

# Parking Standards Review Delegation June 10, 2019

Joseph A. Gaetan B.G.S

## Bio: Joseph A. Gaetan BGS

- BGS Applied Studies
- Board Member: Burlington DPC
- Board Member & Treasurer: HSCC 608
- Board Member: CCI-GHC (Canadian Condominium Institute)
- Chair: CCI-GHC External Relations Committee
- Member: CCI Ontario Legislative Committee

# Condos -Apartments -Tall Buildings

Ernie: "One of these things is not like the other"



## Condominium Corporations

- Creatures of the Condominium Act 1998 & Bill106 (Protecting Condominium Owners Act) 2015
- 4<sup>th</sup> level of government.
- Non-Profit Corporations.
- Two Types: Freehold & Leasehold.
- 660,000 condo units in Ontario (2013).
- 45-50% of new builds are now condominiums.
- 30.9% are high rise.
- Halton has appx. 690 condo corps.
- Condo Corps live with decisions handed to us by the City & Developer.

## 551 Maple as a Proxy

- 551 Maple is outside the DPA and inside TB District in proposed OP
- Demand studies of resident parking not reflective.
- Visitor demand study is reflective.
- 551 Maple is appx. 1,000 meters from COB lot 15 on Brock St.
- 225 resident parking spots (234 if 18 tandems are counted as 2 spots)
- 8 of the 225 spots are surface spots
- 47 visitor spots (2 of which are accessible)

## Three Bears-Goldilocks Demand Study ?



## Map Showing DPA in green



## Response to Staff Comment- Report PB43-19

- Comment: "Party rooms, guest suites and visitor lounges trigger increased use of visitor parking areas".
- Staff Response: *"Party rooms and guest suites are for the use of building occupants. These guests would use the allocated visitor parking"*.
- While the proxy site has adequate parking on most days of the year this comment was meant to be taken within the context of buildings that have little to no visitor parking. (The following charts show the parking impact for various situations).

## Amenity Impact-Parking Supply - Proxy site

Amenity	People/Capacity	Events Per Annum	Assumptions
Lounge	42	45	1 spot/2 visitors
Party Room	150	49	1 spot/2 visitors
Guest Suite	2	88	1 spot per occurrence
Moving Elevator	1	149	Variable

## Service Impact - Parking - Proxy Site

Service Proxy Site	Frequency	Service Personal	Frequency
Pool Service	Daily	PSW	On call
Superintendent	1x 5 days/wk	Housekeeping	On call
Security	1 x 24X7X365	Painting	On call
Housekeeping	2 x Daily	Packages/Food/Grocery	Daily/365
Property Mgr.	1x 5 days/wk	Yoga & Zumba	Weekly
HVAC Service	1-3 X 3 days/week	Misc.	On Call
Elevator Service	1 x On call		
Mail/PKG	1x 5 days		
Vendors Misc: Gym etc	? X On Call		

## Civic and Municipal Event Impact

Civic Event	# Days	Municipal	# Days
New Years	3	Sound of Music	7
Family Day	3	Rib Fest	3
Victoria Day	3		
Canada Day	3		
Civic Holiday	3		
Thanksgiving	3		
Christmas week	5		

## Visitor Parking Rate Analysis and Projections based on Proxy Site for Apartments & per PB43-19

186 Base Unit Comparison	Existing Parking Rate .35	Recommended Rate City Wide .25	Intensification Max. Rate .25	Intensification Min. Rate .25
Projected	65	46.5	46.5	46.5
Actual 551 Proxy	45	45	45	45
Accessible 551 Proxy	2			

## Apartment Parking Spot Comparison & Projections Based on # B.R's @ Proxy site & PB43-19

Bedrooms based on 186 unit Proxy site	Existing Parking Rate	Proposed City Wide Rate	Actual Proxy Site	# of Bedrooms at Proxy Site
1 BR	46.25	37	Note	37
2 BR	<del>231</del> 267	<del>192.5</del> 222.5	Note	<del>154</del> 178
3 BR	75.5	64.5	Note	43
Total Spots	<del>352.5</del> 388.5	<del>294</del> 325	225-234	

