



# Residential Parking Permit Program Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard  
March 20, 2019

## Project overview

A Residential Parking Permit (RPP) Program Review has been directed by Council as part of the 2015-2018 parking policy workplan (TT2014-0935). This report set out four main objectives for the review to determine if the program can be revised to:

- Improve customer service;
- Increase long-term financial stability of the program;
- Ensure efficient use of street space;
- Achieve the objectives of the Municipal Development Plan and Calgary Transportation Plan

A Residential Parking Permit policy is required in order to provide clear, consistent, transparent and easy to manage practices with respect to residential parking. A Council approved policy will also provide clear Council objectives on managing on-street space in residential areas.

## Engagement overview

In this phase of engagement, we sought to understand what you feel is, and is not, working with the current residential parking permit program.

For users of the program, we conducted in-person and online engagement activities. These were:

- Three workshops in December 2018 (mix of daytime and evening times)
- Five workshops in January 2019 (mix of daytime, evening and weekend times)
- Online engagement ran from December 11, 2018 – January 17, 2019

Engagement was communicated in a variety of ways, including social media, bold signs, print ads, radio and emails to targeted groups to share with their networks.

For staff responsible for the program's development and sustainment, we:

- Hosted one drop-in session
- Sent questions by email to provide input

We will use your feedback from phase 1 of engagement to develop new Residential Parking Permit program options. The second phase of engagement will occur in June 2019 when we will seek your input on these options.

To see the engagement principles used in shaping and executing the engagement process see [Appendix A](#).

For a list of specific questions posed in engagement, please see [Appendix B](#).



# Residential Parking Permit Program Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard  
March 20, 2019

## What we asked

Engagement was done internally with staff responsible for the program's development and sustainment as well as externally with users of the program. We asked users of the program to consider providing input of what is and is not working in the program from three different perspectives. These were:

- the perspective of a homeowner/renter in an RPP zone
- the perspective of a visitor to a home in an RPP zone
- the perspective of a visitor to a business, organization or institution in an area with RPP restrictions

We asked about specific features in the program as well as provided an opportunity for general feedback to better understand how you are impacted by these and other aspects of the program. These features included:

- **Residential parking permit only zones** – No parking except by residential parking permit. Only residents and their visitors can park on these streets.
- **Other types of zone restrictions (e.g. paid, unpaid)** – The public can park on these streets for the designated time and fee stipulated in the restriction, which could also include no cost. Residents and their visitors can park beyond these restrictions.
- **Commercial/residential interface** – Streets that are used for parking by residents and visitors to commercial spaces.
- **Major generators** – Draw a large volume of travelers to their facility and thereby a large number of parkers on nearby residential streets.
- **On-site parking** – Garages, parking pads, etc. on a person's property for parking purposes.
- **In-zone commuting** – When someone has a permit for a zone and uses that permit to park in another part of the same zone far from their home.

We asked CPA and City staff to help us understand what is perceived as working well with the program, what elements of the program pose a challenge for staff and what might help staff be more efficient working within the program.

## What we Heard

There were around 900 participants through internal and external engagement. Below are the categories of themes that we heard through engagement. These are laid out in four ways. They are:

- **Overarching themes from external engagement.** These are the high level themes when we looked at all the feedback that was received from external engagement.
- **Themes from each feature according to each of the three perspectives in external engagement.** These are the high level themes we heard from each perspective when we separated out each feature.



# Residential Parking Permit Program Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard  
March 20, 2019

- **Themes from other things you wanted us to know when considering street features in external engagement.** These are themes from the last question we asked in external engagement.
- **Overarching themes from internal engagement.** This includes themes for each of the three questions we asked in internal engagement.

It is important to note that we heard feedback regarding Calgary Parking Authority (CPA) and the implementation of the program through engagement. How CPA administers the program, including visitor permits, was out of scope of this engagement, however, we will share what we heard with them for their consideration in future planning. More details around feedback that was received in this area is included in the summary of input.

For a detailed summary of the input that was provided, please see the [Summary of Input](#) section.

## Next steps

Feedback from phase 1 of engagement will be used to develop new Residential Parking Permit program options. The second phase of engagement will occur in June 2019 when we will seek your input on these options. Your input from phase 2 will be used to develop a recommendation that will be presented to the Standing Policy Committee on Transportation & Transit in Fall 2019 and then Council early 2020. Details on phase 2 of engagement will be posted to [Calgary.ca/RPP](http://Calgary.ca/RPP) when available.



# Residential Parking Permit Program Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard  
March 20, 2019

## Summary of Input

All comments are reviewed to create themes in the summary of input. Each theme includes an explanation and/or examples of verbatim comments in italics. To ensure we capture all responses accurately, verbatim comments have not been altered. In some cases, when only a portion of a comment was used, we used ‘...’

