



MOTION SHEET

CITY COUNCIL *of* SALT LAKE CITY

TO: City Council Members

FROM: Nick Tarbet, Analyst

DATE: September 30, 2014

RE: Drive-through Service Windows - Petition: PLNPCM2009-00169

Council Sponsor: **Luke Garrott**

MOTION 1

I move the Council adopt an ordinance enacting chapter 5.07 – Drive-Through Facility Regulations and amending Section 21A.40.060 - drive-through facility regulations, pursuant to petition No. PLNPCM2009-00169.

MOTION 2

I move the Council reject an ordinance enacting chapter 5.07 – Drive-Through Facility Regulations and amending Section 21A.40.060 pertaining to drive-through facility regulations, pursuant to petition No. PLNPCM2009-00169.





COUNCIL STAFF REPORT

CITY COUNCIL *of* SALT LAKE CITY

TO: City Council Members

FROM: Nick Tarbet, Analyst

DATE: September 30, 2014

RE: Drive-through Window Service
Petition: PLNPCM2009-00169

PROJECT TIMELINE:

Briefing: April 22/July 15/ Sept 16, 2014

Set Date: April 1, 2014

Public Hearing: April 22/July 15, 2014

Potential Action: September 30, 2014

Sponsor: Council Member Luke Garrott

NEW INFORMATION

During the September 16 briefing, the Council expressed support for Council Member Garrott's recommended changes to provide access for bicyclists to drive-throughs during business hours. This revised proposal is different from the first ordinance because businesses with drive-through facilities would not be required to allow pedestrians on foot to use the drive-through.

After the drive-through briefing, Council staff spoke with members of the Restaurant Association and some owners of restaurants with drive-throughs. They wanted these points of concern to be presented to the Council again. They believe:

- The proposed changes will cause safety issues between cars and bikes in the drive-through, especially in the early morning and at night.
- This will increase their costs because their insurance rates will go up.
- Could cost jobs due to increased business costs, i.e. insurance increase.
- Some suggested they will not consider building a restaurant in Salt Lake City.
- They still do not see the demand for this service.
- **“When you think of a cyclist in the drive-through, think of a mother with her kids or with a child-trailer.”** This is a safety issue they are very concerned about.



Motorcycles in Drive-Throughs

During the briefing, Council Member Luke asked if staff would find out if motorcycles are currently allowed in drive-throughs. The Restaurant Association provided this response:

“...Most of the drive through restaurants do allow motorcycles. Motorcycles are heavy enough to trigger the menu board. Motorcycles have lights, are licensed and are required to have insurance. None of these standards does a bicycle meet. Most have responded with the above information which I hope you find helpful.”

Request for Additional Public Comment

Council Member Rogers requested that Council Staff reach out to local businesses and organizations to find out their thoughts on the proposal. The follow is a summary of comments received through the help of the Downtown Alliance, Local First and the **City’s Business Advisory Board**.

About 10 comments were submitted. A few did not address the drive-through question; they instead expressed general concerns about biking in the city.

Comments in support

- I am in favor of modifying the statutes to allow two wheeled vehicles (i.e. bicycles, and motorcycles) access.
- **Bikers bring their bikes into banks and fast food restaurants already. What’s so bad about driving them up on the outside? I’m for bikes in the drive-ins.**
- I really see absolutely nothing wrong with allowing bikers to use drive though lanes.
- I think it would be great to be able to go through drive-throughs on my bike, especially at places that close their lobby's and are drive-thru only for certain hours, like fast food places and banks.

Comments expressing opposition

- I oppose pedestrians using drive thru windows because of risk of robbery. I oppose bicycle use of drive throughs because it is difficult to manage a bag of food on most bikes and it is impossible to eat and ride a bike or drink a soda safely. I feel this would encourage unsafe behavior.
- A drive thru has not been used for bikes. It is much more dangerous with vehicles bumper to bumper. Let's not add to a guest and business' safety risk.
- With regard to the proposed city drive through ordinance, as a business owner, I am wondering why these decisions are made by the city versus the individual business owners. Shouldn't each business have the right to decide their own drive through policies and regulations?
- In my case I ride a bike a lot and take my bike into each of these places. I would feel uncomfortable in a fast food line with my bike! Also I think it may create hazards for pedestrians and bikes and cars in the slow lines for fast food or other mixed lines.

The following information was provided for the September 16 briefing. It is provided again for background purposes.

During the July 15 continued public hearing, six individuals spoke about the proposed changes. A couple expressed support for the proposal citing improvements to walkability and bikeability. The remaining individuals expressed concern that the proposal would place an unnecessary burden on businesses, increase costs and create safety issues.

The public hearing was closed and action was deferred to a future Council meeting.

A follow-up briefing is scheduled for September 16. The next meeting for the Council to consider taking action is on September 30.

In early August, Council Members Garrott and LaMalfa meet with representatives from the Restaurant Association and some owners of drive through facilities. During this meeting, many of the same concerns that have been expressed and outlined in this staff memo were discussed. The major concerns expressed by the group pertained to safety and liability issues regarding potential accidents between motorized vehicles and bicyclists or pedestrians in the drive-through; and lack of demand for the service.

Revised Proposal

Council Member Garrott is proposing a revised draft of the ordinance that would provide access for bicyclists to a drive-through during business hours. This is different from the first proposal because businesses with drive-through facilities would not be required to allow pedestrians on foot to use the drive-through.

The revised ordinance includes the following changes:

Changes that will affect existing drive-throughs (and future development)

Title 5 - Business Taxes, Licenses And Regulations

A new chapter of 5.07 – Drive Through Facility Regulations would be enacted. Any business with a drive-through facility will be required to conform to the provisions of this chapter.

5.07.010: PURPOSE:

The regulations of this chapter are intended to allow all patrons of a business who arrive on a bicycle to have equal access to a drive-through window facility.

5.07.030: ACCESSIBILITY:

During business hours, a business in a building with a drive-through facility shall be accessible to all customers whether they arrive in a motor vehicle or on a bicycle.

Changes that will affect future drive-throughs and significant remodels

Title 21A – Zoning

Amendments to this chapter include the following items:

21A.40.060.B:

Applicability and Permit Requirements

These regulations shall apply to all new drive through facilities, any rebuild or replacement of an existing structure containing a drive through facility or modification to an existing building that includes altering the location of an existing drive through window, expands the floor area by 25% or more of the gross floor area or 1,000 square feet, whichever is less and/or the parking requirement increases as required by this title. The complete replacement of a building containing a nonconforming drive through are subject to Chapter 21A.38 Nonconforming Uses and Noncomplying Buildings.

21A.40.060.D.5.a:

Accessibility.

- a. During business hours, facilities with a drive-through shall provide service to walk-up customers either through the lobby, the drive-through window or a walk-up window.

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment A

Revised Draft of Proposed Ordinance

The following information was provided for the July 15 public hearing. It is provided again for background purposes.

On April 22, 2014 the Council held a public hearing pertaining to the proposed drive-through window amendments. At that time, the Council decided to continue the public hearing until after the Council discussed the proposed changes during a work session briefing.

The Council is scheduled to discuss the proposed changes during the July 15 work session. The continued public hearing is also scheduled for that date.

Six individuals spoke during the April 22, 2014 public hearing. Comments from the public included safety concerns such as; window robberies, increased risks to pedestrians, cyclists, and service providers. Others said that the proposal would have a negative impact on business including potentially requiring early closures and building modifications, increased costs due to additional staff needed to keep the dining area open, impact on **employee's** salaries/business revenues, and increased insurance costs.

