



Public Submission

City Clerk's Office

Please use this form to send your comments relating to matters, or other Council and Committee matters, to the City Clerk's Office. In accordance with sections 43 through 45 of Procedure Bylaw 35M2017, as amended. The information provided may be included in written record for Council and Council Committee meetings which are publicly available through www.calgary.ca/ph. Comments that are disrespectful or do not contain required information may not be included.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY ACT

Personal information provided in submissions relating to Matters before Council or Council Committees is collected under the authority of Bylaw 35M2017 and Section 33(c) of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIP) Act of Alberta, and/or the Municipal Government Act (MGA) Section 636, for the purpose of receiving public participation in municipal decision-making. Your name, contact information and comments will be made publicly available in the Council Agenda. If you have questions regarding the collection and use of your personal information, please contact City Clerk's Legislative Coordinator at 403-268-5861, or City Clerk's Office, 700 Macleod Trail S.E., P.O. Box 2100, Postal Station 'M' 8007, Calgary, Alberta, T2P 2M5.

☒ * I have read and understand that my name, contact information and comments will be made publicly available in the Council Agenda.

* First name

Ron

* Last name

Nicolson

Email

nicolsor@telus.net

Phone

* Subject

Changes to the Residential Parking Program in the Central Business Zone (CBZ)

I represent the condo board at Chateau La Caille.

We have objections to and concerns about ending this program, which may not have been considered.

* Comments - please refrain from providing personal information in this field (maximum 2500 characters)

1) We have many elderly residents who have elderly friends, who require parking passes to help make their access to our building easier and safer.

2) Many of our residents have visitors from out of town, who require parking passes for the duration of their stay in our city.

3) Our resident building manager, Bill Lynch, points out that it is already not easy to get contractors to come downtown because of the headaches associated with parking. They include having to dash out every couple of hours to plug the Park Plus machines.

In closing, we do not believe it is fair for the city to force people to pay to visit residents of our building or to make contractors pay to park so they can do work in our building.

Thank you

CITY OF CALGARY RECEIVED IN COUNCIL CHAMBER OCT 21 2020 ITEM: <u>TT2020-0923</u> <u>Distribution</u> CITY CLERK'S DEPARTMENT
--



Public Submission

City Clerk's Office

Please use this form to send your comments relating to matters, or other Council and Committee matters, to the City Clerk's Office. In accordance with sections 43 through 45 of Procedure Bylaw 35M2017, as amended. The information provided may be included in written record for Council and Council Committee meetings which are publicly available through www.calgary.ca/ph. Comments that are disrespectful or do not contain required information may not be included.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF PRIVACY ACT

Personal information provided in submissions relating to Matters before Council or Council Committees is collected under the authority of Bylaw 35M2017 and Section 33(c) of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIP) Act of Alberta, and/or the Municipal Government Act (MGA) Section 636, for the purpose of receiving public participation in municipal decision-making. Your name, contact information and comments will be made publicly available in the Council Agenda. If you have questions regarding the collection and use of your personal information, please contact City Clerk's Legislative Coordinator at 403-268-5861, or City Clerk's Office, 700 Macleod Trail S.E., P.O Box 2100, Postal Station 'M' 8007, Calgary, Alberta, T2P 2M5.

☒ * I have read and understand that my name, contact information and comments will be made publicly available in the Council Agenda.

* First name L.J.

* Last name Robertson

Email ljrobertson@shaw.ca

Phone 4032634896

* Subject Proposed removal of minimum parking requirements from LUB

* Comments - please refrain from providing personal information in this field (maximum 2500 characters)

Please find attached correspondence updated for five additional signators:
Multi-community letter regarding Item 7.3 for Today's SPC Transportation Meeting

October 20, 2020

City of Calgary
PO Box 2100, Stn. M
Calgary AB, T2P 2M5

Dear SPC Transportation Committee Members:

Re: Municipal Development Plan (MDP) Amendments , Item 7.3

The following communities wish to comment on the proposal to remove minimum parking requirements for non-residential uses from the Land Use Bylaw. We have been told that much of this parking paradigm shift is based upon moving toward designing for people, instead of designing for cars. If this is the case, the result has been deficient in the empathy one would have expected to find in a people-centric policy. Whether dealing with aging populations, young families or those with mobility issues, it is just not realistic to ignore the essential place that vehicles play in the unique circumstances of many citizens.

