## PLANNING COMMISSION <br> MEETING AGENDA REGULAR MEETING

David Lambert, Chairman, Marianna Perakis, Vice Chairman Toby Buechner, Carlton Faison, Michael W. Hutson, Tom Krent, Lakshmi Malalahalli, Sadek Rahman and John J. Tagle

1. ROLL CALL
2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - March 22, 2022
4. PUBLIC COMMENT - For Items Not on the Agenda

## PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN REVIEW

5. PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN REVIEW (SP JPLN2022-0008) - Proposed Westington Phase II, South of Wattles, East of Crooks (870 Barilane Drive; PIN 88-20-21-101-009), Section 21, Currently Zoned NN (Neighborhood Node "I") District- PETITIONER HAS REQUESTED THAT THIS ITEM BE REMOVED FROM AGENDA
6. PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN REVIEW (SP JPLN2022-0009) - Proposed Hills West, East side of Crooks, South of Wattles (3902 Crooks; 88-20-21-101-003), Section 21, Currently Zoned NN (Neighborhood Node "I") District- PETITIONER HAS REQUESTED THAT THIS ITEM BE REMOVED FROM AGENDA

## OTHER ITEMS

7. PUBLIC COMMENTS - For Items on the Agenda
8. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENT
9. ADJOURN

Chair Lambert called the Regular meeting of the Troy City Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. on March 22, 2022, in the Council Chamber of the Troy City Hall. Chair Lambert and Vice Chair Perakis presented opening remarks relative to the role of the Planning Commission and procedure of tonight's meeting.

1. ROLL CALL

Present:
Toby Buechner
Carlton M. Faison
Michael W. Hutson
Tom Krent
David Lambert
Lakshmi Malalahalli
Marianna Perakis
Sadek Rahman
Absent:
John J. Tagle
Also Present:
R. Brent Savidant, Community Development Director

Ben Carlisle, Carlisle Wortman Associates
Julie Quinlan Dufrane, Assistant City Attorney
Kathy L. Czarnecki, Recording Secretary
Mr. Buechner gave a brief introduction of himself and said he was looking forward to participating in the Planning Commission decision making.
2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Resolution \# PC-2022-03-018
Moved by: Perakis
Support by: Malalahalli
RESOLVED, To approve the Agenda as prepared.
Yes: $\quad$ All present (8)
Absent: Tagle
MOTION CARRIED
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - March 8, 2022

Resolution \# PC-2022-03-019
Moved by: Rahman
Support by: Krent

RESOLVED, To approve the minutes of the March 8, 2022 Regular meeting as submitted.
Yes: All present (8)
Absent: Tagle
MOTION CARRIED
4. $\quad$ PUBLIC COMMENT - For Items Not on the Agenda

There was no one present who wished to speak.

## PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT

5. POTENTIAL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD) APPLICATION - Concept Plan Discussion, East side of Stephenson Highway, North of Fourteen Mile (750 Stephenson), Section 35, Currently Zoned RC (Research Center) District

Mr. Carlisle reviewed the proposed site improvements of the PUD (Planned Unit Development) concept plan for 750 Stephenson. He addressed the current zoning as relates to the proposed uses, the Smart Zone Master Plan designation, Standards of the PUD option and displayed renderings provided by the applicant. Mr. Carlisle said the applicant has not identified potential users at this time and is seeking Planning Commission feedback on the concept plan.

Mr. Savidant provided an explanation of the intent of the RC zoning district. He said the district has a campus-like design with open space. He noted that recently businesses and property owners are looking to incorporate amenities such as restaurants and shopping. Mr. Savidant identified the range of uses in the RC zoning district. He shared with the Board that a PUD application is a negotiated process, and their input would be of great value to the applicant.

Present were Joe Latozas and Mike Pizzola of Designhaus Architecture and Steven Kalabat of REalta Group.

Mr. Latozas reported a market study revealed a need for climate-controlled storage units for use by corporate office and commercial users. He said their intent is to continue with the campus-like design, reduce asphalt and incorporate green space, add landscaping, and create connectivity for users within the project. He addressed shared parking among the various users. Mr. Latozas said at this time they do not know what improvements, if any, might be made to the existing 7 -story office building.

Mr. Kalabat said the existing 7-story office building has been vacant for the past 2.5 years. He expressed confidence in the market study findings that climate-controlled storage units and warehousing are in demand. Mr. Kalabat said their intent is to make a cohesive project and accommodate the architectural design of users.

There was discussion on:

- Shared parking and access.
- Cohesiveness of project; consistency in building materials, colors.
- Connectivity within project; provide public pathways.
- Market study results.
- Consideration of alternative options; residential, hotel.
- Flexibility in PUD agreement; option to revert to office use if market indicative.
- Taproom/brewery.
- Location and visibility in relationship to I-75 Interchange.
- Consideration to locate inside office building.
- Brewery equipment on site.
- Architectural design.
- Maintain bones of office building.
- Keep integrity of RC zoning, office building.
- Characteristics of storage facility as relates to color, logos, etc.
- Shared (mobile) office space in existing office building.
- Application options discussed with applicant; PUD, Text Amendment, Conditional Rezoning.

Mr. Savidant addressed the approval process of a PUD application.

## OTHER ITEMS

## 6. APPLICATION TO DE-LIST 54 E. SQUARE LAKE

Mr. Savidant reviewed the procedure to remove a historic designation of a property. He stated the City has no file on record for the property located at 54 E. Square Lake and reported an outside source was contracted to prepare a Preliminary Report which was reviewed by the Historic District Study Committee (HDSC) at their October 5, 2021 meeting. Mr. Savidant read findings of the report and advised the Board that a deed research could not be accomplished because the Register of Deeds office is closed due to the pandemic. He stated the applicant affirms the request to de-list is to allow flexibility for renovating the property and there is no intent to demolish the building.

Mr. Savidant advised the Board its options are to recommend or deny the de-listing request or to take no action.

Discussion followed. Some of the comments related to:

- Reasons one might want to remove a historic designation.
- Current zoning designation of the property (Neighborhood Node).
- Improbability to obtain deed research.
- Approval process for exterior renovations; interior renovations are permitted.
- Exterior of home; modern look with vinyl siding and windows.
- Proximity of home to right-of-way; concerns with safety, minimal front yard, parking.

The consensus of the Board was to take no action.
Mr. Savidant advised the Board this evening's draft minutes would be provided to the HDSC at their March 28, 2022 meeting.
7. PUBLIC COMMENT - For Items on the Agenda

There was no one present who wished to speak.

## 8. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENT

A warm welcome was extended to newly appointed Commissioner Buechner.
Mr. Savidant announced that City Council at their March 14, 2022 meeting granted approval of the Conditional Rezoning for Pine View Condominiums, a 25-unit townhome development located on the west side of Dequindre and north of Long Lake.

Mr. Savidant announced meeting dates scheduled for the Neighborhood Node Subcommittee. Meeting dates are April 5, April 13 and April 27, at 6:00 p.m. to be held in the Council Chambers. Meeting notices are posted.

Mr. Carlisle reported on City Council participation of the Neighborhood Nodes tour conducted on March 12.

## 9. ADJOURN

The Regular meeting of the Planning Commission adjourned at 8:34 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,

David Lambert, Chair

Kathy L. Czarnecki, Recording Secretary

DATE: April 7, 2022
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: R. Brent Savidant, Community Development Director
SUBJECT: PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN REVIEW (SP JPLN2022-0008) - Proposed The Westington II, South of Wattles, East of Crooks (870 Barilane Drive; PIN 88-20-21-101-009), Section 21, Currently Zoned NN (Neighborhood Node "I") District

The petitioner Troy Westington LLC submitted the above referenced Preliminary Site Plan application for a 20 -unit, $21 / 2$ story multi-family apartment building. Multi-family is permitted by right in the NN (Neighborhood Node "I") Zoning District.

Westington Phase I received Preliminary Site Plan Approval on December 8, 2020 and is currently under construction. Phase I included four 3-story buildings and 102 units.

In 2021, the applicant submitted a Preliminary Site Plan application for the same parcel that included two15-unit apartment buildings. The application was denied by the Planning Commission on January 25, 2022. This is a new application.

The attached report prepared by Carlisle/Wortman Associates, Inc. (CWA), the City's Planning Consultant, summarizes the project. CWA prepared the report with input from various City departments including Planning, Engineering, Public Works and Fire. City Management supports the findings of fact contained in the report and the recommendations included therein.

## Attachments:

1. Maps
2. Report prepared by Carlisle/Wortman Associates, Inc.
3. Preliminary Site Plan.
4. Westington \& West Hills Development Traffic Impact Study, dated November 11, 2021.
5. Traffic Impact Study memo, prepared by OHM, dated December 6, 2021.
6. Memo from OHM dated March 2, 2022.

## PROPOSED RESOLUTION

PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN REVIEW (SP JPLN2022-0008) - Proposed The Westington II, South of Wattles, East of Crooks (870 Barilane Drive; PIN 88-20-21-101-009), Section 21, Currently Zoned NN (Neighborhood Node " 1 ") District

## Resolution \# PC-2022-04-

Moved by:
Seconded by:
RESOLVED, That Preliminary Site Plan Approval, pursuant to Article 8 of the Zoning Ordinance, as requested for the proposed The Westington II 20-unit apartment development, South of Wattles, East of Crooks, Section 21, Currently Zoned NN (Neighborhood Node "I") District, be granted, subject to the following:

## ) or

(denied, for the following reasons: ) or
(postponed, for the following reasons: $\qquad$

Yes:
No:
MOTION CARRIED/FAILED

## TROY cis Online



| 835 | 0 | 417 | 835Feet |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | data are hereby notified that the source information represented should be consulted for verification.

GIS Online



Date: January 13, 2022
January 20, 2022
March 22, 2022

# Preliminary Site Plan Review <br> For <br> City of Troy, Michigan 

## Applicant:

## Project Name:

Plan Date:

Location:

Zoning: Neighborhood Node (NN) - I
Action Requested: Site Plan Approval

## SITE DESCRIPTION

The subject site is located on the south side of Wattles Road, just east of Crooks Road. The site is approximately 1.20 acres in area and is proposed for development as the Phase 2 component of the Westington multi-family development project. Phase 1 of the Westington project is currently under construction. The subject site is currently vacant, and the northeastern portion is located within a 100-year floodplain. Proposed Phase 2 is directly east of Phase 1.

The applicant is proposing to construct one (1) 20 -unit multi-family building on the site. The building will be 2.5 stories in height. Interior drives through the Phase 1 component of the Westington project will provide access to the site, in addition to access via 3902 Crooks (proposed for the Hills West Apartment development, and cross-access with the 7-Eleven site. There is no direct access to Barilane Court. The property is zoned Neighborhood Node (NN) and multiple family residential is a permitted use.

The properties to the east and south of the subject site are zoned R1-B, One Family Residential. The adjacent R1-B properties to the northeast and southeast are in use as single-family dwellings. Most of the property to the east of the site is undeveloped woodland and is within the 100-year floodplain, which provides a natural buffer. The southern portion of the site is bounded by a private drive.

## Site Location:



Carlisle Wortman Associates, Inc.
2 Page


Proposed Uses of Subject Parcel:
Thirty (30) multi-family dwelling units.

## Current Use of Subject Property:

Single Family Home

Current Zoning:
The property is currently zoned NN, Neighborhood Node District.
Surrounding Property Details:

| Direction | Zoning | Use |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North | NN, Neighborhood Node | Multi-Family Residential |
| South | R1-B, Single Family | Single Family Residential / Place of Worship |
| East | R1-B, Single Family | Single Family Residential / Vacant |
| West | NN, Neighborhood Node | Multi-Family Residential |

Carlisle Wortman Associates, Inc.
3 Page

## SITE CONTEXT



## PREVIOUS PLANNING COMMISSION REVIEW

The Planning Commission discussed the project at the January 25,2022 meeting. There was lengthy discussion on a variety of topics including traffic, guest parking, tree mitigation, open space/landscaping calculations, compliance with Design Standards, compliance with Site Plan Review Standards, crossaccess, Neighborhood Node zoning designations, intensity of Site Type A and Site Type B.

See the January 22 meeting minutes for more details.

After discussion, the Planning Commission, the Planning Commission moved:

That Preliminary Site Plan Approval, pursuant to Article 8 of the Zoning Ordinance, as requested for the proposed The Westington II 30-unit apartment development, South of Wattles, East of Crooks, (870 Barilane Drive; PIN 88-20-21-101- 009), Section 21, Currently Zoned NN (Neighborhood Node "I") District, be denied, for the following reasons:

1. The Planning Commission does not approve the tree mitigation requirement.
2. The open space fails the Zoning Ordinance calculations.
3. The site Design Standards fail to promote public health, safety and welfare, primarily due to traffic issues.
4. The project fails to meet the transition requirements of the Zoning Ordinance as well as the density requirements.

There was discussion on the motion on the floor.
Chair Lambert said his main concerns are the destruction of the trees on the site and his belief there is not enough of a transition going from the higher height buildings that are closer to the street as proposed to where it comes up to residential areas farther to the east and to the south.

The motion passed 8-0.

## CHANGES SINCE LAST PLANNING COMMISSION REVIEW



## January 2022 Plan



March 2022 Plan

The applicant has proposed the following changes to the Site Plan since the last submittal:

- Combined two $14,000 \mathrm{sq} / \mathrm{ft}$ buildings into one (1) $24,000 \mathrm{sq} / \mathrm{ft}$ building
- Reduced the number of units from thirty (30) to twenty (20)
- By eliminating ten (10) units, they increased guest parking by thirteen (13) spaces, to provide a total of (eighteen) 18 guest spaces
- Preserved six (6) onsite protected trees
- Added onsite gazebo
- Increased overall open space by 9\% for a total of 29\%
- Decreased lot coverage by 5\% for a total of $25 \%$


## NATURAL FEATURES

Topography: A topographic survey has been provided on sheet C-2.0. Elevations decrease in the northwest corner of site towards the floodplain.

Wetlands:

Floodplain:

There are no wetlands on site.

An existing 100-year floodplain is located at the northwest corner of the site, with two different designations as to where the edge of said floodplain lies. The applicant is proposing to continue the retaining wall that was done for Phase 1 to accommodate floodplain on this site.

Floodplain confirmation will be determined as part of final engineering.

Woodlands: A tree inventory and replacement plan has been provided on Sheet L100, with replacement trees shown in the landscape plan on Sheet L101.

| Replacement Details |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Protected Tree | Inches Removed | Replacement Required |
| Landmark | 165 inches | 165 inches |
| Woodland | 597 inches | 299 inches |
|  |  |  |
| Preservation/Mitigation | Inches Preserved | Credit |
| Landmark | 45 inches | 90 inches |
| Woodland | 0 inches | 0 inches |
|  |  |  |
| Protected Replacement Required | 374 Inches |  |
| Preservation Credit | 0 Inches |  |
| Total | 374 -inch |  |
|  |  |  |
| Total Tree Mitigation | 374 trees / 3 inches = 125 3-inch trees |  |

The applicant indicates that they are preserving 130 inches of trees, however, 79 of those inches are prohibited species which do not receive credit for preservation. As such the applicant has not provided the required replacement.

The applicant is preserving six (6) protected trees. We note that there is a clumping of protected trees (white pines, highlighted in red circle). Is the applicant able to shift the building or reconfigure the drive aisle to preserve additional trees?


Items to be addressed: Can the applicant shift the building or reconfigure the drive aisle to preserve additional trees?

## SITE ARRANGEMENT

The applicant is proposing to construct one (1) 20 -unit multi-family building. The building is 2.5 stories in height. The building is located on the western side of the site, with parking and circulation drives to the south and east.

The site is adjacent to a 7-Eleven, a medical office, and single-family residential zoned Neighborhood Node to the east; a single-family residential zoned Neighborhood Node to the southwest; a single-family residential zoned Neighborhood Node to the north; and the eastern portion of the site is located within the 100-year floodplain and provides a natural buffer to the R1-B property to the east.

Items to be addressed: None.

## AREA, WIDTH, HEIGHT, SETBACKS

Table 5.03.B.3, Building Form C, Standards Applicable to All Districts of the Zoning Ordinance establishes the dimensional requirements for the NN, Neighborhood Node District. The requirements of Building form C and the proposed dimensions are shown in the following table.

|  | Required | Provided | Compliance |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Side (East) | N/A, building may be <br> placed up to property <br> line | 66 feet | Complies |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Side (north) | N/A, building may be <br> placed up to property <br> line | 87 feet | Complies |
| Rear (South) | 30 -foot minimum <br> setback | 93 feet | Complies |
| Building Height | Any building, or <br> portion of a building, <br> on a parcel abutting <br> a one-family <br> residentially zoned <br> parcel shall not <br> exceed 2.5-stories, <br> 30 feet in height. | 2.5 stories, 30.0 feet (to <br> mid-point of ridge), 34 <br> feet to roof peak. | Complies but see <br> discussion below |
| Lot Coverage (Building) | $20 \%$ | $22.71 \%$ (Phase 2 only) <br> $22.25 \%$ (Project Total) | Complies |
| Minimum Open Space | $33.68 \%$ (Phase 2 only) <br> $29.17 \% ~(P r o j e c t ~ T o t a l) ~$ | Complies |  |
| Parking Location | Cannot be located in <br> front yard | Parking lots not in front <br> yard | Complies |

Building Height and Story Discussion:
Because this site is adjunct to one-family residentially zoned property, the applicant shall comply with Section 5.06.E.3.c, which limits height and stories to 2.5 stories and 30 -feet. As set forth in the Zoning Ordinance, building height is defined as the following:

The term "building height" shall mean the vertical distance as measured from the established grade to the highest point of the roof for flat roofs, including walls or parapets that extend above the horizontal roof surface; to the deck line of mansard roofs; and to the average height between eaves and ridge for gable, hip, and gambrel roofs. When a non-residential building is located on sloping terrain, the height may be measured from the average ground level of the grade at the building wall. When a residential building is located on sloping terrain, the height shall be measured from the highest grade adjacent to the front of the structure to the highest point of the roof for flat roofs, including walls or parapets that extend above the horizontal roof surface; to the deck line of mansard roofs; and to the average height between eaves and ridge for gable, hip, and gambrel roofs. For residential buildings, the major or main roof over the living area shall be used to determine building height, with the following exception: when the total horizontal roof area of dormers and/or minor gables enclosing the living area exceeds twenty (20) percent of the total horizontal area of the roof to which such dormers or gables are attached, the predominant height of such dormers or gables shall be used as the basis for the determination of the building height.

Story and half-story is defined as the following:

STORY: That part of a building, except a mezzanine, included between the surface of one (1) floor and the surface of the next floor, or if there is not a floor above, then the ceiling next above. A story thus defined shall not be counted as a story when more than fifty (50) percent by cubic content, is below the height level of the adjoining ground.

STORY, HALF: An uppermost story lying under a sloping roof, the usable floor area of which, at a height of four feet above the floor, does not exceed two-thirds (2/3) of the floor area in the story directly below and the height above at least two hundred (200) square feet of floor space is seven feet four inches (7'4"). When the usable floor area of such a story, at a height of four (4) feet above the floor, does exceed two-thirds (2/3) of the floor area of the story directly below, it shall be counted as a full story.


During the review process, we had asked the applicant to confirm that the building complied with the 2.5 story maximum. The applicant's architect provided additional plans and the required calculations. The City's Building Official reviewed the plans and the calculations and confirmed that the building meets the 2.5 story requirement as defined in the Zoning Ordinance. The applicant's architect plans and calculations, and the Building Official's response are provided in your packet.

Items to be addressed: None.

## PARKING

Section 13.06.G of the Zoning Ordinance requires:

|  | Required | Provided |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential (General): <br> 2 spaces per unit | Phase 2: 20 units $=40$ spaces <br> Combined: 214 spaces | Phase 2: 57 spaces including 4 barrier free spaces per Sheet S100 Composite Site Plan <br> Combined: 238 spaces |
| Barrier Free | 4 | 4 |
| Bicycle Parking | 2 |  |
| Loading | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 40 spaces (phase 2) <br> Combined: 214 spaces | 238 spaces |

## Items to be Addressed: None

## SITE ACCESS AND CIRCULATION (Vehicular and Pedestrian)



## Crooks

Interior drives through the Phase 1 component of the Westington project will provide access to the site. Access to Phase 1 is via Wattles Road, 7-11 cross-access, and through 3902 Crooks (proposed to be developed as Hills West, see separate review).

The site plan was reviewed by the Citys Engineer and Engineering Consultant OHM. IN there review they note the following site circulation and pedestrian circulation deficiencies:

1. Improve pedestrian connectivity between the proposed Phase II buildings and the rest of the site. OHM notes this may require some parking reconfiguration to achieve.
a. Add sidewalk along the west side of the building proposed in Phase II to allow for easy access to those who park along the west side.
b. Add pedestrian crosswalks along the north end of the Phase II building to allow for connectivity to the rest of the Phase I buildings and the proposed gazebo.
c. Add a pedestrian crosswalk near the southwest corner of Building 2, providing connectivity to the existing southerly 3 -story building and to the proposed development at 3902 Crooks Rd. For optimal placement, eliminate the parking spot and enlarge the island on the west side, allowing a perpendicular aligned crosswalk at the junction of drive aisles.
2. Widen sidewalks to provide seven (7) feet of sidewalk width adjacent to vehicular travel ways or abutting parking. The proposed sidewalk along the east and south sides of the proposed Phase II building, are approximately only 5 feet wide.
3. Show curb cuts and ramps at each proposed crosswalk. There are several locations, such as along the northeast corner of the proposed Phase II building, where sidewalks and ramps are not shown.
4. The proposed pedestrian crosswalk leading to the dumpster area along Barilane is awkwardly configured. Reorient the ramp and crosswalk such that the sidewalk ramps are aligned with one another.
5. Extend sidewalk to the proposed pavilion area.
6. Circuitous sidewalk layouts (such as at the northwest corner of the proposed Phase II building, with sidewalk following the back of curb) are difficult to navigate and should be revised to reduce the number of jogs or turns.

Items to be addressed: Address Engineering noted comments

## TRAFFIC

As directed by the City the applicant has provided a Traffic Impact Study for both the Westington Phase II and the Hills West developments. Please note that the traffic study has not been revised as the applicant has reduced the overall number of units and thus reduced the traffic impact. The traffic review is based on 162 units. The revised total is 151 units

Summary:

The proposed development includes three (3) multi-family residential homes developments: Westington Phase I, Westington Phase II, and West Hills. The number of peak hour (AM and PM), and daily vehicle trips that would be generated by the proposed residential were forecast based on data published in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual 11 th Edition, and the ITE Trip Generation Handbook, 3rd Edition. The site trip generation was reviewed and approved by the City of Troy (OHM) prior to use in the analysis and is summarized in Table E2.

| Land Use | Phase | Amount (units) | Average DailyTraffic (vpd) | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Multifamily Residential | Westington Phase I | 102 | 701 | 11 | 35 | 46 | 36 | 21 | 57 |
|  | Westington Phase II | 30 | 206 | 4 | 10 | 14 | 11 | 6 | 17 |
|  | West Hills | 30 | 206 | 3 | 10 | 13 | 10 | 6 | 16 |
| Total Trips |  | 162 | 1,114 | 18 | 55 | 73 | 57 | 33 | 90 |


| To/From | Via | AM | PM |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| North | Crooks Road | $31 \%$ | $28 \%$ |
| South | Crooks Road | $39 \%$ | $41 \%$ |
| East | Wattles Road | $14 \%$ | $16 \%$ |
| West | Wattles Road | $16 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| Total |  | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

## ANALYSIS SUMMARY

The conclusions of this TIS are as follows:

1. Existing Conditions (2021): The result of the existing condition analysis indicates that all the study intersection approaches will operate at LOS D or better with the exceptions as follows:

- Crooks Road \& Wattles Road: The eastbound and westbound left and through movements are operating at LOS E during both AM and PM peak periods. Review of SimTraffic network simulations indicates long vehicle queues for these movements especially for eastbound through movement during the PM peak hour; however, these vehicle queues were observed to dissipate and were not present throughout the peak periods.
- Crooks Road \& 7-11 Drive: Although the westbound egress movements at 7-11 driveway currently operate at LOS D or better during the peak periods, long vehicle queue are observed on the site driveway during the PM peak hour. The northbound traffic at Wattles Road intersection occasionally extends past this driveway during peak periods and blocks the egress movements at the 7-11 Drive.

