## Staff Report

To: The Hanahan Planning Commission<br>Cc: Larry Sturdivant, Building Official; Alex Gonzalez, MODHAB<br>From: Jeff Hajek, Planner/Economic Development Director<br>Date: May 4, 2021<br>Re: Subdivision Plat Request for 5725 Edison Avenue

Applicant/Owner: MODHAB<br>Location: Westside of Edison Avenue<br>Tax Map Number(s): 265-16-04-022<br>Approval Requested: Subdivision Plat Approval<br>Existing Zoning/Land Use: Town Residential (TR)/Vacant

## General Application Overview and Background

The proposed site is located on the western side of Edison Avenue, approximately 355 feet north of Remount Road. The existing site is currently vacant, as there was a single-family, detached structure on the property until it was demolished in 1996.

The applicant, MODHAB, is proposing to subdivide the 7,780 SF lot ( 0.17 acres) into three (3) separate parcels to construct three (3) single-family detached residences. The following are the lots and their corresponding sizes:

1. Lot "D-1": $2,840 \mathrm{SF}$
2. Lot "D-2": $2,100 \mathrm{SF}$
3. Lot "D-3": 2,840 SF

This application has utilized the recently adopted 2020 zoning text amendment that added to the definition of what constitutes "frontage." Density in the Town Residential (TR) district is based on frontage. A property owner can construct four (4) dwelling units for every 100 linear feet of frontage. The amendment to the frontage definition allows for both public and private frontage to be counted toward the density calculation.

Proposed access will be primarily off Edison Avenue in the form of an ingress/egress easement that will be maintained by a homeowner's association.

## General Conformance Analysis

The following report utilized the 2008 Hanahan Zoning Ordinance, specifically Section 4.5.11 (Standards By Zone: Town Residential [TR]) and Section 3.5 (Final Plat/Minor Land Development Plat) to analyze the proposed subdivision plat and ensure that it meets all zoning standards.

Per the Zoning Ordinance, staff finds the following general conformance standards for the proposed site:

1. Lot size-The proposed meets the minimum of $1,500 \mathrm{SF}$
2. Lot Width- The proposed parcels meet the minimum width of $25^{\prime}$.
3. Residential Density-Four (4) units per 100 linear feet. Proposed subdivision plat contains 262 linear feet of frontage, which allows for ten (10) units. Applicant only proposing three (3) lots (units).
4. Setbacks-The proposed lots meet the required setbacks:

- Front: 7'
- Side: $0^{\prime}$
- Rear: $15^{\prime}$


## Subdivision Plat Corrections

Section 3.5(B)(2)(b): Applicant will need to provide a vicinity map on the subdivision plat.

## Recommendation

As stated in the General Conformance Analysis section, the proposed subdivision plat meets all the "Standards by Zone" for the Town Residential (TR) zoning district. Furthermore, the provided subdivision plat meets the documentation requirements laid out in Section 3.5 (Final Plat/Minor Land Development Plat). This plat will need to be stamped and signed by the City, as well as stamped and recorded with Berkeley County. Following recordation, a TMS number will be assigned to the subdivided property.

As a reminder, this plan constitutes a subdivision plat submittal. Approval of this plan does not imply approval of permits to begin construction. The subdivision plat must be approved and recorded prior to transfer of individual lots depicted on this plan.
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Based upon staff's review, the City recommends that the Planning Commission approve the submitted subdivision plat, with conditions. Said conditions include:

1. Submitting all requested information in the "Subdivision Plat Corrections" section of this staff report.

"I HEREBY STATE THAT TO THE BEST OF MY PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE,
ACCORDANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE STANDARDS OF PRACTIC
MANUAL FOR SURVEYING IN SOUTH CAROLINA, AND MEETS OR EXCEEDS
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR A CLASS "A" SURVEY AS SPECIFIED THEREIN."

- LUCAS H. STOLTZ, PLS (NO. 34994)


## SUBDIVISION PLAT

SHOWING THE SUBDIVIDED OF LOT "D" (A PORTION OF LOT 5, BLOCK 13) TO CREATE NEW LOT "D-I", LOT "D-2", LOT "D-3" AND A $20^{\prime}$ INGRESS/ EGRESS AND GENERAL UTILITY EASEMENT

RONAELE A. HOLLIDAY AS TRUSTEE
RONAELE A. HOLLIDAY AS TRUSTEE
LOCATED IN THE CITY OF HANAHAN BERKELEY COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA

# Staff Report 

To: The Hanahan Planning Commission<br>Cc: Larry Sturdivant, Building Official; Brad Hinchberger, Bowman<br>Consulting<br>From: Jeff Hajek, Planner/Economic Development Director<br>Date: May 4, 2021<br>Re: Preliminary Land Development Plan Approval for Heron Preserve

Applicant/Owner: Bowman Consultant/Crescent Communities
Location: Southeast of Foster Creek Road/Williams Lane intersection (across the street from Bowen's Corner Elementary School).
Tax Map Number(s): 259-00-00-117
Approval Requested: Preliminary Development Plan Approval Existing Zoning/Land Use: Type B, Planned Development (Type B, PD)/undeveloped

## General Application Overview and Background

The Type B, Planned Development (Type B, PD) District, Heron Preserve at Tanner Plantation, is located immediately south of Williams Lane, adjacent to Bowen's Corner Elementary School and southeast of the intersection of Foster Creek Road and Williams Lane. The twenty-one (21) acre tract currently is comprised of undisturbed wooded uplands ( 17.2 acres) and wetlands (jurisdictional: 3.8 acres; non-jurisdictional: 0.23 acres) throughout the parcel.

This formerly, city-owned parcel was recently sold to Crescent Communities in February 2021. The sale was guided by a development agreement that stipulates conditions for the future use of the property, which includes development of singlefamily detached homes. The Type B, PD received City Council approval January 12, 2021.

It is the intent of the developer to "provide an upscale, residential neighborhood option, presenting a higher-end product line of drive-under home site, as an enhanced offering for the surrounding community." In total, the applicant is proposing to create a subdivision of 90 single-family lots, ranging from 2,850 SF to 6,062 SF (average lot size: $3,340 \mathrm{SF}$ ) in an area on approximately ten (10) acres of land. The proposed houses will be elevated, with drive-under garages. The
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remaining land ( 7 acres or 33 percent of the property), which is primarily wetlands, will be preserved as open space for residents of the community. The applicant is proposing one (1) entrance and exit to the development that will tie-in to Williams Lane, a SCDOT-maintained road. A traffic study was submitted for the Type B, PD approval request. The traffic impact analysis (TIA), approved by SCDOT, found that there was no external mitigation required for the proposed development.

Utilities for Charleston Water System (CWS), Berkeley County Water and Sanitation Authority (BCWS) and Dominion Power are existing and little infrastructure enhancements, other than connections and extensions will be needed.

## Consistency with the Heron Preserve at Tanner Plantation PD Document and Surrounding Districts

Overall, the approved PD document mirrors that of the RS district in regard to primary use-strictly single-family detached units only. The PD document deviated from the RS zoning district by providing regulatory provisions that adjust the density, minimum lot size, height maximum and setbacks to accommodate for the desired number of 91 parcels. Other than these custom regulations, the PD document cedes to the 2008 Zoning Ordinance for guidance on building design standards, landscaping standards, signage standards, parking and access standards, road and bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure standards and natural resource protection and green space standards.

Overall, the proposed development meets the intent of the PD document and the applicable zoning standards of the 2008 Zoning Ordinance. The single-family use is compatible with the surrounding zoning districts, which include Single-Family Residential (RS) to the north, south and west of the site and ResidentialManufactured Housing (RT) to the east of the site. Being that these uses are of the same land use intensity, no additional landscape buffers are required. Additionally, the intended use of the property, single-family residential, will blend in with the character and architectural language of the surrounding neighborhoods.

## General Conformance Analysis

The following report utilized the 2008 Hanahan Zoning Ordinance and the "Heron Preserve at Tanner Plantation" PD document to analyze the submitted preliminary land development plan for the Park at Hanahan development.

Per the Zoning Ordinance, staff finds the following general conformance standards for the proposed site:

1. Lot size-All proposed lot sizes adhere to the PD document's minimum lot size.
2. Lot Width- All lots meet the minimum lot width of 30 ft .
3. Density-5 units per acre maximum. The proposed development meets this requirement currently at 5 units per acre.
4. Setbacks-All proposed building sites meet the required setbacks as dictated by the ordinance. Below are the required:

- Front: 0
- Side: $0^{\prime}$
- Rear: $0^{\prime}$

5. Impervious Surface Ratio-85\% maximum allowed. All homes are under the allowed maximum.

## Preliminary Plat Requested Corrections

Given that the submitted preliminary subdivision plat meets general zoning conformance, there are other pertinent and required elements needed to have a complete submittal. These documentation requirements may be found in the 2008 Zoning Ordinance, Section 3.2. The following will be needed for approval:

## Required Contents of the Preliminary Plan (Section 3.2)

## Existing Site Information

1. Section 3.2(B)(3)(d): Location, ownership, parcel identification numbers, zoning classifications and land uses of adjoining properties, including those across the rights-of-way
a. Zoning classifications and land uses of subject and adjoining properties will need to be shown on existing conditions plan.
2. Section 3.2(B)(3)(e): All existing municipal boundaries, property lines, rights-of-way, easements, railroads, water and sewer lines, fire hydrants, utility transmission lines, culverts, bridges, storm drainage infrastructure, water courses and buildings and other structures.
a. Please ensure all of the listed above is shown on existing conditions plan.
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3. Section $3.2(\mathrm{~B})(3)(\mathrm{g})$ : All trees required to be protected, including graphic indication as to whether landmark trees and protected trees are proposed to be preserved or removed. Tree survey and protection standards shall be those found in Chapter 7 of the Zoning Ordinance.
a. No tree protection plan was shown on the existing site information, only a tree survey. Applicant will need to show what trees are slated from removal and those that are to be preserved. Please refer to Chapter 7 for guidance.
4. Section $3.2(B)(3)(k)$ : Critical lines of jurisdictional and isolated wetlands in accordance with state and federal standards as well as any buffers expected to be required by state and federal agencies.
a. Please show required wetlands buffer measurements around jurisdictional wetlands area.
b. Permits from Army Corps of Engineers, SC DHEC-OCRM and SC DHEC Bureau of Water will need to be submitted.

