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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) has been prepared in support of a Draft Plan of Subdivision for the lands located at 2128 Trim Road. The approximately 38.8-hectare site is currently undeveloped.

The proposed subdivision, referred to as the 'Notting Hill Subdivision' and formerly referred to as the 'Legault Lands,' is to be constructed in six phases. Phases 1-5 (approximately 27.7 hectares) are included in this application, while Phase 6 (approximately 11.1 hectares) will be subject to a future application. At full buildout (assumed to take place in 2025), Phases 1-5 of the development will consist of 535 dwellings.

The proposed Notting Hill subdivision is designated as General Urban Area and Urban Natural Features on Schedule B of the City of Ottawa's Official Plan. The implemented zoning for the property is Development Reserve (DR), which acts as a placeholder to limit permitted uses to those which will not preclude future development options before studies have been completed and approved. There are no Secondary Plans or Community Design Plans applicable to the proposed subdivision.

Phases 1-5 of the proposed subdivision will include 535 dwellings at full buildout. The number of units, year of buildout and the location of each phase are as follows:

- Phase 1 (2019): 35 detached homes and 24 townhomes (northwest corner of Portobello Boulevard and Aquaview Drive)
- Phase 2 (2021): 85 detached homes and 90 townhomes (northwest corner of Trim Road/Millennium Boulevard)
- Phase 3 (2022): 119 detached homes and 30 townhomes (northeast corner of Provence Avenue/Street No. 1)
- Phase 4 (2023): 27 detached homes, 27 townhomes, and 40 apartment units (southwest corner of Trim Road/Millennium Boulevard)
- Phase 5 (2024): 30 detached homes and 28 townhomes (southeast corner of Provence Avenue/Street No. 1)

Connections from the Notting Hill subdivision to the existing road network are proposed at Aquaview Drive, Provence Avenue, Salzburg Drive, and Trim Road.

The study area for this report will include Innes Road, Trim Road, Portobello Boulevard, Provence Avenue, Aquaview Drive, Nantes Street, Montmere Avenue, Plainhill Drive, Salzburg Drive, and Millennium Boulevard. The study area includes the signalized intersections at Innes Road/Provence Avenue and Innes Road/Trim Road, the roundabout at Trim Road/Millennium Boulevard, and the unsignalized intersections at Trim Road/Salzburg Drive, Trim Road/Montmere Avenue, Provence Avenue/Plainhill Drive, and Portobello Boulevard/Aquaview Drive/Nantes Street.

The selected time periods for the analysis are the weekday AM and PM peak hours, as they represent the 'worst case' combination of site generated traffic and adjacent street traffic. The proposed development is expected to be completed with full occupancy by the year 2025. City staff has confirmed that analysis of the horizon year 2030 shall be waived. Therefore, this TIA will perform analysis for the weekday AM and PM peak periods in the buildout year 2025.

The conclusions and recommendations of this TIA can be summarized as follows:

## Forecasting

- Phases 1-5 of the proposed subdivision are projected to generate approximately 614 person trips during the AM peak period and 687 person trips during the PM peak period, which includes approximately 341 vehicle trips during the AM peak period and 379 vehicle trips during the PM peak period.


## Development Design

- With a minimum spacing of 60 m , all proposed intersections to/within the proposed subdivision are appropriately spaced from adjacent intersections, per the TAC Geometric Design Guide for Canadian Roads.
- Street No. 1 has a proposed ROW width of 22 m and a proposed roadway width of 11 m , which is sufficient for a travel lane and a parking lane in each direction. This is consistent for a collector roadway, and is sufficient to accommodate transit service.
- Street No. 2 has a proposed ROW width of 20 m and Streets No. 3 through 10 have a proposed ROW width of 18 m . All of these streets have a proposed roadway width of 8.5 m , which is sufficient for a travel lane in each direction and parking on one side of the roadway. This is adequate given the context of the proposed development, a low-speed residential neighbourhood with limited opportunity for cut-through traffic.
- 1.8 m concrete sidewalks are proposed on both sides of Street No. 1, the west side of Streets No. 2 and 3, and the outside of Streets No. 8 and 9. A 1.8 asphalt pathway is proposed on Street No. 5, which will connect the proposed subdivision to the Trans-Orléans Pathway.
- A PXO D is recommended at the west approach of the Street No. 1/Street No. 2 intersection.


## Boundary Streets

- The results of the segment MMLOS analysis can be summarized as follows:
- Only Provence Avenue meets the target pedestrian level of service (PLOS), while Trim Road, Portobello Boulevard, Aquaview Drive, and Salzburg Drive do not;
- Portobello Boulevard, Aquaview Drive, and Salzburg Drive meet the target bicycle level of service (BLOS), while Trim Road and Provence Avenue do not;
- As the only roadway with a target, Trim Road meets the target transit level of service (TLOS);
- As the only roadway with a target, Trim Road meets the target truck level of service (TkLOS);
- All roadways meet the target vehicular level of service (Auto LOS).
- The PLOS of Trim Road can only be improved to the target PLOS A with a reduction in the operating speed, which is not desirable given Trim Road is an arterial roadway. Therefore, no modifications are recommended.
- The PLOS of Portobello Boulevard can be improved to the target PLOS A by implementing a 0.5 m sidewalk boulevard while maintaining a 2.0 m -wide sidewalk on the east side, and implementing a 1.8 m -wide sidewalk while maintaining a 2.0 m sidewalk boulevard. As the existing cross-section meets the current City standards, no modifications are recommended.
- The PLOS of Aquaview Drive can be improved to the target PLOS A by implementing a 1.8 m wide sidewalk while maintaining a 2.0 m sidewalk boulevard on the south side of the roadway. There appears to be limited space to widen the sidewalk due to the location of street light poles on the south side. Given the acceptable PLOS on the north side of Aquaview Drive, no modifications are recommended.
- The PLOS of Salzburg Drive can be improved to the target PLOS A by implementing sidewalks with a minimum width of 2.0 m and a minimum boulevard width of 0.5 m on both sides of the roadway. As the existing cross-section meets the current City standards, no modifications are recommended.
- The BLOS of Trim Road can be improved beyond the target BLOS C by implementing multiuse pathways on both sides of the roadway. Currently, a multi-use pathway is only provided on the east side of Trim Road, north of Millennium Boulevard. The Ontario Traffic Manual Book 18 identifies bike lanes as a suitable cycling facility, and a reduction in the operating speed is undesirable. Therefore, no modifications are recommended.
- The BLOS of Provence Avenue can only be improved to the target BLOS B by implementing a physically separated bikeway (such as a multi-use pathway). The Ontario Traffic Manual Book 18 identifies a shared roadway as suitable given the low traffic volumes. Therefore, no modifications are recommended.


## Access Intersections

- Phase 1 will be served by two unsignalized all-movement accesses at Aquaview Drive, approximately 60 m and 140 m west of Portobello Boulevard. Phases $2-5$ will be served by three accesses: an unsignalized access at Provence Avenue, a tie-in to Salzburg Drive, and a tie-in to the roundabout at Trim Road/Millennium Boulevard.
- Of the proposed unsignalized access intersections (Provence Avenue/Street No. 1 and the two accesses at Aquaview Drive/Street No. 10), none are anticipated to meet the OTM or City criteria for all-way stop control. Therefore, side street stop control is recommended for the approaches on Street No. 1 and Street No. 10.
- It is anticipated that all-way stop control will not be warranted for the intersection of Trim Road/Salzburg Drive at full buildout.
- It is proposed that the access to Street No. 1 tie into the existing roundabout at Trim Road/ Millennium Boulevard. Assuming similar approach geometry to the existing approach on Millennium Boulevard, the roundabout is anticipated to continue operating acceptably at full buildout.


## Transportation Demand Management

- The following TDM measures will be implemented as the proposed subdivision is built:
- Designate an internal TDM program coordinator;
- Display local area maps with walking/cycling routes and key destinations (at sales centre);
- Display relevant transit schedules and route maps (at sales centre);
- Provide multimodal travel option information packages to new residents (at sales centre).


## Transit

- Phases 1-5 of the proposed subdivision are projected to generate 154 transit trips during the AM peak period and 171 transit trips during the PM peak period.
- No capacity problems are anticipated on OC Transpo routes 33 and 233, which serve the stops adjacent to the proposed Phase 1 development.
- Discussions with City staff confirmed that as the subdivision develops, OC Transpo will provide transit service on Provence Avenue and Street No. 1. Therefore, no capacity problems are anticipated as a result of transit trips generated by Phases 2-5 of the development.


## Intersection Design

- Based on the results of the intersection MMLOS analysis:
- Neither signalized intersection meets the target pedestrian level of service (PLOS);
- Neither signalized intersection meets the target bicycle level of service (BLOS);
- Among signalized intersections, only Innes Road/Provence Avenue meets the target transit level of service (TLOS);
- Among signalized intersections, only Innes Road/Trim Road meets the target truck level of service (TkLOS);
- Among all study area intersections, only Innes Road/Trim Road does not meet the target vehicular level of service (Auto LOS).
- The PLOS of Innes Road/Provence Avenue cannot achieve the target PLOS at any approach without significantly reducing the number of lanes and restricting turning movements. While only the east and west approaches meet the City's vehicle/pedestrian conflict threshold for zebra-striped crosswalks (greater than 400,000 vehicle/pedestrian conflicts over an eighthour period), implementing zebra-striped crosswalks could be considered at all approaches given the intersection is adjacent to a school.
- The PLOS of Innes Road/Trim Road cannot achieve the target PLOS at any approach without significantly reducing the number of lanes and restricting turning movements. Implementing zebra-striped crosswalks could be considered at all approaches to improve the level of comfort for pedestrians.
- The BLOS of Innes Road/Provence Avenue can only improve to the target BLOS A with the implementation of two-stage left-turn bike boxes on all approaches and higher order (separated) cycling facilities. Given that there is insufficient space on Innes Road to accommodate separate cycling facilities, the only recommended modification is to shift the pocket bike lane on the west approach so that it is adjacent with the curb. Based on Exhibit 8 of the MMLOS guidelines, this will improve the level of service of the intersection to a BLOS $B$ based on right turn characteristics. No other modifications are recommended.
- The BLOS of Innes Road/Trim Road can only improve beyond the target BLOS B with the implementation of two-stage left-turn bike boxes and higher order (separated) cycling facilities on all approaches. Given that there is insufficient space on Innes Road to
accommodate separate cycling facilities, the only recommended modification is to shift the pocket bike lanes on all approaches to be adjacent with the curb. Based on Exhibit 8 of the MMLOS guidelines, this will improve the level of service of the intersection to a BLOS B based on right turn characteristics. No other modifications are recommended.
- The TLOS of Innes Road/Trim Road can be achieved if transit signal priority and queue jump lanes are implemented at all approaches. The 2013 TMP identifies that in the Affordable Network, these measures will be implemented on Innes Road between Blair Station and Millennium Station. Extensions of the Blackburn Hamlet Bypass and Brian Coburn Boulevard will provide alternate parallel routes for eastbound/westbound traffic, and may provide some relief to the current traffic volumes on Innes Road.
- The TkLOS of Innes Road/Provence Avenue does not achieve the target TkLOS D at the east approach. Since Provence Avenue is not a truck route, this manoeuvre is not anticipated to occur with regularity, and therefore no recommendations have been made in improving the TkLOS for this approach.
- The Auto LOS of Innes Road/Trim Road does not achieve the target Auto LOS D during the PM peak period, due to the southbound left turn and eastbound left turn movements.
- The southbound left turn movement can meet the target with a reduction of 10 vehicles.
- The eastbound left turn movement requires a reduction of 160 vehicles to meet the target (a reduction of approximately 50\%), and there is insufficient space to implement a second left turn lane without further deteriorating the PLOS and BLOS .
- Under the 2025 background traffic conditions, there is anticipated traffic growth on Innes Road, Trim Road, and Portobello Boulevard. Compared to existing conditions, all intersections are anticipated to operate at approximately the same level of service.
- Under the 2025 total traffic conditions, all intersections are anticipated to operate at approximately the same level of service compared to background conditions. The intersection of Trim Road/Salzburg Drive is projected to downgrade to an Auto LOS C during the AM peak period. All accesses to the proposed subdivision are anticipated to perform acceptably.
- No auxiliary lanes are recommended at Provence Avenue/Street No. 1, as none are required.
- Phases 1-5 of the proposed subdivision are recommended from a transportation perspective. An additional study will be prepared in support of a separate draft plan application for Phase 6.


### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) has been prepared in support of a Draft Plan of Subdivision for the lands located at 2128 Trim Road. The approximately 38.8-hectare site is currently undeveloped.

The proposed subdivision, referred to as the 'Notting Hill Subdivision' and formerly referred to as the 'Legault Lands,' is to be constructed in six phases. Phases 1-5 (approximately 27.7 hectares) are included in this application, while Phase 6 (approximately 11.1 hectares) will be subject to a future application. At full buildout (assumed to take place in 2025), Phases 1-5 of the development will consist of 535 dwellings.

The subject site is surrounded by the following:

- Residences, commercial uses, and a secondary school to the north;
- Residences and Cumberland Millennium Sports Park to the east;
- Residences, a future transitway, a future school, and parkland to the south;
- Residences, an elementary school, and parkland to the west.

A view of the subject site is provided in Figure 1.

### 2.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The proposed Notting Hill subdivision is designated as General Urban Area and Urban Natural Features on Schedule B of the City of Ottawa's Official Plan. The implemented zoning for the property is Development Reserve (DR), which acts as a placeholder to limit permitted uses to those which will not preclude future development options before studies have been completed and approved. There are no Secondary Plans or Community Design Plans applicable to the proposed subdivision.

Phases 1-5 of the proposed subdivision will include 535 dwellings at full buildout. The number of units, year of buildout and the location of each phase are as follows:

- Phase 1 (2019): 35 detached homes and 24 townhomes (northwest corner of Portobello Boulevard and Aquaview Drive)
- Phase 2 (2021): 85 detached homes and 90 townhomes (northwest corner of Trim Road/Millennium Boulevard)
- Phase 3 (2022): 119 detached homes and 30 townhomes (northeast corner of Provence Avenue/Street No. 1)
- Phase 4 (2023): 27 detached homes, 27 townhomes, and 40 apartment units (southwest corner of Trim Road/Millennium Boulevard)
- Phase 5 (2024): 30 detached homes and 28 townhomes (southeast corner of Provence Avenue/Street No. 1)

A sixth phase is to be constructed between Portobello Boulevard and Provence Avenue, north of Nantes Street and Grapefern Terrace. The traffic generated from this phase will be accounted for as background growth in this report, however it will be analyzed in greater detail in a separate draft plan application.

Connections from the Notting Hill subdivision to the existing road network are proposed at Aquaview Drive, Provence Avenue, Salzburg Drive, and Trim Road. A copy of the conceptual site plan is included in Appendix A.

Figure 1: View of the Subject Site


### 3.0 SCREENING

### 3.1 Screening Form

The City's 2017 TIA Guidelines identify three triggers for completing a TIA report, including trip generation, location, and safety. The criteria for each trigger are outlined in the City's TIA Screening Form.

The trigger results are as follows:

- Trip Generation Trigger: The development is anticipated to generate over 60 person trips/peak hour; further assessment is required based on this trigger.
- Location Triggers - The development is located along a Spine Cycling Route (Trim Road); further assessment is required based on this trigger.
- Safety Triggers - The proposed access to Trim Road connects with the existing roundabout for Trim Road/Millennium Boulevard. For this reason, further assessment is required based on this trigger.

A copy of the TIA Screening Form is included in Appendix B.

### 4.0 SCOPING

### 4.1 Existing Conditions

### 4.1.1 Roadways

All roadways within the study area fall under the jurisdiction of the City of Ottawa.
Innes Road is an urban arterial roadway that generally runs on an east-west alignment between St. Laurent Boulevard and Cox Country Road. West of St. Laurent Boulevard, the roadway continues as Industrial Avenue. Between the western and eastern intersections with the Blackburn Hamlet Bypass, Innes Road acts as a major collector. East of Cox Country Road, Innes Road continues as a rural arterial roadway until Dunning Road. Within the study area, Innes Road has a four-lane divided urban cross-section with bike lanes, sidewalks on both sides of the roadway, and a posted speed limit of $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. Innes Road is classified as an urban truck route, allowing full loads. Street parking is not permitted.

Trim Road is an arterial roadway that generally runs on a north-south alignment between Ottawa Regional Road 174 and Wall Road. North of Ottawa Regional Road 174, Trim Road continues as a major collector until Jeanne D'Arc Boulevard, and then as a local roadway until terminating at Petrie Island Park. South of Wall Road, Trim Road continues primarily as a collector, with a short section of arterial roadway in Navan, until terminating approximately 930 m south of Perrault Road. Within the study area, Trim Road has a four-lane divided urban cross-section with bike lanes, sidewalks on the west side of the roadway, and a posted speed limit of $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. Trim Road has a multi-use pathway on the east side between Innes Road and Millennium Boulevard, and a sidewalk south of Millennium Boulevard. Trim Road is classified as a truck route, allowing partial loads. Street parking is not permitted. The right-of-way (ROW) at the subject site is approximately 42 m . The City of Ottawa's Official Plan identifies a ROW protection of 37.5 m throughout the study area, with an additional 5 m protected on the east side to construct a rural cross-section. Widening is not required as part of this application.

Portobello Boulevard is a major collector roadway that generally runs on a north-south alignment between Trim Road and Brian Coburn Boulevard. South of Brian Coburn Boulevard, Portobello Boulevard continues as a major collector roadway before terminating approximately 880 m south of Brian Coburn Boulevard. Within the study area, Portobello Boulevard has a four-lane divided urban
cross-section with bike lanes, and sidewalks on both sides of the roadway. The posted speed limit is $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$, with a reduction to $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ on school days (from 7:00am-9:30am and 2:00pm-5:00pm). Portobello Boulevard is not classified as a truck route. Street parking is not permitted.

Provence Avenue is a collector roadway that generally runs on a north-south alignment between Valin Street and Brian Coburn Boulevard. Within the study area, Provence Avenue has a two-lane undivided urban cross-section, sidewalks on both sides of the roadway, and a posted speed limit of $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. Provence Avenue is not classified as a truck route. Street parking is permitted. The ROW at the subject site is variable, ranging from approximately 26 m at the northern and southern extents and approximately 56.5 m at the future transitway.

Aquaview Drive is a collector roadway that runs east-west at the intersection with Portobello Boulevard, before curving into a north-south alignment and terminating at Brian Coburn Boulevard (approximately 370 m east of Tenth Line Road). East of Portobello Boulevard, the roadway continues as Nantes Street. Within the study area, Aquaview Drive has a two-lane undivided urban crosssection, sidewalk on the south side of the roadway, and a posted speed limit of $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. Aquaview Drive is not classified as a truck route. Street parking is permitted. The ROW at the subject site is approximately 22 m .

Nantes Street is a collector roadway that runs east-west at the intersection with Portobello Boulevard, before curving into a north-south alignment and terminating at Brian Coburn Boulevard (approximately 310m west of Provence Avenue). West of the intersection of Portobello Boulevard, the roadway continues as Aquaview Drive. Within the study area, Nantes Street has a two-lane undivided urban cross-section, sidewalk on the north side of the roadway, and a posted speed limit of $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. As a temporary traffic calming device, flex posts have been installed on either side of the school zone on Nantes Street. Nantes Street is not classified as a truck route. Street parking is permitted.

Montmere Avenue is a collector roadway that runs east-west at the intersection with Trim Road for approximately 380 m before curving into a north-south alignment and terminating at Brian Coburn Boulevard (approximately 220m east of Provence Avenue). Within the study area, Montmere Avenue has a two-lane undivided urban cross-section, sidewalk on the north/west side of the roadway, and a posted speed limit of $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. Montmere Avenue is not classified as a truck route. Street parking is permitted.

Plainhill Drive is a local roadway that runs east-west at the intersections of Montmere Avenue and Provence Avenue, before curving into a north-south alignment and continuing as Comfrey Crescent at the intersection with Ivany Way. Within the study area, Plainhill Drive has a two-lane undivided urban cross-section, sidewalk on the north/west side of the roadway, and an unposted regulatory speed limit of $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ under the Highway Traffic Act. Plainhill Drive is not classified as a truck route. Street parking is permitted.

Salzburg Drive is a local roadway that runs on an east-west alignment from Trim Road, and terminates approximately 200 m west of Trim Road. Salzburg Drive has a two-lane undivided urban cross-section, sidewalk on the north side of the roadway, and an unposted regulatory speed limit of $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ under the Highway Traffic Act. Salzburg Drive is not classified as a truck route. Street parking is permitted.

Millennium Boulevard is a local roadway that generally runs on an east-west alignment from Trim Road, and terminates at Gisèle Lalonde Secondary School (approximately 470 m east of Trim Road).

Within the study area, Millennium Boulevard has a two-lane divided urban cross-section, multi-use pathways on both sides of the roadway to the transit station, and an unposted regulatory speed limit of $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ under the Highway Traffic Act. East of the transit station, Millennium Boulevard has a sidewalk on the north side. Millennium Boulevard is not classified as a truck route. Street parking is not permitted.

### 4.1.2 Intersections

## Innes Road/Provence Avenue

- Signalized four-legged intersection
- Northbound/Southbound: one left turn lane, one shared through/right turn lane
- Eastbound: one left turn lane, two through lanes, one right turn lane
- Westbound: one left turn lane, one through lane, one shared through/right turn lane
- Bike lane on eastbound and westbound approaches



## Trim Road/Salzburg Drive

- Unsignalized four-legged intersection
- Stop controlled on Salzburg Drive
- Northbound/Southbound: one left turn lane and two through lanes
- Eastbound/Westbound: one shared left turn/ through/right turn lane
- Bike lanes on northbound and southbound approaches


## Trim Road/Millennium Boulevard

- Three-legged roundabout
- Northbound/Southbound: two lane approach
- Westbound: one lane approach
- Bike lanes on northbound and southbound approaches
- Multi-use pathway on westbound approach


## Trim Road/Montmere Avenue

- Unsignalized three-legged intersection
- Stop-controlled on Montmere Avenue
- Northbound: one left turn lane and two through lanes
- Southbound: two through lanes and one right turn lane
- Eastbound: one shared left turn/right turn lane
- Bike lanes on northbound and southbound approaches



## Provence Avenue/Plainhill Drive

- Unsignalized four-legged intersection
- All-way stop-controlled
- All approaches: one shared left turn/through/ right turn lane



## Portobello Boulevard/

## Aquaview Drive/Nantes Street

- Unsignalized four-legged intersection
- All-way stop-controlled
- Northbound/Southbound: one shared left turn/ through lane and one shared through/right turn lane
- Eastbound/Westbound: one shared left turn/ through/right turn lane
- Bike lanes on northbound and southbound approaches



### 4.1.3 Driveways

Within 200 m of the proposed accesses to the subdivision, there are accesses to multiple schools, which are identified as follows:

- Avalon Public School (accesses on Aquaview Drive and Portobello Boulevard);
- Des Sentiers Elementary School (access on Nantes Street).

All existing residences are accessed via local roadways, Aquaview Drive and Nantes Street (which are classified as collector roadways), and Trim Road (an arterial roadway with access to 2170 Trim Road and 2088 Trim Road).

### 4.1.4 Pedestrian and Cycling Facilities

Concrete sidewalks are provided on both sides of Innes Road, Portobello Boulevard, Provence Avenue, and Trim Road south of Millennium Boulevard. Concrete sidewalks are provided on one
side of Aquaview Drive, Nantes Street, Montmere Avenue, Plainhill Drive, and Salzburg Drive, along with the west side of Trim Road north of Millennium Boulevard. Multi-use pathways are provided on both sides of Millennium Boulevard, and the east side of Trim Road north of Millennium Boulevard. The multi-use pathway on the south side of Millennium Boulevard provides connectivity to Millennium Park Stadium and the Millennium Station Park and Ride.

In the City of Ottawa's primary cycling network, Innes Road is classified as a Crosstown Bikeway, Trim Road is classified as a Spine Route, and Portobello Boulevard, Provence Avenue, Aquaview Drive, and Nantes Street are designated as Local Routes. Bike lanes are provided on Innes Road, Trim Road, and Portobello Boulevard.

Construction of the Trans-Orléans Pathway, an asphalt multi-use pathway from Liska Street to Trim Road, has been recently completed. The pathway extends along the south limit of the subdivision between Trim Road and Provence Avenue, connecting to Grapefern Terrace. It continues west along the north side of Aquaview Drive/Nantes Street to the transitway corridor, and connects to the RioCan Shopping Centre at Innes Road/Tenth Line Road, the Hydro corridor, and Liska Street. The pathway is designated as a Community Connectivity initiative project, which complements the Ottawa Cycling Plan. The relevant section of the Trans-Orléans Pathway Functional Design is shown in Figure 2.

### 4.1.5 Area Traffic Management

There are no Area Traffic Management (ATM) studies within the study area that have been completed or are currently in progress.

### 4.1.6 Transit

The nearest bus stops to the subject site are as follows:

## Innes Road/Provence Avenue

- Stop \#0571 - for routes 94, 135, 611, 612, and 632 (located at the northwest corner)
- Stop \#3241 - for routes 94, 611, 612, and 632 (located at the southeast corner)
- Stop \#3656 - for routes 135 and 612 (located at the southeast corner)


## Trim Road/Salzburg Drive

- Stop \#9072 - for routes 22, 94, 122, 611, 612, and 632
(located at the southeast corner)
- Stop \#9073 - for routes 22, 94, 122, 611, 612, and 632
(located at the northwest corner)


## Trim Road/Millennium Boulevard

- Stop \#1090 - for routes 22, 30, 33, 94, 122, 135, 611, 612, 618, 630, and 632 (located at the southeast corner)
- Stop \#9075 - for routes 22, 30, 33, 94, 122, 135, 611, 612, 618, 630, and 632 (located at the northeast corner)
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## Portobello Boulevard/Aquaview Drive/Nantes Street

- Stop \#1367 - for routes 33 and 233 (located at the northwest corner)
- Stop \#6314 - for routes 33 and 233 (located at the northeast corner)

The Millennium Transit Station and Park and Ride (Stop \#3076) is approximately 160m east of Trim Road, south of Cumberland Millennium Sports Park. It provides service to routes 22, 30, 94, 122, 612,618 , and 630.

Locations of these bus stops and Millennium Station are shown in Figure 3.
Figure 3: OC Transpo Bus Stop Locations


OC Transpo Route 22 travels between either the Albert/Bay or LeBreton stations and Millennium Station. On weekdays, the route operates every 15 minutes from Millennium Station toward

Albert/Bay Station between 6:00am and 9:00am, and every 15 minutes from LeBreton Station toward Millennium Station between 3:00pm and 7:00pm. This route does not operate outside of these hours, or on weekends.

OC Transpo Route 30 travels between either the Albert/Bay, Blair, or LeBreton stations and Millennium Station. During the weekday peak periods, the route operates every 15 minutes from Millennium Station toward Albert/Bay Station between 5:30am and 8:30am, and every 10 minutes from LeBreton Station toward Millennium Station between 3:00pm and 6:30pm. During the weekday off-peak times, the route operates every 30 minutes between Blair Station and Millennium Station from 5:30am to 12:00am. On weekends, the route operates every 30 minutes between Blair Station and Millennium Station between 7:30am and 11:30pm.

OC Transpo Route 33 travels between either the Albert/Bay or Place d'Orléans stations and Portobello/Summer Sky Station. During the weekday peak periods, the route operates every 15 minutes from Portobello/Summer Sky Station toward Albert/Bay Station between 5:30am and 9:00am, and every 15 minutes from LeBreton Station to Portobello/Summer Sky Station between 3:00pm and $6: 30 \mathrm{pm}$. Additionally, the route operates every 30 minutes between Place d'Orléans Station and Portobello/ Summer Sky Station from 7:00am to 11:00pm. The route does not operate on weekends.

OC Transpo Route 94 travels between Riverview Station and Millennium Station. During the weekday peak periods, the route operates every 10 minutes from Millennium Station to Tunney's Pasture Station between 5:00am and 9:00am, and every 10 minutes from Riverview Station or Tunney's Pasture Station to Millennium Station between 2:00pm and 6:00pm. During the weekday off-peak times, the route operates every 15 minutes from Riverview Station or Tunney's Pasture Station to Millennium Station between 9:00am and 12:00am. On weekends, the route operates every 15 minutes from 9:30am to $5: 30 \mathrm{pm}$, with service from Millennium Station alternating between Riverview Station and Tunney's Pasture Station. The route additionally operates from 5:30am to 9:00am and 5:30pm to 1:30am on weekends.

OC Transpo Route 122 travels between Place d'Orléans Station and Millennium Station. On all days of the week, the route operates every 30 minutes from Place d'Orléans Station and Millennium Station, with weekday service running from 7:00am to 10:30pm, Saturday service running from 8:00am to 10:30pm, and Sunday service running from 9:30am to 9:00pm.

OC Transpo Route 135 travels between Lakeridge/Vista Park Station and Place d'Orléans Station. On all days of the week, the route operates every 30 minutes from Lakeridge/Vista Park Station and Place d'Orléans Station, with weekday service running from 6:30am to 12:30am, Saturday service running from 8:30am to 12:00am, and Sunday service running from 10:00am to 12:00am.

OC Transpo Route 233 travels between either the Albert/Bay or LeBreton stations and Portobello/ Summer Sky Station. During the weekday peak periods, the route operates every 30 minutes from Millennium Station to Albert/Bay Station between 6:30am and 7:30am, and every 30 minutes from LeBreton Station to Millennium Station between 3:30pm and 4:30pm. This route does not operate outside of these hours, and does not operate on weekends.

The 600-series of OC Transpo Routes provide service to schools throughout the City of Ottawa. The following routes provide service to one or more stops within the study area.

OC Transpo Route 611 travels between either the St. Joseph/Youville or St. Joseph/Forest Valley stations and Gisèle Lalonde Secondary School. Based on the schedule, this route arrives at 8:52am and departs at 3:38pm on school days.

OC Transpo Route 612 travels between Renaud/Saddleridge Station and Gisèle Lalonde Secondary School or Béatrice Desloges Catholic Secondary School. Based on the schedule, this route arrives at Gisèle Lalonde Secondary School at 8:52am and 8:55am, and departs at $3: 38 \mathrm{pm}$. The route arrives at Béatrice Desloges Secondary School at 7:43am and departs at 2:30pm on school days.

OC Transpo Route 618 travels between Louis Riel Secondary School and Millennium Station. Based on the schedule, this route departs Millennium Station at 7:53am and arrives at 3:40pm on school days.

OC Transpo Route 630 travels between Ogilvie/Kender Station (for Colonel By Secondary School and Gloucester High School) and Millennium Station. Based on the schedule, this route departs Millennium Station at 8:17am and arrives at 4:10pm on school days.

OC Transpo Route 632 travels between St. Joseph/Orléans Station and Gisèle Lalonde Secondary School. Based on the schedule, this route arrives at Gisèle Lalonde Secondary School at 8:56am and departs at 3:38pm on school days.

OC Transpo maps for the routes outlined above and a copy of the June 2018 OC Transpo System Map are included in Appendix C.

### 4.1.7 Existing Traffic Volumes

Weekday traffic counts completed by the City of Ottawa were used to determine the existing pedestrian, cyclist and vehicular traffic volumes at the study area intersections. The traffic counts were completed on the following dates:

- Innes Road/Provence Avenue
- Innes Road/Trim Road
- Trim Road/Millennium Boulevard
- Trim Road/Montmere Avenue
- Provence Avenue/Plainhill Drive
- Portobello Boulevard/Aquaview Drive/Nantes Street

May 9, 2017
August 19, 2015
February 22, 2017
November 14, 2012
January 22, 2014
May 25, 2017

The average annual daily traffic (AADT) of the boundary arterial and collector roadways are based on the most recent traffic counts, and shown in Table 1. Traffic count data is included in Appendix D.

Table 1: AADT of Boundary Streets

| Roadway | Road Class | AADT |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Innes Road | Arterial | $15,410 \mathrm{vpd}$ |
| Trim Road | Arterial | $7,870 \mathrm{vpd}$ |
| Portobello Boulevard | Major Collector | $3,890 \mathrm{vpd}$ |
| Provence Avenue | Collector | 850 vpd |
| Aquaview Drive | Collector | 650 vpd |
| Nantes Street | Collector | $1,080 \mathrm{vpd}$ |
| Montmere Avenue | Collector | 930 vpd |

The traffic volumes at Trim Road/Salzburg Drive have been estimated through the following methods. For traffic along Trim Road, the volumes have been carried forward from the traffic count for Trim Road/Millennium Boulevard. The west approach is a residential cul-de-sac, while the east approach is an access to the Trim Road Works Yard, a road maintenance facility operated by the City of Ottawa.

There are 50 dwelling units on Salzburg Drive west of Trim Road. Trips generated by these dwellings have been estimated using the recommended rates from the TRANS Trip Generation Manual, prepared in 2009 by McCormick Rankin Corporation. The vehicle trip generation rates, taken from Table 6.3 of the report, correspond to Townhouses in the Suburban Area (outside the greenbelt). The directional split between inbound and outbound trips are based on the blended splits presented in Table 3.17 of the report. The estimated number of trips generated by the residences along Salzburg Drive is shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Salzburg Drive - Trip Generation

| Land Use | TRANS Rates | Units | AM Peak (VPH) |  |  | PM Peak (VPH) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | IN | OUT | тот | IN | OUT | тот |
| Townhouses | AM: 0.54 <br> PM: 0.71 | 50 units | 10 | 17 | 27 | 19 | 17 | 36 |

The corresponding number of person trips generated by the residences along Salzburg Drive are based on the modal shares presented in Table 3.13 of the TRANS report. The estimated number of person trips generated is shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Salzburg Drive - Person Trip Generation

| Land Use | TRANS Auto Share | AM Peak (PPH $\left.{ }^{(1)}\right)$ |  |  | PM Peak (PPH) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | IN | OUT | TOT | IN | OUT | TOT |  |
| Townhouses | AM: $55 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PM: $61 \%$ | 18 | 31 | 49 | 31 | 28 | 59 |  |

1. PPH = Persons Per Hour

There are several storage and administrative buildings on the Trim Road Works Yard land east of Trim Road. CastleGlenn Consultants prepared a Traffic Impact Brief in support of the Trim Road Works Yard development in January 2014, which indicated two phases of construction. The first phase was constructed after the 2015 traffic count at Innes Road/Trim Road, and the buildout year of the second phase is indefinite. To maintain a conservative analysis, the second phase is assumed to be built by the buildout year of the proposed subdivision.

Trips generated by the Trim Road Works Yard have been estimated using trip generation rates from the ITE Trip Generation Manual, $9^{\text {th }}$ Edition. With both phases constructed, the total gross floor area of Buildings A, B, and C as shown on the site plan (included in Appendix E), equals approximately $83,040 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$. A total of 207 parking spaces will ultimately be provided for service and administrative staff, and 70 spaces will be provided for large vehicles. The land use selected for this development is Warehousing (land use 150).

