



AGENDA Equity Commission

New Brighton City Hall; 803 Old Hwy 8 NW
Upper Level Conference Room
July 20, 2023 | 6:30 p.m.

Equity Commissioners will attend the meeting in person. Meeting options for members of the public include:

- **Attend the meeting in person:** Attendees who are ill are asked to wear masks and comply with social distancing parameters.
- **Watch the meeting electronically:** Tune into CTV Chanel 8023 (CenturyLink) or Channel 16 (Comcast). To observe the meeting as a livestream or a webcast, visit www.newbrightonmn.gov, hover over "How Do I...," click on "Public Meetings" under View, choose appropriate Commission and date.
- **Join the meeting electronically:** Join using Zoom app: Meeting ID: 898 6240 2361, Passcode 867530 or visit <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89862402361?pwd=MWtPeIRNTGt2RmR2TktwSkM0R1VHdz09>

I. Call to Order

II. Roll Call

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Chair Lindsay Spooner | <input type="checkbox"/> Commissioner Carlos Herrera |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Vice-Chair Kami Miller | <input type="checkbox"/> Commissioner Ellen Weber |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Commissioner Sanja Obradovic | <input type="checkbox"/> Commissioner Cathy Forbes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Commissioner Jonas Lim | <input type="checkbox"/> Commissioner Jason Steffenhagen |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Commissioner Kristin Lau | |

III. Approval of Agenda

IV. Approval of 6.15.2023 Minutes

V. Business Items

- a. Parking Study

VI. Vice Chair Update – Kami Miller

- a. What have we noticed around the City?

VII. City Staff Update – Hue Schlieu, DEI Coordinator

VIII. City Council Update – Kari Niedfeldt-Thomas, Mayor

IX. Adjournment – Next meeting: August 17, 2023



MINUTES
New Brighton Equity Commission
Regular Meeting – June 15, 2023
6:30 p.m.

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

II. Roll Call

Members Present: Commissioners Cathy Forbes, Carlos Herrera, Kristin Lau, Jonas Lim, Kami Miller, and Jason Steffenhagen.

Members Absent: Chair Lindsay Spooner and Commissioners Sanja Obradovic and Ellen Weber

Also Present: DEI Coordinator Hue Schlieu and Mayor Kari Niedfeldt-Thomas

III. Approval of Agenda

Motion by Commissioner Lim, seconded by Commissioner Lau to approve the agenda as presented.

Approved 6-0

IV. Approval of Minutes

Motion by Commissioner Lau, seconded by Commissioner Lim to approve the minutes from the May 18, 2023 meeting.

Approved 6-0

V. Business Items

A. Equity Strategic Action Plan (ESAP) Update

Schlieu stated an Equity Strategic Action Plan (ESAP) is a comprehensive document that outlines an organization's efforts to identify and dismantle systemic barriers to fairness, inclusion, and access within its operations, policies, and practices. When used with fidelity, an ESAP is a living document that reflects growth as tasks are accomplished and goals are achieved. The creation and implementation of New Brighton's ESAP is one of the many outcomes of the work begun by the New Brighton Inclusive Community Task Force, whose recommendations

were adopted by the City Council in September 2019. The ESAP was finalized in March 2022 and is reflective of the Equity Framework. Staff reviewed the ESAP in further detail with the Commission and asked for questions or comments.

Discussion included:

- Mayor Niedfeldt-Thomas supported KPI's be set for recruitment and staff.
- Mayor Niedfeldt-Thomas suggested goals also be set in order to assist with tracking progress.
- The Commission encouraged staff to interview outgoing staff members in order to learn why they were leaving the organization.
- The Commission supported staff looking further into candidate pools to see if it was representative of the population.
- Staff noting a housing study was being completed by Stantec and this would be shared with the Equity Commission at an upcoming meeting.
- Staff explained she would be speaking with Open to Business to see how they can work with the BIPOC community small business owners.
- Mayor Niedfeldt-Thomas recommended staff review the Climate Action Plan to see if there were items that could be incorporated into the ESAP.
- There was support for the City hosting more community events, like the Iftar dinner.
- It was noted staff would post on the website an ESAP progress report every six months.
- Mayor Niedfeldt-Thomas recommended a document with all completed tasks.
- The Commission thanked staff for all of their efforts on this task.

