TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY THE PROMENADE



PREPARED FOR: PETER ROUVALIS

Project No. 201-02491

MAY 2020



vsp

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| 6.2 | Conclusions | 22 |
|-----|------------------------------------|----|
| 6.1 | Summary | 21 |
| 6 | SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS | 21 |
| 5 | INTERSECTION OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS | 14 |
| | ASSIGNMENT | 10 |
| 4 | TRIP GENERATION, DISTRIBUTION, AND | |
| 3 | BACKGROUND TRAFFIC | 9 |
| 2 | STUDY AREA DESCRIPTIONS | 4 |
| 1 | INTRODUCTION | 1 |

APPENDICES

- A TRAFFIC VOLUME DATA
- B INTERSECTION PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS



1 INTRODUCTION

Background

Plans are being prepared for the Promenade, a multi-use development bound by Robie Street, College Street and Carlton Street in Halifax, Nova Scotia (see Figure 1).

In 2016, SNC-Lavalin completed a Traffic Impact Statement for the proposed multi-use development. Since completing the original Traffic Impact Statement in 2016, two nearby developments are expected to be constructed, therefore, an updated Traffic Impact Study (TIS) has been requested in order to fully evaluate the impacts of the proposed development in combination with the other approved developments in the area.

WSP Canada Inc. has been retained to complete a revised TIS for the proposed multi-use development (see Figure 2). This TIS follows the required plan amendments outlined in HRM's Additional Information Request, dated November 26, 2019.



A Traffic Impact Study Usually Considers Four Questions A TIS usually consists of determining answers for the following questions:

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



Study Objectives

- 1. Establish existing traffic conditions in the Study Area.
- 2. Estimate the number of AM and PM vehicles trips that are expected to be generated by the two nearby developments identified by HRM.
- 3. Develop projected 2024 background weekday AM and PM peak hourly volumes for Study Area roads that include trips generated by the background developments but do not include trips generated by the Promenade site development.
- 4. Estimate the number of weekday AM and PM peak hour trips that will be generated by the Promenade.
- 5. Distribute and assign site generated trips to Study Intersections to project 2024 peak hourly volumes that include site generated trips.
- 6. Evaluate impacts of site generated traffic on the performance of Study Intersections.
- 7. Complete warrant analyses, as necessary, for Study Intersections and recommend improvements that may be needed at study intersections to mitigate the impacts of site development.



2 STUDY AREA DESCRIPTIONS

Description of Existing Site The existing site is occupied by six (6) residential properties. There are three (3) buildings that front College Street:

- 5977 College Street (PID 00135517) is a 4-storey residential building with 12 dwelling units (see Photo 1);
- 5969 College Street (PID 00135509) is a 3-storey designated "Heritage Building" with 17 dwelling units (see Photo 2);
- 5963 College Street (PID 00135491) is a 3-storey residential building with 4 dwelling units (see Photo 3); and,

There are two (2) properties that front Robie Street:

- 1389 Robie Street (PID 00135541) is a 3-storey residential building with 24 dwelling units (see Photo 4); and,
- 1377 Robie Street (PID 00135533) is a 2-storey residential building with 4 dwelling units (see Photo 5).

There is one (1) property on the corner of Robie Street and College Street:

• 5993 College Street (PID 00135525) is a 3-storey residential building with 4 dwelling units (see Photo 6).



Photo 1 – 5977 College Street



Photo 2 – 5969 College Street



Photo 3 – 5963 College Street



Photo 4 – 1389 Robie Street



Photo 5 – 1377 Robie Street



Photo 6 – 5993 College Street



Description of Proposed Redevelopment

The proposed multi-use development will be bound by Robie Street, College Street and Carlton Street in Halifax, Nova Scotia (see Figure 2). The Promenade is expected to be developed in two (2) phases. Phase 1 is planned to include 34 mid-rise apartments on the corner of Carlton Street and College Street (PID 00135475 and 00135483). Phase 2 is expected to include 577 high-rise apartment units, approximately 12,500 ft² of retail space, approximately 30,500 ft² of optional underground commercial space, and an underground parking garage consisting of 511 parking spots. The proposed redevelopment will include the demolition of five (5) of the existing six (6) buildings on the site and the relocation of the designated "Heritage Building" within the boundaries of Phase 1. Completion of the redevelopment is anticipated by 2024.

Proposed Site Access Full vehicular access to the proposed underground parking garage is expected to be located approximately at 5953 College Street. Sight distance appears adequate at the proposed (see Photo 7 and Photo 8). It is expected that an additional access accommodating right-in and right-out (RIRO) maneuvers only will be provided on Robie Street as a drop off driveway.



Photo 7 – Looking Left (East) on College Street towards Carlton Street



Photo 8 - Looking Right (West) on College Street towards Robie Street

Existing Road Descriptions Robie Street is a major collector street that runs north-south approximately 5.5 km between the North End and South End of Halifax. In the vicinity of the proposed development, Robie Street has two traffic lanes in each direction divided by a median and sidewalks on both sides. The posted speed limit is 50 km/h and metered parking is provided on both sides of Robie Street.

College Street is a local road that runs east-west approximately 500 m between Robie Street and Cathedral Lane. College Street consists of one lane in each direction with sidewalks on both sides and the posted speed limit is 50 km/h. Metered parking is provided on the south side of College Street.

Carlton Street is a local road that runs north-south approximately 250 m between the Camp Hill Cemetery and College Street. Carlton Street consists of one lane in each direction with sidewalks on both sides and the posted speed limit is 50 km/h.

Spring Garden Road is an undivided local collector street that runs east-west approximately 1.2 km between Robie Street and Barrington Street. Spring Garden Road consists of numerous residential and commercial properties, access driveways, bus stop locations and metered parking. There are sidewalks on both sides as this corridor is used heavily by pedestrians. The posted speed limit is 50 km/h.

Summer Street is a local street that runs north-south approximately 900 m between Bell Road and University Avenue. In the vicinity of the proposed development, Summer Street has one lane in each direction divided by a median and sidewalks on both sides. The posted speed limit is 50 km/h.



Intersection 1 – Robie Street and Spring Garden Road/Coburg Road is a 4-leg signalized intersection with pedestrian crosswalks on all approaches (see Photo 9). The northbound and southbound approaches consists of one through/left-turn lane, one through lane and a right-turn lane. The eastbound approach (Coburg Road) consists of one left turn lane and a through/right-turn lane and the westbound approach (Spring Garden Road) consists of one through/left-turn lane and a through/left-turn lane and a through/right-turn lane.



Photo 9 – Robie Street at Spring Garden Road and Coburg Road

Intersection 2 – Robie Street and College Street is a 3-leg stop-controlled intersection with free flow on the Robie Street (see Photo 10). The northbound approach consists of one through lane and one through/right-turn lane the southbound approach consists of one through lane and one through/left-turn lane. The eastbound approach (College Street) consists of one lane with pedestrian crossing consisting of parallel bars.



Photo 10 – Robie Street and College Street



Intersection Descriptions (Continued) *Intersection 3 – Spring Garden Road and Carlton Street* is a 4-leg stop-controlled intersection with free flow on Spring Garden Road (see Photo 11). All approaches consist of single lanes and there is an RA-5 pedestrian crossing located on the crossing the east leg.



Photo 11 – Spring Garden Road and Carlton Street

Intersection 4 – College Street and Carlton Street is a 3-leg stop-controlled intersection with free flow on the College Street (see Photo 12). All approaches consist of single lanes and there are no marked pedestrian crosswalks.



Photo 12 – College Street and Carlton Street

Intersection 5 – Spring Garden Road and Summer Street is a 4-leg signalized intersection with pedestrian crosswalks on all approaches (see Photo 13). The westbound approach consists of one through/left-turn lane and a right-turn lane that is supplemented with a transit priority signal. The eastbound approach consists of one through/left-turn lane and a through/right-turn lane. The southbound approach consists of one through/left-turn lane and a right-turn lane, right turns are prohibited during red lights at this approach.



Photo 13 – Spring Garden Road and Summer Street



Intersection Descriptions (Continued)

Intersection 6 - College Street and Summer Street is a 4-leg stop-controlled intersection with free flow on Summer Street (see Photo 14). All approaches consist of single lanes and there are marked crosswalks crossing the east, west and north legs of the intersection.



Photo 14 – College Street and Summer Street

Turning Movement

Turning movement counts were collected during morning and evening peak periods at the existing Study Intersections by WSP on Tuesday, March 3 through Thursday, March 5, 2020. The turning movement counts have been tabulated in Tables A-1 to A-6, Appendix A, with peak hour volumes indicated by shaded areas.

Observed 2020 AM and PM peak hour volumes are shown diagrammatically in Figure A-1, Appendix A. It should be noted that the observed volumes have been rounded to the nearest multiple of 5.

The proposed site has good accessibility for pedestrians. There are sidewalks on both sides of all corridors in the Study Area and marked crosswalks at all Study Intersections.

HRM Transit currently operates several routes near the proposed redevelopment site (see Figure 3), with a number of bus stops located on Robie Street and Spring Garden Road. Currently there is no transit route that runs directly past the proposed site.



Figure 3 – HRM Transit Routes

Counts

Observed Traffic Volumes

Active Transportation & Transit

3 BACKGROUND TRAFFIC

Other Anticipated Developments in the Study Area HRM requested inclusion of two (2) approved developments in the Study Area as the background growth. One of the background developments is expected to be located adjacent to the proposed redevelopment site (Case 20218) and the other background development is expected to be located at 5885 Spring Garden Road (Killam Property) (see Figure 4).

Both of the background developments considered are currently occupied by other existing properties. The adjacent property is currently occupied by several residential and commercial properties. Case 20218 is expected to consist of 250 mid-rise apartment units, 61,000 ft² of office space and 21,000 ft² of commercial space. The Killam Property is currently occupied by a 201-unit mid-rise apartment building and the redeveloped property is expected to consist of a 305-unit mid-rise apartment building.



Figure 4 – Locations of Background Developments

Annual Growth This updated Traffic Impact Study accounts for the adjacent developments as the background growth of traffic in the area, therefore, no annual growth factor was applied to the traffic volumes.

4 TRIP GENERATION, DISTRIBUTION, AND ASSIGNMENT

Anticipated Land Use for Proposed Redevelopment

Anticipated Land Use for Background Developments

Estimation of Site Generated Trips (Background Developments and Proposed Site)

Trips Generated from Case 20218 Phase 1 of the Promenade is expected to include 34 Mid-Rise Apartment units. Phase 2 is planned to include 577 High-Rise Apartment units and 43,000 ft² of Commercial Space consisting of Speciality Retail and High-Turnover (Sit-Down) Restaurants.

Case 20218 is planned to include 250 Mid-Rise Apartment units, 61,000 ft² of General Office and 21,000 ft² of Speciality Retail. The redeveloped Killam Property is expected to consist of 305 Mid-Rise Apartment Units.

When using the published rates in *Trip Generation Manual*, *10th Edition* (Institute of Transportation Engineers, Washington, 2017) the transportation engineer's objective should be to provide a realistic estimate of the number of trips that will be generated.

Generated trips for Mid-Rise Apartments (Land Use 221) and High-Rise Apartments (Land Use 222) are estimated for the AM and PM peak hours of traffic by the number of units. Trips generated for Specialty Retail (Land Use 826), High-Turnover (Sit-Down) Restaurants (Land Use 932) and General Office (Land Use 710) and are estimated for the AM and PM peak hours of traffic by leasable square footage available.

The 10th Edition of the Trip Generation Manual was used to estimate trips for Mid-Rise/High-Rise Apartment units, General Office space and High-Turnover (Sit-Down) Restaurants. The estimates for Speciality Retail trips were prepared using published rates from *Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition* (Institute of Transportation Engineers, Washington, 2012). Speciality Retail is no longer listed as a potential land usage in the 10th Edition, instead more specific retail descriptions are provided (e.g. supermarket, apparel store, pet supply store, etc.). Due to the unknown use of the commercial space, speciality retail was used.

The adjacent property is currently occupied by numerous residential properties and commercial destinations. It was estimated that the proposed commercial development will approximately occupy the same leasable square footage and consist of similar land usages (e.g. coffee shops, restaurants, salons, etc.) as the existing site. The trip generation estimates of the proposed site and the vehicle trip credits for the existing site were assumed to be equivalent, therefore, the trips generated by the commercial development are captured in the traffic counts collected between March 3-5, 2020 by WSP.

In addition, the expected number of units/square footage for each land use for this property was increased by 15%, as request by HRM. The trip generation estimate for Case 20218 is summarized in Table 1.

It is estimated that Case 20218 will generate:

- 62 new two-way trips during the AM peak hour (33 entering and 29 exiting); and,
- 70 new two-way trips during the PM peak hour (30 entering and 40 exiting).

Trips Generated from Killam Property The existing Killam Property located at 5885 Spring Garden Road consists of a Mid-Rise Apartment with 201 units, therefore, a credit was applied to the trip generation estimate in order to determine the number of new trips generated by the redevelopment. The trip generation estimate for the redeveloped Killam Property is summarized in Table 2.

It is estimated that the Killam Property will generate:

- 14 new two-way trips during the AM peak hour (4 entering and 10 exiting); and,
- 17 new two-way trips during the PM peak hour (10 entering and 7 exiting).

wsp

| | | | | Trip Generation Rates ³ | | | | Trip Generation Estimates ³ | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|--------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------|--------------|--|---------------------|--|--|
| Land Use ¹ | Units ² | AM I | Peak | PM | Peak | AM Peak | | PM Peak | | | |
| | | In | Out | In | Out | In | Out | In | Out | | |
| Adjacent Site (Case 20218) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mid-Rise Apartments | 288 | Equa | tions from I | Pages 74 a | ind 75 | 25 | 72 | 73 | 47 | | |
| (Land Use 221) | Units ⁴ | (Resid | ential - Lan | d Uses 20 | 0 - 299) | 20 | 12 | 10 | 47 | | |
| General Office | 69.0 | 1.00 | 1.00 0.16 | | 0.97 | 69 | 11 | 13 | 67 | | |
| (Land Use 710) | KGLA⁴ | 1.00 | | | 0.97 | 03 | | | 01 | | |
| Specialty Retail ⁵ | 24.2 | No cł | nange betw | een existin | g and | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| (Land Use 826) | KGLA⁴ | | prop | osed. | | 0 | 0 | Ŭ | Ŭ | | |
| Trip Generation Estimates | | | | | | 94 | 83 | 86 | 114 | | |
| | | 60 | % Reductio | on for Non-/ | Auto Trips ⁶ | 56 | 50 | 52 | 68 | | |
| | | 5% R | Reduction f | or On-Site | Synergies ⁷ | 5 | 4 | 4 | 6 | | |
| | Primar | y Trip Estin | nate for Pr | oposed Ad | jacent Site | 33 | 29 | 30 | 40 | | |
| NOTES: 1. Land Use Code | 221 and 710 are from Trip G | om Trip Ger | neration, 10 9th Edition | th Edition, | (Institute of | Transporta | tion Enginee | ers, Washing | gton, 2017) | | |
| 2 Number of Dee | idential Unita' for Mi | | | | | | | ington, 2012 | .). ialtu Datail | | |
| 2. Number of Res | | u-Rise Apa | rument. Gro | | he Area X II | | seneral Olio | e and spec | iaity Retail. | | |
| 3. Rates are vehic | 3. Rates are 'vehicles per hour per unit'; trips generated are 'vehicles per hour for peak hours'. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. The expected nu | 4. The expected number of units/square footage for each land use was increased by 15%, as request by HRM. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. It was estimated | 5. It was estimated that the proposed commercial development will approximately occupy the same leasable square footage and | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 1 – Trip Generation Estimates for Case 20218

consist of similar land usages (e.g. coffee shops, restuarants, salons) as the existing site. The trip generation estimates of the proposed site and the vehicle trip credits for the existing site were assumed to be equivalent, therefore, the trips generated by the commercial development are captured in the traffic counts collected between March 3-5, 2020 by WSP. 6. Since high pedestrian / cycling / transit usage is expected in the Study Area, a 60% reduction has been applied to site

generated trip estimates. This reduction considers the IMP target for non-auto (60%) and the 2011 Census data (50%) for nonauto trips for this area.

7. It was assumed that very few trips would be made internally, therefore, only 5% of trips were considered as on-site synergies.

Table 2 – Trip Generation Estimates for Redeveloped Killam Property

| | | Trip Generation Rates ³ | | | | Trip Generation Estimates ³ | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--|-------------|---------------|-----|
| Land Use ¹ | Units ² | AM | Peak | PM Peak | | AM Peak | | PM Peak | |
| | | In | Out | In | Out | In | Out | In | Out |
| Killam Site (5885 Spring Garden Road) | | | | | | | | | |
| Mid-Rise Apartments | 305 | Equa | Equations from Pages 74 and 75 | | | 70 | 51 | | |
| (Land Use 221) | Units | (Resid | ential - Lan | d Uses 200 |) - 299) | 21 | 15 | 15 | 51 |
| Removal of Mid-Rise Apartments | 201 | Equations from Pages 74 and 75 | | | 18 | 50 | 53 | 34 | |
| (Land Use 221) | Units | (Resid | ential - Lan | d Uses 200 |) - 299) | -10 | -30 | -00 | -04 |
| | | | Trip (| Seneration | Estimates | 9 | 25 | 26 | 17 |
| | | 60 | % Reductio | n for Non-A | Auto Trips⁴ | 5 | 15 | 16 | 10 |
| | Prim | ary Trip Es | timate for I | Proposed K | (illiam Site | 4 | 10 | 10 | 7 |
| NOTES: 1. Land Use Code 221 is fr | om Trip Ge | neration, 1 | 0th Edition, | (Institute o | f Transport | ation Engine | eers, Washi | ngton, 2017 |). |
| 2. 'Number of Residential L | 2. 'Number of Residential Units' for Mid-Rise Apartment. | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Rates are 'vehicles per hour per unit'; trips generated are 'vehicles per hour for peak hours'. | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Since high pedestrian / c | ycling / tran | sit usage is | s expected i | in the Study | Area, a 60 | % reduction | has been a | pplied to sit | e |

4. Since high pedestrian / cycling / transit usage is expected in the Study Area, a 60% reduction has been applied to site generated trip estimates. This reduction considers the IMP target for non-auto (60%) and the 2011 Census data (50%) for nonauto trips for this area.

Trips Generated from the Promenade It was estimated that Phase 1 will approximately occupy the same number of apartment units as the existing site. The trip generation estimates of the proposed site and the vehicle trip credits for the existing site were assumed to be equivalent, therefore, the trips generated by Phase 1 are captured in the traffic counts collected between March 3-5, 2020 by WSP.

The site planned for Phase 2 is currently occupied by six (6) residential properties totalling 95 dwelling units. The proposed redevelopment will include the demolition of five (5) of the existing buildings on the site and the designated "Heritage Building" will be relocated with five (5) remaining units. A credit was applied to the trip generation estimate for the removal of 90 dwelling units (*SNC Lavalin, 2016*) in order to determine the number of new trips generated by the redevelopment. In addition, the expected number of units/square footage for each land use for this property was increased by 12.5%, as requested. The trip generation estimate for The Promenade is summarized in Table 3.

