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### 1.0 I ntroduction

Background

## A Traffic Impact Study Usually Considers Four Questions

Plans are being prepared by Marque Investments Ltd. for the development of "Windgate Village", a mixed use residential / commercial subdivision in Beaver Bank, NS. The proposed development is located at PID\# 41043597, a large undeveloped parcel located between "Capilano Country Estates" and "Rivendale Estates", two residential subdivisions with frontages along Windgate Drive (See Figure 1).

The proposed development will include a mix of residential and commercial land uses. The south end of the parcel - located adjacent to Windgate Drive - includes commercial developments and a mix of multi-unit, townhouse, and detached single family residential units. The north end of the parcel, which will be accessed via existing residential streets, will comprise detached single family residential units only. It is anticipated that buildout of the development will be completed by 2025.

WSP Canada Inc. has been retained to complete a Traffic Impact Study satisfactory to the Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM).

A Traffic Impact Study usually consists of determining answers for the following questions:

1. What are the existing traffic situations on roads adjacent to the study site? How have traffic volumes increased historically?
2. What traffic changes are expected at Study Area intersections? How many vehicle trips will be generated by the proposed development during weekday peak hours? How will the traffic be distributed at the exits from the development and to Study Area roads and intersections?
3. What traffic impacts $\mathbf{w}$ ill occu $\mathbf{r}$ on Study Area roads and intersections? How will level of service of roads and intersections be affected?
4. What road o rintersec tion impro vements are requir ed to mitigate project impacts on Study Area traffic movements?

The following are the primary objectives of this Study:

1. Develop projected 2025 background weekday AM and PM peak hourly 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 that will be generated by the proposed development.
3. Distribute and assign site generated trips to Study Area intersections.
4. Add site generated trips to projected 2025 background peak hourly volumes to provide projected volumes that include site generated trips.
5. Evaluate impacts of site generated traffic on the performance and level of service of study intersections.
6. Complete traffic signal warrant analyses, as necessary, for intersections in the vicinity of the proposed development.
7. Complete left-turn lane warrants, as necessary, for intersections on Windgate Drive that access the proposed development.
8. Recommend improvements that may be needed at study intersections to mitigate the impacts of site development.


### 2.0 Study Area Descriptions

## Site Description

Road and Intersection Descriptions

The proposed site is an approximately 83 hectare undeveloped parcel located between "Capilano Country Estates" and "Rivendale Estates", two residential subdivisions between Beaver Bank Road and Windsor Junction Road. The south end of the site will be accessed via a new driveway to Windgate Drive and street connections to Rivendale Drive and Capilano Drive. The north end of the site will be accessed via existing local streets including O'Leary Drive and Briancrest Road. A road connection between the north and south portions of the site is not included in the development concept.

Windgate Drive is a 2-lane collector road that runs east-west approximately 4.7 km between Beaver Bank Road and Windsor Junction Road. In the vicinity of the Study Area, it has gravel shoulders and open ditches; the posted speed limit is $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. Annual average daily traffic volumes on Windgate Drive just west of Rivendale Drive are approximately 3,600 vehicles per day (vpd).


Photo 1: Looking east on Windgate Drive. The proposed development site is to the left of the photo.

Beaver Bank Road is a 2-lane collector road that runs north-south approximately 21 km between Lower Sackville and East Uniacke Road. In the vicinity of Windgate Drive, it has curb and gutter with sidewalk on the east side and gravel shoulders and open ditches on the west side. Annual average daily traffic volumes on Beaver Bank Road just north of Windgate Drive are approximately 14,700 vehicles per day (vpd).

The Beaver Bank Road - Windgate Drive intersection is unsignalized, with stop control on Windgate Drive. There is an exclusive left turn lane on the Beaver Bank Road southbound approach; all other approaches are single lane.

Windsor Junction Road is a 2-lane collector road that runs north-south approximately 3.5 km between Cobequid Road and Fall River Road. In the vicinity of Windgate Drive it has gravel shoulders and open ditches on both sides. Annual average daily traffic volumes on Windsor Junction Road just south of Windgate Drive are approximately 3,700 vehicles per day (vpd).

Road and Intersection Descriptions (Continued)

Public Transportation

Proposed Site Access
(South End of Development)

The Windgate Drive - Windsor Junction Road intersection is unsignalized, with stop control on the Windgate Drive approach. All approaches are single lane.

Rivendale Drive and O'Leary Drive are 2-lane paved local residential streets located west of the proposed development. Rivendale Drive provides access from the south end of the site to Windgate Drive, and O'Leary Drive will provide access (via other local streets) between the north end of the development and Beaver Bank Road. Capilano Drive, Briancrest Road, Terry Roa d, and Tay lor Drive are 2-lane paved local residential streets located east of the proposed development. Capilano Drive, B riancrest Road, and Terry Road will connect the development south to Windgate Drive, while Taylor Drive provides a connection northeast toward Fall River. Each street has a posted speed limit of $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.

Halifax Transit operates Route \#400 (formerly Beaver Bank Community Transit) on Beaver Bank Road between Beaver Bank Villa and the Sackville Terminal, where it provides connection to additional routes including the Metrolink service. The route has stops just north of Windgate Drive.

The south end of the site will be accessed via new street connections to Windgate Drive, Rivendale Drive, and Capilano Drive. The proposed connection to Windgate Drive is located approximately 200m west of Terry Road (See Photo 2 and Photo 3).

Stopping sight distances (SSD) - measured from a driver eye height of 1.05 m to a 150 mm object - were observed on the Windgate Drive eastbound and westbound approaches to a location in the vicinity of the proposed access intersection. Observations indicated SSD greater than 150 meters on the eastbound approach, which exceeds the minimum 134 m required for an assumed operating speed of $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ on a $+1 \%$ approach grade. On the westbound approach, observations indicated SSD of approximately 96 m , which is less than the recommended minimum of 128 m for $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ operating speed on a $+4 \%$ approach grade. Further investigation should be completed to determine a final location, and to determine whether modifications to the existing road profile are necessary to improve sight distance.


