445 Hamilton Avenue, 14th Floor White Plains, New York 10601 T 9147611300

William S. Null, Esq. wnull@cuddyfeder.com
11/22/2021

## BY EMAIL: vdesimone@northcastleny.com

Mr. Christopher Carthy, Chairman, and
Members of the Planning Board
Town of North Castle
17 Bedford Road
Armonk, New York 10504
Re: Site Plan Application for 873 Holding Company LLC
Restaurant with Accessory Brewing Operations and Tap Room
Premises: 873 North Broadway, North Castle, NY 10603 (122.12-4-27)
Dear Chairman Carthy and Members of the Planning Board:
On behalf of 873 Holding Company LLC, the contract-vendee for the Premises ("Applicant"), we respectfully submit this letter and enclosures in furtherance of the pending Site Plan Application for adaptive reuse of the commercial building at 873 North Broadway for a restaurant to be known as "Miles, The Prince." The enclosed information concerning parking is provided in response to questions raised by the Planning Board and by the Planning Board's traffic and parking consultant, Hardesty \& Hanover, LLC, in its review memorandum dated November 4, 2021.

In support of this Application, we respectfully submit the following documents, dated November 22, 2021, prepared by Kimley Horn Engineering and Landscape Architecture, P.C.:

1. A Traffic and Parking Letter with Traffic and Parking Management Plan; and
2. A Valet Parking Layout Plan.

We respectfully request that this Application be placed on the Agenda for consideration by the Planning Board at its December 13, 2021 meeting. We look forward to attending that meeting and addressing any questions.

Thank you for your consideration.

cc: Director of Planning Adam R. Kaufman, AICP; Engineering Consultant Joseph M. Cermele, P.E., Kellard Sessions Consulting; Insite Engineering, Surveying \& Landscape Architecture, P.C.; Wid Chapman Architects

# Kimley ») Horn 

November 21, 2021

Mr. Christopher Carthy, Chairman, and Members of the Town of North Castle Planning Board
Town of North Castle, 15 Bedford Road, Armonk, NY 10504
Re: $\quad$ Site Plan Application, 873 N BROADWAY [2021-037]

Dear Mr. Carthy and Planning Board Members:

We have reviewed Mr. Galante's memorandum dated November 4, 2021 and offer the following responses and are submitting additional data and materials with regard to the above matter:

## 1. Determination of Parking Need

A review of data contained in the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) publication, Parking Generation, $5^{\text {th }}$ Edition, indicates that the average area per seat at quality restaurants is 31.8 square feet and that the average 63 -seat restaurant would measure only $2,003 \mathrm{sf}$. Thus, the average 63 -seat restaurant would measure less than $60 \%$ of the size of the 3,435 -sf gross floor area proposed herein. This recognizes and supports the Applicant's contention that the brewing component of the restaurant is accessory to the restaurant and should not be considered when determining how much parking will be generated by the project.

On this matter, we are in complete agreement with Mr. Galante that, as a practical matter, the parking needs for the business should be based on the number of seats, not the gross floor area of the building.

Mr. Galante indicates that, using the Town Code's parking requirement of 1 parking space for every 3 seats, a total of 21 parking spaces would be needed to serve the 63-seat establishment. Mr. Galante further indicates that, based on ITE Parking Generation Data, the peak parking demand for an average 63-seat restaurant would be 28 vehicles. Our review of the ITE data, which indicates that the average quality restaurant generates 0.47 parked vehicles per seat (see attached), suggests that the facility will likely generate a maximum parking demand of 30 parking vehicles. As this value is very similar to Mr. Galante's 28 parked vehicles, we believe it would be
fair to say that Mr. Galante and Kimley-Horn would be in agreement that an average 63 -seat restaurant would have a peak parking demand of approximately 30 vehicles.

