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## 1 INTRODUCTION

## Background

## A Traffic <br> Impact Study Usually Considers <br> Four Questions

Study Objectives

In 1994 Bedford Town Council approved a development agreement (D.A.) for 221 acres of Residential Comprehensive Development District (RCDD) zoned land in the vicinity of Paper Mill Lake in Bedford. A portion of these lands were developed in the 1990s and the Development Agreement still applies to the remaining lands. A condition of the agreement is that not more than 100 single family dwelling units should be developed on the south side of Kearney Run without the proposed collector street (Nine Mile Drive) extending from what is now Oceanview Drive in the Crestview subdivision to Hammonds Plains Road. This was because the only access/egress to the area was via Moirs Mill Road and Nelsons Landing Boulevard to the Bedford Highway.

Since that time, the road network has changed significantly with the construction of the Larry Uteck interchange, Oceanview Drive, Nine Mile Drive, Southgate Drive, and Larry Uteck Boulevard. This has clearly relieved pressure on the two roadway connections to the Bedford Highway, which was the basis for the original 100 dwelling unit limit.

WSP Canada Inc. has been retained to prepare a Traffic Impact Study to determine whether these changes to the roadway network will allow for additional growth in the RCDD lands without compromising traffic functionality and the intent of the 100 dwelling unit limit.

A TIS usually consists of determining answers for the following questions:

1. What is the existing transportation situation adjacent to the study site? How have volumes changed historically?
2. What transportation changes are expected at key Study Area locations? How many vehicle and active mode trips are expected to be generated by the proposed development during weekday peak hours? What routes are the trips expected to use to travel within and through the Study Area?
3. What transportation impacts will occur on Study Area roads, sidewalks, and intersections?
4. What transportation improvements are required to mitigate project impacts on Study Area travel? Are there transportation modifications that should be made to improve the travel experience for all users?

The objectives of the study are to:

1. Develop projected future background weekday AM and PM peak hourly volumes and daily two-way traffic volumes for Study Area roads that do not include trips generated by proposed site development.
2. Estimate the number of weekday AM and PM peak hour trips and daily two-way trips that will be generated by the proposed development.
3. Distribute and assign site generated trips to Study Area intersections to project future volumes that include site generated trips.
4. Evaluate impacts of site generated traffic on the performance and level of service of study intersections and the volume threshold expectations of collector and local streets in the study area.
5. Estimate daily two-way volumes on key study area streets.

## 2 STUDY AREA DESCRIPTIONS

## Description of Proposed Development and Site Access

Existing
Road Descriptions

Intersection Descriptions

The development site is shown in Figure 1. It is bound between the Bedford Highway and the Bicentennial Highway to the north and south of Paper Mill Lake. The study area, along with key connection points to the adjacent roadway network is shown in Figure 2. For the purpose of this study, the lands are divided into three areas:

Area A: This is an area of approximately 39 acres within the RCDD lands south of Paper Mill Lake. Development of these lands would result in the 100 unit limit specified in the original agreement being exceeded. Determining the impact of developing these lands is the objective of this study

Area B1: This consists of two areas within the RCDD zone that are adjacent to, but not part of the current development proposal.

Area B2: This is an area of approximately 60 additional acres within the RCDD lands north and west of Paper Mill Lake. While these lands are currently not proposed for development, their eventual presence, along with the extension of Nine Mile Drive through them to Hammonds Plains Road, are being considered in this study to help determine longer term traffic patterns and the functional requirement of Nine Mile Drive as a completed connection between Larry Uteck Boulevard and Hammonds Plains Road.

Current access to the site is primarily via Moirs Mill Road and Oceanview Dr/Amin St/Nelsons Landing Blvd to the Bedford Highway and via Nine Mile Drive to Larry Uteck Boulevard. Future access to the site from Hammonds Plains Road via an extension of Nine Mile Drive is expected to be built as Area B is developed.

HRM Engineering has indicated that both Moirs Mill Road and Nine Mile Drive are considered collector streets. All other streets within the study area, in particular Oceanview Drive, Amin Street and Nelsons Landing Boulevard, are considered local streets.

Bedford Highway/Moirs Mill Road is a signalized T-intersection. The northbound Bedford Highway approach has a single through lane, a left turn storage lane and a signalized pedestrian crossing. The southbound Bedford Highway approach has two through lanes, although these taper to a single lane shortly after the intersection. The Moirs Mill Road approach has separate lanes for left and right turns and a signalized pedestrian crossing.


Photo 1: Looking north to Moirs Mill Road/Bedford Highway Intersection


Figure 1: Development Site


Figure 2: Study Area and Roadway Connections

Intersection Descriptions (Continued)
rates normally in the range of half a percent per year, this provides for an assessment horizon of approximately ten years. Counted traffic volumes within the study area street network have been increased by one percent. Since this area (outside of the development lands being assessed) is now substantially fully built, this one percent increase accounts for some very minor future in-filling.

Projected 2021 Background Volumes

Projected AM and PM peak hour and two-way daily background volumes are shown diagrammatically in Figure A-1, Appendix. They consist of the counted traffic volumes plus the projected growth.

## Active Transportation / Transit

The site has good accessibility for pedestrians, with concrete sidewalks on one side of all study area streets and both sides of Nine Mile Drive. The area has been well-designed for active transportation connections within the community and on-going plans to improve the Bedford Highway as an active transportation corridor create a high opportunity for making functional active transportation trips.

The development area is served by transit route 91 with potential to increase penetration of that route into the lands once they are developed. The Bedford Highway is a planned highfrequency bus corridor, and its proximity to the development site ( 900 m to $1,400 \mathrm{~m}$ ) for accessing by walking, biking or an efficient bus transfer will make transit an attractive travel choice. There is opportunity for this corridor to become even more attractive for transit trips with commuter rail or high-speed ferry being future possibilities.

## 3 TRIP GENERATION, DISTRIBUTION, AND ASSIGNMENT

## Anticipated Land Use for Proposed MultiUse Development

Estimation of Total Site Generated Trips

Each of the three sub-areas within the study area has different land use components and trip distribution characteristics. The proposed and anticipated land use is described below.

Area A: This is the area currently being proposed for development. The development consists of single family homes and a small neighbourhood office/retail centre. This area is connected to the roadway network via Moirs Mill Road and Nelsons Landing Boulevard to the Bedford Highway and via Nine Mile Drive to Larry Uteck Boulevard.

Area B1: This area is adjacent to Area A, but not part of the current development application. It is expected to contain single family homes and semi-detached residential units.

Area B2: This area may be developed in the future and is not part of the current development application. The purpose of including this area in the analysis is to project the ultimate traffic loading on collector roadways within the study area. In addition to the existing connections described above for Area A, development of this area would establish an additional connection to Hammonds Plains Road via an extension of Nine Mile Drive. This area consists of single family homes, small-size multi-unit residential buildings ( 6 to 8 units on two or three floors), medium-size multi-unit residential buildings (3-10 story buildings) and a school.

Two assessment scenarios are examined in this study:
Scenario One: Area A is developed and vehicles access the regional roadway network using the existing connection points.

Scenario Two: Areas A, B1 and B2 are developed and Nine Mile Drive is extended to an intersection at Hammonds Plains Road.

Generation of trips for each of the proposed land uses is determined by applying the Trip Generation Handbook, 10th Edition (Institute of Transportation Engineers, Washington, 2017). This reference provides a calculation for the anticipated number of trips produced by each type of land use based on data collected from studies across North America. Trip generation is summarized for Area A in Table 1, for Area B1 in Table 2 and for B2 in Table 3.

