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1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 STUDY PURPOSE & BACKGROUND

The City of London (the City) has recently completed a number of planning, urban design and transportation studies that support the future development of the downtown. The provision, management and supply of parking are an area of special relevance to the successful implementation of the Our Move Forward: London’s Downtown Plan (the Downtown Plan). Determining how much parking is necessary for the functional and economic viability of downtown development programs and the success of the downtown transit hub as well as how the right amount of parking is provided are critical ingredients for future success.

The key to future development in the downtown will be the replacement of existing surface parking lots with new developments. Determining how much parking is required, how it is provided, what role the City should play in meeting future parking demand, the financial implications associated with providing new parking and the most appropriate municipal service delivery model to employ in order to maximize the return on investment of public funds are critical considerations in the development of a parking management strategy for the downtown.

In April 2015, London City Council adopted a plan for the downtown entitled “Our Move Forward: London’s Downtown Plan”. This plan provided seven strategic directions and described ten transformational projects that would ensure the continued success of the downtown well into the future. The plan identified many underutilized sites that were primarily surface parking lots, where new development could bridge street wall gaps and/or link key activity generators and therefore should be viewed as strategic priority locations for redevelopment.

The London 2030 Transportation Master Plan (London 2030 TMP) is intended to achieve a decrease in single occupant vehicle travel into the downtown that will in turn reduce the long term need for parking, particularly employee or commuter related. This includes an overall transportation plan for the city to accommodate growth and increase the use of public transit and active transportation options such as walking and cycling.

In September 2014, Council initiated an Environmental Assessment (EA) process (also called Shift) to identify and examine options for rapid transit in London. This will lead the way to implement several improvements to London’s transit system including a plan to provide bus rapid transit service to and through the downtown area.

In September 2016 the City of London finalized its Cycling Master Plan (London ON Bikes). The Cycling Master Plan was developed as a guide for the City’s future cycling network including key routes that will enhance cycling options to and from the downtown.

The City is currently updating the Development Charge (DC) By-Law and Background Study for the year 2019. The transportation component of the background study, last
completed in 2014, is aimed at identifying the costs of growth-related transportation projects that are attributable to new development over a 20-year horizon period.

Based upon the foregoing, this Downtown Parking Strategy includes a review of existing parking conditions and future development potential based upon the relevant aspects of the London 2030 TMP, Rapid Transit EA (Shift) and Business Case Analysis, Cycling Master Plan (London ON Bikes), the 2014 DC, and the Downtown Plan. Recommendations are provided regarding:

- the City’s future role in the provision of shared public parking resources;
- the integration of Transportation Demand Management considerations into its parking strategy;
- parking supply requirements in the zoning by-law;
- discontinuation of temporary zoning for surface commercial parking lots
- the payment in lieu of parking by-law;
- a funding plan;
- a parking system management structure;
- a Vision, Mission, Key Goals and Objectives for the strategy.

1.2 STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION

Valuable input has been received by the Steering Committee from a wide variety of stakeholders over the course of the study including:

- Downtown London
- Downtown Retailers and Restaurant operators
- Large Downtown Employers
- Private Parking Operators
- Land Owners and Developers

1.3 EXISTING PARKING CONDITIONS

MMM Group was retained by the City of London to prepare the Downtown London Parking Study 2014 Update and 2014 Downtown London Parking Needs Assessment. Parking occupancy observations were undertaken as part of this work in September 2014 which found a peak utilization of 71% across the downtown with localized demands of up to 89% in certain core areas of the downtown. To put this into perspective, 90% utilization is considered as a maximum practical occupancy, at which there is still sufficient available parking across downtown, however certain areas may require drivers to search more for available parking and accept longer walking distances.

The Downtown London Parking Study 2014 Update illustrates in more detail parking occupancy data for each block in the downtown and for six sub-areas. Figure 1 below is an illustration of the six sub-areas within the study boundary and the peak weekday occupancy levels for each area for all parking in the downtown.
Figure 1 - Parking Utilization by Study Sub-Area

Table 1 below provides an excerpt of the parking supply and peak demand conditions across the downtown by type of parking facility as described in the *2014 Downtown London Parking Needs Assessment* (Table 3A – Peak Parking Demand by Facilities during the Overall Peak Parking Demand Period (12:00 pm), Tuesday, September 16, 2014).

**Table 1  Peak Parking Demand by Facility Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Parking Supply</th>
<th>Overall Peak Parking Demand</th>
<th>Utilization Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Parking Lots/Structures</td>
<td>1,953</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Pay Lots (Privately Owned)</td>
<td>3,820</td>
<td>2,811</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Structures (Privately Owned)</td>
<td>3,413</td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Reserved Lots/Structures</td>
<td>3,653</td>
<td>2,411</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Miscellaneous Lots</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Private Public Free Parking Lots¹</td>
<td>1,766</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Street Parking</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>15,436</td>
<td><strong>10,953</strong></td>
<td><strong>71%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Publicly Available Parking</strong></td>
<td>9,897</td>
<td>7,660</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

1. Free parking for customers and/or staff (e.g., Tim Hortons). Generally available for the general public that uses the associated services.
There are a total of 15,436 parking spaces within the study area including on-street, municipal (public), off-street (owned by the City), commercial (public) off-street (privately owned/operated) and private off-street parking (not available for public parking). The total parking supply available across the downtown for public use is 9,897 spaces with a peak demand of 7,658 spaces (77% occupied).

Approximately 17% of the parking supply within the study area is controlled by the City directly or through its corporate entities including the London Covent Garden Market Corporation and the Convention Centre. Based on other similar studies, municipalities which play a strong role in providing shared public parking resources to support development generally control approximately 35% to 50% of the total parking in key areas. Examples include the Cities of Kitchener (41%), Barrie (50%), Brampton (57%), Oakville (60%), Oshawa (70%) and Waterloo (70%).

1.4 FUTURE DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS

One of the key components of the parking strategy is an assessment of future growth and its impact on future parking conditions and requirements, including the role that the City could play in facilitating development from a parking perspective.

In order to understand the potential parking implications associated with new development, an estimate of future parking supply and demand across the downtown study area has been created by using future growth estimates that have been created for the 2014 Development Charges study. While the estimates should be viewed as approximate, they do serve to provide an indication of the potential parking challenges associated meeting the City’s desired development goals and objectives for the downtown as described in various planning documents.

Redeveloping existing surface lots will present a significant challenge as many existing employers and employees rely on the use of the existing lots and the new buildings may generate parking demand in excess of the new parking supply provided. Some new developments, especially commercial space projects, may not provide any parking (opting instead to pay cash-in-lieu) or only provide a portion of their actual needs (i.e. meet the minimum Zoning By-law requirements), which will create additional demand for new off-site parking unless:

- public transit use increases substantially (significant reduction in auto driver mode split);
- new developments increase the amount of parking they provide to meet their own needs and/or the City assists in meeting some of the demand with public parking garages; and
- there is a cultural shift in the demand for parking.
An important factor regarding future parking requirements is the expected decrease in auto person trips from the existing level of 73.5% to 64% by year 2034 due to the substantial investment in new Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service approved by Council, as per the BRT Business Case analysis. The expected increase in transit use equates to a decrease in parking demand of approximately 13%.

Table 2 below provides an estimate of the potential future parking impacts within each of the six sub areas of the downtown based on a transportation mode split of 64% auto-person use by 2034. Parking shortfalls and surpluses within each sub area continue to range significantly with parking supply deficits projected in core area zones 3 and 4 by 2034.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Area</th>
<th>Public Parking Surplus / Deficit (64% Auto person)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+236 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+623 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-230 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-65 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>+450 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>+284 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although a parking surplus is identified in sub area 1, most of the surplus capacity exists within the leased Public Utility Commission (PUC) parking lot that is remotely located to the southwest of the downtown south of the CN railway. If this lot is excluded, sub area 1 would be approaching a parking deficit.

The provision of convenient short-term parking options for visitors to the downtown core area is important to facilitate business, recreational and personal service activity in the area. With this in mind, the projected parking supply deficit of approximately 200 to 300 public parking spaces in core areas 3 & 4, and potentially adjacent area 1 should be addressed. Given the modest magnitude of the projected localized deficits, participation with developers in joint venture projects to integrate public parking within new developments would likely be sufficient and most effective.

With the public parking supply target described above in mind, a strategy needs to be developed to ensure that public parking is provided in strategic locations throughout the downtown in order to facilitate new development on the many existing surface lots and support existing development by maintaining a reasonable supply of parking for customers and employees.
Temporary Zones for Surface Commercial Parking Lots

Limitations on downtown commercial parking lots could result in a significant reduction in existing parking supply. The eventual development of surface parking lots is a primary driver of a future predicted localized parking deficit. Table 3 below provides an estimate of the potential parking impacts within each of the six sub areas of the downtown based on existing transportation mode split of 73.5% auto-person use and the loss of 243 on-street parking spaces related to city-building projects.

**Table 3** POTENTIAL SHORT TO MID-TERM PARKING IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Area</th>
<th>Public Parking Surplus / Deficit (73.5% Auto person)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+87 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+474 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-125 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+81 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>+338 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>+289 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above, it is recommended that a gradual approach is used to the discontinuation of temporary zone permissions for temporary surface commercial parking lots in downtown where parking utilization is low. This approach should be aligned, as much as possible, with mode share shifts as a result of transportation demand management programs, the implementation of the new rapid transit system in the mid-term and active transportation gains.

**1.5 KEY CONCLUSIONS**

1. The City needs to play a significant role in the provision of off-street public parking facilities in order to facilitate future development in the downtown in accordance with the Council approved Our Move Forward: London’s Downtown Plan and future growth estimates prepared for the Development Charges study.

2. The need for additional shared public parking resources required to facilitate and support growth in the downtown is related to several factors including:
   
a) zoning by-law parking supply requirements for non-residential uses in the downtown are below typical demands;
b) the parking supply typically provided by developers for commercial development is below the typical demand;

c) future redevelopment sites are predominantly located on existing commercial parking lots that would be removed as part of the redevelopment; and

d) future construction projects that will result in the loss of on-street parking within the downtown.

3. The need for additional parking across the study area could be reduced by:

a) continuing to implement Transportation Demand Management (TDM) initiatives focused on increasing mobility options and reducing parking demand over time, especially improved transit service to/from the Downtown;

b) requiring new developments that do not provide the minimum supply of parking required on site to make payment in lieu contributions to the City for the shortfall in order to assist in funding municipal shared public parking resources in key areas.

1.6 KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to effectively address future parking strategy, planning and management challenges, the following key recommendations should be implemented:

1. Explore opportunities to improve coordination of all City owned and controlled on and off-street parking facilities to achieve improved downtown area wide parking management and transportation demand management opportunities.

2. Manage the consolidated parking system by using the Enterprise Model. Under this model, the municipal parking system is managed by a City department on a financially self-sustaining basis including operational and life cycle costs as well as future garage development funding. In order to achieve this objective over time, it is recommended that:

a) Net revenue should be allocated from both on-street and off-street parking operations to a parking reserve fund to assist in financing future shared public parking resources;

b) The proceeds of future parking lot sales should be allocated to the parking reserve fund;

---

1 May affect the general revenues tax base where parking revenue is currently applied.
3. Provide 200 to 300 new public parking spaces over the next twenty years through investing in joint venture projects by participating with developers to integrate public parking in new developments in sub-areas 3, 4 and 1 in central and southwest downtown, in order to facilitate meeting City growth targets and urban design objectives.

   a) New public parking facilities need to be strategically located to facilitate economic development, maximize utilization, minimize development cost, may incorporate mixed use development and grade level commercial space and be designed to reflect the London Plan policies.

   b) Leverage the municipal ownership of existing surface lots to facilitate the provision of public parking in garages that are integrated with new development projects.

4. Amend the Downtown Community Improvement Plan (CIP) to provide the opportunity for Council to enter into a joint venture financial partnership with private developers to provide additional public parking and municipal parking garages in the downtown including the use of grants and density bonusing.

5. Take a gradual approach to the discontinuation of temporary zone permissions for temporary surface commercial parking lots in downtown where there is surplus public parking due to lower parking utilization and aligned with the timing of providing additional parking facilities in the future and the implementation of the new rapid transit system.

   As a starting point, the City should develop an inventory of all existing non-complying downtown surface commercial lots and require each land owner to secure a temporary zone permission in order to maintain operations. Temporary zone permissions should no longer be issued for any new surface parking lots in the downtown.

6. Maintain the current minimum zoning by-law parking supply requirement for new commercial development in the downtown of one space per 90 square metres GFA (1.11 spaces per 1000 square feet) and add bicycle supply requirements.

7. Revise the Payment in Lieu (PIL) parking by-law which would provide the flexibility for the City to require a developer to make a cash payment per space to the City for each parking space they are unable to provide. Set the payment in lieu amount at approximately 50% of the estimated capital cost of providing new public parking in the downtown and allocate payments to the reserve fund for public garages.

8. Continue strengthening TDM activities and awareness in the downtown area including a focus on integrating and aligning current and future business actions with City actions.
9. Ensure that parking facilities that support sustainable mobility choices (e.g., bike parking, car pool spaces, car share, electric vehicle charges, etc.) are positioned to be highly visible and easily accessible.

1.7 PARKING STRATEGY VISION, KEY GOALS & OBJECTIVES

In order to effectively guide and direct the implementation of the Downtown Parking Strategy the following Vision, Mission, Key Goals and Objectives have been established.

1.7.1 Parking Strategy Vision

Enabling the achievement of “Our Move Forward - London’s Downtown Plan” by facilitating the replacement of surface parking with new mixed-use development.

1.7.2 Parking Strategy Mission

The provision of efficient, convenient and cost effective shared public parking resources to support business, personal and social activity in the downtown area.

1.7.3 Parking Strategy Key Goals

The primary goals for the Downtown Parking Strategy are to:

a) Foster Economic Development by assisting the private sector in achieving the development vision for Downtown London through strategic public investment in the provision of municipal parking facilities and transportation options;

b) Support Good Urban Design and contribute to creating a walkable downtown by minimizing surface parking and encouraging higher density development through the use of parking garages that are well located and integrated with primary development;

c) Reduce the demand for parking in the medium and long term by using Transportation Demand Management to influence commuter mode choice through parking supply management and pricing.

1.7.4 Key Objectives

With this in mind the Key Objectives for the Downtown Parking Strategy are to;
1. **Provide Sufficient Shared Public Parking Resources** to serve development and facilitate the conversion of surface parking lots into new mixed use development in accordance with the downtown plan.

   a) Develop urban design and sustainability design guidelines with respect to the renewal of temporary surface parking lot zoning/permits in order to develop these sites.²

   b) Maintain the existing parking supply requirements in the Zoning By-law and implement bicycle supply requirements as recommended in this report.

   c) Invest in the provision of new public parking facilities through investing in joint venture projects by participating with developers to top up or provide additional parking where it is desirable to do so in order to free up existing surface parking lots for new development and make it clear what parking will be available to meet future development needs in a timely manner.

   d) Encourage the provision of public parking in new development projects that seek to exceed the base density permitted in the area.

2. **Integrate Parking Management and Sustainable Mobility Policies and Programs** to encourage the use of active transportation and public transportation options by achieving the following key objectives:

   Implement a comprehensive Transportation Demand Management Plan (TDM) program to reduce the amount of costly parking garage(s) required in the future.