This causes westbound egress vehicles to wait longer to find gaps within the through traffic along Crooks Road.
2. Background Conditions (2023): The results of the background conditions analysis indicates that all study intersection approaches and movements will continue to operate in a manner similar to existing conditions with the following exceptions:

- Crooks Road \& Wattles Road: The southbound left-turn movement is expected to operate in LOS E during the PM peak hour at the intersection of Crooks Road \& Wattles Road intersection due to the traffic growth in background (2023) conditions. However, the projected additional delay is only 1.6 seconds, which is not significant.

3. Future Conditions (2023): The results of the future conditions analysis indicates that with the addition of site generated traffic, all the study intersection approaches and delays continue to operate in a manner similar to background conditions with the exceptions as follows:

- Crooks Road \& Wattles Road: The overall intersection is expected to operate at LOS E during the PM peak hour. However, the overall delay at this intersection is expected to increase by only 0.4 seconds, which will be indiscernible from background condition intersection operations.
- Crooks Road \& Site Drive (West Hills): The westbound egress movements at West Hills driveway are expected to operate at LOS E during the PM peak periods with a 95th percentile queue length of 43 feet (2 vehicles), which is not significant. These vehicles will be contained within the project site and will not impact traffic operations at the adjacent streets. Moreover, the review of SimTraffic network simulation indicates the egress vehicles are able to find adequate gaps within through traffic along Crooks Road.


## RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of this study indicate that with the addition of site generated traffic, all the study intersection approaches and delays will continue to operate in a manner similar to existing conditions with minor additional delays. Therefore, no mitigation measures are recommended to accommodate the site generated traffic volumes.

The applicant TIS was reviewed by OHM, the City's Traffic Consultant. OHM concludes:
I have reviewed the Traffic Impact Study for the Westington \& West Hills development site, a proposed residential development located at the corner of Crooks and Wattles Roads. The applicant has proposed 162 dwelling units. The Traffic Impact Study was prepared by Fleis \& Vandenbrink and is dated November 1, 2021.

OHM recommends approval of the TIS. While there are a few corrections and changes that could be made for this report, they are minor and would not impact the conclusions contained in the TIS.

Items to be addressed: None

## LANDSCAPING

A landscaping plan has been provided on Sheet L101. The following table discusses the development's compliance with the landscape requirements set forth in Section 13.02.

|  | Required: | Provided: | Compliance: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| East Property Line: |  |  |  |
| Landscape buffering: Required buffering between two differentiating land uses. Alternative 1 or 2. | 1 large evergreen every 10 feet or 1 narrow evergreen every 3 feet. <br> Alternative screening method may be considered by the Planning Commission. | 1 narrow evergreen every 3 feet. | Complies |
| Southeast property line: (adjacent to existing singlefamily home) |  |  |  |
| Landscape buffering: <br> Required buffering between two differentiating land uses. Alternative 1 or 2. | 1 large evergreen every 10 feet or 1 narrow evergreen every 3 feet. <br> Alternative screening method may be considered by the Planning Commission. | 1 narrow evergreen every 3 feet along northern property line. | Complies |
| West Property Line: |  |  |  |
| Landscape buffering: None required | None required | A variety of trees and bushes, numbering approx. 164 plants. | Complies |
| South Property Line |  |  |  |
| Required buffering between two differentiating land uses. Alternative 1 or 2. | 1 large evergreen tree every 10 feet | 12 evergreen trees | Complies |
| Overall |  |  |  |
| Site landscaping: | 20\% | 24\% | Complies |


| A minimum of twenty percent (20\%) of the site area shall be comprised of landscape material. Up to twenty-five percent ( $25 \%$ ) of the required landscape area may be brink, stone, pavers, or other public plaza elements, but shall not include any parking area or required sidewalks. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mitigation | $\begin{aligned} & 374 \text { trees / } 3 \text { inches }=1253- \\ & \text { inch trees } \end{aligned}$ | 68 trees | Deficient |

## Transformer / Trash Enclosure:

The applicant has indicated a central trash enclosure. There will be one trash enclosure with two trash containers contained within a 6 -foot-high masonry brick wall.

Items to be Addressed: Applicant is deficient in tree mitigation. See tree mitigation discussion.

## PHOTOMETRICS

A photometric plan has been provided. A total of seven (7) building light fixtures are proposed, along with six (6) pole-mounted light fixtures.

Items to be Addressed: None.

## FLOOR PLAN AND ELEVATIONS

Floor plans and elevations have been provided on sheets A100, A101, A102, and A200,. The elevations provided show architectural details, variations in material and pattern (brick, hardiboard siding, and limestone headers roof), as well as general color scheme.

Items to be Addressed: None

## DESIGN STANDARDS AND SITE PLAN REVIEW STANDARDS

The Neighborhood Node design standards as well as Site Plan review standards provide the Planning Commission with direction when reviewing the proposed site plan and design features of this development.

## Section 5.06.E. outlines Design Standards:

## 1. Building Orientation and Entrance

2. Ground Story Activation
3. Transitional Features
4. Site Access, Parking, and Loading

Please see Section 5.06.E for standard details.
Section 8.06 outlines Site Plan Review Design Standards.

1. Development shall ensure compatibility to existing commercial districts and provide a transition between land uses.
a. Building design shall enhance the character of the surrounding area in relation to building and parking placement, landscape and streetscape features, and architectural design.
b. Street fronts shall provide a variety of architectural expression that is appropriate in its context and prevents monotony.
c. Building design shall achieve a compatible transition between areas with different height, massing, scale, and architectural style.
2. Development shall incorporate the recognized best architectural building design practices.
a. Foster a lasting impact on the community through the provision of high quality design, construction, and detailing.
b. Provide high quality, durable materials, such as but not limited to stone, brick, glass, and metal. E.I.F.S. or material equivalent shall only be used as an accent material.
c. Develop buildings with creativity that includes balanced compositions and forms.
d. Design roofs that are appropriate to the architectural style of the building and create an appropriate visual exterior mass of the building given the context of the site.
e. For commercial buildings, incorporate clearly defined, highly visible customer entrances using features such as canopies, porticos, arcades, arches, wing walls, ground plane elements, and/or landscape planters.
f. Include community amenities that add value to the development such as patio/ seating areas, water features, art work or sculpture, clock towers, pedestrian plazas with park benches or other features located in areas accessible to the public.
3. Enhance the character, environment and safety for pedestrians and motorists.
a. Provide elements that define the street and the pedestrian realm.
b. Create a connection between the public right of way and ground floor activities.
c. Create a safe environment by employing design features to reduce vehicular and pedestrian conflict, while not sacrificing design excellence.
d. Enhance the pedestrian realm by framing the sidewalk area with trees, awnings, and other features.
e. Improve safety for pedestrians through site design measures.

## SUMMARY

As part of the deliberation, the Planning Commission and applicant shall discuss:

1. Can the applicant shift the building or reduce the size to preserve additional trees?
2. Compliance with Design Standards
3. Compliance with Site Plan Review Standards

Based on the Planning Commission discussion, the applicant shall also address engineering noted comments, and provide required tree mitigation.

Sincerely,
BumR.Calin
CARLISLE/WORTMAN ASSOC., INC.
Benjamin R. Carlisle, LEED AP, AICP










| Schedule Symbol | Label | Quantit | Manufacturer | Catalog Number | Description | La | Number | name | Lumens Per | Light Los | Wattage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\square$ | A | 7 | Lithonia Lighting | DSXW1 LED 10C 1000 40K T3S MVOLT | DSXW1 LED WITH (1) 10 LED LIGHT ENGINES, TYPE T3S OPTIC, 4000K, @ 1000 mA . | LED | 1 | DSXW1_LED_10C_1000 _40K_T3s_ MVOLTT.ies | 3912 | 1 | 38.8 |
| $\square$ | B | 6 | Lithonia Lighting | DSXW1 LED 10C 1000 40K T3S mvolt | DSXW1 LED WITH (1) 10 LED LIGHT ENGINES, TYPE T3S OPTIC, 4000K, @ 1000 mA . | ED | 1 | DSXW1_LED_10C 1000 _40K_T3̄_MVILT.ies | 3912 | 1 | 38.8 |

Statistics
Description Symbol Avg Max Min Max/ Min Avg/ Min


GENERAL NOTE: Al site lighting to comply with City of Troy lighting standards (Section 13.05)
The engineer and/or architect must determine applicability of the layout to existing /future field conditions
This ighting layout represents sillumination levels calculated from laboratory datata taken under controlled This lighting layout represents illumination levels calculated from laboratory datat taken under controlled
conditions in accordance with illuminating engieering society approved methods. Actual pertormance of

dill
These lighting calculations are not a substitute for independent engiering analysis of lighting system
suitability and safety. The engineer and or architect is responsible to revien for Michigan Energy Code an lighting quality compliance.
Unless exempt, project must comply with lighting controls reauirements defined in ASHRAE 90.13201
For specific information contact GBA controis group at ASG@gasserbush.com or $734-266-6705$





(1) Typican Uniit Plan










# Westington \& West Hills Development Traffic Impact Study 

Troy, Michigan

November 11, 2021

## Prepared by:

## I

FLEIS\&VANDENBRINK
DESIGN. BUILD. OPERATE,
27725 Stansbury Blvd., Suite 195
Farmington Hills, MI 48334

## Notice and Disclaimer

This document is provided by Fleis \& VandenBrink Engineering, Inc. for informational purposes only. No changes or revisions may be made to the information presented in the document without the express consent of Fleis \& VandenBrink Engineering, Inc. The information contained in this document is as accurate and complete as reasonably possible. Should you find any errors or inconsistencies, we would be grateful if you could bring them to our attention.

The opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed herein are those of Fleis \& VandenBrink Engineering, Inc. and do not necessarily reflect the official views or policy of City of Troy or the Road Commission for Oakland County (RCOC) which makes no warranty, either implied or expressed, for the information contained in this document; neither does it assume legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness or usefulness of this information. Any products, manufacturers or trademarks referenced in this document are used solely for reference purposes.


I hereby certify that this engineering document was prepared by me or under my direct personal supervision and that I am a duly licensed Professional Engineer under the laws of the State of Michigan.
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## Executive Summary

This report presents the results of a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) for three (3) multi-family residential developments proposed in the City of Troy, Michigan. The project site is located generally in the southeast quadrant of the Crooks Road and Wattles Road intersection, as shown in Figure E1. The proposed developments include Westington Phase I, Westington Phase II, and West Hills. Access to the project sites is provided via both Wattles Road and Crooks Road. No access to Barilane Drive is proposed with this project.

Figure E1: Site Location


## Background Data

F\&V subconsultant Traffic Data Collection, Inc. (TDC) performed weekday AM (7:00 AM to 9:00 AM) and PM (4:00 PM to 6:00 PM) turning movement counts at the following study intersections on Wednesday, September 29, 2021.

- Wattles Road \& Crooks Road
- Crooks Road \& Barilane Drive
- Crooks Road \& 7-11 Drive/Site Drive (shared access)

Due to the impact of COVID-19 traffic volume is not representative of "typical" operations. Therefore, an adjusted baseline traffic volume was established based on the methodologies described below following the input from City of Troy (OHM).

- Pre-COVID (2018) historical traffic volume data on Crooks Road, and Wattles Road were collected from the RCOC SCATS database due to construction impacts in 2019.
- Historical traffic volume at the adjacent streets were reviewed which shows a negative annual growth rate in recent years. Therefore, a conservative background growth rate of $0.5 \%$ per year was applied to the 2018 data collected to determine the expected 2021 traffic volumes.
- A COVID adjustment factor was calculated by comparing the expected 2021 traffic volumes to the collected 2021 traffic volumes.
- The calculated COVID adjustment factors are summarized in Table E1 which were applied to the collected traffic volume to establish a baseline traffic volume at the intersection of Crooks Road \& Wattles Road, as shown below.

Table E1: COVID Traffic Volume Adjustment Factors

| Roadway Approach | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crooks Road (NB) | $+44 \%$ | $+13 \%$ |
| Crooks Road (SB) | $+20 \%$ | $+22 \%$ |
| Wattles Road (EB) | $+42 \%$ | $+2 \%$ |
| Wattles Road (WB) | $+37 \%$ | $+22 \%$ |

## Trip Generation

The proposed development includes three (3) multi-family residential homes developments: Westington Phase I, Westington Phase II, and West Hills. The number of peak hour (AM and PM), and daily vehicle trips that would be generated by the proposed residential were forecast based on data published in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual $11^{\text {th }}$ Edition, and the ITE Trip Generation Handbook, $3^{\text {rd }}$ Edition. The site trip generation was reviewed and approved by the City of Troy (OHM) prior to use in the analysis and is summarized in Table E2.

Table E2: Trip Generation Summary

| Land Use | ITECode | Phase | Amount | Units | Average Daily Traffic (vpd) | AM Peak Hour (yph) |  |  | PM Peak Hour (yph) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Multi-Family Home (LowRise) | 220 | Westington Phase I | 102 | D.U. | 701 | 11 | 35 | 46 | 36 | 21 | 57 |
|  |  | Westington Phase II | 30 | D.U. | 206 | 4 | 10 | 14 | 11 | 6 | 17 |
|  |  | West Hills | 30 | D.U. | 207 | 3 | 10 | 13 | 10 | 6 | 16 |
| Total Trips |  |  | 162 | D.U. | 1,114 | 18 | 55 | 73 | 57 | 33 | 90 |

## Site Trip Distribution

The vehicular trips that would be generated by the proposed development were assigned to the study roads based on existing peak hour traffic patterns on the adjacent roadway network and the methodologies published by ITE. To determine the distribution of site generated traffic it was assumed that adjacent street trips in the AM are generally home-to-work and PM trips are generally work-to-home. Therefore, the distribution utilizes the existing traffic volumes and patterns to provide an estimated distribution for the site-generated traffic. The site trip distribution was reviewed and approved by the City of Troy (OHM) prior to use in the analysis and is summarized in Table E3.

Table E3: Trip Distribution

| To/From | Via | AM | PM |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North | Crooks Road | $31 \%$ | $28 \%$ |  |  |  |
| South | Crooks Road | $39 \%$ | $41 \%$ |  |  |  |
| East | Wattles Road | $14 \%$ | $16 \%$ |  |  |  |
| West | Wattles Road | $16 \%$ | $15 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $100 \%$ |

## AnAlysis Summary

The results of the analysis are summarized below.
The conclusions of this TIS are as follows:

1. Existing Conditions (2021): The result of the existing condition analysis indicates that all the study intersection approaches will operate at LOS D or better with the exceptions as follows:

- Crooks Road \& Wattles Road: The eastbound and westbound left and through movements are operating at LOS E during both AM and PM peak periods. Review of SimTraffic network simulations indicates long vehicle queues for these movements especially for eastbound through movement during the PM peak hour; however, these vehicle queues were observed to dissipate and were not present throughout the peak periods.
- Crooks Road \& 7-11 Drive: Although the westbound egress movements at 7-11 driveway currently operate at LOS D or better during the peak periods, long vehicle queue are observed on the site driveway during the PM peak hour. The northbound traffic at Wattles Road intersection occasionally extends past this driveway during peak periods and blocks the egress movements at the 7-11 Drive. This causes westbound egress vehicles to wait longer to find gaps within the through traffic along Crooks Road.

2. Background Conditions (2023): The results of the background conditions analysis indicates that all study intersection approaches and movements will continue to operate in a manner similar to existing conditions with the following exceptions:

- Crooks Road \& Wattles Road: The southbound left-turn movement is expected to operate in LOS E during the PM peak hour at the intersection of Crooks Road \& Wattles Road intersection due to the traffic growth in background (2023) conditions. However, the projected additional delay is only 1.6 seconds, which is not significant.

3. Future Conditions (2023): The results of the future conditions analysis indicates that with the addition of site generated traffic, all the study intersection approaches and delays continue to operate in a manner similar to background conditions with the exceptions as follows:

- Crooks Road \& Wattles Road: The overall intersection is expected to operate at LOS E during the PM peak hour. However, the overall delay at this intersection is expected to increase by only 0.4 seconds, which will be indiscernible from background condition intersection operations.
- Crooks Road \& Site Drive (West Hills): The westbound egress movements at West Hills driveway are expected to operate at LOS E during the PM peak periods with a $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue length of 43 feet ( 2 vehicles), which is not significant. These vehicles will be contained within the project site and will not impact traffic operations at the adjacent streets. Moreover, the review of SimTraffic network simulation indicates the egress vehicles are able to find adequate gaps within through traffic along Crooks Road.


## Recommendations

- The results of this study indicate that with the addition of site generated traffic, all the study intersection approaches and delays will continue to operate in a manner similar to existing conditions with minor additional delays. Therefore, no mitigation measures are recommended to accommodate the sitegenerated traffic volumes.


## 1 Introduction

This report presents the results of a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) for three (3) multi-family residential developments proposed in the City of Troy, Michigan. The project site is located generally in the southeast quadrant of the Crooks Road and Wattles Road intersection, as shown in Figure 1. The proposed developments include Westington Phase I, Westington Phase II, and West Hills. Access to the project sites is provided via both Wattles Road and Crooks Road. No access to Barilane Drive is proposed with this project. Crooks Road is under the jurisdiction of the Road Commission for Oakland County (RCOC), Wattles Road is under the jurisdiction of the City of Troy, and Barilane Drive is a Private Road.

The purpose of this study is to identify the traffic related impacts, if any, of the proposed development project on the adjacent road network. F\&V proposes to complete the scope of services for this project consistent with accepted traffic engineering practice and pursuant to the requirements City of Troy (OHM) and the RCOC. Specific tasks undertaken for this study include the following:

1. Study Area
a. Provide a description of the study area including: intersection and roadway geometries, speed limits, functional classifications and traffic volume data (where available). In addition, a study area site map showing the site location and the study intersections will also be provided.

## 2. Proposed Lane Use

a. Obtain and review the proposed site plan which includes the proposed land uses, densities, and desired site access locations. A description of the current and proposed land use will be accompanied with a complete project site plan (with buildings identified as to proposed use). A schedule for construction of the development and proposed development stages (if any) will also be provided.

## 3. Existing Conditions

a. Provide an analysis of the traffic-related impacts of the proposed development at the following study intersections:

- Wattles Road \& Crooks Road
- Crooks Road \& Barilane Drive
- Crooks Road \& 7-11 Drive/Site Drive (shared access)
- Crooks Road \& Site Drive (proposed)
- Wattles Road \& Site Drive (proposed)
b. Due to the impact of COVID-19, current traffic volume data is not representative of "typical" operations. Therefore, the data collection necessary for this study is proposed as follows:
- Collect existing turning movement counts at the study intersections during the AM (7:00AM 9:00AM) \& PM (4:00PM - 6:00PM) peak periods at the study intersections.
- Obtain and review historical turning movement count data and 24-hour traffic volumes where available from the RCOC and MDOT.
- Obtain and review available historical (pre-COVID) traffic count data at the study intersections and adjacent roadways previously performed by MDOT, RCOC, and others.
- Apply a growth rate to the historic traffic volumes to calculate the expected existing traffic volumes, without COVID impact.
- Compare the existing turning movement count data to expected existing traffic volumes collected in the area to determine a COVID adjustment factor for the existing turning movements counts.
- Apply COVID factor(s) where applicable to the existing turning movement counts to calculate the existing baseline traffic volumes for use in the study.


## WATTLES ROAD



LEGEND
c. Calculate the Existing vehicle delays, LOS, and vehicle queues at the study intersections during the AM and PM peak hours. Intersection analysis shall include LOS determination for all approaches and movements. The LOS will be based on the procedures outlined in the HCM 6th Edition, the latest edition of Transportation Research Board's Highway Capacity Manual.
4. Background Conditions
a. Calculate the future background traffic volumes based on an appropriate traffic growth determined from local or statewide data to the project build-out year and/or any applicable background developments in the vicinity of this project as identified by the City of Troy.
b. Calculate the Background (without the proposed development) vehicle delays, LOS, and vehicle queues at the study intersections during the AM and PM peak periods. Intersection analysis shall include LOS determination for all approaches and movements. The LOS will be based on the procedures outlined in the HCM 6th Edition, the latest edition of Transportation Research Board's Highway Capacity Manual.
c. Any state, local, or private transportation improvement projects in the project study area that will be underway in the build-out year as identified by the City of Troy or RCOC will be included as background conditions.

## 5. Trip Generation

a. Forecast the number of Weekday AM and PM peak hour trips and daily trips that would be generated by the proposed development based on data published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) in Trip Generation, $11^{\text {th }}$ Edition and the ITE Trip Generation Handbook, $3^{\text {rd }}$ Edition.
b. Provide the trip generation to the City and OHM for review and approval prior to use in the analysis.
c. A table will be provided in the report outlining the categories and quantities of land uses, with the corresponding trip generation rates or equations, and the resulting number of trips. The trip generation will be summarized to show the projected traffic impact for each phase of the project: Westington Phase I, Westington Phase II, and West Hills.

## 6. Trip Distribution and Traffic Assignment

a. Assign the trips that would be generated by the proposed development to the adjacent road network based on the existing traffic patterns and methodologies outlined in the ITE Transportation and Land Development, $2^{\text {nd }}$ Edition.
b. The distribution percentages with the corresponding volumes will be provided in a graphical format to include in the report and the basis will be explained.
c. Provide the trip distribution to the City and OHM for review and approval prior to use in the analysis.
d. Combine the site-generated traffic assignments with the background traffic forecasts to establish the Future weekday AM, and PM peak hour traffic volumes.

## 7. Future Conditions

a. Calculate the Future (with the proposed development) vehicle delays, LOS, and vehicle queues at the study intersections. Intersection analysis shall include LOS determination for all approaches and movements. The LOS will be based on the procedures outlined in the HCM 6th Edition, the latest edition of Transportation Research Board's Highway Capacity Manual.
b. Identify improvements (if any) for the study road network that would be required to accommodate the site-generated traffic volumes.

The scope of this study was developed based on Fleis \& VandenBrink's (F\&V) knowledge of the study area, understanding of the development program, accepted traffic engineering practices and information published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). The study analyses were completed using Synchro/SimTraffic (Version 11). Sources of data for this study include F\&V subconsultant Traffic Data Collection, Inc. (TDC), information provided by Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), the Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG) and ITE. All background information is provided in Appendix A.

