



May 9, 2024

Mr. Jean Krack, Manager
Borough of Phoenixville
351 Bridge Street, 2nd Floor
Phoenixville, PA 19460

**RE: Trip Generation and Parking Demand Comparison
245-249 Bridge Street | 414 Property Group
Phoenixville Borough, Chester County, PA
Bowman Project No: 313881-01-001**

Dear Mr. Krack:

As requested, Bowman has completed an evaluation of the trip generation and the parking demand relative to the existing 245-249 Bridge Street properties (UPI Nos. 15-9-133, 15-9-134, 15-9-135, and 15-9-136) located on the northeast corner of the intersection of Bridge Street and Gay Street within the Borough of Phoenixville. The site currently contains 5 apartment units and 8,776 square feet of retail space, and will be redeveloped by the applicant (414 Property Group) to include 14 apartment units and 6,523 square feet of commercial space. It is noted that four of the existing apartments and three of the existing four commercial uses will remain on the site. The purpose of this evaluation is to compare the existing trip generation of the site to the proposed site, as well as to identify the parking demand for the site under the proposed scenario.

Trip Generation Comparison

The trip generation for the existing and redeveloped site was determined using the ITE *Trip Generation, 11th Edition*. The existing and redeveloped site propose a relatively small number of apartments and commercial space compared to the data sets for the ITE Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) (Land Use Code 220) and Strip Retail Plaza (<40k) (Land Use Code 822) land uses. As such, our office calculated the trip generation for the existing and redeveloped sites based on both the ITE rate and equation methodologies to determine the trip generation differences between the existing site and the proposed site. The detailed trip generation calculations using the rate method and equation method are provided in Attachment 1.

Based a review of both trip generation methodologies, the redeveloped site will generate slightly less traffic than the existing site regardless of the method used. Although it seems that the redevelopment will generate more traffic based on the increased unit count, it is noted that for each method, the proposed decrease in retail space reduces more trips than the increased residential units will generate. As such, *the trip generation for this proposed redevelopment will not require a traffic impact study per the Borough's Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance Section 22-602.3.A*. A comparison of the trip generation of the existing site and the redeveloped site is provided in Table 1 below based on the trip generation rate method, since it is our opinion that the equation method likely overestimates the trips generated by the site.

Table 1: Trip Generation Comparison

Land Use	Daily	Weekday Morning Peak Hour			Weekday Afternoon Peak Hour			Saturday Midday Peak Hour		
		In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Existing Site	512	12	11	23	31	30	61	30	30	60
Redeveloped Site	449	10	11	21	25	25	50	25	24	49
DIFFERENCE	-63	-2	0	-2	-6	-5	-11	-5	-6	-11

Proposed Parking Demand

As outlined in section 27-405.4 of the Borough’s Zoning Ordinance, dedicated parking is not required within the Town Center Zoning District along Bridge Street east of Church Street, where the site is located. However, as outlined in Section 27-405.5.A and 27-405.5.B, a parking evaluation is required when changes are proposed to existing buildings when land development approval is needed or when additional residential units are proposed. As such, our office has prepared a parking evaluation of the proposed redeveloped site. It is noted that under existing conditions, the site does not have any dedicated parking space located on the site; however, it is proposed to provide seven parking spaces on the site as part of the redevelopment.

Parking demand for the redeveloped site was determined using two different sources. First, the parking demand for the commercial space was determined using ITE *Parking Generation Handbook*, 6th Edition using the Strip Retail (<40K) (ITE Land Use Code 822) land use. Second the parking demand for the residential units was determined using the Parking Evaluation completed for several existing apartment building located within the Borough, which was prepared by our office in August 2022. The proposed 14 apartment units with a total of 30 bedrooms, will generate a peak parking demand of a 24 parking spaces based on the parking study prepared by our office. In addition, and 6,523 square feet of retail space will generate a peak parking demand of a 20 parking spaces based on ITE data. It should be noted that since the commercial space on the redeveloped site will represent as reduction in commercial space, the commercial parking demand will be reduced compared to the existing parking demand for the site.