We have broad memberships which allow us to canvass many conditions across the developed areas of Calgary - that diversity underlines the importance of NOT following a one-size-fits-all policy. As such, we feel it is important to include all of the input in detail as it is all informative in sculpting a rigorous parking approach – it is attached here as an appendix. Concerns have been broken out into impacts on two distinct groups, being businesses and residents. There has also been an attempt made to isolate “hot spots” that trigger problems. Finally, several potential solutions have been suggested to alleviate those problems. We are very cognizant that issues may vary from location to location so observations from both the inner-city to more outlying areas have been included.

The “Engage” survey on parking struck many as designed to elicit responses that would support a pre-determined policy. We urge Administration and councillors to review the appendix carefully and acknowledge the limitations and consequences inherent in the applicant driven policy under consideration. The named community associations would be pleased to work with the CPA to bring about a more flexible approach that would meet City goals while accommodating local conditions.

Signed by fourteen Community Associations:

Cambrian Heights Community Association	Meadowlark Park Community Association
Elbow Park Residents Association	Parkdale Community Association
Elboya Heights Britannia Community Association	Rutland Park Community Association
Hillhurst-Sunnyside Community Association	Scenic Acres Community Association
Hounsfield Heights Briar Hill Community Association	Triwood Community Association
Inglewood Community Association	University Heights Community Association
Mayfair Bel-Aire Community Association	Westgate Community Association

APPENDIX TO COMMUNITY ASSOCIATIONS' PARKING POLICY INPUT

Business impacts

- Parking availability can be a matter of perception. Certain neighborhoods may develop a reputation for parking scarcity which can affect its “shopability” rating, even for residents.
- Parking impediments change with weather, shopping volume (implies the use of a car) and access to and number of parkades.
- Flexibility on parking for commercial enterprises such as restaurants or small businesses works in the inner-city, since the standards are quite suburban and not reflective of what is really required.
- Particularly in small shopping areas, proprietors will lose customers if there is no parking; new businesses may not be supported by CA planning if there is no parking.
- An inequity exists if existing businesses had to comply with parking rules, but new ones might not have to provide any.
- Assuming that everyone will take transit or walk / bike is unrealistic in most cases. In most of our communities, there is still parking to be found somewhere in the area. Even if a community is known for limited parking, rarely will someone plan on taking other transportation.
- For some business (medical clinic or chiropractor), it's likely that people will want to drive if they aren't feeling well and most will assume they can park somewhere in the area.
- Removing the minimum parking requirement is a bonus to landlords and businesses as this is one less hurdle to realize before a business is granted a development permit.
- In Bridgeland, there is a lot of commercial parking relaxations due to the historical nature of buildings on Main Street. If every restaurant had to have bylaw requirement parking stalls, most wouldn't exist. Owners know parking is necessary so will tend to self-police in parking estimates.

Residential impacts

- Several don't believe that it is a 'right' to park in front of one's home however if the status quo changes through restricted or paid permits or pressure by multi-family developments, that may change.
- Circumstances such as small children or age may make parking rights in front of one's home a necessity.
- In R1 neighborhoods, wide lots and garages mean parking is generally available until it is restricted through secondary suites or garages rented out (illegal by the way) – this is beyond CA control.
Unlike business owners who are directly impacted by lack of parking, developers who build, then leave, have no skin in the game. They get the benefit often without paying for it.
- Construction projects, especially large ones, must have plans in place for worker parking. Such projects often occur in areas already at the tipping point for parking chaos and restrictions in place are just ignored, if not enforced.
- Most of the public are unaware of parking bylaw changes and the impact on our City in the long run. Inability to park causes stress for residents.

