



City of Cambridge

CORE AREAS PARKING MASTER PLAN APPENDIX A

PUBLIC CONSULTATION SUMMARY REPORT

MARCH 2009



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #1	1
2.1	Notification.....	1
2.2	Presentation Material	1
2.3	Summary of Comments	2
3.	WEB-CONSULTATION RESULTS.....	2
4.	INTERCEPT SURVEY.....	4
5.	PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #2	4
5.1	Notification.....	4
5.2	Presentation Material	5
5.3	Summary of Comments	5
APPENDIX A:	Copy of Newspaper Notices and Postcard	
APPENDIX B:	Display Boards Presented at Public Information Centres	
APPENDIX C:	Copy of Comment Forms and Sign-in Sheets	
APPENDIX D:	Notes Taken at Public Information Centres	
APPENDIX E:	Comment Forms Received	
APPENDIX F:	Web Consultation Questions and Responses	
APPENDIX G:	Intercept Survey Questions and Responses	

1. INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the public consultation that was carried out for the Cambridge Core Areas Parking Master Plan, consisting of public information centres, a web-based survey, and an intercept survey. The consultation is summarized in chronological order.

2. PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #1

This was the first Public Information Centre (PIC) for the Core Areas Parking Master Plan. The PIC was held on June 18th, 2008. The purpose of this PIC was to present the following:

- Purpose and scope of the study
- A review of parking conditions in the three Cambridge downtown core areas
- A review of potential alternatives
- A review of how alternatives would be evaluated
- An opportunity to discuss issues and ask questions

The first PIC was held at the Cambridge Centre. This location was chosen as it is central and also provided an opportunity to speak with people who may otherwise have not come to a PIC on parking. From a Core Areas retail perspective, people visiting the Cambridge Centre to some extent represent the “competition”.

A total of 13 people signed in at the Cambridge Centre event. Significantly more people stopped to discuss the boards but chose not to sign in. It is estimated that approximately 40 contacts were made.

2.1 Notification

The PIC was widely advertised to the general public and interested stakeholders as follows:

1. Notices were placed in the Cambridge Times on Friday June 6th, 2008 and Friday June 13, 2008 (see **Appendix A** for a copy of the newspaper “Notice of Public Information Centre”)
2. Notices were e-mailed to the Technical Agencies Group and Stakeholder Group
3. Approximately 500 postcard notices were prepared and distributed to the BIAs (see **Appendix A** for a copy of the postcard)

In addition to these formal notification methods, a media release was prepared and resulted in a newspaper article being printed prior to the PIC (see **Appendix A** for a copy of the article).

2.2 Presentation Material

The material on display consisted of presentation boards and a comment sheet. Upon arrival, attendees were asked to sign a visitor sign-in sheet.



In addition to the display boards, two laptop computers were set-up and people were encouraged to complete the on-line parking survey.

A copy of the display boards is provided in **Appendix B1** and copies of the comment form and sign in sheet are provided in **Appendix C1**.

2.3 Summary of Comments

Detailed comments were recorded during the discussions with attendees at the PIC and are provided in **Appendix D1**. Common themes that emerged from the discussions were as follows:

- Concerns about residential intensification and its impact on parking supply and demand.
- Differing opinions on the requirement for additional parking, with some people suggesting all that is required is to maximize use of existing supply; while others strongly feel that a new parking structure is essential.
- There appears to be a mindset that free parking is a right. For example, one attendee complained that he kept getting tickets when parking in an off-street lot all day, when in fact it is clearly evident that only the first two hours are free. Another business owner suggested that it is a hassle for employees to have to move cars every two hours to avoid paying for parking.
- Several people had questions about how the residential parking work programs. e.g. When do you need a permit? When you can or can't park overnight, etc.
- Appears to be some support for shifting long term parkers away from prime spots. Several people also suggested the need for better transit.
- Need for improvements to signage and way-finding systems.

To date, only one comment form has been received and is included in **Appendix E**.

3. WEB-CONSULTATION RESULTS

In conjunction with the PIC, IBI Group also developed an on-line parking survey that was put in place in May 2008 and was available for the remainder of the study. The intent of the survey was to gather background information on the types of trips people make to the Core Areas, and people's reasons for transportation choices. A notice for this survey was published in conjunction with the PIC notice, and also placed on the City's Parking Master Plan project website for the duration of the study. A notice was also included in communication with the Technical Advisory Group and was published in the City's internal newsletter. To the end of March 2009, there have been 123 responses to the web survey.

Some highlights from the responses to date are shown below (note: totals may not add up to 100% due to non-responses or don't know responses; also some questions allow multiple responses so that totals may be higher than 100%). A more detailed summary of the survey responses is included in **Appendix F**.