It is our understanding that the site will include seven dedicated parking spaces located on the site, and these spaces are proposed to be for the use of residents of the apartment units. The remaining apartment parking demand (17 parking spaces) must be accommodated elsewhere (off site). Due to the location of the site within downtown Phoenixville, there are several Borough public parking lots which could be used to accommodate the additional 17 parking space demand for the apartments or parking will need to be

found on nearby streets. The applicant should work with the Borough to determine whether dedicated parking for the apartments could be provided within Borough controlled parking lots. It is also noted that the reduced on-site parking supply may attract tenants that don't require any or more than one parking space, which will reduce the overall residential parking demand.

If you should have any questions or wish to discuss this parking evaluation further, please do not hesitate to reach out to our office.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "John J. Yurick". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized initial "J" and "Y".

John J. Yurick, P.E., PTOE, PTP
Senior Project Manager

JJY/JDG

Attachments

Q:\PA-EXTO-MC\mcm\eng\PHOENBO1\313881 - 414 Bridge Street\Correspondence\Out\2024-02 Trip Gen and Pakring Demand Letter\2024-05-09 Trip Gen and Parking Demand Letter.docx

The top of the page features a dark green background on the left with the word "Bowman" in white. To the right, a collage of images is visible, including a large stone archway, a roundabout with a central tree, and a residential street with houses and cars. The collage is separated from the green background by white diagonal lines.

Bowman

ATTACHMENT 1

TRIP GENERATION COMPARISON

Method 1. Based on ITE Trip Generation Rates

Existing Trip Generation											
Land Use	Size	Daily	AM			PM			SAT		
			IN	OUT	TOTAL	IN	OUT	TOTAL	IN	OUT	TOTAL
Apartments (LUC 220)	5 units	34	0	2	2	2	1	3	1	1	2
Strip Retail Plaza (<40k) (LUC 822)	8,776 s.f	478	12	9	21	29	29	58	29	29	58
Total		512	12	11	23	31	30	61	30	30	60

Proposed Trip Generation											
Land Use	Size	Daily	AM			PM			SAT		
			IN	OUT	TOTAL	IN	OUT	TOTAL	IN	OUT	TOTAL
Apartments (LUC 220)	14 units	94	1	5	6	4	3	7	3	3	6
Strip Retail Plaza (<40k) (LUC 822)	6,523 s.f	355	9	6	15	21	22	43	22	21	43
Total		449	10	11	21	25	25	50	25	24	49

Existing Trip Generation vs Proposed Trip Generation											
Land Use	Size	Daily	AM			PM			SAT		
			IN	OUT	TOTAL	IN	OUT	TOTAL	IN	OUT	TOTAL
Existing Trip Generation		512	12	11	23	31	30	61	30	30	60
Proposed Trip Generation		449	10	11	21	25	25	50	25	24	49
Difference		-63	-2	0	-2	-6	-5	-11	-5	-6	-11

Method 2. Based on ITE Trip Generation Equations

Existing Trip Generation											
Land Use	Size	Daily	AM			PM			SAT		
			IN	OUT	TOTAL	IN	OUT	TOTAL	IN	OUT	TOTAL
Apartments (LUC 220)	5 units	107	6	18	24	14	9	23	1	1	2
Strip Retail Plaza (<40k) (LUC 822)	8,776 s.f	600	16	10	26	35	36	71	29	29	58
Total		707	22	28	50	49	45	94	30	30	60

Proposed Trip Generation											
Land Use	Size	Daily	AM			PM			SAT		
			IN	OUT	TOTAL	IN	OUT	TOTAL	IN	OUT	TOTAL
Apartments (LUC 220)	14 units	165	7	20	27	17	10	27	3	3	6
Strip Retail Plaza (<40k) (LUC 822)	6,523 s.f	505	13	9	22	29	28	57	22	21	43
Total		670	20	29	49	46	38	84	25	24	49

Existing Trip Generation vs Proposed Trip Generation											
Land Use	Size	Daily	AM			PM			SAT		
			IN	OUT	TOTAL	IN	OUT	TOTAL	IN	OUT	TOTAL
Existing Trip Generation		707	22	28	50	49	45	94	30	30	60
Proposed Trip Generation		670	20	29	49	46	38	84	25	24	49
Difference		-37	-2	1	-1	-3	-7	-10	-5	-6	-11