



Residential Parking Permit Review

Verbatim Report
August 1, 2019

Verbatim Comments

Verbatim comments include all of the suggestions, comments and messages that were collected online and in-person.

Verbatim comments from phase two are included here. Offensive words and personally identifying information have been removed and replaced with either, [removed] or [personal information removed]; otherwise, verbatim comments are completely un-edited.

For each of the themes below, we asked you to tell us why you thought a particular option could address the concern. In many cases, the comment indicates a letter ranging from A to E as we asked you to identify which option you were referring to. The following report is laid out by topic, followed by the policy options, followed by verbatim comments.

[Residential on-site parking](#)

[Residential Parking Permit restrictions \(near major generators\)](#)

[Residential Parking Permit restrictions \(exclusionary\)](#)

[Businesses visiting a home](#)

[Residential Parking Permit eligibility and review process](#)

[Other types of zone restrictions, including hourly, paid, and unpaid](#)

[Commercial / residential interface](#)

[In-zone commuting](#)

Topic: Residential on-site parking

A. Cap the total number of permits at two (2) per residence with no eligibility to purchase more

B. All permits must be purchased by residents rather than receiving two (2) at no cost with the option to purchase as many as necessary.

C. Residents are only eligible for permits if there is no available on-site parking

D. Two permits per single family dwelling at no cost with the option to purchase more (multi-family dwellings are not included)

- Yes, stop subsidizing parking. No one should feel entitled to the space in front of their home.
- WE are paying - via taxes
- should not charge anyone to have visitor parking permits to have company. Unfairly penalize inner city residents.



- Yes, stop subsidizing parking. If people want to store a private vehicle on public property they should pay a fee.
- Just charge significantly more \$\$ for additional permits.
- At no cost w/ the option to buy more. Residential.
- Two permit per family at no cost & addit'l one at cost for visitors. Think of a party scenario w/ driveway etc. should be able to park 5 - 7 vehicles.
- Feel that 2 at no-cost is acceptable. Also no-cost recognizes that income levels vary e.g elderly, young families
- People should be encouraged to use their garage more; maybe 1st free permit only.
- This should be per lot not dwelling unit. For example homes with secondary suites have large amounts of permits. Maybe based on frontage?
- Should not have to purchase extra permits if need more than 2 visitor tags. Should have a temporary short-term option for >2 visitors.
- I think that having two parking spots absolutely addresses my need.
- Agree 2 per residence with no option for more otherwise encroaching on other neighbours parking/access
- 2 maximum. No option to purchase more. Must apply to lanes/alleyways also. Should be clearly visible tag. Offenders should be ticketed.
- Minimum of 2 permits at no cost to residents. Availability of on-site parking (e.g. garage) should have no impact on eligibility. This is a fairness principle. People choose to live at residence with or without onsite parking at their own choosing/freedom.
- Yes, for other family members living in the residence
- Yes. # of permits should be tied to front footage of the lot. We have a neighbour on a 25' lot that has 4 vehicles. Our 6-plex has 100% parking but I can't park in front when doing maintenance.
- 2 permits per lot; not building or dwelling unit.
- Yes. But if you have a secondary suite for income you should have a garage.
- If the new permits are tied to residents with licence plate
- yes, but with a limit
- place time limits (ie. 2 days) that a vehicle can remain on the street without moving. People should not be allowed to use street as storage space.
- No extra permits. Use on-site parking, please!! Leave some space for the rest of us and visitors
- Could be a good way to generate extra revenue. Pay-to-play is a but unfair for lower income households, however, lower income households may have less cars anyway
- Price should escalate the more permits you buy. Resident permits only for vehicles registered at that address.
- Shouldn't be capped. Should be able to purchase more than 2 - family dynamics have changed. <max 4-6>
- This option would work well because this would force residents to use their own parking-garages, pad and driveway, instead of choosing to park on streets which could be used by others and visitors.



- If we are forced by law to keep our sidewalk clean, then we should be allowed to park along it vs doing this for other people to park along our property front
- Generally agree, would encourage people to use garages, and rear access. Possibly have to purchase a permit/guest permit if have on site for 2 vehicles
- More effort will be needed to go through an evaluation process, but seems most fair
- it makes sense that if a resident Do Not have any driveway or garage of its own the resident should be able to park in front of their house only
- consider not relaxing parking
- Get rid of permits
- crazy. I can't unload groceries from my garage! No, we should be able to park in front of our home.
- No, if ppl want to use their own on-site parking for uses other than parking, that's their choice. No different from owning a shed instead of a garage.
- ppl take advantage of the street parking esp w/ 2ndary suite application. Don't feel they need onsite parking! (issue)
- Would I be able to get more than 2 permits, if I needed 4?
- Daycare near my house - do they ever get a ticket? In RPP-only zone (other type)
- Business parking relaxations are causing lots of spillover issues in one area. Businesses need adequate parking and no relaxations.
- The digital solution for permit is creating more problems than it is solving. Not easy to use. Inconvenient. Digital pirates taking advantage of the system to make money
- I have similar problem. Neighbours with driveway don't use it to park. Instead they park second vehicles in front of my house so friends with limited mobility have to park down the street many houses away. These vehicles are parked for weeks rarely being used or moved. And they go on vacation for weeks & leave car on street. Empty garage & driveway.
- Let's go back to residential parking permits to identify resident vehicles. Also for guests. Problem: unidentified cars park in front of my house (sometimes for days without a ticket), so there's no place for my guests to park. Also: my next door neighbour with 2 trucks parks in front of my house (sometimes for days) with a permit, my car in front of my house. Thank you.
- Presently residents are parking on the street & renting out their onsite parking using apps some may even be using apps for "visitor" parking. Going digital is a problem.
- the residents of each community should decide about their community and not outsiders
- 2 per household is a fair and reasonable amount. The new parking app makes it easy for visitors to register guest plates for a 24 hours period. Also- homeowners use their garages for many functions, not just parking.
- AirBNB, carriage houses and Lodging houses are making money with no business permit or business license in R1 zone, they need to pay for more than 2 parking permits
- In Sunnyside near the C-train station, the parking situation is difficult and most residents in the area have garages or parking pads that should be used first.
- On site parking is usually an additional fee. This can create a financial burden, especially if the household has more than one vehicle.



- Seems reasonable and simple. Limits the impact of one residence on street parking availability.
- Coupled with the 2 required on-site parking stalls, that provides up to 4 per family - plenty. The street should not become the default parking spot for residences, nor should people be allowed to fill a street with vehicles just because they've filled their garages with too much stuff.
- Visitors
- Businesses working at the home must have an option to park there. Providing this at a reasonable cost is mandatory.
- This option has the most flexibility. The cost for the third permit could be set at a level that would encourage homeowners to create spaces to park on their property
- We live in a high traffic area within walking distance to LRT and SAIT. This creates issues, but I notice that many if my neighbours fill their garages with junk and then complain that they can't find parking.
- First permit should be \$1000, second \$2000, third \$4000 per house hold, and so on. Low income households should be able to purchase one low income permit. We need to change our car culture! This structure would force my house hold to change its behaviour.
- The city should not dictate the number of residents in a housing type. Certain living situations exist where a small family of 3 in a 2 bedroom apartment requires 3 cars. General market and living forces, limited parking space and improvements to transit will pressure users to reduce car use.
- While I agree that on-site parking should be a primary parking option, a financial punishment for needing or choosing to park on the street is not reasonable. The reason may be mobility or safety, and dwelling or person specific, etc.
- We have an adult daughter living with us for a while. The parking has been really awkward. i would be happy to pay for the right for another pass for her.
- This seems like an option to control parking on the street and keep it to a minimum.
- My parking is accessed from the alley. I need to have the parking zone in front of my house - otherwise I would be unable to unload groceries, etc. Including my elderly father near my front door. I already pay twice the amount of property tax as the same house in the suburbs. 2 permits per home
- I disagree with all 4 options. Property owners who have garages, parking pads/driveways own that property. It should be their sole decision/freedom to choose whether it is used for parking. Whether a structure is deemed a "garage" or "shed" intended for storage is subjective and changes over time.
- Two permits per single family dwelling is also about space in front of house. Multi family there is not enough space for two permits without encroaching on other space. It should also reflect your 'land'.
- Two on street permits per household should be enough
- My grandparents (>85) live in a parking restricted zone. My grandmother has difficulty leaving her house so every fam. dinner, birthday/ holiday is at their house. With 6 househ. visiting there is not enough parking. This only once weekly, with 0 cars the rest of the week. What are options for us?
- This is fair to homeowners and renters. If additional spots are required, then they can be purchased. If you are planning to change things so that homeowners are ineligible if they have a garage, you had best talk with those homeowners directly to avoid major pushback.



- I feel VERY strongly that we should not have to pay for what residents who do not live near an LRT or SAIT have as a matter of course!!! We should be able to park on our own street when it is convenient for us. In fact I don't support having to pay after two permits - we should have flexibility!
- This allows for some street parking but also encourages residents to use their on-site parking first. If a home has multiple vehicles, then parking should be considered a cost associated with additional vehicles.
- No more than 2 vehicles for in front of a residence.
- I'd actually prefer one permit per single family dwelling at no cost with the option to purchase more at an increasing price. This should result in an equitable distribution of permits and incentivize homeowners to use their garage, driveway, etc., where available.
- "The family with ten cars does not get to horde the streets.
- Some houses were built before there was traffic issues and do not have on site parking.
- They NEED a street space.
- A small charge for ONE permit (could be free) more for additional ones."
- We try to park on-site when we can but sometimes you need to park on the street. I would need a pretty convincing argument to think that having to pay to park in our own community is a good idea.
- To make inner city living more desirable & encourage families to choose the sustainable inner city living, must ensuring inner city residential streets maintain a residential feel. Also inner city residents walk/bike more. Allowing some convenience for more occasional use helps support this.
- it is absolutely ridiculous that when I have a visitor I have to have them wait at my house while I find your web site, type in their license plate number and then when they go I have to do the same thing the orange paper parking stickers worked just fine - especially for short term - see below
- Car centric city.
- Easiest and cleanest solution. Often no room for additional vehicles.
- 2 is enough, don't need more than 2 cars
- Garage space is not practical for loading, unloading. Mandating garage use will encourage front property access to garages and parking, and will diminish the streetscape.
- These are public streets, if parking is needed it should be paid for. The residents should not be receiving free parking while other citizens are banned.
- Combination of these options is what I would prefer, this option is closest to what I would like. Charge more and tier, i.e. First at 100%, second at 200%, third at 500%. Seems as if visitor passes are being used for residents vehicles. Only allow permits for cars registered at same address.
- Two is enough
- Some rental properties have no or limited on site parking with tenants having 5-10 vehicles per site. This severely limits available parking spaces for other residences. Consider rental properties as a business, not a residence.
- 2 per house free. Option to purchase more should only come after proof that on-site is not possible or available. Having 5 permits and no cars in the garage is irresponsible
- D. This seems like a fair way to assign permits. Approximately 2 cars can fit in front of each house on the street.



- DWhat I do with my property (garage, a garden, etc.) is no one else's business, all residents in an area should be treated equally regardless of the structures on their property. My higher property taxes due to location pay for my on-street parking; more \$ is not acceptable except for extra spaces.
- D. If 6 adults live in a home they all deserve to park at home; A & C are too exclusionary.
- Communities need parking options.
- 2 permit per residents in multi family dwelling is more than enough
- There must be a fee for parking as I would rather see that as a Revenue generation source versus taxes. Homeowners should be able to buy a maximum of four permits as there could be multiple cars per household.
- Two permits should be at no cost b/c no where else in the city do residents have to pay to park on their streets. Inner city pays enough in property taxes that we shouldn't have to pay even more for parking.
- D - This is what we have now and it seems to work well where I live (in Sunnyside). I hope that this still includes two visitor permits per household whether or not the residents own vehicles.
- i live in a condo development
- "A: some families may require more than two
- B: taxes pay for this
- C: Yes, but some on-site parking can be difficult to access when laneways become difficult to navigate due to snow/ice, so purchase passes should be available for these residents
- D: to discourage abuse, a fee is okay"
- Parking is not a fee for service and streets are shared spaces. Capping people at an arbitrary number vs need is easy to implement but does not best suit needs.
- in the area we live, there is limited need for further than 2 places per household guest, and we have been able to accomodate groups by asking for parking relaxation
- D - Until you put RPP in every community there is no way to charge one community parking and another not. Unjust!
- I choose D because it feels the least restrictive and is, I think, the status quo. Since I'm not aware of an issue (at least in my particular RPP zone neighbourhood), I support the status quo.
- This would be helpful to us in our current situation where my husband is using his parents' vehicle to travel back and forth to their home for caregiving, but we are not able to assign the vehicle to our permit without extensive documentation and hoop jumping.
- Option DWe have a single car garage but we have 2 vehicles. It is helpful and more accessible for us to be able to have the option to park one vehicle on the street and one in our garage. Having to pay for permits to park on our own street where we own our home would be inaccessible financially.
- I live near the university so parking is premium. However, many rentals on my street with students, new immigrants etc... if they have more than 2 cars I believe they should be able to purchase more permits rather than using guest passes.
- D = Common Sense. Go back to using the old paper copies. Phoning in the details -- especially for seniors with memory problems -- is a royal PITA.



- two permits seems a reasonable number, and there should n=be no charge for the permits. certainly, there should Not be the option to purchase additional permits.
- d - Two permits work for most areas but we live close to the university and some of the rentals have up to 8 people living in them, doesn't cut down much on parking if the same size residence as mine can get 8 permits without any cost. They also rent out the garage so no option for tenants to park.
- Living in Mission, assigned parking is deemed an additional cost to rent and is unaffordable. Access to free permitted street parking is essential to making it affordable to live here. I don't want it changed.
- I am choosing D primarily because it is the only option that carries no cost for visitor parking. I might have chosen A but it doesn't mention 'at no cost' for the two permits. One needs some on street parking for visitors and I do not believe I should have to pay for this.
- D. Cost of permits beyond two should be significant like \$200 per year to better facilitate the aims of the policy.
- It's fair to have 2 permits no charge which will take into account students and/or young adults living at home. Young people often have student debt & are trying to save. Options B & C unfairly punish these Calgarians who are looking to make a home and life in Calgary. Let's support them.
- I should not have to pay to park in front of my house. I also feel that single family dwellings should be able to get additional permits, some families just have more cars.
- For some reason neighbour often has 4 cars parked can't tell if registered like one could under old tag system. Therefore hard to park anywhere near our house!
- There should not be a cost as this is only a deterrent to the poorest residents. There should not be a reason to need more than 2 as a 4-car household is gratuitous.
- D- makes sense, those with more than 2 cars a household could purchase a permit. The others hurt renters who may be living in basement suites or with roommates
- D. I have a seasonal vehicle that we purchase a pass for
- B - residents do not own on-street parking and therefore should pay for the privilege to use it.
- Off-Street parking in the Established communities should be sufficient when combined with two RPPs. Only in the City-mandated population densification areas is this concept endangered.
- This will prevent large apartment residents from cluttering the surrounding streets because they don't want to purchase site parking at their complex (example: Cedarbrae Gardens on 8 Ave NW)
- Pay for what you use approach, B, will hopefully reduce the cost of each individual permit and make it easier for renters to obtain a permit.
- I actually think 2 is not enough. It should be a min of 4 so that residents can have guests as well. Given the amount we pay in taxes it is ridiculous that a homeowner needs permission to have their own vehicle or guests park on the street. 2 can be residentil & 2 can be for short term parking.
- Why should I need to purchase a permit. I pay \$5000 property tax, have no schools or business near by, snow doesn't get plowed, my lane isn't paved. Yet more money needs to be paid so I can park in front of a house I own. [removed]
- This is the fairest way of dealing with parking in a crowded area
- D



- In inner city communities walking, biking and transit are more viable options and should be considered. The theme is somewhat flawed in that the available vehicle space on properties should also be limited. Permeable space and trees should not be replaced with vehicle space to park more off street
- We live in a cul d sac that has large families and multi family residence. We have a large driveway and we get blocked all the time. If permits are restricted and required it will force others to park a short way away and walk the few doors down.
- D: Fair for all residences, and provides incentive to use available parking that a home has (Garage, pad, etc).
- A - there should be no need for more than 2 parking passes per residence especially with on site parking options as most people have.
- A residence should provide for on-site parking if it has more than 2 vehicles.
- Max 2 per household and only if only. There's no available onsite parking space.
- development for multis should provide parking onsite in most cases.
- D is the best option for areas where people come to park all day, often every day - e.g. close to hospitals, LRT stations.
- I picked D. I live across the street from a high school and do not have a garage. If I have my kids and groceries to carry its hard to juggle that if I have to park down the street. We only have one vehicle but I know my neighbor has a few and think the option to purchase more permits would be nice.
- My neighbour has suites called A, B, and C, each with separate entrances and each have passes. The lot is 25 feet wide. The owner , who does not live there has a Winnebago in the yard so none of the tenants can park in the yard off the lane. There is no Visitor parking left with all these cars.
- If you decide to charge me to park in front of my residence then you should charge all Calgarians to park in front of their residences. If the city wants more revenue then they should enforce the parking restrictions.
- The city should not be essentially subsidizing residents to park on city streets through RPP program.
- When you live close to an LRT station, you can quickly be swamped with non-resident people using all the parking spaces and even blocking your on-site parking so that you can't access it. Since the zone came this is never an issue. When I have someone coming for service I let them use the onsite.
- Because all homeowners pay taxes - unfair to make them pay as well for parking. Many people have children who have their own vehicles.
- There is absolutely no parking in South Calgary and Marda Loop with all of these new condos and townhouses being built.
- If they have a driveway they should not need more space. Visitor permits should be available though
- I live in Inglewood..if we didn't have 24/7 permit parking we would never be able to park in our block. Business employees used to park on our street, shoppers, then pub and restaurant goers nights & weekends. This doesn't even consider special events or ppl who park here to walk downtown to work.



- There is only so much space on the street. 2 per house is good.
- option A (no cost to residence) in order to ensure that there is adequate street parking for visitors and others who visit.
- Permits should only be granted to family units. Houses with 6 boarders should not qualify for 6 permits
- Exclusive use of the public street and car subsidies must end. As a result, (C) residents should not be entitled to permits if they have parking on their premises. Or if they are able to purchase permits, there should be a hard cap of 2 per residence (A)
- ...
- Option D seems to work just fine in my neighbourhood. I don't believe that residents in a restricted parking area should be limited in the number of vehicles they own or use.
- On our avenue each house has a detached garage. Out of 27 houses, only 3 garages actually were used for cars. I conducted this investigation in the winter so it was easy to tell. A new house was built across our avenue, with a detached 3 car garage --- and the owner still parks on the street. Really?
- Option C . Get people to use their on site parking instead of the street.
- Guests must be accomodated at a residence. Multi-family dwellings need to have their parking provided on-site and not at the expence or inconvienece of adjacent residences.
- We live in a dense inner city area. Some homes have on-site parking others don't. It would ease on street parking congestion if only homes without on-site parking used the street.
- C: Residents who can use on-site parking will leave more space for visitors to the area. A: Parking restrictions may act as an incentive for a family to own fewer vehicles.
- More than two vehicles for a single family dwelling is already outrageous. Parking those vehicles on a public street ought to be restricted.
- B. It's completely wrong that all calgarians pay taxes to have streets built but some calgarians get the exclusive right to park on certain streets without paying anything additional for the privilege. These are public spaces, and if not don't make the tax payer pay to build and maintain these roads
- Inner city garages are often not large enough to fit vehicles (trucks, large suvs, mini vans) and especially not large enough for two cars. Capping the number of permits per household limits ability for children to have access to cars and payment for the base two options would not be a fair solution
- I am very tired of hearing proposals B and C. The inner-city is subsidizing the suburbs in terms of tax; you propose that we continue this practice in having us pay for protection against the suburbanites who want to park in front of our house so they can walk downtown without paying for parking.
- I wouldn't purchase a residence in an area where permits are required. I do not visit or do business in areas where permits are required unless I can walk there. I do not go where I have to pay for parking. Medical appointments are an exception. I have no choice.
- Many people in this neighbourhood have garages that only accommodate 1 vehicle, so option C is not viable. However, the ability to purchase as many as you want results in too many cars per house on the street, with people using their garages solely as extra storage space.



- The street should not be free. Parking on the street should cost - even a small amount - everywhere in the city to discourage misuse with folks leaving their cars forever on the streets and gaining a weird sense of entitlement over spaces "in front of my house". No, it's the public street.
- You shouldn't have to pay to park your car in front of your home. I feel 2 permits for free per household, with the option to buy more is a fair option and also helps those larger families with multiple vehicles.
- I am choosing C, the area is getting more dense with infills -that have garages in the new buildings - not as much on street parking required for the new buildings
- B. I agree that off street parking should be the primary option. With on street parking I would have graded increases - first permit cheap, second 3 - 4 times more, have several free visitor guest passes. You must demonstrate a need - 2 car garage, one car - no need for permit.
- I live in a multi-family dwelling with 3 vehicles so eligibility to purchase an extra permit would suit our needs.
- Many multi-unit developments are parked up and overparked, despite the theory that inner city multi-unit developments require less parking than was previously provided or required.
- This would be in line with other major cities. In Toronto you have to have proof that there is no on site parking, pay for your first permit and if others are available, the second permit is slightly more than the first and residents are capped at 2 permits.
- C) I rent a main floor, the owner's son & wife live in illegal suite downstairs. Despite having a beautiful, 2 car garage, they park their trucks on the street. I have no choice but to park on street, & it's ridiculous that I have to fight for a parking spot daily, when 2 trucks could be in garage.
- Residents should be allowed to park near their homes for free.
- I like "A". Have a neighbour in Ramsay that takes up half the block with his work truck, motorcycle, wife's car, vehicles owned by adult children and often a trailer as well. Can't park near my own property some days. He had a small garage and a parking pad off alley but they are rarely utilized.
- Two no cost permits are valuable for people even with on-site parking because they can be used when the on-site parking is closed for cleaning and maintenance. Elderly and retired residents of Beltline condos depend on these permits and regularly move their cars to street spaces during cleanings.
- Two permits at no cost is sufficient.
- In our neighbourhood people sell parking permits to Sait students which defeats the purpose of the restrictions.
- Option D. If parking availability is really such an issue, two free permits should be sufficient. In the case of additional vehicles, permits should be available for a fee (for instance, for work-related vehicles).
- In all ABD options there is easy ability to abuse the system, making it inequitable between participants. Moreover, C should be the rule - roads are public areas, paid for by all and as such should be accessible to all. Residential properties should be required to have parking for residents-



- There should be no charge to park a vehicle if you can prove residency. It also should be easier to get more than 2 short-term permits for guests or this prevents normal visitors like family. Many relatives with mobility issues are unable to visit as they can't walk from other areas.
- Selected A - Most homes can park at least one vehicle elsewhere on their property. I know we have a neighbour who is renting monthly parking to Foothills Hospital workers, as they have removed lawn from their backyard and gravelled a parking lot across it. Additional sites will just be resold.
- If they maintain their offstreet parking and receive two spots, that's 4 plus parking spots. Many remove their off street parking to have a glorified shed aka garage or larger backyard which are personal life style choices.
- "A - this is a good compromise between other options
- D - I would set a limit on the number of additional permits you could purchase... 2 (?)"
- It is important to allow residents to determine the best use of their property. Not all properties have a double car garage and some garages have been converted to address other requirements. Residents should be able to purchase another pass to address their unique needs.
- It is ludicrous that the city has allowed big condo buildings be built with units that do not have parking and need to use street parking. This should be stopped.
- We have significant issue with lazy neighbours parking front of our house instead of using their driveway or street space in front of their house
- Current system works for our area.
- There is a need for more permits
- The truth is many families have more than one vehicle and there are many times that you want to have more than one person visiting. Let's make this work, not be a headache.
- Garage is already full still need street parking, should be allowed to park your own vehicle in front of your house
- This would help the city track how many permits exist per house and crack down on potential illegal secondary suites.
- A - should be free, but it would be rare to require more than two
- In Calgary, it is quite normal (and often necessary) for a family to have more than one vehicle. Thus, two per household should be provided at no cost. Some families with, say, adult children, may have more than two vehicles, where adult children live at home to help manage cost of living costs.
- 2 per residence is reasonable as long as visitor tags are still available.
- permits shouldn't be free, should cost \$\$ but also should be capped at 2 per household
- If someone lives in the area they should be able to park their car on the street (at a cost if they own numerous vehicles)
- The city has made it difficult for me to use my parking pad. Until the curb access issues are solved the city needs to be flexible with their onstreet parking.
- I don't see this as broken so I don't know why we would expend effort to fix it.
- The street belongs to everyone in the city. It is not fair that certain homeowner get preferential access to the street for free. I want parking to be maintained so that streets are narrowed to slow traffic.



- "I don't like ANY of your options as they ALL involve paying for parking.
- You are sneaky bastards trying to trick people into consent to increase paid parking in residential zones!"
- 2 are more than enough for a house
- Even with onsite parking, there are times when residents needs to park on the street without getting towed/ticketed. What if a guest is using your stall? What if the parkade is being cleaned or is undergoing construction.
- I do not want permit restricted parking. Why is that not an option.
- Option D is the system we follow now & there is no need to change it. We have a double-garage (alley access) & no driveway. If work is going on in the alley, or nearby home construction, we are unable to access the garage & need to park on the street.
- People are lazy to park on the back alley and park on the street. 2 vehicles cannot pass. Example: Mahogany streets are now full of cars parked everywhere. Winter time, you can hardly pass a vehicle.
- Since going to an online system my elderly parents can not figure out the system and as a result I just park and hope for the best. Being able to have the physical permits mailed out should still be an option for the elderly and those not connected to internet.
- D. Often a family have more drivers than two. Why limit their parking? I live close to downtown, without permit parking, drivers would park on the streets, resulting in more cars, more speeding thru neighbourhoods, more cut through. This may result in more crime.
- Neighborhoods that do not require parking permits, can have as as many vehicles they want parked on a street, therefore areas that do require a permit should not be limited. If proof provided vehicle is owned, registered, company vehicle driven by someone at the address, should have a free permit
- D. Having to pay for a permit to park on the street where you already pay taxes is just a money grab and, in the not too distant future, people won't be able to afford to live in Calgary.
- D, why does the city think we rpp residents would ever want to purchase the right to park in front of our home? somebody is getting very authoritarian down city hall way
- In Sunnyside, there can be 4-5 vehicles/single family dwelling. Another option is cap the tot. # of permits at one (1) per residence w/ eligibility to purchase one (1) permit. If you live inner city, you should be commuting by foot/cycle to get around. That is the beauty of living inner city!
- As someone with two cars and a single garage, I park one vehicle on the street at all times. I don't think I should be entitled to "Free" parking...my stake in the street is the same as any other taxpayer, and I don't mind paying for it.
- We have one spot on our property to park but need a spot for a second car and don't think we should have to pay for that
- d: Is simple math, the average Canadian family has 3.66 people. the average median age in Calgary is 36.9. That means the average household needs 3.66 permits
- Allows for larger families or roommate situations
- People who reside in these areas should be able to have as many passes as they need. I also don't think full payment is fair for all passes when live in an area.



- D: We are one of the families using multiple services for home care and need several parking spots. However, constantly changing plates by phone is cumbersome and we are limited to plate changes between 8-4. Perhaps an automated system would let us change plates after hours.
- We do not have on site parking (driveway or park pad) and would like to have the option of having extra space for my husband's work vehicle & our visitors. We are constantly having to appeal Calgary parking tickets under our visitors permit which is a huge nuisance.
- It was a toss up between C & D, but I finally settled on d because really these parking restrictions as annoying as they are, are very much needed for areas where students are hogging our street space. D, because each home has relatives and friends that visit there homes so we need more than just
- These are all bad options, permit parking is ridiculous in this city, I drive a work van and it is near impossible to find parking when I have a job to do. Today I had to move my vehicle 4 times to complete an 8 hour job
- The previous 2 free permits and two visitor pass system worked fine.
- Prevents single family homes from becoming unauthorized rooming houses in high density neighbourhoods with parking passes at a rate of 6 to 8 per property.
- It's no business of the City if residents park on the street or on site. Residential properties with a garage have increased property value which increases their property taxes over neighbours without a garage, so penalizing them for paying more taxes but parking on the street is illogical.
- Option D - Residential parking should be for residents, not subsidizing businesses or institutions. On-site parking not always successful when non-residents block entry to driveways. Inner city communities being penalized versus suburban areas.
- D. Some families legitimately have more than two vehicles.
- D because it works best.
- There should be a charge for all permits to deter people from selling permits to students near universities and SAIT, which I see all time.
- Options are flawed favouring single detached dwellings. All permits should be paid for (none for free) and should not be available for units that have onsite parking available regardless of what type of unit it is (single detached or multi-family). Basing it off of unit type is discriminatory.
- Many single family dwellings have adult residents who require a vehicle to get to work. These houses may have limited parking on their parcel.
- Streets are shared space belonging to the entire city. Developers should be encouraged to provide onsite parking, mostly underground for new developments. Also encourage transit use in TOD's
- We have on-site parking, but only for the residents. Visitors, homecare workers & tradepeople do not have an option.
- This would encourage residents to utilize their garages, parking pads, etc. Many people have garage/pads but choose to use them for storage etc. instead of parking, which restricts parking for other residents and guests. There would be incentive to use garages if residents had to purchase permits.
- D. Residents should always have free parking permits in and around their home. Bring back the visitor parking passes instead of renewing online.



- A No homeowner cost for the permit - the expense should be borne by the business tax on the institution. In our area we have people buying extra permits for others who work at the hospital so 5 or 6 associated vehicles park on the street
- Most residential has one parking spot on site, so allowing people to purchase spots beyond what they need and then sell their parking stall would not be helpful in managing high volume areas, particularly around major generators.
- A - two permits should be adequate for inner city homes (I assume this is the only area there are residential parking permits) where it is relatively easy to walk to your destination or take public transportation
- C I believe garages/driveways should be used first and foremost to keep streets open for visitors/workers who do not have that as an option. D, for rental units usually there are multiple cars/unit, the extra purchase option allows all to have the right to park outside their house.
- Where I live Country Village Landing the street parking is full of the cars from condos near us who apparently don't have enough parking so some days I can't park on my own street.
- There should be no restriction on how many one house should have. And charging for the basic right to park on your own block is just stupid. And a money grab by the city.
- People abuse parking permits.
- D - If you get draconian about on-street parking, you just encourage people to say screw it, and move to the suburbs. We should not be asked to pay (even more) in inconvenience and cost to live in more sustainable communities!
- Residents who use parking should pay for their use of the resource. Likewise, residents who need parking for more than two cars should be able to do so (up to a reasonable limit, say 5 permits per address).
- all citizens should be able to use the public street near where they live.
- While onsite parking should be used, on street raking is often necessary as two-car garages are usually not big enough for 2 full size cars. Business customers parking in residential areas can make it a challenge to find nearby parking, complicating routine tasks like grocery shopping.
- B. Making it cost money deters ppl from owning more cars than on-site parking allows
- My property taxes are high enough and I shouldn't have to pay to park in front of my house.
- C) they should use the available on site parking first. Is that available on site open to the public for parking?
- D. Most Calgarian homes have at least one vehicle, so providing two per single-family dwelling is very reasonable (especially, considering many homes have a garage or on-site parking option over street parking.)
- I live near the Foothills Hospital. Parking by hospital workers is becoming an increasingly large problem in this area. I should not have to pay for street parking simply because hospital staff do not want to pay for parking at their place of work. Guests should be able to visit me!
- People with cars should pay. If I have to parking on my lot for a secondary suite then they don't need more street spots. I also think have options to purchase more helps with density if dwellings can't accommodate parking out their lot. It also discourages residents from owning more vehicles .



- Families with children of driving age will require additional permits on a long term basis
- There's may be more than two residents with cars at an property.
- Apartment buildings that have parking stalls allocated should not need residential street permits they have stalls. To many times I can't find parking in front of my own home but the parking lots at apt bulging are empty.
- Fewer cars, less traffic.
- I think it is the best option of those presented. We live in a multi-family dwelling. All the resident here need passes. Other options are too restrictive. The ability to purchase as many passes as you want could result in people here not being able to access on-street parking.
- Re: option D. The property taxes we currently pay for single family dwellings should include two permits, rather than further tax residents in the form of additional fees for street parking.
- D. modern families are not restricted to the "nuclear" archetype, so assuming a household is a "mother and father" plus kids is stupid. Roommates to afford rent ,Teens working to save for school, family members move in to help with/require care. Flexibility is ALWAYS the best option.
- New residential buildings are going up inner city (bungalow replcaed with a 4 or 6 plex) with only one or less parking spot per unit. When in reality most of those residents may have 2 or more vehicles. Overflow parking moves to street. Multi residential madatory rule for 2 spots per unit.
- Most restricted parking are in the larger inner city core where we already pay higher taxes than those living in the periphery. As such this should be part of our city services. We have a right to park on our residential streets
- I believe that people should be allowed to purchase as many permits as they need, as some families have more than two drivers in the family. The first two should be provided with the home so I pick option D.
- It should be a combination of C & D... If a home has onsite parking or garage for 2+ vehicles per single family residence, should have a cap of 1 free parking permit. A home that does not have any on-site parking available should be exempt from any caps on free residential permits.
- D. I live in the basement suite of a 4 plex with my partner and we each need a permit, but if we ever got a roommate, we would need more permits.
- The price should be set high enough to discourage households from buying permits they don't need to encourage parking on-site, but allow option for people who really need it to buy more parking.
- This option allows reasonable access to street parking near ones residence without allowing one or several residences to clog the street with their vehicles. Single family dwellings who choose to have more than 2 cars should be expected to house those additional vehicles on their own property.
- I chose D because R1 houses with teenagers may have more vehicles and should not have to move permits between vehicles. However, all registered vehicles and the number of additional available to purchase should be restricted to vehicles registered at the address for R-1. Different for other zoning.
- We currently have to pay and our condo complex is restricted to less than 1 permit for every 2 residences. I would love to have 2 free permit per residence.



- The area where I live are renting out rooms and hence have 3 or 4 cars per residence and we have no parking space
- Its for people in the area not for friends to park
- Two should be enough for residents. Need to have some visitor spots available. Most multi unit homes provide some residential parking.
- Imagine that I'm your neighbour and I have divided my basement into multiple individual bedrooms where each one is rented out to different people each with their own vehicle where each vehicle would occupy all driveways including the one in front of your house. How would you feel?
- Assuming you have 1-2 spaces included as your primary parking option there likely will not be many instances of needing more than two more street parking spots.
- 2 parking permits is enough per resident.
- I live in an area where high density limits my parking , I have no garage rather it was a garage built in 1912 that does not accommodate a car. Without having permits I would have no place to park, having said that I believe there should be a limit of 2,
- Streets with multifamily dwellings deal with high volume of parking from multiple residents in condos etc no room for housing residents.
- D. I live in a restricted zone and would be very upset if my family or our visitors couldn't park on our block. It's close to c-train and kensington shopping district. It's FULL of all sorts of traffic at all times. I would like it to be restricted to people who live on the block only.
- D. People already pay to live in their homes, shouldn't have to pay extra for parking. There are four people living at my home = 4 vehicles. Two cars favours nuclear families which is not inclusive. Yes Calgary has too many cars but given the infrastructure, sprawl, and transit they're still needed
- none of these options really fit my needs - it is frustrating that multi unit dwellings are not included. An option to purchase another would be ideal for guests.
- There is limited parking space on our street
- D. Although we have a parking pad sometimes we want to park outside the front of our house between quick trips rather than go all the way around through the back entrance.
- Residents should be able to purchase additional passes if required.
- Parking permits are essential for people living in a permitted zone people who pay higher taxes because they have single family homes should always be given two permits plus the option to purchase more.
- Option A - No extra cost should incur for guests at your home. If you need extra parking space for a family gathering extra; you could have a neighbor registered the extra vehicles for a few hours or day. Work with residential neighbors.
- Some houses have more than 2 cars. ..3 or 4 cars. Eligible permits should increase to 4 per household.
- Increase to four no cost. Many families have two adults and two adult children. If restricted to two per household they are discriminated against.



- Seems fair and uncomplicated. The more complicated and rule oriented a system is, the more frustrating it is to use, and the more objections there are. Looking at if each resident has a driveway or a garage is complicating. Maybe their garage is used for storage etc and it's their right.
- The City should not be providing free parking.
- Many people in Hillhurst rent their on-site space and park free in the K permit. That means there is no parking for guests. Parking app needs to be tied with the other cal parking app and allowed to schedule times for different guests. Current system is a pain if out of town with no internet/phone
- D. I have a large driveway and use it when possible, staggering cars. I want to be able to put any 1 or 2 of my cars on street, not be restricted to the 2, I am allowed to register.
- We should not be required to purchase a permit to park by our home
- I choose D. We use one vehicle permit to temporarily put a vehicle on the street to load stuff out the front of the house because getting to the back garage involves many steps, where the vehicle is parked all the time. (Briar Hill)
- I've gotten tickets on my own [removed] street because I couldn't get a permit. [removed]
- D. Most houses require 2 permits minimum FREE, OWNERS right. Older children living at home and driving, additional permits are needed. Protection against illegal suite dwellers purchasing permits must be considered. Homeowners must not be confined to only garage/driveway parking. We are owners!!
- Neighbours of mine have 4-5 vehicles, they have a parking pad and a 2car garage and no one uses them..they all park on the street unfair to the rest as we try to find parking a block down. I have no access to a park pad or any other parking spot within our complex.
- if you have two kids that drive and in school where do they park?
- Especially in the winter. Back lanes don't get cleared, paths from the back garage to the house aren't cleared and people don't park in the driveway / parking pad /garages at the backs of their homes. When healthcare workers or visitors can't park near the patient/home They are trying to access.
- My own property has limited parking available. I have a double garage and space to park in front of the garage door in the alley. This means two available spots if I have guests. Two permits would be sufficient and I would purchase more if needed.
- It's completely unreasonable that certain citizens get to exclusively leave their property on public space that we all pay for. There should be a stiff fee to the permit holder to make up for this. Or no permits at all.
- Flexibility is required due to innumerable circumstances of so many residences. A.& C. aren't suitable due to extreme inflexibility. i.e. a garage is being upgraded so we have to have our cars on the street temporarily. We all pay our taxes so option B isn't fair at all. D is the kindest option.
- 2 is enough vehicles per household. Visitor permits also need to be available.
- Option D is most practical. Calgary continues to expand, things are farther away, and while Transit is an exceptional option, there may be more than one vehicle owned by the residents in a single family dwelling and/or visitors, without this option it would be a deterrent to buying/renting.



- We have a large extended family that gathers weekly for dinner. This does necessitate the use of more parking.
- Make sure the cost of purchasing more parking permits is high enough.
- I feel like myself and my guests should be able to park at my house with no cost outside of our taxes. I'm a fan of only two guest permits because I think some people would take advantage and rent theirs out to commuters.
- Different needs for different families. Posing parking restrictions and numbers of vehicles is too big-brother-ish. The 2 passes plus option to buy more is more functional for more diverse families and their needs.
- If a resident has onsite parking they should be using it. If they choose to use their garage as a storage space, for example, then they should pay to park their car on the street.
- Young adults living with parents who begin driving. Older family members living with children who are still driving.
- I choose option B. Many buildings, like the one I'm in, don't have enough on site parking for everyone. The second vehicle in my house must park on the street. And I must also park on the street if I have a guest since I can't get any visitor passes.
- Residents should be encouraged to utilize their on-site parking before resorting to having their multi-family vehicles, visitors, or tenants from taking up the limited street parking intended for non-residents to the area.
- Option D. By adding parking pads and driveways, you eliminate much of the on street parking. You would be adding cost to homeowners to install driveways or parking pads on their properties and the ramps would eliminate the street parking. It would be cheaper to maintain street parking.
- I am opposed to charging for permits. I also selected option A as there was no option to say permits are free. I do think 2 permits per household is enough.
- We should be creating a proper market for parking that encourages people to consume less of it. Prices are the best way to do this. If demand is too high in an area, raise the price. Parking should not be an infinite resource to be consumed for free.
- There are far too many vehicles parking on my street
- Everyone should have full access to street parking even with garage or driveway, No resident own the street and we should be able to park in front of any home when needed. Why should I pay in addition to increasing taxes single or multi family home or not. I would prefer to remove parking restrict
- Option B is the most fair - if someone wishes to have reserved, preferential parking access it is only fair that they pay for this privilege. If you are developing a property, you must absorb the cost of providing parking on-site so giving free on-site parking to certain residents is unfair.
- My selection reflects the need for residents to have guest and resident street parking available to them. To permit more permits to be purchased creates a class structure that supports residents with excess income and represents an opportunity for abuse if the resident starts to rent out the space
- Residents shouldn't be able to "purchase" extra parking. 2 visitors is enough as most times, events only last 2 hours or a party would be held in the evening.



- I think A is the most fair
- This is currently restrictive enough
- People in RPP zones tend to already have very high property taxes - unfair to charge them more to park in their own neighbourhood. 2 is a reasonable limit per property.
- The City development process has allowed for overcrowded communities and thus more parking issues. I don't need to be taxed more for parking in front of my own home.
- Too many city restrictions make life very difficult and unpleasant
- This provides the most flexibility for possible scenarios for different families with different needs.
- You do not have the right to dictate what homeowners or renters use their garages for.
- We are a single family home with 3 vehicles, we need the option to purchase a third permit thus choice d.
- Hiding the costs of parking are detrimental to Calgary. I believe that the cost of parking should be born by the user. Ideally, this means that parking is always available for those who are prepared to pay for the cost of it. More importantly, the cost discourages automobile use and ownership.
- I pay significant property taxes and should be able to park in front of my house on a private residential R-1 street. To even consider asking more for that right is insulting. Can't even get our streets cleaned properly during the year.
- I would have selected A. except there are always exceptions to a hard limit. Residents should be able to park on street near their house. Individual circumstances can often make on-site parking unavailable. If option A. is implemented, then there needs to be an appeal process for special cases.
- I already pay for my RPP.
- "D" appears to be the most balanced as it provides some parking for residents w/ option for more. "A" - is difficult if a resident is having an event. "B" would disadvantage residents who are unable to pay any parking. "C" does not make sense to me.
- My street is used by non permit holders to take the bus at the corner or party on 17th Ave. I want to go back to actual permits placed in cars so I can call in illegally parked cars. The new system fails us big time!!!
- capping the permits at two and not allowing more, prevents someone from excessively purchasing too many and thereby taking up too many spots that may be available. Two per residence is more than adequate, these should be provided at no cost to the residence.
- I do not agree with any of these. Parking permit should only be purchased and limited to one per home. As new secondary suites and developments require on site parking - so should other existing homes. If people want parking - they should have to pay. It would also generate revenue for the city.
- Price needs to be high to deter people from buying passes to rent out for profit. Otherwise streets by a generation area will still be congested and paid parking lots for those facilities will be empty. I think a set number of passes should be made for an area and demand should dictate price.
- A, because only allowing single family dwellings the option is discriminatory.
- My garage, while a 2-car garage in theory, will not fit two cars. I leave mine there while I walk to work. My babysitter who does not live with me comes every day, and I can't get her an annual



permit. I have to remember to register her each 2 weeks. In one week, she got 3 tickets - very annoying.

- because you have a right to park in front of your house.
- works reasonably well.
- We lived in the zone in Scenic Acres and it was appreciated as we had two sons at UofC with their own cars.
- A and B reflect the value that parking has and the costs to citizens. We shouldn't be giving free parking to rich people just because they don't like other citizens to visit their neighborhoods.
- One person can own multiple cars.
- D. -Should not have to scramble to find parking so I don't get a ticket when visiting family at residences, residences should not have to pay for anything, if entertaining where 3-5 vehicles may be parking for special occasions - residences should be allowed to enter all plate numbers
- Some households have multiple families living in them with an abundance of vehicles. Leaving no room for visitor parking.
- Many homeowners have single-car garages but own multiple vehicles for on-street parking thus limiting the amount of guest/services parking space for those of us who have one garage and one vehicle.
- I love inner city - lots of people park on the street because their garage is full of stuff. Makes it hard to access businesses in the area.
- This system works well I like the option to by another pass sometimes I like to have 4or5 couples over and trying to fingered out parking can be an issue
- I am choosing D as there is no option provided for NO RPP.
- I am choosing D because there is no option to select none of these options. Residential On site parking should have no relevance, to the availability of street parking let alone permitting these areas.
- Most residence in my suburban community have two cars but some have more due to young adults or tenants in the residence (cannot park in their garage due to size limitations) - these people should pay extra for extra parking privileges and I view it is as fair revenue generator
- I think that on site parking should be utilized first and purchase more if needed. This will discourage people from giving out permits to friends for free and will generate money for the city.
- Our neighbor has a single garage, but never parks any of his 4 vehicles in it. They park anywhere including in front of my driveway (at the front) and garage (at the back). They have numerous visitors at all times, we never know who is allowed to be parked in the RRP
- D- We have more garage space than cars, but I should still have option to park on my street at various times (garage cleaning, dropping off groceries, etc) without having to pay extra or risk a ticket.
- D. Extra permits should be included for frequent visitors (family) & caretakers
- Many people have parking on their property but choose to "sublet" their parking passes for profit.
- B: Street space is valuable. We could charge for permits and spend the money in the area.



- This sounds more like generating revenue than anything else. I'm not a permit parking supporter. I pay taxes for the street. I should be able to use it.
- I also want temp. passes for house cleaning OR Yard staff. at no extra cost. when I call the parking authority they have such an attitude showing me I am not important. my taxes went up to 12,000. stop spending my tax money like a drunken sailor. cut back like art spending or more bike lanes.
- We own 4 cars (licensed, registered, insured), and have no driveway, but we are only given 2 permits. We can't switch plates amongst vehicles if we want to park them on the street because the plate is registered to a particular vehicle. We pay taxes and should be allowed to park on a public str.
- I live in a area with 25 ft lots and neighbor has 4 vehicles, 1 motorcycle and I rarely can park near my own house.
- Temp permits should be allowed, but more than 2 permits per residence is just subsidizing the storage or personal possessions on city property (cars on streets.)
- I live in Sunnyside...we appreciate the system but are at a loss to know what to do when we have more than 2 visitors.
- The City has no right to dictate what homeowners and renters do with their garages.
- There should be no cost for parking permit for residents; I suggest that 3 or 4 permits be available to homeowners at no cost - some families have more than 2 cars, or homecare workers, out of town guests, nannies, etc. It would be great to have paper/hard copy parking permits in some cases.
- People should use their own parking first and save passes for visitors
- A: Most residential lots in Calgary have a street frontage that will only accommodate a maximum of 2 vehicles and that should be the limit.
- no need to charge residents, nor their guests... charge visitors to the area
- Option B - Cost recovery should be important; the city shouldn't have to subsidize parking, especially in areas with close proximity to transit and services. People should have to pay for any exclusive access to the street.
- On street parking for registered residents should be available at no charge to residents.
- Single family dwellings can have more than two drivers and vehicles. Consider 2 working or non-working parents with vehicles and one teenager/student or young adult who lives at home due to cost of their own residence.
- The main issue is enforcement of adjacent 2hr parking zones.
- Have no issue with two passes being issued per household. However, additional ones being purchased could mean the city dipping into a University student's pockets for extra \$\$ while their parents get the "free ride". Renters in legal or illegal suites might also get dinged. No easy solution.
- The current system works quite well in our area. We do have a few homes who have 4 permits, and that does make it quite challenging for parking when you consider most lots are 30 feet. 2 permits per household is very fair. It allows people to park relatively close to their home and have friends over
- If they have available parking on their property, leave street parking to those coming to the area to visit or do business.



- Some residences have more than 2 drivers living there. Why penalize the third?
- 2 per person at no cost.
- Yes - and please allow me to have a permit to park in front of my property anywhere in the city! and especially where I live. I pay taxes and overflow of renters next door take my space!!!
- If you have a garage, parking pad, or designated parking space, you should be using it - lane or front. Streets clogged on both sides simply because people do not want to lose that "backyard" space is dangerous to drivers and pedestrians using the roads as they were intended.
- If people need more parking spots, build a garage or parking pad and use it.
- Option D, residents should be entitled to park on the premises at no cost with the understanding that the street doesn't belong to them but would be unfair to pay to park outside. At the same time as families grow, sometimes they have more cars than parking spots and should be able to purchase extra
- C if you have parking accommodations on your lot you should leave the street free for others.
- Multi family dwellings need to be dealt with differently, and not sure what solution is, as not enough space on street to issue 8 permits for a 4plex
- Residents taxes are paying for street access. My back alley and garage is actually a tragic waste - the city permits infill builders to construct totally impractically sized and inaccessible garages such that street parking is more convenient than these tiny garages.
- B) Depending on the availability of off-street parking, perhaps 1 on-street permit might be free, but beyond that there should be a price, and it should increase for every subsequent permit.
- Need to either change the eligibility for getting a RPP from having registered address or the 2 week long permit. My partner and I both own houses in different zones and have to add each other every second week. I have had to pay a coder to write a routine for doing this, which i have sold to others
- Dwellings may have more than 2 vehicles. They should have the option to purchase or apply for additional permits.
- D - Not all houses have sufficient off street parking to accommodate the number of cars people have.
- D - the city imposed the parking permit law. They should then enforce it every day not just once in awhile. Permit parking should be the space in front of that residence along with the visitor permit - not the space in front of your neighbors front door. Visitors should park at the residence too.
- Two permits are a must for any household as most of the families have 2 cars in the family. There should be an option to allow them to buy more permits if required (as some families have more than 2 vehicles as having a vehicle saves a lot of time in Calgary as it it necessity and not luxury.
- Will free up more parking so people don't buy more than two spots.
 - Most properties only have street frontage to allow 2 cars at most. It should be capped at 2 max and this is it. What you choose to use your garage for should have no impact on if you "qualify" for street parking.
- Unless on-site parking is not available I don't see it necessary to offer permits to people to park.
- Our home only has access to street parking and we are a two vehicle family. We would require two permits for our household and the ability to obtain additional permits to allow us to have guests.



- I think people should have to use their on site parking availability. Clean out your garage and park your car. Two parking permits per household should be enough
- As long as proof is given that the number of vehicles in the household exceeds the number of parking spots available on the property, then up to 2 additional parking spaces should suffice in terms of meeting the parking needs of residents.
- Too many cars parked on streets reduce visibility and makes neighborhoods more dangerous for kids.
- A and D. 2 per residence and maybe purchasing a 3rd for visitors. Current online visitor registration doesn't work.
- We pay a lot in taxes as it is, would be nice not to have to pay as well for parking permits on (2) permits.
- The current system works.
- With no other option for parking, the permits should be free.
- Limit purchase ability to an extra one or two, as more would clog the street and favour the wealthy.
- Option A is too restrictive for basement suites. Option B is not a good option for low income residents. Option C would add an additional administrative burden. Option D is a good compromise.
- Best option
- "D.
- Two permits should be plenty for 90% of single-family dwelling. Some may have more than two cars and there should be an application process to get additional permits. Approval for these add'l permits should consider the number of permits already issued on the block."
- Of the options, only A and C are remotely acceptable. Parking on streets should be available to any citizen
- Gives flexibility
- I am tired of seeing people with driveways and garages parking on the street which takes up space for our visitors to park. If your garage is full of junk then you should clean it out so you can park in it. The rest of us seem to manage.
- Residents who utilize their on-site parking and visitors to their residence should not be charged for permits. However if residents have onsite parking or a garage and are using it for storage, a gym, or as part of a home based business they should be ineligible for a RPP.
- When 3 residences across the road that have at times 8 to 10 vehicles parked on the street we cannot even have visitors come, let alone park 1 vehicle in front of our residences. Car to Go should be parked away from residential areas. Wish my area in Parkhill had the option
- We have an issue on our street with people buying multiple vehicles and parking them on the street, and the vehicles have just been sitting there for months not moving.
- A fee encourages people to consider if the street parking space is really necessary. Perhaps a sliding scale of rates - \$ for 1, \$\$ for 2, \$\$\$ for the 3rd or higher.
- Allowing more than two permits encourages families to own more vehicles - very non-environmental, plus it increases costs of City Hall



- Option C - I want to get rid of as much of the residential area permitting system as possible, this is the closes thing.
- The CofC zoning is ever changing, the CofC wants as much DENSITY as possible with little to NO regard for existing homeowners- so when a RC-1 gets converted into a 4 wide rowhouse there is NO concern by CofC Council in parking issues - so it should be capped at 2 free per household with no extras
- D we have regular visitors, primarily family members, who require parking as close to our home as possible.
- I don't believe in any permits at all. I chose C because I could not proceed without choosing one. People who live in multiple-dwelling complexes downtown know when they move in that parking will be limited if there is no on-site parking. Usually apartments have on-site parking for one car.
- Neighbors are taking up street space instead of using their driveway/parking pad
- I live in an apartment building that has no guest parking, and only one stall for each unit. I would like to be able to have a second pass for street parking or access to a guest parking pass for the street.
- Cap the number of permits and people should pay for them. Look at Ottawa.
- Whether you have parking onsite or not you should have the same right to street parking as your neighbors. No need to bit neighbour's against each other.
- It is so frustrating to have to fight for parking spaces since people who own multiple cars park all along the sidewalks. Each single family dwellings without driveways should have the front of their houses as their OWN parking space. I am so sick of people driving in front of my houses!!
- D, sometimes there is a necessity for more than 2 parking spaces, on a temporary or permanent basis, and availability of suitable off-street parking is not universal, particularly in older neighborhoods. Maybe limit by total pool availability?
- the current system works well on our street. Some families have young adult kids living at home with vehicles and shouldn't be penalized by have a strict 2 permit limit.
- Don't allow people to park on the street if they have the option to park on site. But offer the ability for visitors to park on the street.
- It's ridiculous that people have garages and are still parking on the street, making it more difficult for visitors to the area to find parking.
- C- Many people with garages always park on the street. I have lived in rental houses where there are 6 tenants all with a car and limited numbers of on-site spaces. Therefore trying to get parking on the street can be impossible if everyone parks on the street and not in their garage.
- I have 2 cars only and every day I struggle to park my car
- This allows flexibility for residents and their visitors, including visits to the residents by businesses.
- Parking zones should be open to all and not limited
- Option D is most favorable. Single family dwellings that have no other parking options (no garage or parking pad and limited/nonexistent back alley parking) should have priority access to street parking. They sold get 2free permits and optional to buy up to 2more visitor permits.
- Street parking is a hazard and should not be permitted. If you do not have somewhere on your property to park your car, buy a transit pass or buy a bike.



- Every house in my neighbourhood (Back alleys and detached garages/park pad) originally had room to park 2 vehicles off street or lane. With 2 'visitor' permits, that allows 4 vehicles to be legally parked. If a single-family home has more than 4 vehicles, they should pay for the privilege.
- It should be free and unlimited for anyone connected to a household in the area. No one should have to pay to park near their home and their visitors should not have to pay neither
- Option A seems workable so long as the permits have no cost attached to them. No residence should ever be allowed to have more than these two permits, anything more is unfair to fellow community residents, regardless of the number of drivers living in a given residence.
- Parking problems are a direct result of lack of building code provisions mandating adequate parking on every lot. The City needs to build adequate free parking near high volume locations.
- Option A. In our area (close proximity to U pf C) it is not unusual for there to be 6 to 8 vehicles around one property.
- C:I like the idea of people actually parking their cars in their garages.
- We live in Castle Keep, S.W. All the condos have double garages. However, the residences choose NOT to use their garages, and park on the street. It is almost impossible to get through to the rest of the community with vehicles parked on both sides of the street.
- "A) I really mean ONE permit and not two.
- C)I live in an area with back alleys and garages and yet the majority of homeowners in the area park on the street and use the garages as workshops or have 2-3 cars per house. It makes navigating the street we live on difficult."
- Garages are for parking not storing stuff.
- People are too possessive over street parking. Street parking g should be first come first served. If you want a permit, you should have to pay for it. Use your garage to park-people rarely do so in this city.
- Many streets can't accommodate more than 2 per house. This is the fairest system.
- I have been trying to deal with this for a while. I live in bridgeland and keep getting parking tickets with my house in the picture. I have tried many times to contact for a permit but the only office that can make a decision or so I am told has never gotten back to me.
- Option D: two visitor passes is sufficient most of the time, but I juggle several visitor passes each week for my home business. As my business grows, I imagine it would be of great benefit to have the option to purchase even one more.
- Extended families and older children at home. Not an option sometimes to have a maximum
- Inconvenient for adult kids living with parents, parents drops off kids to be babysit by grandparents and stay for dinner or to visit; also providing care for elderly parents or grandparents who lived in a permitted parking neighborhood.
- Parking in the city is valuable. It should all go for fair market value so all residents can benefit
- If you have a garage or driveway you should use it.
- 2 free permits with the ability to purchase more seems fair. Particularly for elderly residents on fixed incomes. These permits allow visitors, care workers, family, and friends to park at the residence unrestricted. Without these permits, many people would be further out of pocket.



- Having lived in a permit zone for almost 20 years, I find D, to be the best system that had been implemented. Going to no sticker was a great idea, the money saved can now be directed to other costs within the system.
- This is working today on our street.
- We live by the U of C. Even with our permits many people who challenge the system, partially block our driveways, etc. Ticket the offenders including overnight and weekends when people park here and stay over in the residences. Residents should not be paying for inconsiderate actions of others.
- a BASIC single family consists of 2 working adults and possible members of driving age dependants.
- A - Allows for two cars in a family and visitor permits. But they should be purchased if wanted particularly if there is available onsite parking.
- We already pay taxes to pay for the road and sidewalk, if you have room to put 2 cars in front of your home and stay within property width, those should be free, if you have room to park behind, there is a 3rd one. There are issues with people who own 4 or 5 vehicles and leave them in front of other
- I have a single car driveway but we have 2 vehicles, 1 for me; 1 for spouse. Across the street is a giant house in which there must be 11 people living; the H. drives taxi/his friends drive it when he is off shift & their cars park outside my house. Same with house next to us. Multi families in single family homes take more than their share.
- Don't agree with any of the options. If there are any parking restrictions, then the first three hours should be free, and if the car isn't moved after three hours, then a parking ticket could be issued. This should only be during the daytime.
- One house on the street can occupy most of the available parking as they have six or more vehicles (and only 4 drivers!!). As long as they can purchase extra permits, they don't care that they are taking parking from non-mobile seniors, etc.
- Exclusive access to public spaces/property should be shared by all, and anytime restrictions are in place, there should be a fee. Public parking is not a right or entitlement, but rather, it should come at a cost if you want that privilege.
- Two permits per single family is a sufficient number. If people in a residence need any more than that they must pay for the permits. Right now I have a single-family residence next door and the people have 5 vehicles.
- It's completely unreasonable to ask residents to pay to park on the street out front of their home. Providing two permits, free of charge, is necessary.
- B is ignorant. A home owner must be able to park in front of their house without having to pay for it. I hate that the city is so stupid as to think that as even as a possibility.
- D - some families have more than two cars and may not have much on site parking.
- Only with proof that more than 2 vehicles owned by the resident who lives there
- Inner City home owners pay the most in property tax and should have the option to park on the street with a permit even if they have other parking options. If someone in a multi family dwelling can produce their vehicle registration then they should also be permitted to obtain parking permits.
- B - houses should have on site parking. Why was development allowed without enough parking?



- Charging for all permits would unfairly punish families on the brink, financially (B). Preventing the purchase of additional permits is unnecessarily inflexible (A). On-site parking is not always what it seems; "two car" garages often store bikes or provide work spaces (C).
- Sorry, it costs for the City to maintain roads. Privilege of on-street parking should be paid for residents on same street. My father paid on-street parking for 15 years in Toronto when he owned a home on same street. Get over it, Calgary! Control the dominance of cars.
- I don't mind paying for excess of 2 spots. Charging for all spots is simply another step toward death by taxation.
- D - this covers most needs
- Cap the permits to two. More than two cars on a house becomes a really bad thing for communities.
- I have neighbors who choose to park on the street and leave their driveway empty taking up valuable street parking for others. If people have a driveway the amount of permits they get should be restricted.
- C - development permits are approved in part based on the number of onsite parking stalls. If residents choose not to use the space for parking they shouldn't burden the neighbourhood.
- If on-site parking requirements were relaxed to allow more innovative density such as laneway suites, the reasonable trade off would be an opportunity to buy on street parking. Vehicle owners should purchase their storage space, just like they do for every other private good.
 - People should park on their own property first rather than taking space on the road which could be used by other people. C) However if not feasible only 2 permits because if they are allowed to purchase more than this could create a Air B n B parking "lot" on the street for a residence.
- A - I have lived in permit parking R2 zoned neighbourhood for many years and have never had an issue with paper permits. On line registration was very inconvenient.
- People with garages etc should use these first
- "B: if a family requires more than on-site provides they should be required to pay for passes required.
- C: passes should be provided in instances where there is no on-site parking, limited to two passes. If more are required they should have to purchase additional passes as well."
- May help deter people lobbying to restrict parking if it affects them as well
- D- a single family dwelling with 2 adults each having a vehicle and no on-site parking does not allow for any visitors. It is not acceptable to ask residents to pay to park in front of their own home or to expect them to not have visitors.
- Disagree as the owner of a property should be able to use a private garage for storage or whatever they want. The city should not be able to tell people they cannot park in front of their home if they have a garage.
- This will deter residents of the area from selling their parking passes to people who do not live here.
- You should not have to pay to park on your own property which you pay taxes on and paid for when you purchased (garages, driveways) and you need parking for guests (on road)



- A assuming there is also parking spaces on the property. Three allowed when only one parking space is available on property. Primary need is visitors
- seems to work now - if you can afford > 2 vehicles then pay the\$50 per ...
- An option is needed for regular visitors. The online 2 week system is awful. The old paper visitors permit was much better.
- There has to be an option so those of us who have social lives can have friends and family over without worrying that they're all going to get parking tickets!
- Anyone buying more than 2 is likely abusing (reselling) or simply overusing (wasteful). Neighbourhoods were designed for one or two vehicles per household.
- This is total bs...3 cars in a family, and they have to pay for permits...By the way, this is a horribly designed website...the meeting today at Hillhurst, was a total waste of time...quit catering to big business, with there overpriced parking downtown...you want customers, make parking accessible.
- I live in University Heights which is a community that is completely surrounded by Institution. We are an island community with major hospitals, the University of Calgary, and McMahon Stadium. It is impossible to park on our street if we do not have residential permit parking restrictions.
- Charging for each vehicle would be fine if everyone in the city had to pay, not just parking zones currently designated. Otherwise this is effectively a tax that is not administered equally.
- Residents who have purchased homes in areas where large institutional developments continue to increase in size require considerations that will preserve the quality of their community experience. Guests and visitor space necessary for residents as homes and parking designed for time they were buil
- D-each homeowner (taxpayer) should have the ability to park two vehicles in front of their home . Be it a person living in the home or a visitor to the home.
- Permits for parking should not be fee based buy covered within property taxes
- Many neighbours of mine have 3+ cars that they park on the street rather than on their drive way or in their garage.
- D, residents should have primary parking access and be able to reliably park close to their residence on a consistent basis.
- Option D - There is already a premium paid on housing and property tax to be close to areas where people want to park (near parks, public transit, commercial retail, etc...)
- Roads are a public utility. Using a road for parking should be equally accessible for all tax payers and should be priced according to the cost of maintaining the road etc.
- I live downtown and my family needs three cars.
- Option C. Too many cars on the street makes it difficult to see oncoming traffic. Less cars may increase visibility, leading to safer driving conditions for commuters, cyclists, and pedestrians.
- most single detached house comes with at least 1 single car garage, together with 2 on street permit this should be more than enough for any typical family
- Our home is multi family at times (people travel for work). The garage holds 2 cars for 4 drivers. And we have visiting family (large family). With no on street parking (even 2 hours, we live right by the hospital) we can't have anyone there for even a Sunday dinner. We need more than 2 permits.



- C&D - Most of the homes in my zone have on-site parking, several homes including mine do not. I should be able to access more free parking permits than my neighbours. Unfortunately my neighbours with onsite parking were the ones to petition for the restricted parking due to the local high school.
- City has actively prevented people from providing sensible street access onsite parking. Laneways are increasingly hostile (blocked, overly busy (multiunit use), constricted (multiunit creep) and full (many garbage bins etc)). Parking permits are troublesome to obtain with the online system. Simplify
- c - if you have a garage or other forms of parking you should use that first
- Because having 2 cars for a family is reasonable and more than 2 permits might be abused by people who might give the space to people from outside the community.
- Works good
- I chose B. Let folks first use their designated park pad or driveway but if there's a lot of car owners in their home, they will need extra parking space. They should pay for that extra because they're taking it away from public use and extra funds help the city.
- C & D - You shouldn't have to pay if you live there. Shouldn't allow unlimited permits per residence either. Streets get congested.
- This will force families to re-evaluate a 2nd car. 2nd and 3rd cars are in many cases the reason that residents "need" parking permits for their residential streets when that already have an assigned space. Raising the cost of living far from work is not a bad thing.
- "A) Every home has either front or back parking that fits two cars. The addition off two street parking spots brings the total to four and that is enough parking.
- We have a group home next door to us and they have upwards of 6 vehicles at a time at the house. [personal information removed] is causing chaos."
- They are getting to use public infrastructure for restricted private use for free, which is utterly ridiculous. IF this must happen, there should be a significant charge for it. Everyone pays for the roads, why do they get private use of them?
 - 2 permits/ residence cover absolute majority of residences. Permits should be optional, and be purchased.
- If you have a driveway, use it to park, and free the street for other use.
- D- Most single dwelling homes have 2 cars and should be able to have the option to park on the street and have a visitor park without penalty. Or have a service like a piano teacher/tutor/cleaner able to park close to their house without penalty
- People that own houses in residential areas should not have to pay for parking. There is always so much extra space that they should have the option to buy more if they want too. But have a cap on how many each resident can buy.
- Often, on site parking is insufficient, poorly maintained, or, as in the case of my condo, ripe with crime. Two cars have been stolen from our ill-lit parking space in the last year and many residents feel more safe parking in the street.
- These restrictions hamper the ability to have visitors to the home.



- In areas like downtown, by the hospital, or by a university, it's unreasonable to make people pay for a permit. They need parking, and if they don't have a permit, they're not getting any. I could imagine it's frustrating!
- "B - to encourage the use of onsite parking, people should pay for street permits.
- A - street permits called at two to limit those with 2+ cars"
- Explaining D: People who live there should be able to park on the street and have visitors over without the risk of a ticket. Rental property landlords would give tenants the permits for as long as they live there.
- People flood the streets and driveways with their multiple vehicles, rv's, utility trucks and leave no extra parking for anyone else.
- I am concerned with residents controlling the city property - parking. The ability of residents to get streets rezoned just pushes the problem elsewhere. The city owns the street and therefore they should have an overall plan for parking that works best for the community, local area and city.
- Reduce car count. When i look outside my house i can see cars everywhere and i can hear them all the time and if i go anywhere i need to constantly be aware to not be run over. If cars where bears we would not allow such a thing!
- I live in a high density area in the SE. Parking is a big issue in this type of community. There is enough room to park ONE vehicle in front of my house. Many of the homes have now become rentals with upwards of 4 and 5 vehicles parking on the street. Permit Parking should be considered!
- There s/be no cost for permits - ever. Residents should get 4 permits and ability to get more. This accommodates 2 cars per resident and visitors.
- B: People do not own the road in front of their house. This is a public street so the permits should cost money to support maintaining the street and to deter people from using the street instead of the parking within their own lots or making housing decisions that fit their parking needs.
- "A. I agree with the overarching philosophy of increased residential density and reducing vehicle use and there no need for more than two vehicles per residence. Maybe 30-year olds would leave home if they can't park their truck in front of Mom and Dad's house!
- Park in your garage or driveway."
- There is no restriction for residents who have off street parking and no onstreet parking restrictions as to how they park their vehicles. As long as a vehicle is registered to an address it should be eligible for a free parking pass. Otherwise parking restrictions lower a home's value
- Residential permit parking is a poor idea as is. Permanent road side parking should always only be a last resort option and should be available to everyone, not just those living in a certain neighbourhood.
- B
- Street parking poses dangers to residents - especially children and the elderly. It blocks lines of sight, increases traffic, contributes to noise and air pollution.



- On street parking is very limited in our neighbourhood. Issuing more than two permits, whether free or otherwise, would create unmanageable congestion. Yes, using a garage would be ideal but many are too small or too run down to be usable. Driveways and pads are rare in our neighbourhood.
- RPP Eligibility and Review process does not exist. I have contacted the city, calgary parking authority, my community association and even tried my MLA. They all point the finger at someone else and no one will take responsibility to get my building authorized for a permit despite being in a zone.
- Streets are public, they are paid for by tax payers. A person who wants to make it their personal parking spot should have to pay. Accommodating parking for over 2 cars per household in public streets is ridiculous.
- People shouldn't be punished for having more family members who drive - d
- Allows for getting as many or as few as the individuals need without redundancies or people trying to leverage their free spots.
- Even though I live on a permitted street, parking is very limited. If each residence has access to a total of 4 passes there is not enough space for every vehicle. Increasing the aloted number of permits will make this worse.
- I agree that each resident in a community has the right to be able to park within a reasonable distance from their home and the streets are to be shared with other other owners. Capping at two per household will also allow room for visitors, care workers etc.
- Most people have 2 cars
- It is unfair that someone who loads their garage with their junk also parks their 4 cars on the street. If you have a hoarding problem, don't make it your neighbour's problem. If there's availability on your property, use it.
- Option C is an overstep of city authority. You cannot make someone use a garage for parking a car, just because one exists. Maybe I am doing a renovation, and need the storage, maybe I am an artist and need the space for my hobby. Maybe I am entitled to use my property as it suits me best!
- "A: capping it allows others to purchase them and there isn't much need for more than 2 permits per residence
- C: allowing people to purchase when they have onsite parking of any form is ridiculous, those spots they take up could be used for multi family dwellings"
- D - This option provides the flexibility of allowing the primary resident to use the street frontage of their property. There should be no additional costs associated with this right. If the city views the ability to park in front of your property as a privilege they are mistaken.
- The existing process seems to work well as is. If anything, all residents with vehicles should be able to park them on the street in front of their residences. As long as they are permanent residents at a given address, they should have unlimited numbers of permits available to them at no cost.
 - Two permits per single family dwelling seems like a fair amount. I don't believe that garages should be considered as a "preferred option" for parking. People use garages for shops or storage, so not appropriate to assume that a garage is sitting empty. Parking pad or driveway okay for parking.



- Charging residents for parking on their own street would help reduce the tendency for residents to enact a parking ban in the first place- if it also negatively affects them.
- On street parking is limited, so when more than 2 cars per house are parked on the street, it is not possible for a homeowner to park when they come home from work which is unfair. We should be able to park one car in front of house for free, we pay enough property tax and property price inner city.
- OPTION A & C - People use their garage as a storage unit resulting in congested street parking. Street parking should be for visitors. If you don't have room for your 2 cars plus a lawn mower than get rid of a car. Permits should be capped at 1 per residence plus 2 visitor permits.
- If citizens are using on street parking, they should pay for the parking. The city should not be subsidizing on street parking. Our roads cost money and those who use them more should pay more. The city can then take that money and invest it in public transportation.
- Limiting the number of vehicles a residence may park near the premises, without the option to purchase more, will not serve residents well. Assessment of available on-site parking and managing resident appeals of such assessments would likely be labour-intensive.
- There is no permit parking in my neighborhood (Renfrew), however we, our guests, delivery people..are never able to park outside our house due to street parking. The city needs to better educate the public to be respectful and neighborly when parking. Ads on Global, Google etc. would go along way.
- Even with pad / garage parking residents have needs to park on the street for short duration and should continue to have at least 2 free permits for their flexibility.
- There are a lot of multi-family homes in the NE with over 4 cars per house. It is getting over crowded and should not be allowed as they are taking up space of residents who only own one car.
- We bought so we could walk to work and have one vehicle. We live in Kensington and do not have working garage we NEED to park in front of house. Neighbours have 4 - 5 vehicles they purchased permits for. Condo across rents out his parking stalls and has residents park on street.
- Sometimes multi "family" rentals have more than two cars in the household. such as with students.
- If this inquiry is addressed to all people in Calgary, the method is wrong. Residents fo the inner city communities should decide about their community and not the people in other communities who are not affected by the rules.
- I honestly believe we should get rid of permits altogether. It's another cash grab for the city (fining visitors, fining those that have mobility issues that try to park close, - CASH GRAB)
- Having the option to purchase more for family's with older kids is important. Having limited visitor parking passes makes it difficult if there are more than 2 vehicles per household.
 - If parking is such a limited resource that RPP are thought to be required, a single household should not be allowed more than two permits. If they have a large number of vehicles they should find a private place to store them.
- There should be a limit and you should not be able to purchase more. This is classist and will result in some homes with many and others who cannot afford more.



- There should be a cap on the number of cars from one residence that can park on the street. ie. one rental with 5 residents and 5 cars should not be able to take up 5 on-site spaces.
- We must live within our means, including the use of public property for private vehicles.
- I support option D if this is the current state, but with online permitting it's hard to tell which cars have permits and which don't.
- D: I live on a block with no parking at all. If you were to charge us to park fewer than 2 vehicles near our home that would be overly restrictive. It is hard enough. We have lived here 16 years and parking issues have grown worse. We should get to park for free near our own home.
- I'm aware of residents who own 3 and 4 vehicles. My concern is that they'll take over the limited available space on my street if there's no limit.
- A, encourages people to use their garage, in our area all houses have a garage but people choose to park on the street. They usually park in front of neighbours house to leave space in front of theirs
- D) This meets the base legal requirement, specifically that no government cannot dictate how many vehicles a family owns, and residents have a right to park on the street near their home.
- Something like B) because: Streets are public space. Those who want to use them to store their car should pay for it specifically, rather than all of us regardless if or how many cars we have/park on the streets. The money could be used to start properly maintaining residential streets for all.
- If space is restricted, residents should use up their own parking first
- This gives the homeowner the same access to visitor parking as the areas without the need for Residential Parking permits.
- Selected D: many homes may have more than 2 vehicles, ie when adult children are living with parents & even if they have on-site parking, the additional purchased permit(s) allows the family flexibility of which vehicle goes to on-site parking which changes during time of day and/or season.
- Residents should not be able to spill over to public space just because they have chosen to purchase more vehicles than their homes support. They are using street parking as extensions of their driveways. Follow other cities, no parking between 2am - 6am so visitors can park but not residents.
- If people want to restrict parking they should pay for enforcement costs
- A: No family should need more than two vehicles, keeping in mind our impact on the environment as well as available parking space.
- The current permit system is cumbersome. A phone app would be desirable.
- D - I think that's what I support BUT I don't understand the 'multi family dwellings are not included' - does that mean there are no rules for multifamily dwellings?
- RPPs are of significant concern in the older communities where garages (etc.) are either not present, or are inadequate. In communities with sufficient on-site parking, RPPs should be paid (B) for and capped (A).
- Flexibility and reduced administration cost
- This options limits parking to two per residence but I hope this includes applying for parking for visitors



- Two at no cost is reasonable balance in modern society with multiple drivers coming and going at different times given work / school etc. We should NEVER have to pay to park in front of our own single dwelling for 2 vehicles.
- residential street parking should always be as low cost as possible.
- Allows larger families to have permits.
- D - residents should be able to park in front of/near their house without limitations.
- A lot of older neighbourhoods do not have garages or driveways and street parking is a must for residents
- Explaining C. I always park in my single garage and never have any parking for my visitors or contractors, near my residence.
- Seems like the most fair option. Personally, I would prefer 1 permit per single family dwelling instead of 2 though.
- B.I don't want to subsidize others parking or be subsidized myself. Let people with cars pay their true cost. However, make sure that the spots are "reserved" for a residence, and it can "give it up" for a bit and can periodically re-opt in, otherwise we hoard them rather than risk losing parking
- I already think it is extremely unfair that if I want to park a 3rd car I must pay. If the purpose of this is to assess equity in parking use then the same restrictions must be applied across the entire city not just affecting my neighbourhood.
- Residents should not have to pay for parking and not all residents have useable garages or parking pads so option D seems like the logical choice.
- Developers must include adequate on-site residential parking i.e. two (2) spots per residential unit. If optimum transit services were available there should be no need for additional parking. Allow normal parking for everyone else. We never visit Kensington any more.
- "A. In my particular area, Kensington, parking is already lacking and paid parking is forced on residents and residents should get priority in the area, but it is very hard to find free parking.
- Some residents in Kensington have one parking space provided by the building, others have to pay."
- Everyone should have street parking regardless of what they have on site but you need to also provide for visitors
- Each family shouldn't have more than two vehicles on the street. Anything more should be in garage or parking pad.
- I have neighbour who has several suites and tenants take up a significant amount of parking on the street
- "A, B, D - there needs to be a cap regardless of a cost, otherwise there is no limit to the number of cars. It also must be registered as the home owner so that permits can't be just rented.
- C, not fair to owners with on-site unless they get break on taxes."
- Some homes have back lane garages and will only occasionally use residential parking when they are making a quick stop at home, for instance to grab something they forgot etc.
- Two permits have generally been sufficient in our neighborhood. Some homes clearly choose to purchase more and that creates parking problems for short term visitors/trades.



- I have been on both sides of the problem. If there is visitor parking, cap the permits. Otherwise change the time frame or allow people to purchase more if needed
- "C is preferable but if on site parking becomes temporarily unavailable provision should be made for temporary permits
- D Should cover the majority of residents"
- Option D, there are reasons why people cannot use their garage or can only get a single car in the garage (e.g., needed for storage, rental not including the garage, single car garage) and may not want to always use their driveway (e.g. park car on street to allow children to use for play)
- There should be an option to purchase more if needed, otherwise it will be difficult to live in such areas as family. There should also be NO cost to have permit or else residential apartments and homes in zones will have lower occupancy due to additional charges for parking
- Cause I already pay enough for my home and property taxes that I shouldn't have to ALSO pay to park at my house!?? Nor should my guests.
- Street parking should not be free for residents or visitors
- Firstly, This is a silly question since it doesn't take into account multi family dwellings (that I live in) and so it seems it is only for the rich. The rich should have less access to parking.
- Families may have more than 2 vehicles;
- Should be an option to gain more than 2 if needed, but did still have an upper cap of maybe 4
- Street parking should only be for short term needs. Reserving street space via permits to support excess vehicles is not a good use of our public good.
- (D) I have single children living at home but need a vehicle to get to school and work. We purchase an additional permit and that is ok.
- I believe that all residences should provide parking onsite. No-one in the city should expect to be able to park their private property (vehicle) on public property.
- One of my properties doesn't allow guests and I can't get a permit because it is not the address on my ID. I pay the taxes so I should be eligible for the pass.
- No vehicles, commercial or personal, should be allowed to park for free on public property.
- We don't have sidewalks in our neighbourhood and are part of the Glenmore pathway system. We have lots of foot traffic and having lots of cars parked on the street presents a hazard to those using the pathway system when travelling through our neighbourhood and those walking through.
- We have multiple drivers with multiple vehicles in our household.
- The rental home I live in does not offer use of the garage. There are three adults here. Permit parking is the only option if you need to leave and return during the day due to the high school down the street.
- None of the above. We are wanting to restrict outside people parking. That should exclude visitors to a home. The area should be Eagle Ridge only.
- There may be instances where there are more cars at the residence. Children living at home etc. Should be capped at residency



- Most homes in my area (Hillhurst) have garages or parking pads. We are a walking community and many of us walk/bike to work. 2 permits are ample for most folks until extra vehicles needed for teens/university age offspring.
- Depending on the nature of one's job it is not always practical to take public transportation. Families with kids that can drive and are in lots of activities may need them to drive themselves with both parents working. not allowing a purchase option is not practical.
- I pay very high taxes and expect to be able to park close to my home without additional costs.
- "C - do not limit my ability to have a permit because I have a 2 car garage. I use it most of the time but this just get abused by my neighbours who have too many cars.
- this is silly not enough room to type in responses."
- Street parking is the only option where I live
- I picked my two choices above. On the street where I live, there are a number of vehicles who have garages, driveways and yet they have parking permits. The same is true for individuals living in single family dwellings. It isn't fair.
- D - Two is a reasonable number per single dwelling at no cost, with the option to purchase for multipurpose dwellings. This ensures that residents can only buy what they need over and above the two permits.
- I like the way it works now
- "A - Some houses have too many cars. They do not need to have, in some cases, 5 cars at one house. Two permits should be enough.
- B - We already pay taxes, and with the electronic system it is easy"
- The current system is too restrictive to home owners and still does not meet the need for deterrence.
- I choose A because it somewhat supports our needed transition to a low carbon life and economy by limiting permits/vehicles. Also it puts some pressure on buildings to provide additional parking vs putting the burden on the streets and City. We need to protect public space not reduce it.
- I don't think residents should have to pay to park in front of their own homes. They should be allowed to purchase more if they need it (renters who may have roommates, adult children living at home with 2 parents). Cost would deter people from buying more than they need and creating shortage.
- D is reasonable but there should be an option for multi-family dwellings.
- Parking permits should be expanded to include the entire city. Too many curbers in Calgary, as well as four or five adults in a home with one or more cars each. One house should not be able to claim the entire street's parking.
- two is a reasonable number of permits to be provided to single family dwelling but there should be an option to purchase more when required ie children living at home who are new drivers etc
- I think it is important for people to purchase the permits, or else there is no accountability to ensure they are only purchased when needed, or to deter people from purchasing and giving them away to non residents.
- The people that are responsible for clear the sidewalk should have the right to park in front of the cleared sidewalk. The same goes for people maintaining Blvd.