The estimated number of person trips generated by the Trim Road Works Yard is shown in Table 4.
Table 4: Trim Road Works Yard - Person Trip Generation

| Land Use | ITE Code | GFA | AM Peak ( $\mathrm{PPH}^{(1)}$ ) |  |  | PM Peak (PPH) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | IN | OUT | TOT | IN | OUT | TOT |
| Warehousing | 150 | $83,040 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ | 75 | 20 | 95 | 17 | 51 | 68 |
|  | Phase 1 | 61,440 ft ${ }^{\text {2 }}$ | 55 | 15 | 70 | 12 | 38 | 50 |
|  | Phase 2 | 21,600 ft ${ }^{\text {2 }}$ | 20 | 5 | 25 | 5 | 13 | 18 |

1. PPH calculated using an ITE Trip to Person Trip factor of 1.28 , consistent with the 2017 TIA Guidelines

The modal shares for the trips generated by the residences on Salzburg Drive are anticipated to be consistent with the modal shares outlined in the 2011 TRANS O-D Survey Report, specific to the Orléans region. The modal share values applied are based on all observed trips from/within Orléans in the AM peak period and all observed trips to/within Orléans in the PM peak period.

Given the vehicular-based land uses of the Trim Road Works Yard, the modal shares are anticipated to be highly skewed toward auto drivers. As such, the vehicle trips generated have been taken directly from the Trip Generation Manual, which translates to approximately $80 \%$ auto drivers. The remainder is split as $10 \%$ auto passengers, $5 \%$ transit, and $5 \%$ non-auto.

A full breakdown of the person trips generated by modal share is shown in Table 5.
Table 5: Salzburg Drive and Trim Road Works Yard - Trips by Modal Share

| Travel ModeModal <br> Share | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | IN | OUT | TOT | IN | OUT | TOT |  |
| Salzburg Drive <br> Person Trips | 18 | 31 | 49 | 31 | 28 | 59 |  |
| Auto Driver | $55 \%$ | 10 | 17 | 27 | 17 | 15 | 32 |
| Auto Passenger | $15 \%$ | 3 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Transit | $25 \%$ | 4 | 8 | 12 | 8 | 7 | 15 |
| Non-Auto | $5 \%$ | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Auto Driver (Total) | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 2}$ |  |
| Auto Passenger (Total) | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ |  |
| Transit (Total) | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ |  |
| Non-Auto (Total) | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ |  |


| Travel Mode | Modal <br> Share | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | IN | OUT | TOT | IN | OUT | TOT |  |
| Trim Road Works Yard <br> Phase 1 Person Trips | 55 | 15 | 70 | 12 | 38 | 50 |  |
| Auto Driver | $80 \%$ | 43 | 12 | 55 | 9 | 30 | 39 |
| Auto Passenger | $10 \%$ | 6 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| Transit | $5 \%$ | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Non-Auto | $5 \%$ | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Trim Road Works Yard | 20 | 5 | 25 | 5 | 13 | 18 |  |
| Phase 2 Person Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Auto Driver | $80 \%$ | 15 | 4 | 19 | 4 | 10 | 14 |
| Auto Passenger | $10 \%$ | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Transit | $5 \%$ | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Non-Auto | $5 \%$ | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Auto Driver (Total) | $\mathbf{5 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | 53 |  |
| Auto Passenger (Total) | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ |  |
| Transit (Total) |  | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ |
| Non-Auto (Total) |  | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ |

From the previous table, the residences on Salzburg Drive are expected to generate 27 vehicle trips in the AM peak period and 32 vehicle trips in the PM peak period. In existing conditions, the Trim Road Works Yard is expected to generate 55 vehicle trips in the AM peak period and 39 vehicle trips in the PM peak period. At full buildout, the Trim Road Works Yard is expected to generate 74 vehicle trips in the AM peak period and 53 vehicle trips in the PM peak period. The traffic generated at full buildout will be reflected in the future background traffic.

The distribution of these trips is assumed to follow existing traffic patterns, where the split between Innes Road and Brian Coburn Boulevard is approximately $70 \% / 30 \%$. This is a reasonable assumption, given that Innes Road (four lanes) has approximately double the capacity of Brian Coburn Boulevard (two lanes). As such, $70 \%$ of trips are distributed to/from the north and $30 \%$ of trips are distributed to/from the south.

Traffic volumes within the study area are shown in Figure 4.

Figure 4: Existing Network Traffic Volumes


### 4.1.8 Collision Records

Historical collision data from the last five years was obtained from the City's Public Works and Service Department for the study area intersections. Copies of the collision summary reports are included in Appendix F.

The collision data has been evaluated to determine if there are any identifiable collision patterns. The number of collisions at each intersection from January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2016 is summarized in Table 6.

Table 6: Reported Collisions

| Intersection | Number of Reported Collisions |
| :--- | :---: |
| Innes Road/Provence Avenue | 10 |
| Innes Road/Trim Road | 34 |
| Trim Road/Salzburg Drive | 0 |
| Trim Road/Millennium Boulevard | 5 |
| Trim Road/Montmere Avenue | 1 |
| Provence Avenue/Plainhill Drive | 0 |
| Portobello Boulevard/Aquaview Drive/Nantes Street | 4 |

## Innes Road/Provence Avenue

A total of 10 collisions were reported at this intersection over the last five years, of which there were four rear-end impacts, two sideswipe impacts, and four angle impacts. One collision caused injuries, but none caused fatalities.

## Innes Road/Trim Road

A total of 34 collisions were reported at this intersection over the last five years, of which there were eight rear-end impacts, 16 turning movement impacts, three sideswipe impacts, five angle impacts, and two single-vehicle/other impacts. Six of the collisions caused injuries, but none caused fatalities.

Of the eight rear-end impacts, two occurred at the northbound approach (two through vehicle incidents), two occurred at the southbound approach (one through vehicle incident and one right turn incident), three occurred at the eastbound approach (three left turn incidents), and one occurred at the westbound approach (a through vehicle incident). One of the eight impacts occurred in poor weather conditions.

Of the 16 turning movement impacts, four involved left turns at the northbound approach, three involved left turns at the southbound approach, one involved a U-turn at the southbound approach, four involved left turns at the eastbound approach, one involved a U-turn at the eastbound approach, and three involved left turns at the westbound approach. Two of the 16 impacts occurred in poor weather conditions.

## Trim Road/Millennium Boulevard

A total of five collisions were reported at this intersection over the last five years, of which there were two rear-end impacts, two sideswipe impacts, and one angle impact. None of these collisions caused injuries or fatalities.

## Trim Road/Montmere Avenue

A total of one collision was reported at this intersection over the last five years, which was an angle impact. This collision did not result in injuries or fatalities.

## Portobello Boulevard/Aquaview Drive/Nantes Street

A total of four collisions were reported at this intersection over the last five years, of which there was one rear-end impact, two angle impacts, and one single-vehicle/other impact involving a pedestrian. Two of the collisions caused injuries, but none caused fatalities.

### 4.2 Planned Conditions

The City of Ottawa's 2013 Transportation Master Plan (TMP) does not identify any upcoming roadway projects within the study area in its Affordable Road Network. The widening of Trim Road between North Service Road and Innes Road has been completed.

The Blackburn Hamlet Bypass Extension is identified as a Phase 2 project (2020-2025) under the Affordable Road Network, and includes a new four-lane road between Innes Road and Navan Road. The Brian Coburn Boulevard Extension is identified under the 2031 Network Concept, and includes a new two-lane roadway (ultimately four-lane) between Trim Road and Frank Kenny Road. Trim Road is also identified as a widened arterial roadway from Millennium Boulevard to Brian Coburn Boulevard under the Network Concept.

The Blackburn Hamlet Bypass and Brian Coburn Boulevard extensions will provide a major parallel arterial route south of Innes Road, and may provide some relief to the eastbound/westbound through traffic volumes on Innes Road.

The Affordable Rapid Transit and Transit Priority (RTTP) Network identifies Innes Road and Brian Coburn Boulevard west of Tenth Line Road as Transit Priority Corridors with Isolated Measures. Transit signal priority and queue jump lanes will be implemented at select intersections. Peak period bus lanes and transit signal priority are identified for the Blackburn Hamlet Bypass between Innes Road and Brian Coburn Boulevard, which may include the repurposing of general purpose lanes. The RTTP 2031 Network Concept identifies at-grade crossings throughout the study area for the Cumberland Transitway, with an underpass at Trim Road. A corridor for the proposed transitway has been reserved by the City of Ottawa. Grade separated crossings are identified between Blair Station and Tenth Line Road.

The 2013 Ottawa Cycling Plan does not identify any projects within the study area. Construction of the Trans-Orléans Pathway is designated as a Community Connectivity initiative, projects which complement the Ottawa Cycling Plan.

A Transportation Overview was completed by IBI Group in August 2017 for a proposed retirement residence located at 5157 Innes Road (northwest corner of Innes Road/Trim Road). The trips generated by this development are accounted for in the forecasting and analysis sections of this TIA. No other development applications are noted on the City's Development Application search tool.

### 4.3 Study Area and Time Periods

The study area for this report will include Innes Road, Trim Road, Portobello Boulevard, Provence Avenue, Aquaview Drive, Nantes Street, Montmere Avenue, Plainhill Drive, Salzburg Drive, and Millennium Boulevard. The study area includes the signalized intersections at Innes Road/Provence Avenue and Innes Road/Trim Road, the roundabout at Trim Road/Millennium Boulevard, and the unsignalized intersections at Trim Road/Salzburg Drive, Trim Road/Montmere Avenue, Provence Avenue/Plainhill Drive, and Portobello Boulevard/Aquaview Drive/Nantes Street.

The selected time periods for the analysis are the weekday AM and PM peak hours, as they represent the 'worst case' combination of site generated traffic and adjacent street traffic. The proposed development is expected to be completed with full occupancy by the year 2025. City staff has confirmed that analysis of the horizon year 2030 shall be waived. Therefore, this TIA will perform analysis for the weekday AM and PM peak periods in the buildout year 2025.

### 4.4 Exemptions Review

This module reviews possible exemptions from the final Transportation Impact Assessment, as outlined in the TIA guidelines. The applicable exemptions for this site are shown in Table 7.

Table 7: TIA Exemptions

| Module | Element | Exemption Criteria | Exemption Applies |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Design Review Component |  |  |  |
| 4.1 <br> Development Design | 4.1.2 <br> Circulation and Access | - Only required for site plans | Exempt |
|  | 4.1.3 <br> New Street Networks | - Only required for plans of subdivision | Not Exempt |
| 4.2 <br> Parking | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { 4.2.1 } \\ \text { Parking } \\ \text { Supply } \end{array}$ | - Only required for site plans | Exempt |
|  | 4.2.2 Spillover Parking | - Only required for site plans where parking supply is $15 \%$ below unconstrained demand | Exempt |
| Network Impact Component |  |  |  |
| 4.5 <br> Transportation Demand Management | All elements | - Not required for non-residential site plans expected to have fewer than 60 employees and/or students on location at any given time | Not Exempt |
| 4.6 <br> Neighbourhood Traffic Management | 4.6.1 <br> Adjacent Neighbourhoods | - Only required when the development relies on local or collector streets for access and total volumes exceed ATM capacity thresholds | Exempt |
| 4.8 <br> Network Concept | All elements | - Only required when proposed development generates more than 200 person-trips during the peak hour in excess of the equivalent volume permitted by the established zoning | Exempt |

The Neighbourhood Traffic Management module will not be reviewed, as the additional traffic generated by the proposed development is not anticipated to change the function of any local or collector roadways. The Network Concept module will not be reviewed, as the established zoning permits the proposed development.

Based on the foregoing, the following modules will be included in the TIA report:

- Module 4.1: Development Design
- Module 4.3: Boundary Streets
- Module 4.4: Access Design
- Module 4.5: Transportation Demand Management
- Module 4.7: Transit
- Module 4.9: Intersection Design


### 5.0 FORECASTING

### 5.1 Development-Generated Travel Demand

### 5.1.1 Trip Generation

Phases 1-5 of the proposed subdivision will include 535 dwellings, of which there will be 296 detached homes, 199 townhomes and 40 apartment units. Trips generated by these dwellings have been estimated using the relevant recommended rates outlined in the TRANS Trip Generation Manual. An additional sixth phase is planned as part of the proposed subdivision, but this will be filed under a separate Draft Plan of Subdivision application. This TIA report will account for this phase (which includes 55 detached homes, 68 townhomes and 230 apartment units) as background traffic.

The vehicle trip generation rates, taken from Table 6.3 of the TRANS report, correspond to either Single-Detached Dwellings, Townhouses, Low-Rise Apartments (1-2 floors), or Mid-Rise Apartment (3-10 floors), all in the Suburban Area (outside the greenbelt). The directional split between inbound and outbound trips are based on the blended splits presented in Table 3.17 of the report.

Estimates of the trips generated by all six phases of the proposed subdivision are summarized in Table 8.

The corresponding number of person trips generated by each phase of the proposed subdivision are based on the modal shares presented in Table 3.13 of the TRANS report. The estimated number of person trips generated by each phase is shown in Table 9.

Table 8: Proposed Residential Vehicle Trip Generation

| Land Use | TRANS Rate | Units | AM Peak (VPH) |  |  | PM Peak (VPH) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | IN | OUT | тот | IN | OUT | TOT |
| Phase 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-Detached Dwelling | AM: 0.70 PM: 0.90 | 35 units | 8 | 17 | 25 | 20 | 12 | 32 |
| Townhouse | AM: 0.54 PM: 0.71 | 24 units | 5 | 8 | 13 | 9 | 8 | 17 |
| Phase 1 Total |  |  | 13 | 25 | 38 | 29 | 20 | 49 |
| Phase 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-Detached Dwelling | AM: 0.70 <br> PM: 0.90 | 85 units | 17 | 43 | 60 | 48 | 29 | 77 |
| Townhouse | AM: 0.54 <br> PM: 0.71 | 90 units | 18 | 31 | 49 | 34 | 30 | 64 |
| Phase 2 Total |  |  | 35 | 74 | 109 | 82 | 59 | 141 |
| Phase 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-Detached Dwelling | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AM: } 0.70 \\ & \text { PM: } 0.90 \end{aligned}$ | 119 units | 24 | 59 | 83 | 66 | 41 | 107 |
| Townhouse | AM: 0.54 PM: 0.71 | 30 units | 6 | 10 | 16 | 11 | 10 | 21 |
| Phase 3 Total |  |  | 30 | 69 | 99 | 77 | 51 | 128 |


| Land Use | TRANS Rate | Units | AM Peak (VPH) |  |  | PM Peak (VPH) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | IN | out | тот | IN | out | тот |
| Phase 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-Detached Dwelling | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AM: } 0.70 \\ & \text { PM: } 0.90 \end{aligned}$ | 27 units | 6 | 13 | 19 | 15 | 9 | 24 |
| Townhouse | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AM: } 0.54 \\ & \mathrm{PM} \cdot \mathrm{n} 71 \end{aligned}$ | 27 units | 6 | 9 | 15 | 10 | 9 | 19 |
| Low-Rise Apartment | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AM: } 0.37 \\ & \text { PM: } 0.46 \end{aligned}$ | 40 units | 3 | 12 | 15 | 12 | 6 | 18 |
| Phase 4 Total |  |  | 15 | 34 | 49 | 37 | 24 | 61 |
| Phase 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-Detached Dwelling | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AM: } 0.70 \\ & \text { PM: } 0.90 \end{aligned}$ | 30 units | 6 | 15 | 21 | 17 | 10 | 27 |
| Townhouse | AM: 0.54 PM: 0.71 | 28 units | 6 | 9 | 15 | 11 | 9 | 20 |
| Phase 5 Total |  |  | 12 | 24 | 36 | 28 | 19 | 47 |
| Phases 1-5 Total |  |  | 105 | 226 | 331 | 253 | 173 | 426 |
| Phase 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-Detached Dwelling | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AM: } 0.70 \\ & \text { PM: } 0.90 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 55 units | 11 | 28 | 39 | 31 | 19 | 50 |
| Townhouse | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AM: } 0.54 \\ & \text { PM: } 0.71 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 68 units | 14 | 23 | 37 | 25 | 23 | 48 |
| Mid-Rise Apartment | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AM: } 0.29 \\ & \text { PM: } 0.37 \end{aligned}$ | 230 units | 16 | 51 | 67 | 53 | 32 | 85 |
| Phase 6 Total |  |  | 41 | 102 | 143 | 109 | 74 | 183 |

Table 9: Proposed Residential Person Trip Generation

| Land Use | TRANS Auto Share | AM Peak (PPH) |  |  | PM Peak (PPH) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | IN | OUT | TOT | IN | OUT | TOT |
| Phase 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-Detached Dwelling | AM: 55\% PM: 64\% | 13 | 32 | 45 | 31 | 19 | 50 |
| Townhouse | AM: 55\% PM: 61\% | 9 | 15 | 24 | 15 | 13 | 28 |
| Phase 1 Total |  | 22 | 47 | 69 | 46 | 32 | 78 |
| Phase 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-Detached Dwelling | AM: 55\% PM: 64\% | 31 | 77 | 108 | 74 | 46 | 120 |
| Townhouse | AM: 55\% PM: 61\% | 35 | 59 | 94 | 55 | 48 | 103 |
| Phase 2 Total |  | 66 | 136 | 202 | 129 | 94 | 223 |
| Phase 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-Detached Dwelling | AM: 55\% PM: 64\% | 44 | 107 | 151 | 104 | 63 | 167 |
| Townhouse | AM: 55\% PM: 61\% | 11 | 18 | 29 | 18 | 16 | 34 |
|  | Phase 3 Total | 55 | 125 | 180 | 122 | 79 | 201 |


| Land Use | TRANS Auto Share | AM Peak (PPH) |  |  | PM Peak (PPH) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | IN | OUT | TOT | IN | OUT | TOT |
| Phase 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-Detached Dwelling | AM: 55\% PM: 64\% | 10 | 25 | 35 | 24 | 14 | 38 |
| Townhouse | AM: 55\% PM: 61\% | 11 | 18 | 29 | 16 | 15 | 31 |
| Low-Rise Apartment | AM: 44\% PM: 44\% | 7 | 27 | 34 | 26 | 15 | 41 |
|  | Phase 4 Total | 28 | 70 | 98 | 66 | 44 | 110 |
| Phase 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-Detached Dwelling | AM: 55\% PM: 64\% | 11 | 27 | 38 | 26 | 16 | 42 |
| Townhouse | AM: 55\% PM: 61\% | 10 | 17 | 27 | 17 | 16 | 33 |
|  | Phase 5 Total | 21 | 44 | 65 | 43 | 32 | 75 |
|  | Phases 1-5 Total | 192 | 422 | 614 | 406 | 281 | 687 |
| Phase 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single-Detached Dwelling | AM: 55\% PM: 64\% | 21 | 50 | 71 | 48 | 30 | 78 |
| Townhouse | AM: 55\% PM: 61\% | 25 | 42 | 67 | 42 | 37 | 79 |
| Mid-Rise Apartment | AM: 44\% PM: 44\% | 36 | 116 | 152 | 120 | 73 | 193 |
|  | Phase 6 Total | 82 | 208 | 290 | 210 | 140 | 350 |

From the previous table, Phases 1-5 of the proposed subdivision are projected to generate 614 person trips during the AM peak period and 687 person trips during the PM peak period. Phase 6 of the proposed subdivision is projected to generate 290 person trips during the AM peak period and 350 person trips during the PM peak period.

The modal shares for the proposed subdivision are assumed to be consistent with the modal shares outlined in the 2011 TRANS O-D Survey Report, specific to the Orléans region. While the subject site is adjacent to the boundary between the Orléans and Rural East regions, the modal shares outlined for the Orléans region are anticipated to be consistent due to the subject site's proximity to the Millennium Park and Ride. The modal share values applied to the proposed dwellings are based on all observed trips from/within Orléans in the AM peak hour, and all observed trips to/within Orléans in the PM peak hour.

A full breakdown of the projected person trips generated by modal share is shown in Table 10.

Table 10: Person Trips by Modal Share

| Travel Mode | Modal Share | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | IN | OUT | TOT | IN | OUT | TOT |
| Phase 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Person Trips |  | 22 | 47 | 69 | 46 | 32 | 78 |
| Auto Driver | 55\% | 12 | 27 | 39 | 26 | 17 | 43 |
| Auto Passenger | 15\% | 3 | 7 | 10 | 7 | 5 | 12 |
| Transit | 25\% | 6 | 11 | 17 | 11 | 8 | 19 |
| Non-Auto | 5\% | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Phase 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Person Trips |  | 66 | 136 | 202 | 129 | 94 | 223 |
| Auto Driver | 55\% | 36 | 75 | 111 | 71 | 52 | 123 |
| Auto Passenger | 15\% | 10 | 20 | 30 | 19 | 14 | 33 |
| Transit | 25\% | 17 | 34 | 51 | 32 | 23 | 55 |
| Non-Auto | 5\% | 3 | 7 | 10 | 7 | 5 | 12 |
| Phase 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Person Trips |  | 55 | 125 | 180 | 122 | 79 | 201 |
| Auto Driver | 55\% | 30 | 70 | 100 | 67 | 44 | 111 |
| Auto Passenger | 15\% | 8 | 18 | 26 | 18 | 12 | 30 |
| Transit | 25\% | 14 | 31 | 45 | 31 | 19 | 50 |
| Non-Auto | 5\% | 3 | 6 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 10 |
| Phase 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Person Trips |  | 28 | 70 | 98 | 66 | 44 | 110 |
| Auto Driver | 55\% | 16 | 38 | 54 | 36 | 25 | 61 |
| Auto Passenger | 15\% | 4 | 10 | 14 | 10 | 6 | 16 |
| Transit | 25\% | 7 | 18 | 25 | 17 | 11 | 28 |
| Non-Auto | 5\% | 1 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| Phase 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Person Trips |  | 21 | 44 | 65 | 43 | 32 | 75 |
| Auto Driver | 55\% | 12 | 25 | 37 | 24 | 17 | 41 |
| Auto Passenger | 15\% | 3 | 6 | 9 | 6 | 5 | 11 |
| Transit | 25\% | 5 | 11 | 16 | 11 | 8 | 19 |
| Non-Auto | 5\% | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Auto Driver (Total) |  | 106 | 235 | 341 | 224 | 155 | 379 |
| Auto Passenger (Total) |  | 28 | 61 | 89 | 60 | 42 | 102 |
| Transit (Total) |  | 49 | 105 | 154 | 102 | 69 | 171 |
| Non-Auto (Total) |  | 9 | 21 | 30 | 20 | 15 | 35 |
| Phase 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Person Trips |  | 82 | 208 | 290 | 210 | 140 | 350 |
| Auto Driver | 55\% | 46 | 116 | 162 | 116 | 76 | 192 |
| Auto Passenger | 15\% | 12 | 30 | 42 | 31 | 21 | 52 |
| Transit | 25\% | 20 | 52 | 72 | 52 | 36 | 88 |
| Non-Auto | 5\% | 4 | 10 | 14 | 11 | 7 | 18 |
| Auto Driver (Total) |  | 46 | 116 | 162 | 116 | 76 | 192 |
| Auto Passenger (Total) |  | 12 | 30 | 42 | 31 | 21 | 52 |
| Transit (Total) |  | 20 | 52 | 72 | 52 | 36 | 88 |
| Non-Auto (Total) |  | 4 | 10 | 14 | 11 | 7 | 18 |

From the previous table, Phases 1-5 of the proposed subdivision are projected to generate 341 vehicle trips during the AM peak period and 379 vehicle trips during the PM peak period. Phase 6 of the proposed subdivision is projected to generate 162 vehicle trips during the AM peak period and 192 vehicle trips during the PM peak period.

### 5.1.2 Trip Distribution

While a widening of Brian Coburn Boulevard (south of the study area) is identified in the TMP's ultimate road network, it is not identified in either the Affordable Network or the 2031 Network Concept. Therefore, the distribution of traffic generated by the proposed subdivision to the road network is assumed to be consistent with existing traffic patterns during the AM and PM peak periods. The trip distribution is as follows:

- 70\% north toward Innes Road, which is further distributed as follows:
- $25 \%$ to/from the north on Trim Road;
- $10 \%$ to/from the east on Innes Road;
- $35 \%$ to/from the west on Innes Road;
- $25 \%$ south toward Brian Coburn Boulevard, of which all traffic is assumed to come to/from the west on Brian Coburn Boulevard;
- 5\% east toward Millennium Boulevard.


### 5.1.3 Trip Assignment

Trips generated by the proposed subdivision have been assigned to the accesses based on access proximity and logical trip routing. For example, a vehicle trip originating from a property adjacent to the access on Provence Avenue is anticipated to use that access to travel north or south. However, that vehicle would use the access at Trim Road/Millennium Boulevard to travel east on Millennium Boulevard.

The assignment of generated trips to the proposed accesses are listed by phase below:

## Phase 1

- Accesses at Aquaview Drive: $100 \%$ of all trips.


## Phase 2

- Access at Salzburg Drive: $60 \%$ of trips to/from the north;
- Access at Trim Road/Millennium Boulevard: $40 \%$ of trips to/from the north, $100 \%$ of trips to/from the south, $100 \%$ of trips to/from the east.


## Phase 3

- Access at Salzburg Drive: $50 \%$ of trips to/from the north;
- Access at Provence Avenue: $50 \%$ of trips to/from the north, $75 \%$ of trips to/from the south;
- Access at Trim Road/Millennium Boulevard: $25 \%$ of trips to/from the south, $100 \%$ of trips to/from the east.


## Phase 4

- Access at Trim Road/Millennium Boulevard: $100 \%$ of all trips.


## Phase 5

- Access at Provence Avenue: $75 \%$ of trips to/from the north, $100 \%$ of trips to/from the south;
- Access at Trim Road/Millennium Boulevard: $25 \%$ of trips to/from the north, $100 \%$ of trips to/from the east.


## Phase 6 (background traffic)

- Access at Nantes Street: $80 \%$ of trips to/from the north, $80 \%$ of trips to/from the south;
- Access at Grapefern Terrace: 20\% of trips to/from the north, $20 \%$ of trips to/from the south, $100 \%$ of trips to/from the east.

Trips generated by Phases 1-5 of the proposed subdivision are shown in Figure 5. Trips generated by Phase 6 of the proposed subdivision are shown in Figure 6.

### 5.2 Background Traffic

### 5.2.1 General Background Growth Rate

A rate of background growth has been established through a review of the City of Ottawa's Strategic Long Range Model, comparing snapshots of 2011 and 2031 AM peak volumes, and the City's 2013 TMP. The snapshots indicate a growth rate of less than $1 \%$ on Innes Road and Portobello Boulevard, while growth rates on Trim Road and Provence Avenue were unrealistic. Section 2.3 of the TMP projects a 33\% growth in the population of the Orléans area between 2011 and 2031, which translates to an annual growth rate of approximately $1.4 \%$ per annum. A $1 \%$ annual growth rate has been assumed for the arterial and major collector roadways (Innes Road, Trim Road, Portobello Boulevard), which is consistent with the 2014 Transportation Brief for the Trim Road Works Yard. A $0 \%$ growth rate has been applied to all other roadways within the study area.

### 5.2.2 Other Area Developments

The projected traffic volumes generated by the proposed retirement residence at 5157 Innes Road has been added to the background traffic at all relevant intersections within the study area. Relevant excerpts of IBI Group's study for 5157 Innes Road are included in Appendix G.

Background volumes for the 2025 buildout year are shown in Figure 7. Total traffic volumes for the 2025 buildout year are shown in Figure 8.

Figure 5: Proposed Site-Generated Traffic, Phases 1-5


Figure 6: Proposed Site-Generated Traffic, Phase 6


Figure 7: 2025 Background Traffic


Figure 8: 2025 Total Traffic


### 6.0 ANALYSIS

### 6.1 Development Design

This section provides a review of the development design in terms of the road network, roadway cross-sections, and pedestrian crossing locations. A review of the City's Transportation Demand Management (TDM) - Supportive Development Design and Infrastructure Checklist is exempt from Draft Plan of Subdivision applications. A review of this TDM checklist will be conducted for the multiunit blocks within the proposed subdivision during the Site Plan Control process, if required. A copy of the concept plan is provided in Appendix A.

### 6.1.1 Road Network

A review of the new road network with respect to the initiatives identified in the City's Building Better and Smarter Suburbs (BBSS) report was completed. The proposed road network is consistent with the following BBSS initiatives:

- Design the street network as an integral part and extension of the municipal grid, taking into consideration its future adjustments and evolution;
- Ensure that a range of appropriate sized roadways complements the character and functional needs of each community area;
- Implement prescribed facilities from the 2013 Ottawa Pedestrian Plan and 2013 Ottawa Cycling Plan with development;
- Avoid reverse frontage lots (rear yards abutting public streets) within a community;
- Encourage representation from OC Transpo at pre-consultation meeting for plans of subdivision, in order to incorporate transit planning into initial subdivision design.

The Transportation Association of Canada (TAC) Geometric Design Guide for Canadian Roads stipulates that the minimum desired distance between two T-intersections is 60 m along a collector roadway and 40 m along a local roadway. Additionally, the minimum desired distance between a fourway intersection and the adjacent intersection is 60 m along local roadways. The proposed intersections on-site are therefore considered to be appropriately spaced from each other and adjacent intersections (with a minimum separation of approximately 60 m , measured centre-tocentre).

### 6.1.2 Roadway Cross-Sections

ROW widths of 18 m are proposed for all internal streets, with the exception of two streets. A ROW width of 22 m is proposed for Street No. 1, which allows it to function as a collector roadway and accommodate transit. Street No. 1 will run east-west between Provence Avenue and Trim Road at Millennium Boulevard. A ROW width of 20 m is proposed for Street No. 2, which ties into Salzburg Drive, an existing local roadway with a ROW width of 20 m . Street No. 2 will run north-south between Salzburg Drive and Street No. 1.

The proposed road width for all internal streets except Street No. 1 is 8.5 m , which can accommodate a travel lane in each direction and parking on one side of the roadway. The proposed road width of Street No. 1 is 11 m , which can accommodate a travel lane and a parking lane in each direction. These road widths are sufficient given the context of the proposed development, a low-speed residential neighbourhood with limited opportunity for cut-through traffic. All roadways within the
proposed subdivision are anticipated to be local roadways with the exception of Street No. 1, which is anticipated to act as a collector roadway.
1.8 m concrete sidewalks are proposed on both sides of Street No. 1, the west side of Street No. 2 (which will tie into the existing sidewalk on Salzburg Drive), the west side of Street No. 3, and the outside of Street No. 8/Street No. 9. A 1.8 m asphalt pathway is proposed on Street No. 5 , which will connect the proposed subdivision to the Trans-Orléans Pathway.

### 6.1.3 Pedestrian Crossovers

The Ontario Traffic Manual (OTM) - Book 15 identifies the following criteria for the consideration of a pedestrian crossover (PXO):

- If the total 8 -hour pedestrian volume crossing the main road is greater than 100 and the total 8 -hour vehicular volume is greater than 750 vehicles; or
- If the crossing location provides system connectivity or is on a desired pedestrian line.

Based on the City's expansion factors for vehicular volumes, the 8 -hour two-way vehicular volume on Street No. 1 is projected to exceed 750 vehicles. While the 8 -hour pedestrian volume crossing Street No. 1 is anticipated to be less than 100 pedestrians, there is a clear desired pedestrian line crossing Street No. 1 at Street No. 2, as transit service will be provided on Street No. 1. This intersection is not within 200 m of a signal-protected pedestrian crossing.

Street No. 1 is assumed to have a speed limit of $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$, and the proposed cross-section of the roadway includes two lanes. With a two-way vehicular volume between 750 vehicles and 2,250 vehicles, the corresponding PXO recommended by the Pedestrian Crossover Selection Matrix shown in OTM Book 15 is a PXO D. Therefore, a PXO D is recommended at the west approach of Street No. 1/Street No. 2.

An illustration from OTM Book 15 of the required PXO D components for a two-way intersection is shown in Figure 9. The PXO selection matrix presented in OTM Book 15 is included in Table 11.

Figure 9: PXO D (Intersection, 2-way)


Table 11: Pedestrian Crossover Selection Matrix

| Two-way Vehicular Volume |  | Total Number of Lanes for the Roadway <br> Cross Section' |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |



| 8 Hour | 750 | 2,250 | 550 | PXO D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 Hour | 395 | 1,185 |  |  |
| 8 Hour | 750 | 2,250 | 60 | PXO C |
| 4 Hour | 395 | 1,185 |  |  |
| 8 Hour | 2,250 | 4,500 |  |  |


| 8 Hour | 2,250 | 4,500 | $\leq 50$ | PXO D | PXO B | PXO D2 | PXO B |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 Hour | 1,185 | 2,370 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 Hour | 2,250 | 4,500 | 60 | PXO C | PXO B | PXO C ${ }^{2}$ | PXO B |
| 4 Hour | 1,185 | 2,370 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 Hour | 4,500 | 6,000 | s50 | PXO C | PXO B | PXO C ${ }^{2}$ | PXO B |
| 4 Hour | 2,370 | 3,155 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 Hour | 4,500 | 6,000 | 60 | PXO B | PXO B | PXO C ${ }^{2}$ | PXO B |
| 4 Hour | 2,370 | 3,155 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 Hour | 6,000 | 7.500 | s50 | PXO B | PXO B | PXO C ${ }^{2}$ | PXOA |
| 4 Hour | 3,155 | 3,950 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 Hour | 6,000 | 7,500 | 60 | PXO B | PXO B |  |  |
| 4 Hour | 3,155 | 3,950 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 Hour | 7,500 | 17,500 | s50 | PXO B | PXO B |  |  |
| 4 Hour | 3,950 | 9,215 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 Hour | 7,500 | 17,500 | 60 | PXO B |  |  |  |
| 4 Hour | 3,950 | 9,215 |  |  |  |  |  |

### 6.2 Boundary Streets

This section provides a review of the boundary streets using complete streets principles. The MultiModal Level of Service (MMLOS) guidelines produced by IBI Group in October 2015 were used to evaluate the levels of service for the boundary roadways for each mode of transportation. Schedule B of the City of Ottawa's Official Plan identifies all boundary streets as being within the General Urban Area land use designation. Virtually all of the proposed subdivision falls under the policy areas 'Within 300 m of a school' or 'Within 600 m of a rapid transit station,' both of which have identical

MMLOS targets. As these targets are more stringent, they have been used to evaluate the MMLOS of all boundary roadways.

Targets for PLOS, BLOS, TLOS, TkLOS, and Auto LOS for the boundary streets adhere to those outlined in Exhibit 22 of the MMLOS guidelines. The boundary streets review evaluates the MMLOS for all boundary roadways based on existing conditions.

### 6.2.1 Pedestrian Level of Service (PLOS)

Exhibit 4 of the MMLOS guidelines has been used to evaluate the segment PLOS of the boundary roadways. Exhibit 22 of the MMLOS guidelines suggest a target PLOS A for all roadways within 300 m of a school (Portobello Boulevard, Provence Avenue, and Aquaview Drive) or 600 m of a rapid transit station (Trim Road and Salzburg Drive). The results of the segment PLOS analysis are summarized in Table 12.

