

## City of Columbus Proposed Parking Code Revisions Summary of Input Received by Topic with Staff Response

**(Referenced Code Sections correspond to the Public Review Draft)**

The parking code revision proposal includes many new ideas and updates to existing requirements, some of which have been unchanged for decades. While significant care has been taken to develop a highly functional draft, it will be important to monitor the new code to determine its effectiveness. Consequently, the proposal includes a commitment to undertake a two-year review of the new code and suggest areas which may require additional consideration.

Parking Requirements	Comment	Staff Response
Real Estate Professional	Single parking requirement for new shopping center designation is a good idea. Likes reduced restaurant parking.	No response needed
Resident	Condominium guest parking – don't go too low.	No response needed
Resident	Downsizing parking –don't do it too much.	No response needed
Southeast Area Communities Coalition	Multi-family requirement should not be reduced. More people are living in the units. Concerns include esthetics, fire service, and identity of the driver if Fire Dept needs to move the car.	Proposed cap for multi-family eliminated. Proposed minimum remains at 1.5 spaces per unit. Will monitor requirement.
Resident	We have parking wars. Gear it to bedrooms. Not enough parking. Dislikes the 3 per unit cap for multifamily. Some builders might know they need more but the code wouldn't allow it.	Proposed cap for multi-family eliminated.
National Association of Office and Industrial Parks (NAOIP)	Examples are confusing on pages 12-13	See newer version of draft with revised format
NAIOP	You are moving in the right direction in reducing requirements for restaurants w/ drive-thrus, general office, furniture stores and a few other uses, you need to distinguish among more uses. For instance, you need to distinguish between restaurants that have waiter service and those that do not. Distinguish between those that sell alcohol and those that do not; 7. You should recognize three reduction factors that are uses in the ULI shared parking analysis. The reduction factors are vacancy allowance, non-auto transportation (walk, COTA, cab, bike) and captive market allowance (% people visiting more than one business).	Can't distinguish between restaurants w and w/o table service as code doesn't regulate.  Commercial overlays are in place in many locations where ULI reduction factors apply.
NAIOP	Use a 80% reduction factor for patio space.	In some cases, patios take on permanent status without the seasonal connotation. Proposed modifications to public review draft include a 50% reduction for patios.
NAIOP	Change shopping center definition to 80,000 sf. Otherwise good change.	Agreed. Proposed modifications to public review draft include a new category for smaller shopping centers to address this suggestion.
NAIOP	I am not sure that a maximum [retail parking] is something that the City should be concerned with.	Proposed modifications to public review draft increase parking maximum for all categories of

		retail to 1:200sf to allow greater flexibility. Additional modification not supported as the objective is to reduce excess parking and reinforce efficiency of land use. Field analysis and other research demonstrate excess parking to be common for many uses.
NAIOP	I am concerned about the provisions that put a maximum number of spaces on big box retail. Retailers often demand more than code and we don't want to lose a deal over this issue.	Proposed modifications to public review draft increase parking maximum for all categories of retail to 1:200sf to allow greater flexibility. Field analysis shows big box retailers among those uses that require significantly less parking than generally provided.
Residential Developer	Will stacking be allowed on driveways in areas zoned for multifamily? If each townhouse has its own driveway, then should allow stacking.	Proposed modifications to public review draft include provision to allow this.
Resident	Something about ADA parking spots. Is the ADA requirement reduced proportionally to the required numbers of parking spaces?	Yes.
Resident	Will parking requirements be further reduced near transit stops?	This accomplished through UCO/CCO provisions.
Green Team	- Allow a calculation by zoning applicants to count available on-street parking to meet parking requirements, further reducing on-site spaces. (3312.03 & 3312.49)	Challenging to implement w/o multiple credit for same spaces. Such proposals considered on a case by case basis.
NAIOP	Consider parking agreements between owners for shared parking	Staff is supportive of this and currently considers on a case by case basis. Regulation can be difficult due to changing nature of private arrangements.
Residential Developer	Supports reducing the minimum numbers of required spaces.	No response needed
Resident/Professional Planner	The reduction in parking requirements is good to see. There are too many parking lots that sit mostly empty and these lower standards will more appropriate requirement. The cap on parking makes a lot of sense.	No response needed.
Resident/Professional Planner	I do not think there should be a cap for single family units.	Residential cap to be eliminated.
Resident/Professional Planner	I think that you should allow a provision for overflow parking if people feel that they need more than what is allowed. This could be allowed if it is reinforced turf, pervious paving or some other alternative pavement system.	Will consider this in future review.
Architect	Expressed concern about reducing parking code minimum requirements.	Objective is to reduce excess parking and reinforce efficiency of land use. Field analysis and other research demonstrate excess parking to be common for many uses.
Architect	One suggestion is that pervious paving be used and if a business can document a certain useage over a period of say three years then the business can elect to install nonpervious paving. Or allow pervious parking spaces to have greater numbers if it replaces nonpervious	Will consider this in future review.
Architect	Also I don't believe that use group should be a limiting factor in parking. Doctors' offices, as you know need 5 spaces per thousand	Field analysis and other research supports proposal. Staff will monitor requirement.