Mr. Galante states the ITE data suggests that parking at the restaurant will be greater, with possibly as many as 54 cars parked on a busy evening. Respectfully, and for the following reasons, we disagree with the magnitude of this estimate (though not necessarily with the principle, which will be addressed later in this report):

- The 54-parked-vehicle number suggested by Mr. Galante is based on the $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile value of 0.86 parked vehicles per seat listed by the ITE in its publication (see attached). Of the 15 sources from which data was gathered in the ITE report, only 1 restaurant ${ }^{1}$ had an observed parking demand ratio greater than 0.72 parked vehicles per seat. This value suggests that such data is atypical in that only one 63-seat restaurant would have more than 45 cars parked at any time ( $14 / 15$ or approximately the $93^{\text {rd }}$ percentile).
- If 6 of the 54 vehicles parked at a 63 -seat restaurant belonged to staff, and diners traveled two per vehicle in the remaining 48 cars during the busiest period, that would mean there would be 96 people at the 63 -seat establishment. In such situation, there would be nowhere in the proposed establishment to accommodate the additional 33 people.

As stated above, we agree with Mr. Galante that a 63-seat restaurant could have more than 28 parked cars at the busiest hours. However, a closer look at the data indicates that, at most, a 63seat restaurant would generate just 45 parked vehicles (based on the highest of all but one of the 15 datapoints).

As discussed hereafter, at most, the Applicant can accommodate 37 parked vehicles (guest parking onsite with Valet and employee parking at the property next door). As previously stated, if the restaurant is more successful than $93 \%$ of other quality restaurant, the maximum parking demand will be 45 vehicles (presuming all 63 seats are in operation at the same time).

To ensure that there will always be sufficient parking, the Applicant proposes not to have service at the outdoor seating at the same time as there is service at the indoor seating. Thus, for much, if not most, of the year, service will only be available at the 45 indoor seats. During the warmer

[^0]months, weather conditions permitting, al-fresco dining at the 18 outdoor seats will be available from 11 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. (or until indoor service starts). It is noted that, under the Town Code, a permit is required from the building department annually to have outdoor seating. Thus, control of the outdoor seating always lies with the Town if there is a problem with parking because of the use of the outdoor seating.

Based on the $93^{\text {rd }}$ percentile ITE data point 0.72 parked cars per seat, it is projected that, if the restaurant is successful, by limiting the amount of seating available to 45 , the maximum projected parking demand is 33 vehicles. For business purposes (to avoid unpleasant waits for customers), and to ensure that there will not be a crowd of people waiting (and parked) to be seated for a meal, the Applicant also commits to operate the restaurant as reservations-only restaurant, during the busier periods ${ }^{2}$. With reservations staggered to reduce wait times and spread out arrivals, the Applicant can guarantee that parking will not exceed the projected maximum of 33 parked vehicles.

In evaluating the reasonableness of the projected possible maximum parking demand of 33 vehicles, consideration should be given to the practical nature of the restaurant business. Not all diners go out to eat in twos and fours (the typical restaurant table set up). Inevitably, even if the restaurant has all of its tables occupied, there will be some empty seats. If even just $10 \%$ of the seats are empty, that means there will be only 41 guests seated. Even on busy nights, one would only expect another couple of groups arriving shortly before their reservation, who would need to wait. If there were three groups of three people, that would bring the total number of guests at the restaurant to 50 . Assuming guests arrive an average two to a car, that would generate just 25 parked vehicles. Add an estimated 5 additional cars for staff parking (many restaurant staff do not have private auto transportation), that would suggest a maximum parking demand of 27 vehicles, 6 vehicles fewer than the projected maximum possible demand.

Thus, by limiting the number of seats available to 45 maximum at any time and by committing to adopting a reservations-only policy at the busier times ${ }^{2}$ (assuming the restaurant is exceptionally successful), the proposed restaurant will most likely generate a maximum parking demand of 22 vehicles but, in no case is the number of parked vehicles expected to exceed 33 vehicles.

[^1]
## 2. Parking Management Strategies

The Applicant proposes to manage parking (and traffic) to ensure that the level of parking activity at the restaurant is not more than the number of vehicles that can be accommodated. The Applicant proposes to provide proximate but offsite parking for staff. In addition to limiting the number of seats being served and seating customers by reservation only (if necessary, valet parking will be provided for guests on-site during peak times.