B. Public Safety Follow-Up Discussion

Schlieu reported at the May 18, 2023, Equity Commission meeting, Director Paetznick presented a comprehensive overview on New Brighton's approach to public safety, staff training, data collection, and community-led partnerships. The Equity Commission is tasked with discussing what areas of the presentation stood out, where does Commissioners see opportunity for collaboration or input, and what additional information is desired

Discussion included:

- The Commission appreciated the detailed and engaging presentation from the Public Safety Director.
- The Commission supported the Public Safety Department reaching out to residents in order to introduce the officers that oversee each neighborhood in the community.
- The Commission supported the Public Safety Department holding more community engagement events in order to assist with building trust with the community.
- The Commission appreciated how the Public Safety Department interacted with the public.
- The Commission agreed the Public Safety Department was doing a wonderful job for the community.
- The Commission discussed the potential of attending Public Safety Commission meetings in order to grow the relationship between these two groups.
- Further discussion ensued regarding the ongoing mistrust of the police for some populations in the community.
- The Commission was interested in learning more about the trust factor with the black community.

- The Commission wanted to learn more about what groups were and were not comfortable with calling the police.
- Mayor Niedfeldt-Thomas commented on how the State legislature was working to provide more mental health services for officers.
- Mayor Niedfeldt-Thomas supported the Equity Commission and Public Safety Commission holding a joint meeting, noting a specific outcome should be set for this meeting.
- The Commission wanted to learn more about the training and use of force techniques officers were trained with along with better understanding the policies that were in place.

C. Community Engagement Discussion

Schlieu reported creating an equitable city is ultimately about ensuring that all residents feel safe, welcomed, and valued. Equity Commissioners acknowledge the importance of engaging with residents and receiving feedback to effectively accomplish that goal. Connecting with residents also allows us to tackle the equity issues most important to them.

Discussion included:

- Vice Chair Miller stated if the Commission wanted to plan a listening session, this could be discussed over the next several meetings.
- The Commission supported holding a listening session at multi-family developments in order to make the session accessible to this population.

VI. Vice Chair Update – Kami Miller

A. What have we noticed around the City?

Miller stated she would like to know what Commissioners have noticed around the City.

Discussion included:

- Staff noted the Equity Commission was signed up to attend the Wednesday, June 21 farmers market from 3:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.
- It was noted an open house regarding the Just Deeds initiative would be held on Thursday, June 29 at the Community Center.

VII. City Staff Update – Hue Schlieu, DEI Coordinator

Schlieu reported staff received a critical corridors grant from Ramsey County and this grant would be used to assist the City with completing a parking study. She explained the Juneteenth concert was well attended and the performers were excellent. She stated Juneteenth was now a State holiday which meant City offices would be closed on Monday, June 19. She noted she met with the faith community leaders to discuss potential partnerships. She reported she signed up for the racial equity dividends index and she was excited about this. She commented on the areas residents can provide DEI feedback on the City's website.

VIII. City Council Update – Kari Niedfeldt-Thomas

Mayor Niedfeldt-Thomas provided the Commission an update from the City Council. She commented on the Sunny Square Park ribbon cutting ceremony. She stated the next concert event would be held on Thursday, July 13. She explained Open to Business would be holding officer hours at City Hall from 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. on fourth Tuesday of the month. She reported the Council recently approved the sale of Block B within the New Brighton Exchange. She noted the City Council would meet next on Tuesday, June 27. She invited the public to attend the chalk walk on Saturday, June 17.

IX. Adjournment – Next Meeting: July 20, 2023

Motion by Commissioner Lim, seconded by Commissioner Lau to adjourn the meeting.

Approved 6-0

Meeting adjourned at 8:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Hue Schlieu
DEI Coordinator



Item: 1
Report Date: 7/14/2023
Commission Meeting Date: 7/20/2023

REQUEST FOR COMMISSION CONSIDERATION

ITEM DESCRIPTION: Parking Study	
DEPARTMENT HEAD'S APPROVAL:	
CITY MANAGER'S APPROVAL:	
No comments to supplement this report ____ Comments attached ____	

Background: Bolton & Menk will be presenting key concepts and are looking to get some feedback for the Right-Sizing parking project.

Task Overview: The Equity Commission is tasked with:

- Reviewing the memo
- Discussing the concepts
- Providing feedback

Financial Impact: None.

Resources:

- Updated Parking and Access Standards Memo

Hue Schlieu
DEI Coordinator



Real People. Real Solutions.