   This program should include local transit improvements, the provision of auto share services, a ride matching service, preferential parking for carpool vehicles, enhanced bicycle parking, electric charging stations, a guaranteed ride home service and the continued use of parking fees for employee parking that are higher than the cost of a transit pass.

3. **Effectively and Efficiently Deliver Shared Public Parking Resources**

In order to effectively and efficiently deliver shared public parking resources, the following key objectives should be achieved:

² City Staff to enforce the June 1995 resolution which required site plan approval and temporary zoning for all surface parking lots created after 1995.
a) The management and operations of all City controlled on and off street parking facilities and future garages should be closely coordinated in order to facilitate strategic planning, as well as consistent management, branding and marketing.

b) Continue the development of the web based parking information system that would identify the location, pricing and availability of parking at city owned/controlled parking facilities and seek to expand the system in the future to include larger private parking facilities where feasible;

c) Actively seek to employ the latest customer payment technologies including cell phone payment systems for both on and off street parking and pay by plate systems for on-street and off-street lots;

d) Actively identify locations to increase the supply of public off-street parking in garages that are integrated with mixed use development;

e) Develop a financial plan to enable the municipal parking system to operate on a financially self-sustaining Enterprise Model basis over the long term (i.e. 20 years) that will:

i. Increase the allocation of on and off street parking net revenue to the parking capital reserve fund in order to finance future parking facilities;

ii. Allocate the proceeds of any existing parking lot land sales to the parking capital reserve fund;

iii. Allocate development charge proceeds related to new downtown parking facilities to the parking capital reserve fund;

iv. Revise and renew a payment in lieu of parking program for new development and deposit the proceeds into the parking capital reserve fund;

v. Identify future capital expenditures in the City budget for the development of new public parking facilities over the next twenty years.

An Action Plan in table format is provided in Table 4 which summarizes the Key Goals and Objectives by time frame.
### Table 4: Downtown London Parking Strategy Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY GOALS &amp; OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>Short-Term (2018-2025)</th>
<th>Mid to Long-Term (2025-34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Take a gradual approach to the discontinuation of temporary zone permissions for temporary surface commercial parking lots in downtown where there is surplus public parking due to low parking utilization.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop urban design and sustainability design guidelines for the renewal of temporary surface parking lot zoning/permits in order to enhance the downtown environment.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain the existing parking supply requirements in the Zoning By-law and implement bicycle supply requirements as recommended in this report.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invest in the provision of new integrated public parking facilities in partnership with new developments in Sub-areas 3, 4 and 1 in order to free up existing surface parking lots for new development. Make it clear what parking will be available to meet future development needs in a timely manner.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the provision of public parking in new development projects that seek to exceed the base density permitted in the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement a comprehensive Transportation Demand Management Plan (TDM) program to reduce the amount of costly parking garage(s) required in the future.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore Opportunities to improve coordination of all City owned and controlled on- and off-street parking facilities to achieve improved downtown area wide parking management and transportation demand management opportunities.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a common branding program for the existing municipal parking system.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a web based parking information system that would identify the location, pricing and availability of parking at city owned/controlled parking facilities and seek to expand the system to include larger private parking facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively seek to employ the latest customer payment technologies including cell phone payment systems for both on and off street parking and pay by plate systems for on-street and off-street lots.</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively identify locations to increase the supply of public off-street parking in garages that are integrated with mixed use development.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**KEY GOALS & OBJECTIVES**

| Develop a financial plan that will allow the municipal parking system to operate on a financially self-sustaining Enterprise Model basis over the long term (i.e. 20 years) that will: |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| I. Increase the allocation of on and off street parking revenue to the parking capital reserve fund in order to finance future parking facilities; |
| II. Allocate the proceeds of any existing parking lot land sales to the parking capital reserve fund; |
| III. Allocate development charge proceeds related to new downtown parking facilities to the parking capital reserve fund; |
| IV. Revise and renew a payment in lieu of parking program for new development and deposit the proceeds into the parking capital reserve fund; |
| V. Identify future capital expenditures in the City budget for the development of new structured public facilities over the next twenty years. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short-Term (2018-2025)</th>
<th>Mid to Long-Term (2025-34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1 STUDY PURPOSE

The City has recently completed a number of planning, urban design and transportation studies that support the future development of the downtown. The provision, management and supply of parking is an area of special relevance to the successful implementation of the “Our Move Forward: London’s Downtown Plan” (herein referred to as the Downtown Plan). Determining how much parking is necessary for the functional and economic viability of downtown development programs and the success of the downtown transit hub as well as how the right amount of parking is provided are critical ingredients for future success.

The key to future development in the downtown will be the replacement of existing surface parking lots with new mixed-use developments. Determining how much parking is required, how it is provided, what role the City should play in meeting future parking demand, the financial implications associated with providing new parking and the most appropriate municipal service delivery model to employ in order to maximize the return on investment of public funds are critical considerations in the development of a parking management strategy for the downtown.

In order to advance the Downtown Plan, the City has retained BA Group in collaboration with Kimley Horn and Read Jones Christoffersen to prepare a parking management strategy that examines in depth the key considerations mentioned above, with a view to developing a specific plan of action for the City.

2.2 BACKGROUND

Our Move Forward: London’s Downtown Plan

In April 2015, London City Council adopted a plan for the downtown entitled “Our Move Forward: London’s Downtown Plan”. This plan provided seven strategic directions and described ten transformational projects that would ensure the continued success of the downtown well into the future. The plan identified many underutilized sites that were primarily surface parking lots. Of these sites, twenty were identified as opportunity sites where new development could bridge street wall gaps and/or link key activity generators and therefore should be viewed as strategic priority locations for redevelopment.

Improving transportation access to/from downtown by increasing transit service, enhancing the cycling and pedestrian network are also identified in the Downtown Plan as important goals for long term sustainable development. Managing transportation demand over the medium to long term is an important element of a municipal parking strategy because it will, if done effectively, reduce demand for expensive parking garage spaces, thereby improving development economics and minimizing the amount of space required for parking. It will also facilitate higher density development and the demand for active transportation.
Downtown London Parking Study 2014 Update
The Downtown London Parking Study 2014 update determined that there currently is sufficient public and private parking throughout the downtown area as a whole with some localized areas that are close to practical operating capacity. This study also noted that parking prices are generally lower than other similar sized municipalities and that pricing for municipal facilities tends to be up to 20% lower than for private facilities. It also provided some high level preliminary suggestions on how to modify the existing disaggregated municipal parking operation in order improve service delivery and support downtown development.

Rapid Transit EA (Shift)
In September 2014, Council initiated an Environmental Assessment (EA) process (also called Shift) to identify and examine options for rapid transit in London. This will lead the way to implement several improvements to London’s transit system including a plan to provide bus rapid transit service to and through the downtown area. It is expected that these new transit initiatives will reduce the demand for single occupant vehicle travel and parking in the downtown over time. This will assist in reducing future development costs associated with replacing existing parking that serves existing uses as well as new parking required to service new development.

Cycling Master Plan (London ON Bikes)
In September 2016 the City of London finalized its Cycling Master Plan (London ON Bikes). The Cycling Master Plan was developed as a guide for the City’s future cycling network including the identification of key routes, supportive programming and a recommended investment and implementation strategy to 2031. The plan identifies an opportunity to create a City-wide network that accommodates both commuters and recreational uses and encourages cycling as a sustainable mode of travel. Short-term and long-term priorities were established to help guide the development of the network. Six supporting objectives are identified to support the achievement of the Cycling Master Plan’s vision including 1) Connectivity, 2) Consistency, 3) Comfort, 4) Maintenance, 5) Prioritization, and 6) Promotion.

Development Charge By-Law
The City is currently updating the Development Charge By-Law and Background Study for the year 2019. The transportation component of the background study, last completed in 2014, is aimed at identifying the costs of growth-related transportation projects that are attributable to new development over a 20-year horizon period.

Existing Parking Management and Operation
The City owns and/or controls a total of 2,664 parking spaces in six surface parking lots, three parking garages and on-street parking in the downtown area.

The three parking garages (1,262 spaces) are owned by the City but controlled by two separate entities – the London Convention Centre with 312 spaces beneath the centre and the Covent Garden Market Corporation that controls the Market garage (416 spaces) as well as the City Hall garage (534 spaces). The net revenues associated with these
garages are utilized to offset the operating costs of the Convention Centre and the Market under terms of their development mandates. The daily operation of each of the garages is contracted out to a private parking management and operations company at the present time.

Most of the remaining 1,402 spaces are managed and operated by the City including 744 spaces in six surface lots and 658 on-street parking spaces. One of the six surface parking lots (Museum London’s parking lot on Ridout Street) is owned by the London Art Gallery, but managed by the City. Another surface parking lot is owned by the Public Utility Commission (PUC) and leased by the City. The PUC lot is very large (427 parking spaces) but remotely located to the southwest of the downtown and has very low utilization rate in the weekend indicating it is not preferred by visitors. The City also operates additional on-street and surface lot parking outside the downtown area, including two park and ride lots near Dundas Street to the east of the downtown. The City keeps 50% of the transit service fee for parking and 50% of the fee goes to the London Transit Commission (LTC) for transit.

2.3 SUPPORTING POLICY FRAMEWORK

The City has incorporated a number of parking policies into their planning documents to help guide development within the Downtown.

The London Plan (2016)
The London Plan will become the City of London’s new Official Plan (adopted by Council on June 23, 2016) once appeals have been resolved and the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) approves the Plan. The London Plan includes a number of transportation policies that recommend guiding principles for compact and sustainable developments, optimization of existing and new infrastructure and strategically locating these facilities to foster sustainable community development.

The London Plan includes policies which; support the development of parking structures either above or below ground in the downtown, do not permit surface accessory or commercial parking lots in the downtown, support the provision of public parking facilities to support transit networks, have parking standards, and support cash-in-lieu of parking, municipal parking and bonus zoning. Future growth is expected to be transit-supportive and sustainable. This includes the reduction of parking demands through the use of active transportation and transit, particularly within intensification areas.

Relevant Sections of the Plan include City Building/City Design (Policies 270-283), City Building Policies/Mobility (Policies 366-369) and Place Type Policies/Downtown (Policy 800 (4) and (5).

City of London Official Plan (1989)
The City’s current Official Plan was adopted by Council on June 19, 1989. Key policies from the Plan are included in Sections 4.1.6 viii) (Commercial Parking Structures and Surface Parking Lots), 4.1.10 (Parking) and 19.4.4 (Bonus Zoning). These policies support
the provision of parking structures, discourage surface parking lots in the Downtown and provide for cash-in-lieu of providing parking, Transportation Demand Management Strategies and Bonus Zoning.

**Our Move Forward: London’s Downtown Plan (2015)**
In April 2015, London City Council adopted a plan for the downtown entitled “Our Move Forward: London’s Downtown Plan”. This plan provided seven strategic directions and described ten transformational projects (e.g. Dundas Place) that would ensure the continued success of the downtown well into the future. The plan identified many underutilized sites that were primarily surface parking lots. Of these sites, over twenty were identified as opportunity sites where new development could bridge street wall gaps and/or link key activity generators and therefore should be viewed as strategic priority locations for redevelopment.

**City of London Zoning By-law Z-1**
The City of London’s Zoning By-law (In force and effect July 1, 1993) includes a specific Downtown (DA) Zone, contains parking standards based on use and location within the City, bonus provisions, bicycle parking requirements and parking reduction incentives (i.e. reduction in the number of parking spaces required in exchange for additional bicycle parking spaces). It also includes a Temporary Use (T) Zone which has been used to permit temporary surface parking lots in the past. The City also has a site plan control By-law that applies to surface parking lots.

The Downtown Design Manual was created to help guide public and private development projects in the Downtown consistent with Downtown policies within the Official Plan, London’s Downtown Plan and the Downtown Heritage Conservation District Plan. The Manual will be used for all new and retrofit private development projects as well as any road reconstruction and public space projects that will be undertaken on public property. Built form and site design guidelines include provisions for appropriate parking lot design, landscaping, and parking structures.

**City of London’s 2030 Transportation Master Plan**
The New Mobility Transportation Master Plan (2030 TMP) builds upon the recommendations from the City’s other policies and studies to provide long-term strategic planning direction to Council including the viability of introducing a rapid transit system across the City. Transportation policies, including management and operational improvements, are outlined to assist with the reduction of single occupant vehicles. Five “Smart Moves” form the basis of the TMP:

- Rethinking Growth to Support the Transportation Master Plan
- Taking Transit to the Next Level
- Actively Managing Transportation Demand
- Greater Investment in Cycling and Walking Infrastructure
- More Strategic Program of Road Network Improvements
Policies include appropriate parking pricing, locating parking in areas that are transit supportive (outside the downtown core), providing park and ride facilities, bicycle parking, and capitalizing on redevelopment opportunities of surface parking lots.

2.4 STUDY SCOPE

The report includes a review of the following key elements for the parking strategy:

1. A review of background studies and conditions
2. Establishment of vision, goals, and objectives of the strategy
3. A review of future development potential within the study area (over the short- and long-term timeframes).
4. The opportunities to potentially reduce future parking demands using Transportation Demand Management initiatives and future mode split targets.
5. A discussion on the rationale for a public sector role in providing parking to support good urban design, economic development and transportation demand management.
6. A review of best practices
7. A review of parking management and operating models
8. The development of a parking strategy action plan for the future.

The Downtown study area is bounded generally by the CNR rail line to the south, Colborne Street to the east, Kent Street and Princess Avenue to the north and Thames River to the west. The overall study boundary is illustrated in Figure 2.
3.0 STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION

3.1 CONSULTATION PROCESS

Stakeholder consultation has been undertaken in order to inform and guide the process. A meeting with key stakeholders was held early on in the study (March 22, 2016) to discuss existing parking operations, general area parking demands, vacancies and the opportunity to provide feedback in the early stages of the study. Consultation included meetings with the following stakeholders:

- Downtown London
- Downtown Retailers and Restaurant Operators
- Large Downtown Employers
- Private Parking Operators
- Land Owners and Developers

A parking strategy stakeholder report was prepared to summarize the input received and is attached in Appendix A.

3.2 STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS

Stakeholder comments solicited through the consultation process were considered when developing this parking strategy. An overview of the comments that were received is summarized below.

- Different ownership and control of parking and enforcement can result in an inconsistent experience for customers. Similar inconsistencies exist with signage, wayfinding, and event parking rates.

- There is a perception that paid parking discourages people from coming into the downtown.

- Concern surrounding the affordability of short-term and monthly parking rates.

- Support to introduce technologies to improve paid parking experience (e.g. pay by phone).

- Concern over existing amount of vacant office space in downtown, and impact on parking that could arise if floor space is occupied, and that no planning permissions would be required to do so.

- Parking structures are a logical solution to ultimate loss of surface parking lots, but customer’s willingness to pay increased parking fees will be an issue.
• Recent Renaissance development provided public parking as benefit to City. Desire to see more of this.

• Distance and perception of personal safety are issues in securing parking for employees.

• Desire to have one inventory/source (such as an on-line map) for finding parking would be a benefit to users.

• New Fanshawe College location downtown will add additional staff parking demands.

• Perception that parking is not available in the downtown (notwithstanding that some private lots are consistently underutilized). Expectation that parking should be available immediately adjacent to a destination.

• Interest in public/private partnerships for parking in order to make efficient use of parking resources.

