

23 August 2012

TO1170TOQ00

BY EMAIL: philc@richcraft.com

Richcraft Group of Companies
Planning and Land Development
2280 St. Laurent Blvd.
Ottawa, Ontario K1G 4K1

Attention: Mr. Phil Castro

Dear Sir:

**RE: 159 – 167 Parkdale Avenue
Transportation Brief: Addendum #1**

The following is provided in response to comments received August 3, 2012 on the above-noted Transportation Brief.

Comment 1: The Traffic study does not take into account background growth and site generated impacts onto a build-out year. The traffic study does not mention or take into account the cumulative impacts of other planned or future developments on Parkdale Avenue. Results documented in report may be optimistic.

Response 1: The TIA guidelines do not require analysis of background growth, impacts to build-out years or other study area developments in a Transportation Brief. Also, based on projected site traffic generation, no analysis is required. As such, we have prepared a reduced scope modified Transportation Brief that focuses on only the development-specific traffic concerns.

Comment 2: The City has 2011 counts for Parkdale Avenue/Lyndale Avenue. Why were they not used for the analysis?

Response 2: We were unaware that the 2011 traffic count was available for the Parkdale/Lyndale intersection. After ordering and reviewing the most recent 2011 intersection count, volumes appear to be slightly higher than the previous 2007 count in the afternoon peak hour. Shown below is the difference between the 2007 and 2011 intersection capacity:

Intersection: Parkdale/ Lyndale	Weekday AM Peak (PM Peak)					
	Critical Movement			Intersection		
	LoS	max. v/c or avg. delay (s)	Movement	Delay (s)	LoS	v/c
2007	A(B)	0.38(0.66)	SBT(NBT)	2.3(7.3)	A(A)	0.37(0.54)
2011	A(D)	0.40(0.89)	SBT(NBT)	2.2(17.6)	A(C)	0.39(0.72)
Note: Analysis of signalized intersections assumes a PHF of 0.95 and a saturation flow rate of 1800 veh/h/lane.						

Comment 3: The CD that was sent along with the Transportation Brief had the wrong Synchro files on them.

Response 3: Noted, the revised Synchro files will be courier with the submission of this Addendum.

Comment 4: Clarification is required as to why a Transportation Brief Report is provided for a development with 196 units. On the other hand, for a comparatively less significant development with 176 dwelling units at 99-107 Parkdale Ave, which is just one block north of the subject site, a Community Transportation Study and Traffic Impact Study had been submitted in Feb 2012.

Response 4: A Transportation Brief was undertaken as the site's projected peak hour traffic generation is well below the City's TIA Guidelines, below which no analysis is required. That being said, we did a comprehensive TB to address all site specific transportation issues to assist in the SPA process.

At the time, we assessed 196 condo units and 155 sq. m. of commercial. The proposal is now for 170 units and 1950 sq. m. of commercial, which is projected to generate 57 and 70 veh/h during the morning and afternoon peak hour, respectively. The revised site traffic generation continues to be below the 75 veh/h TIA trigger.

The initial TB identified a two-way trip generation of approximately 45 veh/h during peak hours based on 40% car drivers, 10% car passengers, 30% transit and 20% bike/walk. City staff suggested these rates were too high. We disagree. The site is within 500 m of a rapid transit station, is across the street for a current 10,000 employment node which has plans to grow to 20,000 employees, is within a few hundred meters of the Ottawa River parkway pathway system and the Scott Street pathway system and is within walking distance of the Parkdale Market and Wellington Main street retail.

Reference was made to another study recently done in the area which used a 77% auto driver and 23% transit/bike/walk/auto passenger. These values, in our opinion seriously overestimate the site traffic generation, show no understanding of the site context, and show no understanding as to why the City is encouraging intensification around rapid transit stations and employment centers. They do so, so that people can take transit, walk and cycle and not have 77% of people drive their car.

Comment 5: The subject TB report did not take into account impact of other proposed developments in the area e.g. 99-107 Parkdale Ave.

Response 5: See Response 1. As well, it should be noted that with the planned redevelopment of Tunney's Pasture over the next few decades, the base conditions will change significantly. The proposal is for employment to

increase from 10,000 to 20,000 with their also being a significant mixed-use component. A revised internal road network is also proposed that will see a new north-south road link through the west portion of the campus connecting Scott Street directly to the Ottawa River Parkway. This link, which is intended to be transferred to the City, will alter traffic patterns in the area and most likely remove a meaningful amount of traffic from Parkdale Avenue.

Comment 6: Allocation of 60% person trips to auto-passengers and non-auto modes appear on very high side. We require further justification on it. Other TIS conducted for nearby development sites of similar magnitude used 23% share for auto-passenger and non-auto modes.

Response 6: See Response 4.

Comment 7: For the unit pavers on City's road right-of-way, the developer has to sign a "Maintenance and Liability Agreement" with the City to cover any claims. Also, an Encroachment Agreement will be required for the trees on the City road allowance, please include this as a condition in the Site Plan Control Approval. Please forward a copy of the Site Plan Control Approval Application document to the By-laws, Permits and Inspections Unit.

Response 7: Noted and forwarded to the developer/architect.

Comment 8: If the front entry walkway's longitudinal grade exceeds 6% (but less than 8%), it should be considered a ramp and will require a coarser surface texture. If the longitudinal grade exceeds 8%, handrails may be required.

Response 8: Noted and forwarded to the developer/architect.

Comment 9: Site access off Lyndale Avenue is substandard in term of grade and width and it lies within 3 metres of the adjacent property line. These deficiencies are referred to in the TIA but no solution is proposed. The access will require 5.0 metre curb radii.

Response 9: The proposed width of the driveway connection to Lyndale of 6.4 m is acceptable. Our Transportation Brief was in error as the 6.7 m refers to the circulation aisle width which has 90° parking on both sides. Regarding the proposed ramp grades, they are the best that can be accommodated given the dimensions of the site. The architect will be advised to reduce the grades to the extent possible, and also that a variance is likely required.

Regarding the 5 m curb radii, the architect will be advised of this requirement.

Regarding the required 3.0 m separation between the site driveway/ramp and the property line, the City's Private Approach By-Law states that this

separation can be reduced to 0.3 m provided that the proposed access is located:

- i. a safe distance from access serving the adjacent property;
- ii. in such a manner that there are adequate sight lines for vehicles exiting the property; and
- iii. in such a manner that it does not crease any safety hazards”.

As can be seen on the Site Plan, there is a little use rear lane adjacent to the property line and it is offset by 1.54 m from the site driveway. As well, the garage door is located approximately 8 m back from the back of the Lyndale sidewalk and approximately 9.5 m from the road edge. The building face adjacent to the west of the garage door is approximately 6.5 m from the road edge.

The combination of the foregoing is such that a vehicle exiting the site driveway/garage onto Lyndale Avenue will have excellent sight lines with respect to all rear lane, sidewalk and on road pedestrian, bicycle and vehicle activity, with there being no resulting safety hazard.


As such, in this instance, a minimum 0.3 m driveway offset from the property line is in keeping with the requirements of the Private Approach By-Law and is considered safe and acceptable.

Comment 10: Transportation Brief makes no mention of build-out and horizon years.

Response 10: See Responses 1 and 5.

We hope the foregoing responds satisfactorily to your concerns. Please call if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Ronald M. Jack, P.Eng.
Vice President Transportation
Manager Ottawa Operations

H:\ISO\ASP\S01170\TOQ\DOCS\159 Parkdale TB_Addendum_23Aug2012.docx