- We live across the street from the U of C. We use our driveway but also need the 2 passes for visitors. Otherwise our street would be clogged with cars.
- we are 5 homes in a large cul de sac. would be nice if we are permitted to park perpendicular to the curb and that way we could get more vehicles parked out front. wish the option on how to park were with the residents and not so stringent as to parking parallel to the curb.
- I have a driveway and garage. Majority of the time the vehicles are parked in the garage. Having the ability to purchase an additional permit for additional vehicle provides a solution if no onsite parking is available.
- In high density neighbourhoods, there is often not enough parking spaces for each resident therefore many residents of a multifamily complex are forced to park on the street. I believe each dwelling (single or multifamily) should be given two no cost parking permits.
- I suspect people have been selling their permits. The cap should be two. C is very bad, housing units should always have at least 2 on site parking spaces.
- simple process
- Makes sense given that a single family could have > 2 vehicles with drivers for each.
- There are various reasons why people might need another permit and if they want to pay they should get it.
- the number of cars per family (or equivalent unit), over and above what fits into its garage or on its driveway, should be limited by permit expenses and/or by a maximum: the roads around our corner lot are regularly cluttered by cars (+associated waste, oil spills) of people nearby
- Option B would be fine with the caveat that the funds be used for extra patrols to ticket non-permitted vehicles. That seems like a good way to maximize the available space for those who want it.
- D Two permits per residence seems reasonable as some owners operate businesses that require multiple vehicles
- Single family dwellings in our neighbourhood are being converted to unregulated duplexes and mini-hostels with as many as 4-6 vehicles added to our street per dwelling.
- A single family dwelling unit can have more than 2 residents needing to own cars.
- "b the space is not free,
- c the space is not for parking."
- A We live by UofC, Foothills, McMahan and the Children's hospital. Most homes have 2-4 parking spots on their property. Some people (mostly those who rent, not those who are long term owner occupiers) rent out their two parking passes per month for profit increasing traffic. Permits must be limited!
- By limiting the number to 2 per dwelling, more options open for visitors and for hourly paid parking to generate more profits for the city. I also feel that the two that are provided should be purchased.
- that is fair. i need a handicapped spot on the street for my house and one other permit would be good for visitors, contractors etc. i do have garage at my house but vehicle does not fit in it so I do need street parking.



- I selected D however I live on a street where there is never a problem with space. It seems unfair I have to purchase passes after the first two free ones. I have three adult kids each with a vehicle. And occasionally a guest. Can some zones have more than 2 free passes when space is not an issue?
- D.) Calgary is very much a driving city and sometimes the parking is a premium commodity, especially for renters. LL may charge exorbitant prices for on site parking that the tenant may not want to pay. Also large families come with many vehicles and they're going to need private parking AND street
- Residential permits are for the residents in that zone. Two per household is average so allow tow free and extras for exceptions to average permits needed
- Visitors, caregivers or contractors may need to park with proximity for safety reasons
- my parents neighbor has 6 cars. they clog up the road and make it hard for my parents to park in their parking spot.
- multi-vehicle homes should have a plan for parking; if they need to use street parking then they should have to pay
- This will avoid residents selling or "renting" extra permits
- The aging population to remain in the home require supports....it may be a cleaning company, the home care workers, the snow removal company or lawn service, the repairmanthey need a place to park and they are expensive to hire, so don't make it more expensive to age in place.
- Single car garage and legal duplex up down suite. 3 to 4 cars would mean 2 spots min needed
- Live by the University - problems with students parking at all hours
- I live in a zone and have a driveway to park on. Before we had RPP requirement on street I could often not use my driveway as it would be blocked by another vehicle. There are enough selfish parkers out there that don't respect driveways. Takes too long to get vehicle towed so need to keep program.
- Residents should have access to permits- capping at 2 is unfair as many households may be made up of multiple car owners
- What we have at present and no problems experienced
- If a 4-plex is built they get 2 permits and they split 2 permits between the 4 units.
- If a residence has on-site parking, the habitual use of the public space restricts visitors & visiting service providers. Those who use the street instead of their own on-site parking often have a sense of entitlement over the space; entering into conflict with visitors needing to use the space.
- We have a single family home with 4 adult drivers who have their own vehicles. We are fine with paying for permits but must have at least 4 and access to guest permits.
- Agreed: I don't own the road in front of my house. However, I don't have a car and on my street we have 4 rental houses with MULTIPLE vehicles, and, owners with 3 cars on the road because "the garage is too full". One renter finally got towed last week for blocking a driveway. Not optimal sol'n.
- Some residents in single family units have multiple borders and there can be as many as 5 or 6 vehicles parked on the street.



- In my opinion residents should be entitled to more than 2 at no charge, perhaps a max of 4, but I agree that this should not apply to multi family or especially illegal secondary suites like we have some of in our area University Heights.
- 2 is reasonable "standard" number of vehicles for a single dwelling and should be free. Many inner city homes do have the option for off street parking for 2 or sometimes even one vehicle.
- The cost of parking should be born by the user.
- D, I should be able to have parking in front of my home without paying for it. I should have the option to have more than 2 passes. I greatly fear the City will move towards requesting payment from me for the two passes which are presently provided with no charge.
- I agree with this.
- When we moved into our neighbourhood, there were no street parking restrictions, although we did have a garage. Today, SAIT has grown to a size that student parking has become an issue. The permit program has addressed this, though it has its own issues by also restricting the number of visitors.
- Match of availability, use & cost
- I feel that option A helps us, as we only have a small driveway, so we need an additional permit for our other vehicle at our residence, and one for visitors. Our neighbours don't have a driveway /garage, so it's imperative that we have these permits available to us. We are all long-term residents.
- I would rather have as many permits (B) as I need during the week and week end without having to go on line to a site that is not user friendly. I find the daily changing of permits time consuming and ridiculous. During the summer with yard care and friends coming over, I don't have enough permit
- Two permits per household is adequate, however most new builds in the inner communities only have off street parking for small to medium sized vehicles. This leaves larger vehicles like pickups and full sized cars on the street. Should be addressed by the planning dept.
- C and D - residents should be using garages and parking pads before street parking.
- In my neighbourhood, many houses have 3 and 4 car garages. The only people without sufficient off-street parking have 5 or more vehicles (for 3 drivers). You could not price extra permits high enough to have any effect on their decision to buy them. But streets should be open to all the public.
- caps are bad people live with one another for a reason, whether someone has a garage or not is their business, what they put in it is their business
- C is the most fair option and will make more street parking available
- Meets needs of most residents in an R1 neighbourhood such as ours.
- D - A conscious effort has to be made by occupant to get more giving a bonfide reason for doing so. We suggest that some occupants are renting these extra permits to workers in the area, those that attend University or work in the hospital complex and are not being used as visitor's permits.
- Apartment vehicles should only be able to park in front of their own building. Vehicles take up all the permitted parking in front of our homes and we are not able to park on our own street!!!
- You should not have to pay to park in front of your own home, regardless of whether or not you have a garage. If you have additional cars (+2), because you are renting, etc., then pay for them.



- B: People who can park on existing space will make the effort to use it. Fee will generate money for the city but give the option of street parking if desired.
- A Two cars is enough for a family. More means that the cars does not belong to them
- It isn't uncommon to have multigenerational families at a single residence requiring more than 2 spaces. They need the option to purchase more if required.
- Charging for permits would promote off-street parking and give the option for 2 hour stay/visitor parking on street.
- Replying to option D. We have a 2 car garage. And we have 4 potential drivers in the house. We will need the extra parking for the additional vehicles.
- I selected A because a single family dwelling may have more than 1 or 2 vehicles. A garage may be on site but is being used as storage for items other than a vehicle
- There should be no restriction on the number of vehicles per household (a single family dwelling may support 3-4 drivers). Two free permits is a good baseline.
- D. Make the price for the extra permit very high; high enough that people think seriously about how many vehicles they should park there. C. If people can park or pay to park in their own building, they should.
- Two is not enough when u have multi family housing or roomates
- My street is not that busy. There is lots of space for residents.
- I live in an inner city condo infill, with only enough parking onsite for one vehicle. We use our garage for storage (bikes, camping gear). We need our street parking. If no permits we required we feel that commuters would park on our street and ride the bus into downtown. (Etc,)
 - This would help limit the number of vehicles associated with a residence. We live in a cul de sac with only 3 street parking spots for 8 houses and it should be left for incidental parking for all residents, but is now being used by our new neighbours with tenants.
- Many multi-vehicle residences have on-site parking that is unused and park 2-3+ vehicles on the street
- As my family grows older I will require more parking than I have available onsite.
- Two permits/residence (A) is a reasonable compromise, considering most residences in our established neighbourhood do have on-site parking, garages, and or pads to use as well. Monitoring who does and who doesn't have parking would be a management nightmare, and expensive to administer.
- Although my area, University Heights, is zoned single family dwellings under a Restrictive Covenant , homes in the area have been sold to absentee landlords who rent out the home to multiple tenants with multiple vehicles and their visitors vehicles. This takes up our parking spaces.
- Too many residence have unused driveways/garages using up valuable street parking instead of their own off street parking.
- user pay is fair. Restricting to two is unfair to anyone with 'kids' who need to drive to school, work, activities.



- We pay taxes and therefore should be able to park at least one car in front of the house as a second car or visitor. All other permits should be paid for. They should go up according to how many are purchased.
- A,C: Many of my neighbours have garages that should provide ample parking but they choose to park in the alley or road. This creates throughway constrictions and blocks visibility on the road. Safety and functionality of the road is significantly impacted when both sides are full of parked vehicles.
- D - Should be allowed 2 and not just for owned vehicles. In other words you could have 2 of your own vehicles and 2 visitors OR 4 visitors Or 1 car and 3 visitors.
- Regarding C.: this punishes people with on-site parking and might lead developers to eliminate on-site parking when they redevelop a property in a desirable neighborhood. Removing parking restrictions and thus decreasing availability of street parking is the biggest incentive to use on-site parking.
- each household should be eligible for one street parking permit at a cost,
- "A. There is often no room for 2 cars to pass each other in the street for long stretches as both sides of the street are full of parked cars.
- I shouldn't have to pay taxes for other peoples parking spaces and they shouldn't have to pay for mine. Should limit # permits for purchase or ramp up cost."
- I chose A because in the beltline the size of the apts and condos mostly do not have more than two drivers - why more than 1 or 2 cars?
- Home owners do not have exclusive rights to the street in front of their house. A reasonable maximum should be set. Two is reasonable.
- I also feel the permits should increase in value with each extra one purchased. This will produce a user pay system with an eye on responsible decisions vs whatever is easiest.
- Option A: Many households have garages/parking pads and still choose to park on the street, and some homes with young adults/renters have multiple vehicles taking up too many on street spaces.
- I think it's insane that in Inglewood, where garages are a luxury, a single residence could purchase more than 2 street parking spaces. I am already fighting for my parking stall with permit parking!!
- Areas with RPP restrictions are usually due to factors outside residents control (e.g. located near post secondary institution or stadium or commercial area). The two permits should be included at no charge as standard service provided per property taxes.
- "D. This is the most viable option from what has been suggested.
- Option A causes problems for houses with a higher density of people.
- Option B is a penalty.
- Option C could further reduce the small yard - could the city in future insist that car pads be installed instead of garden plots?"
- They should only be able to purchase more if they can prove they really need them. People should have visitor permits too for when people come over and people should be using their on site parking primarily to ensure there is room for visitors.



- We have lived in a restricted area for over 20 years and usually received 2 tags. This was plenty for visitors to our home. I still like the option that our own cars, once registered, can park anywhere in our zone.
- Read my responses sequentially in the boxes - I want the system to stay the same for where I am - it works and is fair for our street issues - you cannot have one solution for residential on site parking and business parking issues
- C, There are many communities with garages off lane and yet residence park on street as garages are used for other activities. If a garage is used for anything but cars it puts a major demand on street and also becomes an extension of the house living space and should be taxed accordingly.
- Two vehicles per household is more than enough; if a family has the means for additional vehicles then the space can be purchased.
- This will help deter residents from selling their permits to others for monthly fees and will help open up zones that are close to businesses so that customers and employees have better options of getting to work on time.
- It is the fairest option.
- D is the closest, but I do not agree with it completely. I feel that homes should be limited to two no-cost permits. If a family has 3 vehicles (mum, dad, and an adult child) they should be able to have a permit for each vehicle.
- In the britannia community there is tons of garages and driveways for the residence to park. But they are putting more and more residential parking in areas that no one uses. It is not fair to the businesses or customers to have to park so far away so that they can have no cars on their street
- It would be ridiculous to assume how many cars are in a single family home. There are 5 people with cars that live with us. If we can't park on the street should we park on the lawn of our house?
- No change to present policy other than caregivers (professional or family)being exempt and being granted a special caregiver card for use for that visit
- D - Ideally would like to see 2 permits at no cost, but additional for purchase permits are capped at the number of driving aged occupants live within the residence.
- "A lot of residences with on-site parking still utilize on-street parking as their main option.
- Multi-family (maybe multi-unit would be better terms) will be affected by these permitting, so maybe on-street purchase of a pass, or 2 permits free of charge? Zone concept is a neat one."
- c- If there is already available parking made for the residents of the area then to prevent the streets from being available to the business' and consumers in the area is not fair as they have enough parking to accommodate their needs but then the business' struggle because of the restrictions.
- We have a permanent nanny who comes in 5 days a week and we have to remember to put her in the system especially when over the weekend we have to delete for visitors and reenter and there is no notification system. Would be willing to pay small fee like 25\$ a year for additional permit.
- "B. If a small fee was imposed for every permit, it would help to pay for this and make people less likely to have 4 cars taking up space.
- Garages & driveways are for parking on, so use them! Just make sure there are no parking zones at the driveways so people don't get blocked in."



- A - People who work in the residential area need to have street parking, as not all places of business have enough on site parking. If there are too many residential parking passes, this limits availability of parking spots to people who work at businesses or are customers.
- I choose A because I think family homes should have availability to parking outside their home. I believe most people have 0-2 vehicles so capping it at 2 is fair. Capping it at 2, also supports the care for environment, deterring people from having more vehicles than they need.
- Passes should not be limited to people that actually need them. Most apartments do not include parking space for two cars, and sometimes there is no availability or it is too costly to rent another. A lot of houses specifically rentals only have street parking, and multiple people living in a house
- Owners/tenants should have access to parking at their residence and this option provides flexibility for large families. However, evidence of residency at that residence should be provided to be issued a permit, to avoid abuse of the permits (ie getting extras for nonresident friends, etc.)
- Protect single family home requirements. It is difficult as it is for visitors to park on the block. Too many permits cause excessive pressure on the supply.
- If people have more than 2 vehicles they should park them on their own property, or use their 2 visitor permits. (I don't understand what "which are not tied to license plates" means).
- Option D: 2 free permits are fair. Each additional permit should however cost exponentially more (e.g. 3rd: \$100, 4th: \$200, etc.), to encourage people to use any on-site parking first, and to not take away street parking space due to "excessive" number of cars at a single dwelling.
- A. We live near the University where homes are purchased in order to operate illegal lodging homes for students. It is common for these investors to not only rent out rooms but also to sell the parking permits. By keeping the permit cap it stops investors from making money from city street parking.
- We park our vehicles on the street and feel that two permits at no cost plus the option to purchase an additional permit works best for us. We live next to a high use park (South Calgary) with a playschool on the corner (4 x daily pick up and drop off), C Space, Farmers Market + densification pressures
- As seniors it is unreasonable and unsafe to park behind our garage in the alley.
- I think current system is fine. But if you're going to mess it up. This is the best option. The suggestion D that us living in multi family dwellings should not be eligible is ridiculous. Single family homes should have sufficient parking on their property. Multi family homes are quite limited.
- There is a crazy amount of streets marked as resident permit only for parking when those house have garages and driveways - it's unnecessary and makes it much harder for businesses in those neighbourhoods to a) attract customers and b) provide affordable, accessible parking for their staff.
- Capping the number of permits encourages people to utilize their garage for parking instead of junk and also discourages families from having multiple cars therefore less cars on the road creating emissions.
- I believe as a taxpayer and resident we should be able to park without charge all of our autos in front of our OWN houses at NO COST and such PERMITS should be available based on the ACTUAL REGISTRATION of the Vehicles with that address. This EXCLUDES NEIGHBORS who decide to park in front.



- Residents should have first priority
- I selected D because some residences may require additional passes if there are more drivers living there. It seems fair to allow at least one free pass.
- There is no real option that will address the concerns, but A seemed to be the best. Allow for businesses to visit a home - requires a permit. Instead making the ability to transfer the license plate, or the ability to have MULTIPLE plates on a permit would allow for minimal coordination.
- Higher density in neighbourhoods and redevelopment has caused congestion on our streets. Commuters park and bike into the core or park and walk to university/Foothills/ ACH from our neighbourhood. Residents often can't park near their own homes, or have trades people access easy.
- A - there should be a cap on the number of permits so people don't park excessive cars on street. B - people should pay for any 'reserved' spaces on-street since the street is public property. C - people should be using on-site parking instead of the public street
- With a large family, only two residential permits are not enough. Two minimum plus option to add more at no cost!!
- Two permits would be ample for most situations, however, more permits may be necessary for daytime meetings, etc. in restricted zones.
- C: I think that if there is available on-site parking for residents, there should be no reason for them to take up available space on street sides. However, I do think that those residents who do not have onsite parking should have the right to obtain residential parking permits at no cost.
- In "M zone", many residents park multiple vehicles on the street even though they have garages accessible from the alley. This practice should be discouraged because temporary visitors must then park further away.
- I think D is the appropriate solution. However I find the online system very cumbersome for short term visits. I would prefer to receive paper visitor permits to use for guests.
- DMy son lives on 26th st where he is allowed only a parking pass for his wife and himself however we look after their son 3 days a week I am in my mid 70's and have arthritis struggling to get to their apartment in the snow from over a block away is not easy
- We should not have to pay to park where we live. 2 permits is reasonable for most households. I usuy use my garage but it fits only 1 car and if I am home for a short time and leaving again, it's silly to park in the garage....garage doors use electricity and we are all trying to be better :)
- The present system Option A work reasonable well in University Heights. Changing it will create more dissatisfaction. Contractors should be able to use visitor parking. Contractors generally need more that 2 spaces so increase the visitor parking allowable to 4.
- I think the residential parking permit issue discouraged those who live in those areas from having visitors (especially those with large families). They shouldn't have to spend money to have visitors.
- Our streets are safer, more aesthetically pleasing, and more open for socialization when they are not lined with cars on both sides. Particularly with rentals, and new builds, it is not for on-site parking to be taken into consideration. This option would help with that



- I live in a single family inner city home with a one car garage, no driveway. With businesses, restaurants and condo there is NO available parking on my street. I often have to park a block or 2 away. The condo has underground parking. Both adjacent streets are permit only!! Arg!
- We have a garage on our property but are not able to fit both vehicles in the garage, therefore option C doesn't work for us. I feel like option is not fair to low-income families. I could live with A, but could see where families with driving children may have 3 vehicles.
- If a residence has no parking or very limited they should have the option of parking for more than 2 vehicles
- The cap should be 4 permits. This would take into account 2 cars in the garage and two in the driveway. This would be a standard family of 4 all driving. To allow for mobility of vehicles each would need a permit just to shuffle cars in and out of a standard busy house hold.
- D - Keep the system as is - two permits per single family dwelling at no cost, with option to purchase more.
- Get a driveway.
- D Multi family dwellings are the issue we pay the same taxes as single family yet are restricted
- Many families have more than one vehicle for economic reasons
- There is limited space.
- Two is a reasonable number. If a household has more than two, they should be making arrangements to park on their own property for any more than two. Two cars can fit within the forntage for a typical lot which provides for ample parking for residents and visitors alike.
- Two permits are reasonable. There are inequities between properties with onsite parking. Some have drives + garage, some only have garage. Will the city allow the building of front drives to accommodate off street parking?
- they are taking up street parking when they have a drive way plane and simple.
- Where we live we only had the option for 1 parking space and no visitors. I would like to have the option to buy another space if it was available to me so why take that choice away from others.
- I am assuming you are talking about Resident and Visitor parking here. It seems ridiculous that residents cannot park in front of their homes or if their children come to visit - they must pay for parking - is this not just another money grab making us pay for Visitors infant of my home.
- Should get them free. If can purchase more, could result in fewer parking places for visitors.
- We have a single car garage that is used for storing bicycles, strollers and other items. We need on street parking (one car). I'm ok with b or d.
- I think two permits per house is good, but it becomes problematic if you are having guests over.
- I have guest over in a RPP zone so It's good to have at least two free permits for guest use. I'm okay with the option to purchase more, provided it doesn't itself turn into a sub-letting of the space for profit. The restrictions on parking should exist to optimize use for residents and guests.
- 2 is plenty. We have two hour restriction on front street which is designed to accommodate a number of users (residents, 2 medical clinics, daycare, nearby businesses, etc.) It works well if effectively enforced which it currently is not. Should be extended to weekends.



- The city created this problem. With all the densification construction the worst offenders are the contractors working at the site. Sometimes you need to park in front of your house, all there is wall to wall trucks and vans. Maybe contractors should be bussed to their job site.
- Parking should be free there should be no permit required. We pay taxes, the house or apartment is either owned or rented by us we pay rent, mortgages and yearly property taxes then why the extra.
- Usually these people use their garages for storage. They have 3 to 5 vehicles and park in front of the neighbours. We also have rights!! Also meters park everyway and do not care about the neighbours. Tax paying citizens have rights also. As typical reverse discrimination rules!!!!
- Option C So many people in my area park on the street even though they have a garage or parking pad on their property.
- B paying for parking permits keep the system honest and helps ensure only true residents of a street are buying parking
- C - residents with on-site parking should not be eligible for permanent RPP...perhaps a temp pass for short term visitors or during on-site parking closures (reno or construction)
- Should not have to pay for parking if we've lived here our whole lives.
- A most single dwellings only need two permits those who purchase more are abusing the system selection A
- Prefer old rear view mirror hangers so we know who has a permit and who doesn't before calling 311
- Cap at two but I only receive one permit if on site parking is provided.
- Option D is my choice. It is reasonable to assume at least two drivers per residence.
- Busy streets, 2 per household is ample. Giving options to buy more provides opportunity for illegal parking and selling of permits.
- Life in Calgary (as a spread-out urban centre) is made much easier with a personal vehicle. This is not Manhattan and treating Calgary as such feels like a cash grab. Not everyone can afford parking.
- D. Except give option for more passes free of charge. Many Family's have more than 2 cars. Why do I have to pay extra to park my car on the street
- Typically two people in household can have up to 2 vehicles if they work two separate jobs.
- The owner of the home on the street does not pay any more property tax for the restricted use of their street for parking compared to anyone else who pays property tax in the city. The road should therefore be fully public since the public pays for it equally.
- D Parking on street in one's own neighborhood should be free and easily available.
- Chose D. Whether a residence has onsite parking or not shouldn't be a factor. Every residence should be treated as equal. 2 parking permits per residence is treating people fairly.
- This seems like the fairest option. We rent and don't feel we should have to pay for parking permits to park in front of our house
- Most families have 2 vehicles. Our city taxes should cover permits for 2 vehicles.
- I own more than 2 vehicles, including several motorcycles. Hence D.
- Unless all residents in the city have to purchase permits to park at or near their residence, homeowners should NEVER have to pay to park by their home. Esp on residential streets.



- D, although making the number of visitor permits proportional to street frontage would also be fair. I use street parking for days with multiple trips and loading/unloading since the back lane is not maintained by the city and winter snow/ice can make it hard to navigate.
- This is not applied fairly throughout the city and people should not be punished because of where they live. Eg. inner city residents should not be punished just because the parking on their streets is more valuable. All residents should have the same parking options as every other resident.
- Option D is the best, but only 1 free permit, and capped at number of registered drivers per household.
- None of the above. Exclusive parking permits on public spaces should not be available. All parking should be paid hourly/daily parking where demand outstrips supply to encourage alternative parking and transportation arrangements (bike, transit, carshare)
- A - rental homes often have more than two occupants and each of these has at least one vehicle, often huge trucks!! Home run businesses should not be allowed to park on residential streets or back alleys
- "you cannot make one rule for all as there are so many unique situations
- neighbourhoods needs etc Too many areas of the city we do not visit due to no parking transit not an option for us in most cases we can't visit spend money in much of our own city!"
- Residents assured of access to parking, without allowing excessive use that would impact other residents
- D. This seems to have worked well in the past for me and those in the neighbourhood.
 - I believe that 2 permits is adequate in most circumstances.
- D - We have 3 vehicles. Would prefer no charge for 3 permits.
- All of these are problematic and inflexible. Some residences may require more or fewer than two. On-site parking may be restricted and people may require (an) additional permit(s). Requiring payment may penalize those who have limited options for location of residence and mode of transportation.
- D. Purchasing a home in an area with zone parking has typically higher prices than homes purchased in areas with no parking zones or restrictions. We already pay higher prices and taxes.
- C is closest but not quite right. Our home has three vehicles. we have one parking pad at the rear of the home but we cannot use it because of frequent vandalization. Additional free permits should be available under a special conditions policy.
- Because if one or two vehicles park on the property, there should be no need for more than two permitted spots. Though if someone wants to buy a limited time third spot (ie bought online, tied to a license plate) then that is okay.
- D. Living in a condo with parking, I often have to park on the street due to building construction and maintenance. Living in mission, it would be impossible to find street parking.
- Option A to allow residences to actually get two parking spaces if needed. Not option D because there is no certainty that a resident with two visitor parking spaces will actually have them available if unlimited visitor parking spaces are available at additional cost to other residences.
- It meets the needs of residents



- I picked D. Capping doesn't work for homes with more than 2 vehicles, and sometimes on-site parking isn't sufficient. Forcing everyone to pay doesn't seem right either.
- On site parking is not always suitable for all vehicles. Residents should not be penalized for inadequate on site parking which may not be in their control to change.
- I prefer the status quo, D as it works for our family and allows us to park in front of our residence. I sense there is push by the city to disband the current permitted parking to allow all parking on the street. There needs to be a tax incentive for residence to use on-site parking e.g. garages.
- Chosen by elimination, as I feel the real problem is the lack of on-site parking in the first place. I would NOT want to stop providing permits to multi family buildings. It is also important that "available on-site parking" does not include anything that residents must pay extra to access.
- Of there is on-site parking, people should be utilizing their space more efficiently. Street parking is for everyone, and the street space in front of your home is not yours to own. If you have a parking pad, use it. Everyone should be using their own parking first to leave room for others on street
- Option A - More than two permits per residence means that other residents with permits may not be able to find parking. The city should not be accommodating residences with several vehicles.
- Two is minimum, if you have kids, they will have a car and you need the options for more need something for guests.
- C . People should use their own spaces. Residents whom have excess vehicle ownership, shouldn't have exclusive use of space for excessive ownership of vehicles and trailers. All people in Calgary by way of taxes pay for the use of roadways.
- if people have a garage or parking pad, they should be using it for their cars, and not for storage. If people want to park on the street then they should pay for it. Even condos. Leave street parking for guests and open up some narrow streets.
- I lived close to an LRT station where RPPs were not initiated prior to the station opening (Tuscany Station). I had a spot in my condo garage but my street was a parking lot. Even with the RPPs, people blocked the street. If on site parking is already available, a cap for RPPs makes sense.
- D: An owner should have the option to park on the street or in their garage and should not be discriminated against by virtue of having a garage. By allowing everyone to have the same base and adding a reasonably high cost to purchase more, the City can effectively manage the limited parking.
- D 2 is plenty but not always sufficient - better to have a pay extra option (even if a high fee) than say no more
- More people are living few generations together due to economic circumstances . It means it is more cars in the household .usual single family home has 2 garage .Some new homes has no garage and no other parking options . Like new infields might have garage for some of dwelling Only.
- I can't see why you would be involved in capping the number of vehicles on private property.
- Parking permit areas are a higher property taxes area. Shouldn't have to pay. Apartment/ condo construction should have mandatory minimum parking for all residents and commercial businesses if it applies.



- I still believe families should have option to purchase the permit at no cost if there is no driveway to park at, otherwise the families may not purchase the permits and may have trouble finding parking outside of their own home, which may cause a problem for them especially if they have mobility ha
- People should be able to park in front of their homes and buy as many spaces as they want.
- This seems like the most reasonable choice. People with garages and driveways should make use of those first. Street parking should only be used if completely necessary. If there are more than two cars at a single residence there may be a problem.
- (B) encourages people to consider owning/using fewer vehicles, while still allowing people to purchase their required number of permits should they still choose to own/park many vehicles.
- We have a limited budget for street cleaning with uncertain weather and amount of snow - this would be a good opportunity to generate revenue for such street cleaning, while encouraging residents to use their garages (minimize stuff in their garages) or use alt transport= better 4 environment.
- It makes sense to me to "encourage" the use of on-site options. Imo, making them available, but at a cost would help account for those that need exceptions
- Property taxes are high enough already. Paying for residential parking permits is just another taxation.
- For streets that have on-site parking at the homes there should not be a restriction on parking at all unless they are near a major generator. Most of my neighbors don't park in their garages they just leave them empty. They filled the street then they requested parking restrictions to exclude other
- Maximum two vehicles per residential address, regardless of how many people live at the address (including any carriage/laneway houses). two visitor parking passes per residential address.
- There is no reason why a house should need more than 2 vehicles parked on the street. Use on-site parking first.
- If people have space in their private property they shouldn't be allowed to park on the street
- This works great for us while still allowing room on our street for visitor and contractor parking.
- D, as a property tax payer I think homeowners should be given 2 with the option to purchase more.
- C: CPA might assess a home as having 1 (or more) on-site parking stall, but this might be a garage that is old & unusable except for storage--likely very time-consuming & costly to have CPA review/asses disagreements about eligibility. D: seems fair to have to pay for > 2 permits at a household.
- D appears to be working for the most part. If this isn't broken, don't fix it.
- Home owners already are paying property taxes, they shouldn't have to pay more so they can have family and friends visit them just because there happens to be a parking restriction in front of there house
- We pay way too much in taxes already. Stop gouging!
- Families should be able to park near their homes.
- I live in an apartment where I was only given one stall but our household has two cars. It's frustrating to see homeowners across the street take up the street parking when they have multi-car garages/parking lots available to them for free as an extra stall for us is pricey.
- There should be a maximum of 4 passes per home, two eligible and two purchased.



- Preference is A. More than 2 residential parking permits is unnecessary and off-site parking should not be encouraged.
- This encourages parking on one's own property, but also provides flexibility, e.g. in cases where there are many people living in a residence. Also, there should be options for visitors to park as well. No 100% exclusive resident-only zones.
- There is no good option to choose as an individual living in a multi-family dwelling. Providing 2 visitor parking spots and no easily accessible way to control the online system for multiple owners within a single building
- I object to the exclusion of multi family dwellings. Choose that option because i had no choice. Non-multi family dwellings often have more options available. It is important for a number of options in these high density areas to be available to residents and visitors.
- I do not see how any of these options apply to multi-family residences.
- In quite a few household there is more than one vehicle and if you are renting landlords don't always offer the garage space. There's 4 people with vehicles in my family, we need places to park.
- I pay taxes for the space around my property, including the use of the front street. I should not be taxed additionally if I have a vehicle or want to have guests visit, just because a business or church near me is having an event where they profit from the use of space in front of my property
- I believe on site parking should be used as often as possible but this isn't always possible. I don't believe residents should have to pay to park outside their house. If this changes will all residents then have to pay ie: in Tuscany or only residents close to hospitals. Not fair.
- There should be no additional cost for residential parking regardless of number of vehicles
- There should be two hour limits during business hours, but no "black triangles".
- My neighbor has a secondary suite (basement) and has 8 permits - 4 permits for up/down residents + 4 visitor permits. None of the residents use on-site parking ("garage too small; pad inconvenient"). They often block parking in front of three lots, theirs and two adjoining lots, including mine!
- Option D - we are too close to the downtown and without parking permits for residents, we would have no parking on our streets as people who work downtown would park for free on our street + walk to work We pay enough taxes that we should be able to have first dibs on parking in our neighbourhood.
- Problem is that certain areas need a Residential Parking Restrictions/by permit only as the resident there might never have the chance to park, i.e. due to teenagers near a school. These residents should have the possibility to get the restriction in front of their home! Not for the rest of us!!!!!!
- I am confident that # A should remain. Otherwise, the residents will not be able to park their vehicle. This will potentially create confrontational situations and will compromise security
- D Hospital employees sporting name tags looking for free parking have discovered out street even though it is many blocks away from their work. Now during work hours it is difficult for anyone to find parking to visit our address. RRP application is now held up by this review.
- If the public space needs to be rationed, do it by charging for the space. If demand for parking outstrips supply, establishing a price for the parking is the fair way to allocate it.



- some condo or house don't have garages or driveways, so the resident will need to park on the street.
- Should let people have more but need to provide explanation as to why. Or limit the total that can be purchased.
- A works fine.
- Needs a limit. What's to stop someone from purchasing 10 permits. Capping doesn't work - resident may have more than 2 vehicles. I don't like any of your options. It should be one permit PER VEHICLE, not two per household, not available for purchase.
- on site parking is not an option if I don't have a garage do I park on my grass or if I build a garage do I have to park in it. Alleys downtown are not lit and vandalism is very high both neighbors have had smashed windows on cars parked out back...
- I did not select any of these options as they are leading to restrictions you all ready have and are not inclusive enough. I don't think 2 is a reasonable number to provide accommodation for family/friend events coupled with the overly aggressive enforcement. you are asking for confirmation not ideas
- The city should NOT be looking to increase revenue by charging for two parking permits in front of your own house.
- Two permits should be sufficient for the vast majority of residences. These should be available at no cost.
- Mostly we park our two cars on the driveway. There are times when we are working in the garage and we need to park on the street. If we are having visitors, and there are more than two families visiting, I would like the option of temporarily allowing additional vehicles to park on the street.
- Each situation is unique - one size all does not work. We have 2 hour parking on the street In front which works if effectively enforced (not at present) to serve a variety of users (medical clinics, day care, residents, businesses); permit parking in rear lane to preserve some quality of life.
- Every resident should have the option of parking on the street at no cost (hence not choosing option C). There should be an option to purchase additional permits at a nominal fee. For example, our nanny parks at our house daily and by registering her as a visitor, I now only have one visitor pass.
- You cannot dictate what people do with their garages.
- A - If a resident has available on-site parking (which I have), the permits granted to him should be limited to 2. Sometimes our parkade is being cleaned so we have no choice but to park on the street for a day. This option would help to address that fairly.
- "B - if people have to pay \$, they might be more careful
- C - City should make Developers / Builders provide at least 1 on site parking space for every suite, or 2 if 2-3 bdrm suite.
- I am a Sr, with arthritis, & have to drive downtown for appointments / meetings. I need to be able to park nearby."
- With the demographic in the inner city, two permits are sufficient; however, for some families, there may be a need for additional permits and purchasing should be an option. That said, there needs to be strict restrictions to whom permits are assigned to prevent abuse (ie. must be from same family)



- I chose this option because I know of residences that have more than 2 permits that they give or sell to friends so they don't have to take public transit or purchase parking (near Western Canada High School for instance on 17th Ave)
- The restriction to 2 permits with others being purchased has already inconvenienced my large family. I feel that there should be a process for obtaining an additional permit at no cost under some circumstances. My partner received a ticket while parked in front of our house for 15 minutes.
- B: There is a cost to the City to provide permit parking, therefore any resident who wants permit parking on their block should pay a fee to have it. With the option to purchase as many as necessary, there should be an escalating cost to have more than 2.
- Hi, yesterday I noticed two streets with no cars, 6th Ave NW between 19th St and 20th St. completely deserted yet it's near a community association and people might like to park there and another near the Sauce Italian restaurant. If residents don't own the street how can ALL parking be restricted.
- Too many vehicles on road now, so if they can park on their property, they should.
- Even though we only have 2 cars on site at a time we do have 4 vehicles registered to this address and use them on a rotational/seasonal basis.
- seems fair.
- People should park on site to make street parking more available for residents living in multi-residential dwellings
- D - Restricting number of permits to a max of 2 per household is unnecessarily restrictive. Should be able to pay for more.
- Please scrap electronic RPP and start sending visitor parking tags in the mail. The online system is terrible: it has bugs and it freezes. There is no tech support on weekends/after hours. The requirements can be confusing to elderly, people who are not computer savvy and first time users.
- D- We have a 3 car garage and parking in the driveway. There are, however, times we park our vehicles on the street. It is helpful not to have to register them each time we move a car into the street.
- I have to take care of the green space near my home, and I do all this for my citizen duty. In return, I don't think it's too much to ask for me to be able to park in front of my house.
- I live in a SE community and parking is ATROCIOUS. It's not just downtown that has parking issues, a lot of communities are struggling because people don't utilize their driveways or garages! Whenever I want to park in front of my residence short term to run inside and grab something I can't.
- Two permits per dwelling is enough per residence; otherwise streets/avenues get far too crowded.
- D - Larger families may have more than 2 cars, adults and young adults alike
- It makes sense that each household should automatically have two spots as most have one or two cars. Any families with multiple cars (over 2) should pay for it.
- A/B There has to be a cap on the number of vehicles, as per rental property, high density dwellings being built by developers in inner core. An owner could play, but who will enforce that there is a space available when needed.



- only option A treats all neighbours fairly, giving people in each residence a chance at parking in front of their dwelling. C would penalize the most responsible citizens. D incoherently mixes 2 thoughts. Better yet would be limiting parking by vehicle length, tied to metres of frontage.
- "Two permits per dwelling at not cost with no option to purchase more. Visitor passes provided which restrictions around length of use.
- Developments should provide parking on sites enough for single or multi family dwellings"
- B provides an incentive for residents to use their on site parking rather than turn the garage into an exercise room, storage room, etc and always park on the street. Problems arise for families with grown children who have cars of parking passes are costly.
- Living downtown, it's hard to find vehicle parking. We often give up our one and only stall at our residence to guests so we treasure our residential street pass to allow our guests to stay for extended periods of time at our home and still (usually) find on street parking for ourselves.
- I disagree with all these choices. All residential parking should be uncapped with no limit on permits. It's too hard to have visitors right now or to have a vehicle such as a rental vehicle parked at your residence.
- Many residents do not have alternate parking options like driveways or garages.
- "C - Too many residents in our neighbourhood park on the street rather than in their garages in the alleyways.
- D - Residents with no on-site parking should get 2 free permits since most households have 2 cars. Extra cars should require a payment."
- We live in the inner city (Kensington area). Two permits per household is plenty.
- In suburbs, each home generally has room for 2 cars on driveway and 2 in garage (perhaps 1). w/o garage, unlikely need >4 spots regularly. 2 guest permits work. Problem in suburbs is people park on road with empty driveway. But, not 1 size fits all; set parameters that can change by neighborhood
- I am a single family home that fully utilizes my garage but still needs a street spot. As well some time you need to have your car temporarily out of the garage to do something and have every right to park in front of your house/on the street temporarily.
- D - because we are in a high-use area, we need the ability to receive two permits; used when visitors come to our property and then they can use our driveway.
- Many residents choose to use their existing parking (ie garage) as other storage, and not as parking. Two vehicles per residence is a lot.
- While most families have at least one car, most have two. The other alternatives are does not seem fair. Option A penalizes larger families with more cars while option B penalizes automobile owners and incentivize "rental" arrangements. Option C is l'm practical due to ever-changing situations.
- D - I do not agree with the present "permit only" parking in our neighbourhood. It makes it very difficult to have people over as the system is quite cumbersome. If you look down our street there is absolutely no issue for parking spots that we can't share the roadway with other taxpayers.



- I am against permit parking only. People should use the on-site parking they have available but there are times when it's convenient to park on the street. Limit it to 2 vehicles and purchase permits for the rest.
- People who don't drive should not have to bear the cost of people who have multiple vehicles.
- I live in the residence so I should have access to permits for each individual at the home I own (family) . Most people have 2 cars so minimum should be 2.
- It is another alternative
- I chose D because I'm not sure if I believe in restrictions for resident within our community. I sometimes have to park down the street, but it's not that hard to walk back to my house. If people have to go more than a block away to park in some areas the perhaps I would choose A.
- Option D is the closest answer I could select; I think residents should not have to purchase additional permits. Should be more than two free permits available on a temp basis for visitors esp for seniors needing caregivers/multiple family members.
- There is no problem with two or more residential parking permit per dwelling. The problem is that there are TOO many dwellings with "No Parking Without Permit" which causes their visitors to take the parking spaces in front of their neighbors houses!
- easiest to understand and administer
- Residents who pay property taxes should NOT have to pay additional fees for permits to park in front of their own homes.
- I do not agree with any cap on permits per residence or with charging for the permits. I agree with limiting the time vehicles can be parked on the street. I do not agree with limiting the time they can be parked on front drive garage driveways.
- D seems to be working in most areas as many families have more vehicles than on-site parking now. However, the issue arises when people who do have on-site parking use it for storage or another purpose than parking and then take up street parking that could be used by people who actually need it.
- C.Lots of my neighbours have 3-4 personal vehicles, company vehicles, and still don't use their garages or parking pads. The number of people who use their garages for businesses/workshops is a lot smaller than those using them for household storage. Factor this in when setting up a home business.
- The supply of permits should be tied to the supply of actual street spaces. I'd caveat C by reviewing the decision to not provide on-site parking at time of DP. In high-demand areas, consider an auction to determine value.
- People have often times more than two vehicles due to recreational/seasonal vehicles- they should not be eligible
- "A. In our situation, there are 6 homes along our stretch and if each home had 2 vehicles parked, there wouldn't be enough room for everyone as it is.
- Plus enforcement is non existent now that visible permits are gone. I have often had to manage 2 young children and groceries from a distance."



- Many older homes have extended drive ways large garages or places to park which are often full of refuse cars or storage this should be used for parking.
- To encourage appropriate use of onsite residential parking, on parking pads and driveways and in garages. Multiple vehicles parked on-street in residential areas block sight lines, impede traffic flow and create dangerous road and pedestrian safety conditions.
- C: By not using their on-site parking they are contributing to the problem they're complaining about. This is about the management of space, not access to space. Also by having on-site parking, these residents have more spaces available for their visitors than others, which is unfair.
- This is reasonable to allow for visitors and visitors or home care workers and home maintenance services.
- Would like the option of purchasing additional permit and making it permanent (our nanny drives everyday and parks at our street)
- Encourages accountability for residents who already have access to on-site parking, but allows flexibility when on-site parking is not available.
- D) We have 3 vehicles
- I have no other parking options that on-street. I live close to Prince's Island/downtown, so street parking is desirable, both for events and for commuters who work downtown. So, I need to protect my on-street parking options.
- The ability to simply purchase extra permits is not in lock-step with the requirement for secondary suites to provide on-site parking. There should be 2 permits max allowed per home/lot, regardless of whether there is a secondary suite, to make parking availability fair to all neighbors.
- We live close to the hospital. Zoning is critical. Residents must be able to pull up themselves or have guests pull up to their house.
- This would discourage using on-site parking for other purposes.
- Most households have more than one vehicle but it should operate similarly to garbage cans, for example - if you need another one, you pay for it, most will be OK with just two.
- to limit flagrant abuse by parties with large numbers of vehicles
- Every family should have 2 permits. The previous system where two parking were given to each household, worked well in our community. Every community is not the same and therefore each one should be considered on it's own merits.
- I pay huge property taxes and I should not have to pay more to park in front of my own house. We have a garage in the rear lane but the lane is very steep and not maintained, so parking there is impossible on snowy and icy days.
- If on-site parking is available parking permits are not necessary as they already have available parking so preferential additional parking is unfair. I also feel permits should be purchased when needed to a maximum of 2 per household.
- Note - the comments in this submission do not have an exact matching question, but are important to bring to your attention.
- Very common to have more than 2 vehicles per household, particularly teenagers/students who can drive



- It is reasonable to provide 2 free permits per single family home. In my area higher density building has been approved allowing for single family homes so narrow only a single car garage can be built. Most families have more than one vehicle so street parking should be free up to 2 vehicles
- It seems a reasonable number, and the few people with more cars likely have garages or parking pads on their property. It discourages "collecting" cars that need repair.
- D - I think it's fair. We currently have three vehicles, two that park in the garage and one on the street.
- A. We live in a zone which is legally supposed to be only single family housing. People who have rented to multiple people get more parking permits, which crowds the streets here, making it hard for us to have visitors with babies, small children, wheelchairs and have them safely come to our home.
- Very difficult to accommodate short term visitors (e.g. family gatherings, contractors who are working concurrently but very temporarily) with all options. Do not agree with having to pay to park in front of our own home, that seems very poorly thought out.
- Our church in Inglewood, the Lantern Community Church has been in the community for over 100 years. Our members and visitors are being squeezed out by permit only parking restrictions in all the streets surrounding the church. I would prefer limiting resident permits and have 2 hour parking available

Topic: Residential Parking Permit restrictions (near major generators)

A. No change to current visitor permit – Residences can apply for up to two (2) visitor permits in an RPP zone at no cost. These can be used for any visitor to the home which are not tied to license plates.

B. Increase the amount of hourly parking for visitors within an RPP zone. The times could include paid and unpaid options

C. Reduce the number of 'No Parking except by Permit' zones across Calgary

D. Remove all restrictions within all zones across Calgary

- I am on a block where there should be no restrictions. Some residents got annoyed with people across the street and got restrictions largely out of spite. It should be removed. This is [personal information removed].
- You rigged this question ... What about increasing the number of "no parking except by Permit zones" that is my first choice. This type of bias is usual for city surveys. The survey is skewed to get the result the councilors want. Drew Farrell for one wishes to reduce vehicles in Calgary.
- Explaining A. Answers apply to 25' lot in [personal information removed]. I pay extremely high property taxes now and can never have visitors, to my home, park out front. Visitor parking is only available if they pay to park.
- was like what was before
- Yes, two visitor parking permits per house. A better online system for when you want to have a party
- Why can we only get 2 visitor passes?



- A temporary and ad hoc visitor gathering permit system should be implemented eg. Christmas open house party
- I would like to stay with two visitor parking per unit/home.
- This would be hard to control. Who would know then? (a problem with this) Online system is good but not for someone who doesn't use computer. The paper permit was better.
- *should NOT be 'visitor permits' [would be used to increase the # of permanent vehicles]
- #1 works
- I'm ok with 1-2 guest permits as have had the challenge of visiting inner city friends. I can see problem of misuse - maybe would be controlled by I.D. colour - so stands out as guest.
- No
- No-necessary in some areas, especially near, commercial, workplaces & transit. I think residents would agree.
- No - maybe in some zones it isn't necessary but hard to know each zone's problems. No.
- This would allow family and friends to come visit, and to easily get the grandkids carried into the house.
- Need a place to put your car. Only put permits in areas that truly need it.
- I agree unless in areas where really is a problem, as is a deterrent to me visiting people
- This is good because it doesn't act as a "catch-all" for all areas.
- have paid parking permits for residents and hourly parking (paid) for visitors parking in neighbourhoods near high demand locations.
- need clearer def of "visitors" - my visitors - no charge
- charge market rate for parking - will solve all overflow parking problems.
- This is 100% true. Family & friends do not want to visit strictly knowing they have to deal with a visitor permit system (2 limit). Something as simple as a BBQ becomes a nightmare to organize. Some for of tweaks or improvement to increase the ability for visitors to park is a necessity. (free) Discourage social gatherings! (current policy)
- Restricted hours may deter staff parking but not visitors to hospital
- Commercial uses should ensure they have enough on-site parking so as to minimize spill over on residential streets. This includes office, retail, and multi-residential. City should play its part by NOT relaxing parking requirements on new developments. Imposing [illegible] on the population through poloicy does not work. It has to happen organically and willingly by the population.
- Badly worded. Confusing.
- Please send the parking control car on football game days. Briar Hill is full of fan cars everywhere. Resident people who don't get home an hour before the game will find all the street parking gone. Many families have multiple vehicles for teen kids & need more than the 2 spots in the garage and driveway.
- None of these because there are so many people especially inner city
- wording is a bit confusing! Very loaded. Wording is bad. Contradictory. Exclusionary should be used.



- Prefer paper permit - online registration is difficult for my elderly father. Website often glitches and is frustrating so he risks tickets instead of trying to register guests online.
- Need more than 2 visitor permits per house (at NO CHARGE) - what happens in event of sick resident requiring homecare, doctor visit, family all at once?
- if major generator is at capacity, improve access to get to major generator such as added infrastructure. Account for infrastructure to support movement/parking in/through area before building major generators in residential areas.
- Do not increase the hourly parking (2 hours) on my street in Sunnyside. I'm sure there are many cars parked for longer without a permit. Maintain level of /or increase parking authority ticketing for time allowed and for corner visibility; too many vehicles parked too close to corners.
- Don't understand. Current visitor permitting is tied to license plates - but that is not what I interpret above as saying.
- The two visitor passes encapsulate 99% of requirements for residents.
- It's fine
- For those of us just outside the downtown core, our issue is commuters parking on our streets and walking to downtown. There needs to be a way to limit this without deterring visitors/home health workers etc
- We have never had an issue with the current program. I do not want to lose our residential parking program. With no restrictions, students and commuters would take up all the space and there would be nowhere for visitors to our home to park.
- A 1hr zone, but not longer, directly in front of residential would prove beneficial for the home owner to not have to register every single short term visitor. Often you have someone visit for only a short period of time and registering is cumbersome and unnecessary for 20mins.
- I think the city could be much more critical of residential parking permit zones. Just because enough residents want to protect the street parking in front of their homes does not mean it is a benefit for the community to have permit parking.
- If you know someone is coming to your home it is easy enough to create a Visitor Permit so please leave that the way it is currently.
- The current situation works for our family
- Limit of 2 visitor permits causes friends/family to NOT want to visit. Something as simple as having a casual bbq becomes a huge headache. The City cannot "impose" on citizens to take transit. We are not that type of city currently, it takes time. The 2 visitors limit degrades our quality of life.
- Can not comment on areas with no hourly parking ...we have 2 hours so have some flexibility.
- The number of severely restricted (No parking except by permit Z) zones in Calgary is bad because in my experience I become a far more dangerous driver when I am hunting for a parking spot interpreting signs at 50 km/h while paying half attention to pedestrians and other drivers.
- Most people require their spots after 5:00 pm. Change the definition of the residential zones so that they are ALL automatically 2 hour parking zones between 9:00 am and 5:00 pm (and unlimited if the car has a visitor pass). This helps customers and visitors, and night parking for residents.



- Removing the restrictions or lowering them would result in us being a SAIT or LRT parking lot. I would like the paper permits to give my visitors back - it is easier than having to go online to register them.
- It's difficult if trades are visiting a home. This would help. My preference would be to see it easier to assign visitor passes to visitors. The website is not mobile responsive, there is no app, and it was much easier with the placard-type visitor permits.
- Seems to be working. Although hard to tell when people parked on the street are registered or not.
- Those living in an RPP zone should be able to host a large get together which would require more than 2 visitor permits, which are cumbersome to hand out and retrieve from visitors. Hourly parking (e.g. 2 to 4 hours) should permit visitors to stay while preventing people from parking all day.
- "Allow a period of time for others to park. Be that 30 minutes two hours or whatever.
- TOO MANY 24 hour reserved just for us places in the city.
- For the blue card ones ONE space per block with a time limit."
- Supports and encourages inner city living. Accommodations for visitor parking in inner city communities is important for deliveries/services to be able to access residences.
-or cleaning staff visitors who come for short periods of time. And.....when there are different people coming at different times it's a hassle to register their cars. ESPECIALLY IF I AM ON VACATION AND CAN'T REGISTER THE VEHICLE. Paper parking passes are much better. . See below.....
- The online method for assigning the visitor permits is horrible though.
- This works best in Ramsay. Restrictions should not be removed.
- Actually, make available the opportunity to add extra visitors. This is not an option.
- These are public streets paid for by all citizens of Calgary not just the residents. If a restriction is needed make it a time limit for ALL parking (including residents).
- Not ideal but seems best of options. Current signage often confusing, only some signs indicate permit zone.
- Good enough
- This solution works well.
- Having the option to access additional visitor permits for brief (hours) periods would help. Like dinner parties or social gatherings. Not for days and days.
- C - Needs to be better balance btwn resident concerns and need for access to things like City lands. My neighbourhood is almost entirely parking restricted area (near Foothills hospital) because neighbours collaborated to create a de facto gated community. Not ok near a dog park or City playground
- Visitors are temporary and need to be able to have access to a parking spot where they are visiting.
- A - With the exception of having a party, 2 visitor permits should be enough. If more are required, transit is a better option for guests.
- A - simple and it works.
- In congested areas need dedicated visitor parking



- In multi family dwelling, it's important to provide visitor with parking permit so they can feel free to park and enjoy visiting their friends
- Parking restrictions are needed. They are needed on 22 Street NW between 24 Avenue NW and 20 Avenue NW as University students and C-Train commuters take advantage of the free parking during the work days which limits parking for area residents.
- Living close to downtown means people who live in the burbs try to find free parking within our neighbourhood and then walk into downtown. We are not a parking lot for downtown workers. This is another reason the green line should have been above ground so the city could have afforded to extend it.
- A - I think this should be maintained! RPP zones are not exclusionary. Without them, my elderly neighbours never had visitors because their senior friends could not park close enough to walk to their houses to visit. Having an RPP zone and visitor permits changed things for the better!
- "A: two permits is reasonable. However, a better system must be created for non-vehicle-owners who rent/lease vehicles regularly.
- B: up to 4 hours is okay, I think, and more reasonable for things like tradespeople making repair visits
- D: restrictions are necessary in some places"
- Super pain to try and remember to register each vehicle that comes to visit. When not always home to do it (e.g. friends, family looking in after house) it becomes even more problematic.
- the system to date has worked well for us
- Until you put RPP in every community there is no way to charge one community parking and another not. Unjust!
- Generally no problem in my RPP area, so A, the status quo, works. But occasionally we have a bigger family event, etc. where there would be more than two visitors, and it would be good to be able to either enroll more than two visitors or have longer times when the visitor permit isn't required: B.
- Option A. The current visitor permit system works well and allows residents to be able to accommodate visitors to park near their home without penalty or cost.
- I chose A but i don't really like it. The new RPP visitor process is EXTREME deterrent to visitors and work people coming to my home. My parents no longer visit or use my home when I am at work (they live out of town and used to use it as a place to rest or eat lunch if they were in the city).
- A = The Old System Worked Fine!
- RPP are not exclusionary and certainly are not deterrents, if properly managed, as ours are. Removal of all restrictions would, at least on my street, ensure that there is NO parking available during the day as the street would be full of the cars of walking commuters.
- I am happy with the current system
- As long as I can park with permit in a given area, I don't need an assigned portion of the street.
- "Is A suggesting we would no longer need to put a visitor license plate number into the system?"
- I have become accustomed to the RPP system on my street and can live with entering license plate numbers. It's inconvenient but it allows visitors and service folks to park nearby."



- System works well currently. But should be enhanced with an app to start and stop parking - current process of needing to use web site is very slow and tedious.
- The current system works for the most part, exceptions can be when you have more than 2 guests who have traveled by car or when there are more than 2 trades. Perhaps if a ticket has been issued in these cases, the Parking Authority could remove the ticket.
- I like option B but I think it would be abused. I live by the U of C and I see many cars parking on our street then walking away toward the University.
- B as often have a book club or meeting which lasts more than 2 hours
- It is very difficult to have guests when every street for blocks away are permit only. Even having visitor permits is cumbersome as it is hard for mobility impaired visitors to have to walk back and forth with the permit, and guests may forget to return it. Have more unpaid hours.
- As a tenant (without my own car, but sometimes a rental or work car) in a mostly residential area, that only has permit parking available, or 2 h options, and having to go through my landlord every single time to obtain a visitor option (esp. difficult, when it is a rental with unknown license plate
- Living in a university zone, I'm not comfortable relaxing restrictions as we struggle to park in front of our house as it is because Sarcee RD is rarely monitored
- Seems fair.
- there should be fewer resident-only parking because it is public not private space.
- A return to the Hang-Tag system would be appreciated. This will enable identification of Authorized as well as Un-authorized vehicles parked in the RPP zone. Common sensical.
- Expand this option to include 6 unit townhomes
- Having short term visitors is great!
- I have often foregone going to support businesses within Calgary because there is no parking except by permit. I as a tax payer should have the right to park in any city street. Businesses suffer as a result of this rule.
- We are taxed out the ass, \$5000 in property tax for a house built in the 50s and nothing around for business or school, or anything. Shouldn't have to pay for parking
- A
- The benefits of the RPP outweigh the inconvenience of managing visitor parking. The whole point is to deter parking from outside the community. It's better then walking five blocks to unload your groceries, for instance. Or not be able to plug in your car because you can't park by your house
- By reducing the restrictions it should free up a number of spots for people to use, this providing ease of access.
- A: Fair and balanced.
- The current is too restrictive
- A - no deterrents for visitors to homes; can use the permit or move the vehicle if they stay longer. Businesses requiring more parking should not locate in residential areas.
- I picked A. I really have no idea what they're asking here. Maybe I dont get enough visitors to worry about this.



- Visitors from out of town who have an airport rental can't park in front of my house until I arrive home. Your office expects me to leave meetings or stop my work when the visitor arrives to request a permit. Also, why can I not get one in advance for those licence holders that I know.
- with the online process it is easy to change the visitor parking Enhance the website for this.
- C the city should not be making special rules for these citizens who aren't paying for their own parking pads.
- I think the current system works, except when your visitor drives away with your permit. Maybe there could be a no ticket line that you call in when you have a visitor.
- Not allowing permits isolates people. We are a social society! Give more options for others.
- Two hours parking limit is not enough, it needs to be extended to 4 hours.
- There are a lot of these that don't make sense to have around certain neighbourhoods, and a lot of neighbourhoods that could use the restricted areas
- We had more hourly parking but ppl didn't respect the 2 hour limit and stayed for hours...also, non-restricted hours made parking available at the time residents were getting home from work (and everyone else was going to the pub...no parking for us!
- While we have had no real issues with the visitor permit, it's annoying to renew a workers permit every two weeks. Like caregiver, cleaner, home care, nanny.
- By not linking parking to license plates people are required to manage how they use their parking and those who do live in the area can have balanced and responsible use of the parking they are given.

- I own 17th Ave Thrift [personal information removed] our business is suffering due to the parking restrictions on 26 Street, etc. A 2 hour parking would be preferable as it would allow my customers to enough time to shop with us.
- Exclusive use of the public street and car subsidies must end (D, C) Particularly where residents have existing onsite parking, and particularly where they are located in close proximity to public facilities with no parking or inadequate parking facilities, such as parks or recreation centers and LRT
- ...
- None of these options are actually good. Option A is the best of the bad. Instead, offer residents the ability to host a party a few times per year. Some kind of "event" pass that they can apply for and increase their permits for one night only.
- Streets are public spaces that should be available for all to use. Simple.
- Option A. Spaces are required for bona fide visitors.
- Generally a two hour time limit for commercial business purposes is sufficient. However, for residences a two hour time limit is not long enough. Reading comprehension of signage should not be used as a rationale for business access.
- Business parking is an issue in our block [personal information removed] if restrictions were lifted, residence would not have places to park.



- A: Visitors to someone's home should not have to pay to park in residential areas. C: These zones may act as a deterrent for social gatherings and community-building.
- C. Improving visitor access to these areas is very important, both for people coming to visit residences or who need the parking to visit nearby businesses. Frankly, people should always have the option to pay for parking, even in a permit area, if parking is available.
- I understand why reserved parking is needed but having to arrive 15min early to find a parking space is a huge pain. This will stop commuters from ditching cars all day while letting people shop for an hour or two
- All tax payers should be treated equally. Unless there is a levee paid by permit holders there should not be restrictions placed on public spaces.
- Not enough information about how option B would be managed - you cannot expect all visitors to your home to pay, that is not fair or realistic. I feel strongly that people should not be limited by the system when considering having legitimate visitors over to their private homes.
- By definition, RPPs are residential; businesses are supposed to have parking options and they will not be in our zone. This is a non-problem or should be. With the visitor permit, there is ample opportunity for people to visit during daytime when the restrictions are in force.
- I do not pay for parking or drive where permits are required. I will walk if possible. If a business wants customers they have to provide free parking. Online shopping alleviates this problem. I will not live in an area where permits are required.
- The other options are terrible (B-C). As it is there is usually someone parked in front of my house. I wouldn't be able to get near it during Stampede, Flames games, July 1.... basically any sunny weekend.
- A universal approach might work - if all permits cost money to discourage misuse.
- I feel the current system works fine...although you state its not tied to license plates but you do have to enter the plates in the website to avoid a ticket. I feel this program works nicely.
- I'm choosing A this is the way it is working for the street I live on now- this is the only one in the zone. There are a few of us who still need permits for the visitors that we may receive
- if one has a "legal" home business, maybe they should have more visitor permits but a business's that has 4 - 5 cars at a time shouldn't be a home business. Also enforcement should be complaint generated. Enforcement should not be intrusive looking for ticketing opportunities. Complaint generated
- After living in a high event traffic area, I have often experienced not having any street parking available to the resident. The visitor passes were vital, but it could be nice to have more paid areas in those high-traffic spaces.
- A: within our Zone M, visitor parking is provided by electronic registration of the visitor plates; physical visitor tags were previously abused and this may well be the case with electronic registration of non-resident vehicles.
- Strict parking restrictions is exclusionary to people who are visiting businesses and those who work at businesses. Often making parking impossible in certain parts of the city, as paid parking is limited and often fills. Paid parking is also incredibly overpriced and cost prihobitive for many.



- I don't have family, but a lot of people do and they need parking when visiting.
- "A. Residents should be able to have visitors without limits. The online system works well, but could be optimized to a more user friendly app.
- The problem is not with visitors, the problem is with high density housing (ie. apartments and multi-plexes) that lacks assigned, off-street parking"
- "C. Seems to be turning into a money grab!
- Would like to see landlord visitor permits increased to 1 month. I visit my rentals on a regular basis & monthly would be easier to keep track of for me. I'm tired of getting tickets for parking in front of a house I own & lived in for 20 yrs. prior!"
- Current system works fine downtown where there are condo towers, perhaps provide more visitor options in low-density residential zones.
- There should be a 'paper' option for visitor passes. Registering online is difficult and is an invasion of privacy. How long are records of visitors kept for by the City? Is this public surveillance? Privacy of parking should be a clear and auditable policy.
- The issue I have is different... I would like to see an easier way to allow more visitors to my home. With the maximum of 2 cars/house... sometimes we have more people visiting (at very short notand it is a nightmare to arrange parking for them. I would like to see an easier way to implement this.
- Works well. We need restrictions as we are close to SAIT.
- My preference would be option A or B. Two visitor's permits seems more than fair. In the case of highly restricted parking zones, additional fee-based or free parking could be an alternative.
- I'm tired of Residential property owners in my community renting out their garage to construction workers or others, our using for storage, while they then park their vehicles on the street in front of a 25 foot lot. Completely ridiculous that this can happen leaving no visitor or public access
- B, C. Some restrictions should stay in place for those who drive to our street to park, then walk to the train. However it is very difficult to have normal family gatherings with only 2 parking permits allowed. Short term parking(3 hours?) would be helpful for additional vehicles for special events.
- Actually have had visitors to our home for 2- 3 hours, and have never used the online guest permit system - don't know how, but would figure it out if I had longer term guests. Fortunate that none of our friends have been ticketed. I think there is still room for abuse by selling the guest passes.
- Visitors or commercial should be allowed to visit for up to 4-8 hours. It's the 24 hour plus parking that is the problem. Streets are storage parking.
- A - none of the options are what I'd like, but A is closest.....I would like to be able to purchase additional visitor permits.....limit of 4 additional
- The permit areas are intended in my opinion to keep the spaces for the residents and the resident visitor needs. Make it easy to use by adding it to the app instead of the clumsy website.
- The 1 hour parking zones in restricted residential parking limit the ability of the residents to park in front of their own house: these should be removed. Residents who live in these areas usually pay high taxes due to location and should not have limitation to their own parking.
- make the process of reporting infractions online



- We live near a busy school and setup our 2 hour parking to accommodate drop off and pick ups. We like having the school nearby and tolerate the crunch periods when parking isn't available on the street.
- A but have more visitors parking permit. Maybe 5 for when there is events or parties.
- Let's not make this a headache. We should be able to park in front of our own homes and have guests park there.
- Zone is not exclusionary, visitor permits are already allowed, Nearby hospital has pay parking but people park illegally on street.
- We have never had a problem with visitors to our home and entering their license plate.
- B -friends should be able to visit. I have to go to my friends places (always) because parking is such a pain near my place
- Kind of - although the online system can be difficult to use for some older adults, and can further marginalize those homes who do not have internet or technology infrastructure to be able to book visitors.
- None of these help, I live in the beltline with a 2 hour restriction, but I am not eligible for a permit, this is wrong, I should be able to get a permit
- street parking in our zone already at a big premium. we have small children and already have to park 5-6 houses down sometimes
- It works the way it is.
- Also there needs to be easier ways to schedule in permits. Having someone there every Thursday for instance - allowing it to be set up automatically rather than every Thursday having to mess with the very burdensome system
- Short term visitors should be encouraged. All day parking should be discouraged.
- I would like to see parking used more equitably. I would like to see parking revenue generated and come back to communities.
- "Visitor permits are currently tied to license plates, so are we going back to hangers? I prefer because it's NONE of your business who visits my home!
- You are sneaky bastards trying to trick people into consent to increase paid parking in residential zones!"
- Living inner city without restrictions would make it so residences and visitors could never park.
- You need to look at each zone and see if the zones parking is being utilized. There are some areas (inglewood) where you cannot find any parking, but the zoned areas are empty at that time.
- Option A works perfectly fine for us & everyone on the street. There is no need to change it. We are not near a commercial zone so visitors to businesses is not an issue.
- as above
- No deterrent. We currently put in license plate numbers for visitors. No change needed
- This makes the most sense as there is a plan for visitors.
- A but the wording is crazy 'residents can apply for up to two ...permits in an RPP zone': why don't we just go back to hang tags
- But up to one (1) visitor permit in an RPP zone at no cost.



- We like having our visitors not having to worry about tickets and being able to park for as long as they are visiting
- Change all RPP zones so they allow for 2 hour free parking between 9:00 am and 5:00 pm, and unlimited time with a pass. Change in the definitions and advertise as opposed to the cost of changing signs.
- I appreciate restrictions on my street that if I need to park on it I can. It would be frustrating if people visiting the local shops took up all the parking because they are avoiding to pay at the spots near the shops.
- B: I suggest two-hour parking as many in this neighbourhood are older and need home care.
- Please note my above comments. We should be able to park our personal vehicles as well as have visitors to our home without worrying about tickets.
- I did not like any of these options. If I had to pick one it would be A but really It really is a pain and very frustrating calling in to get these parking permits and then what if I have more than 2 people with cars coming to visit at the same time. There should be no extra cost to us ever.
- See question 2
- I think this is fine. The online registering of visitors is a pain though. I liked the physical passes visitors put in their vehicles.
- Hourly parking zones with or without passes are hard to enforce
- It's ridiculous to ask a generic question like this as it completely depends on location, businesses & after hour events. I live in Brentwood, our residential street is overflow for the Park&Ride facility located across the freeway. It's not right, but this is Calgary & the City doesn't do right.
- Option A - However relaxation of permits needed for special events, eg. family gatherings, book club meetings. Homeowners would need to apply ahead of time to get permission for parking for such events.
- We live next to a 'No Parking except by Permit, the overflow ends up on our street with few vehicles in the restricted area. SDC permits were prompted by insufficient parking in the Sun Park business area and no longer appear to be necessary.
- B because short term visits are fine... it is the people who don't live nearby who might park all day that residents are annoyed about
- There should be no resident only parking restrictions unless the residents take over responsibility for maintaining that street. We all pay taxes and should be able to park on any public street. I'm fine with residents being able to park longer in these areas, but not to the exclusion of public.
- Street parking should be paid for unless the vehicle has a residential permit. Visitor parking passes should be phased out.
- Bring back those paper passes as an option to the online system. Elderly people find it hard to enter in visitors' license plates. It's also easy to forget to start a parking session. I live near downtown and my parents once got a ticket because I entered in the plate too late, they refuse to visit
- Even a paid option is better than what we have now which is zero visitor spots.



- The visitor parking passes work well for me when having guests in my home. I find if I am visiting a business it can be difficult to find parking, I would appreciate if there were less permit only zones, I don't mind paying for parking but often zones are by permit, no paid parking option.
- This was always the best option instead of the silly online process which is in place.
- A: we have limited offstreet parking and need 2 visitor passes or there is nowhere for them to park and visit
- Many big density residential has visitor parking. Allowing for longer parking terms during the day will make it impossible for residents to access on street parking for their parking needs.
- I think there should be restrictions to parking when you live near businesses and schools that do not provide adequate parking or charge for parking. I think having restrictions and having visitor permits is a balance.
- A-Love the electronic form, however hate that only the single homeowner can register. Parking office would not let me as a tenant (license with the same listed address, different unit) to have an account as well, so my landlord and I had to share visitor passes.
- No Parking except by Permit reduces the accessibility of inner city areas.
- A The current restrictions seem proportionate, at least in Crescent Heights where I live. In other communities with greater restrictions, there seems to be some rhyme and reason. People should not be deterred from having visitors. The visitor pass website should work more reliably on mobile devices.
- Hourly parking should be available for people who are visiting residents who do not have visitor permits, patronizing businesses, and going to other places in communities with parking permits. Street parking should be priced where appropriate based on demand.
- hourly parking would allow businesses to service homes without difficulty and still limit general public parking of no value to local residents.
- B provides a good balance and creates an incentive for the city to actually enforce the existing zones. It should be easy for business visiting customer's homes to obtain passes without having to enter license plates.
- As a contractor I would like the ability to get a pass that allows me to park in these areas during the day
- Please do NOT remove RPP restrictions. Leave everything status quo in regards to visitor registration. I would prefer an app to be able to log visitor license plates
- I preferred having the cards for Visitor Parking as sometimes it is not convenient to get online to register, especially if it is just for a couple hours.
- Street parking as always been public and should remain this way.
 - This is best for a residential zone.
- I know of several places (south of Foothills Hospital) where there is excessive residents only parking that is not needed or used by residents. There has to be a cap on the amount of residents only parking in any place, otherwise no one can move around the City.
 - No change to current visitor permit - we do ours online (register visitor's plates to our address), but this system (online) is limiting if we have a lot of guests (not often, but



occasionally), whereas before we could just borrow paper tags from several neighbours for our "event"

- If you remove RPPs or increase the amount of parking options in areas adjacent to hospitals and universities etc., these areas will be overrun by people seeking free parking - a problem now! Maybe instead the City could address the exorbitant costs people must pay to park close to such institutions.
- I think time restricted parking is a good enough deterrent. Allows some short term use of parking.
- Except for residences near hospitals, more than 2 permits are often needed to host larger gatherings eg baby showers, birthdays, dinner parties. Prefer 2 or more hr parking outside business hours rather than permit in strictly non-business residential zones
- I live by a hospital. Before the permit only zone, the garbage truck had trouble getting through the ends of cars on the street. It as dangerous in winter (we live on a steep, narrow hill)
- System appears to be working.
- The current system works well for us. We live near bars and restaurants, so we need to be in an RPP zone. The system isn't perfect, but it works well enough. If we have a party here, it is difficult for guests to park, but the current system is our best option.
- Re Option A: this is fair and reasonable
- What justification do people have to give and prove in order to be granted an RPP? There's enough NIMBY in the be world, let's not indulge people for being selfish and grumpy. There should be an irrefutable, demonstrable need or else it is not granted -not just a bunch of unqualified signatures.
- Tie parking to residents plates, have visitor parking with the tag to a one wk period. This takes away the ability for the renting out of passes., if house has a two car garage or parking pad they should only have one parking pass.
- The current system works reasonably well, although daily ticketing needs to occur for our area below FMC.
- I like the idea that if there is a problem on some streets then make one side "No parking" and one side available for the public. I pick option C.
- If my neighbourhood (Kensington) didn't have a "no parking except by permit", we would NEVER be able to find a parking space!!!! As a family with children, this would be hell & we'd likely have to pay for city metered parking & walk blocks in the winter to return home with kids.
- Visitor permits have worked well for us and since we only have street parking and live near Kensington, the zone restriction ensures we always have parking by our house.
- keep the visitor passes but increase the availability of paid parking for customers. Money should go to CA or BIA.
- I don't believe it is exclusionary to expect to park on the street by my home. I pay higher taxes to live in a lower density area! Having visitor permits and 2 hour zones allows ample parking access for visitors to homes or business customers. Any longer... businesses need a parking lot!
- Adequate and works well in electronic system (University Heights experience)



- We need to restrict parkers who don't have a permit. This includes car-to-go and City parking (who park while they go in for lunch). We have only 2-3 spots and can't afford to have them used by non-visitors to our complex.
- I live in the beltline and a lot of it is paid zone parking. People with permits should be allowed to park in these areas. I hate it when smart cars are allowed to park wherever.
- Useful to have visitor permits.
- Imagine that I'm your neighbour and I have divided my basement into multiple individual bedrooms where each one is rented out to different people each with their own vehicle where each vehicle would occupy all driveways including the one in front of your house. How would you feel?
- I would actually increase the number of No Parking except by Permit zones.
- Seems to be a reasonable solution.
- I have a friend that lives in a parking restricted zone and I like how the current systems works.
- These questions are somewhat limited . With the options I support visitor but to limit to only 1 per household
- Parking a visitor needs to be made more convenient. Make it park of the parking app.
- Residents can manage visitor traffic, ensure that visitors are taken care of within reason
- We are all ready finding it difficult to park on our block and have any visitors come and park. If you relax it further it would be nearly impossible. As a parent with 4 young kids I don't want to walk blocks to brink in my kids and groceries.
- Paying for parking permits is another cost that struggling Calgarians cannot afford. The cost of everything is rising except for salaries
- Would have chosen a, except multi unit dwellings aren't allowed visitor permits, which doesn't address my concerns.
- 2 visitor passes work as long as there is unpermitted parking within a safe distance to the permitted parking street for additional visitors if need be..
- There should always be zones otherwise people will not utilize transit and streets within the inner city will be over crowded and unusable for residents. Again, since inner city residents pay higher taxes compared to people who live outside there should be restrictions.
- Option A - C Many residential homes have extra parking in their garage or back alley for extra visitors. We use our garage for our vehicles and d the garage pad in the back alley if needed. Some areas no parking zones are needed.
- Is it or permits per household should be valid for 1 year term.
- Increase residence permits to four per household.
- Uncomplicated and fair.
- Residents don't have a right to park on the street near their home. In high demand areas, it should be available to whomever is willing to pay for it.
- With K permit limited parking (less now because of empty bike lanes) people no longer want to visit me. In addition more people park illegally in back alley. Many residents park on street 100% of time so no room.
- Return to paper permits then I can use if need to put a car on street.



- I choose A. But I thought that paper permits were abolished in favor of residents logging in and registering a plate number for a home repair guy or friend.
- WHAT A [Removed] Scam
- Part of A and part of B. We need more than 2 visitors at a time for gatherings and having them pay is NOT an option!!
- My family comes for a visit and I would like them to have a pass to park near my home.
- See above
- If the goal is to not be a deterrent to visitors to homes then the residential parking permit program as it exists works if the visitors are not tied by license plate. Logging in to register the visitors license plate is not as easy as it could be. It is not tied to your parking app.
- "Add an option in permit only zones : 1 hr parking option to buy more time.
- For our home it is impossible to have more than 2 groups of people (family) over at a time without worrying about parking fines!! That is ridiculous."
- It is also fairly silly when you want to be a patron of a business but can't because every single parking space within walking distance is restricted to residents.
- It is very easy to register a visitor with the existing system. It works well, why abandon it? This option continues to protect residents in "major generator" zones.
- Too stressful to have friends or family, especially from out of town, have to worry abt how long they can visit.
- This system works well for our area
- Option D. From both the business owner and customer perspective, these restrictions are a deterrent to clientele considering services and areas in which businesses operate from therefore impacting the ability to maximize on profits which then impact taxes and the economic impact.
- Times listed in some inner city areas should be reviewed. Variations of restrictions from street to street are confusing.
- Living in sunnyside the RPP Zone isn't that close to the businesses. If ppl are complaining that they can't park close to shopping it's because they don't want to pay. If businesses feel their clients don't have enough free parking they should advertise the spots they have behind their shops.
- Parking needs some controls, but we need some freedoms too.
- The more visitor permits a household has access to, the higher the probability of misuse. Especially in areas close to Universities and event centers, residents often sell permits to people so they can park close to the school or event. This is not what they are intended for.
- Why do suburban residents get to have unlimited visitors and inner city residents can have to 2?
- I would choose option A but multi family buildings aren't allowed visitor passes. This needs to change. It's punishing people who can't afford houses or want to cut down on their footprint by living in a multi family dwelling.
- I find that rarely do I see most of the parking by Permit zones only are occupied in the inner-city communities like Inglewood. I would encourage the city to do a survey of each community to discover the usage of RPP per household to see if there's room to cut down "No Parking except by Permit' zone



- in addition to keeping the two visitor spots, you should be able to have the option for short term additions. (Option A).
- No charge should be made for permits. Likely should be less restricted zones - for instance i live on a street with 2 hour restriction during the week. I have no idea why - Perhaps because am about 4 blocks from SAIT Next street over has NO parking except by permit - and is further from SAIT?
- If the short term stalls are filled up, then raise the price.
- Again, there are too many vehicles on my street
- if LRT had proper parking by stations this would not be an issue at all. Also City hall development control to include new development with mandatory parking be a garage or driveway, especially for multi residential areas. We have both garage and driveway.
- B - ANY RPP zone should allow anyone to park in it for several hours (maybe 2) to allow for infrequent use of the parking. This will reduce the likelihood of spots being tied up all day while still allowing some public access. Ideally, option D would level the playing field and ensure equal access
- Living adjacent to a commercial shopping district is challenging without adding the burden of supporting parking that both businesses and the city parking authority should be building into the BRZ and existing zones.
- see above
- A seems reasonable
- should be option for more visitor, christmas, birthdays, family visits. What if I have more than 2 friends
- It's up to businesses and the city to provide parking for businesses - not local home owners. The city has already collected 'cash in lieu' for parking and squandered it.
- I completely disagree with the theme as stated. On my street we haven't been able to get permit parking and as a result of heavy traffic attending a business across the street from my home, caregivers cannot even find a place to park to access my home for my senior mother. We need permits!
- Change the definition (so you don't have to change all the signs) so that all residential parking zones become 2 hour parking from 9:00 am to 5:00 am automatically (or all day with a pass). This allows for visitors and businesses. Even these changes will drastically increase the traffic.
- Hiding the costs of parking are detrimental to Calgary. I believe that the cost of parking should be born by the user. Ideally, this means that parking is always available for those who are prepared to pay for the cost of it. More importantly, the cost discourages automobile use and ownership.
- Option A is working poorly right now for visitors. The old tag system worked well. The electronic system, contractors dropping into the house unscheduled with different vehicles to comply is difficult. The electronic cars running around just churns revenue. then The appeals are rejected
- I want the option to invite more than 2 guests to my home for coffee. I regularly need more than 2 visitor passes. Not a whole lot more than 2 are needed, but it wouldn't be unusual to have 4 other couples come to visit.
- Not all RPP zones are eligible for visitor permits. This survey seems slanted towards people living outside the RPP area.