Photo 2: Looking east (to the left) on Windgate Drive from the proposed site access Intersection.


Photo 3: Looking west (to the right) on Windgate Drive from the proposed site access Intersection

Connections to Rivendale Drive and Capilano Drive will also provide access to the south end of the development. Sight distance (See Photo 4 to Photo 7) on the approaches at both intersections appears adequate.


Photo 4: Looking south (to the left) on Rivendale Drive from the proposed site access Intersection.


Photo 5: Looking north (to the right) on Rivendale Drive from the proposed site access Intersection


Photo 6: Looking north (to the left) on Capilano Drive from the proposed site access Intersection.


Photo 7: Looking south (to the right) on Capilano Drive from the proposed site access Intersection

Proposed Site Access (North End of Development)

The north end of the site will be accessed via connections to O'Leary Drive and Briancrest Road. O'Leary Drive (Photo 8) will be extended from its existing terminus across the development to connect to Briancrest Road. The proposed O'Leary Drive - Briancrest Road intersection (Photo 9 and Photo 10) will be located approximately 75 m north of Vickilynn Lane. Sight distance on both approaches appears adequate.


Photo 8: Looking west on O'Leary Drive from the proposed site access connection.


Photo 9: Looking north (to the right) on Rivendale Drive from the proposed site access Intersection


Photo 10: Looking north (to the left) on Capilano Drive from the proposed site access Intersection.

Traffic Volume Data
HRM Traffic \& Right-of-Way Services (TROW) obtained a machine traffic count on Windgate Drive between Beaver Bank Road and Rivendale Drive (just west of the proposed development) during October 2013. Counts indicate Windgate Drive two-way AM and PM peak hour volumes of about 220 and 256 vehicles per hour, respectively. The graphical representation of average weekday hourly volumes during a 24 hour day (Figure 2) illustrates the pronounced 'peaks' of AM and PM peak hour volumes typical of a road with commuter traffic.


Figure 2: Average Weekday Hourly Volumes - October 2013: Windgate Drive (Beaver Bank Road to Rivendale Drive)

## Annual Volume Trends

Manual Traffic Count

## Redistribution of Background Volumes

Projected 2015 and 2025 Background Volumes

Historical volume data obtained by HRM between 2011 and 2013 on Windgate Drive (just west of the proposed development) do not indicate a consistent growth trend in volumes. Volumes are in the range of 3,600 vehicles per day. An annual growth rate of $1.0 \%$ typical of growth in the Halifax region has been used for the projecting future year traffic volumes for this study.

Manual traffic counts were obtained during AM and PM peak periods between Wednesday, March 4 and Friday, March 6, 2015 at Windgate Drive intersections at Rivendale Drive and Windsor Junction Road. A count completed by HRM on Friday, August 10, 2012 at the Windgate Drive - Beaver Bank Road intersection was also obtained from HRM TROW. Turning movement counts are tabulated in Tables A-1 to A-3, Appendix A, with peak hour volumes indicated by shaded areas.

The proposed street connections across the development will provide alternate routing options for existing residents of the area. In some cases, the new east-west connections will shorten the distance required to make certain trips. Overall, it is expected that the potential impact on existing streets and intersections will be minimal, as volumes are relatively low and will likely balance out. Background projections for this Study have incorporated redistribution of volumes based on the presence of the proposed street connections.

Projected 2025 weekday AM and PM peak hour background volumes, calculated using an annual traffic volume growth rate of $1.0 \%$, are illustrated diagrammatically in Figure A-1 (Boxes A and B), Appendix A.

### 3.0 Trip Generation, Distribution, and Assignment

Description of
Proposed
Development

The proposed residential development will include a mix of residential and commercial land uses. The south end of the parcel - located adjacent to Windgate Drive - includes commercial developments, a mix of multi-unit and single family residential units, and a sports field / community park. The north end of the parcel, which will be accessed via existing residential streets, will comprise single family residential units only. Proposed land uses are summarized in Table 3-1.

Table 3-1: Summary of Proposed Developments

| Development <br> Area | Access | Proposed Land Uses |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | Windgate Drive | Residential: <br> $-\quad 46$ Detached Single Family Units <br> Rivendale Drive <br> Capilano Drive |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| $-\quad 60,000$ SF Specialty Retail |  |  |

The proposed commercial parcel includes approximately 11.5 acres of developable land. The Beaver Bank, Hammonds Plains and Upper Sackville LUB for a C-4 (Highway Commercial Zone) includes the following general limitations for development:

- Minimum lot area - 30,000 SF
- Minimum lot frontage - 100 feet
- Maximum gross floor area on a lot $-10,000$ SF

Considering the size and configuration of the commercial parcel, it is estimated that the site will support approximately six lots which will allow construction of up to 60,000 square feet of commercial buildings. Since expected land uses are not known at this time, trip generation estimates have been prepared for a Specialty Retail land use.

Estimation of Total Site Generated Trips

The number of trips that will be generated by the proposed development has been estimated using rates published in Trip Generation, 9th Edition (Washington, 2012). Trip generation estimates, which are summarized in Table 3-2, indicate that the proposed development is expected to generate approximately 251 two-way vehicle trips ( 85 vph entering and 166 vph exiting) during the AM peak hour and 381 two-way vehicle trips ( 211 vph entering and 170 vph exiting) during the PM peak hour.