It should be noted that the ITE Trip Generation Handbook provides "driveway counts" for each of the land uses, meaning that the counts consider only the trip directly entering or exiting the site. For an assessment of a larger, comprehensive study area such as this one, engineering judgement needs to be employed to determine how many of these trips stay within the study area and how many originate from or are destined to areas outside of the study area. In cases where a trip stays within the study area, it will have been identified as a trip that originates from one of the study area land uses and is destined to another land use within the study area. Even though this is one single trip, it will have been calculated as a trip from both the origin and the destination, so a reduction calculation is required to prevent double-counting. For example, a resident of the study area making a trip to a local convenience store (commercial site) to purchase goods and return home
will create one trip out of their driveway and one trip in, as well as one trip into the commercial site and one trip out. But rather than four trips being created there are only two: home-to-store and store-to-home. Accordingly, some adjustments to the rates have been made based on the following assumptions.

Table 1 - Trip Generation Estimates Area A

| Land Use ${ }^{1}$ | Units ${ }^{2}$ | Trip Generation Rates ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  | Trip Generation Estimates ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  | Daily | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  | Daily |
|  |  | In | Out | In | Out | 2-way | In | Out | In | Out | 2-way |
| Single Family (Land Use 210) | 192 | Equations from Pages 2 to 4 |  |  |  |  | 35 | 106 | 120 | 70 | 1895 |
| Small Office Bldg (Land Use 712) | 6 KGLA | 1.59 | 0.33 | 0.78 | 1.67 | 16.19 | 10 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 97 |
| Specialty Retail (Land Use 826) | 6 KGLA | 0.76 | 0.60 | 1.19 | 1.52 | 44.32 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 266 |
| Total Trip Generation Estimate |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50 | 112 | 132 | 89 | 2258 |
| 15\% Reduction for Non-Auto Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 17 | 20 | 13 | 339 |
| 40\% Reduction for Internal Commercial Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 106 |
| Corresponding Reduction for Residential Trips to/from Commercial Area |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 106 |
| Adjusted Trip Estimates |  |  |  |  |  |  | 38 | 91 | 105 | 69 | 1707 |

NOTES: 1. Rates and equations are from Trip Generation, 10th Edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2017.
2. Number of Dwelling Units for Residential; KGLA is 'Gross Leasable Area $\times 1000$ SF'.
3. Rates are 'vehicles per hour per unit'; trips generated are 'vehicles per hour for peak hours'.
4. Since the 10th Edition does not include rates for Specialty Retail, rates for Land Use 826 from the 9th Edition have been used. The equation for 'Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic' has been used to estimate PM peak hour trips. AM trip rates have been assumed to br 50\% of PM rates with reversal of directional split.

Table 2 - Trip Generation Estimates Area B1

| Land Use ${ }^{1}$ | Units ${ }^{2}$ | Trip Generation Rates ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  | Trip Generation Estimates ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  | Daily | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  | Daily |
|  |  | In | Out | In | Out | 2-way | In | Out | In | Out | 2-way |
| Single Family <br> (Land Use 210) | 71 | Equations from Pages 2 to 4 |  |  |  |  | 14 | 41 | 46 | 27 | 759 |
| Semi-Detached (Land Use 210) | 44 | Equations from Pages 2 to 4 |  |  |  |  | 9 | 27 | 29 | 17 | 489 |
| Total Trip Generation Estimate |  |  |  |  |  |  | 23 | 68 | 75 | 44 | 1248 |
| 15\% Reduction for Non-Auto Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 10 | 11 | 7 | 187 |
| Adjusted Trip Estimates |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20 | 58 | 64 | 37 | 1061 |

NOTES: 1. Rates and equations are from Trip Generation, 10th Edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2017.
2. Number of Dwelling Units for Residential
3. Rates are 'vehicles per hour per unit'; trips generated are 'vehicles per hour for peak hours'.

Table 3 - Trip Generation Estimates Area B2

| Land Use ${ }^{1}$ | Units ${ }^{2}$ | Trip Generation Rates ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  | Trip Generation Estimates ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  | Daily | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  | Daily |
|  |  | In | Out | In | Out | 2-way | In | Out | In | Out | 2-way |
| Single Family (Land Use 210) | 152 | Equations from Pages 2 to 4 |  |  |  |  | 28 | 85 | 96 | 56 | 1528 |
| Low-Rise Multi (Land Use 220) | 48 | Equations from Pages 31 to 33 |  |  |  |  | 5 | 18 | 19 | 11 | 322 |
| Medium-Rise Multi (Land Use 230) | 248 | Equations from Pages 73 to 75 |  |  |  |  | 22 | 62 | 65 | 41 | 1350 |
| School ${ }^{4}$ (Land Use 520) | $\begin{gathered} 450 \\ \text { students } \end{gathered}$ | 0.36 | 0.31 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 1.89 | 162 | 140 | 36 | 41 | 851 |
| Total Trip Generation Estimate |  |  |  |  |  |  | 217 | 305 | 216 | 149 | 4051 |
| 15\% Reduction for Non-Auto Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  | 33 | 46 | 32 | 22 | 608 |
| 40\% Reduction for Internal Primary and Pass-by School Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  | 65 | 56 | 14 | 16 | 340 |
| Adjusted Trip Estimates |  |  |  |  |  |  | 119 | 203 | 170 | 111 | 3103 |
| NOTES: 1. Rates and equations are from Trip Generation, 10th Edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2017. <br> 2. Number of Dwelling Units for Residential <br> 3. Rates are 'vehicles per hour per unit'; trips generated are 'vehicles per hour for peak hours'. <br> 4. Refer to Appendix B for more detail on school trip calculations. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Increased Transit and Active Transportation

The normal trip generation rates are measured in suburban areas, typically with lower transit and active transportation use. This study area is well-positioned to take advantage of improving transit service and active transportation connections proposed in the Integrated Mobility Plan. This will reduce the number of vehicle trips generated by each type of land use. Although the Integrated Mobility Plan strives for $25 \%$ of generated trips to use non-vehicle modes of travel, a more conservative reduction of $15 \%$ has been applied for this study.

## Trips to Neighbourhood Office/Commercial Site

The proposed office/commercial site is small enough that it can be expected many of the trips into and out of the site, for the commercial use(s) in particular, will originate from within the study area. To prevent a single trip from being counted twice (generated once by the residential unit and again by the commercial site) the total number of trips generated by the commercial site is reduced. For this analysis, an assumption of $40 \%$ of all trips to the commercial site originating from within the study area was made based on knowledge of other similar sites in the region. No reduction was made for the office use.

## Trips to School Site

Similar to the office/commercial site, a school site will generate trips that originate from both inside and outside of the study area. A site survey of a nearby proxy school (Bedford South Elementary School was used to gauge the characteristics of trips entering and leaving the site. It was determined that during the morning peak, $50 \%$ of all trips would
be school staff entering the site from outside of the study area, $40 \%$ of trips would be student "drop-off" trips originating from a home within the study area and destined to a location outside of the study area, and $10 \%$ of trips would be student "drop-off" trips that leave from a home in the study area and return to that home. More details on the site survey and the school trip analysis is provided in Appendix B.

## Size of the School

Although a site will be set aside in the future for a local school, the exact size and type of school will not be determined until a later date. To develop a reasonable assumption of trip generation, an elementary school with a student population of 450 has been assumed. For comparative purposes, the sizes of other schools in the area are shown in Table 4. In addition to some new collector area, this school would likely result in redistribution of some of the Bedford South collection area, resulting in a single school with a student population of about 600 becoming two schools each with a student population of 450 . To be conservative, no trip reduction for the Bedford South Elementary School has been assumed.

