

AFFORDABILITY AND CHOICE TODAY (A•C•T) STREAMLINED APPROVAL PROCESS PROJECT

Case Study

Condominium Apartment Parking Standards in Mississauga, Ontario

**Urban Development Institute, Peel Chapter
Mississauga, Ontario**

Prepared for:

Federation of Canadian Municipalities

Canadian Home Builders' Association

Canadian Housing and Renewal Association

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation

Prepared by:

Energy Pathways Inc.

Ottawa, Ontario

November 1994

This case study was funded by Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, but the views expressed are the personal views of the authors and the Corporation accepts no responsibility for them.

FOREWORD

The project documented in this case study received funding assistance under the Affordability and Choice Today (A•C•T) Program. A•C•T is a joint initiative, managed by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, the Canadian Home Builders' Association, and the Canadian Housing and Renewal Association, together with the funding agency Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. The A•C•T Program is administered by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities.

A•C•T, which was launched in January 1990, was designed to foster changes to planning and building regulations and residential development approval procedures in order to improve housing affordability, choice and quality.

Through A•C•T, grants are awarded to municipalities, private and non-profit builders and developers, planners and architects to undertake innovative regulatory reform initiatives in municipalities across Canada. Three types of projects are awarded grants under the A•C•T Program: Demonstration Projects, Streamlined Approval Process Projects, and Case Studies (of existing initiatives).

- *Demonstration Projects* involve the construction of innovative housing that demonstrates how modifications to planning and construction regulations can improve affordability, choice and quality.

- *Streamlined Approval Process Projects* involve the development of a method or an approach that reduces the time and effort needed to obtain approvals for housing projects.
- *Case Study* grants are awarded for the documentation of existing regulatory reform initiatives.

Change and innovation require the participation of all the players in the housing sector. A•C•T provides a unique opportunity for groups at the local level to work together to identify housing concerns, reach consensus on potential solutions, and implement action. Consequently, a key component of A•C•T-sponsored projects is the participation and cooperation of various players in the housing sector in all phases of each project, from development to realization.

All projects awarded a grant under the A•C•T Program are documented as case studies in order to share information on the initiatives and the benefits of regulatory reform with other Canadian communities. Each case study discusses the regulatory reform initiative, its goals and the lessons learned. Where appropriate, the cost savings resulting from modifications in various planning, development, and construction regulations are calculated and reported.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROJECT OVERVIEW.....	i
1.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....	1
1.1 Condominium Apartment Parking Standards in Mississauga.....	1
<i>Figure 1. Proposed Condominium Apartment Parking Standards</i> <i>According to Unit Type.....</i>	<i>1</i>
1.2 Study Methodology.....	2
1.2.1 Literature Review.....	2
1.2.2 Conducting the Surveys.....	2
<i>Figure 2. Survey Site Locations.....</i>	<i>3</i>
2.0 STUDY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	5
2.1 Key Findings.....	5
2.2 Study Recommendations.....	7
2.3 The Municipality’s Response.....	8
3.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND.....	9
3.1 Mississauga, Ontario.....	9
3.2 Public Transit Infrastructure in Mississauga.....	9
3.3 Urban Development Institute, Peel Chapter.....	9
4.0 REGULATORY REFORM INITIATIVES AND IMPACT ON HOUSING COST, CHOICE AND QUALITY.....	10
APPENDIX A: BUILDING RESIDENT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE AND SUMMARY.....	12
APPENDIX B: VISITOR PARKING UTILIZATION SUMMARY.....	16
APPENDIX C: BUILDING MANAGEMENT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE.....	17
APPENDIX D: CITY OF MISSISSAUGA BY-LAW 257-94.....	19

PROJECT OVERVIEW

In the late 1980s, many in the construction industry in Mississauga, Ontario, believed that parking standards for condominium apartment buildings were excessive and added unnecessarily to housing cost. In fact, the provision of parking was one of the most expensive components of condominium apartment projects, adding approximately \$5,000 to \$12,000 per space to the cost of a unit.

In 1990, the Urban Development Institute (UDI), Peel Chapter, in cooperation with the City of Mississauga, undertook an A•C•T project to review Mississauga's parking standards for condominium apartments and to recommend appropriate amendments to the zoning by-law.

UDI retained the consulting firm Proctor & Redfern Limited to conduct the review of condominium apartment parking standards. A Steering Committee, comprising representatives of UDI, the City of Mississauga's Planning and Building Department and Proctor & Redfern Limited was formed in order to direct the project. The results of the review were summarized in a report entitled *City of Mississauga Parking Standards Review for Condominium Apartment Buildings*. The report presents information gathered from three surveys:

- A survey of residents regarding vehicle ownership, household composition, and transit use

- A survey of visitor parking utilization rates
- A survey of building managers

The study indicated that the residents of condominium apartments had household characteristics that differed substantially from those of Mississauga's general population. For example, condominium apartments had an average occupancy rate of 1.99 persons per unit, which was much lower than the city-wide average of 3.05 persons per residential unit. The study also predicted that the occupancy rate for condominium apartments would remain stable, as would other household characteristics such as a low percentage of children, a high percentage of occupants over 65 years of age, and a lower-than-average vehicle ownership rate.