There are four tables to report on what we heard from you. They are divided into the following:

- [Overarching themes from users of the program](#)
- [Themes from each feature according to each of the three perspectives](#)
- [Themes from other things you wanted us to know when considering street features](#)
- [Overarching themes from staff](#)

We received a large number of comments in engagement regarding Calgary Parking Authority (CPA) and the implementation of the program. These were mostly focused around the difficulty using the visitor registration system, a desire to return to the paper tag system for visitor registration and concerns regarding enforcement. How CPA administers the program, including visitor permits, was out of scope of this engagement, however, we will share feedback with them for their consideration in future planning.

### Overarching themes from users of the program

This is a summary of your responses to the questions regarding how issues with certain features of the program impact users of the program. Themes are divided by perspective and include an explanation and supporting examples.

Perspective	Theme	Explanation and supporting examples
Homeowner/ Renter	While some support the program, there is room for improvement within the current RPP program	This theme focused on the need for a review of the current program. Few noted areas that work well, while others noted areas of improvement.  <i>I think RPP zones are a perceived problem. I don't think zones should exist.</i>



# Residential Parking Permit Program Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard  
March 20, 2019

		<p><i>... Yes, restrictions need to be in place, but this new system needs work!</i></p> <p><i>Cost of RPPs are too low and incentivize people to park on the street rather than on their own property.</i></p> <p><i>These work well but the zones are inconsistent across my neighborhood, University Heights. We get parking pressure from the University, the Hospital and all related construction.</i></p>
	Use on-site parking for intended purposes	<p>This theme focused on properties with on-site parking. It was noted that properties with garages, driveways, parking pads, etc. should use on-site parking options for their intended purpose to avoid the need for on-street parking.</p> <p><i>I live in an apartment that is located within [personal information removed]. I noticed a lot of people have garages that filled with junk. People tend to park their cars in our parking lot instead of their garage or in front of their house. People should park in their garage. The road should be free for everyone else to park. Only places without garages, parking pads, or parking lots should have parking zone permit requirements. People with disabilities should be able to park for free in those zones since most garages and back yard doors are not designed to be accessible. parking meters are not designed to be accessible either.</i></p>
Visitor to a home	RPP zones are elitist and exclusionary	<p>This theme noted that residential parking permit zones lack inclusivity and promote a perceived sense of personal ownership towards streets, which are public property.</p> <p><i>It s important to be able to visit someones home or have visitors. People do not own the street in front of their house and if I have some renovations done the contractors should be able to park for a short time on the public street without histrionics. A mechanism needs to be in place to allow this.</i></p>



# Residential Parking Permit Program Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard  
March 20, 2019

		<p><i>This seems a little excessive. The RPP process is really heavily skewed toward homeowners, even though the streets are public property and should be more available for the wellbeing of all Calgarians, as the public commons where people can gather.</i></p>
On-street parking makes the street too congested		<p>This theme focused on the relationship between on-street parking and general road congestion, noting that added road congestion makes it difficult to abide by the visitor permit regulations.</p> <p><i>if the street is fully parked up then visitors to houses cannot find a spot to visit the house. The visitor might have to park more than 150 m away if the rest of the block is parked up.</i></p> <p><i>When not using on-site parking all the extra cars make it clustered on the road. Causing congestion on the road...</i></p>
RPP only zones are a deterrent for visitors to a home		<p>This theme noted that RPP zones sometimes act as a deterrent for visitors, negatively impacting their sense of feeling welcomed.</p> <p><i>Inconvenient and I will seldom visit.</i></p> <p><i>This is a significant deterrent to visiting someone's home.</i></p> <p><i>Nowhere nearby the house you are visiting to park. Avoid going to houses with parking restrictions.</i></p>
RPP zones impact homecare workers, and those with mobility issues		<p>This theme focused on the challenges experienced by those working in an industry whereby they are visiting a home for work-related purposes.</p> <p><i>In the Disability Service field, the homeowner or resident is the disabled client, and their private parking space is for their belongings, which may or may not include a vehicle, and staff coming to work in their home are expected to use street parking. As the population demographic shifts toward the elderly, this will become more common and more of a problem. Caregivers could also be coming for a short period such as an hour, or for a</i></p>



# Residential Parking Permit Program Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 20, 2019

		<i>continuous periods (shifts where one staff arrives to relieve another, with continuous staffing present), so on-street parking solutions must be flexible.</i>
Visitor to a business, organization or institution	Businesses should accommodate sufficient on-site parking	<p>This theme focused on the desire for businesses, organizations and institutions to provide sufficient on-site parking for their patrons.</p> <p><i>...Be more thoughtful about approving developments that include adequate parking.</i></p> <p><i>Expectation that parking will be available and would feel upset if it was taken up by community. Is there a limit on businesses in an area? New developments feel betrayed by the City for not enforcing parking restrictions when allowing new developments.</i></p>
	RPP zones are a deterrent for visitors to visit businesses	<p>This theme noted that RPP zones were sometimes viewed as a deterrent to businesses and could detract from their customer-base.</p> <p><i>Avoid areas b/c there`s no place to park. It`s all permit zones. Takes away from businesses.</i></p> <p><i>Mobility challenges. If going to a restaurant and no available parking, choose to go elsewhere.</i></p>



# Residential Parking Permit Program Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 20, 2019

Themes from each feature according for each of the three perspectives

The following table identifies themes that were noted for each of the features that were presented in engagement with users of the program. Each theme has an explanation and at least one verbatim comment that further exemplifies what the theme is about.

