

**My comments for 2025.PH18.3 on January 23, 2025 Planning and Housing Committee - Recommended Parking Requirements for New Development - Accessible, Bicycle, Visitors**

Jan 21, 2025

To: Planning and Housing Committee, Councillor Kandavel, Councillor Ainslie, SUN, Marina Tadenc.

**To the City Clerk:**

Please add my comments to the agenda for the January 23, 2025 Planning and Housing Committee meeting on item 2025.PH18.3, **Recommended Parking Requirements for New Development - Accessible, Bicycle, Visitor**

I understand that my comments and the personal information in this email will form part of the public record and that my name will be listed as a correspondent on agendas and minutes of City Council or its committees. Also, I understand that agendas and minutes are posted online and my name may be indexed by search engines like Google.

The Cliffcrest Scarborough Village Southwest Residents Association (CSVSWRA) is located in south Scarborough, our residents are not opposed to reasonable development, but we are opposed to the reduction in parking requirements for new developments, especially for Accessible and Visitor parking.

Comments:

"The amendment will also reduce the visitor parking requirement for apartment buildings with 60 or fewer dwelling units on lots designated as neighbourhoods and abutting a major street, as shown on Official Plan Map 3, to one (1) visitor parking space."

Removing visitor parking requirements – especially suburbs like Scarborough - is uninformed and counter to building complete communities.

Already closer to the core, there have been complaints from residents who are unable to find parking for their out-of-town family or friends. These "guests" are not segments of the population that can shift their modes to transit or a bicycle. They are coming long distances to visit.

This recommendation will also further exacerbate the battles for on street parking and permits, reducing street walkability and safety and access for plows and emergency vehicles. You may gain a bit of revenue from street parking and then you will lose it quickly and some, through increased regulatory costs for parking complaints and enforcement.

"The recommended changes to the accessible parking standards ...introducing a requirement that at least 5 percent of parking in new developments be accessible. Higher required proportions of accessible parking are recommended at medical offices and clinics, as well as residential developments in Parking Zone A (generally areas within 400 metres of frequent higher-order transit). To ensure that there is a reasonable supply of accessible parking, including in developments with very low overall parking supply,"

With the goal of main-floor retail and services, and little to no advance knowledge about potential medical services moving in, a proper supply of visitor parking is even more imperative to ensure equity and accessibility objectives are met.

- Five percent of 60 units translates to 3 parking spots. Aging in place requires Personal Support Workers, vehicles or special purpose vehicles. On what basis are up to 3 spots deemed sufficient? We would argue that 5% is not sufficient and a figure of at least 10% would be more appropriate.
- What number of visitor parking spots do planning staff deem acceptable for medical services? We feel it would be more prudent to plan for medical services to ensure accessibility is built at the time of development of a site and not an afterthought.

As written, these proposed parking requirements continue to lack foresight and introduce significant risk that these standards will reduce access and accessibility for families, elderly and individuals.

A member of our RA also was in communication with Michael Hain and we would like clarification on the responses from Michael Hain:

“We believe that one visitor parking space will still be able to meet the needs of most residents and note that buildings of this type already exist in many parts of the city.”

– What does most mean and what evidence is there that this standard is sufficient in the suburbs where cars remain a necessity for the every day?

“As you note, people who make more use of visitor parking may not choose to live in these types of buildings.”

– EHON is about expanding housing options. For whom is housing being planned if not for families and an aging population?

**We recommend an increase in the minimum requirements for accessible parking and visitor’s parking that is informed by data and best practice.**

Sincerely,

Tanya Baksh

**CSVSWRA Director and Co-Chair of Planning and Development Committee**