- "B" is optimal. I would love "3 hours free or parking permit" for suburban residential areas near a major generator. It's a good way to allow quick parking (for friends visiting without administrative work) or for a resident hosting an event. "C" and "D" would turn a community into a park-n-ride.
- Permits stop me visiting businesses or friends that live or operate in permit areas.
- No parking except by permit should be limited and allow parking for nearby businesses. This has always been a deterrent for visiting businesses
- It's impossible to have visitors, even when all nearby streets are nearly empty. Why would we not want people visiting other people or businesses? This city already massively lacks a sense of community. Rules that act as a deterrent to creating community are disingenuous and damaging.
- When you have a limited amount of something then there must be a fee. It allows those living in area to get services and see visitors without fees or hassle and it gives the option for things requiring more time to be paid for.
- The street belongs to all citizens.
- These answers really don't fit my issue. I'd like to be able to have two annual passes and 2 visitor passes, even though I only have one vehicle, so parking for my babysitter would be less of a hassle for me.
- cars park in front of your house for days
 - An option to get extra passes for special occasions would be very helpful.
- Make downtown, 17th Ave, etc. accessible again!
- D is a good, democratic choice. B and C are market-based and would solve everyone's problems. What's not to like?
- A - Residences should receive up to 10 with no cost
- There are a large number of businesses that I would like to visit but have a difficult time because parking is not available at or near the business and any parking spots within a 2 block radius are permit parking.
- Current system works reasonably well.
- I live by the university so there can be no change. The streets would fill up with university students
- having flexibility to not enter my visitors would be nice - as well, I've had friends' ticketed for stopping by briefly. I wish I could register more than TWO people, it is very hard to HOST any event at my place. We will remove our vehicles from the drive way, park on the street to accommodate
- Give more opportunity for people to visit these areas without the hassle of obtaining a permit online. I tried to get one for a place I was living in and found it difficult. Make it simple and allow for more none visit parking areas even if its further away
- We need some sort of tag showing that the visitors car is allowed to be there. (see explanation above)
- B- We are in a No Parking except By Permit zone. I'd like for a 30minute grace period before a visitor would be ticketed. Sometimes a guest popping by isn't worth the effort of logging in and registering license plate
- Make the process easier to obtain temporary permits. Website is so frustrating & takes too long. Received a ticket after being there for 19 minutes!!



- "Auburn bay- no parking zones are established around the catholic elementary school, leaving a lack of short term parking for parents picking kids up from school"
- Auburn bay community centre has no parking on nearby streets, residents get ticketed when an event is on and the parking lot is full"
- c: you should be able to park for 1 hour in all zones. Change no parking ex permit to 1hr parking
- We live in a beltline community with almost all permit parking. Our street does not have it, but it's one of only a couple blocks without. We're able to park with just as much ease as anybody else. Proving the permit zones are total BS
- let people park for god sakes. you ppl stress everyone, plus parking officers don't speak English very well and like to write tickets before they investigate matters.
- You did not give an option for "no change but increase the number of residential parking permits at no cost." I have 4 vehicles, 2 car garage, and no driveway. I pay my property taxes. Sometimes we need to move cars around, but cannot change plates as they are registered to a particular car.
- should have time limits and number of days for visitor permit
- See above comment.
- Change the wording on your documents (not the actual signs because it costs too much)-- all residential parking zones to 2 hour parking between 9:00 am and 5:00 pm (unless they have a pass). One of the biggest community benefits for restricted parking is reduced traffic if people know no parking.
- I would also choose C - reduce the number of parking by permit zones.
- Free roam does not work
- A: Bring back the tag system for visitor permits because the present system makes it impossible to ascertain if parked vehicles are legal. The tag system also empowers residents without internet access and those who are visually impaired who can not use the phone or computer access
- Option B - regardless of the reason people are visiting a zone, if there is sufficient demand for space, it makes sense that people should pay to access that space. I really like the hybrid model in place in Mission that is paid or unpaid depending on how busy things are.
- This option is fare to tax paying home owners.
- If people are using the 'free' parking areas to enable a commute to downtown or the hospital for work then they should need to pay a monthly fee. Their free parking limits visitors to homes/business and caregivers/contractor access.
- If I want to have more than 2 visitors for a family celebration (or heaven forbid a sudden tragedy), I can't. Also, if my visitors are here for more than 2 weeks, I have to resubmit their license plate information. Why not have a from/to date so we can enter that way?
- We live in Kensington close to the Ctrain. If there were no restrictions we wouldn't be able to park anywhere because it would become a park & ride. Because our alley is narrow and people park there we aren't able to easily access our garage and even if we do, we can't get out if someone parks there.



- Space is extremely limited in areas around schools for parents to pick up their kids after school or dropping them off. Why penalize someone for a quick drop off/pickup in areas where there are clearly no vehicles parked during pickup and drop off times? Cash cow at its finest.
- Yes - please allow me to have a permit on my street allowing me to park in front of my home. Renters living close by take my space!!!! I'm the one paying the taxes - please allow me to park where I live.
- It's tough to get together for family gatherings, or celebrations, or visits where there is limited or no ability for visitors to park (because of restrictions and because the roads are full all the time by residents who could and should be parking in the designated spaces on their property).
- More visitors between 9am & 4pm should be allowed, when most people are at work but young mothers and seniors who cannot get around town by transit tend to visit each other.
- I think it is working fine, if you have extra guests They can park outside of the permitted area
- Pain in my rear end to have to register & unregister visitors and I don't trust the City to not be keeping tabs on who my visitors are
- Residents need to have the flexibility to have unlimited visitors. Allow vehicles in any zone overnight/wknds to reduce drunk driving and increase uber/taxi use. Reality of winter accessibility is take it wherever your car can find and handle it. "hunting" for parking is safety distraction.
- Visitor permits suck. Make the owner pay for additional permits, including visitor permits. Also let visitors just pay for parking normally. It makes it simpler for visitors, but for homes that need it they can still get a permit.
- Need to either change the eligibility for getting a RPP from having registered address or the 2 week long permit. My partner and I both own houses in different zones and have to add each other every second week. I have had to pay a coder to write a routine for doing this, which i have sold to others
- There are many occasions where 2 permits are not enough, such as construction vehicles, family events or gatherings. These situations need to be dealt with in a fair manner.
- B - one hour parking limits or permit only zones are too short. The hassle of logging in to register a license plate when someone comes for a short visit is irritating.
- "d - People cannot just stop in to visit - need a permit.
- City needs to go back to paper permits for visitors only."
- "A. Residences need visitor permits as they should be the primary users to park for their convenience
- This would make it easier for everyone who would like to park in the restricted area"
 - is the closest answer to respond to . Again max of 2 spots per property. How you manage them when you have guests should be up to the owner. EXCEPTION selling them should be illegal.
- I believe these zones need to be evaluated and assessed to determine whether or not the zones are actually necessary. The zones need to be reduced thereby increasing the number of usable parking zones for regular paid and unpaid options.
- Visitor passes seem fair and logical



- The current restrictions in A are impractical. Often times a single property can have more than 2 vehicles worth of visitors and this causes parking infractions or inconvenience. B strikes a good balance so that the zones are still enforced for residents, but greater options are available.
- Everyone has visitors and since they are not parking their cars for days they should be able to use the space for parking.
- Easier to use visitor parking permits. Physical parking permits or better online system.
- We have a car repair shop and restaurant at the end of our street constantly we are unable to have visitors to our home due to non-permit parking. In the winter it makes it especially hard.
- Again the current system works.
- This system was working well when it was in place.
- Seems to be working fairly well.
- What about current electronic option
- I can't imagine having family bbqs or a birthday party with only two visitor permits. I think there should be time limits for permit-free parking followed by permit requirements. Parking 1HR except permit P (or whichever zone it's in).
- Streets are a public service and any parking permits are in violation of this principal. Option D restores the rights of the public.
- We have been greatly impacted by staff parking in front of our home in recent years with the increase in city approved development - plus commuters parking here and then taking the bus downtown - without it we would be parking miles from our house.
- I think this is fair, however I would like to see the paper parking passes to come back. The online is too time consuming and then we don't know when we can call parking authority if we have cars parked that aren't visitors. The passes visibly showed everyone living on the street.
- There must be a provision made for visitors to a resident to park free. Customers to businesses should be provided parking by the business and the city should ensure adequate parking at businesses is available. Residents near businesses should not have to suffer the consequences of poor planning
- It would be great if the permits had an emitter versus the need to call it in. It would be like toll booths used in various parts of the world
- Short-term parking during the daytime until 3:30 or 4 pm makes sense. The street parking is in demand by residents after work and overnight.
- Areas near downtown CTrain stations and Stampede Park would be swamped with vehicles if no parking restrictions - residents would have nowhere to park. Increasing hourly parking would also reduce parking available for those who live in the area.
- While I'd prefer option D (remove all), that may not be feasible. Option C, a reduction in the number of permit only parking, would be at least a step in the right direction.
- It only takes a minute to input a license plate on line- so no need to change current parking restrictions
- the system is working well for our visitors.



- The streets are public, for everyone. We all pay taxes for all the streets so should have access to them. Handicapped residents need to have a permit. There's enough on-site parking for most residents. Who needs 4 cars???? Businesses with inadequate parking lose out when customers cannot park nearby.
- This isnt an issue in my area
- I actually was refused a visitor permit because I live in a multi-family dwelling. It makes no sense! I have guests, too!
- Must be a balance
- Make the app easier to use and mobile friendly
- A covers visitors and traveling businesses (home care etc.). A business that would be impacted by the RPP zone preventing large numbers of customers from parking simultaneously should not be in that zone in the first place.
- I think the current system works well.
- Why can't an area have permit parking for 2 hours in certain hours? Both kinds of parking can share.
- If there's no permit zone then residents will be on the street and visitors will still be out of luck.
- This option allows for visitors, including business visits.
- Either all parking should be open to everyone, or each area should be restricted to only those who live there
- All citizens of Calgary pay for the roads/repair/snow removal in Calgary, thus they should be able to park without exclusion.
- Option D is most favorable. Single family dwellings that have no other parking options (no garage or parking pad and limited/nonexistent back alley parking) should have priority access to street parking. 2free and up to 2paid permits make the most sense and are the most "fair" compared 2other users.
- Street parking is a hazard and should not be permitted. If you do not have somewhere on your property to park your car, buy a transit pass or buy a bike.
- B - Open it up, but patrol every few hours and ticket those who stay all day - they're the reason for the zone in the first place.
- It should be free and unlimited for anyone connected to a household in the area. No one should have to pay to park near their home and their visitors should not have to pay neither
- Current restrictions wouldn't be necessary if adequate parking on site was mandatory . Other places do it.
- Option A. The current visitor permit seems to work well. An increase in the amount of permits would only increase the amount of abuse of the system, especially in areas such as ours which is close to McMahon Stadium, 2 C Train stations, a church, an apartment building and a restaurant.
- A: I think the current system is fine.
- My physician is in Bridgeland. The permits available works well at the moment.
- I operate a home are business. Residential parking visitor passes waste time
- C and D. It is public parking. Everyone should be allowed to use it. Why do we limit parking at all? It should be free and accessible within residential areas.



- Need to keep permit zones so that residents can park and others don't use them for commuting (close to downtown, ctrain, bike, paths etc). If more than 2 visitor permits are needed, they could always ask a neighbour or park on a near by street with less restrictions or move their vehicle regularly
- Option A: It works pretty well - however on occasion, two is not enough
- No larger gatherings etc. Specifically downtown is a joke. You either spend hours finding a parking spot or you spend hours on the c-train. I don't have the time to waste so I don't go there
- It provides flexibility to have occasional visitors like repair and service personnel to visit permitted location.
- All parking should go for fair market value so all residents benefit.
- We love visitors
- 2 free permits with the ability to purchase more seems fair. Particularly for elderly residents on fixed incomes. These permits allow visitors, care workers, family, and friends to park at the residence unrestricted. Without these permits, many people would be further out of pocket.
- The current system works fine, my current parking area has signs that don't allow unpermitted parking during certain hours. Then if people have a large amount of people over, they are able to park near the house. This stops the people who park on the street and walk or bike to downtown.
- B - gives visitors more options for short term parking
- I disagree with your lead statement. We have had no problems handling visitors or workers at our home under the present system.
- Residents must provide supporting data for why Permit is required. Visitors can be anyone remotely related to the residents and NOT the residents' responsibility to update their licence plates now and then.
- B - Many residential parking zones seem designed to prevent people parking all day in front of their home. There should be availability for hourly parking, especially in blocks near businesses and schools.
- I would like visitors to be able to park near my home. it is
- Option C and D. Calgary has become the most unfriendliest place for parking. Restrictions need to be removed and now that the City has all these bike lanes, they have taken away more parking on streets where there are now bike lanes.
- As long as there are enough non-permit areas for people who can walk a little further to park and let the others unable to walk to use the permits.
- Exclusive access to public spaces/property should be shared by all, and anytime restrictions are in place, there should be a fee. Public parking is not a right or entitlement, but rather, it should come at a cost if you want that privilege.
- Visitor permits are necessary, although sometimes 2 permits are insufficient, e.g., if you have several people visiting at once.
- It is challenging to juggle having only two visitor permits in certain situations. When visitors have to park blocks away from the home they are visiting this seems counter-intuitive and silly. I preferred when the street was "two hour parking, except for permit"



- As a visitor to my mother-in-law, she often has parties with many people over and two parking spaces are not enough even in addition to her driveway.
- We need RRP especially for those who lives close to inner city and c train stations...
- If there are no restrictions the home owners will have no where to park. There is plenty of paid parking available for visitors to any one area.
- B - why can others not park in residential areas? Short term parking should be allowed anywhere parking is allowed - even if it is paid.
- I can't invite my family to my home for major celebrations (e.g. Birthdays, Christmas Dinner) without some of them taking a chance on getting a ticket (B). It's draconian and unnecessarily inflexible.
- If it ain't broke don't fix it
- B - impossible to have a house party with current arrangements. Hourly parking would still restrict excessive parking overnight or all day.
 - each residence should get one full time visitor permit with the option to purchase more on an hourly basis
- Loving next to a busy street, it is nice to know my guests will have a place to park for a short term visit. This helps make inner city attractive.
- Street parking should be free to all
 - I think this is the most flexible option. Otherwise visitors could be parked for days within an RPP zone.
- Revisit the parking by permit locations. Not all streets by saint need this option
 - My home is located close to a school and recreational Center. Over the years I have found people like to park as close to the door as possible even when there is a parking lot attached to the facility. It's nice when company can park near my home.
- To many exclusionary zones
- "A: self explanatory
- C: Reduce the number of these zones would encourage more visitors to areas such as downtown from other areas of the city."
- Public streets are the property of all taxpayers and should be open to all equally. If residents are concerned about parking at their address, they should build on site parking like everyone else has to.
- None of the above are satisfactory alternatives.
- Currently we are unable to have tenants/owners/employees in building with multiple units issued visitor parking permits because the city states we do not have enough frontage. Yet the guy next door in a 30' lot gets 2 and buy more.
- If we had these, and they were properly monitored, perhaps I would not have to call parking control so often about people blocking my drive and back gate access!
- A, Prefer old system with 2 paper permits to the online registration for permits attached to a license plate. Permits attached to license plates made it difficult for people with mobility issues, home care, seniors and online system not good for families with no internet.



- Need an easier option for guests. It can be impossible to visit someone when 4 couples are invited to a house in a restricted zone.
- we always get people parking sans permit , to go get the train at sunnyside or walk to Kensington ave (when they can pay for at their school or work) ps i really appreciate the effort the parking patrol group has taken in the last 6 while , so we can actually park on our str. thanks!
- Must be paper permit. The online system is not good for regular visitors.
- This “restrict everything” attitude has gone too far. When nothing is permitted, who will want to live in this sad little town?
- Parking should not be free (subsidized).
- Get with and quit trying to fleece money out of people...let people park for nothing, and bring people into the area to shop..
- We live in University Heights, which is an island community completely surrounded by institutions such as the University of Calgary major hospitals and McMahon Stadium. If we do not have residential parking restrictions we cannot park in front of our homes.
- The current Parkplus approach to visitor parking is frustrating and problematic. The physical tags are useful.
- ABSOLUTELY MUST be specific considerations that account for varying community differences and needs. Foolishness of the one size fits all secondary suite debacle example of the mess blanket policies (like "D") create. Different communities require different traffic calming measures, why not parking.
- A - each homeowner (taxpayer) should have the ability to park two vehicles in front of their home . Be it a person living in the home or a visitor to the home.
- Parking on a public street should be allowed everywhere. It is a shared public space, not owned by the people who live there.
- A, my street that has restrictions is already packed. We cannot handle more traffic, even if a business or residents would like more visitors. I am lucky that I have a garage so I don't need street parking every day, but visitors usually have to park blocks away already.
- Areas with RPP should have options to park if businesses or commercial retail is desirable to visit which would attract traffic to stores
- Roads a public utility. It is offensive to a liberal society that the roads parking monopoly can be restricted to a certain class of people. There should be no zones with no parking except by permit - rather, parking should be priced according to free market and should be available to all citizens.
- Option B & C. The most reasonable approach is for the city to balance the need to make parking spaces available with the responsibility to ensure the volume of cars is manageable. Paid options are not deterrents for visitors to homes and businesses, and this revenue can offset other transit costs.
- Would like the ability for more visitor parking passes. In the hospital area, adding even 1 hour parking spots, they fill up with hospital staff or visitors and it stays that way almost 24 hrs a day.



- C - I fully support parking restrictions where necessary in order to provide parking options for residents. However many zones, including my own, only exist to restrict parking related to nearby facilities such as high schools.
- IMPORTANT: The paper visitor permit system works. The online system (by virtue of being "online") does not.
- b - I don't go to certain businesses because I cannot find a place to park
- Because the other choices makes the parking generator communities such as those close to hospital, LRT, etc.. a public parking lot . The visitor time from outside community should be limited.
- Works good
- I chose B. Commercial spaces need free visitor parking. Otherwise, it deters business when no permitted or free parking is available.
- Family and friends hate visiting me in Kensington because there is very little free parking. They're always worried about "feeding the meter." This stupid new online system doesn't recognize my address, which it previously did, so I can't offer them visitor parking.
- Residential zones should not have occasionally used 2nd vehicles sitting in them for weeks at a time. Maybe 5pm-7:30am weekdays and weekends but not permanently for residents only. Policies should not be based on popularity but what encourages sustainability. Encourage car share services instead
- The roads are publically funded and maintained. Which, to me, means that the public can use them for their intended purposes (driving and parking) at any place, at any time. These are not private roads, and should not be treated as such, and especially not for free if it MUST happen.
- A). Agree with need for visitor permits EXCEPT that 1 visitor permit issued per 1 purchased parking permit. Also, there should be some free, unrestricted parking areas in a neighborhood block. Plus there should be some parking spots set aside in a block for hourly free parking.
- Encouraging people to park in their driveway will free up parking space on the street, or just make the streets safer for cyclists, pedestrians etc.
- The change needs to be in the automation- the visual passes on the cars was user friendly- if your at someone's place and they haven't done the online registration of visitors plates you could get a ticket, or if you can't find parking directly in front of their house.
- Visitor permits are important for home owners to have, especially in large residential restriction areas, because everyone has a right have visitors.
- These restrictions hamper the ability to have visitors to the home.
- I believe people should have to option to park in an RPP zone.. but not for too long. There's also too many of these zones downtown, where the streets are never full.
- numerous times i have tried to visit a business and had to spend 20min driving around finding parking
- Explains D: if parking was free throughout Calgary we wouldn't have an issue with people parking just to get free parking.
- Those people visiting can use the permits. The resident can use their garage or driveway.



- Again, allowing residents to decide how the street in front of their house is just pushing the parking issue around neighbourhoods.
- If you remove restriction i will never be able to have guests over as the road will be full of parked cars
- I live in a high density area in the SE. Parking is a big issue in this type of community. There is enough room to park ONE vehicle in front of my house. Many of the homes have now become rentals with upwards of 4 and 5 vehicles parking on the street. Permit Parking should be considered!
- no time limit on parking permits for visitors or construction crews required by homeowner
- C & D: We live adjacent to a permitted zone in a multi-family building. When we have visitors they have nowhere to park as we are not eligible for a parking permit and most of our neighbourhood is restricted parking even though it's largely single-family homes with garages.
- Allow 1-2 hour parking in RPP zones to accommodate service vehicles, home care, etc. A lot of RPP zones are empty during the day when residents go to work.
- I live in a restricted zone, if I choose to have people over mid day on a Saturday (which is a better time for young families) they have to take a risk to park. If two visitor passes all day everyday that is a concern, but using extra passes on a one off or short times for renos must be allowed
- Removing all residential permit parking should be done. Again we all pay taxes for the roads, we should all be able to park on them regardless of where we live.
- C
- We need a flexible system that accommodates temporary situations (overnight visitors etc.) without using the street as a parking lot.
- Best option in our neighbourhood
- In bridgeland, there is not one square inch that is not either 2 hour only or park by permit only. There is literally no where for someone without a designated underground stall to legally park during weekdays. Think about that.
- Street parking is already tough to find in highly commercial areas. Placing these restrictions adds to the stress of finding a spot and is an issue for people with mobility problems.
- People park in my residential zone and take all the spots and the city barely ever checks. At least if they're there make money off it - b
- There needs to be realistic options for people that are driving to certain locations. Parking shouldn't be impossible or an unrealistically high cost.
- Even though I live on a permitted street, parking is very limited. If each residence has access to a total of 4 passes there is not enough space for every vehicle. Increasing the aloted number of permits will make this worse.
- We live in the community of Sunnyside for the past 12 years and the system in perfect. It is imperative in this community to restrict parking as the proximity to downtown is close enough for people to park and walk. If unrestricted parking was allowed there would be no parking for residents left.



- b. allow a grace period of up to three hours for visitors. If you have overnight visitors, get a two or three day pass. Other than that, too bad.
- I have permit parking in front of my house, and it is mostly unused by anyone. It annoys me that guests have to be careful of getting tickets, or I have to register them.... People need to understand you don't own the parking in front of your house.
- "B: options are what's needed if they are going to continue having "permit only" zones. Most would pay to park if they had to.
- C: if there isn't a change in zones to pay options or something, drastically reducing them would allow people to visit businesses"
- A - This option again provides the property owner with the ability to have guests park in close proximity to their properties. Generally near RPP's there are hourly zones available for residents having multiple guests. Opening up the paid zones for businesses should be separate from residential.
- The existing system works well in University Heights, but there may be parts of the City where "B" would apply.
 - This entire theme is a bogus concern. The current visitor permit is easy to use.
- Residents that chose to live near a hospital/sporting zone etc should not be able to choose to enact parking restrictions to those venues. A resident in a "busy" area that is not near a hospital/sporting facility has no basis to enact a parking restriction - this is fair.
- Permit restrictions are necessary. On street parking is limited, so when more than 2 cars per house are parked on the street, it is not possible for a homeowner to park one car when they come home which is not reasonable and unfair. Only allow 2 permits per home, no more.
- OPTION A - I was under the impression that visitor parking was tied to a license plate. When I personally log in to the Calgary Parking Authority website I must register my guest vehicle license plate. I would prefer physical parking tags instead of logging in to register a vehicle.
- It is a good system.
- The "No Parking" zones often lie empty, especially during the day when business patrons could use parking. Meanwhile the unrestricted zones are usually packed, especially near SAIT. Students park all day, monopolize the parking, and pay nothing. Street parking shouldn't be free.
- Maintaining a 1-2 hours limit for residential zones is valuable, particularly in neighborhoods close to commercial zones / LRTs / Healthcare facilities, where vehicles may be parked for an entire workday.
- So out of town guests can stay.
- Provide residents with a simplified appeal process in the event that a visitor / home care worker was issued a ticket because the online permit was not updated properly. Especially key for seniors and less tech savvy residents.
- On-line visitor parking has a 2 week limit. This is ridiculous - have a 2 - 3 day limit which can be renewed.
- It is hard to host gatherings when only two of your attendees are allowed to park in your neighbourhood.



- I've been to multiple RPP's and each time there's tons of room to park wether that's in the morning, afternoon or late at night. Makes no sense that all Calgarians can't use those spots if they're available.
 - Our streets are public and parking should not be restricted on public streets for the benefit of a few residents.
- I live in a rpp zone and my biggest struggle is having people drop by for less than an hour. We had renovations done so I was constantly having to put licenses plates in the system for short visits. I would frequently forget as well. I would prefer the old method of a visitor pass.
- Not all neighbourhoods should be allowed to access the "no parking except by permit" zones. I understand if a neighbourhood is near c-train, etc. but simply because you don't want outsiders shouldn't be a reason. ie. Rideau/Roxboro
- "By parking infro t of my own house under a visitor parking pass i have accumulated over 1000\$ in parking tickets feom december 2018-may 2019.
- Many of them issued while i was away helping a sick family member.
- There is no option other then to pay in full. Thats ridiculous"
- Visitors to a residence are temporary users of space and should be able to more conveniently visit friends or family. Residents should be using their pad or garage for vehicle parking.
- Is option A true? I thought all visitor permits were tied to license plates. It is the electronic visitor permit system that I have issue with. Difficult to tell who has a permit and who doesn't and to report concerns when the street is full.
- A: most flexibility for residents like myself. We should have priority. It is where we live.
- Visitors to a home should not have to pay - covered by taxes
- I want my visitors and contractors to be able to access my home easily.
 - Considering this is statistically infrequent, it's trying to a solve a problem that only applies to a small few. It may be beneficial for some categories of businesses to get a "park anywhere" permit.
- I'd say B if Calgary would provide proper infrastructure to get around town with different modes than driving. Alas, that is far from the case. Get that going, until then it's A.
- B - There should be options for non-permit parking for occasional visitors like a limited time parking. Total exclusions means some people have to walk a distance to get to a home and pose a problem for those with mobility restrictions.
- This should not be a problem as the homeowner has 2 visitor permits.
- Selected A: The physical visitor permit not tied to license plates facilitate adult home owner's who are not digital savvy. This is most needed for commercial/service visitors attending to work at the house. Increasing free hourly parking time will encourage abuse of system by non visitors.
- If you implement no parking between 2am - 6am then residents will start to fit in their on-site parking and it will leave space for visitors.
- Sure allow visitors option to pay to park on empty streets, more revenue!
- C: There are so many areas designated as "No Parking Except By Permit" that sit empty throughout the day, which can be a detriment near facilities such as hospitals. My comment does NOT pertain



to transit parking zones; I feel those need to be hugely regulated and an increase in Permit Only Parking.

- There is a parking restriction on my street [personal information removed] for no apparent reason as there is no parking pressure.
- Home owners should be able to park close to home. Visitor permits limits non-residential parking leaving room for residents. (A) The current permit registration is cumbersome, and sometimes it is difficult to connect. An app would be useful
- A ? - I thought the current visitor permit had already changed with having to phone in to register a vehicle license plate. What you are describing under A is the previous system and would be better than the current system
- "The types of restriction zones (C) should be vastly reduced! Replace all "no parking except by permit" and various time limits with a single, time-limited (2 hour) zone, except by permit."
- The current visitor permit scheme (A) is excellent, but the website to use it is appalling."
- Open city opposed to a closed city concept
- I like this option but it needs to be expanded to frequent visitors such as nanny's, etc. This type of visitor should not have to constantly be updated online. Maybe once every three months.
- 2 visitors as a max is not realistic...family gathering?
- The shortage of parking options in residential areas is the fault of the city, in not requiring businesses and multi-family dwellings to provide sufficient on-site parking for visitors and residents, eg.15th Avenue NE between 4th St. and 3rd St. Development permits MUST include adequate parking.
- many permit only zones are now obsolete, for example, Richmond/Knob hill has permit only zones still in effect from having the old hospital. The hospital has since changed to a diagnostic centre and should be re-zoned as such, therefore removing the zone restrictions altogether.
- In residential areas, some visitors can park for an extended period of time.
- A - Keep it flexible for residents to have visitors but still maintain parking restrictions.
- Home owners should not have to pat to park in front of their house
- Areas with restrictions often see heavy traffic from people that do not live in the area. Keeping restrictions and allowing for visitor passes ensures that people who live in the area have access to parking when needed, for themselves or their visitors.
- I think the No Parking is not too necessary - 2hr is ok in most places. However, the city has created a problem in my opinion with the online registration of visitor parking. I would prefer to have possible paper permits. The online permit system sucks - properly sucks. It should have been tested.
- Current visitor parking passes work the majority of time except if you are having a party or event & then the restrictions are a problem. Having paper hang tags for visitors would be helpful - you could borrow those from neighbors. Choice A is the best fit of options.
- There are areas of Calgary that we no longer visit b/c of residential parking restrictions. Kensington and 4th Street among the two most prominent. Businesses are losing customer support b/c of residential parking restrictions.



- Parking is hard in inner city so you need to provide parking for residents plus guest. Too many park in my neighbourhood (Bankview) then take the bus downtown. Parking should be for residents
- 2 visitor passes is sufficient
- Need to allow for visitors - especially home health care etc
- Our neighborhood is close to both the Foothills complex and U of C. Several of our streets are used daily as "free" parking by dozens of non residents. The increased traffic has been identified as a safety concern for neighborhood children and seniors. Residents want more restrictions, not fewer.
- Enforce the [profanity remove] bylaws! People obeying the rules won't park there if there's a good chance they will be ticketed. If I had to go to the hospital or take the train I wouldn't risk a one-hour spot but I know which areas aren't patrolled very often, so sometimes it's a pretty good option
- A - Visitor parking not seen as an issue. Major issue is lack of enforcement of "visitors" who park for hours in residential areas while attending schools or businesses
- Option B: include more hourly parking, unpaid, and unrestricted hours. I currently live in a zone where its always permit only. I wish it would have 1 hr parking without and evenings/weekends unrestricted.
- status quo is as good as it gets and most reasonable
- Current system works fine
- "I hate the permit parking in front of my house.
- would like it removed"
- Streets should be for people, not private vehicle storage
- "I chose none of the above. Parking permits should always be tied to licence plate numbers. If a visitor comes, do what I do. I park in the street and let the visitor park in my assigned unit spot.
- There should be more zones that are for residents only after 6pm."
- This works well for the most part, with the exception of when there are more than two visitors expected - e.g. book club, committee meeting, coffee party for friends, etc. The process to apply for a parking relaxation need to be improved: Works well to go through 311; but requirement for 4 days
- Limit the exclusive and restrictive parking approach. Streets are a common good paid for by all taxpayers
 - current system works fine and with 2 visitor permits any household has plenty of parking.
- Options for visitors near entrances to homes are needed especially in the case of homecare providers and other service providers such as repair technicians.
- Remove 9 hour parking from in front of my house that only benefits the development company that shares the street.
- No vehicles, commercial or personal, should be allowed to park for free on public property.
- Our neighbourhood is by permit only. The only option of the 4 would be applicable.
- This is the way our street is currently set up. It works adequately and there have been no issues with visitors to the home or the homes of our neighbors
- "None of the above. All cars should be permitted to park in our area if they are working or visiting a home in the area.
- The area is Eagle Ridge only"



- Visitors need to park by residents
- Currently the visitor permits options are extremely limited. Sunday is the only day when I can have more than 2 visitors over. Having permits required before 6pm on weekdays and Saturdays is reasonable to reduce unwanted parking. Friends currently have to park elsewhere to come for dinner!!
- it is unfair that some areas are permit only zones and others are open, it makes visitors saturate the other areas and harder to park. particularly if a building is going through renos, street work is being done etc. and parking stalls/street parking are temporarily unavailable
- I have people who visit me with mobility issues and low income. Why should they be penalized for coming to visit me?
- There should not be restricted parking on residential streets. Parking permits in residential areas is a deterrent for visitors. I would not want my visitors receiving parking tickets. I wouldn't buy in area that has residential parking permits. I want my friends/family to visit without worry
- Current visitor passes are required because of major parking volume generators in my neighborhood
- It seemed to be a lot better and available parking was found before residential parking permit restrictions were imposed.
- A - This ensures security in the neighbourhood as not too many unknown motorists will just park their cars for days.
- like the way it is with some flexibility in B
- A - this is wrong - it is tied to a licence plate - you register it online. Damn you guys do not even know what you are currently using!
- In university heights without the restricted parking, it would be impossible to park anywhere near our home we do not have a front drive garage or driveway.
- I've lived in an area where I needed a permit. I still had problems and to my point is I think the responsibility to provide parking is on the building and the person. Buildings and home owners need to account for transportation vs pushing the cost on the City or making different lifestyle choices.
- I don't really like any of the other options but perhaps there should be more public parking in popular areas like mission and Kensington.
- Current version - but can the online registration be back-dated to the calendar day? Sometimes when visitors come, it takes time before they get logged in online. Should be active starting that calendar date. Tickets have been issued simply because we were late registering which is not fair.
- "No Parking" is not enforced in Calgary. Have call Parking Control many times about 10-15 illegally parked vehicles and I had to explain why I thought they should be ticketed to the agent. Just because the street has "no parking" it wasn't a reason. Cars could be ticked daily in this area.
- Currently visitor permits are tied to a specific license plate when the "visitor parking" is set up online.
- More unpaid 2-4 hour spots would be helpful to address visitor parking options.
- We already have a number of cars parked on our street illegally. We need the restrictions so that visitors to the homes have room to park. Many homes on the street do not have front driveways so people have limited options for parking.



- B - I go to visit my daughter who lives in a condo in Kensington - tough to park if the whole family goes to visit as we take up the paid parking and she doesn't get permits where she lives C or D - not everybody gets permits so maybe nobody should get permits!!!
- Current visitor parking works well. I like the online registration for visitor parking.
 - I don't believe people are deterred from visiting RPP zones. Each single and multifam dwelling should be given two no charge parking permits with the ability to register up to two guest plates with the CPA for a limited time period (12, 24, 48 hrs, etc.). Permits should not be tied to plates.
- The current system works well. My house and my street are for me and my neighbors, not people too cheap to pay for parking at the business they are going to.
- I feel it's important to maintain a sense of community without the presence of adjacent nearby work generators' employees continually entering / leaving a community via their cars.
- The no parking restriction limits even short term stays. If the time limit doesn't change then you need to improve the visitor registration system.
- I do not find it difficult to have visitors added to my parking permit. It also ensure university students are not parking and walking taking up all available parking.
- I recommend the opposite of option C: INCREASE the number of 'No Parking except by Permit' zones across Calgary
- It is annoying to visit certain streets with these exclusions and not be able to park anywhere on a block.
- A ...This was our previous system which worked quite well when an annual colour coded cardboard permit was required to be affixed to the rear view mirror of a vehicle, or otherwise easily visible to the Parking Authority people. This allowed residents to know who was legit and who wasn't.
- b best use of the space.
- A We live by U of C, Foothills, McMahan and the Children's hospital. If we did not have highly restricted parking our streets would become parking lots. Already lots of cars speed through our community and endanger our kids walking to school. More parking means more cars, more danger, more noise!
- i live in no parking except by permit zone now, and have an assigned handicapped space in front of house. it is a pain for visitors and contractors to call in to park so if there was a second space allowed that would be good, but not essential.
- I am doing home renovations and there will be more than three other vehicles here at any one time for six months. This will be very inconvenient and clearly not necessary as they are here working and not parking for the hospitals or university. How can we get around this for service vehicles?
- The system I think is fine. People are just lazy and don't want to go online and fill out the visitor info.
- Allow residents to have visitors.
- Safety for people to age in their own home and caregiver turnover is too high to register a team of people



- "A. Some zones have areas of heavier use already. The residences in a zone closest to generators such as hospitals have increased parking issues in front of their homes which would only worsen if restrictions are
- reduced."
- Grandparents come stay with us and won't be able to park within 2 blocks if no restrictions. Too close to downtown and our street isn't monitored enough to deter 1 hr parking. Paid parking would deter visitors.
- Current RPP program does not apply in front of commercial property so they can park there. If city would stop granting parking relaxations for commercial or higher occupancy buildings this would not be a problem.
- Need to enable visitor parking
- Works well
- A is the best but I disagree with only allow 2 visitor passes per house. There are time when I have more than two visitors. What should I do when I have 3 people visiting?
- C & D: Habitual users of street parking invariably develop a sense of entitlement over a public space; leaving cars parked beyond the 72 limit, chasing visitors away(leaving notes), & posting illegal "no parking" signs. Violations are only enforced by complaint, pitting neighbours against each other
- This works for us and ensures parking is available to us.
- Absolutely against D. In my inner city neighbourhood, we already have spots being "rented" for students to walk to SAIT, business commuters, and one resident running a parking lot in front of the Asian grocery store illegally. Entire back yard has been paved over for cars. Need to retain regs.
- A Current system is okay as is.
- In the inner city there is no issues with the visitor process. The RPP program is critical to control parking of downtown workers who are not visiting the area they park in.
- Parking should be made available to whoever wants to pay for it. Cost should be the deterrent to the hoarding of street parking spaces.
- A, no connection to license plates. Utilize paper copies for visitors to hang from rear view mirrors.
- Suggestion A: Prefer old system with physical Visitor Permits. Current use of 2-week electronic permit interferes with visits, takes time to login, get licence plate, etc (especially in winter). 2-week limit VERY annoying for babysitting grandchild while mother parks car here & takes train to work.
- I am generally happy with the 2 visitor permit system except for special occasions when it's an issue. I had not considered B as an option and would be interested in understanding how that might allow more visitor vehicles.
- People need access for their visitors
- Same as above.
- I don't like having to go daily to the Residential parking authority site which is not user friendly. I have more than 2 cars a day coming to my house. I am constantly playing car jockey which is outrageous. People who work at my house have been ticketed unnecessarily



- It is a nuisance to get the plate number every time someone comes to visit . Residents can't identify which cars are permitted to park in their restricted zone. Its fine for neighbours you know but doesn't work for their visitors.
- C - time limits for high use periods should be sufficient to provide space for visitors. Residents should be parked on their property!
- The City has allowed the proliferation of these zones with no vetting of the need for them and no responsibility for the misinformation distributed. Any group of people who want to make their street their private property have been allowed to do it. The City has abdicated responsibility for all.
- it's working don't mess with it
- When there is a celebration/party at home, where do the guests park? Currently there are no options available. B would solve that.
- In some cases, the streets have plenty of available room to park, most homes have garages or driveways, and large amounts of public and private resources are being used (and wasted) to build off-street parking facilities.
- A - do not remove 'permit only parking. We fought hard to get it. We now can leave/return to park outside our home after running errands. We could not do this especially on weekends, due to church, hospital, university parking, and football games. Being seniors and need this access to unload.
- We have no problems with the visitor permits. Very easy to use now that it's online.
- It's none of your business who parks at my house. Its a a privacy violation. With the current Park Plus system, we have to register vehicles and turn on / off parking sessions (for other people's cars). Much easier to hand out a visitor permit to the trades person that is doing work at my house.
- A: the system is already a hassle, having to log in and enter the plate. Previous placard system was much more convenient, especially for seniors who may still have land lines.
- D Restrictions to park is non fear
- I preferred the paper visitor permits to having to register my guests on line. Particularly a hassle when we had construction at our home.
- Visitor parking registration is arduous. There must be a better way
- Response to A. This seems to work the best. Creating more temporary parking zones in an area that is predominantly restricted is a bad idea.
- I chose A because it sounds the most reasonable.
- If there is provision to accommodate special circumstances (weddings, block parties, Stampede parties, etc. where more than 2 visitors may attend, we have no objection to the current policy.
- "A. Some high use areas (generator areas) need visitor parking option
- B. I am increasingly frustrated at trying to frequent local businesses at small neighbourhood malls, to find total residential parking permit restrictions nearby. I want to shop at these places , but no longer do. No sense."
- However there should not be a two visit only rule
- I'd like to see less restrictions for visitors. Especially zones for parking 2 hours or less, or during times that are unlikely to be busy in that particular area.



- I'd like to see the option of improving the visitor parking system. It could be changed so that license plates could be 'favorited' or 'named,' and scheduled in advance so as not to interrupt visits (or up to a couple days in the past) or be forgotten. The current website is not well designed.
- "A. I want family and friends to be able to continue to visit.
- It is reasonable to allow for people visiting nearby business to have the option to pay for a short period."
- As a condo owner getting parking for a guest is an unwieldy process. I have to apply a week before my guest arrives and the approval process is not easy. I'm afraid my guests will be ticketed. There is no option for me to get a permit for them.
- Priority should be given to those living in a residence, not to visitors.
- When holding celebrations it would be nice to have additional parking for guests
- We are both close to downtown and SAIT, and unrestricted or paid visitor parking would further increase the out of community parking we currently have to deal with along the less restricted areas (alongside Rosedale School and community centres and along Crescent Road bluff.)
- We have to register a maximum of 2 visitors license plates online. Since there are no visible permits on visitors, we are unable to tell if vehicles are registered. This is not working because of students/staff/visitors parking on our street.
- Enough cash grabs by the city for now
- But, with caveat. 30 min (near hospital) one, two, three or four hour parking, except with Permit. There should be no where that you can't park for a short time. Residential more than 4 blocks from a street with shops, school or event place should be 4 hour parking without a permit.
- A Having been unable to park in front of or near my house from due to construction workers taking every available space daily Service vehicles and visitors were forced to walk a number of blocks. The new building now has a business open 6am to 10pm m-f and weekends which guarantee be the same issue
- There are too many places with no parking available even for short term.
- temporary parking should be ok and at no cost but should be time restricted
- "B. More parking outside my zone would be good for visiting friends/businesses.
- Reducing overall parking space by reducing permits would clear the streets for driving. Consider parking on 1 side of the street only."
- In crowded and denser neighbourhoods, option A is best to allow owners to enjoy their neighbourhood by having convenient short term parking for guests.
- There are flankage spaces that should be revised to hourly restrictions, these could be used for visitors
- Because C and D would create chaos and there needs to be a way for home care workers, etc to visit residents.
- Option A: Two visitor permits are sufficient.
- I live in Inglewood, backing on to businesses on 9th Avenue. The truth about Inglewood is that we have these beautiful old homes, that don't necessarily come with functional garages (if at all). Taking away residential parking privilege, can be a real access issue, for home owners.



- Visitor permits are best option.
- "A. This system is the best option - if I'm having a party I request a relaxation or ask neighbours to register my guests. Online reg. is more cumbersome than physical permits though.
- B. There's already tons.
- Not near businesses and bars that don't have sufficient parking.
- As above.
- Yikes"
- The parking zones are too restrictive. Most of these areas have garages/parking pads that should be used instead of the street as the primary spot. That will free up street parking for visitors, etc... and make street clearing easier too.
- A has always worked for us so we don't see the need for change.
- Please read thru the boxes for my responses - your feedback system is difficult to address these issues
- C, Issuing parking permits is not a solution. There needs to be a more comprehensive parking plan that addresses when no site parking available, people having multiple cars, hobby cars, trailers etc.
- C & D. I work in a building at [personal information removed]. You provide a building permit for the building, but keep eliminating street parking in the area for people that work there. The building is not equipped to handle parking in the parkade for the number of staff that work in it.
- I think the RPP program allows too much freedom for residents who do not want visitors to their area. I work in the Britannia area and every street around our building is permit only or 2 hour parking. This is a huge deterrent for customers because there is nowhere for them to park.
- I appreciate the current option and use it frequently for family and child care; however, if someone is coming by for only an hour or two (e.g. a cleaning company), it can be a hassle to update the online visitor
- C: Britannia area is a great example. There are several businesses in this area with not enough parking for the employees. Residents have many options of using their driveways and garages. Employees and customers for these businesses need more parking options.
- We need some, but not all, of the current zones.
- I chose C since I live in an area that recently had a "no parking except by permit" zone created that has had no effect on the number of vehicles parked on the street. I now have to constantly update my visitor parking permits, and frequently have to request relaxation periods, wasting my time.
- Britannia, Elboya and Windsor Park areas have too many "No Parking except by Permit" zones and do not allow for visitors to the area or parking for staff of the businesses in the area.
- The more you put up the more trouble people will find parking. It doesn't solve the problem it moves the problem to another zone. If we had no restrictions then parking would be more readily available and there wouldn't be an overcrowding on one street
- We able to have as many visitor parking as needed. If I invite over 3 people now 1 person can't come because they can't park? that's insane!



- C - some areas within the city are becoming increasingly difficult to provide enough employee parking for the business that share the community. Britannia is one example of this where the increasing number of RPP have caused an actual employee retention issue for businesses.
- C - The Britannia area has been over taken by permit zones making it extremely difficult for the workers of the business' in the area to find space that also accommodates them. Having some permits in certain areas makes sense, but please take everyone into consideration and not just the home owners
- Keep as is with option to purchase more.. Also if you could bring back tag system for ease or create a notification such as a text ad a reminder when it will expire.
 - because of so many No parking except by permit zones, it is really hard when we have businesses in the new area and all around is permit parking or just 2 hours parking everywhere. Maybe reducing in certain areas would be a good idea to increase options for clients and employees.
- "A. This would help with people who need visitors such as medical teams.
- We need more short term parking available for people who visit businesses"
- C - I think these zones should be very few where there is residential and also businesses/shopping areas in the same zone.
- We have family come to visit regularly. They are often elderly. I would hate for my parents/inlaws to park 5 streets away every time just to come see us and their grandchildren for a few days.
- It takes a long time to apply for a permit, the problem I've encountered is finding a place to park your car while you are waiting for the permit with all of the restrictions
- A This provides fair flexibility and balance between giving parking access to residents and space for visitors. However, people should be able to apply for extra space for events at their home, as needed. ie, once, all of our guests received parking tickets while at our home for BBQ.
- Greater recognition of single family residential needs and quality of life. Businessss already receive parking relaxations on site why should the burden be transferred to residential neighbourhoods. I like what was done in Hillhurst.
- "Status quo works really well. If it ain't broke don't fix it.
- (I don't understand what ""which are not tied to license plates"" means)."
- Opt.B: Add "two hour free parking" to RPP zones, with paid option for an additional 2 hours or so. This would reduce the need for visitor permits, give homeowners more flexibility when welcoming guests for parties,etc.. and still deter people parking near ctrain etc. as it is limited to 4 hours max.
- Please refer to #2
- There is a permit free parking area directly across the street to accommodate additional visitor parking if required - two visitor permits are fine for us
- As seniors it is unnecessary to have more permits for visitors and businesses.
- Two visitor's stalls is sufficient. However it should be done through your app with each residence restricted to x many hours peak and y many hours off peak per month to remove the abuse of the system.



- The number of No Parking except by Permit zones are excessive, especially in areas where there are businesses that need to be able to offer parking to customers, and for people visiting the home.
- This would encourage car pooling for get-togethers or to have bigger events (parties etc.) at parks.
- Visitors typically stay longer than 2 hours, it is insufficient time and increases social isolation when guests, health care providers cannot park in front of my home.
- There should be more "no parking except by permit" zones
- Change the options for authorizing visitors to park, e.g. for two hours each Thursday morning when the guest comes for a regular visit.
- I picked A because it's closest to my opinion, but I don't understand the wording. My own residential parking permit is indeed tied to my license plate. In any case, I'm pretty happy with the current system in my own zone. But I'd like to have access to more visitor passes when needed.
- best one - use for during business hours options. prefer non-pay in residential as businesses need to be able to attend to homes without having additional costs (ie. support workers). should be flexible non-pay spots or if pay - permits are exempt
- Minimal enforcement is done so signage is often ignored or taken seriously by commuters getting free parking and congesting our community. Without enforcement all options are of equal weight and consequence.
- I know of two specific places where property owners have been able to get parking restrictions, at great inconvenience to nearby condo owners (and I'm not living in said condos), when the residential owners have a two car garage, plus driveway parking, plus parking in front of their house. Not fair.
- C - there shouldn't ever be "no parking except by permit" the street is a public space, not someone's private property. Anyone should be able to park on any public street. B - hourly restrictions should replace all no parking except by permit zones
- Should be able to apply for as many permits as you need or desire for your family!
- It is difficult to find parking in order to go to work. Most households do not have cars parked on the street during business hours yet we can not utilize the space to park during the day. It is unfair that the residential streets are off limits during daytime working hours.
- The paper permits worked better for neighbours to pool their permits in the event of daytime meetings in restricted zones, but 2 permits are sufficient.
- A: I think residents should have the right to obtain visitor parking permits. If not, how else would they be able to host overnight guests or allow for businesses to provide services at their homes.
- Even with extra parking needed for workers on the new tower in Brentwood mall, I have not felt the roads being abused. However, many retail locations remain vacant. Perhaps this is because of the lack of parking, including road parking around university towers?
- 2 permits is usually enough to issue to visitors. The paper based system worked better than the online system because it is more flexible to frequent but very short term visitations especially by the same visitors.
- Our house is near a C train station so the street would be swamped with cars if anyone could park there without a permit.



- AMy reasons are the same as stated above if you have a legitimate reason for visiting a building you should not be forced to park blocks away
- We need options for visitors and this lets us have them. Too much freedom for visitors, such as expanded hours, defeats the purpose of having permits in the first place.
- All the City has to do to address the contractor Parking issue is add two more visitor parking to each residents. That would allow contractors and more guess when people have social events in their home while preventing people using residential parking for school, university, or work.
- It is no fun and living in these areas if the restrictions are too difficult for visitors. It's already limiting with a two hour limit in front of our house. We frequently have more than two cars visiting our home for family dinners...
- "A. Why should my visitors have to pay to park. That is not reasonable.
- C or D. If you reduce, remove the RPP zones around downtown or universities everyone will park on my street and then walk to work/school. WHY should I pay such HIGH property taxes if I can't even park in front of my own home!!!"
- FREE times should be increased from 2 hours to a minimum of 3 hours to allow customers time to conduct business or visit family or friends
- No charge should be incurred to a home owner or a visitor to the home in a restricted parking zone. These people should be allowed visitors just as people that live in non restricted zone without costs. A simple family gathering could easily pass 4-10 vehicles.
- A - Keep the option to have two visitor permits - except allow these permits to be paper OR online. Sometimes or for some people it is not possible to go online, so a paper permit should remain an option.
- Unfair as permit parking is everywhere. All spots people are looking to park are inaccessible and are rare to find. Majority of permit parking spaces are always empty
- B we are multi family 8 units spread over three lots, why are we only allowed 2 visitor parking B permits for our building. We don't need 16 but we sure could use 4. the system for accessing the visitor parking is poorly thought out, where is an app for my phone and why cant I put and expiry date
- Often there is an abundance of parking unable to be accessed by visitors
- Since the change to electronic permit - no window tag - there has been a dramatic increase in parking on our street. There is no longer a visible "I belong here" allowing residents to call for enforcement.
- The online system for registering visitors works. There should be no need for any one residence to require more than two permits.
- C - There are some areas where there is no parking available because of the residential permit parking. Awful to be late for appointments because one has to park blocks away.
- Access to parking for residents should be a higher priority than parking for commercial purposes. Non resident parking cannot distinguish between customer versus employee parking. The current system works fine in our street but one size fits all solution does not work.



- WE NEED PAPER PASSES BACK!!!! it is too hard for a seniors to go online and enter information !! for visitors only stopping in for 5 minuets could be given a ticket. if you need too run inside to help your elder outside for 2 minuets you can end up with a ticket!
- You have to make it so everyone has the choice to have at least one visitor. In our zone we weren't eligible to have any visitor passes which doesn't seem fair if others are getting 2.
- They are exclusionary - we pay big taxes inner city and it's safety in peace of mind to know who is parking in front of my home and to be able to have my children visit without paying for parking! we are near blue gates - don't want anyone just parking. Safety reasons.
- C: between parking restrictions, bike lanes (the worst, esp. along 5th Ave.) and businesses w/o adequate parking, it is very hard to find parking in Hillhurst. Opening up some of these zones might help. Except real problem is lack of space. Better public transportation would help.
- While the parking website isn't perfect, it works for us.
- Hourly free parking, especially near businesses really weighs as part if my decision when I go shopping.
- Access to some small businesses is almost impossible. Time limited paid parking options would be helpful while validating the concerns for local residents that they don't get crowded out.
- Depends on circumstances. 2 hour parking on street in front works well (if enforced, See above. Restricted parking in laneway in back is require to preserve some quality of life for residents. Should be looking at this on a case by case basis.
- The city is responsible for this well as once the building is done you have all the employees who do not want to pay for parking. Again force them to take the bus or cycle to their job. We pay higher taxes for inner city living and all these cheapos want to walk to their job but not pay for parking.
- They shoud be a charge for all residents. Too many multi-vehicles residents and they should find their own parking; not in front of our houses. Also corner lots are picked on because of the length of our lots. We also have rights!!
- Option A. So many people park on the street for extended periods of time, taking parking away from residents that don't have off street parking.
- B the real problem is non residents who park on a residential street for free then hop on a bus or ctrain to work - taking up a spot all day. Limit free visitor parking three hours max
- C - if space is freed up by ensuring residents use all available on-site parking, the space should be given back to be used by other paying visitors to the area...benefiting businesses in the area.
- Two hours is sufficient. It would be nice if they issued tickets as the same three vehicles park in front of our home for six to eight hours daily selection A
- Option A makes sense. We save our visitor permits for those guests with mobility issues. Others can park further and walk. Having no restrictions would be a nightmare as we are near LRT and businesses. We would never be able to have visitors.
- It makes sense and is fair, not opportunities to defraud the systems
- Life in Calgary (as a spread-out urban centre) is made much easier with a personal vehicle. This is not Manhattten and treating Calgary as such feels like a cash grab.



- Calgary parking street signs are confusing. Traffic is generating by people circling trying to find an appropriate zone to park in.
- [removed]
- Sometimes people need to park there but shouldn't take from residence.
- Chose B: parking passes should not be tied to licence plates but residences. Lengthening the visitor parking would be great for businesses and residences alike.
- Current system works well and we have no issues with it. However since going electronic it has become harder to know which vehicles are parked authorized and which are not.
- I selected D, because I find that several times a year, 2 visitor permits are not enough.
- Have to strike a balance esp near schools, large volume businesses, LRT stations etc. Residents and their visitors should receive priority parking
- Charging visitors for parking also acts as a deterrent for visitors. The options which reduce the parking restrictions will likely result in more parking on the street by non-residents and non-visitors, this fills the street and means visitors won't be able to find parking anyway.
- Residents and their visitors should receive priority for on-street parking. Inner city residents should have the same parking allowances as every other resident in the city. This means protecting the parking from being used as a free public parking lot, so they can actually find parking.
- Option B is best. Utilize timed unpaid parking for these zones (2 hour or 3 hour parking), with permits offering an exemption. This accommodates residents and visitors best. Parking enforcement can chalk, as usual.
- Exclusive parking permits on public spaces should not be available. All parking should be paid hourly/daily parking where demand outstrips supply to encourage alternative parking and transportation arrangements (bike, transit, carshare)
- permits should only be valid for overnight to 8 or 9 am freeing up free parking for all during the day /early evening. Usually PPr areas have tons of free space in daytime but unable to park there. What do people do if they have a party in these zones or family event or party. Parking for EVERYONE
- There should be parking options available for people visiting licensed businesses and hourly parking provides this while ensuring people do not leave their vehicles for extended periods of time.
- Homecare workers are at home for more than two hours.
- Unless handicapped.
- "It works well. Allowing paid parking would cause over use,
- especially by customers of adjacent businesses, and thus impacting residents"
- We have seen many individuals park in the residential area just because it sits outside a paid parking area. Parking in general in Calgary seems to be "big business" and extremely expensive - perhaps reduce prices so parkers are more amenable to paying!
- A - we use Park Plus for visitors, not the paper permits previously used. It works OK, but there are some improvements required, e.g. the system should "remember" a previously used licence plate to simplify the recurring visitor process.



- Restrictions should really only be in place where necessary (ie event centres, high schools and post secondary institutions, hospitals, downtown). Not used where entitled people 'think' there's a parking issue. Existing RPP should be reviewed or eliminated and required to reapply.
- My family visits from out of town and I need to be able to have them park legally but restrict to people I want in the area and not a free for all.
- A RRP zones should be clearly labeled to deter non residential use. In my case I live near a LRT and frequently have LRT users take up our crowded spots.
- I think restricting parking to residents is important in certain areas
- Option A provides desirable flexibility and reduces needed input on license plates by residences. It also likely ensures that a residence will actually have two available visitor parking spaces when they are needed.
- I picked A or B - opening it up wide open would negatively impact residents, especially those with mobility issues who may not be able to easily find parking near their home.
- The current option is not great but better than the others.
- As resident with permitted parking Option A works well, I have no problem with it.
- Would allow for more than 2 visitor permits for special instances.
- "A. The current visitor permit system works for me.
- This seems helpful. I wasn't aware there was a time limit for visitors' passes. I live in an apartment building and would like the option of visitor permits not tied to out of town license plates."
- Option B - It should be possible to have short term parking, say 2 hours, in restricted zones without a permit. Many restricted zones have few parked cars while there is no parking spots available on neighboring unrestricted streets. This happens in my Lower Mount Royal neighborhood most days.
- "If the city of Calgary gives people in these Residential zones exclusive rights to parking then all Calgarians should have the same rights.
- Just charge for time or restrict hours for parking in those zone for nonresident vehicles. This still allows parking for visitors and guests."
- "in suburbs just provide hourly parking for visitors
- Other places close to business, stations, ext. keep visitor permits. Make sure people can apply online and print of the permit."
- I understand not wanting commuters parking near where you live. I work near an LRT station, there is no parking for staff & the commute via transit would take me nearly two hours with all transfers. There should be something for area businesses when they don't provide staff parking to buy a pass.
- A&B: It seems to be working. Why change what isn't broken? Also, I would suggest more free time limited parking around commercial areas to encourage customer traffic without placing an additional burden on those same customers.
- B - two hours is insufficient to do business downtown and have a meal too - three hours is better
- A
- I think its unjust that the city can tell me how many visitors I'm permitted to have at any one time. At least with the hard copy permits you could borrow from a neighbor. You could also see if someone had a permit or not



- I think the parking program in place it is great and just needs couple tweaks. I do find though that sometimes I don't bother to go shopping in busy towns anymore like Kennisgton as I can't find parking due to all the streets nearby say parking by permit only.
- There is a reason to limit parking. Dont open it up. Hourly doesn't work as people go over. And it hurts visitors..
- There are honestly too many of these in my opinion. You see areas completely empty and cars all crammed bumper to bumper in another spot because it's the only available parking. This makes no logistical sense. Make use of the space you have and don't force people to park kilometers from work.
- It's not unreasonable for business visitors to have to pay to park. However, paying for parking to visit homes is a major deterrent for visiting friends & family.
- Still allows for visitors to come but in a controlled manner and ensures that non-visiting or non-neighbourhood cards are not parking in areas they shouldn't be.
 - I live in a 2 hr/weekday zone (free). The allocatable e-system works well for me in most instances. I can't safely invite visitors to use my garage, so appreciate some accommodation 2 permits are generally more than enough.
- Too many "no parking except by permit zones" in Calgary. I am a taxpayer and should have the right to park on a street for a limited time, in a city where I pay high residential taxes!!
- C: There is a fire hydrant in front of my duplex and a bus zone. Street parking on the street that my home faces is very limited. My cleaning lady used to be able to park on [personal information removed]. Since parking restrictions were put into place on [personal information removed] there is no good option for parking for my visitors.
- "It would be better to have parking limited to a certain time period (e.g. 2 hrs) unless they have a permit. This would keep the vehicles moving unless it is actually a resident.
- Overall there are too many permit parking zones in the city."
- B: It would be great to have an option to temporarily have more vehicles park, like for hosting family Christmas or other large home events. Could additional temporary permits be available?
- I prefer to make life easier for seniors by removing some of these restrictions. My 91 yr old neighbor is getting fewer visitors and helpers because when she phones in the is not hearing when to respond. They are getting tickets.
- C&D: completely disagree--if my area didn't have restrictions, the business parking would overwhelm my block. B: I disagree that visitors to my home should have to pay to visit me at any time.
- B is a reasonable option to allow visitors in this zone. Still believe visitors to a resident should have access to a free parking permit. We do have family & friends come from out of the city - ie: stampede week.
- Trying to find parking around playgrounds and busy commercial areas is a deterrent for visiting those areas
- Tired of having to pay to park when I already pay copious amount in taxes, sur-charges and user fees just to visit my parents!



- We need flexibility to ensure a good quality of life
- I will 100% avoid businesses if there is paid parking and have avoided living in certain areas with parking restrictions for visitors. It is such an unnecessary cash grab.
- Need more than two visitor permits per house. People often have more than two others over.
- Preference is B and C. Residential permit parking should be reduced in Calgary as private landowners do not own space on the street. That being said it may not be possible to eliminate it everywhere, however in all zones one should be able to visit for a few hours.
- This is helpful where residents, visitors and businesses/destinations all need some parking, without being exclusionary. Few or no areas where RPP excludes all others. C. Absolutely, these are over-used. Should only be employed where there is a genuine need, and with flexibility as in B.
- Again you have provided no acceptable responses to choose from. You provide a multi-family dwelling 2 visitor parking permits and healthcare workers should be exempt from these permits. Our building gets 2 visitor for 8 units. With several seniors that require homecare this uses up the visitor spots
- It is extremely difficult to accommodate visitors, however I would support a small fee.
- A is less restrictive to visitors to a multi-family location
- The current visitor parking isn't bad. I think we need to keep restrictions because people need to be able to park and not have other people stealing their spots
- I don't like the new online system. If I have a worker at my house I frequently forget to enter their license as a visitor. The paper passes were so much easier.
- I feel that one's property ends at the property line and that street parking should be largely unrestricted public space, unless no on-site parking is available. The only exception would be if there were a handicapped person in a residence.
- Choice is with a CAVEAT -should be PER LOT, NOT per RESIDENCE Secondary suites count as 2 residences, therefore double the number of visitors and squeezing out adjoining neighbors w/o suites. This is not equitable!! They can always park visitors on-site if they choose not to use it for themselves!
- Option A. We require visitor permits for our guests and for trades people who need access to our homes. Guests or trades people should not have to pay to park when visiting us or dealing with our home repairs.
- Why should our quiet crescent have these restrictions if we don't have a problem? So the city can charge a permit fee?? Absolutely not. Compare it to a person with a handicap. Because one person NEEDS a parking restriction there are no other handicap-no parking signs down the entire street!!
- Please note that item D is absolutely unacceptable in zones where parking permits have already existed. These permits reflect the limited number of parking spots that should be available for residents
- A Our street was not included in the community RRP. Unfortunately the hospital workers sporting their work tags have found our free parking street and now are using our street as a free parking zone leaving home owners and visitors without parking options during weekday shifts.



- Restrictions are almost entirely a way for residents of an area to claim public resources for no cost; if residents aren't willing to pay for street space, they are saying it has no value to them and it shouldn't be protected by permits.
- if there isn't permit for the visitor it will be hard for people to come to visit. people may not be able to find the parking all the time, or they may need to park very far.
- Makes work hard for mobile healthcare workers having to transport heavy supplies in and out of homes and offices when parking limited by RPP in suburban areas, not near hospitals, stadiums, lrt, etc
- No change. Places that have permit restrictions are there for a reason. Increasing time or removing restrictions increases parking in residents homes.
- A works fine.
- there is options for visitors to local business to have on street parking when their lots are full our street has a portion of any can park area works well 27 a street
- Difficult for landlords who own rental properties because cant get visitor permit and other permit expires in 2 weeks. Also having number of visitors (ie at realtors open house) is difficult.
- B&C, need to have a more fulsome look at the situation, in my area the RPP was a knee jerk community association nanny issue and not really a parking issue except along one street (29th) and this does not change the parking situation there.
- Quit trying to find ways to charge for parking on city streets in front of residences.
- Having lived in a zone that was unrestricted, and is now restricted, for 18 years, there has never been any suggestion that the process is exclusionary or that it acts as a deterrent.
- See above. General comment - this survey is slanted. Not clear how it was designed - info provided not helpful. Clearly those with existing restrictions have them for a reason -have to face parking issues on a daily basis -others without similar issues happy to do away with them. Looks like fix is in
- Perhaps option C or allowing low density residential areas (R1) to have at least 4 visitor passes. This allows for friend and family gatherings. My parents received a ticket late one Sunday afternoon - I didn't register them because I had exceeded my visitor pass allowance.
- Zones should be 2 hour parking from 9 to 5 automatically (unless have permit). Don't change the signs because this is expensive, just change the rules. People need their parking typically at night.
- "A - This should effectively address a resident and his visitor's needs for parking.
- B - By adding hourly paid parking options, this would help to address visitors to businesses."
- "B - Not sure How to answer
- I explained above that I'm a Sr with arthritis, & need to park nearby to go to appointments / meetings in downtown areas."
- We live near SAIT and have extreme troubles with visitor permit abuse. No option here allows for prevention of this abuse. We need increasing restrictions on visitor permits, rather than less!
- "A. works well because it addresses visitors that may be overnight guests.
- works well if between 2 - 3 hours because it deters downtown commuters looking for free parking which is the problem in our community."



- The online system and limit of two passes is complicated and inconvenient for people visiting for short periods of time. There should be a paper tag available in addition to the online system.
- A: I would go along with this providing the resident is already paying a fee for permit parking on their street. A resident shouldn't have to pay an additional fee for being able to provide visitor parking to someone visiting them.
- Calgary is a brutally expensive city. All streets need some free 2 hour parking.
- Resident permits work well on-line but visitors, especially short-term and unannounced visitors should utilize the previously utilized mirror hangers. system.
- it was so much easier to just give company a pass. Login online to register a specific vehicle is not convenient. Most of my guests have rentals so do not just know there plate.
- No changes need to be made if more people park on site instead of on the street
- A No reason to change current system.
- Please scrap electronic RPP and start sending visitor parking tags in the mail. The online system is terrible: it has bugs and it freezes. There is no tech support on weekends/after hours. The requirements can be confusing to elderly, people who are not computer savvy and first time users.
- B-We had limited 2 hour parking Weekdays and anytime on Weekends which worked well. Then the zone was changed to Permit only and the difficulties began. However, no one should have to pay to park in front of my house in a residential area.
- Option A - but we need the paper tags. Visitor parking worked much better when we had hang-tags. This is better since I don't have internet.
- The current process of applying for a visitor or out of province permit is painful, bureaucratic, not timely processing, website is ambiguous.
- This will help with visitors not having issues coming to visit, yet still controlling the amount of parking. This also gives the home owner the responsibility to hang onto the permits and who the give the permits to short term.
- At [personal information removed], we are tied to license plates for the ONE parking permit I, [personal information removed], received. Old, old way was one of two permits we handed out to our guests. Far easier old, old way.
 - Larger family homes, can tend to have more vehicles, visitors and business services for the home are also restricted to the two visitor parking. Larger homes and as well as corner lots should be able to park anywhere on the property boarder not just 150m.
- I live near Foothills Hospital and residential parking is limited. I believe homeowners pay enough taxes and should be entitled to parking in front of their own homes.
- "The registering system put in place last year, was very difficult to work with, as could not access, etc,
- etc. B might work, but not enough information, not really clear"
- not many choices offered, but please understand that parking restrictions are supposed to be restrictive -- to deter inappropriate behavior and lack of consideration for residents.
- Visitor parking passes should be free to residents but they should limit how long a car can park for (e.g., not every day). Have more 2 hour parking spots within RPP zones for guests and parties, with



less restrictions in evenings and weekends, reduce NPEBP zones by green spaces, schools, community

- "A. Visitor permits are important and should not be tied to license number since visitors aren't the same people/vehicles at all times.
- There are too many no parking without permit areas in the city. This puts me at risk of a ticket if I'm looking after a friend's house while he's away on vacation"
- We need to keep parking available for those who live in the area. There are limited spots available in our place and neighboring places of residence. Zone parking helps alleviate parking stress.
- Two visitor permits are not enough when trying to have company over especially on holidays and weekends. There is no parking available near my residence that is not by permit. More non-permitted parking would help have visitors and also be able to visit more areas in Calgary such as parks.
- A - Keep as is. If we lift or modify restrictions, our neighbourhood will be jammed with cars from U of C students as it was before we obtained the restriction on our street. Before the restriction, tradesmen providing services to residents on our street could not park on our street.
- As inner city residents, the issue is too many people coming to park in our neighbourhood. We want street parking for visitors and service people coming to our residence. We don't want people coming into the neighbourhood just to commute to downtown or shop to have more parking options.
- Zones should address exceptional volume of non-residents in area (LRT, Univ, schools). Limiting parking in e.g. beltline to make room for more resident cars is silly; the area is busy. if u don't like parking limits, don't live their. it's a choice. why make impossible for me to go to area.
- I love inner city and would still like to have people over
- A - Two are not even enough if we are having a special event. Would like the hang tags, which would save us from making phone calls, and would save parking personnel's time as well. Or B - but visitors TO OUR HOME should not have to pay!
- I avoid going to areas of the city where there is no easy parking or heavily zoned areas. This limits my access to businesses. Allow reasonable on street parking without a permit (ie two hours)
- The current rules addresses the problem of excessive traffic/parking in residential areas. For example, residential areas across SAIT. If parking rules are relaxed, residents will be negatively impacted through less parking, higher instances of loss/damage of property, and noise pollution.
- C - I understand in a inner-city area with a lot of multi family units where parking permits would make sense. In the Saint Andrews Heights area we can go for a walk and some blocks will only have one or two vehicles parked on the street. I see no need for a system such as this in our area.
- It's ridiculous that people feel so entitled that they can control who parks on a public street. Where lots are 50', streets are wide, there is basically no retail near, there should be no restriction - NONE! I live by Foothills hospital, parking is expensive there, let people park here!!!!!!!!!!!!
- City roads should be shared space and accessible to all. On site parking requirements should ensure that residents have space to park but visitors to an area should not be penalized by excessive restrictions.
- "By the university students would park clogging up the street so we need RPR



- A."
- "My choice is A.
- The permit should be given to only those vehicles that are registered and insured with the address in the zone. One permit should be given for visitor"
- C I'm not a fan of No Parking except by permit restrictions. I don't believe a resident in a neighbourhood owns a city street. I am however in favour of limited parking to 2-3 hours during key times of the day to deter people who work near by from parking in a community with limited parking space.
- Change to on-line registration of visitor licence # is cumbersome. I am medically compromised and have many visitors and caregivers come by. Often the thought of turning on my computer escapes me at the time. Paper permits were much easier.
- The problem is that there are TOO many dwellings with "No Parking Without Permit" which causes their visitors to take the parking spaces in front of their neighbors houses! Make the parking limitations the same all through the neighborhood, NOT in 3-5 house blocks!
- Residents who pay property taxes should NOT have to pay additional fees for permits to park in front of their own homes.
- I am generally not in favour of restricted parking zones. How do the residents and the city know where I need to park to visit or shop? I would guess that many complaints from St Andrews Heights residents about parking has more to do with aesthetics than with a lack of places for residents to park.
- A seems to be working in most areas. Although it would be nice to be able to apply for temporary exemptions to the limit for special occasions. Within reason, of course.
- None of the above. All these options involve making the problem worse, not better.
- There needs to be a simple, user-friendly way to allow visitors (and homecare, contractors, etc) the ability to park in these zones. Maybe it's guest passes, maybe it's designated short-stay/paid stalls on every block.
 - there is only a purpose during a snow event.
- Unless you are disabled parking on city streets is indicative of our tax dollars in use. Reserving parking is elitist as most reserved parking is in affluent areas where homes have many options to park privately
- C: Of the total number of restricted zones/areas, only a very few ACTUALLY NEED the restriction. It has become an exclusive and protectionist perk. Unnecessary zones reduce my interest in visiting businesses within the zone b/c it is a hassle. Businesses should be irritated with these residents.
- Existing system works best in our area.
- General comment : the current online visitor parking system is difficult to use. Go back to issuing paper permits
- Current system is fair.
 - Visitor parking permits are necessary, however, unsure of how this is enforced. The visible tags are better than the call in. With the tag everyone can see that the car is a visitor.



- I have no other parking options that on-street. I live close to Prince's Island/downtown, so street parking is desirable, both for events and for commuters who work downtown. So, I need to protect my on-street parking options.
- To clarify, the CURRENT visitor parking permit requires the visitors license plates registered when the on-line or phone call was implemented. (Previously 2 visitor placards were issued per residence.) Which option is more cost effective??
- Homes with a secondary suite should only be allowed 2 total (not 4) to make parking availability fair to all neighbors. As more secondary suites are developed, which is inevitable, this will only get worse!
- As above
- "B. there is not a parking space problem on my restricted street, when visitors drop in they are they are not taking up spaces the residents use.
- there is no need for 24/7 residential parking restrictions on my street there are about 70 spaces on the street and only 10 to 15 are used at any time."
- This provides the most flexibility for all the various scenarios that could arise.
- C - used to work in a job where I spent all day in other peoples homes (a telecom tech), working in areas that had the residential parking permit restrictions was a nightmare. frustrating to park, many residents didn't have visitor passes or would forget and i'd hope i didnt get a ticket
- "B. To eliminate the cumbersome process of obtaining visitor temporary permits
- Suggest that where a Park Plus zone exists within a Residential Permit zone, permit holders be permitted to park within such included park plus zones.
- Same technology for enforcement of both Residential and PP zones"
- c. No parking by permit only zones is an administrative burden on residents. Each time a visitor arrives, even for 5 minutes, I have to go online to register them. That is not what I like to do each time I have a visitor.
- and C. Two permits for each residence is ideal in some cases, however "No Parking except by Permit" should be reduced across Calgary, especially in Residential Communities. Some permit only zones are never seen to have vehicles parked there which is a total waste.
- I want to choose option B but with so many permits issued per household there is no room left for visitors to park regardless of the length of time they may do so.
- General comment: I live on [personal information removed]. The street side without any homes, i.e., next to the park area and school yards, has restricted parking and it is not consistent with the homes-side of the street. Why? Who gets to decide that? How can it be changed?
- My particular RPP zone X is too restrictive being 24x7, and would prefer relaxed restrictions on evenings and weekends, when I am more likely to have visitors and guests visiting my home
- I'm happy with A BUT I'm most unhappy about the change from parking stickers to electronic. Now I never know if a car in front of my house is entitled to be there and the authority NEVER comes around to check in my neighborhood!!!
- This is my preference, although it is obsolete in my area. Currently I must register a visitor's licence plate number on-line



- I found two visitor passes adequate when my street when the parking restriction was only active during the day. In the evening we did not have to worry if we invited more than two groups of people to our home, such as for a meal.
- A - I don't think it is a deterrent for visitors at all! The only thing I would suggest is to come up with a better solution for obtaining additional visitor permits prior to holding a function at your home. Sometimes they are last minute and then what do you do? Hope they don't get a ticket?
- A. We are always told to borrow permits from neighbours if we need more for an occasion. This can be tricky sometimes- neighbours not home, are not friendly, don't know them, etc. Restrictions are made to work for us, not against us as citizens. Relaxation for reasonable cause should be allowed.
- Even in permit zones, neighbours seem to abuse the system with out of town friends ditching their cars in permitted zones while they leave on vacation (flying). Increased enforcement is required, or really what's the point of permits at all?

Topic: Residential Parking Permit restrictions (exclusionary)

A. No change to current visitor permit – Residences can apply for up to two (2) visitor permits in an RPP zone at no cost. These can be used for any visitor to the home which are not tied to license plates.

B. Increase the amount of hourly parking for visitors within an RPP zone. The times could include paid and unpaid option

C. Reduce the number of 'No Parking except by Permit' zones across Calgary

D. Remove all restrictions within all zones across Calgary

- This works. Don't reinvent the wheel. I agree this seems fair and works.
- This works best for us near foothills hospital. We need protection of residential space. Otherwise we will never have parking at home. So, a blanket solution won't work. Our situation has distinct need for restriction.
- Right now they are tied to license plates so srs. Who don't drive can't get visitor passes
- Agreed - however should be open after certain hours and/or weekends. Large family get together
- Visitors should be able to come to my home & park for free - unpaid. Will this be an app? <not accessible for elderly> <Elderly should be able to access my space -w/o walking a fair distance>
- This is worded very poorly. It should say "revert to old paper system". That is a change. More expensive changing what obviously wasn't thought through.
- 2 visitor permits M-F are fine, but not on a weekend when, perhaps, more visitors might come by ie. Afternoon birthday parties
- I would like to see some way to accommodate more than 2 visitors. Suggest up to 6 visitor vehicles allowed. Limit this increase to twice a month
- Keep w/ 2 visitor permits policy (maybe not tied to plates to accom seniors) w/ temp. relaxation once a month for large events
- But, the allotment of permits should be the same for every house. A secondary suite gets double the amount which chokes out the next door neighbours - and creates a domino effect.



- communicate that you can apply for temp. relaxation for large events exceeding 2 visitors
- No, we need control over parking
- Does not matter what changes are made, if enforcement continues to be inadequate
- Hospital zones - residential parking should be considered different - why do we have to pay to visit or take someone who is ill?
- Not realistic. They have developed for a reason because residents & their visitors could not park by their properties. Not sympathetic when have garages etc. but some people don't
- some residents need the parking by permit for various reason
- Disagree
- No. build more parking garages in business areas & close to residential zones for overflow. We need, esp near post sec schools, restrictions
- Support this
- It's hard to find parking near my child's school, and the restrictions are really confusing
- This is the best option. Make the sign more clear for days of the week
- In our case, we live near a care facility which could leave you to believe we need permits. But, in fact we don't and it's fine as is. That's why this line of thinking has potential.
- Specify what visitors? Mine or just an in-zone commuters? My visitors should be able to visit for as long as they want to
- Increase unpaid options when >2 permits needed for a few hours.
- Please increase hourly parking so visitors can visit me. If residents want to park on the street they can also pay. This will allow more equal opportunity to access parking.
- Parking is a major issue in our neighbourhood or at least on our street in Shawnessy. We have 2 vehicles which we park in our garage but often we don't have parking for visitors.
- Need overall better communication about parking rules, and don't force us all online. I don't go online.
- Bring back the paper permits to indicate when visitors are staying. It is RIDICULOUS to think it is easier to do it online. What about when we are away for extended periods "have someone house sitting. How can I book online when in Africa with no internet, for example?
- No charges for extra visitors - should not have to purchase extra permits to have people come to your home. Should be an option to have more than 2 visitor permits for free - even if just on a temporary basis. My elderly father lives in a restricted zone. If our family or friend want to visit at one time, there is no way to accommodate more than 2 visitors from various parts of the city coming to visit.
- Be aware the CPA tech - this is not an easy option. Not easily accessible.
- allow scheduling for 1 yr. stay electronic
- The tech needed to log in a visitor is ridiculous - go back to tags
- The city can't lose sight of the impact of losing parking, esp in inner city communities
- Are you wanting to charge residents to park? Is this the direction the City is planning to go? Space issues w/ current garage spaces - forced to park on the street.