• Desire to provide secure, weather protected bicycle parking.
4.0 EXISTING PARKING INVENTORY & PEAK OCCUPANCY

A number of parking studies for the downtown have been conducted in order to understand parking utilization trends and support long-term planning initiatives. MMM Group was retained by the City to prepare a Downtown London Parking Study 2014 Update and 2014 Downtown London Parking Needs Assessment. Updated parking counts were undertaken as part of this work in September 2014 which found a peak utilization of 71% across the downtown with localized demands of up to 89% in certain core areas of the downtown. To put this into perspective, 90% utilization is considered a maximum practical occupancy level at which there is still sufficient available parking across downtown, however certain areas may require drivers to search more for available parking and accept longer walking distances.

Table 5 provides an excerpt of the parking supply and peak demand findings across the Downtown by type of parking facility as discussed in the 2014 Downtown London Parking Needs Assessment (Table 3A – Peak Parking Demand by Facilities during the Overall Peak Parking Demand Period (12:00 pm), Tuesday, September 16, 2014).

Table 5 PEAK PARKING DEMAND BY FACILITY TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Parking Supply</th>
<th>Overall Peak Parking Demand</th>
<th>Utilization Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Parking Lots/Structures</td>
<td>1,953</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Pay Lots</td>
<td>3,820</td>
<td>2,811</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Structures</td>
<td>3,413</td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Reserved Lots/Structures</td>
<td>3,653</td>
<td>2,411</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Miscellaneous Lots</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Private Public Free Parking Lots</td>
<td>1,766</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Street Parking</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,436</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,953</strong></td>
<td><strong>71%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Publicly Available Parking</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,897</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,660</strong></td>
<td><strong>77%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Free parking for customers and/or staff (e.g., Tim Hortons). Generally available for the general public that uses the associated services.

There are four categories of public parking identified in Table 5 (Municipal Parking Lots/Structures, Public Pay Lots, Public Structures, and On-Street Parking). The total parking supply available for public use across the downtown is 9,897 spaces with a peak demand of 7,658 spaces (77% occupied). As noted in Section 2.2, the City owns and/or controls a total of 2,664 spaces in six surface parking lots, three garages and on-street parking. The three garages are owned by the City but operated by others and one of the surface lots is leased by the City. While each of these garages is intended to serve the buildings above them, they also provide monthly and hourly parking for people in the
general vicinity. Both the Covent Garden Market Corporation and the London Convention Centre benefit from parking revenues and include this funding in their budgets.

Therefore approximately 17% of the overall public and private parking supply in the downtown area is controlled by the City, including the three garages. The locations of the municipally controlled off-street parking facilities are illustrated on Figure 3. Based on other similar studies, municipalities which play a strong role in providing shared public parking resources to support development generally control approximately 35% to 50% of the total parking in key areas. Examples include the Cities of Kitchener (41%), Barrie (50%), Brampton (57%), Oakville (60%), Oshawa (70%) and Waterloo (70%).

Detailed parking occupancy data is available in the 2014 parking study for each block in the downtown and for six sub-areas. Figure 4 illustrates the six sub-areas and the peak weekday occupancy levels for each area as observed in 2014. This information has been utilized as base data for the future development assessment described later in this report.

The existing parking occupancy levels achieved in most of the study sub-areas is well below the 85% to 90% threshold typically considered to indicate a parking supply shortfall. It should also be noted that many of the private parking facilities not available to the public have significant vacancies as well, some of which could be used to accommodate additional parking demands generated by absorption of existing vacant office space. However the following points should be noted:

- While there is sufficient vacant public parking available in the downtown, the occupancy rates in the central core area zones 3 and 4 are at 89% and 81% respectively which may be making it difficult for visitors to conveniently find parking in these areas.

- Because the City controls a relatively small portion of the overall parking supply compared to most mid-sized municipalities, it has limited scope to assist in providing parking to meet increased demand or significant losses in existing parking supply, particularly in the core area.

The zoning by-law applicable to the downtown requires parking to be provided for new non-residential development at a rate of 1 parking space per 90 square metres of gross floor area or 1.11 spaces per 100 square metres. Based upon the information in the 2014 Parking Needs Study, the overall parking supply rate in the downtown area is approximately 2.14 spaces per 100 square metres of occupied non-residential floor area compared to a total observed demand rate of 1.52 spaces per 100 square metres. It is important to note that the existing parking demand and supply rates are well in excess of the zoning by-law supply requirement.

The City also has a Payment in Lieu (PIL) parking by-law that considers requests to make a cash payment per space for any parking that a new development is not able to provide. To date, there has been little or no use of this provision because existing buildings are exempt, there has been little new commercial space construction and some projects have applied
for a variance to reduce the parking supply requirement rather than provide payment in lieu. As existing vacant building space becomes occupied, this will place additional demand on the existing surface parking lots serving the general area.
OFF-STREET PARKING FACILITIES

Owned or Leased by the City
CURRENT PARKING UTILIZATION BY AREA

Figure 4
5.0 FUTURE DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATIONS

One of the key components of the parking strategy is an assessment of future growth and its impact on future parking conditions and requirements, including the role that the City could play in facilitating development from a parking perspective. As mentioned earlier, the Downtown Plan describes the City’s planning vision for future public and private development across the downtown.

There are many land parcels within the downtown area that have been identified as potential long-term development sites. Figure 5 illustrates the location of potential future development sites, most of which consist of existing surface parking lots. A number of these sites are currently occupied by publicly available parking facilities which will be removed as a result of future redevelopment. As development occurs, the displacement of these surface parking lots with new developments will reduce the amount of parking available. This displacement could be partly offset by requiring the construction of standardized, structured public parking integrated in future developments. Since redevelopment plans for most of these sites are not available at this time, future development assumptions were made based on the population and employee estimates that have been prepared for the City’s Development Charge study. These estimates assume that approximately 3700 new residents and 300 new employees will be located in the downtown area by 2034.

To date, most existing office buildings in the downtown have been under supplying on-site parking to meet actual demand, relying on off-site parking in other lots to accommodate the difference. In contrast, most new residential developments with limited grade related commercial space appear to be supplying enough parking on site to meet actual demand. However, as mentioned in the introduction and background sections of this report, most of the surface parking lots in the downtown area would have to be redeveloped to meet the City’s desired development vision for the area. Since these surface parking lots presently accommodate employees and some visitors from nearby buildings, a significant portion of this parking would have to be replaced in order to avoid creating a parking shortfall and leasing challenge for existing commercial space.

The following sections review the potential parking impacts associated with future development across the study area. The net parking impact is based on the proposed parking supply for the development after subtracting the estimated parking demand generated by the future development as well as the existing peak parking demand on the site if it currently operated as a parking lot. Existing public parking vacancies on remaining parking facilities have been utilized to help offset any excess demand that exceeds the supply provided on-site for the new development. A 10% vacancy buffer (i.e. maximum 90% peak occupancy level) has been maintained within the publicly available parking supply in order to allow people to find a vacant parking space in a reasonable amount of time.

Several locations that currently provide public parking have been identified as potential future development sites across the study area. The vacant parking supply available within
these lots during the peak parking demand period has been removed from the total vacant publicly available parking as they will no longer be available for use.

5.1 POTENTIAL PUBLIC PARKING SUPPLY IMPACTS

As discussed in Section 4.0, there are a total of 9,897 public parking spaces across the downtown. It is recommended that a minimum 10% vacancy buffer should be maintained within the publicly available parking supply in order to allow people to find a vacant parking space in a reasonable amount of time. Application of a 10% vacancy buffer to the public parking supply leaves a total of 8,907 spaces available for public use.

Redeveloping existing surface lots will present a significant challenge as many existing employers and employees rely on the use of the existing lots and the new buildings may generate parking demand in excess of the new parking supply provided. Some new developments, especially commercial space projects, may not provide any parking (opting instead to pay cash-in-lieu) or only provide a portion of their actual needs (i.e. meet the minimum Zoning By-law requirements), which will create additional demand for new off-site parking unless:

- Public transit use increases substantially (significant reduction in auto driver mode split);
- New developments increase the amount of parking they provide to meet their own needs and/or the City assists in meeting some of the demand with public parking garages; and
- There is a cultural shift in the demand for parking.

There are several construction projects in the near future that will result in the loss of on-street parking within the downtown including the full Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system, Dundas Street revitalization project (Dundas Place), bus rerouting off Dundas Street, and cycle tracks on Colborne Street.

City Council has approved a full BRT system for London. The rapid transit plan is illustrated on Figure 6 which will provide dedicated bus lanes and enhance transit service across the City. Two BRT routes are being contemplated (north-east and south-west routes) including a central transfer station in the Downtown. The estimated impact of these two BRT routes is a loss of up to 179 on-street parking spaces.

The Dundas Street revitalization project will result in a loss of 18 on-street parking spaces, bus rerouting off Dundas Street will result in the loss of 24 on-street parking spaces, while the cycle tracks on Colborne Street will lose 22 on-street parking spaces.
POTENTIAL FUTURE DEVELOPMENT SITES

Figure 5

Sites for which development applications have been submitted or had a pre consultation with the City of London

1. 555 Talbot Street (under construction)
2. 100 Fullarton Street
3. 455 Clarence Street
4. 52 King Street
5. 195 Dundas Street
6. 352 & 365 Dundas Street
7. 89 York Street
8. 70-74 Fullarton Street
9. 509 Clarence Street
10. 465 Clarence Street
11. 255 Dufferin Avenue
12. 100 Queen Avenue
13. 189 Queen Avenue
14. 221 Queen Avenue
15. 50 Dundas Street
16. 285 - 323 Dundas Street
17. 75 King Street
18. 131 King Street
19. 196 York Street
20. 57, 71, 73, 85 York Street & 300 Wellington St North
21. 195-197 York Street
22. 287 York Street
23. 301 York Street
24. 331 Talbot Street
25. 332-334 York Street & 299-305 King St.
26. 342 - 380 York Street
27. 305 Queen Avenue
28. 130-134 Cadman Street & 125-127 Queen Avenue
29. 141 Dufferin Avenue

Opportunity Sites identified in "Our Move Forward - London's Downtown Plan" and additional sites identified by City of London staff.
The total loss of on-street parking resulting from the above capital mobility improvement projects within downtown is approximately 243 parking spaces. Within the short term, this loss of public parking spaces will not result in any deficit in public parking since existing demands can be accommodated by the overall parking supply.

The City of London 2030 Transportation Master Plan anticipates increased transit and non-auto use related to the proposed improvements in City wide transit service, including the introduction of two Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) lines that will substantially improve transit accessibility to/from the downtown area. Based upon the information in the London 2030 TMP and subsequent BRT Business Case Analysis, the auto person trip use and parking demand has been assumed to decline from 73.5% today to 64.0% auto person use by 2034. These reductions in auto use and parking demand would apply to future new development and also reduce the existing level of parking demand by an amount equivalent to the reduction in automobile mode split.

5.2 LONG-TERM DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATIONS

Many of the long-term development sites are currently occupied by publicly available parking facilities. This parking supply would be lost as a result of the redevelopment of these sites and the existing demands would be displaced.

It has been assumed that approximately 5.4 acres of surface parking have been used to develop 2175 new apartment units at 1000 units per hectare. At 1.7 people per unit, this would result in 3697 new residents by 2034 as per the 2014 Development Charges study. It has also been assumed that all residential uses will provide sufficient parking to accommodate the residential parking demands for each site (i.e. approximately 1 space per unit) even though the zoning by-law does not require the provision of parking. The net parking impact for each development is based on the proposed parking supply for the development after subtracting the estimated parking demand generated by the future development as well as the existing peak parking demand on the site if it currently operated as a parking lot.

It has been assumed that the projected 306 new employees by 2034 are accommodated in existing vacant office space and no new parking supply is provided for them. Based upon the projected mode split in 2034, this would generate a demand for approximately 150 additional parking spaces.

The expected increase in transit use equates to a decrease in parking demand of approximately 13%. These reductions in auto use and parking demand would apply to future new development and also reduce the existing level of parking demand.

---

3 The reduction in auto mode split as a percentage is (73.5-64)/73.5 x 100 = 12.93% (13% rounded) which is equivalent to a decline in demand from 7,660 to 6,670 spaces by 2034.
Figure 6

FUTURE CONCEPTUAL RAPID TRANSIT NETWORK
Existing public parking vacancies on remaining parking facilities have been utilized to help offset any excess demand that exceeds the supply provided on-site for the new development. A 10% vacancy buffer (i.e. maximum 90% peak occupancy level) has been maintained within the publicly available parking supply in order to allow motorists to find a vacant parking space in a reasonable amount of time.

An overview of the net parking impacts associated with long term redevelopment (taking into account the need to replace existing public parking demands) is provided in Table 6.

### Table 6  Potential Long Term Parking Impacts 2034 Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mode Split 64% Auto person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Public Parking Supply</td>
<td>9897 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Public Parking Supply Losses (New Development)</td>
<td>-780 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundas Street Revitalization (Loss of On-Street Parking)</td>
<td>-18 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT Network (Loss of On-Street Parking)</td>
<td>-179 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus rerouting off Dundas Street (Loss of On-Street Parking)</td>
<td>-24 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colborne Street (Loss of On-Street Parking for Cycle Track)</td>
<td>-22 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Public Parking Supply</td>
<td>8,874 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peak Public Parking Demands (Based on 64% auto mode share by year 2034 resulting in parking demand decrease of approximately 13 %)</td>
<td>6,670 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Development Demands (to meet 2034 Employment Targets)</td>
<td>150 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Public Parking Demand</td>
<td>6,820 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Supply Required to Achieve 90% Occupancy</td>
<td>7,576 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Parking Surplus / Deficit @90% occupancy (8874 – 7576 = 1298)</td>
<td>+1,298 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 6 above, notwithstanding the long-term 2034 population and employment growth forecasts and capital mobility improvement projects within downtown, an overall parking surplus of approximately 1,298 spaces across the downtown would still be available, however all the vacant spaces would not necessarily be convenient for visitors to the downtown core to easily find short term parking.

In order to determine locations within the downtown area where future parking deficit may exist, future public parking supply and demand were reviewed for each sub-area within downtown. Table 7 provides an estimate of the potential future parking impacts within each
of the six sub-areas of the downtown (see Figure 4 for sub-area locations) based on a transportation mode split of 64% auto-person use by 2034. Parking shortfalls and surpluses within each sub area continue to range significantly with significant parking supply deficits for parking projected in core area zones 3 and 4 by 2034.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Areas</th>
<th>Public Parking Surplus / Deficit (64% Auto person)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+236 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+623 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-230 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-65 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>+450 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>+284 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although a parking surplus is identified in sub area 1, most of the surplus capacity exists within the leased Public Utility Commission (PUC) parking lot that is remotely located to the southwest of the downtown south of the CN railway. Sub area 1 is projected to be approaching a parking deficit when excluding the remote PUC parking lot.

The provision of convenient short term parking options for visitors to the downtown core area is important to facilitate business, recreational, and personal service activity in the area. With this in mind, the projected parking supply deficit of approximately 200 to 300 public parking spaces in core areas 3 & 4, and potentially adjacent area 1 should be addressed. Given the modest magnitude of the projected localized deficits, participation with developers in joint venture projects to integrate public parking within new developments would likely be sufficient and most effective.

