

# Memorandum

**TO:**

Bob Blazeovski  
Port Credit West Village Partners

**FROM:**

Stuart B. Anderson

**PROJECT:**

7189-21  
Port Credit West Village

**DATE:**

November 2, 2018

**SUBJECT: Port Credit West Village Resubmission – Transportation Review**

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

This memorandum has been prepared to accompany the resubmission of November 2, 2018 and to specifically address the key transportation aspects of the resubmission.

## 1.1 PREVIOUS SUBMISSIONS

The original transportation report was submitted in August 2017, with a resubmission in March 2018 to address changes in the proposed master plan including a revised street network and changes in the proposed development statistics. A separate report containing microsimulation analysis of the Lakeshore Road corridor was submitted in April 2018. As of the date of this memo, detailed comments had not been received from the City of Mississauga on the transportation analysis submitted in the March 2018 and April 2018 reports. In lieu of detailed comments on the March and April 2018 transportation submissions, this memo addresses the following items:

- Road network and rights of way
  - Private Street - Street G/Mews
  - Private Streets - (Street D and F)
- Parking Provision
- Curbside Management

## 2.0 ROAD NETWORK AND RIGHTS OF WAY

The road network proposed as part of the master plan comprises municipal streets and private streets designed to provide connectivity through the site as well as connect to the existing municipal street network adjacent to the site. The proposed street network supports multimodal travel and a walkable site, by providing for connections for pedestrians and cyclists and accommodating transit vehicles. Block lengths are in the range of 100-150m and with respect to pedestrian connectivity are in line with walkable neighbourhood and transit supportive guidelines. The design philosophy has been to provide for all modes and connections on a network basis, rather than trying to provide for all modes on each individual street. Vehicle lane widths are designed to support an environment of low automobile speeds, and cycle travel is provided for by separated cycle tracks and boulevard lanes on key north-south and east-west streets.

The rights of ways and street network proposed on the original submission have been adjusted in this current submission to respond to comments made by the City. With respect to transportation (excluding issues related to trees, stormwater drainage and other servicing requirements) there are two key areas where differences remain. The subsequent sections of this memo have been prepared to respond to those key areas: provision of a vehicular connection on Street G, and the provision of the northern sections of Streets D and F as private streets as opposed to municipal streets.

### 2.1 STREET G/MEWS

The original design intent of Street G was to create a pedestrian and cycling mews connection on an east-west alignment approximately through the middle of the site to prioritize travel by non-automobile modes. City comments received in 2018 have requested that Street G be designed to accommodate automobiles in addition to pedestrian and cyclists.

It is noted that the originally proposed pedestrian and cycling mews connection along Street G provides porosity and connectivity within the site in a manner that supports the use of transit and active transportation, with block lengths of 120m which are in line with the Ontario Provincial Growth Plan and MTO Transit Supportive Guidelines.

Original traffic capacity analysis (contained in the BA Group report dated March 2018) was carried out to assess the operation of the proposed street network, without a vehicular connection along Street G between Street F and Street D. To evaluate the utility of a continuous vehicle connection on Street G between Street F and Street D, we have estimated potential traffic demands on Street G, arising from re-routing of the originally estimated internal volumes that could be impacted by the provision of vehicle access on Street G.

Previously, it had been assumed that access to the higher density residential blocks P and K would be from Streets A, F and C. If a vehicular connection was provided on Street G, there would be opportunities for re-routing of residential trips to and from Blocks P and K via Street G, which could alter the anticipated turning volumes along Street C in particular, and especially at its intersections with Street F, Street B and Street D. The results in **Table 1** below show the anticipated levels of service and delay for unsignalized intersections along Street C, for the case with and without a vehicular connection on Street G.

**TABLE 1 INTERSECTION OPERATIONS WITH AND WITHOUT VEHICULAR CONNECTION ON STREET G**

Intersection and movement	No Vehicles on Street G		Vehicles on Street G	
	Delay (sec) <sup>1</sup>	LOS	Delay (sec) <sup>1</sup>	LOS
Street C/F intersection				
EB	8.3 (8.3)	A (A)	8.1 (8.2)	A (A)
WB	8.2 (9.0)	A (A)	7.9 (8.6)	A (A)
NB	9.1 (8.3)	A (A)	8.5 (8.0)	A (A)
SB	8.0 (9.5)	A (A)	7.9 (9.3)	A (A)
Street C/B intersection				
EB	8.5 (8.7)	A (A)	8.0 (8.3)	A (A)
WB	7.3 (8.4)	A (A)	7.6 (8.6)	A (A)
NB	7.8 (8.3)	A (A)	7.6 (8.2)	A (A)
SB	8.7 (11.8)	A (B)	8.6 (11.7)	A (B)
Street C/D intersection				
EB	8.3 (8.6)	A (A)	8.0 (8.4)	A (A)
WB	7.1 (7.9)	A (A)	7.4 (8.0)	A (A)
NB	7.2 (7.2)	A (A)	7.4 (7.3)	A (A)
SB	7.0 (7.7)	A (A)	7.0 (7.6)	A (A)

Notes:

1. AM (PM)
2. For consistency and to align with the perception of Lakeshore Road running in an east-west direction, for the purposes of the table, it is assumed that Street B runs generally north-south and Street C runs generally east-west

The results of the traffic capacity modelling show differences in intersection approach delays of between 0 and 0.5 seconds for the cases with and without a vehicular connection on Street G. From these results, it is evident that the internal road network can accommodate the anticipated vehicular traffic demands without provision of vehicle connection on Street G, regardless of whether the connection is made from Street F to Street D, or just from Street F to Street B. Therefore, based on intersection capacity alone, provision of Street G as a vehicular connection is not necessary from a vehicular capacity perspective.

