

Attachment 1: Overview of Current State of Permit Parking in St Albert
AR-26-213: Residential Permit Parking Policy Amendments

The following information is shared to Council to provide an oversight of current state of the Residential Permit Parking Program and to help link quantifiable or discussion topics of the service to the recommended Policy amendments.

A: Overview

1. Permanent (non-temporary construction associated) Permit Parking candidate roadways are located within the following communities:
 - a. Braeside – influence being Ecole M D'Youville High School, Paul Kane High School and St Albert Commercial Centre
 - b. Deer Ridge – influence being Bellerose High School
 - c. Erin Ridge – influence being the hospital and Ecole Alexandre-Tache School
 - d. Forest Lawn – influence being Ecole M D'Youville High School and Paul Kane High School
 - e. Inglewood -influence being the hospital
 - f. Lacombe Park – influence being Bellerose High School
 - g. Mission – influence being St Albert Catholic High School and St Albert Centre Transit Station
 - h. Pineview – influence being Ecole M D'Youville High School
 - i. Sturgeon – Influence being Paul Kane High School
 - j. Woodlands – influence being Ecole M D'Youville High School
2. From the permanent candidate communities there are seventy-four (74) candidate roadways aligned with current Policy to enact Residential Permit Parking, subject to applications and support.
3. Temporary (construction associated) Permit Parking roadways are located within the communities of:
 - a. Erin Ridge – associated with the Botanica Development
 - b. Inglewood – associated with the Botanica Development
 - c. Note: Candidate roadways associated with temporary construction impacts are not quantified as they are subject to the terms of construction occurring.
4. Current Locations (Neighbourhood and Roadway) of enacted Permit Parking, the year they started the program and the total number of permits associated with each roadway include the following
 - a. Deer Ridge (2019) – Dunfield Crescent (51), Desevigny Place (18)
 - b. Erin Ridge (2019) – Evergreen Close (25), Evergreen Place (9), Evergreen Drive (13), Everest Crescent (54), Elm Point (10), Eden Court (11)
 - c. Forest Lawn (2022) – Falcon Crescent (44)
 - d. Inglewood (2019) – Ironwood Drive (28), Ironstone Place (6), Irongate Place (8), Inverness Crescent (29)
 - e. Mission (2020) – Malmo Avenue (33), Michener Place (15)
5. Of sites with enacted permit parking:
 - a. 251 homes of a total of a potential 354 applicable homes (homes within areas of Permit Parking enactment) have applied for and received permits.
 - b. 103 homes within Permit Parking applied areas have not requested permits; suggesting on-site parking is adequate for these residents' needs.
6. All current sites with enacted Permit Parking are set to expire in December 2027.
7. Applications for Permit Parking versus Implementation of the Program:
 - a. Historically, locations that Administration has received requests for have been surveyed and supported by the residents of the roadway of the applicable site with the exception of Dunfield Crescent (West) and Deane Crescent that are the only two sites that have had the experience of residents applying but the program not being supported by residents and advancing to implementation.
 - b. Overall, the values suggest the Policy and Process supports implementation.

