

To:	Chair and Members of Rothesay Planning Advisory Committee
From:	Brian L. White, MCIP, RPP
	Director of Planning and Development Services
Date:	Friday, July 02, 2021
Subject:	Supplemental Report - 48 Unit Apartment Building – Rezoning Chapel Road (PID 30206882)

Applicant:	Sean Hall & Luke Moffett	Property Owner:	637339 NB Inc.
Mailing Address:	76 Highland Avenue Rothesay NB E2E 5N3	Mailing Address:	317 Hampton Road Quispamsis NB E2E 4M9
Property Location:	Chapel Road	PID:	30206882
Plan Designation:	Commercial	Zone:	General Commercial
Application For:	48 Unit Apartment Building		
Input from Other Sources:	Operations, KVFD, KRPF,	Anglophone South I	District School Board

RECOMMENDATION:

PAC HEREBY removes from the TABLE the rezoning application of the lands located off Chapel Drive (PID 30206882) to allow for the development a 48-unit apartment building subject to the execution of a Development Agreement.

ORIGIN:

At the regular meeting of PAC May 3rd, 2021 PAC tabled the application for a 48 unit apartment building located off Chapel Road pending the receipt of a supplemental staff report containing the following:

- 1. Traffic impact assessment results and review;
- 2. Polling results;
- 3. Review by KVFD; and
- 4. Draft development agreement and rezoning By-law.

BACKGROUND:

Staff have received the traffic impact statement and revised architectural drawings (see Attachment A) for the application to develop a 48 unit apartment building on the $1\frac{1}{2}$ acre vacant lot off Chapel Road. Staff's review of the supplemental information is contained in the sections that follow.

TRAFFIC IMPACT

Staff did review the submitted Traffic Impact Statement (Attachment B) and have reviewed the findings with the applicant. Staff's major concern was the level of service (LOS) with the development on the Chapel Road / Marr Road intersection. The report states "that delays at the southbound approach of the Chapel Road / Marr Road intersection will increase slightly (4 - 8 seconds per vehicle); however the approach will remain below capacity and the intersection will continue to perform efficiently overall." The report continues to conclude, "Traffic signals are not warranted at the intersection in the 2027 horizon period." Notwithstanding, the study's conclusion regarding the need for traffic signals Staff have included a clause with the development agreement (Attachment A) that secures a capital cost

contribution toward signalization should conditions arise that require Rothesay to implement traffic signals.

POLLING RESULTS

Staff circulated polling letters to inform the immediate neighbours of the application and to invite any comments they may wish to make with respect to the application. As of July 2, 2021 no comments were received by Staff as a result of our polling efforts.

KENNEBECASIS VALLEY FIRE DEPARTMENT:

As is required by Municipal Plan **Policy FR-7**, the KVFD must review proposals for new development projects to ensure that public safety and firefighting concerns are addressed. The KVFD reviewed the proposal and are satisfied that the proposal fulfills their requirements.



Figure 1 – Revised Rendering 48 unit Apt Building – ZZAP Architecture + Planning

DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT:

A development agreement is a contract between Rothesay and the property owner that specifies the details and obligations of the individual parties concerning the proposed development. The draft development agreement is Attachment A. 2. The Development Agreement requires that the proposed building as seen before PAC and Council will be constructed in conformance the details and Schedules attached to the agreement as follows:

Schedule A	Legal Description of Parcels
Schedule B	Proposed Site Plan and Location of Building
Schedule C	Building Elevations (4)
Schedule D	Landscape Plan
Schedule E	Storm Water Management Plan

Staff would like draw special attention to Parts 5 through 11 of the agreement which layout the mechanisms by which the affordable housing component of the project will regulated. As noted in the

previous report Staff were concerned that the proposed methodology could result in rents as high as \$2200 and be deemed "affordable". Staff have consulted with CMHC and other municipalities to determine the most effective approach to ensuring the agreed rental rates. Staff also note that the developer is unable to access the Affordable Rental Housing Program or Provincial Rent Supplement Assistance Program with the Province of New Brunswick, for that reason, Staff have created agreement clauses as follows:

- 1. The Developer agrees to maintain for a period of twenty (20) years, calculated from the first day of building occupancy, no less than 8 affordable 2 bedroom apartment units with monthly rental rates based at or below 30% of the Single Parent Median Income in Rothesay as determined by the most recent available data from Statistics Canada.
- 2. The Developer further agrees that once the base rents are established in the first year of occupancy, they can only be raised by the higher of Consumer Price Index (CPI).
- 3. The Developer agrees to provide to Rothesay an annual audit or legal affidavit prepared by a licensed member of the Chartered Professional Accountants of New Brunswick that provides reasonable assurance that an audit conducted of the affordable units complies with this agreement in accordance with Canadian generally accepted auditing standards.

APPROVAL PROCESS:

The application is rezone the subject property to the R-4 Multi-Unit Residential Zone to permit a 48unit apartment building by development agreement. The application is being reviewed pursuant to the policies of Rothesay Municipal Plan 1-20. The standard procedure for a rezoning is that Council receive from PAC a recommendation to hold a Public Hearing and that both the rezoning (by-law amendment) and the development agreement be prepared in advance of the public hearing.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommend the Planning Advisory Committee consider the following MOTION:

The Rothesay Planning Advisory Committee HEREBY recommends that Rothesay Council schedule a public hearing to consider rezoning the lands located off Chapel Drive (PID 30206882) from General Commercial (GC) to Multi-Unit Residential (R4) to allow for the development a 48 unit apartment building subject to the execution of a Development Agreement in accordance with the Community Planning Act.

Map 1Location MapAttachment AProposed Development Agreement & By-lawAttachment BTraffic Study

Report Prepared by: Brian L. White, MCIP, RPP Date: Friday, July 02, 2021





BY-LAW 2-10-28 A BY-LAW TO AMEND THE ZONING BY-LAW (No.2-10 Rothesay)

The Council of the town of Rothesay, under authority vested in it by the <u>Community</u> <u>Planning Act</u>, and amendments thereto, hereby amends By-Law 2-10 "Rothesay Zoning By-law" and enacts as follows:

That Schedule A, entitled "Zoning" as attached to By-Law 2-10 "ROTHESAY ZONING BY-LAW" is hereby amended, as identified on the attached sketch, identified as Attachment "2-10-28".

The purpose of the amendment is to rezone lands located off Chapel Drive (PID 30206882) from General Commercial (GC) to Multi-Unit Residential (R4) to allow for the development a 48-unit apartment building subject to the execution of a Development Agreement in accordance with the <u>Community Planning Act</u>, supra.

FIRST READING BY TITLE:SECOND READING BY TITLE:READ IN ENTIRETY:THIRD READING BY TITLE:AND ENACTED:

MAYOR

CLERK

Attachment - Bylaw 2-10- G Subject Property - PID:30206882



Rothesay

DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT

Land Titles Act, S.N.B. 1981, c.L-1.1, s.24

Parcel Identifier of Parcel Burdened by Agreement:	30206882
Owner of Land Parcels:	637339 N.B. INC. Tammy Moffett, Director 76 Highland Avenue Rothesay NB E2E 5N9 (Hereinafter called the "Developer")
Agreement with:	Rothesay 70 Hampton Road Rothesay, N.B. E2E 5L5 (Hereinafter called the "Town")
	a body corporate under and by virtue of the Local Governance Act, RSNB 2021, Chapter 18, located in the County of Kings and Province of New

WHEREAS the Developer is the registered owner of certain lands located off Chapel Road (PID 30206882) and which said lands are more particularly described in Schedule A hereto (hereinafter called the "Lands");

Brunswick

AND WHEREAS the Developer is now desirous of entering into an development agreement to allow for the development of a forty-eight (48) unit apartment building with underground parking on the Lands as described in Schedules B through D. (herein after called the "Project")

AND WHEREAS Rothesay Council did, on **INSERT DATE**, authorize the Mayor and Clerk to enter into a Development Agreement with 637339 N.B. INC. to develop a residential apartment complex on the Lands.

NOW THEREFORE THIS AGREEMENT WITNESSETH that for and in the consideration of the mutual covenants and agreements herein expressed and contained, the parties hereto covenant and agree as follows:

1. The Developer agrees that the number of residential units situated on the Lands shall not exceed forty-eight (48) residential apartment units.

Schedules

- 2. The Developer agrees to develop the Lands in a manner, which, in the opinion of the Development Officer, is generally in conformance with the following Schedules attached to this Agreement:
 - a. Schedule A Legal Description of Parcels
 - b. Schedule B Proposed Site Plan and Location of Building
 - c. Schedule C Building Elevations (4)
 - d. Schedule D Landscape Plan
 - e. Schedule E Storm Water Management Plan

Site Development

- 3. The Developer agrees that except as otherwise provided for herein the use of the Lands shall comply with the requirements of the Rothesay Zoning By-law and Subdivision By-law, as may be amended from time to time.
- 4. The Developer agrees to develop the Lands in a manner, which, in the

opinion of the Development Officer, is generally in conformance with Schedules B, C, D and E.

Affordable Housing

- 5. The Developer agrees to maintain for a period of twenty (20) years, calculated from the first day of building occupancy, no fewer than 8 'affordable' 2 bedroom apartment units with monthly rental rates based at or below 30% of the Single Parent Median Income in Rothesay as determined by the most recent available data from Statistics Canada.
- 6. The Developer further agrees that once the base rents for the affordable are established in the first year of occupancy, they can only be raised by a maximum of the Consumer Price Index (CPI), annual average not seasonally adjusted for Saint John, N.B.
- 7. The Developer agrees to provide to Rothesay an annual audit or legal affidavit prepared by a licensed member of the Chartered Professional Accountants of New Brunswick that provides reasonable assurance that an audit conducted of the affordable units complies with this agreement in accordance with Canadian generally accepted auditing standards.
- 8. The Developer agrees to bear all costs associated with the annual audit or legal affidavit referenced in paragraph 7 and to fully cooperate with Rothesay relating to such audit monitoring and evaluation.
- 9. The Developer agrees that during the full Term of this Agreement, that any failure by the Developer to maintain the affordability provisions as set out in paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 or any other violation of any material term of the affordability principles shall constitute a default under this Agreement.
- 10. The Developer agrees that upon any such default, Rothesay may demand that Developer pay to Rothesay an amount equal to twice the difference of the actual rent received and the maximum amount of rent permitted under clause 6. The Developer agrees to pay interest on any balance in arrears at the rate of 1.25% percent per month compounded monthly.
- 11. Rothesay and the Developer agree that nothing contained in this agreement shall make or be construed to make any tenant or resident of the Project the responsibility of Rothesay.

Universal Design Barrier-Free Apartments

- 12. The Developer agrees to construct two (2) apartments utilizing Universal Design principles to achieve an accessible barrier-free standard to the satisfaction of the Development Officer in consultation with the Town's Building Inspector.
- 13. The Developer agrees that the building occupancy permit shall not be granted by Rothesay until the requirements set out in paragraph 12 are substantially completed and approved by Rothesay.

Architectural Guidelines

- 14. The Developer agrees that an objective of this development is to provide a high quality and visually attractive development, which exhibits an architectural design that reinforces the community character and that is generally consistent with the existing styles of housing in Rothesay. The Developer agrees to ensure the following:
 - a. The architectural design of the building shall be, in the opinion of the Development Officer, generally in conformance with Schedule C.
 - b. All exterior mounted ventilation and related mechanical equipment, including roof mechanical units, shall be concealed by screening in a

manner to reduce clutter and negative impacts on the architectural character of the building.