	or more, if this is reduced like I have seen the doctors will move to another state, again a very poor reason to lose quality medical help.	
Architect	Banks have more transactions that many fast food restaurants and need parking or they will move to other locations (suburbs)	Field analysis and other research supports proposal. Staff will monitor requirement.
Green Team	- Recommend specific minimum number of spaces located near the point of use or occupancy of a building for alternative-fuel, energy-efficient or low-emitting vehicles. (3312.51)	Enforcement beyond scope of the proposal.
Green Team	- Allocation of parking spaces for two wheeled vehicles; motorcycles and/or scooters. (New section)	Will consider this in future review.
Green Team	- Make parking spots available near a building's electrical service for electric vehicles and their necessary connections. (New section)	Could allow, but not ready to require.
Green Team	- Reduce the amount and ease of permit street parking near busy commercial strips to allow less parking on site. For example, have one to two hours of public parking with more time allowed only for designated permit holders. (3312.05 & 3373.01)	This issue is complex. Current applied in areas where parking for residents is often dominated by adjacent retail corridors. Parking Code does not regulate the process, which allows for tailored policies for each area designated.
Retail Consultant	As you may know, the shopping center industry strives to provide enough parking to meet demand for the tenth busiest day of the year. This is analogous to building your church large enough for the Easter Sunday crowd. This leads to all kinds of negative land use and environmental impacts. At the same time, many of Columbus's neighborhood commercial strips suffer from a lack of parking. This ties the other hand behind the back for local independent retailers trying to compete against the massive resources of national big box chains. Please be very careful about adding to parking handicap that urban street retailers face in spite of New Urbanist mythology about pedestrian shoppers. Parking is like oxygen for these small, struggling businesses. With over 60 million square feet of shopping center space already developed in central Ohio, I fear that the horse is out of the barn by now. But hey, way too late is better than never I suppose. Keep up your great work!!! –	No response needed.
Near East Area Commission Leader	I believe the Near East Area Plan favors mitigation on parking through reduced parking, landscaping, buffering, and support of alternate means of transportation e.g. we ask developers to provide bike racks in our continued effort to encourage people to walk, bike instead of driving to every destination. As you know, NEAC is often involved in zoning variances for reduced parking, so we are familiar with the concept of 'right sizing'. I think this is a step in the right direction to remove the effects of suburban 'over spacing' and get back to the grassroots efforts of reviving the pedestrian city.	No response needed.
Sierra Club	The proposed code reduces minimum parking spaces for some uses, which is a step in the right direction. We encourage actions that will prevent additional impervious surfaces so that we can limit	No response needed.