## Proposed Land Development Information

1. Section 3.2(B)(4)(a): Roads, rights-of-way, widths and materials
a. ROW widths were provided, however site plan needs to show road widths and materiality of said roads.
2. Section 3.2(B)(4)(b): Proposed name for "Road A" and "Road B" will need to be pre-approved by Berkeley County E-911.
3. Section 3.2(B)(4)(c): Extent of all parking areas with number of stalls, including handicap-accessible and loading stalls.
a. Parking areas are shown in overall site plan (Sheet 4), but the total number of stalls, both for each residence, handicapped and offstreet parking, will need to be shown on site plan.
4. Section 3.2(B)(4)(h): Schematic plans for utilities (i.e. - sewerage, potable water, electricity, street lighting, cable, telephone, and gas lines and stormwater drainage).
a. No schematic plans were submitted-these will need to be submitted in order to achieve a complete submittal.

Other

## Bicycle/Pedestrian Infrastructure

In the revised "Bicycle and Pedestrian Circulation Plan" provided by Bowman Consulting in November 2020, the plan shows a proposed crosswalk on Williams Lane, connecting Heron Preserve to Bowen Corner Elementary School. This is nowhere in the site plan and will need to be shown on the revised site plan. Additionally, in the Circulation Plan, the development called for crosswalks throughout the neighborhood-these are not shown on the plan either.

Lastly, staff will need an update on the "potential routing for multi-use path to connect to Tanner Pedestrian/Bike Trail." This was a bike/ped connection the developer was proposing to connect to the existing Tanner Bike/Ped. Trail.

## Submittal to Respective Utilities and Agencies

The applicant will need to ensure that the preliminary plan has been submitted to Charleston Water System (CWS), Berkeley County Water and Sanitation (BCWS), Berkeley County Engineering for general review and review for stormwater management and SC Department of Transportation. Letters of recommendation/approval will be needed to receive planning commission approval.

Copies of the eventual construction plans will also need to be submitted to Berkeley County Engineering. Comments received by said agencies may affect changes to the preliminary plan.

Given the presence of jurisdictional wetlands, copies of the proper permits from the Army Corps of Engineers, DHEC-OCRM and DHEC Bureau of Water will need to be sent to the City for approval.

## Recommendation

This plan constitutes a preliminary plat subdivision submittal. Approval of this plan does not imply approval of permits to begin construction. Approval of this application will enable the developer to seek permits for land disturbance and installation of necessary infrastructure to serve this phase of the project. Subsequent to approval to install infrastructure, the applicant must submit a final plat that depicts all easements provided for its maintenance, whether by a public

agency or property owners association. Such plat must be approved and recorded prior to transfer of individual lots depicted on this plan.

Based upon staff's review, the City recommends that the Planning Commission approve the submitted preliminary land development plan for the "Heron Preserve at Tanner Plantation" development with conditions. The stated conditions must be fully completed to receive Planning Commission approval for land development. Said conditions include:

1. Addressing all requested information in the "Preliminary Plat Requested Corrections" section of this staff report.
2. Addressing all requested information in the "Pedestrian/Bicycle Infrastructure" section of this staff report.
3. Receipt of recommendation/approval letters from CWS, BCWS, Berkeley County Engineering, Army Corps of Engineers, DHEC-OCRM and DHEC Bureau of Water.
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## Staff Report

To: The Hanahan Planning Commission<br>Cc: Larry Sturdivant, Building Official, Mike Kittrell (Seamon Whiteside)<br>From: Jeff Hajek, Planner/Economic Development Director<br>Date: May 4, 2021<br>Re: Request for the Creation of a Type "B" Planned Development ("Thrash Property Type ‘B' Planned Development District") and subsequent rezoning of TMS\# 259-00-01-004 and 259-03-01-101 from Planned Development (PD), Type B (Tanner Townhomes) to Planned Development (PD), Type B (Thrash Property)

## General Information

Applicant/Owner: Seamon Whiteside/Stanley Martin Homes
Location: North of Phase III of Scenic Point Subdivision, and West of dead end of Whispering Oak Drive
Tax Map Number(s): TMS \#259-00-01-004; 259-03-01-101
Approval Requested: Rezoning and Creation of Type B, Planned Development Existing Zoning: Type B, Planned Development (PD)
Requested Zoning: Type B, Planned Development (PD)

## Background and General Application Overview

The proposed Type B, Planned Development (PD) district, "Thrash Property" (Name to be determined by developer), is located immediately north of the Scenic Point subdivision, south of the Goose Creek Reservoir and bounded by the Reservoir to the west and The Reserve subdivision to the east. The combined acreage of the two tracts (259-00-01-004=25.14 acres; 259-00-01-001=1.91 acres) is approximately twenty-seven (27.11) acres and currently is comprised of undisturbed wooded uplands ( 26.37 acres) and wetlands ( 0.74 acres; jurisdictional) throughout the parcel. Of this total acreage, 13.5 acres will be developed for residential purposes ( $50 \%$ ) and the remaining 13.49 acres will be open space ( $49.9 \%$ ). The majority of the open space 8.22 acres will be designated for park space.

It is the intent of the developer to:
"to create a zoning district that preserves natural open space by creating development requirements that allow for a more compact development footprint,
while also providing a framework to create a walkable community that supports a high quality of life."

In total, the applicant is proposing to create a subdivision of 81 single-family lots. Forty (40) lots will consist of single-family detached units, while the remaining forty-one (41) units will be single-family attached units (townhomes). Singlefamily detached lots will range from $4,800 \mathrm{SF}$ to $6,000 \mathrm{SF}$ and townhome lots will range from $1,500 \mathrm{SF}$ to $2,212 \mathrm{SF}$. Both housing types will be constructed on a total of 13.5 acres (approximately $50 \%$ of the land).

Currently, no renderings, elevations or specifics on the architectural language of the development have been submitted.

## Bald Eagle Nest Preservation

Currently, there is a bald eagle's nest present in the southeastern area of the site, adjacent to the end of Whispering Oak Drive, where future ingress/egress of the subject site will be. This is one of four (4) nests, that are scattered across the eastern shore of the Goose Creek Reservoir. The eagles present are descendants from the original pair who first settled in this area in 1979. The developer has already been in discussions with the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources (SCDNR) and has applied for permits with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS). Per federal and state regulations, the developer is required to make no disturbance within the 330 -foot radius buffer that surrounds the eagle nest, as well as accommodate construction around the eagle's nesting period within the 660 -foot buffer. Construction activity within the 660 -foot buffer is what requires permits from USFWS.

## Natural and Historical Preservation Amenities

The developer is putting an emphasis on maintaining the natural state of the property as much as possible following completion of the development. In so doing, the applicant is proposing a 35'-50' buffer zone along all the parcel boundaries that border the Reservoir. Additionally, they will maintain a " 25 ' Courtesy Buffer" on the southern boundary of the parcel, between the subject development and the Scenic Point subdivision. Among other amenities will be a $5^{\prime}-8$ ' (variable width) hiking trail network throughout the entire development utilizing the $35^{\prime}-50^{\prime}$ buffer zone, a community dock with boat slips, and two (2) cultural preserve parks. Said parks are sites that have been designated by the South Carolina Historic Preservation Office (SCHPO) as having historical significance.

## Access and Infrastructure

There is one (1) proposed means of ingress/egress for the development, which is located at the end of Whispering Oak Drive (located within The Reserve subdivision). Accessing the site will require the construction of a new bridge over a small creek, that will allow for construction activity and eventual access for residents and guests. The applicant is in the process of obtaining permits from the Army Corps of Engineers to be granted approval for said crossing. All roads within the development will be built to the City of Hanahan and Berkeley County's
standards and following completion all rights-of-way will be turned over to the County.

The developer has completed a traffic impact analysis, as required under Section 4.7.5(D)(1). Given the number of units (81), relatively small compared to the size and acreage of the property, suggested traffic mitigation for the development is minimal. Conclusions from the report recommend installation of an exclusive northbound left-turn lane on Foster Creek Road. This will be installed at the developer's expense. Staff will require Berkeley County approval of traffic impact analysis as a condition for approval.

Lastly, the development will require a pump station to provide proper sewer service to the Thrash Property. Said pump station will be installed at the developer's expense and will be maintained by Berkeley County Water and Sanitation, subject to their acceptance. A current proposed location for the pump station will be located near the southern boundary of the parcel, just north of the 25' Courtesy Buffer.

## Analysis

## History and Overview of Previous Zoning Designation, Type B, Planned Development

Prior to Stanley Martin's acquisition of the Thrash Tract, the subject property was rezoned and approved by City Council as a Type B, PD in 2006. Given its adoption year (prior to the current 2008 Zoning Ordinance) the PD was under the guidance of the 1993 Zoning Ordinance.

The PD, originally titled "The Tanner Townhomes," proposed 171 single-family attached, townhome units throughout the property, with a community dock on the Reservoir. At the time, DNR and Fish and Wildlife, only permitted a 100 -foot radius from the existing eagle's nest at the time. Today, these radii have been significantly increased. The development added other amendments in 2006 and 2007 and changed the name to "Scenic Point Townhomes." Development of the PD was abandoned following the 2008 Great Recession, with no proposals since.

## Overview of Proposed Zoning District: Planned Development, Type B (PD, Type B) and the Overall Proposed Development's Conformance

The proposed zoning district for the subject development is Type "B", PD (Section 4.7). The intent of this district seeks to:

The purpose of the Planned Development District tool in the City of Hanahan is to encourage variety and flexibility in the use and development of land in order to promote its most appropriate use; to improve design, character and quality of new development; to facilitate the provision of streets and utilities; to preserve natural and scenic features in open space; to allow the developer to meet changes in technology and demand; to provide a maximum choice in types of housing, shopping, and community environment; and to promote higher aesthetic
standards for land development in the City of Hanahan. The developer shall own the responsibility to propose alternate zoning and land development standards that further these objectives and, furthermore, to illustrate the envisioned land development that necessitates alternate standards as an official master plan for review by the planning commission and approval of the city council. The proposed text and master plan shall identify all community facilities necessitated by the development to meet the intent of the Hanahan Zoning and Land Development ordinances, including but not limited to roads and parking, parks and open space, natural and cultural resources, and education and public safety facility sites.

In summation, the Type " B " PD district's intent is to provide for the zoning flexibility and allow for the aspirational and visionary; allowing the applicant to provide "higher aesthetic standards", "preserve natural and scenic features" and "improve design," as well as a variety other attributes. Overall, the proposed development mirrors that of the RS district regarding primary use-strictly single-family detached and attached units only. The developer seeks to create regulatory provisions that adjusts the density, minimum lot size, height maximum and setbacks in order to accommodate for the desired number of 81 parcels.