Table 12: PLOS Segment Analysis

| Sidewalk Width | Boulevard Width | Avg. Daily Curb Lane Traffic Volume | Presence of On-Street Parking | Operating Speed ${ }^{(1)}$ | Segment PLOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Trim Road (east side) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\geq 2.0 \mathrm{~m}$ | 0.5 to 2.0m | $\leq 3000 \mathrm{vpd}$ | No | $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | B |
| Trim Road (west side) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\geq 2.0 \mathrm{~m}$ | $\geq 2.0 \mathrm{~m}$ | $\leq 3000 \mathrm{vpd}$ | No | $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | B |
| Portobello Boulevard (east side) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\geq 2.0 \mathrm{~m}$ | Om | $\leq 3000 \mathrm{vpd}$ | No | $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | B |
| Portobello Boulevard (west side) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.5 m | $\geq 2.0 \mathrm{~m}$ | $\leq 3000 \mathrm{vpd}$ | No | $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | C |
| Provence Avenue (east side) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\geq 2.0 \mathrm{~m}$ | $\geq 2.0 \mathrm{~m}$ | $\leq 3000 \mathrm{vpd}$ | No | $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | A |
| Provence Avenue (west side) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\geq 2.0 \mathrm{~m}$ | $\geq 2.0 \mathrm{~m}$ | $\leq 3000 \mathrm{vpd}$ | No | $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | A |
| Aquaview Drive (north side) |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\geq 2.0 \mathrm{~m}$ | 0.5 to 2.0 m | $\leq 3000$ vpd | Yes | $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | A |
| Aquaview Drive (south side) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.5m | $\geq 2.0 \mathrm{~m}$ | $\leq 3000 \mathrm{vpd}$ | Yes | $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | C |
| Salzburg Drive (north side) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.8m | 0m | $\leq 3000 \mathrm{vpd}$ | Yes | $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | B |
| Salzburg Drive (south side) |  |  |  |  |  |
| No sid | walk | $\leq 3000 \mathrm{vpd}$ | Yes | $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | F |

1. Operating speed of Trim Road, Portobello Boulevard, Provence Avenue, and Aquaview Drive taken as the posted speed limit plus $10 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. The operating speed of Salzburg Drive is taken as the unposted regulatory speed limit, as it is currently a cul-de-sac.

### 6.2.2 Bicycle Level of Service (BLOS)

Exhibit 11 of the MMLOS guidelines has been used to evaluate the segment BLOS of the boundary roadways. Exhibit 22 of the MMLOS guidelines suggest a target BLOS B for Local Cycling Routes within 300m of a school (Provence Avenue, Portobello Boulevard, and Aquaview Drive), a target BLOS C for Spine Cycling Routes on arterial roadways within 600m of a rapid transit station (Trim

Road), and a target BLOS D for all roadways with no cycling designation 600m of a rapid transit station (Salzburg Drive). The results of the segment BLOS analysis are summarized in Table 13.

Table 13: BLOS Segment Analysis

| Road Class | Bike Route | Type of Bikeway | Bike Lane Width | Bike Lane Blockage | Travel Lanes | Centerline Type | Operating Speed | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Segment } \\ \text { BLOS } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Trim Road (Salzburg Drive to Montmere Avenue) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arterial | Spine Route | Bike Lane | $>1.8 \mathrm{~m}$ | Rare | 4 | Raised Median | $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | E |
| Portobello Boulevard (Scala Avenue to Aquaview Drive/Nantes Street) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Major Collector | Local Route | Bike Lane | 1.5-1.8m | Rare | 4 | Raised Median | $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | B |
| Provence Avenue (Scala Avenue to Grapefern Terrace) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Collector | Local Route | Mixed Traffic | - | - | 2 | Line Markings | $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | F |
| Aquaview Drive (Clermont Crescent to Portobello Boulevard) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Collector | Local Route | Multi-Use Pathway | - | - | - | - | - | A |
| Salzburg Drive (west of Trim Road) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Local | No Class | Mixed Traffic | - | - | 2 | No Markings | $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | B |

### 6.2.3 Transit Level of Service (TLOS)

Exhibit 15 of the MMLOS guidelines has been used to evaluate the segment TLOS of the boundary roadways. Exhibit 22 of the MMLOS guidelines suggest a target TLOS D for Transit Priority Corridors with Isolated Measures within 600m of a rapid transit station (Trim Road). No other boundary streets have TLOS targets, however Portobello Boulevard and Provence Avenue have been evaluated, as Portobello Boulevard currently serves transit, and Provence Avenue is anticipated to begin serving transit as the proposed subdivision develops. Aquaview Drive and Salzburg Drive have not been evaluated for TLOS. The results of the segment TLOS analysis are summarized in Table 14.

Table 14: TLOS Segment Analysis

| Facility Type | Level/Exposure to Congestion Delay, Friction and Incidents |  |  | Segment TLOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Congestion | Friction | Incident Potential |  |
| Trim Road (Salzburg Drive to Montmere Avenue) |  |  |  |  |
| Mixed Traffic - Limited Parking/Driveway Friction | Yes | Low | Medium | D |
| Portobello Boulevard (Scala Avenue to Aquaview Drive/Nantes Street) |  |  |  |  |
| Mixed Traffic - Limited Parking/Driveway Friction | Yes | Low | Medium | D |
| Provence Avenue (Scala Avenue to Grapefern Terrace) |  |  |  |  |
| Mixed Traffic - Limited Parking/Driveway Friction | Yes | Low | Medium | D |

### 6.2.4 Truck Level of Service (TkLOS)

Exhibit 20 of the MMLOS guidelines has been used to evaluate the segment TkLOS of the boundary roadways. Exhibit 22 of the MMLOS guidelines suggests a target TkLOS D for truck routes within 600 m of a rapid transit station (Trim Road). No other boundary streets have TkLOS targets, and have not been evaluated. The results of the segment TkLOS analysis are summarized in Table 15.

Table 15: TkLOS Segment Analysis

| Curb Lane Width | Number of Travel Lanes Per Direction | Segment TkLOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Trim Road (Salzburg Drive to Montmere Avenue) |  |  |
| 3.3 m to 3.5 m | 2 | A |

### 6.2.5 Vehicular Level of Service (Auto LOS)

Exhibit 22 of the MMLOS guidelines suggest a target Auto LOS E for all roadways within 300m of a school or 600 m of a rapid transit station. The typical lane capacity along the study area roadways are based on the City's guidelines for the TRANS Long-Range Transportation Model. The lane capacity along the boundary streets has been estimated based on roadway classification and general characteristics (i.e. suburban with limited access, urban with on-street parking, etc.). The results of the Auto LOS analysis are summarized in Table 16.

Table 16: Auto LOS Segment Analysis

| Direction | Directional Capacity | Traffic Volumes |  | V/C Ratio and LOS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM Peak | PM Peak | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
|  |  |  |  | V/C | LOS | V/C | LOS |
| Trim Road (Salzburg Drive to Montmere Avenue) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Northbound | 2400 vph | 286 | 308 | 0.12 | A | 0.13 | A |
| Southbound | 2400 vph | 342 | 421 | 0.14 | A | 0.18 | A |
| Portobello Boulevard (Scala Avenue to Aquaview Drive/Nantes Street) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Northbound | 1200 vph | 174 | 146 | 0.15 | A | 0.12 | A |
| Southbound | 1200 vph | 208 | 270 | 0.17 | A | 0.23 | A |
| Provence Avenue (Scala Avenue to Grapefern Terrace) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Northbound | 600 vph | 69 | 43 | 0.12 | A | 0.07 | A |
| Southbound | 600 vph | 59 | 57 | 0.10 | A | 0.10 | A |
| Aquaview Drive (Clermont Crescent to Portobello Boulevard) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | 600 vph | 95 | 68 | 0.16 | A | 0.11 | A |
| Westbound | 600 vph | 90 | 61 | 0.15 | A | 0.10 | A |
| Salzburg Drive (west of Trim Road) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Eastbound | 400 vph | 12 | 11 | 0.03 | A | 0.03 | A |
| Westbound | 400 vph | 8 | 12 | 0.02 | A | 0.03 | A |

### 6.2.6 Segment MMLOS Summary

A summary of the results of the segment MMLOS analysis for the boundary roadways are provided in Table 17.

Table 17: Segment MMLOS Summary

|  | Segment | Trim Road | Portobello <br> Boulevard | Provence Avenue | Aquaview Drive | Salzburg Drive |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sidewalk Width | $\geq 2.0 \mathrm{~m}$ | 1.5m | $\geq 2.0 \mathrm{~m}$ | 1.5m | 0m |
|  | Boulevard Width | 0.5 to 2.0 m | $\geq 2.0 \mathrm{~m}$ | $\geq 2.0 \mathrm{~m}$ | $\geq 2.0 \mathrm{~m}$ | - |
|  | Average Daily Curb Lane Traffic Volume | $<3000$ vpd | $<3000 \mathrm{vpd}$ | $<3000 \mathrm{vpd}$ | <3000 vpd | <3000 vpd |
|  | On-Street Parking | No | No | No | Yes | Yes |
|  | Operating Speed | $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ |
|  | Level of Service | B | C | A | C | F |
|  | Target | A | A | A | A | A |
| $\frac{\frac{\rightharpoonup}{\omega}}{\stackrel{\omega}{0}}$ | Road Classification | Arterial | Major Collector | Collector | Collector | Local |
|  | Bike Route Classification | Spine Route | Local Route | Local Route | Local Route | No Class |
|  | Type of Bikeway | Bike Lane | Bike Lane | Mixed Traffic | Multi-Use Path | Mixed Traffic |
|  | Bike Lane Width | >1.8m | 1.5 to 1.8 m | - | - | - |
|  | Bike Lane Blockage | Rare | Rare | - | - | - |
|  | Travel Lanes | 4 | 4 | 2 | - | 2 |
|  | Centerline Type | Raised Median | Raised Median | Line Markings | - | No Markings |
|  | Operating Speed | $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | - | $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ |
|  | Level of Service | E | B | F | A | B |
|  | Target | C | B | B | B | D |
|  | Facility Type | Mixed Traffic | Mixed Traffic | Mixed Traffic | - | - |
|  | Friction/Congestion/Incident Potential | Limited | Limited | Limited | - | - |
|  | Level of Service | D | D | D | - | - |
|  | Target | D | - | - | - | - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 들 } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \end{aligned}$ | Lane Width | 3.3 to 3.5 m | - | - | - | - |
|  | Travel Lanes (per direction) | 2 | - | - | - | - |
|  | Level of Service | A | - | - | - | - |
|  | Target | D | - | - | - | - |
| $\frac{0}{3}$ | Level of Service | A | A | A | A | A |
|  | Target | E | E | E | E | E |

The results of the segment MMLOS analysis can be summarized as follows:

- Only Provence Avenue meets the target pedestrian level of service (PLOS), while Trim Road, Portobello Boulevard, Aquaview Drive, and Salzburg Drive do not;
- Portobello Boulevard, Aquaview Drive, and Salzburg Drive meet the target bicycle level of service (BLOS), while Trim Road and Provence Avenue do not;
- As the only roadway with a target, Trim Road meets the target transit level of service (TLOS);
- As the only roadway with a target, Trim Road meets the target truck level of service (TkLOS);
- All roadways meet the target vehicular level of service (Auto LOS).


## Pedestrian Level of Service

Trim Road currently achieves a PLOS B. This is attributable to the operating speed of $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. Per Exhibit 4 of the MMLOS guidelines, a PLOS A can only be achieved with a reduction in the operating speed to $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$, which is not desirable given Trim Road is an arterial roadway. As such, no recommendations are made for improving the PLOS for Trim Road.

Portobello Boulevard currently achieves a PLOS B on the east side and a PLOS C on the west side. Per Exhibit 4 of the MMLOS guidelines, a PLOS A can be achieved by providing either:
a) A minimum sidewalk width of 1.8 m and a minimum sidewalk boulevard width of 2.0 m , or;
b) A minimum sidewalk width of 2.0 m and a minimum sidewalk boulevard width of 0.5 m .

No modifications are recommended, as the existing cross-section met the current City standard when Portobello Boulevard was widened approximately 10 years ago.

Aquaview Drive currently achieves a PLOS C on the south side and a PLOS A on the north side. Per Exhibit 4 of the MMLOS guidelines, the south side of Aquaview Drive can achieve a PLOS A by widening the sidewalk to 1.8 m and maintaining a sidewalk boulevard width of at least 2.0 m . However, due to the location of street light poles, it does not appear that there is sufficient room to widen the sidewalk by 0.3 m . Given the acceptable PLOS on the north side of Aquaview Drive, no modifications are recommended.

Salzburg Drive currently achieves a PLOS E on the north side and a PLOS F on the south side. Per Exhibit 4 of the MMLOS guidelines, Salzburg Drive can achieve a PLOS A by implementing sidewalks with a minimum width of 2.0 m and a minimum boulevard width of 0.5 m . However, the existing cross-section meets the current City standards, and therefore no modifications are recommended.

## Bicycle Level of Service

Trim Road currently achieves a BLOS E. This is attributable to the operating speed of $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. Per Exhibit 11 of the MMLOS guidelines, a BLOS C can only be achieved with a reduction in the operating speed to $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. An existing multi-use pathway is provided on the east side of Trim Road, north of Millennium Boulevard. The Ontario Traffic Manual - Book 18 describes the desirable cycling facility for a roadway, given the roadway's average annual daily traffic and operating speed. Based on a curbside lane AADT of approximately 2,000 vehicles/day and an operating speed of $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$, the selection tool presented in OTM Book 18 suggests that bike lanes are appropriate. As noted above, a reduced operating speed on Trim Road is not considered desirable. For these reasons, no modifications are recommended.

Provence Avenue currently achieves a BLOS F. This is attributable to the operating speed of 60 $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h}$, and the requirement of cyclists to be in mixed traffic. For roadways with an AADT of
approximately 1,000 vehicles/day and an operating speed of $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$, the Ontario Traffic Manual states that a 'shared roadway' is appropriate. Therefore, no modifications are recommended. The selection tool used in OTM Book 18 to describe the desirable cycling facility is shown in Figure 10.

Figure 10: Desirable Cycling Facility Pre-Selection Nomograph


Footnotes: - This nomograph is the finst of a three step bicysle facility selection process., and sivodd not be used by itself as the justification for facisty selection (see Steps 2 and 3) The nomograph simply helos practitioners preselect a desirable cycline faccity type. however the conteat of the stuation governs the firal decision.
The nomograph has been adrpted for the Nerth American cornect and is based on international examples and research for two lane roadeagk. It is. however, stil apolicable for muiti-lane roadways. For these stuations, designers shoukd consider he oocrating spood, total combincd traffic volume and traffic mex of the vehicles travsling in the lanes immediacely adjacort to the cycing facilties:

Censider a Separated Facitity of an Alternate Roadd for roadways with an AAOT Ereater than 15,000 vehicies and an operating speed of Erester Uhen $50 \mathrm{krr} / \mathrm{h}$.
For rural and suburban locations this nomog aph assumes good siditlines are provided for all road users. In uban areas, there are typicaly more frequent confict points af driveways, midblock crossings and intersections lespecislly on mukHane foads), as wel Ss on road Bedments whth on street parking This needs to be considered when assessing nisk expos, facaity type.

### 6.3 Access Intersections Design

Phase 1 of the proposed subdivision will be served by two unsignalized all-movement accesses at Aquaview Drive, approximately 60 m and 140 m west of Portobello Boulevard. These distances are consistent with other accesses along Aquaview Drive. Phases 2-5 of the proposed subdivision will be served by three accesses: an unsignalized access at Provence Avenue (approximately 500 m south of Innes Road), a tie-in to Salzburg Drive, and a tie-in to the roundabout at Trim Road/Millennium Boulevard. The accesses at Provence Avenue and Trim Road/Millennium Boulevard will be connected by Street No. 1.

The Ontario Traffic Manual - Book 5 identifies criteria for the implementation of all-way stop control. Based on OTM Book 5, all-way stop control at a three-legged intersection should be implemented if the total vehicle volumes on all approaches to an intersection exceed 350 vehicles during the peak hour and if the split does not exceed $75 \% / 25 \%$.

The City of Ottawa identifies its own criteria for the implementation of all-way stop control. Based on the City's criteria, all-way stop control for local or collector roadways is warranted if any of the following three criteria are met:

- Volume: Total vehicles on all approaches average more than 200 per hour over an 8 -hour weekday period, and the total minor street volume (including pedestrians) average more than 80 per hour over the same 8 -hour period;
- Collision: An average of three or more collisions have occurred over a three-year period (including only the collisions which are preventable by all-way stop control);
- Visibility: The sight distance from a point 2.7 m from the edge of the major street is less than 55 m to the left and 60 m to the right.

Of the proposed unsignalized intersections (Provence Avenue/Street No. 1 and the two accesses at Aquaview Drive/Street No. 10), none are anticipated to meet the OTM or City criteria for all-way stop control. Therefore, it is recommended that stop control be implemented on the minor approaches (Street No. 1 at Provence Avenue, and both accesses to Street No. 10 at Aquaview Drive).

The existing stop control on Salzburg Drive at Trim Road is anticipated to continue being acceptable with the additional traffic generated by the proposed subdivision, with respect to the all-way stop warrants. The performance of this intersection at full buildout is included in Section 6.6.3.

It is proposed that the access to Street No. 1 at Trim Road/Millennium Boulevard tie into the existing roundabout. Assuming similar approach geometry to the existing approach on Millennium Boulevard, the roundabout is anticipated to continue operating acceptably. The performance of this roundabout at full buildout is included in Section 6.6.3.

### 6.4 Transportation Demand Management

A review of the TDM Measures Checklist was conducted, and can be found in Appendix H.
The following measures will be implemented as the proposed subdivision is built:

- Designate an internal TDM program coordinator;
- Display local area maps with walking/cycling routes and key destinations (at sales centre);
- Display relevant transit schedules and route maps (at sales centre);
- Provide multimodal travel option information packages to new residents (at sales centre).

A review of the TDM Measures Checklist can also be conducted for the multi-unit blocks within the subdivision during the Site Plan Control application if required.

### 6.5 Transit

Based on the trip generation presented in Section 5.1.1, Phases 1-5 of the proposed subdivision are projected to generate 154 transit trips in the AM peak period and 171 transit trips in the PM peak period. Discussions with City staff confirmed that as the subdivision develops, OC Transpo will provide transit service on Provence Avenue and Street No. 1. It is anticipated that all transit trips generated by Phases 2-5 of the proposed subdivision will board or alight transit at these new stops. Transit trips generated by Phase 1 of the development are anticipated to board or alight transit at the existing stops at Portobello Boulevard/Aquaview Drive/Nantes Street. The transit trips are distributed as follows:

## Phase 1

- 17 passengers (11 boarding, 6 alighting) at stop \#6314 in the AM peak period;
- 19 passengers ( 8 boarding, 11 alighting) at stop \#1367 in the PM peak period.


## Phases 2-5

- 137 passengers (94 boarding, 43 alighting) at new stops along Provence Avenue and Street No. 1 in the AM peak period;
- 152 passengers (61 boarding, 91 alighting) at new stops along Provence Avenue and Street No. 1 in the PM peak period.

Based on the projected passenger volumes, no capacity problems are anticipated on the bus routes 33 and 233, which serve the stops adjacent to the proposed Phase 1 development. No capacity problems are anticipated as a result of transit trips generated by Phases 2-5 of the proposed subdivision, given the comments from City staff.

### 6.6 Intersection Design

### 6.6.1 Intersection MMLOS Analysis

This section provides a review of the study area intersection using complete streets principles. The MMLOS guidelines produced by IBI Group in October 2015 were used to evaluate the multi-modal levels of service for each signalized intersection. The vehicular level of service has been evaluated for the unsignalized intersections within the study area. The MMLOS targets associated with the policy areas 'Within 300 m of a school' or 'Within 600 m of a rapid transit station' have been used to evaluate the signalized intersections at Innes Road/Provence Avenue and Innes Road/Trim Road. The MMLOS targets associated with the 'General Urban Area' designation have been used to evaluate the signalized intersection at Innes Road/Trim Road.

The full intersection MMLOS analysis is included in Appendix I. A summary of the results is shown in Table 18.

Table 18: Intersection MMLOS Summary

| Intersection | PLOS |  | BLOS |  | TLOS |  | TkLOS |  | Auto LOS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Actual | Target | Actual | Target | Actual | Target | Actual | Target | Actual | Target |
| Innes Road/ Provence Avenue | F | A | F | A | D | D | E | D | C | E |
| Innes Road/ Trim Road | F | C | F | B | F | D | A | D | F | D |
| Trim Road/ Salzburg Drive | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | C | E |
| Trim Road/ Millennium Boulevard | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | A | E |
| Trim Road/ Montmere Avenue | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | B | E |
| Provence Avenue/ <br> Plainhill Drive | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | A | E |
| Portobello Boulevard/ Aquaview Drive/Nantes Street | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | A | E |

Based on the results of the intersection MMLOS analysis:

- Neither signalized intersection meets the target pedestrian level of service (PLOS);
- Neither signalized intersection meets the target bicycle level of service (BLOS);
- Among signalized intersections, only Innes Road/Provence Avenue meets the target transit level of service (TLOS);
- Among signalized intersections, only Innes Road/Trim Road meets the target truck level of service (TkLOS);
- Among all study area intersections, only Innes Road/Trim Road does not meet the target vehicular level of service (Auto LOS).

The following sections outline a further discussion for the intersections of Innes Road/Provence Avenue and Innes Road/Trim Road.

### 6.6.1.1 Innes Road/Provence Avenue

Innes Road/Provence Avenue does not meet the target PLOS A, BLOS A, or TkLOS D.
The target PLOS A is unachievable at all approaches. Each approach has a cross-section with widths equivalent to five lanes crossed or more, with no median refuge provided. There are limited opportunities to improve the current PLOS of each approach without reducing the number of travel lanes or restricting turn movements. While only the east and west approaches meet the City's vehicle/pedestrian conflict threshold for zebra-striped crosswalks (greater than 400,000 vehicle/pedestrian conflicts over an eight-hour period), implementing zebra-striped crosswalks at all approaches could be considered given the intersection is adjacent to a school. There is limited opportunity in improving the delay score for pedestrians without incurring major delays for vehicles.

All approaches do not meet the target BLOS A based on left turn characteristics, with the west approach also failing to meet the target based on right turn characteristics. Each approach requires cyclists to cross one or more lanes of traffic to perform a left turn, and the operating speeds of Innes Road and Provence Avenue are at least $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. For roadways with an AADT of more than 15,000 vehicles/day and an operating speed of $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$, the Ontario Traffic Manual states that a higher order cycling facility (such as cycle tracks) should be considered, which would result in a BLOS A. However, there is insufficient space for a separated bike facility. Based on Exhibit 8 of the MMLOS guidelines, shifting the pocket bike lane on Innes Road curbside would improve the level of traffic stress (LTS) for cyclists from LTS 3 to LTS 2. Exhibit 8 shows that LTS 2 corresponds to a BLOS B, the best possible level of service given the existing ROW of Innes Road. No other modifications have been recommended.

The east approach does not meet the target TkLOS D. Since Provence Avenue is not a truck route, this manoeuvre is not anticipated to occur with regularity, and therefore no recommendations are made to improve the TkLOS at this approach.

### 6.6.1.2 Innes Road/Trim Road

Innes Road/Trim Road does not meet the target PLOS C, BLOS B, TLOS D, or Auto LOS D.
The target PLOS C is unachievable at all approaches. Each approach has a divided cross-section with widths equivalent to nine lanes crossed or more, with no median refuge provided. There are limited opportunities to improve the current PLOS of each approach without reducing the number of
travel lanes or restricting turn movements. The north and west approaches meet the City's vehicle/pedestrian conflict threshold for zebra-striped crosswalks. Implementing these could be considered to improve the level of comfort for pedestrians. There is limited opportunity in improving the delay score for pedestrians without incurring major delays for vehicles.

All approaches do not meet the target BLOS B based on both left turn and right turn characteristics. Each approach requires cyclists to cross at least two lanes to perform a left turn, and the operating speeds of Innes Road and Trim Road are approximately $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. Additionally, the south approach makes use of dual left turn lanes. Without implementing higher order cycling facilities, the BLOS cannot be improved based on left turn characteristics. However, there is insufficient space on Innes Road to accommodate such modifications, and therefore no modifications have been recommended based on left turn characteristics.

With respect to right turn characteristics, all approaches implement pocket bike lanes with right turn lanes greater than 50 m , which translates to a BLOS D. As discussed with the previous intersection, shifting all pocket bike lanes curbside reduces the level of traffic stress to an LTS 2, per Exhibit 8 of the MMLOS guidelines. This level of traffic stress corresponds to a BLOS B, the best possible level of service given the existing ROW of Innes Road.

All approaches do not meet the target TLOS D. The 2013 TMP identifies that in the Affordable Network, transit signal priority and queue jump lanes will be implemented at select intersections with Innes Road between Blair Station and Millennium Station. These measures, provided they are implemented at all approaches of Innes Road/Trim Road will reduce delays and improve the TLOS significantly. Extensions of the Blackburn Hamlet Bypass and Brian Coburn Boulevard will provide alternate parallel routes for eastbound/westbound traffic, and may provide some relief to the current traffic volumes on Innes Road.

The southbound left turn and eastbound left turn movements do not meet the target Auto LOS D during the PM peak period. To meet the target, a reduction of 10 southbound left turning vehicles and 160 eastbound left turning vehicles is required (a reduction of approximately $50 \%$ ). As mentioned above, extensions of the Blackburn Hamlet Bypass and Brian Coburn Boulevard are anticipated to alleviate traffic volumes on Innes Road in the future.

Implementing dual left turn lanes for the eastbound approach would improve the eastbound left turn movement to an Auto LOS E, although there is insufficient space for road widenings on Innes Road and this would further deteriorate the intersection's PLOS and BLOS. To illustrate the effect of dual left turn lanes at this approach, an Auto LOS comparison between the existing intersection and a scenario where dual left turn lanes are implemented at the eastbound approach is presented in Table 19.

Additionally, the Synchro analysis identifies queueing that exceeds storage length for certain movements during the AM and PM peak periods. Based on $95^{\text {th }}$-percentile queue lengths, the westbound left turn movement exceeds the available storage length during the AM peak period, while the southbound left turn and eastbound left turn movements exceed the available storage length during the PM peak period. There is extremely limited opportunity in adjusting the signal timing at Innes Road/Trim Road to allow for longer protected left turn phases, as the minimum time required for pedestrians to cross is approximately equal to the amount of time allotted to the through movement phases.

Table 19: Innes Road/Trim Road - Existing Conditions vs Dual Left Turn Lane Mitigation

| Condition | Mvmt | AM Peak |  |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | v/c | LOS | $50^{\text {th }} \%$ Queue (m) | $95^{\text {th }} \%$ Queue (m) | v/c | LOS | $50^{\text {th }} \%$ Queue (m) | $95^{\text {th }} \%$ Queue (m) |
| Existing (Dual left turn lanes on NB approach only) | EBL | 0.65 | A | 24 | 43 | 1.83 | F | ~128 | \#193 |
| Mitigation (Dual left turn lanes on NB and EB approaches) | EBL | 0.39 | A | 11 | 21 | 0.94 | E | 44 | \#77 |

### 6.6.2 2025 Background Intersection Operations

Intersection capacity analysis has been completed for the 2025 background traffic conditions. The intersection parameters used in the analysis are consistent with the 2017 TIA Guidelines (Saturation Flow Rate: 1800 vphpl, Peak Hour Factor: 1.0). The results of the Synchro analysis for the AM and PM peak periods are summarized in Table 20. Approaches where queuing issues have been identified are listed with the associated $50^{\text {th }}$ - and $95^{\text {th }}$-percentile queue lengths in Table 21. Signal timing plans are included in Appendix J. Detailed reports are included in Appendix K.

Table 20: 2025 Background - Intersection Operations

| Intersection | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | v/c | LOS | Mvmt | v/c | LOS | Mvmt |
| Innes Road/ Provence Avenue | 0.63 | B | NBL | 0.43 | A | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { NBL/ } \\ & \text { NBT } \end{aligned}$ |
| Innes Road/ Trim Road | 0.76 | C | WBL | 1.81 | F | EBL |
| Trim Road/ Salzburg Drive ${ }^{(1)}$ | 14 sec | B | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { EBL/ } \\ & \text { EBR } \end{aligned}$ | 15 sec | B | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { EBL/ } \\ & \text { EBR } \end{aligned}$ |
| Trim Road/ Millennium Boulevard/Street No. $1^{(2),(3)}$ | 5 sec | A | SBT | 5 sec | A | WBT |
| Trim Road/ <br> Montmere Avenue ${ }^{(1)}$ | 13 sec | B | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { EBL/ } \\ & \text { EBR } \end{aligned}$ | 13 sec | B | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { EBL/ } \\ & \text { EBR } \end{aligned}$ |
| Provence Avenue/ Plainhill Drive ${ }^{(1)}$ | 8 sec | A | NBT | 7 sec | A | SBT |
| Portobello Boulevard/ Aquaview Drive/Nantes Street ${ }^{(1)}$ | 10 sec | A | WBT | 11 sec | B | SBL |
| Provence Avenue/ Street No. $1^{(1),(3)}$ | 9 sec | A | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { WBL/ } \\ & \text { WBR } \end{aligned}$ | 9 sec | A | WBL/ WBR |

1. Unsignalized intersection
2. Roundabout - results taken from Rodel analysis
3. Street No. 1 is included in the background analysis, as it is anticipated that some traffic generated by Phase 6 of the proposed subdivision (considered background traffic in this TIA) will use Street No. 1 to access Millennium Station

Table 21: 2025 Background - Queues Over Capacity

| Intersection | Mvmt | AM Peak |  |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | v/c | LOS | $50^{\text {th }} \%$ Queue (m) | $95^{\text {th }} \%$ Queue (m) | v/c | LOS | $50^{\text {th }} \%$ Queue (m) | 95 ${ }^{\text {th }} \%$ Queue (m) |
| Innes Road/ Trim Road | SBL | 0.46 | A | 13 | 30 | 0.91 | E | 44 | \#93 |
|  | EBL | 0.62 | B | 21 | 45 | 1.81 | F | $\sim 126$ | \#192 |
|  | WBL | 0.76 | C | 31 | \#75 | 0.50 | A | 16 | 31 |

\#: volume for the $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile cycle exceeds capacity
$\sim$ : approach is above capacity
Based on the previous tables, marginal changes to the v/c ratios, queue lengths, and delays are anticipated as a result of background growth within the study area. When compared to existing conditions, the 2025 background conditions for some movements appear to improve despite no reduction in traffic volumes. This can be attributed to differences in the Peak Hour Factor (set to 0.90 in existing conditions and 1.0 in future conditions, as per the TIA Guidelines).

### 6.6.3 2025 Total Intersection Operations

Intersection capacity analysis has been completed for the 2025 total traffic conditions. The intersection parameters used in the analysis are consistent with the 2017 TIA Guidelines (Saturation Flow Rate: 1800 vphpl, Peak Hour Factor: 1.0). The results of the Synchro analysis for the AM and PM peak periods are summarized in Table 22. Approaches where queuing issues have been identified are listed with the associated $50^{\text {th }}$ - and $95^{\text {th }}$-percentile queue lengths in Table 23. Signal timing plans are included in Appendix J. Detailed reports are included in Appendix K.

Table 22: 2025 Total - Intersection Operations

| Intersection | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | v/c | LOS | Mvmt | v/c | LOS | Mvmt |
| Innes Road/ Provence Avenue | 0.70 | B | NBL | 0.53 | A | NBL |
| Innes Road/ Trim Road | 0.80 | C | WBL | 1.86 | F | EBL |
| Trim Road/ Salzburg Drive ${ }^{(1)}$ | 19 sec | C | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EBL} / \\ & \mathrm{EBR} \end{aligned}$ | 21 sec | C | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EBL/ } \\ & \text { EBR } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Trim Road/ Millennium Boulevard/Street No. $1^{(2)}$ | 5 sec | A | SBT | 5 sec | A | WBT |
| Trim Road/ Montmere Avenue ${ }^{(1)}$ | 13 sec | B | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EBL/ } \\ & \text { EBR } \end{aligned}$ | 14 sec | B | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EBL/ } \\ & \text { EBR } \end{aligned}$ |
| Provence Avenue/ Plainhill Drive ${ }^{(1)}$ | 8 sec | A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NBT/ } \\ & \text { SBT } \end{aligned}$ | 8 sec | A | SBT |
| Portobello Boulevard/ Aquaview Drive/Nantes Street ${ }^{(1)}$ | 10 sec | A | WBT | 11 sec | B | SBL |
| Provence Avenue/ Street No. $1^{(1)}$ | 9 sec | A | WBL/ WBR | 9 sec | A | WBL/ WBR |

1. Unsignalized intersection
2. Roundabout - results taken from Rodel analysis

Table 23: 2025 Total - Queues Over Capacity

| Intersection | Mvmt | AM Peak |  |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | v/c | LOS | $50^{\text {th }} \%$ Queue (m) | $95^{\text {th }} \%$ Queue (m) | v/c | LOS | $50^{\text {th }} \%$ Queue (m) | 95 ${ }^{\text {th }} \%$ Queue (m) |
| Innes Road/ Trim Road | SBL | 0.46 | A | 14 | 30 | 0.93 | E | 45 | \#93 |
|  | EBL | 0.64 | A | 23 | 48 | 1.86 | F | ~129 | \#194 |
|  | WBL | 0.80 | C | 34 | \#80 | 0.57 | A | 20 | 38 |

\#: volume for the $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile cycle exceeds capacity
$\sim$ : approach is above capacity
Based on the previous tables, marginal increases to the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratios, queue lengths, and delays are anticipated as a result of the additional site traffic within the study area. The level of service at Trim Road/Salzburg Drive is projected to downgrade to an Auto LOS C in the AM peak period.

At Innes Road/Trim Road in the PM peak period, the southbound approach can achieve the Auto LOS D with a reduction of approximately 10 southbound left turning vehicles, and the eastbound approach can achieve the Auto LOS D with a reduction of approximately 180 eastbound left turning vehicles. These results are similar to the existing conditions. As noted in the analysis of the existing conditions, there is insufficient ROW for further widening on Innes Road, and this would further deteriorate the PLOS and BLOS.

The Ministry of Transportation of Ontario (MTO) Left Turn Lane Storage graphs and TAC/MTO warrants for right turn lanes were reviewed for the intersection of Provence Avenue/Street No. 1. No auxiliary turning lanes are recommended, as none are required.

### 7.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the foregoing, the conclusions and recommendations of this TIA can be summarized as follows:

## Forecasting

- Phases 1-5 of the proposed subdivision are projected to generate approximately 614 person trips during the AM peak period and 687 person trips during the PM peak period, which includes approximately 341 vehicle trips during the AM peak period and 379 vehicle trips during the PM peak period.


