



Summary of Engagement

Residential Parking Program



Contents

Contents	2
1 Executive Summary	3
2 Engagement Activities.....	4
2.1 Online Survey #1	4
2.1.1 Intended Audience	4
2.1.2 Data Limitations	4
2.1.3 What We Heard	4
2.2 June 2019 Open Houses	10
2.2.1 Intended Audience	10
2.2.2 Data Limitations	10
2.2.3 What We Heard	10
2.3 Online Survey #2	12
2.3.1 Intended Audience	12
2.3.2 Data Limitations	12
2.3.3 What We Heard	12
2.4 November/December 2019 Open Houses	27
2.4.1 Intended Audience	27
2.4.2 Data Limitations	27
2.4.3 What We Heard	27

1 Executive Summary

Some residential areas in Saskatoon experience significant on-street parking congestion, usually generated by a nearby hospital, educational institution or business district. The Residential Parking Program (RPP) Bylaw was established to designate certain streets as residential parking zones which limit non-resident parking to a short period of time.

With the rapid growth in the city in recent years, demand for on-street parking has increased. A comprehensive review of the RPP was required to identify revisions to the bylaw that will better address current needs and pressures. The review included engagement of residents, businesses and institutions that have first-hand knowledge of the program. This input will play a critical role in identifying appropriate and necessary program change.

The objectives of the RPP Review were to:

- address issues raised while accommodating the original intent of the program;
- establish efficient and appropriate zone creation and modification processes;
- confirm appropriate permit types, fees and eligibility criteria; and,
- identify opportunities to improve and/or automate administrative and operational processes.

There were two phases of public engagement for this review. The first phase, held in June 2019, included five public open houses and an online survey. The purpose of this phase was to collect public input regarding concerns and suggestions for the current program. These consultations inform potential amendments to address issues that were identified in the consultations.

The second phase of public engagement included four public open houses and an online survey held in November/December 2019. The purpose of this phase was to validate what was heard in the first phase of engagement and to collect feedback on proposed draft amendments. The input received during this second phase will be considered as amendments are finalized.

2 Engagement Activities

2.1 Online Survey #1

The first online survey was open for public input from June 3rd through June 30th, 2019. There were 382 responses.

2.1.1 Intended Audience

The stakeholder groups included the following:



- Residents, businesses and organizations in and around Residential Parking Program zones; and
- The general public.


2.1.2 Data Limitations

- Online surveys are not inclusive to those with limited computer or internet access. To mitigate this limitation, paper copies of the online survey were available at the open houses.



2.1.3 What We Heard




Zone Establishment and Modification







Eligibility of Permits







Those respondents who responded “Other” generally reiterated one of the available response options, or clarified their selection of one of the available options.

Permit Cost



Scheduling of Restrictions








For those who would like to see changes to scheduling, some common themes were:


- Some parking generators create parking congestion during evenings and weekends that are not covered by current scheduling; and
- All RPP zones should have restrictions in place at all times.

Enforcement





Other



Those who would like to see some aspects of the program automated using technology primarily offered the following suggestions:

- Online permit purchases and renewals;
- Automated enforcement and permit recognition; and
- Enhanced communications.

2.2 June 2019 Open Houses

There were five open houses held in or nearby current RPP zones in June 2019. The purpose of these open houses was to provide information about the program and the review, and to solicit input on issues with the current program. Participants provided their input verbally to the project team members who took notes, and by leaving their own notes on a provided display boards for comments. In total, there were 108 attendees.

2.2.1 Intended Audience

The stakeholder groups included the following:

- Residents, businesses and organizations in and around Residential Parking Program zones; and
- The general public.

2.2.2 Data Limitations

- Attendance at some open houses was limited.

2.2.3 What We Heard

Common themes from the input received are listed below.