Perspective	Feature	Themes for each feature according to perspective	Explanation and supporting verbatim comments
Homeowner/Renter	RPP Only zones	Permit eligibility poses concerns for multi-family, rentals, and non-driving residents	<p>This theme focused on fairness in the eligibility process. It addressed how multi-family units and residents without vehicles are treated differently.</p> <p><i>I have lived in the same area my whole life. Now because of MRU students taking all the street parking communities have gone to the city for permit parking. The complex I belong to has not. I can't park anywhere near my home. [personal information removed] I do not feel safe anymore walking to and from my vehicle. It has been a constant frustration for myself and many others. It should be location and address based not how it currently is for multiple unit complexes.</i></p> <p><i>I don't own a car, but sometimes rent one or have family visit. The way the RPP is structured means that I a rental won't be registered for a few days (and I can't get the license plate in advance) and I can't have visitors with my residence, including when I borrow a vehicle. I would like to be able to nearly instantly register a vehicle, whether for me personally or for a visitor, to a maximum of one vehicle at a time.</i></p>
		Zone issues, including size and process to obtain/review pose a concern for residents	<p>This theme focused on the need for added criteria in determining the need for zone restrictions. It further addressed how zone restrictions that are in place are not necessarily meeting the needs of the people they were set up to serve.</p>





# Residential Parking Permit Program Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard  
March 20, 2019

			<p><i>This is a source of frustration. The idea residents on a street through a relatively simple petition can gain exclusive (or almost exclusive) parking on that street without a mechanism for review is not appropriate. I understand the frustrations with large venues (hospitals, schools, stadiums etc.) near houses but with very rare exceptions these facilities were present before the house was purchase, or it was zoned to have this facility there in the future.</i></p> <p><i>...The process has completely lost sight of being citizen centric and appears to be focused on ease of administration by The City. This is simply an inconvenience on citizens trying to live their lives and not an example of The City making life better...</i></p>
		<p>On-site parking should be primary space for parking</p>	<p>This theme noted that on-site parking should be a primary parking option when it is available rather than parking on the street so that on-street parking can be used for other purposes.</p> <p><i>Enforces the fallacy that the street in front of a person's house belongs to them. This is not true. This is a very expensive subsidy by the city (free parking/storage/road building/road maintenance/handling of runoff/drainage) for citizens to park their cars AFTER the city has already mandated every house have X number of parking stalls for storage of those vehicles!</i></p>
	<p>Other types of zone restrictions (paid, unpaid)</p>	<p>Costs in residential permit parking zones is a concern</p>	<p>The theme noted the discrepancy between the idea that these zones should not have paid parking options and the thought that paid zones could help balance the needs of the public and visitors to residents in these zones.</p> <p><i>...Preference for specific hours and days over 24-7 permit areas. There should be no paid parking requirements in Residential areas, as primary use of non-resident parking tends</i></p>



# Residential Parking Permit Program Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard  
March 20, 2019

			<p><i>to be for events and activities that provide a benefit to the community and residents overall.</i></p> <p><i>My RPP zone has a two hour free public parking restriction and that works just fine. What I don't like and don't find fair is the number of RPP zones that have been replaced by Park Plus. How is that fair for residents? Just another City of Calgary money grab.</i></p> <p><i>This approach should be the default for all restricted parking zones in the City. It is reasonable to expect people to be able to pay for the right to park on city streets, and it is not reasonable to force guests to houses in RPP zones to park far away from their destination or risk a parking ticket because the person they are visiting does not have enough guest passes or simply forgets to register every vehicle that visits for any amount of time.</i></p>
	<p>Commercial/residential interface</p>	<p>Commercial and residential needs are important and the impact of commercial needs on residents in RPP only zones should be reduced</p>	<p>This theme focused on the relationship between residential and commercial parking needs. It acknowledged that both needs are important and should be considered but appeared to focus more on the needs of residents, including suggestions to reduce the impact of commercial spaces to nearby residents.</p> <p><i>In the development permit and City decisions, parking needs to be top of mind. Requirements need to be met and not have spill over into residential. It is to have a balance for those of us who own homes, but for those wanting to spend money for our businesses to have that access...</i></p> <p><i>Some permit only zones have been turned into pay parking on the north side of the street. While it facilitates the business, it makes it harder for residents to find parking.</i></p>



