



## DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

*Planning and Economic Development Division*

### **m e m o r a n d u m**

**TO:** Bruce K. Walden, Chief Administrative Officer

**FROM:** Elizabeth H. Tyler, AICP/ASLA, Planning Manager

**DATE:** June 21, 2001

**SUBJECT:** Parking Requirements for Multiple Family Residential Uses

---

### **Introduction**

In recent months, there have been increased reports of on-street parking problems in the West Urbana and Sunnycrest neighborhoods associated with multiple family residential uses. These concerns led staff to prepare an evaluation of how our multiple family residential parking requirements compare with those of other downstate and University host communities, including Champaign. The results of that investigation are summarized in a Memorandum, dated October 5, 2000 (copy attached). This comparison shows that Urbana's parking requirements are less restrictive than many of the comparable communities, depending upon the unit mix and size of bedrooms proposed. The comparison also shows that Urbana is unique in basing its parking requirements on individual bedroom size, rather than upon the number of bedrooms or dwelling units. (Note that Champaign bases parking requirements upon the cumulative bedroom area per unit, which is more directly related to the number of bedrooms than is Urbana's requirement).

A case example based upon the Sunnycrest Towers North apartments (currently under construction) shows that Urbana required 98 parking spaces, where other communities would require between 160 and 198 spaces. However, if the apartment had consisted of only four-bedroom units rather than a mixture of two- and three-bedroom units, Urbana would have required the same number of parking spaces (i.e., 160) as several of the other comparison communities. (See tables attached to previous memorandum).

As a result of this preliminary assessment, staff recommended that Urbana's multiple-family parking requirements be re-evaluated to consider changing car ownership and bedroom occupancy patterns. Staff also noted concerns that the parking requirements could be unduly affecting the unit mix of apartments constructed and the size of bedrooms. Under the current regulations, apartment construction composed of two- and three-bedroom units containing bedrooms of less than 120 square feet are favored by builders. This is because the current regulations allow 0.5 parking spaces per bedroom for units with 70 to 119 square foot of area per bedroom. The requirement increases to 1.0 space per bedroom where the area per bedroom is between 120 and 169 square

feet; to 1.5 spaces per bedroom where the area per bedroom is between 170 and 219 square feet; and to 2.0 spaces per bedroom where the area per bedroom is 220 square feet or more. However, in no case shall a dwelling unit have fewer than one parking space. This means that if a developer constructs an apartment building of small sized two-bedroom units, he/she would need to provide no more parking than if the same number of one-bedroom units were built. Staff has suggested that unit mix and bedroom configuration would be better directed by market forces than by zoning requirements. Staff also noted concerns that any change in multiple family parking requirements would need to be conducted with a careful consideration of private sector reactions and possible changes to the housing market.

Possible deficiencies in Urbana's off-street parking requirements for multiple-family residential projects are not limited to the Sunnycrest case example. For example, an apartment building consisting of 21 two-bedroom units and 10 three-bedroom units is currently proposed on the 900 block of West Stoughton. This project is providing 36 parking spaces for a total of 72 bedrooms. In Champaign, this project would be required to provide 52 parking spaces.

## **Apartment Survey**

As a result of the previous evaluation, Council directed staff to continue its investigation of parking requirements for multiple family uses by conducting a limited survey of apartment owners and tenants. The purpose of the survey was to determine car ownership patterns by apartment type as well as to identify other related parking concerns. Staff selected a small number of apartments that had been constructed since the passage of the current parking requirements in 1989 and which reflected a range of locations and developers/owners. Staff focused the survey upon West Urbana and the central portions of the City based upon the concept that apartment builders on the edges of the City would be less likely to be constrained by parking requirements. In this sense, the parking survey represents a worst-case depiction of parking impacts. The results of this survey must be used cautiously due to the small size of the survey sample and to the fact that it did not cover all areas of the City.