Other than the stated provisions, the applicant is not seeking to utilize the PD to the fullest extent in regards to a variety of uses (commercial, mixed-use, etc.), but its intent is to maintain residential uses (single-family) in order to provide harmony with the surrounding subdivisions. Overall, the developer has divided the property into land use categories, which include: Thrash Tract Residential (TTR), which are areas comprised of the single-family detached homes and townhomes, Thrash Tract Open Space (TTO), all land left in its natural state, and Thrash Tract Park Open Space (TTO-P), which include the walking trails and cultural preserve parks.

As noted in more detail in "Background" Section of this report, the developer's intent is to preserve the natural character of the site. This commitment meets Section 4.7.1(E) (PD General Provisions):
"The proposal shall efficiently and effectively program the use of land in a manner that preserves natural amenities and environmentally sensitive features to the greatest extent possible."

## Minimum Requirements for Type B, Planned Development Districts

To be considered as a Type B, Planned Development district, the applicant must meet the Minimum Requirements as outlined in Section 4.7.2 in the 2008 Land Development Ordinance. Below are the following requirements and applicability to the Developer in meeting them:

1. Minimum District Size: Two (2) acres in size. A Planned Development District may need to be larger than two (2) acres to meet the next standard, "district location."
a. Requirement Met: The applicant's proposed development meets this requirement with a total parcel size of approximately twenty-seven (27.11) acres.
2. District Location: To avoid illegal spot zoning, a Planned Development District shall be located in an area that can be justified as a distinct district based on characteristics of the land, access to infrastructure and juxtaposition of zoning districts in the vicinity.
a. Requirement Met: The applicant's proposed PDD will blend in with the surrounding single-family residential character, as it is surrounded by RS and Conservation/Preservation (CP)-zoned properties. Furthermore, the property has ready access to nearly all required utilities and other infrastructure in the vicinity, with the exception of a pump station (proposed to be installed).
3. Minimum Public Infrastructure: The area proposed for a Planned Development District shall have direct access to public infrastructure systems-roads, potable water, sewer, stormwater drainage, etc.-in a location where the infrastructure systems can adequately accommodate increases in demand reasonably expected to be generated by development within the PDD. Alternatively, the developer shall propose to upgrade the infrastructure systems accordingly. Proposed improvements need not be limited to infrastructure segments abutting the property; the broader system shall be upgraded to offset negative impacts to surrounding districts.
a. Requirement Met: The proposed development does meet the minimum required infrastructure per the attached correspondence from the respective utilities and agencies (CWS, BCWS, Berkeley County, SCDOT), with the exception of letters from Berkeley County Engineering and Berkeley County Roads and Bridges.

## Requirements for Illustration of Existing Conditions

To fulfill the requirements of the Type B, PD application, the following existing conditions documentation must be submitted. Below are comments that will need to be addressed for the documents submitted for "Thrash Property." Each heading below corresponds to all required information under Section 4.7.4 (Requirements for Illustration of Existing Conditions):

1. Section 4.7.4(C)(5): Applicant will need to show "existing zoning classifications and uses of land within the proposed Planned Development District and on adjoining properties, including those across rights-of-way
2. Section 4.7.4(C)(7): Applicant will need to show the "existing landmarks, especially those related to infrastructure, such as roads, railroads, bridges, culverts and utility substations in the vicinity of the proposed district.
a. Applicant will need to specifically show the cultural preserve areas on existing conditions map.

## Master Development Plan Requirements

To fulfill the requirements of the Type B, PD application, the following Master Development Plan documentation must be submitted. Below are comments that will need to be addressed for the documents submitted for "Thrash Property." Each heading below corresponds to all required information under Section 4.7.5 (Master development plan requirements.)

## Existing Site Information

1. Section 4.7.5(B)(2): Applicant will need to show on existing conditions plan the "total tract boundaries of the property being developed, showing bearings and distances, and a statement of total acreage of the property.
a. Total tract boundaries and total acreage are shown, but not bearings and distances.
2. Section 4.7.5(B)(3): Applicant will need to show on existing parcel identification numbers (tax map numbers) on subject property and adjacent properties.

## Proposed Land Development Information

1. Section 4.7.5(C)(2): Rights-of-way widths were provided, but applicant will need to show widths for proposed roadways or sidewalks.
2. Section 4.7.5(C)(4): Sites and tentative footprints of structures other than single-family residences with approximate acreages and rough estimates of expected gross floor area.
a. The regulatory provisions state that there may be structures in the parks area no more than 800 SF. Please show said buildings footprints.

## Supplemental Data

1. Section 4.7.5(D)(2): Written statements from affected public infrastructure and service providers were received from: BCWS, CWS, Dominion Energy and the Hanahan Fire Department. However, the City will need a recommendation letter from Berkeley County Engineering and Berkeley County Roads and Bridges.

## Requirements of Statement of Intent and Regulatory Provisions

As mentioned in the "Overview of Proposed Zoning District: Planned Development, Type B (PD, Type B) and the Overall Proposed Development's Conformance" section, the Thrash Property PD relies heavily upon the existing 2008 Zoning and Land Development Ordinance for the majority of the required regulatory provisions. Hanahan zoning ordinances used include: building design standards, landscaping and sign standards, parking and access standards, road and pedestrian infrastructure standards and stormwater standards.

As dictated by Section 4.7.6(B), there are a series of provisions that are suggested to be part of the PDD. Below are the proposed regulations for the development:

| Zoning Comparison Table |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Single-Family Residential-Moderate Density(RSM) | Thrash Property PD: Single-Family Detached | Thrash Property PD: Townhomes |
| Min. Lot AreaResidential | 6,000 SF | None | None |
| Min. Lot Width | 50 ft . | 40 ft . | 18 ft . |
| Min. SetbacksFront, Street Frontage | 25 ft . | 20 ft . | 18 ft . |
| Min. Setbacks-Side-Residential | 5 ft . | 5 ft . | 5 ft . on end units |
| Min. Setbacks-Rear-Residential | 15 ft . | 10 ft . | 10 ft . |
| Max. Impervious Surface Ratio | 55\% | 85\% | 80 \% |
| Max. Height | 35 ft . | 45 ft . | 45 ft . |
| Max. Residential Density | 8 units per acre | 6 units per acre | 6 units per |

Overall, the developer has chosen to minimize the total residential development area to preserve the natural condition of the property and leave substantial space for an "outdoor living room." As such, there is no minimum lot size and the lot widths have been reduced significantly from the RSM designation. Height was increased to allow for drive-under residential product.

Any of these provisions not identified in the PD document, shall revert to the 2008 Zoning Ordinance. The following below represent staff comments for specific provisions provided in the Heron Preserve PD document:

1. Section 4.7.6(B)(A)-An approximate timeline for phasing and build-out of the development will need to be provided in the statement of intent section.

## Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and Other Considerations

As with any rezoning, the requested zoning designation should align with the goals, policies and future land uses of the municipality's guiding comprehensive plan. Stated in the 2012 City of Hanahan Comprehensive Plan (the most current to date), "while the future land use plan neither dictates a precise requirement nor eliminates room for flexibility, it does articulate a vision and guide for future development in the City."

According to the Comprehensive Plan, this proposed rezoning is within relative compliance of this guiding document. In Section I: Issues, Goals and Policies of the
comprehensive plan, this rezoning would be compliant with a list of goals set forth in the document. These include:

## Population Goals and Policies

GOAL 3: Hanahan will guide population growth to areas where supporting infrastructure exists or can efficiently be expanded without sacrificing the environment or quality of life which currently characterize Hanahan.
2. The City will encourage new growth to locate where public services already exist and are adequate to handle needs so the City can continue to provide the highest quality of essential services

## Land Use Goals and Policies

GOAL 1: Hanahan will continue to protect and enhance the character of the City's existing neighborhoods as well as encourage the preservation of its wetlands and natural resources
3. The City will ensure that new development in residential districts is compatible in scale and character with existing residences and that it preserves important neighborhood characteristics.
4. The City will ensure future development is compatible with it natural resources and does not compromise the environmental quality.
5. The City will encourage the protection of natural drainage areas, wetlands, and stream corridors, important wildlife habitat areas and other key scenic resources from encroachment and incompatible uses.

## Natural and Cultural Resources Goals and Policies

GOAL 1: Hanahan will continue to protect and preserve its historic and cultural resources.

1. The City will continue to promote and support the protection and enhancement of its unique historic and cultural resources.

Lastly, the 2012 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map (Appendix: Figure 1) identifies the future land use of the subject properties as "Medium Density Neighborhood." The intent of this future land use district, is "provide for and/or sustain medium density neighborhoods with small lots and a mix of housing types (Page 28)." The principal land use in this designation is single-family residential development typical of urban neighborhoods with small lots, or attached residential structures like duplexes or townhomes, limited to 8 units per acre. Furthermore, in the land use description, new developments within in the Medium Density Neighborhood district should encourage walkable neighborhood units within the community. Given the development's intention to preserve natural resources, reduce lot sizes for walkability, provide a variety of housing types and increase walkability through a trail network, overall, the intent and master plan of the PD fulfills the intent of this future land use district.

## Recommendations

Based upon staff's review, it is recommended that the Planning Commission conditionally approve the planned development district (PDD), Thrash Property, and the subsequent amendment to the 2010 Zoning Map for the rezoning of TMS numbers 259-00-01-004; 259-03-01-101 from Type B, Planned Development (Tanner Townhomes) to Type "B" PD (Thrash Property) for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development is in line with the 2012 Comprehensive Plan Goals, Policies and Future Land Uses
2. The proposed development is in line with the 2008 Zoning Ordinance and its surrounding zoning districts
3. The rezoning will blend in with the surrounding residential character of the area.
4. The rezoning will benefit the economic well-being of the City and its residents.

The following conditions will need to be met to approve the PD and therefore recommend it to City Council for final approval:

1. Addressing all comments in the "Requirements for Illustration of Existing Conditions" section
2. Addressing all comments in the "Development Master Plan Requirements" section
3. Addressing all comments in "Requirements of Statement of Intent and Regulatory Provisions" section
4. Receipt of letters of approval from Berkeley County concerning traffic impact analysis
5. Receipt of letters of recommendation from Berkeley County Engineering, Berkeley County Roads and Bridges on availability to provide service
6. Receipt of permits from the Army Corps of Engineers for wetland crossing and U.S. Fish and Wildlife for bald eagle preservation.