During the month of May, representatives from the Restaurant Association and various businesses that would be impacted by the proposed changes met with Council Members Rogers, Mendenhall and LaMalfa. The group expressed opposition to the proposed changes. They cited safety concerns for employees and customers, increases in business costs including; labor, security, remodeling and insurance. Generally, they expressed the opinion that there is not a demand for this service. They requested the Council table this proposal and asked if they could meet with the Council to devise other ways to address any concerns about drive-through service.

Additionally, the Risk Manager for the Utah Restaurant Association sent a letter outlining what they feel are the safety hazards of opening drive-throughs to pedestrians and cyclists. ***Please see Attachment D.***

The City's Business Advisory Board discussed the proposed changes during their May meeting. They sent a letter to the Council expressing their concerns. *Please see Attachment E.* Although the Board supports the City's general efforts to increase walkability they do not support the drive-through proposal for the following reasons:

- safety concerns;
- negative economic impacts to businesses;
- lack of demand for the service; and
- the City should not dictate how a business should be run.

Both the Restaurant Association and the Business Advisory Board asked that the Police Department review and comment on the proposed changes. The Police Chief provided the following comments on the proposed changes:

“There are several Cities across the nation that prohibit walk-up traffic through drive-through vendors during night-time hours. Some areas have seen an increase in robberies where this has been allowed. Clerks have been subject to incidents that they would not normally be subjected to from pedestrians. The Police Department is not opposed to walk-up traffic in the downtown areas. While we have not seen a dramatic increase in crimes within the Salt Lake City area, we should approach all ordinances being aware of downsides and the possibility of increased associated disorder. “

The following information was provided for the April 22 public hearing. It is provided again for background purposes.

ISSUE AT-A-GLANCE

Proposed changes to drive-through service windows would allow patrons to have equal access to services from businesses with drive-through facilities, regardless of whether they arrive on foot, bicycle, in a motor vehicle or via another mode of transportation. These changes have been proposed with the goal of creating a walkable and sustainable community, inclusive of all City residents and visitors.

Initially, staff had suggested incorporating **all proposed changes in the City's** zoning ordinance. However, staff then realized that existing businesses would not be subject to the equal access change. Therefore, it is now proposed to include the amendments in two sections of City code: Title 21 A- Zoning and Title 5 - Business License Requirements

21A.40.060 - Drive-through facility regulations (Future construction & significant remodeling)

Design standards to improve pedestrian access would include:

- Direct pedestrian entry through the front of the building shall be provided from public streets and sidewalks to the building entrance. Crossing driveways, stacking lanes or parking areas shall be avoided.
- Well-articulated pedestrian routes and zones shall be provided on the site, linking building entrances and parking areas.
- Decorative paving, or similar material, complimented by landscaping, shall be used where appropriate to delineate these linkages

Existing businesses would not be subject to these proposed regulations as legal nonconforming uses. However, any future developments would be subject to the new requirements. **According to the City's code**, "A nonconforming use that lawfully occupies a structure or lot may be continued so long as it remains otherwise lawful, subject to the standards and limitations" in chapter [21 A. 38 - Nonconforming Uses And Noncomplying Structures](#).

Additionally, the drive-through section proposal includes the reordering of the drive-through facility chapter.

Title 5 - Business License Requirements

The operation requirements of businesses with drive-throughs, would include the standard that during business hours, a business must be accessible to all customers.

- During business hours, a building with a drive-through facility shall be accessible to all customers either through the drive-through, a walk-up window, in the dining room or by other means, notwithstanding whether they arrive on foot, bicycle, in a motor vehicle or another mode of transportation.

Council Staff is working with the Attorney's Office and the Administration to determine where the business licensing section of this proposal would best fit in Title 5.

POLICY QUESTIONS

- Would the Council like to have the amendments which would affect Title 21A be reviewed by the Planning Commission?

The Council is legally entitled to act on this petition without returning it to the Planning Commission. These proposed amendments to drive-through accessibility have not been reviewed by the Planning Commission. This proposal was raised after the petition was transmitted to the Council Office. The Council has the authority to accept, reject or modify recommendations of the Planning Commission as long as they are within the scope of the petition. However, since this proposal would create many nonconforming uses, would the Council like the Planning Commission to provide a recommendation?

ADDITIONAL & BACKGROUND INFORMATION

In November 2013, the Council adopted extensive revisions to the City's Land Use Tables. As part of that project, drive-through standards were reviewed and amended. However, at the time of adoption, the Council voted to further study possible amendments pertaining to drive-through service facilities in order to consider changes that would make drive-throughs more accessible to patrons who are not in automobiles. The Council adopted the original amendments to the land use tables, but elected to delay the decision on drive-through standards so they could solicit public feedback.

In addition to the accessibility item, other standards for drive-throughs are being considered that would improve pedestrian access and safety of future drive-through developments. These provisions include: direct pedestrian entry through the front of the building - facing the street and clearly delineated pedestrian routes linking building entrances to the parking areas and public sidewalks.

If the Council adopts the proposed design standards for a business, only new businesses, or businesses undergoing extensive remodeling, will be required to comply. An existing business will not be required to reconfigure their site for these new standards, unless they undergo extensive remodeling.

A letter was sent out to businesses in Salt Lake City who currently operate a drive-through and other stakeholders were notified through email distribution lists for review and comment. The letter introduced the topic, informed people of the public hearing on April 22 and identified the various ways to submit public comments to the Council. The topic was posted on Open City Hall. To date over 60 comments have been submitted. The Council Office has also received a handful of emails on the topic. Below is a summary of the comments received.

Comments in support

- This proposal would make SLC more bike/pedestrian friendly.
- Promotes a greener city.
- This will help air quality because it will eliminate idling and encourage more people to ride bikes.
- This could help keep drunk drivers off the road because people can walk to a drive-through instead of having to drive.
- Some comments suggested an outright ban for all drive-throughs.
- Some expressed support for the design standards for pedestrian access in parking lots and to the public sidewalks.
- Access and service for all is a good idea.

Comments in opposition

- This is government overreach, classic over-regulation.
- Let the market – supply and demand - dictate if there are enough people who will use a walk up window, not the government.
- Business should be able to decide their own hours and how they provide service - based on economics and security.
- This hurts businesses because it will raise costs – will require additional staff and architectural changes to buildings.
- Safety concerns for workers.
- Will encourage more robberies/thefts.
- Existing businesses may find it difficult to balance new service requirements with their risk management goals.

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment A
- Attachment B

**Open City Hall / Email Comments
Draft of Proposed Ordinance**

CC: David Everitt, Karen Hale, Art Raymond, Holly Hilton, Eric Shaw, Mary De La Mare-Schafer, Cheri Coffey, Nick Norris, Michaela Oktay, Lex Traughber, Orion Goff, Les Koch, Larry Butcher, Margaret Plane, Paul Nielson, City Council Liaisons, Mayors Liaisons

File Location: Community And Economic Development Dept., Planning Division, Zoning Text Amendment, conditional & permitted land use tables, outdoor dining and drive-through window service zoning regulations

SALT LAKE CITY ORDINANCE
No. _____ of 2014
(Enacting drive-through facility regulations)

An ordinance enacting Chapter 5.07 (Drive-Through Facility Regulations) of the *Salt Lake City Code*.