Despite the unique household characteristics of condominium apartments, the current City of Mississauga zoning by-law specified a parking standard of two spaces per unit. The study found that, as a result of this inappropriate standard, there were at least 35 percent more resident parking spaces in condominium apartment buildings city-wide than were actually required. UDI believed that parking standards for condominium apartments should reflect the household and vehicle-use characteristics of residents rather than those of the general population in Mississauga.

As a result of the study, UDI recommended a number of revisions to Mississauga's zoning by-law, including the following:

- Parking standards for condominium apartments should be reduced from 2.0 spaces to 1.5 for one-bedroom units and 1.65 for two-bedroom units.
- Condominium apartment buildings with fewer than 50 units should provide a minimum of 20 visitor parking spaces, with at least one additional visitor parking space for every 10 additional units up to 100 units.
- Aisle width should be reduced from 7.0 m to 6.0 m.
- A maximum of 20 percent of parking spaces should be permitted as tandem parking spaces, with a minimum length for a tandem parking stall of 7 m.

On May 30, 1994, Mississauga City Council amended its zoning by-laws and reduced parking standards for condominium apartments, incorporating a number of UDI's recommendations.

This A•C•T project demonstrates that reduced condominium apartment parking standards could adequately meet resident and visitor parking requirements in many municipalities. If condominium apartment parking standards more closely reflected actual parking requirements, construction costs for this type of housing could be reduced considerably. As a result, condominium apartments, an attractive housing option to groups such as seniors, young families, and singles entering the equity housing market, could be made more affordable.

1.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1.1 Condominium Apartment Parking Standards in Mississauga

In the late 1980s, in Mississauga, Ontario, the parking standard for condominium apartments was 2.0 spaces per unit, or 1.75 spaces for resident parking and 0.25 spaces for visitor parking. This standard had been in effect since 1979 and was one of the highest in the area. Parking standards had a direct impact on housing affordability, since the provision of parking was one of the most expensive components of condominium apartment projects, adding approximately \$5,000 to \$12,000 per space to the cost of a unit, depending on whether parking was above or below ground.

Many people in the local construction industry believed that Mississauga's parking standards for condominium apartments were too high and inflexible, and that they added unnecessarily to the cost of this type of housing. Some also questioned the basis upon which standards were established. Parking standards in many municipalities, for example, were established on a per-unit basis regardless of unit size or proximity to public transit.

In 1987, as a result of increasing pressure from the residential construction industry to revise condominium apartment parking standards, City of Mississauga planning staff conducted a parking utilization survey of 38 condominium apartment buildings in the municipality. The survey findings and recommendations were presented to the

Figure 1. Proposed Condominium Apartment Parking Standards According to Unit Type

Unit Type	Resident Spaces	Visitor Spaces	Total Spaces
Studio	1.00	0.25	1.25
Bachelor	1.00	0.25	1.25
One bedroom	1.16	0.25	1.41
One bedroom plus den	1.30	0.25	1.55
Two bedroom	1.50	0.25	1.75
Two bedroom plus den	1.70	0.25	1.95
Three bedroom	1.75	0.25	2.00

City's Community Planning and Development Committee on February 29, 1988. The study recommended that overall parking standards for condominium apartments should be reduced and reflect unit size. Figure 1 above contains the parking standards proposed by the City's study. City Council believed it could consider revising parking standards in accordance with the study's recommendations only after further research.

In November 1990, the Urban Development Institute (UDI), Peel Chapter, was awarded an A•C•T grant to review the City of Mississauga's parking standards for condominium apartments and to recommend appropriate changes to the zoning by-law and the site plan approval process.

1.2 Study Methodology

The review of the City of Mississauga's condominium apartment parking standards was a cooperative effort coordinated by UDI, with assistance from the City of Mississauga's Planning and Building Department and support from the Toronto Home Builders' Association. UDI hired Proctor & Redfern Limited, a consulting firm of engineers, architects, scientists and planners, to conduct the study. A Steering Committee comprising representatives of UDI, the Planning and Building Department and Proctor & Redfern Limited, was formed to oversee the work.

The study contained four parts:

- A literature review and review of condominium apartment parking standards in the City of Mississauga and other municipalities
- A survey of resident vehicle ownership, household composition and transit usage
- A visitor parking utilization survey
- A building management survey

1.2.1 Literature Review

A review examined condominium apartment parking standards in Mississauga and nine other comparable Southern Ontario municipalities. Technical reports on parking standards for housing types other than condominium apartments were also consulted. The consultant found that parking standards in most of the municipalities examined did not vary with the type of unit. Similarly, standards that provided for increased levels of transit were recorded in only two of the municipalities studied. The review also revealed that Mississauga had the second-highest parking standards for condominium apartments in the region.