Figure 1: 2012 Future Land Use Map
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## 1. Statement of Intent

The intent of the Thrash Property PD is to create a zoning district that preserves natural open space by creating development requirements that allow for a more compact development footprint while also providing a framework to create a walkable community that supports a high quality of life. The development requires sidewalks within public rights of way and trails through common areas to promote pedestrian circulation. The PDD requires approximately 10 acres of preserved open space to be provided. This will lead to a reduction in roughly 100 units from the current overall density plan.

Standard Hanahan Single Family zoning would not allow a reduced lot size, reduced setbacks, and increased lot coverage, as outlined in this PD, that provides for a more compact development footprint and associated allocation of preserved Open Space.

Both the preservation of natural open space and the creation of walkability within public rights of way are elements that contribute to the overall sustainability and character of the Hanahan community at large.

## 2. General Provision Criteria

4.7.1 of the City of Hanahan Type B PD—Planned Development ordinance requires certain General Provision criteria be met. The criteria and a description of how each item is met is outlined below:
(A) A Planned Development District is a zoning district proposed by the developer in place of existing zoning classifications applied to the land proposed for development. This Type "B" PD differs from a Type "A" PD in that existing zoning standards are replaced rather than modified. The developer may therefore propose alternative land uses and development intensities. Rezoning—legislative action taken by Hanahan City Council—is therefore necessary for final approval of a Type "B" PD, a Planned Development District.

Alternative land uses and development intensities are proposed within this document and will require rezoning by Hanahan City Council before final approval of the Thrash Property PD
(B) The applicant proposing a Planned Development District in the City of Hanahan shall achieve all of the standards of this section in good faith and shall demonstrate intent of achieving such standards and document how they will be achieved in writing and through illustration.

All standards of the PD requirements are provided herein, and are demonstrated through written descriptions and illustrations.
(C) It shall be the responsibility of the applicant to demonstrate why zoning and land development standards of the City of Hanahan otherwise applicable should be modified or replaced by the provisions of the proposed Planned Development District. The applicant shall document exceptions or variations to existing zoning and land development regulations essential to the project in terms of site, design, or dimensional requirements.

The "Statement of Intent" (1) from this document outlines the reasons for modifying the City of Hanahan development standards, which can be further understood through the

Master Development Plan. Variations to site, design, and dimensional requirements are provided within this document in "Regulatory Provisions" (7).
(D) The proposed land uses, development intensities, and associated standards shall be consistent with all policies and goals of the City of Hanahan Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

The proposed land uses, development intensities, and associated standards are consistent with all policies and goals of the City of Hanahan Comprehensive Land Use Plan. The future Land Use Plan recommends Medium Density Neighborhood which support smaller lots, a mix of product, attached residential structures, and limits density to 8 units per acre. The Thrash Property PD meets all of these recommendations and is well under the density limitation.
(E) The proposal shall efficiently and effectively program the use of land in a manner that preserves natural amenities and environmentally sensitive features to the greatest extent possible.

As stated in the "Statement of Intent" (1) and illustrated on the Master Development Plan, land has been programmed to preserve natural amenities and environmentally sensitive features, such as a bald eagle nesting zone and the adjacent wetlands and reservoir.
(F) The proposal shall not negatively alter the existing prevailing character of an adjacent neighborhood or district by initiating a high concentration of intense uses, a high volume of heavy truck traffic, a scale of the development that dwarfs neighboring properties or disrupts community aesthetics, or degradation and loss of natural resources in and adjacent to the city.

The Thrash Property PD proposes a $25^{\prime}$ buffer along the property line next to the adjacent neighborhood to the South and is complimentary to the adjacent single family land use, scale, vehicular patterns, and aesthetic. Natural resources are being preserved in the form of a natural preserve.
(G) The proposed development shall not create any externalities-obtrusive, disruptive, intrusive, or excessive light, odor, noise, or vibration-beyond the boundaries of the Planned Development District.

The Thrash Property PD proposes lighting per the City of Hanahan Standards. The proposed Land Use is complimentary of the adjacent single family use and does not propose any elements that would create obtrusive, disruptive, intrusive, or excessive light, odor, noise, or vibration.
(H) The proposed Planned Development District with residential components shall include pedestrian-friendly circulation, building scale, and aesthetics and for future occupants to allow the opportunity to walk within the City of Hanahan and to preempt the necessity of driving within the built-out Planned Development District.

Pedestrian friendly circulation is proposed in the form of sidewalks and trails. Building scale is pedestrian appropriate set forth by the maximum 3 story building height, as well are reduced front setbacks that create a better scale within the public realm. Pleasant

Aesthetics are to be provided through proposed architecture, street tree requirements, preservation of quality trees, and allocation of preserved natural areas.
(I) The land proposed for development shall adjoin and have full access to all existing public infrastructure and services available in the City of Hanahan-roads, water and sewer service, stormwater drainage, etc. The responsibility of providing the improvements necessary to serve the development shall be that of the applicant. The proposal shall, where possible, enhance connectivity of infrastructure and minimize dead-end infrastructure lines (roads, water and sewer lines, etc.) by accessing infrastructure networks available along road frontages and adjoining land developments.

The Thrash Property PD is served by Public water, sewer, and storm drainage and is accessed via Whispering Oak Drive Public Right of Way. All necessary improvements to these facilities in order to serve the property will be the responsibility of the Applicant.

## 3. Minimum Requirements Criteria

4.7.2 of the City of Hanahan Type B PD—Planned Development ordinance requires certain Minimum Requirements criteria be met. The criteria and a description of how each item is met is outlined below:
(A) the following shall be required for consideration of a tract of land for a Type "B" Planned Development.
(1) Minimum district size: Two (2) acres. A Planned Development District may need to be larger than two (2) acres to meet the next standard, "district location."

## The Thrash Property PD is approximately 26.99 Acres in Size

(2) District location. So as to avoid illegal spot zoning, a Planned Development District shall be located in an area that can be justified as a distinct district based on the characteristics of the land, access to infrastructure, and juxtaposition of zoning districts in the vicinity.

The Thrash Property PD is located in an area that can be justified as a distinct district based on the characteristics of the land, access to infrastructure, and juxtaposition of zoning districts in the vicinity.
(3) Minimum public infrastructure. The area proposed for a Planned Development District shall have direct access to public infrastructure systems-roads, potable water, sewer, stormwater drainage, etc.-in a location where the infrastructure systems can adequately accommodate increases in demand reasonably expected to be generated by development within the PDD. Alternatively, the developer shall propose to upgrade the infrastructure systems accordingly. Proposed improvements need not be limited to infrastructure segments abutting the property; the broader system shall be upgraded to offset negative impacts to surrounding districts.

The Thrash Property PD has direct access to public infrastructure systemsroads, potable water, sewer, stormwater drainage, etc. The Thrash Property

PD requires the applicant to fund a wastewater pump station and all off-site traffic improvements as required by the included Traffic Impact Analysis. Coordination letters with Utility companies have been provided in Appendix C.
(B) The following minimum requirements shall be met by the approved development upon completion.
(1) The Planned Development District shall include setbacks and/or buffering from adjoining districts of significantly lower development intensity. Specific dimensions of setbacks and buffering shall be proposed by the applicant and reviewed by the planning commission.

A 25' buffer has been proposed adjacent to the existing single-family neighborhood, as well as a 35-50' buffer around all designated wetlands. All buffers are per the City of Hanahan Zoning requirements. Setbacks, buffers, and other development requirements are outlined within this PD.
(2) The Planned Development District shall include provisions to protect natural and cultural resources, provide adequate buffering thereof, and designate adequate park space for recreation and social interaction as appropriate for the land uses and development intensities proposed. Specific dimensions, acreages, and locations shall be proposed by the applicant and reviewed by the planning commission.

Cultural resources have been located and are being preserved and avoided through the subdivision design as illustrated in the Master Development Plan. Natural resources are protected by reduction of lot sizes and setbacks to allow for a Natural Preserve. Recreation and social interaction opportunities are being provided in the form of a trail system through natural areas, open park spaces and a community dock with boat slips, which is being applied for with CWS, DHEC and USACE.
(C) Improvements required by the City of Hanahan shall be limited to capital projects necessary to ensure preservation of pre-existing levels of service in Hanahan. In the event that the proposed planned development can be expected to create a proportional need for upgraded capital facilities, Section 5.18 of the Hanahan Land Development Ordinance: "Adequate, Oversized, and Off-site Improvements" shall prevail.

The Thrash Property PD requires the applicant to fund a wastewater pump station and all off-site traffic improvements as required by the included Traffic Impact Analysis.
4. Existing Conditions Summary
A. The site currently exists as a wooded site served by Whispering Oak Drive, adjacent to the Goose Creek Reservoir. The site is bound by the reservoir on the West, North, and East

Boundaries, and a single-family attached subdivision to the South. The site contains an Eagle Nest and two archeological sites, all of which are to be preserved. Existing conditions plans in the forms of surveys have been provided in Appendix A of this document and meet the requirements of 4.7.4.

## 5. Master Development Plans Summary

A. Master Development Plans including a Land Use Plan and Master Plan including street and pedestrian designs, Open Space Plan, Traffic Study, and Letters of Coordination have been provided in the Appendices of this document.

## 6. Zoning Default Statement

Any zoning or land development regulations or requirements not specifically detailed within this document shall default to the Zoning Ordinance and Land Development Regulations of the City of Hanahan, South Carolina. Land Use criteria not specifically detailed within this document shall default to Single Family Residential - Moderate Density (RSM) section 4.5.5 of the City of Hanahan Zoning Ordinance.