WHEREAS, the Salt Lake City Planning Commission held a public hearing on September 26, 2012 to consider a request made by Salt Lake City Mayor Ralph Becker (Petition No. PLNPCM2009-00169) to amend various sections of Title 21A (Zoning) of the *Salt Lake City Code* to revise and relocate land use tables, to amend certain definitions, to amend regulations concerning outdoor dining, and to amend provisions regarding drive-through service windows; and

WHEREAS, at its September 26, 2012 meeting, the planning commission voted to transmit a positive recommendation to the Salt Lake City Council on said application; and

WHEREAS, the city council held a public hearing on this matter on November 12, 2013 at which the city council approved some proposed amendments and voted to study additional issues concerning drive-through facilities; and

WHEREAS, after additional study of drive-through facility issues, the city council has determined that adopting this ordinance is in the city's best interests.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it ordained by the City Council of Salt Lake City, Utah:

SECTION 1. Enacting Salt Lake City Code Chapter 5.07. Chapter 5.07 of the *Salt Lake City Code* (Drive-Through Facility Regulations), shall be, and hereby is, enacted to read as follows:

Chapter 5.07
DRIVE-THROUGH FACILITY REGULATIONS

5.07.010: PURPOSE:

The regulations of this chapter are intended to allow all patrons of a business who arrive on a bicycle to have equal access to a drive-through window facility. ~~to have equal access and service regardless of whether they arrive on foot, bicycle, in a motor vehicle or another mode of transportation.~~

5.07.020: APPLICABILITY:

Any business with a drive-through facility shall conform to the provisions of this chapter.

5.07.030: ACCESSIBILITY:

During business hours, a business in a building with a drive-through facility shall be accessible to all customers either through the drive-through, a walk-up window, in the dining room or by other means, notwithstanding whether they arrive ~~on foot, bicycle,~~ in a motor vehicle or on a bicycle another mode of transportation.

5.07.040: NOISE LEVELS:

Noise emitted from a drive-through facility (such as remote ordering equipment at outdoor menu boards at fast food restaurants) shall not exceed the levels as established by the Salt Lake Valley health department. Noise generating equipment includes, but is not limited to, items such as speakers, mechanical car washes, vacuum cleaners, and exterior air compressors.

5.07.050: AIR QUALITY:

Idle Free signs shall be posted at drive through facilities pursuant to Chapter 12.58 of this code.

SECTION 2. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective on the date of its first publication.

Passed by the City Council of Salt Lake City, Utah, this _____ day of _____,
2014.

CHAIRPERSON

ATTEST AND COUNTERSIGN:

CITY RECORDER

Transmitted to Mayor on _____.

Mayor's Action: _____ Approved. _____ Vetoed.

MAYOR

CITY RECORDER
(SEAL)

Bill No. _____ of 2014.
Published: _____.

HB_ATTY-#40437-v1-Ordinance_Title_5_drive_thru_amendments.DOCX

LEGISLATIVE VERSION

SALT LAKE CITY ORDINANCE
No. _____ of 2014
(An ordinance amending Section 21A.40.060
of the *Salt Lake City Code* pertaining to drive-through facility regulations)

An ordinance amending Section 21A.40.060 (Zoning: Accessory Uses, Buildings and Structures: Drive-Through Facility Regulations) of the *Salt Lake City Code* pursuant to Petition No. PLNPCM2009-00169 to amend provisions regarding drive-through facilities.

WHEREAS, the Salt Lake City Planning Commission held a public hearing on September 26, 2012 to consider a request made by Salt Lake City Mayor Ralph Becker (Petition No. PLNPCM2009-00169) to amend various sections of Title 21A (Zoning) of the *Salt Lake City Code* to revise and relocate land use tables, to amend certain definitions, to amend regulations concerning outdoor dining, and to amend provisions regarding drive-through service windows; and

WHEREAS, at its September 26, 2012 meeting, the planning commission voted to transmit a positive recommendation to the Salt Lake City Council on said application; and

WHEREAS, the city council held a public hearing on this matter on November 12, 2013 at which the city council approved some proposed amendments and voted to study additional issues concerning drive-through facilities; and

WHEREAS, after additional study of drive-through facility issues, the city council has determined that adopting this ordinance is in the city's best interests.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it ordained by the City Council of Salt Lake City, Utah:

SECTION 1. Amending text of *Salt Lake City Code* section 21A.40.060. That section 21A.40.060 of the *Salt Lake City Code* (Zoning: Accessory Uses, Buildings and Structures: Drive-Through Facility Regulations), shall be, and hereby is, amended to read as follows:

21A.40.060: DRIVE-THROUGH FACILITY REGULATIONS:

A. Purpose:

The regulations of this section are intended to allow for drive-through facilities by reducing the negative impacts they may create. Of special concern are noise from idling cars and voice amplification equipment, lighting, and queued traffic interfering with on site and off site traffic and pedestrian flow. The specific purposes of this section are to:

1. Reduce noise, lighting, and visual impacts on abutting uses, particularly residential uses;
2. Promote safer and more efficient on site vehicular and pedestrian circulation;
3. Reduce conflicts between queued vehicles and traffic on adjacent streets.

B. Applicability and Permit Requirements:

1. These regulations shall apply to all new drive through facilities, any rebuild or replacement of an existing structure containing a drive through facility or modification to an existing building that includes altering the location of an existing drive through window, expands the floor area by 25% or more of the gross floor area or 1,000 square feet, whichever is less and/or the parking requirement increases as required by this title. The complete replacement of a building containing a nonconforming drive through are subject to Chapter 21A.38 Nonconforming Uses and Noncomplying Buildings.

~~1.2.~~ Drive-through facilities may be authorized as accessory uses to permitted uses or conditional uses as listed on the tables of permitted and conditional uses set forth in part III of this title, specific district regulations for residential, commercial, manufacturing, downtown, gateway, and special purpose districts when developed in accordance with the standards of this section.

C. Additional Application Materials Required:

In addition to the site plan and standard application requirements as set forth in chapter 21A.58 of this title, an applicant for a business with drive-through facilities shall submit a site plan that includes: a parking and circulation plan, driveway locations, placement of audio equipment (if this type of equipment will be used) and a litter cleanup plan. A litter cleanup plan shall address litter cleanup on site and off site and shall include, but not be limited to, a litter pick up schedule and a map of the cleanup area.

~~D. Findings Required For Approval:~~

~~The approval of a drive-through facility shall require that the review authority first make all of the following findings:~~

- ~~1. The proposed location of the drive-through facility will not result in adverse impacts upon the vicinity after giving consideration to a litter cleanup plan, the hours of operation, noise and light generation, traffic circulation, and the site plan;~~
- ~~2. The proposed parking and circulation plan will provide adequate area for safe stacking and maneuvering of vehicles, and the site design will provide adequate buffering of the use from adjoining land uses;~~
- ~~3. When a drive-through use adjoins any residentially used or residentially zoned property, a minimum six foot (6') high masonry wall or solid fence shall be erected and maintained along such property line;~~
- ~~4. A traffic study addressing both on-site and off-site traffic and circulation impacts may be required as part of the permit application.~~

DE. Standards.