# Residential Parking Permit Program Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 20, 2019

			<p><i>Where there are popular commercial enterprises (restaurants, bars, etc.) on busy thoroughfares that do not have on-street parking, there tends to be some overspill customer parking onto adjacent RRP streets, typically in the evenings/weekends. Perhaps some investigation and working some flexibility into parking policy for these locations could be undertaken. This is more prevalent in Inner City communities adjacent major roadways. Residents wishing to park on-street are affected by this.</i></p>
	<p>Major generators</p>	<p>Major generators should be equipped with sufficient on-site parking for their users</p>	<p>This theme focused on the need for major generators to include sufficient and affordable parking so visitors to their facilities are not opting to find cheaper alternatives on nearby residential streets.</p> <p><i>This is compounded by these facilities using parking as a profit generating business. Parking should be provided at cost to reduce this pressure. Parking relaxations should not be granted for developments. Relaxations and high fees should not be used to attempt to modify driver behaviour as this does not work - it just moves the parker to a different spot.</i></p> <p><i>In front of my home is residential parking. Major generators need to prepare for their own parking (includes 4 plexes &amp; apt bldgs)</i></p> <p><i>Large businesses and institutions attract many vehicles. If there is not sufficient, reasonably priced parking, these vehicles will spill into residential areas. Development permits must require sufficient parking. The City must not restrict the number of parking stalls to try and force people onto public transit. This strategy does not work and it is disrespectful to adjacent homeowners.</i></p>



# Residential Parking Permit Program Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 20, 2019

		<p>Balance on-street congestion within program</p>	<p>This theme addressed how major generators and commercial spaces draw an influx of non-residents to areas and that this contributes to extra on-street congestion in residential parking permit zones.</p> <p><i>I am not sure if churches fall into the category as Major Generators, but in Zone G, the impact of churches is huge. Currently there are 10-12 active churches and the impact on the community is huge. I support a vibrant commercial strip, and I understand the move to secondary suites, but there isn't street capacity to support all four (primary residences, secondary suites, commercial parking, and church members). Something has to give.</i></p> <p><i>University of Calgary students/staff/visitors parking in the few non-RPP sections in the neighbourhood sometimes block alley access or do not respect the snow route parking ban, and then the street is not cleared.</i></p>
	<p>In-zone commuting</p>	<p>In-zone commuting is generally supported by residents</p>	<p>While some disagreed with in-zone commuting and made recommendations that suggested residents should park within a certain distance of their home, more indicated that they did not have a problem with this feature.</p> <p><i>I wasn't aware that this happened. That's ridiculous. If they are close enough to be in the same zone they should walk/bike and not take up other people's parking.</i></p> <p><i>Within the zone it should be allowed. The number of people who work within zone and need to drive is likely minimal.</i></p> <p><i>Parking permits should be only within the block, similar to visitors passes.</i></p>



# Residential Parking Permit Program Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 20, 2019

	On-site parking	On-site parking should be used as primary parking option when it is available	<p>This theme has been previously noted under RPP only zones. It supports the preference that on-site parking be used primarily for parking purposes when its included on a residential property.</p> <p><i>There is something about this provision that doesn't sit well with me. I would rather residents use parking pads, garages and lay-bys for the purpose for which they were built and leave street parking for visitors.</i></p> <p><i>I park in my garage but, with the RRP system, the trades people working in the area (and there are alot of them) park in the alleyways instead of the street because it is such a hassle getting a temporary parking permit. Often they block the alleyways for extended periods of time, making it very difficult to access my garage. The RRP system is not working. I would like to see the old system with 2 paper parking per household reinstated. There was not a problem with alley parking with the old system.</i></p>
Visitor to a home	RPP Only zones	Administration of visitor permits is a significant concern for visitors and residents.	<p>While administration of visitor permits are beyond the scope of this project, a significant theme emerged regarding the current visitor parking permit process, including easier accommodation for more than 2 guests, and an easier registration system. Many comments focused on returning to the paper tag system.</p> <p><i>The loss of the windshield tags is a pain because now the homeowner must log in to register you as a visitor. I actually have friends I tend not to visit because it is such a pain to park anywhere near where they live.</i></p> <p><i>We used to meet for coffee at a friends home. Now we are forced to go to a restaurant and pay for parking because only 2 cars can be there and er are 6 friends. It costs more, finding</i></p>