Notwithstanding the above capacity analysis, the Master Plan has been revised to include provision for a one-way vehicle connection along Street G from Street B to Street F, to assist with circulation and to provide enhanced access to blocks P and K in particular. The proposed one-way connection will allow for vehicles to access a surface drop-off court on both blocks, which will provide for additional opportunities for pick up and drop off space to support the proposed taller residential buildings. A dedicated two-way cycling facility will be provided along this section of Street G, making a link to the proposed pedestrian and cycling mews to the west of Street F and to the east of Street B.



## 2.2 STREETS D AND F – PRIVATE SECTIONS

The original master plan proposed provision of the northern sections of Street F and Street D (adjacent to Lakeshore Road) as private streets to allow for more comprehensive and efficient commercial blocks with below grade parking extending underneath the alignment of Street F between Lakeshore Road and Street E and Street D between Lakeshore Road and Street C.

In the traffic capacity analysis to date, it has been assumed that vehicle connections will be provided to Lakeshore Road as part of Street F and Street D. These vehicle connections are required in order to accommodate traffic demands to and from Lakeshore Road and will be accessible to the general public via right in and right out accesses. However, the site design is based around parking garages below grade that would extend underneath the portions of Street F and Street D between Street E/Street C and Lakeshore Road.

These sections of Street D and Street F will be designed to have the general appearance of a municipal street and to be as similar as practicable to the portions of Streets F and D that are adjacent to the south. If desired by the City, an easement or stratified ownership can be pursued to address the City's needs for maintenance of the road, in a way that allows for the parking to be provided beneath the road. The intent is that there be public access in perpetuity over these private streets in the form of easements in favour of the City of Mississauga.

## 3.0 PARKING

As with the original master plan submission, the intent is to create a development that is transit supportive and employs a number of strategies to encourage the use of alternatives to automobile travel. One key strategy is to avoid the provision of excess parking, and where parking is provided, to share parking between a mix of different uses to make the most efficient use of parking as possible. The original parking strategy included designing parking provision to be in line with recent guidance contained in the Port Credit and Lakeview Parking Strategy prepared for the City of Mississauga.

To further acknowledge a shared, mixed-use environment, a change in the draft zoning by-law rates is proposed for restaurant uses along Lakeshore Road to better reflect parking demands evident in the existing mixed use area of Port Credit as demonstrated in the Port Credit Parking Strategy. Proposed changes to draft zoning by-law for non-residential uses are described below. Proposed minimum parking requirements for residential uses are unchanged from the previous submission.



### Proposed Minimum Parking Requirements – Non-Residential Uses

Line 1.0	CATEGORY	MINIMUM NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES
1.1	Required number of Vehicular Parking Spaces per 100m <sup>2</sup> GFA for retail, personal service, repair establishments, financial institutions, real estate offices, take-out restaurants, art galleries, and museums	3.0
1.2	Required number of Vehicular Parking spaces per 100m <sup>2</sup> GFA for offices	3.0
1.3	Required number of Vehicular Parking Spaces per 100m <sup>2</sup> GFA for medical offices and sit-down restaurants	4.85
1.4	There is no parking requirement for commercial uses located within a live-work unit.	N/A

It is proposed that take-out restaurants be brought into the 3.0 spaces per 100m<sup>2</sup> GFA category, with sit-down restaurants brought into the 4.85 spaces per 100m<sup>2</sup> GFA category.

The minimum required parking rate that is proposed for office uses (3.0 spaces per 100m<sup>2</sup> GFA) is in line with the minimum rate recommended in the Port Credit Parking Strategy (3.0 spaces per 100m<sup>2</sup> GFA), and the office parking will be part of a shared parking supply on mixed-use blocks. For example, during the weekday evening period when office parking requirement decreases to 10% of the minimum, the parking requirement for restaurant uses increases to 100% of the minimum for that use. Likewise, the parking requirement for office uses is reduced to 10% during all weekend periods, at which time retail and restaurant uses reach 100% on weekend evenings. The proposed parking sharing provisions reflect the sharing provisions recommended in the Port Credit Parking Strategy and are presented below.



