St.
- Newman Center
What’s Been Built?

Number of Buildings since 1996

- >200: 3
- 101-200: 5
- 51-100: 11
- 21-50: 8
- 11-20: 5
- 1-10: 6
- 0: 10

Number of Parking Spaces Required

- 627 S. Wright St. (L)
- 619 S. Wright St. (R)
What’s Been Built?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Parking Spaces Required</th>
<th>Number of Buildings since 1996</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-50</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-200</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;200</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 E. John St.

16 Spaces
What’s Been Built?

Number of Parking Spaces Required

- >200: 3
- 101-200: 5
- 51-100: 11
- 21-50: 8
- 11-20: 5
- 1-10: 6
- 0: 10

Number of Buildings since 1996

- 0: 10
- 1-10: 6
- 11-20: 5
- 21-50: 8
- 51-100: 11
- 101-200: 5
- >200: 3

54 E. Chalmers St.

89 Spaces
What’s Been Built?

Number of Buildings since 1996

- 0-10: 10 buildings
- 11-20: 5 buildings
- 21-50: 8 buildings
- 51-100: 11 buildings
- 101-200: 5 buildings
- >200: 3 buildings

Number of Parking Spaces Required

- 0-10: 100 spaces
- 11-20: 120 spaces
- 21-50: 80 spaces
- 51-100: 110 spaces
- 101-200: 55 spaces
- >200: 33 spaces

202 E. Green St.
What’s Been Built?

Required Parking Spaces: 2,588

Provided Parking Spaces: 2,569

19 fewer parking spaces than required (99.2% of required parking spaces)
What’s Been Built?

Provision of Parking Compared to Minimum Parking Requirements

- 20 Exceeds Requirements
- 28 Does Not Exceed Requirements
What’s Been Built?

Construction Since 2004

- 11 Exceeds Requirements
- 22 Does Not Exceed Requirements
Number of Parking Spaces Above Regulatory Minimum Provided in Recent University District Developments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Required</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Minimum Requirement</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 more</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2 more</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3 more</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-10 more</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+11 or more</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motivations Behind Parking Construction

Developer negotiates to provide less parking
• Can save costs of structured parking while advancing neighborhood goals

Developer provides minimum required parking
• Sees no benefit to providing extra parking; would likely provide less if given the opportunity

Developer provides more parking than is required
1. Handicap accessible spaces are tacked on rather than included in original total (most common)
2. Structured parking increases by multi-space intervals
3. Desire to provide more parking (perhaps only one?)
University District Residential Parking Survey

PRICE

SUPPLY

OCCUPANCY

UNIVERSITY DISTRICT PARKING DEMAND
Participants were asked to answer the following questions for each of their properties:

1. Does this property have parking on-site? (Y/N)
2. Does a standard lease at this apartment include at least one parking space? (Y/N)
   —If yes, how many spaces are assigned?
   —If no, what is the monthly rate for parking rental?
3. May non-residents lease parking at this property?
4. Estimate the occupancy level of this property's parking lot during the school year.
   (0%-50%=Low; 51-90%=Medium; 91%-100%=High)

Additionally, participants were asked to comment generally on whether the demand for parking has shifted over the past five years.
## Parking Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bundled Parking</th>
<th>Unbundled Parking</th>
<th>No Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One or more parking spaces are assigned to a dwelling unit in a standard lease</td>
<td>Parking spaces are available for lease independently of a dwelling unit lease</td>
<td>No parking is available on site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminary Observations on Parking Prices

- Where parking supply exceeds demand, landlords bundle parking to ensure parking revenue
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Preliminary Observations on Parking Prices

- Where parking supply exceeds demand, landlords bundle parking to ensure parking revenue.
- Where parking demand exceeds supply, landlords set rates commensurate with location and quality.
- Almost all “unbundled parking” properties fully lease out their parking spaces, indicating a fluid market.
- Many parking spaces are leased by non-residents, and it is likely that many students shop around for the parking lease that suits them best.
Next Steps

Recent Commercial Development Study

Fringe Residential Development Study

Suggestions?
Overview

• Intended to provide benchmarks for Champaign as it revises parking elements in zoning code
Overview

