



1 John David Carson introduced Brenda Jenkins.

2  
3 **Review and Discuss Think Tank Response to October 21 Issue Exploration Items**

4  
5 Abby Gillfillan provided an overview of the October 21 Issue Exploration Items.

6  
7 Chris Wood raised concerns with a requirement for a 3 ½ ft. screening requirement for parking.

8  
9 John David Carson suggested looking at office and retail separately and allowing office in retail  
10 areas, but not retail in office areas. This change should take place under Brainstormed Solutions  
11 for Employment Centers.

12  
13 The Think Tank agreed to change the wording under brainstormed solutions to “create a fee-in-  
14 lieu for developers who don’t meet the parking requirements.”

15  
16 John David Carson Suggested the following unmet interests be added:

- 17 ○ Create a financial atmosphere that will support transit downtown.
- 18 ○ Create an atmosphere that will create affordable housing downtown. Requiring  
19 addition parking can inhibit this goal.
- 20 ○ Release pressure on taller structures – Small block structures and height cap is  
21 very restrictive on high rise development.

22 John David Carson Suggested the following solutions:

- 23 ○ A scaling factor for parking by unit. E.g., a 4 bedroom unit does not require 4  
24 parking spaces.
- 25 ○ A fee-in-lieu for developers who do not meet the parking requirement.
- 26 ○ Parking reductions for parties that provide car sharing opportunities.

27 Betsy Robertson suggested a parking management which would create strategies to encourage a  
28 fee-based parking management system.

29 **Receive a presentation and discuss themes presented as part of the Transportation Master Plan**

30  
31 Rohit Vij gave a presentation and discussed themes presented as part of the Transportation  
32 Master Plan.

33  
34 **Reflection and Discussion on Think Tank Review Process**

35  
36 Abby Gillfillan gave an update on the new proposed schedule for the code rewrite.

37  
38 **Questions from the press and public**

39  
40 There were no questions from the press or public.

41  
42  
43  
44 **Adjourn**



REPLACE LINES 17 - 25 WITH THE FOLLOWING:

...

John David Carson suggested the following unmet interests be added:

- Create an atmosphere that will support transit downtown (i.e., transit as a more convenient alternative to personal auto use for some/most trips)
- Create affordable housing options downtown  
    Provided Rationale: high parking requirements inhibit this goal by requiring the addition of more high-cost structured parking into unit cost than is necessary in a dense, walkable environment
- Reduce requests for taller structures driven by high parking ratios that make low-rise and mid-rise urban development unfeasible  
    Provided Rationale: Low-rise and mid-rise residential developments are rendered impractical as 1 parking space to 1 bed parking ratios effectively require 1 story of parking for every 1 story of units. The cost cannot be justified when, for example, a four story building delivers only two stories of units as this results in high per unit parking costs and effective "vertical" land loss. Hence, residential projects are not developed or developers request more stories to try and get unit scale to offset the inefficiency of parking costs

John David Carson suggested the following solutions:

- Return to standard urban parking requirement of 1 parking space per dwelling unit and use a scaling factor for dwelling units to bedrooms when a unit has more than two bedrooms  
    Example: the current LDC has an existing scaling factor for scaling dwelling units in calculating allowable density in MF-12/18/24)

...