As indicated by the attached time-of-day-distribution parking demand taken from the ITE Parking Generation Manual, $5^{\text {th }}$ Edition, parking at quality restaurants peaks after 6 pm on weekdays and after 7 pm on weekends. Based on a projected peak possible parking demand of 33 vehicles, it is projected that fewer than 20 vehicles will be parked at the proposed restaurant before these peak hours. Thus, parking for daytime use at the establishment can be accommodated in the proposed 20 on-site parking spaces.

The Applicant is in the process of securing a lease agreement with the owner of 11 Washington Place for the use of at least 5 parking spaces on weekday evenings and at least 7 parking spaces on weekend days and evenings. These spaces will be used for employee parking. Employees working the dinner shift will be directed to park at 11 Washington Place and to walk up to the restaurant. During other periods, employees will be instructed to park in the spaces at the far end of the on-site parking lot.

As indicated in the approved site plan for 11 Washington Place (dated 11/5/18), a total of 29 parking spaces are provided. Based on the Town Code, a total of 18 parking spaces are required for the combined 5,514 sf of office/warehouse space and an additional 16 parking spaces are required for the 7 apartments. It is noted that the ITE Parking Generation Manual indicates that the office and warehouse component of the development at 11 Washington Place will generate a combined maximum of just 9 parked vehicles, not 19, while the residential component of the development will generate a maximum of just 8 parked vehicles, not 16 .

Regardless, Kimley-Horn conducted a shared parking analysis for 11 Washington Place using the 18 office/warehouse parking space requirement and the 16 residential parking space requirement. The shared parking analysis, which is attached, utilized the ULl's Shared Parking 3rd Edition spreadsheet. As indicated in the attached, even using the Town's more conservative Code-based
requirements, the shared parking analysis indicates that there will always be at least 6 of the 29 parking spaces free during the weekday and that there will always be at least 15 of the 29 parking spaces free on weekday evenings and all day on the weekends.

Thus, the shared parking analysis for 11 Washington Place demonstrates that there are between 6 and 15 parking spaces available for use by others, which is consistent with the proposal herein to provide up to 7 parking spaces for use by the Applicant for off-site employee parking.

During the busier evening sittings, the Applicant proposes to provide an on-site valet parking service for customers in the rear of the building. As indicated in the attached, up to 30 guest cars can be accommodated in the rear parking lot (28 parked, one in the valet drop-off area and another in the valet pick-up area). If necessary, the delivery van could be parked off-site on busier days, increasing the number of cars that could be accommodated on the lot by 2 spaces to 32. Added to the offsite parking, a total of 35 parked vehicles (plus the delivery van) can be accommodated at the restaurant on weekday evenings and a total of 37 can be accommodated on weekends (a detailed discussion of the valet parking operation is provided in the attached Traffic and Parking Management Plan).

As can be seen from above, limiting the number of seats being served at any one time to 45 (and implementing a reservations-only policy if necessary at specified times) will limit the maximum amount of parking that can occur at the restaurant (even if greatly successful), while the provision of off-site and valet parking will increase the number of vehicles that can be accommodated to above the projected 33 parked vehicles maximum.

## 3. Traffic Generation

In order to understand how the valet parking would operate at the proposed restaurant, an analysis was conducted of ITE data contained in its publication, Trip Generation, $11^{\text {th }}$ edition. Similar to the parking analysis, $80^{\text {th }}$ percentile values were utilized to understand what level of traffic might be generated by a successful quality 45 -seat restaurant. This analysis is summarized in the table below.

873 N Broadway Projected Peak Hour Traffic ${ }^{1}$

| Day of Week | Lunch (12-1 pm) ${ }^{3}$ |  |  | Dinner ( $7-9 \mathrm{pm}$ ) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Monday to Thursday Friday | 5 | 4 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Saturday (\& Sunday) | 10 | 7 | 17 | 11 | 7 | 18 |

1. Based on ITE Trip Generation, 11th Edition
2. With 45 seats (ITE average values)
3. Based on ITE Parking Generation Temporal Distribution applied to Peak Generator Hour Trips
4. Peak generation based on 2nd highest of all quality restaurants for which data was available.