Copies of the survey were administered to apartment tenants and their owners in Spring of this year. Timing of survey administration was affected by University vacations. Copies of the apartment owner and tenant surveys are attached. Also attached is a summary memorandum of the survey results and composite results for the tenant survey. The survey was prepared, administered, and evaluated by Planner Intern Paul Lindahl.

As noted in the Summary Memorandum, a total of twelve apartment buildings and 245 tenants were surveyed by mail. The response rate was 92% for the apartment owners and 29% for the tenants. The 29% response rate is considered healthy for a mail-back survey. As shown in the summary memorandum, 73% of all residents surveyed have cars. The number of cars per unit was 0.909 for one-bedroom units (11 units responding); 1.533 for two-bedroom units (45 units

responding); 2.154 for three-bedroom units (13 units responding); and 2.000 for four-bedroom units (4 units responding).

Other survey results show that the most common unit type is two-bedrooms (62%); that 90% of units pay an additional fee for off-street parking and that this fee is an average of \$32 per month; that 71% would use one to three additional assigned spaces if they were made available for free; that 26% were use one to two additional assigned space if they were made available for rent; that 15% have cars but do not use their apartment’s parking because it is unavailable; that 25% have cares but do not use their apartment’s parking because it is too expensive; and that 27% park on the street occasionally or often because the apartment’s parking area is full or unavailable.

The apartment owner surveys indicate generally that their tenants are adequately served by existing off-street parking provisions, but that problems occur when visitors arrive and are not able to find a parking space. Near-campus apartment owners noted that students and other visitors to the University fill up on-street parking and cause a problem for visitors to the apartment building. One owner noted that many of the tenants are students from out of town or out of the country and do not have cars.

**Discussion**

The following table depicts Urbana’s current parking requirements for multiple-family residences compared with the car ownership patterns reflected in the survey patterns, and the parking requirements for the City of Champaign. Also shown is a possible response to Urbana’s requirements to bring them more in line with both the survey responses and with Champaign’s requirements. The possible response would also avoid limitations on bedroom size by requiring spaces per bedroom, rather than by bedroom size.

**Required Off-Street Parking Spaces Per Bedroom for Multiple-Family Residential Uses**

Unit Type	Urbana’s Current Reqt.*	Survey Response	City of Champaign*	Possible Response
1 bedroom	0.50, but no less than 1.00	0.91	1.00	0.75, but no less than 1.00
2 bedroom	1.00**	1.53	1.50	1.50
3 bedroom	1.50**	2.15	2.00	2.00
4 bedroom	2.00	2.00***	2.00**	2.50

\* Bedroom sizes are influenced by current regulations.

\*\* Unit type is favored by current regulations due to bedroom size limitations.

\*\*\* Reflects a survey response of only four units.

**Impacts on Developability**

Discussions with local architects and builders suggest that apartment construction in Urbana is

controlled by off-street parking requirements as the single most important determining factor for the feasibility of development. This is particularly true in central portions of the City where lot sizes are limited and land costs are relatively high. If the City were to amend its parking requirements to be more reflective of the survey results and of the City of Champaign's requirements (as suggested in the table above), there is the possibility that apartment construction in many locations in Urbana would no longer be feasible. This could have extreme negative effects upon Urbana's ability to expand its property value base and to provide a supply of new rental housing to its residents.

This potential impact is due to the fact that off-street parking requirements and density limitations - as determined by floor area ratio, open space ratios, and height limitations - inextricably comprise the determining factors that dictate the density (and therefore the economic feasibility) of a development project. Urbana has relatively restrictive limits on FAR, OSR, and height limits for its multiple-family zoning districts. By comparison, Champaign is much more permissive (See attached development standards tables).