111 Washington Avenue S
Suite 650
Minneapolis, MN 55401

Ph: (612) 416-0220
Fax: (612) 416-0222
Bolton-Menk.com

MEMORANDUM

Date: July 13, 2023
To: New Brighton Equity Commission
From: Jenni Faulkner, Senior Planner
Harry Davis, Planner II
Cody Flannery, Planner
Subject: Updating Parking and Access Standards
City of New Brighton
Project No.: T6.130130

I. Goals of the Update

The City of New Brighton wants to modernize its outdated parking and access standards to better reflect the community's needs and to enhance land use, all with equity and climate considerations in mind. Specifically, updates to the parking ordinance(s) will help the City realize the following goals:

- Goal 1: Ensuring the city's parking standards maximize the creation of housing, jobs, and destinations by ensuring that only a necessary amount of parking is required as the city develops and redevelops land
- Goal 2: Eliminating unnecessary hard surfaces through parking standard modernization
- Goal 3: Creating effective mechanisms for providing deviations from parking standards (when warranted) that may take the form of parking deferrals, parking reductions, shared parking agreements, and/or other mechanisms to create efficient parking outcomes
- Goal 4: Establishing appropriate electric vehicle (EV) requirements for new developments
- Goal 5: Addressing how rideshare, on-demand ride services, and other modern transportation options can and/or should be reflected in modern parking regulations
- Goal 6: Updating interrelated access management standards and driveway requirements
- Goal 7: Adding supplemental requirements for pedestrian and bike trail connections to ensure bikes and pedestrians can safely navigate car dominated landscapes
- Goal 8: Properly analyzing new parking standards through an equity lens and a climate change perspective
- Goal 9: Creating a short "best practices" handout or guide outlining the concepts which steered finalization of New Brighton's updated ordinance

Name:
Date:
Page:

II. Preliminary Recommendations

Attached is the first draft on preliminary recommendations to improve parking and access standards. The recommendations utilize current trends and best practices for parking code while seeking to improve New Brighton's climate resiliency and equity.

III. Discussion

As we continue to research and explore options, we would like to hear from the Equity Commission about your thoughts about parking regulations and observations in the City and answer the following questions:

- Is the Equity Commission supportive of the items reviewed and potential incorporation of parking concepts and trends in the attached memo?
- If you require indoor parking for all new multifamily, or larger outdoor parking lots, does that drive up development costs and force higher rents?
- Should the city allow older multifamily buildings more access to legal on-street parking within an agreed upon framework (primarily an issue near the Gardenvue Apartments)?
- Does the Equity Commission feel commercial areas are over or under parked? Multifamily areas over or under parked? Industrial uses over or under parked?
- What does the Council and Planning Commission think about having no minimum standards in certain uses or districts? What about a maximum parking requirement instead of a minimum?
- Is the City willing to require redevelopment sites to adhere to new standards at a certain threshold? Does this negatively or positively impact BIPOC businesses and residents?
- What are the preliminary recommendations missing?



Real People. Real Solutions.

111 Washington Avenue S
Suite 650
Minneapolis, MN 55401

Ph: (612) 416-0220
Fax: (612) 416-0222
Bolton-Menk.com

MEMORANDUM

Date: July 13, 2023

To: Mayor Nari Niedfeldt-Thomas
New Brighton City Council
New Brighton Equity Commission
New Brighton Planning Commission

From: Harry Davis, Planner II
Jenni Faulkner, Senior Planner
Cody Flannery, Planner

Subject: Updating Parking and Access Standards
City of New Brighton
Project No.: T6.130130

I. Potential sections for updates

The City of New Brighton wants to modernize its outdated parking and access standards to better reflect the community's needs and to enhance land use, all with equity and climate considerations in mind. To that end, the content of [City Code Chapter 11 – Parking Standards](#) was reviewed. This memo identifies sections from the chapter that may be updated as part of this effort.

Sec. 11-010. General Requirements.

A. “(1) Application. Off-street parking and loading regulations shall apply to all buildings and land uses established after December 13, 1988. At the time an existing land use or building use changes, a building expands, or an existing parking lot expands or is altered, the existing and any required additional offstreet parking and loading areas must be brought into conformance with the regulations of this Chapter, subject to the provisions of Sections 8-410 through 8-480.”