- Make signs clear - where does zone begin & end? What are day/time limits? Not clear on signs in various zones!
- Can't identify now that the paper permits are gone. Then don't know who is allowed to park there - especially when there are businesses @ end of street.
- Increase parking authority surveillance in Sunnyside (3rd & 4th Avenues between c-train station and 8th St NW) especially illegally parked vehicles too close to corners, that obstruct visibility.
- I think this works well.
- Increasing the number of visitor passes could lead to even more passes being provided to friends to park inappropriately on a street - not as visitors, but as a daily place to park.
- It's fine
- Drivers will always try to find no cost parking. It should not be at the expense of residents
- No change near major generators and events. The streets could be full at all times otherwise and space needs to be available for residents and their visitors. Those attending generators and events should park in the proper designated zones or find alternate transportation.
- Seems like a good way to mix parking use near major generators.
- Currently works fine so please leave it the way it is now.
- Do not increase the # of hours beyond 2 otherwise people use the space to park for going to work and will run out and move their cars on a break
- The RPP system is not perfect but necessary. Those of us living near "major generators" and even Kensington retail streets are constantly fighting to find a parking spot just to go home. The RPP has helped but improvements/tweaks are probably needed.
- Because we have a problem with people parking to go to SAIT, ACAD and use LRT, and is worse when not patrolled, so without would be a significant problem. Visitor permits allow visitors!
- This is a common sense approach to solving this problem.
- Most people require their spots after 5:00 pm. Change the definition of the residential zones so that they are ALL automatically 2 hour parking zones between 9:00 am and 5:00 pm (and unlimited if the car has a visitor pass). This helps customers and visitors, and night parking for residents.
- Basically the same issue as 3). DO NOT open it up such that SAIT or LRT parkers could treat our street as a paid lot either (would still likely be cheaper than the proper lots). And DO NOT make us pay for our own visitors - again we should have what residents away from major generators have.
- Users of major generators need somewhere to park, but should be required to pay if they will be staying for longer periods of time as the large influx of vehicles can be a huge nuisance to those living in the area.
- Adjust paid parking fees by time of day.
- Important for events and large vehicle generators to have alternate travel options to their sites (shuttles, transit, biking lanes) and these options must be widely communicated/advertised/promoted
-it's also a huge hassle when you are having a party - have to register number of vehicles 5 business days before. When I phoned Calgary Parking Authority at one point they also said I have to have everyone's license plate. Are you kidding me? Ridiculous to do-see below
- This works best in our area as parking on street is for small amount of vehicles.



- LRT and hospital zones are crazy busy, patrol them more often
- same reason as number 3
- Current system not bad(option 1), but could raise additional revenue by charging non-residents in vicinity of hospitals, universities, etc. Need to address visitor permits being used for residents vehicles.
- Good
- cannot park within 4-5 blocks of major generators and having some closer options would be helpful.
- Again, this is fair to everyone.
- A - There wouldn't be a problem if hospital parking was free!
- A - simple and it works.
- Same as before
- Parking restrictions are needed. They are needed on [personal information removed] as University students and C-Train commuters take advantage of the free parking during the work days which limits parking for area residents.
- Residential streets are not parking lots for people going to businesses. Businesses need to have adequate parking.
- A - Without the RPP zone, I could not park on my street nor have service people (plumber, repairman) park on the street because of all of the Downtown commuters parked on the street [personal information removed]. The street was bumper-to-bumper vehicles by 7:30 a.m. on weekdays. The RPP changed this.
- Do NOT support paid options. visiting other cities where parking is permitted freely and without payment is a DREAM!
- we are close to a post secondary institution and if relaxation occurred, we would be innudated by student parking.
- Until you put RPP in every community there is no way to charge one community parking and another not. Unjust!
- "Status quo generally works: A
- In my RPP the issue is the LRT station, so you could increase availability to visitors while still discouraging commuters if you increased the number of visitor permits we could give out, or increased the visitor parking time from 2 hours to, say, 4 hours (for a party)"
- Option A. Changing the current system would mean that there would be even less available parking near our home (which we own) due to our proximity to Eau Claire/Prince's Island/Kensington.
- See above
- I am happy with the current system
- System works well currently. But should be enhanced with an app to start and stop parking - current process of needing to use web site is very slow and tedious.
- I live by the stadium and when a Stampeder game is on we would not be able to park anywhere near our house without parking restriction.



- There should be a narrower range on permit parking around major generators, and make parking paid during those peak times only.
- more options for people in apartment buildings - not just 2 per house ..
- There are some free zones where no one lives near which are great, but as I work shift work, I'd like to be able to park at my house not down the road
- can be frustrating to have to move vehicle when attending hospital, event, etc.
- Install ParkPlus meters to discourage overstay parking in 1&2 hour zones near SAIT and any LRT station (prevalent in Hounsfeld Heights)
- Flexibility for short visits to major generators should be encouraged. Hospital visits, stopping at a local bakery, etc.
- A 5th option. Remove the parking permit required in these areas for non residence but institute a max of 2 hour parking for any vehicle that does not have a permit.
- A
- My husband had to park 10 blocks away from our home one evening due to unmanaged event parking. Then, at midnight, he had to go and get our car once the event was over. This isn't acceptable, especially in the winter, or ever for that matter
- I don't really have anything to share
- A: Having no restrictions around major people-catchers (Universities, events, LRT) would create parking havoc for residences in the area. In many cases the LRT came after the residences; whom would have expected ample residential parking to be used by the residents and not visitors.
- A makes most practical sense.
- I picked A. I don't know much about this topic but if I lived close to a train station or some place I know parking would be an issue.
- Calgary wants visitors and then restricts them from visiting family and friends when there is insufficient parking.
- enforcement would help with these problems
- City streets are a shared and valuable resource. Not a right.
- Living near the LRT and SAIT and a high density housing complex we need to have our streets for us and our visitors.
- Need to increase hours - two hours is not enough.
- These areas need to be restricted
- See above.
- It would be chaos to do anything else.
- provide options so that people living in the area are not adversely impacted.
- Same reason as noted above.
- There is no justification to reserve on street parking for residents near public facilities (D) unless they have no on site parking and even then the exclusion zone should be limited (C) or the residents should either pay considerably more for their permit or for the public facility itself
- ...



- See answer above.
- Hospitals, universities and LRT stations have to be good neighbours and parking restrictions next to these uses encourages users to arrive by means other than an automobile or forces them to pay for parking at these sites. Free parking should not be available next to residences.
- A: I still think it's important that visitors to a residence in the area be able to park for free. However, for specific events, restrictions may motivate people to get to the LRT station by bus or bike instead of a car. (Or use CT's park-and-ride.)
- Location of a home near a traffic generator comes with the downside of competitive parking. Visitors should be allowed to pay to park, and permits in these zones should be more expensive.
- Parking should be embraced in these areas to maximize the use of these areas.
- I feel strongly that people should not be limited by the system when considering having legitimate visitors over to their private homes.
- You just explained that the point of the restrictions is to protect residential parking space near these generators. So why would you lift the restrictions? Are you suggesting that we should not be providing this protection? I do not like the tendentiousness of this question and of this survey.
- Just don't go to these areas! Don't take in sporting events! Don't go to Theatre! Don't go to Stampede grounds! Go to Spruce Meadows. Go to Okotoks or High River. My GP has free parking. If I have to go to a specialist with paid parking I get someone to drop me. Or wait until I need an ambulance.
- See above.
- I really like the current program but I also see a benefit to adding maybe a few designated hourly parking spaces in certain area near major generators. Calgary needs to start imposing conditions for parking garages and parking spaces at major generators.
- Hospitals are rip off artists for parking - they must reduce their charges. Also special events - church weddings that overflow for a couple of hours - not a problem, big celebration at temple or mosque - no problem, Grey Cup final with Calgary - no problem, The street is not owners private space
- I live by Max Bell arena and our street parking fills up with event goers. Having RPP visitor permits would hopefully deter this.
- After living in a high event traffic area, I have often experienced not having any street parking available to the resident. The visitor passes were vital, but it could be nice to have more paid areas in those high-traffic spaces.
- People should have access to affordable parking near hospitals. The permit areas near the hospitals are SO prohibitive. Often paid lots fill up and there isn't any available parking areas due to permit restrictions
- I understand the frustration residents feel when they can't park in front of their own home because non residents leave cars all day long. However, there have been occasions where I've needed to run into a business quickly (30 mins or less) & can't park anywhere except illegally in a permit zone.
- High costs of parking at the hospital is unjust to sick people who need treatment. Free parking should be available near major generators to better support low-income calgarians.
- "A. Ramsay needed a permit system due to Stampede! It has made a huge difference.



- Could ADD some paid parking zones on main streets that pass by commercial properties like on Spiller AV SE."
- In areas where the streets are wide enough, consider switching to angled street parking to increase the number of available parking spots.
- Current policy is fine for this case.
- Without restrictions our street would be full of students from SAIT.
- Option A or B. As above, perhaps with enhanced enforcement/monitoring of those who abuse the visitor passes (e.g. using them for longer term parking)
- B, C. Changes are essential near hospitals. While residential areas need some protection. People are being penalized for getting sick or having a relative who is sick. Hospitals should not charge for parking ever. Low-income folks suffer and it creates the whole residential parking problem.
- I was the last hold out on the street, against 24 hr permit only parking. After 3 consecutive days of not being able to park in front of my home because someone parked at 3 pm and didn't leave until 11pm, I went to the neighbours and said I would sign. I pay very high taxes - I expect my parking.
- Should include school zones as well.
- A - having lived near major generators, this is a good solution
- People need to be able to enjoy their homes regardless of the area of the city they live in. These permit areas preserve communities and allow residents spaces to park and have visitors ensuring vibrant communities. Increase on-site parking for those major generators.
- Setup paid parking around major areas and encourage people to use it. Encourage use of a Parking App to reduce confusion and frustration. But let established neighbourhoods near these new facilities to retain their current parking options.
- I live close to the Foothills Hospital and the Cancer Centre. We have people constantly trying to park in our neighbourhood. Maybe help them instead of hindering us.
- This is a HUGE problem for us on a daily basis. In University Heights we are close to the U of C, Foothills and Children's hospitals. Insufficient enforcement and calling CPA results in as snotty "how do you know the car is illegal." I think this RPP was created to give CPA an excuse to not work.
- same as above
- As someone who lived by the UofC for many years, I have seen how these permits are a huge help to managing on street parking. As it is, there should be more frequent enforcement, as there are many students who "risk" a ticket by parking on our street, and they very often get away with it.
- ensure the visitor permits are enforced
- our zone is already very busy with residential parking
- Short term visitors should be encouraged. All day parking should be discouraged.
- I live near the Foothills Hospital. Without parking restrictions from the RPP, the neighbourhood would resemble a parking lot for the employees of the hospital with no access for residents and visitors of residents.
- There should be parking permit space for homes that have no off-street parking (for a cost). All other parking should be available at a cost that is similar to that charged by the parking generator (AHS, U of C, etc.).



- "Visitor permits are currently tied to license plates, so are we going back to hangers? I prefer because it's NONE of your business who visits my home!
- You are sneaky bastards trying to trick people into consent to increase paid parking in residential zones!"
- Limited knowledge on this one.
- Option A works perfectly for us. We live adjacent to the [personal information removed]. The reason we requested permit parking on our street is because visitors & workers were clogging our streets. It's all good now with permit parking!
- as above
- Again, residents are protected from cut through traffic, speeding etc. Real Estate values are affected when there is no parking. You will pit neighbour against neighbour looking for parking.
- People need to have a space to park at their homes, and not feel like they need to stay home to keep their spot or risk walking blocks with kids and groceries because they can't park near their home.
- a is great but where are these permits?
- But up to one (1) visitor permits in an RPP zone at no cost.
- Change all RPP zones so they allow for 2 hour free parking between 9:00 am and 5:00 pm, and unlimited time with a pass. Change in the definitions and advertise as opposed to the cost of changing signs.
- I appreciate restrictions on my street that if I need to park on it I can. It would be frustrating if people visiting these locations as they are avoiding to pay at the spots near the shops.
- B: I suggest two-hour parking as many in this neighbourhood are older and need home care.
- Did not like the options of this one neither. We the residence did not put ourselves in this predicament. The students and employees of hospitals etc. did this to us. We, should not have to go through what we do in order to have car space for us, family, friends. handymen, deliveries etc.
- See question 2
- As above. We live near Banff Trail c-train station, the UofC and McMahon. In areas with no permits, you can see people park during the day for the LRT. Keeping the permit zones would keep open spots for residents. Stamp games are a pain with people flooding the area to park.
- education and enforcement required in residential areas close to LRT People ignore time and sign requirements
- See Q 3, Brentwood, located walking distance to McMann Stadium, UofC so our street is overflow for both + park and ride overflow, because we have no parking restrictions. 2 parking passes don't help when the street is filled with visitors and patrons to evening events. We need more 2hr zones.
- A - Areas zoned as residential areas need to have residential parking, not subsidizing businesses . Development of large facilities ,eg. such as MRU should not be allowed unless adequate parking at a reasonable rate is factored into the plan.
- Reduce the rates charged at medical facilities and make enough space available.



- B because major generators need to service their customers without annoying their residential neighbours
- The problem with this is that residents are selling these extra 2 permits to students and others who don't live in the area. I see SAIT students parking in my area all the time who clearly don't live there, but have a permit.
- Street parking should be paid for unless the vehicle has a residential permit. Visitor parking passes should be phased out.
- South side of 8th Ave NW is all permit while north side is a variety of options
- The visitor parking passes work well for me when having guests in my home. I find if I am visiting a business it can be difficult to find parking, I would appreciate if there were less permit only zones, I don't mind paying for parking but often zones are by permit, no paid parking option.
- As stated above
- D: This is ridiculous - we would never have any parking available for visitors. It would be like the Wild West!
- Events cause huge issues with parking in neighbourhoods surrounding those venues. We already put up with a lot of disruption to traffic, noise, and social disorder as a result of living near these venues. Considering eliminating restrictions is the city letting us down and not working with us.
- Same as RPP restrictions above
- C- Yes there is a right to park in front of your house, but often times that includes both sides of the street when only one side of the street has housing! The restrictions are overbearing re: Brentwood across the bridge from university LRT station.
- There are places and shopping that I will not go to within Calgary if I know there is a problem with parking. You've lost my business before ever having it! I won't travel by LRT unless I can easily get to a station with lots of parking.
- On-street parking is a public resource and should be available as an option to everyone who needs the space, not restricted to residents who can afford a lower-density dwelling in the area.
- limit to 1 hour times to ensure parking access to residences as well as limited availability to others needing to access the generator.
- B is a good balance, but free passes should be available to residents and the hourly cost should be competitive with the parking generator. Paid parking should not be an option or limited to no more than 2 hours where LRT parking is not provided, e.g. near Westbrook Station.
- I live near the Foothills Hospital and across from the Foothills Academy and without the RPP, there would be a lot of people parking for free on the street and it would increase the traffic.
- Street parking have always been public and should remain this way.
- I know of several places (south of Foothills Hospital) where there is excessive residents only parking that is not needed or used by residents. There has to be a cap on the amount of residents only parking in any place, otherwise no one can move around the City.
- A is my answer for this one, but on 'major generators' it IS good to have a time limit (1h, 2h, etc) for various areas just to have some convenience for users. If someone has needs beyond the RPP



zone time avail, the major generators have \$\$ parking options. (How would CoC administer paid/unpaid?)

- Same comments as above. The more congested an area make the time shorter. Or require payment for longer.
- I live near a hospital, and the number of people wanting to use the street as a parking lot every day impacts road safety.
- With an exception of an occasional event where the resident phones into the parking authority to alert that there will be a higher than normal volume of vehicles, in order to prevent ticketing.
- We do not live near a major generator, but I would imagine that living near one is frustrating. Residents should be able to park near their homes.
- Re Option A: this is fair and reasonable
- You have to make it simple. Requiring guest permits are ridiculous and cumbersome. Make paid parking for non permit holders a thing, the city can make money and everyone can park where they need to. The city shouldn't be spending money enforcing parking permits, what a waste of resource.
- If resident has two car garage or parking pad only one pass. Continue with multi units not having passes. Builders should have two pk units per site.
- It is vital to maintain residential parking restrictions near employment centres. Families and visitors need to be able to park park by our houses and not be overwhelmed by people who don't want to pay parking at the hospital. We need daily ticketing of offenders too
- The current restrictions at the LRT stations are very confusing, as the signs are not clear when you can park there and when you can't. I pick option C.
- It really depends on the location... less high density area typically have oodles of on-site parking available, such as homes around our Hospitals & 2 Universities. However, this is not the case when you are within 1 C-train stop from the free-fare zone... those areas need parking by permits only.
- The RPP implies that residents should have some reasonable amount of access to park in front of or near their home. I accept that others may also park on the street but it should not used every day-all day as a free parking lot for business, employees, students, C-train riders, etc.!
- Bridgeland model seems to be working well- business users must register but do not pay for first hour or two depending on location
- same as above
- Same as above
- Same
- Imagine that I'm your neighbour and I have divided my basement into multiple individual bedrooms where each one is rented out to different people each with their own vehicle where each vehicle would occupy all driveways including the one in front of your house. How would you feel?
- I like the way the current rule works.
- Again very limited questions. I would support 1 visitor parking.
- In places where sufficient parking isn't available onsite, and LRT isn't convenient, overflow parking on the street should be allowed.



- We live near a venue, and despite other FREE parking options, the front of our home (no driveway or alley only street parking for our residence). Is the choice spot, really problematic in winter when plugging in is required
- A because I live in one of these zones. I have 4 young children and don't want to have to walk long distances to access my home, bring in my groceries and protect my vehicle.
- If parking restrictions are in place it stops me visiting a business in that area.
- Parking at the hospitals/event space is incredibly expensive, and a barrier for those who want to use the spaces. No one is parking 24/7 at these spaces, and it shouldn't be seen as such an inconvenience to those living in the area
- Reason as above
- There should be no change because these areas would be over run with people who do not live there because they do not want to pay for parking on the site they are visiting. Restrictions are the best way to stop this kind of activity from taking place.
- Option C - If you have a loved one in the hospital for six months ; it can be really costly for those caring and visiting. Have a limited space (perhaps near a park and not in front of a residence home) for no parking . It will ease some pain financially for the caregivers.
- Fair to residents, visitors and the public.
- Residents don't have a right to park on the street near their home. In high demand areas, it should be available to whomever is willing to pay for it.
- There is an increase in people parking in K permit, removing their bikes and going for a ride. This normally happens in 2 hr zones - decrease no of 2 hr without permit.
- Paper permits for visitor.
- I choose A. The system works well except when the stadium has a game and somehow fans are still taking over the neighbourhood with no regard for residents who might be away from home at the time. There is no street parking left even for residents who might purchase permits. Can we ticket the fans?
- Same as #3
- in Auburn bay around the hospital it is horrendous. The parking lot at the hospital for staff is half empty and they take up our neighbour spaces.
- I live near Foothills Hospital and every morning my neighborhood fills up on every street that does not have RPP or hourly parking signs. The increased traffic and rude drivers who race for parking spaces are a frustration. It also leaves very limited space for visitors.
- People who need to use the hospital and who need to drive to university need to use the PUBLIC parking just as much as the residents surrounding them. These people shouldn't have to pay outrageous hospital/university parking fees while the residents pay nothing.
- The current system works well, in my opinion. It is fair to the people who live in those zones as it is restrictive but leaves space for their guests as well without forcing their guests to pay. It seems like a very fair system already exists.
- Same as previous answer



- Option C. These major generators are essential services for the short and long term. While residents should be considered, parking on what is considered private property of these essential services allows for astronomical costs to the user which isn't regulated. It isn't ethical on either end.
 - The only experience I have with this 4) topic is hosp parking. It IS terrible having to pay when visiting a hosp, but I do it. There was one time at the Sheldon chumir that it looked like I was going to run out of time on my parking, I had to mention it to the dr which shouldn't be a concern of ours
 - People can usually PAY to park nearer to their "major generator" destination. Removing parking bans near by just means the ones who live there actually suffer.
 - Again, why do residents who pay more in taxes have less rights? Stop treating citizens as customers!
 - The existing RPP restriction for visitor permit is appropriate to protect respective communities from being "taken advantage" of for being close to major generators.
 - Option B. During Business hours, I think I would like to see more availability of parking in residential areas near major generators. As I don't live in these areas, I don't know how this would affect residences. Not being able to park at home is awful for a resident.
 - Functions well for us - near SAIT and still have students parking and getting ticketed for exceeding time allocation.
 - If the short term stalls are filled up, then raise the price.
 - Again if LRT has a station they should have parking, event also should facilitate for numbers expected. I see a need to permit parking eg around university collages, where standard influx of people come regularly. residence shouldn't have to pay more to have visitors come to their homes.
 - Same as above. While I understand residents want to avoid people parking all day in their street (8+ hours), it should be standard policy that people can park in any zone for up to 2-3 hours.
 - Major generators need to support stronger transit corridors and strategies. It shouldn't fall on residents to sacrifice for poor planning and mgt of parking spaces at hospitals, universities etc
 - We have a problem with SAIT students parking in our 1 hour zone all day and day after day (in Rosedale NW). When I contact parking control, I am told that nobody will ticket cars as the community has requested free use for the Rosedale community hall. Now congested parking playground zone, crosswalk
 - A seems reasonable
 - on 33rd st sw by westbrook - should be just 2 hour max during business hours, open after - it is a residential neighborhood
 - Again, it's up to the city and the generators to deal with parking - not local residents, many of whole have lived in their communities since long before those generators were added.
 - The city already does not enforce parking restriction near the major generators. FHH, Cancer Center, Colonial Belcher, UofC all over load the area and park with impunity. Occasional tickets are less costly the paid parking at the facilities. So they play the game of chance and save \$.
- ENFORCEMENT



- it is critical for permit options to ensure caregivers and others who can't access a resident's private parking, have options for parking. It is extremely restrictive to have no permit parking available on a street that is constantly full from traffic attending a local business.
- Change the definition (so you don't have to change all the signs) so that all residential parking zones become 2 hour parking from 9:00 am to 5:00 am automatically (or all day with a pass). This allows for visitors and businesses. Even these changes will drastically increase the traffic.
- Hiding the costs of parking are detrimental to Calgary. I believe that the cost of parking should be born by the user. Ideally, this means that parking is always available for those who are prepared to pay for the cost of it. More importantly, the cost discourages automobile use and ownership.
- Bring on a better system to allow the electronic registration. right now only i the account holder can register a visitor vehicle, pretty hard to do on drop in contractors or visitors to the house on a short visit and then get tagged and appeals are lost. All about money grab
- I want the option to invite more than 2 guests to my home for coffee. I regularly need more than 2 visitor passes, even when SAIT is in session or an event is on. Not a whole lot more than 2 are needed, but it wouldn't be unusual to have 4 other couples come to visit.
- I think this makes sense surrounding major generators.
- "B" is optimal. I would love "3 hours free or parking permit" for suburban residential areas near a major generator. It's a good way to allow quick parking (for friends visiting without administrative work) or for a resident hosting an event. "C" and "D" would turn a community into a park-n-ride.
- Self explanatory. If illegally parked cars take up my street at least allowing legal visitor parking should continue. Your changes to camera cars are an abject failure. Now we can't tell who is illegally parked.
- This is a money grab by city, for already struggling Calgarians.
- If people want to live in a dense urban area, they can juggle parking spots like any other major city. Limiting daytime parking near crucial amenities so that residents can have night time parking is counterproductive and suggests that Calgary doesn't care about people living their lives.
- If there is limited amount of something then there must be a fee. If people park on their lots when possible and there is a fee for parking on the streets then the fee can be raised to create the desired level of congestion. It also encourages carpooling and other transportation means.
- B, because Permit zones are add odds with city initiatives for mixed use neighbourhoods. Hourly parking ensures all people have access without abusing it.
- For the zone where I live (near SAIT), this could work. I think around the Foothills Hospital and University of Calgary this might not work as well.
- see #3
- My doctor's office is across from Foothills. Impossible to park on street now and sometimes parking lot is full.
- Again, B and C seem to solve the problem and would reduce or eliminate the need for visitor permits.



- The option I want is not present. I would like parking zones in high traffic areas not allow for non-permit visitors at all. This is a problem on 4th Ave in Sunnyside as there is a 2hr parking sign that should read "permit parking only" as no street parking is available for residents who lack space.
 - residences should be given priority and up to 10 parking passes available at no cost
- Parking near LRT and schools should be restricted. Parking around hospitals should not be restricted.
- Major events on Prince's Island requires City to manually restrict parking
- University heights is by hospitals stadium and UofC. Our community is already filled up with non residents already
- having flexibility to not enter my visitors would be nice. I wish I could register more then TWO people, it is very hard to HOST any event at my place. We will remove our vehicles from the drive way, park on the street to accommodate. Ban repeat offenders who violate the time limit.
- Give residences of the city an opportunity to park near those areas for a cost so they can utilize transit and generate revenue by paying for parking. More money to the city. Will also relieve some traffic in downtown.
- I am speaking specifically about the zone near 33 St & 17 Ave SW. There is very little hourly parking near the Corus Bldg which houses medical clinics. The residential streets are controlled yet empty preventing patients from parking near the building. Appears to just be a cash cow.
- A-Living near a high demand parking area shouldn't come with penalties
- N & C. Just make it easier for a daughter to visit her father
- Your solutions sound like revenue generating to me. Again your options are pay more or have restrictions removed. We all know you'll never get rid of restrictions. I can't wait to see some city peon talking on the news. Telling us 68% or some bs wanted paid options because of multiple choice.
- stop monitoring everything
- You did not give an option for "no change but increase the number of residential parking permits at no cost." I have 4 vehicles, 2 car garage, and no driveway. I pay my property taxes. Sometimes we need to move cars around, but cannot change plates as they are registered to a particular car.
- No comment
- While I have experienced the frustration of hospital parking, the system needs to be fair to those residents.
- High volume areas of visitor traffic like these should keep special status, otherwise it creates huge issues with traffic in the community. If people know there is no on street parking, they don't drive around the area looking for it.
- These spots would be filled all the time by non-residents if there was no restrictions
- Option B - By charging for visitor parking, we can help to encourage people to use active modes or transit, and can recoup costs for enforcement. Eliminating visitor permits and tying residential permits to vehicles and residents will ensure fewer people are able to abuse the system.
- This option is fair to tax paying homeowners.



- I live near an LRT station and it is NOT currently a problem due to the downturn. That means that visitors to my home could park there and walk back to my house (assuming after 10am). However, until the pedestrian crossing issues and dangers are dealt with, I won't be recommending this to visitors.
- If there would be no permits there would be no where for people who live there to park or to have visitors over.
- Space is extremely limited in areas around schools for parents to pick up their kids after school or dropping them off. Why penalize someone for a quick drop off/pickup in areas where there are clearly no vehicles parked during pickup and drop off times? Cash cow at its finest.
- D why should residence be punished because of where they live everybody praise property tax everybody pays rent did everybody should be entitled to free street parking
- Yes please issue me a permit to park in front of my home. I pay taxes and need this perk. Renters living close by take my space!!!
- The key here will be to increase ticketing/patrolling of these areas and watching for people who are parking "for free" and impeding residential parking when there is paid parking at the facility. RE: LRT - maybe you need to make the reserved spots available slightly sooner - like 9 or 9:30am.
- Near major generators restrictions need to be stricter.
- I think it is working fine, if you have extra guests They can park outside of the permitted area
- Need to either change the eligibility for getting a RPP from having registered address or the 2 week long permit. My partner and I both own houses in different zones and have to add each other every second week. I have had to pay a coder to write a routine for doing this, which i have sold to others
- Same as #3 . Phone-in permits are difficult to manage. There needs to be a fair way to allow for additional permits in an exception.
- please change back to the paper visitor tags - online is a waste and gets too complicated
- A - Yes paper permits for visitors only
- The best option as everyone would have equal opportunity in terms of when and where to park
- These should he ties to plate numbers.
- The answers in this section do not address major generators or events. Allowing unrestricted , for example, close to a LRT would just plug up the area. Again max of 2 spots per property. How you manage them when you have guests should be up to the owner. EXCEPTION selling them should be illegal.
- Parking by near hospitals is at a premium and it is getting worse. Increase on street parking near hospitals. Forget about charging people money either! They will be walking far enough to get to the hospital!
- The current restrictions in A are impractical. Often times a single property can have more that 2 vehicles worth of visitors and this causes parking infractions or inconvenience. B strikes a good balance so that the zones are still enforced for residents, but greater options are available.
- Only nears major centers to discourage work parking
- No change near major generators.



- Current system is acceptable but I believe the City should investigate charging the major generators (in my case SAIT) for the parking and congestion they cause.
- It's been working in the past.
- Need more permit only zones.
- Public funds for roads should serve the public good, not land owners. Parking on the street, if allowed at all, should be available to anyone, so option D
- Encourage transit use and increase the park and ride options
- Again, if you brought back the paper visitor passes we would be able to tell who is an actual visitor of a residence or who is parking for the LRT. This would also help parking authority in issuing more tickets.
- Major generators generally have parking or transit availability. Taxi and Uber service is also available. Residents of a neighbourhood next to a major generator should not have to suffer the negative consequences such as congestion and rowdiness associated with these.
- it would decrease at time the number of vehicles from 1 residence where they basically saturate available parking on the street
- These sites have off-street parking available, and that should be utilized.
- Areas near downtown CTrain stations and Stampede Park would be swamped with vehicles if no parking restrictions - residents would have nowhere to park. Increasing hourly parking would also reduce parking available for those who live in the area.
- It only takes 1 minute to input a license plate on line- homeowners need to be protected as to a parking spot when near hospitals, universities, etc. As students do not care about you as a homeowner and if you get to park in front of your house or not- I live by Mt. Royal University and know
- the system is working well for our visitors.
- If there is a major event, there can be temporary parking restrictions set up, but all zones are public use paid for by public taxes. Just because someone pays more in taxes doesn't mean they get special treatment. It's all temporary anyhow; people should just chill out.
- I dont like any of these options because I dont u understand how they solve this issue.
- I live in a neighborhood near a hospital and hospital staff use the neighborhood as places to park and go to work for 8-12 hours. You can easily see the same cars daily and people I scrubs. It is not visitors instead a place to park for free rather than pay for parking at work.
- A, I am against opening up the vulnerable street parking for the residents to be squeezed out by non-resident opportunist vultures.
- Does really impact my street.
- Paid parking can be used by visitors to the area or by those attending events, but will still keep the flow of people coming/going steady.
- Major generators should not be allowed to monopolize residential parking.
- No permits should exist, people will just move a couple blocks over and block the next house
- All citizens of Calgary pay for the roads/repair/snow removal in Calgary, thus they should be able to park without exclusion.



- Street parking is a hazard and should not be permitted. If you do not have somewhere on your property to park your car, buy a transit pass or buy a bike.
- I live near LRT. Open it up, but patrol every few hours and ticket those who stay all day - they're the reason for the zone in the first place.
- It should be free and unlimited for anyone connected to a household in the area. No one should have to pay to park near their home and their visitors should not have to pay neither
- Option A seems to be the best option if those of us who live in these areas are to have a hope of getting close to our residence. Abusers of the system will find a way around the restrictions.
- B: Parking around major generators can be difficult to find when it's by permit only. I like the option of being able to pay and park rather than having to drive around looking for a space.
- Going to Foothills Hospital is very difficult for parking. There needs to be more parking spaces available for doctor's visits.
- C and D. Street parking is public parking. Most homes have garages or parking pads. We should not limit street parking at all.
- Need to keep permit zones so that residents can park and others don't use them for commuting (close to downtown, ctrain, bike, paths etc). If more than 2 visitor permits are needed, they could always ask a neighbour or park on a near by street with less restrictions or move their vehicle regularly
- Option A: It's a good system and I like it, but need the option to purchase an extra pass if needed
- Facilities like universities and hospitals should be required to have enough reasonably priced onsite parking
- Once again. People drive and transit isn't an option
- This system protects the residents' visitor to have a place to park near the resident.
- All parking should go for fair market value.
- Pay to park if you don't live in the area.
- Unrestricted parking in these areas cause safety issues on residential streets, increasing the traffic flow from people fighting for and looking for spots. This can also impede guests to residences as there is nowhere to park. SAIT students particularly can use public transit to the school.
- See above.
- A - hospitals and universities provide parking onsite
- We are already overloaded with illegal parking. Why would anyone want to make it worse?!! We have student rentals on our street with over 6 cars at one residence on the street through the school year. Another 6 were parked next door on the property driveways. Out of province cars included.
- Most 'No Parking except by Permit' zones in Calgary have not REAL and Pressing reason for their existence.
- B - as above. And parking permits shouldn't be free - a small cost is warranted.
- it is frustrating to have to attend an event, or hospital when there is no parking. perhaps we need to have parking police? let us park in residential areas if the owner of the home is ok with it?



- Option C and D. It is frustrating enough for a Calgarian to deal with all the bike lanes, which have reduced on street parking and all the parking restrictions. It doesn't take much to realize how frustrating all our parking restrictions have on visitors to the City.
- All hospital parking should be free on site. A better transit system and improved car pool lots and facilities are the real issue here.
- When near major generators and restricted parking zones are in place, both residents and visitors should have parking-by-fee options. Residents should be allowed a limited number of on-street, paid permits. Visitors should have hourly paid parking options. Both should have access, albeit paid.
- It is only reasonable to expect that people have visitors. Therefore the permits should not cost.
- Without it the residents in these areas will not be able to park their own cars...as people will use these zone to park and take c trains to work
- Again, home owners need a place to park. Hauling 20 bags of groceries for block because downtown commuters have and do take up all parking for the entire day. I'm in favour with 2 hour parking restrictions, paid or unpaid for visitors. This would eliminate downtown commuters taking all parking.
- Underutilized land near major generators (e.g. derelict Sears end of North Hill Mall, dilapidated mall north of Foothills Hospital) could be better utilized without impacting existing RPP zones.
- B-allows for short term parking for all
- Charge non permitted visitors to park hourly. Proceeds to local community.
- Street parking should be free and accessible to any visitor of a hospital.
- B) I think this is the most flexible option. Otherwise "visitors" could be parked for days.
- Reduce the number of no parking zones by sait. This does not need to extend as far as 20ave
 - Please see above. Some of us purchased our homes when street parking was not a concern. As congestions increases we still deserve to have easy access to parking near our home.
- "A: self explanatory
- C: reduce in areas where events occur less frequently"
- Public streets are the property of all taxpayers and should be open to all equally. If residents are concerned about parking at their address, they should build on site parking like everyone else has to.
- what is the difference between topic 3 and 4?
- The city needs to treat tenants in properties the same as they do an owner who resides in a property. Find the current policies very discriminatory to tenants while favoring an owner who resides in their property.
- Works best for people with mobility issues, seniors, people with home care.
- A need to preserve space for residential guests
- "works fine now - so who is filing the complaint - people who
- live in the area or those who get tickets for illegally parking OR want to park for free .. they should buy a
- home in the area / pay taxes / deal with no parking everyday instead ."
- 2 hour except by permit would be better. This eliminates the facility staff from parking on the street.



- Ask anyone who's lived in a real city. They'll tell you that parking is always a nightmare, but parking restrictions just make it worse. You may not like it, but you can't make a city great by restricting everything.
- Parking should not be free (subsidized).
- Quit your money making, horrible methods...fed up with you city of Calgary
- We live in University Heights, an island Community completely surrounded by institutions such as the University of Calgary, major hospitals, and McMahon Stadium. If we do not have restricted parking we will never be able to park in front of our homes.
- Yep and rightly so. Communities near such large institutions require protection from being inundated with visitor traffic and parking congestion. Such institutions should be required to build their own on site parking.
- A - each homeowner (taxpayer) should have the ability to park two vehicles in front of their home . Be it a person living in the home or a visitor to the home.
- Parking is expensive, if people are willing to park in an area and then walk to a place, they deserve that right.
- I live near an LRT. Our street is full even with the restriction in place. It's a cul-de-sac, having people go up and down streets looking for parking would create unnessary traffick, and as previously said, the street is already full.
- Major events and major generators create a nuisance for residential. Hospital parking should be free though.
- The previous zone system was developed in a paradigm where enforcement was not automated. Now that enforcement is automated it only makes sense that the automation should be set up to comply with a more human understanding of what parking restrictions are reasonable.
- Option B & C. Restrictions can be adjusted according to the event without impacting access to parking and street visibility. For example, a RPP zone can contain the provision that a permit is not required during an event.
- day time restriction is needed to prevent people living in the suburbs to use it as a free park and ride (along center st N, 1 st NW and 1 st NE). 2 hour limit or day time no permit zone is fine. remove all restrictions for weekends, except for busy corridors.
- See previous answer
- C - Residential space near 'major generators' only needs to be preserved when residences don't have access to on-site parking. If onsite parking is available to the majority of residents there is no need for parking restrictions.
- Some "hourly parking" in all zones is important for "unannounced" visitors (deliveries, house calls, drop-ins etc). In many cases 30 minute or 1 hour zones would be helpful, built into the restricted parking zone. This helps with commercial also, but deters "major generator" parking.
- "A- Other choices makes the whole community a public parking specially the communities that are close to hospital, LRT, University , etc.
- ""A"" is the best solution ."
- If people want to park close without a permit they can pay



- I chose C. Some current restricted areas are not protecting residential area residents from their need to park. Only protect areas that actually are needed to be reserved for residents living in the area or that would lower property value by allowing more public parking in streets.
- Increasing hourly parking gives outsiders an opportunity to access resources. But limiting the hours and enforcing them will make spots accessible to residents.
- See answer above. Same applies here.
- B). ONLY if a zone needs it. I.e, there are known issues in a zone with hourly pkg. otherwise, leave this alone.
- This will allow visitors to major generators ease, and incentive to return.
 - you should be able to have a car and a guest parked by your residence without penalty
- Visitor permits are important for home owners to have, especially in large residential restriction areas, because everyone has a right have visitors no matter where they are located.
- These restrictions hamper the ability to have visitors to the home.
- Permits are 100% needed in these areas.
- I am a parent of students at Chinook Park School near Rockyview Hospital. Some school volunteer opportunities require full 6 hour parking and there is none nearby. There needs to be parking available for this purpose.
- I don't see a need for change - it has been working.
- C&D
- People going to major generators should not use residential streets for parking. They can make arrangements for alternative transportation or pay for on site parking.
- Same comment as above.
- Again we can't have our landscape taken over by stored cars with the attendant noise, visual, air and water pollution and danger to those who live in the neighborhood
- remove restrictions entirely, NO COST FOR PERMITS
- A & D: We want people to be able to access LRT stations and hospitals and other centres. It's a reality that transit and other options are not viable for everyone for their journey and we should allow for parking near these. Paid parking (like much of downtown) would work in these areas.
- Allow 1-2 hour parking in RPP zones to accommodate service vehicles, home care, etc. A lot of RPP zones are empty during the day when residents go to work, but a 1- or 2-hour limit would still discourage students and LRT users.
- (/D) If the generators are not providing enough parking at a reasonable cost the issue is the generator's lack of ability to provide parking, and the city should deal with them not restrict residents. With new system LRT people still park on our street constantly, permits don't work.
- Residents should not be using roadside parking as a permanent option anyway. If you chose to buy a house without any on site parking, you made that decision. You shouldn't get any special roadside parking privileges because of that.
- C



- If you're going to the football game nearby you are not allowed to park in front of my home. Only my guests are allowed to park in front of my home.
- We must protect major generator areas.
- In bridgeland, there is not one square inch that is not either 2 hour only or park by permit only. There is literally no where for someone without a designated underground stall to legally park during weekdays. Think about that.
- Major generators don't have enough parking space to accommodate visitors. Foothills Hospital has a huge parking problem at the moment and the only alternative is to park on the street, this is aggravated by all nearby street parking being restricted.
- Same answer as above - b
- There needs to be realistic options for people that are driving to certain locations. Parking shouldn't be impossible or an unrealistically high cost.
- Even though I live on a permitted street, parking is very limited. If each residence has access to a total of 4 passes there is not enough space for every vehicle. Increasing the aloted number of permits will make this worse.
- We live in the community of Sunnyside for the past 12 years and the system in perfect. It is imperative in this community to restrict parking as the proximity to downtown is close enough for people to park and walk. If unrestricted parking was allowed there would be no parking for residents left.
- b
- People that buy in busy areas should expect that they have different issues than those that buy in the burbs. You get the convenience of being close to services, and it is harder to park. This is not an issue the city needs to address. Street parking is a convenience, not a right.
- B while hospital parking shouldn't be so damn expensive, there needs to be options available to people that can't afford the ridiculous parking fees there
- A - In areas of RPP the availability of parking is generated by poor design and space. The concept of TOD fits in well with option A. Commuters need to utilize LRT zones with parking allotted, not parking in neighbourhoods to access the LRT stations. Business can be access via parking apps.
- The existing system works well in University Heights, but moving forward, there should be unlimited numbers of RPP permits available to residents in RPP zones free of charge.
- A)Hospitals, universities and LRT stations all have parking lots. It is unreasonable to allow parking for these types of places in residential areas - homeowners need to park too. People are cheap, and if they can save money by parking residential and then walking to the LRT/Uni/Hospital, they will.
- Same question as topic #3
- Permit restrictions are necessary. On street parking is limited, so when more than 2 cars per house are parked on the street, it is not possible for a homeowner to park one car when they come home which is not reasonable and unfair. Only allow 2 permits per home, no more.
- OPTION A - I live on an LRT line with a restricted permit zone HOWEVER this zone is NEVER enforced! I have called repeatedly to Calgary Parking to enforce the permit zone but they have only ONCE in FIVE YEARS enforced the restrictions in the zone. It's extremely frustrating!



- "B. Residents shouldn't get free spaces. My neighbours have a 3 car garage they never use but park 4 cars on the street. They should pay for that.
- RPP zones near my son's school are always empty but the unrestricted is always full, making drop off and pick up congested."
- Some restricted parking zones in densely populated communities are absolutely necessary for residents (E.g. Mission). Other areas with lower density living seem to be unnecessary (e.g. around 16th avenue and Centre Street North).
- Offer more parking around LRT stations to avoid congestion.
- same as above
- You could also get rid of paying for parking at medical facilities, Airdrie urgent care doesn't make you pay.. why should Calgary hospitals make you pay? OH YEAH another cash grab by the city.
 - Our streets are public and parking should not be restricted on public streets for the benefit of a few residents.
- These restrictions should be kept or else no one will be able to park in front of their homes near downtown etc. These people pay a premium to live close to major generators and their space should be protected.
- I have accumulated 1300 in parking tickets in front of my own house. My income and daughters education highly depend on my vehicle. I am low income and might not be able to afford a car this fall due to my large amount of unfairly issued tickets.
- B.Parking for major generators is available at transit, universities and hospitals. Perhaps, the issue is the high cost charged for parking at these locations.
- Is option A true? I thought all visitor permits were tied to license plates. It is the electronic visitor permit system that I have issue with. Difficult to tell who has a permit and who doesn't and to report concerns when the street is full.
- Visitors to a home should not have to pay - covered by taxes
- None of these options fit my situation. My avenue is mostly being used as a parking lot for Foothills Hospital employees and visitors. At the very least I'd like to see a 2-hour parking limit and be able to provide my visitors and contractors with a Visitor Parking Permit.
 - Streets should be for the use of the residents on them first and foremost.
- See previous questions. "major generators" should be properly included in a modern transit/mode share concept to reduce vehicle traffic around them and allow everybody to travel safely, not just cars.
- As hospitals and Universities charge high parking fees, people will park in outside areas and therefore, there are no street parking spots in Residential areas for the homeowner's visitors without the parking permit program.
- Same as 3 Above.
- If you're visiting a "generator" you should have options to support hourly parking that allows people to be flexible with their visitation time to the generator



- A: I live on Lake Fraser Drive SE and the entire long street is taken up by people parking to access the Canyon Meadows transit station, and park within feet of the intersections and create very dangerous situations. More Permit Only Parking is required here (and other transit stations).
 - Being able to park near your home should take priority.
 - A? Same comment as under 3.
 - Please see above.
 - Major generators manage their parking less City of Calgary involvement for residential parking
 - If you live near this type of parking scenarios random cars will not be able to park in a permitted area.
 - Need flexibility
 - C-Train Station parking is limited at best; focus on increasing parking stalls/space at all train stations instead.
 - Seems reasonable at the moment
 - A - living near a university, parking permits are necessary.
 - Living close to U of C it is imperative that we have zoned parking otherwise our street would be full of non resident vehicles.
 - Explaining ?? I am a Senior with M.S. and park in hourly parking, East of 29th St. N.W. and walk to the Foothills Hosp. once/year for yearly check-up and renewal of M.S. medication (saves me parking expense).
 - Same reasons as 3.
-
- There are a few zones in our area that are no parking which shouldn't be.
 - Choice A seems to be working well as long as there are enough checks done by Park Plus or enforcement by officers called in by residents.
 - Same reason as the first two. Ensure all residential areas incorporate on-site parking and leave the rest to visitors, customers etc.
 - Businesses should provide their own parking for their customers
 - Has the right balance
 - Need to allow for residents and visitors to park near major generators
 - Not everybody has nor can every lot fit off street parking. It is difficult enough to unload groceries with young kids, impossible if no parking near own house. Calgary has slow transit system and urban sprawl, people use their cars often.
 - I do not want to see my street filled with commuters looking for a cheap place to park and walk into downtown
 - To repeat, we experience dozens of non resident parkers every day and every hour of the day. Parents have stated that the increased vehicle traffic has become a safety concern for their children. Seniors struggle with slippery streets in winter and don't need the additional risk of a vehicle incide
 - I have a zone J pass, [personal information removed]. It's rare I can park on my own street, since most of it is available to visitors. I'd love to see more fully restricted parking, or other parking options available for visitors to Mission. This would free up some space on my street for residents.



- Permit zones are rarely if ever full. Think the areas around the Uni - one hour zones are great for those of us who just need to run in and out. No need for locals to get uppity about not being able to park at their house when there is plenty of room and turnover is quick
 - restrictions are required close to business areas, schools etc. Western Canada High is a good example of such an area. The big problem is a lack of enforcement by Parking Control.
- Option B: I think limited hourly parking is beneficial still, such as only 1 hour parking to allow visitors without always having to input the licence plate number.
- no change is most reasonable option
- I have no opinion
- "There needs to be more by permit only evening parking in my area, mission. Overflow from the stampede grounds eats up local parking.
- Permits should always be tied to license plates."
 - the current system works for these busy areas and in most cases the permit system was installed to cope with over parking
- I believe that all residences should provide parking onsite. No-one in the city should expect to be able to park their private property (vehicle) on public property.
- One of our zones doesn't allow for this
- No vehicles, commercial or personal, should be allowed to park for free on public property.
- Same as before.
- Since the change to online registration for guests, I've notice fewer violations by SAIT/ACAD students and construction workers. I'd still like to see more frequent random checks by Parking Authority officers as a deterrent.
- We are sandwiched between a high school and the football stadium. The current visitor permit system is necessary
- None of the above. No hospital or outside cars permitted.
- Working fine now
- It would be nice to have options and no permits required after 6pm to allow for entertaining.
- you can't have buildings without underground parking, restrict parking, and expect that people will have less vehicles. it is not practical and more parking is needed. there should be lots with paid/unpaid options & ability to register for temporary parking when street/building maintenance is needed
- We need a balance for those who live close to these businesses. Why should they be impacted because of pay / lack of parking.
- I live near a school and a sports complex. Visitor parking helps as the street is the only option here.
- It seemed to be a lot better and available parking was found before residential parking permit restrictions were imposed.
- A - Two is a reasonable number for visitors.
- like the way it is with some flexibility in B



- A - it gets abused enough as it is. If you allow more time then it will get abused more. (Not enough characters to type in full reason)
- The number of permits is fine. The issue is with the current system. When trying to get a relaxation approved, why is it up to a city employee to determine if the reason I want a restriction for parking at my own home is valid.
- B.
- Seems to be fine to me. I've had no issues with the current process/system
- Considering Calgary Transit has problems with employees using their lots for parking, rather than paying employer for parking in their lot ... this is funny.
- Just because a football game is on does not mean the streets should be clogged. This is an older neighbourhood with many seniors and they need access to their homes from the street.
- C - I understand there are some places that need to have those parking restrictions but I see a lot - maybe cut back???
- No change to existing permit parking or zone. Helps control traffic through neighbourhood.
- A & B. Some major generators are in residential neighbourhoods therefore resident street parking should take priority as residents are paying tax in those neighbourhoods. I don't want people using my streets to park if they don't live there and are only using as part of their commute.
- The current system works well. If the university and city (LRT) did not charge for parking people using those facilities would not try to park in residential areas.
- Ditto my above statement. It's important to maintain a community's character without employees from adjacent facilities coming / leaving via their cars.
- Major generators attract people looking for free parking and changes could cause issues.
- If these restrictions are removed my street will be completely filled with university students who do not want to pay for parking but will instead park in front of my home and walk the ten minutes to Mount Royal.
- I recommend the opposite of option C: INCREASE the number of 'No Parking except by Permit' zones across Calgary
- Seems like the best way to keep these types of residential neighborhoods from getting jammed up
- I live by U of C. There are two half block areas with no parking restrictions where you will find cars parked bump to bump daily.
- A .. This helps keeping our neighbour from being clogged with cars driven by students attending the U of C. The old hard card permit system seemed to work better. We have no idea of knowing if parking is being monitored. Fewer tickets have been written than were under the previous system.
- Hospitals and large clinics, in particular, are price-gouging patients and visitors, so there is a need to provide free or inexpensive hourly parking nearby.
- e restrictions should be placed according to different situation,
- A We live by U of C, Foothills, McMahan and the Children's hospital. A lot of cars already speed, people leave drunk from games, smash bottles in the street, yell, urinate on our children's flower garden on their way back to their cars. Lifting restrictions will make this problem much worse!
- that is preferable, even just one visitor permit would be enough per residence.



- I live near McMahon Stadium and on game nights our streets are full. Usually not a problem. I never see anyone doing anything about the parking. Not really a problem
- Do not like idea of paid parking for visitors to residences.
- We need to maintain or increase public transportation options near high density areas and upgrade our snow removal otherwise the other suggestions encourage people to drive more
- it helps transit users find parking. parking is already at a premium in all c-train parking spots.
- Protect residences from generators and event traffic.
- The homeowner needs the ability to have parking available on their street.
- You would increase driving as people would by pass expensive parking to find residential streets near major generators. The zones would decrease space in our already full residential parking
- If city would properly plan for parking at these generators this would not be a problem. Issue is people are cheap and would rather park for free across my driveway than pay at an LRT lot. Rules needed to protect from the tyranny of the stupid.
- This will discourage folks from parking all day and blocking access to businesses and encourage people to use transit as part of commute
- Works well
- Same response as above
- C&D: Residents should park on their own property. If residents want to use the street, they should pay market value. The street is for public/visitor use & traffic. Parking enforcement patrols should resume, not requiring neighbours to police each other, causing inter-neighbour conflict.
- This works for us.
- It's up to Foothills Hospital and SAIT to manage its parking strategy. Owners should be able to keep at least one spot free for their use/visitors/emergencies. Folks need to understand what's reasonable when they become a 3 car family as a 3 person family. As do renters.
- Living across the street from both a school and a community centre often leaves our street with no parking at all. Have had users parking illegally in driveway or block the driveway. No enforcement is biggest complaint!!
- A is best alternative offered here, but the real issue is the front of our house is always jammed with U of C students as it is the first place they can park close to the uni. We need more restrictions, not less in our area.
- same as above
- Use cost to free up spaces for parking. This scenario already exists throughout the more dense neighbourhoods such as downtown, sunnyside, and beltline.
- A I think people should use their 2 passes how they prefer
- Want physical permits back. Use almost entirely for visiting relatives, but have one daily recurring family user, whose child I care for. Renewing every two weeks is a nuisance, also cancelling when we have non-relative visitors.
- Same as above. I like the 2 permits/residence, but would like to explore this option too.
- Manage access



- Our street has a fast food outlet on the corner but we have resident only parking on our half of the block. Large trucks, especially City garbage trucks, almost daily park in front of our house for their coffee and lunch breaks. Diesel fumes in the winter and garbage smells in the summer.
- C - time limits for high use periods should be sufficient to provide space for visitors. Residents should be parked on their property!
- Most permit only zones are not needed. There is nothing inherently sinister about a non-resident parking on a public street. Current zones that are empty all day every day illustrate that the parking is not needed or wanted by the residents and should be open to everyone.
- same
- When there is a celebration/party at home, where do the guests park? Currently there are no options available. B would solve that.
- In some cases, the streets have plenty of available room to park, most homes have garages or driveways, and large amounts of public and private resources are being used (and wasted) to build off-street parking facilities.
- A - as explained above...
- Again, I want to be able to park in front of my own home. I don't want paid parking or hourly parking on a residential street so that non-residents can leave their cars overnight because they went to the bar and are taking a cab home.
- A: living beside Foothills hospital means staff park, stay and rotate cars if there isn't permit only restrictions. Our neighbourhood has seen this occur block by block as the restrictions came into existence pushing the Foothills staff further and then further east from the hospital.
- More flexibility
- There are a lot of streets where there is no parking available due to RPP requirements. I can think of the street near Linas Italian market. Their lot is often full and I can't even park in the neighborhood to run in for 2 items. One hour parking would be great rather than no parking.
- Maybe use two hour parking instead of permit zones. This would have the desired effect around major generators.
- Response to A This seems to work the best. Creating more temporary parking zones in an area that is predominantly restricted is a bad idea. I live in University heights and for some reason unknown to me in front of my hour I have a 1hr parking (nobody ever gets tickets) across the street permit only
- Same as previous question
- Option B makes the most sense to us.
- See above number 3
- A&B. A balance between residential access and business/event access within REASON.
- I'm not sure this applies in this category, but no parking by permit and 2 hour parking is NOT working because students at Mt Royal park in visitor parking and are not ticketed except occasionally. Please fix this.
- But would like to see more 2 hour parking (without permit) and less complete parking bans.
- Too many changes would cause parking chaos near the hospital



- and B. Restricted residential parking where a residence directly fronts the street should remain as in option A. However, where there isn't a residence alongside the street (as in zone F, in front of the school and community centre, I would encourage paid hourly parking, to generate revenue .
- In addition to U of C students/staff parking on our street, Car-to-go can also park on our street. I have had as many as 5 Car-to-go vehicles parked in front of my home. I can provide photos. We must register our visitors online.
- I'm disabled...walking is a major problem for me to get into many appointments.
- (see answer to 3.) Sign redesign with very big time and small details.
- A.
- Regarding A: visitor passes are frequently sold in areas close to major generators. E.g. Foothills Hospital does not provide nearly enough staff parking (worse now with the cancer center) and insufficient public transit, especially for people working at night.
- my motivation is to have a street scape not a parking lot in front of my house. i want to be able to enjoy my home.
- "B. By removing visitor parking permits and increasing hourly parking for visitors, more people would get a fair chance to park. Meters or purchased permits could help restrict clutter but give visitors options.
- Reducing overall parking space by reducing permits would clear the streets for driving"
- The city should be providing other options such as transit and other modes to get to events and near large generators
- Because C and D would create chaos and homicides. Because if you give people an inch they will take a mile, I can foresee some residents making money selling visitor permits to event traffic, hospitals, etc.
- Option A: Continue to protect/zone residential parking spaces near major generators. This also cuts down on traffic speeding up and down the streets and parking too close to corners.
- As long as the city is providing adequate parking, on site. There is no reason home owners need to give up their neighborhood parking.
- Universities, LRT stations all increased parking fees substantially in the last decade. We are near U of C and could no longer park on our own street due to excessive student parking. Parking inhibited spring street cleaning and ability to get a cab in front of house for disabled family member.
- As #3 Topic.
- Need better parking near events to ensure lack of parking is not a reason people dont go. THis helps drive a better and more vibrant city.
- See answer to #4
- Your survey is difficult to address in the categories you have laid out - all zones are not equal and cannot be addressed as if they are - I live inner city on a small dead end street by a health care site which was previously the children's hospital, prior to getting RRP, continued in next box-
- A, major generators must be designed to accommodate their own parking loads. Communities should not take brunt of bad planning. Events should only be held where adequate parking and



transportation is provided. Many facilities such as hospitals continue not to provide adequate parking for their staff

- C - I work in a commercial building at [personal information removed]. There is inadequate parking spaces in the building, and you keep removing a
- The current system seems to work as well as can be expected.
- B since major generators do cause issues for residents. Having 2-hour unpaid parking is a reasonable way to limit parking by non-residents, but allowing residents to have short-term visitors without updating visitor parking permits.
- Britannia, Elboya and Windsor Park areas have too many "No Parking except by Permit" zones and do not allow for visitors to the area or parking for staff of the businesses in the area.
- There are certain types of permit zone I am okay with but in regards to a hospital people should have access to it. It is already unfair that a loved one of someone in the hospital either has to pay an unfair price but that time is cut in half with the long trek one has to do to get to the hospital
- A - Around these major centers it is important to protect the residence parking spaces and have the availability to provide parking for guests.
- Maybe a hybrid of the two? Parking should be utilized on an availability basis, as well as the real cost of space dedicated to parking be paid for. Different travel options may be utilized in this case.
- c - Again, when putting the restrictions in place be accommodating to all the visitors of the area. There must be a balance between allowing parking for the residents but also ensuring the business' and workers of the area have options as well.
- As above
- B - In areas where there is a high volume of non-residents needing parking it makes sense for events, etc to have a charge for non-resident parking.
- A we live near LRT and restrictions preserve resident access to their homes and keep streets safer. The congestion prior to restrictions caused very unsafe areas for traffic flow (pedestrian and vehicle). Disabled persons and residents need the space for easy access to home, loading & unloading...
- Protect single family residential needs.
- "Status quo works really well. If it ain't broke don't fix it.
- (I don't understand what ""which are not tied to license plates"" means)."
- Opt B: Add more RPP in general and add "two hour free parking" to those zones, with paid option for an additional 2 hours or so. This reduces need for visitor permits, give homes more flexibility when welcoming guests and still deter people parking near ctrain etc. as it is limited to 4 hours max.
- Prior to having permit parking we sometimes had to park 2 blocks away from our home when there were events in the park or Cspace (not great when you have 5 bags of groceries)
- We campaigned vigorously to install parking restrictions several years ago. Before that we had university, Foothills Hospital, Children's Hospital, McMahon Stadium and C-train parking. Drivers parked in front of our house, around the park across from us where school and other children play.



- Two visitor's stalls is sufficient. However it should be done through your app with each residence restricted to x many hours peak and y many hours off peak per month to remove the abuse of the system.
- Increase the hourly restrictions and actually enforce the rules!
- Adequate free parking should be made available in these areas by the city and province without jeopardizing local residence parking.
- There should be more "no parking except by permit" zones
- Again, I like the way things are currently, but the wording of option A seems incorrect. As far as I know, resident permits are tied to license plates.
- Businesses have also accomodate their customer's needs in advance of just putting them on the street. Additional spots (if available) and have to pay - permits are exempt
- The system for visitor parking permits is not user friendly. Old paper tag system was troublesome and new online system is also not user friendly or give enough flexibility for residents to enjoy their property and entertain hassle free.
- See above comments. Should be more fair for all residents in an area, not just single family home owners.
- C - there shouldn't ever be "no parking except by permit" the street is a public space, not someone's private property. Anyone should be able to park on any public street. B - hourly restrictions should replace all no parking except by permit zones
- We should be able to get enough permits or the ability to log in license plates for as many visitors to our home as needed.
- I like the fact that the visitor permit would not be tied to the license plate number.
- A: I think residents should have the right to obtain visitor parking permits. If not, how else would they be able to host overnight guests or allow for businesses to provide services at their homes.
- The city has provided ample parking to c-train users. I have not noticed any abuse in road parking spots that have no limit on time.
- A homeowner should be allowed to have visitors and not be overwhelmed by "event" parkers. Venues should insure access to their facility via public transportation on their own on site parking.
- See comments above
- A . If we expand hours for visitors there's no point in having permits
- The present systems work relatively well. During event there are still problems with vehicles parking in residential spaces if the restriction were removed University Heights would be a parking lot for events at McMon.
- "A When I pay very high taxes I should be able to have visitors to my home at no cost.
- RE: events, restrictions could be lifted OCCASIONALLY with advanced notice."
- CHANGES ARE DIFFICULT TO ACCEPT BY THE PUBLIC.
- There are alot of areas that could be removed from the "except by permit". Areas that dont see alot of traffic regardless but make it difficult for residents or vistors to park.



- The old system of a window pass was much more convenient than the on line system. I was recently told that parking must be entered immediately. That is a time frame of 0 seconds. A 1 hour time frame should be in place for all residential outside the core parking.
- A - Keep the option to have two visitor permits to ensure residents are still able to have room to park - except allow these permits to be paper OR online. Sometimes or for some people it is not possible to go online, so a paper permit should remain an option.
- I didn't select this one something wrong with system
- Since the change to electronic permit - no window tag - there has been a dramatic increase in parking on our street. There is no longer a visible "I belong here" allowing residents to call for enforcement.
- The online system for registering visitors works. There should be no need for any one residence to require more than two permits. In this case, residents should not be at the mercy of the parking overflow from major generators. They should provide their own parking.
- C - Some folks will never be able to park in front of their homes - there has to be some option there.
- In my opinion the city should not be providing "free" parking for non residents who use the streets for commercial or event purposes at the expense of local residents. The practice by the city of reducing parking requirements for commercial projects should end.
- you can receive multiple tickets on the same day in the mail. no warnings given. i have gotten tickets for 5 days in a row when i have been registered online parking enforcement needs to stop the harassment i will sit in my car and watch parking enforcement pass me 4 times till im out of my car!
- No change for residential visitor permit - live near blue gates - don't want a free for all in front of my house.
- Parking at hospitals can be difficult.
- Making one side of the street permit parking and the other paid/permit parking in residential area might help with residents having a place to park near the generators while allowing people to still access parking.
- My home is close to the University. The streets were becoming clogged with university parking.
- As indicated we are happy with 2 hour zone on street. Need restricted parking in back lane way for some quality of life. Need two talk to residents in specific case before making holus bolus changes.
- The city created it and now should not penalize residents in areas where everyone wants to park and clog up the streets. You should be working on getting people to take the bus. Why should I as resident have to clogged streets because the city created this mess.
- Initially it was the commuters to Somerset train station that were unruly. NOW it is our neighbours whom think they are above the law parking wherer ever they want!! WE have rights aslo!!
- Option C. Only reduce the number of permit parking zones around hospitals.
- B again the issue isn't short term parking it's non residents parking on a street all day
- C - maximize the space available for visitors in high demand areas.
- A same comments as above selection A
- Parking at night is becoming an issue due to workers from hospital. 2 hour parking should be 24 hour!



- Option A works in our neighbourhood. We used to have no parking because we are close to LRT and restaurants. Now we get to park and there is some space for visitors.
- Same as above, plus this is your home you should be allowed to offer your guests free parking
- Not everyone can afford parking.
- It's hard to know where appropriate places to park due to excessive and confusing parking restrictions. Even the language in this survey is not clear. Do you think the average person knows what "major generators" refers to?
- Living near a hospital and YMCA parking is extremely difficult. As the people don't want to pay for parking in either facilities so they take parking from us residents of the area.
- Around high volume areas, paying for parking should be considered but needs to have a time limit so parking is available for the residences.
- Current system works well
- There are too many of these zones. It puts a burden on many citizens.
- As above
- The City keeps approving developments with parking relaxations and pointing to the RPP to show that local residents won't be impacted by spill-over parking. These relaxations and lack of parking aren't changing the way people travel, they are just pushing drivers to evade RPP enforcement.
- Residents and their visitors should receive priority for on-street parking. Street space in residential areas should be protected for the residents and shouldn't be used as overflow parking for events and generators (including downtown).
- Option B for reasons noted in Topic 3, and a reduction. If not, the precedent will eventually encompass all residential areas, giving homeowners de-facto street ownership of public roads.
- Residents can purchase private parking (personal garages, pads) in these areas. All parking should be paid hourly/daily parking where demand outstrips supply to encourage alternative parking and transportation arrangements (bike, transit, carshare)

- Most PPR areas free of cars during the day. Have PPR rule be for overnight only and part of weekend so we can all use enjoy and visit all parts of city we live in. Near foothills hospital almost all permitted now but streets empty during day occupied only by PPR signs . . multi-use parking needed
- In the absence of businesses, street parking should be for the use of the residents and their visitors. The major generators referenced in the question should provide sufficient parking for their clients.
- I don't have any problem with the way that it is run now. Perhaps address event issues by making Calgary Transit more accessible.
- The hours for parking restrictions around universities and LRT stations could be set so that visitors to residences in these areas would not be limited to one hour after 6 pm for example.
- See above comment.
- A as explained above



- Option A because, otherwise, major traffic generators can eliminate on-street visitor parking all the time for residences. Demand for parking near these generators can be so strong that all on-street parking vanishes for residences and spaces for desired visitor parking are always unavailable.
- A and B again
- As resident with permitted parking Option A works well, I have no problem with it. Our residence is within 400m of a future LRT station with no on site parking, it will put extreme pressure for any available parking within the area.
- I live near south health campus tightening is good however I think multi family dwellings need more options for parking. I am in a townhouse and because I do not have a street facing townhome I can't get a permit. This makes it difficult to having people over and makes it difficult to rent my place
- These are the same options as question 3. I believe there is a technical error.
- Option B. It is important to try to manage the use of the streets for long term parking (all day) by those who are working nearby or using the LRT to commute to work. The street should not be a free parking lot for drivers that are not visitors.
- Need a better way of expanding the zone, in a way that does not put the work on the resident requesting - especially as it looks like getting the info is scamming other neighbors. There needs to be a better way of addressing.
- B, D. Have the residential parking permits only related to the time they can stay parked in area.
- people need to still park near their homes. But guest to the homes are business still need to park.
- Implementing additional paid parking would generate revenue as well as allow visitors to park in an RPP zone without stress.
- B: Around transit stations, few people could realistically abuse a 2 or 4 hour time limit. With regard to hospitals and such, increasing the amount of paid zones could bring in additional revenue and provide alternatives to the limited parking on these sites.
- A
- Popular areas require different consideration
- See above
- There are far too many of these. I often see areas completely empty because of this. Residents should not be allowed to determine how the city uses parking spaces.
- I live near uni, lrt and am impacted by stampeder (macmahon) parking, and church parking. Scheduling a party on football day is tough but I don't see a solution. Otherwise, 2 permits is generally more than enough.
- A friendly and inclusive approach for all city residential taxpayers, to have some unpaid time to park, re: Option B. As a homeowner in Calgary, I pay to have the roads maintained so should receive the benefit of parking on them!! Unlike cyclists who pay nothing & have useless lanes in the city!!
- Parking was restricted on 43ST NW by resident request even though the street wasn't that busy. I live in a duplex adjacent and have no parking on the street my property faces onto. Now I can't get a parking permit for visitors or my cleaning lady. It is interfering with my access without due cause
- hourly parking options keep vehicles from staying too long and are generally too short to use around major generators.



- B: To accommodate those willing to walk from a street parking spot to visit hospitals etc. to keep their parking costs free, having some free available parking in the community would be a great option. Are all possible parking locations close to major attractions available?
- I believe it is just a revenue source for the city. Please let's have a simpler way of life. I live inner city and it has never been an issue for parking in our area.
- B, C & D: disagree with these; most major generators (hospitals, business zones, etc.) have appropriate pay parking, but visitors try to skip this cost by parking in RPP neighbourhoods--this overwhelms homeowners, so reducing RPP areas isn't suitable. Unfair to charge private visitors to RPP homes
- A & B both work well. B could be for short term visitors - ie: 2 hrs.
- Tired of having to pay to park when I already pay copious amount in taxes, sur-charges and user fees . Why should people have to pay out of their nose to pay to go to a hospital or be enrolled in post-secondary education. As for LRT, the fees to ride the LRT should be enough, already overpriced.
- Street parking is supposed to be public so if you do not like it then don't choose to live close to a major generator or use your parking lot/garage properly.
- Need more than two visitor permits per house.
- Preference is B and C. Residential permit parking should be reduced in Calgary as private landowners do not own space on the street. That being said it may not be possible to eliminate it everywhere, however in all zones one should be able to visit for a few hours.
- This is helpful where residents, visitors and businesses/destinations all need some parking, without being exclusionary. Few or no areas where RPP excludes all others. C. Absolutely, these are over-used. Should only be employed where there is a genuine need, and with flexibility as in B.
- Again you keep repeating same stupid options. We live across from peace bridge a 'major generator' and these individuals use up a majority of residential parking on evenings and weekends in an area that is older and lacks onsite parking. Parking restrictions should be 24hrs for non residents
- See previous comments re a charge
- A is less restrictive to visitors to A is less restrictive to visitors to multi-family locations
- I believe that the restrictions are valuable in protecting residents parking. Living close to schools, event centers, etc where there is no restrictions makes it very annoying and frustrating when trying to park near your house.
- As I live close to a hospital restrictions are needed or employees will block up all the parking. 2 hour parking should be required for visitors though. I don't like the restrictive zone parking that doesn't have any hourly parking.
- Enable visitors to park free for two hours near a hospital so that poor people can visit their loved ones in hospital without getting ripped off by the pay parking at the hospital.
- CAVEAT - per LOT not per residence. Otherwise, homes with secondary suites get 4 and this is not equitable to neighbors without suites (2 only). This is creating parking issues for adjoining home owners/residents. I also presume "no plates" means hang-tags, not online system - YES, preferred.



- Option A - if major generators require parking it should be planned in their construction by adding parkades.
- Why should our quiet crescent have these restrictions if we don't have a problem? So the city can charge a permit fee?? Absolutely not. Compare it to a person with a handicap. Because one person NEEDS a parking restriction there are no other handicap-no parking signs down the entire street!!
- agree with the reasoning above
- A Our street is a prime example of what happens if there are no RRP. We are quite a distance from the hospital yet because there are no restrictions the young hospital workers are willing to walk in all weather to park for free in the community instead of paying for parking, or cycling, or transit
- If demand for parking around major generators is high, charge for this parking. It is common in other jurisdictions (eg Australia) to allow parking on roads near transit facilities, for instance -- this allows more people to take advantage of our investments in this infrastructure.
- sometimes, people would like to visit the friend for longer but some residential parking only has 2 hrs then the person needs to move their car here and there. not enough parking at the residential area
- Should increase or limit, why reduce the restrictions? These are where there would be lots of people parking. Or increase for community/ resident parking but not just allow increased public parking.
- A is very important to prevent inner city neighbourhoods from becoming parking lots.
- there needs to be more tolerant enforcement in RPPs, a one time pass by and ticket is easy, but very unfair to those who may be visiting or dropping off, it is not getting at any chronic issue. and by the way why is there no app, it takes 3 web pages to get to permit page.
- I live near Foothills Hospital. This operates round-the-clock. If restrictions were lifted, there would NEVER be parking available for residents or guests. On the unrestricted blocks in our neighbourhood, parking is always full. Thus, this is not reasonable for local residents.
- Being close to the Hospital there are people who park on the street for short period of times, or park on the street when there is a big event at McMahon stadium. Having hourly parking does not detract from this behavior.
- See above. Need to look at individual situations. Two hour parking on our front street makes sense (permit parking down the street not so much. But permit parking in back lane necessary to preserve some quality of life in the residential area. Need to view situations individually.
- Same answer as above.
- Again, make it 2 hour parking from 9 to 5 automatically.
- A - I lived in such a zone (next to the Stampede Grounds and Erlton LRT station). By keeping the current visitor permit in place, this should adequately protect our streets from event/LRT traffic parking for hours on end.
- A - I have friends, who live near Foothills Hospital. I think Workers should have to pay \$ to park. Otherwise, they should take Transit. If they can afford \$ a vehicle, they should pay \$ to park.
- We live near SAIT and have extreme troubles with visitor permit abuse. No option here allows for prevention of this abuse. We need increasing restrictions on visitor permits, rather than less!



- A, B. Some restriction is definitely essential near the hospital, our family relies on street parking and it would be impossible without a restriction. However, the current online system is inconvenient for visitors and there are no options for nearby unrestricted parking if we have more than 2.
- A: If there is a residential area impacted by a close by major generator, then there should be permit parking restrictions in place to alleviate parking abuse by people who do not live in the area. I still feel that anyone wanting permit parking on their street should pay a fee to have it regardless
- If you have the privilege to live near major institutions then don't take it out on people who might like to use streets they have paid for via taxes. Also permits allow residents to drive up their housing prices while people like me pay for it...
- Too many autos parking on residential streets.
- Resident permits work well on-line but visitors, especially short-term and unannounced visitors should utilize the previously utilized mirror hangers.
- simplest way, IMO
- There needs to be MORE restrictions near major generators WHERE THERE IS ON SITE PARKING AVAILABLE FOR THE GENERATOR. e.g. Restrictions by Bowness Park should be INCREASED for residences without on site parking because park visitors use all available street parking instead of using the overflow lot.
- A No reason to change current system.
- Please scrap electronic RPP and start sending visitor parking tags in the mail. The online system is terrible: it has bugs and it freezes. There is no tech support on weekends/after hours. The requirements can be confusing to elderly, people who are not computer savvy and first time users.
 - A 2 hour zone works well weekdays, more on weekends. The community needs to be patrolled to make this work effectively.
- C - Though parking on residential streets become congested with traffic, such as high school students, unless vehicles are towed, no parking violations will continue to occur.
- I live near Foothills Hospital and residential parking is limited. There are some hourly zones available for non-residents which is good but overall I believe homeowners should be entitled to park in front of their own homes in permit only parking zones.
- Again answer for A is the same as well as for. This sounds ok, but will it work, and who is going to enforce all these issues.
- A, because it's the least bad choice. See my earlier responses. Even two permits for giant vehicles associated with a narrow frontage (and a garage too full of junk to hold a car).
- Use spaces to provide more parking unlimited and 2-4 hour limit options around major generators, especially using spaces not in front of homes, like green spaces
- "A. there should be flexibility re visitor permits. Don't make this an administrative problem for residents.
- I have mobility challenges and can't walk very far. If it's hard to park, there's no sense going anywhere."
- It would be great if people living in Multi unit complexes could apply for a zoned parking pass for guests. The lack of ability to do this is unfortunate.



- Disagree with all of these options. Allow for no limit on residential permits per residence to allow easier parking. However, keep areas requiring permits to encourage parking being used for residential purposes only.
- A - Same reason as prior topic. Students will park on our street leaving us with no room for visitors, trades, homecare workers, etc.
- short term (2 hour) parking should be available near major centres.
- We live in Kensington/Sunnyside area. We want street parking for our visitors and service people coming to the house. We don't want people parking here as a convenience to head to a "generator."
- LRT parking available; don't park on my street to avoid paying for LRT parking. Put restrictions close to major generators but not elsewhere. AND PATROL FREQUENTLY. NEW SYSTEM SUCKS AS DON'T KNOW IF PEOPLE LEGALLY PARKED. If reduce restrictions, make 2 hr max and ticket those who stay >2hrs.
- A - for visitors TO OUR HOME. Some people are abusing these permits by renting them out for use of people who work at Foothills Hospital. This must stop!
- All Calgarians pay city taxes - why should those who live close to certain destinations have exclusive access. Allow short term access (two hours) to all Calgarians.
- C - Most events such as Stampeders games were going on in this area well before any of us moved in. If you don't want to have to deal with those eventswhy would you have bought in this area? It is these events and festivals that make a city worth living in and give a sense of community.
- Events are great and beneficial for the city. Football season is short not many home games. I feel privileged to live this close to a hospital. It saddens me that people have to spend ANY time worrying about parking when they are going to Tom Baker or Foothills. They should be able to street park.
- A .leave as is
- No change to current visitor permit – Residences can apply for up to two (2) visitor permits in an RPP zone at no cost. These can be used for any visitor to the home which are not tied to license plates. Some people have misused it, by giving the permit to friends working in downtown.
- Not sure what the issues are in areas that have these so did not weigh in.
- At LEAST two free permits should be issued per residence that are not tied to having a car. Should not limit number of visitors a person can have or charge them to have more than two cars at a time at their home. Isolating to seniors , esp those with health problems needing care, family support
- Increase number of visitor parking passes, it is ridiculous that we are allowed only 2! We are in Parkdale where all streets are residents only 24/7, where are additional guests expected to park?
- The problem is that there are TOO many dwellings with "No Parking Without Permit" which causes their visitors to take the parking spaces in front of their neighbors houses! MAKE the parking limitation (1 hour between 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.) the same for all dwellings.
- Living close to downtown is scary if permits are removed. The City wants people to use transit and to even hint at removing permits is sheer dumb. And by the way, taxes are way more the closer you are to downtown. So it is paid for, do the math!
- needed to reduce traffic in residential zones near high traffic areas as above



- Things are working well on my street [personal information removed] north side of 700 block of 19 Avenue NW) with current restrictions. More regular monitoring of those parking without permits is the only change needed.
- Residents who pay property taxes should NOT have to pay additional fees for permits to park in front of their own homes.
- We live in St Andrews Heights. The permit only parking imposed by our neighbours is very inconvenient. I was fine with the old rules which were 2 hour parking 9 to 6 weekdays and not limited otherwise. Hospital parking is likely to no longer be an issue. University and McMann parking never was.
- B - Particularly around hospitals it seems incredibly unfair to make people pay for parking on top of the rest of the stress of a hospital visit. However, for universities this doesn't seem necessary. There are lots of transportation options available to students.
- None of the above. All these options involve making the problem worse, not better.
- These areas should be seen as potential parking benefit districts where revenue from non-resident parking can be generated and used to fund neighbourhood improvements. Balance this against overall mode split and transportation network objectives (eg Sunnyside would be a bad P+R location).
 - Until there are changes in the parking lots at the lrt, what other option do people have?
- "B: Introduce hybrid zones - RPP/ParkPlus, with a cap on how long a 'paid parking session' can last. ie. 1hr, 2hr, 3hr. Perhaps open up paid parking in these areas from 8am-8pm to balance the needs of residents/paid parkers.
- C: Reduce the number of RPP zones. They aren't needed. They are 'wanted'."
- Our street would be an employee parking lot for the local traffic generator without these restrictions
- Need to protect spaces for residents especially in high demand areas.
 - Visitor parking permits are necessary, however, unsure of how this is enforced. The visible tags are better than the call in. With the tag everyone can see that the car is a visitor.
- I have no other parking options that on-street. I live close to Prince's Island/downtown, so street parking is desirable, both for events and for commuters who work downtown. So, I need to protect my on-street parking options.
- We believe Topic 4 should apply to High Schools as well that have school parking lots to avoid students park on residential streets/Crescents. Also, Commercial/Business employee parking on residential & along playground zones/streets needs to be addressed for safety & permit parking.
- A home with a secondary suite should be considered one (1) residence for the purpose of RPP permit allocation. My next-door neighbour with a secondary suite has 4 resident permits + 4 visitor permits allocated - that totally defeats the purpose of RPP; makes it meaningless and a joke!!
- Hospital workers continue to crowd our streets with little to nothing done about it.
- "B. there is not a parking space problem on my restricted street, when visitors drop in they are they are not taking up spaces the residents use.
- there is no need for 24/7 residential parking restrictions on my street there are about 70 spaces on the street and only 10 to 15 are used at any time."