For example, Urbana's R-4, Multiple-Family Residential, zone has a maximum height of 35 feet, a maximum floor area ratio of 0.50, and a minimum open space ratio of 0.35. In Champaign's MF2 (Multifamily Medium Density) zone, the maximum floor area ratio is 1.4 and the minimum open space ratio is 0.30. The height may equal twice the distance from the front of the building line to the center line of the street right-of-way. This translates to a height of 100 feet in a case where a building is located on a local street with the minimum required setback of 20 feet. The height could be even higher on collectors or arterial streets with greater right-of-way. In Urbana's R-5 zone, the height limit is 35 feet, the maximum FAR is 0.90, and the minimum OSR is 0.30. By contrast, Champaign's MF3 (Multifamily High Density/Limited Business) zone requires a maximum FAR of 1.9, a minimum OSR of 0.25, and the same height restrictions as the MF2 zone. The Champaign Zoning Ordinance notes that its FAR and OSR restrictions will result in an average density of 50 dwelling units per acre in the MF2 zone and 70 dwelling units per acre in the MF3 zone.

Because Champaign is more permissive in its other development requirements than is Urbana, it is able to place a higher off-street parking requirement upon multiple-family residential uses without unduly affecting the feasibility of developing such uses. Further investigation is needed to determine what an appropriate combination of density restrictions might be for Urbana.

## **Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the assessment of off-street parking requirements for multiple-family residential uses be expanded to investigate further the potential effects upon developability of such uses in Urbana and to suggest any necessary modifications to the density requirements in the multiple-family zones to compensate for possible revisions to the parking requirements. Staff further recommends that the potential legal implications of increasing parking requirements in terms of property rights and development expectations be reviewed.

To complete this assessment, staff suggests that representatives of the design and construction industry be contacted and that a series of case examples be developed to test the implications of various adjustments to parking requirements and other density-determining regulations. Once this expanded assessment is completed, staff will be in a better position to recommend possible amendments to the Zoning Ordinance.

Attachments:

1. Memorandum to Bruce Walden, dated October 5, 2000 and attachments
  2. Apartment Survey Instruments
  3. Memorandum from Paul Lindahl Summarizing Survey results
  4. Composite Results of Tenant Survey
  5. Development Regulations by District, Urbana
  6. Development Regulations by District, Champaign
- C:     Apartment Owners Association  
          Bruce Knight, City of Champaign  
          Barry Howell, Urbana Plan Commission Chair



**DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

*Planning and Economic Development Division*

**m e m o r a n d u m**

**TO:** Elizabeth Tyler, Planning Manager

**FROM:** Paul A. Lindahl, Planner Intern

**DATE:** 6/11/01

**SUBJECT:** Tenant Survey Summary Points

245 letters to apartments went out and 73 were returned. 29% response rate.

12 letters to the owners of apartment buildings went out and 11 have returned. 92% response rate.

156 bedrooms, 157 residents, 115 cars. 73% of all residents have cars.

**Cars per unit for 1 bedroom units.**

91% of 1-bedroom apartment have cars.

**Units =11**  
**People Per Unit: 1.182**

**Cars per Unit: 0.909**

**Cars per person 0.769**

**Cars per unit for 2 bedroom units.**

38% of 2-bedroom apartments have one car, and 58% have two.

**Units =45**  
**People Per Unit: 1.978**

**Cars per Unit: 1.533**

**Cars per person 0.775**

**Cars per unit for 3 bedroom units.**

15% of 3-bedroom apartments have one car, 54% have two cars and 31% have 3 cars.

**Units=13**  
**People Per Unit: 3.00**

**Cars per Unit: 2.154**

**Cars per person 0.718**

**Cars per unit for 4 bedroom units.**

**Units=4**

**People Per Unit: 4.00**

**Cars per Unit: 2.000**

**Cars per person 0.500**

With only 4 responses from 4-bedroom apartments the results are inconclusive.

Some general stats on the residents survey Responses:

# Bedrooms	Responses		# People	Responses		# Cars	Responses	
1	11	15%	1	10	14%	0	3	4%
2	45	62%	2	47	64%	1	30	41%
3	13	18%	3	11	15%	2	35	48%
4	4	5%	4	5	7%	3	5	7%
						4	0	

156 bedrooms, 157 residents, 115 cars. 73% of residents have cars.

91% of 1-bedroom apartment have cars. All one car. Only 1 apartment had none.

38% of 2-bedroom apartments have one car, and 58% have two.

