

**Proposed Program Modifications to the Residential Parking Program  
And Associated Bylaw No. 7862, Residential Parking Program, 1999**

Current Provision	Concern	Proposed Modification	Considerations/ Rationale
<p><b>1. Zone Designation Process</b> The current residential parking zone (“zone”) designation process is based upon a resident-submitted petition that must be signed by at least 70% of residents on each block. For new RPP zones, a minimum area of at least 10 block faces must be proposed. Requests for expansion of an existing zone can be submitted on a block by block basis.</p>	<p>The current block by block process has raised concerns that parking issues will simply be pushed into the blocks immediately surrounding and outside of established zones. As well, some residents identified it can be difficult for people to organize and complete petitions without City assistance.</p>	<p><b>Maintain the Petition to Initiate the Zone Designation Process, after which the City will Assist in Boundary Identification</b></p> <p>Continue to initiate designations with a citizen-led block petition and application for the first block(s). Update the process to add a step indicating the City will assist in identifying an appropriate boundary for the zone or zone expansion which may include additional blocks, and will assist in petitioning those residents.</p> <p>The review will consider the extent of parking impacts, the layout of the roads, impact of inadvertently leaving a block of unrestricted parking surrounded by restricted blocks, and public input.</p>	<p>60% of survey respondents indicated a petition should continue to be required.</p> <p>A municipal scan indicated 77% of those jurisdictions reviewed use community petitions. The City of Calgary has been using a block petition process and is currently recommending changes to have the City take on a greater role in the process.</p> <p>In the follow-up survey, 77% of respondents supported an approach that would involve a review by the City to identify whether boundaries should extend beyond the block(s) proposed by residents.</p>
<p><b>2. Only Consider Residential Uses</b></p> <p>At present non-residential blocks (e.g. streets adjacent to parks or school grounds) are generally excluded when zones are proposed and parking remains unrestricted adjacent to those uses.</p>	<p>Small sections of unrestricted parking on blocks within an RPP zone, or with inconsistent restrictions, can create traffic volume and congestion issues. For example, large numbers of people seeking day-long parking may circle those unrestricted blocks looking for an open space to park for the day.</p>	<p><b>Consider all Streets during the Zone Designation Process</b></p> <p>When designating RPP zones, consider whether contiguous, non-residential areas should be included as part of the zone, or have other appropriate parking restrictions established in those areas.</p>	<p>87% of survey respondents supported the proposed approach.</p> <p>Residents noted that the 2019 parking restrictions added to President Murray Park (a park in the middle of an RPP zone) were well done. However, it was noted that community issues would have been avoided if these parking restrictions were put in place at the time of the initial RPP.</p>

Current Provision	Concern	Proposed Modification	Considerations/ Rationale
<p><b>3. Permit Limits for Residential Dwellings</b></p> <p><b>At present, there is no limit on the number of permits that may be issued to a residential address, however each licensed driver is eligible for only one permit and must demonstrate they are the owner or principal operator of a vehicle.</b></p>	<p>This restriction can create concerns when a person has more than one vehicle registered in their name. For example, all vehicles in a family may be registered to one person or a parent might have a child's vehicle registered to them in addition to their own.</p> <p>Additionally, as there is currently no restriction on the total number of permits that might be issued to a dwelling, it does not encourage people to use off street parking and an individual residence may cause local parking issues.</p>	<p><b>Set Permit Limits for Residential Dwellings</b></p> <p>Limit the number of permits issued per dwelling unit to a maximum of three residential permits. Proof of residency and vehicle ownership or principle operator would be required however, the restriction of only one permit per driver would be removed.</p> <p>Multiple unit dwellings that qualify for permits would remain limited to a maximum of 2 permits per dwelling.</p>	<p>61% of survey respondents indicated that there should be a limit to the number of permits issued to a residential address. Of those 84% indicated the limit should be three or less.</p> <p>A municipal scan indicated 55% of municipalities reviewed impose a limit and the average limit is three.</p> <p>In the follow-up survey, 85% of survey respondents support a limit of three permits.</p>
<p><b>4. Blocks Adjacent to an RPP Zone</b></p> <p><b>Properties that are directly adjacent to the RPP zone but not within the zone do not qualify for permits at present.</b></p>	<p>Residents on blocks adjacent to an RPP zone can be significantly impacted when a zone is put in place.</p> <p>They are no longer able to park in the zone for an extended time on RPP designated blocks and also face additional parking congestion on their own block as a result of the zone pushing the parking demand to adjacent blocks with unrestricted parking.</p>	<p><b>Mitigate Impacts on Adjacent Non-RPP blocks by Allowing Those Residents to Purchase Permits</b></p> <p>Allow residential properties that are located on a block directly adjacent to an RPP zone and otherwise meet the eligibility criteria of the bylaw to purchase permits. This would allow those residents additional flexibility for parking near their residence, including on a street that has become part of an RPP zone.</p>	<p>51% of survey respondents indicated that properties directly adjacent to the RPP zone should be eligible for permits (31% no and 18% unsure).</p> <p>The municipal scan identified that two municipalities use similar buffer areas to mitigate parking pressures next to RPP zones or define who is eligible to receive permits.</p> <p>In the follow-up survey 67% of survey respondents supported the modification to allow residents on adjacent blocks to purchase permits.</p>