As can be seen from the table, ITE data indicate that a successful 45-seat quality restaurant would generate a maximum of 18 trips in the busiest hour, or less than 1 vehicle every three minutes, a very modest level of traffic activity.

It is noted that there is a left-turn restriction at the exit from the subject property to Washington Place. It is our understanding that this restriction was placed in direct response to the proposal to operate a dry-cleaning business out of the building, which would have had a much higher turnover than the proposed restaurant. While the Applicant has no opposition to the restriction, it is noted that the need for such a restriction has been greatly diminished with the significantly lower volumes of traffic that will now be generated (approximately 10 exiting trips in the busiest hour of which 7 are likely to turn right and head to North Broadway regardless). It is suggested that this turn restriction be rescinded, for the simple reason that it is not needed and that customers will then be able to depart whichever route best serves them. If the left-turn restriction is to remain, only three vehicles per hour would be impacted and the Applicant has indicated that it will not have an adverse impact on his business.

Assuming, during the busiest period of the busiest hour, the level of traffic activity could briefly (for two or three minutes at a time) spike to three times the average during the hour, it is calculated that there would still be less than one vehicle entering or one vehicle exiting per minute, which will easily allow valets to park arriving vehicles and retrieve parked vehicles one at a time, without having to stack vehicles in the parking lot.

## 4. Site Access, Circulation and Operation

The Site Plan is being expanded to show the location of the 11 Washington Place Parking Lot, the access across the adjacent property from the subject site to Washington Place, and the turn restrictions.

Published information regarding the restaurant will direct guests to proceed to the rear parking lot off of Washington Place. Employees who work in the evenings, when valet parking is in operation, will be instructed to park in the 11 Washington Place Parking lot. During other periods, employees will be instructed to park in the spaces at the far end of the on-site parking lot.

Guests are expected to arrive one car at a time, two at most at the same time. They will enter from Washington Place and, when there is no valet parking, they will self-park and enter the restaurant. Upon departure, they will retrieve their vehicles and leave. When there is valet parking, they will pull over to the right side upon entering the parking lot and give their keys to the valet, proceeding inside the building. The valet will then take their car and, if there is not a second car arriving to be valeted, they will pull forward into the lot, turn left-toward the building and then reverse the car into an appropriate parking space so that it is in a position to be driven out when it is retrieved. If there is a second car arriving to be valeted, the valet will drive the first car directly into a suitable parking space so that the second arriving car can be accommodated immediately. During down time between arrivals, the valets will rearrange vehicles, as may be needed, to ease departure.

The attached Valet Parking Plan shows how the vehicles will be parked on the property. They are arranged such that no more than two cars have to be moved to retrieve any vehicle. When a guest comes out to depart, the valet will move any cars in the way as shown on the plan and bring the guest's vehicle to the front of the parking lot by the building where they will give them the keys. They will then move any of the cars that they have pulled out from spot back, as may be needed.

During busy weekday afternoons, based on the attached time-of-day-distribution parking demand taken from the ITE Parking Generation Manual, $5^{\text {th }}$ Edition, it is projected that fewer than 20 vehicles will be parked at the proposed restaurant. Thus, parking for daytime use at the establishment can be accommodated in the proposed 20 on-site parking spaces. If needed, an
additional 5 vehicles could be accommodated by having a staff member instruct arriving guests to tandem park in front of parked employees' vehicles.
With the implementation of these measures, it is anticipated that the valets can easily accommodate a turnover of 20 vehicles per hour and accommodate as many as 30 vehicles on the property ( 32 if the delivery van is parked elsewhere).

## Conclusions

The proposed restaurant is a small, quality restaurant, which typically experiences more sedate operations than larger, high-turnover facilities. It is proposed to accommodate up to 37 parked vehicles at the restaurant through a combination of valet parking and offsite parking. It is also proposed to limit the amount of parking at the facility by limiting the number of seats served at any time to 45 .