## Development Design

- With a minimum spacing of 60 m , all proposed intersections to/within the proposed subdivision are appropriately spaced from adjacent intersections, per the TAC Geometric Design Guide for Canadian Roads.
- Street No. 1 has a proposed ROW width of 22 m and a proposed roadway width of 11 m , which is sufficient for a travel lane and a parking lane in each direction. This is consistent for a collector roadway, and is sufficient to accommodate transit service.
- Street No. 2 has a proposed ROW width of 20 m and Streets No. 3 through 10 have a proposed ROW width of 18 m . All of these streets have a proposed roadway width of 8.5 m , which is sufficient for a travel lane in each direction and parking on one side of the roadway.

This is adequate given the context of the proposed development, a low-speed residential neighbourhood with limited opportunity for cut-through traffic.

- 1.8 m concrete sidewalks are proposed on both sides of Street No. 1, the west side of Streets No. 2 and 3, and the outside of Streets No. 8 and 9. A 1.8 asphalt pathway is proposed on Street No. 5, which will connect the proposed subdivision to the Trans-Orléans Pathway.
- A PXO D is recommended at the west approach of the Street No. $1 /$ Street No. 2 intersection.


## Boundary Streets

- The results of the segment MMLOS analysis can be summarized as follows:
- Only Provence Avenue meets the target pedestrian level of service (PLOS), while Trim Road, Portobello Boulevard, Aquaview Drive, and Salzburg Drive do not;
- Portobello Boulevard, Aquaview Drive, and Salzburg Drive meet the target bicycle level of service (BLOS), while Trim Road and Provence Avenue do not;
- As the only roadway with a target, Trim Road meets the target transit level of service (TLOS);
- As the only roadway with a target, Trim Road meets the target truck level of service (TkLOS);
- All roadways meet the target vehicular level of service (Auto LOS).
- The PLOS of Trim Road can only be improved to the target PLOS A with a reduction in the operating speed, which is not desirable given Trim Road is an arterial roadway. Therefore, no modifications are recommended.
- The PLOS of Portobello Boulevard can be improved to the target PLOS A by implementing a 0.5 m sidewalk boulevard while maintaining a 2.0 m -wide sidewalk on the east side, and implementing a 1.8 m -wide sidewalk while maintaining a 2.0 m sidewalk boulevard. As the existing cross-section meets the current City standards, no modifications are recommended.
- The PLOS of Aquaview Drive can be improved to the target PLOS A by implementing a $1.8 \mathrm{~m}-$ wide sidewalk while maintaining a 2.0 m sidewalk boulevard on the south side of the roadway. There appears to be limited space to widen the sidewalk due to the location of street light poles on the south side. Given the acceptable PLOS on the north side of Aquaview Drive, no modifications are recommended.
- The PLOS of Salzburg Drive can be improved to the target PLOS A by implementing sidewalks with a minimum width of 2.0 m and a minimum boulevard width of 0.5 m on both sides of the roadway. As the existing cross-section meets the current City standards, no modifications are recommended.
- The BLOS of Trim Road can be improved beyond the target BLOS C by implementing multiuse pathways on both sides of the roadway. Currently, a multi-use pathway is only provided on the east side of Trim Road, north of Millennium Boulevard. The Ontario Traffic Manual Book 18 identifies bike lanes as a suitable cycling facility, and a reduction in the operating speed is undesirable. Therefore, no modifications are recommended.
- The BLOS of Provence Avenue can only be improved to the target BLOS B by implementing a physically separated bikeway (such as a multi-use pathway). The Ontario Traffic Manual -

Book 18 identifies a shared roadway as suitable given the low traffic volumes. Therefore, no modifications are recommended.

## Access Intersections

- Phase 1 will be served by two unsignalized all-movement accesses at Aquaview Drive, approximately 60 m and 140 m west of Portobello Boulevard. Phases $2-5$ will be served by three accesses: an unsignalized access at Provence Avenue, a tie-in to Salzburg Drive, and a tie-in to the roundabout at Trim Road/Millennium Boulevard.
- Of the proposed unsignalized access intersections (Provence Avenue/Street No. 1 and the two accesses at Aquaview Drive/Street No. 10), none are anticipated to meet the OTM or City criteria for all-way stop control. Therefore, side street stop control is recommended for the approaches on Street No. 1 and Street No. 10.
- It is anticipated that all-way stop control will not be warranted for the intersection of Trim Road/Salzburg Drive at full buildout.
- It is proposed that the access to Street No. 1 tie into the existing roundabout at Trim Road/ Millennium Boulevard. Assuming similar approach geometry to the existing approach on Millennium Boulevard, the roundabout is anticipated to continue operating acceptably at full buildout.


## Transportation Demand Management

- The following TDM measures will be implemented as the proposed subdivision is built:
- Designate an internal TDM program coordinator;
- Display local area maps with walking/cycling routes and key destinations (at sales centre);
- Display relevant transit schedules and route maps (at sales centre);
- Provide multimodal travel option information packages to new residents (at sales centre).


## Transit

- Phases 1-5 of the proposed subdivision are projected to generate 154 transit trips during the AM peak period and 171 transit trips during the PM peak period.
- No capacity problems are anticipated on OC Transpo routes 33 and 233, which serve the stops adjacent to the proposed Phase 1 development.
- Discussions with City staff confirmed that as the subdivision develops, OC Transpo will provide transit service on Provence Avenue and Street No. 1. Therefore, no capacity problems are anticipated as a result of transit trips generated by Phases 2-5 of the development.


## Intersection Design

- Based on the results of the intersection MMLOS analysis:
- Neither signalized intersection meets the target pedestrian level of service (PLOS);
- Neither signalized intersection meets the target bicycle level of service (BLOS);
- Among signalized intersections, only Innes Road/Provence Avenue meets the target transit level of service (TLOS);
- Among signalized intersections, only Innes Road/Trim Road meets the target truck level of service (TkLOS);
- Among all study area intersections, only Innes Road/Trim Road does not meet the target vehicular level of service (Auto LOS).
- The PLOS of Innes Road/Provence Avenue cannot achieve the target PLOS at any approach without significantly reducing the number of lanes and restricting turning movements. While only the east and west approaches meet the City's vehicle/pedestrian conflict threshold for zebra-striped crosswalks (greater than 400,000 vehicle/pedestrian conflicts over an eighthour period), implementing zebra-striped crosswalks could be considered at all approaches given the intersection is adjacent to a school.
- The PLOS of Innes Road/Trim Road cannot achieve the target PLOS at any approach without significantly reducing the number of lanes and restricting turning movements. Implementing zebra-striped crosswalks could be considered at all approaches to improve the level of comfort for pedestrians.
- The BLOS of Innes Road/Provence Avenue can only improve to the target BLOS A with the implementation of two-stage left-turn bike boxes on all approaches and higher order (separated) cycling facilities. Given that there is insufficient space on Innes Road to accommodate separate cycling facilities, the only recommended modification is to shift the pocket bike lane on the west approach so that it is adjacent with the curb. Based on Exhibit 8 of the MMLOS guidelines, this will improve the level of service of the intersection to a BLOS $B$ based on right turn characteristics. No other modifications are recommended.
- The BLOS of Innes Road/Trim Road can only improve beyond the target BLOS B with the implementation of two-stage left-turn bike boxes and higher order (separated) cycling facilities on all approaches. Given that there is insufficient space on Innes Road to accommodate separate cycling facilities, the only recommended modification is to shift the pocket bike lanes on all approaches to be adjacent with the curb. Based on Exhibit 8 of the MMLOS guidelines, this will improve the level of service of the intersection to a BLOS B based on right turn characteristics. No other modifications are recommended.
- The TLOS of Innes Road/Trim Road can be achieved if transit signal priority and queue jump lanes are implemented at all approaches. The 2013 TMP identifies that in the Affordable Network, these measures will be implemented on Innes Road between Blair Station and Millennium Station. Extensions of the Blackburn Hamlet Bypass and Brian Coburn Boulevard will provide alternate parallel routes for eastbound/westbound traffic, and may provide some relief to the current traffic volumes on Innes Road.
- The TkLOS of Innes Road/Provence Avenue does not achieve the target TkLOS D at the east approach. Since Provence Avenue is not a truck route, this manoeuvre is not anticipated to occur with regularity, and therefore no recommendations have been made in improving the TkLOS for this approach.
- The Auto LOS of Innes Road/Trim Road does not achieve the target Auto LOS D during the PM peak period, due to the southbound left turn and eastbound left turn movements.
- The southbound left turn movement can meet the target with a reduction of 10 vehicles.
- The eastbound left turn movement requires a reduction of 160 vehicles to meet the target (a reduction of approximately $50 \%$ ), and there is insufficient space to implement a second left turn lane without further deteriorating the PLOS and BLOS .
- Under the 2025 background traffic conditions, there is anticipated traffic growth on Innes Road, Trim Road, and Portobello Boulevard. Compared to existing conditions, all intersections are anticipated to operate at approximately the same level of service.
- Under the 2025 total traffic conditions, all intersections are anticipated to operate at approximately the same level of service compared to background conditions. The intersection of Trim Road/Salzburg Drive is projected to downgrade to an Auto LOS C during the AM peak period. All accesses to the proposed subdivision are anticipated to perform acceptably.
- No auxiliary lanes are recommended at Provence Avenue/Street No. 1, as none are required.
- Phases 1-5 of the proposed subdivision are recommended from a transportation perspective. An additional study will be prepared in support of a separate draft plan application for Phase 6.
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## APPENDIX B

## TIA Screening Form

DILLON
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## City of Ottawa 2017 TIA Guidelines Screening Form

## 1. Description of Proposed Development

| Municipal Address | 2128 Trim Road (Legault Lands) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Description of Location | The approximately 27.7-hectare property is located: <br> - At the northwest corner of Portobello <br> Boulevard/Aquaview Drive/Nantes Street <br> South of Salzburg Drive, between Provence Avenue <br> and Trim Road |
| Single-family homes, townhomes and apartments |  |

If available, please attach a sketch of the development or site plan to this form.

## 2. Trip Generation Trigger

Considering the Development's Land Use type and Size (as filled out in the previous section), please refer to the Trip Generation Trigger checks below.

| Land Use Type | Minimum Development Size |
| :---: | :---: |
| Single-family homes | 40 units |
| Townhomes or apartments | 90 units |
| Office | $3,500 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| Industrial | $5,000 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| Fast-food restaurant or coffee shop | $100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| Destination retail | $1,000 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |
| Gas station or convenience market | $75 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |

* If the development has a land use type other than what is presented in the table above, estimates of person-trip generation may be made based on average trip generation characteristics represented in the current edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual.

If the proposed development size is greater than the sizes identified above, the Trip Generation Trigger is satisfied.

## 3. Location Triggers

|  | Yes | No |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Does the development propose a new driveway to a boundary street that |  |  |
| is designated as part of the City's Transit Priority, Rapid Transit or Spine | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Bicycle Networks? |  |  |
| Is the development in a Design Priority Area (DPA) or Transit-oriented |  |  |
| Development (TOD) zone?* |  |  |
| *DPA and TOD are identified in the City of Ottawa Official Plan (DPA in Section 2.5.1 and Schedules A and B; TOD in Annex 6). |  |  |
| See Chapter 4 for a list of City of Ottawa Planning and Engineering documents that support the completion of TIA). |  |  |

## If any of the above questions were answered with 'Yes,' the Location Trigger is satisfied.

## 4. Safety Triggers

|  | Yes | No |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Are posted speed limits on a boundary street are $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{hr}$ or greater? |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Are there any horizontal/vertical curvatures on a boundary street limits <br> sight lines at a proposed driveway? |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Is the proposed driveway within the area of influence of an adjacent <br> traffic signal or roundabout (i.e. within 300 m of intersection in rural <br> conditions, or within 150 m of intersection in urban/ suburban <br> conditions)? | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Is the proposed driveway within auxiliary lanes of an intersection? |  |  |
| Does the proposed driveway make use of an existing median break that <br> serves an existing site? |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Is there is a documented history of traffic operations or safety concerns <br> on the boundary streets within 500 m of the development? |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Does the development include a drive-thru facility? |  |  |

## If any of the above questions were answered with 'Yes,' the Safety Trigger is satisfied.

5. Summary

|  | Yes | No |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Does the development satisfy the Trip Generation Trigger? | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Does the development satisfy the Location Trigger? | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Does the development satisfy the Safety Trigger? | $\checkmark$ |  |

If none of the triggers are satisfied, the TIA Study is complete. If one or more of the triggers is satisfied, the TIA Study must continue into the next stage (Screening and Scoping).

## APPENDIX C

OC Transpo Route Maps

Monday to Friday / Lundi au vendredi Peak periods only
Périodes de pointe seulement


Effective / En vigueur Dec. 25 déc. 2016

Monday to Friday / Lundi au vendredi Peak periods only
Périodes de pointe seulement

$=\mathrm{O}=$ Transitway \& Station
■ாாாாா Peak periods / Périodes de pointe
"............ Off-peak periods / Périodes hors-pointe
Limited stops: Off only in AM / No stop in PM Arrêts limités : Débarquement en AM seulement / Aucun arrêt en PM
(P) Park \& Ride / Parc-o-bus
2017.12

Schedule / Horaire $\qquad$
Text / Texto $\qquad$ 560560
plus your four digit bus stop number / plus votre numéro d'arrêt à quatre chiffres
Customer Relations
Service à la clientèle

## Effective September 6, 2016

En vigueur 6 septembre 2016

## $C_{\text {Transpo }}$

FORMER / ANCIEN 20A \& 120


Monday to Friday / Lundi au vendredi
All day service
Service toute la journée

Information / Renseignement.............613-741-4390
Customer Relations
Service à la clientèle ..........................613-842-3600
Lost and Found / Objets perdus .........613-563-4011
Schedule / Horaire..............................613-560-1000
Text / Texto ......................................................560560
plus your four digit bus stop number / plus votre numéro d'arêet à quatre chiffres

Effective / En vigueur Dec. 25 déc. 2016

## 0 MILLENNIUM

7 days a week / 7 jours par semaine
All day service
Service toute la journée


Information / Renseignement. 613-741-4390
Customer Relations
Service à la clientèle .613-842-3600

Lost and Found / Objets perdus .........613-563-4011
Schedul / Horaire............................613-560-1000
Text/Texto
.560560
plus your four digit bus stop number / plus votre numéro d'arrêt à quatre chiffres

Effective / En vigueur Sept. 4 sept. 2016
613-741-4390 octranspo.com

7 days a week / 7 jours par semaine
No Saturday late evening service
Aucun service tard en soirée le samedi


Information
Renseignement .613-741-4390
Customer service
Service à la clientèle
613-842-3600
Lost and Found
Objets perdus. 613-563-4011
Schedule
Horaire
.613-560-1000
plus your four digit bus stop number / plus votre numéro d'arrêt à quatre chiffres
Effective / En vigueur Sept 6 sept 2009

## 613-741-4390 octranspo.com

## $135 \frac{\text { nace onamas }}{\text { scim }}$

7 days a week / $\mathbf{7}$ jours par semaine
All day service
Service toute la journée


Information / Renseignement .613-741-4390

Customer Relations
Service à la clientèle .613-842-3600

Lost and Found / Objets perdus .........613-563-4011
Schedule / Horaire .613-560-1000

Text / Texto
560560
plus your four digit bus stop number / plus votre numéro d'arrêt à quatre chiffres
Effective / En vigueur Dec. 25 déc. 2016

ALBERT / BAY
PORTOBELLO

## Connexion

Monday to Friday / Lundi au vendredi
Peak periods only
Périodes de pointe seulement

Transitway \& Station
Limited stops: Off only in AM / No stop in PM
Arrêts limités : Débarquement en AM seulement /
Aucun arrêt en PM
Park \& Ride / Parc-o-bus
2018.05
$\because$
Schedule / Horaire $\qquad$
Text / Texto $\qquad$ 560560
plus your four digit bus stop number / plus votre numéro d'arrêt à quatre chiffres
Customer Relations
Service à la clientèle
Lost and Found / Objets perdus...... 613-563-4011
Security / Sécurité
613-741-2478

## Effective December 25, 2016

En vigueur 25 décembre 2016

- Transpo

INFO 613-741-4390
octranspo.com






## APPENDIX D

## Traffic Count Data

## Turning Movement Count - Full Study Summary Report

## INNES RD @ PROVENCE AVE

Survey Date: Tuesday, May 09, 2017
Total Observed U-Turns
Northbound: $0 \quad$ Southbound: 0
Eastbound: 8 Westbound: 1
Full Study
PROVENCE AVE
INNES RD

|  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{array}{r} \text { NB } \\ \text { TOT } \end{array}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{array}{r} \text { SB } \\ \text { TOT } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{array}{r} \text { EB } \\ \text { TOT } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WB } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 07:00 08:00 | 195 | 40 | 103 | 338 | 29 | 78 | 117 | 224 | 562 | 32 | 263 | 102 | 397 | 117 | 634 | 20 | 771 | 1168 | 1730 |
| 08:00 09:00 | 78 | 19 | 54 | 151 | 39 | 20 | 113 | 172 | 323 | 41 | 337 | 48 | 426 | 66 | 530 | 20 | 616 | 1042 | 1365 |
| 09:00 10:00 | 66 | 19 | 65 | 150 | 10 | 16 | 49 | 75 | 225 | 16 | 308 | 27 | 351 | 41 | 394 | 15 | 450 | 801 | 1026 |
| 11:30 12:30 | 41 | 15 | 32 | 88 | 11 | 17 | 42 | 70 | 158 | 42 | 442 | 41 | 525 | 30 | 399 | 8 | 437 | 962 | 1120 |
| 12:30 13:30 | 45 | 15 | 39 | 99 | 18 | 13 | 39 | 70 | 169 | 40 | 466 | 40 | 546 | 54 | 370 | 19 | 443 | 989 | 1158 |
| 15:00 16:00 | 64 | 23 | 85 | 172 | 35 | 30 | 60 | 125 | 297 | 55 | 661 | 68 | 784 | 83 | 405 | 37 | 525 | 1309 | 1606 |
| 16:00 17:00 | 72 | 36 | 79 | 187 | 45 | 45 | 77 | 167 | 354 | 100 | 785 | 109 | 994 | 81 | 492 | 23 | 596 | 1590 | 1944 |
| 17:00 18:00 | 75 | 28 | 85 | 188 | 39 | 29 | 56 | 124 | 312 | 97 | 713 | 112 | 922 | 88 | 483 | 38 | 609 | 1531 | 1843 |
| Sub Total | 636 | 195 | 542 | 1373 | 226 | 248 | 553 | 1027 | 2400 | 423 | 3975 | 547 | 4945 | 560 | 3707 | 180 | 4447 | 9392 | 11792 |
| U Turns |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 8 |  |  |  | 1 | 9 | 9 |
| Total | 636 | 195 | 542 | 1373 | 226 | 248 | 553 | 1027 | 2400 | 423 | 3975 | 547 | 4953 | 560 | 3707 | 180 | 4448 | 9401 | 11801 |
| EQ 12Hr | 884 | 271 | 753 | 1908 | 314 | 345 | 769 | 1428 | 3336 | 588 | 5525 | 760 | 6885 | 778 | 5153 | 250 | 6183 | 13068 | 16404 |

Note: These values are calculated by multiplying the totals by the appropriate expansion factor. $\mathbf{1 . 3 9}$

| AVG 12 Hr | 796 | 244 | 678 | 1718 | 283 | 310 | 692 | 1285 | 3003 | 529 | 4973 | 684 | 6196 | 701 | 4637 | 225 | 5564 | 11760 | 14763 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Note: These volumes are calculated by multiplying the Equivalent 12 hr . totals by the AADT factor. . 90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG 24 Hr | 1042 | 320 | 888 | 2250 | 370 | 406 | 906 | 1683 | 3933 | 693 | 6514 | 896 | 8117 | 918 | 6075 | 295 | 7289 | 15406 | 19339 |

Note: These volumes are calculated by multiplying the Average Daily 12 hr. totals by 12 to 24 expansion factor. 1.31

## Comments:

Note: U-Turns provided for approach totals. Refer to 'U-Turn' Report for specific breakdown.

Turning Movement Count - Full Study Peak Hour Diagram

## INNES RD @ PROVENCE AVE

Survey Date: Tuesday, May 09, 2017
Start Time: 07:00

WO No:
37021
Device: Miovision


Comments

Turning Movement Count - Full Study Peak Hour Diagram

## INNES RD @ PROVENCE AVE

Survey Date: Tuesday, May 09, 2017
Start Time: 07:00

WO No:
37021
Device: Miovision


Comments

Transportation Services - Traffic Services
Turning Movement Count - Full Study Summary Report
INNES RD @ TRIM RD

| Survey Date: | Wednesday, August 19, 2015 | Total Observed U-Turns |  |  |  | AADT Factor |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Full Study
TRIM RD

|  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{gathered} \text { NB } \\ \text { TOT } \end{gathered}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{array}{r} \text { SB } \\ \text { TOT } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{array}{r} \text { EB } \\ \text { TOT } \end{array}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WB } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 07:00 08:00 | 171 | 288 | 16 | 475 | 72 | 333 | 80 | 485 | 960 | 126 | 167 | 74 | 367 | 59 | 219 | 30 | 308 | 675 | 1635 |
| 08:00 09:00 | 143 | 214 | 11 | 368 | 83 | 330 | 82 | 495 | 863 | 91 | 187 | 74 | 352 | 112 | 284 | 43 | 439 | 791 | 1654 |
| 09:00 10:00 | 91 | 164 | 54 | 309 | 103 | 406 | 104 | 613 | 922 | 94 | 124 | 80 | 298 | 121 | 218 | 36 | 375 | 673 | 1595 |
| 11:30 12:30 | 84 | 300 | 19 | 403 | 60 | 386 | 62 | 508 | 911 | 147 | 120 | 69 | 336 | 60 | 108 | 42 | 210 | 546 | 1457 |
| 12:30 13:30 | 42 | 239 | 39 | 320 | 83 | 452 | 109 | 644 | 964 | 154 | 120 | 48 | 322 | 39 | 105 | 45 | 189 | 511 | 1475 |
| 15:00 16:00 | 111 | 240 | 34 | 385 | 167 | 686 | 185 | 1038 | 1423 | 308 | 661 | 94 | 1063 | 63 | 306 | 41 | 410 | 1473 | 2896 |
| 16:00 17:00 | 105 | 237 | 32 | 374 | 123 | 594 | 124 | 841 | 1215 | 189 | 204 | 72 | 465 | 55 | 129 | 37 | 221 | 686 | 1901 |
| 17:00 18:00 | 36 | 299 | 34 | 369 | 238 | 699 | 152 | 1089 | 1458 | 302 | 253 | 126 | 681 | 28 | 98 | 20 | 146 | 827 | 2285 |
| Sub Total | 783 | 1981 | 239 | 3003 | 929 | 3886 | 898 | 5713 | 8716 | 1411 | 1836 | 637 | 3884 | 537 | 1467 | 294 | 2298 | 6182 | 14898 |
| U Turns |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 783 | 1981 | 239 | 3003 | 929 | 3886 | 898 | 5713 | 8716 | 1411 | 1836 | 637 | 3884 | 537 | 1467 | 294 | 2298 | 6182 | 14898 |
| EQ 12Hr | 1088 | 2754 | 332 | 4174 | 1291 | 5402 | 1248 | 7941 | 12115 | 1961 | 2552 | 885 | 5399 | 746 | 2039 | 409 | 3194 | 8593 | 20708 |

Note: These values are calculated by multiplying the totals by the appropriate expansion factor.
1.39

| AVG 12Hr | 980 | 2478 | 299 | 3757 | 1162 | 4861 | 1123 | 7147 | 10904 | 1765 | 2297 | 797 | 4859 | 672 | 1835 | 368 | 2875 | 7734 | 18638 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Note: These volumes are calculated by multiplying the Equivalent 12 hr . totals by the AADT factor. . 90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG 24Hr | 1283 | 3246 | 392 | 4921 | 1522 | 6368 | 1472 | 9363 | 14284 | 2312 | 3009 | 1044 | 6365 | 880 | 2404 | 482 | 3766 | 10131 | 24415 |

Note: These volumes are calculated by multiplying the Average Daily 12 hr . totals by 12 to 24 expansion factor. $\mathbf{1 . 3 1}$

## Comments:

Note: U-Turns provided for approach totals. Refer to 'U-Turn' Report for specific breakdown.

Survey Date: Wednesday, August 19, 2015
Start Time: 07:00

| WO No: | 35264 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Device: | Jamar |
|  | Technologies, <br> Inc |



Comments

Survey Date: Wednesday, August 19, 2015
Start Time: 07:00

| WO No: | 35264 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Device: | Jamar <br> Technologies, <br> Inc |



Comments

Survey Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017

Total Observed U-Turns
Northbound: 4 Southbound: 31
Eastbound: $0 \quad$ Westbound: 0

AADT Factor
1.00

## Full Study



| AVG 12Hr | 1 | 2474 | 229 | 2710 | 630 | 2620 | 0 | 3293 | 6003 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 215 | 0 | 641 | 856 | 859 | 6862 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| AVG 24Hr | 2 | 3241 | 300 | 3551 | 825 | 3432 | 0 | 4314 | 7865 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 282 | 0 | 839 | 1122 | 1126 | 8991 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Note: These volumes are calculated by multiplying the Average Daily 12 hr. totals by 12 to 24 expansion factor. 1.31

## Comments:

Note: U-Turns provided for approach totals. Refer to 'U-Turn' Report for specific breakdown.

Turning Movement Count - Full Study Peak Hour Diagram

## TRIM RD @ MILLENNIUM BLVD

Survey Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017
Start Time: 07:00

WO No: 36717
Device: Miovision


Comments

Turning Movement Count - Full Study Peak Hour Diagram

## TRIM RD @ MILLENNIUM BLVD

Survey Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2017
Start Time: 07:00

WO No: 36717
Device: Miovision


Comments

## Turning Movement Count - Full Study Summary Report

MONTMERE AVE @ TRIM RD



| AVG 12Hr | 30 | 1968 | 0 | 2003 | 0 | 2150 | 656 | 2815 | 4818 | 672 | 0 | 36 | 709 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 709 | 5527 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Note: These volumes are calculated by multiplying the Equivalent 12 hr. totals by the AADT factor. . 90

| AVG 24Hr | 39 | 2578 | 0 | 2624 | 0 | 2817 | 859 | 3687 | 6311 | 880 | 0 | 48 | 929 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 929 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Note: These volumes are calculated by multiplying the Average Daily 12 hr . totals by 12 to 24 expansion factor. 1.31

## Comments:

Note: U-Turns provided for approach totals. Refer to 'U-Turn' Report for specific breakdown.

Turning Movement Count - Full Study Peak Hour Diagram

## MONTMERE AVE @ TRIM RD

Survey Date: Wednesday, November 14, 2012
Start Time: 07:00

WO No: 36967
Device: Miovision


Comments

Survey Date: Wednesday, November 14, 2012
Start Time: 07:00

WO No: 36967
Device: Miovision


Comments

## Turning Movement Count - Full Study Summary Report

PLAINHILL DR @ PROVENCE AVE

| Survey Date: Wednesday, January 22, | Total Observed U-Turns |  | AADT Factor |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 2014 |  |  |

## Full Study



| AVG 12Hr | 35 | 195 | 106 | 335 | 104 | 135 | 75 | 314 | 649 | 75 | 142 | 39 | 256 | 108 | 188 | 143 | 439 | 695 | 1344 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Note: These volumes are calculated by multiplying the Equivalent 12 hr . totals by the AADT factor. $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$


## Comments:

Note: U-Turns provided for approach totals. Refer to 'U-Turn' Report for specific breakdown.

## PLAINHILL DR @ PROVENCE AVE

Survey Date: Wednesday, January 22, 2014
Start Time: 07:00

WO No:
397
Device: Miovision


Comments

## PLAINHILL DR @ PROVENCE AVE

Survey Date: Wednesday, January 22, 2014
Start Time: 07:00

WO No:
397
Device: Miovision


Comments

## Turning Movement Count - Full Study Summary Report PORTOBELLO BLVD @ AQUAVIEW DR/NANTES ST

Survey Date: Thursday, May 25, 2017
Total Observed U-Turns
Northbound: 4 Southbound: 2
Eastbound: 1 Westbound: 0

## Full Study

|  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Period | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NB } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{array}{r} \text { SB } \\ \text { TOT } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STR } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{array}{r} \text { EB } \\ \text { TOT } \end{array}$ | LT | ST | RT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WB } \\ & \text { TOT } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 07:00 08:00 | 19 | 134 | 4 | 157 | 31 | 129 | 33 | 193 | 350 | 47 | 11 | 19 | 77 | 12 | 33 | 99 | 144 | 221 | 571 |
| 08:00 09:00 | 16 | 126 | 7 | 149 | 51 | 97 | 15 | 163 | 312 | 34 | 13 | 15 | 62 | 8 | 16 | 91 | 115 | 177 | 489 |
| 09:00 10:00 | 2 | 72 | 4 | 78 | 29 | 66 | 8 | 103 | 181 | 14 | 11 | 2 | 27 | 3 | 23 | 55 | 81 | 108 | 289 |
| 11:30 12:30 | 4 | 56 | 0 | 60 | 31 | 62 | 13 | 106 | 166 | 14 | 10 | 2 | 26 | 4 | 5 | 34 | 43 | 69 | 235 |
| 12:30 13:30 | 2 | 47 | 2 | 51 | 23 | 52 | 9 | 84 | 135 | 18 | 5 | 3 | 26 | 2 | 7 | 24 | 33 | 59 | 194 |
| 15:00 16:00 | 13 | 106 | 1 | 120 | 76 | 154 | 20 | 250 | 370 | 27 | 19 | 8 | 54 | 7 | 17 | 46 | 70 | 124 | 494 |
| 16:00 17:00 | 12 | 129 | 5 | 146 | 84 | 162 | 23 | 269 | 415 | 29 | 23 | 18 | 70 | 6 | 13 | 79 | 98 | 168 | 583 |
| 17:00 18:00 | 15 | 161 | 4 | 180 | 80 | 150 | 29 | 259 | 439 | 19 | 27 | 9 | 55 | 4 | 17 | 52 | 73 | 128 | 567 |
| Sub Total | 83 | 831 | 27 | 941 | 405 | 872 | 150 | 1427 | 2368 | 202 | 119 | 76 | 397 | 46 | 131 | 480 | 657 | 1054 | 3422 |
| U Turns |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  | 2 | 6 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 7 |
| Total | 83 | 831 | 27 | 945 | 405 | 872 | 150 | 1429 | 2374 | 202 | 119 | 76 | 398 | 46 | 131 | 480 | 657 | 1055 | 3429 |
| EQ 12Hr | 115 | 1155 | 38 | 1314 | 563 | 1212 | 208 | 1986 | 3300 | 281 | 165 | 106 | 553 | 64 | 182 | 667 | 913 | 1466 | 4766 |
| Note: These values are calculated by multiplying the totals by the appropriate expansion factor. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 39 |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG 12Hr | 104 | 1040 | 34 | 1182 | 507 | 1091 | 188 | 1788 | 2970 | 253 | 149 | 95 | 498 | 58 | 164 | 600 | 822 | 1320 | 4290 |
| Note: These volumes are calculated by multiplying the Equivalent 12 hr . totals by the AADT factor. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG 24Hr | 136 | 1362 | 44 | 1549 | 664 | 1429 | 246 | 2342 | 3891 | 331 | 195 | 125 | 652 | 75 | 215 | 787 | 1077 | 1729 | 5620 |
| Note: These volumes are calculated by multiplying the Average Daily 12 hr . totals by 12 to 24 expansion factor. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 31 |  |  |  |  |  |

## Comments:

Note: U-Turns provided for approach totals. Refer to 'U-Turn' Report for specific breakdown.