Mixed-use development partnerships are preferable to constructing standalone parking garages when considering city-building and the goals of the Downtown Plan. Mixed use developments can maximize the financial opportunity on a site, add important residential and employment opportunities in the downtown, and establish active frontages with commercial and other uses at street level. The design of these facilities will be important and new guidelines should be prepared to provide design guidance for new parking structures to support downtown vitality.
5.3 FUTURE PUBLIC PARKING SUPPLY OPTIONS

As summarized in Table 7 in Section 5.2, approximately 300 public parking spaces would have to be provided or facilitated by the City by 2034 in order to accommodate the anticipated future growth in the downtown. Should employment growth and parking demand materialize at a slower growth rate, building these spaces in advance will also facilitate future development by freeing up surface parking lots.

With the public parking supply target described above in mind, a strategy is needed to ensure that public parking is provided in strategic locations throughout the downtown in order to facilitate new development on the many existing surface lots and support existing development by maintaining a reasonable supply of parking for customers and employees.

Options for meeting the additional need for public parking include:

1. **Redeveloping Existing City Surface Lots**

   The City currently owns and/or operates six surface parking lots (see Figure 3) in the downtown area with a total of 744 spaces. Two of the lots are small in size (i.e. 29 spaces or less) while the other four lots range in size from 69 spaces to 427 spaces. The two larger lots in sub-areas 1 & 4 could be used to provide additional parking to meet the anticipated need for shared public parking resources described above. They could be viewed as future sites for mixed use development, including retail-commercial, office, hotel and residential apartments, where shared public parking would be provided in addition to the parking required to support the new development.

   Two of the larger surface lots (Budweiser Gardens, and Queens Avenue) are well located within the downtown area. The size and shape of the Queens Avenue parking lot could be improved by utilizing adjacent land which would then allow larger more efficient parking garages to be provided. A review of existing land titles and encumbrances would be required to determine if this is feasible. The third lot (PUC parking lot) is very large but remotely located to the southwest of the downtown on leased land so people would only find it attractive if the price was significantly lower than more centrally located lots, and a downtown shuttle bus would probably be required to overcome the remote location. However, shifting some employee parking demand to this location from the core area of the downtown would free up visitor parking in the downtown.

2. **Acquiring Strategically Located Sites**

   The City could strategically acquire new sites for a potential public parking garage, preferably in the central core or nearby within downtown that would be able to provide relatively large and efficient parking floorplates and also include mixed use development in conjunction with public parking. In order to enable the construction of
an efficient public parking garage (in case of a standalone parking garage), it is recommended that the following criteria is considered:

**Size and shape of a site:** A minimum width of two parking modules or bays is required, preferably three so that an internal ramp can be provided that is hidden from view and which enables the provision of grade level commercial space. A minimum site length that would allow for the use of an efficient sloped floor parking ramp with a 5% grade should be provided. Using these criteria, a minimum width of 37 meters (55.5 meters for three bays) and a minimum length of 85 meters would be required. The minimum sized floor plates will generally provide about 130 (2 bays) to 185 (3 bays) parking spaces per level, except for the grade level. The site should also have good access and be able to accommodate mixed use development.

**Location:** Most of the parking will likely be used for employees who could be expected to walk up to 400 to 800 meters. However parking for short term duration visitors to the downtown would be half the employee distance – 200 to 400 meters.

**Height:** A maximum of six (6) levels in one direction, preferably four (4) levels.

### 3. Providing Public Parking in New Development Projects

Providing public parking spaces in smaller quantities in several private development projects as part of the development approval process either as City investments or as private investments in return for density bonusing, or some combination thereof.

The Downtown Community Improvement Plan (CIP) should be amended to clearly allow for joint-venture projects with developers, where appropriate, to encourage the construction of public parking facilities within private new developments. This could consist of City owned or leased parking spaces that would be operated as public parking spaces. The CIP should also allow the City to provide incentives for developers to provide public parking through the use of grants that would offset the realty taxes and or development charges associated with the provision of the public parking.

Policy 1652 (subsections 11 and 14) in the draft London Plan permits type 2 Bonus Zoning for the following parking related items:

(11) The provision of commuter parking facilities on site, available to the general public.

(14) Car parking, car sharing and bicycle sharing facilities all accessible to the general public.

The zoning by-law should be amended to reflect the potential use of a development bonus for the provision of public parking facilities, by exempting the added floor area from GFA calculations or permitting additional development density in return.
It is important to ensure that public parking facilities that are incorporated in new private development projects meet appropriate functional design requirements for safe, effective and convenient use by the public and that the cost per space is reasonable in comparison to typical public parking garage costs.

While much of the new parking demand generated by employment growth could be accommodated in parking facilities that are five or ten minutes walking distance (i.e. 400 to 800 metres) from the place of employment, it will be important to provide and maintain a reasonable amount of parking within shorter walking distance (i.e. 400 metres or less) of retail and service uses because people travelling to these locations are much more convenience oriented. It is also important to prioritize the utilization of sites that are the right size and shape to efficiently provide parking at a reasonable cost. Given these locational and design considerations, the optimum solution in meeting the need for shared public parking resources will require a combination of all three options noted above. It is preferred that future public parking facilities be part of a mixed-use project with active frontages at grade and in line with the City’s Urban Design Guidelines and not free standing parking garages.

5.4 TEMPORARY COMMERCIAL PARKING LOTS

On September 15, 2015, City Council directed staff to report back on the status of all downtown commercial parking lots to confirm that temporary zoning has been applied and that temporary use zoning discourages more commercial parking lots. Limitations on downtown commercial parking could result in a substantial reduction in existing parking supply if they are incorporated widely and quickly. The eventual development of surface parking lots is a primary driver of a future predicted localized parking deficit.

After the expected on-street parking losses related to the capital mobility improvement projects, the overall occupancy levels of the existing parking system are anticipated to increase from 77% to 79%, leaving approximately 1145 vacant parking spaces that could be eliminated and still maintain a 90% overall occupancy level. However some of these vacant spaces could be required to accommodate increased employment in the area. In addition, while the overall downtown area has a significant surplus of publicly available parking, parking occupancy levels in the central core area are at 89% and 81% respectively in sub-areas 3 and 4 as shown in Figure 4. The implementation of the BRT system, Dundas Place, bus rerouting off Dundas Street, and cycle tracks on Colborne Street will result in a loss of approximately 95 short term visitor parking spaces in the core area (sub-areas 3 and 4), thereby increasing the occupancy rate to 95% and 84% respectively. It is desirable to have parking occupancy rates at 90% in order to provide enough vacant parking to allow people to find a space in a reasonable amount of time, especially short term visitors. Therefore, reducing temporary zone parking in the core area should be carefully considered in terms of its impact on short term parking availability. In contrast, existing parking occupancies in the outer areas (sub-areas 2, 5, & 6) of the downtown could absorb reductions in existing surface lot supply with much less impact.
Table 8 below provides an estimate of the potential parking impacts within each of the six sub areas of the downtown based on existing transportation mode split of 73.5% auto-person use and the loss of 243 on-street parking spaces related to city-building projects.

**TABLE 8  POTENTIAL SHORT TO MID-TERM PARKING IMPACTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Area</th>
<th>Public Parking Surplus / Deficit (73.5% Auto person)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+87 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+474 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-125 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+81 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>+338 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>+289 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above, it is recommended that a gradual approach to the discontinuation of temporary zone permissions for temporary surface commercial parking lots in the downtown for areas where parking utilization is low. This approach should be aligned, as much as possible, with mode share shifts as a result of transportation demand management programs, the implementation of the new rapid transit system in the mid-term and active transportation gains.

As a first step, an accurate inventory of all existing non-complying downtown surface commercial lots should be undertaken. All lots identified as non-compliant should be required to obtain a temporary zone permission in order to maintain operations. Failure to secure a temporary zone permission should result in the lot no longer being permitted to operate. The temporary zone permissions should be planned to expire on a gradual basis as the rapid transit system is implemented and new public parking is added to specific areas. Temporary zone permissions should be discontinued for any new surface parking lot in the downtown.

It will be important that the development of these surface parking lots over time re-enforces an active streetscape by ensuring that commercial spaces and other active uses are constructed on the ground floor of any new parking or mixed-use structures.
6.0 RATIONALE FOR MUNICIPAL PARKING

Looking to the future, the parking demand generated by new development combined with the loss of existing surface lots that will become future development sites will present a transformation challenge because many existing employers and employees rely on the use of the existing lots. Since most new commercial developments will likely provide only enough parking to meet approximately half of their actual needs, new development will create substantial additional demand for new off-site parking unless public transit use increases substantially, existing public and private parking resources are managed more efficiently and new developments increase the amount of parking they provide to meet their own needs and/or the City assists in meeting some of the demand with public parking garages. This Parking Strategy was deemed necessary to address the transformation challenge associated with converting surface parking lots to development sites and the long term need for public parking resources in order to support future development in the downtown area.

The City has embarked on an ambitious rapid transit improvement program that includes significant investment in a new BRT system as well as improvements to feeder bus routes. In order to maximize the return on public investment in the transit system, it is important to balance the supply and demand for parking in a manner that will encourage people to utilize public transit and active transportation options in place of single occupant vehicle travel.

As part of this study, a review of Parking Management and Design Best Practices was assembled under separate cover by Kimley Horn in consultation with BA Group. This review covers a wide range of topics from strategic planning, operations and management as well as economic development, urban design and transportation demand management. Based on these best practices and experience in other studies, the following sections provide a rationale for the investment of public funds in the provision of shared public parking resources in the downtown. The full Best Practices document can be found in Appendix B (provided under separate cover).

6.1 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Most municipalities, especially in smaller and mid-size cities like London, invest in public parking resources in order to encourage and facilitate development in their downtown core areas. Municipal parking systems in the very large cities such as Calgary, Vancouver, Toronto, Montreal and Ottawa operate with substantial annual revenue surpluses that are returned to the City to fund other non-parking related initiatives, thereby reducing the general realty tax rate. Some smaller mid-size cities have adopted a “parking enterprise” approach whereby they intend to operate the municipal parking system as a self-sustaining break even basis over the long run. The enterprise model requires parking fees to be high enough to cover operating costs, capital repairs and build a reserve fund to finance future parking infrastructure. In many mid-sized cities, surplus funds generated by on-street parking and off-street surface lots are used to off-set the financial shortfalls associated with building more expensive parking garages. It is not unusual for many municipalities to
control up to 50 to 60% of the overall parking supply in the downtown areas of small to mid-sized cities. It is unusual to see a municipal parking operation that controls less than 25 to 35% of the overall parking supply, which is the case in London with a only a 17% market share.

The provision of municipally controlled public parking infrastructure can encourage new commercial and institutional uses to locate within various sub-areas which, otherwise, may have found the amount and/or cost of providing the required parking prohibitive.

Parking policies can foster economic development by:

- encouraging the provision of well-designed and strategically located municipal parking facilities which will allow multiple users and property owners to benefit from economies of scale, efficient use of parking and land resources;
- allowing builders to provide a cash payment to the municipality in lieu of providing parking for a building on the same site, thereby reducing the proliferation of many small parking facilities and facilitating the intensification of building sites; and
- allowing the municipal government to provide financial support in terms of developing parking facilities for shared use at less cost than the private sector.

In short – shared public parking resources – rather than providing parking in independent private buildings- can be provided at cheaper cost and provide more efficient use of expensive parking infrastructure, thereby supporting sustainable economic development and fostering a more compact urban built form that is transit supportive.

An additional opportunity for the City to support existing and future development would be to own/control and better manage a greater proportion of the overall parking supply by acquiring existing surface lots where it is apparent that they could be used to provide future public parking garages, City control of temporary surface lots would improve their ability to influence parking pricing and better manage the supply for the overall benefit of visitors and employees in the area.

6.2 GOOD URBAN DESIGN

“Our Move Forward: London’s Downtown Plan” provided seven strategic directions and described ten transformational projects that would ensure the continued success of the downtown well into the future. The plan identified many underutilized sites that were primarily surface parking lots. Of these sites, twenty were identified as opportunity sites where new development could bridge street wall gaps and/or link key activity generators and therefore should be viewed as strategic priority locations for redevelopment.

The provision of parking to support new development in a manner that will facilitate compact urban development form and good urban design is an important goal in achieving
the City’s vision for a vibrant downtown. Parking policies can support good urban design by:

- minimizing the amount of overall parking required in zoning by-laws;
- discouraging surface parking;
- facilitating more compact urban development that is more pedestrian friendly and easier to serve with public transit through the use of parking structures that are well located and integrated with primary development;
- carefully planning the location of both municipal and private public parking facilities to ensure they maximize the development potential of development blocks or areas;
- including good quality and well thought out design features for new parking facilities that set an example and provide a positive image for the area the facility serves; and
- considering the potential to incorporate green building design features into new parking facilities that may reduce their environmental impact and potentially the buildings they are meant to serve.

6.3 TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT

The City’s 2030 Transportation Master Plan as well as the strategic Our Move Forward: London’s Downtown Plan will guide and direct new development in the City. The London 2030 TMP includes an overall transportation plan for the city to accommodate future growth and increase the use of alternative modes of transportation such a public transit, walking and cycling. The transportation plan is intended to achieve a decrease in single occupant vehicle travel into the downtown that will in turn reduce the long term need for parking, particularly employee or commuter related.

The London 2030 TMP, the recently approved Cycling Master Plan, and the Downtown Plan recommend the development of a well thought out pedestrian system and cycling network throughout the downtown in order to encourage active transportation. As the downtown attracts more residents who live, work and shop in the area it is important to have active transportation options in order to reduce the need for short trip travel by using single occupant vehicles. The new growth plan includes the identification of priority pedestrian and cycling corridors to/from and through the downtown and also includes the staged implementation of a bus rapid transit system to encourage longer distance commuting trips.

The implementation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategy focused on increasing mobility options and reducing parking demand over time can play a significant role in reducing the existing and future parking demands within the study area.

As transportation planners and government officials have increasingly realized, there is a limit to the amount of road and freeway infrastructure that can be constructed from a
financial and environmental sustainability perspective. More emphasis must be placed on developing effective transit service and on managing transportation infrastructure in a more efficient manner through TDM policies and techniques. The provision of parking services is an important but often overlooked component in this process.

Parking related TDM policies and techniques which can be used to encourage transit use, car/van pooling, walking, cycling and moped/motorcycle use include:

- parking pricing that is the same or higher than transit fares;
- full cost pricing for parking facilities at the individual user level;
- payment-in-lieu of parking & reduced cost transit benefits;
- co-ordinating parking supply strategies with transit initiatives;
- provision of specially designated car/van pool stalls in convenient locations;
- reduced parking fees for car/van pooling;
- provision of parking stalls for bicycles and motorcycles;
- provision of car share and bike share services in both public and private parking facilities;
- provision of a guaranteed ride home service for personal emergencies\(^4\);
- implementing parking supply limits in zoning ordinances (minimum and maximum parking requirements);
- demonstrating leadership by applying all of the above policies and techniques to municipal employee parking.

Most of these policies and techniques can be applied to the study area in order to encourage reduced single-occupancy vehicle use over time.

The ultimate goal of Transportation Demand Management is to provide well-co-ordinated mobility options for commuters and visitors. This will increase the productivity of an area by making the commute more convenient, cost effective and less stressful as well as improve the environment by reducing congestion. It will also facilitate the more efficient use of land and effective urban design. Parking planning, design, management and operation are very important parts of this system.