- So far, this is the best option. Requiring major generators, as well as high-density projects, to provide more on-site parking would be the best option.
- C - reduce where possible, use an option like Park Plus has to "park a friend" rather than residents requesting and maintaining a visitor pass.
- Permits "mixed use" and demonstrates flexibility
- Communities should not have to pay for parking!! If no parking by permit zones is required by some, the limit should be 2 hours Monday to Friday 7-5pm only. If Sports fans need to park on the street in the community, bring them on communities don't own the street!!
- Major generators overwhelm residential on street parking
- General comment: I live on [personal information removed]. Our alley is signed as no parking at all due to one street in the spiderweb petitioning for no parking 20 years ago. That is against the rules but I'm told I cannot get the restriction removed without petitioning over 100 homes. That is just wrong.
- My particular RPP zone X is too restrictive being 24x7, and would prefer relaxed restrictions on evenings and weekends, when I am more likely to have visitors and guests visiting my home
- As per my previous comment. I would like to see a return to this option rather than entering a licence plate online
- Streets near hospitals should allow for 2 hour parking for citizens who do not live in that community. Parking at hospitals is expensive & sometimes viewed as a tax on the sick. Everyone's taxes contribute to all street repair/maintenance; parking should not totally exclusive to the few locals.d
- A - We live below the Foothills hospital and recently petitioned the home owners on the street to change our zoning from "2 hour free parking" to "no parking without a permit", as it was becoming increasing more difficult to park in front of your own home! Staff would park here 24/7!
- A.Restrictions are necessary on our street due to constant university parkers. At one point, they even parked bumper to bumper in the alley w/o restrictions.After 5pm and weekends we often cannot park in front of home to unload, including babies, groceries, luggage or have visitors come close.
- Residential streets should not be the default daily long term parking space for employees and visitors to major generators. Having limited permits combined with hourly parking for visitors would be a good solution.

Topic: Businesses visiting a home

- A. No change to current visitor permit – Residences can apply for up to two (2) visitor permits in an RPP zone at no cost. These can be used for any visitor to the home which are not tied to license plates.
- B. Increase the amount of hourly parking for visitors within an RPP zone. The times could include paid and unpaid options.
- C. Reduce the number of 'No Parking except by Permit' zones across Calgary
- D. Remove all restrictions within all zones across Calgary
- E. Develop customized permit system for service companies visiting a home



- Good to have visitor permits. In the condo, there is only one visitor parking & the business-person. Could have a visitor card issued as a home-owner that could be used for emerg. services
- Srs who don't drive can't get visitor passes
- Yes
- Return to old system with 2 visitor cards to hang on mirror - esp useful when businesses come to complete work in home.
- Visitor(s) permits should be the way to go. We need to go to the "old" system. Give 2 permits per household & have household give permits.
- Get rid of ParkPlus. Paper tickets in real time is fair
- It should be changed to 2 per house. A secondary suite = 2 residences <therefore> 4 visitor permits (+ 4 resident permits) 8 total! Not fair to neighbours.
- cards back More visible to see who is where. (CPA comment)
- Concern: for guests coming over there is no parking for them. - if someone parked there for 3 days... and don't know how to fix that.
- Prefer 2 permits/house. - if there's more than 2 then call 1 week ahead. Extra visitors to pay for short term via visitor pass + resident. Concern if near big generators like CA or LRT station. People could abuse this. The street will always be full. What can we do to make sure not abused.
- This could work, but sometimes you have more than 2 visitors/contractors. So some flexibility or customization.
- I think this would make the most sense. I prefer unpaid option, for 3-4 hours.
- Can be good to allow for the people coming to do work could park easily. Yes.
- Yes please for paid visitor parking. Then allocate some of the revenue to improve the neighbourhood
- Yes
- Yes, BUT in conjunction with other changes - require use of off-street parking esp suites. Homes with secondary suites should NOT get double the # of permits, needs to be a holistic RPP program
- No
- if you have a business put a permit on vehicle. It's that simple. That allows parking whenever. <special permit is obtained and used by business for business purposes>
- absolutely not
- No
- This has potential but could also get too complicated. What if: there are changing contractors/companies? - they arrive off of scheduled time? It could get too complex to plan for
- Ease the application process by offer online application for contractors
- Give the business a card to put in their window that indicates they are a service company.
- Customized system for Home Care, Construction, Landlords, etc.
- Yes
- Good idea - but could be open to abuse



- Yes, customized for home care as they provide a service that affects ppl's basic std of living
- Yes, we need this
- Yes!
- This would be preferred. Hopefully can address the issue without impacting "resident" and "visitor" (normal visitors, not homecare workers) parking.
- Making money on parking in lot deters people to park in lot & move to the street. The hospital parking creates the problem. Need a solution between hospital and Calgary Parking. Not sure how these address the themes. Maybe need more parking at those facilities & parking for staff is expensive and then people will park elsewhere.
- Camera patrol is lazy & the paper permits were better. This system is too complicated for use: challenge w/ rental cars still - out of province vehicles. Paper permits - could borrow neighbours' visitor passes before if having more than 2 guests.
- it works but it needs to be easily visible for the camera patrol. New stuff isn't always the best stuff
- Visible cards back & don't know they players... and can't tell who shouldn't be parking in the zone. Return to the old system.
- Never heard that homecare workers have had a problem. The system is fine as it is. It might be a bit of a hassle to put the visitors' plate online or on the phone. But it's fine.
- Customer saying if someone is coming to pick up or drop off or delivery there should be no thing to get it registered
- Not only impact to homecare, but all services & service calls required for your home (as well as delivery). Need option of a permit for multiple Zone available at a reasonable cost. Not just about residents but those trying to make a livelihood.
- The old method was better because you could see & identify who was parking. Go back to permit for verification purposes.
- Nuisance to go to website & only the 2 week option instead of a day. Business vehicle should have a physical permit. Could be good for visitor too. Should be able to choose 24 hr - 2 w.
- Do business vehicles have an ability to obtain/buy a park-anywhere permit? That could be good but could get abused.
- Visitor passes for people doing more work than 2 hours or need 2 vehicles at the condo
- Business person should identify their vehicle as such so it is clear
- Wording is so poor answers will be inaccurate. The results should be scrapped. Really disappointing
- Confusion abot this (no change) statement. It is tied to a license plate. Need to clarify "at registration" not tied to plate.
- Otherwise, no change to current visitor permits.
- I dont see why the current system cant be used to put a service company at one's house on a visitor permit. Don't see why this is different than managing a non commercial visitor.
- Makes sense
- Businesses working at the home must have an option to park there. Providing this at a reasonable cost is mandatory.



- This allows short term visits without allowing those commuting and just using street parking so that they do not need to pay for parking
- businesses that visit multiple homes in many different zones daily (e.g. home care or construction trades) should be able to purchase a yearly 'business parking permit' which works in ALL zones in the city.
- A customized service company list would prove helpful. The Telus and Shaw installers must rack up a ton of tickets as they're visiting people who have just moved in and likely don't have visitor permits registered yet.
- I think there is a strong case for more flexible parking usage such as "X hour maximum, except by Permit XX".
- These services are vital and it should be acknowledged that they need to park there to do their work.
- If you know someone is coming to your home it is easy enough to create a Visitor Permit so please leave that the way it is currently.
- Only if this does not increase my property taxes
- This is a critical concern especially for low income individuals, seniors, and individuals with mobility/health issues. Similarly, this issue is also applicable to businesses conducting work on a home - e.g. siding replacement, attic insulation, roof replacement, etc.
- Think reasonable for recognized businesses (like home care) to register for an area (maybe another section like Visitor permits and do monthly?) but need License number which would see as reasonable.
- Most people require their spots after 5:00 pm. Change the definition of the residential zones so that they are ALL automatically 2 hour parking zones between 9:00 am and 5:00 pm (and unlimited if the car has a visitor pass). This helps customers and visitors, and night parking for residents.
- This is an example of why residents in these zones should be able to register ALL of the vehicles that legitimately are associated with their residence (not just 2). Again, we should be able to use our street parking in the same way that residents in the burbs away from major generators do.
- It's difficult if trades are visiting a home. This would help. My preference would be to see it easier to assign visitor passes to visitors. The website is not mobile responsive, there is no app, and it was much easier with the placard-type visitor permits.
- Case specific situations can have permitted the makes sense for it. Ie temporary or permanent services.
- Visitors should be able to park short term without requiring a visitor permit. The key is enforcement from Calgary parking.
- "How can residents expect the service person to come if they occupy all the parking spots.
- A spot or two or three for the come and go needs of any place on each block."
- To be honest in our zone (Sunnyside) we rarely even both with visitor permits.
- No comments
- before a party - phoning everyone for their license plate. And....apparently a visitor parking web site permit only allows you to park within 50 yards of your house. Why can' you park anywhere in the area if you are registered |?????



- Easiest solution although a system for visiting businesses good idea.
- ADD the [removed] number of visitor's permits, [removed].
- same as 3 and 4
- Current system works well, but the move away from paper visitor permits has actually made it harder and more inconvenient to use.
- It works
- C - Needs to be better balance between resident parking concerns and resident needs for access to in home and at home services from businesses, AHS, charities (meals on wheels) and other visitors to the community, including for access to City lands such as dog parks and playgrounds.
- if businesses generate more than two vehicles visits at a time, maybe something else needs to be done.
- E - A customized permit system for service companies would eliminate a lot of plate registration for owners.
- A - simple and it works.
- Homecare and mobility issue people should always have a way to park so they can attend their patient or park close without having to walk blocks
- Homeowners can provide homecare workers and other visitors with their visitor permits.
- Pain in the butt if you have cleaners or home services visit your house and you have to enter their license plate EVERY time. Typically they are only there once a week for an hour. Should have a system where we only have to enter it once.
- A - I think that RPP ensures that homecare workers and people with mobility issues can park near the houses that they are going to. Having an RPP on our street made more parking available, not less.
- "A: difficult to administer if homeowner is not present
- B: would help
- C: with the automated system, tracking vehicles is now easier, and these zones are less needed
- E: it would be helpful for landscapers, plumbers, homecare workers, etc"
- "Do not support customized program. More money and resources to manage this for what value?
- Do NOT support payment to park in communities."
- we have had no need, but there are many renovations currently underway in the area and there are often many vehicles associated with construction. have no idea how they have handled that.
- Until you put RPP in every community there is no way to charge one community parking and another not. Unjust!
- Option A generally works, though B could make it more available to service companies. E might be good, because it might not require the homeowner's involvement. But you'd have to trust the service companies not to abuse it.
- Option E. No change to current visitor permit system, but make a customized system available for people who need to have HomeCare or other services visit their home regularly. This will increase accessibility for all who live on the street without penalizing them for needing support services.



- E. in 2016 (before the new online RPP) I had an accident and had severe injuries. I had homecare 3x/week and at least one family/friend visit per day on those days to help, and 2x/day the other days. New system would NOT have worked. I could not have entered their plates online. Nightmare scenario!
- I think that there needs to be some accommodation for homeworkers and indeed, for service businesses visiting houses (plumbers, electricians, etc). I think that there could be a limited time permit for such businesses, based on their license plate.
- E makes sense to me
- Please do not make the system any more complex.
- System works well currently. But should be enhanced with an app to start and stop parking - current process of needing to use web site is very slow and tedious.
- Option C creates another level of complication that a homeowner needs to deal with. On a related note, it is interesting that the City gets hung up on the parking yet misses a revenue opportunity when trades take up a residential city block for over 12 months. This is a greater inconvenience
- its easy enough to get visitor parking
- Anyone with a handicap sign should be able to park as if they have the relevant permit.
- personally affected and know many, who are .. it needs to be more flexible and there needs to be an exception ..
- Home are struggles to find parking when caring for clients. Their companies should be able to receive specialized permits
- seems fair
- The previous Hang Tag system worked perfectly for twenty years for all temporary visitors and should be reinstated. It is unclear why City Administration felt that something new was required.
- 6 unit townhouses are not eligible for visitor passes and makes difficulty for service companies/care agencies.
- Especially for customers with mobility issues, they should have access to the services they need in their home.
- In the era of improving mental health these restrictions prevent people from having help come in, visitors, etc...there must be no restrictions available for all vehicles but implement a time frame. For residences you can still require a permit to circumvent the time limit.
- A
- It doesn't take much effort to meet the business at the door and hand them a parking permit. They go back to the vehicle and then when they leave they bring it back. The online registration is a bad system, plus it isn't visible so you don't know who's parked where.
- Should allow needed visitors the ability to get to where they are going quickly
- E: For short term business visitors an option should exist to allow them to park in front of their client's residence to conduct the service without worry of inputting their plate/details into the parking system. This would create time savings for users (businesses and residents).
- A covers this.
- I picked E. I used to do home care. Last thing a worker should have to worry about is parking.



- Businesses called to fix repairs do not always know which vehicle will arrive, especially for Emergencies. You have to stop them from starting work to get a licence to go on line to register the plate. ITS AN EMERGENCY!!!!!!! The last thing on there mind is parking! ie plumbers, furnace repairs..
- The city absolutely should not spend more money on a permit system that had already cost >\$2M to develop and is run by incompetent managers.
- I don't want to see homecare workers needing to pay for their parking - these people already are at the bottom of the earning scale - rather have a call in number for them to use when they are seeing clients.
- This makes the most sense!
- E would be amazing for us. If there was some way to designate the service providers that visit us every week it would be much easier.
- Trades already have solutions for dealing with busy areas. Mostly this means they charge extra to those who need their services. Option E would helpfully create some balance to that situation.
- There are too many outdated or inappropriate permit and restricted zones. Residents should not have exclusive use of public roads (C or D). The only justification may be to create limited zones where residents have no on site parking.
- ...
- Option E. Businesses that need to visit homes should be exempt from the permit system.
- This is a no brainer. Renovations, builders, home care workers need a permit, but for a contained time period.
- Option E. Residents need available spaces for service workers to their homes..
- The system is simple, however the City Parking Authority website needs to be clarified with clear directions on how to add visitors licence plates in a Residential Parking Permit area.
- A: Businesses providing services like homecare should not have to pay more to deliver those services. E: Some commercial drivers (like school bus drivers) have the option to leave their vehicle at home, and I want this to be allowed under the restrictions.
- E. I'm not convinced of the value of the permit zones, but certainly businesses like home care or utility installers should be exempt.
- Business wanting to work at places with restrictions should have to pay. Owners shouldn't get the right to have business park in restricted areas because it's convenient for them
- Companies that visit residential homes should have their commercial license plates registered with the city and exempt from the system. It is such a hassle to remember to register contractor plates, even when they are only visiting the house for a few minutes.
- I do not see the relationship. Surely homecare workers can use the visitor permits. People with mobility issues can apply for absolute parking restrictions in front of their homes, can they not? People with mobility issues benefit from RPPs like others, or would if the restrictions were enforced
- JUST DON'T GO THERE.
- See above.



- Too many no parking zones that aren't justified or backed up by actual usage / parking availability data. All should be reviewed and only installed with data support. They also shouldn't just apply to wealthy neighbourhoods as is the perception today.
- There is probably an option to sell companies (for a moderate fee) a permit for parking on any residential street. It is quite hard to coordinate when you are doing renovations or have a service call to input their plates.
- Home care and other agencies should have an exemption. Also service people parked are obvious with signage - no brainer that they should be able to park.
- The existing visitor permit systems should provide more than enough permitted parking.
- These permit only areas force those making street parking near services impossible, as those with mobility issues would not be able to park close enough to their services.
- Seems pretty self-explanatory. Care workers, Meals on Wheels, facilitators, etc., need access to the people they assist, and shouldn't have to pay when providing necessary services.
- E. Great option! Contractors and service companies should be exempt from paid or permitted parking for reasonable periods of time (ie. no more than 8 hours a day).
- As a landlord that lives in a different community, I often need to meet with contractors to do work on my rentals re furnace cleaning, plumbing, roofing etc. Please simplify process for landlords & contractors! MUCH appreciate change.
- Most buildings in Beltline have no-parking loading zones in front of the main entrance and back entrances on an ally for more cumbersome deliveries.
- 2 permits are fine, but there should be no online registration requirement. License plate numbers are not required for registration. No more surveillance of visitors to private homes.
- Option E. Existing permit system does not easily allow for one-off contractor or longer term helpers who may not share a vehicle. In many zones this may be fine, but in cases where off-street parking is limited or non-existent it poses a problem.
- Even with the 24 hr restricted parking, I have had times where I couldn't park in front of my house, because of someone using my spot. Have I not mentioned how much property tax I pay for my home? Where's the pleasure when I might have constant parking issues - certainly not increasing my enjoyment.
- The purpose of parking restrictions is to not have our streets as parking lots. Before you issue passes, ensure their offstreet parking is usable. Recreation trailers can be stored and not in backyards taking up offstreet parking.
- E - this would help as currently it is difficult/onerous to keep adding frequent visitors on-line (if there are more than two, combined with the regular visitor parking)
- Make it easier to use... add this to the app instead of the clumsy website.
- An option to extend a visitor permit period would be good to consider. Should be able to apply for an extended permit with stated reason like renovations or homecare.
- While a visitor pass could be used a service permit would make more sense



- CPA should use common sense and not issue tickets to marked vehicles like plumbers and other trades, but asking the CPA to use common sense is like asking a pig to fly.
- Again, people and businesses need to be able to visit a home
- Time is often constrained for these companies/individuals, or the difficulty of getting to the destination, getting the permit, taking it to their car, and then (after the end of the visit) remembering to return the permit... can be quite a headache. A system like Car2Go uses might help this.
- businesses should be able to visit people
- see previous comments
- Care workers are visitors. The system works as is.
- In addition Get smarter software
- Now that permits are electronic one can be creative in allocating visitor permits. One possibility is a recurring pre-scheduled permit (daily, weekly, etc) for any one of a list of plates (providers vary). Include limits to avoid abuse (< all day, limited # of days etc).
- "Go back to hanger tags, none of your business who visits my home!"
- You are sneaky bastards trying to trick people into consent to increase paid parking in residential zones!"
- Again, should be evaluated in each area to make sure all space is maximized.
- Option A works for most scenarios but I can see where service companies that make regular visits to a home (especially one where the resident does not have access to a computer) would benefit by having a special permit that would allow them to park in restricted zones when visiting a home.
- home maintenance, care givers, and other business vehicles should be given special allowances
- Mobility issues and home care workers can have their license plates registered. That's what i do
- a is okay but where are these permits? we didn't get any, have to contact the city
- Inner city communities always suffer with everyone wanting to park in our areas. DT workers often abuse the system and take their chances that they won't get a ticket for parking longer than the allowed time (still cheaper for them than paying DT parking rates if they only get a ticket 1/month).
- It's such a pain to have to get the license plate number for all of the businesses that visit the house. It would be great if the contractors could do it on their end
- Change all RPP zones so they allow for 2 hour free parking between 9:00 am and 5:00 pm, and unlimited time with a pass. Change in the definitions and advertise as opposed to the cost of changing signs.
- People can use their visitor passes for businesses.
- B: I suggest two-hour parking as many in this neighbourhood are older and need home care. It will also help local businesses.
- Technicians or professionals should be able to attend our residence to preform service without being ticketed.
- Lordy but here is another one where I do not like any of the options. The parking problem should never cost us one single sent. The parking issue should never make us have to get on the phone or the computer and tell the parking authority who is coming over to our house and for how long. Lets jus



- See question 2
- E seems reasonable.
- Home care FSCD workers etc should have an exempt pass that allows them to park in a restricted area as an E-RSP. EXEMPT REGISTERED SERVICE PROVIDER.
- This is another regional question dependant on local amenities. You're asking to compare Brentwood residents who compete with UofC, LRT, McMan Stadium users vs. A subdivision without any of the three. Of course the answers should be different. Brutal survey!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
- E - contacting CPA is not always easy. Homeowners may not be home to set up "visitor" parking for workers coming to the home.
- E Most tickets issued in our area are issued to friends and relatives or business vehicles working at the residence. Looks more like a cash grab to me.
- E because it is just so much easier for everyone to have a separate system
- For homecare, contractors, etc. a separate system for a paid longer term permit could be made available for specific periods.
- This type of permit won't be pervasive throughout the City and will serve a vital function in the City.
- Businesses should not be ticketed. What if I have two visitors and a contractor coming to my home?
- These companies need a better system especially for multiple days - construction.
- The visitor parking passes work well for me when having guests in my home. I find if I am visiting a business it can be difficult to find parking, I would appreciate if there were less permit only zones, I don't mind paying for parking but often zones are by permit, no paid parking option.
- a.
- E: Taxis, home care, delivery services etc. need to stop for a few minutes occasionally and should not require us to log in and enter their plate info
- Many businesses drive vehicles that can't access underground visitor parking. Having a loading zone or other customized, time limited parking option for them would be good.
- E. I have noticed in the past that when a senior neighbour had a social worker visitor that the person put some kind of permit on the dashboard although I'm not sure this would work anymore since parking personnel drive by in cars with cameras.
- E - Businesses should be able to park their valuable work assets within sight. Of course those working with the disabled NEED this! It's ridiculous they should also be worrying about parking meters when they're in the care of a human being.
- This is my line of work.
- People who need to park in an existing residential permit area should be able to do so if they are willing to pay for the space and time used.
- customized permits could be required for any parking in excess of 1 hour.
- E provides the best balance by avoiding the need for the resident to have to record the license plate.
- Right now if someone calls me to do a quote in a parking controlled area I am at risk of getting a ticket even if I do not get the job and homeowners are constantly frustrated with the current method of granting parking and are usually unwilling to do so for short visits.



- E. Aging population requires outside the box ideas. Home care or hospice companies/Alberta Health should have looser restrictions on parking times.
- E. This customized permit system would be more convenient especially if a plumber or electrician etc. is coming for a service call.
- The city should issue city wide parking permit to companies or individuals offering in home services. It's an absolute nightmare both for the homeowners and the service personals to have to waste time so we can register a company vehicle license plate.
- The passes are simple and work.
- As above. Make it easier for businesses to offer their services.
- This is logical and practical.
- The current system works well for us. Customized permits for service companies is not a bad idea.
- Re Option A: this is fair and reasonable
- I think a combination of B and E. Strictly Paid parking options ultimately get passed down to the customer, and they may be vulnerable. Allow special passes for care givers, etc, anyone regular and recurring, and allow paid parking for anything else. Can't limit their care based on parking avail.
- Businesses including Services like Home Care should have a city wide pass to allow them to park anywhere in the city - it's a hassle for us to register businesses as visitors
- I would like to see customized permits available at no cost for service companies . This would include homeware, meals on wheels, taxis and other transportation that is needed. I pick option E.
- This is very specific, and there should be a simple system that allows exceptions for special situations like this.

- "Option A or E would allow home care workers to access a residence.
- To ensure people with mobility issues have good access to their residences the permit system needs to be enforced! eg. 2 hour zones are not patrolled near Foothills... my elderly parents can't park by their home almost daily!"
- Visitors permits can cover home care needs for most. Perhaps availability of additional term permit comes with an electrical permit or a building permit to allow contractors easier access(. Licensed lawn cutters and snow removal crews (repeat use at random times) could be issued a general pass?
- Health care workers etc should be able to park to serve a resident. I know where I live its 2 hr parking or paid which means the 2 hr zones should be made permit only
- Useful
- I like the way the current system works.
- There should be accommodation for commercial business.
- Reasonable number of parking options. If a regular maintenance worker requires access a paid hourly option is perhaps in order
- Residents can use their visitors permits for workers to their home.
- E. That's an awesome idea. A separate system for caregivers and contractors etc.
- These companies should pay higher taxes to have access to all zones across the city for their vehicles to park anywhere that allows parking.



- Option E - This would work well with limited times.
- Fair. I think we already have a system, outside of this parking system, in which if you have severe mobility issues you can designate a spot for handicapped people. I do believe I have seen blue signs. Therefore the regular 2 visitor spots, 2 residential spots should do.
- Residents don't have a right to park on the street near their home. In high demand areas, it should be available to whomever is willing to pay for it. Parking is a cost for getting home care services.
- Bike lanes have made it impossible to access my front door without walking a distance or jaywalking. I encourage people with mobility issues to stop for unloading in empty bike lanes. There was no thinking in this design. At times I now feel like a shut-in as nobody wants to visit because of parking
- Putting the placard on and off the vehicle mirror is not easy in bad weather. People might forget. Combine the 2 visitor permits with E. for service companies. Note that not all home help is with a service company.
- We have more elderly and disabled people at home they need these services.
- If the goal is to not be a deterrent to visitors to homes then the residential parking permit program as it exists works if the visitors are not tied by license plate. Logging in to register the visitors license plate is not as easy as it could be. It is not tied to your parking app.
- Same as above.
- There are so many business vehicles in Calgary that would qualify for unlimited parking in option E. It would be very complicated to sort out who is authentic. I believe this privilege would be abused in "major generator" areas because many business vehicles are also driven for personal use.
- Same as previous answer
- Option E. For businesses visiting a home, especially regarding health, home care and those with mobility support requirements and/or limitations, permits should be free of charge and customized so they're identifiable and not limited to a certain timeframe.
- Developing a customized permit system sounds good but could easily lead to abuse of that system.
- They can use visitor permit
- A specialized approval for parking in areas or general parking (handicap pass), with hours restrictions (no over nights or more than 4 hours, etc.) would be a great idea.
- I find that rarely do I see most of the parking by Permit zones only are occupied. I would encourage the city to do a survey of each community to discover the usage of RPP per household to see if there's room to cut down "No Parking except by Permit' zone
- Option B. But no paid options. People should not have to pay large sums of money to go to work and make a living.
- This is an issue- not always home when a service business visits - it is unwieldy for both home owner and business
- If the short term stalls are filled up, then raise the price.
- Delivery trucks and Canada post have to park in street disrupting traffic as All the parking spaces are filled



- each area should have open zones for permit free parking when needed eg cross streets, having specialized permits city provides to these businesses which they would cover cost of and have no hassle parking city wide not zone dependent.
- A seems reasonable
- 2 visitors is sufficient.
- This option provides most flexibility to different situations. In my case, we need permit parking to have home care workers gain access to my home - currently there is never parking available due to a business across the street taking up all the parking. Permits are critical to ensure access.
- Change the definition (so you don't have to change all the signs) so that all residential parking zones become 2 hour parking from 9:00 am to 5:00 am automatically (or all day with a pass). Unfortunately even this change will drastically increase traffic in residential zones.
- Hiding the costs of parking are detrimental to Calgary. I believe that the cost of parking should be born by the user. Ideally, this means that parking is always available for those who are prepared to pay for the cost of it. More importantly, the cost discourages automobile use and ownership.
- "create something as flexible as the old tag system. Tag in mail box worked very well.
- Now system is broken with the convenience of the photo car running around just mining money like this Saturday a drive at 9:30 in the morning hunting for cash, unbelievable"
- Shouldn't just be for homecare but also regular business visitors such as lawn care, snow clearing, housekeeping. As a senior, I need more of those types of services and find the visitor permit system clunky to use. Also need a way to store repeat license plates in the system and renew permits.
- How many permits does one residence need if they already have two visitor permits? I'm failing to understand how this is impacting home care workers...
- "B" is optimal. "3 hours free or parking permit" for suburban residential areas near a major generator. I have friends in these zones and they can't even hold a small get-together with the current method. I would consider "E" but worry parking becomes a 2-tier system and it is abused.
- Remove restrictions to allow people to freely visit their city without being asked for money to park.
- E. service companies should be allowed to park during business hours at no cost or needing to have a permit
- Most business only need a couple of hours to work and how often they visit isn't frequent. Charging for parking past a time period or forcing companies that need longer to do work to get a permit will reduce the amount of service vehicles parked for long amounts of time.
- Yes! Extend to include babysitters and cleaning personnel, who like home care workers, may be visiting daily for several hours. Also, in my case, I'd like to be able to assign one of my 2 'allowed' annual spots to my babysitter, as I have one car only - but I can't as she doesn't live with me.
- in hosp, don;t paid .
- Allow homecare to register license plates to an address they visit regularly. Exclude utility service trucks from system.
- B and C let visitors easily solve their own issues without needing to burden the city or homeowners. Doesn't E already exist?



- E seems the most fair option as the car in question is able to park worry free and with proper permits, it does not annoy residents who have permits.
- A - priority to residences , up to 10 passes at no cost
- This should include services/trades who require nearby parking to service a residence
- No change adding more options will just cost the city money they don't have.
- Allow for the works to apply for a special permit for the ease of visiting their clients. This means for time with their client and one less stress during their day.
- B - parking for short term Parkers should be available.
- E. Residents should have extra plastic permits to use for temporary visitors, whether service companies or families. Go back to the old system!!
- I can't believe you guys get paid to come up with these joke solutions. (I meant over paid) This survey is truly a complete joke.
- if the plumbers are there for 1 day they need to park behind the garage. stupid.,
- Sounds like a reasonable idea.
- E. or exemption permits for companies and homecare workers in all zones.
- The issue here is that the permits need to be TRIVIAL to assign to a visiting business. No online sign-up, no phone registration, etc. The old system of "hang this tag in your car" is trivially easy. Make it at least that easy and you have done your job.
- Just makes sense.
- Two hour parking between 9:00 am and 5:00 pm without changing signs, allows for better use.
- No need
- E. If the vehicle bears commercial plates then access should not require a permit but if not then the resident should provide the vehicle with one of their visitor tags
- "Option B - businesses can build the cost of parking into the costs they charge customers.
- Option E - a customized permit system could work but there should be a mechanism for cost recovery and this could be a competitive advantage that a business pays for."
- "A. This option is fair to tax paying homeowners.
- E. This option will control violators of unassigned street parking."
- Consideration needs to be given to situations where there is an immediate need for a familymember/care giver/contractor to visit a home. There isn't always going to be a nice, let me apply for a visitor permit 1 month or 2 weeks in advance notice.
- Residences with mobility visitors should get an exemption (Driving Miss Daisy, handi bus, meals on wheels etc). Maybe have those companies register a blanket pass for the city?
- It works well... although I did find the paper system easier for when people had to come by. Not everyone wants to give out their license plate number
- Why penalize a business vehicle for doing their job in visiting a residence?
- D Since when do business visit a home unless it's a courier company dropping off a person the guy working for that courier company pays taxes



- Yes please grant me permit to park in front of my home. I pay the taxes. Renters who live close by take my space!!!!
- and perhaps these are applied for on an as needed basis (like regular visitors such as home care workers) and needs to be applied for on an annual basis (but not necessarily for a fee where there is a need - maybe a doctor's note).
- My mother occasionally has RN, OT and PT visits.
- Option E. Businesses visiting should not count on the visitors permits
- Businesses should not be stopped for providing their services and should be exempt from parking restrictions. One way is commercially licensed vehicles to be exempt and maybe if vehicle doesn't have a commercially license, onus on person to phone city & register.
- Need to either change the eligibility for getting a RPP from having registered address or the 2 week long permit. My partner and I both own houses in different zones and have to add each other every second week. I have had to pay a coder to write a routine for doing this, which i have sold to others
- Same as #3,4
- E - this should also include nannies who are self employed. We've permanently used one of our permits for our live out nanny rather than dealing with the hassle of renewing her parking every two weeks.
- E - All home care to residents should have a free, no restrictions permit
- Home based businesses should have to pay more for extra parking around their location
- (E) should be easy for a licensed health care worker to get a general permit for parking. Mobility issues are already addressed with handicap parking permits are they not?
- If you are maintaining the permit system make them have a special permit so that they can be easily recognised and easily registered in any of the areas across the city!
- E. This allows necessary access by businesses regardless of other methods for visitors.
- Should be free since it's necessary
- E. Separate permit.
- Acceptable.
- This was a very easy system to use. No phone calls required.
- Perhaps have permits available for city-wide parking by certain industries, e.g. home-care providers.
- E. Service companies should be an exception as they are helping people stay independent longer.
- streets are a public service and any parking permits are in violation of this principal. Option D prevents this public service being used for private gain
- Much easier when we have contractors in and out of our residence over several months
- Residents and their visitors should have easy access to their homes. The city should not create barriers through their development policies that fall short of ensuring residential and commercial properties have adequate off street parking.
- Short-term parking during the daytime until 3:30 or 4 pm makes sense. The street parking is in demand by residents after work and overnight. I'd suggest keeping a 'visitor permit' as an option though, for after-hours support.



- "At my previous job, I did IT support. It was not uncommon for permit only parking to inflate the bill due to travel time being increased as parking was hard to find.
- I would primarily support option D, remove all restrictions. Option E would only work if those permits were easily available to all."
- Clients come and go and most don't stay long- it only takes a minute to input a license on line- if a business is in residential areas and has lots of clients - the CofC should have denied as it would be a parking nuisance to existing neighbors
- E. customized permits for service companies makes good sense.
- There should be special parking permits for handicapped and home care ONLY. This is where Access and home care vehicles can park.
- I have no opinion.
- A - Homecare workers Etc. can use the visitor permits - there is unlikely to be several cars worth at a given residence at a given time, and if such special circumstances do occur, additional passes can be obtained/provided.
- We don't need another set of permits.
- E-I work as a home care nurse and sometimes cannot find parking near my clients home that is not permitted. Additionally many older clients cannot sign me in on the online system because they don't have a computer or don't know how. I am at risk for getting ticketed when this happens.
- Home care workers would be able to use the visitor permits.
- No restrictions
- Street parking is a hazard and should not be permitted. If you do not have somewhere on your property to park your car, buy a transit pass or buy a bike.
- '[removed] Plumbing' van in front of my house doing work should be exempt. Abuse will arise - if drive-by plate scan shows it to be a perpetual presence. ticket it.
- It should be free and unlimited for anyone connected to a household in the area. No one should have to pay to park near their home and their visitors should not have to pay neither
- Option B & E - Homecare workers, Meals on Wheels delivery persons etc MUST have the ability to park free of charge within permit zones for the short durations typical of their visits. Not allowing this amounts to a tax on the elderly and those with mobility issues. Create special permits for them.
- Option A. We have found that CPA is not unreasonable to exceptions if you explain the reasons.
- A: sounds like a good system.
- I don't have a comment for this other than it seems reasonable to have a permit system for service companies visiting a home.
- E) Specifically home care and temporary services such as repairs and renovations. People who need home care need their help to have access to their clients.
- C and D. If people can park anywhere, it would limit congestion in residential areas as the pressure would be removed from select spots. Residents can park in their garage and able bodied individuals can walk a block if needed.



- Someone having 5 service people at their home at the same time doesn't mean that neighbouring residents should be inconvenienced. If more than 2 visitor permits are needed, they could always ask a neighbour or park on a near by street with less restrictions or move their vehicle regularly
- Option E: this is a great idea - worth looking into
- Businesses need to function
- This system provides occasional visitors to have a place to park near the intended residents.
- This is extremely important for those with mobility issues. But also, for those who may have mobility issues. Visits from business for a particular issue or from friends and family to help with a sick individual, whether physical or mental, regardless of age, are equally important.
- See above.
- B - gives homecare workers more short term options
- I understand this problem and believe there are other ways to solve it rather than opening up the floodgates on certain streets.
- Why develop more systems when time and money can be spent on more pressing issues such as road safety and better designed interchanges.
- B - as above
- I've had contractors park in front of my home to service a different residence, yes they move at 5:30 but that does not help me when I get home at 5. I've had to park down the street from my home.
- Option C and D. The City of Calgary has made so many restrictions that it is ridiculous and they need to pay attention to their spending and see where they can save money. One place would be discontinuing with bike lanes on our streets.
- Why can they not apply for a special permit that allows these homecare workers to park without worrying about parking tickets? Like a handicap permit as they are not in any one place that long
- This affects my mother-in-law who has daily home care at her independent living suite. No parking is available for home care, and street parking is prohibited on weekdays (why, I have no idea - it is a public space and never used - what a shameful practice).
- E. Service companies and care providers (of all types) need to visit homes. They are not "visitors" and, thus, need a customized permit system.
- Home owners need to have parking available for guests and contractors. I had to set up lawn chairs with tape wrapped around them to save a space for the arborist this morning at 7am. Sat out front until they arrived at 9:30.
- Managing permit use for service companies is a major pain under the current system. Why not make all zones numbered like park plus zones and give them special permits to use those numbered zones on a timed basis (e.g. my personal park plus account couldn't activate a session, but they could).
- E - can be part of business cost and licencing
- E) A customized system will enhance accessibility and those with an urgent need for parking near a residence.



- e) If someone requires in home supports the homeowner should be able to apply for and get a pass/passes for their supports workers free of charge. Their 2 Residential Parking Permit should be specifically for friends visiting the home.
- Healthcare workers should be able to access homes where needed with no penalty for parking
- A: if more passes are required approval should be done on a case by case basis
- Public streets are the property of all taxpayers and should be open to all equally. If residents are concerned about parking at their address, they should build on site parking like everyone else has to.
- the current on-line system could be altered to allow for these special types of permits
- Unable to provide parking for these businesses like landscapers, cleaners, other workers under the current system.
- OR, if an obvious service truck is outside a home (like SHAW or a plumber), perhaps the parking people might think for ten seconds about the fact that the driver is probably there for a service call? It's called judgement - use it!
- Works best for people with mobility issues, seniors, people with home care.
- Need an easier system for homecare. Paper passes worked fairly well but the online system is unusable for persons who are not technical. The people needing care often can't navigate the online solution.
- how do you control mis-use if there is a "service" category? consider a limited "2-3 hr parking session -service entry". i am guessing some find it hard now, to remember to enter various plates/day when you are not around. remember though-some people will be disorganized regardless of the system.
- Paper permit held by the occupant. Or better online system for reoccurring visitors.
- Businesses suffer enough already with Calgary's high taxes — the least you could do is not penalize them for having customers.
- Parking should not be free (subsidized).
- The current system allows for people to have guests visiting their home I do not see this as a real issue. I think it's an excuse to try to get rid of the residential parking permits.
- I don't think so, they can simply be granted permits by existing residents. This is not a problem.
- Best of both worlds.
- My restricted street is already full. There is no extra room for businesses to have more customers, even if they wanted to. I live in Tuscany, this neighborhood is not built in a way that can appropriately facilitate home businesses that would have multiple customers at once.
- The current system for contractors visiting a home is absurd. It is not reasonable to expect hard working Calgarians to meet the terms of this ridiculous system. The City absolutely needs to change this system to better understand the needs of all residential contractors in the city.
- Option A. The current system is reasonable and adequate because it provides two spaces per permit for any number of businesses visiting a home.
- a small problem can be resolved with a small specific solution



- It would be easier for companies / business to have special access to a permit for those areas. Not sure how you would stop them from using it when not working. Heavy fines? Loss of sticker if found using improperly?
- C&E Service companies should also include trades (e.g. plumbers)
- Best option is PAPER visitor passes (two per household) as these can be put into operation without "online" problems. Potentially a customized permit system for these type of services would be an alternative. NOT ONLINE is particularly important for supports such as home care.
- It makes the community safer and prevents abuse of visitor permit
- Seems logical
- c is a Low cost and flexible option.
- The current system should work if people are aware of it.
- See above for answer. It applies across the board.
- E). Better flexibility in addressing needs of these service companies AND their clients.
- This will allow service companies to do their job and remain compliant to parking regulations
 - directly effects me. I am a piano teacher and have to drive to some students. 1/2 hr weekly- if the parents forget to re-enter my plate # I get a ticket (which they would have to fight) paper passes easily identified my car as eligible to be there. It's stressful.
- Visitor permits are important for home owners to have, especially in large residential restriction areas, because everyone has a right have visitors.
- These restrictions hamper the ability to have visitors to the home.
- There should be specific spaces for handicapped people, or service workers. Just designated for them. Or if you have a handicapped sign, or a sign that you're a service worker, you should be able to park in permit zones.
- "E Zone activation for companies and business might be an option. Would need to be explored if that's being done in other cities and if it works.

- Otherwise, nochange - just use visitor permits."
- C&D
- 2 permits should be sufficient.
- This is why streets full of parked cars is not viable... can't access my house when i need to
- reduce no parking zones , no cost for permits
- B, C & D: Much like visitors, the parking restrictions make neighbourhoods inaccessible and unwelcoming all to accommodate people's false sense that they own the street in front of their houses. Parking in busy areas can be set up to be paid (like downtown) to address concerns without permits.
- Allow 1-2 hour parking in RPP zones to accommodate service vehicles, home care, etc. A lot of RPP zones are empty during the day when residents go to work, but a 1- or 2-hour limit would still discourage students and LRT users.
- This should not be a concern for people requiring care in there homes. There should be a separate system. The elderly are in general not going to navigate an online system well.



- If permit zones didn't exist, this wouldn't be an issue. Get rid of permit zones and you get rid of the issue.
- E
- Home care services are urgent services that already increase household costs. We should not put vulnerable people at higher financial risk.
- The level of residential parking restrictions have gotten out of hand. When the very limited public parking is filled, people with mobility issues are forced to walk for long distances. This should be a priority over more than 2 car households.
- E is the best compromise
- I think these types of situations require special attention and permissions
- Even though I live on a permitted street, parking is very limited. If each residence has access to a total of 4 passes there is not enough space for every vehicle. Increasing the allotted number of permits will make this worse.
- We live in the community of Sunnyside for the past 12 years and the system is perfect. It is imperative in this community to restrict parking as the proximity to downtown is close enough for people to park and walk. If unrestricted parking was allowed there would be no parking for residents left.
- e. makes the most sense. otherwise people in Calgary take advantage.
- It is onerous to make seniors manage parking for their care-givers, and another layer of admin and permits is not needed. These visits are short and serve great value, and should be accommodated within the existing process.
- E: seems the best option honestly. Home care companies and such need the space and the ability to park
- A - Home owners need to be diligent to ensure they have submitted the visitors via the app or on line. City parking authority can also be a little pragmatic to use judgement. It is very evident to recognize commercial vehicles in front of a property, upon proof city can cancel ticket.
 - Again, this theme seems like a non-issue. There are already handicap parking spots in residential areas directly in front of peoples houses. This is no different than a parking lot.
- This is a rare event- and should not be treated separately from topic 3 & 4.
- Only allow 2 permits per home, no more. On street parking is limited, so when more than 2 cars per house are parked on the street, it is not possible for a homeowner to park one car when they come home which is not reasonable and unfair.
- OPTION A - the current system works fine HOWEVER, I would prefer physical paper visitor tags instead of registering the vehicle online. It is more convenient with a paper tag and would assist elderly individuals with no internet.
- Everyone should pay for street parking.
- Paid parking with restrictions on duration would work well for businesses and individuals alike.
- Provide residents with a simplified appeal process in the event that a visitor / home care worker was issued a ticket because the online permit was not updated properly. Especially key for seniors and less tech savvy residents.



- If a business had to use a guest permit then this only compounds the problem of so few guest permits.
 - Our streets are public and parking should not be restricted on public streets for the benefit of a few residents.
- I would appreciate time limits. My rpp zone is permit required at all times and I find it challenging for workers visiting my home for short periods.
- Unique situations often require a specialized solution.
- Is option A true? I thought all visitor permits were tied to license plates. It is the electronic visitor permit system that I have issue with. Difficult to tell who has a permit and who doesn't and to report concerns when the street is full.
- Can be onerous for some - elderly, those with disabilities - to notify the parking authority each time a business comes to a home e.g. home care etc.
- service vehicles should have a special permit, many services are done when the home owner is away i.e. landscaping, plumbers etc
- E) Some types of businesses need to be able to park "at will" anywhere in the city, and need something simple and cost-effective. Again SIMPLE. Complex apps and setting start/stop times are not going to fly.
- Seriously, why does E not exist already? Enable these businesses without overhead for residents and workers. Keep impact on community to a minimum. Same for disabled if they need to take a car.
- "B - provides temporary parking for infrequent visitors
- C - too many zones at the moment even in neighbourhoods far from any businesses or access point to events"
- This is not a problem as the homeowner has 2 visitor permits.
- Same as 3 Above
- Implement no parking between 2am - 6am on all residential streets. People will stop using the roads as full-time parking and storage for their vehicles and fit in their on-site parking. This will free up lots of space for visitors.
- A: The current method seems to be the best solution!
- There should be exceptions made in situations where someone has ongoing visitors to their home of health reasons, or for times when services are required (D).
- A? Same comment as under 3.
- The current visitor system (A) should work for businesses, homecare workers, and so forth visiting residences. A customized system (D) for service companies (furnace cleaning, painting, plumbing) could be considered, but is not a high priority.
- Open city opposed to a closed city concept
- This would be a logical choice. If a family has a nanny that comes every day a customized permit should be available
- legit business purposes should be exempt from RPP



- Service companies should be allowed to purchase UNIVERSAL permits, allowing parking in ANY zone while on company business. Permits should be tied to business hours at the time of purchase, and would NOT be valid outside of those hours.
- Create special signage for residents with disabilities, follow same example of handicapped parking zones outside residences.
- More businesses can be run from a home office.
- E - makes sense to have service companies exempt
- Same as above
- Explaining A. I never have parking for Contractors (always carrying heavy tool boxes) at my home so I have them park behind my garage, in the lane and offer to pay if they receive a ticket.
- Same reasons as 3. This applies to a small % of the population and should not effect the permitting system.
- So long as it was easy, it would allow for easy movement between zones, so "Business attached" rather than "zone attached".
- Going with Option E would allow workers to a home have easier access to parking without the home owner/resident having to juggle who is coming when and who has a valid pass and who needs one. As long as the system is not abused by workers/ care givers etc it should work.
- There should be MORE handicap parking spaces around the city.
- Those who need extra help due to health issues should be able to get them when needed
- gives some flexibility to allow for these services
- Need to allow for parking for these services
- This should also include some option for not ticketing trades people when an infill house is built. We went through this last year, trades with visible company names were not given tickets but the other vehicles were. Should be able to freeze certain zones from tickets for limited time period.
- Legitimate service providers should be able to obtain permits based on their business function, number of providers with vehicles, etc...
- Customized system would be super easy to bypass. See responses to previous items. Quit inventing new rules and enforce the ones that already exist
- A is currently working but E is a preferable solution
- Option B: as in the other topics, I believe their should almost always be 1 hour available to visitors and workers to complete their visit. If a visit is going to be longer I think it's reasonable to have the resident input the licence plate. A customized permit may be too complex.
- No opinion
- I do have mobility issues and find it difficult in some places to get access
- Let these people be registered with the city.
 - Anyone visiting a home can use the visitor parking permits allowed.
- I believe that all residences should provide parking onsite. No-one in the city should expect to be able to park their private property (vehicle) on public property.
- No vehicles, commercial or personal, should be allowed to park for free on public property.



- We are by permit only and want it to stay that way. We don't have sidewalks so having the streets clear of vehicles (for the most part ..) is more desirable. Also we are near the hospital and transit.
- A This system works fine in my area, with the slight issue of higher-density housing resulting on more vehicles (i.e. 2 vehicles fit fine in front of a 50-foot lot, but they do not fit in front of a 25-foot lot (infills). Maybe 1 registered vehicle per address is allowed in front, the rest in back.
- It would be an improvement if parking restrictions did not apply to service companies (e.g. plumbers, electricians, furnace maintenance, Telus/Shaw, etc.) visiting a homeowner.
- To visitor passes for home is adequate as long as residential restrictions stay in play. Removing restrictions makes it impossible for both visitors and residents to park on my street during the day. With no landlord provided parking this is it essential.
- Potentially E but truly hthe best solution is as described above.
- This would solve the problem of health care workers etcetera
- Options specific to a mobile business would be useful and specific.
- there are typically loading zones available for up to 20mins parking depending on what kind of visit it is, if longer is needed they should still be able to park.
- These are more the exceptions than the norm.
- My parents have mobility issues and when they visit permits are essential
- I don't believe the current system is fair.
- need more flexibility for support workers/ services
- A - this is wrong - currently system does not work like this. Cmon guys - learn about how your current online system works.
- Believe it or not, the old system worked very well for such situations. There are time a paper pass or a printable temporary pass would be preferable to the current system.
- B.
- Same comment as on Q3 - please back date to the beginning of the calendar day. Sometimes i don't get them registered until just before they leave. Or E could work too - that seems like a good idea of people/businesses could register themselves when they have a service call.
- My concern is people who bring their school bus or 3-ton vehicle home rather than "picking" it up in the morning to do their work. School buses tend to run for well over an hour in the mornings when they are parked in residential areas, and welding trucks should not be accessible to children.
- There should be a system where care qorkers can enter the address they are at so they will not be ticketed. My neighbor does not own a computer and the change to an online system has driven her crazy. Seniors should be able to get and use the tags that we used to have to eliminate any confusion
- No change. Online visitor parking works very well.
- If someone works at a residence, you should be able to register the plate through the home owner.
- While E does have potential, it will be abused. It is just a matter of time before students at the university try to claim they need a customized permit system. Then everybody will be wanting a customized permit system.
- Appears to be the most sensible and reasonable option.



- Companies that travel to homes through out the city should be able to register for a separate pass.
- Two visitor passes should be sufficient even if you are running a business from our home.
- Customization is critical: some service companies may need no more than one hour, others (e.g. home renovators) may - perfectly justifiably - need several days
- Makes the most sense
- "A Has never been a problem under the old system.
- E Common sense should prevail. If a truck with a Plumbing companies logo is parked in front of my house for a few hours - do think it might be for a plumbing related reason? These are not the illegal parkers."
- This applies to home renovators, deliveries, etc., as well as homecare workers.
- they are not really visitors.
- A The current two permits per residence in restricted areas is a fair balance. It would be extremely rare that a senior or shut in would need more than two caregivers simultaneously. Perhaps the city can implement a compassionate permit program, allowing more passes upon proof such persons need them
- same as above. having the two visitor permits has always worked well for us in thepast. then you always have parking for service cos. and contractors and other visitors.
- E.) I'm not a person that goes to peoples homes, but that would really suck to have to deal with restrictions or just risk getting a pile of tickets because public parking is blocks away. They should be allowed to park in front of someones home without the worry of tickets.
- Allow for special permitting options for exception visitors or businesses make sense
- There should be no fee for nonprofits to ensure people are safe in their home
- make this free since many of the agencies visiting disabled folks are non for profit. people with disabilities need help to stay in the community.
- e. This will best protect residences in high impact areas.
- Workers need to be able to access the home to provide a service.
- Current on-line system for visitors is easy to use for care workers and easy to get disability signs. Contractor system (5 vehicles for 5 days for \$25) also easy to use. People are cheap and lazy so don't use these despite simplicity.
- No problems experienced
- C&D: Street parking Residents are too entitled over public space, harassing legitimate users, taking spaces needed, causing narrow streets to be blocked by deliveries, and service providers. Residents park too close to crosswalks because it's close to their house or because of too many cars already.
- There is adequate options available for contractors visiting our home. If parking is required I can assign a visitor spot. We did this through an entire house Reno lasting 6 months with few issues.
- Let's support senior in home support and contractors. C and D will result in people taking advantage of the system. E sounds good and I'd like to see more info on that. For A: let's assume that 2 vehicles are reasonable. 4 are not and renters / people who "rent" the street need education.
- RPP should be targeted primarily to stop long term, "all day" parking.



- Free up parking spaces by ensuring that all users are paying for the use of the parking.
- E, in conjunction with option A.
- E. This would not interfere with the very limited number of permits for visitors that we have.
- How would a customized permit system work? Would cost be a deterrent?
- Fairness
- E. Maintenance workers need their own ID system, often the resident isn't home to enter the plate number in the system. We also need more visitor options for recurring visits such as weekly home care workers and one off visits that are less than 24 hours.
- E - businesses should be able to get an "all area" permit that allows them to register their location for a reasonable period of time. Maybe 4 hour chunks?
- I would say remove all zones but there may be a genuine case for them in a FEW locations. We had to coordinate with our neighbours a few weeks ago just to allow for them to have their furnace cleaned when they had visitors from out of town. The zone on my street is absolutely NOT NEEDED.
- don't do separate permit for business visitors that more government and more taxes
- In our area, the old visitor permit system (mirror hangers) is gone, and licence numbers have to be entered online. this is not convenient for drop in visitors.
- A.
- A is straightforward, but if its not working, then E could be an option. These people shouldn't be ticketed if you are hiring them to come to your house to provide a service. Not sure why the visitor permits don't work for this purpose?
- A: The current system works. My mother lived in our home and logging into the current system enabled her care workers to be able to park near by and not receive a ticket.
- C and E.... streets are for all Calgarians.
- If we go back to paper visitor permits, this could be easier. Many elderly people can't figure out how to use the online system.
- Response to A. This seems to work the best.
- Chose E because the business can be issued a parking permit that is valid in all zones for specific hours.
- Home care workers usually require no more than one vehicle at a time - maybe two at most. Current policy is sufficient.
- See above
- E. The permitting should be different for services for the elderly, disabled, having mobility issues.
- Additional hourly parking would be good for landscapers, plumbers etc.
- E. Lots of issues with trades people getting tickets in our restricted parking zone, so perhaps this system needs to be looked at again.
- A VISIBLE permit would identify the vehicle is in the area on legitimate business.
- Fed with homecare having to park blocks away then walk to me. Had 24 hour handicapped parking for 2 vehicles in front of my building. 2 yrs ago city removed them. Still dont know why.



- E. is the best long term solution, but, it is also the most expensive. My answer to 3 might help.
- I think this is the best plan.
- home care workers, construction, repair, cleaning - all should be allowed a separate permit system so they can service houses
- This does not just apply to home care workers, but also e.g. to parents picking up children from a dayhome or daycare in a residential area. It would be nice if short-term parking in most residential areas could be allowed.
- these are essential services and should have handy parking no different than handicapped spots
- "B. Hourly parking would allow businesses to find parking easier.
- E. Custom permits and spots for businesses could make the buisnesses efficient."
- Absolutley, now you're talking.
- Option E: There should be a system in place that sees service companies visiting a home, but they should be restricted to park in front of that home only. Contractors pose a huge problem with multiple workers vehicles taking up multiple spaces.
- My mother takes care of my young children on a regular basis. Remembering to input her license plate, is not a big deal.
- E. would be beneficial to those who need it if it was in addition to A.
- See above
- Traffic on street brutal, dirty diapers, garbage, unable to park at own home - these areas need RRP. My taxes have gone UP yearly and my services have gone down yearly. If it is a residential neighbourhood, and you are a home aide, repair person etc, have special permits for them to park for work
- As communities get older and residence age, and lack of nursing facilities, more home care will be required. This needs to be taken into consideration.
- We need some, but not all, of the current zones.
- B since a 2-hour time-limit is often a reasonable amount of time for a service to be completed. If they intend to work longer they can use a visitor parking permit.
- Britannia, Elboya and Windsor Park areas have too many "No Parking except by Permit" zones and do not allow for visitors to the area or parking for staff of the businesses in the area.
- They should have a specialized permit as they are not planning to stay there for an undetermined amount of time but in order to do a service
- This should be a no brainer
- E - Allow business that visit people's homes the ability to have an exemption permit that is able to park within any RPP.
- A - I think the current visitor permit system works for the areas that have permit zones.
- E. This is a fantastic suggestion! However, plan to include access to smaller homecare, veterinary and personal care (mobile hairdressers, mobile massage therapists, etc) businesses too.
- I understand that residents need parking near their homes, but people who work in the area spend over 7 hours each day there. There should be more non resident parking 8am to 6pm



- I use to do in home visitation. Sometimes I would have to park three blocks away in the winter with a small baby and child. I travelled all over the city, so buying a specific permit did not make sense
- E Preserves the balance between resident access to their homes and visitors, while not penalizing service businesses. Consider time limits on service access permits.
- Existing program covers this need otherwise it seems questionable why so many businesses would be visiting at the same time.
- "Status quo works really well. If it ain't broke don't fix it.
- (I don't understand what ""which are not tied to license plates"" means)."
- Opt B: Add "two hour free parking" to those zones, with a paid option for an additional 2 hours or so. In addition, home owners can still make use of the visitor permits.
- parking without permit available across the street
- This option is adequate for this issue.
- This is best solution. Utilize app to prevent abuse and track effectiveness.
- aging in place is important and requires some healthcare and other supports, requiring longer stays on occasion.
- service companies should have access to all zones
- E. coordination of the current system is cumbersome and additional work for people. Should be agile and easy to use - i.e. multiple licenses on permit for longer times
- Having a 1 or 2 hour parking limit for guests (service/trades people, home care, meal service) to 'pop' in without short term worry would benefit residential needs. Longer term visitors (house watchers, out of town family, etc) need more than two days of registration to the address.
- C - there shouldn't ever be "no parking except by permit" the street is a public space, not someone's private property. Anyone should be able to park on any public street. B - hourly restrictions should replace all no parking except by permit zones. E - commercial companies should manage own permit
- E. This would remove the burden of constantly monitoring permits for regular caregivers for example.
- A: I think residents should have the right to obtain visitor parking permits. If not, how else would they be able to host overnight guests or allow for businesses to provide services at their homes.
- It is important that trades or care providers have flexible access to a residence. This is another reason that the paper tags in the vehicle work well compared to the online system.
- A E the problem with service companies is getting your permit back if you are not present during their call
- There's no reason a business can't use visitor permits. If they have their own class of permit, those permits will be grossly abused. Example...Going to a Stampa game? Great let's use my parking pass in Capitol Hill..no one would know it's not for a home care client eh?
 - Again adding two more visitor parking passes would address the homecare workers issue
- E. Would deal effectively with service companies or home care situations.
- THAT IS REASONABLE.



- E. Business' that make calls to residences or business that may only have street parking should be able to apply for a permit that will allow specific vehicles such as service trucks to park in any "by permit only" areas throughout the city.
- In outlying areas the parking limits should be different. A residential free parking with a 1 hour limit should cover most business transactions. Any movement could require a visitor pass. Inner city could benefit as well
- A - Keep the option to have two visitor permits as this is sufficient for homecare workers, etc. - except allow these permits to be paper OR online. Sometimes or for some people it is not possible to go online, so a paper permit should remain an option.
- E our current 2 slots for visitors for our multi family unite is unworkable so people providing serve just have to take their chances, very poorly thought out
- Since the change to electronic permit - no window tag - there has been a dramatic increase in parking on our street. There is no longer a visible "I belong here" allowing residents to call for enforcement.
- The online system for registering visitors works. There should be no need for any one residence to require more than two permits. And this should apply to contractors. They should require a visitor pass.
- BCE - it may depend on where visiting takes place.
- I am not sure how homecare workers and people with mobility issues are impacted. Visitor permits should be able to address this. In special circumstances if more than two visitor permits are required on a regular basis then perhaps this could be accommodated in current system.
- my grandmother is 70 years old when having to run inside and help her outside i end up getting tickets!!!!!! WE NEED PAPER PASSES BACK OR A 1 HR PARKING LIMIT!!! UNPAID ZONES!! in residential!! we dont need to pay to see family!!
- E. If they're only there a few hours a day get them a universal pass for RPP zones.
- I believe residents should have first dibs in the residential areas for home care - lawn care- reno people - especially family and friends.
- Done this in the past. Also, many contractors feel that parking fines are part of their business expenses
- Commercial permits that allow parking for homecare workers, government services etc to park on a short term basis makes sense to me. It should be limited to services that really require it, and length of time should vary with the service.
- Service companies improve the quality of life of the home owners which is the purpose of the parking restrictions in the first place.
- See above. As no space for - residents with restricted park should have the most say. (obviously others without problems RPP designed to mitigate happy to deprive them of this). Survey clearly slanted. Speak with people with specific RPPs before taking that away.
- Should have a disabled parking permit and then arrange for a no parking zon!
- B see answer above



- C - if space is freed up by ensuring residents use all available on-site parking, the space should be given back to be used by other paying visitors to the area...benefiting businesses and those doing business in the area.
- Option A home care workers can have visited permits should not impact them. People with mobility issues like myself are impacted in an RPP zone by having to park across the street or down from my home because of illegal Parkers that are not ticketed
- E- I recently got a parking ticket while stopped in front of my client's house to drop a package off in her mailbox that took less than a minute. This is a house I've been going to for the last 14 years and have never had an issue. All surrounding streets are permit parking so where do I park??
- Certain businesses should be able to park at a residence, like movers and repair people, but only short term time periods. Construction workers should not be included. We have a big project at the end of our street and it has been a problem. I agree with option E.
- Same as last two responses
- This is an essential service and should be able to be excluded for those who require public assistance.
- Chose E: Businesses should be purchasing a blanket permit that covers all areas of the city. The permit should allow them to park anywhere while working.
- Businesses visiting a residence can use one of the available visitor passes
- Many of the older areas are under parking restrictions. Older homes need more service calls from providers.
- Legitimate business/homecare etc pkg should be exempt.
- E. Homecare vehicles could have a system managed centrally where those vehicles are exempt from RPP (license plates renewed annually). Seniors who can't care for themselves should not be expected to log on every 2 wks to renew visitor permits.
- Residents and their visitors should receive priority for on-street parking. Short-term visitor parking should be available for larger groups (for events like birthday parties), and longer-term visitor parking should be available for regular visitors (eg. homecare workers).
- Options B and C are most convenient for all drivers in the City of Calgary. Must balance needs of residents with needs of the general public, and please note, not all citizens have app access (particularly elderly and challenged individuals). Just increase parking patrol of timed parking areas.
- Home-care businesses can allocate parking budgets for daily/hourly paid parking in areas that require paid parking. No special permits should be available.
- some people visit to provide help care as family or friend but have nowhere to park; the less RPP areas the better including in wealthier areas. Common sense needed. multiuse parking be innovative with timing and hours We should not have to pay to park in residential areas or be restricted to 1 hr
- The visitor permits should be sufficient to address homeware workers and those with mobility issues. The online system is more cumbersome than the paper visitor permits and paper visitor permits may be a better solution for these 2 groups.



- Homecare workers come regularly. Inputting license numbers every two week is annoying. Many seniors don't have computers. Workers worried about getting tickets.
- E. This seems to be the best solution.
- A - return to the old system of providing homes within the restricted zones 2 physical parking passes that can be used by home care providers as necessary.
 - we use park Plus for visitors. Works OK, but system should remember previously visited licence plates to accommodate recurring visitors.
- E. The system as a whole need more flexibility and accountability. Why should the people across the street from me have an RPP and not our side when arguably the parking impact is the same for both sides. How can a resident ask for a review of existing RPP?
- The current plan is sufficient.
- E Customized permitting would also work for multiple resident vehicles with limited parking options.
- Option A gives maximum flexibility to residences and requires less effort (no required info on auto licenses) for desired visitor parking.
- A and B again. I don't like the E option since it seems like a lot of additional administrative cost to research and implement a brand new program, in addition to the potential cost to service businesses should they be required to pay for application to the program.
- Seems the easiest to manage
- E. Much like Car2Go's arrangement, it may may sense for certain important services to have access to any residential permit zone in the city.
- Option E - Parking is often a problem for service companies in my neighborhood even though there is plenty of parking available on nearby 'restricted' streets.
- B,C,D. When my mom was dying from cancer, the health care provider had her car damaged because she parked in a free space that the home owner thought was only their space even though no one parking there. Make the parking permit only related to time that the vehicles can remained parked.
- the business should not be penalized for providing a services. The customized permit system should be for business hours. I have a neighbor who parks a massive landscaping truck on the road making it really narrow....
- as above.
- E: How is this not already a thing? We allow Car2Go to litter the streets with dropped cars. Why can't we endorse/create city wide permits for homecare workers, utility trucks, etc.?
- E different situation requires different response
- A
- Permit parking areas and people still need services. Commercial vehicles and service providers should be exempt. Car2go however should not be able to park in permit parking areas.
- I chose this option as I see this sign anywhere I want to park so I feel there are too many no parking except by permit zones especially in popular places. I understand the needs for them, but maybe I compromise can be made.



- I feel as though this issues is very exclusive and may not apply to the 80/20 rule. This more than likely amounts to less than 20% of residents. Visitor parking passes that could go in windshields would fix this I believe.
- (E) seems just to further complicate the problem. I think increasing hourly parking would be the best option. It's reasonable for businesses to have to pay for parking while they work.
- Businesses should be exempt from this as they are usually providing a service to the home and are there for temporary time. Anything more than 24 hours - they can apply for different type of permit.
- Would it be possible to configure e-system to allow me to "send" visitor permit permission so that cleaners/lawn care/maintenance would enter their own license plate but I'd still have control over length of time/days.
- Already explained most of the checked options. I like the idea of E to help the home care people.
- In general, there should be less restricted parking zones. Its become too easy to apply for restricted parking. At a minimum any small business that needs to park short term should be able to do so wherever they need to work (health care workers, electricians, plumbers, cleaning services etc).
- "Hourly parking is usually enough for most businesses
- some sort of customized permit could be useful for some businesses which might require longer stays."
- E - companies coming to homes to provide service should be able to purchase their own location - flexible pass, without impacting the home owners's parking permit.
- In the case of seniors it is often friends or family helping that need to park not service companies.
- E: The online system to register visitor plates is a major disruption to our social events and very time-consuming; without visible permits, it's impossible to know who is eligible to park in your area. Those with regular service (home-care) would benefit from a customized process to ease hassle.
- B works as is. E is an option but could entail some fancy footwork to get everyone on board and permitted.
- We already pay copious amount in taxes, sur-charges and user fees. Why should he have to pay to park in order to receiver homecare or have mobility issues!
- If someone requires this perhaps there can be something similar to a handicap sign where it is for careworkers.
- Preference is B and C. Through this combination, businesses have the ability to visit any neighborhood.
- I think that visitor hourly parking (B) should be employed in any remaining RPP zones (after reducing them in number, - option C). That should meet the need for "businesses visiting a home". If B is not possible, then E is another solution.
- Finally you add an option that makes sense.
- E.
- A is less restrictive to visitors and also businesses visiting multi-family locations
- We don't really need to change it, but adding in a special permit would help home care providers and service vehicles for disabled people.



- online system pain in the butt when visitors or businesses visit a resident. Hard to remember to enter plate in system. Not very convenient. Businesses could be exempt but how do you control who is using vehicle for business vs parking for personal reasons.
- Street space is public property which we all pay taxes to maintain. Option E is too complicated-we need less bureaucracy not more.
- Paid visitor option just NOT going to work. 2 permits per LOT (not per residence with secondary suite home = 4 permits) plus ability for service companies to park TEMPORARILY (so as not be abused by visitors disguising as service company). Hang tags work until service company drives off with them.
- Option A - homecare workers should not have to pay for parking when performing their jobs. And people with mobility issues should have the right to park near their home.
- Please read my comments above, your survey is in my opinion a waste. If it was for the current Mayor / city council we'd all walk and those who have to drive for a living should get penalized. How long is a business visiting a home?? At best temporarily; You don't need to control everything.
- any changes will negatively impact homecare workers and others who provide help to the residents
- A If you have someone doing repairs, health care visits etc. they cannot park nearby because the street is filled with hospital workers not willing to pay for work parking. RPP allows for visitors to just run out and put the tag in the vehicle and return it afterwards.
- An exemption for medical, public and charity companies seems reasonable -- City of Calgary vehicles already have permits.
- E may also be reasonable, but depending on how it works. Overall reduction would be easier and likely cheaper to implement due to staff changes
- E.
- E would help businesses manage their own parking needs without relying on their clients.
- If I'm doing a home reno, I might have 3 or 4 contractors. Need the ability for them to park daily for a week or two. My housekeeper comes every two weeks. I never remember to register her license. Before, she could just grab a tag when she came. Now, she could get fined.
- Hard tag that I go pick up then if a worker has to visit my place they can place on their work vehicle and everyone can see that they have a permit.. .now with camera method we do not know who is allowed and who is not the window tags is way better to identify valid parkers
- C need to be far more responsive to actual need, not the nanny bots who see issues when they dont exist. E Businesses should have a free pass, I had to pay \$1000s to get permits when my house was being built
- Visitor permits that are NOT tied to licence plates is preferred, as it is an invasion of privacy to have the city track visitors to my home. There should be a special system to register recurrent service providers to an address (home care, cleaning services, etc).
- "See above.
- General comment - resent being presented with a survey which has been designed without our input. Not a very clear explanation of how/why this was done. Looks like other city surveys designed to produce a desired result."



- Option E OR have the ticket issuers exercise common sense. We had a furnace cleaning company parked at our house for 4 hours and they received a ticket. Unless there's a neighbour complaint about a particular business vehicle being parked excessively, tickets should not be issued to service vehicles
- Again, make it 2 hour parking from 9 to 5 automatically.
- "A - Same reasons as stated under the previous few options.
- B - Increasing the amount of unpaid hourly parking in those areas would help with businesses visiting a home (not a business). I think this would be very fair to all concerned."
- E - Workers visiting homes should have to apply for Special Parking Permits, & should have to Re-apply every 6 mos, & the City verify info is current. I see lying / deceit / abuse going on with City Permits! Ex. Handicapped Stickers / Hangers! Limit to 1 year & have to Re-apply!
- Having to do online permit applications on a regular basis for service providers is a bit of a pain. Companies should be able to request being added to a customized permit system.
- As in #3
- E: Make it easier for service companies to park in a permit parking zone. They should be exempt without a resident having to register them as a visitor.
- The city plays a big role in creating a problem: relaxing parking permits for businesses. This should NOT be allowed. The city must look itself in the eye and admit to the problem it's created.
- "E. Does not detract from visitor parking allotment.
- System should be kept simple."
- simplest way, IMO
- This is a specific case that doesn't affect the majority of the public so a custom permit for mobile services should be free but available to maintain business at no extra cost, and help those with mobility issues.
- E Adresses needs of people with "special circumstances"
- Please scrap electronic RPP and start sending visitor parking tags in the mail. The online system is terrible: it has bugs and it freezes. There is no tech support on weekends/after hours. The requirements can be confusing to elderly, people who are not computer savvy and first time users.
- Do this but bring back hangtags.
- E - Agree, difficult for landscapers, services to the home to park by the home with the current restriction of two visitors
- No change however I think the online system should be changed back to parking permit cards. Not everyone has easy access to computers.
- Perhaps E might work, if this is legally a company and not someone just parking the white cube van (ie rental property)
- A, because it's the least bad choice. The identified concern is a silly one. Parking restrictions sensibly designed actually MAKE space available where it isn't today.
- Business should be able to access a home
- "A. Flexibility and affordability are important for people who have home care workers visiting their homes.



- The city is restricting parking in many areas where doesn't appear to be a need to do so."
- We need zoned parking, especially down town. Coming up with a system to help with visitors and service people in the home would be optimal.
- E - This would simplify the process for residents.
- Same as above.
- E. New system can handle guests. Allow more permits for them, but limit to 2 hours rather than 2 weeks! Home business development permit approval should consider parking needs, but home business shouldn't need many people to park; otherwise, not appropriate for residential area.
- It's tough to get service people to get their license number for you and they typically will end up blocking the alley or parking illegally
- E - service companies should not cut into our ability to have VISITORS at our home!
- If the resident has a specialized need, they can use one of the permits they can apply for.
- E - We operate a residential construction company. We park at inner city properties while we are working on them. I can't imagine the amount of city tax dollars to go into all of the appeals that we and others go through to get tickets revoked. Such a waste.
- If you are unwilling to change the PERMIT ONLY zone, then give a free licence to commercial vehicles AND do not make people enter the plate number!
- City streets are shared public space and should not be restricted to area residents.
- E If one is having work done in the home there should be a way the contractor can identify himself to you to be able to park on the street while he is doing work at the residence..
- E- if this is an issue that can easily be solved with a specific on line program, then that should be the solution.
- A and E. Need to address how to accommodate multiple visitors to a resident (esp seniors needing care); why should visitors be capped at 2 cars? Isolating to seniors. Need way to allow temp parking for > 2 visitors . Should not be tied to registered car. What if resident no longer drives?
- We recently went to 24/7 residential only on 32nd street NW in Parkdale (previously a 2 hr. limit Monday-Friday) Reason given by 2 new families neighbours spearheading this change was that Foothills hospital staff was parking. Staff would be working 8-12 hr. shifts so should have been ticketed?
- The problem is that there are TOO many dwellings with "No Parking Without Permit" which causes their visitors to take the parking spaces in front of their neighbors houses! Their business visitors will use the neighbors' parking space.
- The Theme here is already well handled. Tell us how many people are affected by this. You will see very little.
- very challenging to manage with the current system - especially with irregular hours so need to establish a "known regular visitor" and extend beyond the 2 week limit.
- Residents who pay property taxes should NOT have to pay additional fees for permits to park in front of their own homes.



- E, these types of visitors seem like a special circumstance. Perhaps an application process for temporary permits during a project or an extra, more permanent one in the case of home care workers etc.
- Options A-D make the problem worse, not better. Option E will be abused by people who bring company vehicles home for the weekend even when they already have personal vehicles. All the oversized trucks are a big part of the problem.
- There needs to be an easy system for visitors that does not involve a lot of hassle.
- How about we educate the public as to what the rules are there? We live in a high density area and sometimes businesses (ie. window company trucks for condo) take up 6 spots on 2 sides of the street for days without notice.
- "C: Not every zone is needed, it is wanted.
- Also, all-zone permits are available for purchase by businesses to conduct their work. The City should/could communicate this more effectively."
- Specific permits to address home care needs should be accommodated with appropriate approval controls separate from existing 2 visitor permits
- Nanny parks in front of our house everyday. Need a more efficient way to manage this.
 - Visitor parking permits are necessary, however, unsure of how this is enforced. The visible tags are better than the call in. With the tag everyone can see that the car is a visitor.
- Home care and other in-home support are critical to both individuals and to the broader medical system. People who need in-home support shouldn't be punished for their need for care; they should be supported in ways that do not entail further cost and inconvenience.
- It only makes sense to do so.

- "B. there is not a parking space problem on my restricted street, when visitors drop in they are they are not taking up spaces the residents use.
- there is no need for 24/7 residential parking restrictions on my street there are about 70 spaces on the street and only 10 to 15 are used at any time."
- I like this option but believe there would still be times no parking is available.
- E - would be great if companies like Telus/Shaw etc could register all their plates (as they won't change normally) and be exempt from rules governing parking in restricted areas or something similar
- But with Park Plus technology now doing enforcement in Residential Permit zones are there still visitor permits not attached to licence plates?
- If I get a delivery I have to register that businesses licence plate! What if I'm not even home? They get a ticket!
- "C. Commercial businesses and Home care workers should have a permit to park when conducting their services. Reduce the number of No Parking except by Permit zones across Calgary.
- Residents should not have to pay for parking!"
- I also would like to see C happen. Option A is a pain with care workers running back and forth handling permits which is a poor use of time, E would help with this.



- Needs to be better options for home care and other businesses (eg. Construction contractors) visiting my home. And prefer some paper tagging system that is much easier for homeowners to administer than having to use a computer
- "A. As stated above.
- This seems reasonable for frequent service company visitors"
- E- is a great idea to have exemptions for a business who needs to legitimately park in a residential restricted zone.
- It is easier and more secure for service providers to list themselves than for each client to phone in.
- A - How does a parking permit impact homecare workers and people with mobility issues? I don't get it. Sign them in as a visitor. Or I guess you could provide them with an addition special permit just for that type of care.
- E. Service companies must be identified to allowed if the car cannot be identified by its own signage. For example, furnace companies are well known and do not stay beyond a few hours max. Health care providers are often in personal cars and could have 'universal' permits to do their work. No charge
- None of these options adress the issue raised.

Topic: Residential Parking Permit eligibility and review process

- A. No change to current eligibility for multi-family households - multi-family households (4 stories and higher) are not eligible for resident or visitor permits
- B. Residents within an RPP zone can apply for residence and visitor permits no matter the household type.
- C. Increase the amount of hourly parking for visitors within an RPP zone. The times could include paid and unpaid options.
- D. Residents are only eligible for permits if there is no available on-site parking
- E. The City would set a schedule to review RPP restrictions within zones and modify as needed
 - Always need should have at least 2 permits
 - 4 story building doesn't necessarily have sufficient parking for residents let alone visitors - no room for parking on-site
 - If secondary suite, should not get 2x the number of permits, though. Equity per house/lot
 - if you revert back to paper & allow rentals to have would be a nightmare
 - This is only fair as the are are area residents
 - Parking for Institutions/ or multi-family buildings overwhelms residential parking. Multi-unit buildings should not be eligible fo rresident or visitor permits
 - New multi-resident buildings can have a negative impact on residents of a community when there is inadequate on-site parking on the building site. This can lead to a great opposition from communities for any future such developments
 - 4 story + buildings must have on-site parking or we will be swamped.
 - Stop relaxing parking causing street problems



- Residents of multi-family units do not have garage space large enough for trucks this impacts on street space for everyone. Planning & Development should require larger garage minimum to accommodate larger vehicles of today
- Yes, it is brutal to try to change it. 20 years later!
- multiple parking restrictions in the same zone are confusing
- logical
- Would add that someone can apply with valid justification even if there is on-site parking available. Exceptions to the rule could be allowed. For example, someone teaching piano lessons or if the on-site parking doesn't meet the needs
- There is often valid justification for parking restrictions even if there is (the current definition) of on site parking available
- Why should I be penalized for using property space for parking? How many ppl have garages that can't fit a vehicle?
- How does this work for 25 foot lots where some visitor space is needed?
- New build must have parking!
- Isn't on-site parking a building requirement (development permit)
- Got to have resident parking and need access to visitor parking. Like this but only if it's unpaid.
- This could work a bit better because it offers more flexibility. Even with on site parking, sometimes you need an option to park on the street
- Current process is tedious and can be improved in general. Ability for non-vehicle only individuals (residents) to utilize visitor permit for their guests that drive could make sense. Ability for rental cars to qualify also makes sense. (time sensitive)
- Multi-family visitors should only be able to park on street adjacent to the building
- I am not in favour of paying for any type of parking on my street or my neighbourhood
- A certain number of parking stall are required depending on the type of residents. This means there is ample off-street parking. Non-driving residents should not incur the cost for people who choose to drive. Please add a fee for all or use parkers in every zone in the city.
- Consider an increasing scale for parking fees. Ex. 1st two hours free next hour = \$X, over & above = \$2X
- These larger buildings have bylaw requirements to provide on site parking for both residents and visitors.
- This has been key to introducing multi-family dwellings to residential areas - eliminating concerns over crowded street parking situations. Key for affordable housing.
- Separate issue
- Multifamily households should be supplying on site parking for visitors, otherwise visitor permits could be used by residents to bypass parking costs in a building
- All residents should be treated equally regardless of housing type or tenureship model.
- Most multi-family properties can only provide 1 parking stall for each unit which limits the family types that can live there. A household of 3 in a small 2 bedroom condo, shouldn't, but could in unique situations require 3 vehicles to carry out their lives.