Survey Date: Thursday, May 25, 2017
Start Time: 07:00

WO No:
Device: Miovision


Comments

Survey Date: Thursday, May 25, 2017
Start Time: 07:00

WO No:
Device: Miovision


Comments

## APPENDIX E

## Trim Road Works Yard - Site Plan



## APPENDIX F

Collision Records

City Operations - Transportation Services

## Collision Details Report - Public Version

From: January 1, 2012 To: December 31, 2016
Location: INNES RD @ PROVENCE AVE

| Traffic Control: Traffic signal |  |  |  |  | Total Collisions: 10 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date/Day/Time | Environment | Impact Type | Classification | Surface Cond'n | Veh. Dir | Vehicle Manoeuve | Vehicle type | First Event | No. Ped |
| 2014-Jan-03, Fri, 14:34 | Clear | Angle | P.D. only | Dry | East | Going ahead | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | South | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2014-Feb-10, Mon,12:45 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | East | Going ahead $\begin{aligned} & \text { Automobile, } \\ & \text { station wagon }\end{aligned}$ |  | Other motor vehicle |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Slowing or stopping Pick-up truck |  | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2014-May-24, Sat, 13:18 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | East | Slowing or stopping Bus (other) |  | Other motor vehicle |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Stopped | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2016-Mar-18, Fri, 16:40 | Clear | Sideswipe | P.D. only | Dry | East | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Turning left | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2015-Dec-21, Mon,17:46 | Freezing Rain | Rear end | P.D. only | Ice | East | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Stopped | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2016-Dec-19, Mon,16:48 | Clear | Sideswipe | P.D. only | Dry | East | Changing lanes | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |  |


|  |  |  |  |  | East | Going ahead | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2016-Oct-23, Sun,17:29 | Clear | Angle | Non-fatal injury | Dry | West | Going ahead | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | South | Going ahead | Passenger van | Other motor vehicle |
| 2013-Feb-27, Wed, 15:13 | Snow | Angle | P.D. only | Loose snow | West | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | South | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
| 2012-Mar-29, Thu,07:55 | Freezing Rain | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | East | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Turning right | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
| 2012-Nov-01, Thu,16:10 | Clear | Angle | P.D. only | Wet | West | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | South | Going ahead | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |

## Location: INNES RD @ TRIM RD



| 2014-May-03, Sat, 17:54 | Clear | Turning movement | P.D. only | Dry | East <br> West | Turning left <br> Going ahead | Pick-up truck <br> Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle <br> Other motor vehicle |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2014-May-31, Sat, 14:40 | Clear | Turning movement | Non-fatal injury | Dry | South | Turning left | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | North | Going ahead | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |
| 2014-May-30, Fri, 17:25 | Clear | Rear end | Non-fatal injury | Dry | South | Turning right | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | South | Turning right | Motorcycle | Other motor vehicle |
| 2014-Jun-14, Sat, 11:22 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | East | Turning left | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Turning left | Passenger van | Other motor vehicle |
| 2014-Nov-29, Sat, 10:10 | Clear | Angle | P.D. only | Dry | West | Turning left | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | North | Turning left | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
| 2014-Nov-07, Fri, 17:26 | Clear | Turning movement | Non-fatal injury | Dry | North | Turning left | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | South | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
| 2015-Jun-18, Thu, 11:46 | Clear | Turning movement | P.D. only | Dry | West | Turning left | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
| 2016-Feb-27, Sat,09:29 | Clear | Turning movement | P.D. only | Dry | South | Making "U" turn | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |


|  |  |  |  |  | North | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2015-Nov-27, Fri, 17:20 | Clear | SMV other | Non-fatal injury | Wet | East | Turning left | Pick-up truck | Pedestrian | 1 |
| 2016-Jan-08, Fri, 16:55 | Clear | Turning movement | P.D. only | Dry | West | Turning left | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Going ahead | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2016-Apr-25, Mon,22:08 | Clear | Turning movement | P.D. only | Dry | West | Turning left | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2016-Aug-09, Tue, 16:29 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | North | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | North | Stopped | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2016-Apr-02, Sat, 10:32 | Clear | Turning movement | P.D. only | Dry | South | Turning left | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | North | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2016-Jul-01, Fri, 14:02 | Clear | Angle | P.D. only | Dry | West | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | North | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2016-May-17, Tue, 11:58 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | North | Going ahead | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | North | Stopped | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |


| 2016-Aug-04, Thu, 12:00 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | East <br> East | Turning left <br> Turning left | Pick-up truck <br> Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle <br> Other motor vehicle |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2016-Nov-13, Sun, 18:46 | Clear | Turning movement | P.D. only | Dry | East | Turning left | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | West | Going ahead | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |
| 2016-Dec-30, Fri, 19:09 | Clear | Turning movement | Non-fatal injury | Dry | East | Turning left | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | West | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
| 2013-Jun-21, Fri, 11:00 | Clear | Sideswipe | P.D. only | Dry | East | Turning right | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Turning left | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |
| 2013-Sep-16, Mon, 10:15 | Clear | Sideswipe | P.D. only | Dry | South | Turning left | Truck - tractor | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | South | Stopped | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
| 2013-Nov-14, Thu, 17:12 | Clear | Turning movement | Non-fatal injury | Dry | East | Making "U" turn | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | West | Going ahead | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |
| 2013-Dec-11, Wed,22:35 | Clear | Turning movement | P.D. only | Dry | North | Turning left | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | South | Going ahead | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |
| 2013-Dec-26, Thu,23:20 | Clear | Angle | Non-fatal injury | Slush | East | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |


|  |  |  |  |  | South | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012-Jan-15, Sun, 15:00 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | East | Turning left | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Turning left | Passenger van | Other motor vehicle |
| 2012-Jun-03, Sun,22:27 | Clear | SMV other | Non-reportable | Wet | West | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other |
| 2012-Jun-21, Thu, 18:09 | Rain | Angle | P.D. only | Wet | South | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
| 2012-Jun-19, Tue,07:25 | Clear | Turning movement | Non-fatal injury | Dry | West | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Turning left | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | South | Stopped | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | South | Stopped | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |
| 2012-Oct-08, Mon,21:00 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | West | Slowing or stoppin | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | West | Stopped | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |
| 2012-Sep-17, Mon,22:14 | Clear | Turning movement | P.D. only | Dry | North | Turning left | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | South | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
| 2012-Nov-15, Thu, 20:30 | Clear | Sideswipe | P.D. only | Dry | North | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |


|  |  | Rear end | P.D. only | Wet | North | Going ahead | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012-Nov-29, Thu,07:30 | Snow |  |  |  | South | Slowing or stoppi | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | South | Slowing or stoppi | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |
| 2012-Dec-22, Sat, 19:50 | Clear | Turning movement | P.D. only | Wet | South | Turning left | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | North | Going ahead | Pick-up truck | Other motor vehicle |

## Location: MONTMERE AVE @ TRIM RD

Traffic Control: Stop sign Total Collisions: 1

| Date/Day/Time | Environment | Impact Type | Classification | Surface Cond'n | Veh. Dir | Vehicle Manoeuver Vehicle type |  | First Event | No. Ped |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2015-Mar-01, Sun,11:58 | Clear | Angle | P.D. only | Dry | East | Turning left | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | South | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |

## Location: PORTOBELLO BLVD @ AQUAVIEW DR/NANTES ST

| Traffic Control: Stop | sign |  |  |  | Total Collisions: 4 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date/Day/Time | Environment | Impact Type | Classification | Surface Cond'n | Veh. Dir | Vehicle Manoeuv | Vehicle type | First Event | No. Ped |
| 2014-Apr-10, Thu, 20:50 | Rain | SMV other | Non-fatal injury | Wet | South | Turning left | Automobile, station wagon | Pedestrian | 1 |
| 2014-Jun-25, Wed, 16:58 | Clear | Angle | Non-fatal injury | Dry | East | Going ahead | Bicycle | Other motor vehicle |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | South | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Cyclist |  |
| 2014-Dec-08, Mon,20:15 | Clear | Angle | P.D. only | Dry | South | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |


|  |  |  |  |  | East | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012-Apr-27, Fri, 16:50 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | East | Slowing or stopping | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Stopped | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |

Location: TRIM RD @ MILLENNIUM BLVD
Traffic Control: Yield sign Total Collisions: 5

| Date/Day/Time | Environment | Impact Type | Classification | Surface Cond'n | Veh. Dir | Vehicle Manoeuver Vehicle type |  | First Event | No. Ped |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014-Apr-04, Fri, 22:30 | Rain | Angle | P.D. only | Wet | South | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | East | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2015-Aug-21, Fri, 14:20 | Clear | Sideswipe | P.D. only | Dry | South | Turning left | Municipal transit bus | Other motor vehicle |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | South | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2015-Feb-17, Tue,08:40 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Wet | South | Slowing or stopping Automobile, |  | Other motor vehicle |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | South | Stopped | Passenger van | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2015-Mar-30, Mon,14:35 | Clear | Sideswipe | P.D. only | Dry | South | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | South | Going ahead | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |
| 2012-Sep-26, Wed, 17:24 | Clear | Rear end | P.D. only | Dry | South | Going ahead | Municipal transit bus | Other motor vehicle |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | South | Stopped | Automobile, station wagon | Other motor vehicle |  |

## APPENDIX G

## Excerpts of 5157 Innes Road Transportation Overview



## TRAFFIC GENERATION

Traffic generation associated with the proposed development has been estimated based on the data provided in the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual 9th Edition, 2012.
Typically, automobile ownership for residents of this type of land use is relatively low and the majority of trips generated are by employees and visitors to the facility. In addition to this, traffic generation is distributed throughout the day and peak demand does not typically coincide with peak hour commuter traffic on the adjacent road network.

Relevant extractions from the ITE publication are attached. Table 1 summarizes the expected trip generation rates that would be expected during both the weekday morning and weekday afternoon peak hour of adjacent street traffic:

TABLE 1 - Trip Generation

| Land Use (Code) | Peak <br> Hour | Size <br> (No. of Beds) | Trip Generation Average Rate | Directional Split |  | Traffic Generated (veh/h) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Entering | Exiting | Entering | Exiting | Total Trips |
| Senior Adult | AM | 146 | 0.20 | 34\% | 66\% | 10 | 19 | 29 |
| Attached (252) | PM | 146 | 0.25 | 54\% | 46\% | 20 | 17 | 37 |

The results indicate that approximately 30 to 40 new trips can be expected during the weekday peak hours. Traffic generated by the proposed development will be primarily in and out of Site Access \#1, where Site Access \#2 and \#3 will experience only a fraction of the traffic volumes indicated above.

## PRIVATE APPROACH BY-LAW

City of Ottawa By-law 2003-447, which regulates the use of private approaches, has been referenced to ensure that the proposed site plan is in conformance with By-law requirements. Of particular note, the following items have been reviewed in detail:

1) Number of Private Approaches: The site frontage along Trim Road is approximately 80 metres, which allows for either 1 two-way and 2 one-way or 2 two-way private approaches to be constructed. The site plan proposes 1 two-way and 1 one-way private approach, and thus the Bylaw is satisfied in terms of overall frontage requirements to accommodate the proposed access from Trim Road.

The site frontage along Innes Road is approximately 105 metres, and permits the same access configurations as on Trim Road. As only 1 two-way private approach is proposed, the By-law requirements are also satisfied on the Innes Road frontage.
2) Width: Site Access \#1 and \#3 have a proposed with of 6.7 m which is acceptable for a two-way private approach. Site Access \#2 has a proposed width of 6.0 m and is acceptable for a one-way private approach. Each of the proposed private approaches are less than the maximum stipulated with of 9.0 m and are therefore in conformance with the By-law.
3) Spacing: The proposed distance between Site Access \#2 and the Innes Road street line is approximately 24 metres. This complies with the Private Approach By-law, which states that this distance is required to be at least 18 metres for a residential property containing between 20 and 99 parking spaces.
The proposed distance between Site Access \#1 and \#2 is approximately 40 metres, which complies with the minimum By-law requirement of 15 metres between a two-way private approach and any other private approach on a property that is located within 46 metres of an arterial road.

## APPENDIX H

TDM Measures Checklist

## TDM Measures Checklist:

Residential Developments (multi-family, condominium or subdivision)

## Legend

BASIC The measure is generally feasible and effective, and in most cases would benefit the development and its users

BETTER
The measure could maximize support for users of sustainable modes, and optimize development performance

* The measure is one of the most dependably effective tools to encourage the use of sustainable modes

| TDM measures: Residential developments |  |  | Check if proposed \& add descriptions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. TDM PROGRAM MANAGEMENT |  |  |  |
|  | 1.1 | Program coordinator |  |
| BASIC | * 1.1.1 | Designate an internal coordinator, or contract with an external coordinator | $\square$ - member of EQ Homes marketing team |
| 1.2 Travel surveys |  |  |  |
| better | 1.2.1 | Conduct periodic surveys to identify travel-related behaviours, attitudes, challenges and solutions, and to track progress | 区 |
| 2. WALKING AND CYCLING |  |  |  |
| 2.1 Information on walking/cycling routes \& destinations |  |  |  |
| BASIC | 2.1.1 | Display local area maps with walking/cycling access routes and key destinations at major entrances (multi-family, condominium) | $\square$ - will be provided in sales centre |
| 2.2 Bicycle skills training |  |  |  |
| BETTER | 2.2.1 | Offer on-site cycling courses for residents, or subsidize off-site courses | $\boldsymbol{x}$ |

TDM measures: Residential developments
Check if proposed \& add descriptions

## 3. TRANSIT

### 3.1 Transit information

BASIC 3.1.1 Display relevant transit schedules and route maps at entrances (multi-family, condominium)

BETTER 3.1.2 Provide real-time arrival information display at entrances (multi-family, condominium)
$\boxed{\square}$ - will be provided in sales centre
$\boldsymbol{x}$
3.2 Transit fare incentives

BASIC * 3.2.1 Offer PRESTO cards preloaded with one monthly transit pass on residence purchase/move-in, to encourage residents to use transit
BETTER 3.2.2 Offer at least one year of free monthly transit passes on residence purchase/move-in
3.3 Enhanced public transit service

BETTER * 3.3.1 Contract with OC Transpo to provide early transit services until regular services are warranted by occupancy levels (subdivision)

### 3.4 Private transit service

BETTER 3.4.1 Provide shuttle service for seniors homes or lifestyle communities (e.g. scheduled mall or supermarket runs)

## 4. CARSHARING \& BIKESHARING

### 4.1 Bikeshare stations \& memberships

BETTER 4.1.1 Contract with provider to install on-site bikeshare station (multi-family)

BETTER
4.1.2 Provide residents with bikeshare memberships, either free or subsidized (multi-family)
4.2 Carshare vehicles \& memberships

BETTER 4.2.1 Contract with provider to install on-site carshare vehicles and promote their use by residents
BETTER
4.2.2 Provide residents with carshare memberships, either free or subsidized

## 5. PARKING

### 5.1 Priced parking

5.1.1 Unbundle parking cost from purchase price (condominium)

BASIC $\star$ 5.1.2 Unbundle parking cost from monthly rent (multi-family)
$\boldsymbol{x}$ - will be considered during Site Plan Control application
$\boldsymbol{x}$ - will be considered during Site Plan Control application

Check if proposed \& add descriptions

## 6. TDM MARKETING \& COMMUNICATIONS

### 6.1 Multimodal travel information

| BASIC | $\star$ 6.1.1 | Provide a multimodal travel option information <br> package to new residents | $\boxed{\text { - in sales centre }}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 6.2 | Personalized trip planning |  |
| BETTER | $\star$ 6.2.1 | Offer personalized trip planning to new residents | $\boldsymbol{x}$ |

## APPENDIX I

## Intersection MMLOS Analysis

## Intersection MMLOS Analysis

## Pedestrian Level of Service (PLOS)

Exhibit 5 of the Addendum to the MMLOS guidelines has been used to evaluate the existing PLOS at all signalized intersections within the study area. Exhibit 22 of the MMLOS guidelines suggests a target PLOS A for all roadways within 300m of a school (Innes Road/Provence Avenue) and PLOS C for all roadways in the General Urban Area (Innes Road/Trim Road). The results of the intersection PLOS analysis are summarized in Table 1 and Table 2.

## Bicycle Level of Service (BLOS)

Exhibit 12 of the MMLOS guidelines has been used to evaluate the existing BLOS at all signalized intersections within the study area. Exhibit 22 of the MMLOS guidelines suggests a target BLOS A for Crosstown Bikeways within 300m of a school and BLOS B for Crosstown Bikeways in the General Urban Area (Innes Road). The results of the intersection BLOS analysis are summarized in Table 3.

## Transit Level of Service (TLOS)

Exhibit 16 of the MMLOS guidelines has been used to evaluate the existing TLOS at relevant intersections within the study area. Exhibit 22 of the MMLOS guidelines suggests a target TLOS D for Transit Priority Corridors with Isolated Measures within 300m of a school or in the General Urban Area (Innes Road and Trim Road). The results of the intersection TLOS analysis are summarized in Table 4.

## Truck Level of Service (TkLOS)

Exhibit 21 of the MMLOS guidelines has been used to evaluate the existing TkLOS at relevant intersections within the study area. Exhibit 22 of the MMLOS guidelines suggests a target TkLOS D for Truck Routes within 300m of a school or in the General Urban Area (Innes Road and Trim Road). The results of the intersection TkLOS analysis are summarized in Table 5.

## Vehicular Level of Service (Auto LOS)

Exhibit 22 of the MMLOS guidelines suggests a target Auto LOS D for all roadways in the General Urban Area (Innes Road/Trim Road), Auto LOS E for all roadways within 300m of a school (Innes Road/Provence Avenue, Provence Avenue/Plainhill Drive, and Portobello Boulevard/Aquaview Drive/Nantes Street) and Auto LOS E for all roadways within 600 m of a rapid transit station (Trim Road/Salzburg Drive, Trim Road/Millennium Boulevard, and Trim Road/Montmere Avenue). Detailed Synchro and Rodel reports are included in Appendix K.

The results of the intersection Auto LOS analysis are summarized in Table 6. Approaches where queueing issues have been identified are listed with the associated $50^{\text {th }}$ - and $95^{\text {th }}$-percentile queue lengths, and presented in Table 7.

## Intersection MMLOS Summary

A summary of the existing signalized intersection MMLOS analysis is provided in Table 8.

Table 1: PLOS Intersection Analysis - Innes Road/Provence Avenue

| CRITERIA | North Approach |  | South Approach |  | East Approach |  | West Approach |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PETSI SCORE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CROSSING DISTANCE CONDITIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median > 2.4 m in Width | No | 72 | No | 39 | No | 39 | No | 23 |
| Lanes Crossed (3.5m Lane Width) | 5 |  | 7 |  | 7 |  | 8 |  |
| SIGNAL PHASING AND TIMING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Left Turn Conflict | Permissive | -8 | Permissive | -8 | Permissive | -8 | Permissive | -8 |
| Right Turn Conflict | Permissive or Yield | -5 | Permissive or Yield | -5 | Permissive or Yield | -5 | Permissive or Yield | -5 |
| Right Turn on Red | RTOR Allowed | -3 | RTOR Allowed | -3 | RTOR Allowed | -3 | RTOR Allowed | -3 |
| Leading Pedestrian Interval | No | -2 | No | -2 | Yes | 0 | Yes | 0 |
| CORNER RADIUS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parallel Radius | $>10 \mathrm{~m}$ to 15 m | -6 | > 15 m to 25 m | -8 | $>10 \mathrm{~m}$ to 15 m | -6 | $>10 \mathrm{~m}$ to 15 m | -6 |
| Parallel Right Turn Channel | No Right Turn Channel | -4 | No Right Turn Channel | -4 | No Right Turn Channel | -4 | No Right Turn Channel | -4 |
| Perpendicular Radius | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Perpendicular Right Turn Channel | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| CROSSING TREATMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Treatment | Standard | -7 | Standard | -7 | Standard | -7 | Standard | -7 |
|  | PETSISCORE | 37 |  | 2 |  | 6 |  | -10 |
|  | LOS | E |  | F |  | F |  | F |
| DELAY SCORE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length |  | 90 |  | 90 |  | 100 |  | 100 |
| Pedestrian Walk Time |  | 26.7 |  | 26.7 |  | 7.2 |  | 7.2 |
|  | DELAY SCORE | 22.3 |  | 22.3 |  | 43.1 |  | 43.1 |
|  | LOS | C |  | C |  | E |  | E |
|  | OVERALL | E |  | F |  | F |  | F |

Table 2: PLOS Intersection Analysis - Innes Road/Trim Road

| CRITERIA | North Approach |  | South Approach |  | East Approach |  | West Approach |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PETSISCORE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CROSSING DISTANCE CONDITIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median > 2.4 m in Width | No | -10 | No | -10 | No | -10 | No | 6 |
| Lanes Crossed (3.5m Lane Width) | $10+$ |  | $10+$ |  | $10+$ |  | 9 |  |
| SIGNAL PHASING AND TIMING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Left Turn Conflict | Protected | 0 | Protected | 0 | Protected | 0 | Protected | 0 |
| Right Turn Conflict | Permissive or Yield | -5 | Permissive or Yield | -5 | Permissive or Yield | -5 | Permissive or Yield | -5 |
| Right Turn on Red | RTOR Allowed | -3 | RTOR Allowed | -3 | RTOR Allowed | -3 | RTOR Allowed | -3 |
| Leading Pedestrian Interval | No | -2 | No | -2 | No | -2 | No | -2 |
| CORNER RADIUS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parallel Radius | $>10 \mathrm{~m}$ to 15 m | -6 | $>10 \mathrm{~m}$ to 15 m | -6 | $>10 \mathrm{~m}$ to 15 m | -6 | $>10 \mathrm{~m}$ to 15 m | -6 |
| Parallel Right Turn Channel | No Right Turn Channel | -4 | No Right Turn Channel | -4 | No Right Turn Channel | -4 | No Right Turn Channel | -4 |
| Perpendicular Radius | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| Perpendicular Right Turn Channel | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 |
| CROSSING TREATMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Treatment | Standard | -7 | Standard | -7 | Standard | -7 | Standard | -7 |
|  | PETSI SCORELOS | -37 |  | -37 |  | -37 |  | -21 |
|  |  | F |  | F |  | F |  | F |
| DELAY SCORE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length |  | 130 |  | 130 |  | 130 |  | 130 |
| Pedestrian Walk Time |  | 7.0 |  | 7.0 |  | 7.4 |  | 7.4 |
| DELAY SCORELOSOVERALL |  | 58.2 |  | 58.2 |  | 57.8 |  | 57.8 |
|  |  | E |  | E |  | E |  | E |
|  |  | F |  | F |  | F |  | F |

Table 3: BLOS Intersection Analysis

| Approach | Bikeway Facility Type | Criteria | Travel Lanes and/or Speed | BLOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Innes Road/Provence Avenue |  |  |  |  |
| North Approach | Mixed Traffic | Right Turn Lane Characteristics | Shared through/right turn lane | A |
|  |  | Left Turn Accommodation | 1 lane crossed; $\geq 60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | F |
| South Approach | Mixed Traffic | Right Turn Lane Characteristics | Shared through/right turn lane | A |
|  |  | Left Turn Accommodation | 1 lane crossed; $\geq 60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | F |
| East Approach | Curbside Bike Lane | Right Turn Lane Characteristics | Shared through/right turn lane (bike lane remains on the right) | A |
|  |  | Left Turn Accommodation | 2 lanes crossed; $\geq 50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | F |
| West Approach | Pocket Bike Lane | Right Turn Lane Characteristics | Right turn lane introduced to the right and $>50 \mathrm{~m}$ long; turn speed $\leq 30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | D |
|  |  | Left Turn Accommodation | 2 lanes crossed; $\geq 50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | F |
| Innes Road/Trim Road |  |  |  |  |
| North Approach | Pocket Bike Lane | Right Turn Lane Characteristics | Right turn lane introduced to the right and $>50 \mathrm{~m}$ long; turn speed $\leq 30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | D |
|  |  | Left Turn Accommodation | 3 lanes crossed; $\geq 50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | F |
| South Approach | Pocket Bike Lane | Right Turn Lane Characteristics | Right turn lane introduced to the right and $>50 \mathrm{~m}$ long; turn speed $\leq 30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | D |
|  |  | Left Turn Accommodation | Dual left turn lanes | F |
| East Approach | Pocket Bike Lane | Right Turn Lane Characteristics | Right turn lane introduced to the right and $>50 \mathrm{~m}$ long; turn speed $\leq 30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | D |
|  |  | Left Turn Accommodation | 2 lanes crossed; $\geq 50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | F |
| West Approach | Pocket Bike Lane | Right Turn Lane Characteristics | Right turn lane introduced to the right and $>50 \mathrm{~m}$ long; turn speed $\leq 30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | D |
|  |  | Left Turn Accommodation | 2 lanes crossed; $\geq 50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | F |

Table 4: TLOS Intersection Analysis

| Approach | Delay ${ }^{(1)}$ | TLOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Innes Road/Provence Avenue |  |  |
| North Approach | 25 sec | D |
| South Approach | 30 sec | D |
| East Approach | 10 sec | B |
| West Approach | 10 sec | B |
|  |  |  |
| Innes Road/Trim Road |  |  |
| North Approach | 55 sec | F |
| South Approach | 45 sec | F |
| East Approach | 40 sec | E |
| West Approach | 145 sec | F |

1. Delay based on outputs from Synchro analysis (summarized in Table 6)

Table 5: TkLOS Intersection Analysis

| Approach | Effective <br> Corner Radius | Number of Receiving Lanes on <br> Departure from Intersection | TkLOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Innes Road/Provence Avenue |  | 2 | A |
| North Approach | $>15 \mathrm{~m}$ | 2 | A |
| South Approach | $>15 \mathrm{~m}$ | 1 | E |
| East Approach | 10 m to 15 m | 1 | C |
| West Approach | $>15 \mathrm{~m}$ |  | A |
| Innes Road/Trim Road | 2 | A |  |
| North Approach | $>15 \mathrm{~m}$ | 2 | A |
| South Approach | $>15 \mathrm{~m}$ | 2 | A |
| East Approach | $>15 \mathrm{~m}$ | 2 |  |
| West Approach | $>15 \mathrm{~m}$ |  |  |

Table 6: Auto LOS Intersection Analysis - Existing

| Intersection | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | v/c | LOS | Mvmt | v/c | LOS | Mvmt |
| Innes Road/ Provence Avenue | 0.71 | C | NBL | 0.48 | A | NBL |
| Innes Road/ Trim Road | 0.78 | C | WBL | 1.83 | F | EBL |
| Trim Road/ Salzburg Drive ${ }^{(1)}$ | 14 sec | B | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { EBL/ } \\ & \text { EBR } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 16 sec | C | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { EBL/ } \\ & \text { EBR } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Trim Road/ Millennium Boulevard ${ }^{(2)}$ | 5 sec | A | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{SBL} / \\ & \mathrm{SBT} \end{aligned}$ | 5 sec | A | WBL/ WBR |
| Trim Road/ Montmere Avenue ${ }^{(1)}$ | 13 sec | B | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EBL/ } \\ & \text { EBR } \end{aligned}$ | 14 sec | B | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EBL/ } \\ & \text { EBR } \end{aligned}$ |
| Provence Avenue/ Plainhill Drive ${ }^{(1)}$ | 8 sec | A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NBT/ } \\ & \text { SBT } \end{aligned}$ | 7 sec | A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SBT/ } \\ & \text { WBT } \end{aligned}$ |
| Portobello Boulevard/ Aquaview Drive/Nantes Street ${ }^{(1)}$ | 9 sec | A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EBT/ } \\ & \text { WBT } \end{aligned}$ | 9 sec | A | SBL |

1. Unsignalized intersection
2. Roundabout - results taken from Rodel analysis

Table 7: Existing Queues Over Capacity

| Intersection | Mvmt | AM Peak |  |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | v/c | LOS | 50 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ \% Queue (m) | $95^{\text {th }} \%$ Queue (m) | v/c | LOS | $50^{\text {th }} \%$ Queue (m) | $95^{\text {th }} \%$ Queue (m) |
| Innes Road/ Trim Road | SBL | 0.46 | A | 13 | 30 | 0.94 | E | 46 | \#96 |
|  | EBL | 0.60 | A | 21 | 43 | 1.83 | F | $\sim 128$ | \#193 |
|  | WBL | 0.78 | C | 32 | \#78 | 0.51 | A | 17 | 33 |

[^0]Table 8: Signalized Intersection MMLOS Summary

|  | Intersection | Innes Road/Provence Avenue |  |  |  | Innes Road/Trim Road |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | NORTH | SOUTH | EAST | WEST | NORTH | SOUTH | EAST | WEST |
|  | Island Refuge | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
|  | Lanes | 5 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 |
|  | Conflicting Left Turns | Permissive | Permissive | Permissive | Permissive | Protected | Protected | Protected | Protected |
|  | Conflicting Right Turns | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Permissive } \\ & \text { or Yield } \end{aligned}$ | Permissive or Yield | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Permissive } \\ & \text { or Yield } \end{aligned}$ | Permissive or Yield | Permissive or Yield | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Permissive } \\ & \text { or Yield } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Permissive } \\ & \text { or Yield } \end{aligned}$ | Permissive or Yield |
|  | Right Turn on Red | RTOR <br> Allowed | RTOR Allowed | RTOR <br> Allowed | RTOR <br> Allowed | RTOR Allowed | RTOR <br> Allowed | RTOR Allowed | RTOR <br> Allowed |
|  | Pedestrian Leading Interval | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |
|  | Parallel Radius | $\begin{gathered} >10 \mathrm{~m} \text { to } \\ 15 \mathrm{~m} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline>15 \mathrm{~m} \text { to } \\ & 25 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline>10 \mathrm{~m} \text { to } \\ & 15 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} >10 \mathrm{~m} \text { to } \\ 15 \mathrm{~m} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline>10 \mathrm{~m} \text { to } \\ & 15 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline>10 \mathrm{~m} \text { to } \\ & 15 \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} >10 \mathrm{~m} \text { to } \\ 15 \mathrm{~m} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} >10 \mathrm{~m} \text { to } \\ 15 \mathrm{~m} \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Parallel Channel | No Channel | No Channel | No Channel | No Channel | No Channel | No Channel | No Channel | No Channel |
|  | Perpendicular Radius | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | Perpendicular Channel | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | Crosswalk Type | Standard | Standard | Standard | Standard | Standard | Standard | Standard | Standard |
|  | PETSI Score | 37 | 2 | 6 | -10 | -37 | -37 | -37 | -21 |
|  | Delay Score | 22.3 | 22.3 | 43.1 | 43.1 | 58.2 | 58.2 | 57.8 | 57.8 |
|  | Level of | E | F | F | F | F | F | F | F |
|  | Service | F |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |
|  | Target | A |  |  |  | C |  |  |  |
| $\frac{\hbar}{\frac{\omega}{0}}$ | Type of Bikeway | Mixed Traffic | Mixed Traffic | Curbside Bike Lane | Pocket Bike Lane | Pocket Bike Lane | Pocket Bike Lane | Pocket Bike Lane | Pocket Bike Lane |
|  | Turning Speed | Slow | Slow | Slow | Slow | Slow | Slow | Slow | Slow |
|  | Right Turn Storage | - | - | - | $>50 \mathrm{~m}$ | $>50 \mathrm{~m}$ | $>50 \mathrm{~m}$ | $>50 \mathrm{~m}$ | $>50 \mathrm{~m}$ |
|  | Dual Right Turn Lanes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
|  | Shared ThroughRight Lane | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No |
|  | Bike Box | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
|  | Lanes Crossed (Left Turns) | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|  | Dual Left Turn Lanes | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No |
|  | Approach Speed | $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $60 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ |
|  | Level of | F | F | F | F | F | F | F | F |
|  | Service | F |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |
|  | Target | A |  |  |  | B |  |  |  |
|  | Average Signal Delay | 25 sec | 30 sec | 10 sec | 10 sec | 55 sec | 45 sec | 40 sec | 145 sec |
|  | Level of | D | D | B | B | F | F | E | F |
|  | Service | D |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |
|  | Target | D |  |  |  | D |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 늘 } \\ & \text { ㄹㄴ } \end{aligned}$ | Turning Radius | $>15 \mathrm{~m}$ | $>15 \mathrm{~m}$ | 10m-15m | $>15 \mathrm{~m}$ | $>15 \mathrm{~m}$ | $>15 \mathrm{~m}$ | $>15 \mathrm{~m}$ | $>15 \mathrm{~m}$ |
|  | Receiving Lanes | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|  | Level of | A | A | E | C | A | A | A | A |
|  | Service | E |  |  |  | A |  |  |  |
|  | Target | D |  |  |  | D |  |  |  |
| $\frac{0}{3}$ | Level of Service | C |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |
|  | Target | E |  |  |  | D |  |  |  |

## APPENDIX J

## Signal Timing Plans

## Traffic Signal Timing

City of Ottawa, Transportation Services Department
Traffic Signal Operations Unit

| Intersection: | Main: Innes | Side: | Provence |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Controller: | MS-3200 | TSD: | 6562 |
| Author: | Sarah Saade | Date: | 14-May-2018 |

## Existing Timing Plans ${ }^{\dagger}$

|  | Plan |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ped Minimum Time |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM Peak <br> 1 | Off Peak <br> 2 | PM Peak <br> 3 | Night <br> 4 | Weekend <br> 5 | AM School $11$ | PM School $12$ | Walk | DW | $A+R$ |
| Cycle | 100 | 90 | 100 | 80 | 95 | 100 | 90 |  |  |  |
| Offset | 51 | 85 | 21 | X | 85 | 51 | 85 |  |  |  |
| EB Thru | 63 | 53 | 63 | 43 | 58 | 43 | 33 | 7 | 20 | 3.7+2.6 |
| WB Thru | 63 | 53 | 63 | 43 | 58 | 43 | 33 | 7 | 20 | 3.7+2.6 |
| NB Thru | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 57 | 57 | 7 | 23 | 3.0+3.8 |
| SB Thru | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 57 | 57 | 7 | 23 | 3.0+3.8 |

## Phasing Sequence ${ }^{\ddagger}$

Plan:


Notes: 1) Timing plan 11 and 12 have a ped recall for north/south
2) The 5 sec ADV walk interval is included in the split provided in the table above

Schedule

| Weekday |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Time | Plan |
| $0: 10$ | 4 |
| $6: 00$ | 1 |
| $7: 30$ | 11 |
| $8: 05$ | 1 |
| $9: 00$ | 2 |
| $14: 10$ | 12 |
| $14: 40$ | 2 |
| $15: 00$ | 3 |
| $18: 30$ | 2 |
| $22: 00$ | 4 |

Saturday

| Time | Plan |
| :---: | :---: |
| $0: 10$ | 4 |
| $7: 00$ | 2 |
| $9: 00$ | 5 |
| $20: 00$ | 2 |
| $22: 00$ | 4 |

Sunday

| Time | Plan |
| :---: | :---: |
| $0: 10$ | 4 |
| $7: 00$ | 2 |
| $10: 00$ | 5 |
| 19:00 | 2 |
| $22: 00$ | 4 |

## Notes

$\dagger$ : Time for each direction includes amber and all red intervals
$\ddagger$ : Start of first phase should be used as reference point for offset
Asterisk (*) Indicates actuated phase
(fp): Fully Protected Left Turn
4............. $\rightarrow$ Pedestrian signal

Cost is $\$ 56.50$ ( $\$ 50$ + HST)

Traffic Signal Timing
City of Ottawa, Transportation Services Department
Traffic Signal Operations Unit

| Intersection: | Main: Innes | Side: | Trim |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Controller: | MS-3200 | TSD: | 6670 |
| Author: | Sarah Saade | Date: | 14-May-2018 |

## Existing Timing Plans ${ }^{\dagger}$

|  | Plan | Ped Minimum Time |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM Peak <br> 1 | Off Peak <br> 2 | PM Peak <br> 3 | Night <br> 4 | Weekend <br> 5 | Walk | DW | $\boldsymbol{A + R}$ |
| Cycle | 130 | 130 | 130 | 130 | 130 |  |  |  |
| Offset | X | X | X | X | X |  |  |  |
| EB Thru | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 7 | 32 | $3.7+3.3$ |
| WB Thru | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 7 | 32 | $3.7+3.3$ |
| NB Left (fp) | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | - | - | $3.7+3.0$ |
| SB Left (fp) | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | - | - | $3.7+3.0$ |
| NB Thru | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 7 | 28 | $3.7+2.9$ |
| SB Thru | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 7 | 28 | $3.7+2.9$ |
| EB Left (fp) | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | - | - | $3.7+2.8$ |
| WB Left (fp) | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | - | - | $3.7+2.8$ |

## Phasing Sequence ${ }^{\ddagger}$

Plan:
All


Schedule

| Weekday |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Time | Plan |
| $0: 10$ | 4 |
| $6: 00$ | 1 |
| $9: 00$ | 2 |
| $15: 00$ | 3 |
| $18: 30$ | 2 |
| $22: 00$ | 4 |

Saturday

| Time | Plan |
| :---: | :---: |
| $0: 10$ | 4 |
| $7: 00$ | 2 |
| $9: 00$ | 5 |
| $20: 00$ | 2 |
| $22: 00$ | 4 |

Sunday

| Time | Plan |
| :---: | :---: |
| $0: 10$ | 4 |
| $7: 00$ | 2 |
| $10: 00$ | 5 |
| 19:00 | 2 |
| $22: 00$ | 4 |

## Notes

$\dagger$ : Time for each direction includes amber and all red intervals
$\ddagger$ : Start of first phase should be used as reference point for offset
Asterisk (*) Indicates actuated phase
(fp): Fully Protected Left Turn
$\longrightarrow \quad$ Pedestrian si...... $\rightarrow$ ignal

## APPENDIX K

Synchro and Rodel Analysis

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| AM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Lane Group $\quad \varnothing 3 \quad \varnothing 7$ |
| :--- |
| Lane Configurations |
| Traffic Volume (vph) |
| Future Volume (vph) |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) |
| Storage Length (m) |
| Storage Lanes |
| Taper Length (m) |
| Lane Util. Factor |
| Ped Bike Factor |
| Frt |
| Flt Protected |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |
| Flt Permitted |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |
| Right Turn on Red |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |
| Link Speed (k/h) |
| Link Distance (m) |
| Travel Time (s) |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |
| Peak Hour Factor |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) |
| Adj. Flow (vph) |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) |
| Enter Blocked Intersection |
| Lane Alignment |
| Median Width(m) |
| Link Offset(m) |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |
| Headway Factor |
| Turning Speed (k/h) |
| Number of Detectors |
| Detector Template |
| Leading Detector (m) |
| Trailing Detector (m) |
| Detector 1 Position(m) |
| Detector 1 Size(m) |
| Detector 1 Type |
| Detector 1 Channel |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |
| Detector 2 Type |
| Detector 2 Channel |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |
| Turn Type |
| Protected Phases |
| Permitted Phases |
| Detector Phase |
| Switch Phase |



