

## SAH Parking and Secondary Suites Survey Results to June 21 2014

### TOTAL OF 111 RESPONSES

OWNER: 109

RENTER: 2

### PARKING:

#### 1. IS PARKING AN ISSUE FOR YOU/YOUR STREET?

**YES : 46 (41.5%)**

Representative Yes comments –

- because of hospital staff and visitors and people attending McMahon Stadium events;
- current lack of effective enforcement of parking restrictions;
- increasing number of Cars 2 Go parking for extended periods, especially on 29<sup>th</sup> street which is permit only;
- many construction vehicles use Toronto Cres because it is faster;
- 13<sup>th</sup> ave has become congested with a combination of construction traffic and school pick ups, drivers often neglect the playground and school zone signs;
- 29<sup>th</sup> street is permit only but our signs are ignored and not enforced at all – access to and from 29<sup>th</sup> is becoming hazardous with sloppy parking;
- sometimes neighbors with multiple vehicles are not very courteous and park for extended periods right in front of my house so I cannot park;
- perhaps developers should lease space outside of SAH and bus their staff to their work site

**NO : 52 (47%)**

Representative No comments –

- vast majority of respondents are already permit only so parking is not an issue;
- 4 residents feel we do not own the streets and therefore they should be available for all citizens to use

**Existing 1 and 2 hour zones OK: 13 (11.5%)**

- Provides flexibility but also imposes restrictions – if properly enforced

#### 2. SUPPORT FOR PERMIT ONLY ON YOUR STREET AND THE COMMUNITY IN GENERAL ?

**YES : 69 (72%)**

Representative Yes comments –

- many residents would like to see a standard for the community – given the issues with parking, most who do not have permit parking on their street feel it would help on their street and throughout SAH;
- some feel the consistency would take the pressure off certain streets which are not permit only, but adjacent to permit only streets – parkers simply move to 1 and 2 hour zones and hope not get ticketed;
- children's safety is an issue on some streets because of increased Foothills staff and visitor traffic in and out of SAH;
- construction traffic is becoming an issue for certain streets – they don't park properly and sit all day long and many of these drivers have little regard for the speed limits.

**NO : 14 (14.5%)**

Representative No comments –

- feel 1 and 2 hour limits are reasonable;
- we can't close off our community to all traffic, don't want to become a "gated" community

**1-2 hour zones preferred: 13 (13.5%)**

- feel 1 and 2 hour limits are reasonable and provide flexibility

### 3. FLEXIBILITY FOR FOOTHILLS STAFF AND/OR VISITORS

#### YES: 9 (12%)

Representative Yes comments –

- generally feel we should not penalize staff for the lack of parking at Foothills;
- Foothills staff go to work every day to save lives – we should be kinder and more understanding;
- Feel we should have more empathy for patients and visitors – Cancer Centre and main hospital.

#### NO: 49 (65%)

Representative No comments –

- do not want SAH to be a parking lot for Foothills visitors and staff, SAH is first and foremost a residential neighborhood and residents should have priority;
- the Foothills site has been overbuilt over the years without proper parking planning;
- Foothills should provide its own parking solutions for both staff and visitors – as most businesses do – i.e. Stadium Shopping Centre;
- City Transit needs to do a much better job of providing options for staff who work shifts;
- If we offer compromise, it will increase the traffic on the west side of the community, not good for residents with children;
- It is common practice for staff to park as a group along Toronto Cres. and during the day, one individual comes over with several sets of keys and moves all of the vehicles just enough to avoid a ticket, so free all day parking;
- Foothills should lease land from the Children’s Hospital and bus staff back and forth
- Toronto Crescent residents should have the final say.

#### Some accommodation: 17 (23%)

Representative Some accommodation comments –

- extend 2 hour to 4 hour so primarily patients and visitors have more flexibility;
- we have sympathy for patients who can’t find parking on site;
- could staff use the small lot at 13<sup>th</sup> Ave and University Drive ?
- south side of Toronto Cres. has no homes/abuts a green space – could Foothills staff use parking passes on this side?
- the west side of the school on 12<sup>th</sup> ave could be used and would not affect the homeowners’ parking across the street
- could the community identify acceptable “public” parking such as south side of Toronto Cres and south side of school and sell parking passes for designated parking ??

### 4. Help with petition if necessary

**YES – 26**

**NO - 14**

Most did not provide an answer, but 25 respondents said yes, 13 said no – virtually all permit only at the moment.

## SECONDARY SUITES

### 1. In favour of legalizing

#### YES: 28 (25.5%)

Representative Yes comments –

- most indicated subject to proper re zoning to be applied to individual properties;
- also subject to suites meeting all code requirements supported by inspections;
- would support students;
- would support nanny suites for two career families and for elderly/dependent support;
- would allow seniors additional revenue to remain in their homes;
- would diversify the resident base like West Hillhurst and Parkdale – their property values are not decreasing;
- would help with the current outward sprawl of the City ;
- “I think its crazy this bylaw has not passed by now”
- we should not be nimbys
- one resident would like to build a home office above their garage.

#### NO: 81 (74.5%)

Representative No comments :

- current rental properties not well maintained so don't want to expand investor rentals in SAH – landlords and renters do not share the same values/interests/pride as residents;
- bought in SAH to be in an R 1 neighborhood – do not want SAH to become Hillhurst/Sunnyside or Parkdale;
- pay high taxes for R 1 status to have the room between dwellings – don't want to be “cheek by jowl” like other inner city neighborhoods – did not buy in SAH to live in a high density community;
- if I had wanted to live in an R 2 neighborhood, I would have bought in Parkdale;
- SAH has been a family oriented community, secondary suites would change the character of the neighborhood;
- SAH is a very low crime community, more landlords looking to maximize their profit could negatively affect this;
- property values would decrease as the neighborhood would become less desirable;
- lack of controls over developers has already negatively impacted the character of SAH with huge, unattractive homes;
- concerned about increased traffic and parking congestion;
- “more suites , more cars, more parking problems. Let's kill 2 birds with one stone!”
- If the bylaw changes, we lose control as neighbors and as a community over what happens around us, opposed to re zoning;
- don't want SAH to become a university/college housing area.

### 2. In favour of changing the bylaw

YES: 24 (23%) – see comments above and below

NO: 81 (77%) - see comments above

### 3. Restrictions

Yes comments –

- almost all who answered yes said owner occupied is essential;
- many also said no additional parking permits – so max of 4 with 2 resident and 2 visitor permits;
- re zoning applications to be reviewed on a case by case basis and approved by the neighbors and the SAH CA;
- laneway homes to be strictly regulated to avoid parking and privacy problems for adjacent properties;
- some suggested noise bylaws should be updated and enforced – “code of conduct” communicated up front.