	environmental impacts from development.	
Attorney	Opposed to parking maximums. (Input form with exact text in input folder).	Maximums for retail and restaurants increased. Objective is to reduce excess parking and reinforce efficiency of land use. Field analysis and other research demonstrate excess parking to be common for many uses.
Building Industry Association	The changes for the multi-family parking requirements are appropriate to the market in central Ohio and we view them positively. We appreciate these changes and believe they are an improvement for all involved - most importantly our customers and your residents.	No response needed.
Large Commercial Developer	<b>Section 3312.49 Calculation methods.</b> <b>Comments:</b> We believe that amendment to exclude shopping centers is needed in that the existing code does not take into consideration the fact that shoppers visit many stores but only use one parking space. However, the size that is listed does not take into consideration the many smaller shopping centers (especially unanchored retail strips) which are over-parked due to the existing calculation method. We suggest that the 150,000 square feet minimum be reduced to 25,000 square feet. If the concern is over the square footage of restaurants then there could be qualifiers in the code. Centers over 75,000 square feet should not have any qualifiers. It is difficult to argue a retail center with a 40,000 square foot soft goods store, a 10,000 square foot golf store, a 15,000 square foot book store, a 2,000 square foot coffee shop and a 4,000 square foot deli (total 71,000 square feet) is not a shopping center.	Proposed modifications to public review draft include a new category for smaller shopping centers to address this suggestion.
Large Commercial Developer	<b>Section 3312.51 Minimum numbers of parking spaces required.</b> The city has good intentions in its attempt to reduce the area of parking lots within Columbus. Real estate developers, business owners and the city are all in agreement that having high minimum parking ratios can cause unused parking spaces. The spaces use up valuable ground. The cost of improving (grading, paving, striping, and draining) and maintaining such spaces act as an incentive by developers and end-users to be efficient in the parking layout. However, the proposed changes ignore the operational requirements of the businesses to the point that such businesses will seek to go outside of the city limits to operate in a responsible manner. Similar uses (but different operators) have different operational needs. For example, Hometown Buffet, Panera Bread, First Watch, Bonefish Grill Max & Erma's, and P.F. Chang's may all have concepts which could be 6,000 square feet. However, the parking demands, based upon existing units and market research, may be completely different. Lowering the minimum requirements as well as allowing for joint parking for shopping centers will help in this cause. However, the enactment of a maximum parking ratio disregards the operations of	Policy objectives, research and field analysis support caps, however maximums have been increased for restaurants (now at 1:50 sf for all restaurant types) and retail (now at 1:200 sf for all retail categories) to allow for greater flexibility. New category of use created for call centers, allowing for greater parking allowance than other types of office.

businesses. If the new code caps a retailer/restaurant use at say, 62 parking spaces and the business knows from 400 other stores that they need 75 or 83 or 103, why should the city arbitrarily deny the use? Again, if one assumes that most businesses want to minimize their costs in construction and development, why would they buy excess land and construct the extra improvements if they don't believe that the spaces are necessary? The city is trying to enact a one-size-fits-all ordinance where one size definitely does not fit all. It is erroneous to argue that aggrieved landowners/users can simply apply for a variance if they need more parking, The variance process is designed for the rare case not for average one. Also the time and cost of going through the process (with no guarantee of the outcome) will cause some users to seek other sites outside of the city limits. This is a disincentive for economic development. Creating additional barriers of entry in an economic downturn will not be good for the city finances. This will mean a delay in (i) new construction (design and inspection fees, tap fees, capacity charges, frontage fees, etc.) (ii) increased real estate taxes and (iii) new income and sales taxes). We think that maximums should be completely eliminated. If the city is insistent about having maximums then we believe they need to be increased significantly. The new **maximum** for restaurants under 5,000 square feet are (10 spaces per 1,000 square feet) is lower the existing **minimum** (13.33 spaces per 1,000 square feet). Thus, where a 4,500 square foot restaurant would currently be required to have no less than 60 spaces, the new code would require the restaurant to have no more than 45 spaces (regardless of need). This seems arbitrary at best. Like most businesses, all restaurants (large and small) perform extensive market research to estimate demand and sales volume. For the business to be successful, it needs to meet certain goals. Putting a cap on parking will cause some restaurants to choose to go elsewhere. A maximum for retail uses overlook the needs of the business. A 60,000 square foot supermarket has a higher parking demand than a 60,000 soft goods store. Yet the new provisions do not distinguish between the two. It punishes the one which is providing the greater volume of goods and services to the community. Success should not be punished. Putting a cap on office will eliminate certain types of high density employment such as call centers. It does not make sense that the city uses incentives to attract additional office users to Columbus but at the same time discounts the needs of such new businesses by arbitrarily enacting a maximum parking ratio. We feel strongly that the new maximums will not be good for the City of Columbus. We are requesting that due to the arbitrary nature of a maximum parking count that such provisions be eliminated from the new provisions.