Table 4 - Typical School Sizes in the Vicinity of the Site

| School | Students (2018) |
| :--- | :---: |
| Basinview Drive | 620 |
| Kingswood | 616 |
| Bedford South | 612 |
| Rockingham | 491 |
| Sunnyside | 287 |
| Bedford \& Forsythe | 256 |
| Michael Wallace | 180 |

Source: hrce.ca/about-our-schools

Trip Distribution and Assignment

Primary site trips generated by the proposed development were assigned to the roadway network based on counted volumes and local knowledge of the area considering major trip origins and destinations in the region. Some guidance was also taken from previous studies that considered trip distribution in this area (Table 5). Separate trip distribution assumptions were made for Scenario One (Figure 3) and Scenario Two (Figure 4). Trip distribution characteristics for Area B1 were assumed to be the same as for Area A.

Table 5 - Trip Distribution Estimates from Previous Studies

|  | To/From <br> Hammonds <br> Plains Road | To/From <br> Bedford Hwy <br> then north | To/From <br> Bedford Hwy <br> then south | To/From <br> Larry Uteck <br> Blvd |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Beasy Nicoll 1990 | $40 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $26 \%$ | N/A |
| Streetwise 1994 | $50 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $20 \%$ | N/A |
| ARTM 2005 | N/A | $65 \%$ | $35 \%$ | N/A |
| DesignPoint 2016 | N/A | $50 \%$ |  | $50 \%$ |



Figure 3 - Trip Distribution Assumptions - Scenario One


Figure 4 - Trip Distribution Assumptions - Scenario Two

Redistributing The creation of a new connections to the regional roadway network will result in shifting Background Traffic of existing traffic to new routes. Two redistribution scenarios have been included in the analysis, described below and illustrated in Figure 5.

## Redistribution \#1

Some traffic currently generated on Moirs Mill Road and streets that connect to it access Larry Uteck Boulevard via Amin Street and Oceanview Drive. In Scenarios One and

Two, Moirs Mill Road is connected to Nine Mile Drive and a new connection is made to Oceanview Drive via Richardson Drive. Both of these new connections provide a more direct route to Larry Uteck Boulevard and can both be expected to attract traffic away from Amin Street and Oceanview Drive. The volume of traffic assumed to be redistributed is 600 vehicles per day or approximately $34 \%$ of the traffic currently on Amin Street, split evenly between the two optional routes.

## Redistribution \#2

A new connection to Hammonds Plains Road via Nine Mile Drive in Scenario Two can be expected to shift current traffic patterns. For this assessment, it was assumed that $20 \%$ of traffic currently using Moirs Mill Road to access the Bedford Highway and $10 \%$ of traffic using Nelson's Landing Boulevard will be shifted to this new connector.


Figure 5 - Redistribution of Existing Traffic to New Connections


## 4 INTERSECTION OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS

## Daily Volumes by Street Classification

HRM's Municipal Guidelines specify that 3,000 vehicles per day is characteristic of a Local Street. It further suggests that Collector Streets normally accommodate up to 12,000 vehicles per day while Major Collector Streets may exceed a daily volume of 12,000. Projected daily volumes for the key study area streets are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6 - Two-way Daily Volumes on Key Collector and Local Streets

| Street | Classification | Existing | Scenario <br> One | Scenario <br> Two |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Moirs Mill Rd (W of Bedford Hwy) | Collector | 4,100 | 4,550 | 3,700 |
| Moirs Mill Rd (E of Nine Mile Dr) | Collector | 0 | 800 | 1,700 |
| Nelsons Landing Blvd | Local | 1,150 | 1,350 | 1,200 |
| Oceanview Dr (W of Amin Street) | Local | 1,750 | 1,150 | 1,200 |
| Oceanview Dr (E of Nine Mile Dr) | Local | 3,250 | 3,450 | 3,800 |
| Nine Mile Dr (S of Oceanview Dr) | Collector | 4,700 | 4,700 | 5,750 |
| Nine Mile Dr (S of Hammonds PI Rd) | Collector | 0 | 0 | 4,200 |
| Richardson Drive | Local | 0 | 550 | 500 |

## Moirs Mill Road

Volumes on Moirs Mill Road remain within the normal range of a collector street. In the original Paper Mill Lake Area Traffic Impact Study (Streetwise Traffic Engineering, 1994) that led to the establishment of the 100-lot limit for this area, a maximum volume of 5,000 vehicles per day was set for Moirs Mill Road. While this limit may no longer have status for the municipality, it is comforting to see that volumes nonetheless remain below this threshold due to the additional connection to Larry Uteck Boulevard that was not anticipated in the original study.

## Nelsons Landing Boulevard

Little increase to volume on Nelsons Landing Boulevard is expected and volumes remain well below the normal local street volumes.

## Oceanview Drive

Portions of Oceanview Drive currently exceed the characteristic 3,000 vehicle daily volume for a local street and that volume is expected to increase by about 800 vehicles per day at the Nine Mile Drive end under Scenario One. Volume will be well below current levels in the section near Amin Street in both Scenarios One and Two due to better connections being made to Nine Mile Drive for Moirs Mill Road traffic. Increasing delay at the Nelsons Landing Boulevard intersection at the Bedford Highway along with traffic calming measures on Oceanview Drive being considered by HRM may reduce this volume even further.

## Nine Mile Drive

Daily volumes on Nine Mile Drive for full build-out (Scenario Two) are projected to range between 4,000 and 6,000 . The street can be expected to operate successfully as a two-lane Collector Street with these volumes.

Intersection Capacity Analysis Results

Synchro 10.0 (signalized and stop control intersections) and SIDRA (roundabout intersection) have been used for performance evaluation of Study Area intersections for projected design hourly volumes without and with the addition of Scenario One site generated trips. Analysis results are included in Appendix A and summarized in Tables 7 to 9 below and indicate that all movements at all three intersections are expected to operate within HRM Guidelines without and with the addition of traffic generated by Scenario One.

Moirs Mill Rd/Bedford Hwy (Table 7) - Overall performance at the intersection is expected to be satisfactory both without and with the addition of site generated trips. All movements are expected to operate within HRM acceptable limits.

Table 7 - Intersection Capacity Moirs Mill Rd/Bedford Hwy (Scenario One)

| LOS Criteria | Control Delay (sec/veh), v/c Ratio, and $95^{\text {th }} \%$ ile Queue (m) by Intersection Movement |  |  |  | Overall Intersection |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Moirs Mill Road |  | Bedford Highway |  |  |
|  | EB-L | EB-R | NB-LT | SB-TR | Delay |
| AM Design Hourly Volumes without Site Generated Trips |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 50.3 | 10.9 | 6.7 | 6.3 | 12.8 |
| v/c | 0.69 | 0.14 | 0.35 | 0.35 |  |
| Queue | 58.2 | 8.3 | 48.5 | 47.8 |  |
| AM Design Hourly Volumes with Site Generated Trips |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 49.9 | 11.5 | 7.4 | 6.9 | 13.9 |
| v/c | 0.72 | 0.15 | 0.36 | 0.36 |  |
| Queue | 63.4 | 9.3 | 52.4 | 51.8 |  |
| PM Design Hourly Volumes without Site Generated Trips |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 56.7 | 15.8 | 6.7 | 7.2 | 10.6 |
| v/c | 0.64 | 0.09 | 0.49 | 0.57 |  |
| Queue | 49.3 | 6.7 | 71.0 | 96.9 |  |
| PM Design Hourly Volumes with Site Generated Trips |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 56.6 | 14.8 | 7.6 | 8.1 | 11.7 |
| v/c | 0.67 | 0.10 | 0.53 | 0.60 |  |
| Queue | 54.1 | 7.1 | 78.9 | 108.5 |  |

Nelsons Landing Boulevard (Table 8) - Delay at the stop-controlled leg of this intersection is currently high, particularly in the PM peak. As expected, that delay will increase with additional site-generated traffic. This intersection could be evaluated for possible signalization, it does not meet the volume threshold in the signalization warrant ( 75 vehicles per hour approaching) and signalization would work contrary to the aim of minimizing volumes on the local streets that feed the intersection. Maintaining status quo as a deterrent to high use of this connection is recommended and is similar to several other stop-controlled intersections on major roadways (including along the Bedford Highway).