• Intended to provide benchmarks for Champaign as it revises parking elements in zoning code
• Recorded presence or absence of elements either found in typical parking codes or suggested by CMAP’s “Parking Strategies to Support Livable Communities” (April 2012)
Elements Analyzed

**Off-street Parking Ordinances**
- Minimum Parking Requirements
  - Residential
  - Non-Residential
- Maximum Parking Requirements
  - Residential
  - Non-Residential
- Reduced Parking Districts
- In-lieu Fees
- Hidden/Rear Parking Required
- Waivers for Adaptive Reuse
- Off-site Parking Allowance
- Collective Parking Allowance

**Public Parking Policies**
- Municipal Parking Garages and Lots
- Commercial District Street Parking
  - Free, time-limited
  - Paid, time-limited
  - Paid, time-unlimited
- On-street Parking Permits
Elements Present in Champaign Zoning Ordinance (§ 37-331 et. seq.)

**Off-street Parking Ordinances**
- Minimum Parking Requirements
  - Residential
  - Non-Residential
- Maximum Parking Requirements
  - Residential
  - Non-Residential
- Reduced Parking Districts
- In-lieu Fees
- Hidden/Rear Parking Required
- Waivers for Adaptive Reuse
- Off-site Parking Allowance
- Collective Parking Allowance

**Public Parking Policies**
- Municipal Parking Garages and Lots
- Commercial District Street Parking
  - Free, time-limited
  - Paid, time-limited
  - Paid, time-unlimited
- On-street Parking Permits
Overview

• Intended to provide benchmarks for Champaign as it revises parking elements in zoning code
• Recorded presence or absence of elements either found in typical parking codes or suggested by CMAP’s “Parking Strategies to Support Livable Communities” (April 2012)
• Reviewed parking codes of 27 Illinois cities ranging in population from Aurora (~197,000) to Urbana (~40,000)
## Peer City Typology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-war Chicagoland Subcenter</th>
<th>Pre-war Bedroom Community</th>
<th>Post-war Chicagoland Subcenter</th>
<th>Post-war Bedroom Community</th>
<th>Downstate Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>Cicero</td>
<td>Naperville</td>
<td>Arlington Heights</td>
<td>Rockford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joliet</td>
<td>Skokie</td>
<td>Schaumburg</td>
<td>Bolingbrook</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Berwyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>Palatine</td>
<td>Peoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukegan</td>
<td>Oak Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Des Plaines</td>
<td>Champaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evanston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orland Park</td>
<td>Bloomington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tinley Park</td>
<td>Decatur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oak Lawn</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hoffman Estates</td>
<td>Urbana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings:
Minimum/Maximum Parking Requirements

• Cities unanimously impose minimum parking requirements on all or almost all land uses
  • Exemptions and reductions (when available) mainly applicable to non-residential uses in CBDs
• Maximum parking requirements almost nonexistent
  • No code directly imposes a parking impact fee
• Required parking schedules skew towards complexity when listing uses
• Requirements presented in one of two ways:
  1 space per X ft²
  or
  X spaces per 1,000 ft²
• Requirements rarely address parking’s land consumption
• Some codes mandate the provision of free parking
Findings:
Opportunities to Reduce Parking

• Several cities (mostly pre-war) allow for reduced parking in more pedestrian-oriented commercial areas
• Only Naperville and Skokie allow for in-lieu fees
• Waivers for adaptive re-use are restricted
  • Half of surveyed cities do not allow reduced parking when use/floor area changes
  • Those that do issue limited waivers (<15% increase in req. parking is typical)
• Approximately half of surveyed cities allow for collective parking in manner similar to Champaign (i.e. different peak occupancies + cap on reduction)
Findings: Location of Required Parking

• Many planning documents announce goals such as “park once” or “more walkable” districts
• Almost no cities require developers to locate parking lots behind buildings
  • Peoria form districts do so require
  • Evanston requires ground-level retail on certain garages
• Most cities allow some degree of off-site parking
  • 300 foot proximity most common
  • Only a few cities allow 500+ foot proximity
Findings:
Procedural Aspects of Parking

