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### 1.0 Introduction

Background

A Traffic Impact Study Usually Considers Four Questions

Study Objectives

Plans are being prepared by Mo-Par Developments for the development of Carriagewood Estates, a residential subdivision in Beaver Bank, NS. The proposed development is located at PID\#00468694, an undeveloped parcel located just north of the existing terminus of Daisy Drive (See Figure 1). It will consist of up to 270 residential units, accessed by an extension of Daisy Drive and a connection to Trinity Lane. Access to Beaver Bank Road will be from Mayflower Avenue (at the south of the development) and Trinity Lane (north of the development). It is anticipated that buildout of the development will be completed by 2024.

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 will occur on Study Area roads and intersections? How will level of service of roads and intersections be affected?
4. What road or intersection improvements are required to mitigate project impacts on Study Area traffic movements?
5. Develop projected 2014 and 2024 background weekday AM and PM peak hourly volumes for Study Area roads that do not include trips generated by proposed site development.
6. Estimate the number of weekday AM and PM peak hour trips that will be generated by the proposed development.
7. Distribute and assign site generated trips to Study Area intersections.
8. Add site generated trips to projected 2024 background peak hourly volumes to provide projected volumes that include site generated trips.
9. Evaluate impacts of site generated traffic on the performance and level of service of study intersections.
10. Complete traffic signal warrant analyses, as necessary, for intersections on Beaver Bank Road that are accessed by the proposed development.
11. Complete left-turn and right-turn lane warrants, as necessary, for intersections on Beaver Bank Road that are accessed by the proposed development.
12. Recommend improvements that may be needed at study intersections to mitigate the impacts of site development.
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### 2.0 Study Area Descriptions

Site Description

Road and Intersection Descriptions

The proposed site is an approximately 37 hectare undeveloped parcel located just north of the existing terminus of Daisy Drive and east of Trinity Lane. Access to Beaver Bank Road will be from Mayflower Avenue (at the south of the development) and Trinity Lane (north of the development).

Beaver Bank Road is a 2-lane collector road that runs approximately 21 km between Lower Sackville and East Uniacke Road. In the vicinity of the Study Area, the posted speed limit is $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. Just south of the intersection at Mayflower Avenue, there is a conditional school zone speed limit that reduces to $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ "when children are present". Annual average daily traffic volumes on Beaver Bank Road 1.7 km north of Trinity Lane are approximately 5,100 vehicles per day (vpd).

Trinity Lane is a 2-lane local residential street that runs north-south approximately 1.3 km between Mayflower Avenue and Beaver Bank Road. The majority of its length (approximately 1 km ) is unpaved. Though not posted, it has an assumed speed limit of $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.

The Beaver Bank Road - Trinity Lane intersection (See Photo 1 and Photo 2) is unsignalized, with stop control on Trinity Lane and the opposing eastbound approach from Barrett Road (local residential street). All approaches are single lane.


Photo 1: Looking south (to the left) on Beaver Bank Road from the Trinity Lane Intersection


Photo 2: Looking north (to the right) on Beaver Bank Road from the Trinity Lane Intersection

Road and Intersection Descriptions (Continued)

Mayflower Avenue, Ernest Avenue, and Daisy Drive are 2-lane paved local residential streets located east of Beaver Bank Road near the south end of the proposed development. Mayflower Avenue extends from Beaver Bank Road approximately 400 m to the east. Ernest Avenue / Daisy Lane run generally east-west approximately 600 m between Trinity Lane and Pennington Drive. Each street has a posted speed limit of $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.

The Beaver Bank Road - Mayflower Avenue intersection (See Photo 3 and Photo 4) is unsignalized, with stop control on the Mayflower Avenue approach. All approaches are single lane, however, there is a hatched area in the center of Beaver Bank Road that is used to develop the left turn lane at Danny Drive (approximately 150 m to the north).


Photo 3: Looking south (to the left) on Beaver Bank Road from the Mayflower Avenue Intersection


Photo 4: Looking north (to the right) on Beaver Bank Road from the Mayflower
Avenue Intersection
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 at Trinity Lane and Sackville Terminal, where it provides connection to additional routes
including the Metrolink service. The route has stops at Trinity Lane and Mayflower Avenue located approximately 350m and 450m, respectively, from the proposed development.

Public
Transportation

Vehicular access to the proposed development will be via an extension of Daisy Drive and a connection to Trinity Lane. Daisy Lane (See Photo 5), which accesses Beaver Bank Road via Ernest Avenue, Trinity Lane, and Mayflower Avenue, will be extended north from its existing limits by approximately 580 m .