Nine Mile Drive/Larry Uteck (Table 9) - Overall performance at this roundabout intersection is expected to be satisfactory both without and with the addition of site generated trips, all movements are expected to operate within HRM acceptable limits.

Intersection Capacity Analysis Results (Continued)

Table 8 - Intersection Capacity: Nelsons Landing Blvd/Bedford Hwy (Scenario One)

| $\begin{gathered} \text { LOS } \\ \text { Criteria } \end{gathered}$ | Control Delay (sec/veh), v/c Ratio, and $95^{\text {th }} \%$ ile Queue ( m ) by Intersection Movement |  |  |  |  | Overall Intersection <br> Delay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Nelsons Landing Boulevard |  | Bedford Highway |  |  |  |
|  | EB-L | EB-R | NB-L | NB-T | SB-TR |  |
| AM Design Hourly Volumes without Site Generated Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 28.2 | 12.0 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.6 |
| v/c | 0.20 | 0.09 | 0.04 | 0.33 | 0.32 |  |
| Queue | 5.4 | 2.2 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| AM Design Hourly Volumes with Site Generated Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 29.8 | 12.1 | 8.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 |
| v/c | 0.23 | 0.10 | 0.04 | 0.33 | 0.33 |  |
| Queue | 6.5 | 2.4 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| PM Design Hourly Volumes without Site Generated Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 102.3 | 15.4 | 10.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 |
| v/c | 0.38 | 0.09 | 0.05 | 0.52 | 0.50 |  |
| Queue | 10.7 | 2.2 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| PM Design Hourly Volumes with Site Generated Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 124.4 | 15.6 | 10.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.2 |
| v/c | 0.48 | 0.10 | 0.06 | 0.53 | 0.50 |  |
| Queue | 13.6 | 2.4 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |

Table 9 - Intersection Capacity: Nine Mile Drive/Larry Uteck Blvd (Scenario One)

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { LOS } \\ & \text { Criteria } \end{aligned}$ | Control Delay (sec/veh), v/c Ratio, and $95^{\text {th }}$ \%ile Queue ( m ) by Intersection Movement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Overall Intersection <br> Delay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Larry Uteck Boulevard |  |  |  |  |  | Starboard Drive |  |  | Nine Mile Drive |  |  |  |
|  | EB-L | EB-T | EB-R | WB-L | WB-T | WB-R | NB-L | NB-T | NB-R | SB-L | SB-T | SB-R |  |
| AM Design Hourly Volumes without Site Generated Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 11.2 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 14.2 | 6.5 | 6.4 | 12.3 | 5.9 | 6.0 | 14.2 | 6.9 | 6.2 | 8.1 |
| v/c | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.44 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.30 |  |
| Queue | 13.0 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 21.0 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 17.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 11.0 |  |
| AM Design Hourly Volumes with Site Generated Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 11.2 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 14.5 | 6.8 | 6.6 | 12.4 | 6.0 | 6.1 | 14.4 | 7.1 | 6.6 | 8.3 |
| v/c | 0.34 | 0.34 | 0.34 | 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.45 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.37 |  |
| Queue | 13.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 22.0 | 23.0 | 23.0 | 18.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 14.0 |  |
| PM Design Hourly Volumes without Site Generated Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 12.7 | 5.1 | 5.2 | 19.1 | 11.0 | 10.7 | 16.6 | 8.3 | 8.4 | 14.3 | 6.8 | 6.3 | 10.6 |
| v/c | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 0.68 | 0.44 | 0.44 | 0.29 | 0.29 | 0.29 |  |
| Queue | 33.0 | 33.0 | 33.0 | 31.0 | 33.0 | 33.0 | 38.0 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 10.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 |  |
| PM Design Hourly Volumes with Site Generated Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 13.2 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 21.1 | 12.8 | 12.4 | 17.6 | 8.9 | 9.0 | 14.6 | 7.1 | 6.4 | 11.4 |
| v/c | 0.63 | 0.63 | 0.63 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.71 | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.33 |  |
| Queue | 37.0 | 37.0 | 37.0 | 35.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 41.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 12.0 | 13.0 | 13.0 |  |

Analysis uses an Environmental factor of 1.2 for all approaches.

Internal Unsignalized Intersections

Although it is not practical to undertake a microscopic projection of turning movements at internal intersections, the projected corridor volumes provide a good sense of what intersection control might be required.

Nine Mile Drive at Moirs Mill Road - With a total daily volume in the range of 6,000 at this intersection and traffic on Nine Mile being about twice the volume on Moirs Mill Road, this intersection is well suited to all-way stop control. With this type of control, a single lane approach on each leg is appropriate.

Nine Mile Drive at Oceanview Drive - This intersection is similar to the previous intersection, although directional volumes will be even more balanced. Again, all-way stop control is anticipated with single lane approaches in all directions.

Oceanview Drive at Richardson Drive - Volumes here dictate stop control on the Richardson Drive approach. Volumes turning left onto Richardson Drive are expected to be too low to warrant a left turn storage lane on Oceanview Drive. On-street parking controls within proximity of the intersection will improve operation.

## 5 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 5.1 SUMMARY

Description of the Proposed Development

1. Consideration is being given to allowing addition development within an existing RCDD zone in the Paper Mill Lake area. The expansion is proposed to include:

- 185 single family residential units;
- 6,000 square feet of leasable neighbourhood retail floor space; and,
- 6,000 square feet of office floor space.

The conditions of the Development Agreement currently limit the number of lots that can be developed based on the volume of traffic that would be placed on collector and local streets in the area.
Access to the
Development Area
2. Vehicular access to the area currently consists of connections to the Bedford Highway via Moirs Mill Road and Nelsons Landing Boulevard and to Larry Uteck Boulevard via Nine Mile Drive. When the original Development Agreement was put in place, this latter connection was not available. An additional scenario was considered in this assessment whereby a fourth connection is established northward to Hammonds Plains Road via an extension of Nine Mile Drive.
Study Area Roads
3. Traffic on several streets in the area was considered. Volumes were evaluated for Moirs Mill Road (collector), Nine Mile Drive (collector), Nelsons Landing Boulevard (local), Oceanview Drive (local) and Richardson Drive (local).

Background Traffic
Volumes
4. Projected future weekday AM and PM peak hour background volumes were estimated using growth rate of $5 \%$. With an annual traffic growth on $0.5 \%$ being typical in this area, $5 \%$ represents a development horizon of approximately ten years. An overall growth rate of $1 \%$ was used for streets internal to the study area.

Estimation of Site Generated Trips
5. Trip generation estimates, were prepared using rates published in Trip Generation, $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition (Institute of Transportation Engineers, Washington, 2017). Modifications were made to consider the effects of transit and active transportation as well as synergies within the development area.

Trip Distribution and Assignment
6. Primary vehicle trips generated by the development have been assigned to study area streets and intersections based on observation, field survey, local knowledge and previous traffic assessments in the area.
Development Scenarios
7. Two development scenarios were created for this assessment. Scenario One represents the currently proposed development and its impact on the street network with its existing configuration. Scenario Two was considered to help determine longer term traffic patterns and the functional requirement of Nine Mile Drive as a completed connection between Larry Uteck Boulevard and Hammonds Plains Road.