Splits and Phases: 1: Provence \& Innes



|  | 4 |  | 7 | $\checkmark$ |  |  | $4$ | 4 | \％ | $4$ | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 中t | 「 | \％ | 44 | 「 | 7 | 44 | 「＇ | ${ }^{1}$ | 44 | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 89 | 186 | 101 | 137 | 274 | 33 | 163 | 204 | 29 | 58 | 356 | 86 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 89 | 186 | 101 | 137 | 274 | 33 | 163 | 204 | 29 | 58 | 356 | 86 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |
| Storage Length（m） | 90.0 |  | 50.0 | 65.0 |  | 70.0 | 60.0 |  | 80.0 | 85.0 |  | 70.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Taper Length（m） | 35.0 |  |  | 45.0 |  |  | 100.0 |  |  | 25.0 |  |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | 1.00 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.98 | 0.99 |  | 0.98 | 0.98 |  | 0.97 | 0.99 |  | 0.97 |
| Frt |  | 0.989 | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1662 | 3145 | 1354 | 1662 | 3325 | 1488 | 3195 | 3293 | 1473 | 1572 | 3007 | 1406 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 1655 | 3145 | 1323 | 1650 | 3325 | 1459 | 3147 | 3293 | 1430 | 1551 | 3007 | 1368 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  | 6 | 141 |  |  | 141 |  |  | 144 |  |  | 144 |
| Link Speed（k／h） |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |
| Link Distance（m） |  | 496.4 |  |  | 273.9 |  |  | 148.0 |  |  | 249.0 |  |
| Travel Time（s） |  | 29.8 |  |  | 16.4 |  |  | 8.9 |  |  | 14.9 |  |
| Confl．Peds．（\＃／hr） | 7 |  | 10 | 10 |  | 7 | 14 |  | 16 | 16 |  | 14 |
| Confl．Bikes（\＃／hr） |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 4\％ | 4\％ | 4\％ | 4\％ | 4\％ | 4\％ | 5\％ | 5\％ | 5\％ | 10\％ | 15\％ | 10\％ |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 99 | 207 | 112 | 152 | 304 | 37 | 181 | 227 | 32 | 64 | 396 | 96 |
| Shared Lane Traffic（\％） |  |  | 14\％ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 99 | 223 | 96 | 152 | 304 | 37 | 181 | 227 | 32 | 64 | 396 | 96 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width（m） |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 12.0 |  |  | 7.4 |  |
| Link Offset（m） |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width（m） |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 |
| Turning Speed（k／h） | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Leading Detector（m） | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 |
| Trailing Detector（m） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Position（m） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Size（m） | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Queue（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Delay（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 2 Position（m） |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |
| Detector 2 Size（m） |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend（s） |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |
| Detector Phase | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 8 |


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

Splits and Phases: 2: Trim \& Innes



AM Peak Hour




2018 AM Peak
85\% Confidence Level
Daylight conditions

Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
Scheme: Existing AM
Rodel-Win1 - AVERAGE DELAY to Geometry

## Scheme Summary

## Control Data

## Control Data and Model Parameters

| 117155 (Notting Hill) | 2018 PHF Flow Profile (veh) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Existing AM | 7.5 min Time Slice |
| Rodel-Win1 | Queuing Delays (sec) |
| Right Hand Drive | Daylight conditions |
| AM Peak Hour | Peak 60/15 min Results |
| AVERAGE DELAY to Geometry | Output flows: Vehicles |
| Metric Units (m) | $85 \%$ Confidence Level |

## Available Data

| Entry Capacity Calibrated | No |
| :--- | :---: |
| Entry Capacity Modified | No |
| Crosswalks | No |
| Flows Factored | No |
| Approach/Exit Road Capacity Calibrated | No |
| Accidents | No |
| Accident Costs | No |
| Bypass Model | No |
| Bypass Calibration | No |
| Global Results | Yes |

2018 AM Peak
85\% Confidence Level
Daylight conditions

Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
Scheme: Existing AM
Rodel-Win1 - AVERAGE DELAY to Geometry

## Operational Data

## Main Geometry (m)

Geometry and Design Target

| Leg | Leg Names | Bearing <br> (deg) | Grade Sep <br> G | Half Width <br> V | Lanes <br> $\mathbf{n}$ | Target <br> Average <br> Delay <br> $\mathbf{s e c} / \mathbf{v e h})$ | Circulating and Exit Geom <br> Inscribed <br> Diameter <br> $\mathbf{D}$ | Half Width <br> Vx | Lanes <br> $\mathbf{n}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | N - Trim | 0 | 0 | 6.80 | 2 | 10 | 55.00 | 7.40 | 2 |
| 2 | S - Trim | 180 | 0 | 7.40 | 2 | 10 | 55.00 | 7.40 | 2 |
| 3 | E - Millennium | 270 | 0 | 4.30 | 1 | 10 | 55.00 | 4.30 | 1 |

Capacity Modifiers and Capacity Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Capacity |  | Entry Calibration |  | Approach Road |  |  | Exit Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Capacity + or - | XWalk Factor | Intercept + or - | Slope Factor | $\begin{gathered} \text { V } \\ (\mathrm{m}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | Calib Capacity | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{V} \\ (\mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | Calib Capacity |
| 1 | N - Trim | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 4.00 | 3332 | 0 | 7.40 | 3626 | 0 |
| 2 | S - Trim | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 4.00 | 3626 | 0 | 7.40 | 3626 | 0 |
| 3 | E - Millennium | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 4.00 | 2107 | 0 | 4.30 | 2107 | 0 |

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

## 2018 AM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Trucks <br> $\%$ | Flow Modifiers <br> Flow <br> Factor | Peak Hour <br> Factor |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | N - Trim | 0 | 153 | 186 | 0 | 5.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |
| 2 | S - Trim | 0 | 232 | 54 | 0 | 5.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |
| 3 | E - Millennium | 0 | 25 | 86 | 0 | 5.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |

2018 AM Peak
85\% Confidence Level
Daylight conditions

Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
Scheme: Existing AM
Rodel-Win1 - AVERAGE DELAY to Geometry

## Operational Results

## Geometry for Target Input

Geometry Options for 2018 AM Peak

| Leg 1 - N - Trim |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| nv | ne | nc | nx | $\begin{gathered} E \\ (\mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{L}^{\prime} \\ & (\mathrm{m}) \end{aligned}$ |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 6.80 | 0.00 |

Geometry Options for 2018 AM Peak

| Leg 2-S - Trim |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| nv | ne | nc | nx | $\begin{gathered} E \\ (\mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{L}^{\prime} \\ & (\mathrm{m}) \end{aligned}$ |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 7.40 | 0.00 |

Geometry Options for 2018 AM Peak

| Leg 3-E-Millennium |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| nv | ne | nc | nx | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{E} \\ (\mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{L}^{\prime} \\ & (\mathrm{m}) \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.30 | 0.00 |

2018 AM Peak
85\% Confidence Level
Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
Daylight conditions
Scheme: Existing AM
Rodel-Win1 - AVERAGE DELAY to Geometry

## 2018 AM Peak - 60 minutes

Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass Type | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit <br> Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | N - Trim | None | 339 |  | 25 |  | 318 | 1710 |  | 0.1982 |  |
| 2 | S - Trim | None | 286 |  | 153 |  | 211 | 1802 |  | 0.1587 |  |
| 3 | E - Millennium | None | 111 |  | 232 |  | 207 | 925 |  | 0.1200 |  |

Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass Type | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | 95\% Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |
| 1 | N - Trim | None | 4.47 |  | 4.47 | 1.26 |  | A |  | A |
| 2 | S - Trim | None | 2.74 |  | 2.74 | 0.66 |  | A |  | A |
| 3 | E-Millennium | None | 4.14 |  | 4.14 | 0.39 |  | A |  | A |

2018 AM Peak
85\% Confidence Level
Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
Daylight conditions
Scheme: Existing AM
Rodel-Win1 - AVERAGE DELAY to Geometry

## 2018 AM Peak - 15 minutes

Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass Type | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | N - Trim | None | 377 |  | 28 |  | 353 | 1708 |  | 0.2206 |  |
| 2 | S - Trim | None | 318 |  | 170 |  | 234 | 1790 |  | 0.1775 |  |
| 3 | E-Millennium | None | 123 |  | 258 |  | 230 | 916 |  | 0.1347 |  |

Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass Type | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | 95\% Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |
| 1 | N - Trim | None | 4.41 |  | 4.41 | 1.26 |  | A |  | A |
| 2 | S - Trim | None | 2.71 |  | 2.71 | 0.66 |  | A |  | A |
| 3 | E-Millennium | None | 4.09 |  | 4.09 | 0.39 |  | A |  | A |


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | 7 |  |  | $4$ | 4 | $p$ | $4$ | $\frac{1}{1}$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 44 | 「 | \％ | 中 $\uparrow$ |  | \％ | $\hat{\dagger}$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | 个 |  |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 100 | 785 | 109 | 81 | 492 | 23 | 72 | 36 | 79 | 45 | 45 | 77 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 100 | 785 | 109 | 81 | 492 | 23 | 72 | 36 | 79 | 45 | 45 | 77 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |
| Storage Length（m） | 75.0 |  | 145.0 | 60.0 |  | 0.0 | 50.0 |  | 0.0 | 50.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length（m） | 40.0 |  |  | 45.0 |  |  | 100.0 |  |  | 100.0 |  |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor | 0.99 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 0.97 |  | 0.98 | 0.98 |  |
| Frt |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.993 |  |  | 0.897 |  |  | 0.905 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1695 | 3293 | 1517 | 1695 | 3328 | 0 | 1695 | 1557 | 0 | 1695 | 1587 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.436 |  |  | 0.312 |  |  | 0.661 |  |  | 0.675 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 769 | 3293 | 1466 | 555 | 3328 | 0 | 1164 | 1557 | 0 | 1177 | 1587 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  |  | 121 |  | 8 |  |  | 88 |  |  | 83 |  |
| Link Speed（k／h） |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |
| Link Distance（m） |  | 220.1 |  |  | 496.4 |  |  | 517.4 |  |  | 152.1 |  |
| Travel Time（s） |  | 13.2 |  |  | 29.8 |  |  | 31.0 |  |  | 9.1 |  |
| Confl．Peds．（\＃／hr） | 15 |  | 7 | 7 |  | 15 | 13 |  | 23 | 23 |  | 13 |
| Confl．Bikes（\＃／hr） |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 2\％ | 5\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 3\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 111 | 872 | 121 | 90 | 547 | 26 | 80 | 40 | 88 | 50 | 50 | 86 |
| Shared Lane Traffic（\％） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 111 | 872 | 121 | 90 | 573 | 0 | 80 | 128 | 0 | 50 | 136 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width（m） |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |
| Link Offset（m） |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width（m） |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 |
| Turning Speed（k／h） | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  |
| Leading Detector（m） | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  |
| Trailing Detector（m） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Position（m） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Size（m） | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex |  | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex |  | Cl＋Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Queue（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Delay（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 2 Position（m） |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |
| Detector 2 Size（m） |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend（s） |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | Perm | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  | 2 | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 6 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 4 | 4 |  |


| Lane Group $\quad \varnothing 3 \quad \varnothing 7$ |
| :--- |
| Lane Configurations |
| Traffic Volume (vph) |
| Future Volume (vph) |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) |
| Storage Length (m) |
| Storage Lanes |
| Taper Length (m) |
| Lane Util. Factor |
| Ped Bike Factor |
| Frt |
| Flt Protected |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |
| Flt Permitted |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |
| Right Turn on Red |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |
| Link Speed (k/h) |
| Link Distance (m) |
| Travel Time (s) |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |
| Peak Hour Factor |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) |
| Adj. Flow (vph) |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) |
| Enter Blocked Intersection |
| Lane Alignment |
| Median Width(m) |
| Link Offset(m) |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |
| Headway Factor |
| Turning Speed (k/h) |
| Number of Detectors |
| Detector Template |
| Leading Detector (m) |
| Trailing Detector (m) |
| Detector 1 Position(m) |
| Detector 1 Size(m) |
| Detector 1 Type |
| Detector 1 Channel |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |
| Detector 2 Type |
| Detector 2 Channel |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |
| Turn Type |
| Protected Phases |
| Permitted Phases |
| Detector Phase |


|  | $\stackrel{*}{*}$ |  | $\checkmark$ | 7 |  |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\dagger$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |  | 10.0 | 10.0 |  | 10.0 | 10.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 |  | 31.8 | 31.8 |  | 31.8 | 31.8 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 63.0 | 63.0 | 63.0 | 63.0 | 63.0 |  | 32.0 | 32.0 |  | 32.0 | 32.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 63.0\% | 63.0\% | 63.0\% | 63.0\% | 63.0\% |  | 32.0\% | 32.0\% |  | 32.0\% | 32.0\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 56.7 | 56.7 | 56.7 | 56.7 | 56.7 |  | 25.2 | 25.2 |  | 25.2 | 25.2 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.6 |  | 3.8 | 3.8 |  | 3.8 | 3.8 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.3 |  | 6.8 | 6.8 |  | 6.8 | 6.8 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lag | Lag |  | Lag | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | C-Max | C-Max | C-Max | C-Max | C-Max |  | None | None |  | None | None |  |
| Walk Time (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 |  | 23.0 | 23.0 |  | 23.0 | 23.0 |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) | 10 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 7 |  | 10 | 10 |  | 7 | 7 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 72.6 | 72.6 | 72.6 | 72.6 | 72.6 |  | 14.3 | 14.3 |  | 14.3 | 14.3 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.73 |  | 0.14 | 0.14 |  | 0.14 | 0.14 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.20 | 0.36 | 0.11 | 0.22 | 0.24 |  | 0.48 | 0.43 |  | 0.30 | 0.46 |  |
| Control Delay | 6.7 | 6.3 | 1.5 | 7.5 | 5.4 |  | 47.5 | 17.9 |  | 40.7 | 20.8 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 6.7 | 6.3 | 1.5 | 7.5 | 5.4 |  | 47.5 | 17.9 |  | 40.7 | 20.8 |  |
| LOS | A | A | A | A | A |  | D | B |  | D | C |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 5.8 |  |  | 5.7 |  |  | 29.3 |  |  | 26.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 5.3 | 25.3 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 14.5 |  | 14.9 | 7.1 |  | 9.0 | 9.5 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 17.6 | 54.7 | 6.2 | 16.1 | 32.8 |  | 25.3 | 20.3 |  | 17.3 | 23.1 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 196.1 |  |  | 472.4 |  |  | 493.4 |  |  | 128.1 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 75.0 |  | 145.0 | 60.0 |  |  | 50.0 |  |  | 50.0 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 558 | 2390 | 1097 | 402 | 2418 |  | 293 | 458 |  | 296 | 462 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.20 | 0.36 | 0.11 | 0.22 | 0.24 |  | 0.27 | 0.28 |  | 0.17 | 0.29 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset: 21 (21\%), Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6:WBTL, Start of Green |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 9.8 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 76.6\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Splits and Phases: 1: Provence \& Innes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\rightarrow \square 2(\mathrm{R})$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63 s |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 s | 32 s |  |  |  |  |
| $\sqrt{\square 6(R)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{HA}_{0} \mathrm{H}_{08}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63 s |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 s [ | 32 s |  |  |  |  |


| Lane Group | $\emptyset 3$ | $\varnothing 7$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Switch Phase |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 5\% | 5\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  |  |
| Lead/Lag | Lead | Lead |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes | Yes |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Recall Mode | None | None |
| Walk Time (s) |  |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) |  |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  |
| Control Delay |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  |  |
| Total Delay |  |  |
| LOS |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) |  |  |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  |  |
| Starvation Cap Reduct |  |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |



|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | 9 | 7 | ( | $\pm$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 11.5 | 46.0 | 46.0 | 11.5 | 46.0 | 46.0 | 11.7 | 41.6 | 41.6 | 11.7 | 41.6 | 41.6 |
| Total Split (s) | 20.0 | 46.0 | 46.0 | 20.0 | 46.0 | 46.0 | 22.0 | 42.0 | 42.0 | 22.0 | 42.0 | 42.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 15.4\% | 35.4\% | 35.4\% | 15.4\% | 35.4\% | 35.4\% | 16.9\% | 32.3\% | 32.3\% | 16.9\% | 32.3\% | 32.3\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 13.5 | 39.0 | 39.0 | 13.5 | 39.0 | 39.0 | 15.3 | 35.4 | 35.4 | 15.3 | 35.4 | 35.4 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.8 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 2.8 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.9 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.5 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 6.5 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 6.7 | 6.6 | 6.6 | 6.7 | 6.6 | 6.6 |
| Lead/Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Recall Mode | None | Max | Max | None | Max | Max | None | None | None | None | None | None |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 32.0 | 32.0 |  | 32.0 | 32.0 |  | 28.0 | 28.0 |  | 28.0 | 28.0 |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) |  | 5 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 13.5 | 45.2 | 45.2 | 10.2 | 39.1 | 39.1 | 10.0 | 27.5 | 27.5 | 15.3 | 32.9 | 32.9 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.11 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.08 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.08 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.12 | 0.27 | 0.27 |
| v/c Ratio | 1.83 | 0.63 | 0.16 | 0.51 | 0.32 | 0.08 | 0.46 | 0.36 | 0.09 | 0.94 | 0.85 | 0.38 |
| Control Delay | 424.2 | 37.2 | 1.9 | 67.3 | 33.5 | 0.3 | 60.0 | 40.9 | 0.4 | 105.7 | 52.9 | 7.4 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 424.2 | 37.2 | 1.9 | 67.3 | 33.5 | 0.3 | 60.0 | 40.9 | 0.4 | 105.7 | 52.9 | 7.4 |
| LOS | F | D | A | E | C | A | E | D | A | F | D | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 146.5 |  |  | 35.4 |  |  | 42.8 |  |  | 53.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | $\sim 127.6$ | 86.1 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 33.5 | 0.0 | 15.1 | 28.5 | 0.0 | 46.0 | 91.4 | 1.1 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | \#193.0 | 119.3 | 3.8 | 32.5 | 48.9 | 0.0 | 25.2 | 40.7 | 0.0 | \#96.1 | 118.6 | 19.1 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 472.4 |  |  | 249.9 |  |  | 124.0 |  |  | 225.0 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 90.0 |  | 50.0 | 65.0 |  | 70.0 | 60.0 |  | 80.0 | 85.0 |  | 70.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 187 | 1186 | 589 | 183 | 1062 | 560 | 412 | 964 | 534 | 197 | 973 | 568 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 1.83 | 0.63 | 0.16 | 0.38 | 0.32 | 0.08 | 0.30 | 0.28 | 0.07 | 0.94 | 0.78 | 0.36 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Area Type: Other
Cycle Length: 130
Actuated Cycle Length: 122.4
Natural Cycle: 125
Control Type: Semi Act-Uncoord
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.83
Intersection Signal Delay: 83.5
Intersection LOS: F
Intersection Capacity Utilization 98.4\% ICU Level of Service F
Analysis Period (min) 15
~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 2: Trim \& Innes






2018 PM Peak
85\% Confidence Level
Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
Daylight conditions

## Scheme Summary

## Control Data

## Control Data and Model Parameters

| 117155 (Notting Hill) | 2018 PHF Flow Profile (veh) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Existing PM | 7.5 min Time Slice |
| Rodel-Win1 | Queuing Delays (sec) |
| Right Hand Drive | Daylight conditions |
| PM Peak Hour | Peak 60/15 min Results |
| AVERAGE DELAY to Geometry | Output flows: Vehicles |
| Metric Units (m) | $85 \%$ Confidence Level |

## Available Data

| Entry Capacity Calibrated | No |
| :--- | :---: |
| Entry Capacity Modified | No |
| Crosswalks | No |
| Flows Factored | No |
| Approach/Exit Road Capacity Calibrated | No |
| Accidents | No |
| Accident Costs | No |
| Bypass Model | No |
| Bypass Calibration | No |
| Global Results | Yes |

2018 PM Peak
85\% Confidence Level
Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
Daylight conditions

Scheme: Existing PM
Rodel-Win1 - AVERAGE DELAY to Geometry

## Operational Data

## Main Geometry (m)

Geometry and Design Target

| Leg | Leg Names | Bearing <br> (deg) | Grade Sep <br> G | Half Width <br> V | Lanes <br> $\mathbf{n}$ | Target <br> Average <br> Delay <br> $\mathbf{s e c} / \mathbf{v e h})$ | Circulating and Exit Geom <br> Inscribed <br> Diameter <br> $\mathbf{D}$ | Half Width <br> Vx | Lanes <br> $\mathbf{n}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | N - Trim | 0 | 0 | 6.80 | 2 | 10 | 55.00 | 7.40 | 2 |
| 2 | S - Trim | 180 | 0 | 7.40 | 2 | 10 | 55.00 | 7.40 | 2 |
| 3 | E - Millennium | 270 | 0 | 4.30 | 1 | 10 | 55.00 | 4.30 | 1 |

Capacity Modifiers and Capacity Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Capacity |  | Entry Calibration |  | Approach Road |  |  | Exit Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Capacity + or - | XWalk Factor | Intercept + or - | Slope Factor | $\begin{gathered} \text { V } \\ (\mathrm{m}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | Calib Capacity | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{V} \\ (\mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | Calib Capacity |
| 1 | N - Trim | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 4.00 | 3332 | 0 | 7.40 | 3626 | 0 |
| 2 | S - Trim | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 4.00 | 3626 | 0 | 7.40 | 3626 | 0 |
| 3 | E - Millennium | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 4.00 | 2107 | 0 | 4.30 | 2107 | 0 |

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2018 PM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | U-Turn | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Trucks <br> $\%$ | Flow Modifiers <br> Flow <br> Factor | Peak Hour <br> Factor |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | N - Trim | 0 | 44 | 369 | 0 | 5.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |
| 2 | S - Trim | 0 | 292 | 15 | 0 | 5.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |
| 3 | E - Millennium | 0 | 46 | 113 | 0 | 5.0 | 1.00 | 0.900 |

2018 PM Peak
85\% Confidence Level
Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
Daylight conditions
Scheme: Existing PM
Rodel-Win1 - AVERAGE DELAY to Geometry

## Operational Results

## Geometry for Target Input

Geometry Options for 2018 PM Peak

| nv | ne | nc | $\mathbf{n x}$ | Leg $\mathbf{1 - N}-\operatorname{Trim}$ <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 6.80 |
| $(\mathbf{m})$ |  |  |  |  |

Geometry Options for 2018 PM Peak

| Leg 2-S - Trim |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| nv | ne | nc | nx | $\begin{gathered} E \\ (\mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{L}^{\prime} \\ & (\mathrm{m}) \end{aligned}$ |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 7.40 | 0.00 |

Geometry Options for 2018 PM Peak

| Leg 3-E-Millennium |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| nv | ne | nc | nx | $\begin{gathered} E \\ (\mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{L}^{\prime} \\ & (\mathrm{m}) \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.30 | 0.00 |

2018 PM Peak
85\% Confidence Level
Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
Daylight conditions
Scheme: Existing PM

## 2018 PM Peak - 60 minutes

Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit <br> Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | N - Trim | None | 413 |  | 46 |  | 405 | 1691 |  | 0.2442 |  |
| 2 | S - Trim | None | 307 |  | 44 |  | 415 | 1875 |  | 0.1638 |  |
| 3 | E-Millennium | None | 159 |  | 292 |  | 59 | 904 |  | 0.1760 |  |

Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass Type | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | 95\% Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |
| 1 | N - Trim | None | 2.93 |  | 2.93 | 1.02 |  | A |  | A |
| 2 | S - Trim | None | 2.25 |  | 2.25 | 0.58 |  | A |  | A |
| 3 | E-Millennium | None | 4.51 |  | 4.51 | 0.61 |  | A |  | A |

2018 PM Peak
85\% Confidence Level
Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
Daylight conditions
Scheme: Existing PM

## 2018 PM Peak - 15 minutes

Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass Type | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | N - Trim | None | 459 |  | 51 |  | 450 | 1686 |  | 0.2721 |  |
| 2 | S - Trim | None | 341 |  | 49 |  | 461 | 1871 |  | 0.1823 |  |
| 3 | E-Millennium | None | 177 |  | 324 |  | 66 | 892 |  | 0.1981 |  |

Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass Type | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | 95\% Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |
| 1 | N - Trim | None | 2.92 |  | 2.92 | 1.02 |  | A |  | A |
| 2 | S - Trim | None | 2.22 |  | 2.22 | 0.58 |  | A |  | A |
| 3 | E - Millennium | None | 4.49 |  | 4.49 | 0.61 |  | A |  | A |


|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  | \% |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 44 | T | ${ }^{7}$ | 中\% |  | ${ }^{1}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 38 | 284 | 110 | 122 | 639 | 21 | 182 | 35 | 106 | 28 | 76 | 90 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 38 | 284 | 110 | 122 | 639 | 21 | 182 | 35 | 106 | 28 | 76 | 90 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |
| Storage Length (m) | 75.0 |  | 145.0 | 60.0 |  | 0.0 | 50.0 |  | 0.0 | 50.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (m) | 40.0 |  |  | 45.0 |  |  | 100.0 |  |  | 100.0 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor | 0.99 |  | 0.92 | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 0.89 |  | 0.89 | 0.98 |  |
| Frt |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.995 |  |  | 0.887 |  |  | 0.918 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1695 | 3293 | 1473 | 1662 | 3303 | 0 | 1647 | 1369 | 0 | 1647 | 1555 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.343 |  |  | 0.560 |  |  | 0.609 |  |  | 0.655 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 603 | 3293 | 1361 | 944 | 3303 | 0 | 1031 | 1369 | 0 | 1010 | 1555 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 122 |  | 4 |  |  | 118 |  |  | 78 |  |
| Link Speed (k/h) |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 220.1 |  |  | 496.4 |  |  | 517.4 |  |  | 152.1 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 13.2 |  |  | 29.8 |  |  | 31.0 |  |  | 9.1 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 28 |  | 31 | 31 |  | 28 | 25 |  | 114 | 114 |  | 25 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 2\% | 5\% | 5\% | 4\% | 4\% | 2\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 42 | 316 | 122 | 136 | 710 | 23 | 202 | 39 | 118 | 31 | 84 | 100 |
| Shared Lane Trafic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 42 | 316 | 122 | 136 | 733 | 0 | 202 | 157 | 0 | 31 | 184 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  |
| Leading Detector (m) | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  |
| Trailing Detector (m) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Position(m) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Size(m) | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | Cl+Ex | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | Perm | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  | 2 | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 6 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Lane Group $\quad \varnothing 3 \quad \varnothing 7$ |
| :--- |
| Lane Configurations |
| Traffic Volume (vph) |
| Future Volume (vph) |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) |
| Storage Length (m) |
| Storage Lanes |
| Taper Length (m) |
| Lane Util. Factor |
| Ped Bike Factor |
| Frt |
| Flt Protected |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |
| Flt Permitted |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |
| Right Turn on Red |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |
| Link Speed (k/h) |
| Link Distance (m) |
| Travel Time (s) |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |
| Peak Hour Factor |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) |
| Adj. Flow (vph) |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) |
| Enter Blocked Intersection |
| Lane Alignment |
| Median Width(m) |
| Link Offset(m) |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |
| Headway Factor |
| Turning Speed (k/h) |
| Number of Detectors |
| Detector Template |
| Leading Detector (m) |
| Trailing Detector (m) |
| Detector 1 Position(m) |
| Detector 1 Size(m) |
| Detector 1 Type |
| Detector 1 Channel |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |
| Detector 2 Type |
| Detector 2 Channel |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |
| Turn Type |
| Protected Phases |
| Permitted Phases |
| Detector Phase |
| Switch Phase |


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

Splits and Phases: 1: Provence \& Innes



|  | 4 |  | 7 | 7 |  |  | $4$ | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\dagger$ | $\pm$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 「 | \％ | 中4 | 「 | $\cdots$ | 44 | 「＇ | ${ }^{*}$ | 中4 | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 89 | 186 | 101 | 137 | 274 | 33 | 163 | 204 | 29 | 58 | 356 | 86 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 89 | 186 | 101 | 137 | 274 | 33 | 163 | 204 | 29 | 58 | 356 | 86 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |
| Storage Length（m） | 90.0 |  | 50.0 | 65.0 |  | 70.0 | 60.0 |  | 80.0 | 85.0 |  | 70.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 2 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Taper Length（m） | 35.0 |  |  | 45.0 |  |  | 100.0 |  |  | 25.0 |  |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | 0.97 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor | 0.99 | 1.00 | 0.98 | 0.99 |  | 0.98 | 0.98 |  | 0.97 | 0.99 |  | 0.97 |
| Frt |  | 0.989 | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 3225 | 3145 | 1354 | 1662 | 3325 | 1488 | 3195 | 3293 | 1473 | 1572 | 3007 | 1406 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 3201 | 3145 | 1323 | 1650 | 3325 | 1459 | 3147 | 3293 | 1430 | 1551 | 3007 | 1368 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  | 6 | 141 |  |  | 141 |  |  | 144 |  |  | 144 |
| Link Speed（k／h） |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |
| Link Distance（m） |  | 496.4 |  |  | 273.9 |  |  | 148.0 |  |  | 249.0 |  |
| Travel Time（s） |  | 29.8 |  |  | 16.4 |  |  | 8.9 |  |  | 14.9 |  |
| Confl．Peds．（\＃／hr） | 7 |  | 10 | 10 |  | 7 | 14 |  | 16 | 16 |  | 14 |
| Confl．Bikes（\＃／hr） |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 4\％ | 4\％ | 4\％ | 4\％ | 4\％ | 4\％ | 5\％ | 5\％ | 5\％ | 10\％ | 15\％ | 10\％ |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 99 | 207 | 112 | 152 | 304 | 37 | 181 | 227 | 32 | 64 | 396 | 96 |
| Shared Lane Traffic（\％） |  |  | 14\％ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 99 | 223 | 96 | 152 | 304 | 37 | 181 | 227 | 32 | 64 | 396 | 96 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width（m） |  | 7.7 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 12.0 |  |  | 7.4 |  |
| Link Offset（m） |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width（m） |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 |
| Turning Speed（k／h） | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Leading Detector（m） | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 |
| Trailing Detector（m） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Position（m） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Size（m） | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl＋Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | Cl＋Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | Cl＋Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | Cl＋Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Queue（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Delay（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 2 Position（m） |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |
| Detector 2 Size（m） |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl＋Ex |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | Cl＋Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend（s） |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |
| Detector Phase | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 8 |