Current Provision	Concern	Proposed Modification	Considerations/ Rationale
<p><b>5. Permit Fees</b></p> <p><b>The annual program permit fees are currently \$25 for RPP permit and \$15 for LRPP permits.</b></p>	<p>Some resident have identified they pay taxes and additional fees for parking permits are not warranted. They note residents are not causing the parking challenges.</p> <p>It was also identified that some residents may have economic challenges paying for existing permit costs and they should not be increased.</p>	<p><b>Retain Current Permit Fees at this Time</b></p> <p>Retain current fees of \$25 plus tax for Residential Parking Program permit and \$15 plus tax for Limited Residential Parking Program permit.</p> <p>It is proposed that permit fees be assessed further upon implementation of technological systems to facilitate the administration of the RPP.</p>	<p>61% of survey respondents indicated that the current RPP permit fees are appropriate while 52% indicated LRPP permits fees are appropriate.</p> <p>The average permit cost of other municipalities surveyed was \$29. None identified the programs operated on a cost recovery model.</p> <p>In the follow-up survey, 72% of survey respondents supported retaining the current fees.</p> <p>It has been estimated that a permit fee of approximately \$70 for each permit would be needed to achieve program cost recovery at this time.</p>
<p><b>6. Permit Eligibility for certain user groups</b></p> <p><b>The program currently identifies that only residents are eligible to purchase permits. Three permit categories are currently available: residential, visitor, and temporary visitor.</b></p>	<p>Historically, some permits have been issued for institutions and businesses. Businesses have been allocated up to two permits and institutions were allocated permits based upon negotiations with the City.</p> <p>Residents identified that parking for contractors working at their homes can pose challenges.</p>	<p><b>Establish Provisions for Three Additional Permit Eligibilities</b></p> <p><b>Non-profits / Institutions:</b> A limited number of permits may be issued under exceptional circumstances, where the institution is providing a community service. These arrangements will be negotiated on a case by case basis to ensure parking availability for residents will not be compromised.</p> <p><b>Businesses:</b> as per current Administrative Policy, businesses within an RPP zone may purchase up to two permits for each commercial retail unit (CRU).</p> <p><b>Contractors:</b> Allow contractors to purchase temporary visitor permits for their regular-sized vehicle with proof of work in the area. (One temporary permit up to 30 days a year, per address).</p>	<p>54% of respondents supported allowing businesses a maximum of two permits; 22% supported three permits.</p> <p>In the follow up survey, 77% of the survey respondents supported this proposed modification.</p> <p>Larger or longer-term contractor projects can utilize the Right of Way permit (ROW) program that allows for parking of permitted equipment/vehicles within the RPP zone.</p>