Volumes on Local and Collector Streets
8. Traffic volumes on all streets are consistent with the suggested characteristics of their street classification with the exception of Oceanview Drive. Both existing and projected volumes on this street are slightly above the suggested upper volume of 3,000 vehicles per day for section of the street near Nine Mile Drive. Volumes on Richardson Drive are not expected to be of a magnitude that exceed a local street.

Summary - Intersection Capacity Analysis
9. The existing Bedford Highway intersections at Moirs Mill Road and at Nelsons Landing Boulevard, along with the Nine Mile Drive/Larry Uteck Boulevard roundabout will continue to operate within their capacity with the addition of traffic from the proposed development. The unsignalized approach at Nelsons Landing Boulevard and the Bedford Highway currently experiences high delays on the stop-controlled approach and this will increase with added traffic from the development. All intersections are expected to continue to operate within HRM Guidelines.

### 5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

## Nelsons Landing Boulevard Intersection

10. Although signalization may reduce delays on Nelsons Landing Boulevard, the volume is lower than the warrant threshold ( 75 per hour) and signalization is neither desirable nor recommended as it would increase the attractiveness of the local street connections to it. As Moirs Mill Road provides an alternative signalized connection to the Bedford Highway with adequate capacity, higher delays at Nelson's Landing Boulevard should not be considered problematic.

## Oceanview Drive

11. Although two-way traffic volumes on Oceanview Drive are above the 3,000 daily vehicle characteristic for a local street, they are not significantly above this level and will not increase substantially with the addition of development site traffic. Traffic calming measures and increasing delay on Nelsons Landing Boulevard will help to moderate this volume. Furthermore, future extension of Nine Mile Drive to Hammonds Plains Road will ultimately result in a slight reduction in Oceanview Drive volume.
12. Nine Mile Drive can be expected to carry traffic volumes at full build-out of the Paper Mill Lake area not in excess of 6,000 vehicles per day. This is suited to a two-lane collector roadway standard.

## Public Transit and Active Transportation

 active transportation. The study area has good connectivity to this corridor and the development area can be expected to produce high percentages of transit and active transportation trips.
### 5.3 CONCLUSIONS

## Impacts to Vehicular Traffic

14. With implementation of recommendations above, trips generated by Scenario One site development are not expected to have a significant impact to levels of performance on adjacent intersections or to the regional road network.

## APPENDIX



TRAFFIC VOLUME DATA AND INTERSECTION PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

|  |  |  |  |  | s Mill |  |  | ghway |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AM Peak Period Volume Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time |  | Bedford Highway Northbound Approach |  | Bedford Highway Southbound Approach |  | Moirs MillEastbound Approach |  | Total Vehicles |
|  |  | A | B | H | I | J | L |  |
| 07:00 | 07:15 | 2 | 83 | 92 | 5 | 30 | 8 | 220 |
| 07:15 | 07:30 | 3 | 92 | 76 | 11 | 41 | 13 | 236 |
| 07:30 | 07:45 | 0 | 117 | 98 | 15 | 42 | 9 | 281 |
| 07:45 | 08:00 | 3 | 119 | 101 | 26 | 41 | 11 | 301 |
| 08:00 | 08:15 | 4 | 117 | 107 | 27 | 38 | 11 | 304 |
| 08:15 | 08:30 | 4 | 122 | 120 | 31 | 58 | 8 | 343 |
| 08:30 | 08:45 | 2 | 125 | 115 | 18 | 58 | 9 | 327 |
| 08:45 | 09:00 | 5 | 157 | 114 | 29 | 40 | 14 | 359 |
| AM Peak Hour |  | 15 | 521 | 456 | 105 | 194 | 42 | 1333 |
| 07:00 | 08:00 | 8 | 411 | 367 | 57 | 154 | 41 | 1038 |
| 08:00 | 09:00 | 15 | 521 | 456 | 105 | 194 | 42 | 1333 |
|  |  | Ped 1 |  | Ped 3 |  | Ped 4 |  | Total Peds |
| 07:00 | 08:00 | 12 |  | 0 |  | 7 |  | 19 |
| 08:00 | 09:00 | 13 |  | 0 |  | 19 |  | 32 |
| Time |  | PM Peak Period Volume Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | hway <br> pproach | Bed <br> Southb | way <br> proach | Eastb | roach | Total |
|  |  | A | B | H | I | J | L |  |
| 16:00 | 16:15 | 11 | 174 | 155 | 44 | 30 | 7 | 421 |
| 16:15 | 16:30 | 11 | 193 | 165 | 57 | 32 | 5 | 463 |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 6 | 200 | 204 | 34 | 38 | 9 | 491 |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 7 | 181 | 173 | 35 | 25 | 7 | 428 |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 3 | 171 | 203 | 82 | 38 | 2 | 499 |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 11 | 167 | 199 | 52 | 39 | 4 | 472 |
| 17:30 | 17:45 | 13 | 161 | 177 | 54 | 47 | 7 | 459 |
| 17:45 | 18:00 | 13 | 142 | 137 | 43 | 35 | 4 | 374 |
| PM Peak Hour |  | 27 | 719 | 779 | 203 | 140 | 22 | 1890 |
| 16:00 | 17:00 | 35 | 748 | 697 | 170 | 125 | 28 | 1803 |
| 17:00 | 18:00 | 40 | 641 | 716 | 231 | 159 | 17 | 1804 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Peds |
| 16:00 | 17:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 49 |
| 17:00 | 18:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 37 |

[^0]| Table A-2 <br> Bedford Highway <br> @ Landing Boule <br> Bedford, NS <br> Wednesday, November 7, 2018 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Bedford Highway |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AM Peak Period Volume Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Bedford Highway <br> Time <br>  Northbound Approach |  |  |  | Bedford Highway <br> Southbound Approach |  | Nelsons Landing Boulevard <br> Eastbound Approach |  | Total Vehicles |
|  |  | A | B | H | , | $J$ | L |  |
| 07:00 | 07:15 | 2 | 82 | 108 | 1 | 7 | 12 | 212 |
| 07:15 | 07:30 | 5 | 89 | 90 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 201 |
| 07:30 | 07:45 | 1 | 98 | 98 | 3 | 12 | 7 | 219 |
| 07:45 | 08:00 | 6 | 115 | 116 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 258 |
| 08:00 | 08:15 | 9 | 111 | 108 | 5 | 9 | 10 | 252 |
| 08:15 | 08:30 | 14 | 123 | 117 | 5 | 3 | 12 | 274 |
| 08:30 | 08:45 | 11 | 111 | 127 | 5 | 11 | 17 | 282 |
| 08:45 | 09:00 | 2 | 146 | 112 | 4 | 12 | 6 | 282 |
| AM Peak Hour |  | 36 | 491 | 464 | 19 | 35 | 45 | 1090 |
| 07:00 | 08:00 | 14 | 384 | 412 | 14 | 35 | 31 | 890 |
| 08:00 | 09:00 | 36 | 491 | 464 | 19 | 35 | 45 | 1090 |
|  |  | Ped 1 |  | Ped 3 |  | Ped 4 |  | Total Peds |
| 07:00 | 08:00 | 0 |  | 5 |  | 4 |  | 9 |
| 08:00 | 09:00 | 0 |  | 5 |  | 4 |  | 9 |
| PM Peak Period Volume Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time |  | Bedford Highway Northbound Approach |  | Bedford Highway Southbound Approach |  | Nelsons Landing Boulevard <br> Eastbound Approach |  | Total Vehicles |
|  |  | A | B | H | 1 | J | L |  |
| 16:00 | 16:15 | 9 | 202 | 151 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 384 |
| 16:15 | 16:30 | 11 | 211 | 166 | 11 | 4 | 6 | 409 |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 11 | 183 | 179 | 5 | 7 | 14 | 399 |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 7 | 204 | 178 | 8 | 4 | 8 | 409 |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 7 | 182 | 171 | 22 | 4 | 4 | 390 |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 12 | 179 | 172 | 10 | 6 | 10 | 389 |
| 17:30 | 17:45 | 6 | 182 | 161 | 16 | 1 | 12 | 378 |
| 17:45 | 18:00 | 15 | 152 | 145 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 332 |
| PM Peak Hour |  | 36 | 780 | 694 | 46 | 19 | 32 | 1607 |
| 16:00 | 17:00 | 38 | 800 | 674 | 31 | 23 | 35 | 1601 |
| 17:00 | 18:00 | 40 | 695 | 649 | 56 | 18 | 31 | 1489 |
|  |  | Ped 1 |  | Ped 3 |  | Ped 4 |  | Total Peds |
| 16:00 | 17:00 | 0 |  | 19 |  | 10 |  | 29 |
| 17:00 | 18:00 | 0 |  | 18 |  | 6 |  | 24 |