Photo 5: Looking south on Daisy Drive from its existing terminus and location of the south access point to the proposed development

The north site access at Trinity Drive will be via a new connection from the west side of the site, located approximately 800 m north of of Mayflower Avenue (See Photo 6 and Photo 7). Stopping sight distances (SSD), measured from a driver eye height of 1.05 m to a 150 mm object, were observed on the Trinity Lane northbound and southbound approaches to the north access intersection. Observations indicated SSD greater than 190 meters on the northbound approach, which exceeds the minimum 92 m required for an assumed operating speed of $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ on a $-6 \%$ approach grade. On the southbound approach, observations indicated SSD of approximately 170 m , which is greater than the minimum 78 m required based on a $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ operating speed on a $+5 \%$ approach grade.


Photo 6: Looking south (to the left) on Trinity Lane from the proposed north site access Intersection


Photo 7: Looking north (to the right) on Trinity Lane from the proposed north site access Intersection

## Traffic Volume Data

HRM Traffic \& Right-of-Way Services (TROW) obtained a one week long machine traffic count on Beaver Bank Road between Douglas Drive and Kinsac Road (approximately 2 km north of the proposed development) during August 2011. Counts indicate Beaver Bank Road two-way AM and PM peak hour volumes of about 230 and 280 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 - August 2011:
Beaver Bank Road (Douglas Drive to Kinsac Road)

Annual Volume Trends

Manual Traffic Count

Projected 2014 and 2024 Background Volumes

Historical volume data obtained by HRM between 2007 and 2013 on Beaver Bank Road (approximately 1.7km north of Trinity Lane) do not indicate a consistent growth trend in volumes. Volumes are in the range of 5,000 to 5,500 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, Noon, and PM peak periods on Tuesday, July 22 and Wednesday, July 23, 2014 at Beaver Bank Road intersections at Mayflower Avenue and Trinity Lane. Turning movement counts are tabulated in Tables A-1 and A-2, Appendix A, with peak hour volumes indicated by shaded areas.

Projected 2014 and 2024 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 to D), Appendix A.

### 3.0 Trip Generation, Distribution, and Assignment

Trip Generation for Proposed Commercial Development

Estimation of Total Site Generated Trips

The proposed residential development will include up to approximately 270 residential units on an approximately 37 hectare undeveloped parcel located just north of the existing terminus of Daisy Drive and east of Trinity Lane. It has been assumed that all residential units will be detached single family houses.

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 1, indicate that the proposed development is expected to generate 202 vehicles per hour (vph) ( 51 vph entering and 151 vph exiting) during the AM peak hour and $270 \mathrm{vph}(170 \mathrm{vph}$ entering and 100 vph exiting) during the PM peak hour.

Table 1 - Trip Generation Estimates for Proposed Residential Development

| Land Use | Units | Trip Generation Rates ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  | Trips Generated ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
|  |  | In | Out | In | Out | In | Out | In | Out |
| Single Family Residential (ITE Land Use Code 210) | 270 | 0.19 | 0.56 | 0.63 | 0.37 | 51 | 151 | 170 | 100 |
| Trip Generation Estimates for Proposed Development |  |  |  |  |  | 51 | 151 | 170 | 100 |
| 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. <br> 2. Vehicles per hour for peak hours. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Trip Distribution and Assignment

Projected 2024
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 in the following manner:

- North - Beaver Bank Road 10\%
- South - Beaver Bank Road 90\%

Assigned site generated trips at Study Area intersections are shown diagrammatically in Figure A-2 (Boxes A and B), Appendix A.

Site generated trips have been added to the projected 2024 background volumes (Figure A-1, Boxes C and D) to provide projected 2024 volumes that include site generated trips which are illustrated diagrammatically in Figure A-2 (Boxes C and D), Appendix A.

### 4.0 Intersection Performance Analysis

### 4.1 Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

## Traffic Signal

 Warrant PrinciplesTraffic 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 Beaver Bank Road intersections at Mayflower Avenue and Trinity Lane for projected 2024 background traffic with the addition of trips generated by the proposed development. Results are summarized below:

- Beaver Bank Road @ Mayflower Avenue (Table A-3):
- Not Warranted (37 Warrant Points)
- Beaver Bank Road @ Trinity Lane / Barrett Road (Table A-4):
- Not Warranted (15 Warrant Points)


### 4.2 Turn 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-3, Appendix A) for southbound left turns from Beaver Bank Road into Mayflower Avenue and Trinity Lane for projected 2024 volumes both without and 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.

Right Turn Lane Warrant Analysis

Operational problems may result at an intersection where a 'high' number of vehicles slow to make a right turn into a site. The Ohio Department of Transportation State Highway Access Management Manual contains nomographs for evaluating right turn lane warrants on two lane roads. The analysis is based on right turning and advancing volumes.