1.2.2 Conducting the Surveys

For the three surveys, the consultant selected 34 condominium apartment buildings in Mississauga, of which 17 were new. The other 17 had also been surveyed in the City's 1987 study. The buildings were selected on the basis of geographic distribution, proximity to public transit, building age, occupancy rate (more than 75 percent) and representative distribution throughout the city. Figure 2 shows the location and lists the addresses of the condominium apartment buildings that were surveyed.

Figure 2. Survey Site Locations



Source: Proctor & Redfern Limited

A number of factors were considered in developing survey questionnaires and data collection parameters. These factors included the following:

- Type of parking available (underground or surface)
- Number and size of units
- Proximity to transit
- Surrounding land uses (i.e. the presence of available overflow parking at adjacent land uses)
- Residents' and managers' concerns about parking
- Building vacancy rate

In addition, a site appraisal was undertaken for each individual site, in order to record specific site characteristics such as the layout of the resident and visitor parking, fire routes, adjacent land uses, availability of on-street parking facilities, and proximity to transit.

Building Resident Survey

Questionnaires were mailed to every resident in the selected buildings. Of the more than 5 600 resident questionnaires that were distributed, approximately 800, or 14 percent of the total, were completed and returned. The consultants found the response rate to provide a satisfactory sample size for the purposes of the study. At the City of Mississauga's request,

a 95 percent confidence test was used for the statistical analysis of the data from the resident survey. Appendix A contains the building resident survey questionnaire and the summary of the resident survey.

Visitor Parking Survey

A visitor parking utilization survey was conducted to determine the demand for visitor parking at condominium apartment buildings. The survey was carried out between 5:00 p.m. and midnight on a Friday and a Saturday evening, and between 11:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on a Sunday, in order to capture peak utilization time. In addition to the visitor parking provided on-site for each condominium apartment building, any use of parking on neighbouring streets or in adjacent parking lots was recorded.

The visitor parking survey was designed to be compatible for comparison with the 1987 study conducted by the City. Appendix B contains the visitor parking utilization summary.

Building Management Survey

Of the 50 building management questionnaires issued, 16 responses were received. The questionnaire was sent under a cover letter describing components of all three surveys. Appendix C contains the building management survey questionnaire.

2.0 STUDY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study findings and recommendations were compiled in a document entitled *City of Mississauga Parking Standards Review for Condominium Apartment Buildings*.¹

2.1 Key Findings

Presented below are the key findings of the three surveys conducted as part of the review of condominium apartment parking standards in Mississauga.

Condominium apartment residents had a lower-than-average vehicle ownership rate

Resident parking demand was in large part determined by the rate of vehicle ownership. The condominium apartment residents surveyed owned an average of 1.28 vehicles per unit, compared with the city-wide vehicle ownership rate of 1.68.

The resident survey also indicated that approximately 20 percent of condominium apartment households had two or more cars. However, 24 percent of households owning two-bedroom units had two or more vehicles.

Existing resident parking spaces were not fully utilized

The resident survey revealed that residents owned or leased, on average, 1.5 parking spaces per unit, compared with a car ownership level of 1.28 vehicles per unit. When the number of spaces owned or leased by survey respondents (1 227) was compared to the number of vehicles owned or leased by them (1 026), it became apparent that 20 percent of the owned or leased resident parking spaces were not being used. Furthermore, the current City standard of 1.75 parking spaces per unit for resident parking resulted in a total oversupply of approximately 35 percent. Comments from building managers confirmed that current standards created more parking spaces than residents required.

Condominium apartment residents were older than the Mississauga average

Approximately 25 percent of the residents surveyed were 65 or older, while approximately 5 percent of all Mississauga residents were in this age category. In contrast, while approximately 20 percent of all Mississauga residents were under 16 years of age, only about 7 percent of the condominium apartment residents belonged to this group.² The study concluded that condominium apartment residents had a different lifestyle than the general public, and therefore, had a different (lower) car utilization rate.

¹ Proctor & Redfern Limited (Mississauga, 1992). A copy of this document can be obtained by writing to Mr. Tom Rae, Proctor & Redfern Limited, 45 Green Belt Drive, Don Mills, Ontario M3C 3K3.

A copy may also be purchased or obtained on loan from the Canadian Housing Information Centre, 700 Montreal Road, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0P7, Tel: (613) 748-2367, Fax: (613) 748-6192, TTY (613) 748-2143.

² Proctor & Redfern Limited, p. 6. Mississauga population statistics were obtained from *Transportation Tomorrow Survey Report (1986)* and *Statistics Canada Census (1991)*.