Green Initiatives	Comment	Staff Response
Green Team	The Growth and Development Subcommittee of Mayor Michael B. Coleman's Green Team commends the City of Columbus for undertaking the parking revision process, as the code amendments are overdue. These code changes will support improved efficiency of the city's land use and thus help reduce the necessary City of Columbus services. Reductions in related budgets for these services provide long-term and much needed financial relief. Even so, the parking code revisions are only an incremental step and should be used as an opportunity to acknowledge and include other more progressive environmental strategies.	No response needed
Residential Developer	Every time we try to do something innovative, we need a storm water variance.	No response needed, comment will be forwarded.
Real Estate Professional	Would applicant receive a reduced stormwater management fee if they can show that their parking lot would produce less runoff as a result of utilizing rain gardens or other measure that would reduce runoff?	Potentially, applicants should contact the Division of Sewerage and Drainage for additional information. Fees are assessed for commercial uses based on impervious coverage.
Green Team	Supports - Reducing impervious paved areas through general parking reductions and land use.	No response needed
Green Team	Supports - Identifying and acknowledging dumpsters specific to recycling. (3321.01)	No response needed
Green Team	Supports - Identifying and acknowledging bio retention technology. (3312.21)	No response needed
Green Team	Include allowances or acknowledgements for green roofs, solar panel arrays, or wind turbines on top of parking structures or in parking lots, pursuant to the appropriate review processes. (New Section)	Beyond scope of parking code, but also not prohibited in current requirements or proposed code.
Green Team	- Identify and allow for infiltration systems that permit storm water to seep naturally into underground aquifers instead of into storm sewers. (3312.45)	Beyond scope of parking code, but also not prohibited in current requirements or proposed code.
Green Team	- Recommend the use of recycled materials for concrete aggregate. (3312.45)	Proposal allows for alternative materials as approved. Will include language to encourage consideration of permeable pavement.
Green Team	- Recommend use of lighter surface finishing materials (or minimum percentage of lighter surfacing materials) to reduce heat island effect. (3312.45)	Will include note of encouragement in code.
Sierra Club	We support the use of alternative materials and the language should explicitly encourage porous or permeable surfaces as a stormwater control measure, which can also be subject to additional review. In addition, relevant departments and divisions should develop guidance for the use of alternative hard surface materials in favor of	Will update language to suggest consideration of these objectives. Specific guidance on nature of surfaces is beyond the scope of proposal. Suggestion will be forwarded to appropriate departments.

	materials that control stormwater runoff. The city can maximize stormwater control by encouraging the combined use of bio-retention and permeable surfaces.	
--	---	--

<b>Landscaping</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
Green Team	Ensure that plant materials used in landscaping are non-invasive species and are native to Ohio. (3312.21)	The proposed draft will be revised to include the recommendation that native species be considered for parking lot landscaping.
Green Team	Allow for rain gardens within landscaping areas to reduce storm water runoff. (3312.21)	Draft code currently allows for the provision of rain gardens, provided they meet standards from the city's Stormwater Management Manual.
Real Estate Professional	Trees in parking lots may have a negative impact on security in parking lots. Will evergreen trees be allowed?	Trees required as part of interior parking lots standards must be deciduous. Proposal allows for flexible arrangement of interior landscaping.
Resident	Trees might block security cameras.	Proposal allows for flexible arrangement of interior landscaping.
Civic Association Representative	36" headlight screening might be too low to cover SUVs. Consider 38-42"?	Staff considers 36" to be an appropriate compromise between screening parking areas/headlights and allowing visibility for safety purposes and determination of parking availability. In many instances, screens may be higher as he proposed minimum unless shrubs are routinely pruned.
Architect	Opposed to proposed landscaping requirements. Allow for alternative solutions.	Landscaping requirements not considered unusual. Code designed to address typical scenarios. Alternative ideas considered on case-by-case basis.
Resident	Expressed preliminary concern that landscaping requirements would be too onerous.	Landscaping requirements in the proposed parking code are consistent with those in the Urban Commercial Overlay, which is in place for the primary commercial corridors on the Near East Side (Main, Long, Mt. Vernon, and Parsons). Proposed code offers additional flexibility.
Resident/Professional Planner	The proposed revisions to the parking code are to be applauded for reducing unneeded parking areas, creating needed bicycle parking, increasing landscaping standards, and working toward environmentally sustainable stormwater practices. However, the landscaping standard should be considered a bit more closely in its requirement of 1 tree in a 162 sq. ft. soil area. This standard is likely to result in an under landscaped look that is not going to provide beneficial shade cover. The proposed standard should be modified to require a 4ft wide minimum with 1 tree per 80 sq. ft. of soil area. This approach would better meet the intent of the code changes and result	Staff research and discussions with City Forester reinforce the proposed area and ratio requirements.

