



**BURNSIDE**

[ THE DIFFERENCE IS OUR PEOPLE ]

## Memo

---

**Date:** October 25, 2013 **File No.:** 300034401.0000  
**Project:** Main Street Clock Inc., 180 Main Street  
Town of Newmarket  
Review of Traffic Impact and Parking Study  
**Prepared By:** Henry Centen, P.Eng.  
**Distribution:** David Scomazzon, P.Eng.

---

### Comments

This memo provides our review of the following documentation:

- Traffic Impact and Parking Study, Main Street Clock Inc., 180 Main Street, Town of Newmarket, dated August 2013, prepared by Cole Engineering.

The Traffic Impact and Parking Study (TIPS) provides the following main conclusions and recommendations (paraphrased):

- a. The proposed development (150 unit condominium plus 12,247 ft<sup>2</sup> (1138 m<sup>2</sup>) commercial retail units (CRU)) is forecast to generate 50 vph (two-way) in the a.m. peak hour and 42 vph (two-way) in the p.m. peak hour. The trip rates are based on traffic monitoring at a similar proxy site, which resulted in trip rates which are substantially below the trip rates contained in studies made by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). The CRU will service the immediate neighbourhood and therefore will not generate vehicular trips.
- b. Traffic operations are forecast to be acceptable, through horizon year 2018, at the following intersections:
  - Main Street/Botsford Street;
  - Main Street/Water Street;
  - Church Street/Park Avenue;
  - Main Street/Park Avenue;
  - Site Access/Park Avenue.
- c. The site access provides a minimum sight distance of 55 m, which meets the minimum stopping sight distance requirement of 45 m (assuming a design speed of 40 km/h).
- d. The proposed parking spaces (173 spaces) results in a technical shortfall of 90 spaces for the residential use, compared to the Town's zoning by-law. Due to

the ancillary nature of the CRU, no parking is proposed for this land use. Based on a review of zoning bylaws in other municipalities (Toronto, Richmond Hill, Vaughan), as well as a previous study to review parking standards (Toronto) and monitoring at a proxy site in Newmarket (Timothy Lofts), it is concluded that a sufficient number of spaces are provided to meet demands. Also, based on monitoring of parking utilization at the Market Square municipal lot, some residual capacity is available in that lot to accommodate overflow from the demands of the subject development.

- e. It is recommended that a coordinator be retained to manage Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures, to reduce single-occupant vehicles and encourage alternate travel modes.

### **Burnside Review Comments**

Burnside provides the following comments, based on our review of the Traffic Impact and Parking Study (TIPS):

1. The TIPS analyzes only the traffic operations on weekdays. Given the location of the site in the downtown core, we suggest that Saturday traffic operations be considered as well.
2. The TIPS assumes no traffic generation from the CRU, since it is anticipated to service the immediate neighbourhood. Considering the type of uses allowable (e.g., restaurant), some vehicular traffic is likely to be generated from the CRU (e.g., staff and customers from the broader area), and therefore some traffic generation should be forecast from this use.
3. While the criteria applied to sight distance at the proposed access (i.e., stopping sight distance based on 40 km/h design speed) is considered sufficient to the east (i.e., to the intersection of Park Avenue/Main Street), we suggest that the sight distance to the west should be based on the turning sight distance for a 50 km/h design speed (i.e., 180 metres turning sight distance is recommended). The availability of this sight distance should be confirmed.
4. We note that the parking supply at the proxy site (Timothy Lofts) is much higher than the parking supply proposed at the subject development. While the parking demands at the proxy site would support the lower parking supply, we caution that the parking utilization study was completed over a very limited timeframe and at a single site. While some residual capacity is provided in the proposed parking supply for visitor parking, compared with the parking demands at the proxy site, the primary demand is from the tenants. In addition, the parking by-laws referenced for comparison only consider the residential component. We suggest that the adequacy of the parking supply proposed for the residential use should be further reviewed within the context of all of uses proposed (i.e., including the CRU).
5. Insufficient justification is provided to support the conclusion that no parking is required for the proposed CRU. We also note that the TIPS does not provide any analysis of the impacts of the site re-development, based on the replacement

of the existing uses or replacement of the existing surface parking on the site. It is our understanding that the existing retirement home and some of the existing CRU are being replaced, along with some of the surface parking. The impact of these replacements is not adequately documented in the TIPS. Further consideration of these factors may result in the need for additional parking (or cash-in-lieu) for this development, potentially impacting on the timing of the need for the expansion to the Market Square parking lot.