

PLANNING SERVICES STAFF REPORT

For Planning Commission Meeting of November 5, 2025

SUBJECT: Amendments to Unified Development Code (Chapter 55 of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor) related to Bicycle Parking Requirements

PROPOSED CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MOTION

The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve amendments to Chapter 55, Unified Development Code, Section 5.19 to simplify and update the required parking tables and to make the design of bicycle parking facilities more user-friendly.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommend **postponing** the proposed amendments to Section 5.19 that revise the required bicycle parking and design of bicycle parking spaces to the November 18, 2025 meeting to update public hearing notices with additional parking sections and to incorporate feedback from the Planning Commission regarding simplified required vehicle parking tables.

BACKGROUND:

The Planning Commission and staff identified improvements to the City's bicycle parking requirements and standards given the City's goals to increase bicycle ridership and to enhance usability, design, and accessibility of bicycle parking. Staff and Commissioners discussed possibilities for updates at the January 28, 2025 meeting of the Ordinance Revisions Committee (ORC). Based on the feedback received, staff held meetings with community groups, conducted site visits, reviewed parking guides, and consulted bicycle parking ordinances in other cities. Staff presented a summary of this further research and draft language at the July 22, 2025 meeting of the ORC. The research, findings, and draft language from both ORC meetings are attached.

While preparing the proposed ordinance language for bicycle parking, the opportunity arose to also simplify vehicle parking requirements tables. The existing tables are unnecessarily unwieldy, even when the bicycle parking requirements are separated. Since minimum parking requirements were removed, Table 5.19-1: and Table 5.19-2 only regulate electric vehicle requirements (which are often the same across land uses) and maximum parking limits (which only affect a handful of land uses). Therefore, staff is also proposing condensed vehicle parking requirements tables that follow the simplified structure of the proposed bicycle parking tables, while carrying forward requirements that meet the City's parking goals. This proposed amendment is to make the required parking table more user-friendly. No major substantive changes are proposed to the vehicle parking requirements.

SUMMARY:

The attached amendments, initiated by staff, propose the following changes to bicycle parking requirements:

- A simplified required bicycle parking table with barrier-free parking requirements, increased requirements for multi-family developments, and decreased requirements in downtown districts
- Language clarifying acceptable locations for all classes of bicycle parking
- A reformatted design of bicycle parking facilities section to clarify requirements for each parking class, including dimensional standards and other requirements to make racks more user-friendly
- Language clarifying access requirements and encouraging wayfinding signage

The attached amendments, initiated by staff, propose the following changes to vehicle parking requirements:

- Separating the vehicle parking requirements from the bicycle parking requirements and condensing the required vehicle parking table.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS:

Required Bicycle Parking and Design of Bicycle Parking Facilities –

Proposed Amendment	Additional Information and Notes
Table 5.19-1: Required Parking is separated into two tables, one for vehicle parking requirements and one for bicycle parking requirements. Similarly, Table 5.19-2: Special Parking District Requirements is separated into two tables.	<p>In new bicycle parking requirements tables, the listed land uses (that match the former table and permitted use tables in Section 5.15) are collapsed into categories (also matching former table and the use tables) to condense the new table where requirements are the same.</p> <p>The number of required bicycle parking spaces is updated for some land use categories. In particular, the number of required spaces for multi-family residential is increased to provide additional parking for cyclists, following other cities' requirements. The number of required spaces in D1 and D2 districts is decreased because of the existing parking in the area and proximity to services.</p> <p>Barrier-free bicycle parking requirements are added in the table footnotes.</p>
The requirements for design of bicycle parking facilities are updated to make facilities more accessible and user-friendly.	<p>Specifying that space-saving rack designs may only comprise one-third of required bicycle parking.</p> <p>Editing Table 5.19-5: Bicycle Parking Dimensional Standards, to remove the vertical clearance column (this is now included in the Class B standards) and add dimensions for barrier-free spaces.</p>

