

Parking Rate Increase Proposal Public Comment Summary

December 14, 2021

Comment - Residential Area

- 1 Concern of where contractors will park. Does not want to have to pay for parking on the street. Enforcement is always an issue, no one checks for violations east of the park.
- 2 Request for free resident pass for on street parking in neighbourhood.
- 3 Church Street resident who has received free on street parking pass for many years, would like this to continue.
- 4 Church Street resident who has received free on street parking pass for many years, would like this to continue.
- 5 Request for free resident pass for on street parking on Darcy as some do not have driveways and park in the subject neighbourhood.
- 6 2 free passes requested per residence for family/friends.
- 7 Disagrees that any resident should have to pay for on street parking in front of home. Would prefer meters if anything.
- 8 Would support a \$20-\$30 pass.
- 9 Cars parked on King will impede sight lines. Nowhere for contractors to park out front of home.
- 10 Disagrees on \$20 for single parking pass.
- 11 Not fair for beach residents to have to pay when all residents do not have to pay to park in front of homes.
- 12 Residents should not have to pay to park in front of home.
- 13 The whole proposed new area is not always utilized for beach parking outside of long weekends.
- 14 Concern of where caregivers/contractors will park. Deterrent for friends/family to stop in for short term.
- 15 Not fair for residents especially because other close by streets north of King, south of Bay are not impacted. Beach residents already deal with lots of issues in beach area with people dumping garbage which also costs residents to pick up and pay for bag tags.
- 16 Thanks for providing information
- 17 High taxes already. Already fight for parking for friends/family and does not want to now pay for parking.
- 18 Building owner of multi-plex. Very challenging already to find room for residents, visitors and the many contractors that are needed regularly for building upkeep. Please reconsider the pass in consideration of residents/property owners in local area.
- 19 Implement paid parking but do not penalize locals. Bad precedent.
- 20 King Street should be excluded. Lightly used by community and for church. not beach parking.
- 21 Agrees with costs for daily and seasonal pass (\$20). In support of proposal.
- 22 Leave parking as is. Not fair that other residents north of King are not also having to pay for parking or west of the Marina.
- 23 The area is already heavily impacted by excess garbage, traffic and disrespectful visitors. Why just this area and not Water, Third, College St.
- 24 Not opposed to paid parking but more concerned about aesthetics of new signage. Hopes there will not be more pavement markings.
- 25 Uses street parking for visitors as only one spot for the building. Would like free passes. Why not weekend only.
- 26 Day care staff park on street to free up the parking lot for parents to pick up/drop off kids. Parents also park on street.
- 27 Day care parent - can drop off and pick up times be free (7-9am, 4-6pm)
- 28 Day care parent - can drop off and pick up times be free (7-9am, 4-6pm)
- 29 Designated area requested for free parking for day care
- 30 High taxes already. Not in support.
- 31 Day care parent-very busy area for pick up/drop off. Too costly for parents. Lot is too congested.
- 32 Day care parent-requesting staff have passes so they can park on the street and parents can use lot
- 33 Day care parents- should receive free passes
- 34 Letter from daycare-waive parking fees for staff, provide 5-6 passes for staff.
- 35 Concern of where contractors will park. Does not want to have to pay for parking on the street. Enforcement is always an issue, no one checks for violations east of the park.
- 36 Concern of where contractors will park. Does not want to have to pay for parking on the street. Enforcement is always an issue, no one checks for violations east of the park.

Comment - DBIA Area

- 37 DBIA Board, does not support increases. Businesses are still recovering, increases will further deter customers in addition to pay and display machines being too far apart. Request deferral of rate increase to 2023.
- 38 2hr limit would not allow parking for a whole shift and all other accessible spots and lots are too far away. Pay and displays are too far for persons with disabilities.
- 39 Elderly having issues with new parking machines due to distance.

Committee Motions/Comments

- 40 Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC):
 - one year pilot for new waterfront resident pass and visitor parking pass in residential area
 - \$5/hr waterfront hourly rate
 - ensure no parking is well signed on Lake Street
 - ensure boat ramp launch fees and daily parking rates are on par with proposed rate increases elsewhere
 - supports two tiered parking lots in downtown
 - recommends a \$1.50/hr rate for downtown and ultimately supports hourly rate being on par with transit single ride rate to promote public transit