# Residential Parking Permit Program Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 20, 2019

			<p><i>parking is a pain so now we do it less. Thanks for ruining friendships and get togethers with your restrictive policies. You want people to live in denser areas, to be downtown and not drive to the suburbs but you make life unlivable by your control...</i></p> <p><i>It would be great if we could have more than a maximum of 2 visitor permits. When we have birthdays or other gatherings, it is extremely difficult for friends/family to come visit us due to the RPP parking issue. I understand the limit is intended to encourage car sharing/alternate modes of transit, but an undesirable effect is making friends/family NOT want to come to our home at all. It has a social impact that might not be measured through statistics. Increasing the number of visitor permits allowed from a max of 2 to 4 would be greatly helpful. The online system used to register license plate would work well with the increase as well.</i></p> <p><i>Cannot immediately register spontaneous or unexpected drop-by visitors immediately with current online/phone registration if licence plate numbers are unknown until they arrive. Time lag with current system (with possible ticket penalty). Paper Visitor Parking Permits are immediate and visible. Better system.</i></p> <p><i>My very elderly mother no longer has visitors because she has too much difficulty registering visitors.</i></p>
	<p>Other types of zone restrictions (paid, unpaid)</p>	<p>Cost and payment options are seen as a deterrent</p>	<p>This theme focused on cost and payment options being a deterrent to visit friends and family. Few noted that costs should be lower or free while others commented on the lack of payment options when payment is required.</p>



# Residential Parking Permit Program Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard  
March 20, 2019

			<p><i>I don't mind hourly if the price is right, most of the time it's outrageous, so I don't park. I think it should be free if under 2 hrs.</i></p> <p><i>There is no way to pay for parking by debit. This is an issue for those low income families that do not utilize credit cards or have an online account, which again requires a credit card payment, or visiting a city office to have money deposited to the system.</i></p>
	Commercial/ residential interface	Restrictions in these areas can support balance between commercial and residential needs	<p>This theme focused on introducing a solution that seeks to find balance for commercial and residential needs.</p> <p><i>Parking time limits are a reasonable way to ensure people share the space fairly.</i></p>
	Major generators	Restrictions near major generators are valuable in protecting residential street space.	<p>This theme focused on the value of restrictions near major generators to improve access for visitors to homes.</p> <p><i>I go to visit my friend in my car (for the reasons above in 3). I get there and his street parking is plugged solid by people who work at Foothills hospital but don't want to pay for parking. The only parking within 6 blocks of his house in front of a [personal information removed] so I go home. If permit only parking was in place I would be able to visit my friend.</i></p>
	In-zone commuting	In-zone commuting contributes to competitive parking for visitors	<p>This theme focused on the frustration experienced by visitors to a home when parking near the home they want to visit is taken up by residents from other areas within the zone. It was noted that it is difficult to park within 150 meters of the home when residential parking permit holders are taking those spaces.</p> <p><i>I go to visit my friend but his street is full because apparently the east half of the zone works in the west side of the zone and parks in front of my friends house. If residential parking permits</i></p>



# Residential Parking Permit Program Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard  
March 20, 2019

			<i>had the same restriction as visitor permits I would be able to visit my friend.</i>
	On-site parking	On-site parking should be primary parking option when available	<p>On-site parking is a consistent theme and while this is from the perspective of a visitor to a home, it echoes the previous comments on the theme. Visitors to home would prefer that homes with on-site parking use it for parking purposes to free up on-street parking options for them to visit friends and family.</p> <p><i>If they use their on-site parking for storing stuff or other uses, they should have to pay for on-street parking. Why get it for free just because you use your own parking for something else? No reason for giving this public service to them for free. Not fair.</i></p>
Visitor to a business, organization or institution	RPP Only zones	RPP only zones can impact customers' desire to visit businesses	<p>This theme noted how parking challenges impact visitors' desire, or lack thereof, to visit businesses, organizations or institutions.</p> <p><i>I simple dont go to meetings or businesses that have parking issues. They lose my business</i></p> <p><i>A church or other institution loses business because in an RPP zone so people can't go there.</i></p>
	Other types of zone restrictions (paid, unpaid)	Polarized views exist regarding paid and unpaid zone restrictions	<p>Few noted that small fees could solve the problems with visitors to businesses, etc, having difficulty finding parking on nearby streets while few also noted that they do not feel there should be a fee for short timeframes.</p> <p><i>As the public I like the 2hour unpaid parking. Or maybe 3 hours. First 2hours are free then after a small fee you can access on the app. (3)</i></p> <p><i>Replacing free hourly with paid could solve problems BUT! it could work against you if its cheaper than other paid parking.</i></p>