Average condominium apartment household size was lower than the City average

The survey revealed that condominium apartment residents had an average household size of 1.99 persons per unit, 1.56 persons per unit for units with fewer than two bedrooms and 2.11 for units with two bedrooms or more, which was much lower than the city-wide average size of 3.05 persons per household.³

Public transportation was accessible to, and well used by, condominium apartment residents

The condominium apartment buildings surveyed were all within 400 m of a transit stop, and approximately half of the buildings were adjacent to GO Transit stations.⁴ The survey indicated that condominium apartment residents had approximately double the per capita transit ridership of other City of Mississauga residents.

The number of visitor parking spaces required depended on the size of the condominium apartment complex

The study found that the visitor parking supply standard of 0.25 spaces per unit was generally sufficient to accommodate visitor parking needs. For smaller buildings, however, the study found that a peak in visitor parking demand by one or two units could leave too few spaces for the remaining units. A large condominium apartment building, on

the other hand, with a greater overall number of visitor parking spaces would be less sensitive to peaks in demand.

On-street parking was used by visitors even in locations where parking spaces were available in visitor parking areas

This was found to be particularly true if the on-street parking was closer to the building entrance than the designated visitor parking.

For a variety of reasons, parking restrictions were not properly enforced; this could lead to visitor parking supply problems

Findings from the building manager survey indicated that visitor parking supply problems were mainly due to the abuse of visitor parking space privileges by residents and visitors. Enforcement mechanisms were so cumbersome that parking restrictions were not enforced. Interviews with building managers revealed that there was generally a high turnover of the security and caretaker personnel who were responsible for parking enforcement. In addition, because of the long time required for security and caretaker personnel to receive authorization from the City to issue parking tickets, they were not effective in enforcing the regulations. An additional problem was that enforcement personnel who were well established at the condominium apartment building could be reluctant to issue tickets to residents they knew well.

³ *ibid.*

⁴ See Section 3.2.

2.2 Study Recommendations

Based on the survey results, UDI recommended that the City of Mississauga revise its parking standards for condominium apartments in the following ways.

To reduce the number of resident parking spaces required per unit as follows:

Unit Type	Recommended Parking Spaces/Unit
Less than 2 bedrooms	1.25
2 bedrooms or more	1.40

To permit an aisle width of 6.0 m instead of the current 7.0 m

The characteristics of condominium apartment resident parking facilities differed from public parking in that residents became accustomed to their allocated parking space. Therefore, manoeuvrability requirements for parking stalls and driving aisles could be reduced. Resident parking stall dimensions of 2.6 m by 5.2 m would remain unchanged.

To permit a maximum of 20 percent of underground resident parking stalls to be designated for small cars, with a minimum stall dimension of 2.2 m by 4.0 m

To apply the current standard for visitor parking of 0.25 per unit only to condominium apartment buildings with more than 100 units

To require condominium apartment buildings with fewer than 50 units to

provide a minimum of 20 visitor parking spaces, with at least one additional visitor parking space for every 10 additional units, up to 100 units. For example:

Number of Units	Minimum Spaces
50 units or less	20
51-60 units	21
61-70 units	23
71-80 units	24
91-100 units	25

In addition, the report suggested that the following guidelines be adopted in the site plan approval process:

A maximum of 20 percent of resident parking spaces may be tandem parking spaces, with a minimum length for a tandem parking stall of 7.0 m

Tandem parking refers to parking two cars, one behind the other, in an extra-long space. Allowing 20 percent of condominium apartment parking for residents to be tandem parking would minimize the construction and operational costs of parking, by permitting greater flexibility in the design and layout of underground parking. Tandem parking was permitted in Mississauga only on an ad hoc basis for certain site-specific rezonings.

The study made the following additional recommendations pertaining to the design and management of condominium apartment parking facilities. These recommendations would help maximize the use of, and minimize the need for, parking spaces.

- Condominium apartment management (rather than security and caretaker personnel) should be responsible for enforcing parking infractions. In addition, City staff could be more active in parking enforcement at condominium apartment developments. The study also recommended the simplification of procedures for authorizing designated individuals to issue parking tickets on condominium apartment building property.
- Condominium apartment residents should be responsible for storing boats, trailers, and other recreational and oversized vehicles which require special facilities at off-site locations.
- Transit ridership for condominium apartments should be monitored once full GO Transit service is operational. At that time, a further reduction in parking standards for condominium apartment buildings located near GO stations and major bus transit stations may be considered.
- An average peak utilization rate of 85 percent should be used as a design criterion for visitor parking.

2.3 The Municipality's Response

The study was circulated for comment to UDI, the Toronto Home Builders' Association, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, appropriate City of Mississauga departments and agencies, and all condominium apartment corporations in Mississauga. Before it could consider adopting any of the recommendations contained in the study,

Mississauga City Council believed that additional information was required. As a result, Council requested that UDI try to raise additional funds to assist with the cost of meeting the added requirements.

Although UDI was unable to obtain additional funding, Proctor & Redfern and City planning staff were able to carry out the activities recommended by Council.