	in stronger visual breaks to parking surfaces.	
Sierra Club	We welcome improvements to parking lot landscaping requirements. Bio-retention creates an aesthetically pleasing site as well as a functioning landscape to control stormwater quantity and quality. The emphasis on bio-retention should be stronger, and more guidance should be provided to encourage bio-retention. In addition, a design goal should be recommended with the use of bio-retention in order to better quantify the stormwater benefits. For instance, encourage design for a one-inch rain storm	Beyond scope of the proposal, but will reinforce the appropriateness of bio-retention as a design alternative.
NAOIP	As to more and bigger landscaped beds in parking lots. I find that trees grow fine in the current size requirements as long as they are planted properly. In lieu of "more beds" requirement, I would require the owner to replace all landscaping that does not grow in the beds.	Staff research and discussions with City Forester reinforce the proposed area and ratio requirements. Modifications to review draft allow for additional flexibility.
Large Commercial Developer	<b>Section 3312.21A(2):</b> <b>Comments:</b> It is understandable that the city would like to increase the interior landscaping requirements. However, the requirement that all trees be planted in landscape islands a minimum of 162 square feet in size (a tenfold increase from the old requirement) may actually decrease the areas of landscaping and number of trees (other than the minimum) that a landowner may be willing to provide. Many landscape islands are not uniform in shape. Many end-of-row landscape islands, due to creative site/driveway design, may have tapered ends which are less than four feet in width and may only be on one half of the parking "tree". If the minimum width is four feet and the parking space is 18 feet in length, then the minimum area for a tree should be 72 feet (or actually something less to allow for tapered ends). If an island goes completely across a parking "tree" (two parking spaces end to end), two trees would be permitted. This would encourage more trees rather than less. Also, the four feet minimum is not really the minimum. One hundred sixty-two (162) feet divided by 36 feet (18 x 2) equals 4.5 feet. If the purpose is to introduce more trees to the site then the land area for the trees should be large enough to properly handle the tree. The wording of the new section is not clear whether more than one tree can be put in a 162 sf island. Using a minimum sized island (4.5' x 18') for one tree seems to be excessive. Such an island could easily handle 2 trees.	Staff research and discussions with City Forester reinforce the proposed area and ratio requirements. Modifications to review draft allow for additional flexibility.
Large Commercial Developer	<b>Section 3312.21A(5):</b> <b>Comments:</b> The first sentence appears to be missing a few words.	Draft revised.
Large Commercial Developer	<b>Section 3312.21B:</b> <b>Comments:</b> It states that the "lot area between the right-of-way and the parking setback line shall be landscaped with plan material and shall not be paved except for a driveway, if necessary." It should be clear that sidewalks and bike paths are permitted in this area. Even though most of the public sidewalks and bike paths are located in the	Agreed. Language revised to recognize additional legitimate encroachments into this area.

	right-of-way there are instances when the city requires an easement on private property for these uses. In addition, lateral sidewalks from a sidewalk in the ROW leading to the use should be permitted in these set back areas.	
Large Commercial Developer	<b>Section 3312.21B(2):</b> <b>Comments:</b> This requirement will act as a disincentive for redevelopment in urban areas. It will be very difficult to comply for certain urban commercial corridors.	Requirement allows for vehicular access and vision triangles. UCO provisions have shown these requirements work in urban areas.