## 7. Regulatory Provisions

A. Land Use

1. Thrash Tract Residential Land Use (TTR)
a) Permitted land uses include single family attached residential, single family detached residential, associated amenity centers, roadways, utilities, and all other land uses (permitted, conditional, and accessory) as allowed by the City of Hanahan RSM zoning designation.
b) No more than $50 \%$ of the units within TTR may be single family attached product.
2. Thrash Tract Open Space Land Use (TTO)
a) Permitted land uses include preserved natural open space and improved open space. See Green Space Standards.
B. Land Use and Density Chart

| Land Use | Acreage | Allowable Density | Maximum Units |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| TTR | 13.50 | 6 DU/AC | 81 units |
| TTO | 13.49 | 0 DU/AC | 0 units |
| Total | 26.99 | 3 DU/AC | 81 units |

C. Lot, and Building Standards for TTR Land Use Zone

| Standard | PDD Requirement for <br> Single Family Attached <br> Lots | PDD requirement for <br> Single Family Detached <br> Lots | Previous RSM <br> Requirement |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Minimum Lot Width | 18 ft | 40 ft | 50 ft |
| Front / Street Setback | 18 ft | 20 ft | 20 ft |
| Side Setback | 5 ft on end units | 5 ft | 5 ft |
| Rear Setback | 10 ft | 10 ft | 15 ft |
| Maximum Impervious <br> Surface | $85 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $55 \%$ |
| Maximum FAR | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Maximum Height | 45 ft | 45 ft | 40 ft |

D. Building Design Standards

Building design standards will be per the City of Hanahan Code of Ordinances Chapter 8 Building and Building Regulations, and will meet all applicable International Building Code requirements.
There will be a 5' encroachment allowance within the front and rear setbacks for porches, balconies, steps and overhangs.
E. Landscaping and Sign Standards

Landscaping and Sign Standards will be per City of Hanahan Zoning Ordinance Chapter 6 Landscaping and Chapter 8 Signage, with the exception that the buffer between the Thrash Tract PD and adjacent single-family detached community shall be increased to $25^{\prime}$ in width.
F. Parking and Access Standards

Parking and Access Standards will be per City of Hanahan Land Development Ordinance 5.9 Parking.
G. Road and Pedestrian Infrastructure Standards

1. Road and Pedestrian infrastructure standards will be per City of Hanahan Land Development Ordinance 5.5-Blocks, 5.6-Roads, and 5.7-Design and Improvement Standards for Pedestrians with the exception that sidewalks will be required on both sides of the road and may be 4 ' in width.
2. All Road Rights of Ways are intended to be public, to be constructed by the developer and owned and maintained by Berkeley County, subject to their acceptance.
3. All curbs will be rolled or valley curbs.
H. Stormwater
4. Stormwater design shall be per City of Hanahan Land Development Ordinance 5.11Stormwater and Floodplain management.
I. Green Space Standards
5. Green Space standards will be per City of Hanahan Land Development Ordinance 5.13. Green Space with the exception that open air park structures no larger than 800 s.f. may be considered Park Space.
6. Green space shall be a minimum of $40 \%$ of the gross acreage of the Thrash PDD. Of the Total Greenspace, $25 \%$ shall be park space or improved open space.
7. All open space shall be owned and maintained by the POA.

## J. Wetland Buffer Standards

1. Wetland and Reservoir buffer Standards will be per City of Hanahan Land Development Ordinance 5.12-Water Quality Protection with the exception that the Reservoir buffer shall be increased to 50 ' in width and may contain a pervious trail.
2. Views corridors may be created within the buffer along the waterfront through selective clearing of underbrush, trees no greater than 2" caliper, limbs no larger than 3" diameter or higher than 7' from existing grade.
K. Capital Improvements
3. A Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) has been provided in Appendix B of this PD.
a) In summary, the TIA recommends the following: Installation of an exclusive northbound left-turn lane on Foster Creek Road
b) All improvements required by the TIA will be constructed at the developers expense.
4. A pump station is required to provide proper sewer service to the Thrash Property PD.
a) The pump station shall be constructed at the developer's expense.
b) The pump station is intended to be owned and maintained by Berkeley County Water and Sanitation, subject to their acceptance.
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### 1.0 Executive Summary

The Hanahan Thrash Tract development is proposed to be located off of Whispering Oak Drive in Hanahan, SC. The development is proposed to include 40 single-family homes and 43 townhomes, and it will be accessed via a new roadway connected to the western end of Whispering Oak Drive. For the purposes of this traffic impact analysis (TIA), the development is assumed to be complete in 2026.

The study area for the TIA includes the following existing intersections.

- Foster Creek Road at Snake Road (signalized)
- Foster Creek Road at Whispering Oak Drive (unsignalized)
- Foster Creek Road at Song Sparrow Way/Williams Lane (roundabout)
- Foster Creek Road at Tanner Ford Boulevard (unsignalized)

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, traffic volumes and travel patterns have been impacted. All turning movements were adjusted using AM and PM adjustment factors as stated in the SCDOT District 6 Traffic Impact Analyses during COVID-19 Pandemic (Update) memorandum (February 5, 2021). These adjusted traffic volumes were used in the Existing conditions analysis.

Based on the results of the analysis, the intersection of Foster Creek Road at Snake Road currently operates with elevated delay during the AM peak hour and acceptably during the PM peak hour. The intersection of Foster Creek Road at Song Sparrow Way/Williams Lane currently operates acceptably during the AM and PM peak hours. The intersections are projected to continue to operate with elevated delay during the AM peak hour and acceptably during the PM peak hour in the 2026 No Build and 2026 Build conditions. The proposed development contributes less than $1 \%$ of the traffic at the intersection of Foster Creek Road at Snake Road in the 2026 AM and PM peak hour Build conditions. The proposed development contributes less than $3 \%$ of the traffic during the AM peak hour and less than $5 \%$ during the PM peak hour at the intersection of Foster Creek Road at Song Sparrow Way/Williams Lane in the 2026 Build conditions.

The unsignalized intersection of Foster Creek Road at Whispering Oak Drive currently operates acceptably and is projected to continue to operate acceptably in the 2026 No Build and 2026 Build conditions. Based on SCDOT Roadway Design Manual (2017) guidelines, an exclusive northbound left-turn lane "should be considered" on Foster Creek Road at Whispering Oaks Drive. The turn lane was included in the 2026 Build analysis.

The unsignalized intersection of Foster Creek Road at Tanner Ford Boulevard currently operates acceptably and is projected to continue to operate acceptably in the 2026 No Build and 2026 Build conditions.

Based on results of the analysis, the following transportation-related improvement is recommended as a part of this project:

- Foster Creek Road at Whispering Oak Drive
o Installation of an exclusive northbound left-turn lane on Foster Creek Road

Results in this report are based solely on traffic studies and are considered input into final design considerations. The final design will be determined by the project engineer after other design elements (such as, but not limited to, utilities, stormwater, etc.) are taken into consideration.

### 2.0 Introduction

The Hanahan Thrash Tract development is proposed to be located off of Whispering Oak Drive in Hanahan, SC. The development is proposed to include 40 single-family homes and 43 townhomes, and it will be accessed via a new roadway connected to the western end of Whispering Oak Drive. For the purposes of this TIA, the development is assumed to be complete in 2026.

This report presents the trip generation, distribution, traffic analyses, and any recommendations for transportation improvements required to meet anticipated traffic demands.

### 3.0 Inventory

### 3.1 Study Area

The study area for the TIA includes the following existing intersections.

- Foster Creek Road at Snake Road
- Foster Creek Road at Whispering Oak Drive
- Foster Creek Road at Song Sparrow Way/Williams Lane
- Foster Creek Road at Tanner Ford Boulevard

Figure 1 (Appendix) shows the proposed development location and Figure 2 (Appendix) shows the project conceptual site plan.

### 3.2 Existing Conditions

Roadways in the project vicinity include Foster Creek Road, Snake Road, Tanner Ford Boulevard, Whispering Oak Drive, Song Sparrow Way, and Williams Lane.

Foster Creek Road (S-809) is a two-lane, undivided major collector roadway with a posted speed limit of 35 miles per hour (mph) north of the project, 45 mph in the vicinity of the project, and 40 mph south of the project.

Snake Road (S-208) is a two-lane, undivided major collector roadway with a posted speed limit of 35 mph in the study area. Per South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT) counts, Snake Road has a 2019 annual average daily traffic (AADT) of 13,100 vehicles per day (vpd) in the study area.

Tanner Ford Boulevard is a two-lane, divided major collector roadway with a posted speed limit of 35 mph in the study area.

Whispering Oak Drive is a two-lane, undivided roadway with a posted speed limit of 25 mph . The proposed development will connect to Whispering Oak Drive.

Song Sparrow Way is a two-lane, undivided roadway with a posted speed limit of 25 mph .

Williams Lane is a two-lane, undivided roadway with a posted speed limit of 30 mph .
Figure 3 (Appendix) shows the existing roadway laneage in the study area.

### 4.0 Traffic Generation

The potential trip generation of the proposed development was determined using trip generation information from the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) Trip Generation, $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition (2017).

Table 1 summarizes the AM and PM peak hour trips associated with the proposed development.

| Table 1: <br> Projected Trip Generation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use and Intensity | ITE Land Use Code | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
|  |  | Total | In | Out | Total | In | Out |
| Single-Family Detached Housing - 40 Dwelling Units | 210 | 33 | 8 | 25 | 42 | 26 | 16 |
| Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) - 43 Dwelling Units | 220 | 21 | 5 | 16 | 28 | 18 | 10 |
| Net New Trips |  | 54 | 13 | 41 | 70 | 44 | 26 |

Source: ITE Trip Generation, $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition
As shown in Table 1, the proposed development is projected to generate 54 new trips (13 entering, 41 exiting), during the AM peak hour and 70 new trips ( 44 entering, 26 exiting), during the PM peak hour.

### 5.0 Site Traffic Distribution

The proposed development traffic was assigned to the surrounding roadway network. The directional distribution and assignment were based on qualitative knowledge of the project area, quantitative application of existing traffic patterns, and expected trip length.
The following general trip distribution was applied to the project trips associated with the planned development.

- $70 \%$ to/from the east on Tanner Ford Boulevard
- $5 \%$ to/from the east on Williams Lane
- $5 \%$ to/from the east on Snake Road
- $20 \%$ to/from the west on Snake Road

Figure 4 (Appendix) shows the traffic distribution for the proposed development in the study area.

### 6.0 Traffic Volumes

### 6.1 Existing Traffic

Peak hour intersection turning movement counts including vehicular, pedestrian, and heavy vehicle traffic were performed in March 2021 from 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM and from 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM at the following intersections:

- Foster Creek Road at Snake Road
- Foster Creek Road at Whispering Oak Drive
- Foster Creek Road at Song Sparrow Way/Williams Lane
- Foster Creek Road at Tanner Ford Boulevard

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, traffic volumes and travel patterns have been impacted. All turning movements were adjusted using AM and PM adjustment factors of 1.15 and 1.02 for the AM and PM peak hours, respectively, as stated in the SCDOT District 6 Traffic Impact Analyses during COVID-19 Pandemic (Update) memorandum (February 5, 2021). These adjusted traffic volumes were used in the Existing conditions analysis.

Existing peak hour intersection turning movement volumes are shown on Figure 5 (Appendix). The turning movement count data is included in the Appendix.

### 6.2 2026 No Build Traffic

Historic growth is the increase in existing traffic volumes due to usage increases and non-specific growth throughout the area. A growth rate of $3.5 \%$ per year was applied to the study area in the analysis.