Current Provision	Concern	Proposed Modification	Considerations/ Rationale
<p><b>7. Eligibility of Multi-Unit Dwellings</b></p> <p><b>The RPP is not generally intended to accommodate parking for residents of multi-unit dwellings.</b></p> <p><b>Currently the eligibility for a multi-unit dwelling is primarily based zoning. Developments that provided the required amount of off-street parking, as per the Zoning Bylaw at the time of construction, but have less parking than is currently required are generally eligible (i.e. non-conforming). There are additional criteria and restrictions such as residents in these dwellings may purchase a maximum of two permits per dwelling unit if no on-site parking is available.</b></p>	<p>Most concerns raised identified that Multi-Unit dwellings can cause local parking issues if included without some reasonable restrictions.</p> <p>A few people felt that multi-unit dwellings should be included without any restriction, noting challenges posed for residents in multi-unit dwellings if they have to pay for on-site parking or cannot access onsite parking.</p>	<p><b>Clarify Eligibility of Multi-Unit Dwellings</b></p> <p>Continue to use similar restrictions for multi-unit dwellings but clarify the criteria for multi-unit developments that are eligible for permits. Generally, units that have been receiving permits would continue to receive permits, as a legal non-conforming situation.</p> <p>Add a notification requirement to the zone designation process for multi-unit dwellings and non-residential properties to inform them of the upcoming designations that may impact on-street parking.</p>	<p>43% of survey respondents identified that multi-unit dwellings should continue to be eligible with the current restrictions; 22% indicated they should not be included at all.</p> <p>The municipal scan indicated that 75% of other municipalities include multi-unit dwellings, most with some restrictions. These include limits based upon zoning similar to Saskatoon and to building size (e.g. max 4 floors to be eligible).</p> <p>In the follow up survey, 73% of survey respondents supported this proposed modification.</p>
<p><b>8. Sub-zones for Time Restrictions and Permits</b></p> <p><b>Currently, parking time restrictions in an RPP zone can vary from block to block (e.g. one hour restriction on one block and a two hour restriction on the next block.). The time that parking restrictions are in</b></p>	<p>The varying restrictions from block to block causes confusion amongst people looking for parking, makes enforcement more difficult and can push the problem within the zone (i.e. people stop parking on one block with a greater restriction and park on the next block with a lesser restriction).</p>	<p><b>Establish Provisions for RPP Sub-zones</b></p> <p>Establish provisions to allow time restriction variations to be implemented within sub-zones to limit the overall number of varying time restrictions. For example, set one shorter parking time restriction on blocks in close proximity to a parking generator and another longer parking time restriction in the rest of the zone.</p>	<p>51% of survey respondents indicated time restrictions should be consistent throughout a zone.</p> <p>The municipal scan indicated that other municipalities use consistent restrictions to make enforcement more efficient and ensure signage is easier to understand.</p> <p>Calgary identified that block by block changes to restrictions in their RPP review process has created confusion</p>

Current Provision	Concern	Proposed Modification	Considerations/ Rationale
<p>effect may also vary from block to block.</p> <p><b>Currently Residential Permits are valid for use throughout in the zone</b></p>	<p>As zones increase in size, this may become more problematic. People who reside within the RPP zone can use their permit to park in close proximity a place of employment or study (e.g. University or Hospital) adding to parking pressures in proximity to these facilities.</p>	<p><b>Add provisions to the Bylaw to allow for the establishment of subzones within a larger RPP zone.</b></p> <p>This will provide for future consideration to restrict parking permits for use within the subzone in which the residence is location. This will serve as a means to manage in-zone commuting (i.e. people driving to park closer to a parking generator within the RPP).</p>	<p>and is recommending more consistent restrictions.</p> <p>In the follow-up survey, 86% of survey respondents supported increased consistency through use of subzones.</p> <p>In the follow-up survey, 91% of survey respondents support the establishing subzones and other enhanced enforcement tools.</p>
<p><b>9. Parking Time and Day Restrictions</b></p> <p><b>While the most common parking restriction period is between 8:00 am and 5:00 pm Monday to Friday, restricted parking may extend to 9:00 pm in some areas. Maximum parking times without a permit may range from 1-3 hours.</b></p>	<p>Some concerns were identified that there are times that parking can be challenging for residents outside of the current restriction times. However, many noted that extending the length of time of parking restrictions would create additional inconveniences for residents and their visitors.</p>	<p><b>Retain Current Schedule of Times and Days when Parking Restrictions are in Effect</b></p> <p>Retain the same time and day restrictions as in current use, and work towards a more consistent set of restrictions as expansions occur.</p>	<p>The municipal scan identified that 58% of municipalities use similar time and day restrictions.</p> <p>The follow-up survey identified that 87% of survey respondents supported retaining the existing restrictions.</p>
<p><b>10. Enforcement</b></p> <p><b>Parking tickets are issued to people who park longer than allowed.</b></p> <p><b>The Bylaw currently states that no person shall: create, use or display a false permit, or fail to return a permit to the City when the permit is no longer required.</b></p> <p><b>In these cases, the Bylaw provides for fines ranging</b></p>	<p>Feedback received during the review process indicated that the level of enforcement was generally adequate across the City.</p> <p>There was a need for additional enforcement and program enhancements closest to the traffic generators (i.e. hospitals and educational institutions).</p>	<p><b>Enhance Enforcement</b></p> <p>In 2019, one additional enforcement unit was added to address these concerns and focus on areas closest to parking generators.</p> <p>Add additional provisions to the Bylaw to allow for cancellation of permits and refusal of ability to purchase future permits if people are abusing their privileges (i.e. selling visitor permits or submitting false documents).</p>	<p>69% of survey respondents indicated that RPP enforcement was adequate.</p> <p>In the follow-up survey, 91% of survey respondents support the proposed modifications.</p>