Storm Water

- 15. The Developer shall carry out, subject to inspection and approval by Town representatives, the installation of a storm water system as per Schedule E of this agreement. The Developer agrees to accept responsibility for all costs associated such installation including the following:
 - a. Construction, to Town standards, of a storm water system including pipes, fittings, precast sections for manholes and catch basins capable of removing surface water from the entire developed portion of the lands to a predetermined location selected by the Developer's Engineer and approved by the Town Engineer,
 - b. topsoil and hydro-seeding of shoulders of roadways.
- 16. The Developer agrees to submit for approval by the Town, prior to commencing any work on the storm water system such plans, as required by the Town, that shall conform with the design schematics and construction standards of the Town, unless otherwise acceptable to the Town Engineer.
- 17. The Developer agrees that all roof leaders, down spouts, and other storm water drains from the building, parking lot and landscape features shall not be directed or otherwise connected or discharged directly to the Town's storm water or sanitary collection system.
- 18. The Developer agrees to provide to the Town Engineer written certification of a Professional Engineer, licensed to practice in New Brunswick that the storm water system has been satisfactorily completed and constructed in accordance with the Town specifications.

Traffic Signals – Cost Contribution

- 19. The Developer agrees to pay to Rothesay upon receipt of an invoice an amount not exceeding thirty-three percent (33%) of the actual cost incurred and expended by Rothesay for traffic signalization including, curbing, sidewalks, road widening, traffic lights, poles, controllers, accessories, electrical equipment and appurtenances necessary for their installation and initial operation, installed at the intersection of Marr Road and Chapel Drive.
- 20. Rothesay and the Developer agree that the capital cost contribution obligation (paragraph 19) shall expire in twenty 20 years from the date of the execution of this agreement should Rothesay not proceed with the traffic signalization as referenced in paragraph 20.
- 21. The Town and Developer agree that the design and construction of the intersection and related improvements shall be solely determined by the Town.

Water Supply

- 22. The Developer agrees to connect to the Town's nearest and existing water system at a point to be determined by the Town Engineer and utilizing methods of connection approved by the Town Engineer.
- 23. The Town agrees to supply potable water for the purposes and for those purposes only for a maximum of forty-eight (48) residential dwellings and for minor and accessory purposes incidental thereto and for no other purposes whatsoever.
- 24. The Developer agrees to pay the Town a fee for connection of the building to the Town water system including sprinkler feed to the Town water system calculated in the manner set out in By-law 1-18, Rothesay Water

By-law as amended from time to time, to be paid to the Town twelve (12) months following the issuance of the building permit.

- 25. The Developer agrees that the Town does not guarantee and nothing in this Agreement shall be deemed a guarantee of an uninterrupted supply or of a sufficient or uniform water pressure or a defined quality of water. The Town shall not be liable to the Developer or to any person, firm or corporation for any damage or injury caused by the interruption of the supply of water, the lack of uniform pressure thereof or the quality of water.
- 26. The Developer agrees that all connections to the Town water mains shall be approved and inspected by the Town Engineer or such other person as is designated by the Town prior to backfilling and that the operation of water system valves is the sole responsibility of the Town.
- 27. The Developer agrees to comply with the Town's Water By-law and furthermore that a separate water meter shall be installed, at their expense, for each residential connection made to the Town's water system.
- 28. The Developer agrees that the Town may terminate the Developer's connection to the Town water system in the event that the Town determines that the Developer is drawing water for an unauthorized purpose or for any other use that the Town deems in its absolute discretion or if an invoice for water service is more than 90 days in arrears..
- 29. The Developer agrees to provide, prior to the occupation of any buildings or portions thereof, written certification of a Professional Engineer, licensed to practice in New Brunswick that the connection of service laterals and the connection to the existing Town water system have been satisfactorily completed and constructed in accordance with the Town specifications.

Sanitary Sewer

- 30. The Developer agrees to connect to the existing sanitary sewer system at a point to be determined by the Town Engineer and utilizing methods of connection approved by the Town Engineer.
- 31. The Developer agrees to pay the Town a fee for connection to the Town sewer system calculated in the manner set out in By-law 1-15 Rothesay Sewage By-law, as amended from time to time, to be paid to the Town twelve (12) months following the issuance of the building permit.
- 32. The Developer agrees to carry out subject to inspection and approval by Town representatives, and pay for the entire actual costs of Engineering design, supply, installation, inspection and construction of all service lateral(s) necessary to connect to the existing sanitary sewer system inclusive of all pipes, laterals, fittings, and precast concrete units.
- 33. The Developer agrees to submit for approval by the Town, prior to commencing any work to connect to the sanitary sewer system, any plans required by the Town, with each such plan meeting the requirements as described in the Town specifications for such development.
- 34. The Developer agrees that all connections to the Town sanitary sewer system shall be supervised by the Developer's engineer and inspected by the Town Engineer or such other person as is designated by the Town prior to backfilling and shall occur at the sole expense of the Developer.

Retaining Walls

- 35. The Developer agrees that dry-stacked segmental concrete (masonry block) gravity walls shall be the preferred method of retaining wall construction for the purpose of erosion control or slope stability on the Lands and furthermore that the use of metal wire basket cages filled with rock (gabions) is not an acceptable method of retaining wall construction.
- 36. The Developer agrees to obtain from the Town a Building Permit for any

retaining wall, as required on the Lands, in excess of 1.2 meters in height and that such retaining walls will be designed by a Professional Engineer, licensed to practice in New Brunswick.

Indemnification

37. The Developer does hereby indemnify and save harmless the Town from all manner of claims or actions by third parties arising out of the work performed hereunder, and the Developer shall file with the Town prior to the commencement of any work hereunder a certificate of insurance naming the Town as co-insured evidencing a policy of comprehensive general liability coverage on "an occurrence basis" and containing a cross-liability clause which policy has a limit of not less than Two Million Dollars (\$2,000,000.⁰⁰). The aforesaid certificate must provide that the coverage shall stay in force and not be amended, canceled or allowed to lapse within thirty (30) days prior to notice in writing being given to the Town. The aforesaid insurance coverage must remain in full force and effect during the period available to the Developer pursuant to this agreement to complete the work set out as described in this Agreement.

Notice

38. Any notice or advice which is to be given under this Agreement shall be deemed to have been satisfactorily given to the Developer if delivered personally or by prepaid mail addressed to **637339 N.B. INC.**, 76 Highland Avenue, Rothesay NB, E2E 5N9 and to the Town if delivered personally or by prepaid mail addressed to **ROTHESAY**, 70 HAMPTON ROAD, ROTHESAY, NEW BRUNSWICK, E2E 5L5. In the event of notice by prepaid mail, the notice will be deemed to have been received four (4) days following its posting.

By-laws

39. The Developer agrees to be bound by and to act in accordance with the By-laws of the Town as amended from time to time and such other laws and regulations that apply or that may apply in the future to the site and to activities carried out thereon.

Termination

- 40. The Town reserves the right and the Developer agrees that the Town has the right to terminate this Agreement without compensation to the Developer if the specific proposal has not been completed on or before <u>INSERT DATE</u> being a date 5 years (60 months) from the date of Council's decision to enter into this Agreement. Accordingly, the Agreement shall have no further force or effect and henceforth the development of the Lands shall conform to the provisions of the Rothesay Zoning By-law.
- 41. Notwithstanding paragraph 40, the Parties agree that the development shall be deemed to have commenced if within a period of not less than three (3) months prior to **INSERT DATE** the construction of the municipal service infrastructure has begun and that such construction is deemed by the Development Officer in consultation with the Town Engineer as being continued through to completion as continuously and expeditiously as deemed reasonable.
- 42. The Developer agrees that should the Town terminate this Agreement the Town may call the Letter of Credit described herein and apply the proceeds to the cost of completing the work or portions thereof as outlined in this Agreement. If there are amounts remaining after the completion of the work in accordance with this Agreement, the remainder of the proceeds shall be returned to the Institution issuing the Letter of Credit. If the proceeds of the Letter of Credit are insufficient to compensate the Town for the costs of completing the work mentioned in this Agreement, the Developer shall promptly on receipt of an invoice pay to the Town the full amount owing as required to complete the work.

Security & Occupancy

- 43. The Town and Developer agree that Final Occupancy of the proposed building(s), as required in the Building By-law, shall not occur until all conditions above have been met to the satisfaction of the Development Officer and an Occupancy Permit has been issued.
- 44. Notwithstanding Schedule D and E of this Agreement, the Town agrees that the Occupancy Permit may be issued provided the Developer supplies a security deposit in the amount of one hundred twenty percent (120%) of the estimated cost to complete the required storm water management and landscaping. The security deposit shall comply with the following conditions:
 - a. security in the form of an automatically renewing, irrevocable letter of credit issued by a chartered bank dispensed to and in favour of Rothesay;
 - b. Rothesay may use the security to complete the work as set out in Schedule D and E of this Agreement including landscaping or storm water works not completed within a period not exceeding six (6) months from the date of issuance of the Occupancy Permit;
 - c. all costs exceeding the security necessary to complete the work as set out in Schedule D and E this Agreement shall be reimbursed to Rothesay; and
 - d. any unused portion of the security shall be returned to the Developer upon certification that the work has been completed and acceptable to the Development Officer.

Failure to Comply

- 45. The Developer agrees that after sixty (60) days written notice by the Town regarding the failure of the Developer to observe or perform any covenant or condition of this Agreement, then in each such case:
 - (a) The Town shall be entitled to apply to any court of competent jurisdiction for injunctive relief including an order prohibiting the Developer from continuing such default and the Developer hereby submits to the jurisdiction of such Court and waives any defense based upon the allegation that damages would be an adequate remedy;
 - (b) The Town may enter onto the Lands and perform any of the covenants contained in this Agreement or take such remedial action as is considered necessary to correct a breach of the Agreement, whereupon all reasonable expenses whether arising out of the entry onto the Lands or from the performance of the covenants or remedial action, shall be a first lien on the Lands and be shown on any tax certificate issued under the Assessment Act;
 - (c) The Town may, by resolution of Council, discharge this Agreement whereupon this Agreement shall have no further force or effect and henceforth the development of the Lands shall conform with the provisions of the Land Use By-law; and/or
 - (d) In addition to the above remedies, the Town reserves the right to pursue any other remediation under the *Community Planning Act* or Common Law in order to ensure compliance with this Agreement.

Entire Agreement

46. This Agreement contains the whole agreement between the parties hereto and supersedes any prior agreement as regards the lands outlined in the plan hereto annexed.

Severability

47. If any paragraph or part of this agreement is found to be beyond the powers

of the Town Council to execute, such paragraph or part or item shall be deemed to be severable and all other paragraphs or parts of this agreement shall be deemed to be separate and independent therefrom and to be agreed as such.

Reasonableness

48. Both parties agree to act reasonably in connection with any matter, action, decision, comment or approval required or contemplated under this Agreement.

This Agreement shall be binding upon and endure to the benefit of the Parties

hereto and their respective heirs, administrators, successors and assigns.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, each of the parties set out below has caused this Agreement, made in duplicate, to be duly executed by its respective, duly authorized officer(s) as of ______, 2021.

Witness:

637339 N.B. INC.

Tammy Moffett, Director

Witness:

Rothesay:

Nancy E. Grant, Mayor

Mary Jane E. Banks, Clerk

Development Agreement

SCHEDULE A

PID: 30206882

Form 45

AFFIDAVIT OF CORPORATE EXECUTION

Land Titles Act, S.N.B. 1981, c.L-1.1, s.55

Deponent:	Tammy Moffett 76 Highland Avenue Rothesay NB E2E 5N9
Office Held by Deponent:	Director
Corporation:	637339 N.B. INC.