It is estimated that the Promenade will generate:

- 146 two-way trips during the AM peak hour (58 entering and 88 exiting); and,
- 188 two-way trips during the PM peak hour (111 entering and 77 exiting).

| Trip Genera | | | | | tion Rates ³ | | Trip Generation Estimates ³ | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|---|--|--|---|-------------------------|--|
| Land Use ¹ | Units ² | AM I | Peak | PM | Peak | AM I | Peak | PM | Peak | |
| | | In | Out | In | Out | In | Out | In | Out | |
| | | Т | he Promen | ade | | | | | | |
| High-Rise Apartments | 650 | Equat | tions from P | ages 153 ar | nd 154 | 47 | 140 | 162 | 104 | |
| (Land Use 222) | Units ⁴ | (Resi | dential - Lan | d Uses 200 | - 299) | 47 | 140 | 105 | 104 | |
| High-Turnover (Sit-Down) Restaurant⁵ | 15.3 | 5.47 | 1 17 | 6.06 | 3 71 | 83 | 68 | 02 | 57 | |
| (Land Use 932) | KGLA | 5.47 | 4.47 | 0.00 | 5.71 | 00 | 00 | 52 | 57 | |
| Specialty Retail ⁵ | 27.8 | 0.76 | 0.60 | 1 10 | 1 52 | 21 | 17 | 33 | 12 | |
| (Land Use 826) ⁶ | KGLA ⁷ | 0.70 | 0.00 | 1.13 | 1.02 | 21 | 17 | | 72 | |
| Pomoval of Existing Land Uso ⁸ | 90 | s | NC Lavalin (| August 201 | 6) | -6 | -13 | -11 | -10 | |
| | Units | SNC Lavaiin (August 2016) | | | • | -15 | | -10 | | |
| Trip Generation Estimates 145 220 277 193 | | | | | | | 193 | | | |
| | 60% Reduction for Non-Auto Trips ⁹ 87 132 166 116 | | | | | | 116 | | | |
| Primary Trip Estimate for Proposed Subject Site 58 88 111 77 | | | | | | | | | | |
| NOTES: 1. Land Use Code 221 and 93 Use Code 826 is from Trip Ge | 32 is from Ti neration, 9th | ip Generation Edition, (In | on, 10th Editi stitute of Tra | on, (Institute Insportation | e of Transpo Engineers, \ | rtation Engin Washington, | eers, Washi 2012). | ington, 2017) | and Land | |
| 2. 'Number of Residential Unit Specialty Retail. | s' for Mid-Ri | se Apartmer | nt. 'Gross Le | asable Area | a x 1000 SF' | for High-Tur | nover (Sit-Do | own) Restau | rant and | |
| 3. Rates are 'vehicles per hou | ur per unit'; t | rips generat | ed are 'vehic | les per hou | r for peak ho | ours'. | | | | |
| 4. The expected number of re | sidential uni | ts was incre | eased by 12. | 5%, as requ | iested. | | | | | |
| 5. Commercial uses associate resemble high-turnover restau | ed with the c irants (15,25 | optional unde 50 ft ²) with s | erground spa it-down facili | ace have yet ties and 509 | t to be identif % would rese | fied, therefor emble gener | e, it was ass al retail (15,2 | umed that 5 250 ft ²). estal | 0% would blishments. | |
| 6. The Specialty Retail (ITE La Since there is no published ra retail are generally low, AM trip | and Use 826 te for the AM o rates have |) rate for 'Pe I peak hour o been assun | eak Hour of A of adjacent s ned to be 50 | Adjacent Stro street traffic % of the PM | eet Traffic, C for this land I rate with re | One Hour Be use, and sin versal of the | tween 4 and ce AM peak directional s | 6 PM' has be hour trips to plit. | een used. specialty | |
| 7. The Specialty Retail include (15,250 ft ²). | es the 12,500 |) ft ² expecte | d on the gro | und level an | d 50% of the | e optional un | derground co | ommercial s | pace | |
| 8. Credits for the existing land 2016). | 8. Credits for the existing land use of the subject site were extracted from the Traffic Impact Statement completed by SNC Lavalin (August 2016). | | | | | alin (August | | | | |
| Since high pedestrian / cycl estimates. This reduction con | ling / transit siders the IN | usage is exp /P target for | pected in the non-auto (6 | Study Area 0%) and the | , a 60% redu 2011 Censu | uction has be us data (50% | een applied to 6) for nonaut | o site genera o trips for thi | ited trip s area. | |

Table 3 – Trip Generation Estimates for the Promenade

NSD

Trip Distribution and Assignment Trips generated by the background developments and proposed development were assigned to the roadway network based on WSP's collected turning movement counts and local knowledge of the area considering major trip origins and destinations in the region.

| North | 60% | (Halifax Commons, Hospital, North End Halifax, Bedford, Dartmouth/Burnside/Fall River via McKay Bridge or Macdonald Bridge) |
|-------------|-----------|---|
| East | 10% | (Downtown Halifax various possible destinations) |
| South | 20% | (South End Halifax, Dalhousie University, St. Mary's University, Hospital, etc.) |
| West | 10% | (Halifax Shopping Centre, Bayers Lake, Highway 102, Armdale Roundabout, etc.) |
| Trips gener | ated by t | he background developments have been added to the observed 2020 |

Projected 2024 Traffic Volumes with Background Developments and without the Promenade

Projected 2024 Traffic Volumes with Background Developments and the Promenade the background developments taken into consideration are illustrated diagrammatically in Figure A-2, Appendix A.

volumes (Figure A-1, Appendix A) to provide projected 2024 AM and PM peak hourly

volumes that do not include The Promenade site generated trips. The 2024 traffic volumes with

Trips generated by the proposed site (Figure A-3, Appendix A) have been added to the 2024 traffic volumes with the background developments (Figure A-2, Appendix A) to provide projected 2024 AM and PM peak hourly volumes that include The Promenade site generated trips. The 2024 traffic volumes with the background developments and the proposed site are illustrated diagrammatically in Figure A-4, Appendix A.

INTERSECTION OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS

Intersection Capacity Analysis

Intersection

Capacity

Analysis

Results

Intersection capacity analysis was completed to estimate how the Study Intersections may be expected to operate in the future without and with site generated trips.

Synchro 10.0 software was used to evaluate the performance of the Study Intersections for the following scenarios:

- A. Observed 2020 AM and PM peak hour volumes (rounded to the nearest 5);
- B. Projected 2024 AM and PM peak hour volumes with background developments; and,
- C. Projected 2024 AM and PM peak hour volumes with proposed site and background developments.

The following subsections identify each study intersection and summarize the results of the operational analysis. Detailed results of the analyses are included in Appendix B.

Intersection 1 – Robie Street and Spring Garden Road/Coburg Road (Table 4) – The existing intersection is expected to operate under capacity during the AM and PM peak hours. It should be noted that during the evening peak the eastbound left turn movement is currently approaching capacity (v/c = 0.89). With the background developments and the Promenade, all movements are expected to remain operating under capacity. The overall performance of the intersection is expected to be satisfactory both without and with the addition of site generated trips.

Intersection 2 – Robie Street and College Street (Table 5) – The existing intersection is expected to operate well under capacity during the AM and PM peak hours. With the background developments, all movements are expected to operate within HRM acceptable limits in each scenario. Negligible changes in the operational performance of this intersection are expected with the addition of the Promenade.

Intersection 3 – Spring Garden Road and Carlton Street (Table 6) – The existing intersection is expected to operate well under capacity during the AM and PM peak hours. With the background developments, all movements are expected to operate within HRM acceptable limits in each scenario. Negligible changes in the operational performance of this intersection are expected with the addition of the Promenade.

Intersection 4 – College Street and Carlton Street (Table 7) – The existing intersection is expected to operate well under capacity during the AM and PM peak hours. With the background developments, all movements are expected to operate within HRM acceptable limits in each scenario. Negligible changes in the operational performance of this intersection are expected with the addition of the Promenade.

Intersection 5 – Spring Garden Road and Summer Street (Table 8) – The existing intersection is expected to operate under capacity during the AM and PM peak hours. It should be noted that during the morning peak the southbound lane for through and left-turning vehicles is currently approaching capacity (v/c = 0.83). With the background developments and the Promenade, all movements are expected to remain operating under capacity and within HRM acceptable limits. Negligible changes in the operational performance of this intersection are expected with the addition of the proposed site.

Intersection 6 – **College Street and Summer Street** (Table 9) – The existing intersection is expected to operate under capacity during the AM and PM peak hours. With the background developments, all movements are expected to operate within HRM acceptable limits in each scenario. Negligible changes in the operational performance of this intersection are expected with the addition of the Promenade.

TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY – THE PROMENADE Project No. 201-02491 PETER ROUVALIS



| Control Delay (sec/veh), v/c Ratio, and 95 th %ile Queue (m) by Intersection Movement | | | | | | | | Overall |
|---|-------------|--------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------|------------|---------|
| Criteria | Coburg Road | | Spring Garden Road | | Intersection Delay | | | |
| | EB-L | EB-TR | WB-LTR | NB-LT | NB-R | SB-LT | SB-R | |
| | 202 | 0 AM Peak H | our without Proposed | Site or Backg | round Develo | pments (Pa | ge B-1) | |
| Delay | 36.9 | 48.2 | 36.5 | 6.6 | 1.0 | 11.6 | 1.9 | |
| v/c | 0.30 | 0.74 | 0.67 | 0.28 | 0.05 | 0.66 | 0.07 | 17.6 |
| Queue | 18.2 | 53.6 | 29.6 | 32.9 | 2.3 | 105.5 | 5.0 | |
| | 202 | 0 PM Peak H | our without Proposed | Site or Backg | round Develo | pments (Pa | ge B-8) | |
| Delay | 92.9 | 36.1 | 22.4 | 8.6 | 0.0 | 7.4 | 2.3 | |
| v/c | 0.89 | 0.54 | 0.63 | 0.51 | 0.03 | 0.37 | 0.05 | 16.3 |
| Queue | 38.2 | 44.4 | 26.1 | 75.5 | 0.0 | 33.7 | 4.3 | |
| 2024 AM Peak Hour without Proposed Site and with Background Developments (Page B-15) | | | | | | | | |
| Delay | 36.6 | 48.1 | 38.3 | 6.9 | 1.4 | 12.5 | 2.0 | |
| v/c | 0.30 | 0.75 | 0.72 | 0.28 | 0.05 | 0.68 | 0.07 | 18.7 |
| Queue | 18.1 | 55.6 | 32.3 | 34.0 | 3.0 | 112.3 | 5.2 | |
| | 2024 PN | M Peak Hour | without Proposed Site | and with Bad | ckground Dev | velopments (F | Page B-22) | |
| Delay | 96.4 | 36.5 | 22.6 | 8.9 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 2.4 | |
| v/c | 0.90 | 0.56 | 0.64 | 0.52 | 0.03 | 0.38 | 0.05 | 16.9 |
| Queue | 38.8 | 46.8 | 27.0 | 77.1 | 0.0 | 35.0 | 4.4 | |
| | 202 | 24 AM Peak H | lour with Proposed Site | and Backgro | ound Develop | ments (Page | e B-29) | |
| Delay | 37.4 | 50.6 | 40.9 | 7.0 | 1.2 | 12.7 | 1.8 | |
| v/c | 0.31 | 0.78 | 0.74 | 0.31 | 0.05 | 0.70 | 0.07 | 19.3 |
| Queue | 18.6 | 58.6 | 34.0 | 35.1 | 2.8 | 109.0 | 4.7 | |
| | 202 | 4 PM Peak H | lour with Proposed Site | and Backgro | ound Develop | ments (Page | e B-36) | |
| Delay | 93.6 | 37.4 | 22.8 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 2.1 | |
| v/c | 0.89 | 0.60 | 0.65 | 0.54 | 0.03 | 0.40 | 0.05 | 16.9 |
| Queue | 42.0 | 51.5 | 28.4 | 74.7 | 0.0 | 33.2 | 4.0 | |

Table 4 – Intersection Capacity Analysis for Robie Street at Spring Garden Road/Coburg Road



| | Co and 95th % | t | Overall | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| Criteria | College Street | | Robie | Street | | Intersection Delay | | | |
| | WB-LR | NB-T | NB-TR | SB-LT | SB-T | | | | |
| 202 | 2020 AM Peak Hour without Proposed Site or Background Developments (Page B-2) | | | | | | | | |
| Delay | 14.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 0.0 | | | | |
| √c | 0.14 | 0.23 | 0.13 | 0.48 | 0.46 | 1.0 | | | |
| Queue | 3.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | | | | |
| 202 | 20 PM Peak Hour witho | ut Proposed | Site or Back | ground Devel | opments (Pa | ge B-9) | | | |
| Delay | 14.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 0.0 | | | | |
| v/c | 0.17 | 0.37 | 0.19 | 0.26 | 0.18 | 1.0 | | | |
| Queue | 4.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | | | | |
| 2024 AM Peak Hour without Proposed Site and with Background Developments (Page B-16) | | | | | | | | | |
| Delay | 14.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 0.0 | | | | |
| v/c | 0.14 | 0.23 | 0.13 | 0.49 | 0.46 | 1.0 | | | |
| Queue | 3.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | | | | |
| 2024 P | M Peak Hour without F | Proposed Site | and with Ba | ckground De | velopments (| Page B-23) | | | |
| Delay | 14.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 0.0 | | | | |
| v/c | 0.17 | 0.37 | 0.19 | 0.26 | 0.18 | 1.0 | | | |
| Queue | 4.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | | | | |
| 202 | 24 AM Peak Hour with I | Proposed Site | e and Backgr | ound Develo | oments (Page | e B-30) | | | |
| Delay | 14.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 0.0 | | | | |
| v/c | 0.22 | 0.23 | 0.14 | 0.51 | 0.46 | 1.4 | | | |
| Queue | 7.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | | | | |
| 202 | 24 PM Peak Hour with | Proposed Site | e and Backgr | ound Develo | pments (Pag | e B-37) | | | |
| Delay | 16.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 0.0 | | | | |
| v/c | 0.28 | 0.37 | 0.21 | 0.31 | 0.18 | 1.7 | | | |
| Queue | 8.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | | | | |

Table 5 – Intersection Capacity Analysis for Robie Street at College Street



| | ar | Overall | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|-----|--|--|
| Criteria | Spring Ga | rden Road | Carltor | Delay | | | |
| | EB-LTR | WB-LTR | NB-LTR | SB-LTR | | | |
| | 2020 AM Peak Ho | ur without Proposed S | lite or Background Dev | elopments (Page B-3) | | | |
| Delay | 0.6 | 0.6 | 13.2 | 13.5 | | | |
| v/c | 0.24 | 0.30 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 1.7 | | |
| Queue | 0.3 | 0.4 | 1.7 | 1.8 | | | |
| | 2020 PM Peak Hou | ur without Proposed S | ite or Background Deve | elopments (Page B-10) | | | |
| Delay | 0.6 | 0.6 | 13.5 | 14.8 | | | |
| v/c | 0.33 | 0.26 | 0.07 | 0.12 | 2.0 | | |
| Queue | 0.4 | 0.3 | 1.8 | 3.2 | | | |
| 2024 AM Peak Hour without Proposed Site and with Background Developments (Page B-17) | | | | | | | |
| Delay | 0.6 | 0.6 | 13.8 | 14.2 | | | |
| v∕c | 0.26 | 0.31 | 0.07 | 0.10 | 1.9 | | |
| Queue | 0.3 | 0.4 | 1.9 | 2.7 | | | |
| | 2024 PM Peak Hour w | ithout Proposed Site a | and with Background D | evelopments (Page B- | 24) | | |
| Delay | 0.6 | 0.5 | 12.8 | 16.3 | | | |
| √c | 0.35 | 0.28 | 0.10 | 0.14 | 2.3 | | |
| Queue | 0.4 | 0.3 | 2.8 | 4.0 | | | |
| | 2024 AM Peak Ho | our with Proposed Site | and Background Deve | lopments (Page B-31) | | | |
| Delay | 0.6 | 0.6 | 13.8 | 14.2 | | | |
| v/c | 0.26 | 0.31 | 0.07 | 0.10 | 1.9 | | |
| Queue | 0.3 | 0.4 | 1.9 | 2.7 | | | |
| | 2024 PM Peak Ho | our with Proposed Site | and Background Deve | lopments (Page B-38) | | | |
| Delay | 0.6 | 0.5 | 12.8 | 16.2 | | | |
| v/c | 0.35 | 0.28 | 0.10 | 0.14 | 2.3 | | |
| Queue | 0.4 | 0.3 | 2.8 | 4.0 | | | |

Table 6 – Intersection Capacity Analysis for Spring Garden Road at Carlton Street



| | Cont and 95 th %ile | Overall | | | | | |
|----------|--|--------------------------|------------------------|----------------|--|--|--|
| Criteria | College | e Street | Carlton Street | Delay | | | |
| | EB-LT | WB-TR | SB-LR | | | | |
| 20 |)20 AM Peak Hour witho | ut Proposed Site or Bac | kground Developments (| (Page B-4) | | | |
| Delay | 1.8 | 0.0 | 9.3 | | | | |
| v/c | 0.06 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 2.6 | | | |
| Queue | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.9 | | | | |
| 20 | 20 PM Peak Hour withou | ut Proposed Site or Back | ground Developments (| Page B-11) | | | |
| Delay | 2.3 | 0.0 | 9.2 | | | | |
| v/c | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 2.7 | | | |
| Queue | 0.3 | 0.0 | 1.1 | | | | |
| 2024 | 2024 AM Peak Hour without Proposed Site and with Background Developments (Page B-18) | | | | | | |
| Delay | 1.8 | 0.0 | 9.3 | | | | |
| v/c | 0.06 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 2.6 | | | |
| Queue | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.9 | | | | |
| 2024 | PM Peak Hour without P | Proposed Site and with B | ackground Developmen | ts (Page B-25) | | | |
| Delay | 2.3 | 0.0 | 9.2 | | | | |
| √/c | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 2.7 | | | |
| Queue | 0.3 | 0.0 | 1.1 | | | | |
| 20 | 024 AM Peak Hour with I | Proposed Site and Back | ground Developments (F | 'age B-32) | | | |
| Delay | 1.2 | 0.0 | 9.7 | | | | |
| v/c | 0.10 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 1.8 | | | |
| Queue | 0.4 | 0.0 | 1.0 | | | | |
| 20 | 024 PM Peak Hour with I | Proposed Site and Back | ground Developments (F | 'age B-39) | | | |
| Delay | 1.2 | 0.0 | 9.8 | | | | |
| v/c | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.05 | 1.6 | | | |
| Queue | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 | | | | |

Table 7 – Intersection Capacity Analysis College Street at Carlton Street



| | | | Control Delay (and 95 th %ile Queue (m | sec/veh), v/c l) by Intersecti | Ratio, on Movement | | | Overall | |
|---|---|---------------------|---|------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|------|---------|--|
| Criteria | | Spring Ga | rden Road | | Sumn | Delay | | | |
| | EB-LTR | WB-LT | WB-TRANSIT LANE | WB-R | NB-LTR | SB-LT | SB-R | | |
| | 2020 AM Peak Hour without Proposed Site or Background Developments (Page B-5 & 6) | | | | | | | | |
| Delay | 15.9 | 16.8 | 13.0 | 3.0 | 20.0 | 36.3 | 17.5 | | |
| v/c | 0.24 | 0.14 | 0.03 | 0.07 | 0.46 | 0.83 | 0.27 | 23.1 | |
| Queue | 29.0 | 25.1 | 4.1 | 4.9 | 40.4 | 69.2 | 23.3 | | |
| | 2020 F | PM Peak Hou | r without Proposed Site | e or Backgrou | und Developments (Pa | ge B-12 & 13 |) | | |
| Delay | 15.7 | 17.4 | 12.6 | 3.1 | 32.3 | 22.0 | 17.6 | | |
| v/c | 0.22 | 0.25 | 0.04 | 0.07 | 0.79 | 0.48 | 0.25 | 22.3 | |
| Queue | 26.8 | 43.0 | 5.2 | 4.9 | 84.9 | 34.0 | 21.8 | | |
| 2024 AM Peak Hour without Proposed Site and with Background Developments (Page B-19 & 20) | | | | | | | | | |
| Delay | 16.0 | 16.8 | 13.0 | 3.0 | 20.0 | 36.3 | 17.7 | 23.0 | |
| v/c | 0.25 | 0.16 | 0.03 | 0.07 | 0.46 | 0.83 | 0.28 | | |
| Queue | 30.1 | 27.3 | 4.1 | 4.9 | 40.4 | 69.2 | 24.0 | | |
| | 2024 PM I | Peak Hour wi | thout Proposed Site ar | nd with Back | ground Developments (| Page B-26 & | 27) | | |
| Delay | 16.2 | 17.8 | 12.9 | 3.1 | 32.0 | 21.4 | 17.4 | | |
| v/c | 0.25 | 0.27 | 0.04 | 0.07 | 0.80 | 0.47 | 0.26 | 22.0 | |
| Queue | 29.6 | 46.3 | 5.3 | 4.9 | 84.7 | 33.2 | 22.2 | | |
| | 2024 | AM Peak Hou | ır with Proposed Site a | nd Backgrou | nd Developments (Pag | e B-33 & 34) | | | |
| Delay | 17.4 | 18.3 | 14.2 | 3.2 | 19.2 | 35.4 | 16.2 | | |
| v/c | 0.26 | 0.17 | 0.03 | 0.07 | 0.48 | 0.84 | 0.26 | 23.1 | |
| Queue | 31.2 | 28.9 | 4.3 | 5.0 | 43.8 | 72.1 | 22.6 | | |
| | 2020 F | PM Peak Hou | r without Proposed Site | e or Backgrou | und Developments (Pa | ge B-40 & 41 |) | | |
| Delay | 17.6 | 19.5 | 14.1 | 3.3 | 30.6 | 21.0 | 15.9 | | |
| v/c | 0.26 | 0.30 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.80 | 0.51 | 0.24 | 22.1 | |
| Queue | 30.7 | 49.5 | 5.5 | 5.1 | 87.4 | 38.6 | 20.9 | 1 | |