Problem sources

- There is no mechanism to follow-up or control parking relaxations, particularly those who buy in a reduced stall building.
- Commercial pressure tends not to be the big problem, it is granting residential permits for things like heritage apartment buildings that have no parking or underserving other residential buildings, then not monitoring the impact and dealing with it.
- Nearly as bad are buildings who provide lots of paid parking because (especially if it is employee parking (i.e., they must park somewhere) if the cost is unreasonable, it won't be used and parking spills into the residential streets instead, while the lot sits empty. Cost should be factored into the relaxation.
- Some areas have been ruined for both residents and businesses by unthought out or insular parking regulations. It can destroy quality of life and the process needs to be readdressed.
- C-train stations without parking provisions are key sources of residential spillover mayhem unless there are restricted neighborhood parking zones. Removing these restricted areas in residential areas would actually encourage vehicle use and would de-incentivize the use of transit, cycling, and walking to these destinations, which is counter to the purpose of the proposed changes for the parking bylaws. Allowing businesses to construct less than necessary parking should also come with investment in area transit service, as the primary reasons pre-pandemic Calgarians choose not to use transit, is due to low frequency, and long travel times.
- Coupling TOD with limited parking doubles the trouble for residents; how to convey to lawmakers the impact on quality of life that is borne by them through no fault of their own?
- Even when developers provide parking, it needs to be ensured that they do not charge but rather validate parking for their customers to avoid residential encroachment.
- Restricted parking zones for residents around hospitals and universities and other high traffic locations are essential and the City should not even contemplate removing them; this also holds true for C-train stations without Park 'n' Rides or high-profile transit routes.
- Parking restrictions (permit, 2-hour, etc.) are not available on demand for all the existing identified parking zones, e.g. Brentwood has restrictions in a 600 m. TOD circle, but not anywhere else. So, this protection does not exist for many who are victimized by commercial or public buildings.
- The economic viability of a commercial development can be destroyed if parking is not provided because it just won't be patronized.

Problem solutions

- **Parking is area specific and relaxations need to be determined on a case by case basis**, with input from area residents, community associations and the local business community.
- **It is essential to have an over-arching parking plan for the whole community.** Parking relaxations have a way of adding up and neither the City nor CPA keep track of the overages leading to ongoing relaxations with or without any basis for them and no accounting for the impact on the area. There is no feedback mechanism and no way to determine at what point the relaxations become excessive, i.e. have a negative effect on residents or businesses in the area. If a community has a plan with targets in place, there would be flexibility within the total to restrict future relaxations if targeted parking didn't track the reality.
- **Parking is a cost of doing business, but that doesn't mean that it has to be free for the developer.** Parking should not be a way to increase profits at the expense of nearby residents or

businesses. In most of our communities, parking is still relatively available (and “free”) for area residents or existing local businesses. A developer cannot expect to just take over that parking without incurring any costs to do so, or without providing any parking for the new development.

- **Existing businesses should have input into the parking in the area.** Firstly, they understand the current situation for things like shortages, peak hours, and so on. Secondly, they had to meet parking requirements, and new businesses should not be able to take over their existing parking spaces (if in a common mall or developed area). Finally, existing businesses should not lose customers who can no longer find parking, i.e., a chiropractor or medical professional might require that their customers be able to park very close to the business.
- **As more commercial development / businesses are placed in a community, remaining parking capacity is reduced creating a commercial parking supply problem that will then creep into residential parking problems in the area.** Requests for residential parking permits and 1 or 2 hour restricted parking close to these business areas will likely be the next response to fewer commercial parking spaces. The vicious circle can only be prevented by a forward-thinking plan.
- **Discourage residential permits in shopping areas,** since in BIAs 2 hr. restrictions fulfill the same purpose while allowing parking for the local businesses.
- **Work with the community, CA or Roads and Transportation to try to find other solutions which might be available.** One CA worked with a business across from a school with no parking anytime signs a change of parking signage to read “school days x hours only” which the applicant paid for and the CA supported the permit.
- If the minimum parking rates are ineffective at determining what is actually NEEDED or wanted, that does not mean there is too MUCH! It could just as easily mean there should be a lot more, e.g. seniors’ residences with limited stalls where the visitors are perhaps not fit enough to walk great distances, so parking is a real deterrent to visits.
- A City policy that shifts the focus from designing for cars to designing for people which is deemed a small price to pay, this is a limited viewpoint and not empathetic to those who are physically limited by the distance or process (i.e. not everyone can easily take transit).
- Retaining barrier free (accessible) parking requirements at rates comparable to today
- Expanding bicycle parking requirements
- Enhancing design requirements for parking facilities
- TOD relaxations should be supported by other measures such as free transit passes for residents and a car share service within the building.