## 2 Background

### 2.1 Existing Road Network

Vehicle transportation for the study area is provided by Crooks Road and Wattles Road. The lane uses and traffic control at the study intersections are shown on Figure 2 and the study roadways are further described below. For the purposes of this study, all minor streets and driveways are assumed to have an operating speed of 25 miles per hour (mph).
Crooks Road runs north/south adjacent to the west side of the project site. The roadway is classified as a Other Principal Arterial and is under the jurisdiction of the RCOC. The roadway has a posted speed limit of 45 mph and an Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) of 25,400 vehicles per day (SEMCOG 2016). The roadway geometry has a typical five-lane cross section, with two lanes in each direction with a left-center turn lane.
Wattles Road runs in the east/west directions adjacent to the north side of the project site. The roadway is classified as a Minor Arterial and is under the jurisdiction of the City of Troy. Wattles Road has a posted speed limit of 40 mph , and an AADT of 13,400 vehicles per day (SEMCOG 2016). The roadway has a typical threelane cross section, with one lane in each direction with a center left-turn lane.

### 2.2 Existing Traffic Volumes

F\&V subconsultant Traffic Data Collection, Inc. (TDC) performed weekday AM (7:00 AM to 9:00 AM) and PM (4:00 PM to 6:00 PM) turning movement counts at the following study intersections on Wednesday, September 29, 2021.

- Wattles Road \& Crooks Road
- Crooks Road \& Barilane Drive
- Crooks Road \& 7-11 Drive/Site Drive (shared access)

Due to the impact of COVID-19 traffic volume is not representative of "typical" operations. Therefore, an adjusted baseline traffic volume was established based on the methodologies described below following the input from City of Troy (OHM).

- Pre-COVID (2018) historical traffic volume data on Crooks Road, and Wattles Road were collected from the RCOC SCATS database due to construction impacts in 2019.
- Historical traffic volume at the adjacent streets were reviewed which shows a negative annual growth rate in recent years. Therefore, a conservative background growth rate of $0.5 \%$ per year was applied to the 2018 data collected to determine the expected 2021 traffic volumes.
- A COVID adjustment factor was calculated by comparing the expected 2021 traffic volumes to the collected 2021 traffic volumes.
- The calculated COVID adjustment factors are summarized in Table 1 which were applied to the collected traffic volume to establish a baseline traffic volume at the intersection of Crooks Road \& Wattles Road, as shown below.

Table 1: COVID Traffic Volume Adjustment Factors

| Roadway Approach | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crooks Road (NB) | $+44 \%$ | $+13 \%$ |
| Crooks Road (SB) | $+20 \%$ | $+22 \%$ |
| Wattles Road (EB) | $+42 \%$ | $+2 \%$ |
| Wattles Road (WB) | $+37 \%$ | $+22 \%$ |

Existing through traffic volumes at the proposed site driveway was determined through balancing traffic volumes through the study network. The existing AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes are shown on the attached Figure 3. The existing (2021) baseline traffic volume was reviewed and approved by the City of Troy (OHM) prior to use in the analysis.

## 3 Existing Conditions

### 3.1 ExISTING OPERATIONS

The existing AM and PM peak hour vehicle delays and Levels of Service (LOS) were calculated at the study intersections using Synchro (Version 11) traffic analysis software. The results of the analysis of existing conditions were based on the existing lane use and traffic control shown on Figure 2, the existing traffic volumes shown on Figure 3, and the methodologies presented in the Highway Capacity Manual $6{ }^{\text {th }}$ Edition (HCM6).
Descriptions of LOS "A" through "F", as defined in the HCM, are provided in Appendix B for signalized and unsignalized intersections. Typically, LOS D is considered acceptable, with LOS A representing minimal delay, and LOS F indicating failing conditions. The results of the analysis of existing conditions are presented in Appendix B and are summarized in Table 2. Microsimulation was also conducted at the study intersections using SimTraffic to further evaluate the network performance.

Table 2: Existing Intersection Operations

| Intersection |  | Control | Approach | Existing Conditions |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
|  |  | Delay (s/veh) |  | LOS | Delay (s/veh) | LOS |
| 1 | Crooks Road \& Wattles Road |  | Signalized | EBL | 57.0 | E | 71.9 | E |
|  |  |  |  | EBT | 75.9 | E | 77.7 | E |
|  |  | EBR |  | 51.0 | D | 43.8 | D |
|  |  | WBL |  | 75.4 | E | 77.3 | E |
|  |  | WBT |  | 61.5 | E | 65.8 | E |
|  |  | WBR |  | 42.2 | D | 44.6 | D |
|  |  | NBL |  | 49.6 | D | 46.5 | D |
|  |  | NBT |  | 39.7 | D | 58.2 | E |
|  |  | NBR |  | 31.2 | C | 35.4 | D |
|  |  | SBL |  | 45.6 | D | 53.8 | D |
|  |  | SBL |  | 41.2 | D | 37.9 | D |
|  |  | SBT |  | 29.3 | C | 27.2 | C |
|  |  | Overall |  | 49.4 | D | 54.0 | D |
| 2 | Crooks Road \& 7-11 Drive | Stop (Minor) | WB | 13.7 | B | 26.9 | D |
|  |  |  | NB | Free |  | Free |  |
|  |  |  | SBL | 16.1 | C | 25.2 | D |
| 3 |  <br> Barilane Drive | Stop (Minor) | WB | 19.5 | C | 32.7 | D |
|  |  |  | NB | Free |  | Free |  |
|  |  |  | SBL | 10.6 | B | 14.8 | B |

The result of the existing condition analysis indicates that all the study intersection approaches will operate at LOS D or better with the exceptions as follow:

## Crooks Road \& Wattles Road

- The eastbound and westbound left and through movements are operating at LOS E during both AM and PM peak periods. Review of SimTraffic network simulations indicates long vehicle queues for these movements especially for eastbound through movement during the PM peak hour; however, these vehicle queues were observed to dissipate and were not present throughout the peak periods.
- The longer delays at east-west approaches at this intersection are due to high vehicle volumes for north-south approaches in conjunction with the long cycle length ( 130 seconds).


## Crooks Road \& 7-11 Drive

- Although the westbound egress movements at $7-11$ driveway currently operate at LOS D or better during the peak periods, long vehicle queue are observed on the site driveway during the PM peak hour. The northbound traffic at Wattles Road intersection occasionally extends past this driveway during peak periods and blocks the egress movements at the 7-11 Drive. This causes westbound egress vehicles to wait longer to find gaps within the through traffic along Crooks Road.




## 4 Background Conditions

In order to determine the applicable traffic growth rate for the existing 2021 conditions to the buildout year 2023, historical population and economic profile data was obtained for the City of Troy from Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG). Population and employment projections from 2020 to 2045 were reviewed which shows an average annual growth of $-0.16 \%$ and $0.18 \%$, respectively. Therefore, a conservative background growth rate of $0.5 \%$ per year was applied to the existing 2021 traffic volumes to forecast the background (2023) traffic volume without the proposed development, as shown on Figure 4.

### 4.1 BACKGROUND OPERATIONS

The background peak hour vehicle delays and LOS without the proposed development were calculated based on the existing lane use and traffic control shown on Figure 2, the background traffic volumes shown on Figure 4, and the methodologies presented in the HCM6. The results of the analysis of background conditions are presented in Appendix C and are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3: Background Intersection Operations

| Intersection |  | Control | Approach | Existing Conditions |  |  |  | Background Conditions |  |  |  | Difference |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
|  |  | Delay (s/veh) |  | LOS | Delay (s/veh) | LOS | Delay (s/veh) | LOS | Delay (s/veh) | LOS | Delay (s/veh) | LOS | Delay (s/veh) | LOS |
|  | Crooks Road \& Wattles Road |  | Signalized | EBL | 57.0 | E | 71.9 | E | 56.8 | E | 72.9 | E | -0.2 | - | 1.0 | - |
|  |  |  |  | EBT | 75.9 | E | 77.7 | E | 76.3 | E | 78.3 | E | 0.4 | - | 0.6 | - |
|  |  | EBR |  | 51.0 | D | 43.8 | D | 51.1 | D | 43.7 | D | 0.1 | - | -0.1 | - |
|  |  | WBL |  | 75.4 | E | 77.3 | E | 75.8 | E | 77.6 | E | 0.4 | - | 0.3 | - |
|  |  | WBT |  | 61.5 | E | 65.8 | E | 61.6 | E | 66.1 | E | 0.1 | - | 0.3 | - |
|  |  | WBR |  | 42.2 | D | 44.6 | D | 42.0 | D | 44.3 | D | -0.2 | - | -0.3 | - |
|  |  | NBL |  | 49.6 | D | 46.5 | D | 50.2 | D | 47.1 | D | 0.6 | - | 0.6 | - |
|  |  | NBT |  | 39.7 | D | 58.2 | E | 39.9 | D | 59.8 | E | 0.2 | - | 1.6 | - |
|  |  | NBR |  | 31.2 | C | 35.4 | D | 31.3 | C | 35.4 | D | 0.1 | - | 0.0 | - |
|  |  | SBL |  | 45.6 | D | 53.8 | D | 46.3 | D | 55.4 | E | 0.7 | - | 1.6 | $D \rightarrow E$ |
|  |  | SBL |  | 41.2 | D | 37.9 | D | 41.5 | D | 38.2 | D | 0.3 | - | 0.3 | - |
|  |  | SBT |  | 29.3 | C | 27.2 | C | 29.3 | C | 27.2 | C | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - |
|  |  | Overall |  | 49.4 | D | 54.0 | D | 49.7 | D | 54.8 | D | 0.3 | - | 0.8 | - |
| 2 |  | Stop (Minor) | WB | 13.7 | B | 26.9 | D | 13.7 | B | 27.4 | D | 0.0 | - | 0.5 | - |
|  | Crooks Road <br> \& 7-11 Drive |  | NB | Free |  | Free |  | Free |  | Free |  | Free |  | Free |  |
|  |  |  | SBL | 16.1 | C | 25.2 | D | 16.2 | C | 25.6 | D | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - |
|  | Crooks Road | Stop (Minor | WB | 19.5 | C | 32.7 | D | 19.4 | C | 33.1 | D | -0.1 | - | 0.4 | - |
|  | \& Bariane |  | NB | Free |  | Free |  | Free |  | Free |  | Free |  | Free |  |
|  | Drive |  | SBL | 10.6 | B | 14.8 | B | 10.6 | B | 15.0 | B | 0.0 | - | 0.2 | - |

The results of the background conditions analysis indicates that all study intersection approaches and movements will continue to operate in a manner similar to existing conditions with the following exceptions:

## Crooks Road \& Wattles Road

- The southbound left-turn movement is expected to operate in LOS E during the PM peak hour at the intersection of Crooks Road \& Wattles Road intersection due to the traffic growth in background (2023) conditions. However, the projected additional delay is only 1.6 seconds, which is not significant.



## 5 Site Trip Generation

The proposed development includes three (3) multi-family residential developments: Westington Phase I, Westington Phase II, and West Hills. Access to the project sites is provided via two (2) site driveways on Crooks Road, including the shared access with the adjacent $7-11$ store, and one (1) access drive on Wattles Road. The number of peak hour (AM and PM), and daily vehicle trips that would be generated by the proposed residential were forecast based on data published in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual $11^{\text {th }}$ Edition, and the ITE Trip Generation Handbook, $3^{\text {rd }}$ Edition. The trip generation was reviewed and approved by the City of Troy (OHM) prior to use in the analysis and is summarized in Table 4.

Table 4: Trip Generation Summary

| Land Use | ITE Code | Phase | Amount | Units | Average Daily Traffic (vpd) | AM Peak Hour (vph) |  |  | PM Peak Hour (yph) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Multi-Family Home (Low-Rise) | 220 | Westington Phase I | 102 | D.U. | 701 | 11 | 35 | 46 | 36 | 21 | 57 |
|  |  | Westington Phase II | 30 | D.U. | 206 | 4 | 10 | 14 | 11 | 6 | 17 |
|  |  | West Hills | 30 | D.U. | 207 | 3 | 10 | 13 | 10 | 6 | 16 |
| Total Trips |  |  | 162 | D.U. | 1,114 | 18 | 55 | 73 | 57 | 33 | 90 |

## 6 Site Trip Distribution

The vehicular trips that would be generated by the proposed development were assigned to the study roads based on existing peak hour traffic patterns on the adjacent roadway network and the methodologies published by ITE. To determine the distribution of site generated traffic it was assumed that adjacent street trips in the AM are generally home-to-work and PM trips are generally work-to-home. Therefore, the distribution utilizes the existing traffic volumes and patterns to provide an estimated distribution for the site-generated traffic. The trip distribution was reviewed and approved by the City of Troy ( OHM ) prior to use in the analysis and is summarized in Table 5.

Table 5: Site Trip Distribution

| To/From | Via | AM | PM |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North | Crooks Road | $31 \%$ | $28 \%$ |  |  |  |
| South | Crooks Road | $39 \%$ | $41 \%$ |  |  |  |
| East | Wattles Road | $14 \%$ | $16 \%$ |  |  |  |
| West | Wattles Road | $16 \%$ | $15 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $100 \%$ |

The vehicular traffic volumes shown in Table 4 were distributed to the roadway network according to the distribution shown in Table 5. The site generated trips are shown on Figure 5 and were added to the background traffic volumes shown on Figure 4 to calculate the future peak hour traffic volumes shown on Figure 6.


## 7 Future Conditions

### 7.1 Future Operations

Future peak hour vehicle delays and LOS with the proposed development were calculated based on the future lane use shown on Figure 2, the proposed site access plan, the future traffic volumes shown on Figure 6, and the methodologies presented in the HCM6. The results of the future conditions analysis are presented in Appendix D and are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6: Future Intersection Operations

| Intersection |  | Control | Approach | Background Conditions |  |  |  | Future Conditions |  |  |  | Difference |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
|  |  | Delay (s/veh) |  | LOS | Delay (s/veh) | LOS | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Delay } \\ \text { (s/veh) } \end{array} \end{array}$ | LOS | Delay (s/veh) | LOS | Delay (s/veh) | LOS | Delay (s/veh) | LOS |
|  |  <br> Wattles Road |  | Signalized | EBL | 56.8 | E | 72.9 | E | 57.5 | E | 72.1 | E | 0.7 | - | -0.8 | - |
|  |  |  |  | EBT | 76.3 | E | 78.3 | E | 76.6 | E | 79.1 | E | 0.3 | - | 0.8 | - |
|  |  | EBR |  | 51.1 | D | 43.7 | D | 51.2 | D | 43.5 | D | 0.1 | - | -0.2 | - |
|  |  | WBL |  | 75.8 | E | 77.6 | E | 75.8 | E | 77.7 | E | 0.0 | - | 0.1 | - |
|  |  | WBT |  | 61.6 | E | 66.1 | E | 61.8 | E | 66.2 | E | 0.2 | - | 0.1 | - |
|  |  | WBR |  | 42.0 | D | 44.3 | D | 42.0 | D | 44.4 | D | 0.0 | - | 0.1 | - |
|  |  | NBL |  | 50.2 | D | 47.1 | D | 51.0 | D | 47.6 | D | 0.8 | - | 0.5 | - |
|  |  | NBT |  | 39.9 | D | 59.8 | E | 41.3 | D | 60.4 | E | 1.4 | - | 0.6 | - |
|  |  | NBR |  | 31.3 | C | 35.4 | D | 32.1 | C | 35.5 | D | 0.8 | - | 0.1 | - |
|  |  | SBL |  | 46.3 | D | 55.4 | E | 46.5 | D | 58.3 | E | 0.2 | - | 2.9 | - |
|  |  | SBL |  | 41.5 | D | 38.2 | D | 41.6 | D | 38.3 | D | 0.1 | - | 0.1 | - |
|  |  | SBT |  | 29.3 | C | 27.2 | C | 29.3 | C | 27.2 | C | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - |
|  |  | Overall |  | 49.7 | D | 54.8 | D | 50.1 | D | 55.2 | E | 0.4 | - | 0.4 | D $\rightarrow$ E |
|  | Crooks | Stop (Minor) | WB | 13.7 | B | 27.4 | D | 14.6 | B | 30.7 | D | 14.6 | - | 3.3 | - |
| 2 | Road \& 7-11 |  | NB | Free |  | Free |  | Free |  | Free |  | Free |  | Free |  |
|  | Drive |  | SBL | 16.2 | C | 25.6 | D | 16.4 | C | 26.4 | D | 16.4 | - | 26.4 | - |
| 3 | Crooks | Stop (Minor | WB | 19.4 | C | 33.1 | D | 19.7 | C | 34.0 | D | 0.3 | - | 0.9 | - |
|  | Road |  | NB | Free |  | Free |  | Free |  | Free |  | Free |  | Free |  |
|  | Drive |  | SBL | 10.6 | B | 15.0 | B | 10.7 | B | 15.2 | C | 0.1 | - | 0.2 | $B \rightarrow C$ |
| 4 | Crooks | Stop (Minor) | WB | N/A |  |  |  | 19.1 | C | 38.1 | E | N/A |  |  |  |
|  | Road \& Site Drive |  | NB |  |  |  |  | Free |  | Free |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (West Hills) |  | SBL |  |  |  |  | 10.7 | B | 14.6 | B |  |  |  |  |
| Wattles Road \& Site Drive (Westington) |  | Stop (Minor | WB | N/A |  |  |  | Free |  | Free |  | N/A |  |  |  |
|  |  | NB | 8.9 |  |  |  |  | A | 11.5 | B |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | SBL | 12.0 |  |  |  |  | B | 16.5 | C |  |  |  |  |

The results of the future conditions analysis indicates that with the addition of site generated traffic, all the study intersection approaches and delays will continue to operate in a manner similar to background conditions with the exceptions as follows:


## Crooks Road \& Wattles Road

- The overall intersection is expected to operate at LOS E during the PM peak hour. However, the overall delay at this intersection is expected to increase by only 0.4 seconds, which will be indiscernible from background condition intersection operations.


## Crooks Road \& Site Drive (West Hills)

- The westbound egress movements at West Hills driveway are expected to operate at LOS E during the PM peak periods with a $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue length of 43 feet ( 2 vehicles), which is not significant. These vehicles will be contained within the project site and will not impact traffic operations at the adjacent streets. Moreover, the review of SimTraffic network simulation indicates the egress vehicles are able to find adequate gaps within through traffic along Crooks Road.


## 8 Conclusions

The conclusions of this TIS are as follows:

1. Existing Conditions (2021): The result of the existing condition analysis indicates that all the study intersection approaches will operate at LOS D or better with the exceptions as follow:

- Crooks Road \& Wattles Road: The eastbound and westbound left and through movements are operating at LOS E during both AM and PM peak periods. Review of SimTraffic network simulations indicates long vehicle queues for these movements especially for eastbound through movement during the PM peak hour; however, these vehicle queues were observed to dissipate and were not present throughout the peak periods.
- Crooks Road \& 7-11 Drive: Although the westbound egress movements at 7-11 driveway currently operate at LOS D or better during the peak periods, long vehicle queue are observed on the site driveway during the PM peak hour. The northbound traffic at Wattles Road intersection occasionally extends past this driveway during peak periods and blocks the egress movements at the 7-11 Drive. This causes westbound egress vehicles to wait longer to find gaps within the through traffic along Crooks Road.

2. Background Conditions (2023): The results of the background conditions analysis indicates that all study intersection approaches and movements will continue to operate in a manner similar to existing conditions with the following exceptions:

- Crooks Road \& Wattles Road: The southbound left-turn movement is expected to operate in LOS E during the PM peak hour at the intersection of Crooks Road \& Wattles Road intersection due to the traffic growth in background (2023) conditions. However, the projected additional delay is only 1.6 seconds, which is not significant.

3. Future Conditions (2023): The results of the future conditions analysis indicates that with the addition of site generated traffic, all the study intersection approaches and delays will continue to operate in a manner similar to existing/background conditions with the exceptions as follows:

- Crooks Road \& Wattles Road: The overall intersection is expected to operate at LOS E during the PM peak hour. However, the overall delay at this intersection is expected to increase by only 0.4 seconds, which will be indiscernible from background condition intersection operations.
- Crooks Road \& Site Drive (West Hills): The westbound egress movements at West Hills driveway are expected to operate at LOS E during the PM peak periods with a $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue length of 43 feet ( 2 vehicles), which is not significant. These vehicles will be contained within the project site and will not impact traffic operations at the adjacent streets. Moreover, the review of SimTraffic network simulation indicates the egress vehicles are able to find adequate gaps within through traffic along Crooks Road.


## 9 Recommendations

The results of this study indicate that with the addition of site generated traffic, all the study intersection approaches and delays will continue to operate in a manner similar to existing conditions with minor additional delays. Therefore, no mitigation measures are recommended to accommodate the site-generated traffic volumes.