Table 8 – Intersection Capacity Analysis for Spring Garden Road at Summer Street



| | ar | nt | Overall | | | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----|--|--|--|
| Criteria | College | e Street | Summe | Delay | | | | |
| | EB-LTR | WB-LTR | NB-LTR | SB-LTR | | | | |
| | 2020 AM Peak Hour without Proposed Site or Background Developments (Page B-7) | | | | | | | |
| Delay | 14.0 | 12.1 | 0.6 | 0.9 | | | | |
| v/c | 0.15 | 0.24 | 0.13 | 0.24 | 4.5 | | | |
| Queue | 4.1 | 7.5 | 0.2 | 0.6 | | | | |
| | 2020 PM Peak Hou | r without Proposed Si | te or Background Deve | elopments (Page B-14) | | | | |
| Delay | 16.8 | 13.2 | 0.4 | 1.4 | | | | |
| v/c | 0.19 | 0.21 | 0.29 | 0.16 | 4.0 | | | |
| Queue | 5.4 | 6.2 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 1 | | | |
| 2024 AM Peak Hour without Proposed Site and with Background Developments (Page B-21) | | | | | | | | |
| Delay | 14.0 | 12.1 | 0.6 | 0.9 | | | | |
| v/c | 0.15 | 0.24 | 0.13 | 0.24 | 4.5 | | | |
| Queue | 4.1 | 7.5 | 0.2 | 0.6 | | | | |
| | 2024 PM Peak Hour w | ithout Proposed Site a | nd with Background D | evelopments (Page B- | 28) | | | |
| Delay | 17.0 | 13.2 | 0.4 | 1.4 | | | | |
| v/c | 0.19 | 0.21 | 0.29 | 0.16 | 4.0 | | | |
| Queue | 5.4 | 6.3 | 0.3 | 0.6 | | | | |
| | 2024 AM Peak Ho | ur with Proposed Site a | and Background Devel | opments (Page B-35) | | | | |
| Delay | 16.2 | 12.7 | 0.6 | 0.9 | | | | |
| v/c | 0.28 | 0.26 | 0.13 | 0.27 | 5.4 | | | |
| Queue | 9.0 | 8.2 | 0.2 | 0.6 | | | | |
| | 2024 PM Peak Ho | ur with Proposed Site | and Background Devel | opments (Page B-42) | | | | |
| Delay | 21.2 | 14.2 | 0.4 | 1.1 | | | | |
| v/c | 0.35 | 0.24 | 0.31 | 0.21 | 5.2 | | | |
| Queue | 12.4 | 7.5 | 0.3 | 0.6 | | | | |

Table 9 – Intersection Capacity Analysis for College Street at Summer Street

6 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

6.1 SUMMARY

| Description of the Proposed Redevelopment | 1. | Plans are being prepared for the development of a multi-use development bound by Robie Street, College Street and Carlton Street in Halifax, Nova Scotia. The proposed development is expected to include 577 high-rise apartment units, approximately 12,500 ft ² of retail space, approximately 30,500 ft ² of optional underground commercial space, and an underground parking garage consisting of 511 parking spots. Completion of this development is anticipated by 2024. |
|--|----|---|
| Proposed Site Access | 2. | Full vehicular access to the proposed site is expected to be located approximately at 5953 College Street and a right-in/right-out driveway will be provided on Robie Street as a drop off driveway. |
| Study Area Roads | 3. | Robie Street is a major collector street that runs north-south approximately 5.5 km between the North End and South End of Halifax. In the vicinity of the proposed development, Robie Street has two traffic lanes in each direction divided by a median and sidewalks on both sides. |
| | | Robie Street and Cathedral Lane. College Street consists of one lane in each direction with sidewalks on both sides. |
| | | <i>Carlton Street</i> is a local road that runs north-south approximately 250 m between the Camp Hill Cemetery and College Street. Carlton Street consists of one lane in each direction with sidewalks on both sides. |
| | | <i>Spring Garden Road</i> is an undivided local collector street that runs east-west approximately 1.2 km between Robie Street and Barrington Street. Spring Garden Road consists of numerous residential and commercial properties, access driveways, bus stop locations and metered parking. There are sidewalks on both sides as this corridor is used heavily by pedestrians. |
| | | <i>Summer Street</i> is a local street that runs north-south approximately 900 m between Bell Road and University Avenue. In the vicinity of the proposed development, Summer Street has one lane in each direction divided by a median and sidewalks on both sides. |
| Other Anticipated Developments in the Study Area | 4. | Two (2) approved developments in the Study Area were considered as the background growth, Case 20218 adjacent to the proposed site and Killam Property at 5885 Spring Garden Road. |
| Estimation of Site Generated Trips | 5. | Trip generation estimates were prepared using rates published in <i>Trip Generation</i> , 10 th Edition (Institute of Transportation Engineers, Washington, 2017) and <i>Trip Generation</i> , 9 th Edition (Institute of Transportation Engineers, Washington, 2012). |
| | | It is estimated that the Promenade will generate: 146 two-way trips during the AM peak hour (58 entering and 88 exiting) 188 two-way trips during the PM peak hour (111 entering and 77 exiting) |

wsp

| Trip Distribution and Assignment | 6. | Trips generated by the proposed development were assigned to the roadway network based on WSP's collected turning movement counts and local knowledge of the area considering major trip origins and destinations in the region. Trips were distributed to the North (60%), East (10%), South (20%) and West (10%). |
|---|----|---|
| Summary – Intersection Capacity Analysis | | Robie Street and Spring Garden Road/Coburg Road – during the evening peak hour the eastbound left turn movement is currently approaching capacity (v/c =0.89). With the addition of the background developments and The Promenade, there is a negligble impact to the v/c and all movements are expected to operate within HRM acceptable limits. |
| | | <i>Robie Street and College Street</i> – with the addition of the background developments and The Promenade, all movements are expected to operate within HRM acceptable limits. |
| | | <i>Spring Garden Road and Carlton Street</i> – with the addition of the background developments and The Promenade, all movements are expected to operate within HRM acceptable limits. |
| | | <i>College Street and Carlton Street</i> – with the addition of the background developments and The Promenade, all movements are expected to operate within HRM acceptable limits. |
| | | Spring Garden Road and Summer Street – during the morning peak hour the southbound lane for through and left-turning vehicles is currently approaching capacity (v/c = 0.83). With the addition of the background developments and the Promenade, there is a minimal impact to this v/c and all movements are expected to operate within HRM acceptable limits. |
| | | <i>College Street and Summer Street</i> – with the addition of the background developments and The Promenade, all movements are expected to operate within HRM acceptable limits. |

6.2 CONCLUSIONS

| Impacts to Vehicular | 8. | The overall performance of the Study Intersections are expected to be |
|----------------------|----|---|
| Iraffic | | satisfactory without and with the addition of site generated trips. Negligible impacts to vehicular traffic are expected at the Study Intersections as a result |
| | | of the proposed multi-use development. |

APENDIX A TRAFFIC VOLUME DATA





| T Ro Coll ^H Wedne | able A-2 bie Street @ ege Street lalifax, NS rday, March 4, 2020 | | Robie Street H G L Ped 3 Ped 2 Ped 2 Ped 2 Ped 1 College Street F D Ped 2 | | | | | | |
|--|---|------------|--|------------|-----------|------------|------------|--|--|
| | | AM Pea | ak Period Vo | iume Data | | | | | |
| | Robie | Street | College | e Street | Robie | Street | Total | | |
| Time | Northboun | d Approach | Westboun | d Approach | Southboun | d Approach | Vehicles | | |
| | В | С | D | F | G | Н | Venicies | | |
| 07:00 07:15 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 151 | 244 | | |
| 07:15 07:30 | 83 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 169 | 262 | | |
| 07:30 07:45 | 77 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 13 | 218 | 323 | | |
| 07:45 08:00 | 95 | 3 | 0 | 15 | 17 | 222 | 352 | | |
| 08:00 08:15 | 144 | 144 7 | | 7 | 18 247 | | 425 | | |
| 08:15 08:30 | 106 | 6 | 5 | 11 | 22 | 249 | 399 | | |
| 08:30 08:45 | 119 | 5 | 0 | 12 | 14 | 235 | 385 | | |
| 08:45 09:00 | 129 | 8 | 1 | 9 | 17 | 234 | 398 | | |
| AM Peak Hour | 498 | 26 | 8 | 39 | 71 | 965 | 1607 | | |
| 07:00 08:00 | 338 | 338 7 | | 35 | 40 | 760 | 1181 | | |
| 08:00 09:00 | 498 | 498 26 | | 39 | 71 | 965 | 1607 | | |
| | Pe | d 1 | Pe | d 2 | Pe | d 3 | Total Peds | | |
| 07:00 08:00 | | 5 | 3 | 0 | | 4 | 39 | | |
| 08:00 09:00 | | 4 | 1 | 08 | | 4 | 116 | | |
| | | PM Pea | ak Period Vo | lume Data | | | | | |
| | Robie | Street | College | e Street | Robie | Street | 1 | | |
| Time | Northboun | d Approach | Westboun | d Approach | Southboun | Total | | | |
| | В | С | D F | | G | Vehicles | | | |
| 15:30 15:45 | 217 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 122 | 362 | | |
| 15:45 16:00 | 214 | 5 | 1 | 19 | 10 | 107 | 356 | | |
| 16:00 16:15 | 246 | 1 | 2 | 20 | 7 | 106 | 382 | | |
| 16:15 16:30 | 215 | 2 | 1 | 13 | 4 | 90 | 325 | | |
| 16:30 16:45 | 213 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 5 | 108 | 344 | | |
| 16:45 17:00 | 196 | 3 | 1 | 11 | 10 | 104 | 325 | | |
| 17:00 17:15 | 186 | 3 | 2 | 14 | 9 | 109 | 323 | | |
| 17:15 17:30 | 185 | 5 | 0 | 16 | 13 | 116 | 335 | | |
| PM Peak Hour | k Hour 892 11 | | 9 | 62 | 26 | 425 | 1425 | | |
| 15:30 16:30 | 892 | 11 | 9 | 62 | 26 | 425 | 1425 | | |
| 16:30 17:30 | 780 | 14 | 6 | 53 | 37 | 1327 | | | |
| Ped 1 | | | Pe | d 2 | Pe | Total Peds | | | |
| 15:30 16:30 3 | | | 1 | 04 | | 110 | | | |
| 16:30 17:30 | | 3 | 1 | 02 | | 114 | | | |

npl ount co by



| | Tab Colleg Carlto Halit | le A-4 ge Street @ n Street | | Carlton Street I G College Street J $\xrightarrow{Ped 3}$ F K $\xrightarrow{Ped 4}$ Ped 2 F E | | | | | | | |
|------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------|--|------------|------------|-------------------|----------|--|--|--|
| | | | AM Pea | k Period Vo | lume Data | | | | | | |
| | | College | e Street | Carltor | Street | College | e Street | Total | | | |
| Ti | me | Westbound | d Approach | Southboun | d Approach | Eastbound | Approach | Vehicles | | | |
| | | E F | | G | 1 | J | К | Veniolea | | | |
| 07:00 | 07:15 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 18 | | | |
| 07:15 | 07:30 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 16 | | | |
| 07:30 | 07:45 | 9 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 21 | | | |
| 07:45 | 08:00 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 17 | 31 | | | |
| 08:00 | 08:15 | 10 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 13 | 33 | | | |
| 08:15 | 08:30 | 10 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 16 | 46 | | | |
| 08:30 | 08:45 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 22 | 44 | | | |
| 08:45 | 09:00 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 13 | 38 | | | |
| AM Pea | ak Hour | 33 | 14 | 19 | 12 | 19 | 64 | 161 | | | |
| 07:00 | 08:00 | 22 | 3 | 14 | 9 | 6 | 32 | 86 | | | |
| 08:00 | 09:00 | 33 | 14 | 19 | 12 | 19 | 64 | 161 | | | |
| Ped 2 | | | Pe | d 3 | Pe | d 4 | Total Peds | | | | |
| 07:00 | 08:00 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 81 | | | | |
| 00:80 | 09:00 | 12 | 21 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 200 | | | |
| | | | PM Pea | ak Period Vo | lume Data | | | | | | |
| | | College | e Street | Carltor | Street | College | Total | | | | |
| Ti | me | Westbound | d Approach | Southboun | d Approach | Eastbound | l Approach | Vehicles | | | |
| | | E | F | G | 1 | J | К | | | | |
| 15:30 | 15:45 | 18 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 46 | | | |
| 15:45 | 16:00 | 17 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 41 | | | |
| 16:00 | 16:15 | 11 | 15 | 9 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 53 | | | |
| 16:15 | 16:30 | 11 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 32 | | | |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 10 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 30 | | | |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 10 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 30 | | | |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 16 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 9 | (| 41 | | | |
| 1/:15 1/:30 14 2 | | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 27 | | | |
| PIVI Pea | 10UF | 5/ | 35 | 22 | 15 | 14 | 29 | 1/2 | | | |
| 15:30 | 16:30 | 57 | 35 | 22 | 15 | 14 | 29 | 172 | | | |
| 16:30 | 17:30 | 50 13 | | 3 | 14 4 0 | 18 | 128 Total Dada | | | | |
| Ped 2 | | | Pe | u 3 0 | Pe | iotal Peds | | | | | |
| 15:30 | 16:30 | 13 | აა ი | 2 | 3 4 | 7 | 232 | | | | |
| 16:30 17:30 90 | | | 2 | 4 | 5 | 100 | | | | | |

r

| | | | | | | Summer Street | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|-------------------|----------------------------------|------------|----------|--|--------------|-----------|--------------------------------------|-----------|--|--|--------|------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | H G | | | |
| Table A-5 Spring Garden Road @ Summer Street | | | | | | | | к 1 | | Ped 3 | Sprin; | g Garden Road | ł | |
| | | ounnin | | | | | | | L I | | | | E D | |
| | | Hali. Tuesday, | f ax, NS March 3, 2020 | | | | | Spring G | iarden Road | ▼ Surr | Ped 1 ↑ ↑ ↑ A B C amer Street | | 0 | |
| | | | | | | AM Pea | ak Period Vo | lume Data | | | | | | |
| Ti | me | Nor | Summer Stree thbound Appro | et bach | Sp We | Spring Garden Road Westbound Approach | | | Summer Street Southbound Approach | | | Spring Garden Road Eastbound Approach | | |
| | | А | В | С | D | E | F | G | Н | | J | К | L | Venicies |
| 07:00 | 07:15 | 1 | 43 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 8 | 7 | 58 | 11 | 1 | 22 | 4 | 171 |
| 07:15 | 07:30 | 2 | 29 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 60 | 18 | 4 | 19 | 3 | 173 |
| 07:30 | 07:45 | 4 | 30 | 1 | 1 | 19 | 5 | 20 | 64 | 23 | 3 | 34 | 3 | 207 |
| 07:45 | 08:00 | 2 | 27 | 3 | 1 | 25 | 11 | 38 | 72 | 36 | 2 | 38 | 4 | 259 |
| 08:00 | 08:15 | 4 | 48 | / | 2 | 26 | 10 | 38 | 79 | 29 | 8 | 59 | 8 | 318 |
| 08:15 | 08:30 | 9 | 40 | 9 | 1 | 17 | 17 | 34 | 53 | 34 | 8 | 65 | 6 | 293 |
| 08:30 | 08:45 | 10 | 50 | 4 | 1 | 30 | 14 | 22 | 61 | 33 | 10 | 37 | 2 | 2// |
| 06.43 | ak Hour | 29 | 177 | 4 24 | 4 | 24 97 | 50 | 117 | 257 | 124 | 48 | 199 | 21 | 203 |
| 07:00 | | 23 | 129 | 5 | 3 | 72 | 35 | 78 | 257 | 88 | 10 | 113 | 14 | 810 |
| 08:00 | 09:00 | 29 | 123 | 24 | 8 | 97 | 50 | 117 | 257 | 124 | 48 | 199 | 21 | 1151 |
| | | | Ped 1 | | - | Ped 2 | | | Ped 3 | | | Ped 4 | | Total Peds |
| 07:00 | 08:00 | | 59 | | | 93 69 | | | | 98 | | | 319 | |
| 08:00 | 09:00 | | 118 | | | 110 141 | | | | 107 | | | 476 | |
| | | | | | | PM Pe | ak Period Vo | lume Data | | | | | | |
| | | | Summer Stree | t | Sn | pring Garden Road Summer Street | | | | at | Sr | 1 | | |
| ті | me | Nor | thbound Appro | bach | We | Westbound Approach | | | Southbound Approach | | | Eastbound Approach | | |
| | | A | В | С | D | E | F | G | Н | 1 | J | К | L | Vehicles |
| 15:30 | 15:45 | 15 | 77 | 5 | 2 | 41 | 15 | 19 | 33 | 24 | 10 | 43 | 8 | 292 |
| 15:45 | 16:00 | 12 | 81 | 2 | 1 | 47 | 14 | 16 | 38 | 25 | 17 | 43 | 5 | 301 |
| 16:00 | 16:15 | 18 | 97 | 5 | 2 | 41 | 10 | 16 | 21 | 27 | 15 | 44 | 8 | 304 |
| 16:15 | 16:30 | 16 | 72 | 4 | 3 | 42 | 7 | 13 | 39 | 30 | 11 | 41 | 4 | 282 |
| 16:30 | 16:45 | 13 | 97 | 1 | 2 | 42 | 20 | 15 | 36 | 25 | 13 | 43 | 3 | 310 |
| 16:45 | 17:00 | 13 | 92 | 0 | 2 | 51 | 11 | 16 | 32 | 31 | 10 | 46 | 5 | 309 |
| 17:00 | 17:15 | 9 | 65 | 2 | 1 | 37 | 10 | 16 | 40 | 27 | 10 | 38 | 4 | 259 |
| 17:15 17:30 7 54 2 3 | | | | 40 | 17 | 10 | 45 | 21 | 8 | 49 | 4 | 260 | | |
| PM Pea | ak Hour | 60 | 358 | 10 | 9 | 176 | 48 | 60 | 128 | 113 | 49 | 174 | 20 | 1205 |
| 15:30 | 16:30 | 61 | 327 | 16 | 8 | 171 | 46 | 64 | 131 | 106 | 53 | 171 | 25 | 1179 |
| 16:30 | 17:30 | 42 | 308 | 5 | 8 | 170 | 58 | 57 | 153 | 104 | 41 | 176 | 16 | 1138 |
| | 40.00 | Ped 1 | | | Ped 2 | Ped 2 Ped 3 | | | | ļ | rotal Peds | | | |
| 15:30 | 16:30 | | 220 | | | 172 | | | 195 | | | 118 | | 705 |
| 16:30 | 17:30 | 185 | | | | 101 | | 208 | | | 1 | 615 | | |





PAGE A-7



PAGE A-8





PAGE A-10




PAGE A-12



PAGE A-13



PAGE A-14

APPENDIX B INTERSECTION PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS



Traffic Impact Study - Case 20761 1: Robie St & Coburg Rd/Spring Garden Rd

| | ٦ | - | \mathbf{F} | 4 | - | • | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Ŧ | ~ |
|------------------------|----------|------|--------------|------|-------|-----|------|------------|------|-------|-------|------|
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | <u>۲</u> | f, | | | đ þ | | | ₫ † | 1 | | | 1 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 45 | 165 | 35 | 55 | 130 | 80 | 35 | 455 | 40 | 175 | 900 | 65 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 45 | 165 | 35 | 55 | 130 | 80 | 35 | 455 | 40 | 175 | 900 | 65 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1800 | 0 | 0 | 3277 | 0 | 0 | 3529 | 1583 | 0 | 3511 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.469 | | | | 0.657 | | | 0.811 | | | 0.736 | |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 829 | 1800 | 0 | 0 | 2154 | 0 | 0 | 2868 | 1336 | 0 | 2586 | 1435 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) | | 9 | | | 58 | | | | 65 | | | 70 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 49 | 270 | 0 | 0 | 318 | 0 | 0 | 555 | 43 | 0 | 1201 | 71 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | | Perm | NA | | Perm | NA | Perm | pm+pt | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | | 4 | | | 8 | | | 6 | | 5 | 2 | |
| Permitted Phases | 4 | | | 8 | | | 6 | | 6 | 2 | | 2 |
| Total Split (s) | 37.0 | 37.0 | | 37.0 | 37.0 | | 49.0 | 49.0 | 49.0 | 14.0 | 63.0 | 63.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | | | 5.0 | | | 5.0 | 5.0 | | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 19.9 | 19.9 | | | 19.9 | | | 70.1 | 70.1 | | 70.1 | 70.1 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.20 | 0.20 | | | 0.20 | | | 0.70 | 0.70 | | 0.70 | 0.70 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.30 | 0.74 | | | 0.67 | | | 0.28 | 0.05 | | 0.66 | 0.07 |
| Control Delay | 36.9 | 48.2 | | | 36.5 | | | 6.6 | 1.0 | | 11.6 | 1.9 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 36.9 | 48.2 | | | 36.5 | | | 6.6 | 1.0 | | 11.6 | 1.9 |
| LOS | D | D | | | D | | | Α | Α | | В | А |
| Approach Delay | | 46.5 | | | 36.5 | | | 6.2 | | | 11.1 | |
| Approach LOS | | D | | | D | | | Α | | | В | |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 8.6 | 50.3 | | | 25.9 | | | 19.3 | 0.0 | | 63.1 | 0.1 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 18.2 | 53.6 | | | 29.6 | | | 32.9 | 2.3 | | 105.5 | 5.0 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | | 93.9 | | | 126.2 | | | 102.6 | | | 128.8 | |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 25.0 | | | | | | | | 50.0 | | | 50.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 265 | 582 | | | 728 | | | 2010 | 955 | | 1812 | 1026 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.18 | 0.46 | | | 0.44 | | | 0.28 | 0.05 | | 0.66 | 0.07 |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Cycle Length: 100 Actuated Cycle Length: 100 Offset: 94 (94%), Referenced to phase 2:SBTL and 6:NBTL, Start of Green Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.74 Intersection Signal Delay: 17.6 Intersection LOS: B Intersection Capacity Utilization 89.8% Analysis Period (min) 15

ICU Level of Service E

Splits and Phases: 1: Robie St & Coburg Rd/Spring Garden Rd

| Ø2 (R) | , | |
|--------|---------|---------|
| 63 s | | 37 s |
| Ø5 | ₩Ø6 (R) | ₩ Ø8 |
| 14 s | 49 s | 37 s |

WSP Canada Inc.

