Technical Memorandum

To:	Josiane Gervais, Project Manager – Transportation Approvals	Date:	April 3, 2020
Cc:			
From:	Andrew Harte, P.Eng.	Project Number:	2019-49

Re: 19Centrepointe Drive – TIA Step 3 Comment Response

The City of Ottawa provided comments on the TIA Step 3 Report (Draft) for the development application for the proposed residential development at 19 Centrepointe Drive. These comments were received on December 2, 2019. The following summarizes the comments and the response to the comments.

	Comment	Response
Transportation Engineering Services		
1	Confirm that all three towers are 24 storeys. The figure attached near the screening form shows 26 storeys for one of the apartment buildings.	*The concept plan has been revised several times and now includes one 22 storey tower, one 24 storey tower and one 26 storey tower based on the most recent concept plan (March 13, 2020). The most recent concept plan has been included in the Step 4 report.*
2	Correct the screening form which indicates that there are 622 total units.	*The screening form is based on the original plan proposed. Regardless of the changes since it was compiled, the resulting warrants do not change for the need for a TIA. Despite the redundancy of requiring the constant updating of previously submitted and approved materials, Appendix A has been revised to reflect the March 13, 2020 concept.*
3	Correct section 2.2.1, sidewalks are provided on both sides of Centrepointe Drive. Include the Transitway in the road network.	*Noted. The highlighted sections have been revised to reflect this comment.*
4	Correct the restricted movements in section 2.2.2. U-Turns are also restricted at Centrepointe/Highgate and Baseline, while trucks are not permitted to go northbound onto Cobden. The signalized pedestrian/cycling intersection was omitted along Centrepointe.	*Noted. The highlighted section has been revised to reflect the u-turn/trucking restrictions.* *Section 2.2.2 does not include PXOs as they have been removed from the study scope during the pre-consultation and Step 1 review.*
5	Correct section 2.2.3. The access for Bell on the south side of Gemini Way was omitted.	*Noted. The highlighted sections have been revised to reflect this comment.*
6	Confirm that the proposed zoning does not allow for development that can create 200 person trips in excess of the current zoning. Otherwise, Module 4.8 of the TIA Guidelines should not be exempt.	*Noted. Justification has been provided in Table 8 confirming the exemption of Module 4.8.* *For reference, please refer to the Planning Rationale report (Fotenn) for the as-of-right information.*

	Comment	Response
7	Correct Table 11. The existing mode shares should be a blend of from/within district in the AM peak and to/within district for the PM Peak for the Bayshore and Cedarview area.	*A check was performed to check the difference in mode shares with the inclusion of all the OD Survey data and the excluded data set from this comment and no significant differences in mode shares are noted. Therefore, the report has not been updated to reflect this comment.* *Furthermore, in the case of the Bayshore and Cedarview area, the "From" and "To" volumes are approximately even with each other in both the AM and PM peak periods. This would result in the modal share being determined by only 65% of the district trips.* *Please provide rationale for this methodology. The exclusion of the data ("To" during the AM and "From" during the PM) would not accurately represent 20%-40% of the site trips that travel in the off-peak direction. Without a guideline or background documentation to support this methodology, it appears arbitrary when reviewed and hard to defend when questioned technically.* *If the documentation is provided, future TIAs can be structured this way from the start.*
8	Correct section 5.1 which states that the proposed development is a mixed-use development.	*Noted. The highlighted section has been revised to reflect this comment.*
9	Separate the walking and cycling mode shares when forecasting trips.	*Noted. The highlighted section has been revised to reflect this comment.*
10	Consider assigning some of the eastbound site traffic to the Constellation Drive / Baseline Road intersection.	*As per the description in Section 2.2.2, at the intersection of Gemini Way and Constellation Drive, eastbound left-turns are restricted by a center median along Constellation Drive. As such, outbound trips are not permitted access to the Baseline Road intersection. A total of 40% of the inbound trips have been assigned to this intersection. This was illustrated in Figure 9 of the Step 3 report.*
11	Correct Figure 10, the auto volumes assigned to the network are much higher than the amount shown in Table 12.	*Noted. The highlighted figure has been revised to reflect this comment.*
12	Include plans for the Baseline BRT in the Transit section of the strategy report and indicate whether the nearest station is within 600m of the development.	*Noted. The report has been revised to reflect this comment.*
13	Consider the effect of the Baseline BRT and LRT extension as part of demand rationalization.	*Noted. The report has been revised to reflect this comment.*
14	Reducing the overall provision of parking, including several spaces for car-sharing, and providing pre-loaded PRESTO cards (ideally two per unit for one	*Noted. This comment has been passed along to the client and project team. Our recommendations have been included the TDM review (Section 8.3 and Appendix F).*