Mississauga's Planning and Building Department successfully brought the issue before Council again in May 1994. At that time, incorporating a number of UDI's recommendations, Council amended Mississauga's zoning by-laws in order to reduce parking standards for condominium apartments. (Appendix D contains the amending by-law.) Council also voted to add policy guidelines to the Site Plan Manual that would give building developers increased flexibility in designing parking facilities, and that would assist building managers in operating parking facilities:

- Visitor parking should be provided in conveniently accessible locations, preferably at grade and close to the main building entrance.
- Resident and visitor parking areas should be clearly marked and signed. Visitor parking to be clearly identified as being reserved for the exclusive use of visitors.
- A maximum of 10 percent of the resident parking spaces be permitted as tandem parking, where appropriate.
- A den is considered as a bedroom for the purposes of calculating parking.

3.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND

3.1 Mississauga, Ontario

Incorporated in 1974, the City of Mississauga is made up of towns, villages and hamlets that were once independent communities. With a 1991 population of approximately 465 000, the recent influx of residents and industry has made Mississauga one of the fastest-growing cities in Canada.⁵

In May 1991, the average price of a detached, three-bedroom home in Mississauga was about \$210,000 and the price of a condominium apartment ranged from \$140,000 to \$340,000. Rents were as low as half the average cost of rental accommodation in Toronto.⁶

3.2 Public Transit Infrastructure in Mississauga

Located about 20 minutes by car from Toronto, Mississauga is well served by roadways and public transportation. The existing bus system, operated by Mississauga Transit, provides a comprehensive service within the city. Regional transit is provided by GO Transit, including three commercial rail lines that serve a total of eight stations. At present, the GO service operates fully on one line and only at peak hours on the other two. The upgrading of these routes to full service is scheduled for 1997 or 1998.

In the near future, the City proposes to develop a more extensive network of High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes to supplement existing HOV lanes.

3.3 Urban Development Institute, Peel Chapter

For more than 30 years, UDI has represented the land, building and property management industries. In Ontario, there are five active chapters, of which Peel Chapter is one, and several committees, whose members meet regularly with representatives of government policy, planning and regulatory agencies and departments. One of these committees, the Condominium Group, was established to promote the knowledge and acceptance of all aspects of the condominium concept, including legal, planning, marketing and ongoing management issues.

UDI's goals include the following:

- To promote urban planning and development which will best provide for the present and future needs of Ontarians
- To achieve a uniform and fair legislative framework
- To foster responsible dialogue among the development industry, government and the public
- To upgrade development industry standards through education, experience and the exchange of information

⁵ Moving Publications, *Moving to and Around Toronto and Area* (Don Mills, 1991).

⁶ Ibid.

4.0 REGULATORY REFORM INITIATIVES AND IMPACT ON HOUSING COST, CHOICE AND QUALITY

Parking standards for condominium apartments directly affect the cost of this type of housing, since the provision of parking is one of the most expensive components of condominium apartment projects, adding approximately \$5,000 to \$12,000 per space to the cost of a unit.

By revising standards to more closely reflect actual parking requirements, construction costs for condominium apartments could be reduced. For example, if a standard of 1.5 rather than 2.0 parking spaces per unit were applied, the cost of providing parking for a one-bedroom condominium apartment unit could be reduced by \$4,500, based on a cost per parking space of \$9,000.

Condominium apartments have been an attractive option for groups such as seniors, young families, and singles entering the equity housing market. If they become more affordable, they will also become more accessible to a broader clientele.

Interest in the UDI-sponsored study has been expressed by planning professionals and others in the housing field elsewhere in Ontario. The study's findings and recommendations will be useful to other Canadian municipalities considering a review and revision of condominium apartment parking standards to improve the affordability of this housing choice.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: BUILDING RESIDENT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE AND SUMMARY



City of Mississauga CONDOMINIUM APARTMENT PARKING STUDY BUILDING RESIDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Address: _____	Postal Code: _____
_____	_____
_____	_____

1.) Please check the type of condominium unit you occupy:

Studio	<input type="checkbox"/>	Two Bedroom	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bachelor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Two Bedroom & Den	<input type="checkbox"/>
One Bedroom	<input type="checkbox"/>	Three Bedroom	<input type="checkbox"/>
One Bedroom & Den	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>

Condominium size (if known) in square feet or square metre

Do you own or lease the unit?

2.) How many permanent residents live in the unit? Please indicate the number of residents in each category.

Under 16 years	<input type="text"/>
16 to 65 years	<input type="text"/>
Over 65 years	<input type="text"/>

3.) Employment/commuting

	Please indicate the method of commuting used by each resident.				
How many persons in the condominium unit are in:	Private Car	Car Pool	Transit	Kiss-N-Ride	Park-N-Ride
Full time Employment <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Part time Employment <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Full time at School <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Retirement <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Homemakers <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Other (specify) <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

4.) How many vehicles are normally parked overnight at the condominium by persons from your unit?

