## MEMORANDUM

June 2, 2022

Re: Beazer SR 426 Townhomes
Access Analysis
Seminole County, Florida
Project № 22120

## Introduction

The following access analysis was prepared to ensure the suitability of the proposed site access driveway to maintain level of service (LOS) standards on SR 426, and to determine the necessary off-site road improvements for the proposed Beazer SR 426 development.

The development consists of 33 townhome dwelling units. A copy of the preliminary site plan is provided in the Attachments. The $\pm 6.91$-acre site is located at 2028 W SR 426, in Seminole County, Florida, as depicted in Figure 1. Access to the site is proposed via one (1) full access driveway on SR 426, as shown on the site plan.

The analysis evaluates the capacity of the proposed driveway on SR 426 to accommodate the projected traffic for buildout traffic conditions. Additionally, the analysis evaluates the need for ingress turn lanes at the project driveway, including left and right turn lane warrants.

Data used in the analysis consisted of site plan/development information provided by the project engineers, PM peak hour intersection traffic volumes obtained by Traffic \& Mobility Consultants LLC (TMC). Other pertinent traffic data was obtained from Seminole County, Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), and the Institute of Transportation Engineers.
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## Existing Traffic

Existing turning movement volumes at the intersection of SR 426 and Church Street were collected during the PM peak hours on May 24, 2022. The intersection volumes were collected during the off-peak season. A seasonal adjustment factor of 1.04 was applied. The raw turning movement volumes and Peak Season Factor Category Report used in the analysis are included in the Attachments. The existing PM peak hour intersection volumes are displayed below.


## Projected Traffic

A trip generation of the proposed development was calculated using information published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) in the Trip Generation Manual, $11^{\text {th }}$ Edition. The resulting trip generation calculation is summarized in Table 1. Detailed ITE sheets are included in the Attachments.

Table 1
Trip Generation Analysis

| ITE |  |  | Daily |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Code | Land Use | Size | Rate | Trips | Rate | Total | Enter Exit |
| 220 | Multifamily Townhomes | 33 DU | 8.69 | 288 | 1.05 | 35 | 22 |

Trip Generation analysis based on ITE Trip Generation Manual, $11^{\text {th }}$ Edition.
The proposed development is projected to generate 288 daily trips of which 35 trips occur during the PM peak hour.

## Trip Distribution

A trip distribution pattern was estimated based on existing travel patterns and knowledge of the local network. The estimated trip distribution was assigned to SR 426 as follows:

To/from north on SR 426 - 60\%
To/from south on SR 426 - 40\%

## Intersection Analysis

A capacity analysis of the study intersection/project access on SR 426 was conducted using the methods of the Highway Capacity Manual, 6th Edition (HCM) as applied in the Synchro analytical tool utilizing the projected traffic volumes at the study driveway. The analysis was performed by adding existing traffic volumes, Seminole County's committed trips and the project trips at buildout to assess the net impact of the proposed development on the operation of the intersection.

PM peak hour committed trips were calculated by multiplying daily trips from the County database by $K(0.09)$ and $D(0.568)$. The results of the analysis of peak hour conditions are summarized in Table 2. The committed trip data obtained from Seminole County and the detailed background HCM analysis worksheets are provided in the Attachments. The projected PM peak hour intersection volumes are shown below.


Background $+\{$ Committed $\}+($ Project $)=$ Total

Table 2
Intersection Analysis

| Intersection | Traffic Control | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Delay | LOS | v/c | Delay | Los | VIC | Delay | LOS | v/c | Delay | Los | VIC |
| W. SR 426 \& Church St/ Project Access | TWSC | 53.6 | F | 0.16 | 35.6 | E | 0.14 | 15.7 | C | 0.03 | 13.7 | B | 0.06 |

The analysis of intersection operations reveals that the intersection of SR 426 and Church Street/ Project Access Driveway is projected to experience slight delays on the eastbound left turn movement due to the traffic volumes on SR 426. It should be noted that the driveway is projected to operate within its capacity with a volume to capacity (V/C) ratio of 0.16.

## Turn Lane Analysis

SR 426 is a 4-lane divided roadway with a posted speed limit of 45 mph . Based on FDOT guidance provided in Table 27 of the Access Management Guidebook, included in the Attachments, right turn deceleration lanes should be considered at driveways on multilane roadways where the right turn volumes exceed 80 to 125 vehicles per hour (vph). The projected southbound right turn volume is 13 vph ; therefore, a right turn lane is not warranted or necessary to serve the proposed driveway.

The existing northbound left turn lane is approximately 330 feet long, which is adequate to serve the projected volume of 9 vph on the northbound left turn movement.

## Conclusion

This analysis was performed to evaluate operation and suitability of the proposed Beazer SR 426 development access driveway on SR 426 in Seminole County, Florida.

The results of this traffic analysis are summarized as follows:

- The project is estimated to generate 288 daily trips of which 35 trips occur during the PM peak hour.
- The project access driveway is projected to operate at an adequate level of service (LOS) at project buildout.
- A southbound right turn lane is not warranted to serve the project driveway on SR 426.
- The existing 330-foot northbound left turn lane is adequate to serve the project driveway.
- The proposed driveway is projected to operate within its capacity with a V/C ratio of 0.16.