15% of 3-bedroom apartments have one car, 54% have two cars and 31% have 3 cars.

Note the disparity in number of responses between the 2-bedroom apartments and all the others.

With only 4 responses from 4-bedroom apartments the results should be considered inconclusive.

22% of all respondents said either they or their roommates would be willing to rent another assigned parking space were it available. That was often with the caveat that it be reasonably priced.

In the open comments section many said there was not enough street parking and that the towing / ticketing policies were unfair.

One pointed out they would get ticketed for having their car being half way past the sign near the end of the block while a car with a flat tire sat for weeks without being ticketed or towed.

A large number said the parking was adequate for the residents but impossible for visitors.

# DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

*Planning and Economic Development Division*

## **m e m o r a n d u m**

**TO:** Bruce K. Walden, Chief Administrative Officer

**FROM:** April D. Getchius, AICP, Director

**DATE:** October 5, 2000

**SUBJECT:** Parking Requirements for Multiple Family Residential Uses

---

### **Introduction**

Recent parking problems in the West Urbana and Sunnycrest neighborhoods associated with multiple family residential uses have led to questions about the adequacy of the City's parking requirements for these uses. Problems in the West Urbana neighborhood include the parking of vehicles on unapproved surfaces and in front yards. Problems in the Sunnycrest area include overflow of vehicles associated with multiple-family residences onto adjacent and nearby single-family residential streets.

Sunnycrest neighbors report that residents of nearby apartment buildings (e.g., Sunnycrest Towers South at 1102 East Colorado Avenue) do not utilize off-street parking provided for these apartments possibly because the landlord charges an additional monthly fee for the use of these spaces. In the case of the Sunnycrest Manor apartments (an elderly housing development at 1805 South Cottage Grove), a substantial variance was granted that lowered the off-street parking requirements on the basis that the development would rent only to the elderly and that these residents would not have as great a rate of car ownership as non-restricted apartments. Unfortunately, the parking provided at this development does not appear to meet the demand of its residents.

Increased parking problems are likely related to larger societal changes whereby Americans are owning more vehicles and driving more miles than ever before. In particular, students and young people are more mobile than in the past and tend to have a higher disposable income allowing them to own cars at a higher rate. This may be particularly true in locations such as Sunnycrest which are relatively distant from campus. Further compounding matters in communities like Urbana are reduced university restrictions on student car ownership.

As a result of these concerns, the City Council has asked staff to research the City's existing off-street parking requirements for multiple-family residential uses

### **Background**



Urbana's current off-street parking requirements for multiple-family residential uses are set forth in Table VIII-6 of the Zoning Ordinance (copy attached). For two-family, rowhouse, and townhouses, the parking requirement is two spaces per unit. For apartments, the requirement is one space per unit for efficiency apartments (designed to be occupied by one person). The parking requirements for non-efficiency apartments are based upon bedroom size and range from 0.5 spaces per bedroom to 2.0 spaces per bedroom. The intent of the requirements is to provide parking at the rate of one-half space per person, but in no case should a dwelling unit have less than one parking space. For dormitory uses (includes residence halls, fraternities/ sororities and cooperatives of more than 15 people), the requirement is one space for every three residents. For boarding houses, rooming houses, and extended group occupancy units, the requirement is one space for every two residents.

The most recent amendments to these parking requirements occurred in 1988-1989 when the parking requirements were applied to bedroom area in order to better account for actual occupancy. In 1984 the minimum number of one parking space for a multiple-family dwelling was set and in 1985 the parking requirement for efficiency apartments was increased from 0.5 spaces per dwelling unit to one space per dwelling unit.