With these measures, the restaurant is projected to generate just 18 trips and, at most, 33 parked cars in the busiest hours, below the site's capacity to accommodate both traffic and parking. The Applicant is committed to accommodating as many as 37 parked cars through valet parking and offsite parking. Therefore, the proposed development will not have any impact on traffic operating conditions and the requested 26 -space parking variance will not have any detrimental impact to the quality or character of the neighborhood.

Please contact me at the address below if you have any questions.

Very truly yours,
KIMLEY-HORN ENGINEERING AND LANSCAPE ARCHITECTURE, P.C.



John Canning, P.E. Project Manager

## Summary of ITE Quality Restaurant Parking Data Based on Seats

| Query Filter |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| DATA SOURCE: |  |
| Parking Generation Manual, 5th Ed | $\checkmark$ |
| SEARCH BY LAND USE CODE: |  |
| $931$ |  |
| LAND USE GROUP: |  |
| (900-999) Services | $\checkmark$ |
| LAND USE: |  |
| 931 - Quality Restaurant | $v$ |
| LAND USE SUBCATEGORY: |  |
| All Sites | $\checkmark$ |
| INDEPENDENT VARIABLE (IV): |  |
| Seats | $v$ |
| TIME PERIOD: |  |
| Friday | $v$ |
| SETTING/LOCATION: |  |
| General Urban/Suburban | $\checkmark$ |
| Enter iv value to calculate parking demand: |  |
| 63 Calculate |  |
| Data Ranae: $98.00-300.00$ |  |



| DATA STATISTICS |
| :---: |
| Land Use: |
| Quality Restaurant (931) Click for more details |
| Independent Variable: |
| Seats |
| Time Period: |
| Friday |
| Setting/Location: |
| General Urban/Suburban |
| Peak Period of Parking Demand: |
| 7:00-9:00 p.m. |
| Number of Studies: |
| 9 |
| Avg. Num. of Seats: |
| 189 |
| Average Rate: |
| 0.47 |
| Range of Rates: |
| 0.24-1.00 |
| 33rd / 85th Percentile: |
| $0.33 / 0.86$ |
| 95\% Confidence Interval: |
| *** |
| Standard Deviation: |
| 0.22 |
| Coefficient of Variation: |
| 47\% |
| Fitted Curve Equation: |
| ** |
| $\mathrm{R}^{2}$ : |
| $\pm * *$ |
| Calculated Parking Demand: |
| Average Rate: 30 (Total) |

- Saturday data points - Common with Saturday (2) Common to Saturday and Mon-Thu

Friday parking at the two data sources that are common with Saturday ( 219 seats and 300 seats) was $14 \%$ higher and $4 \%$ lower than on Saturday, suggesting (though data is limited) that Parking at quality restaurants on Friday's is $5 \%$ (average) higher than on Saturdays.

Friday parking at the one data source that is common with Mon-Thu (219 seats) was $15 \%$ higher than on Mon-Thu, suggesting that Parking at quality restaurants on Friday's could be is $15 \%$ higher than on Mon-Thu.

Mon-Thu parking at the one data source that is common with Saturday (300 seats) was $56 \%$ lower than on Saturday, suggesting that Parking at quality restaurants Mon-Thu is considerably lower than on Saturdays.

Friday has the most data sources. Where there are common data sources, Friday parking is higher than Saturday, Saturday parking is higher than Mon-Thu and Friday parking is Higher than Mon-Thu parking, Suggesting that the Friday Parking Average is the best predictor of Average peak parking demand.

ITE Parking Demand for Office Space at 11 Washington Place


ITE Parking Demand for 7 Apartments at 11 Washington Place


| Query Filter |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| DATA SOURCE: |  |
| Parking Generation Manual, 5th Ed | $\checkmark$ |
| SEARCH BY LAND USE CODE: |  |
| 150 Q |  |
| LAND USE GROUP: |  |
| (100-199) Industrial | $\checkmark$ |
| LAND USE: |  |
| 150-Warehousing | $\checkmark$ |
| LAND USE SUBCATEGORY: |  |
| All Sites | $\checkmark$ |
| INDEPENDENT VARIABLE (IV): |  |
| 1000 Sq. Ft. GFA | $\checkmark$ |
| tIME PERIOD: |  |
| Weekday (Monday - Friday) | $\checkmark$ |
| SETTING/LOCATION: |  |
| General Urban/Suburban | $\checkmark$ |
| ENTER IV VALUE TO CALCULATE PARKING DEMAND: |  |
| 2.38 Calculate |  |
| Data Range: 3.89-1433.00 |  |
| Parking Demand are not estimated for some methods as yields negative values |  |


| Data Plot and Equation | DATA STATISTICS |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Land Use: 931 Quality Restaurant