## Appendix A

## Background INFORMATION



# Traffic Data Collection, LLC <br> www:tdccounts.com 

Phone: 586.786-5407
Traffic Study Performed For:
FLEIS \& VANDENBRINK

Project: Troy West Traffic Impact Study
Study:4 Hr. Video Turning Movement Count
Weather: Sunny, Dry Deg's 70s
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Site Code : TMC 1
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4 Hour video traffic study was conducted during typical weekday (Wednesday) from 7:00 AM - 9:00 AM morning \& 4:00 PM - 6:00 PM afternoon peak hours, while school was in session \& during COVID 19.

|  | Crooks Road Southbound |  |  |  |  | Wattles Road Westbound |  |  |  |  | Crooks Road Northbound |  |  |  |  | Wattles Road Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | Peds | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | Peds | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | Peds | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | Peds | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 07:00 AM | 33 | 122 | 15 | 0 | 170 | 42 | 85 | 31 | 0 | 158 | 13 | 85 | 28 | 0 | 126 | 31 | 71 | 12 | 0 | 114 | 568 |
| 07:15 AM | 30 | 157 | 39 | 0 | 226 | 34 | 69 | 32 | 0 | 135 | 16 | 95 | 25 | 0 | 136 | 33 | 86 | 22 | 0 | 141 | 638 |
| 07:30 AM | 23 | 201 | 35 | 0 | 259 | 27 | 62 | 44 | 0 | 133 | 12 | 122 | 19 | 0 | 153 | 27 | 50 | 20 | 1 | 98 | 643 |
| 07:45 AM | 28 | 246 | 31 | 0 | 305 | 26 | 62 | 55 | 0 | 143 | 21 | 124 | 14 | 0 | 159 | 28 | 56 | 21 | 0 | 105 | 712 |
| Total | 114 | 726 | 120 | 0 | 960 | 129 | 278 | 162 | 0 | 569 | 62 | 426 | 86 | 0 | 574 | 119 | 263 | 75 | 1 | 458 | 2561 |
| 08:00 AM | 21 | 195 | 23 | 0 | 239 | 33 | 55 | 47 | 0 | 135 | 20 | 117 | 12 | 0 | 149 | 21 | 46 | 31 | 0 | 98 | 621 |
| 08:15 AM | 25 | 208 | 34 | 0 | 267 | 25 | 83 | 61 | 0 | 169 | 12 | 161 | 27 | 0 | 200 | 33 | 46 | 21 | 0 | 100 | 736 |
| 08:30 AM | 26 | 214 | 33 | 0 | 273 | 20 | 59 | 44 | 0 | 123 | 23 | 141 | 20 | 0 | 184 | 41 | 60 | 19 | 0 | 120 | 700 |
| 08:45 AM | 23 | 225 | 28 | 0 | 276 | 31 | 78 | 53 | 0 | 162 | 27 | 125 | 11 | 0 | 163 | 28 | 66 | 19 | 0 | 113 | 714 |
| Tota | 95 | 842 | 118 | 0 | 1055 | 109 | 275 | 205 | 0 | 589 | 82 | 544 | 70 | 0 | 696 | 123 | 218 | 90 | 0 | 431 | 277 |

*** BREAK ***

| 04:00 PM | 27 | 152 | 47 | 0 | 226 | 18 | 53 | 20 | 0 | 91 | 35 | 220 | 23 | 0 | 278 | 18 | 89 | 45 | 0 | 152 | 747 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 04:15 PM | 18 | 194 | 33 | 0 | 245 | 21 | 53 | 26 | 0 | 100 | 44 | 201 | 30 | 0 | 275 | 16 | 92 | 32 | 0 | 140 | 760 |
| 04:30 PM | 16 | 168 | 29 | 0 | 213 | 17 | 81 | 32 | 0 | 130 | 52 | 262 | 24 | 0 | 338 | 26 | 90 | 32 | 0 | 148 | 829 |
| 04:45 PM | 20 | 175 | 51 | 0 | 246 | 21 | 68 | 34 | 0 | 123 | 43 | 249 | 36 | 0 | 328 | 25 | 109 | 32 | 0 | 166 | 863 |
| Total | 81 | 689 | 160 | 0 | 930 | 77 | 255 | 112 | 0 | 444 | 174 | 932 | 113 | 0 | 1219 | 85 | 380 | 141 | 0 | 606 | 3199 |
| 05:00 PM | 15 | 184 | 53 | 0 | 252 | 26 | 68 | 40 | 0 | 134 | 58 | 264 | 33 | 0 | 355 | 27 | 86 | 54 | 0 | 167 | 908 |
| 05:15 PM | 11 | 220 | 59 | 1 | 291 | 17 | 80 | 41 | 1 | 139 | 51 | 270 | 37 | 0 | 358 | 25 | 98 | 55 | 0 | 178 | 966 |
| 05:30 PM | 20 | 183 | 54 | 0 | 257 | 29 | 72 | 38 | 0 | 139 | 45 | 231 | 34 | 2 | 312 | 30 | 75 | 43 | 0 | 148 | 856 |
| 05:45 PM | 16 | 142 | 44 | 1 | 203 | 21 | 70 | 37 | 0 | 128 | 45 | 195 | 23 | 2 | 265 | 14 | 88 | 35 | 0 | 137 | 733 |
| Total | 62 | 729 | 210 | 2 | 1003 | 93 | 290 | 156 | 1 | 540 | 199 | 960 | 127 | 4 | 1290 | 96 | 347 | 187 | 0 | 630 | 3463 |
| Grand Total | 352 | 2986 | 608 | 2 | 3948 | 408 | 1098 | 635 | 1 | 2142 | 517 | 2862 | 396 | 4 | 3779 | 423 | 1208 | 493 | 1 | 2125 | 11994 |
| Apprch \% | 8.9 | 75.6 | 15.4 | 0.1 |  | 19 | 51.3 | 29.6 | 0 |  | 13.7 | 75.7 | 10.5 | 0.1 |  | 19.9 | 56.8 | 23.2 | 0 |  |  |
| Total \% | 2.9 | 24.9 | 5.1 | 0 | 32.9 | 3.4 | 9.2 | 5.3 | 0 | 17.9 | 4.3 | 23.9 | 3.3 | 0 | 31.5 | 3.5 | 10.1 | 4.1 | 0 | 17.7 |  |
| Pass Cars | 349 | 2949 | 596 | 0 | 3894 | 404 | 1078 | 628 | 0 | 2110 | 511 | 2803 | 388 | 0 | 3702 | 409 | 1184 | 487 | 0 | 2080 | 11786 |
| \% Pass Cars | 99.1 | 98.8 | 98 | 0 | 98.6 | 99 | 98.2 | 98.9 | 0 | 98.5 | 98.8 | 97.9 | 98 | 0 | 98 | 96.7 | 98 | 98.8 | 0 | 97.9 | 98.3 |
| Single Units | 3 | 34 | 12 | 0 | 49 | 4 | 20 | 7 | 0 | 31 | 6 | 44 | 8 | 0 | 58 | 14 | 24 | 6 | 0 | 44 | 182 |
| \% Single Units | 0.9 | 1.1 | 2 | 0 | 1.2 | 1 | 1.8 | 1.1 | 0 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 2 | 0 | 1.5 | 3.3 | 2 | 1.2 | 0 | 2.1 | 1.5 |
| Heavy Trucks | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| \% Heavy Trucks | 0 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.2 |
| Peds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| \% Peds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0.1 |

TDC Traffic Comments: Signalized controlled intersection, ped. signals for all quadrants. Video VCU camera was located within SW intersection quadrant. Note: Peds. are excluded from peak hour reports. Traffic study was performed for Troy Westington Phase II Traffic Impact Study for Fleis \& Vandenbrink.
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|  | Crooks Road Southbound |  |  |  | Wattles Road Westbound |  |  |  | Crooks Road Northbound |  |  |  | Wattles Road Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 11:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1 Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 08:00 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 08:00 AM | 21 | 195 | 23 | 239 | 33 | 55 | 47 | 135 | 20 | 117 | 12 | 149 | 21 | 46 | 31 | 98 | 621 |
| 08:15 AM | 25 | 208 | 34 | 267 | 25 | 83 | 61 | 169 | 12 | 161 | 27 | 200 | 33 | 46 | 21 | 100 | 736 |
| 08:30 AM | 26 | 214 | 33 | 273 | 20 | 59 | 44 | 123 | 23 | 141 | 20 | 184 | 41 | 60 | 19 | 120 | 700 |
| 08:45 AM | 23 | 225 | 28 | 276 | 31 | 78 | 53 | 162 | 27 | 125 | 11 | 163 | 28 | 66 | 19 | 113 | 714 |
| Total Volume | 95 | 842 | 118 | 1055 | 109 | 275 | 205 | 589 | 82 | 544 | 70 | 696 | 123 | 218 | 90 | 431 | 2771 |
| \% App. Total | 9 | 79.8 | 11.2 |  | 18.5 | 46.7 | 34.8 |  | 11.8 | 78.2 | 10.1 |  | 28.5 | 50.6 | 20.9 |  |  |
| PHF | . 913 | . 936 | . 868 | . 956 | . 826 | . 828 | . 840 | . 871 | . 759 | . 845 | . 648 | . 870 | . 750 | . 826 | . 726 | . 898 | . 941 |
| Pass Cars | 95 | 831 | 117 | 1043 | 109 | 265 | 202 | 576 | 81 | 517 | 66 | 664 | 117 | 212 | 89 | 418 | 2701 |
| \% Pass Cars | 100 | 98.7 | 99.2 | 98.9 | 100 | 96.4 | 98.5 | 97.8 | 98.8 | 95.0 | 94.3 | 95.4 | 95.1 | 97.2 | 98.9 | 97.0 | 97.5 |
| Single Units | 0 | 11 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 13 | 1 | 20 | 4 | 25 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 13 | 63 |
| \% Single Units | 0 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 0 | 3.6 | 1.5 | 2.2 | 1.2 | 3.7 | 5.7 | 3.6 | 4.9 | 2.8 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 2.3 |
| Heavy Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| \% Heavy Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.3 | 0 | 1.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.3 |
| Peds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \% Peds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
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|  | Crooks Road Southbound |  |  |  | Wattles Road Westbound |  |  |  | Crooks Road Northbound |  |  |  | Wattles Road Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 12:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1 Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 04:45 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:45 PM | 20 | 175 | 51 | 246 | 21 | 68 | 34 | 123 | 43 | 249 | 36 | 328 | 25 | 109 | 32 | 166 | 863 |
| 05:00 PM | 15 | 184 | 53 | 252 | 26 | 68 | 40 | 134 | 58 | 264 | 33 | 355 | 27 | 86 | 54 | 167 | 908 |
| 05:15 PM | 11 | 220 | 59 | 290 | 17 | 80 | 41 | 138 | 51 | 270 | 37 | 358 | 25 | 98 | 55 | 178 | 964 |
| 05:30 PM | 20 | 183 | 54 | 257 | 29 | 72 | 38 | 139 | 45 | 231 | 34 | 310 | 30 | 75 | 43 | 148 | 854 |
| Total Volume | 66 | 762 | 217 | 1045 | 93 | 288 | 153 | 534 | 197 | 1014 | 140 | 1351 | 107 | 368 | 184 | 659 | 3589 |
| \% App. Total | 6.3 | 72.9 | 20.8 |  | 17.4 | 53.9 | 28.7 |  | 14.6 | 75.1 | 10.4 |  | 16.2 | 55.8 | 27.9 |  |  |
| PHF | . 825 | . 866 | . 919 | . 901 | . 802 | . 900 | . 933 | . 960 | . 849 | . 939 | . 946 | . 943 | . 892 | . 844 | . 836 | . 926 | . 931 |
| Pass Cars | 66 | 757 | 215 | 1038 | 93 | 284 | 151 | 528 | 196 | 1006 | 138 | 1340 | 105 | 364 | 184 | 653 | 3559 |
| \% Pass Cars | 100 | 99.3 | 99.1 | 99.3 | 100 | 98.6 | 98.7 | 98.9 | 99.5 | 99.2 | 98.6 | 99.2 | 98.1 | 98.9 | 100 | 99.1 | 99.2 |
| Single Units | 0 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 10 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 29 |
| \% Single Units | 0 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 1.1 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 1.9 | 1.1 | 0 | 0.9 | 0.8 |
| Heavy Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| \% Heavy Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Peds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \% Peds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
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# Traffic Data Collection, LLC <br> www:tdccounts.com 

# Phone: 586.786-5407 <br> Traffic Study Performed For: <br> FLEIS \& VANDENBRINK 

Project: Troy West Traffic Impact Study
Study:4 Hr. Video Turning Movement Count
Weather: Sunny, Dry Deg's 70s
Count By Miovision Video VCU 3CU SE

File Name : TMC 2 Wattles \& Seven Eleven 9-29-21
Site Code : TMC_2
Start Date: 9/29/2021
Page No : 1

4 Hour video traffic study was conducted during typical weekday (Wednesday) from 7:00 AM - 9:00 AM morning \& 4:00 PM - 6:00 PM afternoon peak hours, while school was in session \& during COVID 19.

|  | Crooks Road Southbound |  |  |  |  | Seven Eleven Dw. Westbound |  |  |  |  | Crooks Road Northbound |  |  |  |  | Residential Dw. Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | Peds | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | Peds | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | Peds | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | Peds | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 07:00 AM | 5 | 174 | 0 | 0 | 179 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 123 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 307 |
| 07:15 AM | 3 | 223 | 0 | 0 | 226 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 122 | 0 | 0 | 123 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 359 |
| 07:30 AM | 7 | 266 | 0 | 0 | 273 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 11 | 5 | 147 | 0 | 0 | 152 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 437 |
| 07:45 AM | 1 | 329 | 0 | 0 | 330 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 155 | 0 | 0 | 158 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 496 |
| Total | 16 | 992 | 0 | 0 | 1008 | 19 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 30 | 12 | 544 | 0 | 0 | 556 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 1599 |
| 08:00 AM | 0 | 261 | 0 | 0 | 261 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 152 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 415 |
| 08:15 AM | 0 | 292 | 0 | 0 | 292 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 193 | 1 | 0 | 196 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 499 |
| 08:30 AM | 0 | 303 | 0 | 0 | 303 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 173 | 1 | 0 | 177 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 490 |
| 08:45 AM | 0 | 293 | 3 | 0 | 296 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 151 | 1 | 0 | 155 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 460 |
| Total | 0 | 1149 | 3 | 0 | 1152 | 8 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 21 | 10 | 667 | 3 | 0 | 680 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 11 | 1864 |

*** BREAK ***

| 04:00 PM | 0 | 190 | 1 | 0 | 191 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 286 | 6 | 0 | 298 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 496 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 04:15 PM | 0 | 236 | 0 | 0 | 236 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 267 | 0 | 0 | 271 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 515 |
| 04:30 PM | 0 | 213 | 0 | 0 | 213 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 309 | 0 | 0 | 313 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 534 |
| 04:45 PM | 0 | 222 | 0 | 0 | 222 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 322 | 2 | 0 | 329 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 561 |
| Total | 0 | 861 | 1 | 0 | 862 | 11 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 21 | 19 | 1184 | 8 | 0 | 1211 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 12 | 2106 |
| 05:00 PM | 11 | 261 | 0 | 0 | 272 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 369 | 0 | 0 | 374 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 657 |
| 05:15 PM | 6 | 289 | 0 | 0 | 295 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 339 | 0 | 0 | 341 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 647 |
| 05:30 PM | 5 | 244 | 0 | 0 | 249 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 307 | 0 | 0 | 309 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 559 |
| 05:45 PM | 3 | 188 | 1 | 0 | 192 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 250 | 0 | 0 | 252 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 454 |
| Total | 25 | 982 | 1 | 0 | 1008 | 13 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 17 | 11 | 1265 | 0 | 0 | 1276 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 16 | 2317 |
| Grand Total | 41 | 3984 | 5 | 0 | 4030 | 51 | 11 | 27 | 0 | 89 | 52 | 3660 | 11 | 0 | 3723 | 10 | 0 | 28 | 6 | 44 | 7886 |
| Apprch \% | 1 | 98.9 | 0.1 | 0 |  | 57.3 | 12.4 | 30.3 | 0 |  | 1.4 | 98.3 | 0.3 | 0 |  | 22.7 | 0 | 63.6 | 13.6 |  |  |
| Total \% | 0.5 | 50.5 | 0.1 | 0 | 51.1 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 46.4 | 0.1 | 0 | 47.2 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.6 |  |
| Pass Cars | 41 | 3927 | 5 | 0 | 3973 | 50 | 11 | 27 | 0 | 88 | 52 | 3586 | 10 | 0 | 3648 | 9 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 36 | 7745 |
| \% Pass Cars | 100 | 98.6 | 100 | 0 | 98.6 | 98 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 98.9 | 100 | 98 | 90.9 | 0 | 98 | 90 | 0 | 96.4 | 0 | 81.8 | 98.2 |
| Single Units | 0 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 54 | 1 | 0 | 55 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 109 |
| \% Single Units | 0 | 1.3 | 0 | 0 | 1.3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.1 | 0 | 1.5 | 9.1 | 0 | 1.5 | 10 | 0 | 3.6 | 0 | 4.5 | 1.4 |
| Heavy Trucks | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| \% Heavy Trucks | 0 | 0.2 | 0 | 0 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.3 |
| Peds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| \% Peds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 13.6 | 0.1 |

TDC Traffic Comments: Non-signalized controlled intersection. Video VCU camera was located within SE intersection quadrant. Note: Peds. are excluded from peak hour reports. Traffic study was performed for Troy Westington Phase II Traffic Impact Study for Fleis \& Vandenbrink.
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|  | Crooks Road Southbound |  |  |  | Seven Eleven Dw. Westbound |  |  |  | Crooks Road Northbound |  |  |  | Residential Dw. Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 11:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1 Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 07:45 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:45 AM | 1 | 329 | 0 | 330 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 3 | 155 | 0 | 158 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 496 |
| 08:00 AM | 0 | 261 | 0 | 261 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 150 | 0 | 152 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 415 |
| 08:15 AM | 0 | 292 | 0 | 292 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 193 | 1 | 196 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 499 |
| 08:30 AM | 0 | 303 | 0 | 303 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 173 | 1 | 177 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 490 |
| Total Volume | 1 | 1185 | 0 | 1186 | 7 | 5 | 11 | 23 | 10 | 671 | 2 | 683 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 1900 |
| \% App. Total | 0.1 | 99.9 | 0 |  | 30.4 | 21.7 | 47.8 |  | 1.5 | 98.2 | 0.3 |  | 12.5 | 0 | 87.5 |  |  |
| PHF | . 250 | . 900 | . 000 | . 898 | . 583 | . 417 | . 458 | . 719 | . 833 | . 869 | . 500 | . 871 | . 250 | . 000 | . 583 | . 500 | . 952 |
| Pass Cars | 1 | 1165 | 0 | 1166 | 7 | 5 | 11 | 23 | 10 | 640 | 2 | 652 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 1849 |
| \% Pass Cars | 100 | 98.3 | 0 | 98.3 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 95.4 | 100 | 95.5 | 100 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 97.3 |
| Single Units | 0 | 18 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 |
| \% Single Units | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.6 | 0 | 3.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.2 |
| Heavy Trucks | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| \% Heavy Trucks | 0 | 0.2 | 0 | 0.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.0 | 0 | 1.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 |
| Peds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \% Peds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
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|  | Crooks Road Southbound |  |  |  | Seven Eleven Dw. Westbound |  |  |  | Crooks Road Northbound |  |  |  | Residential Dw. Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 12:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for E | tire Int | rsectio | Begin | at 04:45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:45 PM | 0 | 222 | 0 | 222 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 5 | 322 | 2 | 329 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 561 |
| 05:00 PM | 11 | 261 | 0 | 272 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 369 | 0 | 374 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 657 |
| 05:15 PM | 6 | 289 | 0 | 295 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 339 | 0 | 341 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 644 |
| 05:30 PM | 5 | 244 | 0 | 249 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 307 | 0 | 309 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 559 |
| Total Volume | 22 | 1016 | 0 | 1038 | 16 | 1 | 3 | 20 | 14 | 1337 | 2 | 1353 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 2421 |
| \% App. Total | 2.1 | 97.9 | 0 |  | 80 | 5 | 15 |  | 1 | 98.8 | 0.1 |  | 40 | 0 | 60 |  |  |
| PHF | . 500 | . 879 | . 000 | . 880 | . 667 | . 250 | . 375 | . 625 | . 700 | . 906 | . 250 | . 904 | . 500 | . 000 | . 500 | . 500 | . 921 |
| Pass Cars | 22 | 1005 | 0 | 1027 | 16 | 1 | 3 | 20 | 14 | 1327 | 2 | 1343 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 2400 |
| \% Pass Cars | 100 | 98.9 | 0 | 98.9 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 99.3 | 100 | 99.3 | 100 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 99.1 |
| Single Units | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| \% Single Units | 0 | 1.1 | 0 | 1.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.7 | 0 | 0.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.8 |
| Heavy Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| \% Heavy Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Peds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \% Peds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
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4 Hour video traffic study was conducted during typical weekday (Wednesday) from 7:00 AM - 9:00 AM morning \& 4:00 PM - 6:00 PM afternoon peak hours, while school was in session \& during COVID 19.

|  | Crooks Road Southbound |  |  |  | Barilane Drive (Private) Westbound |  |  |  | Crooks Road Northbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Thru | Left | Peds | App. Total | Right | Left | Peds | App. Total | Right | Thru | Peds | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 07:00 AM | 190 | 0 | 0 | 190 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 121 | 0 | 121 | 312 |
| 07:15 AM | 237 | 0 | 0 | 237 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 | 0 | 124 | 361 |
| 07:30 AM | 266 | 1 | 0 | 267 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 145 | 0 | 145 | 413 |
| 07:45 AM | 339 | 1 | 0 | 340 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 149 | 0 | 149 | 489 |
| Total | 1032 | 2 | 0 | 1034 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 539 | 0 | 539 | 1575 |
| 08:00 AM | 267 | 0 | 0 | 267 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 176 | 0 | 176 | 443 |
| 08:15 AM | 306 | 0 | 0 | 306 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 183 | 0 | 183 | 493 |
| 08:30 AM | 316 | 0 | 0 | 316 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 181 | 0 | 181 | 497 |
| 08:45 AM | 296 | 2 | 0 | 298 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 156 | 0 | 156 | 455 |
| Total | 1185 | 2 | 0 | 1187 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 696 | 0 | 696 | 1888 |

*** BREAK ***

| 04:00 PM | 194 | 0 | 0 | 194 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 311 | 0 | 311 | 506 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 04:15 PM | 240 | 1 | 0 | 241 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 269 | 0 | 269 | 510 |
| 04:30 PM | 221 | 1 | 0 | 222 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 340 | 0 | 342 | 566 |
| 04:45 PM | 227 | 1 | 0 | 228 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 314 | 0 | 314 | 542 |
| Total | 882 | 3 | 0 | 885 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1234 | 0 | 1236 | 2124 |
| 05:00 PM | 265 | 0 | 0 | 265 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 386 | 0 | 386 | 651 |
| 05:15 PM | 288 | 0 | 0 | 288 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 327 | 0 | 327 | 616 |
| 05:30 PM | 244 | 0 | 0 | 244 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 317 | 0 | 318 | 563 |
| 05:45 PM | 188 | 0 | 0 | 188 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 251 | 0 | 252 | 440 |
| Total | 985 | 0 | 0 | 985 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1281 | 0 | 1283 | 2270 |
| Grand Total | 4084 | 7 | 0 | 4091 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 12 | 4 | 3750 | 0 | 3754 | 7857 |
| Apprch \% | 99.8 | 0.2 | 0 |  | 25 | 50 | 25 |  | 0.1 | 99.9 | 0 |  |  |
| Total \% | 52 | 0.1 | 0 | 52.1 | 0 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 47.7 | 0 | 47.8 |  |
| Pass Cars | 4027 | 7 | 0 | 4034 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 3672 | 0 | 3676 | 7719 |
| \% Pass Cars | 98.6 | 100 | 0 | 98.6 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 75 | 100 | 97.9 | 0 | 97.9 | 98.2 |
| Single Units | 49 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 52 | 101 |
| \% Single Units | 1.2 | 0 | 0 | 1.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.4 | 0 | 1.4 | 1.3 |
| Heavy Trucks | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 26 | 34 |
| \% Heavy Trucks | 0.2 | 0 | 0 | 0.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.7 | 0 | 0.7 | 0.4 |
| Peds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| \% Peds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

TDC Traffic Comments: Non-signalized controlled intersection. Video VCU camera was located within SE intersection quadrant. Note: Peds. are excluded from peak hour reports. Traffic study was performed for Troy Westington Phase II Traffic Impact Study for Fleis \& Vandenbrink.
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|  | Crooks Road Southbound |  |  | Barilane Drive (Private) Westbound |  |  | Crooks Road Northbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 11:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 07:45 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:45 AM | 339 | 1 | 340 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 149 | 149 | 489 |
| 08:00 AM | 267 | 0 | 267 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 176 | 176 | 443 |
| 08:15 AM | 306 | 0 | 306 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 183 | 183 | 490 |
| 08:30 AM | 316 | 0 | 316 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 181 | 181 | 497 |
| Total Volume | 1228 | 1 | 1229 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 689 | 689 | 1919 |
| \% App. Total | 99.9 | 0.1 |  | 0 | 100 |  | 0 | 100 |  |  |
| PHF | . 906 | . 250 | . 904 | . 000 | . 250 | . 250 | . 000 | . 941 | . 941 | . 965 |
| Pass Cars | 1207 | 1 | 1208 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 660 | 660 | 1869 |
| \% Pass Cars | 98.3 | 100 | 98.3 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 95.8 | 95.8 | 97.4 |
| Single Units | 18 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 38 |
| \% Single Units | 1.5 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.0 |
| Heavy Trucks | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 12 |
| \% Heavy Trucks | 0.2 | 0 | 0.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 0.6 |
| Peds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \% Peds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Traffic Data Collection, LLC <br> www:tdccounts.com <br> Phone: 586.786-5407 <br> Traffic Study Performed For: <br> FLEIS \& VANDENBRINK 

Project: Troy West Traffic Impact Study
Study:4 Hr. Video Turning Movement Count
Weather: Sunny, Dry Deg's 70s
Count By Miovision Video VCU 1US SE