## **Comparison with Other Communities**

Attached to this Memorandum is a table comparing Urbana's parking requirements for multiple-family residential uses to those of other selected communities, including Champaign, Normal, Bloomington, IL, Carbondale, Peoria, Bloomington, IN, and DeKalb. These communities were selected due to their proximity to Urbana and/or because of similarities to Urbana (e.g., total population, host to a university, etc.). Direct comparison with Urbana's rates is difficult because each community bases its parking requirements on differing units (e.g., per bedroom size, per unit size, per resident, per dwelling unit, etc.). In particular, Urbana bases its multiple-family residential parking requirements on spaces per bedroom, whereas most communities calculate this on a per dwelling unit or per square footage basis. However, some generalized comparisons can be made. These general comparisons are depicted in the table as similar, less restrictive (i.e., less parking is required), more restrictive (i.e., more parking is required), and unknown.

As an example, Champaign's requirements for multiple family residential units are based upon bedroom area per unit and are calculated per dwelling unit. Depending upon unit size, Champaign's requirements may be more or less restrictive than Urbana's. For smaller units, Champaign is more restrictive (see case example below). For four-bedroom units with small bedrooms, Champaign's requirements are the same as Urbana's (i.e., two parking spaces required). In the case of dormitories, Champaign is less restrictive with only one space required per four resident beds, compared to Urbana's one space for every three residents. Parking requirements for boarding houses are more restrictive in Champaign with one space required for every living or sleeping unit compared to Urbana's one space for every two residents.

The attached table shows that in several cases, Urbana is less restrictive than the comparable communities. This is especially true in the categories of dormitories and boarding houses.

## **Case Examples**

Comparison of parking requirements for multiple family housing under the requirements of different communities may best be illustrated using a case example for an actual apartment building. The example chosen is the currently proposed Sunnycrest Towers North at 1806 South Cottage Grove. This project is proposed to have 80 dwelling units, composed of 48 two bedroom units, 28 three bedroom units, and 4 four bedroom units, for a total of 196 bedrooms. Bedroom sizes are approximately 100 square feet. The developer is proposing a total of 115 parking spaces.

Parking requirements for this development in the various communities evaluated is depicted in the attached table. Under Urbana's regulations, a total of 98 spaces would be required, which is equivalent to 1.23 spaces per unit. This is due to the fact that the parking requirement is based upon an average per bedroom. Under Champaign's regulations, a total of 160 spaces would be required, or 2.00 spaces per unit. This is due to the fact that the parking requirement is based upon the total bedroom area in each apartment. All of the other communities are more restrictive than Urbana and would require between 160 and 198 parking spaces (between 2.00 and 2.48 spaces per unit).

Different results may be found depending upon the specific size and number of bedrooms proposed. For example, if the 80 units proposed at Sunnycrest Towers North were all four-bedroom units with bedrooms at 100 square feet in size, then Urbana's requirements would be the same as many of the comparison communities, and less restrictive than some of the communities (see attached table).

## **Discussion**

There are numerous issues associated with increasing the off-street parking requirements for multiple-family residential developments. Among these are:

- Increased convenience for apartment residents
- Reduced effect on neighboring properties
- Reduced congestion on surrounding streets
- Recognition of societal changes in increased automobile usage and ownership
- Possibly improved consistency with other communities
- Increased cost of construction and rental prices
- Increased consumption of land area for parking
- Increased pavement area and associated drainage infrastructure

- Encourages increased automobile usage
- Increases legal nonconformities

It should be noted that any revision to parking requirements would apply only to new construction and would not affect existing properties or existing parking problems. If Urbana were to adopt more restrictive parking requirements, any improvement in parking congestion concerns would be incremental in nature and would occur only as new construction occurs. Revisions to Urbana's multiple-family residential parking requirements could also affect the types and unit mixes of apartments proposed by developers. For example, Urbana's regulations currently favor a mixture of two- and three-bedroom units, while Champaign's regulations favor provision of four-bedroom units. Any revisions to Urbana's parking requirements will need to take a careful look at possible private sector reactions and changes in the multiple-family housing market.

## **Recommendation**

If Council wishes to consider changes to the parking requirements, staff recommends further analysis on the adequacy of our current parking requirements for multiple-family residential uses.