The right turn lane warrant evaluation included in Figure A-4, Appendix A, indicates that a right turn lane is warranted on the northbound approach to Mayflower Avenue during the PM peak hour based on projected 2024 volumes both without and with added site generated trips. It is also noted that a right turn lane is warranted based on 2014 PM peak hour volumes.

### 4.3 Intersection 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 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 2 - Level of Service (LOS) Criteria for Intersections

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

Intersection Level of Service Analysis

Summary Level of Service Analysis

Synchro 8.0 software has been used for performance evaluation of Study Area intersections on Beaver Bank Road for 2024 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 Table 3 and Table 4.

Beaver Bank Road @ Mayflower Avenue- Intersection performance is expected to be satisfactory both without and with the addition of site generated trips. All movements operate within HRM acceptable limits.

Beaver Bank Road @ Trinity Lane / Barrett Road- Intersection performance is expected to be satisfactory both without and with the addition of site generated trips. All movements operate within HRM acceptable limits.

Table 3-LOS for Beaver Bank Road @ Trinity Lane / Barrett Road

| LOS Criteria | Control Delay (sec/veh), LOS, v/c Ratio, and 95\% Queue ( $m$ ) by Intersection Movement |  |  |  | Overall Intersection |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB-LTR | WB-LTR | NB-LTR | SB-LTR | Delay | LOS |
| Weekday AM Peak Hour - Projected 2024 Volumes without Site Development (Page B-1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay <br> LOS <br> v/c <br> Queue | $\begin{gathered} 11.4 \\ \text { B } \\ 0.02 \\ 0.4 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12.8 \\ \text { B } \\ 0.01 \\ 0.3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.3 \\ \text { A } \\ 0.14 \\ 0.1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.2 \\ \text { A } \\ 0.22 \\ 0.1 \end{gathered}$ | 0.6 | A |
| Weekday AM Peak Hour - Projected 2024 Volumes with Site Development (Page B-5) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay <br> LOS <br> v/c <br> Queue | $\begin{gathered} 11.7 \\ \text { B } \\ 0.02 \\ 0.5 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13 \\ \text { B } \\ 0.13 \\ 3.3 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.3 \\ \text { A } \\ 0.15 \\ 0.1 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.3 \\ \mathrm{~A} \\ 0.23 \\ 0.2 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 1.9 | A |
| Weekday PM Peak Hour - Projected 2024 Volumes without Site Development (Page B-3) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay <br> LOS <br> v/c <br> Queue | $\begin{gathered} 14.1 \\ \text { B } \\ 0.04 \\ 0.9 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13.6 \\ \text { B } \\ 0.03 \\ 0.6 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.3 \\ \mathrm{~A} \\ 0.36 \\ 0.2 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0 \\ \text { A } \\ 0.22 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 0.7 | A |
| Weekday PM Peak Hour - Projected 2024 Volumes with Site Development (Page B-7) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay <br> LOS <br> v/c <br> Queue | $\begin{gathered} 15.1 \\ \text { C } \\ 0.04 \\ 1.0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16.7 \\ \text { C } \\ 0.14 \\ 3.7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.3 \\ \text { A } \\ 0.38 \\ 0.2 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.8 \\ \text { A } \\ 0.24 \\ 0.4 \end{gathered}$ | 1.7 | A |

Table 4 - LOS for Beaver Bank Road @ Mayflower Avenue

| LOS Criteria | Control Delay (sec/veh), LOS, v/c Ratio, and $\mathbf{9 5 \%}$ Queue ( m ) by Intersection Movement |  |  | Overall Intersection |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | WB-LR | NB-TR | SB-LT | Delay | Los |
| Weekday AM Peak Hour - Projected 2024 Volumes without Site Development (Page B-2) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 14.6 | 0.0 | 0.4 |  |  |
| LOS | B | A | A | 1.4 | A |
| v/c Queue | 0.15 3.9 | 0.08 0.0 | $\begin{gathered} 0.37 \\ 0.1 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Weekday AM Peak Hour - Projected 2024 Volumes with Site Development (Page B-6) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 21.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |  |
| LOS | C | A | A | 3.9 | A |
| v/c | 0.43 | 0.11 | 0.41 | 3.9 | A |
| Queue | 16.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |  |
| Weekday PM Peak Hour - Projected 2024 Volumes without Site Development (Page B-4) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 18.1 | 0.0 | 0.3 |  |  |
| LOS | B | A | A | 0.9 | A |
| v/c | 0.14 | 0.39 | 0.30 | 0.9 | A |
| Queue | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |  |
| Weekday PM Peak Hour - Projected 2024 Volumes with Site Development (Page B-8) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 28.8 | 0 | 0.2 |  |  |
| LOS | D | A | A |  |  |
| v/c | 0.43 | 0.49 | 0.38 | 2.6 | A |
| Queue | 15.4 | 0.0 | 0.2 |  |  |