Table 3-2 - Trip Generation Estimates for Proposed Development

| Land Use | Units ${ }^{2}$ | Trip Generation Rates ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  | Trips Generated |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
|  |  | In | Out | In | Out | In | Out | In | Out |

Trip Generation Estimates for Area 1 (Southern Portion)

| Single Family Residential <br> ITE Land Use Code 210) $^{3}$ | 90 | 0.19 | 0.56 | 0.63 | 0.37 | 17 | 50 | 57 | 33 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Apartment <br> (ITE Land Use Code 222) | 120 | 0.10 | 0.41 | 0.40 | 0.22 | 12 | 49 | 48 | 26 |
| Specialty Retail <br> (ITE Land Use Code 826) | 60 | 0.76 | 0.60 | 1.19 | 1.52 | 46 | 36 | 71 | 91 |
| Trip Generation Estimates for Area 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 75 | 135 | 176 |

Trip Generation Estimates for Area 2 (Northern Portion)

| Single Family Residential (ITE Land Use Code 210) ${ }^{3}$ | 55 | 0.19 | 0.56 | 0.63 | 0.37 | 10 | 31 | 35 | 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Trip Generation Estimates for Proposed Development\|| |  |  |  |  |  | 85 | 166 | 211 | 170 |

Notes: 1. Trip generation rates are 'vehicles per hour per unit' for Single Family Residential (Land Use Code 210), published in Trip Generation, 9th Edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2012.
2. Residential units are dw ellings. KGLA is 'Gross Leasable Area $\times 1000$ square feet'.
3. The Single Family Residential (Land Use Code 210) has been used to estimate trip generation for tow nhouse units.
4. The Speciality Retail (Land Use 826) rate for 'Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Betw een 4 and 6 PM' has been used. Since there is no published rate for the AM peak hour of adjacent street for this Land Use, and since AM peak hour trips to Speciality Retail are generally low, AM trip rates have been assumed to be $50 \%$ of the PM rate with reversal of the directional split.

Trip Distribution and Assignment

Projected 2025 Volumes that Include Site Generated Trips

Based on review of the local street network and development surrounding the site as well as local knowledge of the area, external trips generated by the proposed development have been distributed as summarized in Table 3-3. Assigned site generated trips at Study Area intersections are shown diagrammatically in Figure A-2 (Boxes A and B), Appendix A.

Table 3-3: Trip Distribution Summary

| Development <br> Area | Direction |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| }{} | East - Windgate Drive | $45 \%$ |
| (South) | East - Taylor Drive | $10 \%$ |
|  | West - Windgate Drive | $45 \%$ |
|  | East - Windgate Drive | $35 \%$ |
|  | East - Taylor Drive | $20 \%$ |
|  | West - Windgate Drive | $10 \%$ |
|  | West - O'Leary Drive | $35 \%$ |

Site generated trips have been added to the projected 2025 background volumes (Figure A-1, Boxes A and B) to provide projected 2025 volumes that include site generated trips which are illustrated diagrammatically in Figure A-3 (Boxes A and B), Appendix A.

### 4.0 I ntersection Performance Analysis

### 4.1 Tr affic Signal Warrant Analysis

Traffic Signal Warrant Principles

Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

A signal warrant analysis is completed to determine if the installation of traffic signals at an intersection will provide a positive impact on total intersection operation. That is, the benefits in time saved and improved safety that will accrue to vehicles entering from a side street will exceed the impact that signals will have in time lost and potential additional collisions for vehicles approaching the intersection on the main street.

The Canadian Traffic Signal Warrant Matrix Analysis (Transportation Association of Canada (TAC), 2005) considers 100 warrant points as an indication that traffic signals will provide a positive impact. Signal warrant analysis uses vehicular and pedestrian volumes, and intersection, roadway and study area characteristics to calculate a warrant point value.

Signal warrant analyses were completed for Windgate Drive intersections at Beaver Bank Road and Windsor Junction Road for projected 2025 background traffic with the addition of trips generated by the proposed development. Results, which are summarized in Table 4-1, indicate that traffic signals are not expected to be warranted at either intersection both without and with site development.

Table 4-1: TAC Traffic Signal Warrant Points by Development Scenario

| Development Scenario | Intersection |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Windgate Drive @ <br> Beaver Bank Road | Windgate Drive @ <br> Windsor Junction Road |
| 2025 Background <br> without Site Development | 63 Points (Signals not warranted) <br> [Table A-4] | (Signals not warranted) |
| 2025 Background <br> with Site Development | 88 Points (Signals not warranted) <br> [Table A-5] | 21 Points (Signals not warranted) |
| [Table A-6] |  |  |

### 4.2 Tu rn Lane Warrant Analysis

Left Turn Lane Warrant Analysis

Left turn movements on a two lane street may cause both operational and safety problems. Operational problems result as a vehicle stopped waiting for an opportunity to turn across 'heavy' opposing traffic causes a queue of stopped vehicles to form. Safety problems result from rear end collisions when a stopped left turning vehicle is struck by an advancing vehicle, or from head-on or right angle collisions when a left turning vehicle is struck by an opposing vehicle.

The Geometric Design Standards for Ontario Highways Manual contains nomographs for left turn lane analysis for two lane streets. The analysis method, which is normally used by WSP Atlantic to
evaluate need for left turn lanes, uses a series of nomographs that consider speed, advancing volumes, left turns as a percentage of advancing volumes, and opposing volumes. A point, based on 'opposing' and 'advancing' volumes, plotted to the right of the 'warrant line' of the appropriate '\% left turns' and 'approach speed' nomograph, indicates that a left turn lane is warranted for the conditions used in the analysis. Similarly, a point that is plotted to the left of the warrant line indicates that a left turn lane is not warranted.

Analysis of left turn lane warrants was completed (Figure A-4, Appendix A) for eastbound left turns from Windgate Drive into the new site access intersection for projected 2025 volumes with the addition of site generated trips. The analysis indicated that left turn lanes are not expected to be warranted based on weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes.

### 4.3 Int ersection Level of Service Analysis

Intersection Level of Service Analysis

Level of Service (LOS) Criteria

The level or quality of performance of an intersection in terms of traffic movement is determined by a level of service (LOS) analysis. LOS for intersections is defined in terms of delay, which is a measure of driver discomfort and frustration, fuel consumption, and increased travel time.

LOS criteria (Table 4-2) are stated in terms of average control delay per vehicle which includes initial deceleration delay, queue move-up time, stopped delay, and final acceleration delay.