1. Stacking Lane Standards:

These standards ensure that there is adequate on-site maneuvering and circulation areas, ensure that stacking vehicles do not impede traffic on abutting streets, and that stacking lanes will not have nuisance impacts on abutting residential lots.

a1. Gasoline Pumps: A minimum of thirty six feet (36') of stacking lane is required between a curb cut and the nearest gasoline pump;

b2. Other Drive-Through Facilities:

ia. Primary Facilities: A minimum of one hundred twenty feet (120') for a single stacking lane or sixty feet (60') per lane when there is more than one stacking lane, is required for all other drive-through facilities. A stacking lane is measured back to the point of service or final service window. Stacking lanes do not have to be linear.

iib. Accessory Facilities: A stacking lane is not required for accessory facilities where vehicles do not routinely stack up while waiting for the service. Examples are window washing, air compressor, and vacuum cleaning stations;

iii3. Stacking Lane Design And Layout: Stacking lanes must be designed so that they do not interfere with parking and vehicle circulation; and

iv4. Stacking Lanes Identified.:- All stacking lanes must be clearly identified, through the use of means such as striping, landscaping, and signs.

2F. Traffic Circulation Requirements.:-

a1. Only one driveway providing vehicular access to and from the drive-through window or service area shall be provided from any ~~local street, as defined in the major street plan of the Salt Lake City transportation master plan;~~

b2. The driveway providing access to the service windows shall be at least fifty feet (50') from the back of the curb of an intersecting street measured to the centerline of the proposed driveway; and

c3. Internal traffic circulation patterns on the lot shall be adequate to keep traffic from backing into a street or blocking access to any required parking spaces located on the lot.

d. A traffic study addressing both on-site and off-site traffic and circulation impacts may be required as part of a permit application for a drive-through facility.

3G. Noise Levels.:- Noise emitted from drive-through service windows and related features (such as remote ordering equipment at outdoor menu boards at fast food restaurants) shall not exceed the levels as established by the Salt Lake Valley health department. Noise generating equipment includes, but is not limited to, items such as speakers, mechanical car washes, vacuum cleaners, and exterior air compressors.

4. Air Quality. Drive through facilities shall post Idle Free signs pursuant to Chapter 12.58 of this code.

5. Accessibility.

a. During business hours, facilities with a drive-through shall provide service to walk-up customers either through the lobby, the drive-through window or a walk-up window.

a-b. Direct pedestrian entry through the front of the building shall be provided from public streets and sidewalks to the building entrance. Crossing driveways, stacking lanes or parking areas shall be avoided.

b-c. Well-articulated pedestrian routes and zones shall be provided on the site, linking building entrances and parking areas.

e-d. Decorative paving, or similar material, complimented by landscaping, shall be used where appropriate to delineate these linkages.

E. Findings Required for Approval.

The approval of a drive-through facility shall require that the review authority first make all of the following findings:

1. The proposed location of the drive-through facility will not result in adverse impacts upon the vicinity after giving consideration to a litter cleanup plan, the hours of operation, noise and light generation, traffic circulation, and the site plan;
2. The proposed parking and circulation plan will provide adequate area for safe stacking and maneuvering of vehicles, and the site design will provide adequate buffering of the use from adjoining land uses;
3. When a drive-through use adjoins any residentially used or residentially zoned property, a minimum six foot (6') high masonry wall or solid fence shall be erected and maintained along such property line;
4. The site plan meets the accessibility standards required in this section.

SECTION 2. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective on the date of its first publication.

Passed by the City Council of Salt Lake City, Utah, this _____ day of _____, 2014.

CHAIRPERSON

ATTEST AND COUNTERSIGN:

CITY RECORDER

Transmitted to Mayor on _____.

Mayor's Action: _____ Approved. _____ Vetoed.

MAYOR

CITY RECORDER
(SEAL)

Bill No. _____ of 2014.
Published: _____.

HB_ATTY-#37765-v1-Ordinance_drive_thrus.DOCX

LEGISLATIVE VERSION

Drive-through regulations

What do you think of proposed changes to Salt Lake City Development Standards for Drive-Through Facilities?

All On Forum Statements sorted chronologically

As of September 25, 2014, 9:31 AM



As with any public comment process, participation in Open City Hall is voluntary. The statements in this record are not necessarily representative of the whole population, nor do they reflect the opinions of any government agency or elected officials.

Drive-through regulations

What do you think of proposed changes to Salt Lake City Development Standards for Drive-Through Facilities?

Introduction

What do you think of proposed changes to Salt Lake City Development Standards for Drive-Through Facilities?

The Salt Lake City Council is currently considering development standards for drive-through service windows. Keeping in mind the City's goals of creating a walkable and sustainable environment, and being inclusive of all City residents and visitors, the proposed changes would allow all patrons to have equal access and service regardless of whether they arrive on foot, bicycle, in a motor vehicle or via another mode of transportation.

Due to the fact that many drive-through windows stay open longer than the dining room, it is proposed that some improvements to drive-through service accessibility be examined. The Council recognizes there may be some limitations due to insurance considerations. Therefore, as an alternative, property owners could provide service through other means; such as having a designated walk-up window or making dining room services available during the same business hours as drive-through services.

It is proposed that the following amendment be included in the development standards for drive-throughs:

Accessibility of Service: During business hours, a building with a drive-through facility shall be accessible to all customers either through the drive-through, a walk-up window, in the dining room or by other means, notwithstanding whether they arrive on foot, bicycle, in a motor vehicle or another mode of transportation.

The Council is seeking comments and suggestions. We want to hear from business that would be affected by the proposed changes.

Drive-through regulations

What do you think of proposed changes to Salt Lake City Development Standards for Drive-Through Facilities?

As of September 25, 2014, 9:31 AM, this forum had:

Attendees:	420
On Forum Statements:	60
All Statements:	95
Hours of Public Comment:	4.8

Drive-through regulations

What do you think of proposed changes to Salt Lake City Development Standards for Drive-Through Facilities?

Name not shown in District 7

July 20, 2014, 10:44 PM

Recently at the Burger King on 33rd South and Highland Drive, a guy on a motorcycle zoomed up along my passenger side where my 83 yr-old mother was sitting and just as I entered the intercom area coming south through the parking lot going 5 mph, he proceeded to drive right ahead of me swerving and looking over HIS shoulder as if I was in the wrong. He wasn't anybody to honk at or mess with but it scared both me and my Mom sooo bad and were very appalled that HE took the attitude of being macho and irate with me just proceeding at no increased speed when he did this to me: daring me to hit him????!!!! I saw the SAME exact person at the Parleys Way Walmart a few days later driving a car after his trip to the store and I was alone and STILL very afraid of him....Q. If I could have THIS kind of experience with a revengeful-type on a motorcycle what would even walkers and bicycle-riders who are capable/prone to the same kind of attitudes when trying to over-compensate for not having a car act like????!!! It makes much more sense for that group of people not driving cars to "park their attitudes as well as their modes of transportation other than cars" than it would to re-define "Drive Thru" and in my case: not to be "Driven Over" by a motorcyclist PLUS being stared-down by one!!!!?????!!!!

Name not shown in District 6

July 20, 2014, 6:16 AM

In a free society, an owner of a business should be able to plan, create and serve whatever market segment he or she so chooses. If they want to limit their business by only having a drive up window for cars, so be it. If you walk, ride a bike or push a wheelchair, patronize the business that wants to serve you.