### Impact: Bi-Annual Power Wash & Sweep

- Occurs between the hours of 8 a.m. and 4 p.m.
- All vehicles (appx 218) parked in underground spots must be removed.
- 7 of our 45 visitor spots are set aside for visitors and or service.
- A lottery is held to determine who gets the remaining 40 spots.
- The balance or 146 residents fend for themselves.
- Most tall buildings will perform this service

## Car Share

- Highly supportive of Car Share with conditions.
- Current COB TDM approach has not resulted in car share.
- Barriers To Implementation: A major barrier is the need to establish and maintain a critical mass of users (typically 30 members or more) in individual neighborhoods. Carsharing cannot develop until enough potential users in each area are familiar with the concept, understand how it can benefit them, and are willing to commit themselves to a Carshare organization. This often requires education and marketing. Carshare organizations often require seed money to become established. (Source TDM Encyclopedia Victoria Transport Institute)

## Car Share Cont'd

- Carsharing is more cost-effective than owning or leasing for cars used less than 7,000 to 10,000 miles per year, depending on location (Litman 2000; Reynolds and McLaughlin 2001; Calgary Alternative Transportation Cooperative n.d.).
- Buy in by 300 participants city wide could theoretically support 10 vehicles
- Communities with successful Car Share Co-ops: Kelowna, Saskatoon, Winnipeg, Regina, Okanagan.
- Benchmark candidate, Modo incorporated in 1997 [www.modo.coop](http://www.modo.coop).
- Recommend COB develop a Car Share Strategy that includes fulsome consultation with stakeholders.



## Dedicated Service Spots

- Dedicated spots may introduce new issues and problems
- Support a ratio based on built form type, condo type etc.
- Recommendation for Condo Corps: Establish a rate and let condo corp. manage

## Bundling vs Un-Bundling

Issues:

May exacerbate a bad situation.

Success dependent on parking rate (i.e intensification vs city wide).

Condo environment - less flexibility after turnover.

How will parking spot inventory be managed, first come or other?

Key to Successful Unbundling:

“This measure is most feasible in medium to high density locations where there are viable public transit options”.

(Parking Management: A. Global Context 2.3.4 p 6)

## Something to Think About !

- C.O.W, May 13, 2018: “Municipal Supply has reached its effective capacity”.
- PL150274 ADI Decision:[151]The first of these matters deals with the concerns of the Participants regarding the reduction in the parking that is required. While the Board understands the apprehension of the Participants, the Board is satisfied that the City decision to reduce the requisite parking standard for parking spaces per unit is reasonable and fully in keeping with the direction from the PPS 2014 and the GGH 2017 for development that emphasizes transit use and is transit-supportive.

## Recommendations

- Consider area specific parking guidelines for DPA and or within intensification areas depending on built form mix.
- Consider a mix of bundling & unbundling vs. one or the other.
- Develop and implement a city-wide car share strategy and action plan.
- Develop a blended parking rate for visitor/service spots that considers built form and ownership type.
- Defer final decision on adopting standards to allow for more in-depth consultation with stakeholders.
- Develop a decision tree for new builds based on agreed upon criteria and hierarchy of needs.
- Consider a building block approach starting with x spots for accessible needs, then add in service then apply standard.

# Thank You



## Source Material

- Victoria Transport Public Institute. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.vtpi.org/tadm/>
- Victoria Transport Public Institute: Understanding Transport Demands & Elasticities
- Translink: Parking Management Working Papers, 2013
- Parking Issue and Policies Transport and Sustainability, Vol 5 87-113
- The Canadian Parking Association: Will that be a parking space for the new condo or something useful? May 21 ,2019
- The Metro Vancouver Apartment Parking Study Revised Technical Report, 2012
- The Strongest Case That Excessive Parking Causes More Driving, City Lab, Eric Jaffe Jan 12, 2016
- City of Toronto Staff Report on Condo Consultation May 30,2014
- Carsharing: A guide for Local Planners : Cohen, Shaheen, McKenzie