<b>Bike Parking</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
NAIOP	Does bike parking make sense at Polaris?	Bike parking requirements are modest and demand/interest continues to grow in this form of transportation.
Resident/Professional Planner	I am happy to see the bicycle parking requirement. With the significant planning for cycling it is good to see this integrated into the parking requirement.	No response needed.
Cycling Advocate	Thanks for your work towards getting bicycle parking included in the mix! I had one thought about that, based on San Fran's code. They require all events at which more than 2000 people are expected to have a dedicated bicycle valet: I'd love to have that included in ours as well.	This is beyond the scope of the code and would perhaps be more appropriately addressed through special event permit requirements. Idea will be passed along to the appropriate department.
Consider Biking	Specification requirements will be maintained by the Department of Public Service. – Consider Biking would like to see a draft of the specs as there are many concerns with some types/location of racks.	Proposed modifications to public review draft includes basic guidelines for bike parking placement and installation.
Consider Biking	Also, I noticed the definition of a "parking space" in section 1-8 references "motor vehicle" – should that be modified to reference all vehicles (bikes?) - see definition.	Not necessary as bike parking spaces don't equate to motor vehicle spaces and are not regulated in the same manner by this proposal.
Resident	Great idea. As is anything that promotes cycling in the area. Thanks to an enlightened city government, Columbus is becoming a better and better place to ride.	No response needed.
Consider Biking and Ohio Bike Federation	It would be good if we could review the "specification requirements" referred to in the parking code, if they already exist. Also, do you think it would be possible to have more spaces at schools? This is not just cause I'm an advocate of SRTS :- ) I do think that there are more students who bike to school (including college) than other places. I'm thinking one bike space per 10 cars at schools. We actually have that many kids biking to middle schools in Gahanna. But maybe it would never happen in Columbus. Has anyone read the draft parking policy in the Bicentennial Bikeways plan lately (appendix E)? It talks about low security and high security parking and where high security parking should be required. But it has much less required spaces than this parking code.	Proposed modifications to public review draft includes basic guidelines for bike parking placement and installation.

League of American Bicyclists	<p>I am glad to learn that Columbus plans to update the parking code to include bicycle lockup as standard. Lack of good lockup facilities is one of the biggest impediments to my use of my bike for errands.</p> <p>The lockup rack should allow the bicycle frame to be securely fastened to this device. The locking up geometry should permit the bicyclist's locking mechanism (cable or U-lock) to keep the bike quite immobilized, and not loose and wiggling around. The squiggle-tube versions we see at the libraries contact the frame in only one place, and the bike frame can too easily fall to the side. The models which require only the front wheel to go into a vertical slot do not hold the bike up, and can cause bending of the front wheel. (I see these often at grocery stores.) These should not be permitted. Those "wheel-bender" slots in concrete should be declared unacceptable as well. The ones put on High St. in Clintonville are next to useless; and a crescent wrench is all that is needed to carry them away. The best examples of secure and useful lockup racks are the upside-down U cast in concrete on the OSU campus, and the ones in the South Campus Gateway.</p>	See above
League of American Bicyclists	Regarding parking lots which share several businesses, the placement of the racks would depend on the overall size of the lot. Small lots could be satisfied with one location for the racks. Larger lots would be better served with 2 or more sets, so that the user can choose the one closest to their destination. The locations ought to be reasonably close to the building entrances. (One good example I remember seeing several years ago is in one of the shopping centers in the Tuttle Crossing-I270 area. The racks were beside the main entrances.)	See above
League of American Bicyclists	The racks should be located in visible locations for security. Thieves like the hidden locations where they can use their cable cutters unnoticed.	See above
League of American Bicyclists	Commercial parking facilities which charge for motor vehicle parking ought to be permitted to charge a fair rate for secure bicycle parking.	See above
League of American Bicyclists	Multi story parking garages should provide bike parking in the sheltered inside, probably on the ground floor.	See above
League of American Bicyclists	Rental apartments should provide secure inside lockup locations for residents, and outside temporary parking for visitors.	See above
Resident	I think you are on the right track in attempting to make Columbus a more "bike friendly" city. Bike parking and perhaps bike lanes on some roads in the future will encourage this green alternative transportation. I'm sure more people would bike into and in downtown if they were assured a safe ride and a place where they could lock up their bike at their destination.	No response needed.