8. Historic values of received Permit Parking Survey Results versus current criteria:
 - a. Key aspects of the program are the criteria associated with “support” or “non-support” from residents. Currently the program requires the following to be achieved for implementation of Permit Parking:
 - i. 70% of households of a roadway or section respond to the survey.
 - ii. 80% of responses received show “support” for Permit Parking to be implemented.
 - iii. In the event “i” and “ii” are not achieved; 60% of “support” is shown by the overall households of the area.
 - b. The number of areas that have had the program applied and resulted in successful implementation of the program suggest applicable areas are supported by the current criteria.
 - c. On average the survey has resulted in:
 - i. A response rate of approximately 75% of households in areas.
 - ii. A non-response rate of approximately 25% of households in areas.
 - iii. A “support” rate of 67% of areas surveyed and responses received.
 - iv. A “non-support” rate of 33% of areas surveyed and responses received.
 - v. The overall values reflect 51% of support for homes surveyed.
 - d. From the above, the values align to a simplified evaluation of permit parking that may achieve similar results of program delivery.
 - e. The objective would be to focus on the value of received responses in “support” and apply an overall democratic approach of majority responses using only “support” versus “non-support” or “nonresponsive”.
9. Since the start of implementation of the Residential Permit Parking program, there have been no sites that have had residents apply for removal or termination of the program.
 - a. Overall, this suggests that the program benefits residents and is desired.
10. Permits Applied and Provided: To date the applied areas of Permit Parking have resulted in the following number and types of permits being provided to residents:
 - a. 577 Total Permits (Resident and Visitor style permits)
 - b. 371 Resident Permits
 - c. 157 Visitor Permits
 - d. 49 Permission to Park Permits
11. Applying the numbers above; the following averages are applied to the City’s current program:
 - a. 1.5 Resident Permits are applied for per household
 - b. 1 Visitor Permit is applied for per household
 - c. 0.2 Permission to Park Permits are applied for per household
 - d. Overall, these values suggest the provided quantities of permits through Policy are supportive of household needs.
12. The “actuals” of breakdown of applied Visitor permits
 - a. Visitor Permits are the most varied between homes in terms of quantity. The program currently has the following breakdown of homes and number of Visitor Permits: These numbers reflect only the quantity of permits per household that have requested any permits; meaning the 251 homes out of the full 354 candidate homes involved in the program.
 - i. Households with <2 Permit Passes = 210 or 84% of the involved program
 - ii. Households with 2 Visitor Passes = 28 or 11% of the involved program
 - iii. Households with 3 Visitor Passes = 4 or 2% of the involved program
 - iv. Households with 4 Visitor Passes = 8 or 3% of the involved program
 - v. Households with 5+ Visitor Passes = 1 or 0.5% of the involved programNote – Percentages shared above have been rounded and result in a slightly above “100%” value due to rounding.
13. Costs of the Program
 - a. Original estimates of enabling the program, based upon estimated costs of permits with total candidate households was \$8,000 annually.
 - b. Following implementation, the costs were recognized to trend at a lower rate, due to lower volumes of applications and implementation.

- c. The program runs at \$3,000 per year; which reflects value of addressing current program permitting requirements and a contingency to allow response to potential new requests annually.
 - d. On average, staff leading the delivery of the program are involved in direct services of Permit Parking five (5) to ten (10) hours per week. This includes receiving and responding to calls, administration of the program (providing new permits to new residents to areas or lost or damaged permits). Note – the resource allocated to the delivery of this program oversees other Transportation Service delivery such as Special Event and Construction Traffic Management Support, Traffic Calming Programming, Large Load Permitting, Speed Programs and Seasonal Patio Permitting).
14. Requests and feedback of the current program
- a. On average, Administration receives fifteen (15) calls of concern related to non-resident on-street parking impacts at locations applicable to the Permit Parking program.
 - b. Most of the calls seek and are provided information on the program, with approximately 35% of these residents taking the next steps to enact the process.
 - c. This suggests that the program's initial steps may be difficult or a deterrent for residents.
 - d. Feedback from residents has supported the suggestion of difficulty, due to concerns related to the necessary "petition" to have neighbours sign and meet a minimum value of roadway household representation.
 - e. Administration also receives calls that are not applicable to the Permit Parking Program and other responses may include site visits for roadway safety (parking concerns in proximity to intersections or accesses), or regulatory issues (parking illegally) which involve engagement with Enforcement.

Takeaway From Overview of Current State of Permit Parking

1. The Permit Parking Program and services provided have accommodated the needs for most areas to which residents have requested the implementation of a permitted parking system on their road.
2. The program and service to date have been low cost and is resourced appropriately.
3. Although criteria of implementation for Permit Parking are relevant and seemingly working in terms of validating the requests for Permit Parking, the process and communication in evaluating the support of residents for the service may be simplified with a focus on received "support" responses to a single majority assessment.
4. Initial steps requesting residents to submit a "petition" with the application for Permit Parking may be a deterrent for requests and due to the process requiring the City to conduct a formal survey to identify "support" versus "nonsupport" also acts as duplication of the actions.