## Time of Day Distribution for Parking Demand

The following table presents a time-of-day distribution of parking demand on a Monday-through-
Thursday weekday (one study site) and a Friday (one study site) in a general urban/suburban setting.
Percent of Peak Parking Demand

| Hour Beginning | Weekday | Friday |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12:00-4:00 a.m. | - | - |
| 5:00 a.m. | - | - |
| 6:00 a.m. | - | - |
| 7:00 a.m. | - | - |
| 8:00 a.m. | - | - |
| 9:00 a.m. | - | - |
| 10:00 a.m. | - | - |
| 11:00 a.m. | 20 | 11 |
| 12:00 p.m. | 51 | 37 |
| 1:00 p.m. | 56 | 54 |
| 2:00 p.m. | 40 | 29 |
| 3:00 p.m. | 27 | 22 |
| 4:00 p.m. | 27 | 19 |
| 5:00 p.m. | 39 | 18 |
| 6:00 p.m. | 71 | 42 |
| 7:00 p.m. | 100 | 91 |
| 8:00 p.m. | 97 | 100 |
| 9:00 p.m. | - | - |
| 10:00 p.m. | - | - |
| 11:00 p.m. | - | - |

*157/219=0.72 parking ratio (parked cars per seat)
$0.72 * 45=33$, maximum parking demand.

## Section of Approved Site Plan for

 11 Washington Place


Code-Based Shared Parking Demand for 7 Apartments, 3,134 sf of Office Space and 2,380 sf of Warehouse Space at 11 Washington Place

| January |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weekday Estimated Peak-Hour Parking Demand |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Use | Monthly | 11 Am | 12 PM | 1 PM | 2 PM | 3 PM | 4 PM | 5 PM | 6 P | 7 PM | 8 PM | 9 PM | 10 PM | 11 PM | 12 AM | Overall Pk | AM Peak Hr | PM Peak Hr | Eve Peak Hr |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 AM | 10 AM | 10 AM | 2 PM | 12 AM |
| Retail |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Food and Beverage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Entertainment and Institutions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hotel and Residential |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential, Suburban |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | - | - | $\cdot$ |
| Studio Efficiency | 100\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 1 Bedroom | 100\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | $\cdot$ | - | - |
| 2 Bedrooms | 100\% | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 14 |
| 3+ Bedrooms | 100\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| Reserved | 100\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| Visitor | 100\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Office |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Office $<25 \mathrm{ksf}$ | 100\% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Reserved | 100\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | $\cdot$ | - | - |
| Employee | 100\% | 16 | 14 | 14 | 15 | 15 | 14 | 10 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 16 | 15 | 0 |
| Additional Land Uses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Customer/Visito |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Employee/Reside |  | 22 | 19 | 19 | 21 | 21 | 20 | 17 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 23 | 23 | 21 | 14 |
| Spaces Available at | Reserved | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | 23 | 20 | 20 | 23 | 22 | 20 | 17 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 15 | 25 | 25 | 23 | 15 |
|  | hington PI. Weel | 6 |  | 9 |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |


| Retail |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food and Beverage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Entertainment and Institutions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hotel and Residential |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential, Suburban |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Studio Efficiency | 100\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 1 Bedroom | 100\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 2 Bedrooms | 100\% | 10 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 12 | 10 | 14 |
| $3+$ Bedrooms | 100\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| Reserved | 100\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | - |
| Visitor | 100\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Office |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Office $<25 \mathrm{ksf}$ | 100\% | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Reserved | 100\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| Employee | 100\% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Additional Land Uses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Customer/Visito | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  | Employee/Reside | 12 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 11 | 14 |
|  | Reserved | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | 13 | 13 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 13 | 15 |



Full Lot with 27


All other vehicle simply drive out of space to valet departure station.
Valet reposition cars shuffled cars after vehicle departure.
Legend Parked vehicle Parked vehicle moved Vehicle Temporarily parked whil to extract another vehicle another vehicle is being extracted arrival station departure station

Valet Parking Plan showing how valets could accommodate 27-29 vehicles on the site without having to move more than 2 cars to extract any vehicle (with all activities confined to the site).