Table 4-2 - Level of Service (LOS) Criteria for Intersections

| LOS | LOS Description | Two Way Stop Controlled <br> (TWSC) Intersections <br> Control Delay <br> (Seconds per Vehicle) |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| A | Very low delay, most vehicles do not stop <br> (Excellent) | Less than 10.0 |
| B | Higher delay; most vehicles stop (Very Good) | Between 10.0 and 15.0 |
| C | Higher level of congestion; number of vehicles <br> stopping is significant, although many still pass <br> through intersection without stopping (Good) | Between 15.0 and 25.0 |
| D | Congestion becomes noticeable; vehicles must <br> sometimes wait through more than one red light; <br> many vehicles stop (Satisfactory) | Between 25.0 and 35.0 |
| E | Vehicles must often wait through more than one <br> red light; considered by many agencies to be the <br> limit of acceptable delay | Between 35.0 and 50.0 |
| F | This level is considered to be unacceptable to <br> most drivers; occurs when arrival flow rates <br> exceed the capacity of the intersection <br> (Unacceptable) | Greater than 50.0 |

## Intersection Level of

 Service AnalysisSummary Level of Service Analysis

Synchro 8.0 software has been used for performance evaluation of Study Area intersections on Beaver Bank Road for 2025 AM and PM peak hour volumes without and with site development.

Level of service (LOS) analysis results are included in Appendix B and are summarized in Tables 4-3 to 4-5.

Windgate Drive @ Beaver Bank Ro ad (Table 4-3) - With the exception of the Windgate Drive westbound approach, overall intersection performance is good. Results indicate that the Windgate Drive approach will experience excessive average delay, V/C ratio, and queue lengths - particularly the PM peak hour - both without and with the addition of site generated trips. It is noted that analysis of unsignalized intersections using Synchro software does have limitations that result in it reporting unreasonably poor levels of performance as a movement approaches capacity. For this reason, it is expected that the results indicated for the PM peak hour (both without and with development) are not representative of actual conditions.

Windgate Drive @ Wind sor Junct ion Road (Table 4-4) Intersection performance is expected to be satisfactory both without and with the addition of site generated trips. All movements operate within HRM acceptable limits.

Windgate Drive @ Proposed Site Access (Table 4-5) - Intersection performance is expected to be satisfactory; all movements operate within HRM acceptable limits.

Table 4-3-LOS for Beaver Bank Road @ Windgate Drive

| LOS Criteria | Control Delay (sec/veh), LOS, v/c Ratio, and 95th\% Queue (m) by Intersection Movement |  |  |  | Overall Intersection |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | WB-LR | NB-TR | SB-L | SB-T | Delay | LOS |
| Weekday AM Peak Hour - Projected 2025 Volumes without Site Development (Page B-1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay v/c Queue | $\begin{aligned} & 39.2 \\ & 0.52 \\ & 20.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0 \\ 0.18 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.0 \\ 0.04 \\ 0.9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0 \\ 0.49 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | 3.6 | A |

Weekday AM Peak Hour - Projected 2025 Volumes with Site Development (Page B-5)

| Delay | 77.8 | 0.0 | 8.1 | 0.0 |  | 10.7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| v/c | 0.87 | 0.2 | 0.05 | 0.49 | B |  |
| Queue | 51.7 | 0 | 1.2 | 0 |  |  |

Weekday PM Peak Hour - Projected 2025 Volumes without Site Development (Page B-3)

| Delay | 288.8 | 0.0 | 11.6 | 0.0 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| v/c | 1.41 | 0.71 | 0.06 | 0.28 | 26.8 | D |
| Queue | 89.7 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 |  |  |

Weekday PM Peak Hour - Projected 2025 Volumes with Site Development (Page B-8)

| Delay | 747.2 | 0.0 | 12.5 | 0.0 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| v/c | 2.45 | 0.76 | 0.11 | 0.28 |  |  |
| Queue | 175.9 | 0 | 2.8 | 0 |  |  |

Table 4-4 - LOS for Windsor Junction Road @ Windgate Drive


Table 4-5 - LOS for Windgate Drive @ Proposed Site Access Street

| LOS Criteria | Control Delay (sec/veh), LOS, v/c Ratio, and 95th\% Queue (m) by Intersection Movement |  |  | Overall Intersection |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB-LT | WB-TR | SB-LR | Delay | LOS |
| Weekday AM Peak Hour - Projected 2025 Volumes with Site Development (Page B-7) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay v/c Queue | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 1.1 \\ 0.02 \\ 0.5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 0.0 \\ 0.07 \\ 0.0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 10.4 \\ 0.13 \\ 3.5 \end{gathered}$ | 3.0 | A |

Weekday PM Peak Hour - Projected 2025 Volumes with Site Development (Page B-10)

| Delay | 2.8 | 0 | 12.2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| v/c | 0.06 | 0.15 | 0.18 | 3 | A |
| Queue | 1.3 | 0 | 12.2 |  |  |

### 5.0 Summary, Recommendations, and Conclusions

Description of the Proposed Development

## Proposed Site Access

Description of Study Area Roads

1. Plans are being prepared by Marque Investments Ltd. for the development of "Windgate Village", a mixed use residential / commercial subdivision in Beaver Bank, NS. The proposed development will include a mix of residential and commercial land uses. The south end of the parcel - located adjacent to Windgate Drive - includes commercial developments and a mix of multi-unit, townhouse, and detached single family residential units. The north end of the parcel, which will be accessed via existing residential streets, will comprise detached single family residential units only. It is anticipated that buildout of the development will be completed by 2025.
2. Separate site accesses will be provided to the north and south ends of the proposed development. The south end of the site will be accessed via new street connections to Windgate Drive, Rivendale Drive, and Capilano Drive. The north end of the site will be accessed via connections to O'Leary Drive and Briancrest Road.
3. Windgate Dri ve is a 2-lane collector road that runs east-west approximately 4.7 km between Beaver Bank Road and Windsor Junction Road. In the vicinity of the Study Area, it has gravel shoulders and open ditches; the posted speed limit is $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.