File Name: TMC_3 Wattles \& Barilane_9-29-21
Site Code : TMC_3
Start Date : 9/29/2021
Page No : 4

|  | Crooks Road Southbound |  |  | Barilane Drive (Private) Westbound |  |  | Crooks Road Northbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 12:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1 Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 04:30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:30 PM | 221 | 1 | 222 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 340 | 342 | 566 |
| 04:45 PM | 227 | 1 | 228 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 314 | 314 | 542 |
| 05:00 PM | 265 | 0 | 265 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 386 | 386 | 651 |
| 05:15 PM | 288 | 0 | 288 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 327 | 327 | 616 |
| Total Volume | 1001 | 2 | 1003 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1367 | 1369 | 2375 |
| \% App. Total | 99.8 | 0.2 |  | 33.3 | 66.7 |  | 0.1 | 99.9 |  |  |
| PHF | . 869 | . 500 | . 871 | . 250 | . 500 | . 375 | . 250 | . 885 | . 887 | 912 |
| Pass Cars | 987 | 2 | 989 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1349 | 1351 | 2343 |
| \% Pass Cars | 98.6 | 100 | 98.6 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 98.7 | 98.7 | 98.7 |
| Single Units | 13 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 14 | 27 |
| \% Single Units | 1.3 | 0 | 1.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.1 |
| Heavy Trucks | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| \% Heavy Trucks | 0.1 | 0 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Peds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \% Peds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |



## Traffic Data Collection, LLC www:tdccounts.com

Phone: 586.786-5407
Traffic Study Performed For:
FLEIS \& VANDENBRINK

Project: Troy West Traffic Impact Study Study:4 Hr. Video Turning Movement Count Weather: Sunny, Dry Deg's 70s Count By Miovision Video VCU 1US SE

File Name: TMC_3 Wattles \& Barilane_9-29-21
Site Code : TMC_3
Start Date: 9/29/2021
Page No : 5

Aerial Photo


| COLLECTED TRAFFIC VOLUME |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| ADJUSTED TRAFFIC VOLUME |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

location: Crooks \& wattles DATE: 11/13/18 civ BY: ALA COUNTY\#: 406 STATE\#: $\qquad$ CHARGES: 78009990 (Labor \& Materials)

PLEASE PERFORM THE FOLLOWING:
ELECTRICAL DEVICE: $\qquad$ INSTALL $\qquad$ MODERNIZE $\qquad$ MAINTENANCE UNDERGROUND: $\qquad$ EDISON OK: $\qquad$ YES $\qquad$ NO JOB\#: $\qquad$
COORDINATE W/DISTRICT 7: $\qquad$

DIAL.. SPLIT.
CHANGE TIMING CHANGE OFFSET CHANGE CYCLE LENGTH. ADD DIAL/SPLIT.
 CHANGE BREAKOUT OR EPROM: $\qquad$

## _ <br> CHANGE HOURS OF OPERATION:

OLD: $\qquad$
NEW: $\qquad$
REPROGRAM TBC
___ INSTALL INTERCONNECT: $\qquad$ TBC $\qquad$ MINITROL $\qquad$ TONE _ MET OK: $\qquad$ YES $\qquad$ NO
$\qquad$ NO CHANGE - RECORD CORRECTION
 - ( $\mathrm{C} \in\left\{\begin{array}{l}\leq B) \\ \text { ) }\end{array}\right.$
(. 2 No. CAMERAS). PLEASE CALL TOC TO CONFIRM CAMERA VIEW \& COMMS. TURN ON LED $\left.\begin{array}{l}\text { GUARD IN MMU OPTIONS- CONFIRM JUMPER 16-MMU Flash -116 Monitor ST Out (ALready has } 2 \text { AIS } \\ \text { ** Personality not changed, paperwork updated for AIS-IV cameras ** } \\ \text { CAMS }\end{array}\right)$
APPROVED BY:
installed by: VApús pirkír

```
    INTERSECTION :- 406 CROOKS & WATTLES
    DESCRIPTION PROMS :- X00406 / F4808
    CONTROLLER TYPE :- STANDARD PERSONALITY CONTROLLER
    SOFTWARE TYPE :- MOD 52 SCATS S30 TS2
    INPUTS :-
    1. WB WATTLES LT (LK)
    2. WB WATTLES THRU (LK)
    NOTE :- ALL DETECTORS ARE AUTOSCOPE
        (RACKVISION, AIS-IV CAMERAS).
    3. WB WATTLES RT (LK)
    4. SB CROOKS LT (NL)
    5. SB CROOKS L (LK)
    6. SB CROOKS R (LK)
    7. SB CROOKS RT (LK)
    8. EB WATTLES LT (LK)
    9. EB WATTLES THRU (LK)
10. EB WATTLES RT (LK)
11. NB CROOKS LT (NL)
12. NB CROOKS L (LK)
13. NB CROOKS R (LK)
14. NB CROOKS RT (LK)
PED 2: NB CROOKS PED EAST P.B.
PED 4: WB WATTLES PED NORTH P.B.
PED 6: SB CROOKS PED WEST P.B.
PED 8: EB WATTLES PED SOUTH P.B.
Opticom 1: TB2 PREEMPT INPUT 3 (CALLS NB & SB CROOKS).
Opticom 2: TB2 PREEMPT INPUT 4 (CALLS EB & WB WATTLES).
APPROACHES :-
A APP 1 : SB CROOKS L,R,RT A APP 2 : NB CROOKS L,R,RT
B APP 1 : SB CROOKS LT B APP 2 : NB CROOKS LT
B APP 3 : NB CROOKS LT - TEST DETECTOR
C APP 1 : WB WATTLES THRU,RT C APP 2 : EB WATTLES THRU,RT
D APP 1 : WB WATTLES LT D APP 2 : EB WATTLES LT
D APP 3 : WB WATTLES LT - TEST DETECTOR
FLEXIDATA :-
SEQUENCE A, B, C,D A,B,C,D
AUTO REL
R- REL A A
R+ REL B B
Q- REL C C
Q+ REL D D
PEDESTRIANS :-
1. NO PED1
2. NB CROOKS PED EAST
3. NO PED3
4. WB WATTLES PED NORTH
5. NO PED5
6. SB CROOKS PED WEST
7. NO PED7
8. EB WATTLES PED SOUTH
SPECIAL FEATURES :-
    Personality revision is 3 (=C).
    A STAGE HAS A PERMANENT DEMAND.
    DEMAND FOR STAGES B,C,D IN FLEXI AND ISOLATED, SET ZNEG TO DISABLE.
    SB CROOKS LT has flashing red display (filter) in A stage(s).
    EB WATTLES LT has flashing red display (filter) in C stage(s).
    NB CROOKS LT has flashing red display (filter) in A stage(s).
    WB WATTLES LT has flashing red display (filter) in C stage(s).
OPTICOM 1 CALLS \(N B\) \& SB CROOKS. OPTICOM 2 CALLS EB \& WB WATTLES.
```

Pedestrians have automatic introduction using SCATS Y-.
NB CROOKS PED EAST introduction is suppressed when OPTICOM is active.

WB WATTLES PED NORTH introduction is suppressed when OPTICOM is active. SB CROOKS PED WEST introduction is suppressed when OPTICOM is active. EB WATTLES PED SOUTH introduction is suppressed when OPTICOM is active.

```
BACKPANEL :- SIZE P44-16 TS2 CABINET
    Load Switch 1: SB CROOKS LT AL FLR
    Load Switch 2: NB CROOKS C FLR
    Load Switch 3: EB WATTLES LT BL FLR
    Load Switch 4: WB WATTLES D FLR
    Load Switch 5: NB CROOKS LT CL FLR
    Load Switch 6: SB CROOKS A FLR
    Load Switch 7: WB WATTLES LT DL FLR
    Load Switch 8: EB WATTLES B FLR
    Load Switch 9: NB CROOKS PED EAST P2
    Load Switch 10: WB WATTLES PED NORTH P4
    Load Switch 11: SB CROOKS PED WEST P1
    Load Switch 12: EB WATTLES PED SOUTH P3
MMU :-
    (MENU : SET/VIEW CONFIG)
    Field Check Enable: Channel 1: G, Y, R
    Channel 2: G, Y, R
    Channel 3: G, Y, R
    Channel 4: G, Y, R
    Channel 5: G, Y, R
    Channel 6: G, Y, R
    Channel 7: G, Y, R
    Channel 8: G, Y, R
    Dual Indication Enable: R+G: Channel 1, 2, 3, 4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12
    R+Y: Channel 1, 2, 3,4,5,6,7,8
    G+Y: Channel 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8
    Enable: Channel 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8
    All OFF except:
    Recurrent pulse
    LED Guard
    Program Memory Card
    Channel 1, 2, 3, 4,5,6,7,8 Enabled
    None
    Compatible Channels:
    1-5, 2-6, 2-9, 2-11, 3-7, 4-8, 4-10, 4-12,
    6-9, 6-11, 8-10, 8-12, 9-11, 10-12.
    Min Flash Time : 4+2+1
    Min Yellow Change Disable: 9,10,11,12
    Voltage Monitor Latch: NONE
Note :- Add Jumper 16 MMU Flash - }116\mathrm{ Monitor ST Out
********************************
* CONTROLLER INFORMATION SHEET * CHECKSUMS
* FOR SITE NO. 406 * TIMES: 81/201
* CARISSA MARKEL * PERS: 07/007
* 06-APR-2018 * TOTAL: 86/206
```


## FLEXILINK PLAN DATA

| Intersection \# |  | 406 | State \# |  |  | Date: 04/06/18 |  | Prepared By: Carissa Mar |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection: Crooks \& Wattles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | City: Troy |  |  |
| Hours of Operation: |  |  | 7 Days: 24 Hours |  |  |  |  | Approved By: Rachel Jon |  |  |
| Hours of Flash: |  |  | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | PLO | PL1 | PL2 | PL3 | PL4 | PL5 | PL6 | PL7 | PL8 |
| 0 | CL |  | 80 | 130 | 130 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | A |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | B |  | 35 | 50 | 55 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | C |  | 45 | 65 | 70 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | D |  | 70 | 115 | 115 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | R- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | R+ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Y- |  | 51 | 71 | 71 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Y+ | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | Z- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | Z+ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | Q- |  | 65 | 85 | 90 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | Q+ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

NOTE: Stages with 1 second of phase time are skipped. Blank entries are default values equal to 0 .
Except for an AWA controller, entries \#8 to \#15 (=254) and 'C' entry means continuous (=255).

| Phase | Direction | Min | Max | ECO | Amber | All Red | Gap | Hdwy | Waste |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | Crooks | 10.0 | 50.0 |  | 4.3 | 1.8 | 3.0 | 1.2 | 10.0 |
| B | Crooks LT | 3.0 | 15.0 |  | 4.3 | 1.8 | 3.0 | 1.2 | 10.0 |
| C | Wattles | 10.0 | 30.0 |  | 3.9 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 1.2 | 10.0 |
| D | Wattles LT | 3.0 | 15.0 |  | 3.9 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 1.2 | 10.0 |
| E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | Day | Hours | Plan\# |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SC1 | 14 | $0: 00$ | 1 |
| SC2 | 8 | $6: 00$ | 2 |
| SC3 | 8 | $9: 00$ | 1 |
| SC4 | 8 | $15: 00$ | 3 |
| SC5 | 8 | $19: 00$ | 1 |
| SC6 |  |  |  |
| SC7 |  |  |  |
| SC8 |  |  |  |
| SC9 |  |  |  |
| SC10 |  |  |  |

Pedestrian Crossing Times

| Direction | Walk | CL 1 | CL 2 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NB Crooks Ped East (Ped 2) | 7.0 | 13.0 | 3.1 |
| WB Wattles Ped North (Ped 4) | 7.0 | 16.0 | 2.9 |
| SB Crooks Ped West (Ped 6) | 7.0 | 13.0 | 3.1 |
| EB Wattles Ped South (Ped 8) | 7.0 | 16.0 | 2.9 |

TSM15 $=$ Opticom Min Alarm Time $=10$
TSM16 $=$ Opticom Max Alarm Time $=200$
Normal Operating Mode

| Isolated | Flexilink | Masterlink | Master Isolated | Flexi Isolated |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

DAY OF WEEK CODE NUMBER

| 0 | End of Schedule | 4 | WED | 8 | MON-FRI | 12 | MON,FRI,SAT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | SUN | 5 | THUR | 9 | MON-SAT | 13 | SAT,SUN |
| 2 | MON | 6 | FRI | 10 | TUE,WED,THU | 14 | EVERY DAY |
| 3 | TUE | 7 | SAT | 11 | MON,FRI | 15 | NEVER |

## TS2 Autoscope AIS-IV Cameras

CO\#406-CROOKS \& WATTLES

| Camera <br> \# | Rack Select Switch Position / Detector BIU | Input/Output LED | Description | Detector Number on Print | Phase |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | WB WATTLES LT | 1 | 7 |
| 1 | 1 | 2 | WB WATTLES THRU | 2 | 4 |
| 1 | 1 | 3 | WB WATTLES RT | 3 | 4 |
| 2 | 1 | 4 | SB CROOKS LT | 4 | 1 |
| 2 | 1 | 5 | SB CROOKS L | 5 | 6 |
| 2 | 1 | 6 | SB CROOKS R | 6 | 6 |
| 2 | 1 | 7 | SB CROOKS RT | 7 | 6 |
| 3 | 1 | 8 | EB WATtLES LT | 8 | 3 |
| 3 | 1 | 9 | EB WATTLES THRU | 9 | 8 |
| 3 | 1 | 10 | EB WATTLES RT | 10 | 8 |
| 4 | 1 | 11 | NB CROOKS LT | 11 | 5 |
| 4 | 1 | 12 | NB CROOKS L | 12 | 2 |
| 4 | 1 | 13 | NB CROOKS R | 13 | 2 |
| 4 | 1 | 14 | NB CROOKS RT | 14 | 2 |
|  | 1 | 15 |  | 15 |  |
|  | 1 | 16 |  | 16 |  |
|  | 2 | 17 |  | 17 |  |
|  | 2 | 18 |  | 18 |  |
|  | 2 | 19 |  | 19 |  |
|  | 2 | 20 |  | 20 |  |
|  | 2 | 21 |  | 21 |  |
|  | 2 | 22 |  | 22 |  |
|  | 2 | 23 |  | 23 |  |
|  | 2 | 24 |  | 24 |  |

## Input / Output Indicators

TS2 Rack Select Switch Position 1 - Detectors 1-16
TS2 Rack Select Switch Position 2 - Detectors 17-32
TS2 Rack Select Switch Position 3 - Detectors 33-48
TS2 Rack Select Switch Position 4 - Detectors 49-64
TS2 Rack Select Switch Position 5 - Red Phases
TS2 Rack Select Switch Position 6 - Green Phases
TS2 Rack Select Switch Position 7-10 - All OFF

## MVP Status LEDs

TS2 Rack Select Switch Position 1-7-Cameras 1-4
TS2 Rack Select Switch Position 8 - Cameras 5-8
TS2 Rack Select Switch Position 9-10 - NOT USED
AutoScope Detection Camera - IP Port Worksheet

| Camera \#3 | Camera \#4 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 10.32 .56 .230 | 10.32 .56 .231 |
| 255.255 .255 .240 | 255.255 .255 .240 |
| 10.32 .56 .225 | 10.32 .56 .225 |
|  |  |
| 56031 |  |
| 56032 | 56041 |
| 56033 | 56042 |
| 56034 | 56043 |
| 56035 | 56044 |
|  | 56045 |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { amera \#8 } \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { \%.32.56.235 } \\
\hline .255 .255 .240 \\
\hline 0.32 .56 .225 \\
\hline \\
\hline 56081 \\
\hline 56082 \\
56083 \\
\hline 56084 \\
56085
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

AutoScope Property Editor // Advanced Comm Tab - Camera \#1 Example


## Community Profiles

YOU ARE VIEWING DATA FOR:

## City of Troy

500 W Big Beaver Rd
Troy, MI 48084-5285
http://troymi.gov/

SEMCOG
MEMBER

Census 2020 Population:
87,294
Area: 33.6 square miles

VIEW 2020 CENSUS MAP

## Economy \& Jobs

## Forecasted Jobs



Source: SEMCOG 2045 Regional Development Forecast

## Forecasted Jobs by Industry Sector

| Forecasted Jobs By Industry Sector | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 | 2045 | Change 20152045 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Pct } \\ \text { Change } \\ 2015- \\ 2045 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Natural Resources, Mining, \& Construction | 3,382 | 3,866 | 3,674 | 3,615 | 3,660 | 3,707 | 3,757 | 375 | 11.1\% |
| Manufacturing | 9,741 | 9,087 | 8,502 | 7,859 | 7,446 | 7,092 | 6,706 | -3,035 | -31.2\% |
| Wholesale Trade | 7,343 | 7,575 | 7,563 | 7,479 | 7,479 | 7,471 | 7,420 | 77 | 1\% |
| Retail Trade | 13,170 | 13,211 | 13,196 | 12,790 | 12,650 | 12,321 | 12,029 | -1,141 | -8.7\% |
| Transportation, Warehousing, \& Utilities | 2,005 | 1,924 | 1,904 | 1,878 | 1,890 | 1,920 | 1,934 | -71 | -3.5\% |
| Information \& Financial Activities | 20,010 | 19,620 | 19,939 | 20,138 | 20,688 | 21,117 | 21,399 | 1,389 | 6.9\% |
| Professional and Technical Services \& Corporate HQ | 28,941 | 32,973 | 33,905 | 35,412 | 36,643 | 37,167 | 37,528 | 8,587 | 29.7\% |
| Administrative, Support, \& Waste Services | 11,811 | 12,183 | 12,339 | 12,407 | 12,679 | 12,959 | 13,130 | 1,319 | 11.2\% |
| Education Services | 4,279 | 4,483 | 4,477 | 4,466 | 4,539 | 4,600 | 4,655 | 376 | 8.8\% |
| Healthcare Services | 13,239 | 14,096 | 14,543 | 14,751 | 15,424 | 16,202 | 16,758 | 3,519 | 26.6\% |
| Leisure \& Hospitality | 8,640 | 9,167 | 9,494 | 9,454 | 9,550 | 9,586 | 9,644 | 1,004 | 11.6\% |
| Other Services | 5,269 | 5,380 | 5,253 | 5,154 | 5,139 | 5,104 | 5,034 | -235 | -4.5\% |
| Public Administration | 1,812 | 1,830 | 1,825 | 1,810 | 1,805 | 1,804 | 1,796 | -16 | -0.9\% |
| Total Employment Numbers | 129,642 | 135,395 | 136,614 | 137,213 | 139,592 | 141,050 | 141,790 | 12,148 | 9.4\% |

Source: SEMCOG 2045 Regional Development Forecast

## Daytime Population

| Daytime Population | ACS 2016 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Jobs | 94,365 |
| Non-Working Residents | 42,007 |
| Age 15 and under | 15,653 |
| Not in labor force | 24,045 |
| Unemployed | 2,309 |
| Daytime Population | 136,372 |



Source: 2012-2016 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates and 2012-2016 Census
Transportation Planning Products Program (CTPP). For additional information, visit SEMCOG's Interactive Commuting Patterns Map

Note: The number of residents attending school outside Southeast Michigan is not available. Likewise, the number of students commuting into Southeast Michigan to attend school is also not known.

## Community Profiles

YOU ARE VIEWING DATA FOR:

## City of Troy

500 W Big Beaver Rd
Troy, MI 48084-5285
http://troymi.gov/

SEMCOG
MEMBER

Census 2020 Population:
87,294
Area: 33.6 square miles

## Population and Households

## Population Forecast



Note for City of Troy : Incorporated as of the 1960 Census from Troy Township. Population numbers prior to 1960 are of the township.

## Population and Households

| Population and Households | Census 2020 | Census 2010 | Change 2010-2020 | Pct Change 2010-2020 | SEMCOG 2045 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Population | 87,294 | 80,980 | 6,314 | 7.8\% | 83,911 |
| Group Quarters Population | 510 | 310 | 200 | 64.5\% | 1,498 |
| Household Population | 86,784 | 80,670 | 6,114 | 7.6\% | 82,413 |
| Housing Units | 34,488 | 32,907 | 1,581 | 4.8\% |  |
| Households (Occupied Units) | 32,961 | 30,703 | 2,258 | 7.4\% | 33,400 |
| Residential Vacancy Rate | 4.4\% | 6.7\% | -2.3\% | - | - |
| Average Household Size | 2.63 | 2.63 | 0.01 | - | 2.47 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau and SEMCOG 2045 Regional Development Forecast

## Components of Population Change

| Components of Population Change | 2000- <br> 2005 Avg. | 2010 Avg. | 2011-2018 <br> Avg. |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Natural Increase (Births - Deaths) | 455 | 281 | 251 |
| Births | 1,045 | 782 | 805 |
| Deaths | 590 | 501 | 554 |
| Net Migration (Movement In - <br> Movement Out) | -572 | -160 | 325 |
| Population Change (Natural <br> Increase + Net Migration) | -117 | 121 | 576 |

Source: Michigan Department of Community Health Vital Statistics, U.S. Census Bureau, and SEMCOG

## Household Types



## Crash and Road Data

## Road Segment Report

Crooks Rd, (PR Number 659810)

| From: | Big Beaver Rd W 4.714 BMP |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Wattles Rd W 5.733 EMP |
| FALINK ID: | 2268 |
| Community: | City of Troy |
| County: | Oakland |
| Functional Class: | 3 - Other Principal Arterial |
| Direction: | 1 Way |
| Length: | 1.019 miles |
| Number of Lanes: | 5 |
| Posted Speed: | 45 (source: TCO) |
| Route Classification: | I-696 / M-5 Connector |
| Annual Crash Average 2016-2020: | $\underline{35}$ |
| Traffic Volume (2016)*: | 25,400 (Observed AADT) |
| Pavement Type (2019): | Asphalt |
| Pavement Rating (2019): | Fair |
| Short Range (TIP) Projects: | No TIP projects for this segment. |
| Long Range (RTP) Projects: | No long-range projects for this segment. |

[^0]

## Crash and Road Data

## Road Segment Report

## Wattles Rd W, (PR Number 618802)

From:

To:

FALINK ID:
Community:
County:
Functional Class:
Direction:
Length:
Number of Lanes:
Posted Speed:
Route Classification:

Annual Crash Average 2016-2020:
Traffic Volume (2016)*:
Pavement Type (2019):
Pavement Rating (2019):
Short Range (TIP) Projects:
Long Range (RTP) Projects:

Crooks Rd 2.894 BMP
S I 75 3.337 EMP

417
City of Troy
Oakland
4 - Minor Arterial
1 Way
0.443 miles

2
45 (source: TCO)
M-1

4
13,400 (Observed AADT)
Asphalt
Fair
No TIP projects for this segment.
No long-range projects for this segment.

* AADT values are derived from Traffic Counts

Street View


## Appendix B

## Existing Traffic Conditions

## Level of Service Criteria for Stop Sign Controlled Intersections

The level of service criteria are given in Exhibit 20-2. As used here, control delay is defined as the total elapsed time from the time a vehicle stops at the end of the queue until the vehicle departs from the stop line; this time includes the time required for the vehicle to travel from the last-in-queue position to the first-in-queue position, including deceleration of vehicles from free-flow speed to the speed of vehicles in queue.