1. Issue 1: Section is written to allow for staff/city to require updating parking lots with new uses, building permits, or changes to a parking area. Is that still desirable?
 - a) Preliminary recommendation: Based on PC/CC and Business input, do not require civic/institutional, commercial, office, and industrial uses to update parking lots *except* when expanding or altering parking areas.

(1) Replace with: Off-street parking and loading regulations shall apply to all buildings and land uses established after

December 31, 2023. At the time an existing parking lot expands or is altered, the existing and any required additional offstreet parking and loading areas must be brought into conformance with the regulations of this Chapter, subject to the provisions of Sections 8-410 through 8-480.

- B. (3) Reduction and Use of Parking or Loading Space. Off-street parking facilities existing as of December 13, 1988 shall not be reduced to an amount less than that required under this Chapter for a similar new building or use. Off-street parking facilities provided to comply with this Chapter shall not be reduced below the Chapter requirements. Required parking or loading space shall not be used for storage of goods, trash disposal containers, or vehicles that are inoperable or for sale or rent, or any use other than the parking of vehicles.
1. Issue 1: Allow for more shared parking between developments.
(Comprehensive Plan, LU 9.0 and TRAN 2.0)
 - a) Preliminary recommendation: Separate reduction for residential uses from all other uses. Reducing non-residential parking through shared parking agreements allows for reducing impervious surfaces while guaranteeing uses still have enough parking that don't spill over into adjacent properties/streets.
 - (1) Replace with text: Off-street parking facilities existing as of December 31, 2023 shall not be reduced to an amount less than that required under this Chapter for residential uses. Off-street parking facilities existing as of December 31, 2023 for all other uses may reduce parking after a parking agreement or similar legal instrument is entered into by the concerned parties, filed with the city, and recorded at the county.
 2. Issue 2: When to require parking lots on the interior of properties? Only for new construction? When should redevelopment flip parking to behind the building?
 - a) Preliminary recommendation: Require parking lots to be behind buildings or no closer to the street than a building.
- C. "(5) Buffers and screens. Off-street parking areas of four or more spaces and loading areas on properties that are adjacent to any residential district shall be screened from the residential district by one or more of the following: an opaque fence per Section 4-540, a planting screen, a land berm of appropriate height or combination of the foregoing. Plans for a fence or landscaping screen shall be submitted for approval at the time of site plan application and shall be installed as part of the approved site improvements. Offstreet parking for single and two family residences shall not be required to be screened."

1. Issue 1: Do parking lots for residential uses need to screen between adjacent residential uses? Would it be feasible to not require screening between residential uses?
 2. Issue 2: Mixed-use district has good, robust screening requirements.
 - a) Preliminary recommendation: Integrate mixed-use district parking standards with main parking chapter.
 3. Issue 3: Screening should be required between parking areas and rights-of-way.
 - a) Preliminary recommendation: Screen between parking areas and rights-of-way.
 - (1) Off-street parking areas of four or more spaces and loading areas on properties that are adjacent to any residential district or right-of-way shall be screened from the residential district or right-of-way by one or more of the following: an opaque fence per Section 4-540, a planting screen, a land berm of appropriate height or combination of the foregoing. The resulting screen or buffer shall limit the impact of parking, such as glare, on adjacent properties or rights-of-way.
- D. (6) Lighting. C. "Lighting as described in this Subsection shall not shine directly into the public right-of-way or onto any residential use. (Ord. No. 567, 12-13-88; Ord. No. 662, 11-23-99; Code of 2001)"
1. Issue 1: While lighting should not shine directly into the right-of-way or a neighboring residential use, indirect light may shine onto these areas.
 - a) Preliminary recommendation: Additional language to provide a measurable standard for indirect light.
 - (1) Replace with text: Mitigative measures shall be employed to limit glare and spill light to protect neighboring parcels and to maintain traffic and pedestrian safety on public streets and sidewalks. Illumination cast from lighting of the subject parcel shall not exceed one (1) footcandle as measured from the centerline of a public street or residential property line. These measures shall include lenses, shields, louvers, prismatic control devices and limitations on the height and type of fixtures. Lights must be downcast and completely shielded on all sides.

Section 11-020. Construction and Maintenance.