The 2026 No Build traffic volumes include existing traffic grown to the buildout year. Figure 6 (Appendix) and Figure 7 (Appendix) show the 2026 No Build AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes, respectively.

### 6.3 Project Traffic

The AM peak hour and PM peak hour projected proposed development trips were assigned based on the trip distribution discussed in Section 5.

### 6.4 2026 Build Traffic

The 2026 total traffic volumes include the 2026 background traffic and the proposed development traffic at buildout. The 2026 AM and PM peak hour total traffic volumes are shown in Figure 6 (Appendix) and Figure 7 (Appendix), respectively.

Intersection volume development worksheets are included in the Appendix.

### 7.0 Capacity Analysis

Capacity analyses were performed for the AM and PM peak hours in the Existing, 2026 No Build, and 2026 Build conditions using the Synchro, Version 10, and SIDRA 7.0 software programs to determine the operating characteristics of the adjacent roadway network and the impacts of the proposed development. The analyses were conducted with methodologies contained in the Highway Capacity Manual, $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition (HCM 6) (Transportation Research Board, December 2016). The Synchro and SIDRA output sheets are included in the Appendix.

Capacity of an intersection is defined as the maximum number of vehicles that can pass through an intersection during a specified time, typically an hour. Capacity is described by level of service (LOS) for the operating characteristics of an intersection. LOS is a qualitative measure that describes operational conditions and motorist perceptions within a traffic stream. HCM 6 defines six levels of service, LOS A through LOS F, with A being the best and F being the worst.

LOS for signalized intersections is determined by the overall intersection operations and is reflected in average delay per vehicle. LOS D or better is typically considered acceptable for signalized intersections.

LOS for a two-way stop-controlled (TWSC) intersection is determined by the delay of the poorest performing minor approach, as LOS is not defined for TWSC intersections as a whole. At a TWSC intersection, the major street experiences little to no delay. LOS for a roundabout is determined by the overall intersection operations and is reflected in seconds per vehicle.

Capacity analyses were performed for the Existing, 2026 No Build, and 2026 Build AM and PM peak hour traffic conditions at the following intersections:

- Foster Creek Road at Snake Road (signalized)
- Foster Creek Road at Whispering Oak Drive (unsignalized)
- Foster Creek Road at Song Sparrow Way/Williams Lane (roundabout)
- Foster Creek Road at Tanner Ford Boulevard (unsignalized)

Any heavy vehicle percentages (HV\%) below $2.0 \%$ were adjusted to $2.0 \%$ in all conditions for the purposes of the analysis.

Existing signal timings were applied to the intersection of Foster Creek Road at Snake Road in the Existing, 2026 No Build, and 2026 Build conditions.

Table 2 summarizes LOS and control delay (average seconds of delay per vehicle) for the projected Existing, 2026 No Build, and 2026 Build AM and PM peak hour conditions.

| Table 2: <br> Level of Service and Delay (average seconds per vehicle) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Traffic Control ${ }^{1}$ | Existing Conditions |  | 2026 No Build Conditions |  | 2026 Build <br> Conditions |  |
|  |  | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour |
| Foster Creek Rd. at Snake Rd. | S | $\begin{gathered} F \\ (106.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { C } \\ (24.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} F \\ (159.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { C } \\ (32.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} F \\ (163.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { C } \\ (34.4) \end{gathered}$ |
| Foster Creek Rd. at Whispering Oak Dr. | U | $\begin{gathered} \text { B } \\ (13.5)- \\ \text { ro } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B } \\ (12.6)- \\ \text { EB } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { C } \\ (15.6)- \\ \text { EB } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B } \\ (14.1)- \\ \text { EB } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { C } \\ (19.1)- \\ \text { EB } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { C } \\ (15.4)- \\ \text { EB } \end{gathered}$ |
| Foster Creek Rd. at Song Sparrow Way/ Williams Ln. | R | $\begin{gathered} \text { C } \\ (16.2) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { A } \\ (2.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} E \\ (36.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{A} \\ (7.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} E \\ (42.4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { A } \\ (8.1) \end{gathered}$ |
| Foster Creek Rd. at Tanner Ford Blvd. | U | $\begin{gathered} \text { B } \\ (10.2)- \end{gathered}$ <br> WB | $\begin{gathered} \text { C } \\ (15.0)- \\ \text { WB } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{B} \\ (11.9)- \\ \mathrm{SB}^{2} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { C } \\ (20.4)- \\ \text { WB } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{B} \\ (12.5)- \\ \mathrm{SB}^{2} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{C} \\ (22.7)- \\ \text { WB } \end{gathered}$ |

1. $\mathrm{S}=$ Signalized, $\mathrm{U}=$ Unsignalized
2. Delay on the southbound approach was found to be longer than the westbound stop-controlled approach due to the number of southbound left turning vehicles.

### 7.1 Foster Creek Road at Snake Road

As shown in Table 2, the signalized intersection of Foster Creek Road at Snake Road currently operates with elevated delay at LOS F during the AM peak hour and at LOS C during the PM peak hour. The intersection is projected to continue to operate with elevated delay at LOS F during the AM peak hour and acceptably at LOS C during the PM peak hour in the 2026 No Build and 2026 Build conditions.

Based on the projected traffic volumes, this development is expected to contribute less than one percent of the total traffic volumes at the intersection of Foster Creek Road at Snake Road in the 2026 Build AM and PM peak hours. Due to the small percentage of site traffic at the intersection, no site-related improvements are recommended at this intersection.

### 7.2 Foster Creek Road at Whispering Oak Drive

As shown in Table 2, the unsignalized intersection of Foster Creek Road at Whispering Oak Drive currently operates acceptably at LOS B during the AM and PM peak hour conditions. The intersection is projected to operate acceptably at LOS C during the AM peak hour and at LOS B during the PM peak hour in the 2026 No Build conditions.

SCDOT Roadway Design Manual (2017) guidelines were reviewed at the unsignalized intersection of Foster Creek Road at Whispering Oak Drive to determine if criteria were met for the consideration of an exclusive northbound left-turn lane on Foster Creek Road. Based on a comparison of the projected 2026 Build AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes to the criteria, it was determined that an exclusive northbound left-turn lane on Foster Creek Road at Whispering Oak Drive "should be considered" for a two-lane roadway and is therefore recommended. The turn lane analysis chart is included in the Appendix. The northbound left-turn lane was included in the 2026 Build analysis. With the addition of the recommended turn lane, the intersection is projected to operate acceptably at LOS C during the AM and PM peak hours in the 2026 Build conditions.

### 7.3 Foster Creek Road at Song Sparrow Way/Williams Lane

As shown in Table 2, the roundabout at the intersection of Foster Creek Road at Song Sparrow Way/Williams Lane currently operates acceptably at LOS C during the AM peak hour and at LOS A during the PM peak hour. The roundabout is projected to operate with elevated delay at LOS E during the AM peak hour and acceptably at LOS A during the PM peak hour in the 2026 No Build and 2026 Build conditions.

Based on the projected traffic volumes, this development is expected to contribute less than three percent of the total traffic volumes at the intersection of Foster Creek Road at Song Sparrow Way/Williams Lane in the 2026 Build AM peak hour and less than five percent in the 2026 Build PM peak hour. Due to the small percentage of site traffic at the intersection, no site-related improvements are recommended at this intersection.

### 7.4 Foster Creek Road at Tanner Ford Boulevard

As shown in Table 2, the unsignalized intersection of Foster Creek Road at Tanner Ford Boulevard currently operates acceptably at LOS B during the AM peak hour and at LOS C during the PM peak hour conditions. The intersection is projected to continue to operate acceptably at LOS B (southbound approach) during the AM peak hour and at LOS C during the PM peak hour in the 2026 No Build and 2026 Build conditions. While not stop-controlled, due to the number of southbound left turning vehicles during the AM peak hour, the southbound approach experience higher delay than the stop controlled westbound approach.

### 8.0 Conclusion

The Hanahan Thrash Tract development is proposed to be located off of Whispering Oak Drive in Hanahan, SC. The development is proposed to include 40 single-family homes and 43 townhomes, and it will be accessed via a new roadway connected to the western end of Whispering Oak Drive. For the purposes of this TIA, the development is assumed to be complete in 2026.

Based on results of the analysis, the following transportation-related improvement is recommended as a part of this project:

- Foster Creek Road at Whispering Oak Drive
o Installation of an exclusive northbound left-turn lane on Foster Creek Road

Results in this report are based solely on traffic studies and are considered input into final design considerations. The final design will be determined by the project engineer after other design elements (such as, but not limited to, utilities, stormwater, etc.) are taken into consideration.

## Appendix



Hanahan Thrash Tract Traffic Impact Analysis







File Name : Snake Rd @ Foster Creek Rd Site Code :
Start Date : 3/2/2021
Page No : 1

|  | From North |  |  |  | Snake Rd From East |  |  |  | Foster Creek Rd From South |  |  |  | Snake Rd From West |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | Int. Total |
| 07:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 111 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 93 | 0 | 352 |
| 07:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 163 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 61 | 0 | 356 |
| 07:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 105 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 59 | 0 | 251 |
| 07:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 52 | 0 | 208 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 455 | 0 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 139 | 265 | 0 | 1167 |
| 08:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 45 | 0 | 177 |
| 08:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 35 | 0 | 172 |
| 08:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 26 | 0 | 180 |
| 08:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 42 | 0 | 207 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 316 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 122 | 148 | 0 | 736 |


| 04:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 75 | 0 | 292 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 04:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 92 | 0 | 265 |
| 04:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 97 | 0 | 274 |
| 04:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 102 | 0 | 293 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 203 | 0 | 0 | 321 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 161 | 366 | 0 | 1124 |
| 05:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 98 | 0 | 270 |
| 05:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 102 | 0 | 261 |
| 05:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 42 | 96 | 0 | 256 |
| 05:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 79 | 0 | 249 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 160 | 0 | 0 | 280 | 0 | 24 | 1 | 0 | 158 | 375 | 0 | 1036 |


| Grand Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 189 | 579 | 0 | 0 | 1372 | 0 | 188 | 1 | 0 | 580 | 1154 | 0 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Apprch \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24.6 | 75.4 | 0 | 0 | 87.9 | 0 | 12 | 0.1 | 0 | 33.4 | 66.6 | 0 |
| Total \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.7 | 14.3 | 0 | 0 | 33.8 | 0 | 4.6 | 0 | 0 | 14.3 | 28.4 | 0 |
| Passenger Vehicle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 186 | 574 | 0 | 0 | 1354 | 0 | 184 | 1 | 0 | 574 | 1146 | 0 |
| \% Passenger Vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98.4 | 99.1 | 0 | 0 | 98.7 | 0 | 97.9 | 100 | 0 | 99 | 99.3 | 0 |
| Heavy Vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 0 |
| \% Heavy Vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.9 | 0 | 0 | 0.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.7 | 0 |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \% Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.4 | 0 | 2.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

