



MEMO

To: David Bricklin

cc: Robin Simons

From: Ross Tilghman

Date: 10 June 2019

Subject: Winslow Hotel – Transportation Comments

I have reviewed the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) for the proposed Winslow Hotel and offer the comments found below. I have also reviewed the project's separate parking analysis (dated March 24, 2018) as well as its SEPA Checklist, site plan (dated April 25, 2019), and the Bainbridge Island zoning code and Island Wide Transportation Study.

- 1) The TIA does not evaluate Saturday transportation demands when the project would generate its highest volumes.** Instead, the TIA focuses solely on weekday conditions. This is in contrast to the parking study that evaluates summer Saturdays as the design-day scenario. The full impact of the project cannot be known without testing Saturday conditions.

Recommendation: The TIA should evaluate the impact of project traffic on weekend conditions.

- 2) The TIA's weekday trip generation does not account for use of the event space.** The number of trips reported (727 daily vehicle trips and 52 PM peak hour trips) represent the hotel and restaurant demands but do not begin to include even modest levels of attendance at an event. The event space at 3,600 sq. ft. can easily accommodate 200 people. If a weekday evening concert, reception or banquet occurs, it will generate approximately 51 peak hour vehicle arrivals. That would double the number reported in the TIA, yielding over 100 p.m. peak hour trips. Note that the parking study identified an event demand for 52 vehicles to park. If they arrive in the peak hour, then the trip generation must be higher than reported in the TIA.

Recommendation: The TIA should evaluate the impact of all project trips.

- 3) The TIA's findings are based on low-volume winter traffic counts, not on higher volume summer traffic.** Traffic counts used in the TIA were taken in December 2018, and do not reflect higher volume summer conditions. According to WSDOT Ferries data, summer (3rd quarter)

ferry volumes average 27% higher than 4th quarter volumes when the traffic counts were taken. Additional evidence of higher summer volumes comes from the Island Wide Transportation Plan that conducted counts in June 2014 that show volumes 51% higher in the P.M. peak hour at Winslow Way/SR-305, and 8% higher at Winslow Way/Madison Ave N than shown in the TIA for December 2018. Summer conditions including intersection levels of service would be worse than the December conditions reported in the TIA.

Recommendation: The TIA should evaluate the project's impacts on summer traffic conditions

- 4) **The surges from ferry traffic have not been adequately considered in the TIA for either existing conditions or for future conditions with the project and its event traffic.** The TIA never discusses traffic operations when ferries unload their vehicles. This is a crucial oversight for disclosing the impacts of event traffic on Winslow Way since the largest single share of the hotel's and event space's market is expected to arrive by ferry from Seattle. The TIA assumes that 40% of project traffic uses the ferry. That assumption seems low given the region's demographics and the project's appeal as a destination venue. In any case, the hourly ferry schedule means that the vast majority of event guests (up to 90% of ferry users) would arrive by the same sailing. That means that the bulk of event traffic would arrive at the site within the span of 5 to 10 minutes, rather than being spread across the hour. The following table shows the potential number of vehicles arriving by ferry.

Impact of Ferry on Project Traffic per TIA				
	PM Peak Hour			Vehicles arriving at
	Arrivals	% by Ferry	% Same Sailing	one time
Hotel & Restaurant	27	40%	90%	10
Event Space	51	40%	90%	18
Totals	78			28
Impact of Ferry on Project Traffic with Higher Ferry Share				
	PM Peak Hour			Vehicles arriving at
	Arrivals	% by Ferry	% Same Sailing	one time
Hotel & Restaurant	27	60%	90%	14
Event Space	51	75%	90%	34
Totals	78			49

Vehicles arriving at the site from the ferry will have to drive along Winslow Way and then turn left into the site. Guests will either turn in the drive to the garage or into the drop-off area at the front door. Guests checking in to the hotel and other guests using valet parking will use the small drop-off area. That area has room for only four or five vehicles at one time. The number of vehicles arriving within a very short period of time, as shown above, is very likely to exceed the capacity of the drop-off area and of a valet service to process arriving cars. The intensity of arrivals in such a short period would likely cause back-ups on Winslow Way between the project

and Madison Ave. which would in turn increase congestion along Winslow Way through downtown.

Recommendation: The project should evaluate its capability to accommodate vehicles arriving by ferry as well as the impact of those vehicles on local traffic conditions. This should include identifying valet processing capacity as well as traffic queuing on Winslow Way.

- 5) **The project's compliance with zoning requirements for parking remains unknown.** No document has yet defined the zoning requirement. Missing from the site plan is a schedule of unit counts and floor areas by use from which zoning requirements would be calculated. Nor did the parking study address zoning requirements.