### 5.0 Summary, Recommendations, and Conclusions

## Description of the Proposed

 Development
## Proposed Site Access

## Description of Study Area Roads

## Background Traffic

 Volumes
## Estimation of Site Generated Trips for the Proposed Development

Trip Distribution and Assignment

Signal Warrant Analysis

1. Plans are being prepared by Mo-Par Developments for the development of Carriagewood Estates, a residential subdivision in Beaver Bank, NS. The proposed development, located just north of the existing terminus of Daisy Drive, will consist of up to 270 single family residential units. It is anticipated that buildout of the development will be completed by 2024.
2. Two site accesses will be provided to the proposed development including: (i) an extension of Daisy Drive and (ii) a connection to Trinity Lane. Access to Beaver Bank Road will be from Mayflower Avenue (at the south of the development) and Trinity Lane (north of the development).
3. Beaver Bank Road is a 2-lane collector road that runs approximately 21 km between Lower Sackville and East Uniacke Road.

Trinity Lane is a 2-lane local residential street that runs north-south approximately 1.3 km between Mayflower Avenue and Beaver Bank Road. The majority of its length (approximately 1 km ) is unpaved.

Mayflower Avenue, Ernest Avenue, and Daisy Drive are 2-lane paved local residential streets located east of Beaver Bank Road near the south end of the proposed development. Mayflower Avenue extends from Beaver Bank Road to the east. Ernest Avenue / Daisy Lane run generally east-west between Trinity Lane and Pennington Drive.
4. Projected 2014 and 2024 weekday $A M$ and PM peak hour background volumes were calculated using an annual traffic volume growth rate of $1.0 \%$.
5. The proposed residential development will include up to approximately 270 single family residential units. Trip generation estimates, estimated using rates published in Trip Generation, 9th Edition (Washington, 2012), indicate that the proposed development is expected to generate 202 vehicles per hour (vph) (51 vph entering and 151 vph exiting) during the AM peak hour and 270 vph ( 170 vph entering and 100 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. Trips were distributed to the north (10\%) and south (90\%) on Beaver Bank Road.
7. Signal warrant analyses were completed for Beaver Bank Road intersections at Mayflower Avenue and Trinity Lane for projected

Left Turn Lane Warrant

Right Turn Lane Warrant Analysis

Summary - Level of
Service Analysis

## Recommendations

2024 background traffic with the addition of trips generated by the proposed development. Traffic signals are not expected to be warranted at the Mayflower Avenue ( 37 warrant points) or the Trinity Lane ( 15 warrant points) intersections.
8. Analysis of left turn lane warrants was completed for southbound left turns from Beaver Bank Road into Mayflower Avenue and Trinity Lane for projected 2024 volumes both without and with the addition of site generated trips. The analysis indicated that left turn lanes are not expected to be warranted for all scenarios.
9. Right turn lane warrants were completed for northbound right turns from Beaver Bank Road into Mayflower Avenue and Trinity Lane for projected 2024 volumes both without and with the addition of site generated trips. The warrant evaluation has indicated that a right turn lane is warranted on the northbound approach to Mayflower Avenue during the PM peak hour based on projected 2024 volumes both without and with added site generated trips. It was also noted that a right turn lane is warranted based on 2014 PM peak hour traffic volumes.
10. Intersection performance analysis was completed for Beaver Bank Road intersections at Mayflower Avenue and Trinity Lane. Results indicate that intersection performance is expected to be satisfactory based on 2024 AM and PM peak hour volumes both without and with site development.
11. The need for a right turn lane on the northbound approach to Mayflower Avenue (warranted based on projected 2024 PM peak hour volumes without and with development) should be reviewed periodically.
12. Consideration should be given to adding a paved surface to the existing gravel section of Trinity Lane.
13. With implementation of recommended upgrades, site generated trips are not expected to have a significant impact to traffic performance in the Study Area.
Appendix A
Intersection Turning MovementCounts
Traffic Volume Diagrams
Traffic Signal Warrants
Left Turn Lane Warrants
Right Turn Lane Warrants

