

---

APPLICATION: 2548 (MOB) & 2550 (Parking Expansion)

SCOPE OF REVIEW: PARKING

DATE: 22 MARCH 2018

---

*COMMENTS / QUESTIONS IN ADVANCE OF 26 MARCH PB HEARING*

OLD COMMENTS (from March 1 Review)

**MOB**

1. How will the parking be managed?  
***Addressed. New plan shows an ungated system that will improve flow and simplify vehicular ingress / egress conditions. Employee parking proposed in the west side lot makes sense.***
2. 4.3.7(b) of the Redevelopment Plan / Patient Drop Off. The canopy should “protect visitors using the drop-off area”. We believe the intent is for the canopy to extend over the travel lanes so patients can be dropped off beneath the canopy. However, the canopy does not appear to extend over the travel lanes.  
***Partially Addressed. The canopy has been lengthened but does still not extend over the travel lanes.***
3. The row of 47 “compact car” spaces are “prime” spaces located directly in front of the MOB entrance. We would prefer to see these spaces be 9’ wide and used for visitor / patient parking. The compact car spaces can be moved to more remote areas of the lot and used by employees (where the narrower stalls are more practical due to low turnover).  
***Addressed. These stalls are primarily 9’ wide in the new plan.***
4. First car in 47-space compact car row backs directly into crosswalk.  
***Not Addressed.***
5. Access to the dumpster and loading areas appear challenging if valet parking area is full.  
***Addressed. A note has been added that no trash pick-up or loading may be conducted during peak (valet) conditions.***
6. Six-deep valet stacking area is difficult to manage / retrieve and there is little room to stage cars that have to be moved during deep retrievals.  
***Partially Addressed. The plan reduces the stacking depth to 3 cars in most of the valet area but two rows with a 6-deep stack still exist. The vehicle staging concern has not been addressed.***

7. Attached sketch (not included) shows concept that reduces stacking depth and opens up access to dumpsters and loading with no loss of parking. Applicant should explore similar concepts to improve site circulation and functionality.  
***Applicant contends that any plan with valet operation in east lot is not feasible due to proximity of residential uses.***

#### **PARKING EXPANSION**

8. Provide greater detail for the gated entry & exit points, including how they are activated and operated.  
***George Street: Addressed.***  
***Bay Street: Not Addressed. Still don't understand ungated "Ticket Box" operation.***
9. Awkward intersection of parking lot drive aisles with double exit onto Bay Street  
***Not Addressed. Would like to see a detail of the Bay Street egress.***
10. In-lot Stop Bars running across rear of parking stalls / Will in-lot Stop Bars be accompanied by Stop Signs?  
***Not Addressed. Would like NV5 input.***

#### **NEW COMMENTS**

#### **SIGNAGE**

11. Sign N-10 requires contact information of towing company. The sign should also be posted in the east lot and the west lot. Using tow truck symbol should be considered to strengthen message.
12. Sign N-11 appears too large to fit in curb strip.
13. Sign N-12 is confusing. Valet arrow wrong way? Sign would be more effective in advance of turn rather than beyond.

By: Gerard Giosa  
LEVEL G ASSOCIATES  
22 March 2018