	<p>Adding language to make racks more user-friendly, and specifying that wave racks, school yard racks, and wheelwell racks do not count towards bicycle parking requirements (See Fig. 19-1 below).</p> <p>Specifying that bicycle parking should be evenly distributed across a site.</p> <p>Encouraging wayfinding signage to direct users to bicycle parking facilities when they are not immediately visible from the building entrances.</p>
<p>The three classes of bicycle parking have been separated into their own subsections for clarity and to include class-specific requirements.</p>	<p>Class A parking has been updated to require routes to parking spaces to be striped if they are shared with vehicles. Specifications have been added to make routes easier to maneuver for users walking with their bikes, including requirements for hallway width and number of doors along the route, among others. Additionally, language has been added to clarify that required parking may not be provided within units.</p> <p>Class B parking has been updated to include vertical clearance requirements and to require spaces to be no more than 50 ft from main building entrances.</p> <p>Class C parking has been updated to require spaces to be no more than 50 ft from main building entrances and to ensure placement of racks does not impact pedestrian circulation.</p>

Fig. 19-1: Prohibited Bicycle Parking Racks (source: 2024 AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities)



Additional proposed amendments to bicycle parking requirements –

- In Section 5.19.5, language regarding access from bicycle parking spaces to public streets, private streets, or alleys is added for clarity.
- Alternatives and waivers have been added to provide flexibility for bicycle parking requirements in unusual circumstances such as large sites, irregularly shaped sites, and sites with unusual topography.

- The primary and accessory uses that currently require no bicycle parking have been moved to the alternatives section since the required parking table has been simplified. These uses still have no required bicycle parking.

Required Vehicle Parking –

After Table 5.19-1 was divided into two, an opportunity was presented to collapse the individually listed land uses into categories as well to simplify the required vehicle parking table. Since many land uses currently have no parking maximum and the same or similar electric vehicle parking requirements, these uses were combined into categories (that match the former table and permitted use tables in Section 5.15). This provides a more useful table set up and does not substantially change parking maximums or EV requirements.

Condensing Electric Vehicle Requirements in Tables 5-19.1 and 5-19.3: In general, the most commonly used percentage breakdown for EV-C and EV-I requirements in the current table are carried forward in the condensed categories. For land uses that had significantly different requirements, a separate row was included in the proposed table to retain those requirements. For example, most commercial uses in the current table have an EV-C requirement of 25%-40% and EV-I requirement of 5%-15%. However, hotels and bed breakfast have an EV-C requirement of 75% and EV-I requirement of 25%. Therefore, hotel and bed and breakfast uses are not combined into a general category in the proposed table. They are included in a separate row to keep the higher requirements. Land uses that had requirements of 25%-40% and 5-15% are combined into “all other commercial uses” with the same EV-C and EV-I requirements.

Condensing Parking Maximums in Tables 5-19.1 and 5-19.3: Where no parking maximums exist, the land uses were combined into categories. Staff proposes limited changes to the maximum requirements for some of the land uses:

- There are no substantive changes to the residential uses category since none of the individual land uses had a maximum limit in the former table.
- Only a few of the public/institutional uses had a maximum limitation (Designated Marijuana Consumption Facility; Museum, Art Gallery; Library). For simplicity staff proposed to eliminate the maximum limitation of these rarely occurring land uses.
- Two commercial use categories (Recreation, Entertainment and Arts; Retail) had maximum limits which are carried forward in the proposed table.
- Four of the five uses in the Office and Research category have a maximum limit. For two of these, the limit is 1/180 sf and for the other two, the limit is 1/250 sf. Staff proposes the same limit of 1/250 sf for all four uses. The fifth use (Laboratories, Research, and Development) will continue to have no maximum limit moving forward.
- No substantive changes are proposed to the transportation use requirements.
- Only a couple of the industrial uses had a maximum limitation (Marijuana Microbusiness; Marijuana Grower). For simplicity, staff proposed to eliminate the maximum limitation of these rarely occurring land uses.
- Accessory land use requirements will follow the requirements of the primary uses.
- Temporary land uses will have no maximum limit or EV requirement.

Additional proposed amendments to vehicle parking requirements –

- Language has been added to Section 5.19.2 to clarify that there is no longer a minimum vehicle parking requirement in the City.

Prepared by; Mariana Melin-Corcoran, City Planner
Reviewed by; Hank Kelley, Deputy Planning Manager and Alexis DiLeo, Principal Planner

Attachment: Draft Ordinance (Bicycle Parking)
7-22-25 ORC Staff Memo
1-28-25 ORC Staff Memo