

**ZONING COMMITTEE  
RECOMMENDATION  
January 25, 2006**

---

**Rezoning Petition No. 2006-003**

- Petitioner:** Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission
- Request:** Text amendment to modify the provisions regarding compact parking spaces in the MUDD, UMUD, PED, TOD, UI and UR zoning districts, allowing up to 25% of the required spaces to be designated for compact cars. However, no more than 40% of the total provided parking spaces shall be designated for compact cars.
- Action:** The Zoning Committee voted unanimously to recommend **APPROVAL** of this text amendment.
- Vote:** Yeas: Carter, Cooksey, Farman, Howard, Hughes, Sheild  
Nays: None  
Absent: Ratcliffe

**Summary of Petition**

This text amendment proposes to delete Section 12.204(5), which states that the compact parking requirements shall not apply in the MUDD, UMUD, PED, TOD, UI, and UR zoning districts. Compact parking spaces should be permitted in all districts. The deletion of this section would then permit no more than 25% of all required parking spaces, in any district, to be designed and designated for compact vehicles.

Because no mention is made of parking spaces provided in addition to those required, new language is proposed for Section 12.204(2). This subsection would state that where additional parking spaces are permitted, no more than 40% of the total provided parking spaces may be designed and designated for compact cars.

**Zoning Committee Discussion/Rationale**

Keith MacVean summarized the text amendment and noted that compact parking spaces are 7.5' X 15' in size. He noted that the Charlotte Department of Transportation (CDOT) is not comfortable with the proposal to allow up to 40% of the total provided parking spaces to be compact in nature. Scott Putnam, from CDOT stated that compact parking spaces can be perceived as small, even for compact car drivers, and non-compact spaces are more appealing. Also, a driver of a larger vehicle will park in a compact space if there are not alternatives. Standard size vehicles parking in compact spaces does create a safety issue.

Mr. Howard asked Mr. Sheild if money is saved by using compact size spaces? Mr. Sheild stated that adding compact spaces allows less square footage to be devoted to parking, leaving more land area for additional incremental development. In an urban setting, compact spaces can make a big difference, particularly when it comes to deck parking. With standard size spaces, a parking deck may require an additional floor to accommodate a low number of additional required spaces.

Mr. Howard asked Mr. Sheild if allowing “up to 40%” of the total provided parking spaces to be compact was a useful regulation. Mr. Sheild replied yes. There has been a movement to reduce the number of parking spaces to encourage transit options, and to reduce impervious surfaces. However, in some instances, a developer/owner may want more standard parking spaces for customers that drive large SUV’s. The developer/owner does not want complaints from customers, even if permitted to have compact spaces.

Mr. Putnam used the example of City Fair, and the number of complaints that were received about having compact spaces in an urban setting.

Ms. Carter stated that flexibility in the regulations is important. Mr. Sheild agreed.

Mr. Cooksey mentioned that the regulations are voluntary as the developer has the option to provide compact spaces.

### **Statement of Consistency**

Upon a motion made by Carter and seconded by Farman, the Zoning Committee unanimously found this petition to be consistent with adopted plans and policies.

### **Vote**

**Upon a motion made by Cooksey and seconded by Farman, the Zoning Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of this text amendment.**

### **Staff Opinion**

Staff agrees with the recommendation of the Zoning Committee.