- A. (1) Surfacing. All off-street driving, loading, and parking areas shall have a paved surface. No vehicle may be parked and no property owner shall allow a vehicle to be parked off-street unless the vehicle is on and over an approved bituminous, concrete, brick, or decorative block surface that spans the entire vehicle. The definition of a “vehicle” in Minn. Stats. §169.011 is hereby adopted for the purpose of this ordinance and includes any conveyance with an axle. (Ord. 768, 11-25-2008).
1. Issue 1: Vehicle definition not needed here.
 - a) Preliminary recommendation: Move definition of vehicle to definitions section.
 2. Issue 2: Flexibility needed for paver system, structured grass paver system, grass paver system covered by solar structure, etc.
 - a) Preliminary recommendation: Add allowance for paver system, structured grass paver system, grass paver system covered by solar structure, etc. when combined with an approved stormwater management plan.
- B. (2) Curbing. All off-street driving, loading, and parking areas shall be constructed with poured-in-place concrete curb except for detached and duplex residential uses.
1. Issue 1: LSID would recommend allowing the option to remove curb for snow management.
 - a) Preliminary recommendation: Allow removal of curb, or reduced curb, for snow management when combined with an approved stormwater management plan, with included areas for snow storage and adequate drainage structures, according to engineering details and design standards.
- C. (4) Traffic Safety Islands. Traffic safety islands shall be installed at the ends of each parking tier. Additional traffic safety islands may be required to maintain safe and orderly flow of traffic within the parking lot.
1. Issue 1: LSID would recommend allowing the option to remove islands for snow management, however removing opportunities to plant trees in parking lots may not help with high temperature microclimates.
 - a) Preliminary recommendation: Only allow removal of parking lot islands with an approved stormwater management plan, with included areas for snow storage and adequate drainage structures, according to engineering details and design standards. Parking lots shall still be designed to discouraging quick movements through the parking lot. Trees may still be planted in areas of at least 5-feet by 5-feet with structured soil.

- D. (8) Driveway and Curb Cut Standards. [...] E. In all other cases, the distances between driveways shall be no less than fifty feet. [...] H. No curb cut or access point shall be created directly into any street of collector status or greater unless approved by the City or County. I. In all commercial and industrial districts, direct access shall be directed away from local streets.
1. Issue 1: 50-feet between driveways makes it harder to allow diverse lot sizes.
Clarification: Has this been a problem before? Need to review this alongside new zoning ordinance for minimum lot widths.
 - a) Preliminary recommendation #1: Specify that driveways for different detached and duplex residences may be 10 feet from each other, or combined to form one driveway on the shared property line, but must have an access easement filed with the city and recorded at the county.
 - b) Preliminary recommendation #2: Specify that driveways for different attached residential uses lots (except duplexes) may be 50 feet from each other, or combined to form one driveway on the shared property line, but must have an access easement filed with the city and recorded at the county.
 - c) Preliminary recommendation #3: Specify that driveways for all uses other than residential may be 100 feet from each other, or combined to form one driveway on the shared property line, but must have an access easement filed with the city and recorded at the county.
 2. Issue 2: Not allowing curb cuts on collector/arterials makes sense, but prohibiting connections with local street seems to conflict with the previous requirement. Additionally, moving access to side streets reduces the number of turning movements along corridors.
 - a) Preliminary recommendation: Reconcile conflicting code sections by allowing connections on side streets, thereby also reducing the number of turning movements on more-trafficked corridors.
- E. (10) Drive-Thru Facilities. Commercial uses containing drive-in or drive-up facilities shall be permitted only by issuance of a Special Use Permit. Such special use shall be considered in accordance with Section 8-130 and the following standards: [...] B. A stacking lane shall be provided with a minimum of four spaces per lane in addition to the number of required parking spaces.
1. Issue 1: What is the purpose behind the special use permit for Drive-Thru Facilities? To control configuration of drive-thru facilities or to discourage building them?
 2. Issue 2: Stacking requirements for drive-thru facilities should be differentiated by particular use types.

- a) Preliminary recommendation: Adoption of differentiated stacking requirements by particular use type (final list of uses to be determined with comprehensive code update).

- (1) See Minneapolis example in Attachment A under Section 11-020. Construction and Maintenance.

Sec.11-030. Minimum Number of Off-Street Parking Spaces Required.

A. Additional Sections

1. Issue 1: Potential new sections

a) Bicycle/Micromobility parking

- (1) This section does not include a standard for the minimum number of bicycle parking spaces required by use types for new developments.