In order to influence travel demand characteristics, particularly for employees, both the supply and price of parking must be effectively managed. The City can control supply by implementing minimum and maximum supply requirements in the Zoning Bylaws for the area. However, this alone will not necessarily result in the desired change in travel

\(^4\) Provides commuters who regularly use alternative modes are provided with a reliable and free ride home in a personal emergency. This service is typically available to users a certain number of times per year and a maximum reimbursable cost (e.g. taxi fare).
behaviour. In addition to supplying reasonable alternatives to single occupant vehicle travel through enhanced transit services and other transportation demand management initiatives, one of the single most effective measures in reducing parking demand is the implementation of parking pricing. Monthly parking rates in the downtown are generally transit supportive as the majority cost more than the $81 cost of a monthly transit pass. It is important that this price differential continue or increase into the future in order to provide a strong economic incentive to use public transit and maximize the return on investment in the City’s BRT system.

It is also important to complement the investment in increased transit and active transportation infrastructure and services with many of the TDM measures described earlier. For example:

- the provision of a car and bike share service will increase the likelihood that people will take transit, if they know that they can access an automobile or bike for short duration business or personal trips when required;
- the provision of a guaranteed ride home service will increase the likelihood that people will take transit or cycle if they can access a ride home for a personal emergency;
- the provision of secure bicycle parking in municipal and private parking facilities will encourage more people to try cycling for commuter trips;
- the provision of shower and change facilities at places of employment will encourage people to cycle for commuter trips;
- the provision of carpool parking in priority locations and the creation of a ride matching service will encourage more people to carpool for at least some of their commuting trips;
- monthly bus pass discounts for employer groups in specific areas will provide an additional economic incentive to use public transit;
- regular surveys of employee commuting characteristics and their propensity to consider the use of alternative travel modes will provide current information to plan and implement new measures to improve mobility options.

A co-ordinated and well-founded transportation demand management plan can be best deployed at the parking management level because this is where the interaction with people who drive regularly occurs and where the opportunity to engage them about changing travel modes as an alternative to driving is most effective. TDM efforts are most successful when trying to address an important parking challenge. Therefore, many of these services should be managed, promoted and funded through the municipal parking operation in co-ordination with other municipal departments, especially London Transit. The municipal parking office should also be able to sell transit passes as an alternative to more expensive monthly parking or a lengthy wait list, perhaps at an introductory discount.
The formal implementation of the TDM function should occur in conjunction with a major new parking or transit project such as a new parking garage and/or the proposed BRT service through the downtown.

A portion of the parking revenues should be used to fund a guaranteed ride home service, subsidize the initial start-up of a ride share service, fund secure bike storage facilities and provide discounts or special memberships in local health clubs for access to shower and change facilities.
7.0 ZONING BYLAW & POLICY REQUIREMENTS

7.1 MINIMUM VEHICULAR PARKING SUPPLY REQUIREMENTS

As mentioned in Section 4, the zoning by-law applicable to the downtown requires parking to be provided for new non-residential development at a rate of 1 parking space per 90 square metres of gross floor area or 1.11 spaces per 100 square metres. Based upon the information in the 2014 Parking Needs Study, the overall parking supply rate in the downtown area is approximately 2.14 spaces per 100 square metres of occupied non-residential floor area compared to a total observed demand rate of 1.52 spaces per 100 square metres. Based upon existing travel characteristics, it is estimated that the existing parking demand for office space is in the order of 2.7 spaces per 100 square metres and retail commercial space demand is in the order of 1.5 spaces per 100 square metres during the weekday daytime period. Therefore current parking demand and supply rates are well in excess of the zoning by-law supply requirement. Even with the expected increase in transit use associated with the new BRT lines through the downtown, the demand for office parking will likely be approximately 2.2 spaces per 100 square metres, some 90% higher than the existing by-law supply rate. Given the potential public parking supply deficits and the cost of providing public garages to accommodate the deficits, the existing parking supply rate for commercial space should not be decreased. However, leaving the supply requirement at well below the actual anticipated demand would continue to provide an important economic development incentive assuming the City proactively supplies the resulting supply deficit in public parking facilities throughout the downtown area.

The City also has a payment in lieu of parking by-law that entertains requests to make a cash payment per space for any parking that a new development is not able to provide. To date, no money has been collected through the by-law because existing buildings are exempt, there has been little new commercial and office space construction, and some developments have applied for a variance to reduce the parking supply requirement rather than provide payment in lieu.

A payment-in-lieu (PIL) of parking by-law (discussed in greater detail in Section 8.1.2) should be maintained, which would allow developers to make a cash payment for each space they do not supply to meet the Zoning By-law requirement. The amount of this payment should be set at 50% of the estimated cost of providing such parking in an above ground garage (including land costs) and rise overtime as demand for downtown space and land values increase. Small scale commercial development or conversions of existing buildings could be exempt from the PIL policy.

7.2 BICYCLE PARKING REQUIREMENTS

The provision of adequate, safe and convenient bicycle parking and support facilities are important to encourage increased cycling as a regular mode of transportation for both commuters (employees) and visitors to commercial, institutional, recreational and residential uses in urbanized areas. In contrast the absence of these facilities will deter regular cycling for non-recreational purposes. Increased cycling will reduce the growth in
vehicle trips and future parking needs as well as support more sustainable urban travel patterns.

Based upon a review of the recent City of Toronto study and best practice information provided by the Victoria Transport Policy Institute, it is recommended that bicycle parking requirements for the downtown be adopted that require a secure and covered supply for approximately 4% of the estimated employee load for all non-residential uses be adopted. In the case of office space this would amount to 0.17 spaces per 100 m². For retail and restaurant and personal service uses, the requirement for employee bicycle parking would be 0.085 per 100 m². It is essential that bicycle parking facilities have a lock-up with key entry to encourage usage of these facilities.

For visitor bicycle parking a similar goal of providing enough space for approximately 4% of the visitors should be considered. In the case of retail/personal service/restaurant uses, this would require 0.25 per 100 m². For office space, the requirement for visitors would be about 8% of the employee demand or 0.014 per 100 m²; however, the greatest demand for visitor bicycle parking in downtown core areas of large cities is for courier deliveries, which could increase the rate to 0.03.

Bicycle parking should also be provided for high density residential buildings, townhouses and horizontal multiple dwellings which do not have exclusive use garages and driveways. The current City requirement to provide 0.75 long term bicycle spaces per unit is in line with other cities that wish to encourage the use of cycling as an alternative travel mode. A visitor requirement of 0.075 spaces per unit should also be established.

The recommended Bicycle parking requirements are summarized in Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Bicycle Parking Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Uses</td>
<td>0.17 spaces per 100 m² GFA staff plus 0.03 spaces per 100 m² GFA visitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Uses</td>
<td>0.085 spaces per 100 m² GFA staff plus 0.25 spaces per 100 m² GFA visitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other non-residential uses</td>
<td>4% for staff and 4% for visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Apartments</td>
<td>0.75 resident spaces per unit 0.07 visitor spaces per unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Residential requirement applies to apartments and townhouses that do not have an exclusive garage.

It is also important that shower and change facilities be provided for employee cyclists in order to encourage the use of this alternative travel mode. The Cities of Toronto and Vancouver require washroom, change and shower facilities for each gender. Toronto requires one shower/change facility for each gender in non-residential buildings greater than 20,000 m² (215,300 sq. ft.) while Vancouver requires one facility per gender when 4 to 29 employee bicycle spaces are required and one additional facility per gender for every 30
spaces thereafter. Converting the Vancouver shower/change room requirement to square metres suggests that an office building would have to be 2,353 m² GFA (i.e. approximately 25,000 sq. ft.) before shower/change facilities are required. For retail/restaurant/personal service uses, the floor area would have to be 4,705 m² (approximately 50,600 sq. ft.). The Vancouver Bylaw also requires clothing lockers at 0.7 times the number of employee parking spaces provided.

It is recommended that an exemption threshold for renovations and small developments that may find it onerous to comply with the recommended bicycle parking provisions. The exemption limit in Toronto of 20,000 square metres (215,300 sq. ft.) is significantly larger than any potential non-residential development that will occur in the study area. It is recommended to apply the exemption limit based on the Vancouver By-law of 2,325 square metres (25,000 sq. ft.) for office developments and 4,705 square metres (50,650 sq. ft.) for retail/restaurant/personal service uses. The Vancouver requirements should be applied to the study area as outlined in Table 10.

### Table 10  **Shower/Change Facility Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required No. of Employee Bike Spaces</th>
<th>Number of Shower Stalls per gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-59</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-89</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-119</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-149</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150-179</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 179</td>
<td>7 plus 1 for each additional 30 bike spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Each gender will also require a change and washroom facility, including storage lockers equal to 0.70 times the number of employee parking spaces provided.

In summary, the bicycle parking and shower/change facility requirements outlined in Table 9 and Table 10 should be implemented into the Zoning By-law for the downtown.

Developments that require less than five bicycle parking spaces in total should be exempt from the requirements. This would exempt office buildings less than 2,353 square metres GFA and all other commercial space less than 4,705 square metres GFA from providing the shower/change facility requirements.
7.3 COMMERCIAL BOULEVARD PARKING

At the present time, the City considers applications from private property owners who have constrained development sites, to make use of part of the boulevard portion of the City street right of way for the provision of parking where this can be done safely and in an operationally acceptable manner. Applications are subject to detailed review by various departments within the City to determine if the application should proceed. If the application is deemed by City staff to be feasible, it is posted for public comment and mediation if required before a final agreement is executed. The City charges an annual rental fee for the use of the boulevard at a rate of $3.10 per square foot of land area in the downtown core or $0.87 per square foot for charitable and non-profit sites. A fee of $1.73 is applied to commercial sites outside the downtown core. All construction and on-going maintenance and operation costs for the parking are the responsibility of the applicant.

The City has 159 commercial boulevard parking agreements in place of which 47 agreements are located in the downtown core area. Annual revenues for the entire City from this program are approximately $215,000 per year with the portion generated by downtown being approximately $106,000 per year.

Leasing a portion of the street right of way boulevard to adjacent landowners is not a common practice in cities where we have conducted parking studies. The renewed emphasis on enhancing the streetscape with wider sidewalks and landscaping should take precedence over private landowners wishing to use the public right of way to improve their supply of private parking.

The downtown has been identified as an area very deficient in trees and the shade canopy that they provide. Recent calculations place the tree canopy cover at 5.6% - compared to an average across the City of approximately 24%. This impacts the micro-climate of the downtown by creating a “heat island” effect, making it less attractive to pedestrians and more expensive for cooling buildings.

The Urban Forest Strategy has specific goals about enhancing tree planting downtown by planting more trees and planting them better – requiring additional soil volumes and land area. These steps are intended to implement Strategic Direction #4 “Greening Our Downtown” cited in London’s Downtown Plan. Existing boulevard parking spaces should be reviewed to assess the impact of being able to provide new trees on public lands. For these reasons, it is recommended that boulevard parking should not be allowed in the downtown where it involves the removal of trees or land area detrimental to their roots.

The current lease rates cited above seem to reflect the lower end of the land value range in the downtown. Lease rates for land located in the core area could be increased up to approximately $4.80 per square foot assuming a lease rate of approximately 4% of the land value is charged. This could generate approximately $60,000 more per year in revenue at the $4.80 per square foot rate. It is recommended that boulevard parking not be allowed in the downtown where it involves the removal of trees.
8.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

As described in Section 5.2, the City will need to provide up to 300 new public parking spaces by 2034 to accommodate anticipated growth and urban design objectives for the downtown (i.e. the replacement of surface parking lots with new development). At current development costs, the provision of these new spaces could cost up to $15.0 million (2017 dollars) for a standalone parking garage. There are many other initiatives requiring municipal funding that will compete against the need to provide new public parking facilities. With this in mind, it is important to develop a funding plan that will allow the parking strategy to move forward deliberately.

Below are some of the tools municipalities utilize to finance municipal shared public parking resources:

- User Fees for parking services;
- Payment in Lieu (PIL) of parking fees from developers;
- Public Private Partnerships;
- Parking lot land sales proceeds;
- Development Charges.

Generally, the emphasis should be on creating a municipal parking system that is financially self-sustaining over the long term and which includes fees that encourage people to consider public transit and active transportation alternatives. Such an approach will ensure that the plan can be delivered confidently and provide certainty to the various stakeholders that it can be relied upon.

8.1 POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES FOR MUNICIPAL SHARED PARKING RESOURCES

8.1.1 User Fees

Except in the high density core areas of Canada’s largest cities, the parking fees generated by new garages rarely cover the full cost of building and operating them. For example, it is estimated that an annual deficit of approximately $2,000 (rounded) per space per year would be incurred for a new above grade garage in the short term.5

Most municipalities use the surplus generated by their on-street and off-street parking operations to offset a substantial portion of their garage infrastructure which operates in a deficit position in terms of recovering development and operating costs. In 2016, the parking operated by the City generated a net annual surplus of approximately $3.375 million. The off street surface lots generated a net surplus of approximately $500,000 while the on-street parking generated approximately $1.545 million. The parking enforcement

---

5 See Table 11 for calculation.
surplus was approximately $1.695 million while customer services cost approximately $365,000, however it should be noted that the customer service unit is an essential support activity that enables the generation of surplus revenue from the on and off street parking facilities.

The existing parking reserve fund has a balance of only $580,000 (rounded) because the on street meter and fine revenue are returned to general revenues rather than the parking reserve fund. Any new surplus revenue generated by future rate increases should be directed to this reserve fund in order assist in financing future garage construction.

At the present time, short duration hourly parking rates for on-street parking are set at $1.50 per hour. The hourly rate for most off-street parking lots is $2.00 per hour with some locations as low as $1.00 per hour and as high as $4.00 per hour. Short term hourly rates for off-street public parking should be set lower than the rate for prime on-street spaces in order to encourage turnover of convenient on-street parking and higher utilization of off street parking for people staying longer periods of time. Some side street on-street parking could be priced lower and have longer parking time limits depending upon demand. A 33% increase in the existing $1.50 per hour rate for on-street parking would at least bring it in line with off-street parking rates and could generate additional revenue which could then be utilized to help fund a first garage or put money in the reserve fund to offset the future capital costs of building a garage. A second step would be to have the on-street parking rate higher than the off-street parking rate.

The London Convention Centre and Covent Garden Market also operate three parking garages on behalf of the City, the net revenue of which is utilized to assist in funding the operations of the Convention Centre and the Market. Therefore, any surplus funds currently generated by these parking facilities are not available to fund additional municipal parking infrastructure at this time. It would be beneficial from a strategic planning and branding/marketing perspective to explore opportunities to improve coordination of all City owned and controlled on and off-street public parking facilities to achieve improved downtown area wide parking management and transportation demand management opportunities. This might also allow any new revenue generated by future rate increases to be allocated to a general reserve fund that could be used to help offset the deficits incurred by a potential standalone public parking garage in the future.

Some of the revenue generated by parking customers should also be directed to the establishment and development of transportation demand management programs, such as a ride sharing program, an auto share program, the provision of bicycle lockers and parking in off street public parking facilities and a discounted transit pass program, all of which should be targeted to reducing the need for costly public or private parking garages over the medium and long term.
8.1.2 Payment in Lieu of Providing Parking

The financial resources required to provide the parking garages to support redevelopment are substantial and addressing them will be a formidable challenge. The implementation of a payment in lieu of parking by-law would assist in generating funds to assist in financing public parking garages thereby reducing the gap between market-based parking fees and the actual cost of building, maintaining and operating the facilities.

