

Yorkshire Village Parking

The Yorkshire Homeowners Association would like to take this opportunity to discuss the parking situation with you. This letter is intended to describe the difficulty with parking and the pros and cons associated with some of the solutions that have been proposed in the past. The solution that provides the maximum benefit in the most areas is the way that parking is currently handled. Other solutions seem promising to the individual but for Yorkshire as a whole, they would not provide a significant enough benefit to justify their implementation.

In the emotion of dealing with parking problems sometimes information is not properly conveyed or explained. We hope this helps and can provide a base of information for future discussions about parking.

Statistics & Problem Areas:

Parking is always a problem when you are looking for a space and in a hurry (or have a lot of things to unload). When considering parking problems it is best to understand that Yorkshire Village has 226 units and ONLY 170 outside parking spaces. This fact alone has a great impact on any present or potential parking solution. Yorkshire parking is in compliance with city regulations and ordinances. However, parking problems have worsened due to an increasing number of units being rented out, which often results in more than 1 or 2 cars per unit, and garages being used for storage instead of vehicles. The parking issue tends to be more of an issue on Somerset and Kensington. A look at some statistics will help explain this. (*There is a statistical breakdown of all Yorkshire parking on the following page of this document.*) The primary reason for problems in Somerset and Kensington is the number of 1-car garage units versus 2-car garage units in the phases. Every 2-car garage unit adds two parking spaces to the parking total. Everyone has stuff, so when a 2-car garage owner has two vehicles and can only fit one in the garage they use one additional outside space. When a 1-car garage/2 car owner, has the same amount of stuff but does not use their garage for parking, then they use 2 outside parking spaces. Those two particular phases (Somerset and Kensington) have more 1 car garage units on average and fewer outside parking stalls than the other four phases. Yorkshire, on average, has adequate parking, but Somerset and Kensington are below that average.

Yorkshire Parking Statistics:

Phase & garage type	Living Units	Garage Parking	Parking Stalls	Total Parking	Spaces per unit	Additional Stalls per Unit
Somerset 2-car=16 1-car=16	32	48	23	71	2.22	.72
Stirling Pl. 2-car=36 1-car=11	47	83	31	114	2.43	.66
Kensington 2-car=8 1-car=16	24	32	22	54	2.25	.92
Coventry 2-car=32 1-car=14	46	78	37	115	2.52	.8
Hampton 2-car=16 1-car=16	32	48	24	72	2.25	.75
Penhurst 2-car=33 1-car=12	45	78	33	111	2.47	.73
TOTALS	226	367	170	537	2.38	.75

2 car garages = 141

1 car garages = 85

City Ordinances:

When people are upset about a parking problem they often are frustrated and feel they deserve an additional parking space. Some people believe that city ordinances require it. In an effort to clear up any confusion surrounding this, we have checked with the city and determined what the ordinances are. In speaking with Logan City officials we learned that for a development like Yorkshire, the regulations say that there should be an AVERAGE of 2.25 parking spaces per unit. The 2.25 spaces include garage parking and 0.25 spaces for visitor parking. City officials clarified that this number has to do with total parking numbers and averages. There is no regulation that says that each unit must be assigned parking or that each unit must have access to a parking stall close to, or near, their unit. The development team that built Yorkshire followed Logan City guidelines and Logan City approved the development and parking as it now exists. At present, Yorkshire has an average of 2.4 parking places per unit.

Decision Criteria:

In order to judge the current situation and proposed parking proposals, we have listed a number of criteria that either will have an impact, or will be impacted by any potential parking changes. These are defined and explained below. Each of these criteria will then be addressed for each proposal.

Construction Costs: This involves how much it will cost to construct any physical modifications that will be necessary to implement the plan. Costs that will be passed along to the homeowners.

Administration Time and Costs: This outlines the time and cost of the people needed to administer any proposed parking solutions.

Policing Time and Costs: This details the time and cost to police and regulate any proposed parking solution.

Flexibility: This explains the proposed plan's impact on residents' and visitors' flexibility to be able to park in any stall at any time.

Seasonal Impediments: This details whether the plan will impact the ability of Yorkshire contractors -i.e.: Snow removal, trash collection and any other contracted service.