• Most cities set minimums without specific reference towards standards for granting parking variances
• A couple cities pre-announce limits on the conditions allowable through a variance
  • e.g. No variance shall be granted for less than 50% of otherwise required parking
• Codes do not contain a bonus system for the provision of more or less parking
Findings:
Public Parking Policies

• Municipalities of all sorts provide public lots and/or garages, with the lone exception of bedroom communities lacking a historic downtown
• Similarly, most cities manage on-street parking in commercial areas with either time limits and/or meters
  • Little evidence of performance pricing
  • Almost all cities using meters impose time limits as well
• Residential parking permits primarily used to limit parking generated by non-residential uses
  • Available for free with proof of residency
  • Generally not used to manage street parking demand in dense residential neighborhoods
• Parking policies are remarkably similar across city typologies. Similarly, off-street parking regulations are remarkably similar across cities of various sizes.
  • City size appears to impact public parking policies
Takeaways

How Do Peer Cities Inform Champaign’s Rezoning?

• Parking policies are remarkably similar across city typologies. Similarly, off-street parking regulations are remarkably similar across cities of various sizes.
  • City size appears to impact public parking policies
• Peer cities do not provide a good model for the Comprehensive Plan’s goal of “promoting development patterns that reduce auto dependency”
  • Many peer cities announce similar goals but fail to reflect them in their parking codes. Others do not share these goals at all.
  • Meaningful reform of Champaign’s parking code will represent a departure from its peer cities
• Caveat: This survey did not compare specific min. requirements
• Parking policies are remarkably similar across city typologies. Similarly, off-street parking regulations are remarkably similar across cities of various sizes.
  • City size appears to impact public parking policies
• Peer cities do not provide a good model for the Comprehensive Plan’s goal of “promoting development patterns that reduce auto dependency”
  • Many peer cities announce similar goals but fail to reflect them in their parking codes. Others do not share these goals at all.
  • Meaningful reform of Champaign’s parking code will represent a departure from its peer cities
  • Caveat: This survey did not compare specific min. requirements
• Champaign’s parking code is fairly progressive relative to peer cities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities to Reduce Parking</th>
<th>Aurora</th>
<th>Joliet</th>
<th>Elgin</th>
<th>Waukegan</th>
<th>Evanston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Parking Districts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FoxWalk overlay district</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>O/I-1, B4, and B5 Districts in CBD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-lieu Fees</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waivers for Adaptive Reuse</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Parking</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Required Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Parking Requirement</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ground-level retail req. for garages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-site Parking Allowed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400’ from entrance</td>
<td>300’ from entrance in CBD</td>
<td>400’ from entrance</td>
<td>300’ from entrance</td>
<td>1,000’ from entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Parking Garages/Lots</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1,885 spaces)</td>
<td>Yes (1,885 spaces)</td>
<td>Yes (1,885 spaces)</td>
<td>Yes (1,885 spaces)</td>
<td>Yes (3,500 spaces)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Parking Restrictions</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free, time-limited Paid, time-unlimited Paid, time-limited</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-street Parking Permits</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(certain downtown meters)</td>
<td>Yes (residential parking permits)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (25 residential districts)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## A3. Peer City Survey Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Section</th>
<th>Parking Minimums</th>
<th>Parking Maximums</th>
<th>Reduced Parking Districts</th>
<th>In-lieu Fees</th>
<th>Waivers for Adaptive Reuse</th>
<th>Collective Parking</th>
<th>Rear Parking Requirement</th>
<th>Off-site Parking Allowed</th>
<th>Public Parking Garages/Lots</th>
<th>Street Parking Restrictions</th>
<th>On-street Parking Permits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aurora</strong></td>
<td>5.13; Appx. Table 2 &quot;Schedule of Parking Requirements&quot;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FoxWalk overlay district</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joliet</strong></td>
<td>Article 47 (various)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elgin</strong></td>
<td>19.45</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (most); No (CC1 &amp; CC2 districts)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Downtown non-residential uses, see 19.45.040</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (19.45.065)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maukegan</strong></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Article 12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Off-1, B4, and B5 Districts in CBD</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>30-50 month delay allowed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evanston</strong></td>