### Mixed Use Development Shared Parking Formula

Line 1.0	TYPE OF USE	PERCENTAGE OF PEAK PERIOD <sup>1</sup>			
		Morning	Noon	Afternoon	Evening
1.1	Office/Medical Office	100 (10)	90 (10)	95 (10)	10 (10)
1.2	Real Estate Office	90 (50)	80 (50)	100 (50)	50 (20)
1.3	Financial Institution	70 (90)	75 (90)	100 (90)	80 (20)
1.4	Retail Store/Personal Service Establishment/Art Gallery/Museum/Repair Establishment	50 (50)	50 (75)	70 (100)	75 (10)
1.5	Restaurant/Take-out Restaurant	25 (20)	65 (90)	25 (50)	100 (100)
1.6	Hotel - Rooms	50 (70)	25 (25)	25 (25)	65 (50)
1.7	Hotel - Function Space <sup>2</sup>	95 (95)	100 (95)	90 (90)	95 (95)
1.8	Residential - Resident	90 (90)	65 (65)	90 (90)	100 (100)
1.9	Residential - Visitor	20 (20)	20 (20)	50 (60)	100 (100)

<sup>1</sup>00 indicates weekday peak period percentage, (00) indicates weekend peak period percentage.

<sup>2</sup>Hotel Function space includes restaurants, meeting rooms, banquet, and conference facilities.



### 3.1 BICYCLE PARKING

The required number of bicycle parking spaces for development in all West Village Zones is unchanged from the previous submission and is contained within the following table.

#### Required Bicycle Parking Spaces

Line 1.0	CATEGORY	MINIMUM NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES <sup>1</sup>
1.1	Required number of Bicycle Parking Spaces for Staff per 100m <sup>2</sup> GFA for <b>office</b> uses	0.15
1.2	Required number of Bicycle Parking Spaces for Visitor per 100m <sup>2</sup> GFA for <b>office</b> uses	0.10
1.3	Required number of Bicycle Parking Spaces for Staff per 100m <sup>2</sup> GFA for <b>retail</b> uses	0.10
1.4	Required number of Bicycle Parking Spaces for Visitor per 100m <sup>2</sup> GFA for <b>retail</b> uses	0.25
1.5	Required number of Bicycle Parking Spaces for Staff per 100m <sup>2</sup> GFA for school/college/university uses	0.60
1.6	Required <b>number</b> of Bicycle Parking Spaces for Visitor per 100m <sup>2</sup> GFA for school/college/university uses	0.18
1.7	Required number of Bicycle Parking Spaces for Staff based on the percentage of staff for all other non-residential <b>uses</b>	4%
1.8	Required number of Bicycle Parking Spaces for Visitor based on the percentage of visitors for all other non-residential <b>uses</b>	4%
1.9	Required number of Bicycle Parking Spaces per unit for Residents in <b>apartment dwellings</b> and <b>townhouse dwellings</b>	0.70
1.10	Required number of Bicycle Parking Spaces per unit for Visitors in <b>apartment dwellings</b> and <b>townhouse dwellings</b>	0.08

<sup>1</sup>Residential bicycle parking requirements only apply to **apartment dwellings** and **townhouse dwellings** that do not have an exclusive garage



## 3.2 ON-STREET PARKING

In addition to on-site vehicle and bicycle parking for non-residential uses, the proposed development will also include on-street vehicle parking. In total, approximately 75 parking spaces will be provided on municipal streets through the proposed development, including on Street A, Street B, Street D, and Street F.

While on-street parking will be provided adjacent to the park and campus uses along Street A, underground parking in the campus block will also be available for visitors to the campus and waterfront park areas. The design and use of curbside space for vehicle use will consider a range of requirements for curbside management as described further below.

## 3.3 CURBSIDE MANAGEMENT

While parking can be an important use of curbside space, the availability of curbside area for pick-up and drop-off (PUDO) use is likely to be of increasing importance in the future if shared autonomous vehicles become widely used.

As the site develops in phases, consideration should be given to use of curb space on municipal streets to accommodate short-stay vehicle demands, especially at areas where higher residential densities are proposed.

To supplement curb space for PUDO on municipal streets, access to the residential blocks with the highest proposed density (Blocks K, P, Q and U) will include off-street vehicle access to the rear of the proposed residential buildings in a manner that will be able to accommodate PUDO activity by taxis, transportation network companies, and for the potential future use of shared autonomous vehicles. However, as an initial measure for municipal streets, it is recommended that two short-stay vehicle loading/unloading spaces be provided in the vicinity of entrances to the tallest residential buildings. Initially, until City policy develops around curbside management for taxis, TNCs and shared autonomous vehicles, it is suggested that these spaces be designated with “No Parking” provisions that would allow standing while engaged in picking up and dropping off passengers.

For the townhouse blocks, the proposed network of private streets and laneways provides access directly to each unit and allows for PUDO activity to take place outside of municipal streets.

## 4.0 WORKING GROUP

As part of the community consultation process initiated by the West Village Partners, a neighbourhood transportation working group was established to discuss neighbourhood traffic issues and opportunities. A number of concerns have been raised by area residents through the working group, including the impact of site traffic on the existing residential neighbourhoods to the west, north and east of the West Village site.

A plan is being developed through the working group process to investigate potential traffic calming alternatives that could be considered as a means of limiting the traffic impact on the adjacent existing neighbourhoods. The plan should be discussed and developed further through consultation with City Staff, and with residents on the transportation working group.