David Leta in District 6

July 15, 2014, 2:49 PM

I support these proposed design changes. For a variety of reasons, including reduced air pollution, encouraging a more healthy, non-vehicular lifestyle, and supporting denser, multi-use commercial and residential neighborhoods, these types of design changes show foresight and leadership. In my opinion, they are likely to lead to better and more sustainable economic development as well.

Name not shown in District 5

July 15, 2014, 1:44 PM

Street service windows or "drive-up windows" should be accessible by all: pedestrians, bicycles and vehicles. In addition, motorized vehicles should not idle at service windows.

Finny Wiggen outside Salt Lake City

July 12, 2014, 2:43 PM

Dear Salt Lake Council,

Why would I visit your city, when you are so determined to make it family unfriendly?

Drive-through regulations

What do you think of proposed changes to Salt Lake City Development Standards for Drive-Through Facilities?

First you charge for parking. Even though you are only a medium -sized town. Then you want to charge me if I idle my car. Now you want to force your restaurants to raise their prices in order to accommodate your silly fantasy about how they should run their own businesses?

You seem to forget that if I drive a few blocks in any direction I can escape your absurdity and deal with cities that are built on common sense.

It is your city. You are certainly entitled to create ridiculous policies. Fortunately you are surrounded by communities that combined are many times bigger than you, that do not charge for parking, that do not ticket for idling, and that have a far greater variety of cultural and family activities.

Like I say, you are entitled to make silly decisions. But bear in mind that most of the valley is conservative (ie we are logical) and that we will just not spend our money within the few blocks that you occupy.

Lucy Knorr in District 3

July 12, 2014, 1:28 PM

This sounds like an idea out of a great brainstorm, but one that should be left on the chalk board. It would negatively impact business in SLC and increase cost of product. The big guys can probably handle it and pass along the cost, but I doubt the small coffee drive up's can. There are several food stands open during the day and at night. Walk up to one and support a small business. Sustainability? Yeah, right. That only counts if big money doesn't sway the city's government like it did with putting totally overly priced soccer fields in sensitive wetlands.

Name not shown in District 7

July 12, 2014, 10:22 AM

I would like to see drive-through windows be required to close during red air days. If all customers had to park, turn off the engine and walk to the window, it would not only cut a level of air pollution, but send a clear message to people that idling contributes to air pollution. Those who park but continue to idle should be refused service until they go back and shut down. People think that the little bit they contribute to dirty air doesn't matter; they don't multiply that little bit by the thousands who are doing it to figure out how it all adds up.

James Guilkey in District 6

July 11, 2014, 11:14 PM

Two years ago I was in San Antonio where I'd taken a cab to my hotel following recent surgery on my eyes that left me unsafe to drive. A nearby Taco Bell was my only option for dinner, and by the time I arrived, only the drive through was still open. I walked up and after begging, they finally agreed to serve me. It opened my eyes (no pun intended) to the second class citizen status that the visually impaired and otherwise disabled face, not to mention those that can't afford or choose not to own a motor vehicle. This ordinance would help to make the same options for services available to everyone, thus I support its passage more as a civil rights issue than an

Drive-through regulations

What do you think of proposed changes to Salt Lake City Development Standards for Drive-Through Facilities?

environmental one.

john boyack in District 3

July 11, 2014, 3:56 PM

I stand in favor!

Excellent memories as a kid visiting the drive-thru with my older brother on bicycles, or by marching up to the microphone in our Adidas Gazelles for burgers and fries and Micky D's hot apple pies.

Not dangerous, inclusive. Not radical, fair. Wish to clear the air? We need many many options. Solutions. Standards for Living.

Well played. Keep it rolling, Council!

CHRISTIE BOGLE in District 2

July 11, 2014, 3:48 PM

I have worked in fast food restaurants and have been robbed at gun point. Requiring service at the window to pedestrians places the window employee at risk. The pedestrian is at a better vantage point to physically reach, touch, grab, or hit the window server or cashier than a person in a vehicle. They can more quickly and unexpectedly act on aggressive behavior or make a robbery attempt. There is less physical distance between the person at a window than at the service counter inside. The window height and the existence of curbs, car mirrors, etc. present a barrier for a car that are not barriers for a pedestrian. Without limits placed on client access, a restaurant cannot protect the employees. Walk up windows could be created with appropriate safety, as in a gas station, but these represent undue hardship for restaurants to redesign buildings for this one frivolous demand.

Name not shown in District 5

July 1, 2014, 5:30 PM

If I hear the words sustainable environment one more time I am going to puke. This coming from an administration that thinks putting as many people into as small a space as possible improves the environment or existing lifestyle. You're all nuts.

Jeremy Beckham in District 2

May 22, 2014, 10:06 PM

I support this proposal. If we want to sit back and wait for the "free market" to solve our air quality problems in this city, we'll all be dead of old age before the problem gets solved. Also, it's delusional to think that we have a car-centric culture as a result of the 'free market.' The government has played an active role in encouraging the use of personal automobiles, namely by building so much infrastructure to support the use of cars - roads, traffic lights, parking lots, meters, etc. So let's not kind ourselves. Our government does and always will play an active role in fostering an environment that encourages or discourages certain modes of transportation. I'm not

Drive-through regulations

What do you think of proposed changes to Salt Lake City Development Standards for Drive-Through Facilities?

saying that's right or wrong, it's just inevitable. Recognizing that reality, I support our city government enacting regulations to incentivize walking and bicycling. These are healthier and cleaner alternatives to the use of cars.

Earl Lewis in District 7

May 22, 2014, 1:17 PM

Accessibility at drive-throughs? Who cares? Close this and move on to more pressing matters. Spending any more time on this is a waste of my tax dollars.

Name not shown in District 6

May 12, 2014, 6:41 PM

If this passes, I intend to idle my car every chance I get just out of spite. Catch me if you can.

Stan Kairawicz outside Salt Lake City

April 28, 2014, 6:55 AM

Leave it alone, Stop fixing things that don't need fixing.

Name not shown in District 4

April 26, 2014, 9:37 PM

Only the USA has drive thru everything. Other economies do just fine without this car-centric access model for retail businesses. A better idea would be to ban drive thru altogether (for less emissions), but given that is unlikely to happen, the proposal of fair access for all is very reasonable and deserving of support.

Myron Willson in District 5

April 26, 2014, 11:08 AM

I support this discussion and hope something is enacted. As a frequent pedestrian and cyclist it is challenging to wait for service in the auto lane. If structured properly the ordinance would not have to compromise worker safety.

Name not shown outside Salt Lake City

April 22, 2014, 5:21 PM

There is too rough a crowd on the streets late at night! This would put employees at risk of robbery and or assault! I think the council should spend a week at night up in salt lake to see what kind of crowd there is up there!

Name not shown in District 6

April 22, 2014, 7:33 AM

Drive-through regulations

What do you think of proposed changes to Salt Lake City Development Standards for Drive-Through Facilities?

Our city council must have too much time on their hands to be dreaming up things like this. What about all the graffiti, vandalism, theft and violence going on out here? Doesn't anyone care about actual quality-of-life problems?

Name not shown in District 5

April 16, 2014, 10:01 PM

I love the spirit of this proposed change; a walkable, bike friendly city is something we can all get behind. However, that's really all this proposed change has, is spirit. This, respectfully, sounds like a law that really wants to be needed. It sounds like a law looking for a problem.