- I think multi-family households should continue to be not eligible for resident permits, but they should be eligible for visitor permits; perhaps in combination with better options on the street, including maximum time.
- My In-Laws live a half block from a four story apartment building and there are NEVER any parking spots on their street so without control on street parking multi-family dwellings would leave no parking spots for residence.
- There is no possible way to have enough street parking for multiple unit buildings
- I believe that multi-family buildings should continue NOT to qualify for permits. In addition, the City needs to do a better job of reviewing parking requirements for new and redevelopments in RPP zones. The cumulative impact of parking relaxations on new developments on a community is significant.
- such residents should provide visitor parking. but hourly parking would be reasonable too.
- Most buildings built today have parking on private property. Future buildings won't require parking spaces because of driverless cars and the sharing economy.
- The City has moved to a system where they are reducing the number of mandatory parking stalls for a multifamily residence. They have stated that those people will be walking or using transit. If that is not the case, then ON SITE parking needs to be provided for those residents! NO to passes!
- Smaller zones may help this issue. The big multi-family buildings should have associated parking already, and should not impose on the surrounding community - I see the parking need disregarded a lot in development permit discussions lately...
- Same rationale as provided previously.
- Why just one choice.
- Streets belong to everyone. Perhaps smaller zones so lower density areas are not overwhelmed with higher density parking. Need to encourage less private vehicle ownership while balancing the need to keep residential areas kid, pedestrian and cycle friendly - ie not full of cars looking for parking
- I live in a four story, multi-family building in Sunnyside. I live in a one-bedroom unit but we have two vehicles. I only have parking for one vehicle in my building so my husband has to park on the street but is not eligible for residential parking therefore is constantly subject to parking tickets
- Developers should need to account for parking when designing and planning their projects. They should not be able to shift this burden onto the existing residence in the area.
- The streets should be available (including parking) to all citizens.
- Only option which seems to provide some flexibility
- residences should provide reasonable sufficient onsite parking and not rely on street parking. This is especially relevant during snow parking bans when insufficient parking is available near by.
- A large multi-family building should have on-site visitor parking before it's approved by the planning department. Visitor parking permits should not be necessary and on street parking should be limited.
- B - Not all buildings have visitor parking available so it would be nice if multi-family dwellers could have temporary visitor permits.
- Larger multi family buildings should provide on site parking.



- A yearly review of eligibility for multi family dwelling should be mandatory as residents in high density traffic area are being abandoned by the city and have no where to park.
- Parking restrictions are needed on 22 Street NW between 24 Avenue NW and 20 Avenue NW as University students and C-Train commuters take advantage of the free parking during the work days which limits parking for area residents.
- Developers have to be accountable for parking on multi family sites. If not, they will make the houses bigger with no parking. City cannot be trusted to review restrictions on a case by case basis. They hardly listen to communities and typically side with the developer.
- E- This option might work better as each RPP zone has its own unique issues. People in multifamily households usually have parking in their building and they should use that first. Otherwise, A is my preferred option.
- "A: why should apartment dwellers not be allowed visitors?"
- D: makes sense for multi-family dwellings, if parking is available on-site"
- Do not support paid community parking.
- not a concern for us, so am hesitant to wade in on this
- Until you put RPP in every community there is no way to charge one community parking and another not. Unjust!
- A seems like the safest choice to preserve street real estate. Large multi-family buildings should be designed with parking needs in mind, and the density associated with that many families could quickly overwhelm the street. Could mitigate the issue with C though.
- Option A & D. No change unless there is no available on-site parking to residents.
- B - seems fair
- A combination of B and D. Because many new developments do not even accommodate even one on-site parking stall per unit, there needs to be some accommodation made for on-street parking. Perhaps limit to one permit per unit.
- A - but this does fix the multi-tenant issue in regular homes
- Again, permitted street parking in Mission makes living here more affordable. Don't change it.
- I live close to a multi family dwelling. I cannot imagine having less parking availability if folks from this residence were allowed to park permanently on the street. I expect multi family dwellings to provide parking for the residents.
- System works well currently. Adding additional on street parking for multi-family would simply offload parking cost from landowner to neighbours.
- Visitors usually come at off-peak times anyway
- Please review! Living in Ramsay, in a small scale (5 units) apartment bldg as renter, without my own car, but sometimes have rental or work vehicle - and cannot access the visitor permit option without going through my landlord. Plus, then it is tied to a license plate ..
- Boardwalk charges a fortune for parking and it isn't fair to renters to be forced to pay ridiculous amounts for parking



- Extreme densification in our area would make it impossible for homeowners to get space. Limitations MUST be put on new multi-family developments that are seriously impacting long-term homeowners in the neighbourhood.
- Option B...increase size limit for visitor permits from 4 units (not stories) to 6 units.
- We should encourage higher density living arrangements and sometimes this means more than one car per stall in a multi family building. E. Pay per use may be different in different RPP
- the city has to build up not out! The consequence of this environmental necessity is that all residents must be able to park where they live. It must also be up to the developer to ensure a min of 1 onsite parking spot per unit and restriction street parking to in front of the unit.
- Parking is part of the multi family household planning zoning requirements and needs to stay with the development, not become a problem for the neighboring homes
- They should be using g what they have available first
- A: No change needed. This adds incentive for appropriate parking garages in developments and multi-family residences.
- D - but in the instances covered by A, there should be limits based on space available, limited to frontage.
- I picked A. I don't really have an opinion about this.
- Multi family buildings should have parking as a requirement for building, and forced by City Planning. Recently my neighbourhood has had building permit issued without sufficient parking. Complaints are never answered.
- Some of the people who requested zones before likely are dead or dont even live there anymore these zones are so old and the attractant to that neighbourhood might not be there anymore. Good time to review the policy.

- why should the multi-family site have different requirements-this city is known for not requiring enough on-site parking for businesses and multi-family housing & letting the developer off the hook and even when they do put in parking, it is too often undersized & useless to the person living there.
- If there is a duplex of 4, each dwelling should have 2 passes and however many visitor passes
- The condos need to figure out their own parking.
- require developments of multifamily to have the necessary parking during development phase. There complexes can totally destroy the available parking for non multifamily users in the same neighbourhood.
- Single homes with multi tenants should be considered Multi family home
- There are too many outdated and inappropriate zones in the city. The goal should be to limited these zones as much as possible since roads are for general public access and use (E). The only justification may be for a limited zone where there is no on site parking available (D).
- Already commented on this above.
- Option D. Onsite parking is a must.



- Parking for multi-family dwellings should include visitor parking and be located on-site. This balances the impacts on adjacent residences. If the City goal is to increase intensity in the inner city areas; parking permits should not be granted to multi-family dwellings.
- B: Families should not be penalized for living in a multi-family dwelling (rather, they should be encouraged). However, D: if those multi-family dwellings have ample parking for residents and visitors, they should not be eligible for additional permits (should be some sort of review process).
- Parking spaces for apartments are often outrageously priced, leading to the use of street parking. If the City became a competitor, the prices would likely drop, ultimately letting the market serve the needs of tenants in those buildings.
- E. The current system is unfair, with Calgary's finances as they are, this could be a useful revenue stream.
- Presumably, multifamily units should be providing parking and they do in our neighbourhood anyway. Residents who don't own a car but would like a visitor permit should be able to apply for one.
- JUST DON'T BUY THERE!
- I am all for densification, but big apartment buildings and condos should not be able to use up limited residential space. Developers should be obliged to create parking and residents should be obliged to use it. Option D is the only one that makes sense.
- Multi-family should be able to purchase a street parking permit like anyone else. But it must cost money for everyone to avoid misuse.
- The city needs to start forcing developers of higher density buildings to include parking or garages into their development plans. Apartment buildings clog up the on street parking for everyone else but residents of high density buildings should be able to park their vehicles near or in their building
- very complicated. Multi-resident units should figure this out before building. I suggest secondary suites must have off street parking before approved. Multi-storey units should figure out guest parking before building - and NO MORE no parking condos / apartments to be approved
- Certain complexes only offer limited parking, which is hard for multiple car rentals.
- Many multi-unit developments in our Zone M are already over-parked; existing garages and visitor stalls sit empty.
- It's ridiculous that people with available on-site parking can have two permits no questions asked. They should have to apply if they require one for a second vehicle and it should be paid. Visitors as well.
- I rent a main floor, the owner's son & wife live in illegal suite downstairs. Despite having a beautiful, 2-car garage, they park their trucks on the street. I have no choice but to park on street, & it's ridiculous that I have to fight for a parking spot daily, when 2 trucks could be in garage.
- Builders and developers of multi-family households should be required to provide adequate off-street parking for their residents, street parking should be for visitors and customers
- I feel larger multi-family complexes should incorporate sufficient parking for tenants & visitors on site. This should be a requirement of development approval!



- I find this question confusing as multi-family buildings in Beltline are eligible for permits. Condos in Beltline should continue to qualify for Permits.
- Use designated parking on-site, if you have one.
- D: don't support city roads that all Calgarians pay for being used as parking for developments that choose to not create enough parking on the site. Others: there is not enough street space to support resident parking volume from mr buildings
- Residents should have parking, but bylaws should force multi-unit buildings to provide that site. A buyer should always take their parking needs into the purchasing decision. If no parking is available, but is needed - wouldn't the logical decision be that they should not buy?
- A & D - these are related. Currently parking stall requirements for a Development Permit for multi-residential are not enough for many of these units.....therefore there will never be enough on-site parking and always have overflow..... which leads to E but I doubt the DP process will change???
- Changing to online registration and no visible permits combined with reporting infractions does not work
- This is already covered in Land Use considerations. A multi-family facility needs to consider parking as part of their development plan and costs.
- B - sometimes you need to park out front.
- Having lived in a rental complex where visitor parking was extremely limited, and on-site parking with a long wait list, residence and visitor permits should be allowed to facilitate living at those locations.
- My building has a hundred units, but not parking for each and we are not eligible for a permit, this is wrong
- see above comments
- developers and the people who purchase the units MUST allow for their own ample parking. This is one of the great scourges on residential society - passing the "cost" off to the neighbourhood by creating vehicle pollution of cars parked everywhere. These building must come with their own parking.
- I don't see this as broken so I don't know why we would expend effort to fix it.
- "Multi residential units should require parking ON SITE.
- You're being sneaky in trying to get people to consent to increasing paid parking areas and reduce homeowners parking in residential areas. Get your spending under control, you've already taxed us enough!"
- Why restrict which residents can get a permit. You need to ensure new buildings have more than the bare minimum of onsite parking.
- This is just red tape and job security. Get rid of all restrictions other than handicap secured parking.
- Option A - multi-family homes should be designed & built with sufficient resident & guest parking onsite with no exceptions or relaxations to the ARP, etc..
- They can apply for permit
- Multi-family households can have many vehicles. Our streets cannot accommodate more vehicles parking inner city.



- If you've got a garage or parking spot, you should use it! They should, of course, have access to visitor permits.
- My house is not eligible for a parking permit despite us only having one parking spot. Everything around us is 2 hour parking except the one zone is "s" parking that we are somehow not eligible for
- The City has significantly reduced the on site parking required for multi-family residents assuming that they are walking or taking transit. Either force the developer to provide on site parking, or NO parking passes!
- I don't think it's fair that you can't park near where you live.
- B: Better options for residents.
- Really, here again I do not like any of the options. A home owner may have a garage for his/her vehicles. But where is everyone else that he or she has over to their home going to park. Should the home owner have to pay for this NO. Should we always have to phone or go on line every single time w
- So dumb, we all have cars, we all pay taxes, we should all get to park where we need to
- A is fine.
- Make parking 3 hours free outside multifamily dwellings.
- The City has partially created this issue by allowing residential units without onsite parking and now to address the problem the neighbours have to make compromises. Policy change at City Hall, multi family buildings require 2 onsite parking spots per unit = no more on street parking issues.
- I live in Lower Mount Royal and the issue is there's many residences with NO on-site parking which have made parking for residents (with permits) a nightmare. Lots of stop signs, but people park too close to the corners which makes it impossible to see oncoming traffic. Need more enforcement.
- B - residents should not be penalized just because of the type of housing they have. City needs to be more thoughtful when issuing development permits. Adding in-fill homes doubles (at least) the number of cars. On-site parking not always used for parking but for storage.
- E. Restrictions should reflect the circumstances and be subject to periodic (2-3 year) reviews.
- C because visitors only need short term usually, but then if a visitor needs a longer time, (D) the resident can provide that
- Parking zones should not be setup for multi family buildings that don't provide parking. City streets are not meant to be permanent parking spots. We all pay for these streets and should all be able to use them (subject to reasonable restrictions (i.e. 1 hour, 2 hour parking limits, etc).
- All permits should be paid for (none for free) and should not be available for units that have onsite parking available regardless of what type of unit it is (single detached or multi-family). Basing it off of unit type is discriminatory to lower income residents who can't afford single detached.
- Our 8 unit townhouse could benefit from more visitor parking options.
- Unfortunately there just isn't enough room to accommodate parking for multi-family residences, if people in these residences need parking they need to find a building which offers parking.
- No one should be unable to park in their own neighbourhood because of structure they live in



- A: Should apply to MF 2 or more stories. The city is focused on reducing onsite parking requirements for new MF buildings to drive its Green agenda forcing on street parking for residents who do not conform. Increase MF parking requirements.
- Availability of permits should be based on need. The won't houses across from me have three stall garage and two car parking pad, yet they get permits for on street parking. They use that rather than use their own driveway, taking up what few on street parking we do have. They do. To need permits
- Make sure the multi family has planned enough parking for all who need it.
- A - could have saturation from multi-family, but it is not clear that this would happen. Or that they should be discriminated against for living in dense housing.
- Parking policy shouldn't discriminate based on the type of building where a resident lives. The status quo effectively discriminates against lower-income residents who are more likely to live in larger buildings and furthermore acts as a (relatively minor) deterrent for increased housing densities.
- multi family buildings should be required to generate sufficient parking, and permits available for grandfathered buildings without, needs monitoring on a case by case basis, i.e. need restrictions only to the extent there is a problem.
- A is ideal as buildings that large should have sufficient parking provided. However, the streets immediately adjacent should not be restricted, allowing residents to park on a first-come basis
- I lived in a multi family dwelling once. I could only park on the street because my parking spot in the garage was too small. I still don't think multi family dwellings should have visitor passes
- If there are buildings with 4 stories and higher, please have the developers/builders provide underground parking for the households.
- How about eliminating the zone all together?
- High-density and ToD zones do have parking issues, but leave these zones as paid areas since the push is for "transit orientation" (different demographic, not fixing cars, etc...."just" using transit/bike/walk/car-share and living urban-style)
- As density increases in the inner city, it should be possible for people living in apartment complexes to apply to have visitor parking.
- And make them pay for their permits.
- Don't know much about this do suggest target survey for this group and closer evaluation and re-evaluation. Moving market needs.
- Should be 3 stories or higher apartment buildings should not need RP they have parking lots behind the buildings
- The current system works well for us.
- Re Option A: this is fair and reasonable
- Don't be elitist. Multi-family dwellings are a modern reality and you shouldn't be prevented from parking on your street just because you can't afford a million dollar late for a house. Ridiculous.
- Apartments and multi family units need to have parking developed with its footprint. This is a separate issue from residential parking permits
- I live in a multi- family home and this is a major problem as there is no visitor parking. I would like to be able to apply for visitor permits that clearly states where parking is available. I choose option B.



- Street parking may get too crowded if everyone uses it out of convenience even though they may have on site parking.
- they can have it if they pay, set prices high enough to act as deterrent
- B/E Multi-family households should be required to provide a base level of off-street parking based on their size. This should be comparable to the rules applied to low-density homes in the area. Once that is met each unit should reasonably be able to apply for 1 resident/visitor permit.
- Start at the source of the problem - require new buildings to have adequate parking (at least one per unit). This is not Europe and the distances in Canada are large so that most units own a vehicle even if they only use it once or twice a month.
- Our RPP parking is used for visitors and workmen. Often work vehicles can't access our underground parking (due to restricted height) so they need the on-street parking without having to pay by the hour.
- Same as above
- Fine as is
- Imagine that I'm your neighbour and I have divided my basement into multiple individual bedrooms where each one is rented out to different people each with their own vehicle where each vehicle would occupy all driveways including the one in front of your house. How would you feel?
- It's the only option I like
- The city creates density issues then developers should be required to have sufficient parking on the land they develop
- People need to be able to park where they live.
- 3 story building across the street very abusive of free parking. No room other residents, causes much friction. No protection for single family or duplex residents.
- A most people who live in these buildings and choose to live there are aware before moving in.
- If everyone else can have visitors, multi unit dwellings should too. There's no restriction on getting a visitor pass for a house with an illegal basement suite, so legal multi unit dwellings shouldn't be restricted.
- Rental suites should not get priority and more parking than other single dwelling homes
- These residents pay lower taxes for there housing And do to this do not get the same type of parking access.
- Option A - Seems to be working well at present.
- 4 stories and higher residential buildings should provide their own parking, visitor parking on site or they should not be built.
- Parking should be available to whomever is willing to pay.
- I believe residents should have priority. We pay higher taxes to live in inner-city neighbourhoods.
- Resident should be allowed to use on street parking regardless of available on-site parking.
- I am not affected, but E. The City should do a specific review.
- Their needs to be a better plan to accomodate



- Apartment buildings (4 stories and higher) should have an obligation to provide onsite parking and not rely on street parking. I do not think a change to the current program is necessary. If a review were scheduled it should not be annually, perhaps rotating areas every 3-5 years to minimize cost.
- I'd prefer to remove it completely but since that's not an option here. Why are apartment/condo residents any less valuable than house residents?
- Multi family households cause an exponentially higher demand for street pkg. Greater access would impact all other types of home/ business pkg in the area. Developments are req'd to provide on-site pkg so this should not be an issue. Temporary permits s/b granted when repairs/ cleaning of parkades.
- Same as previous answer
- Option B. It is important to shift with the times, understanding that there are more multi-family, rentals and non-driving residents who may have parking needs themselves and/or for visitors. The city is promoting these types living and therefore needs to follow through on mitigating RPR issues.
- The restrictions need to be reviewed and some modified.
- When I lived in a apt we had a parking lots which included visitor parking
- Its hard for those renting to get a parking pass. With the need for all your ID's to match, its a struggle, especially if you move often. Proof of eligibility needs to be location specific, but with more flexibility than a drivers license (IE Enmax bill, or phone bill).
- I don't have a car but I rent one regularly. I would like to be able to have a visitor pass that I can use.
- I choose option B. It's not fair that because I choose to live in an apartment I'm not allowed to have friends visit. It's exclusionary, demeaning and isolating to explain to my visitors that they can't park near my house so sometimes they just choose not to visit me because it's too much trouble.
- We live along Morley Trail NW and there is an inefficiency in the ratio between Restricted Zone E Permit only parking to actual parking spaces being used. I think the City can benefit from reviewing the parking usage per household and on-site parking availability to relax Permit only open to visitor
- Option B. This sounds like a density issue and needs to be carefully analyzed at the permitting process. New, higher density developments need to account for available parking.
- Why would you penalize multi-family residents compared to costly-to-serve single family residences? What an absurd incentive system. Just charge for the parking spots at the amount required to create an efficient parking market in that location.
- With the rezoning in my neighborhood And the addition of multi-family buildings, more garage space should be compulsory in any building permit
- Development of facility building should include parking for residence and guests with temporary permits that can be issued by facility operator.
- multi-family units need to plan for onsite parking at building owner expense etc. Again, a business should support the needs of their clients ...the same holds for condo developers etc....visitor parking needs to be supported onsite and not on street to detriment of existing residents
- I would prefer the previous method of marking my vehicle with a sticker as I have yet to figure out the online notification for a visitor.
- B seems reasonable



- Multi-family need to look after their own parking needs on site.
- This one seems most inclusive and provides most flexibility.
- The City has drastically reduced the number of on-site parking requirements for developers because "people will walk and use transit." Either require the developer to provide on site parking, or NO passes for multifamily households!
- Hiding the costs of parking are detrimental to Calgary. I believe that the cost of parking should be born by the user. Ideally, this means that parking is always available for those who are prepared to pay for the cost of it. More importantly, the cost discourages automobile use and ownership.
- Make my tax dollar to be used more efficiently. Cost of parking is already too high for our economy. Now to ask visitors to park and pay in front of my house, unacceptable
- Number of permits available should not exceed on-street capacity. I can't envision a way to manage permits without using some criteria to restrict numbers.
- This question does not take into account challenges faced by some multi-family properties where ridiculous parking relaxations were granted by the City.
- "C" would fix a lot of the current parking problems. I feel that "E" could work, perhaps have an "urban RPP" and "suburban RPP" with different rules. Too many zone classifications become difficult for the public to understand.
- We pay over the top for property tax we should not be told how many cars we can park or how many visitors we are allowed
- "A. self explanatory
- residents of multi family should only receive one permit per unit and only if there is no on site parking available. Any "new" development should always contain on site parking to be approved for building permits"
- Multi family households should have parking on site. City streets are not for misplanned developments. The whole point is to reduce car use.
- High fee or no change. Not everyone in a small area can afford a space. If it's valuable then pay.
- Restricting multi-family is completely discriminatory. Single family homes are entitled, why is that?
- Isn't it reasonable to be able to park close to where you live?
- Cruise through the neighborhoods and see how essential street parking is.
- I do not live or visit people in multi zones, but if I lived in one I would expect similar benefits?
- C seems to eliminate the problem most easily, and I hope E already happens. D is the best option, but it seems like it would open the door to thousands of complaints and exceptions.
- Apartment buildings that do not have underground parking should not be allowed permits unless necessary as homes that do not have on site parking will lose their street space
- B and D- residences should be given up to 10 passes at no cost
- Or they could purchase at a increased few - our area has garage available for high density but due to garage size limitations many park on street. Have them pay for parking
- Monitor to allow that one house cant have way to many permits for one property and should utilize on site parking.
- A - developers and landowners need to make sure enough parking for buildings



- B & E. Parking restrictions should stop people from flooding a neighborhood to get free access to downtown, not punish visitors. Brings home value down
- B: everyone should get permits. Zones across from multi family buildings could be removed
- There are no preferred options here. This is an absolute joke. This could only come from city hall. Option D makes me laugh at you the most. If you have a driveway you become ineligible to park on the street. Who comes up with this garbage.
- I own 4 vehicles. I have a 2 car garage and no drive way. But am only allowed to have 2 residential permits that are not interchangeable with all 4 vehicles. All 4 vehicles have paid licenses, registrations and insurance. I paid to have and use these cars, but have no where to put them.
- multi family complexes should provide on-site parking
- Either force developers to go back to providing parking, or NO on street parking for these buildings.
- I see misuse of these passes sometimes
- A: current lot size will only accommodate 2 vehicles so the max. number of parking passes should be limited to 2.
- Option B and C - all residents should be eligible for permits, but it still shouldn't be free, and all residents should be able to have visitors equally. By having hourly parking that is priced based on demand, everyone should be able to access space.
- This option is fair to tax paying homeowners.
- This one seems to be an issue for when Snow restrictions show up, but I can't speak to this one for myself.
- Current system works quite well
- A lot of times people won't visit those in multi-residence areas because of having to pay for parking. Visitors shouldn't have to pay to visit anyone.
- Yes please grant me a permit to park in front of the home I own and to which you bill me taxes for. Renters who do not pay taxes are parking in front of my home!!!!
- Condo parking is already limited and very strict. Allowing renters to be able to apply for permits would be helpful and could force condo boards to review their available parking spot programs (every unit comes with a spot, but if you don't need maybe you lease it to the board to rent out).
- Multifamily and rented dwellings must provide adequate on-site parking.
- Option D. If the building doesn't have on site parking then they should be able to apply to street parking
- A if your building a structure for multi family you should have to include parking on site.
- Solution needs to be found for duplexes & 4plexes as don't think enough street space to be issuing 8 permits to a 4plex in area full of 4plexes. Not sure what fair solution is.
- Need to either change the eligibility for getting a RPP from having registered address or the 2 week long permit. My partner and I both own houses in different zones and have to add each other every second week. I have had to pay a coder to write a routine for doing this, which i have sold to others
- A - I pay my taxes for these streets, are they? Multi-family homes should have sufficient parking space for their complex or the city should not approve the development



- multi family should have its own parking, again not enough frontage on a multi family to park on the street
- If onsite parking is available then the people should be using it otherwise they are subject to street parking like everyone else. Otherwise why should they have special access to the program?
- D. Many multi-family dwellings have poor parking availability. Residents should be eligible for permits if they have no access to on-site parking. Visitors should have access to hourly parking.
- Developments need to ensure there is ample parking available.
- No change.
- If you live in the area you should be able to park outside your home.
- Some apartments may need a permit.
- why should some residents be eligible and others not? Option B is the only one that treats all citizens as equals
- Buildings should have parking for residents
- Tired of all the duplexes and fourplex rentals on our street having three vehicles per unit , in which the owner does not open up the garage or driveway for them to park, or they have a trailer that is left in the driveway. All cars end up on the street which affects our visitor parking.
- Buildings of this size should have off street parking for residents and visitors. It is negligent of the city to not require adequate off street parking. A significant amount of time and money goes into attempting to resolve the issues caused.
- Requiring minimum parking requirements for the residents in multi-family buildings was part of the development process.
- The CofC and Councillors NEED to stop pushing DENSITY in existing neighbourhoods and think about the existing homeowners prior to thinking about re zoning existing zones to best increase DENSITY
- larger multi family dwellings should be required to provide parking for their tenants.
- Most multi-family households know about parking when they move in. If they move in, they accept that. Most of these households have on-site parking for at least one car. It doesn't hurt visitors or residents to walk a couple of blocks to get home! It's all about convenience and entitlement.
- This is so frustrating for me - people in the apartment take the few spots available to us for parking.
- Multi-family households deserve equal access to parking permits. It's so unfair that we can't access just because we don't have a single dwelling home.
- "As long as there is available street space within the RPP, I would not be opposed to allowing more residents to obtain RPP permits, but with priority to those without off-street parking options & single family residences.
- Secondary suite homes would not get extra passes."
- Why are you discriminating against small apartments? People owning or renting in a four/five story apartment should be able to get a pass.
- People in multi-family homes shouldn't be left out of the permitting process, especially as many places don't have visitor parking available.
- Large multi-family buildings should provide adequate onsite parking for their residents.



- Street parking is a hazard and should not be permitted. If you do not have somewhere on your property to park your car, buy a transit pass or buy a bike.
- Building that big should have on-site parking. Everyone needs access to public road for visitor at some time.
- It should be free and unlimited for anyone connected to a household in the area. No one should have to pay to park near their home and their visitors should not have to pay neither
- Option A Multi-family, rentals should provide parking for their residents. When one property has 8 or more vehicles there is little space left for anyone else. We have found that knowing your neighbors and appealing to their sense of community works in most cases.
- D: people should use provided parking when available.
- Again, I live in Castle Keep, S.W. Condo Residents do have on-site parking called a garage. These garages are full of "stuff" therefore, they park on the street. It is virtually impossible to get through to the houses when vehicles are parked on both sides of the street. Especially in the winter
- Honestly, multi-family units should have ample parking built into their design. Large units should have parking lots duplexes should have driveways or garages. Assisted housing should have one parking spot per unit - not on the street with PAID permits for extra vehicles.
- Multi-family dwellings must be responsible for providing parking space to their residents.
- The number of condos going up in Hillhurst and West Hillhurst would cause huge parking issues for those living close by if parking permits were issued. They take little street frontage and should have enough resident and visitor parking built into the building as part of the permit process.
- I am in a three story multi family building. Why can't I have a permit
- Option E: each multi-family area would have different needs which should be looked at case by case
- Yup
- Multi-family households have on site visitor space allowed and it should not limit parking for non-visitors.
- Use driveways and garages if you have them.
- Multifamily units present a different challenge - much more density with fewer parking spots as compared to residential streets. Here more paid and unpaid options should be made available.
- B - allows for more flexibility
- We have 3 rentals on our street of 15 homes. Two have had 6 or more people living in them plus cars. We haven't heard of them having a problem. The cooperative ones park in the available garages and driveway areas. One house has room for 8 cars on various driveways off the street.
- None of the above makes sense as the City now permits more secondary suites and so "multi-family" is meaningless.
- D - if there is no onsite parking then multi family residents need to be able to purchase a parking pass. But limit the # of passes per household and increase visitor parking availability
- Why is the City so determined to nail drivers for payment to park their vehicle. Most of the drivers on the roads are going a few miles, and it does not make sense to expect everyone to take hours out of their day to bus it, or walk it, or ride a bicycle around our city.



- When a residence is developed, parking should be taken into account and if the developer cannot provide parking for the number of units, then they should not be allowed to develop a multi-family unit.
- Residents should qualify for monthly rates. Visitors should be able to access hourly or daily rates. Everyone should have access, although long-term, reasonable fees should be made available to residents.
- Developers in inner city should be providing parking either underground or a parking space of some sort. Building a building more than 4 stories and not providing a parking stall will in the end fill every available parking place and then there will not be any parking for anyone else at all.
- Why do detached units get preference?
- No comment - I'm not familiar with concerns of apartment dwellers as I don't live in apartment building.
- C and D both ok
- If permits are paid, everyone in a zone should have access.
 - A building 4 stories or higher should have its own parking for residents and visitors.
- b - I believe that all people living in a RPP zone should have the opportunity to have friends and family visit without worry of parking tickets
- A: current system is sufficient
- May help deter people lobbying to restrict parking if it affects them as well
- Current system is unfair and biased in favor of a few. Treats landlords & workers, tenants as second class citizens. Often apartment building have the biggest frontage on the street without no access to parking. Designate frontage for that property only & not for only single family dwellings.
- permits allowed need to take into consideration on site parking and availability of street parking
- C high density dwellers need options for visitors
- the system works -apartment buildings "should be "forced by the city to build sufficient indoor parking
- You must increase the opportunity for people to visit friends, family and customers without worrying about the little traffic robots driving by and issuing unnecessary tickets.
- Parking should not be free (subsidized).
- You live at a place...you want to park close to it...again, City of Calgary, restricting people from there own homes...
- We live in University Heights, an island community that is surrounded by Institutions such as the University of Calgary, major hospitals, and McMahon Stadium. If we do not have residential parking permits then we will not be able to park in front of our own home ever. This is a serious issue.
- They live there. The type of housing shouldn't change there ability to park like anyone else.
- Our restricted street is already full and cannot accommodate more cars even if people could get more permits. Issuing more permits would create a situation where residents are fighting over spots.
- Tax payers should have equal access to parking and should be required to pay for the privilege of parking on the street.



- Option D. On-site parking should be mandatory to create better visibility and space for motorists. On-site parking permits should take into consideration the sizes of the vehicle and the parking arrangement (i.e., a small garage cannot fit a large automobile). A special permit could be obtained.
- developers would abuse the rule and ask buyers to park on the street if the rules for multi family complex are relaxed
- D - this option would help in preventing the proliferation of unnecessary restrictions such as the zone I live in.
- Multifamily units which are being permitted with grossly insufficient parking, should not substitute street parking (overwhelming) for proper design. some visitor space is likely required (limited "hourly" . This increases resistance to multifamily units, which also are impacting laneway use.
- Choice "A" is the best . Other choices changes the nature of a residential community and creates lots of traffic .
- Works well
- But unpaid is better. People will lose friends coming to visit if they have to pay to see them.
- This process needs to be continuously reviewed.
- The issue should be about whether the resident has no access to parking. Not that they have a right to park on the street that trumps anyone else's right just because they are a resident.
- Driving is a privilege, not a right. If you have to park and walk a bit, tough luck.
- E). Trust the experts, and tailor solutions to individual neighborhood needs
- Parking a car in your own driveway , laneway will free up space on the street
- A person should be able to have a visitor/service come no matter where they live if parking is permit. The city should plan parking for buildings so all residents do not have to scramble for street parking.
- Visitor permits are important for home owners to have, especially in large residential restriction areas, because everyone has a right have visitors.
- These restrictions hamper the ability to have visitors to the home.
- I think it's unreasonable that people in these homes can't get a permit.
- Onsite parking should still be a requirement for higher density buildings.
- B&E
- There should be enough parking provided by the dwelling.
- No one has the right to parking right in front of their home. I do understand that multi unit housing is at a disadvantage here, but I think the City can make the call as to what is prudent
- A business is not a resident. They go home at night. We live here.
- reduce no parking zones, no cost for permits
- C, D, & E: If a house includes parking (pad or garage, etc.) they should not be eligible for a parking permit as their house provides ample parking. We should be focusing on providing permits for multi-family units to increase density without needing large parking lots.
- I support this option but the City sends a mixed message by approving multi-family, high-density housing in areas with inadequate public transit.



- Residents will only park on the street where off street parking is not available. Is it not reasonable to restrict them from owning a car or make owning a car inconvenient.
- Again get rid of permit zones and you eliminate most of these issues. Almost all of the issues being discussed are caused by having roadside parking permit zones in the first place.
- D
- Regardless of the make-up of the household, we must ensure that vehicle congestion does not harm the neighbourhood.
- RPP Eligibility and Review process does not exist. I have contacted the city, calgary parking authority, my community association and even tried my MLA. They all point the finger at someone else and no one will take responsibility to get my building authorized for a permit despite being in a zone.
- Developers have taken advantage of the RPP process in order to not build designated parking spaces and push the load onto public, taxpayer owned streets. The street should be shared among residents and the public.
- Neighbor with teenagers who drive can have a ton of cars around but people in building cant is unfair and punishes people who live in multi story building, even though it's cheaper and better for the environment
- I personally feel that there needs a modification on the method for reviewing whether a building is elligible for premit. My own building "has enough spots" but no free street parking close. It's a hassle and difficult and needs attention.
- Building of more than 4 stories should have thei4 own parking
- multi-family are the scourge of on street parking. It is the responsibility of the developer to provide proper parking for their residents and not depend on The City to provide residents with *free parking* on the street. If the developer is not providing parking, then The city must charge them
- Short stay parking of 2-4 hrs in residential areas should always be free, and always allowed. Abusers that abandon cars on the street or use neighborhoods for commuter parking should be ticketed. Lack of enforcement enables the problem. Rules with no consequence....
- "A: applying for them means there will be way more people getting passes, thus reducing the ability for others to park in the area.
- D: again, if they have parking options (driveways and such), there should be minimal need for additional permits"
- A - Apartment buildings are designed with the necessary parking available per size of unit. Generally there are hourly parking zones (time restricted) which apartment units can use.
- D) If there is assigned parking for residents in a multifamily/apartment building, it makes sense that they should park there. These lots typically have visitor parking as well.
- On street parking is limited, so when more than 2 cars per house are parked on the street, it is not possible for a homeowner to park one car when they come home which is not reasonable and unfair.
- OPTION A - However, each building should have access to 2 visitor permits for construction or service companies. These visitor permits would be held by the building manager for distribution as needed.



- B - live in a 4 storey apartment inner city, business and guests of owned condos across the street take up street parking in front of our building too often. Would like multi-family units to have parking permits right in front of building to deter businesses and unrelated guests from using our space
- People don't own the road in front of their residence. If they want to park there, they should pay to rent the space.
- On a volunteer basis, I often assist those in need in residences ineligible for visitor permits. with no time and no budget for busses and cabs, it makes access to these areas very difficult.
- Renters must park at their address. We have many renters on our street parking for days at a time outside our house (three weeks once and I called the city).
- Way too many cars to one house in the NE. Huge problem for residential parking.
- Too much density in Hillhurst - developers should have underground parking.
- see response 3
- B) We should not be favoring one housing type over another when it comes to access to a public resource (ie street parking)
- If multi family homes can all have permits there would be not enough street space for every vehicle.
- Difficult to answer as I think that there should be less zone parking restrictions but if there are, I don't think that muti-family households or rentals should get extra permits.
- We must live within our means, including the use of public property for private vehicles. Residential properties are required to have designated parking and occupants should utilize that.
- Areas of multi-family should have a 2 hour max with payment required. All new multi-family must provide on-site parking minimum of 1 per residence
- D) Older multi-family buildings may not have sufficient parking, by anything built within the last 30 years should have enough for each unit.
- No real opinion on this but if on street parking options are restricted, infrastructure should be in place to enable people to live car free.
- Total exclusion is discriminatory and deters visitors
- Multi-family, rentals should have to provide off street parking for excess vehicles.
- Selected A: Multi-family buildings should have on-site parking for visitors. Allowing visitor permits will have the same effect as if there is no restriction to parking due to the anticipated high volume of visitors.
- This will force developers to include appropriate visitor and resident parking spaces. No parking between 2am - 6am will solve the problem of multi-family households spilling on to the street.
- B: Residents who can only afford multi-family dwellings should not be penalized by having nowhere to park their vehicle. Allow them to apply to a permit.
- There is such a wide variety of multi-family dwellings, in areas with varying parking demands. One rule won't be good at applying to so many situations, so E seems desirable.
- A - I don't understand what the rules are for multifamily
- (B) If you live in an area, you should be able to park in the area; REGARDLESS of your housing type. However, multi-family households ****MUST BE BUILT WITH SUFFICIENT PARKING FOR RESIDENTS****



- Open city opposed to a closed city concept
- I also like option E. There's a challenge with multi-family units but they shouldn't be penalized for living in this type of area.
- As above. Also multi family bldgs should do more to provided onsite pkg for residents
- Multi family residences should have adequate parking on site
- Would be good if there is some data collection on high/low demand periods.
- Explaining B. I own 3 rental, bungalows, that had their on-street parking removed due to the 5th Ave. N.W. bicycle lane between 10 St. and 14 St. N.W. and only have single garages for 1 vehicle
- Current format makes the most sense, as condos/apartments include parking.
- E.As driver who has frequently chosen frequent rentals over car ownership, this system has enraged me at different points. In an apartment, unless I had a car to register, it actually encouraged car ownership. More flexible ways to temporarily register a car as "mine" would address some of that.
- While I think residents should accept the model of parking they moved in to (ie no options for apartments etc) I also think that it would be possibly quite effective to offer the same use for members of the neighbourhood.
- Multi family dwellings should not receive parking passes - parking should be provided by landlord or builder when building is approved by city so Option A would be my choice.
- Why would non-driving residents need to park?
- needs reviews to remain relevant
- Parking is already and should continue to be considered in development planning of a site - and people buying/renting are already aware and should consider that when choosing where to live.
- Why would a non driving resident need a parking permit?
- This only seems fair to level the playing field for all residents.
- See previous response. If you can't park on site what other choice do you have? People in multi family dwellings aren't a problem, but volume is. Is it their fault that their neighbour has three cars and guests every night? There needs to be a way to not punish everyone
- "D - on site parking should be a priority
- E - regular reviews should take place but must include stakeholder involvement"
- No opinion
- "New highrise buildings should be forced to build enough onsite parking instead of one stall for a two bedroom unit. It is this thoughtless process that causes issues in my area.
- Also, with the new recycling requirements, our building lost its visitor parking stall."
 - Majority of RPP areas are R1 neighborhoods and current parking system works. Multi-family homes have to share the parking available to the home same as a family of 7 would need to share theirs in single family home.
- I believe that all residences should provide parking onsite. No-one in the city should expect to be able to park their private property (vehicle) on public property.
- I don't agree with this. Right now any visitors to our house have to pay to park in the core. It's costly. It means there are less visitors to the businesses as a result.



- No vehicles, commercial or personal, should be allowed to park for free on public property.
- No other option is applicable.
- There are 3 adults renting in the home I live in. No garage access here even though there is a garage. Talk to the landlord. On-street parking is essential for all adults living in this dwelling.
- "Again as above.
- Why can the City not revert back o where we were. It worked.
- No outside parking allowed except when visiting a home. I was instrumental in developing this plan and it worked beautifully."
- High density housing should have on site parking
- there is not always enough onsite parking for all units of a building, families often need more than 1 vehicle. particularly downtown parking is difficult with the amount of construction/maintenance and it is not fair that someone would have to purchase parking for these types of inconveniences.
- Parking should be a norm with where you live, if you choose to have a vehicle. You shouldn't have additional payments needed.
- Multifamily dwellings are not an issue where I live. The current system works with residents being allowed to apply for permits and having visitor parking
- I don't feel that residents living in multi-family households should be eligible for any resident or visitor permits. They should only be allowed to park in garages and driveways.
- A - large buildings should have onsite parking - they usually must when they are built but this gets ignored.
- The one size plan that fits every zone is simplistic. It simply doesn't work well for the users. It was set up to work for ease of enforcement not to meet the specific needs of the user.
- People should still be allowed to have guests.
- All the multi-family units in my zone have off street parking so this doesn't seem to be an issue to me. (isn't that a zoning requirement when building a multi-family unit?)
- People living in multi family dwellings or rentals are not limited to only owning 2 vehicles, and they can take up the entire street parking
- If parking on site and is limited then households should be able to apply for a permit
- D - This would be helpful!
- No change to existing parking permit.
- The parking problems of multi-family households are caused by city councils determination to densify the city. These multi-family housing units are popping up everywhere. The city is causing its own problems. Single family house districts should remain single family house districts.
- Needs further investigation.
- Some people propose a change and residence feel pressured to sign the petition. Those people move to a new neighbourhood and leave old residents with the annoyance of restrictions.
- I once lived in an older tall building that did not offer on site visitor parking. Parking was a big problem there.



- There has to be a limit as to how many permits a single family dwelling can have. If the city can't police illegal duplexes and hostel-type accommodation it could at least limit the parking congestion from the excess people.
- Some older apartment buildings have no or insufficient on-site parking.
- C Developers need to provide sufficient parking for residents. Residents need to consider parking options when they decide to move to multi dwelling residences. But they need some visitor parking. If there is not enough, provide a few more in the immediate area around the building for a fee.
- so these multi family units have to provide their parking within the lot that they build on? or underground parking. this is a problem in that many lots in our area are being renovated into multi units.
 - I think the current system strives to be fair for all Scenarios. Perhaps our street laws don't need to change, but laws for these large multifamily home developers do. Maybe they need to start including underground parking to help our city out. These dwellings are the reason for the shortage.
- Do not think city has to take over RPP. Allow residents to have a say in the parking on the street they reside. Removing community engagement will cause disgruntled residents and hatred toward city hall
- New Development or redevelopment needs to be considered. Underground parking is key -older properties need to be grandfathered age of property needs to be considered if it is too expensive to retrofit, we need to discourage urban sprawl and encourage multimodal ways of getting around
- parking permits should be restricted to how many people can legally stay in one house. too many cars are already clogging the parking space on the road.
- City planners need to make sure during planning phase that they have adequate parking on these sites or on the street in front. Easy to get useful zones in place - don't understand that concern.
- This is important to me.
- C&D: Parking enforcement patrols should resume, rather than downloading the responsibility to citizens, causing inter-neighbour conflict. All street parking should cost market value, no discounts or free parking for Residents if visitors have to pay.
- Seems fair.
- Residents and visitors should get priority. They live there. Doesn't matter if it's multi-family. It's up to the vendors and in-house business owners (like "massage" businesses) to manage their clients' needs. Don't open up a coffee shop if you don't have parking.
- These types of residents (who do not use street parking) are currently paying the same as people who hoard public street parking. This imbalance needs correction. Adding a cost to street parking makes the user pay and that is fairer. It also promotes active transportation.
- B, people who live in area should be able to park near where they reside, without paying
- All residential buildings should provide for at least one off street parking spot for residents. Other countries require proof of an off street parking spot before a vehicle can be purchased in congested areas.
- "A - multi-family households should have sufficient parking on the property



- C - additional hourly zones and less permit only zones
- E - with all the data from the camera cars, the use patterns could be analyzed and rules adjusted to use on street parking space efficiently"
- This has worked in other jurisdictions.
- if you don't like your neighborhood and it's multi family units etc, MOvE
- D is the most fair option and will make more street parking available. Parking is a big problem for people who rent as more parking is needed.
- In some cases, the streets have plenty of available room to park, most homes have garages or driveways, and large amounts of public and private resources are being used (and wasted) to build off-street parking facilities.
- A.
- Multi-family households should only be able to park in front of their buildings. Take up to much of single family household parking and fill up our street with no parking
- If you are building a multi-family residence, adequate parking should be part of the building permits / plan. Otherwise it just creates problems. If it wasn't, then they should have to pay for additional parking so they aren't constantly stealing parking from other people's legitimate spots.
- D: DEfforts should be made for people to have places to park off the roads
- B C and E
- My son lives in an area with lots of apartments. There are never parking spaces available. The few spaces available on the street are unrestricted and taken by Foothills employees and university students. Lots of streets need revision.
- Response to A. This seems to work the best.
- D sounds most reasonable
- We like the idea that the RPP restrictions are reviewed and modified within zones as needed. Needs vary between different neighbourhoods and also change with demographic changes over time.
- "Do NOT add to the administrative costs of implementing these parking options. i.e B and D.
- Zone implementation should be available for review maybe annually. Unexpected consequences can appear, such as loss of business revenue due to RPP zone implementation. See 3 above"
- It would be frustrating is as more and more density comes to low density neighbourhoods that long term residents have a harder and harder time finding parking
- N/A because this doesn't apply to our parking area.
- See explanation for Topic 2. We are zoned single family dwellings but are seeing rentals of a dwelling by several non-related individuals with multiple vehicles.
- I live in a building where we have to park on street a few times per yr for maintenace on parking area. Still need permit for that
- parking should not limit who can visit.
- I have an issue with new developments constantly asking and getting parking waived. Two cars per household is enough. It is usually the space in front of ones home. Multi family homes etc should not impinge in neighbours



- AS the density increases, there is no way to accommodate the vehicles of multi-family residences. If they are going to build apartments, they need to build the parking for them.
- It should be the responsibility of the developer and resident to account for sufficient parking space and not use public space for parking.
- multi unit developers should include parking in their plan. Once again, the street is not for everyone's personal use it's for everyone to enjoy.
- "D. People should be encouraged to use the on-site parking for parking and not other uses (i.e. garage as storage). Additional permits should be available for purchase, increasing rate for more permits.
- Problems should be caught and addresses per zone."
- RPP permits could be increased to include multi- family units if existing parking is not over-subscribed
- Life is like a buffet. Don't take more than you can eat.....or don't buy 3 cars and expect to store your private property on public streets, especially in higher density locations. Be more thoughtful about where you live, and be more considerate of how much more space you are taking up.
- Options A and D: No permits for multi family households because the potential for multiple vehicles in a huge complex is too intrusive on other residents. I also think if residents have an adequate garage or pad, that space should be utilized and the resident excluded from having a permit.
- Make sure all new building projects over 4 storeys provide adequate parking on site in conjunction with D for existing buildings..
- There is an rental unit not far from our house and the street around it is always full of cars. This certainly doesn't affect us so if someone can't obtain parking at their apartment it seems only fair they should be able to apply for a parking permit
- Let's be clear - while the city council votes to diminish single family dwellings and build multi family buildings in areas where parking,traffic is already an issue, should not punish existing residents. Make developers provide APPROPRIATE parking space on their building site. Marda Loop prime ex!
- Can someone explain to me how how residential parking permit eligibility possesses concern for non driving residence,
- It is the fairest option available.
- E the city should review the value and needs of RPP restricted zones. The location of my house is 2+ blocks from Britannia plaza and rarely sees visitors parking there. Most cars are resident vehicles, so the parking restrictions are just a nuisance when I have visitors over.
- Britannia, Elboya and Windsor Park areas have too many "No Parking except by Permit" zones and do not allow for visitors to the area or parking for staff of the businesses in the area.
- This one would need more time to consider what the best option would be
- Come on!!!! How is this even a question? If you need to park and you live there you should be allowed to!
- My daughter lives in Maria loop. Her area would be overwhelmed if each multi story condo owner were able to obtain two permits. The developers should be forced to plan onsite visitor parking



- A - Do not believe the situation needs to change for multi-family households.
- Keep as is... They should have to pay for parking or get spot in building.. Already streets are full in Hillhurst.
- If there is onsite parking, then why do they need permits as well?
- Owners of these types of domiciles should be obligated to provide reasonable on-site parking.
- Some people in the city have six cars for a family or three, and it's selfish and unnecessary to take up street parking for others. They can store their cars if they want.
- Residents should have easy access to their residences. Visitor parking would be too muscular around these complexes and negate access for residents. When projects are reviewed for development, City needs to ensure appropriate parking is provided. Current by-law provisions are insufficient.
- Greater on site requirements should be imposed. The block length is not going to change but the land use can be. Less parking relaxations must be considered.
- Multi-family households should provide parking. People know when they move in if there is no parking- that's why it's cheaper. If 4 stories worth of people parked on the street there would be nowhere for everyone else to park. This would only get worse with inner city densification.
- Option D
- "A. Again refer to #2 for rational
- refer to #2"
- with the "densification" strategy the City has for the Marda Loop area, there are going to be increasing pressures on residential parking accessibility
- Leave as is!!!!
- The suggestion that us living in multi family dwellings should not be eligible is ridiculous. Single family homes should have sufficient parking on their property. Multi family homes are quite limited. We have visitor's too and most buildings have insufficient visitor parking. Use app track (above)
- Residents should have first priority
- Discriminating against people based on housing type should not happen. by allowing expansion of the program will strain the available spots and ability of people to access a spot. Review of the restrictions and number of permits may have to be reviewed
- Developers need to plan for parking to be held to onsite standards. they can't develop with the expectation that street parking is the solution for the density they are adding to a neighbourhood.
- B, C, D and E all make sense provided there are no except by permit zones. Parking is then first come first serve for everyone when it's just hourly restrictions
- I am unaware of all the issues involved in this theme.
- D: If a resident has on-site parking, there is no reason for them not to utilize it and take up available street parking.
- I live in the University condos. I pay property taxes like anyone else in this neighbourhood. I own a van I use for employment to pay property taxes, that will not fit in the underground parking lot. This van is not a "want", it's a necessity for employment. However, im ineligible for a permit.



- Multi-family units should have on-site parking. The intent of parking permits should be to limit excessive or unrelated visitor parking in a zone.
- D...there's no reason for permits if the multi family property has parking. For those who don't, they should be able to get a permit.
- When Multi-family complexes are developed sufficient parking should be provided.
- I don't understand how that type of housing you live in should dictate your eligibility to park on commonly shared streets
- On site parking should always be the first choice BUT in the event of multi car families with only one on site spot would require modification. Hence E. modifications may be needed on occasion.
- FOR VERY SPECIFIC HIGH DENSITY AREAS!
- This option make sense and should be reviewed on a case by case basis
- Because the parking system has deemed a zone permit. This should not violate the freedoms of people that live within those zones. Nor should it be substantial more difficult to have visitors.
- A & D - Builders should provide on-site parking if they are building multi-family buildings - if this is not the case (for some ridiculous reason) they residents should be able to apply for parking permits
- BTreat us all fairly, I am muti family yet even though we have three lots we only get 2 visitor permits for all 8 residents. Fix the very unfriendly system to enter visitors get an app and let us put our own expire time on the entry.
- Structures of this nature should provide their own parking.
- D - and I can't believe that the city approved an apartment building in East Village with NO parking. A lot of virtue signalling there, but what about visitors, home care, etc.
- In high density situations parking will always be an issue. How do cities such as Vancouver and Toronto handle their city core parking issues?
- Take the cameras off vehicles parking enforcement is getting Camera happy! give people a 1 hr parking limit!!
- If the building doesn't have parking and they're not eligible for a pass where will they park? They'd be paying for on-street anyways so just take their money all at once with the 50 dollar fee.
- Is there enough on street parking available to do otherwise?
- Multi residence houses should still be allowed visitor passes. Demand builders ensure enough on site parking for residents in the complex. Make visitor permits have a set amount of time so they are not used as residence extra vehicle parking.
- Permits are issued for new developments are issued subject to their providing assurances of sufficient on site parking. Issuing them permits at he expense of existing residents would put the lie to this.
- A builders need to incorporate parking lots in their plans and not expect residential street parking to accommodate extra density from said building.
- D - if space is freed up by ensuring residents use all available on-site parking, the space should be given back to be used by other paying visitors to the area...benefiting businesses in the area.
- Option A multi family usually have an assigned parking spot and visitor spot.



- Higher density housing should have access to permit street parking if no on site parking is provided. Single family homes should not have priority as they often have on site parking.
- Option A would be my choice. Multi family units should have on site parking. Densification is happening all over my neighbourhood and developers need to make provision for parking or we would have hundreds of extra drivers competing for very few spaces.
- Multi family living areas do not always provide sufficient parking for residence and street parking should be included to help ease that burden.
- Chose D: multi-family residences should be allowed to apply for one parking permit if there is no onsite parking.
- Current restrictions are suitable
- I often have more than 2 visitors at a time and the 2 hour window is unacceptable.
- Multi family needs to incorporate on site parking in their development plan as priority and city needs to enforce esp in high density areas
- A, but the periodic review of E is a good idea. Multi-family buildings could be eligible for the number of visitor permits proportional to the frontage of the building
- All residents and their visitors should receive priority for on-street parking. Multi-family, rental and non-driving households should not be excluded from this privilege.
- Option A: Allowing multi-family parking permits in front of structure will swamp any available parking for visitors and business stops. Hourly parking is best balance for residences who can obtain exemption permits, while allowing others to visit. All policies need to be reviewed regularly.
- None of the above. Exclusive parking permits on public spaces should not be available. All parking should be paid hourly/daily parking where demand outstrips supply to encourage alternative parking and transportation arrangements (bike, transit, carshare)
- more unpaid parking in residential areas - it is our city! Don't allow density unless parking provided with all developments. it is not one size fits all across the city
- Far too little street parking to support high density residences
- Although I feel for multi-family households, The issue of Parking should have been dealt with at the planning and approval stage of the development permit. Planning and more planning and putting the cost onto the developer will help.
- A review system is sorely needed of existing RPP.
- The current plan is sufficient.
- B Residents should have preferential parking access,
- Option A because multi-family households ought to be expected to create their own off-street parking spaces.
- You need to allow for car sharing. Currently the car needs to be registered to the resident. This needs to be changed so a person sharing a vehicle with a resident in a restricted area doesn't need to sell their car to the resident.
- More options are needed. I am in a townhouse and because I do not have a street facing townhome I can't get a permit. This makes it difficult to having people over and makes it difficult to rent my place



- Building management is not consistent in providing parking for residents, often leaving this in the hands of private companies who charge high rates for parking spaces. Residents need access to residential parking permits.
- Option A - It defeats the purpose of permits if more and more permits are issued. Three hundred permits for a zone with thirty parking spaces would make no sense.
- Need a better way of expanding the zone, in a way that does not put the work on the resident requesting - especially as it looks like getting the info is scamming other neighbors. There needs to be a better way of addressing.
- C, D. Multi-family residents tend to have multi families in residences. Up the required amount of space given to families by the developer required for parking.
- If you have parking use it. If you have one stall in your condo then it was not designed to have multiple cars, and should pay for extra on street parking.
- Given the new trend toward building condos without parking, this is exclusionary. I lived in a condo building and because it was multi family, only 3 signatures were counted (one per building in the complex) for the RPP petition.
- A: A high density MF building should have sufficient on site parking. If they don't, it's not fair to offload that on the nearby residents. E: I think all RPPs should probably have some level of review every 3-5 years.
- can't follow this query
- Too many buildings under 4 stories have access to street parking. If its multiple dwelling it should be 2 residential permits per legal city lot. With mandatory off street parking provided by landlord
- Multi unit buildings are being built without parking. They should not get access to street parking because the city doesn't required enough spots in other parking.
- Along with the city being the ones making the final decision. Not the residents. Review the trends, the traffic, and the availability of parking at any given time.
- Multi-family developments should include parking options within the property boundaries at the time of construction.
- "A - multi family units should provide their own resident and visitor parking
- E - functionality should be reviewed periodically"
- If the city has rpp then everyone should be able to apply
- E: most multi-family sites are dense, newer & should have been built with minimum number of on-site stalls; numerous on-street parkers from a dense multi-family site would overwhelm the surrounding neighbourhood--this isn't fair to nearby homes.
- B - persons in multi-family homes and residences should have the same eligibility as single family homes. C would allow extra visitors if the hours were reasonable ie: 2 hour minimum.
- If anything it is more likely for those living in apartments to not have access to parking because you are typically given one stall and most households have more than one vehicle. They should get priority over those who use their house garages for storage.
- Preference is C. Allowing for visitors to visit on an hourly basis would help renters have friends over.



- Available to all residents, but only if you have to pay for the on-street permit. And C, hourly visitor parking also available.
- Why aren't these same restrictions forced on individuals living in suburban neighborhoods? Why are these restrictions forced on inner city residents that pay a higher portion of property taxes?
- Excluding multi-family residences is unfair and does not serve the needs of the community equally.
- B is less restrictive and more equitable
- People need somewhere to park, no matter what kind of household, if you live in a residents that has a restricted parking zone, you should be able to apply for a parking permit.
- not sure residents can't apply for a permit. May because not enough street parking for a high rise apartment but then it would be a first come first served situation. But if a street is zoned for a permit and an condo can't apply that's not fair.
- We already pay taxes for public roads.
- There will otherwise be NO EQUITY for nearby single family residents. Multi-family residences must provide adequate amount of on-site visitor parking, typically 1st come 1st serve, and not squeeze out adjoining neighbors. Density/mixed use is good, but that should mean less cars, not more chaos!
- Option D - multi rental buildings should plan for on-site parking.
- BS questions again, so you can sell more permits!
- this is the only acceptable way to control parking in these areas
- A It seems unreasonable that there could be parking for 4+ stories infills on once lower density residential street. Bylaw should ensure that adequate visitor parking is included within the footprint of the structure including underground as a solution.
- Why is the City interested in discriminating against multi family residents, especially with stated goals to increase density?
- Increasing hourly only increases public parking. Cause more inconvenience for residents. Limit with the residents, then gives residents more flexibility.
- A ensures that densification that comes with multi-family properties does negatively affect parking availability in currently low-density neighbourhoods. This helps combat NIMBYism. Multi-family properties have the scale to be designed with sufficient parking.
- Limit the number of permits to an address to two. More than that creates congestion on city streets.
- Development is sold to community on basis that there is sufficient off street parking. B, C and D would put the lie to this. Wonder why anyone would ever trust what the City says.
- Different zones have different needs. An R1 zone is very different from a block with multiple apartment buildings. Each zone should have a customized parking plan.
- The City needs to force the developers to provide the parking for multifamily homes! NO to passes for these buildings.
- B - I live in a 5-storey multi-family condo, and I have been obtaining a permit for years. With most multi-storey, multi-family household complexes being approved with inadequate onsite parking, I don't think the "current" restriction indicated under "A" is fair.



- B - I cannot understand Why? the City is Not giving permits? These dwellings probably need permits more than single family homes.
- Parking permit abuse is a problem in inner city (around SAIT). Existing restrictions need to stay in place, or made more restrictive. The city's land use zoning has a requirement for parking allowances and ratios. Allowances for multifamily units should be addressed through land use zoning, NOT here
- E: The RPP eligibility and review process should be flexible. I think the City should open the whole process city wide and if a street wants PP and gets the required percentage of neighbours then they should be granted PP with a fee attached.
- Free on street parking...needed.
- Too many autos on streets.
- Multi-family units should provide off-street parking.
- I am thinking of downtown here and my selections are just my opinion :)
- It makes no sense for people to park on the street if they have on site parking available - these spaces should be left for people who don't have them available, including tenants living in houses with on site parking that's reserved for a landlord or a specific tenant.
- B More equitable.
- Please scrap electronic RPP and start sending visitor parking tags in the mail. The online system is terrible: it has bugs and it freezes. There is no tech support on weekends/after hours. The requirements can be confusing to elderly, people who are not computer savvy and first time users.
- E - we are in an area of single family homes so I am not sure how to deal with rentals and multi-family residences.
- out of province, needing to apply days in advance, the bureaucratic and painful process with poor website explanations of the rules are a detriment. Unacceptable being advised that certain buildings are not eligible for visitor when clearly needed.
- if residents have garages/drive ways/ concrete pads they need to be utilizing these. I think requests should be reviewed case by case. too many people are not utilizing their at home parking and just parking on streets or have too many vehicles and taking up others space.
- E - Unless we are able to revisit manpower to ensure parking violators are enforced, there is really no sound reason to have restrictions.
- Permits available as required if no other parking is available seems reasonable and fair.
- A/B might work in some areas, however when you mix rental, owner occupied and multi-family homes none of these are going to work
- A, because it is the least bad choice. D is insane, encouraging the worst of behavior and penalizing the good neighbours at the expense of the most aggressive and inconsiderate.
- make sure multi-family units have development plans with onsite parking for visitors as well. limit parking passes for multi-family residents for the street
- As the city allows more multi family buildings to increase density in the inner city, the residents of these buildings won't be able to have visitors without the ability to obtain visitors permits. It might be necessary to limit visitor permits for multi unit residences to one per residence.



- We don't have visitor parking with our condo. We only have one spot so we went down to one vehicle. When we have guests for an extended time we have to park in the zone parking to allow our guests to have a place to park for an extended time. These zones and passes are imperative to us.
- Multi-unit dwellings should provide off-street parking for residents and visitors
- Zones too big; one size doesn't fit all; set parameters to deal with circumstances; LRT parking problems not same as Beltline problems. Those who live in high density need to realize the parking is limited. They live there with known parking problem. Why solve problem they knowingly created.
- A - Any other option puts too much stress on RESIDENTS OCCUPYING SINGLE FAMILY FACILITIES.
- Multi unit buildings should have their own parking, or residents should understand they don't get special treatment. Roads and parking are paid for by all taxpayers.
- E - I would like the city to review our parking zone in Saint Andrews Heights and have it removed. I understand that more people were parking in our area while the Foothills was working on the parking garage. I believe it is operating now. Bottom line those are still taxpayers that are working.
- 2 Issues here: 1) I agree that multi-family should not be eligible for residential. 2) To have an RPP zone in St. Andrews Heights is absolutely, unequivocally, one the most asinine decisions. ENTITLEMENT. If a household opts for permit parking then increase their taxes. I didn't sign the petition.
- different situations occur at different locations. review to set a standard .
- E- not an expert on this topic so selected E
- B,C. Need more free permits for residents in RPP zone. Do not agree with PAID parking for visitors at a persons home.
- I have resided in the same home for 33 years and am upset this Residential Only restriction was instituted without prior direct communication from the city. Yes we were approached by the 2 families that spearheaded this change but I felt it was somewhat confrontational & we weren't being listened to
- Please make the parking limitations the SAME all through the neighborhood! The problem is that there are TOO many dwellings with "No Parking Without Permit" which causes their visitors to take the parking spaces in front of their neighbors houses!
- Living in an area that if we do not have this system people will who work downtown will park and walk. If the City cancels permits then it should not be allowed to have meter parking anywhere. The City is in a financial crisis and this survey comes out. Hats off to Chu and Farkas for seeing light
- Residents who pay property taxes should NOT have to pay additional fees for permits to park in front of their own homes.
- People in multi-family buildings need to be able to park too.
- Ban new multi family housing complexes from being built except on streets where city councillors and managers live. Maybe then you'll come up with solutions that make the situation better instead of worse.
- The status quo is egregious discrimination and should be challenged in court. How is a renter who forgoes on-site parking different from a homeowner who fills their garage with junk?



- D: Addresses with on-site parking should not qualify. Additionally, The City should ensure new builds/developers are including on-site parking instead of maxing out the space with additional units in order to make more revenue - this is contributing to the problem, but they don't care.
- B remains our opinion of the best compromise
- B) assuming there is enough parking space available
- Current system seems to be working well, from my limited perspective.
- As a condo resident in the Beltline I am shocked that I am not eligible to request a visitor permit when I have guests in town. I pay my property taxes like the next person. I should have the same parking rights as those living in detached, semi detached, townhouses etc.
- There should definitely be higher requirements for multi-family developers to provide on-site resident and visitor parking. At the very least they should be required to provide 1 spot for every bedroom in the complex.
- B or D - if there are available locations to park that aren't street parking those should be used first, but downtown only option is street parking and living in an apartment/condo shouldn't exclude people from being able to get the passes
- KISS-Keep It Simple Sam
- We are in a single family residential area and we are not up to date with these problems.
- My on street parking should not be compromised by developers not including sufficient on site parking for residents of multi family units
- Developers must provide parking onsite for all residents
- Each circumstance/situation will be different, so need flexibility and judgment in administration
- A person living in a given area should be able to park on the street
- RPP restrictions should allow reasonable use by all citizens. Allowing so many areas with restrictions and allowing 24 hour restrictions promotes virtual gated communities.
- D - If they are not provided with on-site parking, then they should have access to free parking permits.
- Each situation needs to be looked at. There should be some on-site parking to access, possibly regulated by the city.

Topic: Other types of zone restrictions, including hourly, paid and unpaid

A. Install paid parking in all RPP zones for residents and visitors

B. Establish unpaid time restrictions in RPP zones for residents and visitors

C. Residents can park in RPP zones at no cost while, visitors are charged a fee to park in the same zone

D. No change to current policy - Residents living in RPP zones do not have to pay to receive resident and visitor permits. These costs are covered through property taxes

- There is no current option for construction sites or redevelopment projects to have the ability to access sites. There are multiple phases requiring different parking & different access (ie - delivery of materials. How can goals of MDP be achieved or progressed without options to allow it to occur?



- None of the proposed solutions work. We need something that allows the following: 1. No cost parking to residents at all times. 2. Limited (more than 2!) no cost parking to resident's visitors. 3. Limited low cost/no cost visitor parking for homecare workers. 4. Current visitor limited to 2 reduces our quality of life.
- Paying >5K in property taxes should entitle me my visitors to park free
- No pay 2 hour
- No payment for parking in RPP
- Yes, please charge for parking in all zones for visitors and residents. The cost of the road is not free. Off street parking is included in most residents. The user should pay if they want to store there private car on city property
- I don't think that paying for parking in RPP zones is fair (I don't think that my daughter should pay for parking)
- absolutely not. We pay taxes already
- No!
- No. Also not. We need to encourage people to visit inner city areas & visit family & friends
- I'm against to this Residential Paid Parking the zoning should apply to the RPP that are in the radius of 3 blocks within a commercial zone
- yes
- This is used in other municipalities eg. Oakville, Residents do not park on the street
- yes
- no - should be no time restrictions
- people shouldn't have to pay for parking. Paying for parking makes me sick. It's a money grab for municipalities
- I think there should be more unpaid RPP zones with generous time restrictions (3-7 hrs)
- Sick of city charging loss of faith in the City
- absolutely no. defies when I want to complain about neighbour parking
- My visitors? No. Clarify visitor
- Everyone should pay to park
- No, this would add extra inconvenience (and cost) when visitors arrive.
- Visitors should not have to pay. I will never get visitors!
- this works because it is our home! Us and visitors - friends or visiting family - should not have to pay to visit. It restricts your social life otherwise!
- Agreed. Calgary property taxes are high - Vancouver is at least 50% lower! Permits should be free for residents.
- Yes. Yes to hanging tags
- I would prefer to go back to hanging tags for the respective elders or seniors. I agree!
- Yes, bring back hanging tags!
- having to register my vehicle with Edmonton is an infringement on my rights (sharing my personal info just to park)



- yes
- yes
- What would be the increase to property taxes?
- Living closer to inner city means my house value is higher and I pay higher taxes. Why should I also have to incur higher costs to have a visitor.
- I wouldn't want my visitors to have to pay to visit the residential community I live in, just like I don't have to pay to visit a suburban community.
- Seems fine
- Businesses working at the home must have an option to park there. Providing this at a reasonable cost is mandatory.
- Charging visitor is a hidden tax and affects those with low income far more than it affects the rich. Property taxes are a more fair way of paying for this
- SAIT students and commuters should have to pay to park in our neighbourhood. More important than this though is that there is enforcement of the time limits in our area. Many people park here because they know they won't get caught most days.
- Do not add a confusion layer to zones. It just adds another set of signage and guests to residential that could be registered as a visitor by the homeowner will pay for parking in a zone first.
- I think a combination of the current policy and increase in parking access (free) with a time limit would be a good balance.
- I feel that it is controlled enough as it is right now so please leave it as it currently is now.
- My taxes are already twice what I paid in the suburbs for a lot that is half the size. Both homes are similar value
- Residents/visitors should not have to pay just to park on the street. If a charge is to be implemented, it should be across ALL city roads/streets including the suburbs. It needs to be fair and residents in RPP zones should not be penalized for living in high density area as encouraged by the City.
- My elderly parents shouldn't have to pay to visit my home in a predominately residential neighbourhood.
- These costs ARE covered through property taxes. Enough gouging of homeowners already!
- Again, I feel VERY STRONGLY that we should not have to pay for what others in the city have as a matter of course. It is not our fault that LRT or SAIT parkers would find our neighbourhood attractive - the cost should NOT be on us!!! (and I expect Druh Farrell to support this!!)
- This option could work, combined with visitor passes.
- Paid parking should apply during all busy times. At other times parking should be free and time limited.
- "The times do not need to be identical for both nor do the rates.
- WHY should my taxes subsidize my neighbours parking when I have no car? Park in my garage?"
- To encourage inner city living. Increased parking cost and inconvenience may push people to the suburbs and make inner city living less desirable.
- Parking shouldn't be free, increasing parking rates



- We should be treating all citizens fairly, not special treatment for residents who want to use the public street as their private parking lot.
- This is probably closest to what i would like. Charging residents would encourage more use of onsite parking. Second, third permits should have escalated cost. Free visitor permits, but current 2 week period allows easy misuse.
- D. This is a solution looking for a problem. No need to change anything.
- D - Charging visitors discourages people from visiting different neighbourhoods which can isolate communities instead of building diversity.
- Residents and their visitors should never be charged to park where they live
- No change to currently policy other than Parking restrictions are needed on 22 Street NW between 24 Avenue NW and 20 Avenue NW as University students and C-Train commuters take advantage of the free parking during the work days which limits parking for area residents.
- Why should I have to pay more b/c I am inner city? My property taxes are already the highest in the city! How is this fair???
- D- I think that this is working very well and now that the system is digital, I expect that the costs to parking permits are lower - no paper or postage anymore.
- "A: what?
- B: This makes the most sense.
- C: Maybe in a commercial zone, but I don't want my visitors to need to pay in my residential neighbourhood
- D: Where I live, this is fine"
- seems fair. good luck at policing it.
- D. Until you put RPP in every community there is no way to charge one community parking and another not. Unjust!
- "A combination of B and D is the status quo in my RPP zone. I live on a street that gives visitors up to 2 hours free without a permit, and free parking with a permit after that. I like that it's easy to activate the permit online now.
- This all works well, so I'm voting for the status quo here."
- Option D. We already pay high property taxes, residents and their visitors should not have to pay to park on their own streets.
- D. This is fair. But please make the visitor option more FRIENDLY!!! The online guest registration system sucks. Not a word I use in my daily vocabulary. You've made it so my elderly parents do not visit or have access to my home when I am at work unless they let me know ahead, which they often can'
- I cannot see why I should pay to park on the street outside my home, while those in the suburbs do not. I think option B has some merit, but how is it monitored and I certainly cannot see charging my visitors to park (option C)
- D - the current system works for me
- Visitors create community and keep Calgarians engaged.



- As someone who lives at a restricted parking are I think the system works. It's not broken so don't fix it.
- Costs are only a deterrent to those who can least afford them
- unpaid options, maybe some paid ones for visitors (if going over a certain amount of time ..) or close to businesses.
- So long as the zone has a free after time, and is not a ridiculous rate, I'd rather visitors pay in high density areas (near hospitals/universities)
- D. works for us.
- Install meters in all inner city zones and near LRT stations and secondary education institutions (Hounsfeld Heights)
- How absurd to tell your friends they can come visit but it will cost you! Talk about creating a "shut in" environment.
- D
- The other options require more enforcement, for both the resident and the City. Has the car been parked in front of your house for two hours? Did they pay? When do you call CPA? It increases traffic in the community because now there's parking within walking distance to downtown
- D: If this was not the case, property taxes still would not decrease.
- D works well for what I experience.
- I picked D. Throw it in with the taxes.
- I should have the ability to park on my street somewhere. I have not been able to park in front of my own home more than five times in the past year, sometimes on the next block. Cars are regularly parked for several days, often two weeks, at a time with no ticket.
- Enforcement might help raise revenue. The same cars park every day and I know they are not living near or have visitor passes
- No one should get to park for free.
- A it costs to implement and enforce these zones and the people benefiting from them should be paying for it not every tax payer
- This appears to be more about the City getting more money than about residents needs. This city is bad at effectively budgeting and this seems to be more about a cash grab than a parking issue.
- As stated, people pay property tax. Stop bleeding residents.
- Nobody wants to pay for this that would be a complete money grab by the city
- - are you kidding?? C. - except they don't pay, and residents end up with nowhere to park!
- I would be fine if my restricted zone was 2 hour. It would deter the high school kids, but make it work for our cleaning lady.
- property taxes are adequate expense. Owners should get their parking and have adequate ease at finding a space.
 - public roads are for general public use purposes. Any exclusive use should be paid by the user and not subsidized by the taxpayers. The current system is inappropriate and encourages private use at the expense of the general public.
- "Option D works just fine.



- Also, please note there is a typo in option C. No comma needed there."
- Commercial businesses should consider the needs of their customers when selecting a location or focus their business on local (600 metres or so) foot traffic from adjacent residences.
- Option C seems more inclusive however may also reduce places for permitted residence to park.
- D: I think it's important that neighbourhoods be friendly and inviting to visit, which includes not having to worry about paying for parking. Paid parking makes more sense in the city centre.
- C. Time restrictions are a mess, and too confusing for visitors. My preference is for paid passes for residents and hourly rates at any time of day for visitors.
- "C. Is wrong. The owners pay nothing for the privilege of free parking.
- Make the whole area paid parking if needed, have the market decide who will park there."
- You cannot charge a legitimate visitor to park when visiting a home in an RPP area - the property taxes are already high in these areas and we / our visitors should not be punished by having to pay for parking! Also, paid parking will not deter people from parking for other non-legit purposes.
- I already explained why we do not want to charge residents of desirable parts of the city to park near their homes where others can take that for granted. I think we also do not want to increase costs by imposing more fees and thus costs to obtain them. How about patrolling the zones?
- Don't buy there. Don't go there. Order on line.
- Residents and visitors to residents should not have to pay to visit a house. That would be ridiculous. Option D.
- It's a public resource that is over-used and misused because it's free - make everyone pay (even a small amount). That aligns incentives for folks to not abuse the public asset.
- Again, best to designate small areas that are 2 hour parking zones, and to keep current system.
- the city is already ripping off taxpayers with high paid parking - STAY OUT of residential areas. But you should have to justify the permit and pay a reasonable fee for it
- Residents should not have to pay.
- i.e 30 minute parking outside businesses, could still have to register plate.
- Inner city residents should not be charged for parking near their homes.
- "Care workers, Meals on Wheels, facilitators, etc., need access to the people they assist, and shouldn't have to pay when providing necessary services.
- I don't have family, but a lot of people do and they need parking when visiting."
- My family members shouldn't have to pay to visit me at my home because I live in a RPP. Timed, unpaid, visitor parking (evenings and weekends unlimited with 3 hour visitor maximum during business days) should be available in all RPPs
- Biggest problem with existing system is the way it treats owner/landlords. I think an owner should be eligible for an annual permit even IF they live elsewhere since I am paying the property tax for that lot! Establish paid parking zones in commercial areas - not residential!
- There should not be an additional cost for living in a densely populated area: This is what the City has been trying to encourage.
- I am completely against charging people to park who are visiting me. This would be a deterrent to visiting me!



- More paid zones would be helpful with limited times. 2-3 hours.
- We own a 920 sq ft, 1950's bungalow in Parkdale. Our 2019 taxes are within a hair of \$4,300 - figure out how much per sq ft that tax is. I expect problem free parking. We do not have a usable garage, and can only park one vehicle comfortably off street. Don't mess with what is mostly working well.
- paid options put strain on those who cannot afford it
- Who is driving this "theme"? Trying to generate revenue for parking from residential homeowners will require cracking open the overall property tax increase problem.
- C but visitor without the visitor permit should pay but if you have a visitor permit then you don't have to
- Enter your visitor's license plate...not hard.
- B Friends should be able to visit for free, especially in the evenings
- Charging visitors a fee to visit family or friends seems really silly. Punish people who choose to live in an RPP by deterring visitors sounds like it might affect the desirability of an area as a place to purchase or rent accomodation.
- I can't believe you are considering charging local residents to park in their area of residence. If you really want to get us living in the core, you need to remove the constraints.
- see above comments
- I don't see this as broken so I don't know why we would expend effort to fix it.
- This might address the problem I have in my neighbourhood where renters are selling parking permits for profit. This is against the rules but almost never enforced by CPA. The fee would have to be enough to deter people from using the neighbourhood to park instead of the hospital parking lot.
- "Do *NOT* charge my visitors to park to visit me. DO NOT charge my visitors. Do NOT!
- You're trying to increase parking revenue to make up for your MISMANAGEMENT and OVERSPENDING - and create an ADDITIONAL TAX for inner city residents!"
- If you are going to charge visitors and residents to park in an area, charge everyone in the city in all areas.
- All are restrictive.
- Option D - Absolutely NOT should residents or visitors have to pay any fees. I would sell my property & leave Calgary in a heartbeat if paid-parking was instituted for RPP zones. Time restrictions (per B) are very inconvenient. Fees for visitors to MY home (per C) are absurd.
- We do not need any changes to permit parking
- Residents should not have to pay to park at their home, nor should their visitors in residential areas.
- I live in an RPP zone and if I had to pay to park my vehicle I would move out of this city so fast it would make your head spin.
- we go for D, but would prefer paper hang tags to having to go online or phone in a license #
- We're still trying to figure out what our ridiculously high taxes pay for in Sunnyside!
- Change all RPP zones so they allow for 2 hour free parking between 9:00 am and 5:00 pm, and unlimited time with a pass. Change in the definitions and advertise as opposed to the cost of changing signs.



- I don't think it's fair you have to pay to park near where you live.
- D: We pay nearly \$5000 in property taxes for a small bungalow. I think this should be covered by our high taxes.
- We are already paying property taxes for the home we own.
- All I can say here once again is that the home owners, their family, their friends, their rapairment etc should never have to pay a single dime for parking.
- So dumb, just another money grab
- D is fine. No change needed.
- Enforcement is difficult. Hard to develop a sense of community when meter plugging over tides congeniality and community activities
- Parking is tied to location, which has a positive correlation to market value and taxes. Imposing a penalty on residents in the core who already subsidize the burbs in order to park near their house is sheer lunacy.
- D- having paid parking in residential areas is only a way of getting income for the city. It does not address the fact that homeowners and their visitors can not park near their home. People in RPP zones not being treated equally as other areas.
- D No win situation.
- C because visitors not attached to a resident should pay a fee, and D because a resident should be able to host visitors for short term without payment
- If there is a charge for parking in zones, it should be paid by all. People who have built garages, parkades, etc. should not have subsidize those who haven't.
- Street parking should be paid for unless the vehicle has a residential permit. Visitor parking passes should be phased out. All residential permits should be paid for (none for free) and should not be available for units that have onsite parking available.
- Come on... don't make them pay! That's so dumb.
- This is a high density area with 2 seniors homes and a big apartment complex. The status quo is providing enough options.
- I like the idea of residents paying for each residential and visitor pass they want, with a cap on the total number they can purchase. This would encourage use of garages/parking pads.
- There is already way too much paid parking in the city. Residential parking should not be a cash cow for the city.
- D Costs should be covered by business taxes on the business causing the problem
- If you want to encourage high density housing to reduce traffic and benefit the environment, don't punish people by making them pay to park at home.
- Unless the city charges all residents and visitors to park on the street near their homes, I don't see how you can charge some people for choosing to live inner city.
- I avoid all business that I need to pay for parking. I won't park downtown. I won't park in a lot / street or pay.
- D - Fees get annoying. It can be more hassle to pay the fee than the value of the fee itself.



