

Final Speaking Points TEYCC Dec 3, 2019 Permit Parking Item TE11.35**BILL**

Thank you for hearing us. My Name is Bill O'Henly. EVERYTHING WE'RE SAYING HERE IS ALREADY IN MY SUBMISSION SENT LAST FRIDAY.

We have four requests of Community Council.

1. Transportation Services in its Nov 26 report for this Item says that permit parking requires a more balanced and strategic approach across the City; that a report on that is due in early 2021; and that future decisions on permit parking should hold off until then. The current permit parking approach is a TEMPORARY band-aid solution with inconsistent application ward to ward. We ask that Council vote to defer the permit parking extension until that work is done in 2021 as recommended by city staff.

2. That Council and the City require **that** condo developers **in future** build one parking spot for each condo unit plus adequate parking for retailers in each development; and that each new condo development be a separate permit parking area to ensure adequate parking without dumping condo owners onto surrounding streets.

3. That if Council does not defer permit parking, that it amend any permit parking motion that it passes, to exclude the streets in Ward 4

as was done in Josh Matlow's Ward 12, so that that area continues to have the resident petition and polling provisions of the current permit parking By-law until 2021 or that it implement polling as will be done in Brad Bradford's Ward 19.

4. If Council does not defer permit parking and does not agree to remove or poll the streets in Ward 4, that it amend any permit parking motion it passes now so that **in** Permit Parking Area 1H on the Ward 4 Map in the Nov. 26th report, if residents of any street submit to the City a petition with more than **60%** in favour of opting out or converting to street only (vs. Area) permit parking, that street would be opted out or be converted automatically, as requested, within a reasonable period after the City has verified that the petition is proper.

Why do we ask this?

1. In old Ward 13 (now Ward 4) we feel misled by Councillor Perks on permit parking. Other wards followed a "robust" consultation process explaining the current By-law protections and the proposal to amend it, soliciting feedback and reporting the results & staff answers to resident concerns.
2. **NONE OF THAT WAS DONE IN OLD WARD 13. NO EFFORT WAS EVER MADE** at the June and September community meetings to inform or solicit feedback as required by Item TE27.49 or respect the Consultation process used in other wards as set out in Item TE7.78.

3. Notification of the first meeting was so poor most found out by word of mouth. At the meetings we were kept in the dark. Current By-law protections and the intention to eliminate them were never even mentioned. Councillor Perks told us that permit parking had already been approved in East York and thanks to Doug Ford we were now stuck with it. And that THERE WAS NO LEGAL AVENUE TO OPPOSE IT or to provide feedback on whether we wanted it or not ; AND no point sending a petition since even if every person on every street opposed it, it's a done deal. We could only comment on which streets we would suggest go with which streets.

4. At the September meeting we raised **this** Community Council's Sept 16th reversal of a previous council's "*unprecedented*" decision to push through permit parking without proper consultation, because it "*did not meet the test of fairness*" in ward 19. Councillor Perks refused to discuss it. He also refused to discuss the current By-law protections when raised at the meeting, He said the By-law was not relevant (even though it's still in force). He did not even allow staff to answer a question directed to them. He avoided raising any of it and blocked any such discussion if others raised it.

We feel that his attempt to push through Ward 4 permit parking without allowing his constituents to know about the By-law and his push to

amend it **is just wrong**.

5. When we met with Councillor Perks on Nov 15th we raised all this but he said it doesn't matter.

He technically held two community meetings and got resoundingly negative feedback even though he did not raise the By-law issues at all, nor allow discussion of them.

Even if he publicly dismissed all our feedback as invalid, he says that was sent it to city staff so technically he's on-side.

6. For him even if more people knew the facts - even if every person at both community meetings did not want permit parking, it would make no difference.

Councillor Perks feels permit parking is a good idea. It's going through.

So the public meetings he held were an empty sham.

Jane

Councillor Perks stated that he has no problem pitting himself against the interests of a majority of his constituents. He's done that before and will do it again - even if it's all constituents on all 86 streets. He'll decide what's right. If we don't like it, we can vote him out.

