



Legislation Text

File #: AR-18-497, **Version:** 1

TAMRMS#: B06

Residential Permit Parking

Presented by: Dean Schick, Manager, Transportation

RECOMMENDATION(S)

1. That the City Council Policy C-TS-03 Residential Permit Parking, provided as an attachment to the November 26, 2018 agenda report entitled Residential Parking Permit Program be approved.

2. That the following Postponed Motion be approved:

PM-19-017

That the 2019 budget be amended to add \$8,000 for program support related to the Residential Permit Parking program and;

That administration incorporate the budget amendment for consideration within the 2019 Municipal Operating Budget on December 17, 2018.

PURPOSE OF REPORT

Administration has revised the drafted Council Policy for Residential Permit Parking, based on feedback received at the October 9, 2018 Governance, Priorities and Financial Committee meeting. The proposed policy shall direct a Process and Guidelines for Residential Permit Parking by establishing guiding principles and responsibilities surrounding the consideration for implementation of permitted parking within St. Albert communities.

ALIGNMENT TO COUNCIL STRATEGIC PRIORITY

N/A

ALIGNMENT TO ADMINISTRATIVE PRIORITY

N/A

ALIGNMENT TO SERVICE DELIVERY

N/A

COUNCIL DIRECTION

At the October 9, 2018 GPFC the above recommendations were forwarded to Council for their consideration.

(AR-18-298)

That the Governance, Priorities and Finance Committee (GPFC) receive as information the draft City Council Policy C-TS-03 Residential Permit Parking, provided as an attachment to the October 9, 2018 GPFC Agenda Report entitled Residential Parking Permit Program.

That City Council Policy C-TS-03 Residential Permit Parking, revised as required to take into account the comments of GPFC members at the October 9, 2018 GPFC meeting, come before Council for consideration by November 30, 2018.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

The following feedback on the previous draft of the Council Policy for Residential Permit Parking was received during the October 9, 2018 GPFC meeting:

- 1) That proposed policy C-TS-03, service standards expectations section 3(c) is amended to add secondary (high school) institutions to the list.
- 2) That proposed policy C-TS-03, service standards expectations section 4 (a) is amended to change the minimum response level from 80% to 70%.

In response to Committee member comments, the Council Policy has been revised for final consideration of the Policy by Council. A summary of amendments includes:

- a) Service standard adjusted to include roadways within 400m radius of “Senior High School” sites as candidate sites. Section 3c of the drafted Policy.
- b) Service standard requirement for approval amended to require a response level of 70% from homes on a candidate roadway. Section 4b of the drafted Policy.
- c) Service standard requirement for approval amended to require a “support” level of 80% of responses received (from the previous 75%). Section 4 c of the drafted Policy.
 - a. This increase is to reflect the offset from the value of the responses necessary that will provide greater overall roadway support for the service; eliminating the conflict of a candidate roadway being a 50/50 split of resident opinion or service desire.
 - b. The proposed values (70% responses received and 80% support rate from responses received) represent an overall support ranging from 55% to 60% of households.
- d) Service standard requirement to begin the process of permit parking implementation requires a resident “petition”, signed by $\frac{2}{3}$ of the resident homes of a candidate roadway to begin the process. Section 4 a of the drafted Policy.
 - a. This has been added to place some onus on residents to initiate a process that will begin with residents engaged and an earlier identification to support resource placement on conducting the program at a candidate site.
- e) Service standard adjusted to remove reference of “exempted” sites.
 - a. This reference was used specific to the area of Michener Place, which previously was an approved site not meeting candidate roadway requirements. With the addition of high school sites, this reference can be eliminated.

The implications of the requested amendments to the Policy are that there is a greater volume of locations and thus residents to service which increases the work load of the program to deliver. It is anticipated that dedicated resources will be needed to provide the service guided by Policy C-TS-03; however, Administration shall be performing a resource needs evaluation and assessment that will identify overall resource requirements, the alignment of the new service to appropriate organizational department(s), and capability to cover needed resources under current levels.