| Table A-1 <br> Beaver Bank Road <br> @ <br> Trinity Lane / Barrett Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $J-$ $\mathbf{K}$ <br> Barrett |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AM Peak Period Volume Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time |  | Beaver Bank Road <br> Northbound Approach |  |  | Trinity Lane <br> Westbound Approach |  |  | Beaver Bank Road Southbound Approach |  |  | Barrett RoadEastbound Approach |  |  | Total Vehicles |
|  |  | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | 1 | J | K | L |  |
| 07:00 | 07:15 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 101 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 126 |
| 07:15 | 07:30 | 2 | 22 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 108 |
| 07:30 | 07:45 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 93 |
| 07:45 | 08:00 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 73 |
| 08:00 | 08:15 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 97 |
| 08:15 | 08:30 | 1 | 30 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 98 |
| 08:30 | 08:45 | 1 | 42 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 113 |
| 08:45 | 09:00 | 3 | 36 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 67 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 112 |
| AM Peak Hour Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00 | 08:00 | 2 | 73 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 294 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 11 | 400 |
| 08:00 | 09:00 | 5 | 141 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 257 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 420 |
| AM Peak Total |  | 5 <br> PED:1 <br> 0 |  | 1 | 6 0 <br> PED:2  |  | 0 | 1 <br> PED:3 |  | 2 | 3 PED:4 |  | 4 | 381 |
| Pede | ians |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 4 | - |
| Heavy Vehicles |  | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| \% Heavy |  | 7\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 4\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | - |
| Noon Peak Period Volume Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time |  | Beaver Bank Road Northbound Approach |  |  | Trinity Lane Westbound Approach |  |  | Beaver Bank Road Southbound Approach |  |  | Barrett RoadEastbound Approach |  |  | Total Vehicles |
|  |  | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | 1 | J | K | L |  |
| 11:00 | 11:15 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 63 |
| 11:15 | 11:30 | 3 | 30 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 50 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 93 |
| 11:30 | 11:45 | 1 | 28 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 90 |
| 11:45 | 12:00 | 0 | 38 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 47 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 92 |
| 12:00 | 12:15 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 40 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 |
| 12:15 | 12:30 | 1 | 41 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 103 |
| 12:30 | 12:45 | 4 | 54 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 107 |
| 12:45 | 13:00 | 1 | 54 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 43 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 108 |
| Noon Peak Hour Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11:00 | 12:00 | 4 | 132 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 169 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 338 |
| 12:00 | 13:00 | 6 | 181 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 178 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 393 |
| Noon Peak Hour |  | 6 | 181 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 2 <br> PED:3 |  | 2 | 5 0 <br> PED:4  |  | 8 | 393 |
| Pedestrians |  | PED:1 |  | 0 | PED:2 |  | 0 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 0 | - |
| Heavy Vehicles |  | 0 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| \% Heavy |  | 6\% |  |  | 14\% |  |  | 7\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | - |
| PM Peak Period Volume Data  <br> Beaver Bank Road Trinity Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time |  | Beaver Bank Road Northbound Approach |  |  | Trinity LaneWestbound Approach |  |  | Beaver Bank Road Southbound Approach |  |  | Barrett RoadEastbound Approach |  |  | Total Vehicles |
|  |  | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L |  |
| 16:00 | 16:15 | 0 | 73 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 47 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 129 |
| 16:15 | 16:30 | 4 | 83 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 43 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 137 |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 2 | 83 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 41 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 137 |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 3 | 98 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 35 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 147 |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 4 | 91 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 144 |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 2 | 102 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 153 |
| 17:30 | 17:45 | 2 | 89 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 165 |
| 17:45 | 18:00 | 0 | 101 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 53 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 161 |
| PM Peak Hour Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16:00 | 17:00 | 9 | 337 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 166 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 550 |
| 17:00 | 18:00 | 8 | 383 | 13 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 198 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 623 |
| PM Peak Hour |  | 8 | 383 | 13 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 198 <br> PED:3  |  | 2 | 2 PED:4 |  | 7 | 623 |
| Pedestrians |  | PED:1 |  | 0 | PED:2 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles |  | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
|  |  | 2\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 4\% |  |  | $0 \%$ |  |  | - |