Place of Execution:	Rothesay, Province of New Brunswick.
Date of Execution:	, 2021

I, **Tammy Moffett**, the deponent, make oath and say:

- 1. That I hold the office specified above in the corporation specified above, and am authorized to make this affidavit and have personal knowledge of the matters hereinafter deposed to;
- 2. That the attached instrument was executed by me as the officer(s) duly authorized to execute the instrument on behalf of the corporation;
- 3. the signature "**Tammy Moffett**" subscribed to the within instrument is the signature of me and is in the proper handwriting of me, this deponent.
- 4. the Seal affixed to the foregoing indenture is the official seal of the said Corporation was so affixed by order of the Board of Directors of the Corporation to and for the uses and purposes therein expressed and contained;
- 5. That the instrument was executed at the place and on the date specified above;

)

)

)

)

DECLARED TO at Rothesay, in the County of Kings, and Province of New Brunswick, This ____ day of _____, 2021 BEFORE ME:

Commissioner of Oaths

Tammy Moffett

Development Agreement

Form 45

AFFIDAVIT OF CORPORATE EXECUTION

Land Titles Act, S.N.B. 1981, c.L-1.1, s.55

Deponent:	MARY JANE E. BANKS
	Rothesay 70 Hampton Road Rothesay, N.B. E2E 5L5
Office Held by Deponent:	Clerk
Corporation:	Rothesay
Other Officer Who Executed the Instrument:	NANCY E. GRANT Rothesay 70 Hampton Road Rothesay, N.B. E2E 5L5
Office Held by Other Officer Who Executed the Instrument:	Mayor
Place of Execution:	Rothesay, Province of New Brunswick.
Date of Execution:	, 2021

I, MARY JANE E. BANKS, the deponent, make oath and say:

- 1. That I hold the office specified above in the corporation specified above, and am authorized to make this affidavit and have personal knowledge of the matters hereinafter deposed to;
- 6. That the attached instrument was executed by me and **NANCY E. GRANT**, the other officer specified above, as the officer(s) duly authorized to execute the instrument on behalf of the corporation;
- 7. The signature "**NANCY E. GRANT**" subscribed to the within instrument is the signature of Nancy E. Grant, who is the Mayor of the town of Rothesay, and the signature "**Mary Jane E. Banks**" subscribed to the within instrument as Clerk is the signature of me and is in the proper handwriting of me, this deponent, and was hereto subscribed pursuant to resolution of the Council of the said Town to and for the uses and purposes therein expressed and contained;
- 8. The Seal affixed to the foregoing indenture is the official seal of the said Town and was so affixed by order of the Council of the said Town, to and for the uses and purposes therein expressed and contained;
- 9. That the instrument was executed at the place and on the date specified above;

)

DECLARED TO at town of Rothesay, in the County of Kings, and Province of New Brunswick, This ____ day of _____, 2021

BEFORE ME:

Commissioner of Oaths

MARY JANE E. BANKS



	EXTERIOR MATERIALS LEGEND
1	MASONRY VENNEER
2	ALUMINUM CURTAIN WALL SYSTEM
3	PREFINISHED CLADDING TYPE I_COLOUR I_PROFILE I
4	PREFINISHED CLADDING TYPE I_COLOUR II_PROFILE I
5	PREFINISHED CLADDING TYPE I_COLOUR III_PROFILE II
6	PREFINISHED CLADDING TYPE II
7	ALUMINUM FRAMED GLASS GUARD
8	ARCHITECTURAL CONCRETE
9	PATIO DOOR
10	PVC WINDOW

NOTE: CLADDING TO BE NON-COMBUSTIBLE, NON-VINYL TYPE.

ROOF PARAPET <u>RO</u>OF 78.54m (4) 4) 12'-0" 6) 6 10 LVL 4 10 10 10'-0" 10 9 -3 (7 <u>LV</u>L 3 (5) 10'-0" 48'-0" (5) LVL 2 I I I I 11'-10" (4) 2 (1)(8) LVL 1 AV.GRADE 63.94m WALL MOUNTED LIGHTING FIXTURE EGRESS EXIT MAIN RESIDENTIAL -EGRESS - EXIT <u>LVL P1</u> ENTRANCE SOFFIT MOUNTED LIGHTING FIXTURE SOFFIT MOUNTED LIGHTING FIXTURE PROJECTED CANOPY



2021July12OpenSessionFINAL_213

2021July12OpenSessionFINAL_214

	EXTERIOR MATERIALS LEGEND
1	MASONRY VENNEER
2	ALUMINUM CURTAIN WALL SYSTEM
3	PREFINISHED CLADDING TYPE I_COLOUR I_PROFILE I
4	PREFINISHED CLADDING TYPE I_COLOUR II_PROFILE I
5	PREFINISHED CLADDING TYPE I_COLOUR III_PROFILE II
6	PREFINISHED CLADDING TYPE II
7	ALUMINUM FRAMED GLASS GUARD
8	ARCHITECTURAL CONCRETE
9	PATIO DOOR
10	PVC WINDOW

NOTE: CLADDING TO BE NON-COMBUSTIBLE, NON-VINYL TYPE.



SOUTH ELEVATION









SOFFIT MOUNTED LIGHTING FIXTURE LVL P1









2021July12OpenSessionFINAL_220



CHAPEL ROAD APARTMENT TRAFFIC IMPACT STATEMENT

Traffic Impact Study Proj. No.2104646 May 5, 2021 Revision No.: 0

James Avery Grace



Prepared by:

Jill DeMerchant, P.Eng., M.Eng. Transportation Engineer Civil and Transportation Engineering

Reviewed by:

Ryan Esligar, P.Eng., M.Sc.E. Team Leader - Transportation Engineering Civil and Transportation Engineering

CONFIDENTIALITY

"This report can only be used for the purposes stated therein. Any use of the report must take into consideration the objective and scope of the mandate by virtue of which the report was prepared, as well as the limitations and conditions specified therein and the state of scientific knowledge at the time the report was prepared. Englobe Corp. provides no warranty and makes no representations other than those expressly contained in the report.

No information contained in this report can be used by any third party without the prior written authorization of Englobe Corp. Englobe Corp. disclaims any responsibility or liability for any unauthorized reproduction, distribution, adaptation or use of the report."



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
	1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND1.2 STUDY TASKS1.3 HORIZON YEAR	1 3 3
2	INFORMATION GATHERING	4
	2.1 STREET AND DEVELOPMENT CHARACTERISTICS2.2 TRAFFIC DATA AND COVID ADJUSTMENTS	4 4
3	EXISTING LEVEL OF SERVICE	6
	3.1 LEVEL OF SERVICE CRITERIA3.2 EXISTING LOS ANALYSIS3.3 FUTURE BACKGROUND LOS ANALYSIS	6 7 7
4	DEVELOPMENT TRAFFIC GENERATION	10
	4.1 TRAFFIC GENERATION AND ASSIGNMENT4.2 EFFECT OF REZONING	10 13
5 6	LOS ANALYSIS WITH DEVELOPMENT ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS	14 17
	6.1 EXISTING PARKING LOT CIRCULATION6.2 PEDESTRIAN ACCESS6.3 COMMERCIAL VEHICLE ACCESS	17 18 18
7	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	19



2021July12OpenSessionFINAL_223

TABLES

Table 1 – COVID-19 Adjustment Factors ······4
Table 2 – Intersection Level of Service Criteria
Table 3 – 2021 Existing LOS Results 8
Table 4 – 2027 Background LOS Results 9
Table 5 - Traffic Generation for the Proposed Development······10
Table 6 – General Commercial Zone Land Use Trip Generation Examples 13
Table 7 – 2028 LOS with Development15
Table 8 – Peak Hour Traffic Volumes at Each Access With and Without Parking Lot Separation …18

FIGURES

Figure 1 – Study Area ······1
Figure 2 – Site Photos ······2
Figure 3 – 2021 Background Peak Hour Volumes······5
Figure 4 – Development Traffic Assignments ······11
Figure 5 – 2027 Peak Hour Traffic Volumes with Development in Place
Figure 6 – Development Traffic Circulation in Existing Lot

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Development Site Plans Appendix B: Traffic Count Data Appendix C: Level of Service Reports Appendix D: Signal Warrant Worksheet

ii

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

A new 4-storey residential development has been proposed along Chapel Road in the Town of Rothesay. The development will consist of 48 units as well as an underground parking garage and a surface parking lot. The proposed development site plan, which is included in **Appendix A**, shows 61 parking spaces, including 24 surface level spaces and 37 underground spaces. The plan also includes 2 barrier free spaces – 1 underground and 1 at surface level. The surface level parking lot will be accessible via two existing development accesses – one off Marr Road and one off Chapel Road – that provide access to two existing commercial development properties along Marr Road. A third access is also included in the site plan, which will be located north of the building and will provide access to the underground parking facility. Site photos of existing conditions are shown in **Figure 2**.

The proposed residential development requires rezoning of the property from General Commercial to Multi-Unit Residential. As part of the development approval and rezoning process, the Town of Rothesay requires that a Traffic Impact Statement (TIS) be completed for this development. The primary concerns are how the development will impact traffic at the intersection of Marr Road and Chapel Road and how the additional traffic generated by the development will impact traffic flows at the development accesses and within the existing parking facility. James Avery Grace retained Englobe Corp. to complete this TIS. The Study Area for this TIS includes the intersection of Marr Road and Chapel Road as well as the existing and proposed development accesses, as shown in **Figure 1**.





Figure 1-Study Area



1



2021July12OpenSessionFINAL_226

Figure 2 – Site Photos



Proposed Development Site, looking north from existing parking lot



Existing Chapel Road Access

Existing Marr Road Access

1.2 STUDY TASKS

The main objectives of this TIS were to estimate how much additional traffic the residential development would generate and determine what impact, if any, the development traffic would have on the existing commercial parking lot, its accesses and the intersection of Marr Road and Chapel Road. The following activities were undertaken as part of this TIS:

- Englobe staff visited the study area to review existing conditions;
- Traffic volumes were collected at the intersection of Marr Road and Chapel Road and at the two existing development accesses;
 - A 1.0 % annual growth rate was applied to these traffic volumes to estimate the future (2027) background traffic volumes for the Study Area. 2027 represents the 5-year horizon period beyond the anticipated full build-out of the development;
- Level of Service (LOS) analyses were completed for the existing traffic conditions;
- ITE Trip Generation rates were used to estimate the amount of traffic that will be generated by the new development. These were added to the background traffic volumes to estimate the 2027 total traffic volumes with the development in place;
- LOS analyses were completed for the 2027 future conditions with full build out of the development;
- A review of the existing development accesses and parking facility was completed to identify any potential areas of concern. Alternative parking lot and access scenarios were evaluated following feedback from discussions with the existing tenants of adjacent commercial properties;
- A review of pedestrian connectivity in the area of the proposed development was completed;
- A review of service vehicle access was completed to ensure proper circulation and traffic flows within the existing parking facility; and
- The methodology, findings, and recommendations of the TIS were documented in this written report.

1.3 HORIZON YEAR

A 5-year horizon period was utilized for the analysis. Should all approvals be granted it is expected that the proposed development will be fully operational in 2022, therefore 2027 was chosen as the future horizon year for the analysis.

2 INFORMATION GATHERING

📥 Englobe

2.1 STREET AND DEVELOPMENT CHARACTERISTICS

Chapel Road is a collector road with an AADT of approximately 1,500 vehicles/day. Chapel Road is oriented in the north-south direction. It features one lane in each direction and has a speed limit of 40 km/h. Within the Study Area, Chapel Road features a sidewalk along the east side of the street. A narrow gravel shoulder extends along the west side of the street.