7. We ask that Toronto East York Community Council recognize and reverse what we consider to be a trampling of By-law rights of constituents in the old Ward 13 portion of Ward 4 by considering the motions we are making.

If not, then City Council should be asked to, if it gets a say.

8. So... why don't we want permit parking imposed? There are many reasons. Here are four:

- a. People have received advice from local real estate agents that permit parking could negatively impact their property values by:
 - i. adding congestion due to increased parking which affects snowplows and garbage trucks and emergency vehicles;
 - ii. causing additional traffic that normally would not even use the street except to find permit parking spots; and
 - iii. eliminating the quiet, children friendly & elder safe nature of these streets – qualities that justify the higher prices paid for homes on these streets.

- b. Permit parking **may** add value and appeal to properties on high density streets in a traffic heavy grid where many people have no driveway and therefore need permit parking to enhance quality of life and house values.

But for our low density streets where people already have a driveway and don't require as much street parking, and where traffic is limited, it detracts from the quality of our street and the value of our properties.

Our streets become a cheap parking lot for distracted drivers from higher density streets looking for an overnight parking space.

- c. Since most residents of these added streets already have driveways, a parking permit on their own street will cost 3 times as much as a resident of a neighbouring street without a driveway would pay for the same spot.

So permit parking brings no benefit here to residents of these streets. That's why these streets are different and should be able to choose.

- d. Condo real estate agents have advised prospective buyers not to worry if there is no available parking in the condo since cheap on street permit parking will be available.

We are concerned that we will see increased overflow parking

from Bloor West condos (***especially future condos where the city is allowing developers to build less than one parking spot per unit***).

We see condo developers as primary beneficiaries of adding this huge cheap parking lot as it will reduce developer building costs and increase what they can charge for a spot while dumping overflow condo parking demand onto nearby city streets.

That's why we propose that Council require every new condo to build a parking spot for each unit and appropriate spots for any retailers in the building to satisfy ALL demand for parking. Any spots not taken should be available to rent to help soak up demand on busy permit parking streets.

And that each condo development should also be its own permit parking area.

These changes should be made whether or not permit parking is extended.

Lee

9. Why should this community council reconsider across the board permit parking on the 86 streets in old ward 13, now Ward 4.
- a. We feel it will be a money losing proposition on our 86 streets. The projected **revenues** of permit parking in the April 1 2019 report are overstated.
 - i. Streets across the city that have managed to escape permit parking should be removed from projected revenues.
 - ii. The 25% take up assumption is too high for our 86 streets. Most residents on those streets don't need permit parking and most of these streets ramble far away from the grid streets that need permit parking. Ward 4 Area 1L will generate virtually no permit parking revenues.
 - v. Meanwhile the fixed **costs** associated with permit parking are about \$6.2 million up front with annual costs of almost half a million dollars. Permit parking is unlikely to pay for itself here.
 - vi. **Council can reduce those fixed and variable costs by removing those 86 streets as requested in our fourth motion.**
 - b. Better still the Nov 26th report says that the whole permit parking matter needs to be revisited with a more balanced and strategic approach. Don't rush this through now! Let Transportation Services do their job. **Council should approve our motion to defer this**

until a more strategic and balanced approach is decided in 2021 as recommended by city staff.

- c. Councillor Perks says that this is an equity issue. That people two or three streets over have to pay for a permit but we don't.
- i. First, the higher values of homes on those 86 streets and the higher taxes paid on those values take that into account. Also, homes with no driveway get a property tax discount.
 - ii. More importantly if someone from another street decides to park overnight on our street they run the same risk of getting a ticket as we do.
 - iii. **So there is no equity issue** here. Residents are happy with the 3 hour rule.
 - iv. Permit parking introduces two inequities.
 - v. A person without a driveway two streets over can get a permit parking spot in front of my home 24/7 for one third of what I would pay for that same spot.
 - vi. Second, whereas other wards in TEY got a robust communication and feedback opportunity, old ward 13 didn't. That is extremely inequitable.
 - vii. Councillor Perks keeps telling us that this is being driven by some waiting list but on Nov 15th we asked where the demand is. We didn't want addresses just some objective measure. He would not tell us. A signed petition done this weekend showed that on my street, Palisades, there is no demand. Of the 33 households 28

responded and of those 96% opposed permit parking.