The average total delay for any particular FRCNRTMGmovement is a function WגH FDSDFLW IDFFRW/
 H HFXA WXHGMLHGP DQ-XYHV DOGWHIRGZZ XS KHDGZD V UHXXHGE HDFK GIMHULQDTXHX
 WDIIIF signals are present on the major street, upstream of the subject intersection, flows may not be random but will likely have some platoon structure. Although the procedures in this chapter provide a method for approximating the operations of a TWSC intersection with an upstream signal, the operations of such an intersection is arguably best handled by including it in a complete simulation

Exhibit 20-2. Level of Service Criteria for Stop-Controlled Intersections (Motor Vehciles)

| LEVEL OF SERVICE | AVERAGE CONTROL DELAY <br> (sec/veh) |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | $\leq 10$ |
| B | $>10$ and $\leq 15$ |
| C | $>15$ and $\leq 25$ |
| D | $>25$ and $\leq 35$ |
| E | $>35$ and $\leq 50$ |
| F | $>50$ |

Average total delay less than $10 \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ is defined as Level of Service (LOS) A. Follow-up times of less than 5 sec have been measured when there is no conflicting traffic for a minor street movement, so control delays of less than $10 \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ are appropriate for low flow conditions. A total delay of $50 \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ is assumed as the break point between LOS E and F.



 combine to make delays at signalized intersections less onerous than at unsignalized intersections. For example, drivers at signalized intersections are able to relax during the red interval, where drivers on the minor approaches to unsignalized intersections must remain attentive to the task of identifying acceptable gaps and vehicle conflicts. Also, there is often much more variability in the amount of delay experienced by individual drivers at unsignalized than signalized intersections. For these reasons, it is considered that the total delay threshold for any given level of service is less for an unsignalized intersection than for a signalized intersection.

LOS F exists when there are insufficient gaps of suitable size to allow a side street demand to cross safely through a major street traffic stream. This level of service is generally evident from extremely long total delays experienced by side street traffic and by queueing on the minor approaches. The method, however, is based on a constant critical gap size - that is, the critical gap remains constant, no matter how long the side street motorist waits. LOS F may also appear in the form of side street vehicles' selecting smaller-than-usual gaps. In such cases, safety may be a problem and some disruption to the major traffic stream may result. It is important to note that LOS F may not always result in long queues but may result in adjustments to normal gap acceptance behavior. The latter is more difficult to observe on the field than queueing, which is more obvious.

## Level of Service for Signalized Intersections

Level of service for signalized intersections is defined in terms of delay, which is a measure of driver discomfort and frustration, fuel consumption, and lost travel time. LOS can be characterized for the entire intersection, each intersection approach, and each lane group. Specifically, level-of-service (LOS) criteria are stated in terms of the average stopped delay per vehicle. The criteria are given in Exhibit 19-8. Delay may be measured in the field or estimated using procedures presented later in this chapter. Delay is a complex measure and is dependent on a number of variables, including the quality of progression, the cycle length, the green ratio, and the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio for the lane group in question.

LOS A describes operations with a control delay of $10 \mathrm{~s} / \mathrm{veh}$ or less. This level is typically assigned when the volume-to-capacity ratio is low and either progression is extremely favorable or the cycle length is very short. If LOS $A$ is the result of favorable progression, most vehicles arrive during a green indication and travel through the intersection without stopping.

LOS B describes operations with control delay between 10 and $20 \mathrm{~s} / \mathrm{veh}$. This level is typically assigned when the volume-to-capacity ratio is low and either progression is highly favorable or the cycle length is short. More vehicles stop than with LOS A.

Exhibit 19.8. Level-of-Service Criteria for Signalized Intersections (Motorized Vehicles)

| LEVEL OF SERVICE | STOPPED DELAY PER VEHICLE (SEC) |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | $\leq 10.0$ |
| B | $>10.0$ and $\leq 20.0$ |
| C | $>20.0$ and $\leq 35.0$ |
| D | $>35.0$ and $\leq 55.0$ |
| E | $>55.0$ and $\leq 80.0$ |
| F | $>80.0$ |

1. If the v/c ratio for a lane group exceeds 1.0, a LOS F is assigned to the individual lane group. LOS for approach-based and intersection-wide assessments are determined solely by the control delay.

LOS C describes operations with control delay between 20 and $35 \mathrm{~s} / \mathrm{veh}$. This level is typically assigned when progression is favorable or the cycle length is moderate. Individual cycle failures (i.e. one or more queued vehicles are not able to depart as a result of insufficient capacity during the cycle) may begin to appear at this level. The number if vehicle stopping is significant, although many vehicles still pass through the intersection without stopping.

LOS D describes operations with control delay between 35 and 55 s/veh. This level is typically assigned when when the volume-to-capacity ratio is high and either progression is ineffective or the cycle length is long. Many vehicles stop and individual cycle failures are noticeable.

LOS E describes operations with control delay between 55 and $80 \mathrm{~s} / \mathrm{veh}$. This level is typically assigned when when the volume-to-capacity ratio is high, progression is unfavorable, and the cycle length is long. Individual cycle failures are frequent.

LOS F describes operations with control delay exceeding $80 \mathrm{~s} / \mathrm{veh}$ or a volume-to-capacity ratio greater than 1.0. This level, considered to be unacceptable to most drivers, often occurs with over-saturation, that is, when arrival flow rates exceed the capacity of the intersection. This level is typically assigned when the volume-to-capacity ratio is high, progression is very poor, and the cycle length is long. Most cycles fail to clear the queue.

Source: Highway Capacity Manual, 6th Edition. Transportation Research Board, National Research Council

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | 7 |  |  | 4 | 4 | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | $\uparrow$ | 「 | \％ | $\uparrow$ | 「 | \％ | ¢4 | 「 | ${ }_{1}$ | 斥 | F |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 128 | 311 | 175 | 282 | 378 | 150 | 101 | 786 | 118 | 141 | 1008 | 114 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 128 | 311 | 175 | 282 | 378 | 150 | 101 | 786 | 118 | 141 | 1008 | 114 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 1984 | 1984 | 1984 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 142 | 346 | 194 | 324 | 434 | 172 | 116 | 903 | 136 | 148 | 1061 | 120 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ， | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap，veh／h | 248 | 379 | 321 | 353 | 485 | 411 | 312 | 1302 | 581 | 373 | 1371 | 611 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.10 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.15 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.11 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.13 | 0.36 | 0.36 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1905 | 2000 | 1695 | 1905 | 2000 | 1695 | 1890 | 3770 | 1682 | 1905 | 3800 | 1695 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 142 | 346 | 194 | 324 | 434 | 172 | 116 | 903 | 136 | 148 | 1061 | 120 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1905 | 2000 | 1695 | 1905 | 2000 | 1695 | 1890 | 1885 | 1682 | 1905 | 1900 | 1695 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 5.3 | 22.0 | 13.6 | 17.7 | 27.3 | 11.1 | 0.1 | 26.8 | 7.5 | 0.0 | 32.2 | 6.3 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 5.3 | 22.0 | 13.6 | 17.7 | 27.3 | 11.1 | 0.1 | 26.8 | 7.5 | 0.0 | 32.2 | 6.3 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 248 | 379 | 321 | 353 | 485 | 411 | 312 | 1302 | 581 | 373 | 1371 | 611 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.57 | 0.91 | 0.60 | 0.92 | 0.90 | 0.42 | 0.37 | 0.69 | 0.23 | 0.40 | 0.77 | 0.20 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 248 | 402 | 340 | 412 | 602 | 510 | 312 | 1302 | 581 | 373 | 1371 | 611 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 53.8 | 51.6 | 48.2 | 52.3 | 47.7 | 41.5 | 48.8 | 36.6 | 30.3 | 44.9 | 36.8 | 28.6 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 3.1 | 24.2 | 2.8 | 23.1 | 13.8 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 3.1 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 4.3 | 0.7 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 4.5 | 13.4 | 5.9 | 12.4 | 15.2 | 4.7 | 3.4 | 12.5 | 3.2 | 4.2 | 15.2 | 2.7 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 57.0 | 75.9 | 51.0 | 75.4 | 61.5 | 42.2 | 49.6 | 39.7 | 31.2 | 45.6 | 41.2 | 29.3 |
| LnGrp LOS | E | E | D | E | E | D | D | D | C | D | D | C |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 682 |  |  | 930 |  |  | 1155 |  |  | 1329 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 64.9 |  |  | 62.8 |  |  | 39.7 |  |  | 40.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |
| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration（ $G+Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ），$s$ | 22.5 | 51.0 | 26.0 | 30.5 | 20.5 | 53.0 | 19.1 | 37.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period（ $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ），s | ＊ 6.1 | ＊ 6.1 | 5.9 | 5.9 | ＊ 6.1 | ＊ 6.1 | 5.9 | 5.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | ＊11 | ＊45 | 24.1 | 26.1 | ＊ 8.9 | ＊47 | 11.1 | 39.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 2.0 | 28.8 | 19.7 | 24.0 | 2.1 | 34.2 | 7.3 | 29.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.2 | 5.7 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 5.9 | 0.1 | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrr DelayHCM 6th LOS |  |  | 49.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes

＊HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier．

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | 虾 |  |  | ¢ $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 11 | 7 | 998 | 10 | 3 | 1462 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 11 | 7 | 998 | 10 | 3 | 1462 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | 245 | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 72 | 72 | 87 | 87 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 15 | 10 | 1147 | 11 | 3 | 1624 |


HCM LOS B

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | NBRWBLn1 | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | -438 | 328 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | -0.057 | 0.01 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | -13.7 | 16.1 | 0.8 |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - | $B$ | C |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | - | - | 0.2 | 0 |

## Notes

$\sim$ : Volume exceeds capacity $\$$ : Delay exceeds 300s $\quad+$ : Computation Not Defined $\quad$ : All major volume in platoon

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement V | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | * |  | 中t |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 中4 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 1 | 0 | 1008 | 0 | 1 | 1472 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 1 | 0 | 1008 | 0 | 1 | 1472 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | 500 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 60 | 60 | 94 | 94 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 2 | 0 | 1072 | 0 | 1 | 1636 |


HCM LOS C

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | NBRWBLn1 | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | - | 250 | 646 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | - | -0.007 | 0.002 |
| - |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | - | 19.5 | 10.6 |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - | C | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | - | - | 0 | 0 |

## Notes

$\sim$ : Volume exceeds capacity $\$$ : Delay exceeds 300s $\quad+$ : Computation Not Defined $\quad$ : All major volume in platoon

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | 7 |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 4 | 「 | \％ | $\uparrow$ | 「 | \％ | 个4 | 「 | \％ | 个4 | F |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 184 | 368 | 107 | 186 | 351 | 113 | 159 | 1150 | 223 | 265 | 929 | 80 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 184 | 368 | 107 | 186 | 351 | 113 | 159 | 1150 | 223 | 265 | 929 | 80 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 198 | 396 | 115 | 196 | 369 | 119 | 169 | 1223 | 237 | 294 | 1032 | 89 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap，veh／h | 249 | 424 | 359 | 225 | 413 | 350 | 384 | 1283 | 572 | 409 | 1429 | 638 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.09 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.08 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.14 | 0.34 | 0.34 | 0.18 | 0.38 | 0.38 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1905 | 2000 | 1695 | 1905 | 2000 | 1695 | 1905 | 3800 | 1695 | 1905 | 3800 | 1695 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 198 | 396 | 115 | 196 | 369 | 119 | 169 | 1223 | 237 | 294 | 1032 | 89 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1905 | 2000 | 1695 | 1905 | 2000 | 1695 | 1905 | 1900 | 1695 | 1905 | 1900 | 1695 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 7.6 | 25.3 | 7.5 | 8.6 | 23.3 | 7.8 | 2.7 | 40.9 | 14.0 | 14.4 | 30.2 | 4.5 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 7.6 | 25.3 | 7.5 | 8.6 | 23.3 | 7.8 | 2.7 | 40.9 | 14.0 | 14.4 | 30.2 | 4.5 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 249 | 424 | 359 | 225 | 413 | 350 | 384 | 1283 | 572 | 409 | 1429 | 638 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.80 | 0.93 | 0.32 | 0.87 | 0.89 | 0.34 | 0.44 | 0.95 | 0.41 | 0.72 | 0.72 | 0.14 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 249 | 432 | 366 | 287 | 509 | 432 | 384 | 1283 | 572 | 409 | 1429 | 638 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 55.7 | 50.4 | 43.3 | 57.1 | 50.2 | 44.0 | 45.7 | 42.0 | 33.1 | 47.8 | 34.7 | 26.7 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 16.2 | 27.4 | 0.5 | 20.2 | 15.6 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 16.1 | 2.2 | 6.0 | 3.2 | 0.5 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 7.3 | 15.6 | 3.1 | 7.5 | 13.3 | 3.3 | 4.8 | 21.2 | 6.0 | 9.3 | 14.1 | 1.9 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 71.9 | 77.7 | 43.8 | 77.3 | 65.8 | 44.6 | 46.5 | 58.2 | 35.4 | 53.8 | 37.9 | 27.2 |
| LnGrp LOS | E | E | D | E | E | D | D | E | D | D | D | C |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 709 |  |  | 684 |  |  | 1629 |  |  | 1415 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 70.6 |  |  | 65.4 |  |  | 53.7 |  |  | 40.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |
| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration（ $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ）， s | 29.8 | 50.0 | 16.7 | 33.4 | 24.8 | 55.0 | 17.4 | 32.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period（ $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ），s | ＊ 6.1 | ＊ 6.1 | 5.9 | 5.9 | ＊ 6.1 | ＊ 6.1 | 5.9 | 5.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | ＊19 | ＊44 | 15.1 | 28.1 | ＊14 | ＊49 | 10.1 | 33.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 16.4 | 42.9 | 10.6 | 27.3 | 4.7 | 32.2 | 9.6 | 25.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.2 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 6.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrr DelayHCM 6th LOS |  |  | 54.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes

＊HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier．

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow All | 2380 | 850 | 0 | 0 | 1700 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | 1692 | - | - | - | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | 688 | - | - | - | - |


| Approach | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 26.9 | 0 | 0.3 |
| HCM LOS | D |  |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | NBRWBLn1 | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | -195 | 179 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | -0.157 | 0.006 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | -26.9 | 25.2 | 0.3 |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - | $D$ | D | A

## Notes

$\sim$ : Volume exceeds capacity $\quad \$$ : Delay exceeds $300 \mathrm{~s} \quad+$ : Computation Not Defined $\quad$ : All major volume in platoon

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $l$ | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |



| Approach | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 32.7 | 0 | 0 |

HCM LOS D

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | NBRWBLn1 | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | -135 | 368 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | -0.037 | 0.006 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | -32.7 | 14.8 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - | D | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | - | - | 0.1 | 0 |

## Notes

$\sim$ : Volume exceeds capacity $\quad \$$ : Delay exceeds $300 \mathrm{~s} \quad+$ : Computation Not Defined $\quad$ : All major volume in platoon

Intersection: 1: Crooks Road \& Wattles Road

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | T | R | L | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 224 | 341 | 122 | 351 | 334 | 82 | 134 | 116 | 128 | 89 | 324 | 503 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 104 | 226 | 56 | 199 | 235 | 30 | 87 | 110 | 102 | 39 | 114 | 267 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 192 | 328 | 111 | 302 | 339 | 61 | 147 | 117 | 126 | 79 | 214 | 407 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1097 |  |  | 380 | 380 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 |  | 850 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 26 | 43 | 19 | 0 |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 66 | 109 | 48 | 1 |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 500 |  | 645 | 500 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 500 | 0 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |

Intersection: 1: Crooks Road \& Wattles Road

| Movement | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 372 | 185 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 233 | 88 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 354 | 215 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 850 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  | 110 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) | 28 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 32 |  |

Intersection: 2: Crooks Road \& 7-11 Drive/Site Drive

| Movement | WB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | T | T | T | LT | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 52 | 118 | 215 | 198 | 99 | 82 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 13 | 27 | 155 | 106 | 14 | 6 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 43 | 91 | 221 | 192 | 65 | 40 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 261 | 512 | 512 | 512 | 86 | 86 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  | 5 | 1 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 3: Crooks Road \& Barilane Drive

| Movement | WB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | T | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 31 | 52 | 65 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 4 | 6 | 3 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 20 | 31 | 24 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 446 | 25 | 25 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  | 0 | 0 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 0 | 1 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 0 |  |

## Zone Summary

## Zone wide Queuing Penalty: 263

Intersection: 1: Crooks Road \& Wattles Road

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | T | R | L | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 525 | 1112 | 795 | 380 | 409 | 127 | 148 | 135 | 120 | 111 | 413 | 448 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 365 | 651 | 251 | 168 | 265 | 37 | 105 | 117 | 111 | 73 | 309 | 246 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 632 | 1118 | 807 | 330 | 404 | 84 | 138 | 130 | 120 | 119 | 407 | 378 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1097 |  |  | 380 | 380 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 |  | 850 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  | 1 |  | 0 | 2 |  | 46 | 62 | 57 | 11 |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 0 |  | 0 | 7 |  | 180 | 239 | 219 | 43 |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 500 |  | 645 | 500 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 500 |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) | 0 | 38 |  | 0 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 1 | 107 |  | 0 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Intersection: 1: Crooks Road \& Wattles Road

| Movement | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 419 | 185 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 237 | 73 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 391 | 205 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 850 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  | 110 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) | 29 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 23 |  |

Intersection: 2: Crooks Road \& 7-11 Drive/Site Drive

| Movement | WB | NB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | T | T | T | TR | LT | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 276 | 290 | 563 | 558 | 335 | 55 | 56 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 110 | 75 | 393 | 362 | 82 | 3 | 2 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 280 | 201 | 564 | 555 | 317 | 20 | 19 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 261 | 512 | 512 | 512 |  | 86 | 86 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) | 13 |  | 3 | 2 |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 0 |  | 18 | 12 |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  | 245 |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  | 21 |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  | 85 |  |  |  |

Intersection: 3: Crooks Road \& Barilane Drive

| Movement | WB | NB | NB | SB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | T | TR | L | T | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 52 | 462 | 481 | 24 | 31 | 47 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 11 | 66 | 93 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 35 | 328 | 395 | 15 | 21 | 19 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 446 | 447 | 447 |  | 25 | 25 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  | 500 |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  | 2 | 0 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  | 9 | 0 |  |

## Zone Summary

[^1]
## Appendix C

## Background Traffic Conditions



## Notes

* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | 虾 |  |  | * 4 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 11 | 7 | 1008 | 10 | 3 | 1477 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 11 | 7 | 1008 | 10 | 3 | 1477 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | 245 | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 72 | 72 | 87 | 87 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 15 | 10 | 1159 | 11 | 3 | 1641 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow All | 1992 | 585 | 0 | 0 | 1170 |
| Stage 1 | 1165 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 827 | - | - | - | - |

HCM LOS B

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | NBRWBLn1 | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | -438 | 324 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | -0.057 | 0.01 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | -13.7 | 16.2 | 0.8 |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - | B | C |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | - | - | 0.2 | 0 |

## Notes

$\sim$ : Volume exceeds capacity $\$$ : Delay exceeds 300s $\quad+$ : Computation Not Defined $\quad$ : All major volume in platoon

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement V | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | * |  | 中 ${ }^{\text {P }}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 中4 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 1 | 0 | 1018 | 0 | 1 | 1487 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 1 | 0 | 1018 | 0 | 1 | 1487 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | 500 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 60 | 60 | 94 | 94 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 2 | 0 | 1083 | 0 | 1 | 1652 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow All | 1911 | 542 | 0 | 0 | 1083 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | 1083 | - | - | - | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | 828 | - | - | - | - |


| Approach | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 19.4 | 0 | 0 |

HCM LOS C

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | NBRWBLn1 | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | -252 | 640 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | -0.007 | 0.002 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | -19.4 | 10.6 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - | C | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | - | - | 0 | 0 |

## Notes

$\sim$ : Volume exceeds capacity $\$$ : Delay exceeds 300s $\quad+$ : Computation Not Defined $\quad$ : All major volume in platoon

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | \％ | 7 | $4$ | 4 | 4 | 4 | 7 | $t$ | $\frac{1}{7}$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | 「 | \％ | 44 | 「 | \％ | 44 | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 186 | 372 | 108 | 188 | 355 | 114 | 161 | 1161 | 225 | 268 | 938 | 81 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 186 | 372 | 108 | 188 | 355 | 114 | 161 | 1161 | 225 | 268 | 938 | 81 |
| Initial Q $(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 200 | 400 | 116 | 198 | 374 | 120 | 171 | 1235 | 239 | 298 | 1042 | 90 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap，veh／h | 249 | 427 | 362 | 227 | 418 | 354 | 377 | 1283 | 572 | 403 | 1429 | 638 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.09 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.08 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.14 | 0.34 | 0.34 | 0.18 | 0.38 | 0.38 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1905 | 2000 | 1695 | 1905 | 2000 | 1695 | 1905 | 3800 | 1695 | 1905 | 3800 | 1695 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 200 | 400 | 116 | 198 | 374 | 120 | 171 | 1235 | 239 | 298 | 1042 | 90 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1905 | 2000 | 1695 | 1905 | 2000 | 1695 | 1905 | 1900 | 1695 | 1905 | 1900 | 1695 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 7.8 | 25.6 | 7.5 | 8.8 | 23.7 | 7.8 | 3.0 | 41.5 | 14.1 | 14.9 | 30.6 | 4.5 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 7.8 | 25.6 | 7.5 | 8.8 | 23.7 | 7.8 | 3.0 | 41.5 | 14.1 | 14.9 | 30.6 | 4.5 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 249 | 427 | 362 | 227 | 418 | 354 | 377 | 1283 | 572 | 403 | 1429 | 638 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.80 | 0.94 | 0.32 | 0.87 | 0.90 | 0.34 | 0.45 | 0.96 | 0.42 | 0.74 | 0.73 | 0.14 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 249 | 432 | 366 | 288 | 509 | 432 | 377 | 1283 | 572 | 403 | 1429 | 638 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 55.8 | 50.3 | 43.2 | 57.0 | 50.0 | 43.8 | 46.2 | 42.2 | 33.2 | 48.3 | 34.9 | 26.7 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 17.1 | 28.0 | 0.5 | 20.5 | 16.0 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 17.6 | 2.2 | 7.1 | 3.3 | 0.5 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 7.5 | 15.9 | 3.2 | 7.6 | 13.5 | 3.3 | 4.9 | 21.7 | 6.1 | 9.6 | 14.3 | 1.9 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 72.9 | 78.3 | 43.7 | 77.6 | 66.1 | 44.3 | 47.1 | 59.8 | 35.4 | 55.4 | 38.2 | 27.2 |
| LnGrp LOS | E | E | D | E | E | D | D | E | D | E | D | C |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 716 |  |  | 692 |  |  | 1645 |  |  | 1430 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 71.2 |  |  | 65.6 |  |  | 55.0 |  |  | 41.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |
| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 29.5 | 50.0 | 16.8 | 33.6 | 24.5 | 55.0 | 17.4 | 33.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | ＊ 6.1 | ＊ 6.1 | 5.9 | 5.9 | ＊ 6.1 | ＊ 6.1 | 5.9 | 5.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | ＊ 19 | ＊ 44 | 15.1 | 28.1 | ＊ 14 | ＊ 49 | 10.1 | 33.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 16.9 | 43.5 | 10.8 | 27.6 | 5.0 | 32.6 | 9.8 | 25.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 6.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay |  |  | 54.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes

＊HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier．

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |



| Approach | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 27.4 | 0 | 0.3 |
| HCM LOS | D |  |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | NBRWBLn1 | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | - | 191 | 176 |

## Notes

$\sim$ : Volume exceeds capacity $\quad \$$ : Delay exceeds $300 \mathrm{~s} \quad+$ : Computation Not Defined $\quad$ : All major volume in platoon

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $l$ | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |


HCMLOS D

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | NBRWBLn1 | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | -133 | 363 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | -0.038 | 0.006 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | -33.1 | 15 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - | D | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | - | - | 0.1 | 0 |

## Notes

$\sim$ : Volume exceeds capacity $\quad \$$ : Delay exceeds $300 \mathrm{~s} \quad+$ : Computation Not Defined $\quad$ : All major volume in platoon

Intersection: 1: Crooks Road \& Wattles Road

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | T | R | L | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 267 | 342 | 229 | 355 | 303 | 156 | 137 | 130 | 128 | 84 | 198 | 367 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 125 | 220 | 61 | 206 | 219 | 45 | 84 | 111 | 92 | 32 | 112 | 245 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 235 | 315 | 140 | 320 | 302 | 103 | 145 | 120 | 125 | 57 | 178 | 345 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1097 |  |  | 380 | 380 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 |  | 850 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18 | 40 | 13 | 0 |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 47 | 102 | 34 | 1 |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 500 |  | 645 | 500 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 500 |  |

## Intersection: 1: Crooks Road \& Wattles Road

| Movement | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 301 | 185 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 206 | 77 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 309 | 204 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 850 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  | 110 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) | 24 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 28 |  |

Intersection: 2: Crooks Road \& 7-11 Drive/Site Drive

| Movement | WB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | T | T | T | LT | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 52 | 210 | 227 | 198 | 73 | 80 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 13 | 22 | 145 | 99 | 5 | 3 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 39 | 105 | 225 | 205 | 34 | 27 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 261 | 512 | 512 | 512 | 86 | 86 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 3: Crooks Road \& Barilane Drive

| Movement | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 52 | 59 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 8 | 8 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 35 | 38 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 25 | 25 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) | 0 | 0 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 0 | 1 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) | 0 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 0 |  |

## Zone Summary

[^2]Intersection: 1: Crooks Road \& Wattles Road

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | T | R | L | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 344 | 413 | 83 | 380 | 413 | 104 | 140 | 135 | 133 | 112 | 525 | 813 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 198 | 273 | 37 | 138 | 247 | 46 | 108 | 117 | 114 | 75 | 485 | 487 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 347 | 421 | 76 | 272 | 399 | 93 | 142 | 128 | 124 | 124 | 577 | 824 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1097 |  |  | 380 | 380 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 |  | 850 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  | 0 | 4 |  | 56 | 64 | 61 | 16 |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  | 0 | 13 |  | 217 | 247 | 236 | 62 |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 500 |  | 645 | 500 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 500 |  |
| Storage BIk Time (\%) |  |  |  | 0 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 29 | 0 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  | 0 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  | 132 | 1 |

Intersection: 1: Crooks Road \& Wattles Road

| Movement | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 741 | 185 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 390 | 83 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 720 | 213 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 850 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  | 110 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) | 37 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 30 |  |

Intersection: 2: Crooks Road \& 7-11 Drive/Site Drive

| Movement | WB | NB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | T | T | T | TR | LT | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 266 | 529 | 563 | 562 | 335 | 96 | 112 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 167 | 195 | 474 | 467 | 199 | 7 | 9 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 322 | 501 | 644 | 651 | 465 | 46 | 52 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 261 | 512 | 512 | 512 |  | 86 | 86 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) | 42 | 2 | 18 | 14 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 0 | 12 | 90 | 71 |  | 2 | 1 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  | 245 |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  | 43 |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 3: Crooks Road \& Barilane Drive

| Movement | WB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | T | TR | L | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 31 | 481 | 477 | 24 | 47 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 3 | 287 | 305 | 1 | 3 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 17 | 658 | 664 | 10 | 20 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 446 | 447 | 447 |  | 25 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  | 20 | 28 | 2 | 0 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  | 500 |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  | 2 | 0 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  | 13 | 0 |

## Zone Summary

[^3]
## Appendix D

## Future Traffic Conditions



## Notes

* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | M | 体 |  |  |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 15 | 12 | 1014 | 12 | 5 | 1479 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 15 | 12 | 1014 | 12 | 5 | 1479 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | 245 | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 72 | 72 | 87 | 87 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 21 | 17 | 1166 | 14 | 6 | 1643 |


HCM LOS B

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | NBRWBLn1 | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | -411 | 320 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | -0.091 | 0.017 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | -14.6 | 16.4 | 1.8 |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - | B | C |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | - | - | 0.3 | 0.1 |

## Notes

$\sim$ : Volume exceeds capacity $\$$ : Delay exceeds 300s $\quad+$ : Computation Not Defined $\quad$ : All major volume in platoon

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | 个 |  |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 1 | 0 | 1025 | 0 | 1 | 150 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 1 | 0 | 1025 | 0 | 1 | 1508 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | 500 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 60 | 60 | 94 | 94 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 2 | 0 | 1090 | 0 | 1 | 1676 |



| Approach | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 19.7 | 0 | 0 |

HCM LOS C

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | NBRWBLn1 | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | -246 | 636 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | -0.007 | 0.002 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | -19.7 | 10.7 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - | C | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | - | - | 0 | 0 |

## Notes

$\sim$ : Volume exceeds capacity $\$$ : Delay exceeds 300s $\quad+$ : Computation Not Defined $\quad$ : All major volume in platoon

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | 中t |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 中4 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 17 | 6 | 1020 | 5 | 2 | 1492 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 17 | 6 | 1020 | 5 | 2 | 1492 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None |  | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | 500 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 95 | 95 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 18 | 7 | 1109 | 5 | 2 | 1571 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 1902 | 557 | 0 | 0 | 1114 | 0 |  |
| Stage 1 | 1112 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 790 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.84 | 6.94 | - | - | 4.1 | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.84 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.84 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.52 | 3.32 | - | - | 2.2 | - |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | *233 | 474 | - | - | 634 | - |  |
| Stage 1 | *276 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | *439 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% | 1 |  | - | - |  | - |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | *232 | 474 | - | - | 634 | - |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | *245 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 1 | *276 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | *438 | - | - | - | - | - |  |


| Approach | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 19.1 | 0 | 0 |

HCM LOS C

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | NBRWBLn1 | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | - | 280 | 634 |

## Notes

~: Volume exceeds capacity $\$$ : Delay exceeds 300s $\quad+$ : Computation Not Defined *: All major volume in platoon

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ |  | 1 | 个 | ri |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 576 | 5 | 2 | 819 | 17 | 6 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 576 | 5 | 2 | 819 | 17 | 6 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | 500 | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 87 | 87 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 640 | 6 | 2 | 941 | 18 | 7 |



| Approach | EB | WB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| HCM LOS |  | $B$ |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 543 | - | - | $* 917$ | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.046 | - | -0.003 | - |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 12 | - | - | 8.9 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | - | - | A | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.1 | - | - | 0 | - |

## Notes

$\sim$ : Volume exceeds capacity $\$$ : Delay exceeds 300s $\quad+$ : Computation Not Defined $\quad$ : All major volume in platoon

|  | 4 |  |  | 7 | $\checkmark$ | 4 | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 4 | 「 | \％ | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 中4 | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | 中4 | F |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 186 | 377 | 110 | 188 | 358 | 120 | 163 | 1165 | 226 | 278 | 944 | 81 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 186 | 377 | 110 | 188 | 358 | 120 | 163 | 1165 | 226 | 278 | 944 | 81 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 200 | 405 | 118 | 198 | 377 | 126 | 173 | 1239 | 240 | 309 | 1049 | 90 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap，veh／h | 250 | 430 | 365 | 227 | 421 | 357 | 371 | 1283 | 572 | 398 | 1429 | 638 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.09 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.08 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.14 | 0.34 | 0.34 | 0.18 | 0.38 | 0.38 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1905 | 2000 | 1695 | 1905 | 2000 | 1695 | 1905 | 3800 | 1695 | 1905 | 3800 | 1695 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 200 | 405 | 118 | 198 | 377 | 126 | 173 | 1239 | 240 | 309 | 1049 | 90 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1905 | 2000 | 1695 | 1905 | 2000 | 1695 | 1905 | 1900 | 1695 | 1905 | 1900 | 1695 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 7.8 | 25.9 | 7.6 | 8.8 | 23.8 | 8.2 | 3.3 | 41.7 | 14.2 | 15.9 | 30.9 | 4.5 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 7.8 | 25.9 | 7.6 | 8.8 | 23.8 | 8.2 | 3.3 | 41.7 | 14.2 | 15.9 | 30.9 | 4.5 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 250 | 430 | 365 | 227 | 421 | 357 | 371 | 1283 | 572 | 398 | 1429 | 638 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.80 | 0.94 | 0.32 | 0.87 | 0.90 | 0.35 | 0.47 | 0.97 | 0.42 | 0.78 | 0.73 | 0.14 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 250 | 432 | 366 | 287 | 509 | 432 | 371 | 1283 | 572 | 398 | 1429 | 638 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 55.7 | 50.2 | 43.0 | 57.0 | 49.9 | 43.8 | 46.7 | 42.3 | 33.2 | 48.9 | 34.9 | 26.7 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 16.5 | 28.9 | 0.5 | 20.7 | 16.2 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 18.1 | 2.3 | 9.4 | 3.4 | 0.5 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 7.4 | 16.1 | 3.2 | 7.6 | 13.6 | 3.5 | 5.0 | 21.9 | 6.1 | 10.3 | 14.4 | 1.9 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 72.1 | 79.1 | 43.5 | 77.7 | 66.2 | 44.4 | 47.6 | 60.4 | 35.5 | 58.3 | 38.3 | 27.2 |
| LnGrp LOS | E | E | D | E | E | D | D | E | D | E | D | C |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 723 |  |  | 701 |  |  | 1652 |  |  | 1448 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 71.4 |  |  | 65.5 |  |  | 55.5 |  |  | 41.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |
| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration（ $G+Y+R c$ ），$s$ | 29.2 | 50.0 | 16.9 | 33.9 | 24.2 | 55.0 | 17.5 | 33.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period（ $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ），s | ＊ 6.1 | ＊ 6.1 | 5.9 | 5.9 | ＊ 6.1 | ＊ 6.1 | 5.9 | 5.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | ＊ 19 | ＊ 44 | 15.1 | 28.1 | ＊ 14 | ＊ 49 | 10.1 | 33.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 17.9 | 43.7 | 10.8 | 27.9 | 5.3 | 32.9 | 9.8 | 25.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 6.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay |  |  | 55.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes

＊HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier．

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Yr | 体 |  |  |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 5 | 20 | 1534 | 19 | 5 | 1237 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 5 | 20 | 1534 | 19 | 5 | 1237 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | 245 | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 62 | 62 | 90 | 90 | 88 | 89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Mvmt Flow | 8 | 32 | 1704 | 21 | 6 | 1390 |



| Approach | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 30.7 | 0 | 2.1 |
| HCM LOS | D |  |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | NBRWBLn1 | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | - | 180 | 174 |

## Notes

$\sim$ : Volume exceeds capacity $\$$ : Delay exceeds 300s $\quad+$ : Computation Not Defined $\quad$ : All major volume in platoon

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Yr |  | 个 |  |  | 7 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 2 | 1 | 1568 | 2 | 2 | 1247 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 2 | 1 | 1568 | 2 | 2 | 1247 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | 500 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 60 | 60 | 89 | 89 | 87 | 87 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Mvmt Flow | 3 | 2 | 1762 | 2 | 2 | 1433 |


HCM LOS D

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | NBRWBLn1 | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | - | 129 | 354 |

## Notes

$\sim$ : Volume exceeds capacity $\$$ : Delay exceeds 300s $\quad+$ : Computation Not Defined $\quad$ : All major volume in platoon

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | 中t |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 中4 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 11 | 3 | 1550 | 19 | 4 | 1238 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 11 | 3 | 1550 | 19 | 4 | 1238 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None |  | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | 500 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 12 | 3 | 1685 | 21 | 4 | 1376 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow All | 2392 | 853 | 0 | 0 | 1706 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | 1696 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 696 | - | - | - | - |

HCM LOS E

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | NBRWBLn1 | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | - | 124 | 378 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | - | -123 | 0.012 |
| - |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | - | 38.1 | 14.6 |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - | E | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | - | - | 0.4 | 0 |

## Notes

$\sim$ : Volume exceeds capacity $\$$ : Delay exceeds 300s $\quad$ : Computation Not Defined $\quad$ : All major volume in platoon

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ |  | 1 | 个 | ri |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 866 | 15 | 10 | 657 | 9 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 866 | 15 | 10 | 657 | 9 | 4 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | 500 | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 93 | 93 | 95 | 95 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 931 | 16 | 11 | 692 | 10 | 4 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 |  | ajor2 |  | Minor1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 0 | 0 | 947 | 0 | 1307 | 939 |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 939 | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 368 | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | - | 4.1 | - | 6.63 | 6.23 |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.43 | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.83 | - |  |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | - | 2.2 | - | 3.519 | 3.319 |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | *561 | - | *351 | *372 |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | *351 | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | *671 | - |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% | - | - | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | *561 | - | *344 | *372 |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | *320 | - | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | *351 | - |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | *658 | - | - |


| Approach | EB | WB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 0.2 | 16.3 |
| HCM LOS |  | C |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 334 | - | - | $* 561$ | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.042 | - | -0.019 | - |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 16.3 | - | - | 11.5 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | - | - | B | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.1 | - | - | 0.1 | - |

## Notes

$\sim$ : Volume exceeds capacity $\$$ : Delay exceeds 300s $\quad+$ : Computation Not Defined $\quad$ : All major volume in platoon

Intersection: 1: Crooks Road \& Wattles Road

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | T | R | L |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 184 | 395 | 149 | 380 | 418 | 101 | 154 | 133 | 127 | 67 | 241 |
| T | 422 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Queue (ft) | 94 | 232 | 68 | 206 | 237 | 35 | 101 | 110 | 97 | 33 | 119 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 153 | 356 | 122 | 347 | 369 | 71 | 154 | 126 | 135 | 60 | 201 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1097 |  |  | 380 | 380 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 80 | 408 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  | 0 | 1 |  | 51 | 44 | 22 | 0 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  | 0 | 2 |  | 137 | 112 | 58 | 0 |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 500 |  | 645 | 500 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 500 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 1: Crooks Road \& Wattles Road

| Movement | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 376 | 185 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 260 | 79 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 372 | 208 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 850 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  | 110 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) | 30 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 34 |  |

Intersection: 2: Crooks Road \& 7-11 Drive/Site Drive

| Movement | WB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | T | T | T | LT | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 75 | 272 | 246 | 208 | 118 | 106 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 25 | 80 | 162 | 116 | 25 | 14 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 60 | 215 | 237 | 212 | 85 | 64 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 261 | 512 | 512 | 512 | 86 | 86 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  | 5 | 1 |  |

Intersection: 3: Crooks Road \& Barilane Drive

| Movement | WB | SB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | L | T | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 30 | 24 | 65 | 47 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 1 | 1 | 13 | 5 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 10 | 8 | 50 | 28 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 446 |  | 25 | 25 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  | 500 |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 1 | 0 |  |

## Intersection: 4: Crooks Road \& Site Drive (Hills West)

| Movement | WB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | T | TR | L | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 51 | 28 | 28 | 30 | 36 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 20 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 44 | 9 | 0 | 10 | 12 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 451 | 25 | 25 |  | 512 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  | 200 |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |

## Intersection: 5: Site Drive (Westington) \& Wattles Road

| Movement | WB | WB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 29 | 51 | 31 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 1 | 3 | 16 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 10 | 21 | 40 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1876 | 234 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 500 |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Network Summary |  |  |  |
| Network wide Queuing Penalty: 354 |  |  |  |

Intersection: 1: Crooks Road \& Wattles Road

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | T | R | L | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 525 | 1112 | 795 | 367 | 364 | 112 | 134 | 134 | 115 | 110 | 525 | 866 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 477 | 1112 | 617 | 145 | 201 | 38 | 110 | 113 | 109 | 70 | 454 | 659 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 705 | 1112 | 1136 | 252 | 313 | 82 | 143 | 123 | 117 | 113 | 636 | 1131 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1097 |  |  | 380 | 380 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 |  | 850 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  | 77 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 58 | 60 | 43 | 5 |  | 56 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 229 | 231 | 164 | 20 |  | 0 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 500 |  | 645 | 500 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 500 |  |
| Storage BIk Time (\%) | 0 | 79 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 62 | 0 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 0 | 233 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 290 | 0 |

Intersection: 1: Crooks Road \& Wattles Road

| Movement | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 865 | 185 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 619 | 94 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 1077 | 230 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 850 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) | 1 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 0 |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  | 110 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) | 37 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 30 |  |

Intersection: 2: Crooks Road \& 7-11 Drive/Site Drive

| Movement | WB | NB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | T | T | T | TR | LT | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 276 | 261 | 429 | 417 | 334 | 120 | 142 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 125 | 88 | 295 | 267 | 13 | 17 | 15 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 289 | 220 | 400 | 364 | 113 | 78 | 78 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 261 | 512 | 512 | 512 |  | 86 | 86 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) | 17 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 0 |  |  |  |  | 11 | 5 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  | 18 |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (ven) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 3: Crooks Road \& Barilane Drive

| Movement | WB | SB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | L | T | T |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 31 | 24 | 54 | 28 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 7 | 3 | 6 | 2 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 27 | 15 | 31 | 13 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 446 |  | 25 | 25 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  | 500 |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 2 | 0 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 14 | 0 |  |

## Intersection: 4: Crooks Road \& Site Drive (Hills West)

| Movement | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | TR | L |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 51 | 56 | 68 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 17 | 9 | 6 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 43 | 40 | 34 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 451 | 25 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  | 0 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  | 200 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |

## Intersection: 5: Site Drive (Westington) \& Wattles Road

| Movement | WB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 28 | 31 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 5 | 11 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 22 | 34 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 234 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 500 |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Network Summary |  |  |
| Network wide Queuing Penalty: 1247 |  |  |

## memorandum

Date: December 6, 2021

To: William Huotari, PE
cc:
From: Stephen Dearing, PE, PTOE

Re: Traffic Impact Study

I have reviewed the Traffic Impact Study for the Westington \& West Hills development site, a proposed residential development located at the corner of Crooks and Wattles Roads. The applicant has proposed 162 dwelling units. The Traffic Impact Study was prepared by Fleis \& Vandenbrink and is dated November 11, 2021.

OHM recommends approval of the TIS. While there are a few corrections and changes that could be made for this report, they are minor and would not impact the conclusions contained in the TIS.

## memorandum

Date: March 2, 2022
To: Bill Huotari, PE

From: Genevieve Schneemann \& Sara Merrill, PE, PTOE
Re: The Westington Phase 2
Preliminary Site Plan Review

We have reviewed the preliminary site plans for The Westington Phase II, a residential development consisting of a new 20-unit 2-story building. Westington Phase I, previously approved, consists of 102 units spread across four buildings. The development is located on the south side of Wattles Road, approximately 300' east of Crooks Road. The plans were prepared by DesignHaus Architecture and PEA, Inc. and dated February $17^{\text {th }}$, 2022.

At this time, OHM recommends approval of the preliminary site plan, subject to the comments below being incorporated into the final engineering plans. We note these changes may result in a slight reduction of proposed parking spaces.

OHM's comments on the proposed site plan are noted below:

1. There are some discrepancies in site layout and parking configuration. For example, Sheet S100 and S101 show different configurations for parking stalls, sidewalk, and location of ADA spaces along the north side of the proposed Phase II building. Additionally, the retaining wall configuration and gazebo location varies between the Civil and Architectural sheets. Revise the sheets to eliminate discrepancies.
2. Parking:
a. The parking aisle layout to the north of the proposed Phase II building has been modified from prior plans. It appears that this area is now proposed for two-way traffic flow (perpendicular parking, aisle width). This area should be modified to provide only one-way traffic flow up to the dumpster. If the parking spaces on the north side of Building 2 are fully occupied, there is insufficient space for a southeast bound vehicle to turnaround, which may inadvertently lead to wrong-way movements on the north and east side of the proposed building.
b. Perpendicular parking spaces must be 9.5 feet in width. The parking space at the northwest corner of the proposed Phase II building measures approximately 8.5 feet wide to face of curb.
3. Sidewalks:
a. Improve pedestrian connectivity between the proposed Phase II buildings and the rest of the site. OHM notes this may require some parking reconfiguration to achieve.
i. Add sidewalk along the west side of the building proposed in Phase II to allow for easy access to those who park along the west side.
ii. Add pedestrian crosswalks along the north end of the Phase II building to allow for connectivity to the rest of the Phase I buildings and the proposed gazebo.
iii. Add a pedestrian crosswalk near the southwest corner of Building 2, providing connectivity to the existing southerly 3 -story building and to the proposed development at 3902 Crooks Rd. For optimal placement, eliminate the parking spot and enlarge the island on the west side, allowing a perpendicular aligned crosswalk at the junction of drive aisles.

b. Widen sidewalks to provide seven (7) feet of sidewalk width adjacent to vehicular travel ways or abutting parking. The proposed sidewalk along the east and south sides of the proposed Phase II building, are approximately only 5 feet wide.
c. Show curb cuts and ramps at each proposed crosswalk. There are several locations, such as along the northeast corner of the proposed Phase II building, where sidewalks and ramps are not shown.
d. The proposed pedestrian crosswalk leading to the dumpster area along Bari lane Drive is awkwardly configured. Reorient the ramp and crosswalk such that the sidewalk ramps are aligned with one another.
e. Extend sidewalk to the proposed pavilion area.
f. Circuitous sidewalk layouts (such as at the northwest corner of the proposed Phase II building, with sidewalk following the back of curb) are difficult to navigate and should be revised to reduce the number of jogs or turns.
4. The retaining wall along the curved drive aisle (north of the proposed Phase II building) has a vertical drop-off of over seven feet. It is unclear whether the railing along the top of wall is ornamental or an appropriate vehicular barrier. The retaining wall should extend approximately 3 feet above the pavement surface, or a guardrail-style barrier be provided.
5. Label proposed dimensions for curb radii.
6. Provide AutoTurn turning diagram for firetruck access around Phase II.
7. A detail for bollards has been provided on Sheet S101. Proposed bollard locations should be clearly shown on the plans.
8. Add "One Way" and "Do Not Enter" signs to convey the direction of traffic flow for the one-way aisle.

DATE: April 7, 2022
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: R. Brent Savidant, Community Development Director
SUBJECT: PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN REVIEW (SP JPLN2022-0009) - Proposed Hills West, East side of Crooks, South of Wattles (3902 Crooks; 88-20-21-101-003), Section 21, Currently Zoned NN (Neighborhood Node "l") District

The petitioner Hills West LLC. submitted the above referenced Preliminary Site Plan application for one 15 -unit building and one 14-unit multi-family apartment buildings ( 29 units total). Both buildings are $21 / 2$ stories/30 feet in height. Multi-family is permitted by right in the NN (Neighborhood Node "l") Zoning District.

The applicant submitted a Preliminary Site Plan application for the same site that included two15-unit apartment buildings ( 30 units total). The application was denied by the Planning Commission on January 25, 2022. This is considered a new application.