Traffic Impact Study - Case 20761 2: Robie St & College St

| | 4 | • | 1 | 1 | 1 | Ŧ | |
|------------------------------|--------|------|-------------|------|---------|------------|---|
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | |
| Lane Configurations | ¥ | | ≜ 1≽ | | | Aî∳ | _ |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 10 | 40 | 500 | 25 | 70 | 965 | |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 10 | 40 | 500 | 25 | 70 | 965 | |
| Sign Control | Stop | | Free | | | Free | |
| Grade | 0% | | 0% | | | 0% | |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.86 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.82 | |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 12 | 49 | 581 | 27 | 76 | 1177 | |
| Pedestrians | | | | | | | |
| Lane Width (m) | | | | | | | |
| Walking Speed (m/s) | | | | | | | |
| Percent Blockage | | | | | | | |
| Right turn flare (veh) | | | | | | | |
| Median type | | | None | | | None | |
| Median storage veh) | | | | | | | |
| Upstream signal (m) | | | | | | 126 | |
| pX, platoon unblocked | 0.86 | | | | | | |
| vC, conflicting volume | 1335 | 304 | | | 608 | | |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol | | | | | | | |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol | | | | | | | |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 1058 | 304 | | | 608 | | |
| tC, single (s) | 6.8 | 6.9 | | | 4.1 | | |
| tC, 2 stage (s) | | | | | | | |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 | | | 2.2 | | |
| p0 queue free % | 93 | 93 | | | 92 | | |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 174 | 692 | | | 966 | | |
| Direction, Lane # | WB 1 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 | SB 2 | | |
| Volume Total | 61 | 387 | 221 | 468 | 785 | | |
| Volume Left | 12 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 0 | | |
| Volume Right | 49 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | | |
| cSH | 436 | 1700 | 1700 | 966 | 1700 | | |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.14 | 0.23 | 0.13 | 0.08 | 0.46 | | |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 3.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | | |
| Control Delay (s) | 14.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 0.0 | | |
| Lane LOS | В | | | А | | | |
| Approach Delay (s) | 14.6 | 0.0 | | 0.8 | | | |
| Approach LOS | В | | | | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | |
| Average Delay | | | 1.0 | | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utiliz | zation | | 56.7% | IC | U Level | of Service | 9 |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | | |

Traffic Impact Study - Case 20761 3: Carlton St & Spring Garden Rd

| | ≯ | - | \mathbf{r} | 4 | - | • | • | 1 | 1 | 1 | Ŧ | ~ |
|--|---|---|--|--|---------------------------|------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations Traffic Volume (veh/h) Future Volume (Veh/h) Sign Control | 15 15 | 220 220 Free | 15 15 | 20 20 | 285 285 285 Free | 20 20 | 15 15 | 0 0 Stop | 15 15 | 15 15 | ♣ 0 0 Stop | 15 15 |
| Grade Peak Hour Factor Hourly flow rate (vph) Pedestrians Lane Width (m) Walking Speed (m/s) | 0.92 16 | 0% 0.87 253 | 0.92 16 | 0.92 22 | 0% 0.84 339 | 0.92 22 | 0.92 16 | 0% 0.92 0 | 0.92 16 | 0.92 16 | 0% 0.92 0 | 0.92 16 |
| Right turn flare (veh) Median type Median storage veh) Upstream signal (m) pX, platoon unblocked | | None 150 | | | None 147 | | | | | | | |
| vC, conflicting volume vC1, stage 1 conf vol | 361 | | | 269 | | | 703 | 698 | 261 | 703 | 695 | 350 |
| vCu, unblocked vol tC, single (s) tC, 2 stage (s) | 361 4.1 | | | 269 4.1 | | | 703 7.1 | 698 6.5 | 261 6.2 | 703 7.1 | 695 6.5 | 350 6.2 |
| tF (s) p0 queue free % cM capacity (veh/h) | 2.2 99 1198 | | | 2.2 98 1295 | | | 3.5 95 336 | 4.0 100 353 | 3.3 98 778 | 3.5 95 337 | 4.0 100 355 | 3.3 98 693 |
| Direction, Lane # | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Volume Total Volume Left Volume Right cSH Volume to Capacity Queue Length 95th (m) Control Delay (s) Lane LOS Approach Delay (s) Approach LOS | 285 16 1198 0.01 0.3 0.6 A 0.6 | 383 22 22 1295 0.02 0.4 0.6 A 0.6 | 32 16 469 0.07 1.7 13.2 B 13.2 B | 32 16 454 0.07 1.8 13.5 B 13.5 B | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Summary Average Delay Intersection Capacity Utiliz Analysis Period (min) | ation | | 1.7 32.4% 15 | IC | CU Level (| of Service | | | A | | | |

Traffic Impact Study - Case 20761 4: College St & Carlton St

| | ≯ | - | - | • | 1 | - ▲ | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|---------|----------|------|-----------|--------------|---|--|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR | | |
| Lane Configurations | | ۴ | 4Î | | Y | | | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 20 | 65 | 35 | 15 | 20 | 10 | | |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 20 | 65 | 35 | 15 | 20 | 10 | | |
| Sign Control | | Free | Free | | Stop | | | |
| Grade | | 0% | 0% | | 0% | | | |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | | |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 22 | 71 | 38 | 16 | 22 | 11 | | |
| 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 | F 4 | | | | | | | |
| vC, conflicting volume | 54 | | | | 161 | 46 | | |
| VC1, stage 1 conf vol | | | | | | | | |
| VC2, stage 2 coni voi | Γ4 | | | | 1/1 | 47 | | |
| VCU, UNDIOCKED VOI | 54 | | | | 101 | 40 | | |
| tC, Single (S) | 4.1 | | | | 0.4 | 0.2 | | |
| tC, Z Stage (S) | 1 1 | | | | 2 5 | ^ ^ ^ | | |
| IF (S) | 2.2 | | | | 3.0 07 | 3.3 00 | | |
| pu queue liee 70 | 99 1551 | | | | 97 010 | 77 1000 | | |
| | 1001 | | | | 010 | 1025 | | |
| Direction, Lane # | EB 1 | WB 1 | SB 1 | | | | | |
| Volume Loft | 93 | 54 | 33 | | | | | |
| Volume Leit | 22 | 0 14 | 22 | | | | | |
| | U 1551 | 1700 | | | | | | |
| LON Volumo to Conacity | 1001 | 1700 | 877 | | | | | |
| Outrie to Capacity | 0.01 0.2 | 0.03 | 0.04 | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s) | U.J 1 Q | 0.0 | 0.9 | | | | | |
| Lane LOS | ۲.o ۸ | 0.0 | 7.J A | | | | | |
| Annroach Delay (s) | А 1 Q | 0.0 | 03 | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | 1.0 | 0.0 | 7.5 A | | | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | |
| Average Delay | | | 2.6 | | | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utiliza | ation | | 21.2% | IC | Ulevelo | of Service | А | |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | 2 201010 | | | |

Traffic Impact Study - Case 20761 5: Summer St & Spring Garden Rd & Transit Priority

| | ٦ | - | $\mathbf{\hat{z}}$ | 4 | + | * | • | 1 | 1 | ۲ | 1 | Ŧ |
|------------------------|------|-------|--------------------|------|-------|--------|------|------|-------|-----|------|-------|
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | WBR2 | NBL2 | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | | đ îr | | | र्भ | 1 | 1 | | \$ | | | ર્ન |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 50 | 200 | 20 | 10 | 85 | 10 | 50 | 30 | 175 | 25 | 115 | 255 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 50 | 200 | 20 | 10 | 85 | 10 | 50 | 30 | 175 | 25 | 115 | 255 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 3446 | 0 | 0 | 1853 | 808 | 1583 | 0 | 1811 | 0 | 0 | 1837 |
| Flt Permitted | | 0.889 | | | 0.960 | | | | 0.840 | | | 0.796 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 3042 | 0 | 0 | 1777 | 703 | 1583 | 0 | 1521 | 0 | 0 | 1465 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) | | 9 | | | | | 82 | | 10 | | | |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 336 | 0 | 0 | 116 | 11 | 54 | 0 | 257 | 0 | 0 | 444 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | | Perm | NA | custom | Perm | Perm | NA | | Perm | NA |
| Protected Phases | | 2 | | | 6 | 1 | | | 8 | | | 4 |
| Permitted Phases | 2 | | | 6 | | 6 | 6 | 8 | | | 4 | |
| Total Split (s) | 27.0 | 27.0 | | 27.0 | 27.0 | 9.0 | 27.0 | 44.0 | 44.0 | | 44.0 | 44.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | | 6.0 | | | 6.0 | 3.0 | 6.0 | | 6.0 | | | 6.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | | 37.0 | | | 37.0 | 41.2 | 37.0 | | 29.2 | | | 29.2 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | | 0.46 | | | 0.46 | 0.52 | 0.46 | | 0.36 | | | 0.36 |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.24 | | | 0.14 | 0.03 | 0.07 | | 0.46 | | | 0.83 |
| Control Delay | | 15.9 | | | 16.8 | 13.0 | 3.0 | | 20.0 | | | 36.3 |
| Queue Delay | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | | 15.9 | | | 16.8 | 13.0 | 3.0 | | 20.0 | | | 36.3 |
| LOS | | В | | | В | В | А | | С | | | D |
| Approach Delay | | 15.9 | | | 12.4 | | | | 20.0 | | | 31.9 |
| Approach LOS | | В | | | В | | | | С | | | С |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | | 15.2 | | | 9.8 | 0.8 | 0.0 | | 29.2 | | | 63.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | | 29.0 | | | 25.1 | 4.1 | 4.9 | | 40.4 | | | 69.2 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | | 24.0 | | | 105.6 | | | | 101.9 | | | 97.8 |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | | | | | | 35.0 | 35.0 | | | | | |
| Base Capacity (vph) | | 1410 | | | 821 | 370 | 775 | | 727 | | | 695 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | | 0.24 | | | 0.14 | 0.03 | 0.07 | | 0.35 | | | 0.64 |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Cycle Length: 80 Actuated Cycle Length: 80 Offset: 25 (31%), Referenced to phase 6:WBTL and 2:EBTL, Start of Green Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.83 Intersection Signal Delay: 23.1 Intersection Capacity Utilization 72.4% Analysis Period (min) 15

Intersection LOS: C ICU Level of Service C

Splits and Phases: 5: Summer St & Spring Garden Rd & Transit Priority

| Ø1 | ₩ Ø6 (R) | € Ø4 | |
|-----|-----------------|---------|--|
| 9 s | 27 s | 44 s | |
| | <u>∕</u> 22 (R) | | |
| | 27 s | 44 s | |

WSP Canada Inc.

Synchro 10 Report April 2020

| Page | B-6 |
|--------------|------|
| 2020 AM Peak | Hour |

| | 1 |
|-------------------------|-----------|
| Lane Group | SBR |
| LanetConfigurations | 1 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 125 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 125 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1379 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) | |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 136 |
| Turn Type | Perm |
| Protected Phases | |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |
| Total Split (s) | 44.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 29.2 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.36 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.27 |
| Control Delay | 17.5 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 |
| I otal Delay | 17.5 |
| LOS | В |
| Approach Delay | |
| Approach LOS | 110 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 14.9 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 23.3 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 25.0 |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 35.0 |
| Base Capacity (vpn) | 655 |
| Starvation Cap Reductin | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductin | 0 |
| Siorage Cap Reducin | U 0.01 |
| REDUCED N/C RAIIO | U.Z I |
| Intersection Summary | |

Traffic Impact Study - Case 20761 6: Summer St & College St

| | ٦ | - | \mathbf{i} | ∢ | ← | * | 1 | Ť | 1 | 1 | ţ | ~ |
|--|--|--|---|---|------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations Traffic Volume (veh/h) Future Volume (Veh/h) Sign Control | 20 20 | 4 15 15 Stop | 20 20 | 20 20 | 20 20 Stop | 95 95 | 10 10 | 125 125 Free | 10 10 | 30 30 | 225 225 Free | 30 30 |
| Grade Peak Hour Factor Hourly flow rate (vph) Pedestrians Lane Width (m) Walking Speed (m/s) Percent Blockage | 0.92 22 | 0% 0.57 26 | 0.92 22 | 0.92 22 | 0% 0.59 34 | 0.92 103 | 0.92 11 | 0% 0.88 142 | 0.92 11 | 0.92 33 | 0% 0.80 281 | 0.92 33 |
| Right turn flare (veh) Median type Median storage veh) | | | | | | | | None | | | None | |
| pX, platoon unblocked vC, conflicting volume vC1, stage 1 conf vol | 0.84 653 | 0.84 538 | 0.84 298 | 0.84 568 | 0.84 550 | 148 | 0.84 314 | | | 153 | 120 | |
| vCu, unblocked vol tC, single (s) tC, 2 stage (s) | 492 7.1 | 355 6.5 | 69 6.2 | 391 7.1 | 369 6.5 | 148 6.2 | 88 4.1 | | | 153 4.1 | | |
| tF (s) p0 queue free % cM capacity (veh/h) | 3.5 93 334 | 4.0 94 464 | 3.3 97 835 | 3.5 95 434 | 4.0 93 456 | 3.3 89 899 | 2.2 99 1266 | | | 2.2 98 1428 | | |
| Direction, Lane # | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Volume Total Volume Left Volume Right cSH Volume to Capacity Queue Length 95th (m) Control Delay (s) Lane LOS Approach Delay (s) Approach LOS | 70 22 472 0.15 4.1 14.0 B 14.0 B | 159 22 103 663 0.24 7.5 12.1 B 12.1 B | 164 11 1266 0.01 0.2 0.6 A 0.6 | 347 33 33 1428 0.02 0.6 0.9 A 0.9 | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Summary Average Delay Intersection Capacity Utiliza Analysis Period (min) | ation | | 4.5 37.9% 15 | IC | CU Level (| of Service | | | A | | | |

Traffic Impact Study - Case 20761 1: Robie St & Coburg Rd/Spring Garden Rd

| | ٦ | - | \mathbf{r} | ∢ | + | • | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | Ŧ | ~ |
|------------------------|----------|------|--------------|------|-------|-----|------|-------|------|-------|-------|------|
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | <u>م</u> | ţ, | | | đ þ | | | -41 | 1 | | | 1 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 95 | 155 | 15 | 30 | 175 | 165 | 90 | 860 | 25 | 100 | 380 | 45 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 95 | 155 | 15 | 30 | 175 | 165 | 90 | 860 | 25 | 100 | 380 | 45 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1825 | 0 | 0 | 3190 | 0 | 0 | 3522 | 1583 | 0 | 3507 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.338 | | | | 0.895 | | | 0.821 | | | 0.640 | |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 606 | 1825 | 0 | 0 | 2855 | 0 | 0 | 2896 | 1358 | 0 | 2265 | 1448 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) | | 6 | | | 179 | | | | 73 | | | 49 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 103 | 192 | 0 | 0 | 434 | 0 | 0 | 1033 | 27 | 0 | 578 | 49 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | | Perm | NA | | Perm | NA | Perm | pm+pt | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | | 4 | | | 8 | | | 6 | | 5 | 2 | |
| Permitted Phases | 4 | | | 8 | | | 6 | | 6 | 2 | | 2 |
| Total Split (s) | 37.0 | 37.0 | | 37.0 | 37.0 | | 40.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 13.0 | 53.0 | 53.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | | | 5.0 | | | 5.0 | 5.0 | | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 17.2 | 17.2 | | | 17.2 | | | 62.8 | 62.8 | | 62.8 | 62.8 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.19 | 0.19 | | | 0.19 | | | 0.70 | 0.70 | | 0.70 | 0.70 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.89 | 0.54 | | | 0.63 | | | 0.51 | 0.03 | | 0.37 | 0.05 |
| Control Delay | 92.9 | 36.1 | | | 22.4 | | | 8.6 | 0.0 | | 7.4 | 2.3 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 92.9 | 36.1 | | | 22.4 | | | 8.6 | 0.0 | | 7.4 | 2.3 |
| LOS | F | D | | | С | | | А | А | | А | А |
| Approach Delay | | 56.0 | | | 22.4 | | | 8.4 | | | 7.0 | |
| Approach LOS | | E | | | С | | | А | | | А | |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 18.5 | 30.9 | | | 22.0 | | | 39.4 | 0.0 | | 19.1 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | #38.2 | 44.4 | | | 26.1 | | | 75.5 | 0.0 | | 33.7 | 4.3 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | | 93.9 | | | 126.2 | | | 102.6 | | | 128.8 | |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 25.0 | | | | | | | | 50.0 | | | 50.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 215 | 652 | | | 1130 | | | 2020 | 969 | | 1579 | 1024 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.48 | 0.29 | | | 0.38 | | | 0.51 | 0.03 | | 0.37 | 0.05 |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Cycle Length: 90 Actuated Cycle Length: 90 Offset: 36 (40%), Referenced to phase 2:SBTL and 6:NBTL, Start of Green Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.89 Intersection Signal Delay: 16.3 Intersection Capacity Utilization 86.6% Analysis Period (min) 15

95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
 Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

Splits and Phases: 1: Robie St & Coburg Rd/Spring Garden Rd



WSP Canada Inc.