[^1]|  | L <br> ine | Tab <br> Utec <br> rive <br> Bedfo <br> day, No |  | riv |  | Nine Mile Drive <br> ↔ 1 <br> A B C |  |  |  |  |  | arry U | Boule |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AM Peak Period Volume Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time |  | Starboard Drive Northbound Approach |  |  | Larry Uteck Boulevard Westbound Approach |  |  | Nine Mile Drive Southbound Approach |  |  | Larry Uteck Boulevard Eastbound Approach |  |  | Total Vehicles |
|  |  | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L |  |
| 07:00 | 07:15 | 58 | 5 | 11 | 24 | 81 | 7 | 5 | 13 | 43 | 21 | 45 | 22 | 335 |
| 07:15 | 07:30 | 87 | 10 | 12 | 31 | 110 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 61 | 35 | 50 | 12 | 430 |
| 07:30 | 07:45 | 96 | 11 | 10 | 30 | 103 | 11 | 7 | 11 | 56 | 40 | 66 | 20 | 461 |
| 07:45 | 08:00 | 86 | 14 | 12 | 25 | 111 | 11 | 12 | 23 | 52 | 42 | 98 | 20 | 506 |
| 08:00 | 08:15 | 97 | 9 | 18 | 47 | 134 | 18 | 8 | 12 | 50 | 56 | 70 | 25 | 544 |
| 08:15 | 08:30 | 105 | 10 | 13 | 26 | 122 | 21 | 17 | 20 | 47 | 55 | 73 | 33 | 542 |
| 08:30 | 08:45 | 99 | 16 | 11 | 37 | 123 | 14 | 11 | 25 | 69 | 63 | 78 | 25 | 571 |
| 08:45 | 09:00 | 85 | 13 | 21 | 38 | 95 | 13 | 17 | 24 | 34 | 61 | 87 | 25 | 513 |
| AM P | Hour | 386 | 48 | 63 | 148 | 474 | 66 | 53 | 81 | 200 | 235 | 308 | 108 | 2170 |
| 07:00 | 08:00 | 327 | 40 | 45 | 110 | 405 | 37 | 30 | 55 | 212 | 138 | 259 | 74 | 1732 |
| 08:00 | 09:00 | 386 | 48 | 63 | 148 | 474 | 66 | 53 | 81 | 200 | 235 | 308 | 108 | 2170 |
|  |  | Ped 1 |  |  | Ped 2 |  |  | Ped 3 |  |  | Ped 4 |  |  | Total Peds |
| 07:00 | 08:00 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 5 |  |  | 7 |
| 08:00 | 09:00 | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 9 |
| PM Peak Period Volume Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time |  | Starboard Drive Northbound Approach |  |  | Larry Uteck Boulevard Westbound Approach |  |  | Nine Mile Drive Southbound Approach |  |  | Larry Uteck Boulevard Eastbound Approach |  |  | Total Vehicles |
|  |  | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | 1 | J | K | L |  |
| 16:00 | 16:15 | 109 | 25 | 40 | 50 | 92 | 18 | 11 | 21 | 28 | 83 | 121 | 42 | 640 |
| 16:15 | 16:30 | 126 | 17 | 20 | 42 | 87 | 24 | 20 | 29 | 39 | 107 | 121 | 54 | 686 |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 119 | 16 | 44 | 46 | 91 | 18 | 14 | 25 | 41 | 118 | 124 | 50 | 706 |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 113 | 11 | 43 | 40 | 103 | 21 | 21 | 26 | 47 | 99 | 141 | 54 | 719 |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 92 | 16 | 44 | 49 | 102 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 31 | 102 | 124 | 46 | 681 |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 93 | 15 | 36 | 46 | 62 | 18 | 18 | 12 | 31 | 108 | 144 | 55 | 638 |
| 17:30 | 17:45 | 96 | 9 | 35 | 36 | 93 | 22 | 18 | 19 | 32 | 94 | 133 | 48 | 635 |
| 17:45 | 18:00 | 84 | 8 | 36 | 40 | 88 | 19 | 13 | 19 | 32 | 70 | 127 | 44 | 580 |
| PM P | Hour | 450 | 60 | 151 | 177 | 383 | 88 | 80 | 105 | 158 | 426 | 510 | 204 | 2792 |
| 16:00 | 17:00 | 467 | 69 | 147 | 178 | 373 | 81 | 66 | 101 | 155 | 407 | 507 | 200 | 2751 |
| 17:00 | 18:00 | 365 | 48 | 151 | 171 | 345 | 84 | 74 | 75 | 126 | 374 | 528 | 193 | 2534 |
|  |  | Ped 1 |  |  | Ped 2 |  |  | Ped 3 |  |  | Ped 4 |  |  | Total Peds |
| 16:00 | 17:00 | 12 |  |  | 14 |  |  | 5 |  |  | 5 |  |  | 36 |
| 17:00 | 18:00 | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 12 |





## Daily Traffic Volume Projections

Table A1 - Two-Way Traffic Volumes - Scenario One

| Street Location | Background <br> Traffic | Background <br> Traffic <br> Growth | Redistribution <br> $\# 1$ | Site Generated <br> Traffic | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Moirs Mill Road (west of Bedford Hwy) | 4019 | 40 |  | 512 |  |
| Moirs Mill Road (at Nine Mile Dr) | 0 | 0 | +300 | 512 | 871 |
| Nelson's Landing Boulevard | 1174 | 12 |  | 812 |  |
| Oceanview Drive (west of Amin Street) | 1740 | 17 | -600 | 171 | 1357 |
| Oceanview Drive (east of Nine Mile Dr.) | 3226 | 32 | -300 | 171 | 469 |
| Nine Mile Drive (south of Oceanview Dr) | 3624 | 36 |  | 3427 |  |
| Richardson Drive | 0 | 0 | +300 | 250 | 468 |