Resident	I love the changes to the bike parking. Good work	No response needed.
Resident	I commend the city for including mandatory bike parking regulations. This will provide real options for cyclists like myself who use bikes beyond recreation. I commute frequently into work by bike and around the downtown Columbus area. Bike parking can be a challenge at times. One suggestion I would make is allowing the option of on street bike corrals as Portland and other cities have done. In the same space previously occupied by a vehicle, 20-30 bikes could be parked freeing sidewalk space for pedestrian travel. This would be an ideal solution in high density areas, such as downtown, the Arena District, Short North and Clintonville.	Parking code regulates parking on private property rather than on-street parking or parking in the right-of-way. This idea will be passed along to appropriate staff.
Sierra Club	The proposed code includes minimum bicycle parking requirements for residential, retail, institutional, educational and athletic uses. Our hope is that accessible bike parking will increase biking and reduce the number of cars on the road.	No response needed.
Attorney	Opposed to bike rack requirements. (Input form with exact text in "Input" folder).	Bike parking requirements are modest and demand/interest continues to grow in this form of transportation.
Consider Biking	They are supportive. Would like to see several enhancements, which are detailed in their letter located in the "Input" folder.	No response needed.

<b>Lighting</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
Resident	Make sure lighting is "down lighting".	This is part of the proposal.
Southeast Communities Coalition	Pickerington Ponds lights too tall. 28 feet might be too tall. Some parking lot lights are way too bright. It's a problem for migratory birds. Look into light pollution recommendations. They could use the same lights, but make the poles shorter. And don't increase the number of light poles.	Proposal requires fully shielded, recessed lamps.
NAIOP	3321.02, Lighting New section that largely reflects administrative policy on parking lot lighting with rezoning applications. The current code standard is 0.5 (1/2) foot candle. I don't know if 0.1 proposed maximum foot candle at property line of residential district is achievable or not. I assume 0.1 foot candle can be achieved without large setbacks of the light poles or very low height. A standard is OK, but don't know how the 0.1 relates to typical parking lot lighting to gauge how much of a change this is. Foot candles can be measured in different ways also - horizontal foot candles and vertical foot candles.	Modifications to public review draft eliminates use of foot candles as a means of measure due to difficulty of determination and enforcement.
NAIOP	3321.02 (E), Lighting, Variance from standards. I think the word "may" is meant rather than "might". ".....the applicant may submit a detailed lighting plan...." It isn't clear to me whether the "variance" is meant in the context of an administratively approved plan that is different from the standards listed or whether "variance" means BZA.	

Loading and Stacking	Comment	Staff Response
NAIOP	We have found that we have too much space dedicated to loading areas.	Proposed modifications to public review draft include adjustment to number of loading spaces required for smaller uses. Further consideration will be given to this section.
NAIOP	Good to reduce stacking except consider reducing restaurant stacking too – down to 6 instead of 8 with transp. approval	Restaurants generate significantly more drive-through traffic than other uses.
Large Commercial Developer	<p><b>Section 3312.11 Drive-up stacking area.</b>  <b>Comments:</b> It was a good idea to amend the code to provide guidance for drive-up windows. ATMs and fast-food restaurants do not have the same demand. However, we believe that the requirements are still too restrictive based upon practical use of the facilities. We think that local banks should be consulted about the stacking of ATMs. In the past when we have worked with banks for ATMs, they have stated that the actual demand is typically fairly spread out through the day. An informal poll in our office found that most people will skip an ATM if there is more than 2 cars in front of them (one at the ATM and one stacking behind.).  We are also assuming that the "other uses" would include pharmacies. Like the ATM, we could not find anyone who would get in line at a pharmacy drive-up if there was more than one car at the window. If the purpose is to reduce areas of unused pavement, we believe that these requirements could be relaxed even more.  In both cases banks and pharmacies have a vested interest in making sure their operations are working at its highest efficiencies. They are not going to reduce the number of stacking spaces to save money on development costs if it going to anger customers. We really think that their input (based on hundreds if not thousands of units) would be very valuable.</p>	Current proposal represents significant reduction. Staff uncomfortable going further without opportunity to assess impact.

Other	Comment	Staff Response
Resident	Will seasonal banners be allowed in parking lots?	Beyond scope. These are addressed in 3378.
NAIOP	3357.01, C-5 Commercial District Not sure why Billboards are being eliminated as a use.	These are addressed in 3378.
Resident	Will buildings be required to be oriented toward the street?	Parking Code does not address this issue.
Resident	Will more than one connection be required to the sidewalk network? How direct will the path be?	Site plan review process will be used to address this issue.
Green Team	- Regulate safe connections between pedestrian oriented infrastructure within the right of way and between buildings that are separated by parking lots. (3312.43)	Site plan review process will be used to address this issue. Commercial overlays also require designated pedestrian pathways.