<td>§ 6-16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No (except some SFH)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some non-residential GFA exemptions (6-18-1-4)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some (no increase req. for most use changes)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cicero</strong></td>
<td>Appx. A Chap. 7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some non-residential GFA exemptions (6-18-1-4)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skokie</strong></td>
<td>Chapter 118, Article IV</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some non-residential GFA exemptions (6-18-1-4)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Berwyn</strong></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance, Part 12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some non-residential GFA exemptions (6-18-1-4)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oak Park</strong></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Art. 6.2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some non-residential GFA exemptions (6-18-1-4)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Naperville</strong></td>
<td>Title 6, Chapter 9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some non-residential GFA exemptions (6-18-1-4)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schaumburg</strong></td>
<td>Chapter 154,120-127</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some non-residential GFA exemptions (6-18-1-4)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arlington Heights</strong></td>
<td>Chapters 18 &amp; 28</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some non-residential GFA exemptions (6-18-1-4)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bolingbrook</strong></td>
<td>Chapter 29, § 3-310, 6-201, 9-206</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some non-residential GFA exemptions (6-18-1-4)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Palatine</strong></td>
<td>Appx. A Art. VII</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some non-residential GFA exemptions (6-18-1-4)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Des Plaines</strong></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Art. 9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some non-residential GFA exemptions (6-18-1-4)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orland Park</strong></td>
<td>Land Development Code 6-306</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some non-residential GFA exemptions (6-18-1-4)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tinley Park</strong></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Sec. 8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some non-residential GFA exemptions (6-18-1-4)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oak Lawn</strong></td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance 4-13-1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some non-residential GFA exemptions (6-18-1-4)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hoffman Estates</strong></td>
<td>Mun. Code 9-3-2, 10-5-2</td>
<td>Yes (ad-hoc)</td>
<td>Yes (ad-hoc)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some non-residential GFA exemptions (6-18-1-4)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Ordinance, Code, or Article</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockford</td>
<td>Article 50</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>Title XIV, Chapter 155, Art. V</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Limited (see § 155.141b)</td>
<td>At discretion of city traffic engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoria</td>
<td>Appx. B Art. 13.15; Land Development Code</td>
<td>Yes (most); No (form districts [LDC 6.9.1])</td>
<td>Yes (most); No (form districts [LDC 6.9.1])</td>
<td>Yes (form districts)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Limited (see Appx. B 15.1.a)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>De facto in certain form districts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champaign</td>
<td>Sec 37</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No (except UN dist.)</td>
<td>No (except UN dist.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CB, CB-CCO</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Historic Buildings</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes in CB-CCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomington</td>
<td>Sec. 44.7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>GAP Form Based Code Neighborhood</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (GAP only)</td>
<td>Yes (Gap only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decatur</td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance §XXIV</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes except B-4 zone in CBD</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>WM-CL District (§ XX.E.7.d)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Mun. Code 15.7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbana</td>
<td>Zoning Ordinance Art. VIII</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100%: B-4 CBD; 50%: B-4E, CCD</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (85%, VIII-5(E))</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A4. List of References

1. City of Champaign Documents

2. Peer City Zoning Ordinances
   - Zoning Ordinances and Land Development Codes for the following municipalities are available online at Municode:
     - Aurora
     - Cicero
     - Evanston
     - Hoffman Estates
     - Joliet
     - Naperville
     - Peoria
     - Rockford
     - Schaumburg
     - Skokie
     - Springfield
     - Urbana
     - Waukegan
• Zoning Ordinances and Land Development Codes for the following municipalities are available online at municipal websites:
  o Arlington Heights
  o Berwyn
  o Bloomington
  o Bolingbrook
  o Decatur
  o Des Plaines
  o Elgin
  o Naperville
  o Normal
  o Oak Lawn
  o Oak Park
  o Orland Park
  o Palatine
  o Tinley Park

3. Other References


• Wade, Patrick. 2010, April 25. “Downtown Champaign parking deck not packing them in; permit rate decrease planned”. The News-Gazette.