# Traffic \& Parking Management Plan 

873 North Broadway, Town of North Castle, NY

## Prologue

This Traffic \& Parking Management Plan (T\&PMP) was required as part of the approval process for operation of a restaurant at 873 North Broadway, White Plains, NY. Due to the requirement of a Parking variance, the traffic and parking management strategies detailed hereafter were developed. The T\&PMP was developed to detail the strategies to be used to safely and efficiently manage traffic and parking at the restaurant (the "Property") during the busier hours, as may be needed.

The purpose of the T\&PMP is to ensure that worker and public safety is protected to the greatest extent practicable and that impacts to the traveling public, area businesses and residents are minimized as much as possible. Actions required by the T\&PMP are to be implemented at the start of operations at 873 North Broadway, as specified herein.

## Restaurant Operation

To ensure that there will always be sufficient parking, seating will be limited to 45 seats, maximum, at any time. Outdoor seating shall be included in the seat count and in no instance shall more than 45 seats in use for dining at the same time.

Any service at the restaurant that has a seating capacity of more than 25 seats shall operate on a reservations-only basis. Guests shall not be permitted to wait for their table unless they have made a reservation.

Published information regarding the restaurant shall direct guests to proceed to the rear parking lot off of Washington Place to park.

## Parking Operation

Weekdays after 5:00 p.m. and all day on weekends, employees shall be required and instructed to park in approved off-site, off-street parking within 250 feet of the property. Weekdays before 5:00 p.m. employees shall be required to park in the parking spaces at the far/west end of the on-site parking lot.

Valet Parking must be provided in the rear parking lot of the restaurant on weekdays before 5:00 p.m. whenever parking demand is anticipated to exceed 20 vehicles and on weekday evenings and weekends whenever parking demand is anticipated to exceed 25 vehicles. Regardless of the previous requirement, valet parking shall be required on Friday and Saturday evenings except when weather or other circumstances indicate a lower attendance at the restaurant.

When valet parking is provided, arriving guests shall be directed to pull to the righthand side of the entrance to the rear parking lot, exit the vehicle, receive a ticket, and proceed into the building.

The valet shall then take their car and, if there is not a second car arriving to be valeted, they pull forward into the lot, turn left-toward the building and then reverse the car into an appropriate parking space so that it is in a position to be driven out when it is retrieved.

If there is a second car arriving to be valeted, the valet shall drive the first car directly into a suitable parking space so that the second arriving car can be accommodated immediately.

During down time between arrivals, the Valets shall rearrange vehicles, as may be needed to ease departure. The attached Valet Parking Plan shows how the vehicles will be parked on the property.

When a guest comes out to depart, they valet shall move any cars in the way as shown on the plan and bring the guest's vehicle to the front of the parking lot by the building where they will give them the keys. The valet shall then move any of the cars that they have pulled out from spot back, as may be needed.

During busy weekday afternoons, when valet parking is not needed, a staff member shall instruct arriving guest to tandem park in front of parked employees' vehicles, if needed.
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Valet Parking Plan showing how valets could accommodate 27-29 vehicles on the site without having to move more than 2 cars to extract any vehicle (with all activities confined to the site).


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The one restaurant that exceeded the $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile had 98 cars parked for a 98 -seat restaurant. This data seems to be an anomaly, as it suggests that almost every guest drove alone to the restaurant, and we believe it should be discounted (unworthy of consideration because it lacks credibility).

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Typically after 5:00 p.m. on Fridays and after 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays (per ITE Parking Generation, $5^{\text {th }}$ Edition).