So, the current problem, as I understand it, is that a person who wants some Taco Bell at 2am, but cannot operate a car...or does not own one, will not be able to go south of the border until the restaurant dining room opens at 7am?? Has this very specific customer/citizen demographic been so marginalized as to need a law to rescue it from a tacoless 2am?

Acknowledging that laws are not always there to solve problems but also to influence behavior, what behavior is this promoting?? Is it the "Hey its 3am let's walk not drive to McDonald's because there is a walk-up window," behavior??

How will the law operate? Besides requiring a walk-up window to be built, will the law mandate that the walk-up window be staffed as long as the dining room is closed? At which point the council should ask itself what has led these multi-nationals to close their dining rooms after a certain hour?

Will this ordinance include banks? If not, then why? The banks would argue it's a security concern. Does a drive-through restaurant not have the same security concerns?

Again, I understand the spirit of the proposed law and which behaviors and problems it seeks to promote and solve respectively. However, I really hope the council examines this proposal through the more practical lens that the Salt Lake Council is known for rather than the more rhetorical one that this proposal actually serves.

Name not shown in District 1

April 13, 2014, 8:24 AM

This proposal is a gross violation of private property rights and far outside the proper role of government. In no way should the city council attempt to dictate such things. This is an extremely bad idea and good example of paternalistic government run amok.

Name not shown in District 6

April 10, 2014, 12:25 PM

It is interesting to read all the statements about drive-thru as related to eating establishments. As I read the proposal I see nothing limiting the requirement to restaurants. Would this not apply to banks, credit unions, dry cleaners and any other establishment with a drive-thru? This should be a business decision not one made by local government. I can see business owners making the decision to close at an earlier hour rather than have to go to the expense of having a walk-up/bike-up window. Hey, just close earlier, reduce the hours for employees and save money on payroll, payroll taxes and healthcare costs by putting everyone on part-time. Yep, *sarcasm* City Hall that will work quite well. Let's encourage businesses to relocate outside the city limits of Salt Lake City.

Drive-through regulations

What do you think of proposed changes to Salt Lake City Development Standards for Drive-Through Facilities?

Let businesses have their business model and function in ways that help them survive and add to the city. Back off city council and give business men and women the opportunity to really do business within the city.

Name not shown in District 6

April 10, 2014, 10:50 AM

To Deborah Walling. I appreciate your comments, but the notion of folks being able to bike drunk instead of drive drunk is small consolation. Be careful out there.

Name not shown in District 6

April 10, 2014, 10:41 AM

Eliminate drive-thru anything! With our lousy air quality, it's preposterous to encourage idling.

Name not shown outside Salt Lake City

April 10, 2014, 9:18 AM

I think this is a blatant government overreach. Let the private sector work on its own! If consumers find this such a necessary thing to do, let them petition or boycott the establishment and give the company a chance to respond to true consumer demands.

I think it is evil to force companies to provide these drive-through services. I strongly oppose this.

Name not shown in District 1

April 10, 2014, 8:41 AM

I agree that patrons should be serviced regardless of the means of arrival, but vehemently disagree that our City government has any business declaring what a business must do when the business owner selects how to operate the business the businessperson, not the City, owns.

It isn't mentioned, but there is no preclusion that someone arriving on horseback must also be accomdated.

Ditto a heavy truck. Quite an expense involved to make a good fit there.

If they choose to make the drive-thru available only to cars, for security reasons for example, then what compensating protection is promised by this action, and who has signed up to pay for it? Same question follows for the insurance, structural, hardscaping, and landscaping requirements. Yes those will cost plenty - just tour some of the variations which abound in SLC, (which also help create the local flavor). Imagine what it will take to make cookie-cutter approaches to any and all. Just imagine what it will do to the character of a business if that element of all business be so similar by being so closely defined.

If the originators of this were honest, they would have included in the title or description that this is another go at social engineering . A thinly disguised, untested and unproven variant, but with the end goal of supressing individuality and coercing uniformity.

Businesses have enough working against them already, and the best run survive, and even thrive. If that includes allowing pedestrians to compete with cars in the drive-thru, great. If they have found that doesn't work for them, that is a calculation they have made - knowing full well they are missing sales by not being all-inclusive. The reasons may be safety of the employees, liability issues from comingling various forms of traffic, or other reasons they choose, it is their business.

Mat Kent outside Salt Lake City

April 10, 2014, 8:08 AM

All On Forum Statements sorted chronologically

As of September 25, 2014, 9:31 AM

<http://peakdemocracy.com/1590>

Page 9 of 17

Drive-through regulations

What do you think of proposed changes to Salt Lake City Development Standards for Drive-Through Facilities?

I would ask who it is that the council is trying to put out of business. There are those that wouldn't be able to afford to make the changes required or wouldn't have the real estate for it and I'm guessing that those that can easily comply, or already accommodate for customers in this way, are lobbying for a new regulation that would help restrict their competition. In a free market you make what you have work as well as you can. If I want to start a restaurant that only has drive-through service, I should be able to do so. If you don't care for that kind of service, you have the right not to shop there. I'm not trying to be mean by not allowing you to get food the way you want, I want your money as much as you want my food. But if that's what I've decided to do, then I live with the consequences.

P Mattingly in District 6

April 10, 2014, 7:10 AM

Another bad idea from the creative minds of the progressive liberals that have taken over our city government. These socialist bent people have no concept of free enterprise and the success it has brought to this country.

If a business comes to the understanding that they are losing a lot of money by not having a special entrance just for someone who walks up or rides a bike, they will be the first to provide one. This is what an independent business capitalist does to stay in business without having a manipulative government telling him to do it.

A government should protect us from the bullies both foreign and national and provide services for the public that private enterprise probably would not like police, water and sewer and roads.

Making a law that requires a business to serve a guy coffee through a special opening who rides up in a snowstorm late at night does not qualify although an image of him riding off with a hot coffee in one hand and shifting gears with the other comes to mind.

What's next, limiting the amount of hours each day you can tie up your dog? Stay tuned. They are working on that one too.

Name not shown outside Salt Lake City

April 9, 2014, 10:39 PM

This proposal steps over the boundaries of appropriate government and crosses into violating free market principles. Every new requirement placed on a business adds to the cost of running that business, increasing the challenges to staying financially solvent and paying its employees a good wage. If there is truly a demand for walk-up services, the healthiest thing for all involved is for those desiring the service to speak personally to the manager or owner of whichever business it is. Enough voices will make a difference.

Having the county council mandate it instead is a little like running to Mom and demanding that she fix the problem for you. Learning to solve the problem yourself with the person-- or in this case, the business-- you have issues with leads to real progress. Communicating politely while you're at it helps, too.

Name not shown in District 1

April 7, 2014, 9:27 PM

Drive-through regulations

What do you think of proposed changes to Salt Lake City Development Standards for Drive-Through Facilities?

This is not a city issue. It's a free market issue. Any business that wants to have a walk up window can already have one. We don't need big government to demand it. Supply and demand stipulate that if there are enough people who will use a walk up window, then the businesses will make one to generate revenue. Leave the free market alone. The role of the city government is not to meddle in this way.