Table A2 - Two-Way Traffic Volumes - Scenario Two

| Street Location | Backgrnd <br> Traffic | Backgrnd <br> Traffic <br> Growth | Redist <br> $\# 1$ | Redist <br> $\# 2$ | Internal <br> School <br> Trips | Site <br> Generated <br> Traffic |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Moirs Mill Road (west of Bedford Hwy) | 4019 | 40 |  | -800 |  | 457 |
| Moirs Mill Road (at Nine Mile Dr) | 0 | 0 | +300 | +920 | +50 | 4707 |
| Nelson's Landing Boulevard | 1174 | 12 |  | -120 |  | 457 |
| Oceanview Drive (west of Amin Street) | 1740 | 17 | -600 | -120 |  | 151 |
| Oceanview Drive (east of Nine Mile Dr.) | 3226 | 32 | -300 |  | 1217 |  |
| Nine Mile Drive (south of HamPlns Rd) | 0 | 0 |  | +920 |  | 151 |
| Nine Mile Drive (south of Oceanview Dr) | 3624 | 36 |  |  | 1188 |  |
| Richardson Drive | 0 | 0 | +300 |  |  | 842 |


| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | 4NBL | $\uparrow$NBT | $\downarrow$ <br> SBT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | * | ${ }^{7}$ |  | * $\uparrow$ | 性 |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 195 | 40 | 15 | 545 | 480 | 105 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 195 | 40 | 15 | 545 | 480 | 105 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1789 | 1601 | 0 | 2634 | 2566 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.924 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1789 | 1601 | 0 | 2436 | 2566 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 43 |  |  | 30 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 212 | 43 | 0 | 608 | 636 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Prot | Perm | Perm | NA | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 |  |  | 2 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  | 4 | 2 |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 35.0 | 35.0 | 65.0 | 65.0 | 65.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 5.5 | 5.5 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 17.1 | 17.1 |  | 71.4 | 71.4 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.17 | 0.17 |  | 0.71 | 0.71 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.69 | 0.14 |  | 0.35 | 0.35 |  |
| Control Delay | 50.3 | 10.9 |  | 6.7 | 6.3 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 50.3 | 10.9 |  | 6.7 | 6.3 |  |
| LOS | D | B |  | A | A |  |
| Approach Delay | 43.7 |  |  | 6.7 | 6.3 |  |
| Approach LOS | D |  |  | A | A |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 39.0 | 0.0 |  | 27.7 | 27.3 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 58.2 | 8.3 |  | 48.5 | 47.8 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 241.6 |  |  | 32.5 | 268.6 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) |  | 25.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 518 | 494 |  | 1738 | 1839 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.41 | 0.09 |  | 0.35 | 0.35 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 100
Actuated Cycle Length: 100
Offset: 0 (0\%), Referenced to phase 2:NBSB and 6:, Start of Green
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.69
Intersection Signal Delay: $12.8 \quad$ Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 64.6\% ICU Level of Service C
Analysis Period (min) 15

Splits and Phases: 1: Bedford Highway \& Moirs Mill Road



| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | 4NBL | 4NBT | $\downarrow$ <br> SBT | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | * | 「 |  | * $\uparrow$ | 性 |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 140 | 20 | 25 | 755 | 820 | 205 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 140 | 20 | 25 | 755 | 820 | 205 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1789 | 1601 | 0 | 2632 | 2558 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.854 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1789 | 1601 | 0 | 2252 | 2558 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 22 |  |  | 34 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 152 | 22 | 0 | 848 | 1114 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Prot | Perm | Perm | NA | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 |  |  | 2 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  | 4 | 2 |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 36.0 | 36.0 | 74.0 | 74.0 | 74.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 5.5 | 5.5 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 14.7 | 14.7 |  | 83.8 | 83.8 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.13 | 0.13 |  | 0.76 | 0.76 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.64 | 0.09 |  | 0.49 | 0.57 |  |
| Control Delay | 56.7 | 15.8 |  | 6.7 | 7.2 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 56.7 | 15.8 |  | 6.7 | 7.2 |  |
| LOS | E | B |  | A | A |  |
| Approach Delay | 51.6 |  |  | 6.7 | 7.2 |  |
| Approach LOS | D |  |  | A | A |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 31.3 | 0.0 |  | 41.5 | 57.8 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 49.3 | 6.7 |  | 71.0 | 96.9 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 241.6 |  |  | 32.5 | 268.6 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) |  | 25.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 487 | 452 |  | 1716 | 1957 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.31 | 0.05 |  | 0.49 | 0.57 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 110
Actuated Cycle Length: 110
Offset: 0 (0\%), Referenced to phase 2:NBSB and 6:, Start of Green
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.64
Intersection Signal Delay: $10.6 \quad$ Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 74.0\% ICU Level of Service D
Analysis Period (min) 15

Splits and Phases: 1: Bedford Highway \& Moirs Mill Road

| $11_{\varnothing 2(R)}$ | $\varnothing 4$ |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 74 s |  | 36 s |  |


| Movement | \% | $\rangle$ | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 7 | \% | $\uparrow$ | t | SBR |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 20 | 30 | 35 | 820 | 730 | 45 |  |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 20 | 30 | 35 | 820 | 730 | 45 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Free | Free |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 22 | 33 | 38 | 891 | 793 | 49 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (m/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  | None | None |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (m) |  |  |  |  | 252 |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.77 |  |  |  |  |
| VC , conflicting volume | 1784 | 818 | 842 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 1872 | 609 | 641 |  |  |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 62 | 91 | 95 |  |  |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 57 | 379 | 723 |  |  |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 |  |  |
| Volume Total | 22 | 33 | 38 | 891 | 842 |  |  |
| Volume Left | 22 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 49 |  |  |
| cSH | 57 | 379 | 723 | 1700 | 1700 |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.38 | 0.09 | 0.05 | 0.52 | 0.50 |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 10.7 | 2.2 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 102.3 | 15.4 | 10.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Lane LOS | F | C | B |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 50.1 |  | 0.4 |  | 0.0 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 1.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Util |  |  | 53.2\% |  | Leve | Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |


| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | 4 NBL | $\uparrow$ NBT | $\frac{1}{\downarrow}$ SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{1}$ | 「 |  | ¢4 | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 218 | 45 | 17 | 550 | 482 | 115 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 218 | 45 | 17 | 550 | 482 | 115 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1789 | 1601 | 0 | 2634 | 2560 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.918 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1789 | 1601 | 0 | 2421 | 2560 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 45 |  |  | 33 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 237 | 49 | 0 | 616 | 649 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Prot | Perm | Perm | NA | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 |  |  | 2 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  | 4 | 2 |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 35.0 | 35.0 | 65.0 | 65.0 | 65.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 5.5 | 5.5 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 18.5 | 18.5 |  | 70.0 | 70.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.18 | 0.18 |  | 0.70 | 0.70 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.72 | 0.15 |  | 0.36 | 0.36 |  |
| Control Delay | 49.9 | 11.5 |  | 7.4 | 6.9 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 49.9 | 11.5 |  | 7.4 | 6.9 |  |
| LOS | D | B |  | A | A |  |
| Approach Delay | 43.4 |  |  | 7.4 | 6.9 |  |
| Approach LOS | D |  |  | A | A |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 43.5 | 0.6 |  | 30.0 | 29.7 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 63.4 | 9.3 |  | 52.4 | 51.8 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 241.6 |  |  | 32.5 | 268.6 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) |  | 25.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 518 | 496 |  | 1693 | 1800 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.46 | 0.10 |  | 0.36 | 0.36 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 100
Actuated Cycle Length: 100
Offset: 0 (0\%), Referenced to phase 2:NBSB and 6:, Start of Green
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.72
Intersection Signal Delay: $13.9 \quad$ Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 65.8\% ICU Level of Service C
Analysis Period (min) 15