Synchro 10 Report April 2020

Traffic Impact Study - Case 20761 2: Robie St & College St

| | ✓ | • | 1 | 1 | 1 | ↓ | |
|------------------------------|--------|------|------------|------|---------|------------|---|
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | |
| Lane Configurations | ¥ | | ↑ Ъ | | | -۠ | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 5 | 55 | 870 | 10 | 25 | 410 | |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 5 | 55 | 870 | 10 | 25 | 410 | |
| Sign Control | Stop | | Free | | | Free | |
| Grade | 0% | | 0% | | | 0% | |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.91 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.87 | |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 6 | 71 | 956 | 11 | 27 | 471 | |
| Pedestrians | | | | | | | |
| Lane Width (m) | | | | | | | |
| Walking Speed (m/s) | | | | | | | |
| Percent Blockage | | | | | | | |
| Right turn flare (veh) | | | | | | | |
| Median type | | | None | | | None | |
| Median storage veh) | | | | | | | |
| Upstream signal (m) | | | | | | 126 | |
| pX, platoon unblocked | 0.98 | | | | | | |
| vC, conflicting volume | 1251 | 484 | | | 967 | | |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol | | | | | | | |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol | | | | | | | |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 1207 | 484 | | | 967 | | |
| tC, single (s) | 6.8 | 6.9 | | | 4.1 | | |
| tC. 2 stage (s) | | | | | | | |
| tF(s) | 3.5 | 3.3 | | | 2.2 | | |
| p0 queue free % | 96 | 87 | | | 96 | | |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 165 | 529 | | | 708 | | |
| Direction. Lane # | WB 1 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 | SB 2 | | |
| Volume Total | 77 | 637 | 330 | 184 | 314 | | |
| Volume Left | 6 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 | | |
| Volume Right | 71 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | | |
| cSH | 451 | 1700 | 1700 | 708 | 1700 | | |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.17 | 0.37 | 0.19 | 0.04 | 0.18 | | |
| Oueue Length 95th (m) | 4.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | | |
| Control Delay (s) | 14.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 0.0 | | |
| Lane LOS | В | | | A | | | |
| Approach Delay (s) | 14.6 | 0.0 | | 0.7 | | | |
| Approach LOS | В | 010 | | 017 | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | |
| Average Delay | | | 1.0 | | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utiliz | zation | | 40.4% | IC | U Level | of Service | е |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | | |

Traffic Impact Study - Case 20761 3: Carlton St & Spring Garden Rd

| | ٦ | - | \mathbf{i} | 4 | ← | * | 1 | Ť | ۲ | 1 | Ļ | ~ |
|--|---|---|--|--|--------------------|------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations Traffic Volume (veh/h) Future Volume (Veh/h) Sign Control | 20 20 | 345 345 Free | 20 20 | 15 15 | 215 215 Free | 25 25 | 15 15 | ♣ 0 0 Stop | 15 15 | 30 30 | 0 0 Stop | 15 15 |
| Peak Hour Factor Hourly flow rate (vph) Pedestrians Lane Width (m) Walking Speed (m/s) Percent Blockage | 0.92 22 | 0% 0.92 375 | 0.92 22 | 0.92 16 | 0% 0.84 256 | 0.92 27 | 0.92 16 | 0% 0.92 0 | 0.92 16 | 0.92 33 | 0% 0.92 0 | 0.92 16 |
| Right turn flare (veh) Median type Median storage veh) | | None | | | None | | | | | | | |
| vC, conflicting volume vC1, stage 1 conf vol | 0.98 283 | 150 | | 0.92 397 | 147 | | 0.93 748 | 0.93 745 | 0.92 386 | 0.93 748 | 0.93 742 | 0.98 270 |
| vCu, unblocked vol tC, single (s) | 261 4.1 | | | 303 4.1 | | | 648 7.1 | 646 6.5 | 291 6.2 | 648 7.1 | 643 6.5 | 247 6.2 |
| tF (s) p0 queue free % cM capacity (veh/h) | 2.2 98 1280 | | | 2.2 99 1159 | | | 3.5 95 341 | 4.0 100 352 | 3.3 98 689 | 3.5 90 340 | 4.0 100 353 | 3.3 98 777 |
| Direction, Lane # | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Volume Total Volume Left Volume Right cSH Volume to Capacity Queue Length 95th (m) Control Delay (s) Lane LOS Approach Delay (s) Approach LOS | 419 22 22 1280 0.02 0.4 0.6 A 0.6 | 299 16 27 1159 0.01 0.3 0.6 A 0.6 | 32 16 456 0.07 1.8 13.5 B 13.5 B | 49 33 16 417 0.12 3.2 14.8 B 14.8 B | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Summary Average Delay Intersection Capacity Utiliz Analysis Period (min) | ation | | 2.0 35.8% 15 | IC | CU Level o | of Service | | | A | | | |

Traffic Impact Study - Case 20761 4: College St & Carlton St

| | ≯ | - | - | • | 1 | 1 | |
|--|---|--|--|------------|------------------|------------|---|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR | |
| Lane Configurations Traffic Volume (veh/h) Future Volume (Veh/h) Sign Control | 15 15 | 4 30 30 Free | 40 40 Free | 30 30 | 20 20 Stop | 15 15 | |
| Peak Hour Factor Hourly flow rate (vph) Pedestrians Lane Width (m) Walking Speed (m/s) Percent Blockage | 0.92 16 | 0% 0.81 37 | 0% 0.79 51 | 0.92 33 | 0% 0.92 22 | 0.92 16 | |
| Right turn flare (veh) Median type Median storage veh) Upstream signal (m) pX, platoon unblocked | | None | None | | 10/ | (0 | |
| vC, conflicting volume vC1, stage 1 conf vol vC2, stage 2 conf vol | 84 | | | | 136 | 68 | |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 84 | | | | 136 | 68 | |
| tC, single (s) | 4.1 | | | | 6.4 | 6.2 | |
| tC, 2 stage (s) | | | | | | | |
| tF (s) | 2.2 | | | | 3.5 | 3.3 | |
| p0 queue free % | 99 | | | | 97 | 98 | |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1513 | | | | 848 | 996 | |
| Direction, Lane # | EB 1 | WB 1 | SB 1 | | | | |
| Volume Total Volume Left Volume Right cSH Volume to Capacity Queue Length 95th (m) Control Delay (s) Lane LOS Approach Delay (s) Approach LOS Intersection Summary | 53 16 0 1513 0.01 0.3 2.3 A 2.3 | 84 0 33 1700 0.05 0.0 0.0 0.0 | 38 22 16 904 0.04 1.1 9.2 A 9.2 A | | | | |
| Average Delay | ration | | 2.7 | | | of Condoc | ٨ |
| Analysis Period (min) | 2011011 | | 19.1% 15 | IC | U Level C | N Service | A |

Traffic Impact Study - Case 20761 5: Summer St & Spring Garden Rd & Transit Priority

| | ≯ | - | \mathbf{r} | 1 | + | * | • | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | ŧ |
|------------------------|------|--------|--------------|------|-------|--------|------|------|-------|-----|------|-------|
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | WBR2 | NBL2 | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | | đ î ja | | | र्भ | 1 | * | | 4 | | | र्स |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 50 | 175 | 20 | 10 | 160 | 15 | 50 | 60 | 360 | 10 | 60 | 130 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 50 | 175 | 20 | 10 | 160 | 15 | 50 | 60 | 360 | 10 | 60 | 130 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 3436 | 0 | 0 | 1857 | 808 | 1583 | 0 | 1841 | 0 | 0 | 1837 |
| Flt Permitted | | 0.864 | | | 0.978 | | | | 0.920 | | | 0.721 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 2954 | 0 | 0 | 1815 | 703 | 1583 | 0 | 1687 | 0 | 0 | 1333 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) | | 10 | | | | | 82 | | 2 | | | |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 303 | 0 | 0 | 209 | 16 | 54 | 0 | 480 | 0 | 0 | 228 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | | Perm | NA | custom | Perm | Perm | NA | | Perm | NA |
| Protected Phases | | 2 | | | 6 | 1 | | | 8 | | | 4 |
| Permitted Phases | 2 | | | 6 | | 6 | 6 | 8 | | | 4 | |
| Total Split (s) | 26.0 | 26.0 | | 26.0 | 26.0 | 9.0 | 26.0 | 45.0 | 45.0 | | 45.0 | 45.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | | 6.0 | | | 6.0 | 3.0 | 6.0 | | 6.0 | | | 6.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | | 37.1 | | | 37.1 | 41.7 | 37.1 | | 28.7 | | | 28.7 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | | 0.46 | | | 0.46 | 0.52 | 0.46 | | 0.36 | | | 0.36 |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.22 | | | 0.25 | 0.04 | 0.07 | | 0.79 | | | 0.48 |
| Control Delay | | 15.7 | | | 17.4 | 12.6 | 3.1 | | 32.3 | | | 22.0 |
| Queue Delay | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | | 15.7 | | | 17.4 | 12.6 | 3.1 | | 32.3 | | | 22.0 |
| LOS | | В | | | В | В | А | | С | | | С |
| Approach Delay | | 15.7 | | | 14.4 | | | | 32.3 | | | 20.5 |
| Approach LOS | | В | | | В | | | | С | | | С |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | | 13.3 | | | 18.4 | 1.2 | 0.0 | | 66.7 | | | 27.5 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | | 26.8 | | | 43.0 | 5.2 | 4.9 | | 84.9 | | | 34.0 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | | 24.0 | | | 105.6 | | | | 101.9 | | | 97.8 |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | | | | | | 35.0 | 35.0 | | | | | |
| Base Capacity (vph) | | 1376 | | | 842 | 375 | 778 | | 823 | | | 649 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | | 0.22 | | | 0.25 | 0.04 | 0.07 | | 0.58 | | | 0.35 |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Cycle Length: 80 Actuated Cycle Length: 80 Offset: 44 (55%), Referenced to phase 6:WBTL and 2:EBTL, Start of Green Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.79 Intersection Signal Delay: 22.3 Intersection Capacity Utilization 87.0% Analysis Period (min) 15

Splits and Phases: 5: Summer St & Spring Garden Rd & Transit Priority

| Ø1 | Ø6 (R) | ↓ _{Ø4} | |
|-----|--------------------|------------------------|--|
| 9 s | 26 s | 45 s | |
| | ø₂ (R) | A 08 | |
| | 26 s | 45 s | |

WSP Canada Inc.

Synchro 10 Report April 2020 В

13.8

21.8

35.0

672

0

0

0

0.19

| | ~ |
|-----------------------|------|
| Lane Group | SBR |
| Lane | 1 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 115 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 115 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1379 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) | |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 125 |
| Turn Type | Perm |
| Protected Phases | |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |
| Total Split (s) | 45.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 28.7 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.36 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.25 |
| Control Delay | 17.6 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 17.6 |

| Page B-13 |
|-------------------|
| 2020 PM Peak Hour |

Approach Delay Approach LOS Queue Length 50th (m)

Queue Length 95th (m)

Internal Link Dist (m) Turn Bay Length (m)

Base Capacity (vph)

Starvation Cap Reductn

Spillback Cap Reductn

Storage Cap Reductn

Intersection Summary

Reduced v/c Ratio

LOS

Traffic Impact Study - Case 20761 6: Summer St & College St

| | ≯ | - | \rightarrow | 4 | - | * | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | ↓ | ~ |
|--|--|--|--|---|------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------------|------------|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations Traffic Volume (veh/h) Future Volume (Veh/h) Sign Control | 25 25 | 15 15 Stop | 15 15 | 0 0 | 15 15 Stop | 80 80 | 15 15 | 335 335 Free | 5 5 | 25 25 | 120 120 Free | 10 10 |
| Peak Hour Factor Hourly flow rate (vph) Pedestrians Lane Width (m) Walking Speed (m/s) Percent Blockage | 0.92 27 | 0% 0.58 26 | 0.92 16 | 0.92 0 | 0% 0.52 29 | 0.92 87 | 0.92 16 | 0% 0.86 390 | 0.92 5 | 0.92 27 | 0% 0.81 148 | 0.92 11 |
| Right turn flare (veh) Median type Median storage veh) | | | | | | | | None | | | None | |
| pX, platoon unblocked vC, conflicting volume vC1, stage 1 conf vol | 0.96 734 | 0.96 634 | 0.96 154 | 0.96 661 | 0.96 638 | 392 | 0.96 159 | | | 395 | 120 | |
| vCu, unblocked vol tC, single (s) tC, 2 stage (s) | 706 7.1 | 603 6.5 | 105 6.2 | 631 7.1 | 606 6.5 | 392 6.2 | 110 4.1 | | | 395 4.1 | | |
| tF (s) p0 queue free % cM capacity (veh/h) | 3.5 90 270 | 4.0 93 385 | 3.3 98 917 | 3.5 100 345 | 4.0 92 383 | 3.3 87 656 | 2.2 99 1428 | | | 2.2 98 1164 | | |
| Direction, Lane # | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Volume Total Volume Left Volume Right cSH Volume to Capacity Queue Length 95th (m) Control Delay (s) Lane LOS Approach Delay (s) Approach LOS | 69 27 16 373 0.19 5.4 16.8 C 16.8 C | 116 0 87 557 0.21 6.2 13.2 B 13.2 B | 411 16 5 1428 0.01 0.3 0.4 A 0.4 | 186 27 11 1164 0.02 0.6 1.4 A 1.4 | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Summary Average Delay Intersection Capacity Utilization | on | | 4.0 36.5% | IC | CU Level o | of Service | | | А | | | |

Traffic Impact Study - Case 20761 1: Robie St & Coburg Rd/Spring Garden Rd

| | ٦ | - | \mathbf{r} | 1 | + | • | 1 | 1 | 1 | × | Ŧ | - |
|------------------------|----------|------|--------------|------|-------|-----|------|-------|------|-------|-------|------|
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | <u>م</u> | ţ, | | | đ þ | | | -41 | 1 | | | 1 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 45 | 175 | 35 | 60 | 140 | 90 | 35 | 455 | 45 | 185 | 900 | 65 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 45 | 175 | 35 | 60 | 140 | 90 | 35 | 455 | 45 | 185 | 900 | 65 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1803 | 0 | 0 | 3271 | 0 | 0 | 3529 | 1583 | 0 | 3511 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.440 | | | | 0.642 | | | 0.809 | | | 0.730 | |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 781 | 1803 | 0 | 0 | 2102 | 0 | 0 | 2861 | 1336 | 0 | 2564 | 1435 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) | | 8 | | | 61 | | | | 65 | | | 69 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 49 | 284 | 0 | 0 | 347 | 0 | 0 | 555 | 49 | 0 | 1212 | 71 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | | Perm | NA | | Perm | NA | Perm | pm+pt | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | | 4 | | | 8 | | | 6 | | 5 | 2 | |
| Permitted Phases | 4 | | | 8 | | | 6 | | 6 | 2 | | 2 |
| Total Split (s) | 37.0 | 37.0 | | 37.0 | 37.0 | | 49.0 | 49.0 | 49.0 | 14.0 | 63.0 | 63.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | | | 5.0 | | | 5.0 | 5.0 | | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 20.7 | 20.7 | | | 20.7 | | | 69.3 | 69.3 | | 69.3 | 69.3 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.21 | 0.21 | | | 0.21 | | | 0.69 | 0.69 | | 0.69 | 0.69 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.30 | 0.75 | | | 0.72 | | | 0.28 | 0.05 | | 0.68 | 0.07 |
| Control Delay | 36.6 | 48.1 | | | 38.3 | | | 6.9 | 1.4 | | 12.5 | 2.0 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 36.6 | 48.1 | | | 38.3 | | | 6.9 | 1.4 | | 12.5 | 2.0 |
| LOS | D | D | | | D | | | А | Α | | В | А |
| Approach Delay | | 46.4 | | | 38.3 | | | 6.5 | | | 11.9 | |
| Approach LOS | | D | | | D | | | А | | | В | |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 8.5 | 53.3 | | | 28.8 | | | 19.8 | 0.0 | | 66.5 | 0.1 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 18.1 | 55.6 | | | 32.3 | | | 34.0 | 3.0 | | 112.3 | 5.2 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | | 93.9 | | | 126.2 | | | 102.6 | | | 128.8 | |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 25.0 | | | | | | | | 50.0 | | | 50.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 249 | 582 | | | 714 | | | 1982 | 945 | | 1776 | 1015 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.20 | 0.49 | | | 0.49 | | | 0.28 | 0.05 | | 0.68 | 0.07 |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Cycle Length: 100 Actuated Cycle Length: 100 Offset: 94 (94%), Referenced to phase 2:SBTL and 6:NBTL, Start of Green Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.75 Intersection Signal Delay: 18.7 Intersection Capacity Utilization 90.4% Analysis Period (min) 15

Intersection LOS: B ICU Level of Service E

Splits and Phases: 1: Robie St & Coburg Rd/Spring Garden Rd

| Ø2 (R) | , | |
|--------|---------|---------|
| 63 s | | 37 s |
| Ø5 | ₩Ø6 (R) | ₩ Ø8 |
| 14 s | 49 s | 37 s |

WSP Canada Inc.

Traffic Impact Study - Case 20761 2: Robie St & College St

| | - | • | 1 | 1 | 1 | Ŧ | |
|-------------------------------|----------|------------|-------|------|-------------|------------|---|
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | |
| Lane Configurations | Y | | A | | | -۠ | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 10 | 40 | 500 | 25 | 70 | 970 | |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 10 | 40 | 500 | 25 | 70 | 970 | |
| Sign Control | Stop | | Free | | | Free | |
| Grade | 0% | | 0% | | | 0% | |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.86 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.82 | |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 12 | 49 | 581 | 27 | 76 | 1183 | |
| Pedestrians | | | | | | | |
| Lane Width (m) | | | | | | | |
| Walking Speed (m/s) | | | | | | | |
| Percent Blockage | | | | | | | |
| Right turn flare (veh) | | | | | | | |
| Median type | | | None | | | None | |
| Median storage veh) | | | | | | 107 | |
| Upstream signal (m) | 0.05 | | | | | 126 | |
| pX, platoon unblocked | 0.85 | 204 | | | (00 | | |
| VC, conflicting volume | 1338 | 304 | | | 608 | | |
| VCT, Stage T cont vol | | | | | | | |
| VCZ, Stage Z COTIL VOL | 1040 | 204 | | | 600 | | |
| tC single (s) | 1049 | 304 6.0 | | | 000 // 1 | | |
| C_{1} single (s) | 0.0 | 0.9 | | | 4.1 | | |
| tE(s) | 35 | 2 2 | | | 2.2 | | |
| n0 queue free % | 03 03 | 0.0 03 | | | 92 | | |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 175 | 692 | | | 966 | | |
| Direction Lane # | WR 1 | NR 1 | NR 2 | SR 1 | SR 2 | | |
| Volume Total | 61 | 387 | 221 | 470 | 789 | | |
| Volume Left | 12 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 0 | | |
| Volume Right | 49 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 0 | | |
| cSH | 437 | 1700 | 1700 | 966 | 1700 | | |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.14 | 0.23 | 0.13 | 0.08 | 0.46 | | |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 3.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | | |
| Control Delay (s) | 14.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 0.0 | | |
| Lane LOS | В | | | А | | | |
| Approach Delay (s) | 14.6 | 0.0 | | 0.8 | | | |
| Approach LOS | В | | | | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | |
| Average Delay | | | 1.0 | | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utiliza | ation | | 56.8% | IC | U Level | of Service | В |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | | |

Traffic Impact Study - Case 20761 3: Carlton St & Spring Garden Rd

| | ٦ | - | \mathbf{i} | 4 | - | * | 1 | Ť | 1 | 1 | Ļ | ~ |
|--|---|---|--|--|--------------------|------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|------------------|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations Traffic Volume (veh/h) Future Volume (Veh/h) Sign Control | 15 15 | 235 235 Free | 15 15 | 20 20 | 300 300 Free | 20 20 | 15 15 | 0 0 Stop | 15 15 | 20 20 | ♣ 0 0 Stop 0% | 20 20 |
| Peak Hour Factor Hourly flow rate (vph) Pedestrians Lane Width (m) Walking Speed (m/s) Percent Blockage | 0.92 16 | 0% 0.87 270 | 0.92 16 | 0.92 22 | 0% 0.84 357 | 0.92 22 | 0.92 16 | 0% 0.92 0 | 0.92 16 | 0.92 22 | 0% 0.92 0 | 0.92 22 |
| Right turn flare (veh) Median type Median storage veh) Upstream signal (m) | 0.00 | None 150 | | | None 147 | | 0.00 | 0.00 | | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| vC, conflicting volume vC1, stage 1 conf vol | 379 | | | 286 | | | 0.99 744 | 0.99 733 | 278 | 0.99 738 | 0.99 730 | 368 |
| vCu, unblocked vol tC, single (s) tC, 2 stage (s) | 373 4.1 | | | 286 4.1 | | | 740 7.1 | 729 6.5 | 278 6.2 | 734 7.1 | 726 6.5 | 362 6.2 |
| tF (s) p0 queue free % cM capacity (veh/h) | 2.2 99 1179 | | | 2.2 98 1276 | | | 3.5 95 313 | 4.0 100 337 | 3.3 98 761 | 3.5 93 319 | 4.0 100 339 | 3.3 97 679 |
| Direction, Lane # | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Volume Total Volume Left Volume Right cSH Volume to Capacity Queue Length 95th (m) Control Delay (s) Lane LOS Approach Delay (s) Approach LOS | 302 16 1179 0.01 0.3 0.6 A 0.6 | 401 22 22 1276 0.02 0.4 0.6 A 0.6 | 32 16 443 0.07 1.9 13.8 B 13.8 B | 44 22 434 0.10 2.7 14.2 B 14.2 B | | | | | | | | |
| Average Delay Intersection Capacity Utiliz Analysis Period (min) | ation | | 1.9 33.4% 15 | IC | CU Level (| of Service | | | A | | | |