Marr Road is a collector road with an AADT of approximately 7,000 vehicles/day. Marr Road is oriented in the east-west direction, has one lane in each direction and a speed limit of 50 km/h. Marr Road features unidirectional bike lanes along both sides of the street and a sidewalk along the north side of the street.

The intersection of Marr Road and Chapel Road is a stop-controlled intersection. Marr Road is free flowing and a stop sign is present at the north leg on Chapel Road. The south leg consists of a commercial development access. A crosswalk is present across the Chapel Road approach.

2.2 TRAFFIC DATA AND COVID ADJUSTMENTS

Traffic volumes were collected at the intersection of Marr Road and Chapel Road and at both existing development accesses on Monday, April 26th 2021. The traffic counts were completed during the morning and evening peak periods. The traffic count data are provided in **Appendix B**.

Since traffic patterns have decreased as a result of the current COVID-19 pandemic, the Study Team determined that the traffic count data collected as part of this study should be adjusted to better represent typical traffic volumes under normal conditions. Adjustment factors that were developed by the Study Team as part of a January 2021 study were used. This study compared traffic data that were collected in 2016 at two locations in Fredericton, NB to traffic volumes that were collected during the COVID-19 pandemic. The average AM and PM peak hour adjustment factors were calculated for the two Fredericton locations and applied to the traffic volume data in this study. The adjustment factors that were used in this study are shown in **Table 1**.

Study	Date	AM Peak	PM Peak	
Fredericton, NB	January, 2021	1.26	1.20	
Fredericton, NB	January, 2021	1.36	1.25	
Applied to This Study	April, 2021	1.31	1.22	

Tables	- month	art id a	do milan	mark Town	
THEFT.	- 001	UTE-FULL	dirigius	ient raci	OWT:

The adjustment factors were applied to the peak hour volumes at the intersection. The adjusted 2021 AM and PM background traffic volume estimates are shown in Figure 3.

2021July12OpenSessionFINAL_229





Figure 3 - 2021 Background Peak Hose Volumes

3 EXISTING LEVEL OF SERVICE

A Level of Service (LOS) analysis was completed for the existing and future (2027) traffic conditions at the intersection of Marr Road and Chapel Road and at the two existing development accesses. The findings are discussed in this section.

3.1 LEVEL OF SERVICE CRITERIA

The LOS analyses were completed with Synchro 10, which is a traffic analysis software that uses the Highway Capacity Manual and Intersection Capacity Utilization procedures.

The intersection performance was evaluated mainly in terms of the level of service (LOS), which is a common performance measure of an intersection. LOS is determined based on vehicle delay and is expressed on a scale of A through F, where LOS A represents very short delay (<10 seconds per vehicle) and LOS F represents very long delay (>50 seconds per vehicle at a stop controlled intersection and >80 seconds per vehicle at a signalized intersection). A LOS D is often considered acceptable in urban locations; however, some communities will accept a LOS E. The LOS criteria for both signalized and stop control intersections are shown in Table 2.

LOS		Control Delay (seconds per vehicle)		
	LOS Description	Signalized Intersections	Stop Controlled Intersections	
Α.	Very low delay; most vehicles do not stop (Excellent)	less than 10.0	less than 10.0	
в	Higher delay; more vehicles stop (Very Good)	between 10.0 and 20.0	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 20.0 and 35.0	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 35.0 and 55.0	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 55:0 and 80.0	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 intersection (Unacceptable)	greater than 80.0	greater than 50.0	

Table	1.16	den en en	and the second	which in	3.5	100	and second
Contraction of the local division of the loc	E	Cold Pollo	A HUNDER &	0000	1 200	100.01	TAXABLE INC.

3.2 EXISTING LOS ANALYSIS

A LOS analysis was completed for the existing traffic conditions at the intersection of Marr Road and Chapel Road and at the two existing development accesses on Marr Road and Chapel Road. The LOS results are summarized as follows:

- The Marr Road / Chapel Road intersection and both existing development accesses operate efficiently at an overall LOS A during both peak periods.
- At the Marr Road / Chapel Road intersection, the southbound approach operates at LOS E and F with a v/c ratios of 0.50 and 0.58 during the AM and PM peak periods, respectively.
- At the Marr Road development access, the southbound approach operates at a LOS D with a v/c ratio of 0.11 during the PM peak.
- All other movements operate efficiently at a LOS C or better during both peak periods.

The LOS results indicate that the southbound approach at the Marr Road / Chapel Road intersection experiences delay during both peak periods; however, the approach is well below capacity. The southbound approach at the Marr Road development access also experiences some delay but is also well below capacity.

The LOS results, including average delay, volume to capacity (v/c) ratios, and the 95th percentile queue lengths for the existing conditions are summarized in **Table 3**. Detailed Synchro analysis outputs are included in **Appendix C**.

3.3 FUTURE BACKGROUND LOS ANALYSIS

A LOS analysis was completed for the future 2027 background traffic volumes at the intersection of Marr Road and Chapel Road and at the two existing development accesses on Marr Road and Chapel Road. The peak hour traffic volumes for the 2027 horizon year were estimated by applying an annual growth rate of 1.0 % to the 2021 background traffic volumes.

The future background LOS results indicate that the delay for the southbound approach at the Marr Road/Chapel Road intersection will increase by 10 - 20 seconds per vehicle as a result of the background traffic growth; however, both movements will remain well below capacity and all intersections wills continue to operate efficiently overall.

The LOS results, including average delay, volume to capacity (v/c) ratios, and the 95^{th} percentile queue lengths for the future background conditions are summarized in **Table 4**. Detailed Synchro analysis outputs are included in **Appendix C**.

The study team completed a traffic signal warrant for the intersection of Marr Road and Chapel Road for the future 2027 background condition. A score of 100 points or more would typically warrant traffic signals. A warrant score of 32 points was achieved for the intersection, therefore traffic signals would not be warranted in the future condition. The signal warrant worksheet is provided in **Appendix D**.
Table 3 - 2021 Existing LOS Result

Inters	rection		Overall LOS, Delay					Averag [Volu 91	Turning Mov te Delay (sec ume to Capa 5 th Percentil	ement LOS onds per ve city Ratio (v e Queue (m	hicle) /c]])				
			(sec/veh)	Eastbound				Westbound	1	1	Northboun	d		iouthbound	1
East-West Street @	Traffic	Time		L	Ţ	R	L,	T	R	L	T	R	C.	T	R
North-South Street	Control	Period		1	1	11	1	1	- P	1	Î	P	1	1	P
Marr Road @ Chapel		AM Peak	LOS A 3.8	Shared	A 0,4 [0.02] <1	Shared	Shared	A 0.2 [0.01] <1	Shared	Shared	B 11.9 [0.01] <1	Shared	Shared-	E 35.0 [0.50] 20	Shared
Road PM Peak	LOS A 4.0	Shared	A 0.5 [0.02] <1	Shared	Shared	A 0.2 [0.01] <1	Shared	Shared	C 24.8 [0.11] 3	Shared	Shared	F 52,5 [0,56] 23	Shared		
Marr Road @ Existing		AM Peak	LOS A 0.2	Shared	A 0,3 {0.01] <1	+		A 0.0 [0.29] <1	Shared		-	-	A 0.0 [0.00] 0	-	A 0.0 [0.00] 0
Access	-	PM Peak	LOS A 0.4	Shared	A 0.1 [0.00] <1	-1	4	A 0.0 [0.47] <1	Shared	3	100	-	D 26.0 [0.11] 3		0 26.0 [0.11] 3
Existing Access @		AM Peak	LDS A 0.5	-			A 8.7 [0.01] <1		A 8.7 [0.01] <1		A 0.0 [0.03] <1	Shared	Shared	A 0.3 [0.00] <1	-
Existing Access @		PM Peak	LOS A 0.3	+		+	A 9.1 [0.01] <1		A 9.1 [0.01]		A 8.0 [0.08]	Shared	Shated	A 0.1 [0.00]	÷

Table 4 - 2027 Background LOS Results

Inter	section		Overall LOS, Delay	Turning Movement LOS Average Delay (seconds per vehicle) [Volume to Capacity Ratio (v/c)] elay 95 th Percentile Queue (m)											
and the second	_		(sec/veh)		Easthound			Westbound	1		orthboun	d		Southbourn	1
East-West Street @	Traffic	Time		L.	T	R	L.	T	R	L	T	R	Ľ	T	R
North-South Street	Control	Period		1	1	1	1	1	P	1	1	P	1	1	P
Marr Road @ Chapel		AM Peak	LOS A 4.9	Shared	A 0.5 [0.02] <1	Shared	Shared	A 0,2 [0.01] <1	Shared	Shared	8 12.3 [0.01] <1	Shared	Shared -	E 45.9 [0.60] 27	Shared
Road PM Peak	PM Peak	105 A 5.5	Shared	A 0.6 [0.02] <1	Shared	Shared	A 0.3 [0.01] <1	Shared	Shared	D 28.2 [0.13] 4	Shared	Shared	F 75.0 [0.69] 31	Shared	
Marr Road @ Existing		AM Peak	LOS A 0.2	Shared	A 0,4 [0,01] <1	-	-1	A 0.0 [0.31] <1	Shared	4	-	-	A 0.0 [0.00] 0	4	A 0.0 [0.00] 0
Access	-	PM Peak	LOS A 0.5	Shared	A 0.1 [0.00] <1	-		A 0.0 [0.50] <1	Shared	4	~	÷	D 29,4 [0.13] 4	-	D 29,4 [0.13] 4
Existing Access @		AM Peak	LOS A 0.5		-		A 8.8 [0.01] <1	-	A 8.8 [0.01] <1	7	A 0.0 [0.04] <1	Shared	Shared	A 0.3 [0.00] <1	
Existing Access @ Chapel Road		PM Peak	LOSA 0,4		-	-	A 9,1 [0.01] <1	÷	A 9,1 [0.01] <1	-	A 0.0 [0.09] <1	Shared	Shared	A 0.1 [0.00] <1	-

9

4 DEVELOPMENT TRAFFIC GENERATION

4.1 TRAFFIC GENERATION AND ASSIGNMENT

📥 Englobe

Trip generation rates for the proposed development were estimated using the ITE TripGen Web-based App, which is based on the 10th Edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineer's (ITE) *Trip Generation Manual*. The Developer provided information regarding the size and type of development that is planned. The building will consist of 4 stories with a total of 48 dwelling units.

ITE Land Use #221 (Multifamily Housing – Mid-Rise) was used to generate trips for the development. The resulting vehicle trip generation is shown in Table 5. It was assumed that all of these trips would be made by motor vehicle as that would represent a conservative approach in estimating traffic generation.

Development	Elen .	AM Peak Hour				PM Peak Hour			
Development	Dize	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	Total	
Multifamily Housing - Mid-Rise (ITE Land Use #221)	48 Dwelling Units	4	13	17	13	8	21	261	

Table 5 + Traffic Generation for the Proposed Development

The development traffic was assigned to the accesses. Based on the configuration of the parking facilities, it was assumed that 75% of the generated trips would be assigned to the underground parking access, while 25% of the trips would be assigned to the surface level parking facility accesses. This is because most residents will use the underground parking facility, while the surface level parking lot will mostly be used as overflow parking for residents and their guests. The generated traffic was assigned to each access based on the existing traffic volume distributions at the Marr Road / Chapel Road intersection. The traffic assignments are shown in **Figure 4**.

The peak hour traffic volumes for the 2027 horizon year were estimated by applying an annual growth rate of 1.0 % to the 2021 background traffic volumes and adding the traffic generated by the development. The 2027 traffic volumes with the development in place are shown in **Figure 5**.