Zone Establishment and Modification

- RPP zones do not adequately fix the parking issues caused by parking generators;
 - Parking generators should have greater responsibility for providing clients and employees with adequate, affordable parking;
 - Residential areas effectively become “parking lots” for parking generators;
- Block by block designations rather than strategically designating a larger area simply pushes the problem to the next block;
- The designation process is too infrequent and inflexible to mitigate parking issues stemming from transient sources (e.g., construction);
- A parking permit does not guarantee a spot near a permit holder’s home;
- Better communication from the City during the petition/designation process is needed to increase awareness of the process and increase understanding of the implications;
- President Murray Park is a good example of how the City could consider non-residential block faces during the designation process;
- The petition process can be a challenge, especially in areas with a high proportion of renters;
- It is a difficult process to remove a zone that is no longer needed; and
- Residents of multi-unit buildings with 5 or more units are not consulted or communicated with during the designation process.

Eligibility of Permits

- Small businesses and other organizations (e.g., non-profits) near parking generators have similar parking issues as local residents;
- Visitors and contractors can have difficulty finding parking;
- Permits should be transferable between vehicles; and

- Off-street parking for those in multi-unit buildings is often expensive and insufficient for accommodating the vehicles of all residents (or their visitors), so current eligibility for multi-unit buildings is not adequately helping these residents.

Permit Cost

- Some were frustrated that they are tax payers but are expected to also pay to park on-street;
- Many people felt the current fees were fair; and
- Some felt parking within the zones should be free for residents and those coming into the zone to park should be the ones who pay.

Scheduling of Restrictions

- Some areas (e.g., near hospitals) would benefit from restrictions on evenings and weekends;
- Some areas (e.g., near schools) do not need restrictions during the summer months; and
- Some felt restrictions should be 24/7.

Enforcement

- Need better enforcement on general parking rules (e.g., distance to the curb, distance from alleyways, etc.);
- Some people move their vehicles within the zone throughout the day to evade enforcement;
- More enforcement is needed in areas directly outside the RPP zones; and
- Some feel that there are people abusing the system by selling their permits to others for a profit.

Other

- Some confusion over elements of the program, such as the petition process or scheduling of restrictions;
- Parking congestion in RPP zones can create other issues (e.g., safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists, curbside waster pickup, traffic congestion from those looking for spots, etc.);
- Better transit and active transportation routes would alleviate the need for parking at parking generators;
- People commute within a zone to save walking the extra blocks, which causes worse day-long parking congestion the closer one gets to the parking generators;
- Revenue collected through permit fees and fines should be directed to the RPP program in that zone; and
- The City should have the authority to make common sense decisions and exemptions rather than strictly follow policy.

2.3 Online Survey #2

The second online survey was open for public input from November 15th through December 13th, 2019. This survey solicited feedback on a number of proposals meant to address issues heard during the June engagements. Some of the draft proposals include potential options, of which respondents were asked to indicate a preference. There were 87 responses.

2.3.1 Intended Audience

The stakeholder groups included the following:

- Residents, businesses and organizations in and around Residential Parking Program zones; and
- The general public.

2.3.2 Data Limitations

- Online surveys are not inclusive to those with limited computer or internet access. To mitigate this limitation, paper copies of the online survey were available at the open houses.

2.3.3 What We Heard


Proposal 1 – Zone Designations (Process)

Continue to initiate designations with a block petition and application. After review and confirmation of the issue, the City will assist in identifying an appropriate boundary for expansion. The review will include consideration of the parking issue, layout of the roads and public input.

There are two potential options for how the City could assist with the petition process with this proposal:


Option A – The City provides a copy of the required streets and addresses for the residents to lead the petition process; or

Option B – The City takes a direct role in confirming support from the additional residents in the proposed boundary.




Those who did not fully agree with the proposal provided comments. Some of the more common themes included:

- Parking zone designations should be based on objective parking reviews conducted by the City rather than resident petitions;
- Some expressed confusion regarding the process; and
- Some questioned the roles of landlords and renters in the petition process.



Proposal 2 – Zone Designations (Non-Residential Block Faces within the Zone)

When designating RPP zones, consider the need for inclusion or restriction of non-residential areas at the same time (e.g., parks, school grounds).



Those who did not fully agree with the proposal provided comments. Some of the more common themes included:

- Residents in the area should take priority; and
- There should be some unrestricted parking in these neighbourhoods.


Proposal 3 – Permit Limits

Limit the number of permits per address to 3 residential permits.

There are two potential options for how this limit could be implemented:


Option A – With proof of residency and ownership (driver's license and vehicle(s) registered to occupant).

