

2020 October 01 Calgary Planning Commission Discussion

SUMMARY OF CPC DISCUSSION

Calgary Planning Commission communicated strong support for removing minimum parking requirements as it provides cost savings and flexibility for businesses. Commission provided comments on items to consider for future work such as electric vehicles and bicycle parking that will support the renewed Land Use Bylaw.

Comment/Question	Administration's Response
Future Work	
Have you considered electric vehicles?	Transportation is looking into charging stations. No regulations are presently proposed in the Bylaw amendments, as it would be premature. EVCs will be considered with "Future Work".
Glad that residential is being considered with future work.	Comment received.
Multifamily rental and ownership have different demand characteristics; rental usually lower than ownership (condo). If minimums will still be enforced, look at research to benchmark lower minimum requirements for purpose built rental projects.	Comment received. Need to look at the use versus user aspect.
Low and Multi-res development: Examine a ratio of parking stall reductions for provision of onsite car share programs in multifamily (or commercial, for that matter). Usually considered X stalls reduced per car provided onsite. Roundsquare (South Calgary) and Jemm (Bridgeland) have both pioneered this type of reduction in Calgary context. Greater Vancouver municipalities have programs like this as well.	Comment received.
Bike/E-scooter parking: when zero parking or large parking reduction is considered, ensure that other modes are reasonably accommodated onsite. Ensure increases in bike parking to accommodate additional demand is driven by research and data on increase in demand for other modes.	We will be discussing this with SMEs in Transportation and considering this with Future Work.
Bicycle parking should not be a direct relationship to parking. People keep their bikes in their	Comment received.

apartments. Walking is happening more, so there may be too many bike spots. Be careful of this.	
Sites that are constricted in terms of access and loading – recommend that you look at loading zones in the front on the street.	Curb management and loading, our future work and strategy will look into this. We are going in that direction and curbside management strategy – initial look at downtown then elsewhere. Still maintain the public realm.
Regarding parking maximums – a lot of commercial buildings had a parking requirement and then allowed to build ½ and the other ½ was in cash-in-lieu. Undersupply of parking for office buildings and not keeping up with demand has led to high cost of parking. May want to consider lifting maximums and this limitation. Flip side, there could be a supply and demand situation.	Calgary has a cash in lieu program in the downtown that did have changes to the conditions of the program (in terms of the ½ the number of required parking stalls with the other ½ as cash in lieu). With the pandemic, we want to take a bit more time to get it right. Need to work with our partners regarding the cash in-lieu program as part of Future Work.
Should we create incentives for no parking in TODs?	Comment received.
Implementation/Process	
Elimination of parking minimums. Applications still need to rationalize their parking needs. Will Administration base decisions on the soon to be deleted ratios?	Administration will be able to request a parking study through a discretionary review, and can enforce the results of the parking study, however there will be no reference to the soon to be deleted parking ratios.
Can the Development Authority still ask for parking? Electric vehicles – by 2050 all vehicles would need to be electric or alternative vehicles and so we have been looking at where the infrastructure should be located (at homes, etc.), as long as we can continue to ask for stalls, then this should be okay.	Yes – the Development Authority can ask for parking through a discretionary application. Highlighting that the DA can only require parking for discretionary uses, but as trends change, existing buildings would likely strive to have EVC Stations.
Key Highlights bylaw Matrix – existing rule versus proposed: Is this a different way of accessing the same info?	Yes – housekeeping to put all parking requirements within one table, instead of having them located throughout the Commercial Districts.
Downtown is excluded, what about the Beltline? Is it expanding existing elimination of parking minimums to other uses? Any lessons learned from the Beltline?	Beltline is included. Yes, this will mean expansion of existing uses in the Beltline that do not require parking. Had conversations with the parking strategists and they have noted it was a success.

<p>Parking at council and SDAB not being mentioned – is that realistic? They always talk about parking</p>	<p>By removing parking minimums we hope to have the conversations not be about parking but with apps going to CPC, parking studies are already being done. No real need to question the study.</p> <p>Positive outcome is that parking and the narrative will change. Opportunity to file an appeal solely for a relaxation and based on a questionable ratio is now removed</p>
<p>General Support</p>	
<p>Super interested, and agree with other Commissioners.</p> <p>Mixed use, residential; you need to get at this. Spend so much resources on old standards.</p>	<p>Comment received.</p>
<p>Excessive parking is an economic killer pre and during COVID. We need to do better and find better solutions.</p>	<p>Comment received.</p>
<p>This is a great initiative to align supply with demand in a better way.</p>	<p>Comment received.</p>
<p>Biggest impact will be for tenants fitting into existing buildings. Not a lot of new buildings in the inner city at the moment and more in developing areas. The amendments will help novel uses move into existing buildings.</p>	<p>Yes, we have heard similar positive feedback, including from the Business and Local Economy Team.</p> <p>No longer a prohibitive parking requirement to go into a space.</p>
<p>As a firm, we have been pushing to eliminate parking minimums so this is welcome and long overdue.</p> <p>Parking impedes walkability, opportunity costs, and makes sense to do this and we are catching up (Buffalo, Edmonton and Beaumont). Needs to translate quickly to mixed use and multi. More supply demand model – modal options are coming up.</p> <p>Don't see any additional items but it should be a priority and massive design implications due to parking requirements.</p> <p>This work is linked to the renewed LUB work.</p>	<p>Comment received.</p>