| Table A-2 <br> Beaver Bank Road <br> @ <br> Mayflower Avenue <br> Beaver Bank, NS <br> Wednesday, July, 23, 2014 |  |  |  |  |  | PED 3 <br> PED 1 |  | nue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AM Peak Period Volume Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time |  | Beaver Bank Road <br> Northbound Approach |  | Mayflower Avenue <br> Westbound Approach |  | Beaver Bank Road Southbound Approach |  | Total Vehicles |
|  |  | B | C | D | F | G | L |  |
| 07:00 | 07:15 | 18 | 2 | 17 | 0 | 1 | 123 | 161 |
| 07:15 | 07:30 | 31 | 6 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 101 | 149 |
| 07:30 | 07:45 | 29 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 128 | 171 |
| 07:45 | 08:00 | 33 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 85 | 132 |
| 08:00 | 08:15 | 27 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 85 | 123 |
| 08:15 | 08:30 | 28 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 88 | 130 |
| 08:30 | 08:45 | 31 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 102 |
| 08:45 | 09:00 | 35 | 5 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 60 | 111 |
| AM Peak Hour Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00 | 08:00 | 111 | 11 | 51 | 1 | 2 | 437 | 613 |
| 08:00 | 09:00 | 121 | 17 | 33 | 1 | 2 | 292 | 466 |
| AM Peak Total |  | 111 | 11 | 51 | 1 | 2 | 437 | 613 |
| Pedestrians |  | PED:1 | 0 | PED:2 | 0 | PED:3 | 0 | - |
| Heavy Vehicles |  | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | - |
| \% Heavy |  | 8\% |  | 0\% |  | 3\% |  | - |
| Noon Peak Period Volume Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time |  | Beaver Bank Road <br> Northbound Approach |  | Mayflower Avenue <br> Westbound Approach |  | Beaver Bank Road Southbound Approach |  | Total Vehicles |
|  |  | B | C | D | F | G | L |  |
| 11:00 | 11:15 | 37 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 58 | 100 |
| 11:15 | 11:30 | 38 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 117 |
| 11:30 | 11:45 | 39 | 10 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 57 | 112 |
| 11:45 | 12:00 | 53 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 126 |
| 12:00 | 12:15 | 61 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 69 | 141 |
| 12:15 | 12:30 | 52 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 54 | 114 |
| 12:30 | 12:45 | 39 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 60 | 105 |
| 12:45 | 13:00 | 58 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 43 | 106 |
| Noon Peak Hour Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11:00 | 12:00 | 167 | 26 | 24 | 3 | 0 | 235 | 455 |
| 12:00 | 13:00 | 210 | 9 | 16 | 3 | 2 | 226 | 466 |
| Noon Peak Hour |  | 191 | 28 | 28 | 2 | 1 | 246 | 496 |
| Pedestrians |  | PED:1 | 0 | PED:2 | 0 | PED:3 | 0 | - |
| Heavy Vehicles |  | 12 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 14 | - |
| \% Heavy |  | 7\% |  | 7\% |  | 6\% |  | - |
| PM Peak Period Volume Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time |  | Beaver Bank Road <br> Northbound Approach |  | Mayflower Avenue Westbound Approach |  | Beaver Bank Road Southbound Approach |  | Total Vehicles |
|  |  | B | C | D | F | G | L |  |
| 16:00 | 16:15 | 90 | 15 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 178 |
| 16:15 | 16:30 | 116 | 15 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 182 |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 112 | 13 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 188 |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 127 | 7 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 57 | 199 |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 127 | 18 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 53 | 206 |
| 17:15 | 17:30 | 110 | 15 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 186 |
| 17:30 | 17:45 | 133 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 72 | 224 |
| 17:45 | 18:00 | 123 | 17 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 50 | 200 |
| PM Peak Hour Data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16:00 | 17:00 | 445 | 50 | 21 | 1 | 0 | 230 | 747 |
| 17:00 | 18:00 | 493 | 62 | 32 | 2 | 1 | 226 | 816 |
| PM Peak Hour |  | 493 | 62 | 32 | 2 | 1 | 226 | 816 |
| Pedestrians |  | PED:1 | 0 | PED:2 | 0 | PED:3 | 0 | - |
| Heavy Vehicles |  | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | - |
| \% Heavy |  | 1\% |  | 0\% |  | $3 \%$ |  | - |




# 2005 Canadian Traffic Signal Warrant Matrix Analysis 

Table A-3 - Beaver Bank Road@ Mayflower Avenue Projected 2024 Background Traffic Volumes with Site Development

| Traffic Input | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT |
| 7:00-8:00 | 0 | 130 | 50 | 0 | 520 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00-9:00 | 0 | 140 | 50 | 0 | 350 | 0 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:30-12:30 | 0 | 190 | 70 | 0 | 275 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:30-13:30 | 0 | 240 | 50 | 0 | 265 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15:30-16:30 | 0 | 515 | 185 | 0 | 280 | 0 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:30-17:30 | 0 | 560 | 180 | 0 | 270 | 0 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total (6-hour peak) | 0 | 1,775 | 585 | 0 | 1,960 | 0 | 565 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Average (6-hour peak) | 0 | 296 | 98 | 0 | 327 | 0 | 94 | 0 | , | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Average 6-hour Peak Turning
Movements


$$
\begin{array}{r}
\mathbf{W}=\left[\mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{bt}}\left(\mathbf{X}_{\mathrm{v}-\mathrm{v}}\right) / \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{1}}+\left(\mathbf{F}\left(\mathbf{X}_{\mathrm{v}-\mathrm{p}}\right) \mathbf{L}\right) / \mathbf{K}_{2}\right] \times \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{i}} \\
\qquad \begin{array}{llrr|}
\hline \mathbf{W}= & 37 & 37 & 0 \\
& \text { Veh } & \text { Ped } \\
\text { NOT Warranted }
\end{array} \\
\hline
\end{array}
$$

