

EXHIBIT S 3-1

CD.05.PAR
(Parking Space)

DATE: October 31, 2000

TO: Chairman and Members of the Planning and Development Committee

FROM: Thomas S. Mokrzycki, Commissioner of Planning and Building

SUBJECT: **Response to Comments - Parking Space Dimensions
Supplementary Report
PUBLIC MEETING DATE: November 20, 2000**

ORIGIN: Recommendation PDC-0119-2000

BACKGROUND: The Planning and Development Committee (PDC) at its meeting on August 8, 2000 considered a report titled "*Response to Comments - Parking Space Dimensions*" dated July 18, 2000 from the Commissioner of Planning and Building and approved Recommendation PDC-0119-2000, which was adopted by City Council on August 16, 2000.

Part 1 of Recommendation PDC-0119-2000 states that a public meeting be held at the Planning and Development Committee to consider proposed amendments to Zoning By-law 5500 (former Town of Mississauga), Zoning By-law 65-30 (former Town of Streetsville) and Zoning By-law 1227 (former Town of Port Credit) by:

- amending the definition of "PARKING SPACE" to increase the minimum width of the parking space standard from 2.6 m (8.5 ft.) to 2.75 m (9.0 ft.);
- amending the definition of "AISLE";

- adding the definitions of "PARKING ANGLE", "PARALLEL PARKING SPACE" and "PARKING SPACE - DISABLED";
- amending the general provisions requiring parking and loading spaces to be provided and maintained on the same lot;
- amending the parking provisions designated for the disabled;
- adding minimum aisle width provisions to allow angled parking;
- amending the general provisions regarding the size of a detached private garage and a private garage associated with detached, semi-detached and row dwellings;
- enacting housekeeping amendments to sections of the Zoning By-laws by the foregoing.

Parts 2 and 3 of Recommendation PDC-0119-2000 state as follows:

- "2. That the By-law Enforcement Division of the Corporate Services Department prepare amendments to Disabled Persons Parking By-law 134-83, as amended, regarding the width and the total number of parking spaces designated for the disabled in accordance and concurrently with the proposed amendments to the Zoning By-laws.*
- 3. That the letter dated August 4, 2000 from Mr. P. King, Orlando Corporation, requesting deferral of the above item to allow staff to evaluate suggested solutions, be received for information."*

Attached as Exhibit S 2-1 is the report titled "*Response to Comments - Parking Space Dimensions*" dated July 18, 2000 from the Commissioner of Planning and Building, including Recommendation PDC-0119-2000.

COMMENTS:

With respect to Part 1 of Recommendation PDC-0119-2000, a public meeting has been scheduled to consider the proposed amendments to the Zoning By-laws as outlined in the report titled

"Response to Comments - Parking Space Dimensions" dated July 18, 2000 from the Commissioner of Planning and Building.

Deputation at PDC and Comments Received

At the PDC meeting on August 8, 2000, representatives from OMERS Realty Management Corporation, B.A. Consulting Group, and City Centre Plaza Limited addressed the Committee and objected to the proposal to increase the minimum width of the parking space standard from 2.6 m (8.5 ft.) to 2.75 m (9.0 ft.). No concerns were expressed with respect to other proposed amendments related to angled parking, aisle width for one-way traffic, parking for the disabled and private garages.

Subsequent to the PDC meeting on August 8, 2000, staff met with representatives from OMERS Realty Management Corporation, B.A. Consulting Group, City Centre Plaza Limited, Orlando Corporation and the Credit Valley Hospital. Written comments were received from City Centre Plaza Limited and RT Realty Advisors (attached as Exhibit S 2-2), Orlando Corporation (attached as Exhibit S 2-3), Square One Management Office (attached as Exhibit S 2-4), Monarch Construction Limited (attached as Exhibit S 2-5), John D. Rogers & Associates Inc. on behalf of the Credit Valley Hospital (attached as Exhibit S 2-6) and Hurontario Centre Limited (attached as Exhibit S 2-7) providing justifications and documentation why the minimum width of the existing parking space standard in the Zoning By-laws should remain. Their comments are summarized as follows:

- no complaints received related to the existing size of parking spaces in their developments;
- additional land and construction costs if the size of parking spaces is increased. These costs would ultimately be paid by the end users - tenants and customers;
- the biggest problem which developers of office buildings face is the parking issue. Tenants are already requesting increasing amount of parking than the Zoning By-law requirements. An increase in the size of parking space standard would become a barrier to economic development;

- it is unreasonable, inappropriate and uneconomical to design all parking facilities to provide a high level of service for only a small percentage of large vehicles (very large sport utility vehicles (SUVs) comprise less than 5% of the total vehicle population).

Comments were also received from Edwin J. May (attached as Exhibit S 2-8) expressing concern that wider parking stalls would be environmentally unsound.

CONCLUSION:

Subsequent to the holding of the public meeting, this matter should be referred back to staff for further consideration and recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the reports titled "*Response to Comments - Parking Space Dimensions*" dated July 18, 2000 and "*Response to Comments - Parking Space Dimensions, Supplementary Report*" dated October 31, 2000 from the Commissioner of Planning and Building, be referred to staff for further consideration and recommendation.

Original Signed By: _____

Thomas S. Mokrzycki
Commissioner of Planning and Building