



Additional Correspondence Received on Proposed ZBA for Housekeeping Amendment with Administration Response

Below is a summary of the comments received by the Planning Services Division on ZBA/03/22.

Julie Spasuk:

Thank You for forwarding the red-lined version of the proposed changes to the parking spaces.

Council – Thanks in advance for hearing my concern/feedback regarding the proposed changes to the accessible parking standards!

Accessible parking is unfortunately, an issue close to my heart as I am one of those people requiring such parking.

In reviewing the proposed change, I can see that it is helpful for facilities with parking between 25 and 100 spaces as it will provide anywhere from 1 to 3 more parking spaces than previously required based on the size of the lot.

However, it actually does nothing for lots between 12 and 25 spots. The proposed standard is actually somewhat deceiving when you do the math as proposed:

1 to 12 requires 1 accessible parking spot

13 to 100 requires 4% of parking to be allocated to accessible parking

** you would have to hit 26 spots (not 12+) before 4% would require more than 1 spot.

The proposal also differs from our current standard in that the current standard moves from 1 to 2 spots at the number 20. Proposing 5% from 13 to 100 would allow us to maintain the 20 threshold to have 2 accessible spots.

However, I actually believe 6% or 16+ spots should require 2 accessible spots. Particularly if this is a restaurant or other commercial or recreational establishment. The reality for those of us with disabilities is that when an accessible spot is not available we wind up standing in lots waiting for a spot to free up, or we wind up going home instead of doing what we had planned. I am sure you could find a stat on the rate of increase of people requiring accessible parking permits. I can tell you from personal experience the demand is definitely increasing!

One work around that is not in our proposal, but exists in other towns is a Type “C” caregiver spot. For example, here is an excerpt from the Town of Oakville, which has also recently been growing. Their rules essentially mandate 2 spots near the entrance

– 1 accessible, and 1 courtesy/caregiver spot. The courtesy caregiver spot is slightly wider and longer than other parking spaces and can often be managed by those with a cane rather than a wheel chair.

[Table 41.3] Required Number of Type A, B, and C Parking Spaces

Total Number of Parking Spaces	Amount of Accessible Parking Spaces Required Type A and B	Amount of Courtesy /Limited Mobility and Caregiver Parking Type C
Less than 12	1 Type A	1
13 to 100	4% of total	2
101 to 200	3% of total plus 1	2

**** Figure taken from page 125 [Oakville Universal Design Standards v2.1](#)**

Thanks again for reviewing my thoughts. I appreciate your consideration.

Best Regards,

Julie Spasuk

Administration's Response:

The existing language in the Zoning By-law states;

“In addition to the parking spaces required by Section 3(23)(b) and 3(23)(c) where the parking requirement for any use is in excess of twenty (20) spaces, one (1) space out of the first twenty (20) spaces required and one additional space out of each additional one hundred (100) spaces or portion thereof, shall be provided near and accessible to the building and clearly marked for the parking of vehicles used by the physically handicapped person or persons. Parking spaces for the physically handicapped shall have a minimum width of 3.7 metres and a minimum length of 6.0 metres.”

The proposed amendment is copied directly from the Integrated Accessibility Standards Regulation (O.Reg. 191/11) under the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA). The proposed amendment language can be found in the draft by-law 2022-105 which is attached to the report. Also, it should be noted that ratios are rounded to the next whole number. For example, if the number of barrier free parking spaces required calculates to 1.01 spaces then 2 spaces will be required.

The amendment also includes provisions for Type A (being wider van accessible spaces) and Type B parking spaces and parking aisles.

It should be noted the Universal Design Standards she references in Oakville are only applicable to Oakville Town Facilities, not to the general public.

Council may choose to proceed with Administration's suggestion of bringing the Zoning By-law into compliance with the AODA standards or may choose to direct Administration to bring back additional barrier free parking space standards that are in excess of the provincially mandated AODA Standards.