Beaver Bank Road is a 2-lane collector road that runs north-south approximately 21 km between Lower Sackville and East Uniacke Road.

Windsor Junction Road is a 2-lane collector road that runs northsouth approximately 3.5 km between Cobequid Road and Fall River Road.

Rivendale Dr ive and O'Leary Dri ve are 2-lane paved local residential streets located west of the proposed development. Rivendale Drive provides access from the south end of the site to Windgate Drive, and O'Leary Drive will provide access (via other local streets) between the north end of the development and Beaver Bank Road. Capilano Drive, Bria ncrest Road, Terry Road, and Taylor Drive are 2-lane paved local residential streets located east of the proposed development. Capilano Drive, Briancrest Road, and Terry Road will connect the development south to Windgate Drive, while Taylor Drive provides a connection northeast toward Fall River.
4. Projected 2025 weekday AM and PM peak hour background
volumes were calculated using an annual traffic volume growth rate of $1.0 \%$.

Background Traffic Volumes

## Estimation of Site Generated Trips for the Proposed Development

Trip Distribution and Assignment

Signal Warrant Analysis

Left Turn Lane Warrant

Summary - Level of
Service Analysis

## Conclusions

5. The proposed development is expected to generate approximately 251 two-way vehicle trips ( 85 vph entering and 166 vph exiting) during the AM peak hour and 381 two-way vehicle trips (211 vph entering and 170 vph exiting) during the PM peak hour.
6. External trips generated by the development have been assigned to study area streets and intersections based on review of the local street network and development surrounding the site as well as local knowledge of the area.
7. Signal warrant analyses were completed for Windgate Drive intersections at Beaver Bank Road and Windsor Junction Road for projected 2025 background traffic with the addition of trips generated by the proposed development. Traffic signals are not expected to be warranted at the Beaver Bank Road (88 warrant points) or the Windsor Junction Road (21 warrant points) intersections.
8. Analysis of left turn lane warrants was completed for eastbound left turns from Windgate Drive into the proposed site access street for projected 2025 volumes with the addition of site generated trips. The analysis indicated that left turn lanes are not expected to be warranted for all scenarios.
9. Intersection performance analysis was completed for Windgate Drive intersections at Beaver Bank Road, Windsor Junction Road, and the proposed site access street. Results indicate that intersection performance at the Windgate Drive - Windsor Junction Road and Windgate Drive - proposed site access street intersections are expected to be satisfactory based on 2025 AM and PM peak hour volumes both without and with site development. At the Beaver Bank Road - Windgate Drive intersection, results indicate that the Windgate Drive (westbound) approach will experience excessive average delay, V/C ratio, and queue lengths -- particularly the PM peak hour - both without and with the addition of site generated trips.
10. Further investigation should be completed to determine a final location for the proposed site access road to Windgate Drive, and to determine whether modifications to the existing road profile are necessary to improve sight distance.
11. Consideration should be given to the installation of traffic signals at the Beaver Bank Road - Windgate Drive intersection to accommodate existing traffic demand as well as projected traffic demand (both without and with site development). Though traffic signal warrants were not met, installation of signals will improve unacceptably high delays currently experienced on the Windgate Drive approach during AM and PM peak periods.
12. Site generated trips are not expected to have a significant impact to traffic performance in the Study Area.

## Appendix A

Intersection Turning Movement Counts<br>\section*{Traffic Volume Diagrams}<br>Traffic Signal Warrants



|  | March 5 | Table ndgat | Road <br> 6 (PM | ), 2015 |  | $\qquad$ $\qquad$ <br> ate Drive |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AM Peak Period Volume Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time |  | Windsor Junction Road Northbound Approach |  | Windsor Junction Road Southbound Approach |  | Windgate Drive Eastbound Approach |  | Total Vehicles |
|  |  | A | B | H | I | J | L |  |
| 07:00 | 07:15 | 4 | 18 | 16 | 2 | 17 | 26 | 83 |
| 07:15 | 07:30 | 8 | 8 | 11 | 8 | 21 | 31 | 87 |
| 07:30 | 07:45 | 4 | 8 | 23 | 17 | 30 | 43 | 125 |
| 07:45 | 08:00 | 9 | 15 | 20 | 11 | 28 | 44 | 127 |
| 08:00 | 08:15 | 12 | 16 | 15 | 17 | 30 | 28 | 118 |
| 08:15 | 08:30 | 7 | 9 | 17 | 4 | 17 | 23 | 77 |
| 08:30 | 08:45 | 6 | 10 | 14 | 7 | 17 | 17 | 71 |
| 08:45 | 09:00 | 9 | 14 | 19 | 11 | 32 | 18 | 103 |
| AM P | Hour | 33 | 47 | 69 | 53 | 109 | 146 | 457 |
| PM Peak Period Volume Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time |  | Windsor Junction Road Northbound Approach |  | Windsor Junction Road Southbound Approach |  | Windgate Drive Eastbound Approach |  | Total Vehicles |
|  |  | A | B | H | I | J | L |  |
| 15:30 | 15:45 | 9 | 14 | 20 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 69 |
| 15:45 | 16:00 | 15 | 14 | 17 | 15 | 16 | 11 | 88 |
| 16:00 | 16:15 | 10 | 16 | 14 | 21 | 21 | 15 | 97 |
| 16:15 | 16:30 | 22 | 19 | 12 | 19 | 15 | 18 | 105 |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 29 | 19 | 14 | 22 | 18 | 8 | 110 |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 27 | 29 | 17 | 21 | 15 | 12 | 121 |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 21 | 24 | 14 | 19 | 17 | 15 | 110 |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 35 | 25 | 17 | 17 | 22 | 7 | 123 |
| PM Peak Hour |  | 112 | 97 | 62 | 79 | 72 | 42 | 464 |