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

Splits and Phases: 2: Trim \& Innes






|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | $\checkmark$ | 1 |  |  |  | 4 | \％ |  | $\ddagger$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 中4 | 「 | \％ | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | \％ | $\uparrow$ |  | \％ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 100 | 785 | 109 | 81 | 492 | 23 | 72 | 36 | 79 | 45 | 45 | 77 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 100 | 785 | 109 | 81 | 492 | 23 | 72 | 36 | 79 | 45 | 45 | 77 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |
| Storage Length（m） | 75.0 |  | 145.0 | 60.0 |  | 0.0 | 50.0 |  | 0.0 | 50.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length（m） | 40.0 |  |  | 45.0 |  |  | 100.0 |  |  | 100.0 |  |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor | 0.99 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 0.97 |  | 0.98 | 0.98 |  |
| Frt |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.993 |  |  | 0.897 |  |  | 0.905 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1695 | 3293 | 1517 | 1695 | 3328 | 0 | 1695 | 1557 | 0 | 1695 | 1587 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.436 |  |  | 0.312 |  |  | 0.661 |  |  | 0.675 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 769 | 3293 | 1466 | 555 | 3328 | 0 | 1164 | 1557 | 0 | 1177 | 1587 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  |  | 121 |  | 8 |  |  | 88 |  |  | 83 |  |
| Link Speed（k／h） |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |
| Link Distance（m） |  | 220.1 |  |  | 496.4 |  |  | 517.4 |  |  | 152.1 |  |
| Travel Time（s） |  | 13.2 |  |  | 29.8 |  |  | 31.0 |  |  | 9.1 |  |
| Confl．Peds．（\＃／hr） | 15 |  | 7 | 7 |  | 15 | 13 |  | 23 | 23 |  | 13 |
| Confl．Bikes（\＃／hr） |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 2\％ | 5\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 3\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 111 | 872 | 121 | 90 | 547 | 26 | 80 | 40 | 88 | 50 | 50 | 86 |
| Shared Lane Traffic（\％） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 111 | 872 | 121 | 90 | 573 | 0 | 80 | 128 | 0 | 50 | 136 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width（m） |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |
| Link Offset（m） |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width（m） |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 |
| Turning Speed（k／h） | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  |
| Leading Detector（m） | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  |
| Trailing Detector（m） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Position（m） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Size（m） | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex |  | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex |  | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Queue（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Delay（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 2 Position（m） |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |
| Detector 2 Size（m） |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | Cl＋Ex |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend（s） |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | Perm | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  | 2 | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 6 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 4 | 4 |  |


| Lane Group $\quad \varnothing 3 \quad \varnothing 7$ |
| :--- |
| Lane Configurations |
| Traffic Volume (vph) |
| Future Volume (vph) |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) |
| Storage Length (m) |
| Storage Lanes |
| Taper Length (m) |
| Lane Util. Factor |
| Ped Bike Factor |
| Frt |
| Flt Protected |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |
| Flt Permitted |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |
| Right Turn on Red |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |
| Link Speed (k/h) |
| Link Distance (m) |
| Travel Time (s) |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |
| Peak Hour Factor |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) |
| Adj. Flow (vph) |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) |
| Enter Blocked Intersection |
| Lane Alignment |
| Median Width(m) |
| Link Offset(m) |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |
| Headway Factor |
| Turning Speed (k/h) |
| Number of Detectors |
| Detector Template |
| Leading Detector (m) |
| Trailing Detector (m) |
| Detector 1 Position(m) |
| Detector 1 Size(m) |
| Detector 1 Type |
| Detector 1 Channel |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |
| Detector 2 Type |
| Detector 2 Channel |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |
| Turn Type |
| Protected Phases |
| Permitted Phases |
| Detector Phase |


|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | $4$ |  |  |  | $\frac{1}{\dagger}$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |  | 10.0 | 10.0 |  | 10.0 | 10.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 34.5 | 34.5 | 34.5 | 34.5 | 34.5 |  | 31.8 | 31.8 |  | 31.8 | 31.8 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 63.0 | 63.0 | 63.0 | 63.0 | 63.0 |  | 32.0 | 32.0 |  | 32.0 | 32.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 63.0\% | 63.0\% | 63.0\% | 63.0\% | 63.0\% |  | 32.0\% | 32.0\% |  | 32.0\% | 32.0\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 56.7 | 56.7 | 56.7 | 56.7 | 56.7 |  | 25.2 | 25.2 |  | 25.2 | 25.2 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.6 |  | 3.8 | 3.8 |  | 3.8 | 3.8 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.3 |  | 6.8 | 6.8 |  | 6.8 | 6.8 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lag | Lag |  | Lag | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | C-Max | C-Max | C-Max | C-Max | C-Max |  | None | None |  | None | None |  |
| Walk Time (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 |  | 23.0 | 23.0 |  | 23.0 | 23.0 |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) | 10 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 7 |  | 10 | 10 |  | 7 | 7 |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 72.6 | 72.6 | 72.6 | 72.6 | 72.6 |  | 14.3 | 14.3 |  | 14.3 | 14.3 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.73 |  | 0.14 | 0.14 |  | 0.14 | 0.14 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.20 | 0.36 | 0.11 | 0.22 | 0.24 |  | 0.48 | 0.43 |  | 0.30 | 0.46 |  |
| Control Delay | 6.7 | 6.3 | 1.5 | 7.5 | 5.4 |  | 47.5 | 17.9 |  | 40.7 | 20.8 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 6.7 | 6.3 | 1.5 | 7.5 | 5.4 |  | 47.5 | 17.9 |  | 40.7 | 20.8 |  |
| LOS | A | A | A | A | A |  | D | B |  | D | C |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 5.8 |  |  | 5.7 |  |  | 29.3 |  |  | 26.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 5.3 | 25.3 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 14.5 |  | 14.9 | 7.1 |  | 9.0 | 9.5 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | 17.6 | 54.7 | 6.2 | 16.1 | 32.8 |  | 25.3 | 20.3 |  | 17.3 | 23.1 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 196.1 |  |  | 472.4 |  |  | 493.4 |  |  | 128.1 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 75.0 |  | 145.0 | 60.0 |  |  | 50.0 |  |  | 50.0 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 558 | 2390 | 1097 | 402 | 2418 |  | 293 | 458 |  | 296 | 462 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.20 | 0.36 | 0.11 | 0.22 | 0.24 |  | 0.27 | 0.28 |  | 0.17 | 0.29 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset: 21 (21\%), Referenced to phase 2:EBTL and 6:WBTL, Start of Green |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 9.8 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 76.6\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Splits and Phases: 1: Provence \& Innes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\rightarrow \square 2(\mathrm{R})$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63 s |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 32 s <br> 年 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\forall \square 6(\mathrm{R})$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{HE}_{\mathrm{E}}^{\mathrm{g},} \mathrm{~T}_{08}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63 s |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Lane Group | $\emptyset 3$ | $\varnothing 7$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Switch Phase |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 5\% | 5\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  |  |
| Lead/Lag | Lead | Lead |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes | Yes |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Recall Mode | None | None |
| Walk Time (s) |  |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) |  |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  |
| Control Delay |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  |  |
| Total Delay |  |  |
| LOS |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) |  |  |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  |  |
| Starvation Cap Reduct |  |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |


|  | 4 |  | V | 7 |  |  | $4$ | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\dagger$ | $\pm$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 「 | \％ | 中4 | 「 | $\cdots$ | 44 | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | 中4 | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 308 | 661 | 94 | 63 | 306 | 41 | 111 | 240 | 34 | 167 | 686 | 185 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 308 | 661 | 94 | 63 | 306 | 41 | 111 | 240 | 34 | 167 | 686 | 185 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |
| Storage Length（m） | 90.0 |  | 50.0 | 65.0 |  | 70.0 | 60.0 |  | 80.0 | 85.0 |  | 70.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 2 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Taper Length（m） | 35.0 |  |  | 45.0 |  |  | 100.0 |  |  | 25.0 |  |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | 0.97 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor | 0.99 |  |  |  |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 |
| Frt |  | 0.998 | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 3288 | 3209 | 1354 | 1662 | 3325 | 1488 | 3288 | 3325 | 1517 | 1572 | 3325 | 1488 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 3254 | 3209 | 1354 | 1662 | 3325 | 1455 | 3278 | 3325 | 1490 | 1566 | 3325 | 1460 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  | 1 | 141 |  |  | 141 |  |  | 144 |  |  | 200 |
| Link Speed（k／h） |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |
| Link Distance（m） |  | 496.4 |  |  | 273.9 |  |  | 148.0 |  |  | 249.0 |  |
| Travel Time（s） |  | 29.8 |  |  | 16.4 |  |  | 8.9 |  |  | 14.9 |  |
| Confl．Peds．（\＃／hr） | 10 |  |  |  |  | 10 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 |  | 5 |
| Confl．Bikes（\＃／hr） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 2\％ | 3\％ | 4\％ | 4\％ | 4\％ | 4\％ | 2\％ | 4\％ | 2\％ | 10\％ | 4\％ | 4\％ |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 342 | 734 | 104 | 70 | 340 | 46 | 123 | 267 | 38 | 186 | 762 | 206 |
| Shared Lane Traffic（\％） |  |  | 10\％ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 342 | 744 | 94 | 70 | 340 | 46 | 123 | 267 | 38 | 186 | 762 | 206 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width（m） |  | 7.7 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 12.0 |  |  | 7.4 |  |
| Link Offset（m） |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width（m） |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 |
| Turning Speed（k／h） | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Leading Detector（m） | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 |
| Trailing Detector（m） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Position（m） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Size（m） | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl＋Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | Cl＋Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | Cl＋Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | Cl＋Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Queue（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Delay（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 2 Position（m） |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |
| Detector 2 Size（m） |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl＋Ex |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | Cl＋Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend（s） |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |
| Detector Phase | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 8 |


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

Splits and Phases: 2: Trim \& Innes






| ur |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20 | kgro | raffi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\psi$ <br> EBL |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ \text { NBL } \end{gathered}$ | 4NBT | NBR | SBL | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\text { SBT }}$ | $\pm$ ¢BR |
| Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 中4 | F゙ | \％ | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | \％ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 41 | 304 | 118 | 137 | 691 | 28 | 182 | 35 | 122 | 28 | 76 | 90 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 41 | 304 | 118 | 137 | 691 | 28 | 182 | 35 | 122 | 28 | 76 | 90 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |
| Storage Length（m） | 75.0 |  | 145.0 | 60.0 |  | 0.0 | 50.0 |  | 0.0 | 50.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length（m） | 40.0 |  |  | 45.0 |  |  | 100.0 |  |  | 100.0 |  |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor | 0.98 |  | 0.92 | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 0.89 |  | 0.89 | 0.98 |  |
| Frt |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.994 |  |  | 0.883 |  |  | 0.919 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1695 | 3293 | 1473 | 1662 | 3298 | 0 | 1647 | 1357 | 0 | 1647 | 1557 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.351 |  |  | 0.567 |  |  | 0.636 |  |  | 0.652 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 617 | 3293 | 1361 | 955 | 3298 | 0 | 1076 | 1357 | 0 | 1006 | 1557 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  |  | 118 |  | 5 |  |  | 122 |  |  | 78 |  |
| Link Speed（k／h） |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |
| Link Distance（m） |  | 220.1 |  |  | 496.4 |  |  | 517.4 |  |  | 152.1 |  |
| Travel Time（s） |  | 13.2 |  |  | 29.8 |  |  | 31.0 |  |  | 9.1 |  |
| Confl．Peds．（\＃／hr） | 28 |  | 31 | 31 |  | 28 | 25 |  | 114 | 114 |  | 25 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 2\％ | 5\％ | 5\％ | 4\％ | 4\％ | 2\％ | 5\％ | 5\％ | 5\％ | 5\％ | 5\％ | 5\％ |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 41 | 304 | 118 | 137 | 691 | 28 | 182 | 35 | 122 | 28 | 76 | 90 |
| Shared Lane Traffic（\％） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 41 | 304 | 118 | 137 | 719 | 0 | 182 | 157 | 0 | 28 | 166 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width（m） |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |
| Link Offset（m） |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width（m） |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 |
| Turning Speed（k／h） | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  |
| Leading Detector（m） | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  |
| Trailing Detector（m） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Position（m） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Size（m） | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl＋Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | Cl＋Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | Cl＋Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Queue（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Delay（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 2 Position（m） |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |
| Detector 2 Size（m） |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl＋Ex |  |  | Cl＋Ex |  |  | Cl＋Ex |  |  | Cl＋Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend（s） |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | Perm | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  | 2 | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 6 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Lane Group $\quad \varnothing 3 \quad \varnothing 7$ |
| :--- |
| Lane Configurations |
| Traffic Volume (vph) |
| Future Volume (vph) |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) |
| Storage Length (m) |
| Storage Lanes |
| Taper Length (m) |
| Lane Util. Factor |
| Ped Bike Factor |
| Frt |
| Flt Protected |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |
| Flt Permitted |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |
| Right Turn on Red |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |
| Link Speed (k/h) |
| Link Distance (m) |
| Travel Time (s) |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |
| Peak Hour Factor |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) |
| Adj. Flow (vph) |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) |
| Enter Blocked Intersection |
| Lane Alignment |
| Median Width(m) |
| Link Offset(m) |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |
| Headway Factor |
| Turning Speed (k/h) |
| Number of Detectors |
| Detector Template |
| Leading Detector (m) |
| Trailing Detector (m) |
| Detector 1 Position(m) |
| Detector 1 Size(m) |
| Detector 1 Type |
| Detector 1 Channel |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |
| Detector 2 Type |
| Detector 2 Channel |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |
| Turn Type |
| Protected Phases |
| Permitted Phases |
| Detector Phase |
| Switch Phase |



Splits and Phases: 1: Provence \& Innes



|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | \％ | 7 |  |  | $4$ | 9 | 7 |  | $\frac{1}{\dagger}$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 中t | F＇ | ${ }^{7}$ | 44 | 「 | ＊ | 44 | 「 | ${ }^{1}$ | 44 | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 103 | 210 | 108 | 147 | 299 | 35 | 175 | 222 | 31 | 64 | 388 | 100 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 103 | 210 | 108 | 147 | 299 | 35 | 175 | 222 | 31 | 64 | 388 | 100 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |
| Storage Length（m） | 90.0 |  | 50.0 | 65.0 |  | 70.0 | 60.0 |  | 80.0 | 85.0 |  | 70.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Taper Length（m） | 35.0 |  |  | 45.0 |  |  | 100.0 |  |  | 25.0 |  |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | 1.00 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.98 | 0.99 |  | 0.98 | 0.98 |  | 0.97 | 0.99 |  | 0.97 |
| Frt |  | 0.991 | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1662 | 3152 | 1354 | 1662 | 3325 | 1488 | 3195 | 3293 | 1473 | 1572 | 3007 | 1406 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 1655 | 3152 | 1323 | 1650 | 3325 | 1459 | 3146 | 3293 | 1430 | 1551 | 3007 | 1368 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  | 5 | 141 |  |  | 141 |  |  | 144 |  |  | 144 |
| Link Speed（k／h） |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |
| Link Distance（m） |  | 496.4 |  |  | 273.9 |  |  | 148.0 |  |  | 249.0 |  |
| Travel Time（s） |  | 29.8 |  |  | 16.4 |  |  | 8.9 |  |  | 14.9 |  |
| Confl．Peds．（\＃／hr） | 7 |  | 10 | 10 |  | 7 | 14 |  | 16 | 16 |  | 14 |
| Confl．Bikes（\＃／hr） |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 4\％ | 4\％ | 4\％ | 4\％ | 4\％ | 4\％ | 5\％ | 5\％ | 5\％ | 10\％ | 15\％ | 10\％ |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 103 | 210 | 108 | 147 | 299 | 35 | 175 | 222 | 31 | 64 | 388 | 100 |
| Shared Lane Traffic（\％） |  |  | 12\％ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 103 | 223 | 95 | 147 | 299 | 35 | 175 | 222 | 31 | 64 | 388 | 100 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width（m） |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 12.0 |  |  | 7.4 |  |
| Link Offset（m） |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width（m） |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 |
| Turning Speed（k／h） | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Leading Detector（m） | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 |
| Trailing Detector（m） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Position（m） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Size（m） | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Queue（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Delay（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 2 Position（m） |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |
| Detector 2 Size（m） |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | Cl＋Ex |  |  | Cl＋Ex |  |  | Cl＋Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend（s） |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |
| Detector Phase | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 8 |


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

Splits and Phases: 2: Trim \& Innes



|  | $\psi$EBL |  | 4 |  | 1 | $\downarrow$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group |  | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | \％ | 中4 | 中4 | 「 |  |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 94 | 5 | 4 | 277 | 284 | 57 |  |
| Future Volume（vph） | 94 | 5 | 4 | 277 | 284 | 57 |  |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |  |
| Storage Length（m） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 55.0 |  |  | 60.0 |  |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 0 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |
| Taper Length（m） | 2.5 |  | 40.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt | 0.993 |  |  |  |  | 0.850 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.955 |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1676 | 0 | 1695 | 3293 | 3144 | 1406 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.955 |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 1676 | 0 | 1695 | 3293 | 3144 | 1406 |  |
| Link Speed（k／h） | 60 |  |  | 60 | 60 |  |  |
| Link Distance（m） | 321.9 |  |  | 342.9 | 293.3 |  |  |
| Travel Time（s） | 19.3 |  |  | 20.6 | 17.6 |  |  |
| Confl．Peds．（\＃／hr） |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 3\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 5\％ | 10\％ | 10\％ |  |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 94 | 5 | 4 | 277 | 284 | 57 |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic（\％） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 99 | 0 | 4 | 277 | 284 | 57 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |  |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Left | Left | Right |  |
| Median Width（m） | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 | 3.7 |  |  |
| Link Offset（m） | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Crosswalk Width（m） | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 | 1.6 |  |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 |  |
| Turning Speed（k／h） | 24 | 14 | 24 |  |  | 14 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Free | Free |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type： | her |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type：Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 20．8\％Analysis Period（min） 15 |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |





2025 AM Peak 85\% Confidence Level Daylight conditions

Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
Scheme: 2025 Background AM Rodel-Win1 - AVERAGE DELAY to Geometry

## Scheme Summary

## Control Data

## Control Data and Model Parameters

| 117155 (Notting Hill) | 2025 PHF Flow Profile (veh) |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2025 Background AM | 7.5 min Time Slice |
| Rodel-Win1 | Queuing Delays (sec) |
| Right Hand Drive | Daylight conditions |
| AM Peak Hour | Peak 60/15 min Results |
| AVERAGE DELAY to Geometry | Output flows: Vehicles |
| Metric Units (m) | $85 \%$ Confidence Level |

## Available Data

| Entry Capacity Calibrated | No |
| :--- | :---: |
| Entry Capacity Modified | No |
| Crosswalks | No |
| Flows Factored | No |
| Approach/Exit Road Capacity Calibrated | No |
| Accidents | No |
| Accident Costs | No |
| Bypass Model | No |
| Bypass Calibration | No |
| Global Results | Yes |

2025 AM Peak
85\% Confidence Level
Daylight conditions

Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
Scheme: 2025 Background AM
Rodel-Win1 - AVERAGE DELAY to Geometry

## Operational Data

## Main Geometry (m)

Geometry and Design Target

| Leg | Leg Names | Approach Geometry (m) |  |  |  | Target <br> Average Delay (sec/veh) | Circulating and Exit Geom |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Bearing (deg) | Grade Sep G | Half Width V | Lanes n |  | Inscribed Diameter D | Half Width Vx | $\underset{\mathrm{n}}{\text { Lanes }}$ |
| 1 | N - Trim | 0 | 0 | 6.80 | 2 | 10 | 55.00 | 7.40 | 2 |
| 2 | W - Street No 1 | 90 | 0 | 4.30 | 1 | 10 | 55.00 | 4.30 | 1 |
| 3 | S - Trim | 180 | 0 | 7.40 | 2 | 10 | 55.00 | 7.40 | 2 |
| 4 | E-Millennium | 270 | 0 | 4.30 | 1 | 10 | 55.00 | 4.30 | 1 |

## Capacity Modifiers and Capacity Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Capacity |  | Entry Calibration |  | Approach Road |  |  | Exit Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Capacity + or - | XWalk <br> Factor | Intercept + or - | Slope Factor | $\begin{gathered} V \\ (\mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | Calib Capacity | $\begin{gathered} V \\ (\mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | Calib Capacity |
| 1 | N - Trim | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 6.00 | 3332 | 0 | 7.40 | 3626 | 0 |
| 2 | W - Street No 1 | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 6.00 | 2107 | 0 | 4.30 | 2107 | 0 |
| 3 | S - Trim | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 6.00 | 3626 | 0 | 7.40 | 3626 | 0 |
| 4 | E-Millennium | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 6.00 | 2107 | 0 | 4.30 | 2107 | 0 |

2025 AM Peak 85\% Confidence Level Daylight conditions

Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
Scheme: 2025 Background AM Rodel-Win1 - AVERAGE DELAY to Geometry

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2025 AM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | Turning Flows |  |  |  |  | Flow Modifiers |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Trucks \% | Flow Factor | Peak Hour Factor |
| 1 | N - Trim | 0 | 164 | 205 | 0 | 0 | 5.0 | 1.00 | 1.000 |
|  | W - Street No 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 5.0 | 1.00 | 1.000 |
| 3 | S - Trim | 0 | 0 | 252 | 58 | 0 | 5.0 | 1.00 | 1.000 |
| 4 | E-Millennium | 0 | 25 | 2 | 86 | 0 | 5.0 | 1.00 | 1.000 |

2025 AM Peak 85\% Confidence Level Daylight conditions

Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
Scheme: 2025 Background AM Rodel-Win1 - AVERAGE DELAY to Geometry

## Operational Results

## Geometry for Target Input

Geometry Options for 2025 AM Peak

| nv | ne | nc | $\mathbf{n x}$ | Leg $\mathbf{1 - N}-\operatorname{Trim}$ <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 6.80 |
| $(\mathbf{m})$ |  |  |  |  |

Geometry Options for 2025 AM Peak

|  |  |  | Leg 2-W - Street No 1 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| nv | ne | nc | $\mathbf{n x}$ | $\mathbf{E}$ <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | $\mathbf{L}^{\prime}$ <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ |  |
| 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.30 | 0.00 |  |

Geometry Options for 2025 AM Peak

| nv | ne | nc | nx |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | $\mathbf{E}$ <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ |

Geometry Options for 2025 AM Peak

|  |  |  | Leg 4-E-Millennium |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| nv | ne | nc | $\mathbf{n x}$ | $\mathbf{E}$ <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | $\mathbf{L}^{\prime}$ <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ |  |
| 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.30 | 0.00 |  |

2025 AM Peak
85\% Confidence Level
Daylight conditions

Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
Scheme: 2025 Background AM Rodel-Win1 - AVERAGE DELAY to Geometry

## 2025 AM Peak - 60 minutes

Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit <br> Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | N - Trim | None | 369 |  | 27 |  | 338 | 1657 |  | 0.2227 |  |
| 2 | W - Street No 1 | None | 6 |  | 394 |  | 2 | 853 |  | 0.0070 |  |
| 3 | S - Trim | None | 310 |  | 170 |  | 230 | 1691 |  | 0.1833 |  |
| 4 | E-Millennium | None | 113 |  | 252 |  | 228 | 904 |  | 0.1250 |  |

Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass Type | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | 95\% Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |
| 1 | N - Trim | None | 4.72 |  | 4.72 | 1.27 |  | A |  | A |
| 2 | W - Street No 1 | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 3 | S - Trim | None | 3.02 |  | 3.02 | 0.68 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | E-Millennium | None | 4.29 |  | 4.29 | 0.36 |  | A |  | A |

2025 AM Peak
85\% Confidence Level
Daylight conditions

Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
Scheme: 2025 Background AM Rodel-Win1 - AVERAGE DELAY to Geometry

## 2025 AM Peak - 15 minutes

Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit <br> Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | N - Trim | None | 369 |  | 27 |  | 338 | 1657 |  | 0.2227 |  |
| 2 | W - Street No 1 | None | 6 |  | 394 |  | 2 | 853 |  | 0.0070 |  |
| 3 | S - Trim | None | 310 |  | 170 |  | 230 | 1691 |  | 0.1833 |  |
| 4 | E-Millennium | None | 113 |  | 252 |  | 228 | 904 |  | 0.1250 |  |

Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass Type | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | 95\% Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |
| 1 | N - Trim | None | 4.73 |  | 4.73 | 1.27 |  | A |  | A |
| 2 | W - Street No 1 | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 3 | S - Trim | None | 3.02 |  | 3.02 | 0.68 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | E-Millennium | None | 4.30 |  | 4.30 | 0.36 |  | A |  | A |


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | $\checkmark$ | 7 |  | 4 | $4$ | $\dagger$ | 7 |  | $\frac{1}{1}$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 44 | 「7 | ${ }^{1}$ | 中 F |  | \％ | $\uparrow$ |  | \％ | 个 |  |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 107 | 842 | 117 | 103 | 533 | 29 | 72 | 36 | 90 | 45 | 45 | 77 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 107 | 842 | 117 | 103 | 533 | 29 | 72 | 36 | 90 | 45 | 45 | 77 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |
| Storage Length（m） | 75.0 |  | 145.0 | 60.0 |  | 0.0 | 50.0 |  | 0.0 | 50.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length（m） | 40.0 |  |  | 45.0 |  |  | 100.0 |  |  | 100.0 |  |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor | 0.99 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 0.97 |  | 0.98 | 0.98 |  |
| Frt |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.992 |  |  | 0.893 |  |  | 0.905 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1695 | 3293 | 1517 | 1695 | 3324 | 0 | 1695 | 1548 | 0 | 1695 | 1587 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.441 |  |  | 0.323 |  |  | 0.679 |  |  | 0.676 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 777 | 3293 | 1466 | 574 | 3324 | 0 | 1196 | 1548 | 0 | 1178 | 1587 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  |  | 117 |  | 9 |  |  | 90 |  |  | 77 |  |
| Link Speed（k／h） |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |
| Link Distance（m） |  | 220.1 |  |  | 496.4 |  |  | 517.4 |  |  | 152.1 |  |
| Travel Time（s） |  | 13.2 |  |  | 29.8 |  |  | 31.0 |  |  | 9.1 |  |
| Confl．Peds．（\＃／hr） | 15 |  | 7 | 7 |  | 15 | 13 |  | 23 | 23 |  | 13 |
| Confl．Bikes（\＃／hr） |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 2\％ | 5\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 3\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 107 | 842 | 117 | 103 | 533 | 29 | 72 | 36 | 90 | 45 | 45 | 77 |
| Shared Lane Traffic（\％） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 107 | 842 | 117 | 103 | 562 | 0 | 72 | 126 | 0 | 45 | 122 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width（m） |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |
| Link Offset（m） |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width（m） |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 |
| Turning Speed（k／h） | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  |
| Leading Detector（m） | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  |
| Trailing Detector（m） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Position（m） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Size（m） | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex |  | Cl＋Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | Cl＋Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Queue（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Delay（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 2 Position（m） |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |
| Detector 2 Size（m） |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | Cl＋Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend（s） |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | Perm | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  | 2 | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 6 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  |


| Lane Group $\quad \varnothing 3 \quad \varnothing 7$ |
| :--- |
| Lane Configurations |
| Traffic Volume (vph) |
| Future Volume (vph) |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) |
| Storage Length (m) |
| Storage Lanes |
| Taper Length (m) |
| Lane Util. Factor |
| Ped Bike Factor |
| Frt |
| Flt Protected |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |
| Flt Permitted |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |
| Right Turn on Red |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |
| Link Speed (k/h) |
| Link Distance (m) |
| Travel Time (s) |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |
| Peak Hour Factor |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) |
| Adj. Flow (vph) |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) |
| Enter Blocked Intersection |
| Lane Alignment |
| Median Width(m) |
| Link Offset(m) |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |
| Headway Factor |
| Turning Speed (k/h) |
| Number of Detectors |
| Detector Template |
| Leading Detector (m) |
| Trailing Detector (m) |
| Detector 1 Position(m) |
| Detector 1 Size(m) |
| Detector 1 Type |
| Detector 1 Channel |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |
| Detector 2 Type |
| Detector 2 Channel |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |
| Turn Type |
| Protected Phases |
| Permitted Phases |
| Detector Phase |



| Lane Group | $\emptyset 3$ | $\varnothing 7$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Switch Phase |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 5\% | 5\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  |  |
| Lead/Lag | Lead | Lead |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes | Yes |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Recall Mode | None | None |
| Walk Time (s) |  |  |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  |  |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) |  |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  |
| Control Delay |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  |  |
| Total Delay |  |  |
| LOS |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (m) |  |  |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  |  |
| Starvation Cap Reduct |  |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |



|  | 4 |  | V | $\bigcirc$ |  | 4 | 4 | 4 | \% | ( | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 11.5 | 46.0 | 46.0 | 11.5 | 46.0 | 46.0 | 11.7 | 41.6 | 41.6 | 11.7 | 41.6 | 41.6 |
| Total Split (s) | 20.0 | 46.0 | 46.0 | 20.0 | 46.0 | 46.0 | 22.0 | 42.0 | 42.0 | 22.0 | 42.0 | 42.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 15.4\% | 35.4\% | 35.4\% | 15.4\% | 35.4\% | 35.4\% | 16.9\% | 32.3\% | 32.3\% | 16.9\% | 32.3\% | 32.3\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 13.5 | 39.0 | 39.0 | 13.5 | 39.0 | 39.0 | 15.3 | 35.4 | 35.4 | 15.3 | 35.4 | 35.4 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.8 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 2.8 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.9 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.5 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 6.5 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 6.7 | 6.6 | 6.6 | 6.7 | 6.6 | 6.6 |
| Lead/Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Recall Mode | None | Max | Max | None | Max | Max | None | None | None | None | None | None |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 32.0 | 32.0 |  | 32.0 | 32.0 |  | 28.0 | 28.0 |  | 28.0 | 28.0 |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) |  | 5 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 13.5 | 45.4 | 45.4 | 10.1 | 39.1 | 39.1 | 9.8 | 26.8 | 26.8 | 15.4 | 32.4 | 32.4 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.11 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.08 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.08 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.13 | 0.27 | 0.27 |
| v/c Ratio | 1.81 | 0.61 | 0.15 | 0.50 | 0.32 | 0.08 | 0.45 | 0.36 | 0.08 | 0.91 | 0.84 | 0.39 |
| Control Delay | 416.8 | 36.3 | 1.5 | 66.8 | 33.2 | 0.3 | 59.8 | 41.0 | 0.4 | 98.9 | 51.7 | 6.8 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 416.8 | 36.3 | 1.5 | 66.8 | 33.2 | 0.3 | 59.8 | 41.0 | 0.4 | 98.9 | 51.7 | 6.8 |
| LOS | F | D | A | E | C | A | E | D | A | F | D | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 145.6 |  |  | 35.1 |  |  | 42.9 |  |  | 50.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | $\sim 126.2$ | 82.6 | 0.0 | 16.1 | 33.2 | 0.0 | 14.5 | 28.1 | 0.0 | 44.4 | 88.0 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | \#192.4 | 115.8 | 3.1 | 31.4 | 48.9 | 0.0 | 24.6 | 40.2 | 0.0 | \#93.0 | 114.3 | 17.9 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 472.4 |  |  | 249.9 |  |  | 124.0 |  |  | 225.0 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 90.0 |  | 50.0 | 65.0 |  | 70.0 | 60.0 |  | 80.0 | 85.0 |  | 70.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 188 | 1197 | 593 | 184 | 1069 | 563 | 414 | 970 | 536 | 198 | 980 | 578 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 1.81 | 0.61 | 0.15 | 0.37 | 0.32 | 0.08 | 0.29 | 0.27 | 0.07 | 0.91 | 0.76 | 0.36 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Area Type
Other
Cycle Length: 130
Actuated Cycle Length: 121.7
Natural Cycle: 125
Control Type: Semi Act-Uncoord
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.81
Intersection Signal Delay: 82.3
Intersection LOS: F
Intersection Capacity Utilization 101.7\% ICU Level of Service G
Analysis Period (min) 15
~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 2: Trim \& Innes







2025 PM Peak
85\% Confidence Level
Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
Daylight conditions

## Scheme Summary

## Control Data

## Control Data and Model Parameters

| 117155 (Notting Hill) | 2025 PHF Flow Profile (veh) |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2025 Background PM | 7.5 min Time Slice |
| Rodel-Win1 | Queuing Delays (sec) |
| Right Hand Drive | Daylight conditions |
| PM Peak Hour | Peak 60/15 min Results |
| AVERAGE DELAY to Geometry | Output flows: Vehicles |
| Metric Units (m) | $85 \%$ Confidence Level |

## Available Data

| Entry Capacity Calibrated | No |
| :--- | :---: |
| Entry Capacity Modified | No |
| Crosswalks | No |
| Flows Factored | No |
| Approach/Exit Road Capacity Calibrated | No |
| Accidents | No |
| Accident Costs | No |
| Bypass Model | No |
| Bypass Calibration | No |
| Global Results | Yes |

2025 PM Peak
85\% Confidence Level
Daylight conditions

Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
Scheme: 2025 Background PM Rodel-Win1 - AVERAGE DELAY to Geometry

## Operational Data

## Main Geometry (m)

Geometry and Design Target

| Leg | Leg Names | Approach Geometry (m) |  |  |  | Target <br> Average Delay (sec/veh) | Circulating and Exit Geom |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Bearing (deg) | Grade Sep G | Half Width V | Lanes n |  | Inscribed Diameter D | Half Width Vx | $\underset{\mathrm{n}}{\text { Lanes }}$ |
| 1 | N - Trim | 0 | 0 | 6.80 | 2 | 10 | 55.00 | 7.40 | 2 |
| 2 | W - Street No 1 | 90 | 0 | 4.30 | 1 | 10 | 55.00 | 4.30 | 1 |
| 3 | S - Trim | 180 | 0 | 7.40 | 2 | 10 | 55.00 | 7.40 | 2 |
| 4 | E-Millennium | 270 | 0 | 4.30 | 1 | 10 | 55.00 | 4.30 | 1 |

## Capacity Modifiers and Capacity Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Capacity |  | Entry Calibration |  | Approach Road |  |  | Exit Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Capacity + or - | XWalk <br> Factor | Intercept + or - | Slope Factor | $\begin{gathered} V \\ (\mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | Calib Capacity | $\begin{gathered} V \\ (\mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | Calib Capacity |
| 1 | N - Trim | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 6.00 | 3332 | 0 | 7.40 | 3626 | 0 |
| 2 | W - Street No 1 | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 6.00 | 2107 | 0 | 4.30 | 2107 | 0 |
| 3 | S - Trim | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 6.00 | 3626 | 0 | 7.40 | 3626 | 0 |
| 4 | E-Millennium | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 6.00 | 2107 | 0 | 4.30 | 2107 | 0 |

2025 PM Peak 85\% Confidence Level Daylight conditions

Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
Scheme: 2025 Background PM Rodel-Win1 - AVERAGE DELAY to Geometry

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2025 PM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names |  |  |  |  |  | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | Bypass \(\left.\begin{array}{c}Trucks <br>

\%\end{array} $$
\begin{array}{c}\text { Flow Modifiers } \\
\text { Flow } \\
\text { Factor }\end{array}
$$ $$
\begin{array}{c}\text { Peak Hour } \\
\text { Factor }\end{array}
$$\right]\)

2025 PM Peak
85\% Confidence Level
Daylight conditions

Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
Scheme: 2025 Background PM Rodel-Win1 - AVERAGE DELAY to Geometry

## Operational Results

## Geometry for Target Input

Geometry Options for 2025 PM Peak

| nv | ne | nc | $\mathbf{n x}$ | Leg $\mathbf{1 - N}-\operatorname{Trim}$ <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 6.80 |
| $(\mathbf{m})$ |  |  |  |  |

Geometry Options for 2025 PM Peak

|  |  |  | Leg 2-W - Street No 1 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| nv | ne | nc | $\mathbf{n x}$ | $\mathbf{E}$ <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | $\mathbf{L}^{\prime}$ <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ |  |
| 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.30 | 0.00 |  |

Geometry Options for 2025 PM Peak

| nv | ne | nc | nx |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | $\mathbf{E}$ <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ |

Geometry Options for 2025 PM Peak

| Leg 4 - E-Millennium |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| nv | ne | nc | nx | $\underset{(\mathrm{m})}{\mathrm{E}}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{L}^{\prime} \\ (\mathrm{m}) \end{gathered}$ |
| 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.30 | 0.00 |

2025 PM Peak
85\% Confidence Level
Daylight conditions

Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
Scheme: 2025 Background PM Rodel-Win1 - AVERAGE DELAY to Geometry

## 2025 PM Peak - 60 minutes

Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit <br> Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | N - Trim | None | 448 |  | 52 |  | 432 | 1635 |  | 0.2740 |  |
| 2 | W - Street No 1 | None | 4 |  | 494 |  | 6 | 818 |  | 0.0049 |  |
| 3 | S - Trim | None | 335 |  | 51 |  | 447 | 1799 |  | 0.1862 |  |
| 4 | E-Millennium | None | 165 |  | 319 |  | 67 | 880 |  | 0.1874 |  |

Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass Type | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | 95\% Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |
| 1 | N - Trim | None | 3.16 |  | 3.16 | 1.03 |  | A |  | A |
| 2 | W - Street No 1 | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 3 | S - Trim | None | 2.43 |  | 2.43 | 0.59 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | E-Millennium | None | 4.73 |  | 4.73 | 0.57 |  | A |  | A |

2025 PM Peak
85\% Confidence Level
Daylight conditions

Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
Scheme: 2025 Background PM Rodel-Win1 - AVERAGE DELAY to Geometry

## 2025 PM Peak - 15 minutes

Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit <br> Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | N - Trim | None | 448 |  | 52 |  | 432 | 1635 |  | 0.2740 |  |
| 2 | W - Street No 1 | None | 4 |  | 494 |  | 6 | 818 |  | 0.0049 |  |
| 3 | S - Trim | None | 335 |  | 51 |  | 447 | 1799 |  | 0.1862 |  |
| 4 | E-Millennium | None | 165 |  | 319 |  | 67 | 880 |  | 0.1874 |  |

Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass Type | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | 95\% Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |
| 1 | N - Trim | None | 3.17 |  | 3.17 | 1.03 |  | A |  | A |
| 2 | W - Street No 1 | None | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | A |  | A |
| 3 | S - Trim | None | 2.43 |  | 2.43 | 0.59 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | E-Millennium | None | 4.73 |  | 4.73 | 0.57 |  | A |  | A |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| AM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Lane Group $\quad \varnothing 3 \quad \varnothing 7$ |
| :--- |
| Lane Configurations |
| Traffic Volume (vph) |
| Future Volume (vph) |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) |
| Storage Length (m) |
| Storage Lanes |
| Taper Length (m) |
| Lane Util. Factor |
| Ped Bike Factor |
| Frt |
| Flt Protected |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |
| Flt Permitted |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |
| Right Turn on Red |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |
| Link Speed (k/h) |
| Link Distance (m) |
| Travel Time (s) |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |
| Peak Hour Factor |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) |
| Adj. Flow (vph) |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) |
| Enter Blocked Intersection |
| Lane Alignment |
| Median Width(m) |
| Link Offset(m) |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |
| Headway Factor |
| Turning Speed (k/h) |
| Number of Detectors |
| Detector Template |
| Leading Detector (m) |
| Trailing Detector (m) |
| Detector 1 Position(m) |
| Detector 1 Size(m) |
| Detector 1 Type |
| Detector 1 Channel |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |
| Detector 2 Type |
| Detector 2 Channel |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |
| Turn Type |
| Protected Phases |
| Permitted Phases |
| Detector Phase |
| Switch Phase |