Prepared by:

---

Elizabeth H. Tyler, AICP/ASLA  
Assistant City Planner

Other community research conducted by Paul Lindahl, Planning Intern

Attachments:

1. Table VIII-6, Parking Requirements by Use, from Urbana Zoning Ordinance
2. Comparison of Parking Spaces Required for Multi-Family Residences for Various Communities
3. Apartment Parking Requirements Case Examples: Sunnycrest Towers North and Hypothetical Case Example

## Apartment Parking Requirements Case Example: Sunnycrest Towers North

(80 dwelling units: 48 two-bedroom units, 28 three-bedroom units, 4 four-bedroom units)

<b>Community</b>	<b>Parking Requirement</b>	<b>Unit Calculation</b>	<b>Project Parking Needed</b>	<b>Required Spaces/Unit</b>
Urbana	0.5 spaces per bedroom between 70 and 119 square feet	0.5 x 196	98	1.23
Champaign	2.0 spaces per dwelling unit for over 200 square feet of bedroom area per unit	2.0 x 80	160	2.00
Normal	2.0 spaces per dwelling unit	2.0 x 80	160	2.00
Normal – Campus Overlay	1.0 spaces per bedroom	1.0 x 196	196	2.45
Bloomington, IL	2.0 spaces per dwelling unit	2.0 x 80	160	2.00
Carbondale	Depends upon Land Use Intensity standards.			
Peoria	2.0 spaces per dwelling unit	2.0 x 80	160	2.00
Bloomington, IN	2.0 spaces per dwelling unit for two-bedroom units; 3.0 spaces per dwelling unit for three-bedroom units; 4.5 spaces per dwelling unit for four-bedroom units	2.0 x 48 + 3.0 x 28 + 4.5 x 4	198	2.48
DeKalb	1.0 spaces per bedroom	1.0 x 196	196	2.45

## Apartment Parking Requirements Hypothetical Case Example

(80 dwelling units: all four-bedroom units)

<b>Community</b>	<b>Parking Requirement</b>	<b>Unit Calculation</b>	<b>Project Parking Needed</b>	<b>Required Spaces/Unit</b>
Urbana	0.5 spaces per bedroom between 70 and 119 square feet	0.5 x 320	160	2.00
Champaign	2.0 spaces per dwelling unit for over 200 square feet of bedroom area per unit	2.0 x 80	160	2.00
Normal	2.0 spaces per dwelling unit	2.0 x 80	160	2.00
Normal – Campus Overlay	1.0 spaces per bedroom	1.0 x 320	320	4.00
Bloomington, IL	2.0 spaces per dwelling unit	2.0 x 80	160	2.00
Carbondale	Depends upon Land Use Intensity standards.			
Peoria	2.0 spaces per dwelling unit	2.0 x 80	160	2.00
Bloomington, IN	4.5 spaces per dwelling unit for four-bedroom units	4.5 x 80	360	4.50
DeKalb	1.0 spaces per bedroom	1.0 x 320	320	4.00



# APARTMENT OWNER SURVEY

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES  
Planning and Economic Development Division

Owner: \_\_\_\_\_

**Building**  
Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Please provide the following information about the *specific building* noted above:

1. How many apartments total are in the building? \_\_\_\_\_

2. How many apartments of each type are in the building?

<b>Efficiency</b>	/	_____
<b>Studio</b>		_____
<i>1 bedroom</i>		_____
<i>2 bedroom</i>		_____
<i>3 bedroom</i>		_____
<i>4 bedroom</i>		_____

3. How many off street parking spaces are provided in the building's lot? \_\_\_\_\_

4. Does the building have any unused parking? \_\_\_\_\_

If so, please estimate the number of unused spaces. \_\_\_\_\_

5. Is use of the parking spaces included in the rent at this building? **Yes**

*No*

If not, is there an additional fee? *Yes*

*No*

What is the cost per month? \$ \_\_\_\_\_

6. Is off street parking assigned at this building? **Yes**   
*No*

If so, how are spaces allocated among the apartments?

---

---

---

---

---

7. Do tenants sometimes request more parking than the building's parking lot provides? Please explain.

---

---

---

---

---

---

8. Please provide any additional comments.

---

---

---

---

---

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS IMPORTANT SURVEY!