Community Goodwill: This attempts to gauge any impact that a proposal might have on the community's attitude or goodwill. For example, will the plan foster or detract from goodwill between neighbors.

Equitable: This judges a proposal to determine if it is equitable to all Yorkshire residents.

Ease of Use: This examines whether a proposal will make it physically easier or harder to drive in and out of Yorkshire. Implicit in this is that a road that is more difficult to navigate may also result in more parking accidents involving other cars or buildings.

Resale: This category gauges potential impact that a proposal might have on the overall resale value of the Townhomes.

Proposed Solutions:

1. The Current Situation:

Parking in Yorkshire is currently open for all residents and visitors to park in parking stalls on a first come first serve basis. Current restrictions involve booting cars that are not registered and are permanently parked without moving. A booting service was contracted primarily to take care of these non-registered (stored) vehicles and also vehicles that park behind garages. In the past, there have been a number of complaints that people could not get in or out of their own garages because someone was parked next to or behind their garage. The booting service has eliminated this problem with no additional cost to Homeowners Association members.

Construction Costs: None

Administration Time and Costs: None

Policing Time and Costs: Minimal to None

Flexibility: Maximum

Seasonal Impediments: None

Community Goodwill: Does not detract from existing goodwill. The animosity over booting is offset by fewer problems with people parking behind other people's garages.

Equitable: Being first come, first served is equitable in that everyone has an equal chance to any parking stall.

Ease of Use: Maximum

Resale: Stated parking problems could have an impact on resale values. However, every owner bought a unit in Yorkshire with the situation pretty much as it is now.

2. Assigned Parking:

In this proposal each unit is assigned a parking space. Since there are not enough to assign one extra outside stall to each unit then this proposal would have to mean one extra stall assigned to 1-car garage units only.

Construction Costs: The cost of identifying the assigned stalls

Administration Time and Costs: It would take some time, discussion and wrangling to determine which stall would be assigned to which unit and to mark the stalls appropriately. Another cost would be to North HOA Management for assigning and handing out the permits.

Policing Time and Costs: Policing this proposal could be potentially time consuming and would result in more cars being booted.

Flexibility: Very Little. This will reduce flexibility of all residents greatly.

Seasonal Impediments: None

Community Goodwill: Reduces. This proposal would reduce community goodwill with people feeling upset about their assigned spot or the fact that they were not assigned a spot.

Equitable: No

Ease of Use: No impact

Resale: Could impact negatively those who do not have spaces.

3. Parking Behind Garages:

In this proposal people would be able to park behind garages. Since parking behind someone else's garage would cause chaos, this proposal must mean that people can only park behind their garage. City space regulations would prohibit 1 car garage units from parking behind their own garages and garbage collection would prohibit some 2 car garage units from parking behind their garages. This would limit the benefit to certain 2 car garage units only. Some parking would be gained.

Construction Costs: Identifying and painting these parking stalls.

Administration Time and Costs: None

Policing Time and Costs: There would be some policing involved in this but most of the problems would be dealt with by booting.

Flexibility: This would add to the residents flexibility.

Seasonal Impediments: YES. This proposal would essentially be prohibited during the winter months because snow removal services will not remove snow with people parked behind garages. This limits their effectiveness in actually doing their job and greatly increases the risk of parking and snow removal accidents with parked cars. Garbage collection could also impact this proposal because of an increased risk of accidents (The city may actually refuse to do garbage collection if the trucks are unable to get in and out without risking damage to cars parked behind garages). Additionally some phases have a narrower access which would make this option unusable.

Community Goodwill: Could cause unnecessary contention between neighbors with difficulty turning and backing out of garages with cars parking behind garages.

Equitable: No

Ease of Use: Reduces the ease of use because of the increased difficulty in driving through the parking areas. There will also be greater difficulty in actually parking behind a garage because in some instances it would be akin to parallel parking.

Resale: The dedicated spot could help those who can park behind their garage but the increased difficulty of driving through congested areas may detract from resale value.

4. Purchasing Stalls:

In this proposal people would be able to purchase their own extra stalls. It is unclear if this proposal is a stall buy-out or a yearly purchase/lease fee. It is likely the fees would be prohibitively high because at present all parking areas are common areas and other owners would need to be compensated for 'selling' the parking space to another owner.