Current Provision	Concern	Proposed Modification	Considerations/ Rationale
<p><b>from \$2,000 for individuals and \$5,000 for corporations, per day upon a summary conviction or the court may order, in default of payment, imprisonment for up to one year.</b></p>	<p>The City should have the authority to cancel or restrict the ability to purchase future permits in situations where people are abusing permits by selling them or inappropriately providing them to people.</p> <p>Clarity could be provided regarding parking restrictions and enforcement on holidays.</p>	<p>Clarify that the restrictions are not enforced on statutory holidays.</p>	
<p><b>11. Parking Generators Relations</b></p> <p><b>Organizations such as a hospital, business districts or educational institutions that draw large numbers of people who may park in the surrounding area.</b></p> <p><b>In the past there was limited communication with parking generators.</b></p>	<p>During the review, it was identified that residents felt parking generators had a responsibility to participate in solutions to the challenges they create.</p>	<p><b>Communications with Parking Generator representatives</b></p> <p>As part of the review process, Administration met with staff of parking generators to provide information and discuss meeting on an ongoing basis to share information, discuss concerns and options.</p> <p>Administration will continue to meet with representatives of the parking generators on an ongoing basis and discuss opportunities, address issues and share information and concerns.</p>	<p>In the follow-up survey 86% of survey respondents support this proposed approach.</p>
<p><b>12. Technology</b></p> <p><b>At present, all permit purchases must be made in person, usually at City Hall.</b></p>	<p>Feedback received during the review ranged significantly with almost an equal number of people requesting automation as those identifying that none was required.</p> <p>Priorities identified for additional technology: Online purchases so that people did</p>	<p><b>Pursue Technological Solutions</b></p> <p>Pursue automation opportunities focusing on:</p> <p>Online services such as permit renewal/sales; and</p> <p>Digital recognition of permitted vehicles and parking restriction capabilities for the parking enforcement vehicles so that they can automatically recognize</p>	<p>33% of survey respondents wanted more automation.</p> <p>30% did not want more automation (the remainder were unsure).</p> <p>In the follow up survey, 92% of survey respondents supported this proposed modification.</p>

Current Provision	Concern	Proposed Modification	Considerations/ Rationale
	<p>not have to visit City Hall during business hours; and enhanced capabilities of the automated enforcement vehicles (e.g. permit recognition, automated permit identification to restrict the need display permits in vehicles).</p>	<p>vehicles with permits and time restrictions in that area.</p> <p>Until these services can be implemented, consideration will be given to providing more opportunities for RPP permit sales outside of traditional business hours during the month leading up to the permit renewal date.</p>	
<p><b>13. Communication</b></p> <p><b>At present, details of the program are communicated through pamphlets, web pages and conversations in person and on the phone.</b></p>	<p>During the review it was indicated the information on the RPP could be communicated more clearly and effectively.</p> <p>In particular, it was identified some people believed a permit was required to park in the area for any amount of time.</p>	<p><b>Provide Enhanced Communication</b></p> <p>Review communication tools (i.e. website, brochures and signage) to ensure they provide up-to-date information and highlight that people can park in the area up to the time limit allowed without a permit.</p> <p>Work with Community Associations, Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) and others to enhance the knowledge of the program.</p>	<p>94% of survey respondents supported this proposed approach.</p>
<p><b>14. Exemptions</b></p> <p><b>At present, permit allocations are specifically prescribed and the Bylaw does not provide for opportunities to address unique or exceptional circumstances.</b></p>	<p>It was identified that the City should have discretion to assess program eligibility or how many permits may be issued when unique situations arise.</p>	<p><b>Accommodate Exemptions in Unique Circumstances</b></p> <p>Add a provision to the Bylaw to empower an exemption clause for specific situations. This power would be delegated to the General Manager responsible for the RPP. This authority would be limited to approving an individual address to receive permits that are not otherwise deemed eligible under the Bylaw, or to change the number of permits an eligible address may receive.</p>	<p>In the follow up survey, 86% of survey respondents supported this proposed modification.</p>