Option B – One permit per resident driver to a maximum of 3 per residence.




Those who did not fully agree with the proposal provided comments. Some of the more common themes included:

- Some felt that a limit of 3 would be too restrictive for dwellings with more than 3 drivers / vehicle owners (e.g., larger families, dwellings with multiple suites, etc.); and
- Others felt the limit should be lower than 3 since the on-street parking space in front of most lots would not accommodate that many vehicles.



Proposal 4 – Adjacent Properties to RPP Zones

Allow properties that are directly adjacent to the RPP zone to be eligible for permits to the zone.




Those who did not fully agree with the proposal provided comments. Some of the more common themes included:

- Block faces adjacent to an RPP zone that are experiencing parking congestion should go through the petition process to be included in the zone rather than being eligible without going through the process; and
- Making adjacent properties eligible for a permit in the neighbouring RPP zone will increase congestion within the zone.

Proposal 5 – Permit Fees

Retain current fees of \$25 + tax for RPP zone permits and \$15 + tax for Limited RPP zone permits.




Those who did not fully agree with the proposal provided comments. Some of the more common themes included:

- Several felt it should be free for residents / taxpayers to park in front of their residences;
- Some suggested it should be the non-residents who park in the zone who should be paying a fee; and
- Some felt the \$25 / \$15 fee structure is not enough to cover the costs of the program.

Proposal 6 – Non-Residential Permits


Add 3 permit types to legalize past practices and address requests from residents.

1. Non-profits / Institutions
 - These will continue to only be granted under exceptional circumstances where they are providing a community service and can be accommodated. These arrangements will be negotiated based on the individual unique situations.
2. Contractors
 - Create a permit for contractors of 1 temporary permit up to 30 days a year with proof of work in the area (longer term / larger projects can utilize the Right of Way permit).
3. Businesses
 - There are two options being considered for business permits:
 - Option A – 2 permits, which is consistent with past practice.
 - Option B – 3 permits, which considered issues in other jurisdictions and is consistent with the proposed limit for residential permits.




Those who did not fully agree with the proposal provided comments. Some of the more common themes included:

- Some were concerned that additional types of permits could increase parking congestion within the zones; and
- A few expressed confusion regarding the different types of permits.



Proposal 7 – Multi-Unit Dwellings

Similar restrictions for multi-unit dwellings will be clarified and maintained. A notification step will be added for multi-units (and non-residential) properties as part of the designation process.




Those who did not fully agree with the proposal provided comments. Some of the more common themes included:

- Some felt that a multi-unit dwelling should not be eligible for more permits than the property's street frontage could accommodate in terms of parking spaces;
- Some felt that providing off-street parking should be required of multi-unit dwellings;
- Some commented on the lack of visitor parking available for those in multi-unit dwellings that do not qualify; and
- Off-street parking provided by the landlord of a multi-unit dwelling (which would make the residents ineligible for RPP permits) can be cost prohibitive.

Proposal 8 – Scheduling (Time Restrictions)

Increase the consistency of time restrictions. Establish provisions to allow variances to be implemented where needed within sub-zones (e.g., in close proximity to a parking generator). This will be implemented with ongoing input from residents.




Those who did not fully agree with the proposal provided comments. Some of the more common themes included:

- Some felt all zones should be consistent to reduce confusion about time restrictions; and
- Some felt flexibility is needed based on circumstances (e.g., proximity to large employers like hospitals that have staff working 24 hours a day, 7 days a week).

Proposal 9 – Scheduling (Time of Day & Day of Week)

Generally retain the same time and day restrictions. As noted in Proposal 8, however, there would be provisions to allow variances to be implemented where needed.



Those who did not fully agree with the proposal provided comments. Some of the more common themes included:

- Some felt all zones should be consistent to reduce confusion about time restrictions; and
- Some felt flexibility is needed based on circumstances (e.g., proximity to large employers like hospitals that have staff working 24 hours a day, 7 days a week).


Proposal 10 - Enforcement

Generally maintain levels of enforcement. Add additional resources to focus on the 1 hour time limit areas and areas closest to parking generators.