## Attachments



## TURNING MOVEMENT COUNT ANALYSIS

 AUTOS \& TRUCKS| Intersection (N/S): Intersection (E/W): | R 426 <br> hurch St |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | SR 426 |  |  | SR 426 |  |  | Church St |  |  | Church St |  |  |  |
|  | Start | End | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | TOTAL |
|  |  |  | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |  |
|  | 4:00 PM | 4:15 PM | 0 | 296 | 1 | 3 | 303 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 609 |
|  | 4:15 PM | 4:30 PM | 0 | 281 | 3 | 10 | 315 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 613 |
|  | 4:30 PM | 4:45 PM | 0 | 300 | 4 | 15 | 355 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 684 |
|  | 4:45 PM | 5:00 PM | 0 | 327 | 5 | 9 | 389 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 741 |
|  | 5:00 PM | 5:15 PM | 0 | 352 | 5 | 7 | 414 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 784 |
|  | 5:15 PM | 5:30 PM | 0 | 340 | 2 | 4 | 412 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 762 |
|  | 5:30 PM | 5:45 PM | 0 | 344 | 1 | 2 | 382 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 731 |
|  | 5:45 PM | 6:00 PM | 0 | 322 | 2 | 3 | 361 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 690 |
| Total for: | 4:00 PM | 5:00 PM | 0 | 1204 | 13 | 37 | 1362 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 15 | 2647 |
| Total for: | 5:00 PM | 6:00 PM | 0 | 1358 | 10 | 16 | 1569 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 9 | 2967 |
| Tota Peak Hour: | 4:45 PM | 5:45 PM | 0 | 1363 | 13 | 22 | 1597 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 12 | 3018 |
| Overall PHF: | 0.96 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



2020 PEAK SEASON FACTOR CATEGORY REPORT - REPORT TYPE: ALL CATEGORY: 7700 SEMINOLE COUNTYWIDE


## Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) <br> Not Close to Rail Transit (220)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Dwelling Units
On a: Weekday

## Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban

Number of Studies: 22
Avg. Num. of Dwelling Units: 229
Directional Distribution: 50\% entering, 50\% exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per Dwelling Unit

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6.74 | $2.46-12.50$ | 1.79 |

Data Plot and Equation


## Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) <br> Not Close to Rail Transit (220)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Dwelling Units
On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.

## Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban

Number of Studies: 59
Avg. Num. of Dwelling Units: 241
Directional Distribution: 63\% entering, 37\% exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per Dwelling Unit

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.51 | $0.08-1.04$ | 0.15 |

Data Plot and Equation


HCM 2010 TWSC
4: SR 426 \& Church St




This information has been provided by Tony Nelson, P.E. at Seminole County Engineering and is current information as of the above referenced date.

HCM 2010 TWSC
4: SR 426 \& Project Access/Church St

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \& |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{*}$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | 㻢 |  | ${ }^{1 /}$ | 虫 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 8 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 12 | 9 | 1439 | 14 | 23 | 1689 | 13 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 8 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 12 | 9 | 1439 | 14 | 23 | 1689 | 13 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - |  | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | 340 | - | - | 300 | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 96 | 92 | 96 | 92 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 9 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 13 | 10 | 1499 | 15 | 24 | 1759 | 14 |


7.2

WHEN SHOULD WE BUI LD RIGHT TURN LANES?

Exhibit 44<br>Recommended Guidelines for Exclusive Right Turn<br>Lanes to Unsignalized*<br>Driveway

| Roadway Posted <br> Speed Limit | Number of <br> Right Turns Per Hour |
| :--- | :---: |
| 45 mph or less | $\mathbf{8 0 - 1 2 5}$ (see note 1) |
| Over 45 mph | $\mathbf{3 5 - 5 5}$ (see note 2) |

*May not be appropriate for signalized locations where signal phasing plays an important role in determining the need for right turn lanes.

1. The lower threshold of 80 right turn vehicles per hour would be most used for higher volume (greater than 600 vehicles per hour, per lane in one direction on the major roadway) or two-lane roads where lateral movement is restricted. The 125 right turn vehicles per hour upper threshold would be most appropriate on lower volume roadways, multilane highways, or driveways with a large entry radius ( 50 feet or greater).
2. The lower threshold of 35 right turn vehicles per hour would be most appropriately used on higher volume twolane roadways where lateral movement is restricted. The 55 right turn vehicles per hour upper threshold would be most appropriate on lower volume roadways, multilane highways, or driveways with large entry radius ( 50 feet or greater).

Note: A posted speed limit of 45 mph may be used with these thresholds if the operating speeds are known to be over 45 mph during the time of peak right turn demand.

Note on Traffic projections: Projecting turning volumes is, at best, a knowledgeable estimate. Keep this in mind especially if the projections of right turns are close to meeting the guidelines. In that case, consider requiring the turn lane.