Please indicate the number of each type of vehicle normally parked overnight at your condominium.

Small cars	<input type="text"/>
Full size cars	<input type="text"/>
RV's & vans	<input type="text"/>
Other (specify)	<input type="text"/>

5.) During the next 5 years do you anticipate any change in:

a) the number of vehicles you park overnight YES
NO

b) if YES, please indicate the number of additional vehicles
or reduction in vehicles

(Please consider children who stay in the condominium and who may obtain a license; get married etc... and improved transit service which may reduce auto commuting)

6.) How many parking spaces are owned by the condominium unit? Number
Are there additional spaces leased from others?
Are there additional spaces leased to others?

7.) Do you have any problems or comments with respect to parking for residents in the building?

8.) Visitors Parking - Have your visitors experienced any parking problems? YES
NO

Please report the type of problem encountered by your visitor, check any combination and indicate the approximate time of day that most parking problems are encountered.

Visitors
Lack of reserved parking spaces for visitors
Spaces are inconveniently located
Spaces are used by other residents
Spaces are used by other not visiting the building
other (please explain) _____

9.) Comments on the number of parking spaces and the operation and control of parking are invited:

Thank you for your cooperation.

If you have any questions please contact John Calvert
City of Mississauga
86-5727

RESIDENTS PARKING SURVEY SUMMARY

Area	No of apn.	No. of Residents/ Response/Age Category			Transportation			Car/unit	Cars/pers.	No. of Cars			Parking Spaces			Space/unit		
		<16	16-65	>65	Car	Car Pool	Transit			Small Car	Full Size	RV Other	Owned	Leased From	Leased To			
1-Bedroom	1	51	1	59	15	75%	3%	22%	1.12	0.76	31	20	6	62	1	2	1.22	
	2	35	0	31	19	69%	0%	32%	1.09	0.76	18	17	3	46	2	0	1.37	
1-Bed + Den	1	66	1	70	37	86%	0%	14%	1.17	0.71	30	43	4	102	1	4	1.55	
	2	18	2	15	16	74%	0%	26%	1.17	0.64	6	13	2	20	1	3	1.33	
2-Bedroom	1	198	33	349	41	78%	1%	21%	1.43	0.67	135	127	22	298	4	25	1.51	
	2	129	9	166	81	74%	0%	26%	1.28	0.7	74	83	21	195	3	14	1.53	
2-Bed + Den	1	119	33	164	70	78%	0%	22%	1.29	0.58	69	76	9	189	3	12	1.59	
	2	32	2	42	14	79%	3%	18%	1.25	0.69	17	23	0	39	4	6	1.53	
3-Bedroom	1	79	20	118	50	75%	2%	23%	1.26	0.54	41	52	8	96	3	9	1.22	
	2	62	15	66	52	80%	0%	20%	1.23	0.57	25	49	2	74	2	7	1.34	
TOTAL		799	116	1080	395				Average	1.23	0.66	446	503	77	1121	24	82	Avg 1.42
		1591									1026			1227				

1 In buildings located near the city centre and public transit.

2 In buildings located in outlying areas.

**RESIDENT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE
SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS
Mississauga Condominium Parking Standards Review**

Condominium Location	Comments
2301 Derry Road West	<i>No response</i>
1625 Bloor Street	<i>Some residents parking in visitors parking "most residents have no problem"</i>
1271 Walden Circle	<i>No response</i>
250 Webb Drive	<i>Lack of visitor parking Residents park in visitor parking</i>
300 Webb Drive	<i>Residents park in visitor parking Lack of visitor parking</i>
1500 Grazia Court	<i>No problems</i>
355 Rathburn	<i>No problems</i>
550 Webb Drive	<i>Some residents parking in visitors parking</i>
25 Fairview Road	<i>No problems</i>
20&50 Mississauga Valley Blvd	<i>Some residents parking in visitors parking Lack of resident parking</i>
1580 Mississauga Valley Blvd	<i>No problems</i>
2665 Windwood Drive	<i>No response</i>
4205 & 4185 Shipp Drive	<i>Inconvenient visitor parking, on roof Visitor parking located away from building</i>
1111 Bough Beeches Blvd	<i>No problems</i>
3100 Kirwin Avenue	<i>No problems</i>
2929 Aquitaine Avenue	<i>No response</i>
1615 Bloor Street	<i>Townhouses use visitor parking spaces Residents park in visitor parking "most residents have no problems"</i>
6500 Montevideo Road	<i>Some residents parking in visitors parking</i>
966 Inverhouse	<i>No problems</i>
880 Dundas Street	<i>No problems</i>
50 Kingsbridge Garden Circle	<i>No problems</i>
1300 Bloor Street East	<i>No response</i>
965 Inverhouse	<i>No response</i>
1155 Bough Beeches Blvd	<i>No response</i>
350 Rathburn Road West	<i>No problems</i>
45 Kingsbridge Garden Circle	<i>Some residents parking in visitors parking Inconvenient visitor parking</i>
66 High Street	<i>Lack of visitor parking</i>
1660 Bloor Street East	<i>No response</i>
200 Robert Speck Pkwy	<i>Lack of visitor parking Residents park in visitor parking</i>
1110 Walden Circle	<i>No problems</i>
330 Rathburn Road West	<i>Lack of visitor parking Residents park in visitor parking</i>
25 Agnes Street	<i>No response</i>