|  |  | Table <br> er Ba <br> @ <br> dgate <br> ver Ba <br> ay, Augus |  |  |  |  | Windga <br> $\uparrow$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AM Peak Period Volume Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time |  | Beaver Bank Road Northbound Approach |  | Windgate Drive Westbound Approach |  | Beaver Bank Road Southbound Approach |  | Total Vehicles |
|  |  | B | C | D | F | G | H |  |
| 07:00 | 07:15 | 38 | 20 | 22 | 3 | 10 | 175 | 268 |
| 07:15 | 07:30 | 45 | 22 | 18 | 2 | 13 | 175 | 275 |
| 07:30 | 07:45 | 34 | 22 | 20 | 1 | 6 | 162 | 245 |
| 07:45 | 08:00 | 53 | 24 | 26 | 2 | 11 | 180 | 296 |
| 08:00 | 08:15 | 59 | 18 | 12 | 4 | 8 | 148 | 249 |
| 08:15 | 08:30 | 67 | 15 | 16 | 6 | 5 | 134 | 243 |
| 08:30 | 08:45 | 70 | 16 | 13 | 6 | 10 | 137 | 252 |
| 08:45 | 09:00 | 68 | 22 | 19 | 12 | 7 | 139 | 267 |
| AM P | Hour | 170 | 88 | 86 | 8 | 40 | 692 | 1084 |
| Noon Peak Period Volume Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time |  | Beaver Bank Road Northbound Approach |  | Windgate Drive Westbound Approach |  | Beaver Bank Road Southbound Approach |  | Total Vehicles |
|  |  | B | C | D | F | G | H |  |
| 11:00 | 11:15 | 80 | 12 | 14 | 5 | 5 | 71 | 187 |
| 11:15 | 11:30 | 83 | 14 | 19 | 2 | 5 | 71 | 194 |
| 11:30 | 11:45 | 82 | 21 | 19 | 1 | 5 | 83 | 211 |
| 11:45 | 12:00 | 81 | 21 | 19 | 7 | 3 | 80 | 211 |
| 12:00 | 12:15 | 84 | 16 | 16 | 4 | 5 | 94 | 219 |
| 12:15 | 12:30 | 83 | 27 | 23 | 4 | 5 | 93 | 235 |
| 12:30 | 12:45 | 78 | 31 | 16 | 10 | 5 | 87 | 227 |
| 12:45 | 13:00 | 75 | 20 | 15 | 3 | 5 | 93 | 211 |
| Noon | k Hour | 326 | 68 | 71 | 15 | 18 | 305 | 803 |
| PM Peak Period Volume Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time |  | Beaver Bank Road Northbound Approach |  | Windgate Drive Westbound Approach |  | Beaver Bank Road Southbound Approach |  | Total Vehicles |
|  |  | B | C | D | F | G | H |  |
| 15:30 | 15:45 | 163 | 39 | 27 | 6 | 14 | 99 | 348 |
| 15:45 | 16:00 | 180 | 37 | 32 | 7 | 7 | 88 | 351 |
| 16:00 | 16:15 | 199 | 37 | 25 | 14 | 8 | 90 | 373 |
| 16:15 | 16:30 | 233 | 26 | 20 | 12 | 10 | 77 | 378 |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 264 | 46 | 32 | 19 | 7 | 122 | 490 |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 218 | 36 | 24 | 19 | 5 | 109 | 411 |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 181 | 31 | 29 | 14 | 6 | 116 | 377 |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 156 | 25 | 26 | 11 | 6 | 119 | 343 |
| PM Peak Hour |  | 896 | 139 | 105 | 64 | 28 | 424 | 1656 |

[^0]



## 2005 Canadian Traffic Signal Warrant Matrix Analysis

Table A－4：Beaver Bank Road＠Windgate Drive
Projected 2025 Background Traffic Volumes without Site Development

| Main Street（name） <br> Side Street（name） | Beaver Bank Road |  |  | Direction（EW or NS） |  |  | NS | Date： City： |  | March 2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Windgate Drive |  |  | Direction（EW or NS） |  |  | EW |  |  | Halifax NS |
| Lane Configuration |  | Ј 牙 x | ち \％ F |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sim} \\ & \approx \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{F} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{v}}{\frac{x}{4}}$ |  | 䯭 |  |  |
| Beaver Bank Road | NB |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Beaver Bank Road | SB |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1，000 | 1 |  |  |
| Windgate Drive | WB |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | EB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Other input |  | Speed <br> $(\mathrm{Km} / \mathrm{h})$ | Trucks <br> $\%$ | Bus Rt <br> $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | Median <br> $(\mathrm{m})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Beaver Bank Road | NS | 50 | $2.0 \%$ | n | 0.0 |
| Windgate Drive | EW | 50 | $2.0 \%$ | n |  |


|  |  |  | Ped1 | Ped2 | Ped3 | Ped4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | NS | NS | EW | EW |
|  |  |  | W Side | E Side | N Side | S side |
| 7：00 | ：00 | －8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8：00 | ：00 | －9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11：30 | 2：30 | －1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12：30 | 3：30 | －1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15：30 | 6：30 | －1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16：30 | 7：30 | －1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total 6－hour（ak） |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Average 6－hour（eak） |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| Demographics |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Elementary School | $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | y |
| Senior＇s Complex | $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | n |
| Pathway o chool t S | $\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | $(\mathrm{n}$ |
| Metro rea opuAtioorP | $\mathrm{\#})$ | $(300,000$ |
| Central usiness Bistrict D | $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | n |


| Traffic Input | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT |
| 7：00－8：00 | 0 | 185 | 100 | 45 | 760 | 0 | 95 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8：00－9：00 | 0 | 140 | 75 | 35 | 570 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11：30－12：30 | 0 | 360 | 75 | 20 | 335 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12：30－13：30 | 0 | 350 | 105 | 20 | 405 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15：30－16：30 | 0 | 985 | 130 | 30 | 435 | 0 | 105 | 0 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16：30－17：30 | 0 | 835 | 110 | 25 | 370 | 0 | 90 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total（6－hour peak） | 0 | 2，855 | 595 | 175 | 2，875 | 0 | 515 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Average（6－hour peak） | 0 | 476 | 99 | 29 | 479 | 0 | 86 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 |



$$
\begin{array}{r}
\mathrm{W}=\left[\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{bt}}\left(\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{v}-\mathrm{v}}\right) / \mathrm{K}_{1}+\left(\mathrm{F}\left(\mathbf{X}_{\mathrm{v}-\mathrm{p}}\right) \mathrm{L}\right) / \mathrm{K}_{2}\right] \times \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{i}} \\
\hline \mathbf{W} \quad 63 \\
\text { NOT Warranted }
\end{array} \text { Veh } \begin{aligned}
& 0 \\
& \text { Ped }
\end{aligned}
$$