- (a) Preliminary recommendation: Adopt a standard for the minimum number of bicycle parking spaces required by use type, and specify requirements for room to park bicycles, active/passive surveillance, lighting, room for micromobility (rentable bikes/scooters), etc. (Parks Master Plan; Comprehensive Plan, PR&OS 5.1)

- (i) See Minneapolis example in Attachment A under Sec.11-030. Minimum Number of Off-Street Parking Spaces Required for Bicycle/Micromobility Parking.

b) Electric vehicle (EV) charging stations

- (1) This section does not include a standard for the minimum number of EV charging stations required by use types for new developments.

- (a) Preliminary recommendations: Adopt a standard for the minimum number of EV charging stations required (or encourage installation) by use types for new developments

- (i) See Roseville example in Attachment A under Sec.11-030. Minimum Number of Off-Street Parking Spaces Required for EV Charging Stations.

- (ii) See Minneapolis example in Attachment A under Sec.11-030. Minimum Number of Off-Street Parking Spaces Required for EV Charging Stations.

c) Transit/Rideshare/Micromobility (Comprehensive Plan, TDM Strategy)

(1) This section does not include transit, rideshare, and on-demand transit for new developments.

(a) Preliminary recommendation #1: Adopt an allowance for rideshare pickup, transit (as a future variable), and micro mobility transit (small bus or van).

(b) Preliminary recommendation #2: Adopt standards and allowances for curbside pickup and online orders.

2. (3) Number of Spaces Required.

a) Issue 1: Based on PC/CC and Business feedback, moving to a “no minimum” approach with a “flexible maximum” is feasible for commercial, civic/institutional, office, and industrial uses. Due to residential parking concerns, keeping minimums (but altering the ratio) is preferred for residential uses.

(1) Preliminary recommendation: Move to “no minimum, flexible maximum”, but retain residential requirements. Flexible maximum can be tied to:

(a) Incorporation of low-salt design and maintenance, EV/micromobility/bicycle parking, shared parking, permeable surfaces, etc.

(b) Developer analysis of similar projects and/or specific use parking requirements

b) Issue 2: This table is relatively limited in the scope of example use types with specific standards. It is also lacking an intentional categorization scheme for the purposes of strengthening the shared parking subsection of the code.

(1) Preliminary recommendation: Consider expand the table to include a wider breadth of example uses and categorize them in a scheme that’s compatible with and supportive of the shared parking subsection.

c) Issue 3: Requiring enclosed parking for 2+ unit dwellings and exempting single family dwellings may be inappropriate.

(1) Preliminary recommendation: Remove enclosed parking requirements for attached dwellings or impose the same standard for detached dwellings. If imposing the same standard, specify the minimum enclosed parking area size.

d) Issue 4: Consider parking demand overall and determine if a modern use

requires these numbers of vehicle parking spaces with respect to increases in walkability, bikability, and transit improvements.

- (1) Preliminary recommendation: Utilize a combination of today's standards for parking ratios (Institute of Transportation Engineers [ITE] Trip Generation Manual), shared parking agreements, and parking analysis provided by developers to remove minimums for all but residential and establish maximums (with flexibility)

Sec. 11-040. Special Circumstances.

A. (5) Joint Facilities.

1. Issue 1: This section is dense and not easily understood.
 - a) Preliminary recommendation: Develop a shared parking need table for this section based on the category of the use type and some determined percentage required for each at various points of day, requiring the maximum amount calculated for the combined total.
 - (1) See Lake Elmo example in Attachment A under Sec. 11-040. Special Circumstances for Joint Facilities.
 - (2) See Burnsville example in Attachment A under Sec. 11-040. Special Circumstances for Join Facilities.
 - (3) See Carver example in Attachment A under Sec. 11-040. Special Circumstances for Joint Facilities.

II. Other sections

Sec. 6-530. Parking. & Sec. 6-535. Site circulation and vehicular access. (Chp. 6, Article 4, Mixed-Use Districts)

- ##### **A. Issue 1: Parking should be located in one location for ease of finding standards.**
1. Preliminary recommendation: Combine parking for mixed-use into main parking section.

Sec. 6-540. Pedestrian & Trail Accommodations. (Chp. 6, Article 4, Mixed-Use Districts)

- ##### **A. Issue 1: Part of section is written to discuss pedestrian circulation within site.**
1. Preliminary recommendation: Include pedestrian circulation language alongside parking standards to ensure compatible and integrated design.