Name not shown in District 7

April 7, 2014, 4:14 PM

I think this a great idea. Salt Lake City has many bikers and walkers, I am one of them. Just the other night after last call at the bars, I wanted to go to McDonald's but I was denied food because I had walked. This has also happened to me when biking at other fast food restaurants that are open late. I think this is an obvious step needed for the city if biking is going to keep gaining popularity (bikes available for use around the city) and as we strive to reduce pollution in the city. This also promotes safe drinking for those who drink. If the only way one can get food is to be in a car at the drive thru... people are more likely to get in their car and drive drunk. Allowing pedestrians in the drive-thru will make it safer for people to get food without getting behind the wheel and protect others from drunk drivers on the road. As for security, opening the inside could be a potential problem, but not at the windows (keep them locked unless serving) and have a way of keeping track of pedestrians just like we do for cars. Pedestrians could even push a button (order now (similar to Sonic's)) so that the workers know someone has arrived. All in all I think this is a good idea, if I hadn't seen this I would've started talking to someone about this proposal as well. A city that promotes biking needs this if they are going to continue to promote that message and see the results they want.

Deborah Walling in District 6

April 6, 2014, 4:03 PM

This is a great idea, although opponents do have some legitimate concerns. While it should be relatively fair and straight-forward for fast-food business owners who are planning renovations or new construction to accommodate walk/ bike-up customers, existing businesses may find it difficult to balance new service requirements with their risk management goals. Some public comments are promoting a generous amount of time to "grandfather" existing businesses, which may be reasonable to a degree. I think there are cost-effective options to support an accelerated implementation in full consideration of safety, however. For example, businesses may require pre-payment by electronic/ mobile purchase from on-foot/ cyclist customers to remove the risk of motorists striking pedestrians/ cyclists in the drive-through lane. The electronic pre-payment would also diminish the risk of crimes against the business or injury to employees in the course of delivering purchased items to customers via an alternative door or window (other than the drive-through window). Just as many businesses require a minimum purchase amount or impose a surcharge for credit card purchases (in order to cover associated transactional costs), it would be reasonable for businesses serving late-night customers (in any mode of transportation) to impose a modest, late-night service charge. Another direction which would also have environmental benefits would be to phase-out drive-through service entirely, as idling vehicles produce unnecessary pollution. Instead of creating exceptions for pedestrians to access walk-up service, perhaps walk-up service should become the norm, with exceptions created to provide service for those who are physically unable to do so.

Eric Hamren outside Salt Lake City

April 5, 2014, 2:31 PM

Drive-through regulations

What do you think of proposed changes to Salt Lake City Development Standards for Drive-Through Facilities?

Completely in favor of having changes that allow better accessibility. Personally, I have had several occasions where I was denied service at a drive thru because I was on foot or on a bike, yet the dining area is closed. And whenever I'm on a bike, they never notice that I'm waiting to place an order and I always have to ride up to the main window, which screws up their system

Name not shown in District 2

April 5, 2014, 6:36 AM

There is a safety issue here. We currently have an issue with bank robberies. Now you want those business that stay open later to have walk-up traffic. Not a good idea. During the day the front doors are open and you can walk right in. Don't need a special window, use the front door! After hours drive-through allow for extended business hours. Without putting staff at risk. Workers clean & prep while being safely behind locked doors. Not something the city should try to enforce. If a business can make more money with a walk-up window, they would build one. Notice they do not . . .

Now, as for the walk ways not crossing driveways. This is a good idea. Too many business give the drive-through right of way at the risk of the walk-in customers.

Martin Cuma in District 6

April 4, 2014, 9:14 PM

Sounds good to me, I am tired of feeling like a second class citizen whenever I walk or bike. Most of our city's infrastructure is built around the car, it's time to change it.

Leslie Keating in District 4

April 4, 2014, 7:12 PM

Yes and then some. Not only do I think we should demand equal access for those who do not have cars but I think we should also work on getting rid of drive throughs in the city. Idling cars are one of the biggest causes of unnecessary pollution and we should be doing everything we can to decrease our air pollution. I think we should put a stop to any new drive throughs and phase out existing drive throughs in a five/ten year plan. I'm speaking as a mother of two young children who realizes that this is a sacrifice for people to get out of their cars, but the bigger sacrifice is the effects of pollution on our health.

Name not shown in District 4

April 4, 2014, 6:49 PM

Walking is my primary mode of transport and I appreciate and support this proposal. It provides another really good step towards a more pedestrian friendly city. I do believe that it could go further by beginning to limit new drive through construction in additional zones (beyond transit, etc.) and include higher requirements for idle free standards/enforcement. I am a business owners that owns two store fronts and understand the extra stretch for local business to compete in the global market. However, we all have to do our part to recapture our health and quality air. As good community citizens, business needs to and can lead the way.

Name not shown in District 7

April 4, 2014, 3:07 PM

Drive-through regulations

What do you think of proposed changes to Salt Lake City Development Standards for Drive-Through Facilities?

If driving through the driver must be required to turn off the engine if they do not have a vehicle that does this automatically (such as a Prius) as idling adds to air pollution.

Nate Housley in District 4

April 4, 2014, 2:42 PM

I like the proposal. I think more people and businesses could benefit from realizing that cars are not the only mode of transportation.

Brian Rallison in District 5

April 4, 2014, 2:40 PM

I wonder if there has been some studies done for the safety of the employees for walk-up windows that are open during late or when it is dark. I like the idea very much, I would just hope that the city is not causing more risk to people.

Name not shown in District 5

April 4, 2014, 12:58 PM

I think it would be better for us to get rid of drive thrus entirely, but if we absolutely have to have them, they SHOULD service every mode of transportation available, including feet, bicycles, skateboards and everything else.

But I would prefer to just see drive-thru's go away. It makes our city less walkable if we aren't forced out of our cars.

jeri fowles in District 4

April 3, 2014, 8:05 PM

Why are we not talking about requiring that drivers turn off their engines while at drive-thrus? Even if I had more access to a drive-thru on my bike I wouldn't want to wait behind someone who wouldn't turn off their car.

JOY DANTINE in District 1

April 3, 2014, 6:09 PM

Yes, let the restaurants decide; I trust they decided to work with the City Council in this matter that "plagues" us all. Banks and restaurants have a monopoly on drive-through "technology" whereas, this "approach" to business sense goes without saying. Access and service all and all will come. Some customers will chose to exit their vehicle and walk up to window. How grand and long overdue is this concept? If some can not read between the lines, I am highly in favor of this legitimate consideration. I trust the business partners are not as frustrated as some citizens are. Great proposal!

Name not shown in District 1

April 3, 2014, 5:54 PM

Drive-through regulations

What do you think of proposed changes to Salt Lake City Development Standards for Drive-Through Facilities?

This is good. Go for it.

Richard Madsen in District 7

April 3, 2014, 5:53 PM

Stay out of it. Its none of the council business. Let the fast food industry decide. Just keep on riding you bikes to work. Not every body wants to walk or ride a bike, or take public transportation.

Name not shown in District 5

April 3, 2014, 3:48 PM

What is it with people and their loaded adjective use? I'm down for the idea. It'd be nice to have more access for cyclists and pedestrians to areas of business. Perhaps in the future this will provide incentive to take more low cost and alternative means of getting around. Also utilizing alternative means of transportation greatly benefit the city in both economically and socially.

District 5.

Thomas Tischner in District 5

April 3, 2014, 3:43 PM

This is just one more (of MANY) ridiculously stupid ideas coming out of Becker's and the city council's control addled brains. Most people in SLC don't live in downtown apts and use cars on a daily basis. Leave it alone and let businesses and customers choose how to live. Stop trying to regulate every aspect of our lives. Are you trying to make SLC as screwed up as NYC? If so, you're on the right path.