2021July12OpenSessionFINAL_235





Figure 4 – Development Traffic Assignments

2021July12OpenSessionFINAL_236

🐣 Englobe



Figure 5 - 2027 Peak Hour Traffic Volumes with Development in Place

4.2 EFFECT OF REZONING

The proposed development property is currently zoned for General Commercial use; however, the developer is proposing that it be rezoned to Multi-Unit Residential. According to the *Rothesay Zoning By-Law No. 02-10*, the General Commercial Zone applies to larger commercial operations that require an emphasis on automobile access. Examples of permitted land uses include, but are not limited to, restaurants, retail stores, hotels, gasoline retailing, etc. These types of properties typically generate a large number of vehicle trips, particularly in comparison to residential properties. **Table 6** summarizes examples of daily vehicle trips that were generated as part of various studies completed by the Study Team for a variety of General Commercial land use properties and sizes.

Location	Land use	Size	Daily Trips Generated
Moncton, NB	Gas Station	8 Fuelling Pumps	1,474
Moncton, NB	Cotfee Shop with Drive Thru-	167 m ²	1,348
Pennfield, NB	Gas Station	6 Fuelling Pumps	1,011
Pennfield, NB	Coffee Shop with Drive Thru	186 m ²	2,851
Moncton, NB	Restaurant	558 m ²	763
Moncton, NB	Restaurant	465 m ²	636
Moncton, NB	Fast Food Restaurant	335 m ²	1,786
Moncton, NB	Convenience Store / Gas Bar	10 Fuelling Pumps	1,686
Moncton, NB.	Hotel	120 Rooms	980

Table 5 - General Communital June Claut H at True Generation Examples

The commercial property trip generation examples above are much greater than the trips that are expected to be generated at the proposed residential development, as detailed in Section 4.1. The proposed residential development is expected to generate approximately 261 vehicle trips daily. This represents roughly 10% - 40% of the daily traffic volumes generated by the commercial developments listed above. If the proposed development property were to remain zoned for General Commercial and be developed, it would be expected that the trips generated by the commercial development would far exceed the number of trips expected for the proposed residential development.

5 LOS ANALYSIS WITH DEVELOPMENT

📥 Englobe

A Level of Service (LOS) analysis was completed for the 2027 traffic conditions with the proposed residential development in place. The analysis included the intersection of Marr Road and Chapel Road, the existing development accesses on Marr Road and Chapel Road, and at the proposed development access on Chapel Road. The LOS results are summarized as follows:

- In 2027, the Marr Road / Chapel Road intersection, both existing development accesses and the proposed development access would operate efficiently at overall LOS A during both peak periods.
- At the Marr Road / Chapel Road intersection, the southbound approach would operate at LOS E and F with v/c ratios of 0.65 and 0.74 during the AM and PM peak periods, respectively. All other movements at Marr Road / Chapel Road would operate efficiently with a LOS D or better during both peak periods.
- In 2027, the southbound approach at the Marr Road access would operate at a LOS D with a v/c ratio of 0.15 during the PM peak. All other movements at the access will operate efficiently with a LOS C or better during both peak periods.
- At the existing and proposed Chapel Road accesses, all individual turning movements are expected to operate at a LOS A.

The LOS results indicate that, in 2027 with the additional development traffic, the delays at the southbound approaches at the Marr Road / Chapel Road intersection are expected to increase slightly (4 – 8 seconds more than in the background conditions); however, these movements will remain below capacity. This is not uncommon at stop control intersections where the traffic volumes on the major street are much higher than the volumes on the minor street. The overall intersection delay and LOS are expected to remain acceptable up to 5 years beyond the anticipated full build-out. The development accesses on Chapel Road (existing and proposed) are expected to operate efficiently with minimal delay.

The LOS results, including average delay, volume to capacity (v/c) ratios, and the 95^{th} percentile queue lengths for the 2027 traffic conditions with the development in place are summarized in **Table 7**. Detailed Synchro analysis outputs are included in **Appendix C**.

Table 7 - 2028 LDS with Developmont

Inters	ection		Overall LOS, Delay	Turning Movement LOS Average Delay (seconds per vehicle) [Volume to Capacity Ratio (v/c)] Delay Delay												
	_	فعصص	(sec/veh)		Eastbound	1	Westbound			Northbound			Southbound			
East-West Street @	Traffic	Time		L	T	R	Ľ,	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	
North-South Street	Control	Period		1	1		1	_1_	- P	1	Î.	P	1	1	P .	
Marr Road @ Chapel		AM Peak	LOS A 5.6	Shared	A 0.5 [0.02] <1	Shared	Shared	A 0.3 [0.01] <1	Shared	Shared	B 12.3 [0.01] <1	Shared	Shared-	E 49.7 [0.65] 31	Shared	
Road PM Peak	PM Peak	LOS A 6.3	Shared	A 0.7 [0.03] <1	Shared	Shared	A 0.3 [0.01] <1	Shared	Shared	D 29.7 [0.15] 4	Shared	Shared	F 83.2 [0.74] 35	Shared		
Marr Road @ Existing		AM Peak	LOS A 0.3	Shared	A 0.4 [0.01] <1	-		A 0.0 [0.31] <1	Shared		-	-	C 17.8 (0.01) <1	-	C 17.8 [0.01] <1	
Access	-	PM Peak	LOS A 0.6	Shared	A 0.2 [0.01] <1	×	÷	A 0.0 [0.51] <1	Shared	е	14	-1	D 30.0 {0.15} 4	+	D 30.0 [0.15] 4	
Existing Access @		AM Peak	LOS A 0.4	-			A 8.8 (0.01) <1		A 8.8 [0.01] <1		A 0.0 [0.04] <1	Shared	Shared	A 0.2 [0.00] <1		
Existing Access @ Chapel Road		PM Peak	LOS A 0.3	+	-	+	A 9.2 [0.01] <1		A 9.2 [0.01] <1	-	A 0.0 [0.09]	Shared	Shared	A [0.00] [>	÷	

15

🐣 Englobe

Inters	section 1		Overali LOS, Delav		Turn Average D [Volume 95th p					ement LOS onds per v tity Ratio (Queue (n	5 ehide) v/c]] n)		Southbound		
			(sec/veh)		Eastbound			Westboun	d		Northboun	d		Southbound	÷.
East-West Street @	Traffic	Trèse		4	T	R	- 6	T	R	4	T	R	L	T	R
North-South Street	Control	Period		1	1	r	1	1	E .	1	1	1	1	1 L	r.
Naw Access @ Chanal		AM Peak	LOS A 0.5	-	×	(7)	A 9.5 [0.01] <1	1	A 9.5 [0.01] <1	-	A 0.0 [0.04] <1	Shared	Shared	A 0,1 [0.00] <1	
Road	1	PM Peak	LOS A 0.2	+	-	-	A 9.8 [0.01] <1	*	A 9.8 [0.01] <1	-	A 0.0 [0.10] <1	Shared	Shared	A 0.1 [0.00] <1	+

16

6 ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 EXISTING PARKING LOT CIRCULATION

📥 Englobe

The two existing development accesses are currently being used to access a parking lot that is shared between two commercial developments. The parking lot encompasses three parcels of land, the two commercial development properties and the proposed development property, and is subject to a Reciprocal Access Agreement between the owners of the three properties. The agreement states that vehicles requiring access to each property are entitled to use the parking lot and its accesses to do so. The agreement also references the internal circulation within the parking lot, which is complex and is defined by pavement markings and signage throughout the lot. **Figure 6** shows how the proposed development traffic would circulate through the existing parking lot. The red arrows represent how vehicles entering the development would circulate and the yellow arrows represent how vehicles exiting the development would circulate.

Proposed Broutopment Site

Figure 6 – Development Traffic Circulation in Existing Lot

There have been some questions regarding the implications of allowing the additional traffic generated by the development to circulate through the existing parking lot and whether this will have a negative impact on the facility and its accesses. The existing Chapel Road access is located on the proposed development property and, therefore, the option is available to separate the existing parking lot from the proposed surface parking lot. This would limit the Chapel Road access to the proposed residential development while all traffic travelling to the existing commercial developments would have to use the Marr Road access. In this situation all traffic that is currently passing through the Chapel Road access to the existing commercial developments would be switched over to the Marr Road access. **Table 8** outlines. the peak hour traffic volumes that would be expected in 2027 at each access with and without separation of the existing and proposed parking facilities.

- Annalista	Marr Ros	ad Access	Chapel R	nad Access	
scenario	AM Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak	PM Peak	
Maintain Circulation Between Lots	29	62	11	11	
Separate Existing Lot and Proposed Lot	35	67	5	6	

Table 8 - Peak Noul Traffic Volumes at Each Access With and Without Parking Lot Separation

The peak hour traffic volumes summarized above show that if the parking lots were separated the traffic volumes at the Marr Road access would actually increase. This is because the volume of traffic that currently uses the Chapel Road access to access the commercial developments outweighs the volume of traffic that would use the Marr Road access to access the proposed residential development. In order to optimize the circulation of traffic within the parking lots and to minimize impacts on the Marr Road access, it is recommended that internal circulation between the parking lots be maintained.

6.2 PEDESTRIAN ACCESS

👶 Englobe

The Study Team completed a review of the existing pedestrian infrastructure near the proposed development. Chapel Road currently features a monolithic concrete sidewalk along the east side of the street that connects to the pedestrian facilities along Marr Road. As per the proposed development site plan, a sidewalk is planned for the space between the surface parking lot and the apartment building to accommodate pedestrian traffic between the parking lot and apartment building. To improve pedestrian connectivity, a connection between the existing sidewalk on Chapel Road and the sidewalk along the building should be considered. This could be achieved by extending a sidewalk or pedestrian pathway along the edge of the existing driveway off Chapel Road or by adding a path that would extend west from the north edge of the surface parking lot to the existing sidewalk on Chapel Road.

6.3 COMMERCIAL VEHICLE ACCESS

Commercial vehicle access will be dependent on vehicle type. Delivery, moving and similar types of service vehicles will be able to access the building using the surface level parking lot accesses. A turnaround area is provided in front of the building at the north end of the parking lot so that vehicles can turn around and exit back onto Chapel Road. Garbage truck access will be depend on the location of the garbage receptacle. If a dumpster is used, it will be located in the southeast corner of the development property and will be accessible by travelling around the eastern-most commercial development and back through the parking lot. If smaller receptacles are selected, these would be located inside the underground parking facility and will be accessible via the northern access on Chapel Road.

7 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

📥 Englobe

The key findings and recommendations of this Traffic Impact Statement are summarized as follows:

- 1. The proposed development, which would be located near the corner of Marr Road and Chapel Road, is a 4-storey apartment complex consisting of 48 dwelling units. The proposed development plan shows 61 parking spaces, including 23 regular and 1 barrier-free surface level parking spaces and 36 regular and 1 barrier-free underground parking spaces. The surface level parking facility would be accessible via two existing accesses on Marr Road and Chapel Road and the underground parking facility would be accessible via a new access off of Chapel Road.
- The LOS results for the 2021 existing scenario at the intersection of Marr Road and Chapel Road and at the two existing accesses showed that, although the intersection of Marr Road and Chapel Road currently operates efficiently overall, the southbound approach on Chapel Road experiences some delay.
- 3. It is expected that the proposed development will generate 17 vehicle trips during the AM Peak hour (4 entering/13 exiting) and 21 vehicle trips during the PM Peak hour (13 entering/8 exiting) and a total of 261 trips daily. Based on the proposed site plan, 75% of these trips are expected to be generated at the new access, while 25% of these trips are expected to be generated at the existing accesses.
- 4. The proposed development requires that the property be rezoned to Multi-Unit Residential from General Commercial. By rezoning the property, development traffic volumes are expected to be significantly less than they would be if the property were developed under its currently designated land use.
- 5. The LOS results for the 2027 horizon period with the development in place indicate that delays at the southbound approach of the Chapel Road / Marr Road intersection will increase slightly (4 8 seconds per vehicle); however the approach will remain below capacity and the intersection will continue to perform efficiently overall. Traffic signals are not warranted at the intersection in the 2027 horizon period.
- 6. The proposed surface parking lot will be connected to an existing parking lot that is shared between two commercial properties. There has been some concern that traffic generated by the proposed residential development will cause congestion within the existing parking lot and at the accesses and there has been some debate as to whether the parking lots should be separated. However, a review of traffic volumes indicated that if the parking lots and accesses were separated, the traffic volumes at the Marr Road access would actually increase, while the traffic volumes at the Chapel Road access would be expected to decrease. Maintaining the connection between both parking lots will help balance the traffic between the accesses and it is recommended that the existing circulation within the existing parking facility be maintained.