# Residential Parking Permit Program Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 20, 2019

	Commercial/ residential interface	Zones should be shared space and not perpetuate exclusivity	<p>This theme noted once again that zone restrictions perpetuate exclusivity and there should be more focus on finding balance and promoting shared street space.</p> <p><i>Hourly, time restricted, and /or paid access to in-demand areas seems like a good idea here. Most people don't need more than a couple hours to conduct business. Let the locals residents park long term (for a nominal monthly flat rate) and charge visitors by the hour. RPP should not be exclusive to residents, especially when so many sit empty all day.</i></p>
	Major generators	Event traffic and unrestricted parking contribute to a lack of available parking on streets near major generators	<p>This theme focused on the overuse of parking on streets during school event times or near parks, whereby people will park all day and leave the area.</p> <p><i>Make a time limit for parking near parks, etc. so people can not use limited parking for other purposes nearby. Ex. Commuting via bike to downtown from edworthy park. (3)</i></p> <p><i>Events increase use of RPP zones at schools, etc.</i></p>
		Cost of parking at major generators perpetuates use of on-street parking	<p>This theme noted how the costs of parking at major generators pushes people to park on nearby streets in efforts to find cheaper parking alternatives.</p> <p><i>Major generators should be required to provide more parking spaces on-site at affordable prices for travelers to them. People use residential parking areas mostly because they either cannot find parking at the facility or it is expensive.</i></p>
	In-zone commuting	In-zone commuting can deter people from visiting businesses, etc.	<p>This theme focused on the impacts of in-zone commuters on visitors to businesses, organizations and institutions.</p> <p><i>In-zone should not work more than a block from your house. It just passes the problem to another house-hold.</i></p>



# Residential Parking Permit Program Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 20, 2019

			<p><i>This should not happen. It seems like a way of privileging people who live in nice areas of town to better parking everywhere. Zone access should be limited by address to prevent this.</i></p> <p><i>businesses can issue a visitor permit for parking within 300 m of their business</i></p> <p><i>If I am visiting a business I expect on site parking. If it is full say and there is 2 hour parking unpaid but the spots are all taken because a several people that work there can park as long as they want because they have a permit for that zone. I am out of luck and so is the business since none of the 2 hour cars are going to move and I am going somewhere else. I do not support zone commuting. Residential parking is for residents.</i></p>
	On-site parking	It is a residential and commercial responsibility to have and make use of sufficient on-site parking options	<p>This theme addressed the need for residential and commercial properties to provide for sufficient on-site parking so that street parking is not heavily relied upon.</p> <p><i>Frustrating when residents use up limited on-street parking instead of onsite locations that they have repurposed or used for other purposes. (3)</i></p> <p><i>There should be sufficient parking provided by the business/institutions for their type of business</i></p>



# Residential Parking Permit Program Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard  
March 20, 2019

Themes from other things you wanted us to know when considering street features

The following table identifies themes that were noted when we asked what else we should be aware of when considering what you perceive to be important street features. Each theme has a brief explanation and at least one verbatim comment that further exemplifies what the theme is about.

What we asked	Themes	Explanation and supporting verbatim comments
Other things to consider when thinking about the purpose of a street	Street/sidewalk maintenance, including potholes, cracks, snow removal, lighting, and visible street & crosswalk markings are other factors to consider	<p>This theme focused on how streets' main purpose is to have infrastructure in which to move vehicles for the end goal of visiting people and places. It noted that other considerations such as snow removal, improved lighting, etc. further support the end goal. The main focus here was having all systems working together to enhance people's abilities to travel within communities to visit each other and businesses, etc.</p> <p><i>The main reason we have streets is to move vehicles (cars, trucks, bikes) and gain access to buildings that are built in a community. Streets must be crossed safely by pedestrians and vehicles. Movement on these streets is impeded when a narrow street is further narrowed by cars parked on both sides. It is often hard for a bike and a car to pass comfortably between 2 rows of traffic. It often becomes one way traffic!!</i></p> <p><i>Streets are how we travel, whether by foot, bicycle or car. They are where we park when visiting friends &amp; family. It's important to have adequate lighting, adequate parking, safe driving conditions clear of ice &amp; snow &amp; giant potholes, and reasonable speed limits.</i></p> <p><i>Safety. Visibility. Good pedestrian access - some streets don't have sidewalks and when you get out of your car you have to walk in the street or on someone's property on the side of the road.</i></p>
	Street design and use should be considered as a contributor to a sense of community	This theme focused on streets as a source of movement rather than a space for stationary uses. It further noted that the current residential parking permit program hinders the sense of community by setting



# Residential Parking Permit Program Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 20, 2019

		<p>restrictions/parameters regarding visitors and the need to notify The City of activities in order to plan for these visitors.</p> <p><i>Streets are a place for people to move and gather. Streets are a public good and should not be seen as an extension of the adjacent property owner's land. Streets serve a tertiary role of vehicle storage. Too often residents or businesses feel an entitlement to the forntage in front of their property. Calgary should disband the free RPP zone system and charge for passes (like Toronto or Vancouver) and use on-street parking parking demand management to control the availability of parking. Finally, RPP zones and parking management should be based on on-street parking analysis and not collecting a certain percentage of neighbours signatures.</i></p> <p><i>I feel that the RPP system on my street and the associated requirements to constantly be planning, limiting the number of guests I have over and having to inform the city of my plans to affect my sense of community and can easily turn into a feeling of isolation. A street should foster a sense of community. The hindrance brought on by the RPP system, and especially the new electronic system takes away from this and of my ability to enjoy my street/house/community and share it with others.</i></p>
	<p>On-site parking for businesses, organizations, institutions, new developments, rental properties/units and schools should be considered</p>	<p>This theme focused once again on the desire for commercial spaces and major generators to account for sufficient parking for residents, visitors and customers.</p> <p><i>Residential neighbourhoods are not parking lots for large community generators, like the hospitals and Universities. Our streets are dramatically unsafe due to the massive increase we have observed in non-resident parking the past 16 years and it was bad before then. We also have had to fear for our property and personal safety as we have seen increased numbers of thefts, and as neighbours, we cannot watch for suspicious people, because there are far too many unknown people in our neighbourhood. Our streets in residential neighbourhoods should be for the residents, their actual visitors (not people renting passes) and the visitors to</i></p>