viii. In the absence of objective evidence of demand for permit parking we and you need to ask who benefits from this effort? Not residents. Not the City. Perhaps saving condo developer costs? Then that is not an equity issue.

d. On Nov 15th

i. Councillor Perks referred to you, his fellow councillors, as “cowards” for agreeing to listen to their constituents when making these decisions.

ii. He said permit parking must be applied across the city. We pointed out that it will be handled differently in each ward so it will not be applied consistently.

iii. Ward 4 is pushing through permit parking in old ward 13 without consultation other than on boundaries. Wards 10, 11 and 13 are going to full consultation and Ward 19 is re-polling.

iv. This inconsistent approach represents a disparity in the treatment of Toronto residents.

e. The Feb 2019 Consultation Summary recognized the concern that permit parking will turn streets into cheap parking lots for neighbouring streets. It responded as follows:

“ The only people who would be able to park on the street would be people who live on the street and/or their guests. This is the main purpose for having a permit parking program....”

We asked Transportation Services: could we ask for street only permit parking or opt out where our street has a driveway for each home and we see no benefit from permit parking?

They said we have the right to petition to opt out or convert. BUT that would go to Councillor Perks.

We asked Councillor Perks if he would block such a petition.

He told us on Nov 15th that **even if every household on any given street or on every street filed such petitions, he would block the petition from going to this community council for consideration.**

As long as he is councillor no-one will ever opt out or convert. Again we see that as an abuse of power. **You should too.**

Richard

- f. Councillor Perks is planning to create a new, large and cheap 86 street permit parking lot in Ward 4 which will attract even more cars to the area by encouraging people in the area to buy additional cars by making parking easier, creating more pollution.

Council needs to ask how this reduces Toronto's contribution to **climate change**.

10. Several people have told us that they met with Councillor Perks separately but any arguments they made, such as those we've mentioned, were simply dismissed as they were at the two community meetings, including the fact that:

many residents of the 86 streets in old ward 13 are still unaware that this change to bring in permit parking is even going on.

11. Councillor Perks told us on Nov 15th he will propose amending the by-law to remove the current petition and polling provisions and push through permit parking.

12. In summary we recommend that:

First, this Council should vote to defer the extension of permit parking until a more strategic and balanced approach is decided in 2021 as recommended by staff. There is nothing urgent about more permit parking.

- 13. Second, this Council should pass a resolution that condo developers be required to build one parking spot for each unit, plus adequate spots for retailers in the development and each condo development should be its own permit parking zone.**
- 14. Third, given the poor communication of the By-law and the process; and Councillor Perks' threat to block any valid petition to opt out or convert to street only permit parking in old ward 13, that if Council does not defer permit parking, that it amend any permit parking motion that it passes, to exclude the streets in Ward 4 as was done in Josh Matlow's Ward 12, so that that area continues to have the resident petition and polling provisions of the current permit parking By-law until 2021; or that it implement polling as will be done in Brad Bradford's Ward 19.**

This could occur before signage and other costs are incurred so that these costs could be averted where the street clearly wants to opt out.

Councillor Perks would get permit parking installed on every street where there was no such objection and only those streets with a 60% supermajority would be allowed to opt out or convert - as other streets across the city can.

Councillor Perks has said no to that. No one opts out as long as he is councillor.

15. And Lastly, If and only if, this Council still passes a motion to impose permit parking in Ward 4, Council should include a provision that allows residents of any of these 86 streets to opt out of permit parking or to convert to street only permit parking in Ward 4 Area 1H, if 60% sign a petition to that effect and that that street would be opted out or be converted automatically.

Thank you for listening to us today.