“Payment-in-Lieu” contributions from developers who cannot or do not want to provide minimum parking requirements on their own sites should play a role in financing future public parking structures. Payment in lieu rates are usually set at a discount to the actual cost of development, typically ranging from 25 to 50% of the actual cost to reflect that they are not as valuable as directly owned stalls and that the City will recover some of the cost through parking fees. Typically, the lower percentage is applied to small infill developments which require the economic incentives to develop, while larger sites with more flexibility and presumably more ample financial resources are assessed the higher 50% amount. In some cases, the actual cost of developing parking is a municipal parking system wide average rather than the marginal cost of developing the next stall. A PIL system usually works in a thriving economic area where land and parking facilities are relatively scarce. In areas where redevelopment is just beginning and economic stimulus is required, payment in lieu policies have limited success.

The payment in lieu amount would be set at a discount to the actual cost of providing the parking to:

- provide a financial incentive for developers to contribute to the creation of strategically located public parking facilities.
- recognize that the City will be able to recover some of the costs through user fees.
- recognize that as a municipal facility, the parking facilities would not be subject to certain taxes.
- recognize that the parking spaces are not allocated to specific users on a reserved basis, although the general supply will be available to meet demand.
- recognize that the payment in lieu contributor will not obtain an ownership position in the garage.

Parking garage costs of $50,000 to $70,000 per space for above and below grade parking are possible for the downtown area, which would result in a payment in lieu rate of $25,000 to $35,000 per space using a 50% recovery rate. At existing parking rates and using estimated garage development costs, new garages would run a financial deficit of roughly
Therefore, the City would need to collect approximately $30,000 per space in cash-in-lieu funds in order to break even over the long run on new above grade garage construction. Recognizing that the discount factors described above and the desirability of encouraging development in the downtown, a rate of $25,000 per space or 50% of the estimated capital cost of providing public parking in an above grade garage at the present time, should be used.

It is important to note that the success of the payment in lieu of parking by-law can be substantially compromised if the City approves parking variance requests in order to relieve owners from some or the entire obligation to provide parking according to the Zoning By-Law which would then relieve them of the need to provide payment in lieu. Variance requests should only be approved where the applicant can clearly demonstrate that the By-Law requirement is excessive, not simply to allow an applicant to proceed because they are unable to provide what is deemed to be an appropriate amount of parking. Should the City approve a reduction in the payment in lieu By-Law amount because it is technically justifiable, the applicant would still have the ability to use the program to reduce the amount of parking required on site.

A special payment in lieu rate for small developments could be considered in order to assist individual property owners who are not large scale developers and property investors who renovate or add onto their buildings. Some municipalities provide reduced payment in lieu rates for changes of use within an existing building where the Zoning By-Law would require more parking. For example, the City of Toronto provides reduced rates for smaller building or additions, less than 400 sq. metres in floor area and a further reduction for less than 200 sq. metres.

In order to enact the payment in lieu program, a corporate policy for the downtown should be established to indicate where the program would apply and to provide guidance regarding appropriate application and costs. A draft outline of such a policy is provided below:

In the Downtown area, the City may at its sole discretion consider accepting payment in lieu funds for all or part of the Zoning By-Law requirements for parking, having regard for the following:

- the existing municipal public parking supply in the surrounding area can or will be able to accommodate the on-site parking supply deficiency at the time of development;
- the presence of site constraints that prevent the provision of the required number of parking spaces;

---

6 Estimated annual deficit for an above grade parking garage costing $50,000 per space including land costs, 100% fully financed at 4.25% over 25 years with 50% monthly employee parking and 50% short duration visitor parking during the weekday daytime.

7 Present value of the $1983 per year deficit with a 4.25% discount rate over 25 years.
• the use of the property is not considered overdevelopment of the site;
• the development or applicant has prepared a formal TDM Plan for the project which is likely to reduce the need for parking.

The payment in lieu amount will be reviewed and set annually based upon current information regarding the anticipated cost of providing shared municipal public parking resources and the desire to provide economic development incentives.

It should be noted that the decision to accept payment in lieu should remain at the discretion of the City. This will allow the City to ensure that if it accepts payment in lieu payments, there is a reasonable expectation municipal parking is already available to serve the development or that the City will be able to provide a supply increase in the short term.

8.1.3 Public-Private Partnerships

Potential opportunities could be considered to deliver parking infrastructure through partnerships and collaboration on specific development projects, where this would result in achieving the goals and objectives established in the Parking Strategy as described in this report. The primary goals being to support good urban design, transportation demand management, and economic development.

It is important to incorporate public parking facilities in any new development that might be considered for any of the existing and all future surface lots the City may own. In addition, on sites the City does not own or control, the density bonusing provisions in the Official Plan and Zoning By-Law should be considered to obtain public parking facilities as part of new development projects. Alternatively, a commitment from the developer might be obtained to provide additional public parking in return for the density bonus, although the developer would likely retain ownership of the parking.

In order to achieve the primary goals described above, it is important that any partnership arrangement allow the City to control the price of parking, the use of the spaces, and the ability to expand a parking garage. It is also important the City have control over the design of the parking garage to ensure it meets reasonable urban design, functional design and life cycle cost considerations. These later elements are also important to attract parking customers and maximize revenue generation in a garage that would compete with other facilities in the downtown area. As an example, the Parking Authority of Toronto often engages in private sector partnerships to achieve substantial development on their parking lots. However, they maintain strict control over the cost and design aspects of their garages as well as operational control or the development does not proceed.

A detailed evaluation of the financial costs would also be required in order to ensure that the City was not paying more for the parking than it would otherwise be able to do on its own.
8.1.4 Development Charges

Some Ontario municipalities have been using development charges to fund a portion of the capital costs associated with future garage construction. Examples include Kitchener, Mississauga and Oakville.

However, this would not cover a large portion of the cost and would have to net out the anticipated payment in lieu funds received from developers and the funds would likely be received gradually over many years.

8.1.5 Parking Lot Land Sales

Five of the City owned parking lots have a potential land value of approximately $20.0 million in total that should be used to assist in funding future municipal parking garages, in some cases on the same lots. These funds could be used to acquire other more suitable sites for garages in conjunction with mixed use development.

8.2 FUTURE PARKING GARAGE FINANCIAL OUTLOOK

In order to illustrate the order of magnitude financial implications for the City to provide 300 new public parking spaces in the downtown area, a preliminary revenue/cost analysis for 300 spaces in an above ground garage\(^8\) has been prepared using a capital cost of $50,000 per space or $15 million. Existing hourly and monthly rates of $2.00 and $175 respectively have been utilized and it is assumed that the garage would be allocated 50% (150 spaces) to hourly visitor parking and 50% (150 spaces) to monthly employee parking.

Table 11 indicates that providing 300 new public garage spaces would incur an annual deficit of approximately $595,000 in Year 1 which is equivalent to approximately $1,983 per space per year. The present value of the annual deficit in Year 1 would be approximately $30,000 per space using a discount rate the same as the assumed interest rate of 4.25% per year. In other words, an upfront payment of $30,000 per space would need to be provided in order to eliminate the annual deficit of approximately $595,000 per year. These funds would typically come from a reserve fund built up from annual operating surpluses for the municipal parking system, from payment in lieu funds received from building developers or perhaps from land sales proceeds received from selling off City surface parking lots or air rights for development on the garage site itself. In practical terms, the City might not receive all of the funds necessary to offset the deficit in advance of building the parking, but would instead receive them over the 25 year finance period.

\(^8\) A below ground parking garage would likely cost up to $70,000 per space. These estimates include construction costs for constrained downtown sites with a high level of architectural/urban design and include land, a 25% allowance for non-construction related soft costs including legal, construction financing, feasibility studies, building permit and development charges, etc.
### Table 11 Financial Outlook for 300 New Public Parking Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual Total</th>
<th>Annual Total per Parking Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Parkers(^2)</td>
<td>$335,000</td>
<td>$1,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly Parkers(^3)</td>
<td>$435,000</td>
<td>$1,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$770,000</td>
<td>$2,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Operating Costs(^4)</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Capital Reserve Contribution(^5)</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Debt Service Costs(^6)</td>
<td>$985,000</td>
<td>$3,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Costs</strong></td>
<td>$1,365,000</td>
<td>$4,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Deficit</td>
<td>-$595,000</td>
<td>$1,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Present Value of Annual Deficit(^7)</strong></td>
<td>-$9,055,000</td>
<td>-$30,183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Annual stabilized total after initial phase in using 2016 parking rates and costs.
2. 150 spaces at $175 per month with a 20% oversell rate, less HST.
3. 150 spaces with average $3.00 parking fee, turnover of 3.0 per space per day, 365 days, less HST.
4. Includes maintenance/operating, credit card fees, security and management fee.
5. 1.2% of $15 million capital cost.
6. Assumes 4.25% interest rate amortized over 25 years.
7. Using a 4.25% discount rate.

An additional source of revenue that is often used by municipalities to fund new garage construction, is the annual net revenue surplus generated by the on-street parking operation. However, this revenue is now directed to City general revenue rather than the parking reserve fund. As mentioned in Section 8.1.1, a 33% ($0.50) rate increase for on-street parking would likely generate additional revenue that would help offset the costs associated with the first municipal parking garage and also move towards achieving the desirable objective of pricing on-street parking significantly higher than off-street parking. For example, roughly $250,000 per year in additional revenue might be generated to offset some of the annual deficit associated with a first garage, by increasing rates by $0.50 per hour in the downtown, taking into account the expected loss of on-street parking in the downtown due to various initiatives. If the rate increase were to be applied to all of the on-street parking the City controls, including areas outside the downtown, an additional $500,000 might be generated.

Regular annual increases in monthly and hourly rates over several years would also be required to reduce the annual deficit associated with building the first garage.
9.0 PARKING MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE

9.1 PARKING SYSTEM ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMEWORKS

Parking management best practices from a program organizational perspective focus on the concept of a “vertical integration” of parking functions. This is in contrast to the “horizontally fragmented” organizational structures that tend to evolve naturally in many municipal parking organizations. The Parking Management and Design Best Practices review created for this study (see Appendix B in a separate document) provides some insight into organizational challenges and provides examples of entities that have integrated best practices to achieve success in their communities.

Horizontally fragmented systems are defined by the compartmentalization of parking functions and responsibilities, such as on-street parking, enforcement, and parking structures, among multiple, disparate departments or entities. The police, facilities management, and accounting departments all may play a role, yet no singular entity has responsibility for, perspective on, or understanding of all of the interrelated functional areas that comprise a parking system. In this scenario, there is no overall accountability for parking. Or put another way, parking is everyone’s part-time job, but no one’s full-time responsibility.

In a vertically integrated system, parking is managed as a cohesive system. At a minimum, one entity manages on-street parking, off-street parking, and parking enforcement. More advanced models include parking/transportation planning, transportation demand management programs, and, in some communities, transit system management. Vertically integrated systems can be self-managed or management can be outsourced via management or concession agreements.

While the options for a vertically-integrated organizational approach and operational methodology can widely vary, each is based on the core recognition that parking significantly impacts the economic vitality and growth of the downtown area. Each model must be carefully considered in terms of London’s specific goals. The importance and impact that a well-managed public parking system can have in creating a vibrant and healthy downtown should not be under estimated.

A brief discussion of various vertically integrated management and operating models is provided below. Each of these models has its own strengths and weakness depending on various factors including the parking system’s size, degree of development, programs offered, political landscape, and community goals, among others. Despite the details, they all address the major problem associated with horizontally fragmented systems

9.1.1 Existing Parking Management Structure
The City currently owns and controls a total of 2,664 spaces in the downtown that are located in seven surface parking lots, three garages and on-street parking. The current parking system in downtown London is partially fragmented in that there are three garages that are managed and operated by separate entities other than the municipal parking department. The three garages provide a total of 1,262 spaces, including 327 spaces beneath the London Convention Centre, 416 spaces beneath the Covent Garden Market and 534 spaces beneath City Hall. While each of these garages is intended to serve the buildings above them, they also provide monthly as well as hourly parking for people in the general vicinity. Both the Covent Garden Market Corporation and the Convention Centre contract out the operation of their parking facilities to a private parking operations company. They both also benefit from parking revenues and include this funding in their budgets. The remaining 1,402 spaces are managed and operated separately by the Parking & Licensing Enforcement Division including 744 spaces in six surface lots and 658 on-street parking spaces. One of the seven surface parking lots (Museum London’s parking lot on Ridout Street) is owned by the London Art Gallery, but managed by the City. The City also operates additional on-street and surface lot parking outside the downtown area, including two park and ride lots near Dundas Street to the east of the downtown. The City keeps 50% of the transit service fee for parking in these lots and 50% of the fee goes to London Transit Commission (LTC) for transit.

The wider area municipal parking system generated a net annual surplus of approximately $3.375 million in 2016. Most municipalities use the surplus generated by on-street parking to fund a significant portion of their off-street surface lot and garage infrastructure which operates in a deficit position in terms of recovering development and operating costs. The existing parking reserve fund has a balance of only $580,000 because the on street meter and fine revenue are returned to general revenues rather than the parking reserve fund.

9.1.2 Consolidated Department Model (Enterprise Model)

The consolidated or “vertically integrated” city/district department model is managed by a department head with complete responsibility for the management of all parking-related program elements. Primary elements include off-street parking facilities, on-street parking resources, overall program financial performance, parking system planning, and enforcement. Other responsibilities may include transportation demand management, marketing, the implementation of new technologies, and planning, among others. In many cases, the Parking Department submits budgets each year for council approval that are subject to competition with other departments for funding.

Advance planning and financial stability can be compromised with this model unless council has mandated it to operate on a financially self-sustaining basis including the use of reserve funds for future capital repairs, maintenance and new parking facility development. Parking Departments that are mandated to operate on a financially self-sustaining basis are often referred to as an Enterprise Model. Examples include The City of Kitchener, Kingston, Oakville and Ottawa.
9.1.3 Parking Authority Model

In the Parking Authority Model, a separate agency is created that is governed through a board of directors with a President or General Manager and other senior executives responsible for managing and operating the entire system. In some cases, separate entities are responsible for enforcement or for both enforcement and operations of the on-street parking component while the authority is responsible for all off-street parking. The Authority is responsible for preparing annual financial statements and reporting back to its major shareholder that is usually the local municipality. In the United States, the Parking Authority often owns the parking assets and has bonding capacity to raise funds on its own to finance future development and other operations. In Canada, the Authority usually operates the parking assets on behalf of the municipality and when necessary borrows funds through the City for specific parking purposes, although they are reported in the Authority financial statements. In Ontario under the recent revisions to the Municipal Act, parking authorities are incorporated as municipal service corporations much like utilities that generate profits which are returned to the shareholders through dividends.

The primary characteristics of a parking authority model in Ontario are:

- The ability and desire to generate substantial surplus revenues;
- The authority is largely independent of direct political control, thereby enabling more efficient management and operations;
- The planning, design and delivery of significant new parking infrastructure can be more effectively and efficiently achieved;
- The board of directors can include a variety of stakeholders including political, local business, and subject matter (i.e. finance, construction, strategy, legal) representatives that allow a center of expertise to be created.