The site plan dated April 25, 2019 shows 136 parking stalls. My preliminary calculation is that zoning may require between approximately 160 and 195 spaces. That range reflects the variation and uncertainty in floor areas for the restaurant and meeting/banquet rooms. Additional information on the staffing and number of occupants for the restaurant is needed to verify the zoning requirement. In any case, it appears that the project may not provide enough parking to meet zoning requirements. To the extent that off-site parking is used to fulfill the required supply, the zoning code mandates that it be located within 1,000 feet of the site, that it be purchased through in-lieu fees to the city, or owned outright (fee simple), or that its use be secured with an irrevocable easement or agreement. No information about zoning compliance for parking purposes has been provided in project submittals to date.

Recommendation: The project should identify the zoning requirement for parking and show how it fully complies with that requirement.

- 6) **The parking analysis has not been revised for the updated land use program and should include additional refinements about restaurant and banquet demand.** The analysis was for a 70-room hotel that has now grown to 87 rooms. Updating the room count results in demand for 11 more parking stalls at 9:00 p.m. Based on well documented information in ULI's Shared Parking (2nd ed.), the analysis uses data for a Leisure Hotel that includes a restaurant/lounge and conference/banquet space. However, the nature of this project I think differs from the examples studied in Shared Parking that tend to be larger corporate sites with its signature design and destination attraction. For example:

- i) Shared Parking's data for a hotel's restaurant shows that it peaks with just 70% occupancy on a weekend evening. That is not a reasonable assumption for a signature restaurant in a distinctive building oriented to the street. It is more reasonable and likely that such a restaurant will operate at or close to 100% capacity for three to four hours. Shared Parking's category for a Fine/Casual Dining restaurant better reflects the likely characteristics of this project's restaurant, showing occupancies from 90% to 100% between 6 p.m. and 11 p.m. The base demand rate is also higher at 17.0 spaces per 1,000 sq. ft. versus 10.0 per 1,000 sq. ft. as used in the parking study.
- ii) Restaurant employees must be considered in the parking analysis. While the proposed floor area of the restaurant remains unclear in the latest site plan, the parking study

assumed 4,730 sq. ft. That size would be expected to have approximately 16 employees. Based on the study's assumed employee drive ratio of 63%, restaurant employee parking demand would be 10 spaces.

- iii) Similarly, the meeting/banquet space would have its own employees for major functions. If staffed at a level comparable to the restaurant for its size, about 11 employees would be present at peak resulting in demand for 7 parking spaces.

An updated parking demand calculation would look like this:

Design Day -- Acknowledging Restaurant as local draw & Adding Staff for Restaurant and Events							
Use	Size	Base Rate	Monthly Factor	Hourly Factor	Driving Ratio	Non-Captive Ratio	July 9:00 pm Total Parking Demand (Spaces)
Hotel	87 rooms	1.00	100%	95%	70%	100%	58
Hotel Employee	87 rooms	0.18	100%	55%	63%	100%	5
Restaurant/Lounge	4,730 sq. ft.	17.00	98%	90%	70%	50%	25
Hotel Sundry Shop	100 sq. ft.	3.20	64%	50%	100%	25%	1
Hotel Sundry Employee	100 sq. ft.	0.80	80%	65%	63%	100%	1
Spa	1,670 sq. ft.	3.00	65%	0%	100%	50%	-
Spa Employee	1,670 sq. ft.	3.00	75%	0%	63%	100%	-
Meeting/Banquet Space	3,600 sq. ft.	30.00	100%	100%	75%	70%	57
Sub-total demand:							147
Restaurant Employee	4,730 sq. ft.	3.00	100%	100%	63%	100%	9
Banquet Employee	3,600 sq. ft.	3.00	100%	100%	63%	100%	7
Total Parking Demand:							163

If these floor areas remain approximately correct, the project's design-day demand would be 163 spaces, more than the 136 spaces provided on the site. Spillover demand of approximately 18 spaces would occur. Peak events would generate demand for approximately 228 spaces, with a spillover of 92 spaces.

Recommendation: Update the parking analysis to reflect the latest land use program, to recognize the signature restaurant, and to include employee demands for both the restaurant and meeting/banquet space.

- 7) **It is unclear how and where the project can secure off-site parking to meet zoning requirements and accommodate overflow demand.** On-street parking is heavily utilized on both weekdays and Saturdays and offers few available spaces in the site's immediate vicinity, as recently documented in the Bainbridge Island Downtown Parking Study. Off-street parking is fragmented and distributed among many different, mostly private lots. Nor is the project's overflow demand restricted to late evenings, since the project would reach overflow conditions early in the afternoon if an event is scheduled over the lunch hour and into the afternoon, just when downtown parking peaks on both weekdays and Saturdays.

Recommendation: The project should demonstrate how it will reliably accommodate overflow parking demands on both weekdays and weekends.