Miscellaneous Standards Across Code to Incorporate

Move parking for licensed day care facilities located in a church (pg Z4-3)

Move parking for R-4 zoning uses (pg Z4-17) and evaluate multi-family residential standards (pg Z4-20)

Incorporate spaces for racquet clubs (pg Z5-2)

Address allowed surface materials (Z6-8)

Review NBE parking standards and setbacks (pgs Z6-30 and Z6-33)

Evaluate PRD minimum parking standards (pg Z7-4)

Site plan approval parking standards on raised islands (pg Z8-3)

Attachments:

- Attachment A – Code Examples

Attachment A – New Brighton Parking Study Examples

From: Section 11-020. Construction and Maintenance.

E. Drive-Thru Facilities; Issue 2:

Minneapolis example:

<i>Use</i>	<i>Minimum spaces</i>	<i>Measured from</i>
Bank teller lane	4	Teller or window
Automated teller machine	3	Teller
Restaurant or coffee shop drive-through	4	Pick-up window
Car wash	2 per 20 ft. of washing line or area for principal use car wash; 1 per 20 ft. of washing line or area for accessory use car wash	Entrance
Drug store	3	Pick-up window
Other	As determined by the zoning administrator	

Full code:

https://library.municode.com/mn/minneapolis/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=MIC_OOR_TIT20ZOCO_CH541OREPALOMO_ARTVIIIPAARDEMA_541.840STSP

From: Sec.11-030. Minimum Number of Off-Street Parking Spaces Required.

A; Issue 1; a) Bicycle/Micromobility Parking

Minneapolis example:

Multi-family (4+)	1/DU
School (K-12)	3/classroom
Community center	6, or 1/2,000 sq ft.
Community service facility/Library	1/5,000 sq ft.
General retail	1/5,000 sq ft GFA
General industrial	1/40,000 sq ft GFA

Full code:

https://library.municode.com/mn/minneapolis/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=MIC_OOR_TIT20ZOCO_CH541OREPALOMO_ARTIIISPOREPARE_541.320BIPARE

A; Issue 1; b) EV Charging Stations

Roseville example:

All new parking areas, existing parking areas expanding by more than 25% additional parking spaces, and existing parking areas improving more than 25% of the parking area are subject to the standards of Table 1019-2.

29 or fewer	None required
30-49	Multi-family: 5% at Level I charging or greater Non-residential: 2 spaces at Level II charging or greater
50+	Multi-family: 10% at Level 1 or greater; 1 space at Level II or greater Non-residential: 5% at Level II or greater

All new gas stations must include one Level II (or greater) charging facility

All new development must have capacity to go up to Level II in future

Full code (pg 25-28):

<https://www.cityofroseville.com/DocumentCenter/View/34614/Ordinance-No-1629-Amending-Title-10-Zoning-of-the-Roseville-City-Code-to-Update-and-Amend-Shoreland-Mgmt-and-Environmental-Regulati>

Minneapolis example:

Use	Electric Vehicle Charging Stations	Electric Vehicle Ready Spaces	Notes
All Uses providing ten (10) or more enclosed parking spaces	5% of provided parking spaces capable of L2 charging.	Additional 10% of provided spaces at L2 charging level. For each charging station provided in excess of the minimum standard, the number of electric vehicle ready spaces may be reduced by an equivalent amount.	Adequate electrical service is required to allow for simultaneous charging of 10% of provided parking spaces at an L2 level.

Full code:

https://library.municode.com/mn/minneapolis/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=MIC_OOR_TIT20ZOCO_CH541OREPALOMO_ARTIVELVECH

From: Sec. 11-040. Special Circumstances.

A. Joint Facilities; Issue 1:

Lake Elmo example:

Shared parking. Joint use of required parking spaces is encouraged where two or more uses on the same or adjacent sites are able to share the same parking spaces because

their parking demands occur at different times. The applicants must submit analysis showing that peak parking times of the uses will occur at different times and the parking area will be adequate for both uses. A legal instrument such as an easement or deed restriction that guarantees access to the parking for both uses shall be submitted.