File Name : Snake Rd @ Foster Creek Rd
Site Code :
Start Date : 3/2/2021
Page No : 2


File Name : Snake Rd @ Foster Creek Rd
Site Code :
Start Date : 3/2/2021
Page No : 3

|  | From North |  |  |  |  | Snake Rd From East |  |  |  |  | Foster Creek Rd From South |  |  |  |  | Snake Rd From West |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 07:00 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 111 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 160 | 0 | 25 | 93 | 0 | 118 | 352 |
| 07:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 163 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 203 | 0 | 40 | 61 | 0 | 101 | 356 |
| 07:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 105 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 113 | 0 | 37 | 59 | 0 | 96 | 251 |
| 07:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 76 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 83 | 0 | 37 | 52 | 0 | 89 | 208 |
| Total Volume | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 204 | 455 | 0 | 104 | 0 | 559 | 0 | 139 | 265 | 0 | 404 | 1167 |
| \% App. Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 49 | 51 | 0 | 0 |  | 81.4 | 0 | 18.6 | 0 |  | 0 | 34.4 | 65.6 | 0 |  |  |
| PHF | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 472 | . 897 | . 000 | . 000 | . 689 | . 698 | . 000 | . 531 | . 000 | . 688 | . 000 | . 869 | . 712 | . 000 | 856 | 820 |
| Passenger Vevicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 201 | 446 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 549 | 0 | 138 | 263 | 0 | 401 | ${ }^{1151}$ |
| \% Passenger Venicies |  |  |  |  |  | 97.0 |  |  |  |  | 98.0 |  | 99.0 |  |  |  | 99.3 | 99.2 |  |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 7 |
| \% Heary Venicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.7 | 0 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.7 | 0.6 |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| \% Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.5 | 1.1 | 0 | 1.0 | 0 | 1.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.8 |



File Name : Snake Rd @ Foster Creek Rd
Site Code :
Start Date : 3/2/2021
Page No : 4

|  | From North |  |  |  |  | Snake Rd From East |  |  |  |  | Foster Creek Rd From South |  |  |  |  | Snake Rd From West |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 04:00 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 93 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 46 | 75 | 0 | 121 | 292 |
| 04:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 70 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 78 | 0 | 38 | 92 | 0 | 130 | 265 |
| 04:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 79 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 86 | 0 | 39 | 97 | 0 | 136 | 274 |
| 04:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 79 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 92 | 0 | 38 | 102 | 0 | 140 | 293 |
| Total Volume | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 203 | 0 | 0 | 241 | 321 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 356 | 0 | 161 | 366 | 0 | 527 | 1124 |
| \% App. Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 15.8 | 84.2 | 0 | 0 |  | 90.2 | 0 | 9.8 | 0 |  | 0 | 30.6 | 69.4 | 0 |  |  |
| PHF | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 792 | . 860 | . 000 | . 000 | . 849 | . 863 | . 000 | . 673 | . 000 | . 890 | . 000 | . 875 | . 897 | . 000 | . 941 | 959 |
| Passenger Venicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ${ }^{38}$ | 201 | 0 | 0 | 239 | 316 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 348 | 0 | 159 | 363 | 0 | 522 | 1109 |
| \%Passenger Venicies |  |  |  |  |  |  | 99.0 |  |  |  | 98.4 |  | 91.4 |  |  |  | 98.8 | 99.2 |  |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 11 |
| \% Heary Vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.8 | 1.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.1 | 0 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.9 | 1.0 |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| \% Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.3 | 0 | 8.6 | 0 | 1.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.4 |



File Name : Foster Creek Rd @ Song Sparrow Way Site Code :
Start Date : 3/2/2021
Page No : 1

|  | Foster Creek Rd From North |  |  |  | Williams Ln From East |  |  |  | Foster Creek Rd From South |  |  |  | Song Sparrow Way From West |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | Int. Total |
| 07:00 AM | 40 | 73 | 3 | 10 | 83 | 31 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 49 | 0 | 11 | 19 | 6 | 0 | 397 |
| 07:15 AM | 16 | 82 | 3 | 1 | 77 | 15 | 51 | 0 | 1 | 45 | 15 | 0 | 17 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 338 |
| 07:30 AM | 4 | 75 | 7 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 44 | 6 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 182 |
| 07:45 AM | 4 | 76 | 9 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 5 | 36 | 6 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 187 |
| Total | 64 | 306 | 22 | 12 | 190 | 46 | 118 | 0 | 8 | 145 | 76 | 0 | 55 | 25 | 37 | 0 | 1104 |
| 08:00 AM | 0 | 65 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 37 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 132 |
| 08:15 AM | 2 | 55 | 9 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 42 | 2 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 149 |
| 08:30 AM | 4 | 57 | 7 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 38 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 145 |
| 08:45 AM | 3 | 50 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 42 | 6 | 0 | 16 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 146 |
| Total | 9 | 227 | 23 | 2 | 28 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 18 | 159 | 14 | 0 | 37 | 1 | 36 | 0 | 572 |


| 04:00 PM | 5 | 51 | 7 | 1 | 14 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 12 | 74 | 14 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 204 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 04:15 PM | 5 | 56 | 8 | 0 | 14 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 8 | 73 | 11 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 200 |
| 04:30 PM | 6 | 53 | 15 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 87 | 16 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 224 |
| 04:45 PM | 13 | 63 | 15 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 100 | 22 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 252 |
| Total | 29 | 223 | 45 | 1 | 48 | 7 | 31 | 0 | 38 | 334 | 63 | 0 | 33 | 6 | 22 | 0 | 880 |
| 05:00 PM | 10 | 55 | 9 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 81 | 22 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 221 |
| 05:15 PM | 12 | 53 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 11 | 79 | 19 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 219 |
| 05:30 PM | 7 | 49 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 4 | 87 | 15 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 203 |
| 05:45 PM | 9 | 57 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 7 | 80 | 13 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 205 |
| Total | 38 | 214 | 39 | 0 | 40 | 8 | 36 | 0 | 33 | 327 | 69 | 0 | 23 | 2 | 19 | 0 | 848 |
| Grand Total | 140 | 970 | 129 | 15 | 306 | 62 | 202 | 0 | 97 | 965 | 222 | 0 | 148 | 34 | 114 | 0 | 3404 |
| Apprch \% | 11.2 | 77.4 | 10.3 | 1.2 | 53.7 | 10.9 | 35.4 | 0 | 7.6 | 75.2 | 17.3 | 0 | 50 | 11.5 | 38.5 | 0 |  |
| Total \% | 4.1 | 28.5 | 3.8 | 0.4 | 9 | 1.8 | 5.9 | 0 | 2.8 | 28.3 | 6.5 | 0 | 4.3 | 1 | 3.3 | 0 |  |
| Passenger Vehicles | 136 | 963 | 126 | 15 | 297 | 60 | 198 | 0 | 95 | 959 | 219 | 0 | 146 | 34 | 112 | 0 | 3360 |
| \% Passenger Vehicles | 97.1 | 99.3 | 97.7 | 100 | 97.1 | 96.8 | 98 | 0 | 97.9 | 99.4 | 98.6 | 0 | 98.6 | 100 | 98.2 | 0 | 98.7 |
| Heavy Vehicles | 2 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 29 |
| \% Heavy Vehicles | 1.4 | 0.6 | 1.6 | 0 | 2.3 | 1.6 | 0.5 | 0 | 1 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0 | 0.7 | 0 | 1.8 | 0 | 0.9 |
| Buses | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| \% Buses | 1.4 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.7 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 0 | 1 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.4 |

File Name : Foster Creek Rd @ Song Sparrow Way
Site Code :
Start Date : 3/2/2021
Page No : 2


File Name : Foster Creek Rd @ Song Sparrow Way Site Code :
Start Date : 3/2/2021
Page No : 3

|  | Foster Creek Rd From North |  |  |  |  | Williams Ln From East |  |  |  |  | Foster Creek Rd From South |  |  |  |  | Song Sparrow Way From West |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 07:00 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00 AM | 40 | 73 | 3 | 10 | 126 | 83 | 31 | 52 | 0 | 166 | 0 | 20 | 49 | 0 | 69 | 11 | 19 | 6 | 0 | 36 | 397 |
| 07:15 AM | 16 | 82 | 3 | 1 | 102 | 77 | 15 | 51 | 0 | 143 | 1 | 45 | 15 | 0 | 61 | 17 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 32 | 338 |
| 07:30 AM | 4 | 75 | 7 | 1 | 87 | 11 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 19 | 2 | 44 | 6 | 0 | 52 | 11 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 24 | 182 |
| 07:45 AM | 4 | 76 | 9 | 0 | 89 | 19 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 26 | 5 | 36 | 6 | 0 | 47 | 16 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 25 | 187 |
| Total Volume | 64 | 306 | 22 | 12 | 404 | 190 | 46 | 118 | 0 | 354 | 8 | 145 | 76 | 0 | 229 | 55 | 25 | 37 | 0 | 117 | 1104 |
| \% App. Total | 15.8 | 75.7 | 5.4 | 3 |  | 53.7 | 13 | 33.3 | 0 |  | 3.5 | 63.3 | 33.2 | 0 |  | 47 | 21.4 | 31.6 | 0 |  |  |
| PHF | . 400 | . 933 | . 611 | . 300 | . 802 | . 572 | . 371 | . 567 | . 000 | . 533 | . 400 | . 806 | 388 | . 000 | . 830 | . 809 | . 329 | . 712 | . 000 | . 813 | 695 |
| Passenger Venicles | 63 | 304 | ${ }^{21}$ | 12 | 400 | 185 | 45 | 115 | 0 | 345 | 8 | 144 | 76 | 0 | 228 | 54 | ${ }^{25}$ | 37 | 0 | 116 | 1089 |
| \% Passenger Venices | 98.4 | 99.3 | 95.5 |  |  | 97.4 | 97.8 | 97.5 |  |  |  | 99.3 |  |  |  | 98.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heary Vehicles | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 |
| \% Heary Venicles | 0 | 0.3 | 4.5 | 0 | 0.5 | 2.1 | 0 | 0.8 | 0 | 1.4 | 0 | 0.7 | 0 | 0 | 0.4 | 1.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.9 | 0.8 |
| Buses | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| \% Buses | 1.6 | 0.3 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 2.2 | 1.7 | 0 | 1.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 |