Traffic Impact Study - Case 20761 4: College St & Carlton St

| | ≯ | - | - | • | × | 1 | | |
|-------------------------------|-------|---------------------|-------|------|----------|--------------|---|--|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR | | |
| Lane Configurations | | ب ا ا | eî | | ¥ | | | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 20 | 65 | 35 | 15 | 20 | 10 | | |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 20 | 65 | 35 | 15 | 20 | 10 | | |
| Sign Control | | Free | Free | | Stop | | | |
| Grade | | 0% | 0% | | 0% | | | |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | | |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 22 | 71 | 38 | 16 | 22 | 11 | | |
| Pedestrians | | | | | | | | |
| Lane Width (m) | | | | | | | | |
| Walking Speed (m/s) | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Blockage | | | | | | | | |
| Right lurn liare (ven) | | Mono | None | | | | | |
| Median type | | None | None | | | | | |
| Unstroom signal (m) | | | | | | | | |
| nV platoon unblocked | | | | | | | | |
| γC conflicting volume | 54 | | | | 161 | 16 | | |
| vC1 stage 1 conf vol | 54 | | | | 101 | 40 | | |
| vC2 stage 2 conf vol | | | | | | | | |
| vCu_unblocked vol | 54 | | | | 161 | 46 | | |
| tC, single (s) | 4.1 | | | | 6.4 | 6.2 | | |
| tC, 2 stage (s) | | | | | | • | | |
| tF (s) | 2.2 | | | | 3.5 | 3.3 | | |
| p0 queue free % | 99 | | | | 97 | 99 | | |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1551 | | | | 818 | 1023 | | |
| Direction, Lane # | EB 1 | WB 1 | SB 1 | | | | | |
| Volume Total | 93 | 54 | 33 | | | | | |
| Volume Left | 22 | 0 | 22 | | | | | |
| Volume Right | 0 | 16 | 11 | | | | | |
| cSH | 1551 | 1700 | 877 | | | | | |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.04 | | | | | |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.9 | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s) | 1.8 | 0.0 | 9.3 | | | | | |
| Lane LOS | A | | A | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s) | 1.8 | 0.0 | 9.3 | | | | | |
| Approach LUS | | | A | | | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | |
| Average Delay | | | 2.6 | | | (0) | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utiliz | ation | | 21.2% | IC | CU Level | ot Service | A | |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | | | |

Traffic Impact Study - Case 20761 5: Summer St & Spring Garden Rd & Transit Priority

| Lane Group EBL EBT EBR WBL WBT WBR WBR2 NBL2 NBT NBR SBL Lane Configurations 1 1 </th <th>ŧ</th> | ŧ |
|--|-------|
| Lane Configurations Image: configuration for the state of the state o | SBT |
| Traffic Volume (vph) 50 210 20 10 95 10 50 30 175 25 115 Future Volume (vph) 50 210 20 10 95 10 50 30 175 25 115 Satd. Flow (prot) 0 3451 0 0 1855 808 1583 0 1811 0 0 Flt Permitted 0.889 0.962 0.840 0 0 1782 703 1583 0 1521 0 0 Satd. Flow (perm) 0 3048 0 0 1782 703 1583 0 1521 0 0 | र्च |
| Future Volume (vph) 50 210 20 10 95 10 50 30 175 25 115 Satd. Flow (prot) 0 3451 0 0 1855 808 1583 0 1811 0 0 Flt Permitted 0.889 0.962 0.840 0 0 1583 0 1521 0 0 Satd. Flow (perm) 0 3048 0 0 1782 703 1583 0 1521 0 0 | 255 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) 0 3451 0 0 1855 808 1583 0 1811 0 0 Fit Permitted 0.889 0.962 0.840 0 0 3048 0 0 1782 703 1583 0 1521 0 0 Satd. Flow (perm) 0 3048 0 0 1782 703 1583 0 1521 0 0 | 255 |
| Flt Permitted 0.889 0.962 0.840 0 Satd. Flow (perm) 0 3048 0 1782 703 1583 0 1521 0 0 Satd. Flow (0TOD) 0 3048 0 1782 703 1583 0 1521 0 0 | 1837 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) 0 3048 0 0 1782 703 1583 0 1521 0 0 Satd Flow (0TOD) 0 0 0 1782 703 1583 0 1521 0 0 |).796 |
| Cate Flow (DTOD) 0 00 10 | 1465 |
| Salu, FIOW (RTUR) 8 82 10 | |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) 0 349 0 0 128 11 54 0 257 0 0 | 444 |
| Turn Type Perm NA Perm NA custom Perm Perm NA Perm | NA |
| Protected Phases 2 6 1 8 | 4 |
| Permitted Phases 2 6 6 8 4 | |
| Total Split (s) 27.0 27.0 27.0 27.0 9.0 27.0 44.0 44.0 | 44.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) 37.0 37.0 41.2 37.0 29.2 | 29.2 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio 0.46 0.46 0.52 0.46 0.36 | 0.36 |
| v/c Ratio 0.25 0.16 0.03 0.07 0.46 | 0.83 |
| Control Delay 16.0 16.8 13.0 3.0 20.0 | 36.3 |
| Queue Delay 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay 16.0 16.8 13.0 3.0 20.0 | 36.3 |
| LOS B B A C | D |
| Approach Delay 16.0 12.7 20.0 | 31.8 |
| Approach LOS B B C | С |
| Queue Length 50th (m) 15.9 10.9 0.8 0.0 29.2 | 63.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) 30.1 27.3 4.1 4.9 40.4 | 69.2 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) 24.0 105.6 101.9 | 97.8 |
| Turn Bay Length (m) 35.0 35.0 | |
| Base Capacity (vph) 1412 823 370 775 727 | 695 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio 0.25 0.16 0.03 0.07 0.35 | 0.64 |
| Intersection Summary | |

Cycle Length: 80 Actuated Cycle Length: 80 Offset: 25 (31%), Referenced to phase 6:WBTL and 2:EBTL, Start of Green Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.83 Intersection Signal Delay: 23.0 Intersection Capacity Utilization 72.4% Analysis Period (min) 15

Splits and Phases: 5: Summer St & Spring Garden Rd & Transit Priority

| Ø1 | ● ● Ø6 (R) | ₩ Ø4 |
|-----|-----------------------|-------------|
| 9 s | 27 s | 44 s |
| | → ² Ø2 (R) | A 08 |
| | 27 s | 44 s |

WSP Canada Inc.

7

| Lane Group | SBR |
|------------------------|------|
| Lane | 1 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 130 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 130 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1379 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) | |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 141 |
| Turn Type | Perm |
| Protected Phases | |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |
| Total Split (s) | 44.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 29.2 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.36 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.28 |
| Control Delay | 17.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 17.7 |
| LOS | В |
| Approach Delay | |
| Approach LOS | |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 15.5 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 24.0 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 35.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 655 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.22 |
| Intersection Summary | |

Traffic Impact Study - Case 20761 6: Summer St & College St

| | ≯ | - | \mathbf{i} | 1 | + | • | • | 1 | 1 | 1 | Ļ | ~ |
|--|--|--|---|---|------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations Traffic Volume (veh/h) Future Volume (Veh/h) Sign Control | 20 20 | 15 15 Stop | 20 20 | 20 20 | 20 20 Stop | 95 95 | 10 10 | 125 125 Free | 10 10 | 30 30 | 225 225 Free | 30 30 |
| Peak Hour Factor Hourly flow rate (vph) Pedestrians Lane Width (m) Walking Speed (m/s) Percent Blockage | 0.92 22 | 0% 0.57 26 | 0.92 22 | 0.92 22 | 0.59 34 | 0.92 103 | 0.92 11 | 0.88 142 | 0.92 11 | 0.92 33 | 0.80 281 | 0.92 33 |
| Right turn flare (veh) Median type Median storage veh) Upstream signal (m) | | | | | | | | None | | | None 126 | |
| pX, platoon unblocked vC, conflicting volume vC1, stage 1 conf vol vC2, stage 2 conf vol | 0.84 653 | 0.84 538 | 0.84 298 | 0.84 568 | 0.84 550 | 148 | 0.84 314 | | | 153 | | |
| vCu, unblocked vol tC, single (s) tC, 2 stage (s) | 492 7.1 | 355 6.5 | 69 6.2 | 391 7.1 | 369 6.5 | 148 6.2 | 88 4.1 | | | 153 4.1 | | |
| tF (s) p0 queue free % cM capacity (veh/h) | 3.5 93 334 | 4.0 94 464 | 3.3 97 835 | 3.5 95 434 | 4.0 93 456 | 3.3 89 899 | 2.2 99 1266 | | | 2.2 98 1428 | | |
| Direction, Lane # | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Volume Total Volume Left Volume Right cSH Volume to Capacity Queue Length 95th (m) Control Delay (s) Lane LOS Approach Delay (s) Approach LOS | 70 22 472 0.15 4.1 14.0 B 14.0 B | 159 22 103 663 0.24 7.5 12.1 B 12.1 B | 164 11 1266 0.01 0.2 0.6 A 0.6 | 347 33 33 1428 0.02 0.6 0.9 A 0.9 | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Summary Average Delay Intersection Capacity Utiliz Analysis Period (min) | ation | | 4.5 37.9% 15 | IC | CU Level (| of Service | | | A | | | |

Traffic Impact Study - Case 20761 1: Robie St & Coburg Rd/Spring Garden Rd

| | ≯ | - | \rightarrow | 1 | - | • | 1 | Ť | 1 | 1 | Ŧ | - |
|------------------------|----------|------|---------------|------|--------|-----|------|-------|------|-------|-------|------|
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | <u>م</u> | ¢Î | | | र्स कि | | | -4↑ | 1 | | | 1 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 95 | 165 | 15 | 30 | 185 | 170 | 90 | 860 | 25 | 105 | 380 | 45 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 95 | 165 | 15 | 30 | 185 | 170 | 90 | 860 | 25 | 105 | 380 | 45 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1828 | 0 | 0 | 3194 | 0 | 0 | 3522 | 1583 | 0 | 3504 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.324 | | | | 0.888 | | | 0.820 | | | 0.629 | |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 582 | 1828 | 0 | 0 | 2837 | 0 | 0 | 2893 | 1358 | 0 | 2226 | 1448 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) | | 5 | | | 185 | | | | 73 | | | 49 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 103 | 204 | 0 | 0 | 452 | 0 | 0 | 1033 | 27 | 0 | 583 | 49 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | | Perm | NA | | Perm | NA | Perm | pm+pt | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | | 4 | | | 8 | | | 6 | | 5 | 2 | |
| Permitted Phases | 4 | | | 8 | | | 6 | | 6 | 2 | | 2 |
| Total Split (s) | 37.0 | 37.0 | | 37.0 | 37.0 | | 40.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 13.0 | 53.0 | 53.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | | | 5.0 | | | 5.0 | 5.0 | | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 17.7 | 17.7 | | | 17.7 | | | 62.3 | 62.3 | | 62.3 | 62.3 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.20 | 0.20 | | | 0.20 | | | 0.69 | 0.69 | | 0.69 | 0.69 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.90 | 0.56 | | | 0.64 | | | 0.52 | 0.03 | | 0.38 | 0.05 |
| Control Delay | 96.4 | 36.5 | | | 22.6 | | | 8.9 | 0.0 | | 7.7 | 2.4 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 96.4 | 36.5 | | | 22.6 | | | 8.9 | 0.0 | | 7.7 | 2.4 |
| LOS | F | D | | | С | | | А | А | | А | А |
| Approach Delay | | 56.6 | | | 22.6 | | | 8.6 | | | 7.3 | |
| Approach LOS | | E | | | С | | | А | | | А | |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 18.5 | 33.1 | | | 23.2 | | | 40.3 | 0.0 | | 19.7 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | #38.8 | 46.8 | | | 27.0 | | | 77.1 | 0.0 | | 35.0 | 4.4 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | | 93.9 | | | 126.2 | | | 102.6 | | | 128.8 | |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 25.0 | | | | | | | | 50.0 | | | 50.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 206 | 653 | | | 1127 | | | 2003 | 962 | | 1541 | 1017 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.50 | 0.31 | | | 0.40 | | | 0.52 | 0.03 | | 0.38 | 0.05 |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Cycle Length: 90 Actuated Cycle Length: 90 Offset: 36 (40%), Referenced to phase 2:SBTL and 6:NBTL, Start of Green Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.90 Intersection Signal Delay: 16.9 Intersection LOS: B Intersection Capacity Utilization 86.8% ICU Level of Service E Analysis Period (min) 15

95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

Splits and Phases: 1: Robie St & Coburg Rd/Spring Garden Rd



WSP Canada Inc.

Synchro 10 Report April 2020

Traffic Impact Study - Case 20761 2: Robie St & College St

| | < | • | 1 | 1 | 1 | ↓ |
|------------------------------|--------|------|-------------|------|---------|------------|
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Y | | ≜ 1≽ | | - | att |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 5 | 55 | 870 | 10 | 25 | 410 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 5 | 55 | 870 | 10 | 25 | 410 |
| Sign Control | Stop | | Free | | | Free |
| Grade | 0% | | 0% | | | 0% |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.91 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.87 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 6 | 71 | 956 | 11 | 27 | 471 |
| Pedestrians | | | | | | |
| Lane Width (m) | | | | | | |
| Walking Speed (m/s) | | | | | | |
| Percent Blockage | | | | | | |
| Right turn flare (veh) | | | | | | |
| Median type | | | None | | | None |
| Median storage veh) | | | | | | |
| Upstream signal (m) | | | | | | 126 |
| pX, platoon unblocked | 0.97 | | | | | |
| vC, conflicting volume | 1251 | 484 | | | 967 | |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol | | | | | | |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol | | | | | | |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 1206 | 484 | | | 967 | |
| tC, single (s) | 6.8 | 6.9 | | | 4.1 | |
| tC, 2 stage (s) | | | | | | |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 | | | 2.2 | |
| p0 queue free % | 96 | 87 | | | 96 | |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 165 | 529 | | | 708 | |
| Direction, Lane # | WB 1 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 | SB 2 | |
| Volume Total | 77 | 637 | 330 | 184 | 314 | |
| Volume Left | 6 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 | |
| Volume Right | 71 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | |
| cSH | 452 | 1700 | 1700 | 708 | 1700 | |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.17 | 0.37 | 0.19 | 0.04 | 0.18 | |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 4.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | |
| Control Delay (s) | 14.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 0.0 | |
| Lane LOS | В | | | А | | |
| Approach Delay (s) | 14.6 | 0.0 | | 0.7 | | |
| Approach LOS | В | | | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | |
| Average Delay | | | 1.0 | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utiliz | zation | | 40.4% | IC | U Level | of Service |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | |

Traffic Impact Study - Case 20761 3: Carlton St & Spring Garden Rd

| | ≯ | - | \mathbf{F} | 4 | + | • | ٠ | Ť | 1 | 1 | ŧ | ~ |
|---|---|---|--|--|--------------------|------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations Traffic Volume (veh/h) Future Volume (Veh/h) Sign Control | 20 20 | 365 365 Free | 20 20 | 15 15 | 230 230 Free | 30 30 | 15 15 | 0 0 Stop | 35 35 | 35 35 | 0 0 Stop | 15 15 |
| Peak Hour Factor Hourly flow rate (vph) Pedestrians Lane Width (m) Walking Speed (m/s) Percent Blockage | 0.92 22 | 0% 0.92 397 | 0.92 22 | 0.92 16 | 0% 0.84 274 | 0.92 33 | 0.92 16 | 0% 0.92 0 | 0.92 38 | 0.92 38 | 0% 0.92 0 | 0.92 16 |
| Right turn flare (veh) Median type Median storage veh) Upstream signal (m) pX, platoon unblocked vC, conflicting volume vC1, stage 1 conf vol | 0.97 307 | None 150 | | 0.91 419 | None 147 | | 0.93 790 | 0.93 791 | 0.91 408 | 0.93 812 | 0.93 786 | 0.97 290 |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol vCu, unblocked vol tC, single (s) tC, 2 stage (s) tF (s) p0 queue free % | 271 4.1 2.2 98 | | | 318 4.1 2.2 99 | | | 666 7.1 3.5 95 | 666 6.5 4.0 100 | 305 6.2 3.3 94 | 689 7.1 3.5 88 | 660 6.5 4.0 100 | 254 6.2 3.3 98 |
| Direction, Lane # Volume Total Volume Left Volume Right cSH Volume to Capacity Queue Length 95th (m) Control Delay (s) Lane LOS Approach Delay (s) Approach LOS Intersection Summary | EB 1 441 22 22 1255 0.02 0.4 0.6 A 0.6 | WB 1 323 16 33 1136 0.01 0.3 0.5 A 0.5 | NB 1 54 16 38 515 0.10 2.8 12.8 B 12.8 B | SB 1 54 38 16 374 0.14 4.0 16.3 C 16.3 C | | | 221 | 542 | 071 | 300 | 545 | |
| Average Delay Intersection Capacity Utiliz Analysis Period (min) | ation | | 2.3 39.5% 15 | IC | CU Level (| of Service | | | A | | | |

Traffic Impact Study - Case 20761 4: College St & Carlton St

| | ≯ | - | - | • | × | - ▲ | | |
|------------------------------|--------|------|----------|------|------------|------------|---|--|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR | | |
| Lane Configurations | | ę | el el | | Y | | | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 15 | 30 | 40 | 30 | 20 | 15 | | |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 15 | 30 | 40 | 30 | 20 | 15 | | |
| Sign Control | | Free | Free | | Stop | | | |
| Grade | | 0% | 0% | | 0% | | | |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.81 | 0.79 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | | |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 16 | 37 | 51 | 33 | 22 | 16 | | |
| 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 | 84 | | | | 136 | 68 | | |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol | | | | | | | | |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol | | | | | | | | |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 84 | | | | 136 | 68 | | |
| tC, single (s) | 4.1 | | | | 6.4 | 6.2 | | |
| tC, 2 stage (s) | | | | | | | | |
| t⊢ (s) | 2.2 | | | | 3.5 | 3.3 | | |
| p0 queue free % | 99 | | | | 97 | 98 | | |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1513 | | | | 848 | 996 | | |
| Direction, Lane # | EB 1 | WB 1 | SB 1 | | | | | |
| Volume Total | 53 | 84 | 38 | | | | | |
| Volume Left | 16 | 0 | 22 | | | | | |
| Volume Right | 0 | 33 | 16 | | | | | |
| cSH | 1513 | 1700 | 904 | | | | | |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.04 | | | | | |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 0.3 | 0.0 | 1.1 | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s) | 2.3 | 0.0 | 9.2 | | | | | |
| Lane LUS | A | ~ ~ | A | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s) | 2.3 | 0.0 | 9.2 | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | A | | | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | |
| Average Delay | | | 2.7 | | | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utiliz | zation | | 19.1% | IC | CU Level o | ot Service | А | |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | | | |

Traffic Impact Study - Case 20761 5: Summer St & Spring Garden Rd & Transit Priority

| | ٦ | - | $\mathbf{\hat{z}}$ | 4 | + | * | • | 1 | 1 | ۲ | 1 | ŧ |
|------------------------|------|-------|--------------------|------|-------|--------|------|------|-------|-----|------|-------|
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | WBR2 | NBL2 | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | | đ îr | | | र्स | 1 | 1 | | \$ | | | र्स |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 55 | 195 | 20 | 10 | 175 | 15 | 50 | 65 | 360 | 10 | 60 | 130 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 55 | 195 | 20 | 10 | 175 | 15 | 50 | 65 | 360 | 10 | 60 | 130 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 3443 | 0 | 0 | 1859 | 808 | 1583 | 0 | 1841 | 0 | 0 | 1837 |
| Flt Permitted | | 0.857 | | | 0.978 | | | | 0.913 | | | 0.726 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 2937 | 0 | 0 | 1816 | 703 | 1583 | 0 | 1673 | 0 | 0 | 1343 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) | | 9 | | | | | 82 | | 2 | | | |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 335 | 0 | 0 | 227 | 16 | 54 | 0 | 486 | 0 | 0 | 228 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | | Perm | NA | custom | Perm | Perm | NA | | Perm | NA |
| Protected Phases | | 2 | | | 6 | 1 | | | 8 | | | 4 |
| Permitted Phases | 2 | | | 6 | | 6 | 6 | 8 | | | 4 | |
| Total Split (s) | 26.0 | 26.0 | | 26.0 | 26.0 | 9.0 | 26.0 | 45.0 | 45.0 | | 45.0 | 45.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | | 6.0 | | | 6.0 | 3.0 | 6.0 | | 6.0 | | | 6.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | | 36.8 | | | 36.8 | 41.2 | 36.8 | | 29.2 | | | 29.2 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | | 0.46 | | | 0.46 | 0.52 | 0.46 | | 0.36 | | | 0.36 |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.25 | | | 0.27 | 0.04 | 0.07 | | 0.80 | | | 0.47 |
| Control Delay | | 16.2 | | | 17.8 | 12.9 | 3.1 | | 32.0 | | | 21.4 |
| Queue Delay | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | | 16.2 | | | 17.8 | 12.9 | 3.1 | | 32.0 | | | 21.4 |
| LOS | | В | | | В | В | А | | С | | | С |
| Approach Delay | | 16.2 | | | 14.9 | | | | 32.0 | | | 19.9 |
| Approach LOS | | В | | | В | | | | С | | | В |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | | 15.2 | | | 20.5 | 1.2 | 0.0 | | 67.5 | | | 27.2 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | | 29.6 | | | 46.3 | 5.3 | 4.9 | | 84.7 | | | 33.2 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | | 24.0 | | | 105.6 | | | | 101.9 | | | 97.8 |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | | | | | | 35.0 | 35.0 | | | | | |
| Base Capacity (vph) | | 1355 | | | 834 | 370 | 772 | | 816 | | | 654 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | | 0.25 | | | 0.27 | 0.04 | 0.07 | | 0.60 | | | 0.35 |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cycle Longth: 00 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Cycle Length: 80 Actuated Cycle Length: 80 Offset: 44 (55%), Referenced to phase 6:WBTL and 2:EBTL, Start of Green Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.80 Intersection Signal Delay: 22.0 Intersection Capacity Utilization 87.3% Analysis Period (min) 15

Splits and Phases: 5: Summer St & Spring Garden Rd & Transit Priority

| ▶ – Ø1 | Ø6 (R) | ∲ Ø4 | |
|------------------|--------------------|-------------|--|
| 9 s | 26 s | 45 s | |
| | <u>⊿</u> ø2 (R) | A 08 | |
| | 26 s | 45 s | |

WSP Canada Inc.

7

| | • |
|------------------------|------|
| Lane Group | SBR |
| LanetConfigurations | 1 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 120 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 120 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1379 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) | |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 130 |
| Turn Type | Perm |
| Protected Phases | |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |
| Total Split (s) | 45.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 29.2 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.36 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.26 |
| Control Delay | 17.4 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 17.4 |
| LOS | В |
| Approach Delay | |
| Approach LOS | |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 14.2 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 22.2 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 35.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 672 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.19 |
| Intersection Summary | |

Traffic Impact Study - Case 20761 6: Summer St & College St

Page B-28 2024 PM Peak Hour Without Site

| | ≯ | - | \mathbf{r} | 1 | - | • | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Ŧ | ~ |
|------------------------------|-------|------|--------------|------|----------|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | | \$ | | | \$ | | | 4 | | | \$ | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 25 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 15 | 80 | 15 | 340 | 5 | 25 | 120 | 10 |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 25 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 15 | 80 | 15 | 340 | 5 | 25 | 120 | 10 |
| Sign Control | | Stop | | | Stop | | | Free | | | Free | |
| Grade | | 0% | | | 0% | | | 0% | | | 0% | |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.58 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.52 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.86 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.81 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 27 | 26 | 16 | 0 | 29 | 87 | 16 | 395 | 5 | 27 | 148 | 11 |
| Pedestrians | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lane Width (m) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Walking Speed (m/s) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Blockage | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Right turn flare (veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Median type | | | | | | | | None | | | None | |
| Median storage veh) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Upstream signal (m) | | | | | | | | | | | 126 | |
| pX, platoon unblocked | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | | 0.97 | | | | | |
| vC, conflicting volume | 738 | 640 | 154 | 666 | 642 | 398 | 159 | | | 400 | | |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 712 | 609 | 106 | 637 | 612 | 398 | 112 | | | 400 | | |
| tC, single (s) | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 4.1 | | | 4.1 | | |
| tC, 2 stage (s) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.2 | | | 2.2 | | |
| p0 queue free % | 90 | 93 | 98 | 100 | 92 | 87 | 99 | | | 98 | | |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 267 | 382 | 916 | 342 | 381 | 652 | 1428 | | | 1159 | | |
| Direction, Lane # | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Volume Total | 69 | 116 | 416 | 186 | | | | | | | | |
| Volume Left | 27 | 0 | 16 | 27 | | | | | | | | |
| Volume Right | 16 | 87 | 5 | 11 | | | | | | | | |
| cSH | 370 | 553 | 1428 | 1159 | | | | | | | | |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.19 | 0.21 | 0.01 | 0.02 | | | | | | | | |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 5.4 | 6.3 | 0.3 | 0.6 | | | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s) | 17.0 | 13.2 | 0.4 | 1.4 | | | | | | | | |
| Lane LOS | С | В | А | А | | | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s) | 17.0 | 13.2 | 0.4 | 1.4 | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | С | В | | | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Average Delay | | | 4.0 | | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utiliz | ation | | 36.8% | IC | CU Level | of Service | | | А | | | |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | | | | | | | |

Traffic Impact Study - The Promenade 1: Robie St & Coburg Rd/Spring Garden Rd

| | ٦ | - | $\mathbf{\hat{v}}$ | 4 | - | • | • | Ť | 1 | 1 | Ļ | ~ |
|------------------------|--------|------|--------------------|------|-------|-----|------|-------|------|-------|-------|------|
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ٦ ۲ | ef 👘 | | | et îr | | | | 1 | | | 1 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 45 | 175 | 41 | 60 | 140 | 90 | 44 | 481 | 45 | 185 | 909 | 65 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 45 | 175 | 41 | 60 | 140 | 90 | 44 | 481 | 45 | 185 | 909 | 65 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1794 | 0 | 0 | 3271 | 0 | 0 | 3525 | 1583 | 0 | 3511 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.438 | | | | 0.629 | | | 0.774 | | | 0.717 | |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 778 | 1794 | 0 | 0 | 2060 | 0 | 0 | 2736 | 1336 | 0 | 2519 | 1435 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) | | 9 | | | 56 | | | | 65 | | | 71 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 49 | 291 | 0 | 0 | 347 | 0 | 0 | 595 | 49 | 0 | 1222 | 71 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | | Perm | NA | | Perm | NA | Perm | pm+pt | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | | 4 | | | 8 | | | 6 | | 5 | 2 | |
| Permitted Phases | 4 | | | 8 | | | 6 | | 6 | 2 | | 2 |
| Total Split (s) | 30.8 | 30.8 | | 30.8 | 30.8 | | 57.2 | 57.2 | 57.2 | 12.0 | 69.2 | 69.2 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | | | 5.0 | | | 5.0 | 5.0 | | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 20.5 | 20.5 | | | 20.5 | | | 69.5 | 69.5 | | 69.5 | 69.5 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.20 | 0.20 | | | 0.20 | | | 0.70 | 0.70 | | 0.70 | 0.70 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.31 | 0.78 | | | 0.74 | | | 0.31 | 0.05 | | 0.70 | 0.07 |
| Control Delay | 37.4 | 50.6 | | | 40.9 | | | 7.0 | 1.2 | | 12.7 | 1.8 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 37.4 | 50.6 | | | 40.9 | | | 7.0 | 1.2 | | 12.7 | 1.8 |
| LOS | D | D | | | D | | | А | А | | В | А |
| Approach Delay | | 48.7 | | | 40.9 | | | 6.6 | | | 12.1 | |
| Approach LOS | | D | | | D | | | А | | | В | |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 8.5 | 54.5 | | | 29.4 | | | 22.3 | 0.0 | | 69.5 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 18.6 | 58.6 | | | 34.0 | | | 35.1 | 2.8 | | 109.0 | 4.7 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | | 93.9 | | | 126.2 | | | 102.6 | | | 128.8 | |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 25.0 | | | | | | | | 50.0 | | | 50.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 200 | 469 | | | 573 | | | 1901 | 948 | | 1751 | 1019 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.24 | 0.62 | | | 0.61 | | | 0.31 | 0.05 | | 0.70 | 0.07 |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Cycle Length: 100 Actuated Cycle Length: 100 Offset: 94 (94%), Referenced to phase 2:SBTL and 6:NBTL, Start of Green Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.78 Intersection Signal Delay: 19.3 Intersection Capacity Utilization 90.7% Analysis Period (min) 15

Intersection LOS: B ICU Level of Service E

Splits and Phases: 1: Robie St & Coburg Rd/Spring Garden Rd

| Ø2 (R) | • | <u>⊿_</u> |
|--------|-----------|-------------|
| 69.2 s | | 30.8 s |
| Ø5 | ■ 100 (R) | ₩ Ø8 |
| 12 s | 57.2 s | 30.8 s |

WSP Canada Inc.

Traffic Impact Study - The Promenade 2: Robie St & College St

| | - | • | 1 | 1 | 1 | Ļ | |
|------------------------------|-----------|------|-------------|------|---------|------------|---|
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | |
| Lane Configurations | ¥ | | ≜ t≽ | | - | .a∱ | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 12 | 75 | 500 | 36 | 85 | 970 | |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 12 | 75 | 500 | 36 | 85 | 970 | |
| Sign Control | Stop | | Free | | | Free | |
| Grade | 0% | | 0% | | | 0% | |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.86 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.82 | |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 15 | 93 | 581 | 39 | 92 | 1183 | |
| Pedestrians | | | | | | | |
| Lane Width (m) | | | | | | | |
| Walking Speed (m/s) | | | | | | | |
| Percent Blockage | | | | | | | |
| Right turn flare (veh) | | | | | | | |
| Median type | | | None | | | None | |
| Median storage veh) | | | | | | | |
| Upstream signal (m) | | | | | | 126 | |
| pX, platoon unblocked | 0.85 | | | | | | |
| vC, conflicting volume | 1376 | 310 | | | 620 | | |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol | | | | | | | |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol | 1001 | 010 | | | (00 | | |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 1091 | 310 | | | 620 | | |
| tC, single (s) | 6.8 | 6.9 | | | 4.1 | | |
| tC, 2 stage (s) | 2.5 | 2.2 | | | 2.2 | | |
| IF (S) | 3.5 | 3.3 | | | 2.2 | | |
| pu queue free % | 91 171 | 80 | | | 90 | | |
| civi capacity (ven/n) | 101 | 080 | | | 956 | | |
| Direction, Lane # | WB 1 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 | SB 2 | | |
| Volume Total | 108 | 387 | 233 | 486 | 789 | | |
| Volume Left | 15 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 0 | | |
| Volume Right | 93 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 0 | | |
| CSH | 4/2 | 1/00 | 1/00 | 956 | 1/00 | | |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.14 | 0.10 | 0.46 | | |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | /.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | | |
| Control Delay (S) | 14.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | | |
| Lane LUS | 14 O | 0.0 | | A | | | |
| Approach LOS | 14.9 | 0.0 | | 1.0 | | | |
| Approach LUS | В | | | | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | |
| Average Delay | | | 1.4 | | | | _ |
| Intersection Capacity Utiliz | ation | | 59.5% | IC | U Level | ot Service | В |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | | |

Traffic Impact Study - The Promenade 3: Carlton St & Spring Garden Rd

| | ٦ | - | \mathbf{i} | 4 | ← | * | 1 | Ť | 1 | 1 | Ļ | ~ |
|--|---|---|--|--|--------------------|------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations Traffic Volume (veh/h) Future Volume (Veh/h) Sign Control | 15 15 | 235 235 Free | 15 15 | 20 20 | 300 300 Free | 20 20 | 15 15 | 0 0 Stop | 15 15 | 20 20 | 0 0 Stop | 20 20 |
| Grade Peak Hour Factor Hourly flow rate (vph) Pedestrians Lane Width (m) Walking Speed (m/s) Percent Blockage | 0.92 16 | 0% 0.87 270 | 0.92 16 | 0.92 22 | 0% 0.84 357 | 0.92 22 | 0.92 16 | 0% 0.92 0 | 0.92 16 | 0.92 22 | 0% 0.92 0 | 0.92 22 |
| Right turn flare (veh) Median type Median storage veh) Upstream signal (m) | | None 150 | | | None 147 | | | | | | | |
| pX, platoon unblocked vC, conflicting volume vC1, stage 1 conf vol | 0.99 379 | | | 286 | | | 0.99 744 | 0.99 733 | 278 | 0.99 738 | 0.99 730 | 0.99 368 |
| vCu, unblocked vol tC, single (s) tC, 2 stage (s) | 371 4.1 | | | 286 4.1 | | | 738 7.1 | 727 6.5 | 278 6.2 | 732 7.1 | 724 6.5 | 359 6.2 |
| tF (s) p0 queue free % cM capacity (veh/h) | 2.2 99 1179 | | | 2.2 98 1276 | | | 3.5 95 313 | 4.0 100 337 | 3.3 98 761 | 3.5 93 319 | 4.0 100 339 | 3.3 97 680 |
| Direction, Lane # | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Volume Total Volume Left Volume Right cSH Volume to Capacity Queue Length 95th (m) Control Delay (s) Lane LOS Approach Delay (s) Approach LOS | 302 16 16 1179 0.01 0.3 0.6 A 0.6 | 401 22 22 1276 0.02 0.4 0.6 A 0.6 | 32 16 443 0.07 1.9 13.8 B 13.8 B | 44 22 435 0.10 2.7 14.2 B 14.2 B | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Summary Average Delay Intersection Capacity Utiliz Analysis Period (min) | ation | | 1.9 33.4% 15 | IC | CU Level o | of Service | | | А | | | |

Traffic Impact Study - The Promenade 4: College St & Carlton St

| | ∕ | - | - | • | × | - | |
|------------------------------|-------|--------------|-------|------|-----------|------------|------|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR | |
| Lane Configurations | | स | el 👘 | | Y | | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 20 | 116 | 68 | 15 | 20 | 10 | |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 20 | _116 | _ 68 | 15 | 20 | 10 | |
| Sign Control | | Free | Free | | Stop | | |
| Grade | | 0% | 0% | | 0% | | |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 22 | 126 | /4 | 16 | 22 | 11 | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Lane widin (m) | | | | | | | |
| Walking Speed (m/s) | | | | | | | |
| Percerit Diuckaye | | | | | | | |
| Modian typo | | Nono | Nono | | | | |
| Median storage veh) | | NULLE | NULLE | | | | |
| Linstream signal (m) | | | | | | | |
| nX platoon unblocked | | | | | | | |
| vC, conflicting volume | 90 | | | | 252 | 82 | |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol | 70 | | | | 202 | 02 | |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol | | | | | | | |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 90 | | | | 252 | 82 | |
| tC, single (s) | 4.1 | | | | 6.4 | 6.2 | |
| tC, 2 stage (s) | | | | | | | |
| tF (s) | 2.2 | | | | 3.5 | 3.3 | |
| p0 queue free % | 99 | | | | 97 | 99 | |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1505 | | | | 726 | 978 | |
| Direction, Lane # | EB 1 | WB 1 | SB 1 | | | | |
| Volume Total | 148 | 90 | 33 | | | | |
| Volume Left | 22 | 0 | 22 | | | | |
| Volume Right | 0 | 16 | 11 | | | | |
| cSH | 1505 | 1700 | 794 | | | | |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.04 | | | | |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 0.4 | 0.0 | 1.0 | | | | |
| Control Delay (s) | 1.2 | 0.0 | 9.7 | | | | |
| Lane LOS | A | ~ ~ | A | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s) | 1.2 | 0.0 | 9.7 | | | | |
| Approach LUS | | | А | | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | |
| Average Delay | - 11 | | 1.8 | | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utiliz | ation | | 23.9% | IC | U Level o | of Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | | |
Traffic Impact Study - The Promenade

| | ٦ | - | $\mathbf{\hat{z}}$ | 4 | + | * | × | 1 | 1 | ۲ | 1 | Ŧ |
|------------------------|------|-------|--------------------|------|-------|--------|------|------|-------|-----|------|-------|
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | WBR2 | NBL2 | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | | đ îr | | | र्स | 1 | 1 | | \$ | | | ર્સ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 50 | 210 | 20 | 13 | 95 | 10 | 50 | 30 | 201 | 30 | 115 | 282 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 50 | 210 | 20 | 13 | 95 | 10 | 50 | 30 | 201 | 30 | 115 | 282 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 3451 | 0 | 0 | 1853 | 808 | 1583 | 0 | 1808 | 0 | 0 | 1839 |
| Flt Permitted | | 0.887 | | | 0.949 | | | | 0.850 | | | 0.792 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 3042 | 0 | 0 | 1755 | 703 | 1583 | 0 | 1538 | 0 | 0 | 1460 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) | | 8 | | | | | 82 | | 11 | | | |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 349 | 0 | 0 | 131 | 11 | 54 | 0 | 292 | 0 | 0 | 478 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | | Perm | NA | custom | Perm | Perm | NA | | Perm | NA |
| Protected Phases | | 2 | | | 6 | 1 | | | 8 | | | 4 |
| Permitted Phases | 2 | | | 6 | | 6 | 6 | 8 | | | 4 | |
| Total Split (s) | 25.0 | 25.0 | | 25.0 | 25.0 | 9.0 | 25.0 | 46.0 | 46.0 | | 46.0 | 46.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | | 6.0 | | | 6.0 | 3.0 | 6.0 | | 6.0 | | | 6.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | | 35.0 | | | 35.0 | 39.2 | 35.0 | | 31.2 | | | 31.2 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | | 0.44 | | | 0.44 | 0.49 | 0.44 | | 0.39 | | | 0.39 |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.26 | | | 0.17 | 0.03 | 0.07 | | 0.48 | | | 0.84 |
| Control Delay | | 17.4 | | | 18.3 | 14.2 | 3.2 | | 19.2 | | | 35.4 |
| Queue Delay | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | | 17.4 | | | 18.3 | 14.2 | 3.2 | | 19.2 | | | 35.4 |
| LOS | | В | | | В | В | А | | В | | | D |
| Approach Delay | | 17.4 | | | 13.9 | | | | 19.2 | | | 31.0 |
| Approach LOS | | В | | | В | | | | В | | | С |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | | 16.8 | | | 11.8 | 0.9 | 0.0 | | 32.5 | | | 67.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | | 31.2 | | | 28.9 | 4.3 | 5.0 | | 43.8 | | | 72.1 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | | 24.0 | | | 105.6 | | | | 101.9 | | | 97.8 |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | | | | | | 35.0 | 35.0 | | | | | |
| Base Capacity (vph) | | 1335 | | | 767 | 353 | 738 | | 774 | | | 730 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | | 0.26 | | | 0.17 | 0.03 | 0.07 | | 0.38 | | | 0.65 |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Cycle Length: 80 Actuated Cycle Length: 80 Offset: 25 (31%), Referenced to phase 6:WBTL and 2:EBTL, Start of Green Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.84 Intersection Signal Delay: 23.1 Intersection LOS: C Intersection Capacity Utilization 74.4% Analysis Period (min) 15

ICU Level of Service D

Splits and Phases: 5: Summer St & Spring Garden Rd & Transit Priority

| Ø1 | Ø6 (R) | ₽ Ø4 | |
|-----|--------|-------------|--|
| 9 s | 25 s | 46 s | |
| | Ø2 (R) | A @8 | |
| | 25 s | 46 s | |

WSP Canada Inc.