Within the drafted Residential Permit Parking Policy, Administration has drafted the level of service of the Policy to reflect that up to 2 permits for the home's parking and 2 Visitor permits are free to each household. Charges are identified in the Policy for only 3 or more permits, or for lost or replacement of damaged permits. Based on the pilot program experience, where 94% of homes requested 2 or less permits, the anticipated revenue from the proposed program would be negligible and thus the program would not be generating any revenue to recover costs.

If desired by Council, the level of service could be amended to have all permits charged for, which would result in an offset to costs of running the program. Based on estimates of anticipated permits, the following charges could be considered:

- a) A charge of \$25.00 per permit / year = estimated revenue of \$15,075.00
- b) A charge of \$50.00 per permit / year = estimated revenue of \$30,150.00

The estimate above is reflective of the anticipated permits that will be requested, and as such, the actual costs and revenue of running the program may vary depending on the actual roadways from the candidate sites that meet criteria for permit parking implementation.

Considerations relative to the integration of charges for permits:

- 1) Charging for permits may reduce overall applications for the program - resulting in a reduced estimated value from what is shown above.
- 2) During the pilot program's evaluation, a survey question was posed that gave an option for choice:
"I **would support** permanent implementation of residential permit parking at a cost ranging from \$50 to \$75 per permit"

There was a very low response rate received that supported this charge.

- 3) The service of Residential Permit Parking is set to specific residents of the City (residents of candidate sites) and is customized for their use. It does not reflect a service provided for the overall benefit of all residents.

Should Council approve the recommendation and the resulting Policy C-TS-03, the expected timeframe for implementation would be September 1, 2019. This timeline reflects the needs to:

- 1) Update the Residential Permit Parking Process and Guidelines to reflect changes to the Policy and service level.
- 2) Perform the resource assessment and evaluation and align resources to complete the service delivery and program management of Residential Permit Parking.

- 3) Prepare documents and program records for implementation.

STAKEHOLDER COMMUNICATIONS OR ENGAGEMENT

Various surveys and information letters were sent throughout the duration of the 2017 / 2018 Residential Permit Parking Pilot Program that informed the final proposed process and policy.

No formal public engagement was conducted during the development of the revised Policy.

IMPLICATIONS OF RECOMMENDATION(S)

Financial:

By approving the Policy C-TS-03 Residential Permit Parking, an annual operating budget will be required to fund costs associated with the administration and field work associated with implementing the Policy. Final funding requirements will be dependent upon candidate roadways involvement with the program; however, it is estimated that \$8,000 will fund initial setup and preliminary service delivery.

Resource requirements to provide the service shall be evaluated by Administration; however, there is no new resource requested at this time.

Legal / Risk:

None at this time.

Program or Service:

This is a new service provided by the City and is aligned to specific residents of single streets. It supports residents of the streets in proximity to high schools, institutions or commercial sites or public transit stations; but it is not supportive of potential user needs of said facilities.

Organizational:

This policy and resulting administrative process creates additional workload on staff, that may be supported by re-designation of work load to existing staff, or a new staff resource assigned to project coordination and delivery for the program. Assessment of needs and organizational resourcing shall be performed.

Implications on Enforcement resources are unknown at this time; however, anticipated to be off set by existing calls of resident concerns and reports of parking violations in areas proposed as candidate sites for the program delivery.

ALTERNATIVES AND IMPLICATIONS CONSIDERED

If Council does not wish to support the recommendation(s), the following alternatives could be considered:

Alternative 1

Council may choose not to proceed with a Policy, which would result in no further action taken to finalize a Policy or an Administrative Process for Residential Permit Parking. The use of permitted

parking within the City (currently on Michener Place) would cease with no further process or actions from Administration.

Alternative 2

Council may choose to further amend the drafted Policy, to which Administration may identify constraints or capability to deliver on requests.

Alternative 3

Council may choose to target an amendment to the Policy to off set service costs by having charges to home owners for all permits applied for. The drafted Policy proposes no charges for up to 2 permits per household and 2 visitor permits per household.

Report Date: November 26, 2018

Author(s): Dean Schick

Committee/Department: Engineering Department

Deputy Chief Administrative Officer/Chief People Officer: Michelle Bonnici

Chief Administrative Officer: Kevin Scoble