Add provisions to the bylaw to be able to establish areas within the RPP zone with different permits (similar to the Exhibition zone) as a tool to manage in-zone commuting.

Add provisions to the bylaw to cancel permits or refuse permits if people are abusing their privileges (e.g., selling visitor passes or submitting false documents).

Clarify that the restrictions are not enforced on statutory holidays.




Those who did not fully agree with the proposal provided comments. Some of the more common themes included:

- Some felt current enforcement is inadequate and more is required than presented in the proposal;
- Some felt current enforcement is adequate; and
- Some were confused by the proposed amendments to enforcement.

Proposal 11 – Parking Generators

Meet with the representatives of the parking generators on an ongoing basis and discuss opportunities, address issues and share information and concerns.




Those who did not fully agree with the proposal provided comments. Some of the more common themes included:

- Some felt parking generators need to take greater responsibility for parking congestion in neighbouring residential areas; and
- Some expressed doubt that parking generators will be motivated to help find solutions to residential parking congestions.

Proposal 12 – Automation Using Technology

Pursue automation opportunities using technology, including:

- Online services such as permit renewal; and
- Digital recognition of permitted vehicles.




Those who did not fully agree with the proposal provided comments. Some of the more common themes included:

- Some were confused by what was meant by “digital recognition of permitted vehicles”;
- Some were supportive of online renewal but not of digital recognition; and
- Some wondered if people could abuse an online renewal system by providing false information.

Proposal 13 – Communication / Education

Review communications tools (e.g., website, brochures, and signage) to ensure they provide up-to-date information that people can park in the area to the time allowed without a permit.


Work with the Community Associations and Business Improvement Districts to enhance knowledge of the program.



Those who did not fully agree with the proposal provided comments. There were no common themes among the comments.

Proposal 14 – Exemptions

Investigate options to empower an exemption or exceptional circumstances clause.



Those who did not fully agree with the proposal provided comments. Some of the more common themes included:

- Some wanted more information on what types of exemptions would be considered before agreeing to this proposed amendment; and
- Some felt exemptions are a “slippery slope,” and are based on a subjective determination rather than consistency for everyone.

2.4 November/December 2019 Open Houses

There were four open houses held in or nearby current RPP zones in June 2019. The purpose of these open houses was to present the draft proposals to local residents and solicit their feedback. Participants provided their input leaving notes on a provided display board. In total, there were 69 attendees at the open houses.

2.4.1 Intended Audience

The stakeholder groups included the following:

- Residents, businesses and organizations in and around Residential Parking Program zones; and
- The general public.

2.4.2 Data Limitations

- Attendance at some open houses was limited; and
- Attendees gave little feedback on the individual proposals at the open houses. Specific feedback on individual proposals was received more through the online surveys while the open houses generated more universal questions and conversations about perceived issues with the program.

2.4.3 What We Heard

Generally, attendees expressed acceptance of, or agreement with, the proposed amendments. Concerns expressed by attendees during conversations with staff in attendance were typically confirmations of current issues that the proposed amendments are intended to address.

Common themes from the input received in the November/December open houses are listed below.

- General acceptance of, or agreement with, the proposed amendments;
- Frustration with parking congestion and traffic;
- Those living just outside the Residential Parking Permit zones have commuters to parking generators in front of their homes for extended periods of time and therefore have difficulty finding parking for themselves or visitors;
- Residential Parking Permit zones need to be large enough that they are an actual deterrence to commuters who would instead find alternative parking or transportation modes;
- The City should consider making the zones resident parking only;
- Shorter-term contractor permits would be welcome;
- Most attendees agreed there should be a limit to the number of permits per residence, though some would prefer a limit of 2 rather than 3;
- Some attendees felt residents / taxpayers should not have to pay for a permit while others felt the current permit fees are inadequate for covering the costs of the program;
- Some felt current enforcement levels / fines are inadequate for current parking issues;
- Areas near the hospitals and the University experience congestion outside the restriction schedule due to shift workers;
- Online permit renewal would be appreciated;
- Concerns with parking restrictions around Nutana Collegiate; and
- Some believed all multi-unit buildings should be eligible for on-street parking permits, similar to single unit dwellings.