	Comment	Response
	year) as part of the TDM program are proven measures to help achieve TOD mode share targets.	*Please note that the parking supply will be dictated by market studies for the proposed site. This will be further refined once the site proceeds to site plan review.*
15	It is recommended that the Forecasting Report be resubmitted prior to submission of the Strategy Report.	*Noted. The comments above have been addressed, with additional documentation required from the City to address comment #7, a resubmission was not required necessary.*
Traffic Signal Design		
16	The eastbound queues currently back up on Baseline Road from Woodroffe Avenue to Highgate Road in the morning. The arterial is very congested, and delays are very high. Intersection does not operate well during peak. Signal timing changes as indicated on pg. 27 will not fix the operational issues. Woodroffe Avenue is over capacity as well, even if traffic signal light is green, cars are unable to proceed.	*Noted. The results in the report indicate the results of the synchro analysis, subject to the study area included. Congestion beyond the study area intersection is not captured and the limitations are noted in the City's comment.* *Additional text has been included to reflect the congested operations and limits of the Baseline Road and Woodroffe Avenue intersection.*
17	Proposed development is very large with 554 parking spaces and projected transit modal share is very aggressive at 65%. The development should reduce parking provisions to help attain modal split.	*Noted. See comment #14.*
18	Interim bus transit measures are slated to be implemented on Baseline Road in this section as well. The EB curb lane will be converted to a bus only lane and bus bays will be filled in. The EB lane arrangements in Synchro for future forecast must reflect lane conversion.	*Noted. The analysis has been revised to reflect this comment.*
19	The phasing sequence for Synchro model of the intersection of Baseline Road and Centrepointe Drive/Cobden Road is not quite right. Phase hold function used to depict pedestrian phase is not accurate, it is always skipped. Therefore, results rendered are optimistic (shorter queues and delays to EB). Please check.	*Noted. The analysis has been revised to reflect this comment. Please consider revising notes on timing plan for future use.*
Development Review-Transportation		
20	As previously indicated, the TIA must clearly compare how many units/trips would be allowed under the current zoning bylaw and compare this to the number of units/trips under a worst-case scenario under the proposed rezoning. The TIA must evaluate the worst case volumes based on the applicable zoning sought (in this case, assuming the zoning amendment sought is greater building height, the difference between the sought building height versus the current height accepted under the existing zoning would be compared). This must be addressed within the report and the difference in	*Noted. See comment #6.* *From a high level process, given that zoning typically permits a wide range of land use types and densities, does the City have a guiding document to determine the applicable "worst-case" scenario to analyze? Transportation Engineers are not Planners or Architects and it is outside out professional realm to develop multiple building/development concepts that may or may not be worst case scenarios.* *Also please consider if a zoning change is sought, it is the generally the "worst-case" scenario. Applications*

	Comment	Response
	site generated traffic volume should be discussed as part of Module 3.1.	*do not include extraneous zoning changes (e.g. zone for 24 storeys but build only 15) that would create a scenario that produces more trips than what is proposed for the site.*
21	Module 3.3 – Demand Rationalization should address initial projections of development-generated traffic combined with background travel auto demands. Refer to the outlined tasks in the TIA guidelines.	*Noted. Given the low auto trips generated by the TOD mode shares, there would be minimal impact of site traffic over the background growth. The resulting analysis would be nearly identical between the four data sets and not provide any materially different conclusions.* *As Step 4 was prepared, Section 11 provides this analysis for review.*
22	The proposed parking stall rate proposed is currently 0.83 stalls/unit (tenants + visitors), as per Section 2.1. Sections 101-102 of the Zoning By-law 2008-250 Consolidation outlines a required minimum parking space rate of 0.5 per dwelling unit for tenants/owners (Table 101) and 0.2 per dwelling unit for visitors (Table 102). As such, if a reduction in parking below these rates is requested as part of the re-zoning application, then the applicant is to provide justification for the reduction in parking proposed. Module 4.2 – Parking can be included within the TIA to provide this justification.	*As per Section 2.1, the proposed site is within a TOD zone, as such no justification is required to reduce parking as there is no minimum parking restriction for TOD sites.* *Module 4.2 will be included once the site proceeds to a site plan application.*