

# Technical Memorandum

To: Doug van den Ham  
 Copy: Mark Baker  
 From: Andrew Harte

Date: August 476224 - 01000  
 Project:

## Re: Site Plan Control Approval Application – 1463 Prince of Wales Drive – Traffic/Transportation Comments Response

This letter addresses the traffic and transportation related comments received from the City of Ottawa, dated July 22, 2017, for the 1463 Prince of Wales Drive Site Plan Control Application. Included within this submission was a Transportation Overview, dated February 2, 2017. No issues were noted with the current access configuration and continued use of this access arrangement in the future. It should also be noted that the Site Plan Control was submitted for an addition to the existing building for a total gross floor area of 527.8m<sup>2</sup>. This expansion constitutes a gymnasium and a single storey entry lobby with no additional rooms.

The following comments have been noted to the proponent and the responses by Parsons can be found herein.

### TRAFFIC ENGINEERING

**Comment 20:** *There is concern that a southbound left turning vehicle waiting to turn could delay through traffic and potentially cause queues to spill back into the intersection. Provide the consolidated volume of vehicle turning movements from Prince of Wales Drive to the site. Provide traffic data for the spring/summer season.*

**Response 20:** In discussions with City of Ottawa Approvals staff, it was requested that Parsons review the existing conditions, including field observations, to document the current operations. At that time, City Staff did not have any specific issues and while unaware of any existing conflicts, requested Parsons analyze existing conflicts due to various potential turning movements and proximity to the Meadowlands intersection. During the field observations (January 31, 2017), no vehicles were noted to complete a left-out movement from the site onto Prince of Wales Drive and majority of the facility’s participants arrived on foot. Existing operations of the Prince of Wales and Meadowlands/Hog’s Back intersection, completed in Synchro™ 10, show a 95%ile queue during the PM peak from the northbound right turning volume that may extend beyond 110m. This queue blocks access to the driveways and is likely the reason there are no observed left-turns. Given that the accesses will remain the same, and volumes at the intersection will be unchanged, the future site operation will likely be consistent with the current conditions.

From a safety perspective, no collisions have been documented by the City of Ottawa between the Meadowlands and Nesbitt intersections, nor at the Nesbitt intersection, involving a left-out movement between 2010 to 2015. The collisions history is summarized below:

Type	Amount	Notes
Rear End	3	2 northbound, 1 southbound
Side Swipe	2	1 merge and 1 lane change
Angled	3	1 eastbound and southbound vehicle, 2 southbound right turn with a cyclist

As shown above, no current issues or past collisions denote an issue along this section of Prince of Wales Drive, as it relates to the Boys and Girls Club access configuration. The data supports the conclusion that the addition of the gymnasium and lobby area to the existing site will not pose a new safety issue or exacerbate an existing problem. Therefore, the continued use of these accesses is considered appropriate for the current and future site usage.

# PARSONS

**Comment 21:** *The use of a painted gore area is not recommended for the storage of southbound left turning vehicles. A left turn lane would be more appropriate in this circumstance.*

**Response 21:** No storage requirements have been noted due to the low frequency and volume of vehicles that access the site. The existing data and field observations noted less than 5 cars making this movement during the PM peak, posing little interruption to the mainline traffic along Prince of Wales Drive. The updated 2017 TAC Guidelines (Book 8) identify left turn lane warrants required at locations with operational issues or a collision history, neither of which is present at this location.

**Comment 22:** *There are two other uncontrolled accesses in this area; one access to the plaza and the other to the garage (both on the west side). Review if there are safety concerns with the interactions between the various turning movements and the proposed consolidated access to the site.*

**Response 22:** Noted, see Response 20. The collision data, provided by the City, shows 3 'angled' collisions (during the past 3-years) that are likely related to the accesses on the west side of Prince of Wales Drive. The information provided shows these collisions are related to through vehicle and cycling traffic on Prince of Wales Drive and not turning movement traffic from the existing site's accesses. As such, based on the available information, the interaction between the turning movements at the multiple accesses has not historically been a safety issue.

## TRANSPORTATION

**Comment 23:** *There is concern with the proposed change in use of the existing access locations on Prince of Wales Drive and with the removal of the access on Nesbitt Place. A preferred scenario would be to close the accesses on Prince of Wales for vehicles given the low numbers traveling to the site and the challenges with having access on the arterial so close to the signalized intersection with Meadowlands Drive. The preference is to have parking concentrated at the back of the site with access only to Nesbitt Place. If the existing space at the back of the building is insufficient, consider relocating the gym on the site to the proposed new parking location along Meadowlands Drive.*

**Response 23:** Noted, see Response 20.

**Comment 24:** *If the site plan cannot be modified, it is recommended that the center median on Prince of Wales be extended to restrict access from the site to right in and out onto Prince of Wales. Southbound left turn movements into the site could be allowed through development of a southbound left turn lane. An RMA will be required for this scenario.*

**Response 24:** Noted, see Response 20.

**Comment 25:** *The minimum clear throat length required is 15.0 metres from end of curb radius. Please refer to TAC Manual Part 2; Table 3.2.9.3 and Figure 3.2.5.2 for appropriate throat length and dimensioning.*

**Response 25:** As the existing building and driveway connections to Prince of Wales Drive are not being modified, extending the existing throat length is not considered to be within the scope of the submission. In addition, the TAC Guidelines (2017 update Book 8, Section 8.9) provide minimum throat lengths for major driveways only. As the driveways to Prince of Wales Drive are not considered 'major driveways', the existing throat lengths are considered acceptable.

**Comment 26:** *The closure of an existing private approach shall reinstate the sidewalk, shoulder, curb and boulevard to City standards.*

**Response 26:** Noted. No existing private approach is closing under the current building renovations/expansion.

**Comment 27:** *The configuration of the parking lot off of Nesbitt Place is odd and it would appear that the vehicles would need to back out into the City's ROW to exit parking spots. This is especially an issue since on street parking is allowed on the north side of Nesbitt Place. Parsons report dated February 02, 2017 concluded that "the majority of vehicle traffic will use the Prince of Wales Drive connection once the Nesbitt Place connection is removed". The Site Plan doesn't match with the report, one or the other needs to be revised.*

# PARSONS

**Response 27:** The current site plan was updated to provide a loading zone and four (4) parking stalls. While typically an issue on a traditional local road, Nesbitt Place has very low traffic volumes with only five private driveways along its length. As such, the reversing maneuver is not considered an issue for this location. The low vehicle volume, minimal speed, and available sight lines, due to the angle in which the stalls approach the roadway, the revised access/parking arrangement is not considered to be in conflict with the on-street parking. An alternative approach would be the reduction of the parking requirements for the site, as the current parking lot is currently underutilized during normal Boys & Girls Club operations.