APPENDIX B: VISITOR PARKING UTILIZATION SUMMARY

Release No.	Address	Number of units	Number of spaces	Ratio Space/Unit	Utilization		Comments
					Peak (1)	Avg. (2)	
1	2301 Derry Road West	98	26	0.27	119%	104%	Illegal parking records
2	1625 Bloor Street East	134	36	0.27	106%	89%	No on-street parking available
3	1271 Walden Circle	113	44	0.39	102%	91%	No on-street parking available
4	250 Webb Drive	265	82	0.31	98%	88%	Parking survey includes 10 on-street parking spaces
5	300 Webb Drive	197	72	0.37	97%	85%	Parking survey includes 10 on-street parking spaces
6	1500 Gracia Court	85	22	0.26	95%	73%	
7	355 Rathburn Road East	123	30	0.24	93%	80%	
8	590 Webb Drive	344	86	0.25	93%	84%	
9	25 Fairview Road	170	44	0.26	86%	77%	
10	20 & 50 Mississauga Valley Blvd. *	352	68	0.25	85%	82%	
11	1580 Mississauga Valley Boulevard	224	75	0.33	83%	81%	
12	2565 Windwood Drive	97	21	0.22	81%	71%	
13	4205 & 4185 Shipp Drive *	350	155	0.44	79%	74%	Parking survey includes 10 on-street parking spaces
14	1111 Bough Beeches Blvd	100	24	0.24	79%	71%	
15	3100 Irwin Avenue	228	57	0.25	77%	72%	
16	2929 Aquitaine Avenue	175	44	0.25	70%	61%	
17	1615 Bloor Street	134	38	0.27	69%	67%	
18	6500 Montevideo Road	161	33	0.24	66%	61%	
19	905 Inverhouse	197	115	0.58	64%	62%	Parking survey includes 10 on-street parking spaces
20	660 Dundas Street	150	41	0.27	63%	59%	
21	50 Kingsbridge Garden Circle	290	82	0.25	61%	55%	
22	1300 Bloor Street East	300	81	0.27	40%	43%	
23	905 Inverhouse	125	40	0.32	43%	40%	Parking survey includes 10 on-street parking spaces
24	1155 Bough Beeches Blvd	120	45	0.38	42%	38%	
25	350 Rathburn Road West #	184	46	0.25	na	na	Underground visitor parking not recorded
26	45 Kingsbridge Garden Circle #	359	90	0.25	na	na	Underground visitor parking not recorded
27	1110 Walden Circle #	125	32	0.26	na	na	Underground visitor parking not recorded, include 10 on-street spaces
28	66 High Street #	46	22	0.46	105%	95%	Small number of units, trip survey includes 10 on-street spaces
29	1960 Bloor Street East #	112	14	0.13	114%	107%	Substandard supply
30	230 Robart Speck Parkway #	161	34	0.21	74%	65%	Substandard supply
31	330 Rathburn Road West #	184	23	0.13	138%	122%	Underground visitor parking not recorded, include 10 on-street spaces
32	25 Agnes Street	97	na	na	na	na	Visitor parking shared with commercial use

(1) Peak Hour of the Peak Period (Peak Period = two or more hours in one day with the highest utilization)

(2) Average of the Peak Period

* Combined parking operation

See Appendix C for further details

VISITOR PARKING UTILIZATION SUMMARY

APPENDIX C: BUILDING MANAGEMENT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE



City of Mississauga BUILDING MANAGEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Address: _____	Contact Name: _____
_____	_____
_____	_____

1.) Please indicate the number of condominium units in the building according to unit type and ownership.

	Ownership		Floor area (if known)	
	Owned	Leased	Ft. ²	M ²
Studio	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Bachelor	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
One Bedroom	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
One Bedroom & Den	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Two Bedroom	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Two Bedroom & Den	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Three Bedroom	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Other (specify)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
TOTAL	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

2.) Please indicate the number of vacancies for each unit type.

Studio	<input type="text"/>	Two Bedroom	<input type="text"/>
Bachelor	<input type="text"/>	Two Bedroom & Den	<input type="text"/>
One Bedroom	<input type="text"/>	Three Bedroom	<input type="text"/>
One Bedroom & Den	<input type="text"/>	Other (specify)	<input type="text"/>

3.) Residents' Parking - Please indicate the number of parking spaces for residents.