Burnsville example:

Joint Parking Facilities: Required parking facilities serving two (2) or more uses may be located on the same lot or in the same structure except in R-1 Districts provided that the total number of parking spaces furnished shall be not less than the sum total of the separate requirements for each use during any peak hour parking period when the parking facility is used at the same time by two (2) or more uses. The Development Review Committee (DRC) may approve a reduction to the number of parking spaces required for joint use facilities provided the applicant can demonstrate through site specific analysis and/or documented parking studies that less parking demand will be generated. Conditions required for joint use are:

1. The proposed joint parking space is within four hundred feet (400') of the use it will serve.
2. The applicant shall show that there is not substantial conflict in the principal operating hours of the two (2) or more buildings or uses for which joint use of off street parking facilities is proposed.
3. A deed restriction or properly drawn legal instrument for joint use of off-street parking facilities shall be executed by all parties, be in a form acceptable to the city attorney, and be filed in the Recorder's Office of Dakota County.
4. In lieu of a deed restriction or other legal instrument, an application for conditional use permit (CUP) or planned unit development (PUD) shall be submitted to the city and if approved, said CUP or PUD will be filed on all affected properties.

Carver example:

Proof of parking. A Development may be granted a deferment on the construction of parking spaces if a plan showing proof that parking can be provided on-site is provided to and approved by the city. Upon review and acceptance by the city, the city council may permit the applicant to construct fewer than the required number of parking spaces. This permission is subject to the condition that the city in its sole discretion may require the property owner to construct the remainder of the parking spaces if the city so determines that conditions warrant an increase in the number of spaces provided. A development agreement, easements or other agreements acceptable to the city attorney shall be executed and recorded to ensure that the parking spaces will be constructed if determined to be needed.

Cooperative parking. Off-street parking requirements of a given use may be met with off-site, off-street parking facilities of another use when, and if, all of the following conditions are met:

1. The off-site, off-street parking facilities are within 300 feet of the subject property;

2. The parking demands of the individual uses, as determined by the zoning administrator based upon minimum off-street parking requirements, are such that the total parking demands of all the uses at any one time is less than the total parking stalls required;

3. A written agreement between the owners and tenants is executed for a minimum of 20 years, approved by the zoning administrator as provided in subsection 4. below. The agreement shall be recorded and a copy maintained in the project file. Should a lease expire or otherwise terminate, the use for which the off-site parking was provided shall be considered nonconforming and any and all approvals, including CUP's shall be subject to revocation. Continuation or expansion of the use shall be prohibited unless the use is brought into compliance with the parking regulations of this division.

4. An application for approval of a cooperative parking plan shall be filed with the zoning administrator by the owners of the entire land area to be included within the cooperative parking plan, the owner or owners of all structures then existing on such land area, and all parties having a legal interest in such land area and structures, including the written consent of mortgagees. Sufficient evidence to establish the status of applicants as owners or parties in interest shall be provided. The application shall include plans showing the location of the uses or structures for which off-street parking facilities are required, the location of the off-street parking facilities, and the schedule of times used by those sharing parking in common; and 5. Pursuant to the same procedure and subject to the same limitations and requirements by which the cooperative parking plan was approved and registered, any such plan may be amended or withdrawn, either partially or completely, if all land and structures remaining under such plan comply with all the conditions and limitations of the plan, and all land and structures withdrawn from such plan comply with the regulations of this division.

Shared parking. Developments that contain a mix of uses on the same parcel, as set forth in Table 50-88-2, may reduce the amount of required parking in accordance with the following methodology;

1. Determine the minimum parking requirements in accordance with Table 50-88-2 for each land use as if it were a separate use;

2. Multiply each amount by the corresponding percentages for each of the five time periods set forth in Columns (B) through (F) of Table 50-88-2;

3. Calculate the total for each time period; and

4. Select the total with the highest value as the required minimum number of parking spaces.

	Weekday		Weekend		
(A) Land Use	(B) Daytime (9 a.m.—4 p.m.)	(C) Evening (6 p.m.—midnight)	(D) Daytime (9 a.m.—4 p.m.)	(E) Evenings (6 p.m.—midnight)	(F) Nighttime (Midnight—6 a.m.)
Office/industrial	100%	10%	19%	5%	5%
Retail	60%	90%	100%	70%	5%
Hotel	75%	100%	75%	100%	75%
Restaurant	50%	100%	100%	100%	10%
Entertainment/commercial	40%	100%	80%	100%	10%

Full code:

https://library.municode.com/mn/carver/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=CO_CH50_ZOOR_ARTVSPRE_S50-88PADR