AM Peak Hour 2025 Total Traffic



|  | 4 |  | 7 | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 | $4$ | 4 | \％ | ${ }^{*}$ | $\frac{1}{\dagger}$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ |  | 「 | \％ | 44 | 「゙ | 7\％ | 44 | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | 44 | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 107 | 214 | 127 | 155 | 300 | 35 | 214 | 270 | 51 | 64 | 409 | 102 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 107 | 214 | 127 | 155 | 300 | 35 | 214 | 270 | 51 | 64 | 409 | 102 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |
| Storage Length（m） | 90.0 |  | 50.0 | 65.0 |  | 70.0 | 60.0 |  | 80.0 | 85.0 |  | 70.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Taper Length（m） | 35.0 |  |  | 45.0 |  |  | 100.0 |  |  | 25.0 |  |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | 1.00 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.98 | 0.99 |  | 0.98 | 0.99 |  | 0.97 | 0.99 |  | 0.97 |
| Frt |  | 0.985 | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1662 | 3130 | 1354 | 1662 | 3325 | 1488 | 3195 | 3293 | 1473 | 1572 | 3007 | 1406 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 1655 | 3130 | 1323 | 1651 | 3325 | 1459 | 3147 | 3293 | 1430 | 1553 | 3007 | 1368 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  | 9 | 141 |  |  | 141 |  |  | 144 |  |  | 144 |
| Link Speed（k／h） |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |
| Link Distance（m） |  | 496.4 |  |  | 273.9 |  |  | 148.0 |  |  | 249.0 |  |
| Travel Time（s） |  | 29.8 |  |  | 16.4 |  |  | 8.9 |  |  | 14.9 |  |
| Confl．Peds．（\＃／hr） | 7 |  | 10 | 10 |  | 7 | 14 |  | 16 | 16 |  | 14 |
| Confl．Bikes（\＃／hr） |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 4\％ | 4\％ | 4\％ | 4\％ | 4\％ | 4\％ | 5\％ | 5\％ | 5\％ | 10\％ | 15\％ | 10\％ |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 107 | 214 | 127 | 155 | 300 | 35 | 214 | 270 | 51 | 64 | 409 | 102 |
| Shared Lane Traffic（\％） |  |  | 19\％ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 107 | 238 | 103 | 155 | 300 | 35 | 214 | 270 | 51 | 64 | 409 | 102 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width（m） |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 12.0 |  |  | 7.4 |  |
| Link Offset（m） |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width（m） |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 |
| Turning Speed（k／h） | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Leading Detector（m） | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 |
| Trailing Detector（m） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Position（m） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Size（m） | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Queue（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Delay（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 2 Position（m） |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |
| Detector 2 Size（m） |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend（s） |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |
| Detector Phase | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 8 |


|  | 4 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 | $4$ | 4 | \% | ( | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 11.5 | 46.0 | 46.0 | 11.5 | 46.0 | 46.0 | 11.7 | 41.6 | 41.6 | 11.7 | 41.6 | 41.6 |
| Total Split (s) | 20.0 | 46.0 | 46.0 | 20.0 | 46.0 | 46.0 | 22.0 | 42.0 | 42.0 | 22.0 | 42.0 | 42.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 15.4\% | 35.4\% | 35.4\% | 15.4\% | 35.4\% | 35.4\% | 16.9\% | 32.3\% | 32.3\% | 16.9\% | 32.3\% | 32.3\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 13.5 | 39.0 | 39.0 | 13.5 | 39.0 | 39.0 | 15.3 | 35.4 | 35.4 | 15.3 | 35.4 | 35.4 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.8 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 2.8 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.9 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.5 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 6.5 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 6.7 | 6.6 | 6.6 | 6.7 | 6.6 | 6.6 |
| Lead/Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Recall Mode | None | Max | Max | None | Max | Max | None | None | None | None | None | None |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 32.0 | 32.0 |  | 32.0 | 32.0 |  | 28.0 | 28.0 |  | 28.0 | 28.0 |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) |  | 5 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 11.5 | 39.3 | 39.3 | 13.3 | 41.1 | 41.1 | 12.5 | 27.4 | 27.4 | 10.0 | 22.1 | 22.1 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.10 | 0.34 | 0.34 | 0.12 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.11 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.09 | 0.19 | 0.19 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.64 | 0.22 | 0.19 | 0.80 | 0.25 | 0.06 | 0.61 | 0.34 | 0.11 | 0.46 | 0.70 | 0.27 |
| Control Delay | 68.9 | 27.9 | 2.8 | 79.8 | 28.6 | 0.2 | 57.6 | 38.4 | 0.5 | 62.2 | 49.8 | 3.6 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 68.9 | 27.9 | 2.8 | 79.8 | 28.6 | 0.2 | 57.6 | 38.4 | 0.5 | 62.2 | 49.8 | 3.6 |
| LOS | E | C | A | E | C | A | E | D | A | E | D | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 31.9 |  |  | 42.7 |  |  | 42.5 |  |  | 43.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | 22.7 | 19.3 | 0.0 | 33.6 | 24.4 | 0.0 | 23.4 | 27.2 | 0.0 | 13.6 | 45.2 | 0.0 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | \#48.0 | 35.7 | 6.2 | \#79.8 | 43.3 | 0.0 | 40.0 | 41.0 | 0.0 | 29.8 | 62.7 | 5.2 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 472.4 |  |  | 249.9 |  |  | 124.0 |  |  | 225.0 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 90.0 |  | 50.0 | 65.0 |  | 70.0 | 60.0 |  | 80.0 | 85.0 |  | 70.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 197 | 1082 | 547 | 197 | 1197 | 615 | 431 | 1028 | 545 | 212 | 939 | 526 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.54 | 0.22 | 0.19 | 0.79 | 0.25 | 0.06 | 0.50 | 0.26 | 0.09 | 0.30 | 0.44 | 0.19 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 130 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 114.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 115 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Semi Act-Uncoord |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: |  |  |  |  | ersection | LOS: D |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utiliz | 8.7\% |  |  |  | Level of | Service E |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maxim | re two cyc |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 2: Trim \& Innes


AM Peak Hour 2025 Total Trafic


|  | $\psi$EBL |  | 4 |  | $\frac{1}{1}$ | $\downarrow$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group |  | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | \% | 44 | 44 | 「 |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 94 | 5 | 4 | 292 | 317 | 57 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 94 | 5 | 4 | 292 | 317 | 57 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |  |
| Storage Length (m) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 55.0 |  |  | 60.0 |  |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 0 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |
| Taper Length (m) | 2.5 |  | 40.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt | 0.993 |  |  |  |  | 0.850 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.955 |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1676 | 0 | 1695 | 3293 | 3144 | 1406 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.955 |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1676 | 0 | 1695 | 3293 | 3144 | 1406 |  |
| Link Speed (k/h) | 60 |  |  | 60 | 60 |  |  |
| Link Distance (m) | 321.9 |  |  | 342.9 | 293.3 |  |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 19.3 |  |  | 20.6 | 17.6 |  |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 3\% | 2\% | 2\% | 5\% | 10\% | 10\% |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 94 | 5 | 4 | 292 | 317 | 57 |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 99 | 0 | 4 | 292 | 317 | 57 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |  |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Left | Left | Right |  |
| Median Width(m) | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 | 3.7 |  |  |
| Link Offset(m) | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 | 1.6 |  |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 |  |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 24 | 14 | 24 |  |  | 14 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Free | Free |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 21.7\%Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

AM Peak Hour 2025 Total Traffic



|  | $\bigcirc$ | $4$ |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |  |
| Lane Configurations | * |  | 个 |  |  | 4 |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 21 | 39 | 52 | 15 | 17 | 24 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 21 | 39 | 52 | 15 | 17 | 24 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 0.912 |  | 0.970 |  |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.983 |  |  |  |  | 0.980 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1600 | 0 | 1731 | 0 | 0 | 1749 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.983 |  |  |  |  | 0.980 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1600 | 0 | 1731 | 0 | 0 | 1749 |  |
| Link Speed (k/h) | 60 |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |
| Link Distance (m) | 596.5 |  | 547.2 |  |  | 517.4 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 35.8 |  | 32.8 |  |  | 31.0 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 21 | 39 | 52 | 15 | 17 | 24 |  |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 60 | 0 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 41 |  |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |  |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |  |
| Median Width(m) | 3.7 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) | 1.6 |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 |  |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 24 | 14 |  | 14 | 24 |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 19.4\% ICU Level of Service A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

2025 AM Peak 85\% Confidence Level Daylight conditions

Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
Scheme: 2025 Total AM
Rodel-Win1 - AVERAGE DELAY to Geometry

## Scheme Summary

## Control Data

## Control Data and Model Parameters

| 117155 (Notting Hill) | 2025 PHF Flow Profile (veh) |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2025 Total AM | 7.5 min Time Slice |
| Rodel-Win1 | Queuing Delays (sec) |
| Right Hand Drive | Daylight conditions |
| AM Peak Hour | Peak 60/15 min Results |
| AVERAGE DELAY to Geometry | Output flows: Vehicles |
| Metric Units (m) | $85 \%$ Confidence Level |

## Available Data

| Entry Capacity Calibrated | No |
| :--- | :---: |
| Entry Capacity Modified | No |
| Crosswalks | No |
| Flows Factored | No |
| Approach/Exit Road Capacity Calibrated | No |
| Accidents | No |
| Accident Costs | No |
| Bypass Model | No |
| Bypass Calibration | No |
| Global Results | Yes |

2025 AM Peak
85\% Confidence Level
Daylight conditions

Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
Scheme: 2025 Total AM
Rodel-Win1 - AVERAGE DELAY to Geometry

## Operational Data

## Main Geometry (m)

Geometry and Design Target

| Leg | Leg Names | Approach Geometry (m) |  |  |  | Target <br> Average Delay (sec/veh) | Circulating and Exit Geom |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Bearing (deg) | Grade Sep G | Half Width V | Lanes n |  | Inscribed Diameter D | Half Width Vx | $\underset{\mathrm{n}}{\text { Lanes }}$ |
| 1 | N - Trim | 0 | 0 | 6.80 | 2 | 10 | 55.00 | 7.40 | 2 |
| 2 | W - Street No 1 | 90 | 0 | 4.30 | 1 | 10 | 55.00 | 4.30 | 1 |
| 3 | S - Trim | 180 | 0 | 7.40 | 2 | 10 | 55.00 | 7.40 | 2 |
| 4 | E-Millennium | 270 | 0 | 4.30 | 1 | 10 | 55.00 | 4.30 | 1 |

## Capacity Modifiers and Capacity Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Capacity |  | Entry Calibration |  | Approach Road |  |  | Exit Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Capacity + or - | XWalk <br> Factor | Intercept + or - | Slope Factor | $\begin{gathered} V \\ (\mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | Calib Capacity | $\begin{gathered} V \\ (\mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | Default Capacity | Calib Capacity |
| 1 | N - Trim | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 6.00 | 3332 | 0 | 7.40 | 3626 | 0 |
| 2 | W - Street No 1 | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 6.00 | 2107 | 0 | 4.30 | 2107 | 0 |
| 3 | S - Trim | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 6.00 | 3626 | 0 | 7.40 | 3626 | 0 |
| 4 | E-Millennium | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 6.00 | 2107 | 0 | 4.30 | 2107 | 0 |

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2025 AM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | Turning Flows |  |  |  |  | Flow Modifiers |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Trucks \% | Flow Factor | Peak Hour Factor |
| 1 | N - Trim | 0 | 164 | 205 | 23 | 0 | 5.0 | 1.00 | 1.000 |
| 2 | W - Street No 1 | 0 | 51 | 17 | 32 | 0 | 5.0 | 1.00 | 1.000 |
| 3 | S - Trim | 0 | 14 | 252 | 59 | 0 | 5.0 | 1.00 | 1.000 |
| 4 | E-Millennium | 0 | 26 | 8 | 86 | 0 | 5.0 | 1.00 | 1.000 |

2025 AM Peak 85\% Confidence Level
Daylight conditions

Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
Scheme: 2025 Total AM
Rodel-Win1-AVERAGE DELAY to Geometry

## Operational Results

## Geometry for Target Input

Geometry Options for 2025 AM Peak

| Leg 1 - N - Trim |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| nv | ne | nc | nx | $\begin{gathered} E \\ (\mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{L}^{\prime} \\ (\mathrm{m}) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 6.80 | 0.00 |

Geometry Options for 2025 AM Peak

|  |  |  | Leg 2-W - Street No 1 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| nv | ne | nc | $\mathbf{n x}$ | $\mathbf{E}$ <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | $\mathbf{L}^{\prime}$ <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ |  |
| 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.30 | 0.00 |  |

Geometry Options for 2025 AM Peak

| nv | ne | nc | nx $-\mathbf{S}-$ Trim | $\mathbf{E}$ <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ | $\mathbf{L}^{\prime}$ <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 7.40 | 0.00 |

Geometry Options for 2025 AM Peak

| Leg 4 - E-Millennium |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| nv | ne | nc | nx | $\begin{gathered} E \\ (\mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{L}^{\prime} \\ & (\mathrm{m}) \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.30 | 0.00 |

2025 AM Peak 85\% Confidence Level Daylight conditions

Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
Scheme: 2025 Total AM Rodel-Win1-AVERAGE DELAY to Geometry

## 2025 AM Peak - 60 minutes

Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass Type | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit <br> Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | N - Trim | None | 392 |  | 48 |  | 389 | 1639 |  | 0.2392 |  |
| 2 | W - Street No 1 | None | 100 |  | 395 |  | 45 | 853 |  | 0.1172 |  |
| 3 | S - Trim | None | 325 |  | 232 |  | 263 | 1634 |  | 0.1989 |  |
| 4 | E-Millennium | None | 120 |  | 317 |  | 240 | 881 |  | 0.1362 |  |

Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass Type | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | 95\% Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |
| 1 | N - Trim | None | 4.65 |  | 4.65 | 1.32 |  | A |  | A |
| 2 | W - Street No 1 | None | 4.51 |  | 4.51 | 0.33 |  | A |  | A |
| 3 | S - Trim | None | 3.15 |  | 3.15 | 0.75 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | E-Millennium | None | 4.46 |  | 4.46 | 0.39 |  | A |  | A |

2025 AM Peak 85\% Confidence Level

Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
Daylight conditions

## 2025 AM Peak - 15 minutes

Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass Type | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit <br> Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | N - Trim | None | 392 |  | 48 |  | 389 | 1639 |  | 0.2392 |  |
| 2 | W - Street No 1 | None | 100 |  | 395 |  | 45 | 853 |  | 0.1172 |  |
| 3 | S - Trim | None | 325 |  | 232 |  | 263 | 1634 |  | 0.1989 |  |
| 4 | E-Millennium | None | 120 |  | 317 |  | 240 | 881 |  | 0.1362 |  |

Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass Type | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | 95\% Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |
| 1 | N - Trim | None | 4.65 |  | 4.65 | 1.32 |  | A |  | A |
| 2 | W - Street No 1 | None | 4.52 |  | 4.52 | 0.33 |  | A |  | A |
| 3 | S - Trim | None | 3.15 |  | 3.15 | 0.75 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | E-Millennium | None | 4.47 |  | 4.47 | 0.39 |  | A |  | A |


|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 中4 | 「 | \％ | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | \％ | $\uparrow$ |  | \％ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 107 | 882 | 150 | 106 | 562 | 29 | 94 | 36 | 93 | 45 | 45 | 77 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 107 | 882 | 150 | 106 | 562 | 29 | 94 | 36 | 93 | 45 | 45 | 77 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |
| Storage Length（m） | 75.0 |  | 145.0 | 60.0 |  | 0.0 | 50.0 |  | 0.0 | 50.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length（m） | 40.0 |  |  | 45.0 |  |  | 100.0 |  |  | 100.0 |  |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor | 0.99 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 0.97 |  | 0.98 | 0.98 |  |
| Frt |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.993 |  |  | 0.892 |  |  | 0.905 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1695 | 3293 | 1517 | 1695 | 3328 | 0 | 1695 | 1546 | 0 | 1695 | 1587 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.429 |  |  | 0.307 |  |  | 0.679 |  |  | 0.674 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 757 | 3293 | 1466 | 546 | 3328 | 0 | 1196 | 1546 | 0 | 1175 | 1587 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  |  | 150 |  | 9 |  |  | 93 |  |  | 77 |  |
| Link Speed（k／h） |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |
| Link Distance（m） |  | 220.1 |  |  | 496.4 |  |  | 517.4 |  |  | 152.1 |  |
| Travel Time（s） |  | 13.2 |  |  | 29.8 |  |  | 31.0 |  |  | 9.1 |  |
| Confl．Peds．（\＃／hr） | 15 |  | 7 | 7 |  | 15 | 13 |  | 23 | 23 |  | 13 |
| Confl．Bikes（\＃／hr） |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 2\％ | 5\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 3\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 107 | 882 | 150 | 106 | 562 | 29 | 94 | 36 | 93 | 45 | 45 | 77 |
| Shared Lane Traffic（\％） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 107 | 882 | 150 | 106 | 591 | 0 | 94 | 129 | 0 | 45 | 122 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width（m） |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.7 |  |
| Link Offset（m） |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width（m） |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 |
| Turning Speed（k／h） | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  | Left | Thru |  |
| Leading Detector（m） | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  | 6.1 | 30.5 |  |
| Trailing Detector（m） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Position（m） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Size（m） | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  | 6.1 | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | Cl＋Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | C＋Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Queue（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 1 Delay（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Detector 2 Position（m） |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |
| Detector 2 Size（m） |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl＋Ex |  |  | Cl＋Ex |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | Cl＋Ex |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend（s） |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA | Perm | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  | 2 | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 6 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 8 | 8 |  |


| Lane Group $\quad \varnothing 3 \quad \varnothing 7$ |
| :--- |
| Lane Configurations |
| Traffic Volume (vph) |
| Future Volume (vph) |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) |
| Storage Length (m) |
| Storage Lanes |
| Taper Length (m) |
| Lane Util. Factor |
| Ped Bike Factor |
| Frt |
| Flt Protected |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |
| Flt Permitted |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |
| Right Turn on Red |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |
| Link Speed (k/h) |
| Link Distance (m) |
| Travel Time (s) |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |
| Peak Hour Factor |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) |
| Adj. Flow (vph) |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) |
| Enter Blocked Intersection |
| Lane Alignment |
| Median Width(m) |
| Link Offset(m) |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |
| Headway Factor |
| Turning Speed (k/h) |
| Number of Detectors |
| Detector Template |
| Leading Detector (m) |
| Trailing Detector (m) |
| Detector 1 Position(m) |
| Detector 1 Size(m) |
| Detector 1 Type |
| Detector 1 Channel |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) |
| Detector 2 Position(m) |
| Detector 2 Size(m) |
| Detector 2 Type |
| Detector 2 Channel |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) |
| Turn Type |
| Protected Phases |
| Permitted Phases |
| Detector Phase |


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

Splits and Phases: 1: Provence \& Innes



|  | $\begin{gathered} \boldsymbol{\psi} \\ \text { EBL } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { EBR } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | WBL |  | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ \text { WBR } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ \text { NBL } \end{gathered}$ | NBT |  |  | $\frac{1}{\downarrow}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \psi \\ & \text { SBR } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 中4 | 7 | ＊＊ | 44 | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | 44 | F |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 343 | 719 | 139 | 84 | 342 | 44 | 146 | 295 | 49 | 181 | 788 | 213 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 343 | 719 | 139 | 84 | 342 | 44 | 146 | 295 | 49 | 181 | 788 | 213 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |
| Storage Length（m） | 90.0 |  | 50.0 | 65.0 |  | 70.0 | 60.0 |  | 80.0 | 85.0 |  | 70.0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Taper Length（m） | 35.0 |  |  | 45.0 |  |  | 100.0 |  |  | 25.0 |  |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | 1.00 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor | 0.99 |  |  |  |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 |
| Frt |  | 0.997 | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1695 | 3206 | 1354 | 1662 | 3325 | 1488 | 3288 | 3325 | 1517 | 1572 | 3325 | 1488 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 1685 | 3206 | 1354 | 1662 | 3325 | 1455 | 3278 | 3325 | 1490 | 1566 | 3325 | 1460 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  | Yes |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  | 1 | 141 |  |  | 141 |  |  | 144 |  |  | 199 |
| Link Speed（k／h） |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |
| Link Distance（m） |  | 496.4 |  |  | 273.9 |  |  | 148.0 |  |  | 249.0 |  |
| Travel Time（s） |  | 29.8 |  |  | 16.4 |  |  | 8.9 |  |  | 14.9 |  |
| Confl．Peds．（\＃／hr） | 10 |  |  |  |  | 10 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 |  | 5 |
| Confl．Bikes（\＃／hr） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 2\％ | 3\％ | 4\％ | 4\％ | 4\％ | 4\％ | 2\％ | 4\％ | 2\％ | 10\％ | 4\％ | 4\％ |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 343 | 719 | 139 | 84 | 342 | 44 | 146 | 295 | 49 | 181 | 788 | 213 |
| Shared Lane Traffic（\％） |  |  | 10\％ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 343 | 733 | 125 | 84 | 342 | 44 | 146 | 295 | 49 | 181 | 788 | 213 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width（m） |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 12.0 |  |  | 7.4 |  |
| Link Offset（m） |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width（m） |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 |
| Turning Speed（k／h） | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Number of Detectors | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Detector Template | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |
| Leading Detector（m） | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 30.5 | 6.1 |
| Trailing Detector（m） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Position（m） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Size（m） | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 1.8 | 6.1 |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex | Cl＋Ex |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Queue（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Delay（s） | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 2 Position（m） |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |  | 28.7 |  |
| Detector 2 Size（m） |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |  | 1.8 |  |
| Detector 2 Type |  | Cl＋Ex |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |  | Cl＋Ex |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend（s） |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |
| Detector Phase | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 8 |


|  | 4 |  |  | 7 |  | 4 | $4$ | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\frac{1}{1}$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 5.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 11.5 | 46.0 | 46.0 | 11.5 | 46.0 | 46.0 | 11.7 | 41.6 | 41.6 | 11.7 | 41.6 | 41.6 |
| Total Split (s) | 20.0 | 46.0 | 46.0 | 20.0 | 46.0 | 46.0 | 22.0 | 42.0 | 42.0 | 22.0 | 42.0 | 42.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 15.4\% | 35.4\% | 35.4\% | 15.4\% | 35.4\% | 35.4\% | 16.9\% | 32.3\% | 32.3\% | 16.9\% | 32.3\% | 32.3\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 13.5 | 39.0 | 39.0 | 13.5 | 39.0 | 39.0 | 15.3 | 35.4 | 35.4 | 15.3 | 35.4 | 35.4 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.8 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 2.8 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.9 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 6.5 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 6.5 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 6.7 | 6.6 | 6.6 | 6.7 | 6.6 | 6.6 |
| Lead/Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Recall Mode | None | Max | Max | None | Max | Max | None | None | None | None | None | None |
| Walk Time (s) |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Flash Dont Walk (s) |  | 32.0 | 32.0 |  | 32.0 | 32.0 |  | 28.0 | 28.0 |  | 28.0 | 28.0 |
| Pedestrian Calls (\#/hr) |  | 5 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 13.5 | 44.5 | 44.5 | 11.0 | 39.1 | 39.1 | 10.8 | 29.3 | 29.3 | 15.3 | 33.7 | 33.7 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.11 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.09 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.09 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.12 | 0.27 | 0.27 |
| v/c Ratio | 1.86 | 0.64 | 0.22 | 0.57 | 0.33 | 0.08 | 0.51 | 0.38 | 0.11 | 0.93 | 0.87 | 0.39 |
| Control Delay | 438.8 | 38.5 | 4.8 | 70.2 | 34.3 | 0.3 | 60.8 | 40.8 | 0.5 | 104.2 | 54.8 | 8.3 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 438.8 | 38.5 | 4.8 | 70.2 | 34.3 | 0.3 | 60.8 | 40.8 | 0.5 | 104.2 | 54.8 | 8.3 |
| LOS | F | D | A | E | C | A | E | D | A | F | D | A |
| Approach Delay |  | 149.4 |  |  | 37.5 |  |  | 42.8 |  |  | 54.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |
| Queue Length 50th (m) | ~129.4 | 86.5 | 0.0 | 20.2 | 34.1 | 0.0 | 18.0 | 31.8 | 0.0 | 45.0 | 96.7 | 2.5 |
| Queue Length 95th (m) | \#194.0 | 117.2 | 12.0 | 37.5 | 49.2 | 0.0 | 28.9 | 44.7 | 0.0 | \#93.0 | \#125.5 | 21.8 |
| Internal Link Dist (m) |  | 472.4 |  |  | 249.9 |  |  | 124.0 |  |  | 225.0 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (m) | 90.0 |  | 50.0 | 65.0 |  | 70.0 | 60.0 |  | 80.0 | 85.0 |  | 70.0 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 184 | 1150 | 576 | 181 | 1047 | 554 | 406 | 950 | 528 | 194 | 954 | 560 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 1.86 | 0.64 | 0.22 | 0.46 | 0.33 | 0.08 | 0.36 | 0.31 | 0.09 | 0.93 | 0.83 | 0.38 |

Area Type: Other
Cycle Length: 130
Actuated Cycle Length: 124
Natural Cycle: 125
Control Type: Semi Act-Uncoord
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.86
Intersection Signal Delay: 84.3
Intersection LOS: F
Intersection Capacity Utilization 103.2\% ICU Level of Service G
Analysis Period (min) 15
~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 2: Trim \& Innes


PM Peak Hour 2025 Total Trafic


PM Peak Hour 2025 Total Traffic


|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | \% |  | $\downarrow$ | $\pm$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \& |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | ¢ち |  |  | \& ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 43 | 23 | 19 | 23 | 24 | 123 | 22 | 137 | 27 | 152 | 177 | 45 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 43 | 23 | 19 | 23 | 24 | 123 | 22 | 137 | 27 | 152 | 177 | 45 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 | 1800 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt |  | 0.970 |  |  | 0.902 |  |  | 0.978 |  |  | 0.982 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.975 |  |  | 0.993 |  |  | 0.994 |  |  | 0.980 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1688 | 0 | 0 | 1598 | 0 | 0 | 3249 | 0 | 0 | 3233 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.975 |  |  | 0.993 |  |  | 0.994 |  |  | 0.980 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1688 | 0 | 0 | 1598 | 0 | 0 | 3249 | 0 | 0 | 3233 | 0 |
| Link Speed (k/h) |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |  | 60 |  |
| Link Distance (m) |  | 231.0 |  |  | 336.5 |  |  | 404.0 |  |  | 435.7 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 13.9 |  |  | 20.2 |  |  | 24.2 |  |  | 26.1 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) | 12 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 12 | 6 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 6 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 4\% | 2\% | 2\% | 4\% | 2\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 43 | 23 | 19 | 23 | 24 | 123 | 22 | 137 | 27 | 152 | 177 | 45 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 170 | 0 | 0 | 186 | 0 | 0 | 374 | 0 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 1.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Link Offset(m) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(m) |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.06 |
| Turning Speed (k/h) | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 | 24 |  | 14 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 42.0\%Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

PM Peak Hour 2025 Total Traffic


## Scheme Summary

## Control Data

## Control Data and Model Parameters

| 117155 (Notting Hill) | 2025 PHF Flow Profile (veh) |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2025 Total PM | 7.5 min Time Slice |
| Rodel-Win1 | Queuing Delays (sec) |
| Right Hand Drive | Daylight conditions |
| PM Peak Hour | Peak 60/15 min Results |
| AVERAGE DELAY to Geometry | Output flows: Vehicles |
| Metric Units (m) | $85 \%$ Confidence Level |

## Available Data

| Entry Capacity Calibrated | No |
| :--- | :---: |
| Entry Capacity Modified | No |
| Crosswalks | No |
| Flows Factored | No |
| Approach/Exit Road Capacity Calibrated | No |
| Accidents | No |
| Accident Costs | No |
| Bypass Model | No |
| Bypass Calibration | No |
| Global Results | Yes |

2025 PM Peak
Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
85\% Confidence Level
Daylight conditions

Scheme: 2025 Total PM
Rodel-Win1 - AVERAGE DELAY to Geometry

## Operational Data

## Main Geometry (m)

Geometry and Design Target

| Leg | Leg Names | Approach Geometry (m) |  |  |  | Target <br> Average Delay (sec/veh) | Circulating and Exit Geom |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Bearing (deg) | Grade Sep G | Half Width V | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lanes } \\ & \mathrm{n} \end{aligned}$ |  | Inscribed Diameter D | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Half Width } \\ & \mathbf{V x} \end{aligned}$ | Lanes n |
| 1 | N - Trim | 0 | 0 | 6.80 | 2 | 10 | 55.00 | 7.40 | 2 |
| 2 | W - Street No 1 | 90 | 0 | 4.30 | 1 | 10 | 55.00 | 4.30 | 1 |
| 3 | S - Trim | 180 | 0 | 7.40 | 2 | 10 | 55.00 | 7.40 | 2 |
| 4 | E-Millennium | 270 | 0 | 4.30 | 1 | 10 | 55.00 | 4.30 | 1 |

## Capacity Modifiers and Capacity Calibration (veh/hr)

| Leg | Leg Names | Entry Capacity |  | Entry Calibration |  | Approach Road |  |  | Exit Road |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Capacity } \\ & \text { + or - } \end{aligned}$ | XWalk <br> Factor | Intercept + or - | Slope <br> Factor | $\underset{(\mathrm{m})}{\mathrm{V}}$ | Default Capacity | Calib Capacity | $\underset{(\mathrm{m})}{\mathrm{V}}$ | Default Capacity | Calib Capacity |
| 1 | N - Trim | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 6.00 | 3332 | 0 | 7.40 | 3626 | 0 |
| 2 | W - Street No 1 | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 6.00 | 2107 | 0 | 4.30 | 2107 | 0 |
| 3 | S - Trim | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 6.00 | 3626 | 0 | 7.40 | 3626 | 0 |
| 4 | E-Millennium | 0 | 1.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 6.00 | 2107 | 0 | 4.30 | 2107 | 0 |

## Traffic Flow Data (veh/hr)

2025 PM Peak Peak Hour Flows

| Leg | Leg Names | Turning Flows |  |  |  |  | Flow Modifiers |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | U-Turn | Exit-3 | Exit-2 | Exit-1 | Bypass | Trucks \% | Flow Factor | Peak Hour Factor |
| 1 | N - Trim | 0 | 47 | 401 | 50 | 0 | 5.0 | 1.00 | 1.000 |
| 2 | W - Street No 1 | 0 | 36 | 11 | 22 | 0 | 5.0 | 1.00 | 1.000 |
| 3 | S - Trim | 0 | 31 | 319 | 17 | 0 | 5.0 | 1.00 | 1.000 |
| 4 | E-Millennium | 0 | 47 | 16 | 113 | 0 | 5.0 | 1.00 | 1.000 |

2025 PM Peak 85\% Confidence Level Daylight conditions

Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
Scheme: 2025 Total PM
Rodel-Win1 - AVERAGE DELAY to Geometry

## Operational Results

## Geometry for Target Input

Geometry Options for 2025 PM Peak

| nv | ne | nc | $\mathbf{n x}$ | Leg $\mathbf{1 - N}-\operatorname{Trim}$ <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 6.80 |
| $(\mathbf{m})$ |  |  |  |  |

Geometry Options for 2025 PM Peak

| Leg 2 - W - Street No 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| nv | ne | nc | nx | $\begin{gathered} E \\ (\mathrm{~m}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{L}^{\prime} \\ & (\mathrm{m}) \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.30 | 0.00 |

Geometry Options for 2025 PM Peak

| nv | ne | nc | nx |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | $\mathbf{E}$ <br> $(\mathbf{m})$ |

Geometry Options for 2025 PM Peak

| Leg 4 - E-Millennium |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| nv | ne | nc | nx | $\underset{(\mathrm{m})}{\mathrm{E}}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{L}^{\prime} \\ (\mathrm{m}) \end{gathered}$ |
| 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.30 | 0.00 |

2025 PM Peak
Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
85\% Confidence Level
Scheme: 2025 Total PM
Daylight conditions

## 2025 PM Peak - 60 minutes

Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit <br> Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | N - Trim | None | 498 |  | 94 |  | 468 | 1598 |  | 0.3116 |  |
| 2 | W - Street No 1 | None | 69 |  | 495 |  | 97 | 817 |  | 0.0844 |  |
| 3 | S - Trim | None | 367 |  | 94 |  | 470 | 1760 |  | 0.2085 |  |
| 4 | E-Millennium | None | 176 |  | 386 |  | 75 | 856 |  | 0.2055 |  |

Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass Type | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | 95\% Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |
| 1 | N - Trim | None | 3.38 |  | 3.38 | 1.22 |  | A |  | A |
| 2 | W - Street No 1 | None | 4.55 |  | 4.55 | 0.23 |  | A |  | A |
| 3 | S - Trim | None | 2.65 |  | 2.65 | 0.71 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | E-Millennium | None | 4.96 |  | 4.96 | 0.64 |  | A |  | A |

2025 PM Peak
Project: 117155 (Notting Hill)
85\% Confidence Level
Scheme: 2025 Total PM
Daylight conditions

## 2025 PM Peak - 15 minutes

Flows and Capacity

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass <br> Type | Flows (veh/hr) |  |  |  |  | Capacity (veh/hr) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Arrival Flow |  | Opposing Flow |  | Exit <br> Flow | Capacity |  | Average VCR |  |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |  | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass |
| 1 | N - Trim | None | 498 |  | 94 |  | 468 | 1598 |  | 0.3116 |  |
| 2 | W - Street No 1 | None | 69 |  | 495 |  | 97 | 817 |  | 0.0844 |  |
| 3 | S - Trim | None | 367 |  | 94 |  | 470 | 1760 |  | 0.2085 |  |
| 4 | E-Millennium | None | 176 |  | 386 |  | 75 | 856 |  | 0.2055 |  |

Delays, Queues and Level of Service

| Leg | Leg Names | Bypass Type | Average Delay (sec) |  |  | 95\% Queue (veh) |  | Level of Service |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Entry | Bypass | Leg | Entry | Bypass | Entry | Bypass | Leg |
| 1 | N - Trim | None | 3.39 |  | 3.39 | 1.22 |  | A |  | A |
| 2 | W - Street No 1 | None | 4.56 |  | 4.56 | 0.23 |  | A |  | A |
| 3 | S - Trim | None | 2.66 |  | 2.66 | 0.71 |  | A |  | A |
| 4 | E - Millennium | None | 4.97 |  | 4.97 | 0.64 |  | A |  | A |


[^0]:    \#: volume for the $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile cycle exceeds capacity
    $\sim$ : approach is above capacity