- Paid parking should be available to visitors who do not have access to a visitor permit, either because they are not visiting a private residence, or if they are visiting residents without permits.
- should have right to use public property adjacent to residence.
- B would work in conjunction with paid parking for other users. Not cost should be competitive with other options and not available near LRT stations where parking is not provided, e.g. Westbrook.
- I still live in a RPP zone. I pay a lot of tax to allow street parking in our mature community. Visitors should have to pay. I don't believe the city is financially wise enough to make a net zero system.
- Property taxes already covers the cost of permits.
- Again, eliminate the zones. Steer parking should remain public.
- Re: A, Calgary is too car-centric (really, another 14 new subdivisions...really?!) for the CoC to charge residents and their visitors for parking (tacky! don't do it) Re: B, how would you cost-effectively administer time restrictions for all RPP zones? (don't do it) Re: C, awful idea. I chose D! :)
- I live in a very modest home that happens to be near the hospital but my taxes are already higher than many other neighbourhoods. The hospital workers who park all over my neighbourhood who seek to avoid parking charges are coming from other areas of the city where they pay lower taxes.
- This allows folks to have a party and more visitors.
- Residents should zNOT pay for on street parking in their residential zone
- Having to pay for these options is a tax. Calling it a service fee is disingenuous. We pay property taxes already so we can have services.
- Re Option D: this is fair and reasonable
- The purpose is to ensure parking for residents, so let them park. Visitors can pay- you could do a "pay for two hours get two hours free" deal to accommodate visitors to homes and capitalizes on people parking short term to visit businesses, just like everywhere else in the city.
- As above our taxes are higher given the area we live in and this should cover costs of parking
- As long as option B cause problems , I choose B, as this would help with businesses in the area.
- D is the only option... everything else feels like another city cash grab or like an additional tax.
- Please funnel money back to CAs and BIA
- I favor option D - I pay taxes to have the right to park and have visitors park in and around my home. However whichever option is selected the City must do a better job of enforcement. Many 2 hour zones (near foothills for example) are parking lots all day long and no enforcement ever happens!
- I chose D. Impractical to install all of the infrastructure for other options
- We shouldn't have to pay more for repair/installation services due to the repair person having to pay \$8/hr for parking. Its difficult to get service because of the parking issue w/o having to add \$8/hr for parking
- Smart cars get it why shouldn't we
- Ok as is
- Imagine that I'm your neighbour and I have divided my basement into multiple individual bedrooms where each one is rented out to different people each with their own vehicle where each vehicle would occupy all driveways including the one in front of your house. How would you feel?



- I like the current policy
- "We have enough fees in Calgary this seems like another fee generator.
- Inner city gets punished enough. Residential should have enjoyment and access to their home, when I bring groceries home I shouldn't have to walk blocks to get to my home."
- Home owners and residents live in established communities with a reasonable expectation of residential parking. New infill multifamily structures should have to ensure sufficient per unit parking.
- D There are many options for non residents to park in my area. There is also a c-train station. I can't taking residential restrictions away as a method to improve things for businesses. There has all ready been a reduction in residential parking as it's been converted to pay parking.
- We certainly pay enough tax!
- If it isn't broken why change it? This survey is costing valuable tax dollars that could be spent on virtual services.
- Option D - System to be working well at present.
- It is fair and reasonable to residents. Promotes inner city living. You cannot expect people to absorb the higher cost of a lot to live inner city, and then have no where to park their car, or to then pay high costs for parking their car.
- Highly demand parking areas should be available for a few, but visitors could get some time for free.
- Residents should not have to pay to have guests but residents who rent their garages & park on the street should be penalized heavily - even denied a future permit for a couple years.
- "The new system is a total waste of taxpayer money. ... total disaster." :-(
- D. You can also ticket the parking offenders near the stadium, LRT stations, etc. and raise money for the program that way. Maybe word will spread and drivers will be more careful about parking in restricted zones. It does not help to have a 2 hour limit near the stadium. Fans don't care.
- I hate u
- D. No explanation required
- Paying to park in a residential area when visiting someone is outright ridiculous. Establishing time restrictions would limit the number of commuters parking in an area for the entire day to avoid paying parking closer to their place of work and simply taking up all the residential spaces.
- If they want to have exclusive rights, then they should exclusively pay.
- The current system works very well and seems to be fair. Most people living in RPP zones already pay higher taxes than other residents of the city - they shouldn't be penalized further. I don't see a benefit to changing it.
- Our taxes are excessive already and we had LRT users parking on our street until we added a permit only zone. It's unfair to contemplate making us now pay to park on our own street.
- Option D. All other proposed options are deterrents to residing and/or visiting, and will continue to have significant negative impact.
- It doesn't make a lot of sense that when I put in a visitor plate it doesn't expire for 2 weeks. Maybe make it 72 hours.
- Parking is already tough, please don't inhibit those who need it and those who are invited over to our homes to share in our lives, restricting their parking and charging for it too is insane.



- Why should residents who pay more tax have less service?
- Option D. We all pay property taxes. Residents should not have to pay to park in front of their houses (EVER).
- Believe it is working fine as is. Taxes are high enough.
- "No fees in residential area - to charge would be a large deterrent to people intending to visit
- I notice that the city ticket vehicle is now in my area regularly - never was before but i expect with new vehicle is easier to "police " and get money for fines. there never has been an issue to park"
- On-street parking is a public resource and needs to be rationed carefully, rather than be treated as a titled right. I think the residents using an RPP that costs them an annual price is also a way to do it. But if the RPP permits are free, than the use of on-street parking will be inefficient.
- "The current parking in
- The current 2 hr parking in my area is not adhered to and I hardly ever see parking authority checking cars"
- we don't want to deter our citizens from enjoying the city and traveling to others homes. Over regulation and payment parking would make thing ridiculous
- The city's bylaws are clear that residents don't "own" the space in their street. This philosophy should apply to parking restrictions as well. If residents aren't paying to pave, clear, and maintain the roadway, they should also not have free exclusive access to them. It's a shared common resource.
- making visitors pay to visit residents of a street is totally unacceptable. If my grandkids want to visit me, why should they have to pay? Our property taxes generate enough to cover parking issues.....stop already!
- all fine now but I would be happier if the SAIT users received tickets on 11 ave NW as they are RARELY marked/ ticketed. It is free public parking in our 1 hour zone!
- C seems reasonable
- "The city needs to stop trying to weasel its way into nickel and diming city residents.
- Just leave us alone!"
- These ARE covered through property taxes.
- Hiding the costs of parking are detrimental to Calgary. I believe that the cost of parking should be born by the user. Ideally, this means that parking is always available for those who are prepared to pay for the cost of it. More importantly, the cost discourages automobile use and ownership.
- It was so simple with the tags. Now the 7th question to just to ask the same just slightly different. I and my house visitors are always comprised aand asking what they have to do.
- Might consider B. but only use unpaid time restrictions for visitors. Might be problematic when out-of-town visitors need to park though.
- I already pay for my RPP.
- "B" would be optimal - a short stay helps community feel. If "C" however rates should be set so that there is room for residents (or the fee goes to community improvement). "A" is a no - Local residents should not have to pay to park - many of these zones were brought in with that understanding.
- D. self explanatory



- These services are not covered by taxes - parking should not be limited to residents. They should have on site parking or build it if they want 24 hour convenience. At the least, there should be 2 hour maximum parking for all and parking by permit for after. All permits should be provided for a fee.
- Do this then encourage or mandate new homes build driveways. Stop building idiotic residential lanes, they just get paved eventually and become pseudo streets anyhow.
- Maintaining a level of congestion requires fees and you must increase the fees till the congestion is what you want. It does not deter people because there would be no spots if it were free. It encourages people to find other ways if it is not viewed as worth the cost. Bike, bus, carpool, etc.
- No one should have to pay to use on-street parking in residential areas. But it also does not belong solely to the adjacent landowner. Street parking is for everyone to use. By establishing time restrictions you ensure no one abuses its availability and there is a equitable turnover.
- I do not feel quite as strongly on this point. I prefer no fees, but the current system works very poorly for my family, so today, I'd be willing to pay to make it stop and replace it with something less irritating. Long term, however, paying to be able to park at home doesn't really appeal.
- you get the money from our property taxes.
- B should be the norm everywhere -I should be able to visit my friends and RPP zones don't let me now. A is a great choice - good luck. C might be the easy compromise between the two.
- Visitors who are visiting an area need to pay. Visitors visiting a family or person who have a permit may use a visitor pass. But any vehicle that is strictly parking in the area for free parking to take a train or go to a restaurant, should have to pay. Neighborhoods are not park and rides.
- Residences should be given 10 passes at no cost
- Allow 1 - 2 visitors per property per day. Otherwise implement a fee during the day. More city for the money. Allow evenings and weekends to be complimentary
- D - taxes already too high.
- Just make it easier, use plastic hang tags for the mirrors allow residents to have up to a certain number of tags for visitors, so to four, with ability to phone in more if required for parties, etc.
- I can't believe I'm wasting my time with this. Do you really think any of this survey is a practical solution to a problem that doesn't even exist. I love how your solutions are we'll just put paid meters everywhere. Again this is a total waste of time and money. Are you guys for real??
- This statement is untrue and not complete. Although residents are given no cost permits to park in RPP zones, the permits are restricted in number. Property taxes should cover the cost for me to be able to park my 4 cars on the street at any given time, and accommodate my guests.
- residents in these area's are already paying higher taxes for living in these areas.
- Charge different fees for different users. Maybe residents pay a small fixed fee per month (encouraging them to park their vehicles on their own property) and visitors pay per hour like most other pay parking areas in the city?
- I wouldn't feel comfortable asking guests to pay for parking.
- Covered by our taxes.
- No resident should have to pay for parking at their residence.



- People should be allowed visitors and not have to pay its not their fault the city allows irresponsible building (lack of available parking caused by front garages and bad planning)
- D: no change to current system
- "Option C - Residents should have to pay for their permit though.
- Options A and B - having paid and unpaid visitor time restrictions based on demand and occupancy. (Eg. like in Mission), and charging residents for permits."
- D. This option is fair to tax paying homeowners.
- Where would the extra money go to if you are charging for visitor parking? Will it go to the city coffers generally or back to the specific community improvements? Think before you CHARGE arbitrarily.
- There is already paid parking in our area and easy ctrain access for visitors
- A lot of times people won't visit those in multi-residence areas because of having to pay for parking. Visitors shouldn't have to pay to visit anyone.
- Please issue me a permit allowing me to park in front of my home. I pay the taxes. Renters who do not pay taxes are taking my space!!!!
- I don't think people should have to pay to park at their own home - unless they are NOT using designated space on their property. If they have a property with designated space, they should NOT be able to park on the street in front of their home as a replacement.
- B. This could cover most home-care situations and friends visiting friends when transit is abysmally sparse.
- Option D. I think the residents pay enough property taxes to cover the cost of street parking on the premises
- A it's a public street everyone should have to pay to store their vehicles on it.
- Do my property taxes not pay for maintenance of streets? Why should I or my visitors have to pay extra to park in front of my house that I am paying property taxes on already. Maybe if transit service was better, parking problems would be reduced.
- Need to either change the eligibility for getting a RPP from having registered address or the 2 week long permit. My partner and I both own houses in different zones and have to add each other every second week. I have had to pay a coder to write a routine for doing this, which i have sold to others
- Weekends and evenings should be considered as being as unrestricted.
- D - Yes, our extremely HIGH property taxes should cover alot of this instead of high paid pensions, and a 2 pension seat.
- (D) I already pay property tax, I have to maintain the sidewalk for snow, why do I have to pay to park too.
- I currently go to a minimum of 4 appointments a week. Everywhere I go I get charged by the City or another provider to park. Now if I start going to a friends or relative's house and have to start paying to park while I am there too I will be unable to go anywhere ever again! My taxes should pay!
- B. C. Residents should not have costs so long as they have the required permits. Visitors however could have cost associated when parking is busier and no cost when it is less busy.
- D. No change.



- I object to the thought that I be charged to park outside my home. I pay property taxes.
- seems to work well.
- if restricting parking is important for traffic flow, then restriction should apply to all vehicles. A
- I don't want my friends charged given I don't live in the inner core
- We pay unbelievable taxes already and therefore shouldn't have to pay in order for our visitors or us to park in front of our house. We use our garage, so it's not an issue for us, however this might help limit the amount of cars if homeowners were charged to park on the street.
- C. A resident should be able to park at or near their residence without cost. Visitors visiting residents should also not have to pay. People should be entitled to enjoyment of their home without additional cost. Visitors to the zone to conduct business at a non-residence should have to pay.
- Pay enough in city taxes
- Then this portion of the property taxes could go towards improved snow plowing on our street. We have a care home on our street with frequent visits from AHS. To me it's a safety issue that our street isn't plowed yet these folks need care.
- Cost to purchase the permit, but no additional cost to park for residents. Visitors can be a combination of unpaid and paid time, based on demand for the space.
- Not fair that residents can't park without cost outside their own homes just because they happen to live next to Stampede Park or a CTrain Station
- Quit nickel & diming people and try creative ways on making revenue- I've been taxed and city service fee'd to my limit
- D. the system is working well
- If residents want places to park at night, then put in those signs that show one hour parking between certain times of day and then after that time, parking is available and free. They do that downtown, and you can park all day on weekends. It's a good system.
- Parking has a cost
- "C, we already pay property taxes on these locations.
- Paid visitor parking within or outside certain hours seems legit, though, depending on particular zone concerns."
- Charging people to park in their own neighbourhood sounds like a Druh Farrell thing to get everyone to stop driving. Dumb idea!
- Parking should always be paid for. Residents can pay directly or through property taxes, but it's not free.
- D. Residents should pay through property taxes. The program should also receive revenue from parking tickets. That way, those creating the parking problems will help pay for the costs.
- Street parking is a hazard and should not be permitted. If you do not have somewhere on your property to park your car, buy a transit pass or buy a bike.
- B. Reason for zone implementation was to stop daytime users taking LRT. Relax those rules in the evening, so my 3 friends who visit don't need to rush here to get my 2 visitor permits.
- It should be free and unlimited for anyone connected to a household in the area. No one should have to pay to park near their home and their visitors should not have to pay neither



- Option D We would not be adverse to paid parking, although it does seem that we are paying enough in taxes, but it would then have to be strictly enforced.
- D: I think the current policy works well.
- D. Take out zone parking and make all residential parking free and without time limits. Residents and visitors can park freely - it is public space after all.
- Option D: It's still a good system
- Already pay enough on taxes
- D. Calgarian pays enough for property taxes and pay too much for parking in the city and especially at hospitals and walk in clinics. We should provide short term parking (3 hour) on residential street near them but need to be strictly enforced otherwise workers will abuse this system.
- D. Residents should have first right for street parking as this is their dwelling, where they spend their nights, days. Visits from businesses, family, friends cannot be compromised to alleviate someone's issue of trying to find parking - in most cases not paying for it in the designated lots.
- D - no issues today on our street
- I don't see a need to change this policy. The City can increase ticketing to cover the costs. This is a biased survey trying to kill the current RPP and create havoc for those of us living near institutions!
- The whole parking infrastructure review is more about cash-grab than solving any REAL issues
- B - if people are using residential zone restrictions to limit overnight or all day parking, or heavy parking during events, this can be managed by having time limitations for visitors. Residents with passes would be exempt from time limitations.
- Again, parking restrictions need to be removed.
- My taxes have gone up 10% in the last year, 25% in the last six. I should be getting SOMETHING for these crazy taxes increases!!!
- Property taxes are not adjusted when RPP zones are created. If they were, I would support a fair annual increase to pay for parking. Otherwise, monthly, daily, or hourly rates should apply to all parking so that everyone has fair access (although visitors could be restricted to hourly fees).
- B. Time restrictions make sense. Why should a visitor be penalized when a resident parks on a street for over two months without moving the vehicle?
- Why does everything come down to charging more money?
- Residents own the house - they should have the same access to parking that people away from major centers do
- Inner city home owners pay a huge amount in property tax. Surely, asking to be able to park on their own street isn't asking too much. If you want to eliminate our parking restrictions and permit, you can eliminate our extremely high property tax costs along with it. No change needed.
- If on street timed parking is pay, why should residents get free parking - all Calgarian pay the same taxes.
- I would rather deal with the nuisance of congestion than pay constantly to park my damn car in front of my house.
- D- non permitted visitors should pay hourly. Proceeds cover permit admin and remainder goes to local community.



- B) if the residents have a driveway, garage or pad then they should use it but if they need more space then there should be time restrictions on the street for them and visitors. The residents do not own the public streets and should not be allowed to park there indefinitely.
- d- I really don't think I or my visitors should have to pay to park in front of my home.
- D: current system sufficient
- Public streets are the property of all taxpayers and should be open to all equally. If residents are concerned about parking at their address, they should build on site parking like everyone else has to.
- Current 2 week period is frustrating for people who attend property on a weekly basis for needs such as landscaping, cleaners, etc.
- This would bring revenue and discourage non residents from parking here.
- D. requiring visitors to pay affects people with mobility issues, home care, seniors.
- D current process is fair and aligns with how people use their households.
- "we do not need more people
- parking on the already crowded streets around our houses"
- C. Parking restrictions just make life intolerable for everyone. You should remove all parking restrictions — that would be just as effective as trying to restrict everything.
- Parking should not be free (subsidized).
- Quit your horrible greed tactics...
- I find this question discriminatory. Do people in other communities where they don't have restricted parking due to real parking issues have to charge their visitors to visit them? I pay a lot in taxes and I expect that money to go towards my being able to park in front of my own home.
- Residents in RPP zones are often in areas of higher property value. Charging for parking to these residents is an unfair tax. If one person has to pay for on street parking then all do.
- My guests shouldn't have to pay to park on my street to visit.
- I do not want my friends to have to pay to visit me. That is insane! I should be able to have someone over for coffee without paying for parking. I live far in the burbs, but near an LRT. Paid parking should not exist outside of downtown.
- A, B, and C are all better than the current system, which is outdated and poorly thought out. A is the best option because tax payers should have equal access to roads (a public utility) for parking, and the cost should be based on the market.
- Option C. Fees may be adjusted according to the time of day, allowing more freedom to visit during business hours and during daylight hours. Increasing fees during the evening and nighttime may discourage people from gathering at night when they may reduce visibility or create disturbance.
- option C would be a good solution to the illegal on street "park and ride" problem. set a low rate for the first 2 hours, punitive daily rate to keep people from abusing their rights.
- My visitors shouldn't have to pay to visit me. I pay enough taxes that instead of having permits to park, we should gate the community and ONLY friends and family can get in. No more parking problems then. If you charge to park on the street by the hospital, charge out in Tuscany too!
- Consider interspersing unpaid "hourly" spots in RPP zones.



- D. is the best. Other choices creates problem for residents and is difficult to implement
- Same as all the other citizens
- B. Don't use property tax to solve this. The city already is destroying businesses with outrag property tax rates. People need free options and those should be available at quieter hours.
- B. Make access to businesses and workplaces more readily available during business hours. This increases people walking through neighbourhoods instead of parking at businesses, which increases pedestrian presence and the chance they will visit other businesses in the neighbourhood.
- If there is to be restricted parking, then let them pay for it. Recoup some of the costs of maintaining the roads
- A). I am in favour of paying for permits
- Having people pay for parking in residential areas is a money grab
- Home owners should not have to pay for parking.... just because they live in a residential restriction area.
- These restrictions hamper the ability to have visitors to the home.
- It already costs to park in most areas in Calgary, this should be included if you're not a visitor.
- The policy seems fine as is. If the intent is to charge for permits, we should charge for street parking everywhere in the city. Limits on the number of permits per household is best to encourage use of garages and on site parking.
- D
- Paying to drop things off at my house or to have guests is not acceptable unless it is applied city wide (including in the rich areas) as a means to reduce car use and congestion... get people on transit or bikes
- "NO PAID PARKING, NO PAID PARKING, NO PAID PARKING
- NO COST FOR PERMITS"
- A: Paid parking can be used as an alternative to allow people to park on the street if they wish. This is used successfully in downtown and can be used in other areas. It would also provide an incentive for people to reduce the number of cars they have to save the daily parking fee.
- I think residents should pay for RPP zones but if this already factored into their property taxes (is it?) then only visitors should pay.
- D. The system already does not deter parking in violation of the zones. Is this question implying once the city is generation revenue from visitors (and or residents) they will actually inforce parking zones?
- No paid parking in permit zones. Get rid of permit zones.
- B
- On-site parking should become a priority to any city permits for housing or neighbourhood construction. Street parking should be discouraged or treated as a last-resort option
- Property taxes should NOT cover RPP zones. This should be paid in separate by the household members. The city would benefit from restricting the number of permits and allowing for paid visitor parking.



- D - making residents pay for parking is insane and will be punishing middle class folks for living closer to downtown and make it even less affordable
- While I understand the need to control parking and manage everyone's vehicles, I do not believe this should be a money grab for the city. Creating paid parking in more spots makes me feel that the city is doing just that. We need more unpaid locations.
- It is our right as taxpayers to be able to park for free on streets in front of our homes we pay to maintain!
- Residents should not be paying for parking in residential areas, but long stay visitors could be made to pay. Could this be managed through the existing parking app with a resident \$0 parking code?
- A: allows options for people that want extra vehicles over or something, giving them the chance to have visitors and such without getting more permits
- D - Residents are the primary users of an area and have the right to be there via the taxation system. Visitors are temporary and need to work with residents accordingly to organize parking. Businesses, can accommodate patrons via the app or online.
- Unpaid time restrictions for visitors but not residents
- D) This seems like a fair option.
- Option A would charge the residents- ensuring that they really do want a parking permit zone in the first place. Option B is more flexible and allows for short term free parking (and reduces the overhead that option A requires).
- We should be able to park one car in front of house for free, we pay enough property tax and property price inner city. On street parking is limited, so when more than 2 cars per house are parked on the street, it is not possible for a homeowner to park when they come home from work which is unfair.
- OPTION D - if the City wants to increase density in the core but do not provide amenities or better transit options they cannot charge to park. As a beltline resident I need a car to go to Walmart, Homedepot etc. because those amenities are not provided in the core.
- People should pay for the parking they're using. The city should invest that money in public transportation.
- I believe the parking rate for non-residents would have to be significantly higher than the standard parking rate across the city. An enforceable time limit would be of help as well.
- Our taxes are going to the new subdivisions outside of the inner side. We pay property taxes that should include parking for residents!
- YAY another cash grab by the city. Just remove all RPP zones.
- D. Residents should not have to pay for parking when they are already paying property tax. There should be the option to be able to purchase additional visitor parking on occasion when there are more guests than the allotted number of permits provided.
 - If the demand for parking in an area exceeds supply, parking should be paid. The funds generated can be invested back into the community.
- If a neighbourhood wants RPP zones then the residents should have to pay extra.



- No one should have to pay to park in a city that apparently wants to grow and progress. That is creating stagnant negative energy directed towards the city
- Most family/friends visit outside of peak hours and should have access accordingly.
- People in these parking zones are in desirable areas and paying a lot of taxes. This should be covered by their tax contribution
- I feel strongly that residents and those visiting a residence should not have to pay to park. Our taxes should cover this!
- As a resident of the inner city and with a limited income, I pay hefty property taxes and cannot afford to pay for ANY MORE fees.
- D) Unless the city is determined to engage in a social engineering exercise, don't drift into "we hate cars, so we'll punish their owners", leave it alone. This already is the perception with bike lanes.
- Street space in Calgary is underdeveloped as a community space and that needs to change for various reasons of community building, climate change resiliency and quality of life. Having free parking paid for by property taxes charges non-drivers for drivers needs and keeps cars on the streets.
- A & B either options will provide additional parking for visitors with due consideration for resident parking by limiting time
- The homeowner pays taxes to the city and should have the same benefits as all other homeowners in non RPP areas of the city.
- Selected D: this should be the more efficient method of administering for the City and the Residents who pay property taxes. Residents in RPP zones may have to pay a slight increase in property taxes to offset cost of administering the permit system which is fair to all City property tax payers.
- I do not support street parking for residents. They have a home that should include enough parking space for the vehicles they purchase. In an area with a "generator" there should be paid parking for visitors. If no "generator" then a ban on resident street parking should provide visitor parking
- D: Residents should have access to their own areas along with their visitors but people should not be able to park in a resident's "area" for free.
- Asking our guests to pay for parking hinders our ability to have friends/family at our home, so I like having some visitor parking permits as in D.
- All the other options sound like a money grab by the City
- (D) Parking near your home - especially in the older and inner city communities - shouldn't become an extra, paid privilege. If it does, it will be rightly seen as a duplicitous cash grab by the city.
- Keep it simple
- I don't agree with paid parking in residential areas
- cover these costs thru enforcement penalties not tax
- Review current zones and remove ones that no longer have the need for them. This should have been looked at years ago.
- Allow residents to manage their own parking needs.
- D - I believe no restrictions should be put on residents and their visitors



- Explaining D. As previously stated, I pay extremely high property taxes now for my own residence and crazy high property taxes for all of my rentals in the 1200 block on the North side of 5 Ave. N.W. where there is ZERO parking on the North side of 5 Ave. N.W. for residents or visitors
- Common sense approach.
- I want change. I think residents of an RPP area should be allowed to park free at any metered spots and for use when shopping etc. I do not have the same privileges as other neighbourhoods for parking close to my local retailers. With this new electronic system, this can be done easily.
- Option D seems to work well currently so no need to change it.
- A In Kensington, there is NO free parking for visitors, so if one has a visitor staying the night, the visitors have to plan to pay \$20+ per night for them to visit. There should be a couple of FREE parking areas - in hillhurst and in kensington/sunnyside for visitors.
- While on the topic of paid parking do you know that motorcycles get away with not paying because they back up into the space where cameras don't see their plates?
- if you add fees you won't reduce property taxes so don't double dip
- Changing the current system to any of the options described above would create major enforcement problems. And yes, I do believe my taxes are quite sufficient to justify not having to pay for parking on my street.
- Establish peak time periods where people have to pay if they don't have a permit. Doesn't make sense that people would have to pay to park 24 hours a day
- No change. The big problem in the area of Western Canada High is visitors with no permits parking most of the day. Lack of enforcement is an issue
- Current system is fine
- Leave my area mostly alone, but make sure new business have adequate parking, not like they are normally built.
- Requirement for 4 days notice for Parking relaxation is unreasonable; Improve the communication between permit grantors and parking /ticketing - should be instantaneous. There should be no reason to NOT permit a parking relaxation for a period of time.
- (D) The current system works fine and the residents in these RPP areas would have not required the permits if only residents and their visitors occupied the parking spots available. But people from other areas of the city that do not want to use Ctrain, pay for public parking etc. flood these areas.
- I believe that all residences should provide parking onsite. No-one in the city should expect to be able to park their private property (vehicle) on public property. However, I think there needs to be some unpaid options for service vehicles and homecare workers (maybe offer short term passes)
- No vehicles, commercial or personal, should be allowed to park for free on public property.
- It applies to our needs.
- We pay lots of taxes. We've had lots of tax increases. Not sure how the increases are being spent.... should be able to park for free in front of my own house and have friends visit as well.
- Stadium in high school choke out whatever parking is available here to Residence I do not have access to a garage. How would you feel if you could not park within blocks of your own home? Would you stay home during the day to avoid it?



- "As above.
- Please read"
- Working now
- Please see above. I would like to have more than 2 guests over for dinner. Restrictions until 6pm is reasonable.
- I think that there should be more zones free for residents, and I think the concept of paid visitor timed (e.g. 2 or 3 hr parking) during the day is reasonable.
- As it explains, I already pay enough for this normal access. Or you change the ENTIRE city, not just our areas that are closer to downtown.
- Paying for parking in front of my own home would be unacceptable. Especially since I have no other option.
- There should only be some times when residents and visitors can park and not pay.
- parking in your home neighbourhood should not be punitive, residents have to deal with lots of inbound traffic they don't need to pay for parking too
- D - my taxes pay for it already.
- Perhaps our taxes could actually be put to better use than they are now to cover such a system. If I have to pay to park in front of my own home, then everyone else in the city should have to do the same.
- Residents shouldn't have to pay to park.
- I visited an Ontario town years ago, and their policy was that NO vehicle could be left on a street between certain times, 365 days a year, to clean roads, plow, etc.
- We pay enough in taxes which are going up very quickly year to year.
- No change required.
- C & D - If you live in the neighbourhood you should be able to park for free.
- The current system works well. The city establishing a pay system is a cash grab.
- Most reasonable to me.
- I already pay significantly in property taxes to live in this particular neighbourhood close to Mount Royal, changing permits will completely fill my street with students who could otherwise pay to park at the university.
- It is disproportionate that some families (or equivalent) spend lots of money for 6-10 and nothing for garages or suitable driveways to entertain their folly
- I wish there were more zones like this.
- Some commercial vehicles like limos, buses and vans do not have weights on their plates so CPA will not enforce weight bylaws for street parking. A resident in our area has been parking a mega (40 plus feet) and a stretch (30 plus feet) limo for the past three years by his home and others.
- "Leave the current system as is - BUT PLEASE police it better.
- Taxes are killing our city."
- e different situation call for different thing, may be a bit confusing, but is the only way to best use the resources.



- D Charging residents has a disproportionate impact - we already live here and would be negatively impacted more than the thousands of drivers who don't live here but are in constant search in our community to park free or cheaper (we are by UofC, Foothills, ACH and McMahon. Quality of life suffers
- my taxes have steadily increased even as market values have declined over past few years in my cres. hts. area. so I think the parking should be covered by taxes. we shouldn't have to pay more.
- It is interesting to see the option that you have to pay for parking in front of your house... even for visiting family...shouldn't be that restriction.
- D.) people would be very upset to have yet another payment to make. Calgary is such a driving city, the majority of the population has a vehicle and to be expected to pay to park every day is ridiculous.
- I am fine with paying for extra permits because I must have a place to park in a permanent basis. My visitors or home care staff is parking because I need them and should not have to pay because this should not be a charge to anyone. Nine of the options listed are preferred
- Encourage people to shop local buy local to reduce wear and tear on roads, calmer streets in high density areas and safety for children in inner cities-too car centric, people do not honour playground zones in high density areas, we need to shift to mass public transit, mobility permits exempt
- the tickets and the meters are just cash grabs. parking authority does nothing to keep cars and owners safe.
- The workers coming into the home are not going to pay for parking....the care recipients will be paying.
- Paid parking would deter visitors to my house. If people are abusing the system. There should be a way of enforcing a max weeks allowance for visitor
- Don't add on any more fees for residents/taxpayers - the continual layering/increasing of fees (which are really taxes) by this city is not acceptable!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! Find cost savings in your dept. You could easily find 10% overnight!!!!!!!!!!
- My taxes are high enough already. These are generally inner city issues with outer city parkers looking for free parking. As our assessments are higher than theirs we are already paying more tax. If you want equality then move away from assessment based tax first.
- It's the least I expect with the amount of taxes paid
- Why Should I have to pay for parking in front of my house yet a majority of people in Calgary do not. Have to pay for parking at their house.
- A: Too many Residents abuse the current street parking. All should pay market value at all times. Tagging & towing violators should be more frequent & City initiated, not by complaint. Parking Control will pass a dozen violations to ticket the one called about. Think of all the missed revenue...
- D. This is most fair to residents and visitors.
- Strongly support D. I'm not in favour of paying any more \$ for parking in front of a house that I bought. It's reasonable to assume 2 cars / house; apartments/condos have parking lots; businesses/hospitals should manage their operational concerns. Not the city's job to help Foothills' employees.
- Payment requirement will afford a measure of control. But enforcement will have to be ramped up.



- Residents need full flexibility on parking times. Our property taxes are already higher due to the advantage of living in a RPP zone e.g. close to downtown and should cover any administration cost for the RPP system.
- The cost of providing street parking can be paid by the users.
- D, if you live there you shouldn't have to pay. A woman I spoke with at the City said parking visits are not a part of property taxes. I pay \$6000 in property taxes. It is my view I should not have to pay fees for parking outside my home.
- D. Agree
- I would like to explore this as an option rather than paying for extra residential visitor permits that I may only use occasionally.
- Residents could have a code match to licence to balance cost
- D most residential zones don't need additional paid parkers. However, there should be some paid areas within some residential zones (near restaurants, universities, etc)
- At least this would make it the same rules for everybody. Make sure it includes construction people; they seem to be above all the laws.
- just say no to taxes
- D is not optimal but still the best option for the offered ones. It does not make sense to have the same rules everywhere in Calgary - a quiet residential neighborhood does not need the same restrictions as a busy commercial zone.
- D - We pay an exorbitant amount of taxes now. Our home is currently assessed at \$117,000 above current market value so we are being unfairly taxed. Therefore any addition to fees required by the city is unconscionable especially those that currently live on a pension.
- Stop trying to make us pay to park at our own houses! That's why we choose to live inner city. So we can walk or bike to work. If you live in the suburbs, and drive to the inner city to park for free in front of my house, instead of paying for parking downtown, that's not fair.
- D: the system is working
- Some places is non fear to pay if only parking for less than one hour
- It is absurd that my visitors should be charged a fee to visit me!
- Response to D. This seems to work the best. And take a look at my property taxes... its high enough to cover the cost.
- D is 100% true. Property tax covers this.
- In our area, at least, paid parking would be seen as a deterrent to visitors.
- easy to implement with Park Plus system. Then I can visit a business / friend for one hour, and not be given a ticket for illegal parking.
- I do not think I should pay for the RPP zone in front of my house. I would prefer the zone did not exist than to pay.
- These are people's home. Residents firstly and then their guests should have priority
- I'm less likely to have visitors come to my home if they have to pay to park.
- Parking for visitors not linked to a specific address should be paid parking (ie. those parking areas around our local school and community centre.)



- (D) We are retired pensioners whose taxes go up every year. Enough is enough! Even if we pay, vehicles will still park illegally (for free) and we will be unable to park in front or near our home. This is from years of past experience with illegally parked vehicles
- Enough taxes and cash grabs
- D., but, some areas may need paid parking
- I don't feel inner cities should have to pay if suburbs don't. Either the policy should be city wide for other options or covered by property tax which keeps going up
- it's not safe, the line up of cars make it impossible to drive safely especially on streets that are a bus route.
- "A. Paid parking would ensure those who want to park can do so.
- B. Some evening and weekend parking for residents and visitors should be made available for free."
- A residential rate could be charged that is lower than non-residents
- user pay is the fairest. Perhaps residents should buy their own visitor permits. Part of reality in inner city living.
- Again, in Inglewood parking can get crazy. And these hundred year old homes, often don't come with functioning garages. I
- Glad to know these are already COVERED, meaning there would NOT be an increase to property taxes if this option is chosen.
- For some highly used areas anyway. Not in real residential areas. Our street is filled with commuters for the nearby c-train and SAIT. So we can never use our street parking. While these people need to get to school, etc... it would be nice if there was a way I could use the street parking too.
- Your statement in option D expresses my opinion on this
- My annual increasing property taxes should cover this- you don't plow our street, you do not grate the alley to provide proper water drainage despite entire neighborhood calling, you do not remove tree stumps of "city trees" on res properties etc- tax increasing, service diminishes- my taxes can pay
- Why should residence pay for street parking, that is just another tax.
- Short term, free parking would help with visitors to residences and provide incentive for people to live in the more central areas as opposed to sprawling suburbs
- B: Employees who work in these areas should not have to pay to get to work just because the city has not planned on proper parking to go with business developments. Opening up more parking or extending time restrictions would ensure businesses in these areas would not suffer.
- Don't change what is working.
- D since residents should be able to park in front of their own home for free, and residential visitors should be able to for free as well. Monitoring the RPP zone I live in is a poor use of tax dollars, and would be more aggravating if there was a cost associated with it.
- Why would I be charged to allow someone to park in front of my house? Are we not taxed enough?
- B - I think this is the best option of the 4, but not sure it is the best solution overall.
- A - Paid parking equally among the resident and visitor. Please allow for affordable rates. \$3 per 30 minutes its very expensive and makes it unavailable to those who have a low income.



- C. With the exception that homecare services are exempt - see above question.
- B - I think there needs to be a balance between needs of residents and visitors. Assuming many residents leave the area for work, more places should be available for visitors and workers in the area.
- I pay more money to live in the inner city. This includes property taxes. I strongly believe as a resident I should be able to park for free in my own community. We have a problem in our community with people parking all over the streets, in residents drive-ways, dangerously on Sundays.
- Paying for parking is a huge barrier in providing services to people on low income down town. The bus is not a logical answer as it still is seven dollars for a round trip, and for those who commute buying a pass is an unnecessary expense
- D To make residents pay seems like an abuse of the system.
- I pay property taxes and live in the neighbourhood. This status should afford me some rights above visitors and businesses.
- It's not fair that I should have to pay to park on my street just because of inner city densification. If I have to pay everyone in the city that parks on the street should also have to pay.
- "Opt B/D:
 - Resident can apply for 2 free permits, additional permits costs exponentially more for each pass.
 - Unpaid time restrictions in RPP for visitors (2h)
 - Paid parking in RPP for visitors for add. limited time (e.g. 2h)
 - 2 visitor passes can be requested for a small fee (e.g. 20/pass)"
- we should not have to pay for parking because the city has chosen to drastically increase the density of our neighborhood and allow increased commercial projects which have inadequate parking (which spills over into neighborhoods)
- There should be no restrictions on residents and visitors above what is provided now. We want no parking meters in this area.
- If you change, residents should be free. I can live with visitor's paying. I was told I could not get a visitor pass. Not fair.
- There should be more "no parking except by permit" zones
- B. balance need and access. paid time is revenue for the City. If it is not reinvested to address parking issues, should not be implemented
- Our inner city taxes have increased plenty over the past 20 years and we haven't gained any new services for this increase. Do not cash grab residential parking in a neighbourhood that you surcharged residents to pay for repaving of the streets separate from annual taxes. We paid for street.
- A - if there is demand for paid parking both residents and visitors should pay. Residents could pay annually to have exclusions from restrictions, and visitors can pay as they use the parking.
- Residents have already paid through taxes, so no additional costs are appropriate.
- D: I don't think it's fair to make residents' visitors pay to visit their family/ friends.



- Option D is self explanatory. No more fees as property taxes cover this.
- The intent of parking permits should be to reduce excessive parking on the streets but still allow for temporary visitations or trade access.
- D...we pay huge taxes to live where we live. We should not have to pay to park nor to have guests. Those who need to enter the area should find appropriate free or paid parking. I should not be punished for living where I live.
- Option C for streets near high traffic business locations, but no fee for parking in primarily residential areas
- We could not afford to pay parking cost every time people visit our home, that would be such a sad change. And I would feel guilty for inviting people over knowing they would have to pay for parking
- D. AS THEY SHOULD BE AS OUR PROPERTY TAXES ARE VERY HIGH
- THAT IS THE BEST!
- D. this is the fair option. residents should never have to pay for street parking in front of their house.
- Parking restrictions in outlying area are viewed as a cash grab by the city. 1–2 hour parking restrictions are more feasible than the you must have a pass immediately.
- D - no change - residents and their visitors should not have to pay for parking on top of property taxes
- Since the change to electronic permit - no window tag - there has been a dramatic increase in parking on our street. There is no longer a visible “I belong here” allowing residents to call for enforcement.
- The current system works in this regard.
- D You should not have to pay to park in front of your own residence.
- There is no one size fits all solution. Each street withing a RPP zone can have unique issues. High density areas are one thing, but single family residential areas impacted by commercial projects are another issue. If you buy in a high density area you know what you are dealing with going in.
- C is the best but with a two hours free for visitors in the area. Perhaps using an app so that just moving your car doesn't start the time again in a residential zone.
- Basically we're attempting to ensure that the residents of an RPP have first call on the parking spaces.
- See above. No problem with short term parking zone in street. If there is paid parking, there should be a time constraint (e.g. 2 hours except for residents) and residents should not have to pay. No change to parking restriction in laneway.
- D The City just wants to find another way to get revenue.
- C in very dense areas it may be necessary to charge no residents for any parking over a few hours or overnight
- D - as long as usage of on-site parking is maximized and visitor passes are limited, RPPs should remain free and any extra space given back to paid parking to support local businesses and those doing business in the area.
- Option D if tickets are issued regularly this should provide income over and above property taxes



- No resident should have to pay to park near their home. Option D is my choice. Our property taxes should get us at least that.
- Home owners should be allowed to park at no cost close to their home
- There should be an unsure option
- Should be optional for those willing to pay.
- Chose D: actually residences with permits should never have to pay, however visitors should have the option to pay and park with a time limit. Or maybe only during certain times.
- Current system works well
- I dislike all these options.
- Cover costs thru enforcement not taxes
- Residents in RPP zones tend to pay higher property taxes already, because of the location's desirability, which is why we need RPP. RPP and its enforcement contributes to quality of life for us and allows our visitors to visit us (by leaving parking spots open for them).
- On-street restrictions are not applied to all areas of the city; most residents in the city can expect to have some on-street parking for themselves/ their visitors. People should not be punished for where they live. RPP zones were created to protect residential areas from becoming parking lots.
- B is best for all. Just modify for residences to have one exemption permit for timed parking per household.
- Option A - this is the most effective way of regulating supply and demand for parking, regardless of demand in any particular zone. Go ahead, Ask an economist!
- too many rules more free parking in residential areas at all times and in rpp zones during day when rpp streets usually empty. many signs confusing. as few rules/restrictions as possible. share the road share the parking let us all park in residential areas without rules & costs
- B. Parking restrictions should apply to normal event and business hours (7AM - 8PM daily) except near hospitals.
- D. "Parking is BIG Business" in Calgary and I wonder if is it really necessary to increase the size of the bureaucracy to run it? Use the KISS principle. It is very seldom that offenders are ever ticketed. As a property owner, don't charge me more, I pay too much for parking already in other areas.
- "D. Using that rationale, there should be no paid parking anywhere in the city as it is covered through property taxes.
- Establishing paid parking is problematic where it abuts a non-paid area, as people will choose to park in the unpaid areas."
- The current plan is sufficient.
- D Residents and visitors should park free. LRT etc users should be informed thru signage that they cannot park in these RPP zones
- Option D because property taxes are paid by residences. Visitors needing parking may or may not pay property taxes associated with the parking space. The difference is that a resident chooses who gets to use a parking space, having paid property tax.
- Residents should never have to pay to park in front of their home.



- The “cost” to receive a permit seems minimal so there would seem to be little burden to property tax. A car is the primary means of transport for many people and it is unfair to charge residents additional fees for driving or having visitors drive.
- D. Unless the city is willing to hold developers accountable to plan for on-site parking AND hold management companies accountable to provide affordable parking to apartment residents, there should not be any new fees for street parking.
- Option B - Currently RRP zones seem to provide '24-hour' reserved parking for permit holders. There are often parking spaces available in RRP zones while there is no parking available in neighboring unrestricted streets. RRP zones are a privilege & have costs (signs & ticketing) Should not be free.
- Again make the permits a time amount and not the right to park. If it related to the right to park, people believe then the space right in front of their home is theirs.
- visitors should not have to worry about paying.
- This would generate revenue and still curb abuse like commuters parking in residential areas to reach LRT or BRT stations.
- B: There shouldn't be a charge to go and visit family or friends who happen to live in a particular area. For A, installing pay machines in some areas (around the Tuscany LRT) makes no sense as it is a long zone and would require several machines for limited use.
- D like it says
- Property tax is highest in the areas that have permit parking. Parking is already being paid for. Multi unit dwellings with no available off street parking could be levied a fee to access street parking.
- I feel this provides parking for visitors without extra costs.
- I believe this is fair. Not everyone will use it, but the option is there. This would also help keep the money in Calgary and not in parking companies pockets.
- I desire to be able to host visitors to my home without them having to pay for parking.
- situation dependent but I support policies to encourage use of on-site parking for residents while making it possible for visitors to park (i.e., time restrictions in residential near lrt station are required, imo)
- Option D because making these zones paid parking is a ridiculous money grab. The only way that would be ok is if most restricted parking zones would become unrestricted and unpaid.
- Just put in time restrictions. It wouldn't be good to be charged to visit family and friends. Plus machines would need to be installed everywhere to accept payments.
- D - Our property taxes pay for the costs of our parking permits
- A, B, C: these unfairly punish homeowners in RPP zones &/or their personal visitors. Business visitors to 'hub' zones (e.g.: Kensington, etc.) should have to pay to use public parking only--not residential streets. There are virtually NO times in Kensington BZ where unpaid parking times would be ok.
- Stop gouging the citizens of this city!
- Visitors should be able to come to your home without paying.
- There should be some benefit for paying property tax



- Preference is B. Residential permit parking should be reduced in Calgary as private landowners do not own space on the street. Visitors and residents should be treated more or less equally, but perhaps visitors can pay a little more.
- In remaining RPP areas, I think residents should have to pay for a pass, and that visitors should have to pay hourly. I also think that (B) there might be unpaid one-hour or two-hour zones for visitors, while residents pay for a "park all the time" pass.
- Why can't you allow unpaid for residents and their visitor passes + special exemptions for healthcare/businesses and paid parking for all others especially at major generators. Monies can be used to clean up after these parking users as they leave garbage, dog poop and debris everywhere
- As long as the fee is nominal.
- D avoids imposing financial barriers on residents
- We should make zones more accessible for residents so that they don't need to pay just to park on their street.
- as mentioned before why should I have to pay to park outside my house. Will all residents? why should I have to pay just because hospital employees don't want to pay for parking and use the street. I had to pay to park downtown to work. And what is the crap about this being covered by taxes? Costs?
- RPPs should only exist for residences that have no on-site parking at all.
- RPP zones are moreso inner city, near traffic generators and already pay higher property taxes and in that respect subsidize the roads out to the suburbs. It is just wrong to make such residents pay to park (but there needs to be # LIMITS - see other comments). To make our visitors pay just sucks.
- Option D - we pay enough property taxes to allow us to park near our homes.
- Tired of this. Again, there are problem areas like school zones, shopping areas and LRT stations. There you ask the residents what THEIR need is, not yours!
- fair and reasonable; other options will punish residents and also create chaos in parking
- Inner city property taxes are already high and one would assume includes the privilege of parking on your own block. These taxes should include proper enforcement.
- The parking outside my residence is paid, yet I still pay property taxes. If I buy too much stuff, the City won't pay to provide me a place for storage -- unless it's a car. If you can't afford to store something, don't own it.
- Not fair to make residents pay now. Letting everyone oh also causes inconvenience to the residents. They didn't buy their houses believing there would be more parking available for no residents.
- D works fine.
- B, think about a multi pass enforcement rather than a one time so that a visitor can stay a reasonable amount of time (4 hours) without having to a) limit number of visitors arbitrarily to 2 vehicles, and b) not have to deal with the ridiculously hard web interface (the old tags were better for many
- Costs are covered through property taxes (which are high in the inner city). Residents and their visitors should be permitted to park near their homes at no cost.



- D preferred as C makes a problem with having visitors (whether tradesmen or friends) attend at the residence.
- Costs are already covered through taxes.
- "D - I like this option because it is very fair.
- A - I also like this as a secondary option, so if a resident who isn't allowed more than 3 permits (or a visitor to his home) still wants to come, then let them pay rather than saying 'no parking' or you'll be ticketed."
- "B - I'm a Sr, with arthritis, who needs to park nearby, when I come downtown, to visit these areas.
- D - Are the property taxes enough to allow Visitors to come downtown, & be able to find a parking space close to their destination?"
- Not sure the purpose of requiring temporary visitors to pay for parking when visiting tax-paying residents ... That said, we NEED to find ways of preventing visitor parking permit abuse - the current system seems to be helping, but requires too much hands-on action by residents to enforce.
- A: Not sure what constitutes paid parking in all RPP zones but I am in favour of residents paying a fee to have PP parking on their street. There is a cost to the City to impliment a RPP and some of the cost should be passed on to residents who want the restricted parking on their street.
- T
- Our taxes just went up 25%. Various City fees should be drawn from tax revenue.
- simplest way, IMO
- If additional charges are added, what would the revenue generated by property taxes go to?
- D No reason to change current system.
- Please scrap electronic RPP and start sending visitor parking tags in the mail. The online system is terrible: it has bugs and it freezes. There is no tech support on weekends/after hours. The requirements can be confusing to elderly, people who are not computer savvy and first time users.
- Visitors should be allowed to park free for short periods -2 hours. They should not have to pay to visit. Residents should receive passes for guests who are staying longer than 2 hours.
- D- Home owners should be able to have permits for visitors and service calls to the home.
- Current policy seems fair.
- There should be some benefit from the high property taxes being levied on home owners. Also, do you really think that one should ask their visitors to pay for parking out of the downtown area.
- D, so long as the permits are restricted reflecting the number of dwellings and their frontage on the street.
- Residents should be able to park for free in front of their homes, same with their visitors. if anything add more unpaid free times in RPP zones (e.g. 2 hour limits ect) for more movement of people without charges
- Charging people to visit their friends and family will quickly curtail visits and generate a lot of ill will for the city that implements this. Ridiculous! My property taxes have increased by over 70% since Nenshi became mayor. City council should reduce spending, not increase our costs!!!!



- I should NOT have to pay to park at my home. Street parking is the only option in my neighbourhood where properties are small and do not include parking pads or garages. All street parking for residents and visitors should be FREE.
- Making visitors pay in residential areas seems fundamentally wrong.
- Option C: we are so tired of people from outside the community parking in front of our house to go to nearby restaurants, commute downtown, etc. People coming down here from the suburbs who want cheap or free parking should have to pay.
- First, manage zone size; entire zone not same as areas near major generators; zones too big. As farther away from generator, can make 1 or 2hr limit parking, but only if you patrol to prevent abuse.
- Why should my visitors pay for parking when I live here? I don't pay in the suburbs when I visit them.
- D - Again, why should we reduce our ability to have VISITORS TO OUR PROPERTY? D - And we need to eliminate parking of VISITORS sponsored by a resident, when the VISITORS uses it to go to work at Foothills Hospital, rather than visiting the residence.
- D - I believe if we reduce the number of zones we would reduce the costs incurred by the city to monitor these areas. Less parking restrictions would make us less anal and increase the feeling of community throughout the city.
- Residents should be able to park in a zone with no time restrictions. Time restrictions during business hours only for visitors would be more useful than the current system where a residence is restricted to 2 passes good for 2 weeks.
- I don't want my friends who visit to have to pay for parking....
- D- I think the current system work well, especially the new on line payment and visitor registration process.
- D - residents should not have to pay to have visitors . Isolating.
- 24/7 Residential Only is unreasonable. Are we only allowed 2 friends or family members over or do we send them driving around looking to park in front of someone else's house? Would like to see weekends and holidays exempted from this resident only parking
- The problem is that there are TOO many dwellings with "No Parking Without Permit" which causes their visitors to take the parking spaces in front of their neighbors houses! Make the parking Zones the same all through the neighborhood.
- You did not need to do a survey to figure this out.
- Residents who pay property taxes should NOT have to pay additional fees for permits to park in front of their own homes.
- I do not use some Calgary services yet I pay for them in my taxes. The parking regime is the same. Why should there be an extra charge to car owners? Whatever rules are decided upon the City must enforce them. If they are not enforced for cost or other reasons then do not create the prohibition.
- We need deterrents to improve the situation, not incentives to cram more oversized vehicles onto city streets. You wouldn't be doing this survey if deterrents weren't needed.
- Parking pricing should be based on an 85% occupancy target, rather than a blanket rule; visitor parking in RPP areas should be available with pricing depending upon supply/demand.



- B- to reduce traffic in the downtown core, why not encourage parking outside the core for free as an incentive
- "D: Issue vehicle-specific permits to qualifying addresses that DO NOT have on-site parking + two visitor sessions.
- Addresses WITH on-site parking get 0 vehicle-specific + 2 visitor sessions
- Property taxes paid by the whole shouldn't benefit the few. If you live in an RPP zone you should pay for it"
- The current policy works best on our street.
- D) This is fine
- I have no other parking options that on-street. Because I live close to downtown, I don't drive to work: so, I often leave my car parked from Sunday evening until Saturday morning. Having time limitations on parking in front of the house I own (and pay taxes on) wouldn't work .
- Yes, covered through property taxes. If we have to pay for RPP program because of density, then suburbs should have to pay for roads and infrastructure development through their taxes, not mine.
- there is not a parking space problem on my restricted street, when visitors drop in they are they are not taking up spaces the residents use.
- Residents should not have to pay and visitors should since these tend to be high-demand areas.
- B - free parking for two hours or something, would've been a lifesaver for me while working as a tech.

- Ding dong! I have a visitor. "hi, what is your licence plate number. I need to go online to register your plate. I will pay for that pizza after that!" That does not seem reasonable.
- Residents should never have to pay to receive resident and visitor permits. If visitors have to pay they will not be visiting friends. It makes no sense to have to pay for parking in a community. Some communities have no signs at all regarding parking and all communities should be the same.
- My taxes have doubled in the past few years. I cannot afford to pay more for parking.
- Option D is not fair as we all pay property tax so we should all get to park.
- Again looking for more flexibility to be offered to residents.
- People need some allowance to visit different parts of their city without constantly paying expensive parking fees.
- D - See know need to change.
- As property owners, we also are responsible for clearing sidewalks of ice and snow, for example, and we should have rights too. Random parking people do nothing for the area and have even used our streets to leave their garbage, empty ashtrays, block driveways, fire hydrants or crosswalks.
- Please see D, costs are covered in ever increasing taxes, other options are nothing more than a money grab. Why not enforce current rules to generate more money (clearly the real goal here!). However car to go should have to adhere to the same rules, you should have to register!!!
- As stated earlier, residential parking spaces should not be used as daily long term parking for employees and visitors to adjoining businesses, churches and generators. But residents should not



Residential Parking Permit Review

Verbatim Report

August 1, 2019

have exclusive rights to all RPP parking. Visitors should have hourly access to parking in RPP zones.

Topic: Commercial / residential interface

- A. Increase the amount of hourly parking for visitors within an RPP zone. The times could include paid and unpaid options.
- B. Reduce the number of 'No Parking except by Permit' zones across Calgary
- C. Residents can park in RPP zones at no cost while, visitors are charged a fee to park in the same zone
- D. No change to current policy – Residents and their visitors are prioritized over parking for businesses

- Some form of this is highly recommended. Currently, friends and family are hesitant to visit simply because of the difficulty in [illegible] the visitor permit system. The 2 permits limit makes something as simple as a BB almost impossible.
- different areas require different solutions. Have clear mandates!
- Residents should pay a steep price for more than 2 vehicles per household
- I would suggest making all of the parking pay/permit parking to a first come first serve. I would suggest keeping the permit situation the same for residents as it is now. But typically all of the paid parking is used by residents after hours anyway. Especially in areas where businesses are not affected [personal information removed]
- Strongly agree!
- We should have not gone away from the "hang-in" the car parking pass. Return just like was before
- residents can't tell which cars belong to other residents. Need some kind of ID on cars so we know who can park in our area.
- Agree, as well as their visitors -no pay-
- Agree
- Depends on the business and the area. Some level of cap on # of vehicles going to areas with high residential area. Got to run a business.
- What does this mean? What areas are having to pay anything?
- Increase 2 hour parking not paid parking
- Please add paid parking in our neighbourhood. Then the proceeds can go to community improvement projects. On street parking should not be free, please add user fee for on street parking (including residents). The maintenance of the road is not free, the user should pay if they would like to store their private property on the city owned street.
- RPP is the privatization of public space. Everyone should pay market rate for public parking
- I want more low cost parking downtown
- short-term parking should be cheaper than the whole day
- My preferred option. Unpaid is better
- Ridiculous - 7 families visiting grandparents and their kids families having to pay. Are our property taxes in the central core not high enough that visitors need to pay for parking. üüü



- charging family and friends to visit residents would contribute to isolation of senior citizens. Commercial visitors (care workers, plumbers, electricians, etc.) would charge back to resident. It will cost the resident in the end.
- This could make sense in very high demand areas with Commercial close by
- Good idea!... IF: visitor of residents would still get a visitor permit though, non-resident visitors would be charged only
- This generally works for residents and businesses. However, it should be designed so that family and friends aren't forced to pay or be ticketed
- We live 4 blocks from the school and our kid's friends and both are in a different zone. Strongly agree.
- Yes, permit parking not fair - keeps people out. Citizens don't own their road.
- Disagree. In our case it's the only way we can park anywhere near our home.
- Don't relax parking for businesses
- it should be in context of the parking pressure. Eg, for a school, parking should be allowed outside of school days. Why no parking in summer?
- Reduce # of permit zones. Streets are for all citizens
- But, this needs to be in conjunction with a requirement to use on-site parking (use it for parking, not storage, please!)
- Disagree, even with permit only parking my street is full of non resident downtown working parkers. A lack of enforcement of the zone is a problem.
- Depends on proximity to landmarks prone to parking issues ie. Train, etc. In those cases, permit parking necessary. I agree, enforcement is the real issue.
- Our street is a residential street.
- Seems okay
- We should be encouraging the use of public transit, biking and walking to get to businesses
- I don't see situations around Calgary where there isn't already pay zones directly adjacent to commercial streets. There is no need to allow visitors to commercial to park a couple blocks over on residential streets.
- Residents (and their permitted visitors) should be able to park at no cost, while parking for businesses should be limited time and/or charged a fee.
- I feel that it is controlled enough as it is right now so please leave it as it currently is now.
- As above - I am already paying for my visitors through my taxes
- To be clear, residents and their visitors should ALWAYS be prioritized over parking for businesses. At the same time, the amount of hourly parking (paid/unpaid) should still increase for residents' visitors. Businesses should account for their own on-site parking within their property.
- Restrictive parking zones are killing local businesses.
- Most people require their spots after 5:00 pm. Change the definition of the residential zones so that they are ALL automatically 2 hour parking zones between 9:00 am and 5:00 pm (and unlimited if the car has a visitor pass). This helps customers and visitors, and night parking for residents.



- Business should have considered parking when being established. I prefer no change, but a charge for visitors (unrelated to residents - not our guests) would be OK as long as the hours are still kept short (don't want a wall to wall parking lot on our street so we can't find space).
- Just one choice?? Some zones are just too large. Park on your street not the entire neighbourhood reserved for residents of neighbourhood only. 24 hrs a day.
- In areas where there are businesses and residences, this should be shared space. When purchasing a home in these areas buyers should understand the convenience of having local services so close means increased non-res on street parking
- Businesses usually have paid parking options, eg parkades. Businesses are just trying to reduce their costs At the expense of residents.
- This would encourage alternatives to car travel.
- These zones are way to common, an example being in Crescent Heights where the public should have way more access to the view from Crescent Road. It is bad enough when parking is eliminated in front of homes but when streets with no facing homes are restricted the rules have gone way to far.
- City has aggravated problem by allowing more and more businesses in what were once solely residential areas and not adequately addressed resulting parking issues. Allowing for more paid visitor parking might help.
- B - Needs to be better balance between resident parking concerns and resident needs for access to in home and at home services from businesses, AHS, charities (meals on wheels) and other visitors to the community, including for access to City lands such as dog parks and playgrounds.
- D. Residents should have priority. They are paying more tax!
- D - Charging visitors discourages people from visiting different neighbourhoods which can isolate communities instead of building diversity.
- C - we do need to allow access to businesses.
- Residents and their visitors should always be prioritize over businesses
- No change to currently policy other than Parking restrictions are needed on 22 Street NW between 24 Avenue NW and 20 Avenue NW as University students and C-Train commuters take advantage of the free parking during the work days which limits parking for area residents.
- Residential streets are not parking lots for businesses. Businesses/developers need to be responsible for their own adequate parking.
- D - I think that the current system works well. Visitors to residents can use a parking permit. Visitors to the community can usually park for two hours at least without requiring a permit or payment.
- "A: helpful for people visiting businesses and residences
- B: with the new camera cars, this type of restriction is less needed
- C: I don't want my residential visitors to pay
- D: this is fine, I think"
- seems to work and is fair
- D. Until you put RPP in every community there is no way to charge one community parking and another not. Unjust!



- "I'm admittedly thinking mostly about my own RPP street in answering these questions, and our street doesn't have businesses on it, but the current policy seems to work well, so I pick D.
- However, A would also be helpful occasionally on my street, and would certainly help for businesses, so A too."
- Option D. It is already hard enough to park on our street at all times of the day. Residents and their visitors should have priority to park on their own street over businesses.
- I am not sure of the circumstances referred to here. I do not think that there should be an RPP zone on a business street frontage. Parking should be exclusively for the business.
- Current system works for me
- I would like to think that businesses make parking part of developing a business plan if parking is necessary to their success. If there is limited parking, and the business succeeds/fails on having parking, the business has the option of choosing a different location.
- D. System works well currently. Adding additional on street parking for multi-family simply offload parking cost from businesses (commercial) to residents.
- It's not broken so don't fix it.
- Thriving businesses make for thriving communities, no reason to treat their customers as less important than residents. Everyone can tell what land is zoned for commercial use and factor that into their living choices.
- If a business is present they should have decent parking options
- D. seems fair
- I will never live a yoga studio again...the classes turnover every 60-90 minutes and between the old class leaving and the new class arriving...it is chaos
- I understand this to mean street parking is opened up to non permit holders to park on the street FOR FREE for a limited amount of time. Enabling everyone to coexist and attend to business and recreational activities.
- D
- Visitors to a zone don't have the same access rights as residents. Without the RPP our community would be filled with commuter and event parking. Suddenly the 'community' becomes a parking area instead. The city has a responsibility to residents to preserve quality of life. Visitors can adjust
- In residential neighbourhoods the residents should take priority over businesses.
- D, as businesses should have space available for customers. If not, there's something wrong with zoning bylaws in that area.
- I picked D. I just think the residents shouldn't have to worry about parking.
- No parking except by permit is a privilege that should have a cost.
- This seems more about money than parking - leave it alone and how much of our tax dollars were spent on this survey? Seems the city pays too much for consultation on no brainer issues.
- Visitors should be able to park after busy hours to visit friends, etc
- D. There is already street parking on 9th Ave. and adjoining streets, as well as pay parking lots...leave the residential parking restrictions in place!
- No change



- have a special 'trade parking' pass
- The policy should be that roads are for public use (B). The taxpayers should not be subsidizing or reserving public assets for the exclusive personal use of a few. The concept that a resident owns the road in front of their residence is harmful for a number of reasons
- Regional focus business should be located in regional shopping centres where there is ample parking. Local commercial businesses should focus on local foot traffic OR provide on-site parking.
- We choose to live inner city in an old house without on-site parking. It feel punitive to our family decision if we need to pay for our on-street parking while our new build neighbours do not.
- A: Increasing hourly parking would help visitors feel relaxed about being in an area. B: Similarly, fewer restricted zones makes it easier for people to visit other parts of the city and build community that way.
- B. C. Time restrictions are a mess, and too confusing for visitors. My preference is for paid passes for residents and hourly rates at any time of day for visitors.
- B. The street outside a house is public land and it is not owned by the property adjacent.
- This is repetitive. See answer to (3).
- "Don't go there. Don't visit there.
- Don't buy there.
- Order on line and have it delivered."
- Option D. I am tired of having large trucks park in front of my house -- and they aren't even allowed currently. If they were allowed, it would presumably be worse.
- Residents don't own the street in front of their house so shouldn't have any greater control than anyone else.
- D. RPP zones should be for a predetermined reason - where I live, it is close to SAIT and Lions Park C train Stn. Legitimate visitors are welcome - the street is not your private exclusion zone. There are too many paid zones in or near residential areas.
- RPP should not be shared space and exclusive to residents.
- certain businesses are located in residential areas, there should be options for those that allow parking nearer to the business.
- We are in close proximity to Centre Street North and a major traffic generator two doors down, parking is already at a premium under the RPP and should not be relaxed
- See above reasons
- People live there. Shoppers or others visiting businesses do not.
- FALSE
- The policy is fine. All the other options require more surveillance by ParkPlus vehicles.
- Completely against charging visitors to park while visiting me. This would a deterrent to visiting me!!
- Either all pay, or no one pays.
- You buy a home under certain conditions and you expect those conditions not to change. We paid a premium to buy here, and pay a premium to stay here. We do not expect to subsidize those who live more cheaply, to park in our neighbourhood. Let them pay for parking lots.



- D - businesses need to take parking into consideration when looking to build/move to a particular spot
- These general questions only have applicability in specific situations. We have restrictions in our area only M-F to limit LRT commuters looking for free parking. It works for our immediate area. Streetscapes are an important part of a community.
- No one should be in our community's zone because they don't want to pay at parking at commercial sites. It creates a danger for drivers, pedestrians and cyclists in our community.
- Reduce... where parking for businesses is limited. People shouldn't have to pay to park where they want to shop, as this will deter people from shopping there and harm the business. We've seen this in downtown, with The Core attracting very few shoppers outside of "business" hours.
- see above comments
- This might address the problem I have in my neighbourhood where renters are selling parking permits for profit. This is against the rules but almost never enforced by CPA. The fee would have to be enough to deter people from using the neighbourhood to park instead of the hospital parking lot.
- "Do *NOT* charge my visitors to park to visit me. DO NOT charge my visitors. Do NOT
- Wasted \$7 million on an Olympic bid you need to make up for? Give up one of your capital projects!"
- Business is just as important as visitors and residents.

- Option D - It seems that there should be at least 2 different types of zones. I live in a residential area bordered by an extended care centre & a seniors apartment so D is best. For areas like Kensington & Inglewood that need more parking for businesses, there should be a different policy.
- D. It's working now. Why spend money to change. Do not change it
- Residents in Sunnyside - paying high taxes - should get priority for parking.
- Change all RPP zones so they allow for 2 hour free parking between 9:00 am and 5:00 pm (customers of businesses included), and unlimited time with a pass. Change in the definitions and advertise as opposed to the cost of changing signs.
- People should be able to park near their homes.
- A and D: Allows home care and other workers to visit, and limits traffic to the Foothills Hospital nearby
- Home owners should always trump in this situation. We live here
- You make it difficult to do our jobs, we need to be able to park our work vehicles
- Seems fine.
- Make it consistent. If coming to visit a business be prepared to pay to park. Full stop.
- This is tied to multi family building and current City policy requiring on site parking. Fix the policy will eliminate the parking challenges.
- D- Residential areas are homes, not businesses. My inner city community was once considered the suburbs. Development of larger facilities, eg. MRU has changed the tone of the community as they do not have affordable parking. Students now park in alley blocking driveways and sidewalks.



- D. Don't understand this option. I do know that we often have commercial vehicles on our street due to SDC on adjoining ones.
- A and B because it is a good balance between public and private interests
- There should be no permit only zones for residents. The residents do not own the street and should not have exclusive use.
- Street parking should be paid for unless the vehicle has a residential permit. Visitor parking passes should be phased out. All residential permits should be paid for (none for free) and should not be available for units that have onsite parking available.
- There is restricted parking in many areas of the city and it needs to be preserved for the residents of that area and their visitors.
- D. As stated above
- Businesses need to provide their own onsite parking if it relies on vehicle access for doing business
- D. One side of our street is permit parking and the other is two hour parking and this seems to be working to provide parking for residents and the businesses and school nearby.
- B - these zones can be very restrictive, wasting the streets which are often 2/3 empty.
- Paid parking should be available for people visiting businesses which do not have sufficient off-street parking.
- we all both live and work, and need access both personal and for customer. needs to be a blend
- D is preferable as customers will often avoid the less convenient onsite options especially if underground and/or at a cost. Parking in residential areas make it difficult for residents to conduct their lives, e.g. grocery shopping .
- Eliminate the zones.
- For all of these "themes" and the subsequent "options", please continue to evaluate the administrative burden (and cost) of the idea, as well as the reasonableness for stakeholders (ie be it business, residential, or major generators who are paying the property tax and each of their "visitors")
- The wording and suggested solutions do not meet all needs and are not exclusive. Think a combination of hourly and permits are needed to meet visitor and residence owner needs
- We should be able to park near our homes. I don't mind walking to get to a business.
- Re Option D: this is fair and reasonable
- Flexibility is key. Don't be exclusive, it's rude and unnecessary. Unless there is an irrefutable, demonstrable need, there should be no permitted parking period. Don't indulge grumpy, anti-social behaviour. It's too Toronto. Very un-Calgary!
- The current system is working quite well and there are parking lots & people can walk to the businesses.
- I believe that it should be shared space to increase parking for restaurants in the area. I pick option B.
- Our city over-charges for paid parking (most meter rates are higher than anywhere else in Canada), and it would help businesses to allow for up to 1 hour free parking for visitors/shoppers with the option of paying for additional time.



- If we are talking about a residential neighborhood then option D which favors residents and their visitors should be the priority. This does not preclude business customers from using street parking within the time limits but prevents the street from becoming a parking lot.
- expand the Bridgeland model.
- give these vehicles passes to park for home or healthcare workers
- Ok as is
- Imagine that I'm your neighbour and I have divided my basement into multiple individual bedrooms where each one is rented out to different people each with their own vehicle where each vehicle would occupy all driveways including the one in front of your house. How would you feel?
- I like the current policy
- I have a permit street I am inner city . It works fine. If you remove permits we will see people driving from suburbs to walk downtown. I don't feel that is equitable as we are all paying taxes but inner city gets hit highest
- People should be able to park anywhere reasonable for a short amount of time.
- Residents can include visitors who are providing service. I have to pay to park when I do business, why should others be exempt?
- I live in this zone. I am frustrated by the lack of residential parking all ready. To reduce it would be infuriating.
- If it isn't broken why change it? This survey is costing valuable tax dollars that could be spent on virtual services.
- Option D - Seems to be working well at present.
- D. I spend most of my time in inner city, living and working, and finding a space to park is not difficult as I move through my day.
- User pay is the fairest distribution.
- Do not deny residents to have visitors. It is already hard to convince people that we will find parking for them. Often I park on the street so my visitors can park in my garage as I can move my car before streets get busy.
- "In the past, if a vehicle was in a spot that didn't look right for more than a couple days and it didn't have a permit maybe somebody would call. Now you don't know if the person has a permit or not and all you see is more city employees driving around burning fuel for no good reason."
- D. Some home-all-day residents expect to be able to come and go from street parking spaces during the day; working people should be able to come home and find a nearby space to unload kids, groceries, etc.
- Give me back my money
- Residents and their visitors should not be charged. Neither should those frequenting a business. The business will suffer from visitors requiring to pay and a resident/their visitor have costs covered by taxes.
- Charging for this seems like a low class money grab...
- Businesses need to ensure they make arrangements for parking for their customers. Relying on street parking only just does not seem wise.



- We all pay for the streets, so everyone should be able to use them.
- I like the current system, but if it has to change, I would support option A over B & C.
- Option B. Commercial/residential interface can still attract prospective buyers/renters/business owners & operators and visitors if the "no parking except by permit" zones are reduced. Not doing so negatively affects business and clientele, even though the majority of the parking spots are vacant.
- I am on the [personal information removed], because of the ctrain tracks there isn't enough space for the residents to park on the street, never mind our guests. There's no space for general public.
- Where neighbourhoods are ok for parking, a reduction in the no parking permit zones might be nice. But with a time limit. No all day parking to travel to work or abroad.
- Small businesses should be able to have same rights as residents. Large businesses should be forced to provide parking. Building permits should encourage this!
- There appears to be an inefficient use of 'No Parking except by Permit' in many major communities like Inglewood and Charlswood. I believe many areas like these could benefit from an in-depth review of usage to relax parking restrictions to encourage visitors
- Please do not make us pay to park in a residential area. Time limits are fine when businesses and major drivers are affecting parking in a residential area. Option D.
- directly in front of residences could remain permit only but through way and in front of businesses need to promote people to come by and have available short term parking with out charge.
- Same question, different wording.....businesses need to support their clients, not residents needing to support businesses. Use common sense here please.
- C seems reasonable
- Business and the city need to solve their own parking problems - not local residents, many of whom have lived in RPP zones for a very long time and pay a lot of taxes already.
- Change the definition (so you don't have to change all the signs) so that all residential parking zones become 2 hour parking from 9:00 am to 5:00 am automatically (or all day with a pass). This allows for visitors and businesses. Even these changes will drastically increase the traffic.
- Hiding the costs of parking are detrimental to Calgary. I believe that the cost of parking should be born by the user. Ideally, this means that parking is always available for those who are prepared to pay for the cost of it. More importantly, the cost discourages automobile use and ownership.
- I pay higher house taxes and now had my business / property tax doubled up. parking fees/tickets for unregistered guests/contractors and appeals are rejected, making Calgary a less desirable place to live. This is coming from a native Calgaryian of 60 plus years and never imagine i would say this
- Should be able to have friends over for coffee or lunch.
- The RPP are intended for residents, visitors are secondary to residents.
- "A" helps community feel (I have friends in RPP zones that I rarely visit). "C" only if there is still room for residents. "C" would work better in an urban/commercial setting, and not in suburban.
- "These interfaces prevent me from visiting busy commercial areas because they full of residential parking permit areas. Charge the local residences if they want 24 parking permit and limit commercial
- Visitors to 2 hours, etc. currently these cater to residents that should be parking on their lot"



- D. It's impossible to have visitors, even when all nearby streets are nearly empty. Why would we not want people visiting other people or businesses? This city already massively lacks a sense of community. Rules that act as a deterrent to creating community are disingenuous and damaging.
- Yo, do I have to keep saying this? To manage congestion you need to implement a fee. If something is worth it then it is worth the fee. If a couple of hours of free is not enough then they must pay. Then patrol the area a ticket anyone staying long. Easy cash grab and solves problems
- Parking for businesses is integral to more mixed use neighbourhoods. Small businesses shouldn't have to provide on-site parking as this can become prohibitively expensive make for a less desirable urban form.
- Reflecting on this, I often don't mind paying a small fee to park when I'm going to a business, although free is better. A fee I think would incentivize me to get in & out - not wander around and doddle or explore. I'm thinking Inglewood - lots of little shops & restaurants, little street parking.
- Parking restrictions limit my interest in going to these places.
- All commercial areas should have a surrounding area like 'A'. Why are we killing businesses just to protect a few snobby people?
- D I wholeheartedly agree with
- Residents and businesses should be given up to 10 passes at no cost
- Allow for others to utilize the area and avoid congestion in the main streets of areas. I.E. Kensington - parking can be limited on the street, allow visitors to park on neighborhood streets to accommodate all visitors to the area.
- A - even short time restrictions give some flexibility for visitors to the area
- D. What's the point of owning a house if you & visitors can't park there?
- ABC are all good options
- Not "should be shared space". It is shared space period. It's the language you use that really bothers me. Nobody owns the street.
- This choice goes without saying. If you own or rent a home and pay taxes you should be able to utilize the street parking outside your home.
- I live here and need to park in front of my house.
- Two hour parking 9 to 5 as I mentioned. In addition, the City forces new commercial developments to provide some parking, however, it needs to remain FREE parking, otherwise these customers are taking up street spots.
- Seems like a money grab by the city. If the area can't handle the traffic generated by businesses then maybe they should not be there
- Options A - residents should have to pay for permits and hourly paid and unpaid option could balance the needs and interests of visitors to both residents and businesses.
- D. This option is fair to tax paying homeowners.
- see answer for 7.
- Works well as is



- Space is extremely limited in areas around schools for parents to pick up their kids after school or dropping them off. Why penalize someone for a quick drop off/pickup in areas where there are clearly no vehicles parked during pickup and drop off times? Cash cow at its finest.
- I want a permit to park in front of the house I own and the property you collect taxes from. Renters who do not pay taxes are parking in front of my home!!!
- I've stopped shopping in areas where I cannot find a parking spot.
- D. Businesses should have on site parking
- This frees up more parking spaces
- Need to either change the eligibility for getting a RPP from having registered address or the 2 week long permit. My partner and I both own houses in different zones and have to add each other every second week. I have had to pay a coder to write a routine for doing this, which i have sold to others
- D - We pay for our houses, we pay high taxes businesses should have parking in place before city approval
- (D) again 2 spot per property, how you manage them is up to you. if you run a home based business them you better have no cars or a garage or a parking pad from you cars. why should I struggle to park so that someone else can use them
- Reduce the permit only zones. Increase the number of parking spots available across the city! While you're at it reduce the bloody prices on the City Impark fees for the downtown and other premium spots!
- C. Residents should not have costs so long as they have the required permits. Visitors however could have cost associated when parking is busier and no cost when it is less busy.
- Increase the number of hourly parking. Especially around Mission and Kensington.
- It works in my residential area where outside parking is generated by SAIT students.
- When street parking is limited, maybe a fee will deter those parking in a residential area and then walking over to the "pay as you go" streets.
- Ideally the "No Parking except by permit" should be reduced to 0. Option B
- Like I said before - our neighborhood is all employee parking. And parking for people who live in the burbs and take the bus from my street. If we "shared" our side of the street we would be parking miles from our home.
- Visitors to residents should not be charged a fee however visitors to commercial establishments should be charged. The root cause of this problem is the fact the city does not require businesses to have adequate parking available and the surrounding community suffers the consequences.
- Homeowners bought prior to business and should be rewarded not punished by the GREED of CofC and Council about fees and service charges
- the system is working well
- You cannot prioritize parking over businesses who count on customers to make a living. Residents have enough on-site parking unless they are greedy and have more than 4 cars. Putting up time zones with restricted times would work during the day. Only unpaid!
- This only applies to me when I try and park downtown.
- "Sorry, residents over nearby business, period."



- What of the parent struggling to get into a home with multiple small children + groceries etc.?"
- Residents and their visitors should be prioritized.
- Street parking is a hazard and should not be permitted. If you do not have somewhere on your property to park your car, buy a transit pass or buy a bike.
- Implement time limits to keep the all-day LRT riders out
- It should be free and unlimited for anyone connected to a household in the area. No one should have to pay to park near their home and their visitors should not have to pay neither
- more loading zones at building entrances
- Option D. Residents should be prioritized over commercial. Commercial should be required to provide some on site parking for patrons.
- D: Residents should have priority over business parking.
- d) There is a daycare by us where parents dropping off and picking up park all over the place. They block sidewalks, park in front of neighbours several houses down the street and cause line of sight issues for residents trying to leave the street.
- Parking is public. There should be no preference given to residents.
- Calgary pays enough for property taxes and pay too much for parking in the city and especially at hospitals and walk in clinics. We should provide short term parking (3 hour) on residential street near them but need to be strictly enforced otherwise workers will abuse this system.
- Residents should have first right for street parking as this is their dwelling, where they spend their nights, days. Visits from businesses, family, friends cannot be compromised to alleviate someone's issue of trying to find parking - in most cases not paying for it in the designated lots.
- A business can provide onsite parking.
- D - current policy is working fine today
- This is a residential area. The business area is separate. The U of C based businesses should provide their own parking and not send customers into the neighbourhood which already has enough issues.
- No fee should be charged when the City is not responsible for snowing removal, traffic flow through and other real "costly" issue in a residential district. This sounds like another way of cash grab for the [removed] at City Hall.
- A - pretty much as I've said to all the other questions.
- Option B. Remove the parking restrictions and permits.
- If I decide to start a business, it is up to me to ensure I have enough parking in the space I have. Otherwise, move the business elsewhere....purchase another lot and provide parking there or something similar.
- It is unfair that some citizens receive free parking on public spaces just by virtue of living nearby. If visitors pay, so should residents, although residents should be given exclusive options to purchase daily, monthly, or annual parking at rates that reduce with the longer terms.
- An unpaid option might be for a set amount of time and anything over that time would be charged.
- This survey is biased you aren't asking the right questions. Residence don't have priority over neighbourhood business. If you have a 2 hour zone visitors and park for business for 2 hours



Monday to Friday. Residence can park by their own home at any time of day, any day with their permits.