# Residential Parking Permit Program Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 20, 2019

		<i>the businesses in the neighbourhood only. No outside parking should be permitted.</i>
	Seeking balance between residents and non-residents is important to consider	<p>This theme noted the value in respecting residents and non-residents within the program.</p> <p><i>I believe there needs to be a balance between residents and other community members. I have parked in other communities from time to time for various reasons, but I always try to be respectful of the area, not park right in front of someone's front door, etc. With that said, I think there is a reasonable expectation that residents and their guests might be afforded an opportunity to park within a reasonable distance of their homes. When I come home from work (where I pay good money for parking) in the evening, or come home from shopping on the weekend, having to park a half block or a block away from my home and haul my groceries in... all because somebody is too cheap to pay for parking at their work... that is simply NOT acceptable.</i></p>
	Safety concerns in residential parking zones should be considered	<p>This theme focused on the need for the program to consider pedestrian safety. It acknowledged that additional vehicles reduce sightlines and pedestrians' ability to cross streets safely.</p> <p><i>Clear sightlines, sidewalks for pedestrians, light up crossings for pedestrians, and frequent street lights.</i></p> <p><i>Safe streets are important. There are kids playing on or near the streets and it is important that drivers can see them easily. Clearly marked cross walks, well lit, slow speed limits in residential areas.</i></p>
	Multiple street uses, including those for people walking, cycling, driving and taking transit, should be considered	<p>This theme addressed the need for the residential parking permit program review to consider the many uses and users of streets.</p> <p><i>On-street parking can be an important amenity for residents and businesses, but the current approach is regressive towards small business and those with low incomes, costly, and environmentally destructive.</i></p>



# Residential Parking Permit Program Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

March 20, 2019

		<p><i>Please move towards a model that balances supply and demand, shifts towards user-pay instead of property tax-subsidized, and deregulate off-street parking. The current approach is frankly un-Albertan and does a disservice to our self-reliant, maverick roots. Thank you!</i></p> <p><i>Traffic calming needs to become a top priority in residential areas as the City moves toward densification. Tree plantings and green spaces are also very important to the pedestrian experience. 50 km/h is still a reasonable speed limit and 30 km/h in playground zones. Traffic calming will help to naturally reduce speeds on inner residential roads, including integrated bike paths in residential areas. Roads are for vehicles-- the sidewalks beside them need to be pedestrian friendly.</i></p> <p><i>The street has a dual use. Transportation and parking. To only consider one is very naïve...</i></p>
--	--	---

## Overarching themes from staff

The following table identifies themes that were noted when we asked staff what is working well with the current RPP program, what aspects of the program pose a challenge and what staff felt would help improve efficiency when working within the program. Each theme has a brief explanation that further explains the theme.

Question we asked	Theme	Explanation and supporting verbatim comments
What is working well	Website is efficient	This theme noted that the website is working well and helps the program function more efficiently for staff.
	Zones are clearly marked	This theme noted that clearly marked zones helps the program work well.



# Residential Parking Permit Program Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard  
March 20, 2019

	Program is effective at controlling parking in the area and gives more control over to residents in these areas	This theme centered on the program achieving the goal of controlling parking in certain areas and handing some of that control over to residents in these areas.
What are challenges with the program	Balancing the needs of residents and non-residents is a challenge	Few staff noted that the program is struggling to balance the needs of residents and non-residents.
	Program administration including eligibility, approval process and regulations are currently a challenge	This theme noted that operations could be improved with consistent policies and regulations. It identified that a lack of understanding of the rules within the program is a problem for people who live in areas that have sought out residential parking permit restrictions.
	Perceived ownership of public space is a challenge	Similar to what was heard in external engagement, perceptions that street space is an extension of private property is a challenge within the program.
	Visitor permit process is a challenge	Also similar to what was heard in external engagement, the current visitor permit process is viewed as challenging for staff.
What would improve work efficiency	Further clarification of processes for staff as well as additional education for users of the program would improve efficiencies	This theme focused on how improved clarification of process for staff and users of the program would improve staff's ability to work within the program.
	Additional visitor permit options would improve efficiencies	Similar to what was heard in external engagement, staff also noted that additional visitor permit options would improve their ability to work with the program.