📥 Englobe

- 7. Based on a review of the existing pedestrian facilities near the development property, it is recommended that a sidewalk connection be provided between the apartment building and the Chapel Road sidewalk.
- 8. Commercial vehicles will be able to access the development via the proposed accesses. Delivery, moving and other service vehicles will be able to access the development from the front of the building and garbage trucks will either access the development at the southeast corner of the building or from within the underground parking facility.



Appendix A: Development Site Plans







acKenzle, Comeau MacKenzle Architecture 09/04/2021 2:30pm 221364-Chapel Roadidwg







Appendix B: Traffic Count Data



AM and PM Peak Hours

Marr @ Chapel



ſ	Marr	Road @	Develo	pment A	Access
	I	n	0	ut	Access Hourly
	EBL	WBR	SBL	SBR	
7:30	0	2	0	1	
7:45	0	3	0	2	
8:00	2	2	0	0	
8:15	3	1	0	0	16
8:30	1	4	0	0	18
8:45	2	2	0	0	17
4:00	1	7	3	2	
4:15	2	8	5	2	
4:30	0	5	2	1	
4:45	0	3	1	1	43
5:00	2	4	1	2	39
5:15	1	2	3	3	31
5:30	2	3	1	2	31
5:45	1	1	3	5	36

2021July12OpenSessionFINAL_251

AM Peak	8	9	0	0
PM Peak	3	23	11	6

2021July12OpenSessionFINAL_252

	Chap	el Rd @	Develop	oment A	ccess
	li	n	0	ut	Access Hourly
	SBL	NBR	WBL	WBR	Total
7:30	0	0	0	0	
7:45	1	0	0	0	
8:00	0	0	0	2	
8:15	0	0	1	2	6
8:30	2	1	0	0	9
8:45	0	1	0	0	9
4:00	0	0	1	2	
4:15	0	1	0	2	
4:30	0	0	0	1	
4:45	1	0	0	1	9
5:00	0	0	0	1	7
5:15	0	0	0	1	5
5:30	0	0	0	0	4
5:45	0	2	1	1	6

AM Peak	3	1	1	4
PM Peak	1	1	1	6



Appendix C: Level of Service Reports



2021 AM Peak

2021 AM Peak 2021July12OpenSessionFINAL_254 3: Development/Chapel Rd & Marr Rd

	•	-+	>	*	+	*	1	1	1	1	+	4
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WEL	WBT	WBR	NEL	NBT	NBR	SEL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		47+			4.			4.			4	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	16	525	4	7	401	39	0	0	4	84	1	24
Future Volume (Veh/h)	16	525	- 4	7	401	39	0	0	4	84	1	24
Sign Control		Free			Free			Stop		-	Stop	
Grade		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94
Hourly flow rate (vph)	17	559	4	7	427	41	0	0	4	89	1	26
Pedestrians					100					-		
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	468			563			1083	1077	561	1060	1058	448
vC1, stage 1 cont vol								-				
vC2, stage 2 conf vol												
vCu, unblocked vol	468			563			1083	1077	561	1060	1058	448
IC, single (s)	4.1			4.1			7.1	6.5	6.2	7.1	6.5	62
IC, 2 stage (s)										-		
IF (s)	2.2			2.2			3.5	4.0	3.3	3.5	4.0	3.3
p0 queue free %	98			99			100	100	99	55	100	96
cM capacity (veh/h)	1094			1008			183	214	527	197	220	611
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1								
Volume Total	580	475	4	116			-					_
Volume Left	17	7	0	89								
Volume Right	4	41	4	26								
CSH	1094	1008	527	232								
Volume to Capacity	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.50								
Queue Length 95th (m)	0.4	0.2	0.2	20.4								
Control Delay (s)	0.4	0.2	11.9	35.0								
Lane LOS	A	A	В	E								
Approach Delay (s)	0.4	0.2	11.9	35.0								
Approach LOS			В	E								
Intersection Summary	_				_							
Average Delay			3.8									-
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	tion		56.3%	K	CU Level	of Service			8			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

2021July12OpenSessionFINAL_255

2021 AM Peak 6: Marr Rd & Access

	,	+	+	*	4	1			
Movement	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBL	SBR			
Lane Configurations		4	T+		M.				
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	12	601	447	10	0	0			
Future Volume (Veh/h)	12	601	447	10	0	0			
Sign Control		Free	Free		Stop				
Grade		0%	0%		0%				
Peak Hour Factor	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94			
Hourly flow rate (vph)	13	639	476	11	0	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	487				1146	482			
VC1, stage 1 cont vol									
vC2, stage 2 conf vol									
vCu, unblocked vol	487				1146	482			
IC, single (s)	4.1				6.4	6.2			
IC, 2 stage (s)									
tF (s)	2.2				3.5	3.3			
p0 queue free %	99				100	100			
cM capacity (veh/h)	1076				218	585			
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB1	SB 1				_		
Volume Total	652	487	0						
Volume Left	13	0	0						
Volume Right	0	11	0						
cSH	1076	1700	1700						
Volume to Capacity	0.01	0.29	0.00						
Queue Length 95th (m)	0.3	0.0	0.0						
Control Delay (s)	0.3	0.0	0.0						
Lane LOS	A		A						
Approach Delay (s)	0.3	0.0	0.0						
Approach LOS			A						
Intersection Summary									
Average Delay			0.2		10.00	22.2			
Intersection Capacity Utilizatio	N3		44.6%	ю	U Level	of Service		A	
Analysis Period (min)			15	_	and a local				

	1	*	t	1	+	+	
Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	
Lane Configurations	Y		î.			4	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	1	5	54	1	4	107	
Future Volume (Veh/h)	1	5	54	1	4	107	
Sign Control	Stop		Free			Free	
Grade	0%		0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	
Hourly flow rate (vph)	1	5	57	1	- 4	114	
Pedestrians							
Lane Width (m)							
Walking Speed (m/s)			_				
Percent Blockage							
Right lum flare (veh)							
Median type			None			None	
Median storage veh)							
Upstream signal (m)							
X, platoon unblocked							
C, conflicting volume	180	58			58		
C1, stage 1 conf vol							
C2, stage 2 conf vol							
Cu, unblocked vol	180	58			58		
C, single (s)	6.4	6.2			4.1		
C, 2 stage (s)	-				- 200		
F(s)	35	3.3			22		
p0 queue free %	100	100			100		
cM capacity (veh/h)	808	1009			1546		
Direction, Lane #	WE 1	NB 1	SB 1			_	
/olume Total	6	58	118				
/olume Left	1	0	4				
/olume Right	5	1	0				
SH	969	1700	1546				
Volume to Capacity	0.01	0.03	0.00				
Queue Length 95th (m)	0.1	0.0	0.1				
Control Delay (s)	8.7	0.0	0.3				
ane LOS	A		A				
Approach Delay (s)	8.7	0.0	0.3				
Approach LOS	A						
Intersection Summary							
Average Delay	-		0.5		1000		
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	ation		18.9%	1C	U Level	of Service	A
Analysis Period (min)			15				

2021 PM Peak

2021 PM Peak 2021July12OpenSessionFINAL_257 3: Development/Chapel Rd & Marr Rd

	1	-	7	1	+	*	1	1	1	1	+	1
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NEL	NBT	NBR.	SBL	SET	SBR
Lane Configurations		4.			4			4.			41.	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	16	516	7	9	612	117	10	0	11	62	0	24
Future Volume (Veh/h)	16	516	7	9	612	117	10	0	11	62	0	24
Sign Control		Free			Free			Stop			Stop	1
Grade		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Hourly flow rate (vph)	17	543	7	9	644	123	11	0	12	65	0	25
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	767			550			1329	1366	546	1316	1308	706
vC1, stage 1 cont vol	-											
vC2, stage 2 conf vol												
vCu, unblocked vol	767			550			1329	1366	546	1316	1308	706
IC, single (s)	4.1			4.1			7.1	6.5	62	7.1	6.5	62
IC, 2 stage (s)												
IF (s)	2.2			2.2			3.5	4.0	3.3	3.5	4.0	3.3
p0 queue free %	98			99			91	100	98	50	100	94
cM capacity (veh/h)	851			1025			122	144	539	129	156	438
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB1	NB.1	SB 1								
Volume Total	567	776	23	90								
Volume Left	17	9	11	65								
Volume Right	7	123	12	25								
CSH	851	1025	205	161								
Volume to Capacity	0.02	0.01	0.11	0.56								
Queue Length 95th (m)	0.5	0.2	3.0	23.0								
Control Delay (s)	0.5	0.2	24.8	52.5								
Lane LOS	A	A	C	F								
Approach Delay (s)	0.5	0.2	24.8	52.5								
Approach LOS			C	F								
Intersection Summary												
Average Delay			4.0	-	1000							1
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	ation		57.4%	- 10	U Level	of Service			8			
Analysis Period (min)			15		fair and been	-						

2021 PM Peak 6: Marr Rd & Access

	1	+	+	*	4	1		
Movement	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBL	SBR		
Lane Configurations		4	Ĩ+		Y			
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	4	586	731	28	13	7		
Future Volume (Veh/h)	- 4	586	731	28	13	7		
Sign Control		Free	Free		Stop			
Grade		0%	0%		0%			
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95		
Hourly flow rate (vph)	4	617	769	29	14	1		
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	798				1408	784		
vC1, stage 1 cont vol								
vC2, stage 2 conf vol								
vCu, unblocked vol	798				1408	784		
IC, single (s)	4.1				6.4	6.2		
IC, 2 stage (s)	-				-			
tF (s)	2.2				3.5	3.3		
p0 queue free %	100				91	98		
cM capacity (veh/h)	829				153	395		
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	SB 1					-
Volume Total	621	798	21					-
Volume Left	4	0	14					
Volume Right	0	29	7					
CSH	829	1700	192					
Volume to Capacity	0.00	0.47	0.11					
Queue Length 95th (m)	0.1	0.0	29					
Control Delay (s)	0.1	0.0	26.0					
Lane LOS	A		D					
Approach Delay (s)	0.1	0.0	26.0					
Approach LOS			D					
Intersection Summary								
Average Delay			04					
Intersection Capacity Utilizatio	in in the second se		50.2%	10	U Level	of Service	A	
Analysis Period (min)			15					_