- If an RPP zone has encroached on a business area, trim the zone back.
- High traffic business should not operate in residential zones.
- "A) I do not think residents and their visitors should have priority on the public streets.
- Exceptions could be made for handicapped persons who have a handicapped parking permit."
- Create an App for visitor parking. Issue with website all the time
- d- same as above
- A: encourages more visitors while keeping them from taking advantage by staying excessive lengths of time
- Public streets are the property of all taxpayers and should be open to all equally. If residents are concerned about parking at their address, they should build on site parking like everyone else has to.
- Think that residents and visitors and people attending the business should be reasonably allowed access to parking. People who park and then go out of the area should not have access to restricted zones.
- requiring visitors to pay affects people with mobility issues, home care, seniors.
- Free to homeowners would be abused by some people. Having to pay to visit is better than no parking options when more than two people visit someone.
- Too many restrictions! You can't build a so-called "great city" by restricting everything.
- Parking should not be free (subsidized).
- Unpaid...quit your gouging...
- We live in an island community in University Heights that is completely surrounded by institution such as hospitals, the University of Calgary and McMahon Stadium. We cannot park in front of our homes unless there's restricted parking.
- It's a pain when an entire area is covered in no parking signs but the people who live there have drive ways or aren't even home
- Communities need to be livable in order to attract residents. Residents should have priorities to keep communities vibrant.
- It should be expected that people use their off street parking and if they don't they should have to pay to park just like anyone else.
- Option A. People need residential access to parking spaces, and at the same time supporting growth in the business sector is a collective need. Residents should have free access, while consumers may pay a fee.
- restrictions are needed to prevent abuse, for all residents living within 30km of downtown
- Again, with the hospital, even the smallest of parking times are taken up within the neighbourhood. The school lost its 2 hour free parking zone for parents because the hospital staff take it. Even the pay option would be taken up unless it was very expensive.
- Modest times (deter major generator use), unpaid
- Other choices are detrimental to businesses or create problem for residents



- Businesses have to deal with their own parking
- b. If residents take all the parking, there is nowhere to park for short term business needs. Stop restricting who can park where and when.
- We want people walking around neighbourhoods. Both residents and visitors. But we do not want cars permanently parked in the same spot on the street for days and weeks. This option encourages sharing.
- Again, roads are public, not private. Residents need to remember that and stop whinging.
- A). Find a better balance to bringing in commerce. Some areas like Cliff Bungalow are ridiculous in terms of finding parking to dine at a restaurant.
- It just makes sense
- More businesses are opening in residential areas, everyone has to share
- These restrictions hamper the ability to have visitors to the home.
- There should be less zones in downtown, and people should be able to pay to park there.
- These are busy areas which is why there is RPPs in place. The business is already getting a lot of traffic and visitors... They are likely the reason the RPP was out in place many a years ago.
- B&D
- Businesses are not residents... they go home at night. We live here.
- FREE PERMITS for residents and FREE PERMITS for visitors
- A & B: These are public streets and should be accessible to anyone. The use of paid parking zones would address concerns regarding people parking their for days, and it should be communicated that homeowners do not own the streets in front of their houses.
- Make 1- or 2-hour parking available in RPPs. The "exclusivity" is unfair if the RPP exists in an area like Rosedale that isn't severely impacted by SAIT during the summer semester but has a very aggressive community association that wants to limit parking, even next to the community centre.
- The zones do not work, fancy new electronic system or not.
- Roadside parking should not be exclusive based on living in a permit zone. Get rid of permit zones.
- D
- Parking should be prioritized for households, but any household with more vehicles than they have on-site parking spaces should be charged a high fee for using the street.
- Streets are public. When they are littered with 3+ vehicles owned by a single family that get to park for free, the rest of the city is forced to find alternate spaces even though everyone's taxpayers dollars are spent on the roads.
- A - as mentioned this is already a huge problem for me in Kensington! Nothing like coming home and there being NO parking spots left for residents and CPA nowhere to be seen
- There needs to be realistic options for people that are driving to certain locations. Parking shouldn't be impossible or an unrealistically high cost. Parking shouldn't hinder business performance.
- Residents have priority over businesses. Residents cant change where they live businesses can choose to open a business where they want and if they want a business in a residential area they need to look at that before opening a business, not the homeowners concern.



- Businesses need community support, and customer parking is a great low cost way for a community to support neighboring businesses. Business parking is usually short term, and is efficient use of space. Commuter parking around businesses and residences is not.
- A/B: by not allowing people to have a choice in paying or not, you are taking the chance for out of community people to visit places (ex Elite Brewing; since some live out of the community, it's insanely difficult to visit and partake in businesses that are in that community because theres no parkin
- D - A commercial business should be restricted to a proximity of their business. I think the way things are with paid parking in close proximity to businesses and hourly parking in adjacent neighbourhoods allows patrons the flexibility to access those businesses. Expand hourly to from 2 to 3 hrs
- Loading zones should become available parking after 6pm
- A and C are reasonable options depending on context.
- We should be able to park one car in front of house for free, we pay enough property tax and property price inner city.
- OPTION C - if there is significant commercial businesses in a zone then I would be OK with a system that charges commercial business visitors a fee but left residential visitor permits free.
- In the NW there are too many RPP zones. A benefit to living the inner city is that you need a car less. People shouldn't be encouraged to store their cars on the street for free while their garages are full of other stuff they never use.
- If the parking was open here in Hillhurst - we would not be able to find parking ANYWHERE on our street. We have one vehicle!!!
- Residents and visitors should be prioritized to some extent. If there is enough parking for all residents, their visitors and additional space is available for businesses then opening up an hourly option for part of the zone would make sense. But only if there is no substantial impact to resident
- B) Our streets are public and parking should not be restricted on public streets for the benefit of a few residents.
- Again, residents who live near major generators paid more for their property and they have the right to street space more than visitors and commuters.
- Businesses should be responsible for providing client/customer parking.
- Again, you have to make places liveable. Always worrying about parking in a city that worships cars is not appropriate.
- it is the responsibility of a business to provide ample customer and employee parking without intruding on the residence
- D) Park near your business, not in front of someone's house. Businesses visiting residents need a SIMPLE and cost-effective "park anywhere" type of permit.
- No selection. If parking is necessary for businesses urban development has failed and you should rather install non-car transportation infrastructure to help people get around town. This is also usually beneficial for business development, theres lots pf data about this.



- A - will provide additional parking for visitors with due consideration for resident parking by limiting time
- Same as above
- Selected D: Businesses should have on site parking for clients. There should be some 30 min or 1 hour free parking for short stay visitors not requiring permits.
- While i don't support resident parking, if the only options are the ones above it should be paid parking. We should not be subsidizing road construction to allow people to park for free
- D: Businesses should have their own customer-related parking without customers needing to take up residential spots.
- B - We wanted parking by permit for the period that Foothills hospital parking was in chaos. Would be quite happy to return to two hour parking on our block. I think it is also important to differentiate between areas with primarily business, mixed, and primarily residential.
- "(B) As mentioned above, ""no parking except by permit"" zones should be eliminated completely.
- (C) RPP parking should serve residents first, followed by residential visitors, and finally commercial or 'neighbourhood' visitors. The current system provides this adequately."
- Keep it simple
- This is a tough one.
- ugh same answer...why trying to skew results
- The shortage of parking options in residential areas is the fault of the city, in not requiring businesses and multi-family dwellings to provide sufficient on-site parking for visitors and residents, eg.15th Avenue NE between 4th St. and 3rd St. Development permits MUST include adequate parking.
- see above
- Avoid commercial clients using up residential spaces.
- Explaining D. I was always under the understanding that businesses in Hillhurst/Sunnyside were required to provide sufficient parking for persons accessing their businesses.
- Common sense approach.
- Maybe 3hr parking - BUT ABSOLUTELY NO NEW TAXES/FEES. We should be striving for the simplest and low cost improvements.
- We live close to LRT, downtown & local businesses as well as several condo developments either already built or coming soon so we already get alot of street parkers that can currently be monitored by residents and visitors having priority as in option D.
- the only change I want to see is in the way we get no parking by permit zones. Currently you need to find a way to get everyone on the block to agree to this. How are we supposed to do this? On my street is parking by permit on one side but no permit on the other
- really this depends on the area
- Business should have to provide their own parking.
- As mentioned, the only "businesses" that impact our community are Foothills and U of C. Residents should have priority over visitors to both institutions and as stated earlier, the increased traffic we currently experience is already a safety concern for the community.



- No big viewpoint on this issue. I'm annoyed if I am a visitor and just as annoyed if I am a resident
- No opinion
- (D) Each home has up to 4 or more parking stalls available based on vehicles, and parking in the zone is for the residents and their visitors, not public that are too cheap to pay for public parking or take public transportation.
- I believe that all residences should provide parking onsite. No-one in the city should expect to be able to park their private property (vehicle) on public property.
- "9 hr parking for a company is ridiculous.
- (20 Ave sw)"
- No vehicles, commercial or personal, should be allowed to park for free on public property.
- We don't have any businesses in our neighbourhood.
- Should depend on case by case. Some businesses are bigger than others. Some businesses require different kinds of parking than others
- Again, imagine not being able to park within blocks of your own home. This is the reality on the street that I live in without restricted parking. Restricted parking has been in place here for 2 years. Prior to that leaving was not an option during the day.
- As above
- Residents need priority
- residents should have priority and be able to find free street parking generally close to their home.
- A business should have some parking associated with their building/location. It shouldn't impact residents.
- A school is on my block. We used to have no restrictions. Not possible to park at home during the day!
- I think it was a lot better before residential parking permit zones were applied in Calgary. People seem to take advantage of the current system by not parking in their garages, driveways and using unlimited parking permits. This is unfair.
- see above
- D - we used to have no place to park when getting home from work due to visitor/workers parking on the street. We were pariahs in our own community.
- Again this one size fits all approach does not work. This is a residential district with no businesses in our zone. A group of residents asked for the restrictions. Our taxes were over \$5200 this year and I should be happy to allow students to park in front of my house all the time. Unbelievable.
- Residents should have priority.
- In the neighbourhood there is a good mix of some permit only sections and some 2 hour sections and some all day paid areas. It's good to mix them all and I think it's been done well.
- Although I agree that people should take responsibility for where they live, under flight patterns, or beside the Stampede grounds, you don't always get a say as to what the City puts in your neighborhood. GlobalFest, Country Thunder, Religious parades, Music festivals.
- Controls the number of hours visitors are parked. Prevents all day parking. Maximum 2 hours.



- C - In favour of seeing a few paid visitor spots nearby business if located in a residential zone.
- If the city changes the system there will be certain districts over run by parking, like next to the university and hospitals. It will be just a matter of time before businesses will not bother having their own parking because they will think people can park in residential areas instead.
- Appears to be most reasonable option.
- Residents are the ones who have paid significant costs to live in these particular neighbourhoods. We purchased in the area due to location and the fact that it was permit parking for residents. Homeowners should take priority as they are the ones who have paid for homes and paying property taxes.
- This would be good in a lot of areas where there is a mix of businesses and residential in the area.
- What answer are you fishing for? Leave our "No Parking except by permit" designation alone.
- D residents should get priority because we have ALREADY bought here and because we suffer far greater impact than those who are visitors. It is proven that those attending businesses, events, school etc often speed on their way to work, appointments etc. Free community parking endangers our kids!
- we need exclusive parking for residents and should have at least one parking for visitors. i also have a handicapped spot designated for me in front of house. this is a necessity and should be included in my prop. tax for the property.
 - if there's businesses near by rpp zones then I think it would be fair to have 2 hr parking windows for visitors. I don't think that would upset residents too much.
- Mobility permits exempt, BRZ in high density areas need to be high transit corridors and multimodal, snow clearing and emergency services to easily enter and leave high density areas
- D Businesses should have the responsibility and cost for arranging customer parking
- Too many rules already with parking. Fee parking would reduce my visitors and care giving fees would increase so I would have to pay for my visitors.
- See comments above on #7
- Businesses should build more parking on their sites and not get relaxations.
- Present system works well
- I disagree with making people pay. Just put 2 hr parking except for permits.
- B: Residents do not have exclusive rights to public space. If anything, preference should be given to parking for business visitors who are supporting the area's economy. Adding more handicap parking closer to the businesses would be a good idea, & resume Parking Control patrols, tagging & ticketing
- Residents and homeowners who require parking deserve priority. Visitors to businesses should take advantage of current street parking available.
- Disagree that visitors should be given the same access. I bought the house, not the friends of the renters and nor did my visitors. It's reasonable to assume 2 spots for residents, or however many feet can be allocated based on frontage. 3/4 car families need to plan better (campers for Air BnB?)
- Hourly parking is an effective way to allow for a more equitable use of public street parking.
- I am satisfied with the description associated with D.



- Please consider also revamping the online registration process which can be onerous. For recurring visitors, the website could save frequent visitor license plates for re-registration and extend the length of stay past 2 weeks.
- Balance needs
- All businesses should provide sufficient off street parking for their customers
- A&B most residential zones don't need additional paid parkers. However, there should be some paid areas within some residential zones (near restaurants, universities, etc)
- As I said before, any permit only zone that is empty most of the time is not needed by residents and should be abolished. Because someone might not be able to park right in front of their house whenever they wish doesn't mean that they should have exclusive use of the curb at all times.
- why have zones if no enforcement
- A and B are the best options, depending on the area.
- In some cases, the streets have plenty of available room to park, most homes have garages or driveways, and large amounts of public and private resources are being used (and wasted) to build off-street parking facilities.
- D.
- You can make hourly parking on buffer streets / busy roads that access the businesses. But patrons shouldn't be allowed to encroach on neighbouring homes and park on residential streets when visiting the businesses. They can walk an extra block or pay for parking adjacent to the biz on the main road
- D: when visiting a business we should be more willing to walk a distance and have the convenience of parking closer to where we live. There should be accommodation of a few disabled spaces closer to businesses for those who are less mobile
- A and B
- See comments to #4
- Businesses must be able to accommodate customers.
- Response to D. This seems to work the best.
- I live in an unrestricted zone and have never had any issue with finding parking near or in front of my home.
- In areas where commercial and residential zones intersect, residential parking should be prioritized over businesses during non-business hours (9 pm - 7 am weekdays and Saturdays). During business hours, parking restrictions would be eased to provide additional parking for patrons.
- A,C. So frustrating to have daytime parking restrictions near commercial businesses. Especially daytime, when many permitted streets are empty. Bad for business, and city could be making \$ with park plus.
- People should have a reasonable ability to park in front of or close to their home
- Same reason as in #7.
- This applies to our area. I can't speak for other areas. Ours is strictly a residential area except for the University of Calgary across the road from our home which has plenty of parking lots for the staff/students/visitors. It people looking for free parking that are the problem.



- Enough cash grabs by city
- D
- Residents take president over businesses. Businesses should have adequate parking.
- "A. More parking outside my zone would be good for visiting friends/businesses.
- Reducing overall parking space by reducing permits would clear the streets for driving. Consider parking on 1 side of the street only."
- Restaurants and other businesses add to the vibrancy of communities; there should be more support of these businesses
- Absolutely, but, if I am responsible for keeping the public sidewalk in front of my home safe, I should be able to park in front of my home. Maybe residents like me should be able to purchase a permit exclusive to my property. Some residents regularly have more visitors than normal.
- In these older, inner city neighborhoods, I understand that parking is a challenge. But, it sucks, when you have paid for a property and cannot park within blocks of said property because of businesses. I would love if the city would look into better multi parking solutions, that don't involve us.
- There is great sharing on my street - and I've lived on the same spot for 35 years . When service vehicles arrive (plumbers, electricians etc) often residents move their vehicles to allow the services better access. There doesn't need to be a prioritized parking.
- Something like this could help get better utilization of the space. It just overwhelms the nearest non restricted space.
- Again, all zones are not equal. Residential parking on streets impacted by hospitals, other high traffic/ parking use should be protected, the business has the responsibility to provide adequate parking - help if hospital parking was not outrageous. bigger issue is dealing with this when building
- D, I am against any additional fees, the road is already in the tax budget why should there be another tax. Time for the City to find another source of revenue.
- b- You cannot put commercial buildings in a location near residential and continue to reduce street parking at the same time. Where do people park that work there? Our building at [personal information removed] does not have room for all of the staff to park underground.
- We need some, but not all, of the current zones.
- B since the street should be a shared space and "no parking except by permit" zones are NOT needed in most places. The zones are valuable in some areas (near major generators) but most community streets should be left open, saving the city money.
- Britannia, Elboya and Windsor Park areas have too many "No Parking except by Permit" zones and do not allow for visitors to the area or parking for staff of the businesses in the area.
- B - some areas within the city are becoming increasingly difficult to provide enough employee parking for the business that share the community. Britannia is one example of this where the increasing number of RPP have caused an actual employee retention issue for businesses.
- B - There needs to be a better balance between what is available to who. The way the current permit parking and zone restrictions are set up is in favor of the resident. The resident who has a parking pad or garage should not also have full ownership of the street parking as well.



- By reducing the amount of zones with permit around commercial areas that can increase the business for the locals. Also it will help and free up stress of finding parking around local business like the Britannia area.
- This should help free up space for visitors. However, if "hourly parking" means 1 hr only, you may need to rethink this!
- Businesses pay much higher property taxes than residents do. There should be ample parking for employees of those businesses reasonably near the places of work.
- If no parking except by permit is reduced, I would always have people parked right in front of my house. I would never have the ability to use this space as it is close to a main street.
- Residents peace and enjoyment of their homes should not be compromised by businesses. Businesses need to factor in appropriate locations when establishing themselves.
- It often seems The City accommodates businesses without much regard to the single family homes and families that make this neighbourhood so special. It's about time The City supports residents.
- Businesses should provide their own parking. If they need more space they could relocate. It's hard enough for residents to find parking space as it is.
- "Opt A:
 - Unpaid time restrictions in RPP for visitors (2h)
 - Paid parking in RPP for visitors for add. limited time (e.g. 2h)
- More flexibility while still deterring unallowed long-term parkers"
- see response for previous question - this is a big issue on 33rd Avenue and is only going to become worse as there is no place to put additional parking for these commercial properties
- Current policy is suitable for this area. It should NOT be shared space or inclusive for anyone to park here. There are 2 hospitals, a university, a stadium and a park on our street. In the past we had unlimited parking for anyone, it posed a danger to the community with so much traffic.
- If you change, residents should be free. I can live with visitor's paying. I was told I could not get a visitor pass. Not fair.
- A - there is a lot of 2 hour parking spots but sometimes you need longer, especially if you're going to a restaurant or doctor's appointment, etc.
- There should be more "no parking except by permit" zones
- Business visitors should be on equal footing to ensure the businesses which are making the neighbourhood vital keeps in business. difficult to ensure this access without impeding the residential community life, but has to be balanced.
- Commuters should pay to park in our community, we are a community not a parking lot. I don't live in suburbia or park in front of your home all day. Park at work, use transit, or carpool, making my community a parking lot is not an acceptable solution. any fees collected need to be allocated here.
- B - There shouldn't be any no parking except by permit zones. The road is public property and shouldn't be reserved for specific people, but available to all.
- This is a difficult balance, but I think residents and visitors trump businesses.
- C: I think it's very disruptive to a residents' life if their parking availability is variable due to visitors.



- Residents and their visitors deserve access to their homes. Businesses need to include onsite as part of their business plan/costs, and not impact residential parking.
- D...if our street didn't have permits, we would never find parking. U of C and LRT users would make it impossible. That's why we got this area to be permit in the first place! A person should not have to struggle just to arrive home, that's ridiculous.
- There are generally no business in Residential zones; hence, there is no problem. Where the residential zones are adjacent Commercial zones if there were not existing policies people would not be able to find parking in their own neighbourhood.
- I agree with D for the residents and their visitors BUT C. Visitors to businesses could pay a fee to park (as long as the fee goes to the infrastructure in that particular community!
- THAT IS OKAY, EXCEPT HIGH DENSITY COMMERCIAL OR RESIDENTIAL!
- If an area has limited parking residents should have the priority over business
- 1-2 parking times should work for most visits. Any stays longer than that can be applied for a visitor permit.
- D - residents should definitely have priority over businesses - if a business is to have a large amount of customers parking, the business should have their own on-site parking
- Since the change to electronic permit - no window tag - there has been a dramatic increase in parking on our street. There is no longer a visible "I belong here" allowing residents to call for enforcement.
- The current system works in this regard.
- A
- Charging a fee for parking will not address the issue of shortage of parking for residents who have to compete with commercial users. The city when approving commercial projects should provide ample commercial parking and not expect the neighboring residential areas to pick up the slack.
- no payment for residential !!
- Perhaps - more parkades can be utilized -our businesses are leaving because of high taxes - that should be looked after first.
- Businesses in an area pay taxes to. Free short term parking combined with longer paid parking would work to help. Parking restrictions at night so residents can park also makes sense (parking by permit only after 9 pm).
- As above, residents should get adequate space available with preferential access.
- See above. If A no charge for residents. In return for hourly parking (2 hour) on street in front which serves a variety of users, need to preserve restriction in laneway finback of residence. 2 hour restriction should exert to weekend so parking not tied up by all day users.
- D Just a money grab to get more revenue with paid options.
- D homeowners need to have street parking for themselves and to a degree for their guests.they should have priority
- B - if space is freed up by ensuring residents use all available on-site parking, the space should be given back to be used by other paying visitors to the area...benefiting businesses in the area.
- Option D if it is not broken do not try to fix it



- No change, option D. Businesses need to plan for parking for their customers.
- Unless visitors have a permit then it's hard to tell who is a resident and who is a guest
- Residence should be able to have permits as that is their space of living but visitors should have to pay as it isn't a long term issue for them.
- Chose A: residences should never have to pay but allowing the public to park in the areas should also be an option with time restrictions and a nominal fee.
- Current system is suitable
- Residents rights are more important than business rights.
- People who live there and limited guests should have priority. Businesses and city need to factor in onsite pkg when developing.
- Businesses are making money from their customers, they should be required to spend money to provide parking for customers. Charging for visitors to visit residents or making it hard for them to park will just discourage social visits.
- Residential streets should not be relied upon to provide parking for businesses.
- Option B is a theme I agree with to help stem the ownership of street in front of my residence syndrome. All citizens pay for the streets, all citizens should have access to all but very few exclusions.
- Residents should not have any special privileges. There are many legitimate users of any parking zone - just have them pay where there isn't enough supply and this will encourage alternative transportation options.
- Yes share the parking Less restrictions regarding 1 hr only and no or minimal cost to pay to park in residential areas. weekend free always
- Parking restrictions should apply to normal event and business hours (7AM - 8PM daily) except near hospitals.
- Keep it Simple.
- Timed restrictions for business hours? Parking restrictions create an uneven
- The current plan is sufficient.
- D Self explanatory
- Option D offers the best solution, particularly where major traffic generators are located nearby. Otherwise there may be no on-street parking available during the work week.
- Residents and visitors should not subsidize business parking.
- I agree wholeheartedly that residents and their visitors should be prioritized over businesses. I understand and accept this when I drive to small businesses near residential zones myself.
- A,B,C. Permits are only related to the amount of time they can park in a space.
- n/a
- as above.
- A: Depending on the area, having a patrolled area with time restrictions should help control abuses of on street parking. D: residents should generally take precedence over businesses since the business should have on site parking.



- B make it simpler
- Residents and businesses don't usually have the same hours. Business is day/time use and residents is evening and weekends. The only conflict would be weekend. Every business pays enough taxes to allow it to have customers without additional costs. Inner city residents pay enough property tax to pay
- This will help businesses as visitors will have more parking to go to the stores
- Business need to know their parking needs and provide
- This is honestly the best option I would think. These zones are very exclusive and not exactly fair to anyone but residents.
- For the most part, just limit the time that can be spent in the rpp zone and allow anyone to park there. Reduce the amount of zones where they're not necessary. In some places directly adjacent to busy commercial areas it might make sense for non-residents to have to pay to park.
- A/D - depending on the location, having daytime parkers using local businesses doesn't interfere with homeowners parking needs.
- It is too difficult for seniors living inner city. We should be finding ways of helping them stay in their homes not making life complicated for them
- D: In Kensington BZ, use of paid parking stalls is NOT optimized--spill-over onto residential streets is not due to lack of public parking, but perceived availability of 'free' parking. Perhaps a review should be done for other RPP zones where this type of congestion is not so problematic.
- If we have hourly parking for visitors - it would be as it is downtown...pay and use and leave.
- Preference is B and C. Residential permit parking should be reduced in Calgary as private landowners do not own space on the street. That being said it may not be possible to eliminate it everywhere, however in all zones one should be able to visit for a few hours.
- Regarding C, I still think that residents should have to pay some fee for a "park any time" pass. To encourage them to use on-site parking.
- See previous comments.
- D prioritizes the needs of residents and their visitors
- Residents should always have a spot to park over people going to businesses.
- If you change the policy to favour those who donate to councillors, ie businesses and have the city decide, you will create a policy where individual citizens take a back seat to those with deep pockets. Corruption will reign within Calgary's bureaucratic institution as a result.
- I don't agree with the very restrictive parking. There should be some available parking for visitors and businesses. 2 hours seems adequate. Paid or free should be determined by the area. Downtown maybe but not in the outskirts of the downtown.
- Private residents should not be able to monopolise public space if they have on-site parking.
- Businesses should be required to provide on-site parking. BUT, RPP zones should be contextual to day/time parking pressures, including high parking generators such as schools, hospitals, as well as density - apartments AND SECONDARY SUITES. Suites DO create issues, especially when many per block.
- Option D - we pay enough property taxes to allow us to park near our homes



- will be fair and improve parking for both residents and visitors
- D Again, high inner city residential taxes suggest that the costs are included for owners and their visitors.
- I avoid commercial areas with too much parking; it's dangerous to walk through and unsightly. I suspect this is common; the highest rent commercial areas like 17th have limited parking.
- D.
- D works fine. Businesses should be responsible for providing adequate parking on their properties.
- we have 20% of our street for business parking
 - by having so many unnecessary RPPs it makes more of an issue than it needs to be
- There are no businesses in our residential area. This is a non-issue. Residents and their visitors should be permitted to park for free (with permits).
- St. Andrews is a residential neighborhood and I would not like to see businesses starting up within the neighborhood. My main concern is that if properties were to be used exclusively for businesses, the neighborhood would not be very family friendly.
- "See above.
- General comment - should be a contact where we can discuss questions/ concerns with group conducting study so our concerns/questions are clearly addressed. Ant paid options should be time limited for non residents to prevent hourly parking from being tied up."
- Again, make it 2 hour parking from 9 to 5 automatically. In addition, when you force a developer to provide parking for businesses, it needs to be 1 hour free to get customers to use their parking rather than the street!
- "D - I agree that residents & their visitors should have priority over businesses.
- B - I also feel that there may be many no parking zones except by permit that are now unnecessary.
- A - Increasing the amount of hours (paid) in an RPP zone would assist with this comm/res interface."
- A - I keep explaining my own personal Age & Mobility situation, regarding coming downtown as a Business Visitor to these areas.
- Similar to the points above. The biggest challenge is finding a way to avoid abuse of residential parking around major generators - blanket changes to policy as above will not achieve this outcome. Work with the major generators to come up with a solution rather than putting it on residents!
- Will encourage using public transit.
- D: If there is a commercial business in a residential area then right out front the business there should be hourly parking restrictions in place to allow for visitors to the business. If you live on the street you should be able to park unrestricted but pay a fee for the permit.
- This is the preferred option.
- simplest way, IMO
- C More equitable.
- Please scrap electronic RPP and start sending visitor parking tags in the mail. The online system is terrible: it has bugs and it freezes. There is no tech support on weekends/after hours. The requirements can be confusing to elderly, people who are not computer savvy and first time users.



- D- With all the construction builds and business/services vehicles it can be VERY difficult to have a visitor park with a permit in the appropriate zone. For over a year I had vehicles parked in front of my house not my visitors between the hours of 7AM - 4PM and not once were they ticketed.
- Home owners should be able to park in front of their own residences.
- This can work for most people as the vehicle will only be there for a few hours. Rental areas - no, again if left overnight or parked for days, who will enforce.
- The stated "theme" is simply preposterous; D is the least bad choice offered.
- Residents should have priority, businesses should be able to provide parking
- "B. It's getting hard to park in Calgary. Don't make it worse. I suspect that city council likes it this way.
- Residents and their visitors should always have priority. We're paying the steadily increasing taxes. Back off!"
- Parking is so limited as it is. I like the practice of maintaining spots specifically for people who live in the vicinity.
- Residents should always have priority to park at their home and should not have to pay to do so.
- Same as above. Every Sunday for a year, we've had a couple park in front of our house to go somewhere in the neighbourhood for a few hours. Currently, parking is free outside the house on Sundays. They have been rude, obnoxious, threatened our dog. Having to pay would deter people like this.
- Answer varies by location. suburbs, problem is major generators like LRT/high schools. In Beltline, much different. If you keep looking for 1 size fits all, you will have the same crap system we have now.
- D - There are no businesses in St. Andrews that require parking!
- B - I compare our parking zones to others that I've lived in that actually have parking problems. We have a select number of inner-city communities that do have issuesotherwise we need to let this go as it makes us look quite petty to the rest of the city/country.
- You should not have to pay to park on a residential street.
- D.. I don't want to pay for parking if I go to visit a friend,... and same goes if someone comes to visit me. Just because we have RPR
- D- I chose D unless we are talking about a major commercial street we're I believe the hourly paid meter parking would be best.
- The problem is that there are TOO many dwellings with "No Parking Without Permit" which causes their visitors to take the parking spaces in front of their neighbors houses!
- Residents who pay property taxes should NOT have to pay additional fees for permits to park in front of their own homes.
- A - I work in an area where the free street parking is slowly being taken away due to resident complaints. However, now no one parks in these areas during the day and those of us who work here are scrambling to find places to park. We are just as much a part of the community as the residents are.



- D seems like the best option if actually enforced. My neighbourhood became trendy long after I moved in and parking only became a problem in the past few years. Why should residents subsidise fly by night businesses who contribute nothing to the community and will be gone in less than a year.
- Need to balance residents/businesses in order to support main street businesses. Ensure that revenue generated from visitor parking is reinvested in local improvements.
- "A: hybrid zones - paid parking/RPP, with time restrictions for the paid parking portion ie. 8am to 8pm. RPP users can park 24 hours.
- B: Re-evaluate the zones. Which zones ACTUALLY need to exist, which have been established as a perk or desire. Also, the dynamic of each zone has changed over time."
- Selection D is best option for our street
 - Residents and their guests should have priority
- I have no other parking options that on-street. I live close to Prince's Island/downtown, so street parking is desirable, both for events and for commuters who work downtown. So, I need to protect my on-street parking options. The current system does that well.
- Concern with Business employees parking on residential streets & along playground zones. The City encourages people to use the LRT, walk, etc. to help the environment & climate change. Businesses 2 blocks from LRT & employees park on residential streets/playground Zones to avoid parking fees??
- As above
- there is not a parking space problem on my restricted street, when visitors drop in they are they are not taking up spaces the residents use.
- This is only fair. Businesses need to take more responsibility in providing parking.
- A - using hourly parking that must be paid also deters residents from parking in designated visitor-type stalls/areas
- C and D. Reduce the number of "No Parking except by Permit", the city owns the street not the Residents! Residents and visitors should have parking priority over business.
- No small group of people should be able to exclude all others from common civic spaces like roads. We often need to go here and there around the city, often for quick errands or meetings; we should have some option to move freely. B. Many people seem to think they own their street.
- D - leave as is.
- Residential property owners have responsibilities regarding the streets/sidewalk areas and deserve credit for doing this. City can educate and monitor this situation. Fees are not necessary except at businesses (or short term parking) or to ensure movement. Property tax payers create the city.
- Car to go should have to register using a visitor permit or park elsewhere. Infuriating that commuters have priority over residents/local businesses.
- A flexible parking arrangement is required in the inner city. Long term daily visitor parking in residential streets is detrimental to residents. But visitors should have access to available parking in RPP zones for short term periods.



Residential Parking Permit Review

Verbatim Report

August 1, 2019

In-zone commuting

A. Divide large zones into smaller ones to reduce in-zone commuting potential

B. Increase the amount of hourly parking for residents and visitors within an RPP zone. The times could include paid and unpaid options.

C. No change to current policy - No restrictions for in-zone commuting

- As our household is on downtown edge of zone, we experience lots of 'in zone' commuting and parking. Perhaps enforcing zone holders only be allowed within 200-300m of home address?
- In-zone commuting isn't a problem I have encountered, but decreasing zones to a standard size makes sense.
- Block & half (1.5) radius - 2 block only. Honour what you're supposed to do! Within your assigned street.
- Not fair. People don't own the road
- force residents to park close to their homes - somehow
- Reduce admin. 1. zone approval - councillor, CA. 2. then custom restrictions by street with neighbours. - eliminate custom restrictions.
- Get rid of pole signs - restrictions posted at entrance to restricted area.
- Sometimes you need to drive and park in your own zone. At my age, my doctor might be in the same neighbourhood and I may not be able to walk.
- No interzone parking. Residents from another area of your zone parking in front of your house and going to the LRT or University
- If residents are to be charged for street parking, then that should apply to all residents city-wide.
- Increase hourly parking then the proceeds can be returned to community improvement projects like Bump in the beltline. Pay parking (hourly) will also ensure parking is available for ppl that want to spend money in our neighbourhood at local businesses.
- this option does not work for me, we do not need another fee for parking
- This is a problem near the university. Charge market rate for parking. Do not permit people to profit from their free parking/guest passes.
- This makes sense. You do need to allow for some in-zone commuting for those w/ mobility issues & ppl making large purchases
- No more money
- Yes, unpaid when >2 permits required
- people that have access to "all" zone take advantage & park/use their zone ticket/pass to park close to DT
- flexible and more appropriate
- this is critical especially for the elderly and those with mobility and/or health issues. Do not impose any limits or reduce zone size
- make e-zone smaller
- I think it's okay
- This puts every commuter on an even playing field without affecting residents



- Make zones small enough that it makes sense for people to be walking within those zones instead of driving and parking in different spots.
- In zone commuting is fine. Some times people know other people in the neighbourhood and visit their without the nuisance of registering as visitor, or they quickly stop to pick up something from a local business on the way home while leaving a spot on the commercial pay parking zone open for others.
- I have not seen this as an issue in my area of residence within the city, so not an issue I can speak directly to. Certainly reducing the size of bigger zones should help.
- there should be no reason to commute wihtin a zone. My experience is with unviersity students who cant be bothered to walk the rest of the way to school. Perhaps special permits for those with mobility issues.
- I feel that it is controlled enough as it is right now so please leave it as it currently is now.
- I only do this when I am patronizing a business in my community
- In-zone commuting is critically important especially for seniors and individuals with mobility/health issues. They should not be unfairly penalized and their quality of life unfairly lowered, by living in a higher density area as encouraged by City policies.
- Don't see as aproblem
- The lowest priority for change-- not a huge problem.
- Do NOT go to hour restrictions for residents - that's again not a fair thing compared to what people living away from demand have. Consider enforcing XXX m away from the registered address? I believe that restriction is already there (don't make too tight - must be able to find space)...
- "In-zone commuting is when someone uses their permit to park far from their home.
- You need to park at your home.
- EVERYONE wants to park for their doctors visit. Why to nearby walking distance people get priority use? Business hours EVERYONE PAYS for the prime spots."
- Is this actually a problem?
- In zone commuting is an issue in my zone - goes against the walkability aspect of inner city living.
- Here is my one concern: I live at [personal information removed] and have people parking during the day in front of my house and take the LRT that is very close by and also park there at night. I would like to request 24/ 7 residential permit in front of my house. Thank you.
- None of these choices. If you live in a zone you should be able to park anywhere in that zone. If I want to go grab some food from a local restaurant and it's pouring rain I should be able to travel within my own community to do so.
- Seems to be the fairest way to equalize treatment of citizens of the city as a whole.
- Using permit to park for brief periods far from my home but within same zone actually allows me to shop at local businesses which otherwise I would not be able to do. Zones could be smaller in areas affected by all day parking.
- If someone drives three streets over, this is a problem with the individual. I can't see this being a huge issue.



- C - Generally I walk to places in my zone however I see no significant issues with in-zone commuting.
- Businesses can have their own parking area as long as it doesn't take away parking for residents
- No change to currently policy other than Parking restrictions are needed on 22 Street NW between 24 Avenue NW and 20 Avenue NW as University students and C-Train commuters take advantage of the free parking during the work days which limits parking for area residents.
- Why penalize a resident for shopping/commuting within our community? If I'm stopping by a friends place down the street to pick up or drop off kids, I shouldn't have to worry about getting a parking ticket.
- A - I know that this is a problem in our neighbourhood and Option A might be a way to resolve it.
- C: I thought the permit program already required you to park within a certain distance of your residence
- has it worked?
- Until you put RPP in every community there is no way to charge one community parking and another not. Unjust!
- Any or all three seem fine. I've actually not observed the phenomenon, because I think the zones are small where I live.
- Option C. No change, please. This is a useful perk that increases my access to my own community.
- How does in-zone commuting deter people from visiting businesses? Suggests option A as mitigation.
- C - current system works for me
- I don't think this is a big deal. The zones are already pretty small.
- I don't have a strong opinion as I'm not aware of any information on what zone I'm in or where it extends to.
- I don't understand this?
- Too much added administration in making smaller zones. This can't be that big of a problem.
- I didn't even know this was a thing
- might help others who are having trouble finding parking when shopping, etc.
- Tether any RPP issuance to the address of record; small modification to residential parking bylaw required to restrict maximum distance one can park away from registered residential address.
- My lazy neighbour does this to park by a LRT station and I think it is the height of rudeness
- If there are specific areas of concern with this, they could certainly be addressed in the next review, zones don't have to be stagnant.
- To add any restrictions would most likely cause harm to local businesses. As we encourage "support local" restricting this zone would cause more harm than good.
- C
- Either A or C. A unless it increases the cost of the program . The system worked better with paper permits. It was more visible who was parking on the street



- A zone is fair to all residents, and a permit is specific to a zone; in-zone commuting should be allowed as a benefit to the community's residents.
- A - I live on a street that this occurs on all the time and it is so frustrating. One nice day people drive their cars down to our street (the closest street you can park to get to downtown and still be in zone M) and when we get home we have nowhere to park. Smaller zones would fix this issue.
- A would best suit the objective.
- I picked A. It's hard for me to wrap my head around why someone would do this but maybe I don't realize how large the zones are.
- Enforce the penalties that are in place. Violators park for days at a time in 48 hour zones, sometimes weeks. Phoning does not help, as nothing I should do.
- Enforcement of current policy I believe parking is within 50 meters of residence issued to.
- I think this is a fairytale that CPA management like to tell to replace them actually going and seeing what the problems are on the front lines. Do they even have data to back up this claim of inzone commuting? More like a red herring to distract from their incompetence.
- There are so few people who do this that this isn't an issue - stop all this nonsense about whether or not someone is using their permit to park in another area - this is not a serious issue for a few people who might do this - besides the person lives within the zone - there should be some perk.
- If you restrict it, you encourage people to drive further- out of their own zone. Don't you want people to frequent businesses in their own area?
- I thought the permits required people to park within 150 metres of their residence??
- Not aware that this is an issue
- living in an area it is convenient to be able to do short stops near your home to pick up necessary materials to transport home. Groceries, supplies and large objects still need to be moved to our homes. The commuting within our zone is how we support local business to thrive.
- None of the above. This demonstrates that the zone should be removed or more restricted. Residents should not be given exclusive use of a public asset. If this is a problem it shows that there is public demand for the road that should be made available to the general public
- Option A. Permit parking should be confined to a set distance from the registered address to allow better use of the on street parking spaces.
- Has there been any actual evidence of this? Did the City do the research or is this antidotal?
- A: If in-zone commuting is a significant problem, this seems like the most logical way to address it.
- C. I don't see a problem with in zone commuting. I'm guessing most people who do it have a reason. That said, more paid parking options would still increase choice.
- You have to be within a specific distance from your home with the current system. I don't see what the issue is.
- I don't understand. You cannot use your permit to park "far from your home but within your zone"; the permits are not valid past a short distance from your home. It might be nice if we could use our permits anywhere in the zone, I suppose, but it's not necessary.
- Don't go there. Don't buy there. Don't visit there. Go to Spruce Meadows. Go to High River or Okotoks. Get a doctor with free parking. Use a lab with free parking. Walk to the gym. In my



business I don't deliver to customers without parking. They have to come and pick it up or pay shipping.

- This can't be that big of an issue?
- You have a pass fro your zone, you should be able to park anywhere in that zone.
- other option: I thought the RPP permit had your address - and you parked at that address - you should not be using it to park any where you want in the zone no matter how large or small!!
- Indifferent.
- this is a commuting city. prices to park downtown are far too high and there should be options for those who cannot afford the price of parking downtown.
- This occurs in our Zone M but is not a major problem currently.
- See above.
- A: maybe not smaller zones but shape the zone in rings out from commuting hubs so you gain little by in-zone commuting. Appreciate this isn't an easy thing to plan/map out!
- I have no idea what in zone commuting is? Why would someone purposely park far away from their home?
- Should only be an issue in larger zones. Address this issue as necessary when it becomes a significant problem.
- greed greed and more greed,our crown is more organized than any organized crown
- With all the construction near my Condo in Beltline, sometimes residents with street parking permits need to park far away to find a spot. Shrinking the zones could make it impossible for people to find parking during periods of construction.
- The zones are small enough. This is not a big issue.
- None of the above. Remove zones, remove fee paying - too much expense and administrative cost to enforce. Just make it all equal.
- There is a modest amount of this going on, but fortunately we have only been inconvenienced a few times. Mostly due to construction in our area, and residents temporarily losing their favoured spots. But I'd love to control those who "rent" their guest passes to others!
- If it's in their community why not?
- C - I feel this is working just fine.....detering in-zone commuting is getting too nit-picky
- I don't understand this issue. I think of most Zones as within a community. People in a community should be encouraged to visit local businesses. Another statement that must apply to a specific area.
- Have I mentioned how terrible the CPA is at their job? Too many entitled people working there who have clearly forgotten they answer not to managers, not to Councillors but to the citizen tax payer.
- C - is this actually a problem?
- Seems reasonable for someone to shop in their community without challenges or complications, as this has a tendancy to build communities.
- Don't allow people to take advantage
- see above comments



- Residents should be able to commute easily within their own neighbourhoods.
- I don't see this as broken so I don't know why we would expend effort to fix it.
- Free parking is a deterrent to walking.
- People who live in these areas are inconvenienced enough already by non-residents, don't punish them by disallowing them from taking advantage of their zone permit. You overspent and now you're trying to tax permit areas more!?
- No comment
- I'm not entirely clear on this theme but I would think that if you live in a zone with businesses within walking distance, one should walk rather than drive.
- Again it is working. No change needed. Neighbours will be pitted against each other
- On a completely different note, with the new program it is difficult to tell if vehicles that are unrecognized are parked illegally, or if they in fact are visitors. The old program with hardcopy visitor tags were great, because you could call in and have people ticketed for illegal parking.
- c is fine
- c: There already is a restriction of 150 meters from your address
- If people are concerned this is the only fair way.
- C: We often can not find parking near our home in spite of tight restrictions. I would like the right to park nearby if needed.
- Never heard of this one. Who would park so far away from their home. Unless the parking is either legitimately full up all the time and that should be looked into. Or the parking authority is not doing their job by keeping illegal car parking out of that zone.
- It's fine.
- Awareness is developed by knzine commuting.
- Really - how real or applicable is this issue? General comments - you're not interested in feedback, only another survey to say you surveyed residents to allow you to do what you were going to do anyway. Crowchild improvement survey all over again, 6 surveys later the City did what nobody wanted.
- None of the above. Having a permit does not guarantee being able to park near your home. Permit only allows me to park within 150 metres of my home.
- Not aware that this was a problem
- No option. I think in-zone is fine as long as there is a short-term window...
- Residential permits should only be valid within a short distance from the residence.
- In-zone commuting encourages transit usage by allowing people to drive the short distance to a bus stop. This is something that should be encouraged to increase transit use.
- With all the new in-fills and activity, status quo is not adequate.
- This would ensure residents and visitors are utilizing parking close to their home and not clogging up other areas where they don't live.
- Sometimes you have to park far from your residence such as a snow ban restriction



- A: We do have a few inzone people parking on our street who work at the hospital and live further away but its not a big problem
- Makes sense to address the issue.
- C - No need to micromanage the population. Who cares.
- Allow residents who commute within the zone to use available parking spaces provided they are willing to pay the appropriate rate.
- fits with all the other choices I have made. i.e. allows for flexibility but restricted by time to limit abuse.
- significantly reduces the problem.
- This is not a problem. Who thinks this is a real problem?
- The system in place is reasonable. We appreciate that you look to Calgaryans for input on a range of topics....aside from potential improvements to the administrative (perhaps \$) end that we are unaware of, without affecting the overall useability for Calgaryans, *if you are changing something.
- I use in zone commuting which increases my visits to businesses
- Our permits are by street. This doesn't make any sense to me.
- Re Option A: this is fair and reasonable
- Don't micromanage, nobody appreciates it and it's a waste of resource.
- I don't see this as a big issue. The change to electronic visitor passes has reduced misuse of those being 'sold' to non-residents
- I am not sure
- Why is a resident using in-zone parking should be the first question... are they visiting neighbours or doing a large shopping trip? Yes, this should be allowed... it benefits our communities!!
- People should park within a small distance from the address the permit is associated with. Whether this is achieved by smaller zones (option A) or by just making the rules more restrictive and enforced under the current policy.
- Electronic permits by license number can solve this with a 300m limit.
- I don't agree with in-zone commuting. I'm not sure "A" is the best solution but it's better than the others
- No restrictions at all. We don't need them.
- Advantage of living within a zone especially in the downtown core
- Same
- Reducing the size of the zone will eliminate/reduce in zone commuting
- Is this really an issue? Sounds made up.
- I literally do not leave my house to do things because the parking problem in my community is so bad. I try not to leave on the weekends and schedule grocery trips for when I think I can upload with hassle. People are jerks
- This happens in front of my house because I live near the train and businesses.
- If it isn't broken why change it? This survey is costing valuable tax dollars that could be spent on virtual services.



- Option C - Seems to be okay.
- I spend most of my life living and working in inner city. Are there large zones that you can do this? I think not. I am continually moving from one zone to another each day, and am revisiting parking machines to put in new zone numbers.
- If everyone has to pay for parking, including residents in the zone, this won't be an issue.
- Often have friends/businesses in the zone & need to drive because of mobility, senior, kids etc. Should be free to at least move around one's own neighbourhood.
- "The new system is a total waste of taxpayer money. They now have to drive around constantly to police these parking zones that don't need any policing. This is a huge cost and totally unnecessary."
- We talked to a W permit holder from near Lions Park who drove to a W spot in front of our house to attend a football game. She felt she had a right to do that. I wanted to ask her if we could go park in front of HER house.
- Having smaller zones would help accommodate and have more people using transit
- Is this really a problem? How large are the zones. I feel I would need more information to make an informed response to this question.
- The current system works for me. If it has to change, I would support option A.
- Option A. It is the most inclusive and fair.
- Permits should be for parking around your direct area - residence and shops - not for parking in front of houses far from yours in order to shorten your commute to work.
- Although I do feel like the zones (or at least my zone) are tight enough that you should be walking within it as opposed to driving.
- Dividing the zones would probably solve this issue.
- Elderly people should be able to visit friends, businesses within their community.
- Option C. I'm surprised this is even an issue. If it is, it would only be a small number of occurrences?
- Some residents with multi-vehicles use this approach and block parking for other residents.
- perfectly within the rules why not if an issue then make zones smaller with additional short term free parking.
- This is a minor inconvenience....
- A seems reasonable
- The old permits had an address on them. If you were not actually visiting that home then you were illegally parking. Enough said.
- Typically not as much of an issue.
- I find it hard to believe that this is happening in any significant way. Nevertheless, I believe that the cost of parking should be born by the user. The cost of parking can discourage automobile use. Charging for street parking is a win-win.
- More flexibility required sounding like a broken record. My opinion does it really matter??
- Not completely true... some zones do have smaller ones to reduce this - e.g. AAA in Bridgeland.



- "A" would make sense (especially for areas such as parking zone "N" where people would park near the LRT station). "B" would help provide a balance for suburban areas. A "3 hour free" parking limit would add community feel while keeping full-day parkers from leaving their cars all day.
- None - I don't agree with this p
- Just get rid of these zones
- 2h limit except paid permit holders. City gets money, less congestion, city gives tickets and gets more money, people will find alternatives to driving or will carpool because of cost, less carbon. Congestion lowered. No house owns the street space in front of it so why make exceptions for these area
- Street belongs to everyone, just institute time restrictions. Residents DO NOT own the street in front of their property.
- I don't really view this as an issue, personally. Perhaps it does not apply to my area, or perhaps I benefit from it a little... although I'm sure the pass used to state you had to be within so many meters of your home within the zone. Perhaps this just hasn't been enforced?
- No comment
- This isn't a problem. C is good.
- This is beneficial in areas where non-resident visitors abuse "2hr zones" in permit areas and residents are not able to park near or in front of their home.
- I have lived at my current apartment for over a year. My building does not have on-site parking and we are right off of 17th Ave. Almost every day I see people parking on the street and walking to restaurants and bars, leaving no room for me to park on my own street.
- C - we need to promote community
- Of course residents should support their local business & using their zone pass could be allowed
- C: I don't think this is a big issue
- I sure hope what ever committee came up with this survey finds themselves looking at budget cut job losses. This survey proves how brutally useless city bureaucracy is.
- If I have a permit good for a particular zone, I should be able to park within that zone whether it is near or far from my home.
- similar to visitor permit, permits should only be valid within a small area near where it is registered.
- Not that much of a problem
- Making smaller zones solves this
- C: not broken so no need to fix
- "Option A. This is probably only an issue within communities where there is a transit hub or a major generator.
- Option B - paid visitor parking and time restrictions would help to reduce this for people who have on-site parking and otherwise wouldn't get a permit."
- This option is fair to tax paying homeowners.
- not aware of issues on this one.



- We have this issue a lot. We live on 10A Street (Hillhurst) and have a number of people who drive from within the zone to park there so the walk downtown or to the Ctrain is shorter. Makes it hard to find a spot.
- More opportunity for business in the area to benefit from short term visitors as opposed to someone parking in an available spot and waking to shop in a different zone.
- I don't understand
- The whole purpose of residential permits is to be able to park in front of your residence. Put metered parking spots near businesses, where residents can park for free in the off hours.
- Option C. Don't see an issue here
- Didn't think that zones were big enough for this to be a problem
- Need to either change the eligibility for getting a RPP from having registered address or the 2 week long permit. My partner and I both own houses in different zones and have to add each other every second week. I have had to pay a coder to write a routine for doing this, which i have sold to others
- a - Parking permits should be for that address only
 - so simple not even sure why this is a question.
- I don't believe that either option will provide a solution for this problem because often the person lives and works in the same zone so will drive to a different area and park in a different location. Neither solves the problem.
- No change.
- It makes sense if the goal is to park outside of your home.
- Give businesses more space.
- Anyone should be able to park on any street at any time. Only options B and C move toward this.
- Makes sense to divide into smaller zones
- The ability to shop locally is one of the things that make a community pleasant. However zones should not be so large that people could not walk to commercial establishments within their zone. This would eliminate the need to drive and park. Businesses should provide adequate parking.
- This would seem to be a minor issue at best, and not worth significant effort to remedy.
- Just remove the zones.
- All is good with existing policy
- the system is working well
- Have hourly parking during the day and open during the evenings. Unpaid. This concept is confusing to me. Why would anyone park far from their home? Is it to get closer to the business?
- Our neighbor does this and it must be so frustrating for the people trying to park by their home.
- If a zone is large enough to make in-zone commuting desirable, the zone is too large.
- hasn't been an issue that I know of in our neighbourhood.
- I don't consider in-zone commuting to be a problem.
- The resident permits should have a limitation along the "May park up to 100m from 123 Anystreet N address".



- Street parking is a hazard and should not be permitted. If you do not have somewhere on your property to park your car, buy a transit pass or buy a bike.
- A - what lazy person would drive and park within the same zone? Make them smaller to eliminate that
- It should be free and unlimited for anyone connected to a household in the area. No one should have to pay to park near their home and their visitors should not have to pay neither
- Option A - In-zone commuting is an abuse of the system and not what parking permits are designed for. Needs to be eliminated, creating smaller zones would probably take care of this problem sufficiently.
- Option A Especially in areas in close proximity to schools, universities, C Train stations, churches.
- As a resident of a near downtown zone, on the closest end to downtown, I have observed people parking in front of my house who use it to reduce walk time from 45-50 min to only 30 min to walk downtown. This can present parking issues for the residents how live on that street.
- This could limit the resident with small kids who needs a vehicle to visit in neighborhood facilities like playground and friends in the neighborhood.
- If this is an issue, dividing the zones seems to be a good solution to reduce in-zone commuting. There are specific reasons for permits in residential zones, and that is to be close to the dwelling. There is no other purpose.
- C - current policy is working fine
- Our neighbourhood is not that big. People can walk. Doesn't the City want people to walk and bike? We walk to the U of C, visit neighbours, etc. The need to drive within our zone is not that great.
- It not constitutional and not part of Charter of Rights
- A - I didn't know this was even a thing but it seems like a total corruption of the residential permit policy and should be prevented.
- It is frustrating if it's -35 and you cannot park near your home and have groceries to bring in. We must provide easier access to bus terminals so there is less in-zone commuting.
- Where is the option for "Remove the number of "No Parking except by permit zones across Calgary".
- That's just trying to bend the rules and being discourteous to your neighbors.
- Public spaces should be shared spaces with no exclusive access; otherwise, there should be a fee for preferred access. Hourly, daily, monthly, or annual fees should apply. Make the zones smaller so that citizens can choose which level to pay at (cost reduces with the length of the term).
- In-zone commuting is a problem that can be solved with smaller zones.
- Again, weird question! In zone commuting shouldn't happen because there is a two block restriction as advertised on CPA website so this isn't an issue AND this has nothing to do with business. Another biased and inaccurate question.
- In-zone commuting makes it easier for people to get out of the way of street cleaners so our streets get cleaned properly in the spring! Compliance is already bad enough, don't make it harder by reducing options for people to move our cars in-zone. What do you want people to do, park on their lawns?



- Everyone should be able to park in front of their own home.
 - Would park closer to home and not use permit for commuting purposes.
 - only makes sense that those that abuse the system need to be stopped!
- A: makes it easier for visitors while still providing parking options for residents
- May help deter people lobbying to restrict parking if it affects them as well
- On a street with single family residences and one four story rental apartment building, it is unfair to not allow tenants and owners and owners employees or workers not to park in a RPP zone.
- addresses issue without affecting residential/visitor parking
- C dont know how big a problem this is
- "i do not agree with this but i think you need enforce the ""
- within150m from your place""
- more strictly or reduce to 100m?? . home owners also pay tax"
- I don't like any of these "options," but this is the one I dislike the least.
- Parking should not be free (subsidized).
- I am addressing a different concern than the above- I have had guests such as cleaning people park at our address to clean our home, and we forgot to sign one vehicle in and they got a ticket. There should be an easy way to cancel a ticket like that. The restriction is to protect us not punish us.
- Fed up with your horrible signage, lack of marking where hidden fire hydrants are...Wake up...more then one kind of signage on one block...unbelievable your greed tactics...Quite letting the Stampede Board dictate hours and times of parking..eg...12 ave...should be free parking 24 hours a day.
- I don't see how this is an issue in tiny communities like University Heights. We are an island Community surrounded by institutions and we require restricted parking so that we can park in front of our homes. We won't be able to do so otherwise.
- This is not a significant issue to my knowledge.
- Residents should be able to park close to their home.
- In zone commuting is not a real problem, it is something that busy body neighbours imagine is a problem.
- Option C. There is no harm in this because a permit holder can only take one space. Here or there, what is the difference?
- Don't know about this. I thought you could only park right out in front of your residence.
- There already exists a proximity restriction for residential parkers.
- is the best choice because it prevents abuse of system and reduces in -zone traffic.
- Seems logical
- It helps visitors.
- B Some residents go through periods of needing to commute in zone. Such as families with infants and young children. Allow for flexibility. Make businesses accessible but don't necessarily give preference to residents.
- Not sure how much of a problem this actually is, but anything discussed above would take care of it.
- A). More targeted approach



- If there is no space to park by your residence, you park further away where there is a spot. Doesn't mean your "in zone commuting"
- I don't know why this says there are no restrictions for in-zone commuting because there are.....
- These restrictions hamper the ability to have visitors to the home.
- I can't see why this is an issue.
- C
- In zone commuting should be done on foot or by bike... reduce cars
- NO PAID ZONES, NO PAID ZONES
- B: I do not think in-zone commuting is a large concern, but increasing the amount of paid parking for visitors and businesses should be pursued in all zones.
- It's supposed to be parking for residents, so keep the RPP as close as practicable to the residence.
- just another way these zones do not work at curbing behaviour they are trying to restrict
- Get rid of the permit zones. This is only a problem because people with permits have exclusive access. Get rid of permit parking, get rid of the problem.
- C
- I really don't understand this one.
- Option A would solve the issue while also reducing the amount of permits given to a single household to allow for more space.
- C I see this as being a very minor issue that probably only affects a few zones
- There needs to be realistic options for people that are driving to certain locations. Parking shouldn't be impossible or an unrealistically high cost. Parking shouldn't hinder business performance.
- In zone commuting is bending the rules. This is not a good use of parking, and should be stopped. This is the kind of issue that makes residents and businesses suffer. Designated parking for transit access should be made available at ALL transit hubs and C-train stations - paid or unpaid.
- C: if the zones are that big, you're allowing people with a permit to park wherever. If they are having to park that far away, there's already an issue with the zone size or amount of permits given out
- C- In zone parking benefits businesses from the patrons in the neighbourhoods that are the primary users of the business. Areas have enough paid and hourly parking to accommodate businesses. Expand hourly to 3 hrs.
- This is a complete non-issue as far as I can tell
- Is this really that big of an issue? I don't understand how it would "deter people from visiting businesses, etc." This seems like a ridiculous concern.
- OPTION A - I live on an LRT line and this is a huge issue. People drive from their house down the street to park at my house to catch the LRT. Very frustrating.
- Unless you're disabled, no one should receive free street parking. People should not be able to monopolize the parking in front of their house, especially when they're not for using their garage for parking. Make people use their private space efficiently.
- Remove RPP zones.



- Not happy with any of these options - the zones should not exist. Replace with paid parking or free parking which is available to all.
- Is this really a major issue?
- Or tie the parking permit to a particular street, as the with the park plus code system.
- A: is a good idea.
 - not sure this really needs an explanation
- No selection as this is not a problem I am familiar with.
- The only time someone would use their permit to park far from their home would be if there was no parking at the home. If this is not the case, perhaps reducing the size of the zone would be a benefit.
- Selected C: This is the simplest and most cost effective for the City and Tax payers. However, if a Zone is too large, consideration should be made to separate it into smaller zones. Zone's that spans more than a 15 min walk in a high density commercial area is likely too large.
- A: It seems fair that permits should only apply to one's home base where a spot should be available to you.
- C - I understood you had to park within a set distance of the registered home owners property so don't think that this option is currently correct?
- Multiple RPP zones in a neighbourhood is regressive and restrictive. I currently cannot park on the street at my own community centre to coach my child's soccer team because it is a different zone. Zones and restrictions should be neighbourhood-wide.
- Keep it simple
- Don't like too many rules
- See answer to Question 4.
- C - zone size seems reasonable as they are
- Explaining A. Past 2 days, vehicle parked out-front of my residence all day (facing a No Parking - Permit Zone sign). Does not have permission to park. Often have a vehicle with a bicycle in the trunk that they assemble and ride to and from work I presume because it's there all day as well.
- Common sense approach. Easiest to manage.
- Mainly an issue downtown/ high density from when I was in Beltline. I was often FORCED to go far afield as so many people were parked nearby, which is indistinguishable from in-zone commuting. Splitting the problem zones into smaller would have less parking options for high density areas
- Are you kidding? If you apply this in my zone I want to see it applied in the suburbs too. I should be able to drive my car in my zone to a business or neighbour's house for personal use. I get why this seems like an issue, but beware the consequences as it will affect community.
- We have mobility issues & can not walk to visit businesses in the zone so drive & park closer to business in the zone. If we were not able to do that we would not be able to frequent local businesses. Option C is the best option for us personally.
- Businesses should provide their own parking. Parking in residential areas should be for residents.
- Easier for residents for support local businesses if they don't need to pay to park to shop in the neighborhood
- will solve the problem



- Keep it simple - this cannot be a major issue in most RPP communities.
- No need to punish people for making things easier on themselves
- Some zones are currently too big and so promote in-zone commuting
- Current system works fine
- I use in-zone commuting to grab things on the way home. If I had to pay I wouldn't visit the local businesses
- (C) current policy works in most cases. If it is a problem in larger zones for residents closer to public institutions, make permits only eligible if you park within 200 meters of your home. Outside that area, you would need to be registered as a visitor by the home you are visiting.
- No vehicles, commercial or personal, should be allowed to park for free on public property.
- It doesn't really apply to us but I imagine this is frustrating for people who have to deal with it.
- Keep C, but enforce the maximum distance allowed between registered vehicle and address. This should be easy with the electronic system and GPS. In the old system with tags, one could clearly see if someone's 'guest' is 3 blocks from the address, suggesting tags were being rented or sold to students
- The area I live in is purely residential. Other than the high school down the road businesses are not affected
- "Please call me to discuss.
- The preferred plan in our small community is as we had it.
- It worked for fifteen years until the City changed the rules."
- Parking priority close to home
- sometimes I can't find parking near my home and need to park several blocks away. making the zone smaller without implementing other changes will only make it more stressful for me.
- Majority of people don't take advantage of this option. It would be more of an occasional benefit.
- Daytime parking is essential for us. There is a lot of traffic generators in the area I live.
- Businesses should have more parking available to attract customers.
- see above
- Our zone has a variety of smaller area restrictions already. If I go a few blocks away to the local school, am I really a visitor?
- Residents shouldn't have to walk far to get to their car. Should be able to park on the street.
- The zones seem small enough that this isn't really an issue (or maybe my zone is smaller than most?)
- Seriously doubt this will be enforced. Have rarely ever seen a vehicle ticketed for parking in a handicapped stall without the proper licence tags or window sign
- Pay for parking when visiting businesses. Should not use residential parking permit.
- C - This depends on the zone. Some zones are quite large therefore in-zone commuting is rampant. Easy to determine these zones especially if near a transit station, commercial district, zone allows a person to "commute" closer to downtown.



- I thought my car or my visitors have to be within 100m of my house. If that is not the rule, it should be.
- Ditto: sounds like the most reasonable option to me.
- Is this a real problem?
- I thought there were tighter restrictions already in place to prevent this sort of thing i.e. a visitor permit could not be used for a visitor parking more than a block away.
- A seems fair. Every street and every community is not created equal. To ensure equitable results in quality of life and safety, we need to implement different conditions to properly respond to those differing conditions
- not sure why people park like that. i think they should be given one space for their home and one visitor permit. and the parking should be within 3 houses of their home, not anywhere in the zone. too haphazard. i need a space right in front so not flexible.
- "C.) I would never complain if people in-zone commute. So what? They're in their zone, if they Park away from their house, then that spot opened up for someone else. Circle of life.
- You don't like people parking in front of your house? Well then move to the suburbs. Don't change for whiners."
- Zones are not that big and we want to encourage local business and reduce social isolation, mobility permits exempt
- Reduces opportunity for in-zone residents to abuse their privileges
- Not enough of this going on to constitute overhaul requiring tax \$
- See comments above on #7
- It works well
- Same comment as above
- A:If by "Divide" you mean "Eliminate" RPP zones, that would be good. Or use the plate recognition software on the Park Plus cars to ticket cars parked more than 2 blocks away from their registered residential address. Increase the frequency of tagging & towing violators.
- We have not done this as walking is the preferred option.
- In-zone commuting is a big problem on my street. Students and commuters are registering with owners and then going to SAIT or downtown. Business owners need to manage their parking, not the city, and certainly not at the expense of owners. Good job on the survey - txs for asking for feedback.
- Visitors should be required to have parked close the property they are supposedly visiting
- It is my choice where I want to park.
- I haven't experienced this, but I can see how it could be an issue for residents living near a major generator.
- Balance of cost, need & use
- Zones could be smaller to deter this.
- I like to be able to drive to my doctors office and local restaurants without worrying about finding parking - it encourages me to use local businesses



- The amount of restricted parking in any area should never exceed the amount of parking open to all. I don't know what it is but I know it is not fair and equitable.
- I do not understand this issue. I thought that residents are required to park within a certain distance from home, just as visitors do. Is this rule not enforced at all? Then you should simply start enforcing it.
- A - this is OK but how is it going to be enforced the personnel of the parking enforcement are now understaffed and underfunded as it is. Why we pay enough taxes to enable this group to do there job. For us they have been absolutely first class in enforcing this area's parking rules.
- If you live in a neighbourhood within a zone, and visit a neighbour's house in the same zone, that's fine. You shouldn't need a visitor permit or have to pay to visit your neighbour's house. Its to keep other people that are using the streets for non-residents purposes. Like free parking for school
- Wasn't aware that this was a problem.
- C.. we not need more restrictions
- Can't imagine this is a big issue. I will assume most zones aren't that large.
- Why not promote commuting by other mode within a zone?
- Response to C. This seems to work the best.
- A - if in-zone commuting is happening then obviously the zone is too big
- If the intent is to reduce or eliminate in-zone commuting, dividing larger RPP zones into smaller ones may work. How big an issue is this?
- I have no opinion on this
- Seems unfair. A parking zone should enable someone to park in front of or very close to their home. Parking elsewhere in the zone is cheating the system
- N/A as I don't believe this applies to our zone.
- We have regularly had people from the other end of University Heights parking in front of our home. They are parked all day and leave in the evening, returning in the morning.
- When visitors or shoppers have to walk blocks but parking is used by all day workers in downtown for an easy access to d/t, it sucks
- I'm not sure what the biggest zone is, so, maybe A.
- People will always abuse the system. Make it harder to do so
- This is not the current policy!! We were told there is no in-zone commuting and that we cannot park more than 1 block from our house in our own zone. We should be able to in-zone commute and then i would patronize the businesses close to us!!
- do everything you can to enable people to drive to a commuting point
- Residential parking permits should only be for the area the resident is near and otherwise be handled by business, metered or visitor parking when in other areas.
- People living within the zone should share the same options as out of zone visitors
- Ugh. This is the worst! Before we established residential parking permits, our block, in Inglewood, was overrun with commuters.
- I have not seen problems with the current policy.



- We live near the university, on the east side of Crowchild Trail. I really like the option of leaving my car at the C-train station if I'm in a rush. This parking is within my zone so this is convenient. Maybe a 10 block restriction would be in order.
- Again, all zones are not equal. A small dead end street is very different from a big zone - and this is not open for abuse in a small area
- C, If its not broken leave it alone
- I think the current set up encourages a community mindset.
- The other options will cost more.
- B since hourly parking is a reasonable way to deter commuters from parking all day in other areas of their zone. Also A, if the zone is reasonable to be split up into smaller ones that will solve the problem.
- Restricting where people can go and park within zone is nuts.
- This is an abuse of the system
- C - Did not know this was an issue.
- And make sure passes are different for every small zone.
- I don't think someone who lives and works within the same zone should be prevented from using their residential parking pass to park for work.
- For me, this is about access to your residence. Abuses of this privilege should not be permitted.
- Why is there a focus on resident movements? Shouldn't The City focus on encouraging visitors to take transit and not visit with their cars. Numerous city policies calling for alternate modes of transportation but is not applied to commercial/multi family nodds
- A addresses this concern very well.
- "Opt A/B:
 - Unpaid time restrictions in RPP for visitors (2h)
 - Paid parking in RPP for visitors for add. limited time (e.g. 2h)
- More flexibility while still deterring unallowed long-term parkers.
- Divide zones in smaller pieces, but the city has to ensure permits don't exceed av. space."
- in our case we have a big problem with people who are not permitted to park in the zone parking their vehicles there regardless- cutting down the area for the parking zone just makes the problem worse for us as residents
- No comment. Leave as is.
- I'm sure that happens. I'm near Stampede grounds and I'm sure most of the parking is being used by in zone users. High demand areas, such as Stampede, should have much smaller zones so you can charge for actual non-resident users.
- No one should be allowed to leave/park a vehicle in front of another's residence for their convenience and therefore take up a homeowners ability to park in front of their own residence! This is wrong and also impacts snow cleaning, lawn repair etc and the enjoyment of ones own premises
- Residents should have first priority



- Though I do not support more administration in generating smaller zones, perhaps that would allow for more control of parking spots being taken by various visitors and residents
- Seems the most logical solution.
- I do not have experience with this theme, so have picked this option without a great deal of information.
- I think there should be no change to the policy. Some areas in some zones have more residents parking than others. It's already frustrating to have to park a few blocks from your home. It becomes an issue when you don't even have the option to park far away.
- How often does this really happen? Those infractions can be handled on a case-by-case basis using the current camera technology. The address associated with the license plate is registered.
- We haven't encountered any problems with in-zone commuting.
- I cannot imagine that this is a large/common enough problem to warrant change. How many vehicles in a day leave home and have their sole all day destination be in the same zone? And hey if they do, well the parking in front of their home is empty for someone else to use.
- I do not see this as a problem. What does it matter if the person visiting the businesses is from the zone as this is less energy and pollution than someone coming across the city.
- Due to the nature of my community the CLOSEST I can park to my home may be 2 blocks. If you change the policies, where will I be able to park???
- IT IS WORKING AND IT IS VERY STRICT!
- Zones should be smaller to deter this albeit unlikely scenario
- 1-2 parking times should work for most visits. Any stays longer than that can be applied for a visitor permit.
- C - no restrictions for parking within a residents' current zone - this survey indicates that there is no restriction, however last I read on your website, residents were restricted to parking within 150m of their residence within the zone - residents should be encouraged to support local business
- This used to be more limited. It used to be that you had to park within the block that the pass was issued for. This should be the case to avoid issues caused by in-zone commuting.
- C Snow removal/gravel removal- has to change! Toronto has signs where one side of the street is plowed on Monday, Wednesday, Friday and on a snow or clean up day, no park there on those days but on the other side. Tuesday, Thursday, Saturday, Sunday, no park on that side on those days. Much better!
- Some current zones are quite large possibly for administrative reasons. Regardless of size, as I understand the current rules, each block within a zone can set its preference and in-zone commuting is not an option as your permit is only valid within a certain distance of your residence.
- Who cares? They're supporting local business.
- None of these are great. Having a permit for one area should not allow someone to park somewhere else far from their home for free if others have to pay. Residential permits should be required to be used within a few blocks of the residence they are assigned to.
- Is a n obvious problem in areas close to downtown/East Village such as ours - become a parking lot for other neighbourhoods.



- C Again it is a grab to money for parking. Do people in the suburbs pay for parking on their streets. I think not!
- A in zone commenting defeated the purpose - residents should park near their own homes not someone else's
- A - this practice should be discouraged...are ppl this lazy?
- Option C does not apply
- Option C. Zones are not very big.
- Just seems so logical, limit the zone to a reasonable distance from their home
- How wide spread of a problem is this?
- It shouldn't be abused for that purpose.
- Chose C: who cares where they park, if they have a permit, then it is permitted.
- Having smaller zones specific to the area would help deter people commuting in zone
- A makes the most sense in this instance.
- This really is non issue
- Moving to a standard zone size across the city makes sense. Perhaps the City needs to have a campaign around 'polite parking', like the transit courtesy campaigns. ie not parking right in front of others' front door, not sweeping snow off car onto a shovelled sidewalk, not boxing in others, etc
- Is this actually deterring others from visiting businesses?
- Option A is the answer, as it addresses the problem quite well. Have permits labelled per district and subzones within district.
- Removing all residential zones and creating paid zones instead would solve this problem.
- Some people will always take advantage Go though experimental phase re parking before making new rules and spending much \$ on changes & signs
- I usually stay within may area and if you want to charge me, why not give me a credit of XX hours for visiting businesses in my area? Don't make me pay!!!
- The current plan is sufficient.
- C I believe that permits are tied thru licence plates to the address they are close to.
- Option A because, if the problem is a zone that is too large, solve the problem by making the zone smaller. Seems like a no-brainer.
- I live on 17 avenue.nw in montgomery I think the digital parking is really. You have to sign your visitors in and out. I am a senior and the parking permits were a lot easier to manage for a senior where as computers are a lot to naivety for seniors. [personal information removed]
- Dividing into smaller zones sounds overly complex and beaurocratic
- "C. I don't actually think this is a problem.
- If you were to change anything, this would be my preference."
- n/a
- see previous answers about revenue generation.



- A: Depending on the zone, it would have to be determined that this is indeed an issue and that splitting the zone wouldn't create undue burden or hardship on a resident or visitor. If parking 4 blocks away is the closest someone can get, splitting the zone could be unfair.
 - not following
 - Maybe its better to have people participating in Calgary areas than charging them for everything
 - Divide them up, or create more zone codes and limit it to a kilometer or so radius. Park where you are supposed to. If it is meant for over night residents in one area, it shouldn't be able to be used away from their home.
 - In-zone commuting defeats the purpose of RPP. In areas where this is an issue, the zone size should be decreased to prevent the abuse of the system.
 - I'd be interested in data on the size of this problem. If material choice A, but if not, choice C
-
- Is this really a problem?
 - C - don't see why this is a problem
 - A: In Kensington RPP zone, residents living several blocks away from the LRT will park on streets closer to LRT stations--some streets like 10A are overwhelmed by both LRT & business traffic, while streets farther west are less affected--however, we're lumped into the same restriction zone.
 - NONE - I don't know how big this problem is in the city??
 - Why aren't the permits linked to the house and only good within several blocks of the house
 - Preference is B, but there should be another option which includes reduce the zone area.
 - Seem obvious. B. This should be standard. No absolutely exclusive resident-only zones.
 - People in neighborhood are using their on street parking permit to park on street then renting their onsite spot to downtown workers or renting their visitor parking permit. A simple check into how many visitor permits are the exact same licence plate for months at a time.
 - I do think there can be a proper balance of permitted, hiurly and unrestricted parking in some areas.
 - A addresses the need to limit in-zone commuting
 - If you are living in the zone you should be able to park anywhere in it. It's nice to be able to drive and park to places that are in your zone but are too far to walk to.
 - This is a made up issue. I seriously doubt this happens and is clearly an attempt by the city to create an issue where there is none to add additional bureaucratic bs, to allow the city justify adding additional staff to manage an overly complicated system.
 - Not sure how much of a problem this is. Zones seem quite small to me.
 - The lesser evil. RPPs are anti business.
 - I don't understand this question. The permit currently is only valid up to 150 m from the permitted address, not the entire zone. In any case, that system should remain - not fair otherwise. Overall, RPP system should be holistic with planning and development bylaws, both business and residential.
 - Option C - we do business with businesses in our community and having parking access in our zone helps us.



- A If there is actually a significant in-zone commuting problem then address it. It would be prudent to ensure that is the problem not just that parking on own street could not be found due to lack of area parking enforcement.
- Some zones are ridiculous; Shawnessy has parking permits, presumably because of the LRT station, but that includes residents two kilometres away. Make zones contingent on distance from generators; start with 400m.
- C
- A would help prevent abuse.
- Anything that would reduce one area becoming a parking lot for other areas would be helpful. The 2 hour zone was implemented on our front street as it had become an all day parking area for Downtown/East Village.
- Not much of a problem.
- "C - I was never aware of the boundaries of my permit parking. I thought it was restricted to the immediate streets around my complex.
- A - This would make sense, if this issue is a real issue. I've never heard of it before."
- A - if people are driving to their jobs, which are close to where they live, they should have to pay \$, or take Transit, or Walk.
- I don't see how in-zone commuting is truly an issue in the inner city core. It is abuse of out-of-zone parkers visiting the major generators that is the problem - at least in the North Hill area!
- C: Not sure how prevalent In Zone commuting is. I think the City should abolish all existing zones & open up RPP city wide to whom ever wants it with specifics. Example: A whole ST/AV must be PP with a specific percentage of the block's residents in favour for it to be implemented. Plus a fee.
- I don't understand topic 9. I guess you need to be an "insider"
- I am not aware of this having been a problem.
- simplest way, IMO
- B More equitable.
- Well that's a lie - "no restrictions on in-zone commuting" - I got a parking ticket for parking "too far" from my house (I was a block away and within the same zone) - I could not find a parking spot on the street that was closer!!!!!!
- "This doesn't impact me.
- There is another issue with RPP: Someone went ahead and got the registration for their car using my address. I was at work all day while they were parking in front of my home."
- A - Only makes sense.
- It would be very difficult to monitor in-zone commuting.
- This could work in some situations, as currently this happens frequently.
- This might work, and could not however would need to be tailored to the area. "one size does not fit all"
- A: Each block should be a zone. Otherwise the most aggressive/inconsiderate drivers simply move the problem onto the next block.



- If you've got a permit for the area, you should be able to park in the area. Government should get off the backs of the public and avoid the delicious opportunity to micro-manage. We're sick of increasing government intrusion in our lives.
- My street/zone is already quite small. Sometimes, such as during street cleaning, I have to in zone commute. I see no reason that a distance of a few blocks cannot be covered in the same zone.
- Yes, please! Again, we are in Kensington. Some guy parks in on our street every morning and takes his bike off the rack to cycle downtown. I don't know how he got a permit but he should either cycle from his own residence or park in paid parking downtown.
- I'm in Springbank Hill zone. We get people driving for 3 minutes to park closer to LRT station. This is stupid. Make smaller zones. Add a # after the zone to deal with this division. This seems so obvious to me i don't know why it hasn't been done before.
- Zones (I.e z) is so small I'm not sure this happens anymore. Commuters do come in and park all day in 2hr zones, trying to squeeze into zones/blocking my alley and making it difficult for me to see what traffic is coming.
- A - Makes sense to divide large zones.
- Even if someone is in-zone commuting, they are taxpayers. What is wrong with taxpayers Parking on public streets? You do not own the street in front of your house ...the city does. As a taxpayer you should be allowed as needed.
- I really don't understand this topic. There are restrictions where I live.
- "Maybe I am visiting a friend in the same zone but further away from where I live. I should be free to park in the same zone as the permit permits without any problem..."
- c.."
- C- I imagine that someone would move within the Zone to visit a local business, which sounds like a good thing.
- There are far TOO many dwellings with "No Parking Without Permit" which causes their visitors to take the parking spaces in front of their neighbors houses with 1-hour limitation!
- The City did not need to do a survey to figure any of this out. But hire a bunch to which most residents already know. I see a money grab here. The City having meter parking is exclusionary. ha ha
- Residents who pay property taxes should NOT have to pay additional fees for permits to park in front of their own homes.
- A - Your permit is for your home. If you live close enough to something to in-zone commute, walk.
- This is a non-issue for residents. Make business licenses conditional upon how they deal with parking and large fines when they fold up shop in less than a year. Why should residents give up parking for the 20 hair salons in a 4 block radius in my area?
- Is this actually a problem?
- C I believe this promotes community and the local economy. Especially important considering the recent years 17th ave has had with all the construction.



- "A: Re-evaluate the size of the zones. Perhaps by doing this the number of zones would be reduced as well. Vehicle-specific permits should only be able to be used within 300 meters of the address it is associated with.
- B: Hybrid zones!"
- A is the best compromise
 - this will deter in zone commuting
- Having the option to park within my neighborhood allows me to support local businesses, which is one of the reasons I live in my neighborhood.
- This doesn't seem like it would be a very common problem or affect that many people so no changes would be required. If it is a major issue in certain areas, smaller zones would be the best solution.
- Resident should not have to pay for parking!! If the the larger zones were divided into smaller zones, this may help to alleviate the problem.
- These parker's are my neighbours and part of my community. I'm OK sharing my parking with them.
- The purpose of the rpp is to be able to park close to one's home. In zone commuting should not be covered
- I am not clear where this problem exists and not picturing the situation makes it a bit difficult to comment. I am not sure how option B would help; by the information provided it seems A may be the most suitable answer.
- C - I personally don't see this as an issue.
- C.I was told that we must park within a block of our address which was on the physical permit in the past.. Didn't matter whether we were in our zone or not- could not be far from home for 'free', or risk a ticket. Businesses could have designated parking for all to access.