Surface	<input type="text"/>
Underground	<input type="text"/>
Parking Deck	<input type="text"/>

4.) Visitors' Parking

a) Please indicate the number of parking spaces for residents:

Surface	<input type="text"/>
Underground	<input type="text"/>
Parking Deck	<input type="text"/>

Are there surrounding areas used for parking by visitors? YES

NO



City of Mississauga BUILDING MANAGEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

b) Does the building have any other landuses? YES [] NO [] If YES provide area of landuse.

Table with 2 columns: Landuse Type (Office, Retail, Restaurant, Other), and 2 columns: Area (Ft² or M²)

c) Is the visitors parking shared with these landuses? YES [] NO []

d) Is there illegal use of visitors parking? YES [] NO []

If YES can you specify the extent? [] [] [] []

5.) Please describe the parking control(s) used in your operation. (Please tick more than one if appropriate)

Table with 3 columns: Control Type (Security Guard, Parking Attendant, Automatic Gate, No Control, Other), and 3 columns: Visitors, Residents, Other Landuses

6.) Comments on the number of parking spaces and the operation and control of parking area:

Multiple horizontal lines for providing comments on parking spaces and control.

Thank you for your co-operation.

If you have any questions please contact: T. ER... at 445-3600 or fax 467-6024

APPENDIX D: CITY OF MISSISSAUGA BY-LAW 257-94



THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF MISSISSAUGA
BY-LAW NUMBER 257-94

A By-law to amend By-law Number 5500, as amended

The Council of The Corporation of the City of Mississauga, pursuant to section 34 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P.13, ENACTS as follows:

- By-law 5500, as amended, being a City of Mississauga Zoning By-law, (former Town of Mississauga), is further amended by deleting the provisions of clause 44(17)(b) pertaining to Condominium Apartment House, and substituting the following therefor:

TYPE OF BUILDING	MINIMUM REQUIRED PARKING SPACES PER DWELLING UNIT			
	Resident	Visitor	Rec. Equip.	Total
<u>Condominium Apartment House</u>				
One-Bedroom Unit	1.25	0.25	-	1.50
Two-Bedroom Unit	1.40	0.25	-	1.65
Three-Bedroom Unit or more	1.75	0.25	-	2.00

ENACTED and PASSED this 30th day of MAY 1994.


ACTING MAYOR

APPROVED AS TO FORM OF EXECUTION City Solicitor MISSISSAUGA	
MVB	
Date	94 05 24


DEPUTY CLERK

In accordance with Section 34(21)
of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990,
c.P.13, this By-law came into effect
on May 30th, 1994

APPENDIX "A" TO THE APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF BY-LAW NO. 257-94

Explanation of the Purpose and Effect of the By-law

This By-law amends parking standards for condominium apartments in By-law Number 5500. Existing parking standards for condominium apartments are as follows:

<u>TYPE OF BUILDING</u>	<u>MINIMUM REQUIRED PARKING SPACES PER DWELLING UNIT</u>			
	<u>Resident</u>	<u>Visitor</u>	<u>Rec.Equip.</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Condominium Apartment House</u>				
One-Bedroom Unit	1.75	0.25	-	2.00
Two-Bedroom Unit	1.75	0.25	-	2.00
Three-Bedroom Unit	1.75	0.25	-	2.00

The proposed amendment to existing parking standards would reduce the number of parking spaces required for one and two bedroom units. The proposed parking standards are as follows:

<u>TYPE OF BUILDING</u>	<u>MINIMUM REQUIRED PARKING SPACES PER DWELLING UNIT</u>			
	<u>Resident</u>	<u>Visitor</u>	<u>Rec.Equip.</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Condominium Apartment House</u>				
One-Bedroom Unit	1.25	0.25	-	1.50
Two-Bedroom Unit	1.40	0.25	-	1.65
Three-Bedroom Unit or more	1.75	0.25	-	2.00

Location of Lands Affected

All lands in the former Town of Mississauga, now in the City of Mississauga.

Further information regarding this By-law may be obtained from Susan Tanabe of the Planning and Building Department at 566-4164.



TWENTY-NINTH DAY OF JUNE, 1994

DECLARATION UNDER SECTION 34 OF THE PLANNING ACT, R.S.O. 1990, c.P.1

I, ARTHUR D. GRANNUM, Deputy Clerk hereby certify that the notice for By-law 257-94 of the Corporation of the City of Mississauga by the Council of The Corporation of the City of Mississauga on the 30th day of May was given in the manner and form and to the persons prescribed by regulation made by the Mayor and Council under subsection 19(1) of Section 34 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P.1, on the 8th day of June, 1994.

I also certify that the last day for notice of Appeal pursuant to subsection 19(2) of Section 34 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P.1 is the 28th day of June, 1994, and to this date no notice of objection or request for a change of provisions of the by-law has been filed by any person with the office of the Clerk.

DATED at the City of Mississauga on the 28th day of June, 1994.

Arthur D. Grannum,
Deputy Clerk