Construction Costs: Identifying and painting these parking stalls.

Administration Time and Costs: Setting up the system would take some time and investment. We would have to pay someone to handle the administrative work when stalls become available for resale and also keeping track of who owns the stalls.

Policing Time and Costs: There would be some policing involved in this but most of the problems would be dealt with by booting.

Flexibility: Reduces

Seasonal Impediments: None

Community Goodwill: Reduces. Those who cannot purchase will be impacted, especially if they have a 1-car garage unit and are unable to afford paying for an outside spot. It would be

difficult to preserve and monitor guest parking so it doesn't get overrun by Yorkshire residents who do not pay for parking. No guest parking at all would be very inconvenient for most people, especially in the winter with no overnight street parking.

Equitable: No

Ease of Use: No change

Resale: Could affect 1-car garage units more upon resale. Here is one scenario: Current owner does not need an outside spot, so why would they pay the money for it? However, they go to sale sometime in the future and prospective buyers need an outside spot but may not have a way of getting one if they are already all taken. Would have to figure out if a leased space would or would not be passed with the sale of a unit.

5. Creating Additional Stalls on Penny Lane:

In this proposal additional parallel parking stalls would be created on Penny Lane. This would require actual construction and would add an insignificant number of stalls (only 8 additional stalls). Since people are sometimes reluctant to walk to the next phase to park, the actual impact of this type of parking would be minimal.

Construction Costs: Significant. The curb would have to be moved back, trees removed and resurfacing done. Stall identifying and painting would also be required.

Administration Time and Costs: None

Policing Time and Costs: There would be some policing involved in this but most of the problems would be dealt with by booting.

Flexibility: No change

Seasonal Impediments: Some winter impediments with snow removal.

Community Goodwill: Nuisance for unit owners living on Penny Lane who are backing out of their garage.

Equitable: No change

Ease of Use: May impact traffic/driving on Penny Lane.

Resale: Little change

6. Buying Land and Creating Parking:

In this proposal the homeowners association would purchase land and build parking. Financially this would require an increase of homeowners dues and is completely dependent on the land owner's willingness to sell (The field east of Yorkshire is the only open space that could lend itself to this proposal). Since people are sometimes reluctant to walk to the next phase the actual impact of this type of parking would be nullified.

Construction Costs: Very large.

Administration Time and Costs: Very little after construction.

Policing Time and Costs: Some, if other developments try to park there.

Flexibility: In reality minimal improvement. The stalls would require significant walking which actually reduces its flexibility.

Seasonal Impediments: None

Community Goodwill: Little Impact

Equitable: No change

Ease of Use: No change

Resale: Little impact

7. Issuing Fines for Not Using a Garage:

Do semi-annual or yearly checks and issue fines to those who cannot park in their garages. Or maybe only do checks on two car garages. If you cannot fit at least 1 car in the garage a fine would be issued. With the frequent turnover in rental units it would be difficult to keep up to date on garage use.

Construction Costs: None.

Administration Time and Costs: Possibly some if this needs to be outsourced to North HOA.

Policing Time and Costs: Time to police the garages, including coordinating with residents to open their garage, and issue fines.

Flexibility: Yes, residents can still use the parking lots when doing temporary projects in the garage or a garage door is awaiting repair.

Seasonal Impediments: None

Community Goodwill: Some, if not all units are willing to open their garages for checks.

Equitable: No change

Ease of Use: No change

Resale: Minimal

Final Summation, Findings and Recommendations

The only solution that provides the maximum benefit in the most areas is the current solution. Other solutions seem promising to the individual, but for Yorkshire as a whole they would not provide a significant enough benefit to justify their implementation. Truth is, that parking is what it is. There is enough parking in Yorkshire as a whole. For some residents at certain times of the day this may mean walking to/from another phase, but this is the reality of townhome living.

In conclusion, it would be most beneficial to emphasize:

- *Neighborly Courtesy by Cleaning Out and Parking in Garages:* This is the solution to the parking problem. People should clean out their garage so that they can park in their own garage. Cars that are not used on a regular basis or are not in driving condition should be stored or kept off of the property to provide maximum parking for residents. Storage facilities may offer a discount for customers that sign a yearly contract.