Shopping Trips

- For their last shopping trip to the core areas, 75% of respondents went to Galt, 13% to Hespeler and 12% to Preston. For these shopping trips, 56% drove alone, 33% went as a passenger and 8% walked. Only 13% paid for parking.
- 68% of respondents indicated that the 2 hour free parking was very important to their choice of where to shop, 21% said it was somewhat important and 10% said it is not important.
- 49% of respondents indicated that the 2 hour free parking program is easy to use; while 21% said it is somewhat easy to use. 28% said it is confusing.
- 25% of respondents indicated that the City's no-reparking in the central areas is very important, followed by 23% as somewhat important. 42% indicated it is not important and 11% did not know. 43% found it to be confusing; while 46% found it very easy or somewhat easy to understand.

Residential Parking

- 28% of respondents live in the cores areas while 72% do not. Of those who do, 91% of had a private driveway or garage and 6% parked at a different property from their residence. 13% paid for residential parking.

Work/commuting trips

- 67% of respondents commuted to one of the core areas; while, 33% did not. 85% of those did so five days per week.
- 80% of respondents commuted to Galt, followed by Preston (11%) and Hespeler (6%).
- 66% of respondents took less than 15 minutes to commute, and 27% 15-30 minutes, indicating most respondents live in close proximity to the Core Areas.
- 21% of respondents indicated working at home was an option; while 77% said it was rarely or never an option.
- 72% of respondents indicated they drive alone to work, followed by 14% who travel as a passenger. Only 3% take transit, and 10% walk or bike.
- 71% of people driving to work parked at a parking lot within a 5 minute walk of the place of work, and 17% parked on street (9 out of 52 responses). Of those who parked, 36% said the lot they parked in was usually full or almost full and 27% said they often have trouble finding a parking spot.
- 59% of people working in the core areas have free parking. Of these people, 60% said they would continue to drive if they had to pay for parking, 12% would not drive and 29% may or may not drive depending on the price. Most respondents considered less than \$5 as the maximum acceptable daily rate.
- 29% of people commuting to the core areas choose to drive because they have free parking. 56% of people chose to drive because of time/convenience.

4. INTERCEPT SURVEY

To supplement the data received from the PIC and the on-line survey, an intercept survey was carried out on the streets of each Core Area in August 2008. The survey involved a two minute survey by questionnaire, and was conducted from August 22 to August 27, 2008 on-street and at municipal parking lots. A total of 227 persons were surveyed.

Key findings included:

- Majority made regular trips to core areas, and planned to park for less than 2 hours (79%);
- 30% have had trouble with parking (e.g. parking lot full, infraction, etc.); and
- 50% didn't know about the No Reparking policy, and 60% were unaware of the boundaries of the no reparking area.

The findings appeared to be in line with comments that had been made by stakeholders, and observations of the study team. A more detailed summary of the survey responses is contained in Appendix G.

5. PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #2

The second PIC was held as a round of information centres, with one centre held in each of the Core Areas on January 27, 28 and 29, 2009. The purpose of the second PIC was to:

- Review the purpose and scope of the study
- Review the parking survey results from the three core areas in Cambridge
- Review public consultation carried out to date
- Identify and discuss key parking issues
- Present recommended parking strategies and the implementation plan
- Discuss issues and ask questions

The second PICs presented the evaluation of alternative solutions, and the recommended alternative. Despite advertising in the newspaper, and coverage of the meetings by local newspapers and radio, attendance was relatively low, with approximately four members of the Public attending in Preston, approximately 10 in Galt, and approximately 5 in Hespeler. Comments received at the PICs were generally in favour of the proposed alternative.

5.1 Notification

The PIC was widely advertised to the general public and interested stakeholders as follows:

1. Notices were placed in the Cambridge Times on Friday January 16, 2009 and Friday January 23, 2009 (see **Appendix A** for a copy of the newspaper "Notice of Public Information Centre")
2. Notices were e-mailed to members of the Technical Agencies Group and Stakeholder Group

3. Notices were mailed to people who had registered at the first PIC in June 2008.

In addition to these formal notification methods, a media release was prepared, which resulted in a newspaper article being printed prior to the PICs, and another article before the last PIC (see **Appendix A** for a copy of the articles).

5.2 Presentation Material

The material on display consisted of presentation boards and a comment sheet. Upon arrival, attendees were asked to sign a visitor sign-in sheet.

In addition to the display boards, a formal presentation was made at each location to summarize the study process, findings and recommendations. Each concluded with a formal question and answer session.

Copies of the display boards and presentation are provided in **Appendix B2** and copies of the comment form and sign in sheet are provided in **Appendix C2**.

5.3 Summary of Comments

Common themes that emerged from the discussions were as follows:

- Queries about the proposed time limits for parking, and request to consider extending the paid parking period until 6, 7 or 8pm.
- General agreement on future direction for parking structure(s), and on the need to carefully plan for structure(s) to ensure location and design enhances core areas.
- Concern that paid municipal parking may lead to increased pressure on private parking facilities.
- Requests for provision of accessible parking on streets.
- Comment forms received are included in Appendix E.