Synchro 10 Report May 2020

| | 1 |
|----------------------------|------|
| Lane Group | SBR |
| LanetConfigurations | 1 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 130 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 130 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1379 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) | |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 141 |
| Turn Type | Perm |
| Protected Phases | |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |
| Total Split (s) | 46.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 31.2 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.39 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.26 |
| Control Delay | 16.2 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 16.2 |
| LOS | В |
| Approach Delay | |
| Approach LOS | 44.0 |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 14.8 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 22.6 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | 25.0 |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 35.0 |
| Base Capacity (Vpn) | 689 |
| Starvation Cap Reductin | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reducth | U |
| Solution Solution Solution | |
| NEUULEU VIL KALIU | 0.20 |
| Intersection Summary | |

Traffic Impact Study - The Promenade 6: Summer St & College St

| | ≯ | - | \rightarrow | 1 | - | • | • | 1 | 1 | 1 | Ŧ | ~ |
|--|---|--|---|---|------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations Traffic Volume (veh/h) Future Volume (Veh/h) Sign Control | 47 47 | 4 19 19 Stop | 36 36 | 20 20 | 23 23 Stop | 95 95 | 10 10 | 125 125 Free | 10 10 | 30 30 | 225 225 Free | 60 60 |
| Peak Hour Factor Hourly flow rate (vph) Pedestrians Lane Width (m) Walking Speed (m/s) Percent Blockage | 0.92 51 | 0% 0.57 33 | 0.92 39 | 0.92 22 | 0% 0.59 39 | 0.92 103 | 0.92 11 | 0% 0.88 142 | 0.92 11 | 0.92 33 | 0% 0.80 281 | 0.92 65 |
| Right turn flare (veh) Median type Median storage veh) Upstream signal (m) | | | | | | | | None | | | None | |
| pX, platoon unblocked vC, conflicting volume vC1, stage 1 conf vol | 0.82 672 | 0.82 554 | 0.82 314 | 0.82 604 | 0.82 582 | 148 | 0.82 346 | | | 153 | 120 | |
| vCu, unblocked vol tC, single (s) tC, 2 stage (s) | 495 7.1 | 353 6.5 | 61 6.2 | 414 7.1 | 386 6.5 | 148 6.2 | 100 4.1 | | | 153 4.1 | | |
| tF (s) p0 queue free % cM capacity (veh/h) | 3.5 84 322 | 4.0 93 457 | 3.3 95 828 | 3.5 94 398 | 4.0 91 438 | 3.3 89 899 | 2.2 99 1230 | | | 2.2 98 1428 | | |
| Direction, Lane # | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Volume Total Volume Left Volume Right cSH Volume to Capacity Queue Length 95th (m) Control Delay (s) Lane LOS Approach Delay (s) Approach LOS | 123 51 39 443 0.28 9.0 16.2 C 16.2 C | 164 22 103 633 0.26 8.2 12.7 B 12.7 B | 164 11 1230 0.01 0.2 0.6 A 0.6 | 379 33 65 1428 0.02 0.6 0.9 A 0.9 | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Summary Average Delay Intersection Capacity Utiliz Analysis Period (min) | ation | | 5.4 43.5% 15 | IC | CU Level o | of Service | | | A | | | |

Traffic Impact Study - The Promenade 1: Robie St & Coburg Rd/Spring Garden Rd

| | ٦ | - | $\mathbf{\hat{z}}$ | 1 | - | • | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Ŧ | ~ |
|------------------------|-------|----------|--------------------|------|--------|-----|------|-------|------|-------|--------------|------|
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ľ | el el | | | र्स कि | | | {î† | 1 | | - 4 ↑ | 1 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 95 | 165 | 26 | 30 | 185 | 170 | 98 | 883 | 25 | 105 | 396 | 45 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 95 | 165 | 26 | 30 | 185 | 170 | 98 | 883 | 25 | 105 | 396 | 45 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1807 | 0 | 0 | 3194 | 0 | 0 | 3522 | 1583 | 0 | 3507 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.326 | | | | 0.873 | | | 0.806 | | | 0.624 | |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 586 | 1807 | 0 | 0 | 2790 | 0 | 0 | 2843 | 1358 | 0 | 2208 | 1448 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) | | 8 | | | 185 | | | | 73 | | | 49 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 103 | 216 | 0 | 0 | 452 | 0 | 0 | 1067 | 27 | 0 | 603 | 49 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | | Perm | NA | | Perm | NA | Perm | pm+pt | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | | 4 | | | 8 | | | 6 | | 5 | 2 | |
| Permitted Phases | 4 | | | 8 | | | 6 | | 6 | 2 | | 2 |
| Total Split (s) | 29.0 | 29.0 | | 29.0 | 29.0 | | 49.0 | 49.0 | 49.0 | 12.0 | 61.0 | 61.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | | | 5.0 | | | 5.0 | 5.0 | | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 17.8 | 17.8 | | | 17.8 | | | 62.2 | 62.2 | | 62.2 | 62.2 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.20 | 0.20 | | | 0.20 | | | 0.69 | 0.69 | | 0.69 | 0.69 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.89 | 0.60 | | | 0.65 | | | 0.54 | 0.03 | | 0.40 | 0.05 |
| Control Delay | 93.6 | 37.4 | | | 22.8 | | | 9.1 | 0.0 | | 7.7 | 2.1 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 93.6 | 37.4 | | | 22.8 | | | 9.1 | 0.0 | | 7.7 | 2.1 |
| LOS | F | D | | | С | | | А | А | | А | А |
| Approach Delay | | 55.5 | | | 22.8 | | | 8.9 | | | 7.3 | |
| Approach LOS | | E | | | С | | | А | | | А | |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 18.2 | 34.3 | | | 22.8 | | | 45.1 | 0.0 | | 21.8 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | #42.0 | 51.5 | | | 28.4 | | | 74.7 | 0.0 | | 33.2 | 4.0 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | | 93.9 | | | 126.2 | | | 102.6 | | | 128.8 | |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 25.0 | | | | | | | | 50.0 | | | 50.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 156 | 487 | | | 879 | | | 1964 | 960 | | 1525 | 1015 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.66 | 0.44 | | | 0.51 | | | 0.54 | 0.03 | | 0.40 | 0.05 |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Cycle Length: 90 Actuated Cycle Length: 90 Offset: 36 (40%), Referenced to phase 2:SBTL and 6:NBTL, Start of Green Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.89 Intersection Signal Delay: 16.9 Intersection Capacity Utilization 87.8% Analysis Period (min) 15

Intersection LOS: B ICU Level of Service E

95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

Splits and Phases: 1: Robie St & Coburg Rd/Spring Garden Rd



WSP Canada Inc.

Synchro 10 Report May 2020

Traffic Impact Study - The Promenade 2: Robie St & College St

| | 4 | • | † | 1 | 1 | .↓ | |
|------------------------------|-------|-----------|----------|------|---------|------------|--|
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | |
| Lane Configurations | Y | | A | | | 4 † | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 7 | 86 | 870 | 33 | 52 | 410 | |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 7 | 86 | 870 | 33 | 52 | 410 | |
| Sign Control | Stop | | Free | | | Free | |
| Grade | 0% | | 0% | | | 0% | |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.91 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.87 | |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 9 | 110 | 956 | 36 | 57 | 471 | |
| Pedestrians | | | | | | | |
| Lane Width (m) | | | | | | | |
| Walking Speed (m/s) | | | | | | | |
| Percent Blockage | | | | | | | |
| Right turn flare (veh) | | | | | | | |
| Median type | | | None | | | None | |
| Median storage veh) | | | | | | | |
| Upstream signal (m) | | | | | | 126 | |
| pX, platoon unblocked | 0.97 | | | | | | |
| vC, conflicting volume | 1324 | 496 | | | 992 | | |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol | | | | | | | |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol | 4070 | 10/ | | | | | |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 12/2 | 496 | | | 992 | | |
| tC, single (s) | 6.8 | 6.9 | | | 4.1 | | |
| tC, 2 stage (s) | 2 5 | 2.2 | | | 2.2 | | |
| IF (S) | 3.5 | 3.3 | | | 2.2 | | |
| pu queue free % | 94 | /9 F10 | | | 92 | | |
| civi capacity (ven/n) | 142 | 519 | | | 693 | | |
| Direction, Lane # | WB 1 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 | SB 2 | | |
| Volume Total | 119 | 637 | 355 | 214 | 314 | | |
| Volume Left | 9 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 0 | | |
| Volume Right | 110 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 0 | | |
| cSH | 432 | 1700 | 1700 | 693 | 1700 | | |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.28 | 0.37 | 0.21 | 0.08 | 0.18 | | |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 8.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | | |
| Control Delay (s) | 16.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 0.0 | | |
| Lane LOS | С | | | A | | | |
| Approach Delay (s) | 16.5 | 0.0 | | 1.4 | | | |
| Approach LOS | С | | | | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | |
| Average Delay | | | 1.7 | | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utiliz | ation | | 53.6% | IC | U Level | of Service | |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | | |

Traffic Impact Study - The Promenade 3: Carlton St & Spring Garden Rd

| | ٦ | - | \mathbf{i} | 4 | ← | * | 1 | Ť | 1 | 1 | ţ | ~ |
|--|---|---|--|--|--------------------|------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|------------------|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations Traffic Volume (veh/h) Future Volume (Veh/h) Sign Control | 20 20 | 365 365 Free | 20 20 | 15 15 | 230 230 Free | 30 30 | 15 15 | 0 0 Stop | 35 35 | 35 35 | ♣ 0 0 Stop 0% | 15 15 |
| Peak Hour Factor Hourly flow rate (vph) Pedestrians Lane Width (m) Walking Speed (m/s) Percent Blockage | 0.92 22 | 0% 0.92 397 | 0.92 22 | 0.92 16 | 0% 0.84 274 | 0.92 33 | 0.92 16 | 0% 0.92 0 | 0.92 38 | 0.92 38 | 0% 0.92 0 | 0.92 16 |
| Right turn flare (veh) Median type Median storage veh) | | None | | | None | | | | | | | |
| Upstream signal (m) pX, platoon unblocked vC, conflicting volume vC1, stage 1 conf vol | 0.97 307 | 150 | | 0.91 419 | 147 | | 0.93 790 | 0.93 791 | 0.91 408 | 0.93 812 | 0.93 786 | 0.97 290 |
| vCu, unblocked vol tC, single (s) | 269 4.1 | | | 316 4.1 | | | 660 7.1 | 661 6.5 | 304 6.2 | 684 7.1 | 655 6.5 | 252 6.2 |
| tF (s) p0 queue free % cM capacity (veh/h) | 2.2 98 1255 | | | 2.2 99 1136 | | | 3.5 95 334 | 4.0 100 344 | 3.3 94 672 | 3.5 88 310 | 4.0 100 347 | 3.3 98 763 |
| Direction, Lane # | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Volume Total Volume Left Volume Right cSH Volume to Capacity Queue Length 95th (m) Control Delay (s) Lane LOS Approach Delay (s) Approach LOS | 441 22 1255 0.02 0.4 0.6 A 0.6 | 323 16 33 1136 0.01 0.3 0.5 A 0.5 | 54 16 38 517 0.10 2.8 12.8 B 12.8 B | 54 38 16 376 0.14 4.0 16.2 C 16.2 C | | | | | | | | |
| Average Delay Intersection Capacity Utiliza Analysis Period (min) | ition | | 2.3 39.5% 15 | IC | CU Level (| of Service | | | А | | | |

Traffic Impact Study - The Promenade 4: College St & Carlton St

| | ∕ | - | + | • | 1 | - | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------|-----------|------------|------|-----------|------------|---|--|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR | | |
| Lane Configurations | | र्स | ef 👘 | | Y | | | |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 15 | 74 | 101 | 30 | 20 | 15 | | |
| Future Volume (Veh/h) | 15 | 74 | 101 | 30 | 20 | 15 | | |
| Sign Control | | Free | Free | | Stop | | | |
| Grade | | 0% | 0% | | 0% | | | |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.81 | 0.79 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | | |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 16 | 91 | 128 | 33 | 22 | 16 | | |
| 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 | 161 | | | | 268 | 144 | | |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol | | | | | | | | |
| VC2, stage 2 cont vol | 1/1 | | | | 2/0 | 1 4 4 | | |
| VCU, UNDIOCKED VOI | 161 | | | | 268 | 144 | | |
| tC, single (s) | 4.1 | | | | 6.4 | 0.2 | | |
| IC, Z Stage (S) | ^ ^ ^ | | | | 2 5 | | | |
| IF (S) | 2.2 | | | | 3.0 | 3.3 00 | | |
| cM canacity (voh/h) | 99 1/10 | | | | 97 717 | 003 20 | | |
| | 1410 | | 05.4 | | /14 | 703 | | |
| Direction, Lane # | EB 1 | WB 1 | SB 1 | | | | | |
| Volume Loft | 10/ | 101 | 38 | | | | | |
| Volume Leit | 10 | 0 | 22 14 | | | | | |
| | 0 1/10 | ى 1700 | 10 207 | | | | | |
| Volumo to Canacity | 1410 0.01 | 0.00 | 703 | | | | | |
| Ouque Longth 95th (m) | 0.01 | 0.09 | 0.05 | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.5 | 0.0 | 1.Z 0.Q | | | | | |
| Lane LOS | ۲.۷ | 0.0 | 2.0 | | | | | |
| Annroach Delay (s) | 12 | 0.0 | л 9 8 | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | 1.2 | 0.0 | Â | | | | | |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | |
| Average Delav | | | 1.6 | | | | | |
| Intersection Capacity Utiliza | ation | | 25.2% | IC | U Level o | of Service | А | |
| Analysis Period (min) | | | 15 | | | | | |

Traffic Impact Study - The Promenade

| | ≯ | - | \mathbf{r} | 4 | + | * | • | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Ļ |
|------------------------|------|--------|--------------|------|-------|--------|------|------|-------|-----|------|-------|
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | WBR2 | NBL2 | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | | đ î ji | | | ť. | 1 | * | | \$ | | | र्भ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 55 | 195 | 20 | 16 | 175 | 15 | 50 | 65 | 383 | 14 | 60 | 174 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 55 | 195 | 20 | 16 | 175 | 15 | 50 | 65 | 383 | 14 | 60 | 174 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 3443 | 0 | 0 | 1855 | 808 | 1583 | 0 | 1838 | 0 | 0 | 1842 |
| Flt Permitted | | 0.854 | | | 0.963 | | | | 0.908 | | | 0.768 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 2928 | 0 | 0 | 1785 | 703 | 1583 | 0 | 1664 | 0 | 0 | 1423 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) | | 8 | | | | | 82 | | 3 | | | |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 335 | 0 | 0 | 233 | 16 | 54 | 0 | 516 | 0 | 0 | 283 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | | Perm | NA | custom | Perm | Perm | NA | | Perm | NA |
| Protected Phases | | 2 | | | 6 | 1 | | | 8 | | | 4 |
| Permitted Phases | 2 | | | 6 | | 6 | 6 | 8 | | | 4 | |
| Total Split (s) | 24.0 | 24.0 | | 24.0 | 24.0 | 9.0 | 24.0 | 47.0 | 47.0 | | 47.0 | 47.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | | 6.0 | | | 6.0 | 3.0 | 6.0 | | 6.0 | | | 6.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | | 34.9 | | | 34.9 | 39.4 | 34.9 | | 31.0 | | | 31.0 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | | 0.44 | | | 0.44 | 0.49 | 0.44 | | 0.39 | | | 0.39 |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.26 | | | 0.30 | 0.05 | 0.07 | | 0.80 | | | 0.51 |
| Control Delay | | 17.6 | | | 19.5 | 14.1 | 3.3 | | 30.6 | | | 21.0 |
| Queue Delay | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | 0.0 | | | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | | 17.6 | | | 19.5 | 14.1 | 3.3 | | 30.6 | | | 21.0 |
| LOS | | В | | | В | В | А | | С | | | С |
| Approach Delay | | 17.6 | | | 16.3 | | | | 30.6 | | | 19.4 |
| Approach LOS | | В | | | В | | | | С | | | В |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | | 16.1 | | | 22.3 | 1.3 | 0.0 | | 70.4 | | | 33.4 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | | 30.7 | | | 49.5 | 5.5 | 5.1 | | 87.4 | | | 38.6 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | | 24.0 | | | 105.6 | | | | 101.9 | | | 97.8 |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | | | | | | 35.0 | 35.0 | | | | | |
| Base Capacity (vph) | | 1283 | | | 779 | 354 | 737 | | 854 | | | 729 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | | 0.26 | | | 0.30 | 0.05 | 0.07 | | 0.60 | | | 0.39 |
| Intersection Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cyclo Lonath: 80 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Cycle Length: 80 Actuated Cycle Length: 80 Offset: 44 (55%), Referenced to phase 6:WBTL and 2:EBTL, Start of Green Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.80 Intersection Signal Delay: 22.1 Intersection LOS: C Intersection Capacity Utilization 89.2% Analysis Period (min) 15

ICU Level of Service E

Splits and Phases: 5: Summer St & Spring Garden Rd & Transit Priority

| Ø1 | ● Ø6 (R) | ↓ _{Ø4} | |
|-----|-------------|------------------------|--|
| 9 s | 24 s | 47 s | |
| | ₩ Ø2 (R) | → Ø8 | |
| | 24 s | 47 s | |

WSP Canada Inc.

7

| | - |
|------------------------|------|
| Lane Group | SBR |
| LaneConfigurations | 1 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 120 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 120 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1379 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) | |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 130 |
| Turn Type | Perm |
| Protected Phases | |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |
| Total Split (s) | 47.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 31.0 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.39 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.24 |
| Control Delay | 15.9 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 15.9 |
| LOS | В |
| Approach Delay | |
| Approach LOS | |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 13.6 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 20.9 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) | |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 35.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 706 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.18 |
| Intersection Summarv | |

Traffic Impact Study - The Promenade 6: Summer St & College St

| | ٦ | - | \mathbf{i} | 1 | - | * | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Ŧ | ~ |
|--|--|--|--|---|------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------------|------------|
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations Traffic Volume (veh/h) Future Volume (Veh/h) Sign Control | 52 52 | 4 19 19 Stop | 28 28 | 0 0 | 20 20 Stop | 80 80 | 15 15 | 340 340 Free | 5 5 | 25 25 | 120 120 Free | 66 66 |
| Peak Hour Factor Hourly flow rate (vph) Pedestrians Lane Width (m) Walking Speed (m/s) Percent Blockage | 0.92 57 | 0% 0.58 33 | 0.92 30 | 0.92 0 | 0% 0.52 38 | 0.92 87 | 0.92 16 | 0% 0.86 395 | 0.92 5 | 0.92 27 | 0% 0.81 148 | 0.92 72 |
| Right turn flare (veh) Median type Median storage veh) | | | | | | | | None | | | None | |
| pX, platoon unblocked vC, conflicting volume vC1, stage 1 conf vol | 0.93 774 | 0.93 670 | 0.93 184 | 0.93 714 | 0.93 704 | 398 | 0.93 220 | | | 400 | 120 | |
| vCu, unblocked vol tC, single (s) tC, 2 stage (s) | 717 7.1 | 605 6.5 | 81 6.2 | 653 7.1 | 641 6.5 | 398 6.2 | 120 4.1 | | | 400 4.1 | | |
| tF (s) p0 queue free % cM capacity (veh/h) | 3.5 77 248 | 4.0 91 369 | 3.3 97 908 | 3.5 100 310 | 4.0 89 352 | 3.3 87 652 | 2.2 99 1361 | | | 2.2 98 1159 | | |
| Direction, Lane # | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Volume Total Volume Left Volume Right cSH Volume to Capacity Queue Length 95th (m) Control Delay (s) Lane LOS Approach Delay (s) Approach LOS | 120 57 30 340 0.35 12.4 21.2 C 21.2 C | 125 0 87 518 0.24 7.5 14.2 B 14.2 B | 416 16 5 1361 0.01 0.3 0.4 A 0.4 | 247 27 72 1159 0.02 0.6 1.1 A 1.1 | | | | | | | | |
| Intersection Summary Average Delay Intersection Capacity Utiliza Analysis Period (min) | ation | | 5.2 39.9% 15 | IC | CU Level o | of Service | | | A | | | |