This models places all of the major stakeholders at the same table via a parking authority board or commission, which often results in all parties gaining a deeper understanding of the complexities of parking and the often competing interest of various constituent groups.

Examples in Canada include the Toronto Parking Authority, Winnipeg Parking Authority, Calgary Parking Authority, Vancouver’s Easy Park, and the Saint John Parking Commission.

9.1.4 Business District Contract Model

In an increasing number of communities in the United States, downtown business improvement districts or downtown development authorities have taken over operational responsibility for parking. Parking is governed by a well-defined operating agreement that sets specific expectations and guidelines for the management of parking assets. These contracts or operating agreements are typically reauthorized every three to five years.
based on whether the defined contract goals were achieved. If reauthorized, it is not uncommon for new goals and program objectives to be set for the next contract period. The City of Montreal essentially outsources the operation of its parking services to the Board of Trade that employs the staff and resources to operate the program and return back surplus revenue in the form of a dividend. While some smaller scale municipalities have considered this option, we are not aware of any that have implemented it.

9.1.5 Parking District Model

The parking district model is defined by an overarching goal of creating a comprehensive parking management function under the aegis of one management entity. In most cases, the parking district’s geographic boundaries and responsibility for district improvements (parking, transportation demand management, clean and safe programs, events/programming, etc.) are managed to by the district to better promote downtown vitality and activation. Parking thus becomes a tool for economic development, place making and other larger district goals. While specific implementation policies can vary significantly, parking revenue is collected and managed by the district for reinvestment in the district in this model. Revenue sources include special assessments, off and on-street parking, special events, advertising, in-lieu-fees, enforcement revenues etc. While this model is utilized in the United States, we are not aware of any large scale examples in Canada. The City of Burlington in Ontario, because of historical circumstances, is able to levy a special assessment for the downtown business district to provide a source of funding for parking services. The operation is relatively small and unable to be replicated due to changes in the Municipal Act over many years.

9.1.6 Parking Management Collaborative Model

This approach was developed for communities that have not developed a significant off-street public parking system and therefore do not have the ability to influence the off-street parking market in traditional ways. The collaborative model is aimed at developing a comprehensive approach between private, off-street parking assets and on-street parking to make the downtown more accessible to visitors. The primary objective is to develop a “parking management program overlay” to establish a well-coordinated user-friendly parking system marketed as a cohesive public parking program. While the approach requires only a small, highly effective staff, an executive-caliber program director is essential for the strategy to succeed. The support of major parking property owners is also vital. We do not know of any specific examples in a Canadian context.

9.2 PARKING SYSTEM OPERATIONAL METHODOLOGIES

Once a management structure has been determined, operating methodologies are another organizational/management consideration. There are three primary methodologies for operating parking programs:

9.2.1 Self - Operation
The managing entity or owner operates the parking program itself. The owning entity receives all gross parking revenues and pays for all operating expenses. Self-operation requires the involvement of internal administrative and managerial staff at a higher level than other operational methodologies. While self-operation allows the owners to have greater control over service and planning, it often comes with higher expenses, costs, and assumption of financial risk.

9.2.2 Outsourced Management Contract

In this model a small professional parking services group works in conjunction with an outsourced parking management firm. The parking services group defines the overarching vision and mission, while the management firm is responsible for day-to-day parking operations. Because daily operations are outsourced, a lean group of professional management staff can focus on the strategic goals of the parking program without becoming involved with a myriad of operational issues. The City of Ottawa adopted this model in 2009 when it outsourced the operation of its on-street parking and off-street garages as part of a large scale parking access and revenue control equipment procurement contract while maintaining overall management, strategic planning, new facility development as well as on-going maintenance and repair within the City department.

This is an effective option if the City has not made the investments that result in parking operations being a “core competency” of the municipal operation.

9.2.3 Outsourced Concession Agreement

The facility owner or managing organization contracts a parking management firm to assume full responsibility for all aspects of the operation, including expenses and most liabilities, and the parking management firm pays the owner a guaranteed amount and/or a percentage of gross revenues (or a combination). The concessionaire has much more control and autonomy under this approach.

A variation on the concession agreement methodology that is being introduced in the U.S. market is parking system “monetization”. Sometimes referred to as public-private partnerships or PPPs, monetization is very similar to the concession agreement approach except the term of the contract is much longer, and the owning entity receives a large cash infusion at the front end of the lease that is paid back with significant financing and other fees over its term.

9.3 Recommended Organizational Model

Based on the foregoing discussion, it is recommended that the parking system in London be managed and operated by using an Enterprise Model. As noted before, examples of this model include the Cities of Kingston, Kitchener, Oakville, Oshawa and Ottawa with Kitchener having the most explicit mandate.
Under this model, the municipal parking system is operated by a City department or division on a financially sustainable basis in terms of operation, life cycle costing and future development funding. Long term budgeting would be prepared for the department and approved by Council with the intent that little or no external funding would be required. In order for this model to be successful annual revenue surpluses from the parking operation should be allocated to the parking reserve fund as should any parking lot land sales. The anticipated capital costs for new parking infrastructure should be budgeted for multi-years in advance and approved by Council in order to provide certainty that the parking strategy described in this report can move forward confidently and expeditiously.
10.0 CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

10.1 KEY CONCLUSIONS

1. The City needs to play a greater role in the provision of off-street public parking facilities in order to facilitate future development in the downtown in accordance with the Council approved Our Move Forward: London’s Downtown Plan and future growth estimates prepared for the 2014 Development Charges Study.

2. The need for additional shared public parking resources required to facilitate and support growth in the downtown is related to several factors including:
   a) zoning by-law parking supply requirements for non-residential uses in the downtown are typically below typical demands;
   b) the parking supply typically provided by developers for commercial development is below the typical demand;
   c) future redevelopment sites are all located on existing commercial parking lots that would be removed as part of the redevelopment; and
   d) future construction projects that will result in the loss of on-street parking within the downtown.

3. The need for additional parking across the study area will be substantially reduced by:
   a) continuing to implement Transportation Demand Management (TDM) initiatives focused on increasing mobility options and reducing parking demand over time, especially improved transit service to/from the Downtown;
   b) requiring new developments that do not provide the minimum supply of parking required on site to make payment in lieu contributions to the City for the shortfall in order to assist in funding municipal shared public parking resources in key areas.
10.2 KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to effectively address future parking strategy, planning and management challenges, the following key recommendations should be implemented:

1. Explore opportunities to improve coordination of all City owned and controlled on and off-street parking facilities to achieve improved downtown area wide parking management and transportation demand management opportunities.

2. Manage the consolidated parking system by using the Enterprise Model. Under this model, the municipal parking system is managed by a City department on a financially self-sustaining basis including operational and life cycle costs as well as future garage development funding. In order to achieve this objective over time, it is recommended that:
   a) Net revenue should be allocated from both on-street and off street parking operations to a parking reserve fund to assist in financing future shared public parking resources;
   b) The proceeds of future parking lot sales should be allocated to the parking reserve fund;

3. Provide 200 to 300 new public parking spaces over the next twenty years through investing in joint venture projects by participating with developers to integrate public parking in new developments in sub-areas 3, 4 and 1 in central and southwest downtown, in order to facilitate meeting City growth targets and urban design objectives.
   a) New public parking facilities need to be strategically located to facilitate economic development, maximize utilization, minimize development cost, may incorporate mixed use development and grade level commercial space and be designed to reflect the London Plan policies.
   b) Leverage the municipal ownership of existing surface lots to facilitate the provision of public parking in garages that are integrated with new development projects.

4. Amend the Downtown Community Improvement Plan (CIP) to provide the opportunity for Council to enter into a joint venture financial partnership with private developers to provide additional public parking and municipal parking garages in downtown including the use of grants and density bonusing.

---

9 May affect the general revenues tax base where parking revenue is currently applied.
5. Take a gradual approach to the discontinuation of temporary zone permissions for temporary surface commercial parking lots in downtown in areas where there is surplus public parking due to lower parking utilization and aligned with the timing of providing additional parking facilities in the future and the implementation of the new rapid transit system.

As a starting point, the City should develop an inventory of all existing non-complying downtown surface commercial lots and require each land owner to secure a temporary zone permission in order to maintain operations. Temporary zone permissions should no longer be issued for any new surface parking lots in the downtown.

6. Maintain the current minimum zoning by-law parking supply requirement for new commercial development in the downtown of one space per 90 square metres GFA (1.11 spaces per 1000 square feet) and add bicycle supply requirements.

7. Revise the Payment in Lieu (PIL) parking by-law which would provide the flexibility for the City to require a developer to make a cash payment per space to the City for each parking space they are unable to provide. Set the payment in lieu amount at approximately 50% of the estimated capital cost of providing new public parking in the downtown and allocate payments to the reserve fund for public garages.

8. Continue strengthening TDM activities and awareness in the downtown area including a focus on integrating and aligning current and future business actions with City actions.

9. Ensure that parking facilities that support sustainable mobility choices (e.g., bike parking, car pool spaces, car share, electric vehicle charges, etc.) are positioned to be highly visible and easily accessible.
11.0 SETTING A FUTURE DIRECTION AND ACTION PLAN

In order to proactively guide and direct the provision of parking and achieve the desired goals and objectives described in this report, it is important to develop a vision for the strategy that provides a vivid description of the desired future condition that stakeholders will find easy to understand. It is also important to set out key goals and objectives for the strategy that will provide an implementation plan for future success and allow stakeholders to gauge progress. The following Vision, Mission, Key Goals and Objectives have been established for the Downtown Parking Strategy.

11.1 THE VISION FOR THE PARKING MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

The primary challenge for the parking strategy is facilitating the replacement of surface parking with new development while maintaining enough parking to service the needs of downtown stakeholders. With this in mind, the following Vision has been established for the Downtown Parking Strategy.

Enabling the achievement of “Our Move Forward - London’s Downtown Plan” by facilitating the replacement of surface parking with new mixed-use development.

11.2 THE MISSION STATEMENT

Improving the parking system in the City of London is a critical element for enhancing the overall downtown experience. Well-managed, customer-oriented parking facilities encourage visitors to shop, work, and explore local cultural and entertainment options by improving access to downtown attractions, reducing traffic congestion, and clearly informing users about regulations and fee structures associated with available parking. The creation of such a system will support commerce; promote the City’s transportation, sustainability, support rapid transit in downtown, and traffic mitigation goals; and advance the broader objectives of economic development and downtown vitality. With this in mind, the following Mission is recommended for the downtown parking strategy:

The provision of efficient, convenient and cost effective shared public parking resources to support business, personal and social activity in the downtown area.

11.3 KEY GOALS

The primary goals for the Downtown Parking Strategy are:

a) Foster Economic Development by assisting the private sector in achieving the development vision for downtown London through strategic public investment in the provision of municipal parking facilities and transportation options;

b) Support Good Urban Design and contribute to creating a walkable downtown by minimizing surface parking and encouraging higher density development through the use of parking garages that are well located and integrated with primary development;
c) Reduce the demand for parking in the medium and long term by using Transportation Demand Management to influence commuter mode choice through parking supply management and pricing.

11.4 ACTION PLAN

11.4.1 Key Objectives

With this in mind the Key Objectives or Action Plan for the Downtown Parking Strategy should be to;

1. **Provide Sufficient Shared Public Parking Resources** to serve development and facilitate the conversion of surface parking lots into new mixed use development in accordance with the downtown plan.

   In order to effectively facilitate future sustainable development, the following key objectives should be achieved:

   a) Develop urban design and sustainability design guidelines with respect to the renewal of temporary surface parking lot zoning/permits in order to develop these sites.\(^{10}\)

   b) Maintain the existing parking supply requirements in the Zoning By-law and implement bicycle supply requirements as recommended in this report.

   c) Invest in the provision of new public parking facilities through investing in joint venture projects by participating with developers to top up or provide additional parking where it is desirable to do so in order to free up existing surface parking lots for new development and make it clear what parking will be available to meet future development needs in a timely manner.

   d) Encourage the provision of public parking in new development projects that seek to exceed the base density permitted in the area.

2. **Integrate Parking Management and Sustainable Mobility Policies and Programs** to encourage the use of active transportation and public transportation options by achieving the following key objectives:

   Implement a comprehensive Transportation Demand Management Plan (TDM) program to reduce the amount of costly parking garage(s) required in the future.

---

\(^{10}\) Restate and direct staff to enforce the June 1995 resolution which required site plan approval and temporary zoning for surface parking lots created after 1995.
This program should include local transit improvements, the provision of auto share services, a ride matching service, preferential parking for carpool vehicles, enhanced bicycle parking, electric charging stations, a guaranteed ride home service and the continued use of parking rates for employee parking that are higher than the cost of a transit pass.

3. Effectively and Efficiently Deliver Shared Public Parking Resources

In order to effectively and efficiently deliver shared public parking resources, the following key objectives should be achieved:

a) The management and operations of all City controlled on and off street parking facilities and future garages should be closely coordinated in order to facilitate strategic planning, as well as consistent management, branding and marketing.

The consolidated parking system should be managed by using the Enterprise Model. Under this model, the municipal parking system is managed by a City department on a financially self-sustaining basis including operational and life cycle costs as well as future garage development funding.

b) Continue the development of the web based parking information system that would identify the location, pricing and availability of parking at city owned/controlled parking facilities and seek to expand the system to include larger private parking facilities where feasible;

c) Actively seek to employ the latest customer payment technologies including cell phone payment systems for both on and off street parking and pay by plate systems for on-street and off-street lots;

d) Actively identify locations to increase the supply of public off-street parking in garages that are integrated with mixed use development;

e) Develop a financial plan that will allow the municipal parking system to operate on a financially self-sustaining Enterprise Model basis over the long term (i.e. 20 years) that will:

i. Increase the allocation of on and off street parking net revenue to the parking capital reserve fund in order to finance future garage development;

ii. Allocate the proceeds of any existing parking lot land sales to the parking capital reserve fund;

iii. Allocate development charge proceeds related to new downtown parking facilities to the parking capital reserve fund;
iv. Revise and renew a payment in lieu of parking program for new development and deposit the proceeds into the parking capital reserve fund;

v. Identify future capital expenditures in the City budget for the development of new public parking garages over the next ten years.

An Action Plan in table format is provided in Table 12 which summarizes the Key Goals and Objectives by time frame.