2005 Canadian Traffic Signal Warrant Matrix Analysis
Table A-4-Beaver Bank Road @ Trinity Lane / Barrett Road Projected 2024 Background Traffic Volumes with Site Development


| Other input |  | Speed <br> $(\mathrm{Km} / \mathrm{h})$ | Trucks <br> $\%$ | Bus Rt <br> $(\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{nt})$ | Median <br> $(\mathrm{m})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Beaver Bank Road | NS | 70 | $2.0 \%$ | n | 0.0 |
| Trinity Lane | EW | 50 | $2.0 \%$ | n |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ped1 | Ped2 | Ped3 | Ped4 |
|  | NS | NS | EW | EW |
|  | W Side | E Side | N Side | S side |
| $7: 00-8: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $8: 00-9: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $11: 30-12: 30$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $12: 30-13: 30$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $15: 30-16: 30$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16:30-17:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total (6-hour peak) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Average (6-hour peak) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |



| Traffic Input | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | $\overline{W B}$ |  |  | EB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT | LT | Th | RT |
| 7:00-8:00 | 0 | 80 | 5 | 5 | 325 | 0 | 55 | 0 | 15 | 5 | 0 | 10 |
| 8:00-9:00 | 5 | 155 | 5 | 5 | 285 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| 11:30-12:30 | 5 | 145 | 15 | 5 | 185 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 10 |
| 12:30-13:30 | 5 | 200 | 10 | 10 | 195 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 10 |
| 15:30-16:30 | 10 | 370 | 35 | 25 | 185 | 5 | 25 | 0 | 15 | 5 | 0 | 10 |
| 16:30-17:30 | 10 | 420 | 35 | 20 | 220 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Total (6-hour peak) | 35 | 1.370 | 105 | 70 | 1,395 | 5 | 195 | 0 | 70 | 25 | 0 | 55 |
| Average (6-hour peak) | 6 | 228 | 18 | 12 | 233 | 1 | 33 | 0 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 9 |



$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{r}
\mathrm{W}=\left[\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{bt}}\left(\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{v}-\mathrm{v}}\right) / \mathrm{K}_{1}+\left(\mathrm{F}\left(\mathbf{X}_{\mathrm{v}-\mathrm{p}}\right) \mathrm{L}\right) / \mathrm{K}_{2}\right] \times \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{i}} \\
\qquad \begin{array}{lrr|}
\hline \mathbf{W}= & 15 & 0 \\
& \text { Veh } & \text { Ped } \\
\text { Not Warranted - } \mathrm{Vs}<75
\end{array}
\end{array} \\
& \text { Not Warranted - Vs }<75
\end{aligned}
$$
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Figure A-3 Beaver Bank, NS
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Figure A-4
Intersection Performance

Appendix B - Intersection Performance Analysis 2: Beaver Bank Road \& Barrett Road/Trinity Lane

