



January 21, 2026

City Hall  
100 Queen Street West  
Toronto, On M5H 2N2  
Attention: Nancy Martins

Chair and Members of the Committee:

**Re: PH27.8 Visitor Parking Requirements for New Development**

The Bloor Street East Neighbourhood Association (BENA)'s footprint runs along Bloor Street from Yonge Street to Sherbourne west to east and the Rosedale Valley Road to Selby/Charles north to south. Our footprint includes condominiums, purpose-built rentals, business and churches. The built form includes condominiums from 45 years in age to new builds with other forms as well. As we have stated in the past, we have had discussions on our building needs in the context of reviewing and making representations on development applications in our area. Our submissions and deputations with respect to parking requirement have focused on the various needs for Visitor Parking based on our experiences.

Attached to this report are our comments on various segments of the Staff Report.

Our conclusions and recommendations for you are:

- Support the recommendation of a further review of loading space definition to reflect changes in demand and use for loading spaces. (Much of this was provided by utilizing existing visitor parking). We also note this was a recommendation we made 5 years ago. (See attachment)
- Bill 185 and the conflict with AODA, find ways to accommodate disability needs within the envelope of the new build and develop mechanisms to ensure it is not abused.
- Provide the community with more information on the Strategic Parking Framework and opportunities to provide input.
- Concerns with the policy change from a new build being self sufficient and costs to the City to provide parking are in the comments below.
- Analysis that has not been completed – Additional operational costs to new builds as necessary parking is moved offsite and charged to the building and its' residents. Analysis has been concentrated on building costs and affordability to purchase. No analysis has been presented on the increased operating costs of offsite parking which increases affordability after purchasing. Developers often low ball the first-year operating costs and these additional costs may be the breaking point for someone to remain in their home – a City of Toronto objective.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Brett, President, Bloor Street East Neighbourhood Association (BENA)

On behalf of the Bloor Street Neighbourhood

CC. Councillors Moise, Saxe

Bcc. BENA Executive Committee

## Appendix

### Comments on Sections of the Report

#### Equity Statement

The equity statement captures the essence of what BENA has written and deputed with respect to since the start of the Parking Requirements review and appreciate the acknowledgement of the other aspects of high buildings and residents require over their lifetime.

#### Page 6 Second Paragraph (General Comments)

##### Recommended action:

“As a result of the review, Staff recommend future direction to explore the feasibility of amending the definition of and requirements for loading spaces in Zoning By-law 5692013.”

We fully endorse this recommendation and is in line with our request in our first request in our submission for the January 21, 2021. Comment on Visitor Parking Requirements:

“Currently; this parking is provided by the shrinking availability of “guest parking”. Hopefully through this consultation process, another category of parking can be identified as “service provider parking” to acknowledge and address their ongoing needs.”

#### 1.0 Bill 185 and Implementation of Protected/Major Transit Station Areas

Our concern is with respect to removal of all parking requirements and the need to **accommodate Persons with Disabilities (AODA)**. Page 7 indicates that they are regulated through AODA but how this will be accomplished in new builds is not defined in the report other than to say they will likely be diminished. From a community perspective, we request more guidance on this in evaluating new applications.

#### 2.0 to 2.4 Visitor Parking, Summaries etc.

We are pleased to see the recognition of the various users of visitor parking. We have also reviewed the surveys that you completed and agree it is hard to measure over time. Each building requirements change as they age as well as its residents’ demographics and needs are dynamic. A study period of about 25 years would more appropriately provide meaningful information. The monitoring of visitor parking also aligns with our observations of our member buildings (hard to track).

Our member buildings are seeing a decline in resident required exclusive use (either exclusive use common element or deeded) and increase in demands for visitor parking for trades, support workers etc. A more flexible allocation to allow for shifts in needs would be helpful and how it can be implemented should be explored.

#### 3.0 Parking Information

We generally agree with the conclusion and add that any perspective buyer of a Condominium Unit has a cooling off period to review the documents which include this disclosure. The

application process information is useful for current residents to review the application and make comments.

#### **4.0 Strategic Parking Framework**

We fully embrace this approach and would like more information on how it will proceed and the consultation process. We are in Big Move A area and are very concerned with how parking for our deliveries, trades, visitors etc. will be accommodated in the future.

We see a significant **Policy Change**.

**Current Policy** – New developments accommodate all parking requirements within its envelope and not allowing residents of these developments to apply for and obtain street parking permits.

**Policy Change** – Require City or public parking to accommodate the needs of new builds. How this works hopefully will be addressed as it is not adequately addressed in new applications. Parking supply surveys include all lots either with approvals or in the process of obtaining approvals. Additionally, one cannot guarantee the other public sites will remain. Allowing more permit parking adds, in many areas, to already oversubscribed permits.

#### **5.0 to 5.1 Monitoring and Next Steps**

These steps will address the issues identified in 4.0 and again suggest the Condo and High-Rise Communities be engaged.

#### **6.0 Recommended Changes**

We concur with the next steps and interest in following how this all gets integrated. Issues that we feel need to be addressed:

- Cost to the City for the use of the Public Realm required to accommodate the parking offloaded from the Developers on an ongoing basis.
- A cost analysis of the increased costs to buildings and residents of not providing onsite parking for guest, trades etc. It is our experience, that making a unit affordable to buy does not necessarily make it affordable in the long term. If the City has a policy to keep people housed this analysis should be part of the process.