	1	*	1	1	1	+		
Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT		
Lane Configurations	W		T+			4		
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	1	7	132	1	1	85		
Future Volume (Veh/h)	1	7	132	1	1	85		
Sign Control	Slop		Free	-		Free		
Grade	0%		0%			0%		
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95		
Hourly flow rate (vph)	1	7	139	1	1	89		
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								
C, conflicting volume	230	140			140			
vC1, stage 1 cont vol					-			
vC2, stage 2 conf vol								
vCu, unblocked vol	230	140			140			
IC, single (s)	6.4	6.2			4.1			
IC, 2 stage (s)					200			
IF (s)	3.5	3.3			22			
p8 queue free %	100	99			100			
cM capacity (veh/h)	759	911			1449			
Direction, Lane #	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1					
Volume Total	8	140	90					
Volume Left	1	0	1					
Volume Right	7	1	0					
SH	889	1700	1449					
Volume to Capacity	0.01	0.08	0.00					
Queue Length 95th (m)	0.2	0.0	0.0					
Control Delay (s)	9.1	0.0	0.1					
Lane LOS	A		A					
Approach Delay (s)	9.1	0.0	0.1					
Approach LOS	A							
Intersection Summary								
Average Delay			0.3		-			
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	ation		17.0%	IC	ULevel	of Service	A	
Analysis Period (min)			15		and a literate			

2027 AM Background 2021July12OpenSessionFINAL_260 3: Development/Chapel Rd & Marr Rd

	1	-	7	*	+	*	1	1	1	1	+	1
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WEL	WBT	WBR	NEL	NBT	NBR.	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		47+			4			4			4	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	16	525	4	7	401	39	0	0	4	84	1	24
Future Volume (Veh/h)	16	525	4	7	401	39	0	0	4	84	1	24
Sign Control		Free			Free			Stop			Stop	
Grade		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94
Hourly flow rate (vph)	18	598	5	8	456	44	0	0	5	96	1	27
Pedestrians										-		100
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	500			603			1158	1152	600	1136	1133	478
vC1, stage 1 cont vol									-			
vC2, stage 2 conf vol												
vCu, unblocked vol	500			603			1158	1152	600	1136	1133	478
IC, single (s)	4.1			4.1			7.1	6.5	6.2	7.1	6.5	62
IC, 2 stage (s)												
tF(s)	22			2.2			3.5	4.0	3.3	3.5	4.0	3.3
p0 queue free %	98			99			100 t	100	99	45	99	95
cM capacity (veh/h)	1064			975			161	193	501	174	198	587
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	S8 1								
Volume Total	621	508	5	124	_							
Volume Left	18	8	0	96								
Volume Right	5	44	5	27								
CSH	1064	975	501	206								
Volume to Capacity	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.60								
Queue Length 95th (m)	0.4	0.2	0.2	27.3								
Control Delay (s)	0.5	0.2	12.3	45.9								
Lane LOS	A	A	8	E								
Approach Delay (s)	0.5	0.2	123	45.9								
Approach LOS			B	E								
Intersection Summary			-									
Average Delay		-	4.9	-								-
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	ation		59.3%	K	CU Level	of Service			8			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

2027 AM Background 6: Marr Rd & Access

1

Γ	Ra	ě,	Access	-	

Movement	EBL	EBT	WET	WBR	SBL	SBR		
Lane Configurations		4	4		A			
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	12	601	447	10	0	0		
Future Volume (Veh/h)	12	601	447	10	0	0		
Sign Control		Free	Free		Stop			
Grade		0%	0%		0%			
Peak Hour Factor	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94		
Hourly flow rate (vph)	14	684	509	11	0	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	520				1226	514		
VC1, stage 1 conf vol								
vC2, stage 2 conf vol								
vCu, unblocked vol	520				1226	514		
IC, single (s)	4.1				6.4	6.2		
IC, 2 stage (s)								
IF (s)	2.2				3.5	3.3		
p0 queue free %	99				100	100		
cM capacity (veh/h)	1046				194	560		
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB1	SB 1					
Volume Total	698	520	0					
Volume Left	14	0	0					
Volume Right	0	11	0					
cSH	1046	1700	1700					
Volume to Capacity	0.01	0.31	0.00					
Queue Length 95th (m)	0.3	0.0	0.0					
Control Delay (s)	0.4	0.0	0.0					
LaneLOS	A		A					
Approach Delay (s)	0.4	0.0	0.0					
Approach LOS			A					
Intersection Summary								
Average Delay			0.2	-		-		
Intersection Capacity Utilizatio	n		47.5%	IC	ULevelo	Service	A	
Analysis Period (min)			15		and a local			

2027 AM Background 8: Chapel Rd & Access

	+	*	1	1	1	ŧ	
Movement	WEL	WER	NET	NBR	SBL	SBT	
Lane Configurations	Y		Ť+			4	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	1	5	54	1	4	107	
Future Volume (Veh/h)	1	5	54	1	4	107	
Sign Control	Stop		Free			Free	
Grade	0%		0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	
Hourly flow rate (vph)	1	6	61	1	5	122	
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	194	-62			62		
VC1, stage 1 conf vol		-					
vC2, stage 2 conf vol							
vCu_unblocked vol	194	62			62		
IC, single (s)	6.4	6.2			4.1		
IC, 2 stage (s)							
IF (s)	3.5	3.3			22		
p0 queue free %	100	99			100		
cM capacity (veh/h)	793	1004			1541		
Direction, Lane #	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1				
Volume Total	7	62	127				
Volume Left	1	0	5				
Volume Right	6	1	0				
CSH	967	1700	1541				
Volume to Capacity	0.01	0.04	0.00				
Queue Length 95th (m)	0.2	0.0	0.1				
Control Delay (s)	8.8	0.0	0.3				
Lane LOS	A		A				
Approach Delay (s)	8.8	0.0	0.3				
Approach LOS	A						
Intersection Summary		-	-				
Average Delay			0.5	-	1		
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	ation		19.5%	10	ULevel	of Service	A
Analysis Period (min)			15				14 C

2027 PM Background 2021July12OpenSessionFINAL_263 3: Development/Chapel Rd & Marr Rd

	1	-	7	1	+	*	1	1	1	1	+	1
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NEL	NBT	NBR.	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		4.			4			4			47+	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	16	516	7	9	612	117	10	0	11	62	0.	24
Future Volume (Veh/h)	16	516	7	9	612	117	10	0	11	62	0	24
Sign Control		Free		-	Free			Stop	-	-	Stop	-
Grade		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Hourly flow rate (vph)	18	581	8	10	689	132	11	0	12	70	0	27
Pedestrians					100						100	
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	821			589			1423	1462	585	1408	1400	755
VC1, stage 1 cont vol												
vC2, stage 2 conf vol												
vCu, unblocked vol	821			589			1423	1462	585	1408	1400	755
IC, single (s)	4.1			4.1			7.1	6.5	6.2	7.1	6.5	62
IC, 2 stage (s)							-	-				
IF (s)	2.2			2.2			3.5	4.0	3.3	3.5	4.0	3.3
p0 queue free %	98			99			89	100	98	37	100	93
cM capacity (veh/h)	813			991			104	125	513	111	136	410
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WBI	NB 1	SB 1								1
Volume Total	607	831	23	97	-							_
Volume Left	18	10	11	70								
Volume Right	8	132	12	27								
dSH	813	991	178	140								
Volume to Capacity	0.02	0.01	0.13	0.69								
Queue Length 95th (m)	0.5	0.2	3.5	31.4								
Control Delay (s)	0.6	0.3	28.2	75.0								
Lane LOS	A	A	D	F								
Approach Delay (s)	0.6	0.3	28.2	75.0								
Approach LOS			D	F								
Intersection Summary	-											
Average Delay			55									-
Intersection Capacity Utilization	1		60.9%	R	ULevel	of Service			8			-
Analysis Period (min)			15									

2021July12OpenSessionFINAL_264

2027 PM Background 6: Marr Rd & Access

	1	+	+	1	4	1		
Movement	EBL	EBT	WBT	WER	SBL	SBR		
Lane Configurations		4	1+		W			
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	4	586	731	28	13	7		
Future Volume (Veh/h)	- 4	586	731	28	13	1		
Sign Control	_	Free	Free		Stop			
Grade		0%	0%		0%			
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95		
Hourly flow rate (vph)	5	660	823	32	15	8		
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, piatoon unblocked								
vC, conflicting volume	855				1509	839		
vC1, stage 1 cont vol								
vC2, stage 2 conf vol								_
vCu, unblocked vol	855				1509	839		
IC, single (s)	4.1				6.4	6.2		
IC, 2 stage (s)								
IF (s)	22				3.5	3.3		
p0 queue free %	-99				89	98		
cM capacity (veh/h)	789				133	367		
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB1	SB 1					
Volume Total	665	855	23					
Volume Left	5	0	15					
Volume Right	0	32	8					
CSH	789	1700	170					
Volume to Capacity	0.01	0.50	0.13					
Queue Length 95th (m)	0.2	0.0	3.7					
Control Delay (s)	0.2	0.0	29.4					
Lane LOS	A		0					
Approach Delay (s)	0.2	0.0	29.4					
Approach LOS			D					
Intersection Summary								
Average Delay			0.5					
Intersection Capacity Utilizatio	n		53.0%	1C	ULevel	of Service	A	
Analysis Period (min)			15					

2027 PM Background 8: Chapel Rd & Access

	*	*	t	1	+	+	
Movement	WEL	WBR	NET	NBR	SBL	SBL	
Lane Configurations	Y		Ţ.			4	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	1	7	132	1	-1	85	
Future Volume (Veh/h)	1	7	132	1	1	85	
Sign Control	Stop		Free	-		Free	
Grade	0%		.0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	
Hourly flow rate (vph)	1	8	149	1	1	96	
Pedestrians							
Lane Width (m)							
Walking Speed (m/s)							
Percent Blockage							
Right lum flare (veh)							
Median type			None			None	
Median storage veh)							
Upstream signal (m)							
X, platoon unblocked							
C, conflicting volume	248	150			150		
C1, stage 1 cont vol							
vC2, stage 2 conf vol							
Cu, unblocked vol	248	150			150		
C, single (s)	6.4	6.2			4.1		
C, 2 stage (s)							
F(s)	3.5	3.3			22		
p0 queue free %	100	99			100		
cM capacity (veh/h)	743	900			1437		
Direction, Lane #	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1				
/olume Total	9	150	97				
/olume Left	1	0	1				
Volume Right	8	1	0				
SH	879	1700	1437				
Volume to Capacity	0.01	0.09	0.00				
Queue Length 95th (m)	0.2	0.0	0.0				
Control Delay (s)	9.1	0.0	0.1				
ane LOS	A		A				
Approach Delay (s)	9.1	0.0	0.1				
Approach LOS	A						
Intersection Summary							
Average Delay			0.4	-			
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	noite		17.5%	IC	U Level	of Service	A
Analysis Period (min)			15				

2027 AM with Development 2021July12OpenSessionFINAL_266 3: Development/Chapel Rd & Marr Rd

	1	-+	7	1	+	*	1	1	1	1	+	1
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NEL	NBT	NBR.	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		4			4			4			4	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	18	563	4	8	432	43	0	0	4	95	1	29
Future Volume (Veh/h)	18	563	- 4	8	432	43	0	0	4	95	1	29
Sign Control		Free		-	Free			Slop			Stop	
Grade		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94
Hourty flow rate (vph)	19	599	4	9	460	46	0	0	4	101	1	31
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	506			603			1172	1163	601	1144	1142	483
vC1, stage 1 cont vol				-					-	-		
vC2, stage 2 conf vol												_
vCu_unblocked vol	506			603			1172	1163	601	1144	1142	483
IC, single (s)	4.1			.4.1			7.1	6.5	6.2	7.1	6.5	62
IC, 2 stage (s)				-				-	-			
IF (s)	2.2			22			3.5	4.0	3.3	3.5	4.0	3.3
p0 queue free %	98			99			100	100	99	41	99	95
cM capacity (veh/h)	1059			975			156	189	500	172	195	584
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB.I	SB 1								
Volume Total	622	515	4	133	1 - C							
Volume Left	19	9	0	101								
Volume Right	4	46	4	31								
CSH	1059	975	500	206								
Volume to Capacity	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.65								
Queue Length 95th (m)	0.4	0.2	0.2	30.8								
Control Delay (s)	0.5	0.3	12.3	49.7								
Lane LOS	A	A	8	E								
Approach Delay (s)	0.5	0.3	12.3	49.7								
Approach LOS			В	E								
Intersection Summary		-	-	-								
Average Delay			5.6		a second second	-						
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	noite		60.1%	10	CU Level	of Service			8			
Analysis Period (min)			15	-								

