

May 13, 2014

Mr. Michael Quint
Director of Planning
City of McKinney
P.O. Box 517
McKinney TX 75070

RE: Parking Requirements for Avilla McKinney

Dear Mr. Quint:

The purpose of this letter is to address our proposed parking ratio for the Avilla McKinney project, located at the northeast corner of W. University Drive (Hwy. 380) and Grassmere Road, McKinney, TX. The parking ratio in our proposed Development Regulations is as follows:

- a) *For multi-family residential uses, parking shall be a minimum of 1.85 total parking spaces per unit (surface spaces plus garage spaces, including visitors), with the minimum being:*
 - i. *1.55 covered or surface parking space per unit, and*
 - ii. *0.30 garage parking space per unit.*
- b) *Surface parking shall include a minimum of one assigned covered parking space per unit.*

The proposed ratio is based on a study performed on existing Avilla neighborhoods by Kimley Horn & Associates (KHA), a highly respected national engineering firm with substantial traffic engineering expertise. The study, which has been included in our application, observed actual parking trends over a four-week period during peak parking demand hours, and compares the results against two national studies of parking demand rates, the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) and the Urban Land Institute (ULI). The observed parking trends at Avilla neighborhoods indicates a require parking ratio of 1.58 parking spaces per unit (enclosed and surface parking). This is similar or slightly less than the ITE and ULI recommendations. As a conservative approach, KHA recommended a parking ratio of 1.85 parking spaces per unit, which was included in our proposed Development Regulations. These ratios are driven by market demand, providing an assigned covered space and giving the residents the option of paying more for a garage if they desire one. As garages are an additional expense and revenue source, our objective is to provide as many as the market demands without oversupply. To date the proposed ratio has balanced the market demand with availability, and we have a low vacancy rate for our garages.

During the Planning & Zoning Commission hearing, there was some discussion regarding the parking ratio. This was not unexpected considering that City Staff supports the Avilla McKinney application with the exception of the proposed parking ratio. Just prior to the motion and vote, the Chairman asked if we would consider increasing the parking ratio to 2.0 total parking spaces per unit, which we agreed to. After some clarification, I was under the impression that we had agreed that we would provide 2.0 total parking spaces under the requirements above, which included one assigned **covered** parking space per unit. When the motion was made, it stipulated one assigned **enclosed** parking space per unit. The Commissioners who expressed concern over the parking ratio appeared to be concerned over the number of parking spaces, not the type of parking spaces. Because the type of parking spaces was never indicated as a

concern prior, I did not notice the Commissioner used the term “enclosed” rather than “covered”. I would have objected if I had noted the change from my discussion with the Chairman. It is certainly my own mistake, however, this is a substantial impact on the project.

Our understanding is that Commission’s recommendation would change our Development Regulations to the following:

- a) *For multi-family residential uses, parking shall be a minimum of 2.0 total parking spaces per unit (surface spaces plus garage spaces, including visitors).*
- b) *Enclosed parking shall include a minimum of one enclosed parking space per unit.*

This recommendation would change the market driven approach discussed above. With at least half of the parking spaces as enclosed garages, we would be forced to assign garages (rather than covered parking) in order to assure that the enclosed parking is fully utilized. Otherwise, if not enough residents elected to lease a garage it could create an unintended shortage of available parking; exactly the situation that the Commissioners indicated they want to avoid. Essentially this would give the residents of Avilla fewer options. In addition, it is notable that this requirement increases the number of garages over the existing City standards of 0.5 enclosed spaces per unit.

As an alternative, we would propose the revision that was discussed just prior to the motion (changes from Development regulations in bold/underline):

- a) *For multi-family residential uses, parking shall be a minimum of **2.0** total parking spaces per unit (surface spaces plus garage spaces, including visitors), with the minimum being:
 - a. **1.70** covered or surface parking space per unit, and
 - b. **0.30** garage parking space per unit.*
- b) *Surface parking shall include a minimum of one assigned covered parking space per unit.*

We believe this meets the Commission’s desire to increase the total amount of parking without changing the availability of resident options regarding uncovered, covered, and enclosed parking. It also maintains the general intent of the development plan that has been reviewed and revised based on substantial City Staff and neighborhood input on the Avilla project.

We look forward to further discussion on this topic. Please do not hesitate to contact me at any time to discuss.

Respectfully submitted by,



Josh E. Hartmann
Vice President

Encl.

Cc. Mark Housewright, Masterplan