# 2005 Canadian Traffic Signal Warrant Matrix Analysis 

Table A-5: Beaver Bank Road @ Windgate Drive
Projected 2025 Background Traffic Volumes with Site Development


# 2005 Canadian Traffic Signal Warrant Matrix Analysis 

Table A-6: Windsor Junction Road @ Windgate Drive
Projected 2025 Background Traffic Volumes with Site Development

| Main Street (name) | Windsor Junction Road |  |  | Direction (EW or NS) |  |  | NS | Date: City: |  | March 2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Side Street (name) | Windgate Drive |  |  | Direction (EW or NS) |  |  | EW |  |  | Halifax NS |
| Lane Configuration |  | $\stackrel{5}{5}$ x | ち ※ F |  | ® \% ( F | ¢ ¢ x |  |  |  |  |
| Windsor Junction Road | NB |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Windsor Junction Road | SB |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1,000 | 1 |  |  |
| Windgate Drive | WB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | EB |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Other input |  | Speed <br> $(\mathrm{Km} / \mathrm{h})$ | Trucks <br> $\%$ | Bus Rt <br> $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | Median <br> $(\mathrm{m})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Windsor Junction Road | NS | 50 | $2.0 \%$ | n | 0.0 |
| Windgate Drive | EW | 50 | $2.0 \%$ | n |  |


|  |  |  | Ped1 | Ped2 | Ped3 | Ped4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | NS | NS | EW | EW |
|  |  |  | W Side | E Side | N Side | S side |
| 7:00 | :00 | -8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 | :00 | -9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:30 | 2:30 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:30 | 3:30 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:30 | 6:30 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:30 | 7:30 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total 6-hour (eak) |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Average 6-hour (eak) |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| Demographics |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Elementary School | $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | y |
| Senior's Complex | $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | n |
| Pathway o chool t S | $\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | $(\mathrm{n}$ |
| Metro rea oputatiorP | $\mathrm{\#})$ | $(300,000$ |
| Central usiness Bistrict D | $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{n})$ | n |


| Traffic Input | $\mathrm{NB}$ |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | $\overline{\mathbf{E B}}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT |
| 7:00-8:00 | 45 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 170 | 0 | 185 |
| 8:00-9:00 | 35 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 | 0 | 140 |
| 11:30-12:30 | 50 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 65 |
| 12:30-13:30 | 50 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 65 |
| 15:30-16:30 | $150$ | $110$ | 0 | 0 | 70 | $150$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 | 0 | 65 |
| 16:30-17:30 | 130 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 110 | 0 | 55 |
| Total (6-hour peak) | $460$ | $380$ | 0 | 0 | 350 | $550$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 690 | 0 | 575 |
| Average (6-hour peak) | 77 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 | 0 | 96 |



$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{W} & =\left[\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{bt}}\left(\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{v}-\mathrm{v}}\right) / \mathrm{K}_{1}+\left(\mathrm{F}\left(\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{v}-\mathrm{p}}\right) \mathrm{L}\right) / \mathrm{K}_{2}\right] \times \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{i}} \\
& \begin{array}{lcc}
\mathrm{W}= & 21 & 0 \\
\text { NOT Warranted } & \text { Veh } & \text { Ped }
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$



## Appendix B

## Intersection Performance Analysis

| Movement | WBL | + WBR | 4 NBT | NBR |  | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\text { ¢ }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% |  | $\stackrel{ }{ }$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 95 | 5 | 185 | 100 | 45 | 760 |  |
| 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) | 103 | 5 | 201 | 109 | 49 | 826 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (m/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC, conflicting volume | 1179 | 255 |  |  | 310 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 1179 | 255 |  |  | 310 |  |  |
| tC, single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 49 | 99 |  |  | 96 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 202 | 783 |  |  | 1251 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 109 | 310 | 49 | 826 |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 103 | 0 | 49 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 5 | 109 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| cSH | 210 | 1700 | 1251 | 1700 |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.52 | 0.18 | 0.04 | 0.49 |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 20.2 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 39.2 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | E |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 39.2 | 0.0 | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | E |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 3.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utiliz |  |  | 52.2\% |  | Level | Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | ¢ ${ }_{\text {NBT }}$ | ¢ SBT | \% SBR |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | * |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 125 | 165 | 35 | 55 | 80 | 60 |  |
| 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) | 136 | 179 | 38 | 60 | 87 | 65 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  | None | None |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (m) pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 255 | 120 | 152 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 255 | 120 | 152 |  |  |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 81 | 81 | 97 |  |  |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 714 | 932 | 1429 |  |  |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 315 | 98 | 152 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 136 | 38 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 179 | 0 | 65 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 823 | 1429 | 1700 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.38 | 0.03 | 0.09 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 13.7 | 0.6 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 12.1 | 3.1 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | B | A |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 12.1 | 3.1 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 7.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Util |  |  | 39.8\% |  | Level | Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | WBL |  | NBT | $\begin{gathered} > \\ \text { NBR } \end{gathered}$ |  | ¢ SBT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | F |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 105 | 55 | 985 | 130 | 30 | 435 |  |
| 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) | 114 | 60 | 1071 | 141 | 33 | 473 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal ( m ) pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 1679 | 1141 |  |  | 1212 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 1679 | 1141 |  |  | 1212 |  |  |
| 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 \% | 0 | 76 |  |  | 94 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 98 | 244 |  |  | 576 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 174 | 1212 | 33 | 473 |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 114 | 0 | 33 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 60 | 141 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| cSH | 124 | 1700 | 576 | 1700 |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 1.41 | 0.71 | 0.06 | 0.28 |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 89.7 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 288.8 | 0.0 | 11.6 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | F |  | B |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 288.8 | 0.0 | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 26.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Util |  |  | 75.6\% |  | Level | Service | D |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | ¢ ${ }_{\text {NBT }}$ | $\frac{1}{\text { ¢ }}$ | 4 SBR |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | * |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 80 | 45 | 125 | 110 | 70 | 90 |  |
| 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) | 87 | 49 | 136 | 120 | 76 | 98 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (m/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  | None | None |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal ( m ) pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 516 | 125 | 174 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 516 | 125 | 174 |  |  |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 81 | 95 | 90 |  |  |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 469 | 926 | 1403 |  |  |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 136 | 255 | 174 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 87 | 136 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 49 | 0 | 98 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 570 | 1403 | 1700 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.24 | 0.10 | 0.10 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 7.0 | 2.4 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 13.3 | 4.6 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | B | A |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 13.3 | 4.6 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 5.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Util |  |  | 39.1\% |  | Level | Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |



2: Windsor Junction Road \& Windgate Drive

| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | 4 NBT | - SBT | + SBR |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | * |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 172 | 184 | 46 | 55 | 80 | 87 |  |
| 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) | 187 | 200 | 50 | 60 | 87 | 95 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  | None | None |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 294 | 134 | 182 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 294 | 134 | 182 |  |  |  |  |
| tC, single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 72 | 78 | 96 |  |  |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 672 | 915 | 1394 |  |  |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 387 | 110 | 182 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 187 | 50 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 200 | 0 | 95 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 779 | 1394 | 1700 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.50 | 0.04 | 0.11 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 21.3 | 0.8 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 14.1 | 3.7 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | B | A |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 14.1 | 3.7 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 8.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Util |  |  | 45.8\% | IC | Level | Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | + EBL | $\begin{gathered} \rightarrow \\ \text { EBT } \end{gathered}$ | - WBT | $4$ WBR | SBL | / SBR |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |  | * |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 27 | 180 | 78 | 25 | 44 | 52 |  |
| Sign Control |  | Free | Free |  | Stop |  |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 29 | 196 | 85 | 27 | 48 | 57 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (m/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | None | None |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 112 |  |  |  | 353 | 98 |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 112 |  |  |  | 353 | 98 |  |
| tC , single (s) | 4.1 |  |  |  | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 98 |  |  |  | 92 | 94 |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1478 |  |  |  | 632 | 958 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 225 | 112 | 104 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 29 | 0 | 48 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 27 | 57 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1478 | 1700 | 775 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.02 | 0.07 | 0.13 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 0.5 | 0.0 | 3.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 1.1 | 0.0 | 10.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  | B |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 1.1 | 0.0 | 10.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Uti |  |  | 29.9\% | IC | Level | Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | WBL | WBR | 4 NBT | P NBR | + SBL | ¢ SBT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | * |  | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{1}$ | 4 |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 157 | 79 | 985 | 197 | 54 | 435 |  |
| 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) | 171 | 86 | 1071 | 214 | 59 | 473 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (m/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 1768 | 1178 |  |  | 1285 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 1768 | 1178 |  |  | 1285 |  |  |
| 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 \% | 0 | 63 |  |  | 89 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 82 | 232 |  |  | 540 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 257 | 1285 | 59 | 473 |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 171 | 0 | 59 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 86 | 214 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| cSH | 105 | 1700 | 540 | 1700 |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 2.45 | 0.76 | 0.11 | 0.28 |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 175.9 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 747.2 | 0.0 | 12.5 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | F |  | B |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 747.2 | 0.0 | 1.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 92.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utili |  |  | 84.0\% |  | Level | Service | E |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | ¢ SBT | + |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | * |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 132 | 67 | 151 | 110 | 70 | 151 |  |
| 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) | 143 | 73 | 164 | 120 | 76 | 164 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  | None | None |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (m) pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 606 | 158 | 240 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 606 | 158 | 240 |  |  |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 64 | 92 | 88 |  |  |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 403 | 887 | 1326 |  |  |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 216 | 284 | 240 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 143 | 164 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 73 | 0 | 164 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 494 | 1326 | 1700 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.44 | 0.12 | 0.14 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 16.7 | 3.2 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 17.8 | 5.1 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | C | A |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 17.8 | 5.1 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 7.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Util |  |  | 48.5\% |  | Level | Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

10: Windgate Drive \& Proposed Site Access

| Movement | 4 EBL | $\begin{gathered} \rightarrow \\ \mathrm{EBT} \end{gathered}$ | WBT | WBR | SBL | \% SBR |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |  | * |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 67 | 145 | 182 | 58 | 49 | 54 |  |
| Sign Control |  | Free | Free |  | Stop |  |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 73 | 158 | 198 | 63 | 53 | 59 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (m/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | None | None |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 261 |  |  |  | 533 | 229 |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 261 |  |  |  | 533 | 229 |  |
| tC , single (s) | 4.1 |  |  |  | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 94 |  |  |  | 89 | 93 |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1304 |  |  |  | 479 | 810 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 230 | 261 | 112 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 73 | 0 | 53 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 63 | 59 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1304 | 1700 | 610 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.06 | 0.15 | 0.18 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 1.3 | 0.0 | 5.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 2.8 | 0.0 | 12.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  | B |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 2.8 | 0.0 | 12.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 3.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 40.5\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |


[^0]:    *Count obtained from HALIFAX Traffic \& ROW Services.