# APARTMENT TENANT SURVEY

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES Planning and Economic Development Division

Address: \_\_\_\_\_, Apartment No. \_\_\_\_\_

*Please assist us in determining the needs of our growing community by participating in this short survey. Responses to the survey will remain anonymous and only the summary of statistics for all the apartment buildings surveyed will be available for review. Please fill out only one survey form for your apartment unit.*

1. How many bedrooms are in your apartment? \_\_\_\_\_

2. How many people live in your apartment? \_\_\_\_\_

3. How many cars total do you and your roommates have in Champaign-Urbana? \_\_\_\_\_

4. Are off-street parking spaces included in your rent? **Yes**   
*No*

If not, is there an additional fee? **Yes**   
*No*

What is the for the parking space cost per month? \$ \_\_\_\_\_

5. Are parking spaces assigned at your apartment building? **Yes**   
*No*

If so, how many spaces are assigned to you and your roommates? \_\_\_\_\_

If not, how many spaces do you and your roommates use?  
**On-street** \_\_\_\_\_  
*Off-street* \_\_\_\_\_

6. If additional assigned parking were available, how many spaces do you think you and your roommates would want? *For free* \_\_\_\_\_  
*To rent* \_\_\_\_\_



7. How many of the people in your apartment (include yourself) have cars, but do not use the building's parking because it is either:

**Unavailable** \_\_\_\_\_

*Too expensive* \_\_\_\_\_

8. How often do you find you need to park on the street because your apartment's parking area is full or the spaces are assigned to others?

*Often*  
*(More than once a week)*

*Occasionally*  
*(Once a week or less)*

*Never or seldom*

9. Do visitors to your apartment have trouble finding a place to park? Please explain.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

10. In general, do you think your apartment provides:

**Adequate parking**

*Too much parking*

*Not enough parking*

11. Please provide any additional comments in the space below.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS IMPORTANT SURVEY!

QUESTIONS? Please contact Assistant City Planner Elizabeth Tyler at 384-2440.

**CITY OF URBANA**

**NON-SUBSIDIZED SINGLE FAMILY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY**  
**(by month)**

<b><u>MONTH</u></b>	<b><u>2001</u></b>	<b><u>2000</u></b>	<b><u>1999</u></b>	<b><u>1998</u></b>	<b><u>1997</u></b>
January	1	1	0	3	0
February	1	5	1	3	2
March	7	2	0	3	1
April	5	2	4	4	1
May	6	3	3	5	0
June	-	5	1	4	1
July	-	5	5	2	4
August	-	1	3	0	2
September	-	6	0	6	2
October	-	3	2	0	2
November	-	1	4	1	2
December	-	1	1	2	2
Ave. EAV Per Unit	N/A	\$64,640*	\$61,650**	\$57,390	\$69,100
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>19</b>

Note: 1/1/01 - 5/31/01 = 20 units      3/1/01 - 5/31/01 = 18 units  
1/1/00 - 5/31/00 = 13 units      3/1/00 - 5/31/00 = 7 units  
1/1/99 - 5/31/99 = 8 units      3/1/99 - 5/31/99 = 7 units  
1/1/98 - 5/31/98 = 18 units      3/1/98 - 5/31/98 = 12 units  
1/1/97 - 5/31/97 = 4 units      3/1/97 - 5/31/97 = 2 units

\*EAV's available on 25 of 35 houses

\*\*EAV's available on 23 of 24 houses

**COMPARISON OF NUMBER OF UNITS FOR CONDOMINIUMS, ZERO  
LOT LINE UNITS AND DUPLEXES BY YEAR BETWEEN URBANA AND  
CHAMPAIGN**

**YEAR**

	<b>2001*</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1997</b>
<b>URBANA</b>					
<b># of units</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>
<b><u>CHAMPAIGN</u></b>					
<b># of units</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>28</b>

**\*(1/1/01-6/1/01)**