Splits and Phases: 1: Bedford Highway \& Moirs Mill Road

| 1\%ø2 (R) | ${ }^{4} \square 64$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 65 s | 35 s |


| Movement | $\stackrel{4}{\text { EBL }}$ | EBR | 4 NBL | $\uparrow$ NBT | $\downarrow$ SBT | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\text { SBR }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 7 | 7 | $\uparrow$ | F |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 40 | 50 | 37 | 517 | 490 | 22 |  |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 40 | 50 | 37 | 517 | 490 | 22 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Free | Free |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 43 | 54 | 40 | 562 | 533 | 24 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (m/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  | None | None |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal ( $m$ ) |  |  |  |  | 252 |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |  |  |  |  |
| VC , conflicting volume | 1187 | 545 | 557 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 1148 | 425 | 438 |  |  |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 77 | 90 | 96 |  |  |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 187 | 559 | 996 |  |  |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 |  |  |
| Volume Total | 43 | 54 | 40 | 562 | 557 |  |  |
| Volume Left | 43 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 24 |  |  |
| cSH | 187 | 559 | 996 | 1700 | 1700 |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.23 | 0.10 | 0.04 | 0.33 | 0.33 |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 6.5 | 2.4 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 29.8 | 12.1 | 8.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Lane LOS | D | B | A |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 20.0 |  | 0.6 |  | 0.0 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 1.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 40.7\% |  | Leve | Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |


| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | 4NBL | 4NBT | $\downarrow$ <br> SBT | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | * | 「 |  | 44 | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 157 | 23 | 30 | 758 | 825 | 231 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 157 | 23 | 30 | 758 | 825 | 231 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1789 | 1601 | 0 | 2632 | 2550 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.822 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1789 | 1601 | 0 | 2167 | 2550 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 25 |  |  | 38 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 171 | 25 | 0 | 857 | 1148 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Prot | Perm | Perm | NA | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 |  |  | 2 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  | 4 | 2 |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 36.0 | 36.0 | 74.0 | 74.0 | 74.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 5.5 | 5.5 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 15.8 | 15.8 |  | 82.7 | 82.7 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.14 | 0.14 |  | 0.75 | 0.75 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.67 | 0.10 |  | 0.53 | 0.60 |  |
| Control Delay | 56.6 | 14.8 |  | 7.6 | 8.1 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 56.6 | 14.8 |  | 7.6 | 8.1 |  |
| LOS | E | B |  | A | A |  |
| Approach Delay | 51.3 |  |  | 7.6 | 8.1 |  |
| Approach LOS | D |  |  | A | A |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 35.2 | 0.0 |  | 45.5 | 64.2 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 54.1 | 7.1 |  | 78.9 | 108.5 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 241.6 |  |  | 32.5 | 268.6 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) |  | 25.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 487 | 454 |  | 1628 | 1925 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.35 | 0.06 |  | 0.53 | 0.60 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 110
Actuated Cycle Length: 110
Offset: 0 (0\%), Referenced to phase 2:NBSB and 6:, Start of Green
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.67
Intersection Signal Delay: 11.7
Intersection Capacity Utilization 74.9\%
Analysis Period (min) 15

Splits and Phases: 1: Bedford Highway \& Moirs Mill Road

| $11_{\square 02(R)}$ | ${ }^{4} 94$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 74 s | 36 s |


| Movement | $\stackrel{y}{\text { EBL }}$ | EBR | $\stackrel{+}{*}$ | $\uparrow$ NBT | $\downarrow$ SBT | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\text { SBR }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ | 7 | \% | $\uparrow$ | F |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 23 | 33 | 40 | 825 | 733 | 50 |  |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 23 | 33 | 40 | 825 | 733 | 50 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Free | Free |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 25 | 36 | 43 | 897 | 797 | 54 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (m/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  | None | None |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal ( $m$ ) |  |  |  |  | 252 |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.75 |  |  |  |  |
| VC , conflicting volume | 1807 | 824 | 851 |  |  |  |  |
| vC 1 , stage 1 conf vol $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 1911 | 596 | 632 |  |  |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 52 | 90 | 94 |  |  |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 53 | 377 | 711 |  |  |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 |  |  |
| Volume Total | 25 | 36 | 43 | 897 | 851 |  |  |
| Volume Left | 25 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 54 |  |  |
| cSH | 53 | 377 | 711 | 1700 | 1700 |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.48 | 0.10 | 0.06 | 0.53 | 0.50 |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 13.6 | 2.4 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 124.4 | 15.6 | 10.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Lane LOS | F | C | B |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 60.2 |  | 0.5 |  | 0.0 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 53.4\% |  | Leve | Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

## APPENDIX



SCHOOL TRIP
PROJECTION DETAILS

# APPENDIX B SCHOOL TRIP PROJECTION DETAILS 

## Background

Site Count at Bedford South Elementary School

As noted in Section 3 of this report, the ITE trip generation numbers provide only a driveway count and judgement needs to be made to determine how many of those driveway trips have an origin or destination outside of the study area and how many remain inside.

An onsite trip generation count was undertaken at Bedford South Elementary School to substantiate assumptions made for trip generation at the proposed school in Area B2. This school was judged to be a good proxy for the proposed school as due to its proximity to the study area. Bedford South Elementary School has a passenger pickup area that is separated from the staff parking lot. This makes allows for counting of three types of trips:

- Primary trips - staff arriving at the site in the morning and departing in the afternoon
- Pass-by trips - parents driving from home in the morning, dropping child(ren) off, then continuing on to work or vice versa in the afternoon.
- Internal primary trips - parents driving to the site, dropping child(ren) off, then returning home

The data from the site count (below) shows that approximately half of the trips are Primary (enter or exit the staff parking lot) and the other half are either Pass-by or Internal Primary (enter or exit the student drop-off area). Without actually surveying parents, it is not possible to determine how many of the drop-off trips are Pass-by and how many are Internal Primary. We believe an assumption that $80 \%$ of these trips are Pass-by is reasonable.

| TIME | Passenger Pickup Area |  | Parking Lot |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | IN | OUT | IN | OUT |
| $8: 00-8: 15$ | 18 | 19 | 36 | 0 |
| $8: 15-8: 30$ | 32 | 32 | 11 | 2 |
| $8: 30-8: 45$ | 7 | 6 | 2 | 0 |
| $8: 45-9: 00$ | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| AM Total | $\mathbf{5 8}$ | $\mathbf{5 8}$ | $\mathbf{5 2}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| $16: 15-16: 30$ | 5 | 8 | 0 | 6 |
| 16:30-16:45 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| $16: 45-17: 00$ | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 |
| 17:00-17:15 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| PM Total | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{1 8}$ |

Note: Counts were taken on June 25, 2019 at Bedford South Elementary School
Time periods counted correspond to the peak traffic on adjacent streets

The figure on the next page shows the catchment area for Bedford Elementary School and demonstrates that a school of this type can be expected to serve students in an area no larger than the study area used in this study. This provides us confidence that virtually all of the student drop-off trips will originate within the study area in the morning and be destined to it in the afternoon.

Trip Distribution Summary

The figure below shows the relative volume of each of the three trip types identified. The result is that it is to be expected $60 \%$ of trip ends will be outside of the study area and $40 \%$ will be internal to the study area. This explains why a $40 \%$ trip reduction is used in Table 3 when determining trips entering and exiting the study area. Some of the internal trips are added to the internal streets as shown in Appendix A.


Note: This diagram illustrates morning peak trips. Afternoon peak trips would be the reverse of this diagram.

## A Conservative Analysis

Overall, we believe this analysis of school-generated traffic is very conservative. Since the nature of the school that will be located here (if any) is unknown, this provides good assurance that any variety of school can be accommodated.

Firstly, the trip generation numbers used from the ITE Handbook are about $50 \%$ higher than what was counted at the proxy site. The assumption that all primary trips to the site (staff) have an origin and destination outside of the study area is also conservative.


[^0]:    * Count completed by WSP

[^1]:    * Count completed by WSP