	•	+	+	*	4	1			
Movement	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBL	SBR			7
Lane Configurations		4	1+		Y				
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	13	649	480	12	2	2			
Future Volume (Veh/h)	13	649	480	12	2	2			
Sign Control		Free	Free		Stop	-			
Grade		0%	0%		0%				
Peak Hour Factor	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94			
Hourly flow rate (vph)	14	690	511	13	2	2			
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	524				1236	518			
VC1, stage 1 cont vol									
vC2, stage 2 conf vol									
vCu, unblocked vol	524				1236	518			
IC, single (s)	4.1				6.4	6.2			
IC, 2 stage (s)					-				
IF (s)	2.2				3.5	3.3			
p0 queue free %	99				99	100			
cM capacity (veh/h)	1043				192	558			
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	SB 1				-		
Volume Total	704	524	4						
Volume Left	14	0	2						
Volume Right	0	13	2						
cSH	1043	1700	286						
Volume to Capacity	0.01	0.31	0.01						
Queue Length 95th (m)	0.3	0.0	0.3						
Control Delay (s)	0.4	0.0	17.8						
Lane LOS	A		C						
Approach Delay (s)	0.4	0.0	17.8						
Approach LOS	-		C						
Intersection Summary			_						
Average Delay			0.3		10.00	22.0			
Intersection Capacity Utilization			54.6%	1C	U Level	of Service		A	
Analysis Period (min)			15		and a feature				
2027 AM with Development 2021July12OpenSessionFINAL_268 8: Chapel Rd & Access

	+	*	t	1	1	+		
Movement	WEL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SEL	SBT		
Lane Configurations	Y	-	T.			4		
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	1	5	60	1	4	123		
Future Volume (Veh/h)	1	5	60	1	4	123		
Sign Control	Stop		Free			Free		
Grade	0%		0%			0%		
Peak Hour Factor	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94		
Hourly flow rate (vph)	1	5	64	1	.4	131		
Pedestrians			-			171		
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								
C. conflicting volume	204	64			65			
VC1, stage 1 conf vol	-				11			
vC2, stage 2 conf vol								
vCu, unblocked vol	204	64			65			
IC, single (s)	6.4	6.2			4.1			
IC, 2 stage (s)					-			
IF (s)	3.5	3.3			22			
p0 queue free %	100	99			100			
cM capacity (veh/h)	783	1000			1537			
Direction, Lane #	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1					
Volume Total	6	65	135					
Volume Left	1	0	4					
Volume Right	5	1	0					
SH	956	1700	1537					
Volume to Capacity	0.01	0.04	0.00					
Queue Length 95th (m)	0.2	0.0	0.1					
Control Delay (s)	8.8	0.0	0.2					
Lane LOS	A		A					
Approach Delay (s)	8.8	0.0	0.2					
Approach LOS	A							
Intersection Summary								
Average Delay			0.4	-				
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	noite		19,7%	IC	U Level	of Service	A	
Analysis Period (min)			15					

2027 AM with Development 2021July12OpenSessionFINAL_269 10: Chapel Rd

	*	*	1	1	4	+	
Movement	WBL	WER	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	
Lane Configurations	¥		1.			4	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	8	1	63	2	1	119	
Future Volume (Veh/h)	8	1	63	2	1	119	
Sign Control	Stop		Free		-	Free	
Grade	0%		0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	
Hourly flow rate (vph)	9	1	67	2	1	127	
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	197	68			69		
VC1, stage 1 cont vol							
vC2, stage 2 conf vol							
vCu, unblocked vol	197	68			69		
IC, single (s)	6.4	6.2			4.1		
IC, 2 stage (s)					-		
tF (s)	3.5	3.3			22		
p0 queue free %	-99	100			100		
cM capacity (veh/h)	791	995			1532		
Direction, Lane #	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1				
Volume Total	10	69	128				
Volume Left	9	0	1				
Volume Right	1	2	0				
cSH	808	1700	1532				
Volume to Capacity	0.01	0.04	0.00				
Queue Length 95th (m)	0.3	0.0	0.0				
Control Delay (s)	9.5	0.0	0.1				
Lane LOS	A		A				
Approach Delay (s)	9.5	0.0	0.1				
Approach LOS	A		120				
Intersection Summary		-					
Average Delay		-	0.5		1		
Intersection Capacity Utilizatio	on		17.1%	10	ULevel	of Service	A
Analysis Period (min)			15				

2027 PM With Development 2021July12OpenSessionFINAL_270 3: Development/Chapel Rd & Marr Rd

	1	+	7	1	+	*	1	1	1	+	+	1
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		47+			47+			4			4	
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	20	555	8	10	657	130	11	0	12	68	0	29
Future Volume (Veh/h)	20	555	8	10	657	130	11	0	12	68	0	29
Sign Control		Free		-	Free			Stop		-	Stop	
Grade		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Hourly flow rate (vph)	21	584	8	11	692	137	12	0	13	72	0	31
Pedestrians		20.00										
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	829			592			1444	1481	588	1426	1416	760
vC1, stage 1 cont vol												
vC2, stage 2 conf vol												
VCu, unblocked vol	829			592			1444	1481	588	1426	1416	760
IC, single (s)	4.1			4.1			7.1	6.5	6.2	7.1	6.5	62
IC, 2 stage (s)				11						-		
IF (s)	2.2			2.2			3.5	4.0	3.3	3.5	4.0	3.3
p0 queue free %	97			99			88	100	97	33	100	92
cM capacity (veh/h)	807			989			99	121	511	108	133	407
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	W9 1	NB 1	SB 1								-
Volume Total	613	840	25	103								
Volume Left	21	11	12	72								
Volume Right	8	137	13	31								
dSH	807	989	171	138								
Volume to Capacity	0.03	0.01	0.15	0.74								
Queue Length 95th (m)	0.6	0.3	4.0	35.1								
Control Delay (s)	0.7	0.3	29.7	83.2								
Lane LOS	A	A	D	F								
Approach Delay (s)	0.7	0.3	29.7	83.2								
Approach LOS			D	F								
Intersection Summary												
Average Delay			6.3		-				-			1
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	tion		61.5%	H	CU Level	of Service			8			
Analysis Period (min)			15		and a first in							

	1	+	+	1	4	1	
Movement	EBL	EBT	WET	WBR	SBL	SBR	
Lane Configurations		4	1+		M		
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	6	630	789	32	15	9	
Future Volume (Veh/h)	6	630	789	32	15	9	
Sign Control		Free	Free		Stop		
Grade		0%	0%		0%		
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	
Hourly flow rate (vph)	6	663	831	34	16	9	
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	865				1523	848	
vC1, stage 1 cont vol							
vC2, stage 2 conf vol							
vCu, unblocked vol	865				1523	848	
IC, single (s)	4.1				6.4	6.2	
IC. 2 stage (s)							
IF (s)	22				3.5	3.3	
p0 queue free %	99				88	98	
cM capacity (veh/h)	782				130	363	
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	SB 1				
Volume Total	669	865	25				
Volume Left	6	0	16				
Volume Right	0	34	.9				
CSH	782	1700	169				
Volume to Capacity	0.01	0.51	0.15				
Queue Length 95th (m)	0.2	0.0	4.1				
Control Delay (s)	0.2	0.0	30.0				
Lane LOS	A		D				
Approach Delay (s)	0.2	0.0	30.0				
Approach LOS			D				
Intersection Summary			_				
Average Delay			0.6		10000		
Intersection Canacity Utilizatio	6		53.5%	10	ULevel	of Service	A
Analysis Period (min)			15				17.

2027 PM With Development 2021July12OpenSessionFINAL_272 8: Chapel Rd & Access

	1	*	1	1	1	+		
Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBI		
Lane Configurations	Y		1.			4		
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	1	B	150	1	1	96		_
Future Volume (Veh/h)	1	8	150	1	1	96		
Sign Control	Stop		Free			Free		
Grade	0%		0%			0%		
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95		
Hourly flow rate (vph)	1	8	158	1	1	101		
Pedestrians								
Lane Width (m)								
Walking Speed (m/s)								
Percent Blockage								
Right turn flare (veh)								
Median type			None			None		
Median storage veh)						Contract of the second s		
Upstream signal (m)								
X. platoon unblocked								
C, conflicting volume	262	158			159			
C1, stage 1 conf vol								
C2, stage 2 conf vol								
Cu. unblocked vol	262	158			159			
C, single (s)	6.4	6.2			4.1			
C. 2 stage (s)								
IF (s)	3.5	3.3			22			
p0 queue free %	100	99			100			
cM capacity (veh/h)	729	889			1427			
Direction, Lane #	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1					
/olume Total	9	159	102					
Volume Left	1	0	1					
/olume Right	8	1	0					
SH	868	1700	1427					
/olume to Capacity	0.01	0.09	0.00					
Queue Length 95th (m)	0.3	0.0	0.0					
Control Delay (s)	9.2	0.0	0.1					
ane LOS	A		A					
Approach Delay (s)	9.2	0.0	0.1					
Approach LOS	A							
Intersection Summary			_					
Average Delay			0.3		1000	200		
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	ation		18.0%	IC	U Level	of Service	A	
Analysis Period (min)			15					

	1	*	1	1	1	1		
Movement	WBL	WER	NET	NBR	SEL	SBT		
Lane Configurations	W		t.			4		
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	5.	1	150	8	1	92		
Future Volume (Veh/h)	5	1	150	8	1	92		
Sign Control	Stop		Free	-		Free		
Grade	0%		0%			0%		
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95		
Hourly flow rate (vph)	5	1	158	8	1	97		
Pedestrians								
Lane Width (m)								
Walking Speed (m/s)								
Percent Blockage								
Right turn flare (yeh)								
Median type			None			None		
Median storage veh)								
Upstream signal (m)								
pX, platoon unblocked								
vC, conflicting volume	261	162			166			
VC1, stage 1 cont vol	-	-			-			
vC2, stage 2 conf vol								
vCu, unblocked vol	261	162			166			
IC, single (s)	6.4	6.2			4.1			
IC, 2 stage (s)								
IF (s)	3.5	3.3			22			
p0 queue free %	99	100			100			
cM capacity (veh/h)	730	885			1418			
Direction, Lane #	WE 1	NB 1	SB 1					
Volume Total	6	166	98					
Volume Left	5	0	1					
Volume Right	1	8	0					
CSH	752	1700	1418					
Volume to Capacity	0.01	0.10	0.00					
Queue Length 95th (m)	0.2	0.0	0.0					
Control Delay (s)	9.8	0.0	0.1					
Lane LOS	A		A					
Approach Delay (s)	9.8	0.0	0.1					
Approach LOS	A							
Intersection Summary								
Average Delay			0.2		1			
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	noide		18.4%	10	ULevel	of Service	A	
Analysis Period (min)			15					



Appendix D: Signal Warrant Worksheet