The attached report prepared by Carlisle/Wortman Associates, Inc. (CWA), the City's Planning Consultant, summarizes the project. CWA prepared the report with input from various City departments including Planning, Engineering, Public Works and Fire. City Management supports the findings of fact contained in the report and the recommendations included therein.

## Attachments:

1. Maps
2. Report prepared by Carlisle/Wortman Associates, Inc.
3. Preliminary Site Plan.
4. Memo from OHM, dated March 10, 2022.

## PROPOSED RESOLUTION

PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN REVIEW (SP JPLN2022-0009) - Proposed Hills West, East side of Crooks, South of Wattles (3902 Crooks; 88-20-21-101-003), Section 21, Currently Zoned NN (Neighborhood Node "l") District

Resolution \# PC-2022-04-
Moved by:
Seconded by:
RESOLVED, That Preliminary Site Plan Approval, pursuant to Article 8 of the Zoning Ordinance, as requested for the proposed Hills West 29-unit apartment development, East side of Crooks, South of Wattles, Section 21, Currently Zoned NN (Neighborhood Node "I") District, be granted, subject to the following:
(denied, for the following reasons: _______) or or
(postponed, for the following reasons: ___
Yes:
No:
MOTION CARRIED/FAILED

## TROY cis Online


835 835Feet

Note: The information provided by this application has been compiled from recorded deeds, plats, tax maps, surveys, and other public records and data. It is not a legally recorded map survey. Users of this data are hereby notified that the source information represented should be consulted for verification.

## GIS Online



# Carlisle Wortman 

ASSOCIATES, INC.

Date: January 20, 2022
March 22, 2022

# Preliminary Site Plan Review 

## For

## City of Troy, Michigan

| Applicant: | DesignHaus |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project Name: | Hills West |
| Plan Date: | February 24, 2022 |
| Location: | Crooks Road, south of Wattles |
| Zoning: | Neighborhood Node (NN) - I |
| Action Requested: | Site Plan Approval |

## SITE DESCRIPTION

The subject site is located on the east side of Crooks Road, south of Crooks Road. The site is approximately 1.33 acres in area, and is proposed for development as multiple-family residential. The applicant is proposing to construct two (2) multi-family buildings on the site, one with fifteen (15) dwelling units and one with fourteen (14) units. Both buildings will be 2.5 stories in height.

Access is via Crooks Road, with a cross-access to the Westington development. There is no direct access to Barilane Court. The property is zoned Neighborhood Node (NN) and multiple family residential is a permitted use.

The properties to the south of the subject site is zoned R1-B, One Family Residential, and NN, Neighborhood Node to the north, east, and west.

Site Location:



Proposed Uses of Subject Parcel:
Twenty-nine (29) multi-family dwelling units.

## Current Use of Subject Property:

Single Family Home

## Current Zoning:

The property is currently zoned NN, Neighborhood Node District.

Surrounding Property Details:

| Direction | Zoning | Use |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North | NN, Neighborhood Node | Commercial |
| South | R1-B, Single Family | Single Family Residential |
| East | NN, Neighborhood Node | Multi-Family Residential |
| West | NN, Neighborhood Node | Vacant |

## PREVIOUS PLANNING COMMISSION REVIEW

The Planning Commission discussed the project at the January 25,2022 meeting. There was lengthy discussion on a variety of topics including traffic, guest parking, tree mitigation, open space/landscaping calculations, compliance with Design Standards, compliance with Site Plan Review Standards, crossaccess, Neighborhood Node zoning designations, intensity of Site Type A and Site Type B.

See the January 22 meeting minutes for more details.

After discussion, the Planning Commission, the Planning Commission moved:

That Preliminary Site Plan Approval, pursuant to Article 8 of the Zoning Ordinance, as requested for the proposed Hills West 30-unit apartment development, East side of Crooks, South of Wattles, (3902 Crooks, PIN 88-20-21-101-003), Section 21, Currently Zoned NN (Neighborhood Node "I") District, be denied, for the following reasons:

1. The orientation of the buildings violates the Zoning Ordinance
2. Planning Commission does not approve the tree mitigation requirement.
3. The open space failed the Zoning Ordinance calculations
4. The site Design Standards fail to promote public health, safety and welfare, primarily due to traffic issues.
5. The project fails to meet the transition requirements of the zoning ordinance as well as density requirements.

The motion passed 8-0.

## CHANGES SINCE LAST PLANNING COMMISSION REVIEW



January 2022 Plan


March 2022
Plan

The applicant has proposed the following changes to the Site Plan since the last submittal:

- Reduced the number of units from thirty (30) to twenty-nine (29)
- Relocated trash enclosure location
- Changed floor plans and elevations to have entrance front on Crooks
- Increased open spaces by $2.68 \%$ to $22.68 \%$
- Shifted building to the north to provide additional buffering along Barilane Drive.
- Increased lot coverage by $0.8 \%$
- By eliminating one (1) unit, they decreased the guest parking by eight (8) spaces, to provide a total of four (4) guest spaces.


## NATURAL FEATURES

Topography: A topographic survey has been provided on sheet C-2.0. The site has a slightly higher elevations in the northeast section of the site.

Wetlands:
There are no wetlands on site.

Floodplain: $\quad$ There is no floodplain on site.

Woodlands:
A tree inventory and replacement plan has been provided on Sheet L100, with replacement trees shown in the landscape plan on Sheet L101. The applicant notes that a total of 230 inches will be removed, requiring 115 inches of replacement.

| Replacement Details |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Protected Tree | Inches Removed | Replacement Required |
| Landmark | 154 inches | 154 inches |
| Woodland | 234 inches | 117 inches |
|  |  |  |
| Preservation/Mitigation | Inches Preserved | Credit |
| Landmark | 0 inches | 0 inches |
| Woodland | 0 inches | 0 inches |
|  |  |  |
| Protected Replacement Required | 271 Inches |  |
| Preservation Credit | 0 Inches |  |
| Total | 271-inches |  |
|  |  |  |
| Total Tree Mitigation | 271 trees / 3 inches = 91 3-inch trees |  |

The applicant is not preserving any onsite trees. There is a clumping of along the southern property line/ Barilane Street. Is the applicant able to shift the site to preserve additional trees?

Items to be addressed: Is the applicant able to shift the site to preserve additional trees?

## SITE ARRANGEMENT

The applicant is proposing to construct two (2) multi-family buildings on the site, one with fifteen (15) units and one with fourteen (14) units. The buildings will be located on the western side of the site with parking and an access drive between the two buildings.

Items to be addressed: None.

## AREA, WIDTH, HEIGHT, SETBACKS

Table 5.03.B.3, Building Form C, Standards Applicable to All Districts of the Zoning Ordinance establishes the dimensional requirements for the NN, Neighborhood Node District. The requirements of Building form C and the proposed dimensions are shown in the following table.

|  | Required | Provided | Compliance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Front (Crooks) | 10-foot build-to-line | 12 -feet | Complies |
| Side (north) | N/A, building may be <br> placed up to <br> property line | 12 -feet | Complies |
| Side (south) | N/A, building may be <br> placed up to <br> property line | 86 -feet | Complies |
| Rear (South) | 30 -foot minimum <br> setback | 52 -feet | Complies |
| Building Height | Any building, or <br> portion of a building, <br> on a parcel abutting <br> a one-family <br> residentially zoned <br> parcel shall not <br> exceed 2.5-stories, <br> 30 feet in height. | 2.5 stories, 30.0 feet (to <br> mid-point of ridge), 34 <br> feet to roof peak. | Complies but see <br> discussion below |
| Lot Coverage (Building) | 30\% | Complies |  |
| Minimum Open Space | 20\% | Complies |  |
| Parking Location | Cannot be located in <br> front yard | Parking lots not in front <br> yard | Complies |

## Building Height and Story Discussion:

Because this site is adjunct to one-family residentially zoned property, the applicant shall comply with Section 5.06.E.3.c, which limits height and stories to 2.5 stories and 30 -feet. As set forth in the Zoning Ordinance, building height is defined as the following:

The term "building height" shall mean the vertical distance as measured from the established grade to the highest point of the roof for flat roofs, including walls or parapets that extend above the horizontal roof surface; to the deck line of mansard roofs; and to the average height between eaves and ridge for gable, hip, and gambrel roofs. When a non-residential building is located on sloping terrain, the height may be measured from the average ground level of the grade at the building wall. When a residential building is located on sloping terrain, the height shall be measured from the highest grade adjacent to the front of the structure to the highest point of the roof for flat roofs, including walls or parapets that extend above the horizontal roof surface; to the deck line of mansard roofs; and to the average height between eaves and ridge for gable, hip, and gambrel roofs. For residential buildings, the major or main roof over the living area shall be used to determine building height, with the following exception: when the total horizontal roof area of dormers and/or minor gables enclosing the living area exceeds twenty (20) percent of the total horizontal area of the roof to which such dormers or gables are attached, the predominant height of such dormers or gables shall be used as the basis for the determination of the building height.

Story and half-story is defined as the following:

STORY: That part of a building, except a mezzanine, included between the surface of one (1) floor and the surface of the next floor, or if there is not a floor above, then the ceiling next above. A story thus defined shall not be counted as a story when more than fifty (50) percent by cubic content, is below the height level of the adjoining ground.

STORY, HALF: An uppermost story lying under a sloping roof, the usable floor area of which, at a height of four feet above the floor, does not exceed two-thirds (2/3) of the floor area in the story directly below and the height above at least two hundred (200) square feet of floor space is seven feet four inches ( $\left.7^{\prime} 4^{\prime \prime}\right)$. When the usable floor area of such a story, at a height of four (4) feet above the floor, does exceed two-thirds (2/3) of the floor area of the story directly below, it shall be counted as a full story.


During the review process, we had asked the applicant to confirm that the building complied with the 2.5 story maximum. The applicant's architect provided additional plans and the required calculations. The City's Building Official reviewed the plans and the calculations and confirmed that the building meets the 2.5 story requirement as defined in the Zoning Ordinance. The applicant's architect plans and calculations, and the Building Official's response are provided in your packet.

Items to be addressed: None

## PARKING

Section 13.06.G of the Zoning Ordinance requires:

|  | Required | Provided |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential (General): <br> 2 spaces per unit | 29 units $=58$ spaces | 62 spaces |
|  |  |  |
| Barrier Free | 4 | 4 |
| Bicycle Parking | 2 | Internal to building |
| Loading | 0 | 0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 8}$ spaces | $\mathbf{6 2}$ spaces |

## Items to be Addressed: None

SITE ACCESS AND CIRCULATION


Access is via Crooks Road, with a cross-access to the Westington development. There is no direct access to Barilane Court. The site plan was reviewed by the Citys Engineer and Engineering Consultant OHM. In there review they note the following site circulation and pedestrian circulation deficiencies:

1. At the site driveway, extend the concrete sidewalk (with sidewalk jointing) through the driveway approach, as shown in the City's Engineering Standards.
2. On the site civil plans, the proposed sidewalk connection on this site does not match up with the sidewalk on the adjacent Westington site. Revise plans to provide a continuous and accessible pedestrian route between the two sites.
3. The proposed sidewalk along the Crooks Road right-o-fway, just north of the site drive, appears to conflict with an existing electric pole. The utility pole near the southwest corner of Building 1 is located immediately adjacent to the public sidewalk. Utility poles should be located two (2) feet off the edge of walk. Plans should clearly indicate which poles are being relocated, as well as show proposed pole locations (if applicable).
4. At Barilane Drive, proposed sidewalk along the right-of-way must be aligned with the existing sidewalk on the south side of the street. Extend proposed sidewalk and reconfigure to provide a pedestrian crossing perpendicular to the road

Items to be addressed: Address Engineering noted comments

## TRAFFIC

As directed by the City the applicant has provided a Traffic Impact Study for both the Westington Phase II and the Hills West developments. Please note that the traffic study has not been revised as the applicant has reduced the overall number of units and thus reduced the traffic impact. The traffic review is based on 162 units. The revised total is 151 units

Summary:

The proposed development includes three (3) multi-family residential homes developments: Westington Phase I, Westington Phase II, and West Hills. The number of peak hour (AM and PM), and daily vehicle trips that would be generated by the proposed residential were forecast based on data published in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual 11 th Edition, and the ITE Trip Generation Handbook, 3rd Edition. The site trip generation was reviewed and approved by the City of Troy (OHM) prior to use in the analysis and is summarized in Table E2.

| Land Use | Phase | Amount (units) | Average DailyTraffic (vpd) | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour (vph) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Multifamily Residential | Westington Phase I | 102 | 701 | 11 | 35 | 46 | 36 | 21 | 57 |
|  | Westington Phase II | 30 | 206 | 4 | 10 | 14 | 11 | 6 | 17 |
|  | West Hills | 30 | 206 | 3 | 10 | 13 | 10 | 6 | 16 |
| Total Trips |  | 162 | 1,114 | 18 | 55 | 73 | 57 | 33 | 90 |


| To/From | Via | AM | PM |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| North | Crooks Road | $31 \%$ | $28 \%$ |
| South | Crooks Road | $39 \%$ | $41 \%$ |
| East | Wattles Road | $14 \%$ | $16 \%$ |
| West | Wattles Road | $16 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| Total |  | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

ANALYSIS SUMMARY

The conclusions of this TIS are as follows:

1. Existing Conditions (2021): The result of the existing condition analysis indicates that all the study intersection approaches will operate at LOS D or better with the exceptions as follows:

- Crooks Road \& Wattles Road: The eastbound and westbound left and through movements are operating at LOS E during both AM and PM peak periods. Review of SimTraffic network simulations indicates long vehicle queues for these movements especially for eastbound through movement during the PM peak hour; however, these vehicle queues were observed to dissipate and were not present throughout the peak periods.
- Crooks Road \& 7-11 Drive: Although the westbound egress movements at 7-11 driveway currently operate at LOS D or better during the peak periods, long vehicle queue are observed on the site driveway during the PM peak hour. The northbound traffic at Wattles Road intersection occasionally extends past this driveway during peak periods and blocks the egress movements at the 7-11 Drive. This causes westbound egress vehicles to wait longer to find gaps within the through traffic along Crooks Road.

2. Background Conditions (2023): The results of the background conditions analysis indicates that all study intersection approaches and movements will continue to operate in a manner similar to existing conditions with the following exceptions:

- Crooks Road \& Wattles Road: The southbound left-turn movement is expected to operate in LOS E during the PM peak hour at the intersection of Crooks Road \& Wattles Road intersection due to the traffic growth in background (2023) conditions. However, the projected additional delay is only 1.6 seconds, which is not significant.

3. Future Conditions (2023): The results of the future conditions analysis indicates that with the addition of site generated traffic, all the study intersection approaches and delays continue to operate in a manner similar to background conditions with the exceptions as follows:

- Crooks Road \& Wattles Road: The overall intersection is expected to operate at LOS E during the PM peak hour. However, the overall delay at this intersection is expected to increase by only 0.4 seconds, which will be indiscernible from background condition intersection operations.
- Crooks Road \& Site Drive (West Hills): The westbound egress movements at West Hills driveway are expected to operate at LOS E during the PM peak periods with a 95th percentile queue length of 43 feet (2 vehicles), which is not significant. These vehicles will be contained within the project site and will not impact traffic operations at the adjacent streets. Moreover, the review of SimTraffic network simulation indicates the egress vehicles are able to find adequate gaps within through traffic along Crooks Road.


## RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of this study indicate that with the addition of site generated traffic, all the study intersection approaches and delays will continue to operate in a manner similar to existing conditions with minor additional delays. Therefore, no mitigation measures are recommended to accommodate the site generated traffic volumes.

The applicant TIS was reviewed by OHM, the City's Traffic Consultant. OHM concludes:

I have reviewed the Traffic Impact Study for the Westington \& West Hills development site, a proposed residential development located at the corner of Crooks and Wattles Roads. The applicant has proposed 162 dwelling units. The Traffic Impact Study was prepared by Fleis \& Vandenbrink and is dated November 1, 2021.

OHM recommends approval of the TIS. While there are a few corrections and changes that could be made for this report, they are minor and would not impact the conclusions contained in the TIS.

## Items to be addressed: None

## LANDSCAPING

A landscaping plan has been provided on Sheet L101. The following table discusses the development's compliance with the landscape requirements set forth in Section 13.02.

|  | Required: | Provided: | Compliance: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Greenbelt Planting |  |  |  |
| Crooks: 1 tree every 30 feet | $306 / 30=11$ | 11 trees | Complies |
| Southern property line: |  | large <br> Landscape buffering: <br> Required buffering between <br> two differentiating land uses. <br> Alternative 1 or 2. | 1 large evergreen every 10 <br> feet or 1 narrow evergreen <br> every 3 feet. <br> Alternative screening <br> method may be considered <br> every 10 feet <br> along northern <br> property line. |
| by the Planning |  |  |  |
| Commission. |  |  |  |
| Parking Lot Landscaping |  | 8 trees |  |
| 1 tree per every 8 parking <br> spaces | 8 trees | Complies |  |
| Overall |  | Applicant notes | Complies |
| Site landscaping: <br> A minimum of twenty percent <br> (20\%) of the site area shall be <br> comprised of landscape <br> material. Up to twenty-five <br> percent (25\%) of the required <br> landscape area may be brink, <br> stone, pavers, or other public <br> plaza elements, but shall not | $20 \%$ |  |  |


| include any parking area or <br> required sidewalks. |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Mitigation | 91 | 75 trees | Deficient by <br> trees |

## Transformer / Trash Enclosure:

The applicant has indicated a central trash enclosure. There will be one trash enclosure with two trash containers contained within a 6-foot-high masonry brick wall.

Items to be Addressed: Provide sixteen (16) replacement trees.

## PHOTOMETRICS

Applicant did not provide photometric plan.
Items to be Addressed: Provide Photometric Plan.

## FLOOR PLAN AND ELEVATIONS

Floor plans and elevations have been provided on sheets A100, A101, A102, and A200,. The elevations provided show architectural details, variations in material and pattern (brick, hardiboard siding, and limestone headers roof), as well as general color scheme.

Items to be Addressed: Applicant should confirm that they meet the transparency requirements.

## DESIGN STANDARDS AND SITE PLAN REVIEW STANDARDS

The Neighborhood Node design standards as well as Site Plan review standards provide the Planning Commission with direction when reviewing the proposed site plan and design features of this development.

Section 5.06.E. outlines Design Standards:

1. Building Orientation and Entrance
2. Ground Story Activation
3. Transitional Features
4. Site Access, Parking, and Loading

Please see Section 5.06.E for standard details.
Section 8.06 outlines Site Plan Review Design Standards.
Section 8.06 outlines Site Plan Review Design Standards.

1. Development shall ensure compatibility to existing commercial districts and provide a transition between land uses.
a. Building design shall enhance the character of the surrounding area in relation to building and parking placement, landscape and streetscape features, and architectural design.
b. Street fronts shall provide a variety of architectural expression that is appropriate in its context and prevents monotony.
c. Building design shall achieve a compatible transition between areas with different height, massing, scale, and architectural style.
2. Development shall incorporate the recognized best architectural building design practices.
a. Foster a lasting impact on the community through the provision of high quality design, construction, and detailing.
b. Provide high quality, durable materials, such as but not limited to stone, brick, glass, and metal. E.I.F.S. or material equivalent shall only be used as an accent material.
c. Develop buildings with creativity that includes balanced compositions and forms.
d. Design roofs that are appropriate to the architectural style of the building and create an appropriate visual exterior mass of the building given the context of the site.
e. For commercial buildings, incorporate clearly defined, highly visible customer entrances using features such as canopies, porticos, arcades, arches, wing walls, ground plane elements, and/or landscape planters.
f. Include community amenities that add value to the development such as patio/ seating areas, water features, art work or sculpture, clock towers, pedestrian plazas with park benches or other features located in areas accessible to the public.
3. Enhance the character, environment and safety for pedestrians and motorists.
a. Provide elements that define the street and the pedestrian realm.
b. Create a connection between the public right of way and ground floor activities.
c. Create a safe environment by employing design features to reduce vehicular and pedestrian conflict, while not sacrificing design excellence.
d. Enhance the pedestrian realm by framing the sidewalk area with trees, awnings, and other features.
e. Improve safety for pedestrians through site design measures.

## SUMMARY

As part of the deliberation, the Planning Commission and applicant shall discuss:

1. Can the applicant shift the buildings or reduce the size to preserve additional trees?
2. Compliance with Design Standards
3. Compliance with Site Plan Review Standards

Based on the Planning Commission discussion, the applicant shall also address engineering noted comments, provide required tree mitigation, provide photometric plan, and confirm transparency requirements.

Sincerely,

## BumPC.Caln

CARLISLE/WORTMAN ASSOC., INC.
Benjamin R. Carlisle, LEED AP, AICP
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## memorandum

Date: March 10, 2022
To: Bill Huotari, PE

From: Genevieve Schneemann \& Sara Merrill, PE, PTOE
Re: Hills West
Preliminary Site Plan Review

We have reviewed the preliminary site plans for Hills West, a residential development consisting of two new 2.5 -story buildings, one proposing15-units and the other proposing 14-units. The site proposes one access point to Crooks Road, as well as a proposed cross-access to the adjacent easterly site (Westington MultiFamily). The development is located on the south side of Wattles Road, just east of Crooks Road. The plans were prepared by DesignHaus Architecture and PEA, Inc. and provided electronically on March $10^{\text {th }}, 2022$.

At this time, OHM recommends approval of the preliminary site plan, subject to the comments below being incorporated into the final engineering plans.

OHM's comments on the proposed site plan are noted below:

1. Revise plans to eliminate inconsistencies between the PEA and DesignHaus plans. For example, plan sheets with a C- prefix show proposed sidewalks along the Crooks Road frontage, sidewalk curb ramps, and curb islands and radii within the parking lot (resulting in 1 less parking space), whereas sheets with S-prefix appear to show less refined layouts, a shorter deceleration lane, and omit the sidewalk along Crooks Road. We presume the PEA plans reflect the most accurate site layout.
2. Add dimension labels for the right turn lane and taper, curb radii and driveway throat width.
3. The right turn lane geometry on Crooks Road must conform with RCOC requirements. It appears the entrance taper may be less than 75 feet in length.
4. A detail for bollards has been provided on Sheet S101. Proposed bollard locations should be clearly shown on the plans.
5. Sidewalks:
a. At the site driveway, extend the concrete sidewalk (with sidewalk jointing) through the driveway approach, as shown in the City's Engineering Standards.
b. On the site civil plans, the proposed sidewalk connection on this site does not match up with the sidewalk on the adjacent Westington site. Revise plans to provide a continuous and accessible pedestrian route between the two sites.

c. The proposed sidewalk along the Crooks Road right-of-way, just north of the site drive, appears to conflict with an existing electric pole. The utility pole near the southwest corner of Building 1 is located immediately adjacent to the public sidewalk. Utility poles should be located two (2) feet off the edge of walk. Plans should clearly indicate which poles are being relocated, as well as show proposed pole locations (if applicable).

d. At Barilane Drive, proposed sidewalk along the right-of-way must be aligned with the existing sidewalk on the south side of the street. Extend proposed sidewalk and reconfigure to provide a pedestrian crossing perpendicular to the road.


[^0]:    * AADT values are derived from Traffic Counts

[^1]:    Zone wide Queuing Penalty: 950

[^2]:    Zone wide Queuing Penalty: 214

[^3]:    Zone wide Queuing Penalty: 1305