**TABLE 12  DOWNTOWN LONDON PARKING STRATEGY ACTION PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY GOALS &amp; OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>Short-Term (2018-2025)</th>
<th>Mid to Long-Term (2025-34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Take a gradual approach to the discontinuation of temporary zone permissions for temporary surface commercial parking lots in downtown where there is surplus public parking due to low parking utilization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop urban design and sustainability design guidelines for the renewal of temporary surface parking lot zoning/permits in order to enhance the downtown environment.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain the existing parking supply requirements in the Zoning By-law and implement bicycle supply requirements as recommended in this report.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invest in the provision of new integrated public parking facilities in partnership with new developments in Sub-areas 3, 4 and 1 in order to free up existing surface parking lots for new development. Make it clear what parking will be available to meet future development needs in a timely manner.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the provision of public parking in new development projects that seek to exceed the base density permitted in the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement a comprehensive Transportation Demand Management Plan (TDM) program to reduce the amount of costly parking garage(s) required in the future.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore Opportunities to improve coordination of all City owned and controlled on- and off-street parking facilities to achieve improved downtown area wide parking management and transportation demand management opportunities.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a common branding program for the existing municipal parking system.</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a web based parking information system that would identify the location, pricing and availability of parking at city owned/controlled parking facilities and seek to expand the system to</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### KEY GOALS & OBJECTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Short-Term (2018-2025)</th>
<th>Mid to Long-Term (2025-34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Include larger private parking facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively seek to employ the latest customer payment technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including cell phone payment systems for both on and off street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parking and pay by plate systems for on-street and off-street lots.</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively identify locations to increase the supply of public off-street</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parking in garages that are integrated with mixed use development.</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a financial plan that will allow the municipal parking system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to operate on a financially self-sustaining Enterprise Model basis over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the long term (i.e. 20 years) that will:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Increase the allocation of on and off street parking revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the parking capital reserve fund in order to finance future parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilities;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Allocate the proceeds of any existing parking lot land sales</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the parking capital reserve fund;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. Allocate development charge proceeds related to new downtown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parking facilities to the parking capital reserve fund;</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. Revise and renew a payment in lieu of parking program for new</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development and deposit the proceeds into the parking capital reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fund;</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Identify future capital expenditures in the City budget for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development of new structured public facilities over the next twenty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years.</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the stakeholder consultation carried out for the London Parking Strategy study, comprising a day of stakeholder meetings held at Covent Garden Market on March 22, 2016.

2.0 MEETING PURPOSE

The overall intent of the parking strategy study is to look at 20-30 year time horizon for parking supply and needs in Downtown London, in the context of recent and current council direction on Smart Moves Transportation Master Plan and Shift rapid transit project.

The meeting purpose was to introduce the parking strategy study and get comments on parking from stakeholders, and represented an opportunity for stakeholders to comment at the start of study. A further stakeholder meeting in 2016 will provide an opportunity for review and comment on the draft findings and recommendations of the parking strategy study.

A general list of parking discussion points was sent with the meeting invitation, and is attached to this report as Appendix A.

The meetings were divided into five sessions, grouped to have discussions amongst people and organizations with similar interests. The stakeholders were grouped as listed below:

- Downtown BIA Stakeholders
- Large Downtown Employers
- Land Owners and Developers
- Parking Operators
- City Boards and Commissions

A list of attendees is included as Appendix B.
3.0 MEETING SUMMARY

The following summaries contain the key points raised in each meeting session, based on notes made by the Project Team and City Staff.

3.1 SESSION 1 - DOWNTOWN BIA STAKEHOLDERS

At 10:30am

- Different ownership and control of parking and enforcement can result in an inconsistent experience for customers. Similar inconsistencies exist with signage and wayfinding.
- Consistency of rates and application of event parking rates was also noted as an issue, in particular signage to advise when event parking rates are in effect.
- Logistics issue for lots used for event parking, some or all of lot needs to be clear at event start. Some lots relocate permit holders on event days, so have to find replacement parking.
- In some cases, parking enforcement is seen as aggressive and a deterrent to downtown business customers.
- Comment that there appears to be a perception amongst some public that parking should be available in the immediate proximity to destination, and be unpaid. Price appears to be more of an issue than availability.
- Comment that some parking lot conditions are in need of surface repairs not in line with expectations given the rates charged.
- Transit use in the downtown will increase in the future with Shift initiative, but concern on removal or loss of parking in the interim. Comment that the transit infrastructure has to be in place first before parking is taken away.
- Parking is a large expense for downtown landlords, some pay for and/or provide parking for employees and visitors.
- Technology (e.g. mobile apps) provides an opportunity to enhance ease of use and improve customer experience. Making it easier to pay and to extend parking duration may result in fewer parking enforcement actions. For instance, you can only pay up to 5:30pm or 6:00pm depending on the lot, then you have to go out to pay again – but you can pay for your full stay if it’s past 5:30pm/6:00pm.
- Having one inventory/source such as an on-line map for finding parking would be a benefit to users.
- Regional context: competition for office space (leases) as well as for retail/restaurant and other commercial uses. Availability and cost of parking is an issue in deciding on business/office location, especially for leasing. Affordable and secure parking can be an issue for attracting and retaining tenants/employees.
- Concern over existing amount of vacant office space in Downtown, and impact on parking that could arise if floor space is occupied, and that no planning permissions would be required to do so.
- Current competition for office and commercial space (e.g. Westmount Mall, Masonville Mall etc.) have unpaid customer parking. Could the City consider a levy
or tax on parking outside downtown as a means of rebalancing costs and perceptions against downtown paid parking?

- Parking structures are a logical solution to ultimate loss of surface parking lots, but customer’s willingness to pay increased parking fees will be an issue. Comment that the hospital has provided structured parking recently in London.

- Some innovative measures currently being used:
  - Bar using shuttle to drop off patrons at end of evening
  - City/LTC providing park and ride service from east end
  - Recent Renaissance development provided public parking as benefit to City. Desire to see more of this.

- Changing travel preferences for younger demographic: anecdotal evidence of emerging trend to do not have a driver’s license – expectation that parking needs may not increase as in the past. Covent Garden Market estimates that 2/3rd of permit holders are older than 45.

3.2 SESSION 2 - MAJOR DOWNTOWN EMPLOYERS

At 11:30am

- Large employers/landowners provide parking for employees/leaseholders in some cases. Parking for management can be a retention (or attraction) issue. High demand for these spaces adjacent to building e.g. London Life had waiting list of approximately 2000 people.
- Waiting list for parking at Covent Garden Market of approximately 340 people.
- Distance and perception of personal safety are issues in securing parking.
- Anecdotal evidence that new public parking at Renaissance is underutilized despite having lower monthly rates than some adjacent parking lots. Parking at lots such as the Renaissance building and park and ride remote parking offered by City and LTC does not appear to be well used or not known about as an option.
- Suggestion that having one inventory/source such as an on-line map for finding parking would be a benefit to users.
- Some culture shift may be required for stakeholders negotiating leases – may not necessarily be making deals based on recent changes in demands.
- Fanshawe College: new location with 2000 students and 75 staff in 2017/2018. Some overlap with main campus with staff, but programs mainly stand-alone. Concern regarding staff parking and on-street loading availability.
- Covent Garden Market has high demand for parking. Perception that Renaissance parking spaces, (approx. 300 spaces 30% cheaper than market) is “too far”. Comment made that this suggests a small city mindset, “perception problem”.
- Displacement of regular parkers downtown when large event is downtown (e.g. Memorial Cup and Figure Skating 2013 Worlds)
- Secure bike parking is desirable – bike parking is well used at some locations (e.g. Covent Garden Market and City Hall) but willingness to pay for secure bike parking not well understood. Previous work by Covent Garden Market found no business case for paid secure bike parking.
• Provision exists in zoning by-law to reduce automobile parking by up to 10% when bike parking is provided.
• Consideration of interim parking solutions until such time as LRT in full service and travel behaviour has changed. Consider parking solutions that can be adapted/changed.
• Interest in public/private partnerships on parking in order to make efficient use of parking resources.

3.3 SESSION 3 - LAND OWNERS AND DEVELOPERS
At 1:30pm

• Density of workers increasing in existing office space.
• Parking validations well used at Citi Plaza, most transient parking is unpaid due to validations.
• Current parking for Old Oak properties and Citi Plaza is sufficient.
• Farhi Holdings some properties hard to lease because parking is “too far” from office space (tenants also desire parking for clients). Hear that a 5 minute walk is too far.
• Some current surface parking lots scheduled for redevelopment
• Downward trend in parking occupancy seen at some parking lots. Comment that “culture shift” may be occurring, older generation people think a parking spot per person is necessary, but millennials don’t want/use those spaces due to increased walk/cycle transit use.
• Technology becoming available for people to rent/use a parking space via a mobile app.
• Demand for secure, covered bike parking is going up (from tenants), and Citi Plaza had been approached by City for general public bike parking
• State of the Downtown Report contains information on recent trends on downtown activity.
• Recent activity growth in area of Richmond/Piccadilly for restaurants in particular. Parking is in high demand in this area.
• Generally, parking is only an issue when there are major events in the Downtown.
• How will parking be affected by city’s initiatives? Where will people park if Dundas Place is a success?
3.4 SESSION 4 - PARKING OPERATORS

At 2:30pm

- Impark currently responsible for approximately 5,000 parking spaces, including leased and managed lots, and carries out own enforcement.
- Parking rates at managed lots are set by property owners, with Impark advising.
- Downward trend in parking occupancy seen at many parking lots.
- Approximately five surface lots currently managed by Impark may be redeveloped in the near future.
- The City has a hard time reacting quickly to changes as private parking operators, as everything has to be brought to Council and multiple by-laws updated to implement operational change.
- Aware of some private lots (e.g. Renaissance) that are consistently under-used.
- Noted recent activity in area of Richmond/Piccadilly with parking in high demand in this area.

3.5 SESSION 5 - CITY BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

At 3:30pm

- Convention centre attendees – for some events with regional draw, attendees already at hotel so no additional parking demands. LTC works with Convention Centre and with Tourism London to provide transit pass for large events.
- LTC monthly pass currently priced at $81 for full monthly pass and $69 for weekday pass, and are lower than monthly parking rates – generally $120-$150/month.
- Major LTC service/route changes coming in September 2016, including several new express services.
- Parking tickets in Impark lots are too high – Impark vs. City
- Inconsistency of rates between parking lots within the downtown
- Monthly parking costs should be greater than the monthly parking costs – some cities regulate this – for example the least expensive monthly parking fee has to be at least 10% higher than the most expensive monthly bus pass
- Competition between Western Fair and Convention Centre – Western Fair has a lot of free parking whereas the Convention Centre is paid parking
APPENDIX A:
Meeting Invitation and Issues List
RE: MEETING NOTICE – PARKING STRATEGY FOR DOWNTOWN LONDON

March 10, 2016

Dear Downtown London BIA Members:

The City of London has retained BA Consulting Group Ltd. to develop a Parking Strategy for Downtown London. In 2012, Council approved the City’s Smart Moves Transportation Master Plan (TMP), a long-term transportation strategy to guide transportation and land use decisions to 2030 and beyond. A key goal of the TMP was to provide convenient choices to enhance mobility for all users and all modes of transportation, including a rapid transit network serving downtown London as the main transit hub. One of the recommendations of the TMP was the development of a Downtown Parking Strategy to support transit in Downtown London.

The main intent of the Parking Strategy study is to develop an effective parking strategy for Downtown London to support businesses and development in the short term, while managing parking supply and demand in the longer term, mainly to support the City’s urban design, economic, land use, and transportation objectives.

Preliminary meetings with downtown stakeholders are being held to provide an opportunity to review the scope of the study, meet the study team, and discuss issues related to parking in the downtown. Meetings will be held on

Date: Tuesday, March 22, 2016
Time: 10:30 am to 11:30 am
Location: Labatt Lounge – 2nd Floor – beside Mezzanine
Covent Garden Market, 130 King St,
London ON

The intent of this meeting is to give an opportunity for stakeholders to provide input on the study. Please review the attached discussion points in preparation for the meeting. Stakeholders will have further opportunity to provide comments as the study progresses.

For more information and future updates, please visit the project web site at www.london.ca/ParkingStrategy. If you have any questions or comments about the Parking Strategy for Downtown London, please feel free to contact us at your convenience; Maged Elmadhoon, at (519) 661-2500 Ext. 4934 or melmadho@london.ca.

Sincerely,
BA Consulting Group Ltd.

Stuart Anderson, Associate

cc: Maged Elmadhoon, City of London

“Information collected for the study will be used in accordance with the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. Except for personal information, including your name, address and property location, all comments received throughout the study will become part of the public record and included in project documentation.”
DISCUSSION POINTS FOR LONDON PARKING STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS – MARCH 22, 2016

CURRENT PARKING:

What are your existing parking needs?

Do you own or lease parking in Downtown London?
  • On-site or off-site?

Parking availability, convenience, safety/security, tickets (enforcement), cost
  • Issues for employees
    o How is employee parking paid for (by employer or by employee)?
    o Permits and waitlists?
    o Proximity of long-stay parking
  • Issues for visitors/customers
    o Availability of supply and convenient access to short-stay parking
  • Issues for residents
    o Availability of supply and convenient access to overnight guest parking

Day to day parking experience versus event peaks

Experiences for on-street parking versus off-street parking
  • Availability, convenient access to, and cost

Loading: on-street supply and demand versus off-street or laneway options

FUTURE PARKING:

(Foreseeable future changes to existing parking needs)

Expansion plans for businesses / downtown intensification and redevelopment

Market for additional office development

Market for residential development

Opportunities for transportation change – shift to transit or active transportation and impact on parking needs

Long-term parking impacts from downtown infrastructure projects e.g.
  • Rapid Transit
  • Dundas Place
  • Cycle Track on Queens Avenue
Parking requirements for new developments/redevelopments/conversions
- Zoning by-law requirements or relief
- Shared parking between facilities

Future shift from surface parking to structured parking
- Cost and benefit implications for City/Developers/Users

POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS

Policy
- Existing policy for office use – over 5000 s.m. required to locate downtown
- Cash-in-lieu of providing parking
- Parking requirements in Zoning By-law
- Parking maximums
- Implications of restriction of commercial parking lots as a land use
- Implications of reduced parking requirements and supply on marketability/leasing

Alternatives
- Downtown transit loops to link to rapid transit stations
- Downtown bike share
- Park and ride on LRT

Technology
- Wayfinding with real-time parking information
- Parking Apps

Fee Structures
- Encourage efficient use of all parking
- Variable rates based on location and type of parking
APPENDIX B:  
Meeting Attendees - March 22, 2016
LONDON PARKING STRATEGY STAKEHOLDER MEETING  
MARCH 22, 2016

Project Team in attendance at all sessions:

| City of London - Maged Elmadhoon, Jim Yanchula, Shane Maguire, Annette Drost | BA Group - Stuart Anderson, Ralph Bond, Kristie Ellis |

SESSION 1

In attendance at 10:30am:

| Felipe Gomes, Aroma Restaurant | Lou Pompili, City Planning |
| Kathy McLaughlin, Downtown London | Jodi Simpson, CityMatch + Mainstreet London |
| Kerri Killen, City Planning | Nicole Laidler, Spilled Ink + Mainstreet London |
| Janette MacDonald, Downtown London | Tanya Park, City Councillor |
| Edward Soldo, City of London |

SESSION 2

In attendance at 11:30am:

| Don McCallum, Covent Garden Market | Janette MacDonald, Downtown London |
| Bob Usher, Covent Garden Market | Kevin Teal, London Life |
| Michelle Giroux, Fanshawe College | Mary June Clancy, London Life |
| Shawn Harrington, Fanshawe College |

SESSION 3

In attendance at 1:30pm:

| Bonnie Wludyka, Citi Plaza | Georgette Durston, Farhi Holdings |
| Keith McAlister, Old Oak Properties | Janette MacDonald, Downtown London |
| Stephan Sommalias, Old Oak Properties |
# SESSION 4

In attendance at 2:30pm:

| Shannon McCartney, Impark |

# SESSION 5

In attendance at 3:30pm:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neil Watson, City Housing</th>
<th>Kerri Killen, City Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chris Campbell, Tourism London</td>
<td>Lori DaSilva, London Convention Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Adams, LEDC</td>
<td>Katie Burns, London Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Wilson, London Transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B:
Parking Management & Design Best Practices (separate document)