Name not shown in District 5

April 3, 2014, 3:35 PM

City Council and the mayor should be required to do an economic impact study (impact to the regulatee) for every one of their proposed 'standards'. The benefits sought by this regulation will never happen. If you force a window for 'after hours' or walk in, the business will just shut down the drive thru, impacting 99% of the customers for the benefit of the 1% who are too lazy to walk inside. Businesses would have to spend tens of thousands of dollars for the extra windows, safety features, added inspections and mandatory assessments that will evolve around this. It is not worth it for the benefit to folks who can just walk in.

If the council wants a good project, how about regulating the traffic lights crisscrossing the city. north-south and east-west are controlled separately and it is impossible to drive across town without stopping at 7-10 signals. This causes excess start-stopping and idling, creating the horrendous SLC smog that we don't need. Do something that benefits everyone-drivers and pedestrians alike. Of course the answer to my question is that the city purposely screws up anything to do with using autos in the city to further their goal of creating an urban environment without any cars at all.

Name not shown in District 6

April 3, 2014, 1:45 PM

Drive-through regulations

What do you think of proposed changes to Salt Lake City Development Standards for Drive-Through Facilities?

Excellent idea! I'd like to see pedestrian access and crosswalks on interstate freeways as well. Equal access for all!

Don't waste your time.....and my tax dollars even discussing this.

Mike Christensen outside Salt Lake City

April 3, 2014, 1:23 PM

I feel that it is discriminatory for businesses to refuse service to people who are not arriving in a car. I don't understand how it would be financially beneficial for businesses to limit their customer bases. For example, I have seen hungry truckers turned away from late night drive through windows for walking up to the window, since their rigs are too big for the drive through windows. It's mind boggling why a business owner would want to discourage entire segments of potential patrons from being able to access the business.

Name not shown in District 5

April 3, 2014, 11:33 AM

We oppose your Drive-Through ordinance. We feel that the Accessibility component will place an undue burden on those businesses and will result in the closing of many of the late-night drive through windows that allow people—especially women and the elderly—a safer more secure method to obtain services at a late hour of the night when they are likely to feel more vulnerable, and are more vulnerable, to predators. The Mayor and City Council seem determined to control every aspect of commerce in the city, to make it comply with their vision of a city with very constricted automobile use. However, I think most of the citizens in the city want to have the benefit of the use of their cars within the city, including the option to have drive-through windows available for their convenience and safety. City Council, please focus your desire to pass ordinances on things that are important to all citizens, like reducing crime and poverty in the city (e.g., giving businesses incentives to create more jobs) instead of trying to find every nit-picky little way you can to reduce automobile use.

Name not shown in District 5

April 3, 2014, 11:19 AM

This is a terrible idea -- why even waste time on this topic.

Drive Throughs are there for a purpose and should not accommodate every possible situation (bikes, walkups, wheel chairs, kids, etc). There are huge safe issues and why force businesses to modify their stores and drive throughs to accommodate a small few. If there was a true need and a large enough market then a restaurant would remain open or provide for walk up service.

How many people have actually complained about this and requested walk up windows?

I have another great idea for SL City to waste their time on... how about any location that does not have a drive through be required to add a drive through. See how ridiculous this proposed change by the city is.

The City should really be asking, can we save money by firing the person who decided to waste TAX PAYER money even considering this topic.

Robert Barth in District 4

April 3, 2014, 9:32 AM

Drive-through regulations

What do you think of proposed changes to Salt Lake City Development Standards for Drive-Through Facilities?

This topic seems to have started a Libertarian range fire. It is so surprising that even the suggestion of any kind of regulation can set off such defensive, angry reactions... That being said, why not open this topic up further? For example, what justifies continued community support of car-centric and car-dependent businesses in the first place? The idea of community support (cross-sidewalk access, enforcement, establishing a legally justified hierarchy of protection with pedestrians and bike riders at the bottom) provided to a business catering to the convenience of automobile drivers is straight out of the mid-20th Century and is obviously increasingly unrealistic and unsustainable in our urban environment. Given Salt Lake City's many goals of restoring walkability, ensuring equal pedestrian/cyclist safety, and encouraging a more earth-friendly, human-oriented urban environment why would our city government want to support more car-dependency? I can suggest we start the discussion by considering the idea that drive-through services be made available only to those who have no other means of reaching a business - and that a disability/limited physical mobility tag be required in order to use any drive-through service in Salt Lake City.

Christi Baum in District 2

April 3, 2014, 8:44 AM

Keep your government out of business unless it's for safety. If a business wants to have different service times for different means, it is up to the customers of that business to tell them they don't like it.

Name not shown in District 7

April 3, 2014, 8:43 AM

Idling is unavoidable in a drive-through, turning on and off one's engine for six or more times damages the ignition system, I don't see how re-designing the windows would fix this problem, maybe I missed the point, Would we, then, be supposed to park, and walk to the window? Clearly there is not enough parking space in SLC. I think the sentiment behind this proposal is positive, but is not a good idea.

Name not shown in District 1

April 3, 2014, 8:27 AM

LESS GOVERNMENT IS BETTER GOVERNMENT!

Why do we need more legislation telling business owners how to run their business? Get out of my house, my business, and my life. Let me decide how my business should be ran, let me decide if I need a walk-up window, and if I should set different hours for drivers vs. pedestrians!

Why is this even up for discussion?!?

Steve Davis in District 6

April 3, 2014, 7:49 AM

Seriously, do you really want to regulate everything to death, clearly the answer is YES! Welcome to Salt Lake City, the home of the new \$10 burger. Less government is better government.

Name not shown in District 7

April 3, 2014, 7:17 AM

Drive-through regulations

What do you think of proposed changes to Salt Lake City Development Standards for Drive-Through Facilities?

Just another solutiouon looking for a problem. Another stupid idea from our eco-terrorist mayor, who does not personally follow the laws and environmentalist lifestyle he pushes onto the public. New campaign slogan: Ralph Becker: Fining you into prosperity since 2006.

Name not shown in District 5

April 3, 2014, 6:36 AM

Ridiculous. This is taking bicycle-mania much too far. But I'd suggest a deal: if SLC 1) requires owners to license every bicycle, and 2) develops regulations that define bike riders as either vehicles, pedestrians, or something else, I might support this idea. Of course, regulations would involve enforcement - maybe even ticketing cyclists who ride on the sidewalk, blow through stop signs and red lights, and cross in crosswalks while switching to traffic lanes. As long as riders' behavior is utterly unpredictable and often dangerous, I don't favor offering any additional privileges.

Name not shown in District 4

April 3, 2014, 6:20 AM

This is an idiotic idea. Salt Lake City government should better understand its role. This is an intrusion into private business that rings of gestapoism. What next? Shall we determine what hours businesses can be open? Or, tell them what they can sell? How about just making them meet customers half way to their homes so they don't have to walk so far? This goes too far in telling private business how they go to market and will deliver very little in making the city more walkable. If you want to make the city more walkable how about putting more police on foot or bicycles to at least make us feel more safe from the dozens of people begging or trying to con walkers out of money. Enforce the laws on the books now such as noise (loud motorcycles, leaf blowers, etc,) bikes on sidewalks, cars that ignore pedestrians. Enforce trash and weed codes. Before you add more laws just work on enforcing those we already have, please. Get real. Maybe all of you in planning should really spend more time walking around downtown -- not just from your car/metro stop to your office.