# Residential Parking Permit Program Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard  
March 20, 2019

## Verbatim Comments

Verbatim comments include all of the suggestions, comments and messages that were collected online and in-person with users of the residential parking permit program. Verbatim comments collected internally, with staff responsible for the program's development and sustainment have been shared with the project team for incorporation and are not included in the RPP Verbatim Report due to maintaining privacy within a small network.

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.

All comments were reviewed and were used to create the themes included in this report. The RPP Verbatim Report is posted to [Calgary.ca/RPP](http://Calgary.ca/RPP).





# Residential Parking Permit Program Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard  
March 20, 2019

## Appendix A – Engagement Principles

In alignment with City Council's [Engage Policy](#), all engagement efforts, including this project are defined as: *Purposeful dialogue between The City and citizens and stakeholders to gather meaningful information to influence decision making.*

As a result, all engagement aligns with the following principles:

**Citizen-centric:** focusing on hearing the needs and voices of both directly impacted and indirectly impacted citizens.

**Accountable:** upholding the commitments that The City makes to its citizens and stakeholders by demonstrating that the results and outcomes of the engagement processes are consistent with the approved plans for engagement.

**Inclusive:** making best efforts to reach, involve, and hear from those who are impacted directly or indirectly.

**Committed:** allocating sufficient time and resources for effective engagement of citizens and stakeholders.

**Responsive:** acknowledging citizen and stakeholder concerns.

**Transparent:** providing clear and complete information around decision processes, procedures and constraints.

For more information about engagement at the City of Calgary, please visit: [engage.calgary.ca](http://engage.calgary.ca)



# Residential Parking Permit Program Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard  
March 20, 2019

## Appendix B – Engagement Questions

External Engagement – Users of the program

### **Are you a homeowner/renter in an area with a Residential Parking Permit program (RPP)?**

What are the issues for you as a home owner/renter in an area with Residential Parking Permit zones? Please select the feature you are referencing and tell us how this issue impacts you.

- 1) RPP only zones (these zones are designated as parking permit only zones)
- 2) Other types of RPP zones include those that are hourly, paid and unpaid.
- 3) Commercial / residential interface can result in competing needs between business operators and residents in an area.
- 4) Major generators are large organizations/facilities that contribute to significant parking use in adjacent communities due to the volume of travelers to their facility.
- 5) In-zone commuting is when someone has a permit for a zone but uses it to park in another part of that zone far from their home.
- 6) On-site parking is required to be provided through the Land Use Bylaw. This allows residents of buildings with private parking (garages, parking pads) to use assigned parking for other purposes and park on the street instead.

### **Are you a visitor to a home in an area with a Residential Parking Permit (RPP) program?**

What are the issues for you as a visitor to a home in an area with Residential Parking Permit zones? Please select the feature you are referencing and tell us how this issue impacts you.

- 1) RPP only zones (these zones are designated as parking permit only zones)
- 2) Other types of RPP zones include those that are hourly, paid and unpaid.
- 3) Commercial /residential interface can result in competing needs between business operators and residents in an area.
- 4) Major generators are large organizations/facilities that contribute to significant parking use in adjacent communities due to the volume of travelers to their facility.
- 5) In-zone commuting is when someone has a permit for a zone but uses it to park in another part of that zone far from their home.



# Residential Parking Permit Program Review

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard  
March 20, 2019

6) On-site parking is required to be provided through the Land Use Bylaw. This allows residents of buildings with private parking (garages, parking pads) to use assigned parking for other purposes and park on the street instead.

## **Are you a visitor to a business, organization or institution in an area with a Residential Parking Permit (RPP) program?**

What are the issues for you as a visitor to a business, organization or institution in an area with Residential Parking Permit zones? Please select the feature you are referencing and tell us how this issue impacts you.

- 1) RPP only zones (these zones are designated as parking permit only zones)
- 2) Other types of RPP zones include those that are hourly, paid and unpaid.
- 3) Commercial /residential interface can result in competing needs between business operators and residents in an area.
- 4) Major generators are large organizations/facilities that contribute to significant parking use in adjacent communities due to the volume of travelers to their facility.
- 5) In-zone commuting is when someone has a permit for a zone but uses it to park in another part of that zone far from their home.
- 6) On-site parking is required to be provided through the Land Use Bylaw. This allows residents of buildings with private parking (garages, parking pads) to use assigned parking for other purposes and park on the street instead.

## **Finally, when you think about what a street is for and which street features you consider important, is there anything else you would like us to know?**

Internal Engagement - Administration

What aspects of the current RPP program do you perceive are working well? Why?

What aspects of the current RPP program do you perceive as challenging? Why?

Considering the challenges you, and others, encounter with this program, what would help you feel more efficient working with the RPP program? Why?