Page B-1
2024 AM Peak Hour Without Site Development

| Movement | EBL | $\rightarrow$ EBT | EBR | WBL | - WBT | WBR | NBL | 4 NBT | NBR | SBL | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{ }{ }^{\text {SBT }}$ | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | \$ |  |  | * |  |  | 4 |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 5 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 155 | 5 | 5 | 285 | 0 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 5 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 168 | 5 | 5 | 310 | 0 |
| 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 | 503 | 505 | 310 | 508 | 503 | 171 | 310 |  |  | 174 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 503 | 505 | 310 | 508 | 503 | 171 | 310 |  |  | 174 |  |  |
| tC , single ( s ) | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 99 | 100 | 99 | 99 | 100 | 100 | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 476 | 465 | 730 | 469 | 467 | 873 | 1251 |  |  | 1403 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane\# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 11 | 5 | 179 | 315 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 576 | 469 | 1251 | 1403 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 11.4 | 12.8 | 0.3 | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | B | B | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 11.4 | 12.8 | 0.3 | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | B | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Ut |  |  | 27.1\% |  | Level | Servic |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | WBL | 4 WBR | N $\uparrow$ | NBR | SBL | $\downarrow$ SBT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% |  | f |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 55 | 5 | 120 | 10 | 5 | 480 |  |
| 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) | 60 | 5 | 130 | 11 | 5 | 522 |  |
| 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 | 668 | 136 |  |  | 141 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 668 | 136 |  |  | 141 |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 86 | 99 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 421 | 913 |  |  | 1442 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane\# | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 65 | 141 | 527 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 60 | 0 | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 5 | 11 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 441 | 1700 | 1442 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.15 | 0.08 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 3.9 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 14.6 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | B |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 14.6 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 1.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Uti |  |  | 39.3\% |  | ICU Level | f Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | $\rightarrow$ | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | ¢ SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | \$ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | * |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 10 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 420 | 15 | 0 | 220 | 0 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 11 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 457 | 16 | 0 | 239 | 0 |
| 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 | 731 | 734 | 239 | 731 | 726 | 465 | 239 |  |  | 473 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 731 | 734 | 239 | 731 | 726 | 465 | 239 |  |  | 473 |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{tF}(\mathrm{s})$ | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 97 | 100 | 99 | 98 | 100 | 99 | 99 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 332 | 345 | 800 | 333 | 348 | 598 | 1328 |  |  | 1089 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 16 | 11 | 484 | 239 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 11 | 5 | 11 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 5 | 5 | 16 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 413 | 428 | 1328 | 1089 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 14.1 | 13.6 | 0.3 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | B | B | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 14.1 | 13.6 | 0.3 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | B | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 0.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Util |  |  | 41.1\% |  | Level | of Servic |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | ${ }_{\text {WBL }}$ | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | $\stackrel{\text { SBT }}{\downarrow}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% |  | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 35 | 5 | 540 | 70 | 5 | 250 |  |
| 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) | 38 | 5 | 587 | 76 | 5 | 272 |  |
| 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 | 908 | 625 |  |  | 663 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 908 | 625 |  |  | 663 |  |  |
| 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 \% | 87 | 99 |  |  | 99 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 304 | 485 |  |  | 926 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 43 | 663 | 277 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 38 | 0 | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 5 | 76 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 319 | 1700 | 926 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.14 | 0.39 | 0.01 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 18.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | C |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 18.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Ut |  |  | 42.7\% |  | CU Leve | f Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | $\rightarrow$ | EBR | ${ }_{\text {WBL }}$ | - WBT |  | 4 | $\dagger$ NBT | NBR | SBL | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\downarrow}$ | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\text { SBR }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 5 | 0 | 5 | 46 | 0 | 15 | 5 | 155 | 12 | 10 | 285 | 5 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 5 | 0 | 5 | 50 | 0 | 16 | 5 | 168 | 13 | 11 | 310 | 5 |
| 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 | 536 | 527 | 312 | 526 | 523 | 175 | 315 |  |  | 182 |  |  |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 536 | 527 | 312 | 526 | 523 | 175 | 315 |  |  | 182 |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 99 | 100 | 99 | 89 | 100 | 98 | 100 |  |  | 99 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 442 | 451 | 728 | 455 | 453 | 868 | 1245 |  |  | 1394 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 11 | 66 | 187 | 326 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 5 | 50 | 5 | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 5 | 16 | 13 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 550 | 515 | 1245 | 1394 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.02 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 0.5 | 3.3 | 0.1 | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 11.7 | 13.0 | 0.3 | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | B | B | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 11.7 | 13.0 | 0.3 | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | B | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 1.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Util |  |  | 31.6\% |  | U Leve | of Service |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Appendix B - Intersection Performance Analysis
Page B-6 6: Beaver Bank Road \& Mayflower Avenue

| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | $\underset{\text { NBR }}{ }$ |  | $\downarrow$ SBT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 150 | 5 | 127 | 49 | 5 | 521 |  |
| 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) | 163 | 5 | 138 | 53 | 5 | 566 |  |
| 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 | 742 | 165 |  |  | 191 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 742 | 165 |  |  | 191 |  |  |
| 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 \% | 57 | 99 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 382 | 880 |  |  | 1382 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 168 | 191 | 572 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 163 | 0 | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 5 | 53 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 389 | 1700 | 1382 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.43 | 0.11 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th ( $m$ ) | 16.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 21.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | C |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 21.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 3.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Util |  |  | 46.7\% |  | CU Level | fervice | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | 4 NBT | NBR | SBL | $\dagger$ SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | 4 |  |  | \& |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 10 | 0 | 5 | 32 | 0 | 15 | 10 | 420 | 38 | 17 | 220 | 0 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 11 | 0 | 5 | 35 | 0 | 16 | 11 | 457 | 41 | 18 | 239 | 0 |
| 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 | 791 | 796 | 239 | 780 | 775 | 477 | 239 |  |  | 498 |  |  |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 791 | 796 | 239 | 780 | 775 | 477 | 239 |  |  | 498 |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 96 | 100 | 99 | 89 | 100 | 97 | 99 |  |  | 98 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 293 | 312 | 800 | 304 | 321 | 588 | 1328 |  |  | 1066 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 16 | 51 | 509 | 258 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 11 | 35 | 11 | 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 5 | 16 | 41 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 371 | 360 | 1328 | 1066 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.04 | 0.14 | 0.01 | 0.02 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 1.0 | 3.7 | 0.2 | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 15.1 | 16.7 | 0.3 | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | C | C | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 15.1 | 16.7 | 0.3 | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 1.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utiliz |  |  | 37.0\% |  | Level | S Servic |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