File Name : Foster Creek Rd @ Song Sparrow Way Site Code :
Start Date : 3/2/2021
Page No : 4

|  | Foster Creek Rd From North |  |  |  |  | Williams Ln From East |  |  |  |  | Foster Creek Rd From South |  |  |  |  | Song Sparrow Way From West |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 04:30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:30 PM | 6 | 53 | 15 | 0 | 74 | 9 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 19 | 9 | 87 | 16 | 0 | 112 | 7 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 19 | 224 |
| 04:45 PM | 13 | 63 | 15 | 0 | 91 | 11 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 16 | 9 | 100 | 22 | 0 | 131 | 8 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 14 | 252 |
| 05:00 PM | 10 | 55 | 9 | 0 | 74 | 10 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 25 | 11 | 81 | 22 | 0 | 114 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 221 |
| 05:15 PM | 12 | 53 | 10 | 0 | 75 | 10 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 18 | 11 | 79 | 19 | 0 | 109 | 6 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 17 | 219 |
| Total Volume | 41 | 224 | 49 | 0 | 314 | 40 | 9 | 29 | 0 | 78 | 40 | 347 | 79 | 0 | 466 | 25 | 5 | 28 | 0 | 58 | 916 |
| \% App. Total | 13.1 | 71.3 | 15.6 | 0 |  | 51.3 | 11.5 | 37.2 | 0 |  | 8.6 | 74.5 | 17 | 0 |  | 43.1 | 8.6 | 48.3 | 0 |  |  |
| PHF | . 788 | . 889 | . 817 | . 000 | . 863 | . 909 | . 563 | . 659 | . 000 | 780 | . 909 | . 868 | . 898 | . 000 | 889 | . 781 | . 625 | 700 | . 000 | 763 | 909 |
| Passenger Venic | 40 | 222 | 49 | 0 | 311 | ${ }^{38}$ | 8 | ${ }^{28}$ | 0 | 74 | 40 | 347 | ${ }^{76}$ | 0 | 463 | 24 | 5 | ${ }^{27}$ | 0 | ${ }^{56}$ | 904 |
| \% Passenger venices | 97.6 | 99.1 |  |  |  | 95.0 | 88.9 | 96.6 |  |  |  |  | 96.2 |  |  | 96.0 |  | 96.4 |  |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicles | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 9 |
| \% Heary Venicles | 2.4 | 0.9 | 0 | 0 | 1.0 | 5.0 | 11.1 | 0 | 0 | 3.8 | 0 | 0 | 2.5 | 0 | 0.4 | 0 | 0 | 3.6 | 0 | 1.7 | 1.0 |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| \% Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.4 | 0 | 1.3 | 0 | 0 | 1.3 | 0 | 0.2 | 4.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.7 | 0.3 |



File Name : Whispering Oak Rd @ Foster Creek Rd
Site Code :
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|  | Foster Creek Rd From North |  |  |  | From East |  |  |  | Foster Creek Rd From South |  |  |  | Whispering Oak Dr From West |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | Int. Total |
| 07:00 AM | 0 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 189 |
| 07:15 AM | 0 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 208 |
| 07:30 AM | 0 | 80 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 155 |
| 07:45 AM | 0 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 142 |
| Total | 0 | 350 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 308 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 694 |
| 08:00 AM | 0 | 54 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 106 |
| 08:15 AM | 0 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 121 |
| 08:30 AM | 0 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 116 |
| 08:45 AM | 0 | 58 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 |
| Total | 0 | 226 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 222 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 470 |


| 04:00 PM | 0 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 153 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 04:15 PM | 0 | 68 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 159 |
| 04:30 PM | 0 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 167 |
| 04:45 PM | 0 | 87 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 193 |
| Total | 0 | 282 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 362 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 672 |
| 05:00 PM | 0 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 181 |
| 05:15 PM | 0 | 70 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 163 |
| 05:30 PM | 0 | 66 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 162 |
| 05:45 PM | 0 | 64 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 162 |
| Total | 0 | 280 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 351 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 668 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Grand Total | 0 | 1138 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 1243 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 2504 |
| Apprch \% | 0 | 98.5 | 1.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.1 | 96.9 | 0 | 0 | 30.3 | 0 | 69.7 | 0 |  |
| Total \% | 0 | 45.4 | 0.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.6 | 49.6 | 0 | 0 | 0.8 | 0 | 1.8 | 0 |  |
| Passenger Vehicles | 0 | 1130 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 1232 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 2482 |
| \% Passenger vehicles | 0 | 99.3 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 99.1 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 93.5 | 0 | 99.1 |
| Heavy Vehicles | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 12 |
| \% Heavy Vehicles | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.2 | 0 | 0.5 |
| Buses | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 10 |
| \% Buses | 0 | 0.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.3 | 0 | 0.4 |
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|  | Foster Creek Rd From North |  |  |  |  | From East |  |  |  |  | Foster Creek Rd From South |  |  |  |  | Whispering Oak Dr From West |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 07:00 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00 AM | 0 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 189 |
| 07:15 AM | 0 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 115 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 10 | 208 |
| 07:30 AM | 0 | 80 | 1 | 0 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 155 |
| 07:45 AM | 0 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 142 |
| Total Volume | 0 | 350 | 1 | 0 | 351 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 308 | 0 | 0 | 318 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 25 | 694 |
| \% App. Total | 0 | 99.7 | 0.3 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3.1 | 96.9 | 0 | 0 |  | 20 | 0 | 80 | 0 |  |  |
| PHF | . 000 | . 866 | . 250 | . 000 | . 869 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 500 | . 700 | . 000 | . 000 | . 691 | . 417 | . 000 | . 556 | . 000 | 625 | . 834 |
| Passenger Venicles | 0 | 46 | 1 | 0 | 347 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | ${ }^{303}$ | 0 | 0 | ${ }^{313}$ | 5 | 0 | 19 | 0 | ${ }^{2}$ | 684 |
| \% Passenger Venicies |  | 98.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 98.4 |  |  |  |  |  | 95.0 |  |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicles | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| \% Heary Venicles | 0 | 0.9 | 0 | 0 | 0.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.9 |
| Buses | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| \% Buses | 0 | 0.3 | 0 | 0 | 0.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.6 | 0 | 0 | 0.6 | 0 | 0 | 5.0 | 0 | 4.0 | 0.6 |
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|  | Foster Creek Rd From North |  |  |  |  | From East |  |  |  |  | Foster Creek Rd From South |  |  |  |  | Whispering Oak Dr From West |  |  |  |  | Int. Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total |  |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 04:30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:30 PM | 0 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 167 |
| 04:45 PM | 0 | 87 | 2 | 0 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 101 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 193 |
| 05:00 PM | 0 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 181 |
| 05:15 PM | 0 | 70 | 5 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 163 |
| Total Volume | 0 | 305 | 7 | 0 | 312 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 360 | 0 | 0 | 379 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 13 | 704 |
| \% App. Total | 0 | 97.8 | 2.2 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 5 | 95 | 0 | 0 |  | 38.5 | 0 | 61.5 | 0 |  |  |
| PHF | . 000 | . 876 | . 350 | . 000 | . 876 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 792 | . 928 | . 000 | . 000 | . 938 | . 313 | . 000 | . 667 | . 000 | . 542 | 912 |
| Passenger Venicles | 0 | 305 | 7 | 0 | ${ }^{312}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 357 | 0 | 0 | 376 | 5 | 0 | ${ }^{7}$ | 0 | 12 | 700 |
| \% Passenger Velices |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 99.2 |  |  |  |  |  | 87.5 |  |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| \% Heary Venicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12.5 | 0 | 7.7 | 0.1 |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| \% Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.8 | 0 | 0 | 0.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.4 |



File Name : Foster Creek Rd @ Tanner Ford Blvd Site Code :
Start Date : 3/2/2021
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|  | Foster Creek Rd From North |  |  |  | Tanner Ford Blvd From East |  |  |  | Foster Creek Rd From South |  |  |  | From West |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | Int. Total |
| 07:00 AM | 184 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 253 |
| 07:15 AM | 197 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 248 |
| 07:30 AM | 141 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 202 |
| 07:45 AM | 118 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 188 |
| Total | 640 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 187 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 891 |
| 08:00 AM | 94 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 148 |
| 08:15 AM | 117 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 152 |
| 08:30 AM | 139 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 196 |
| 08:45 AM | 82 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 141 |
| Total | 432 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 176 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 637 |


| 04:00 PM | 78 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 212 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 04:15 PM | 81 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 142 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 235 |
| 04:30 PM | 73 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 153 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 240 |
| 04:45 PM | 77 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 171 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 259 |
| Total | 309 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 588 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 946 |
| 05:00 PM | 70 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 143 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 229 |
| 05:15 PM | 69 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 132 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 211 |
| 05:30 PM | 66 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 158 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 237 |
| 05:45 PM | 50 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 132 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 203 |
| Total | 255 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 565 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 880 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Grand Total | 1636 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1516 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3354 |
| Apprch \% | 94.1 | 5.9 | 0 | 0 | 0.2 | 0 | 99.8 | 0 | 0 | 88.7 | 10.3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Total \% | 48.8 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0.1 | 0 | 45.2 | 0 | 0 | 2.6 | 0.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Passenger Vehicles | 1617 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1505 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3321 |
| \% Passenger Vehicles | 98.8 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 99.3 | 0 | 0 | 97.7 | 100 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99 |
| Heavy Vehicles | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| \% Heavy Vehicles | 0.9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.4 | 0 | 0 | 2.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.7 |
| Buses | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| \% Buses | 0.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.3 |
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|  | Foster Creek Rd From North |  |  |  |  | Tanner Ford Blvd From East |  |  |  |  | Foster Creek Rd From South |  |  |  |  | From West |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 07:00 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00 AM | 184 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 190 | 1 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 253 |
| 07:15 AM | 197 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 205 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 248 |
| 07:30 AM | 141 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 147 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 202 |
| 07:45 AM | 118 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 126 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 188 |
| Total Volume | 640 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 668 | 1 | 0 | 187 | 0 | 188 | 0 | 29 | 6 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 891 |
| \% App. Total | 95.8 | 4.2 | 0 | 0 |  | 0.5 | 0 | 99.5 | 0 |  | 0 | 82.9 | 17.1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| PHF | . 812 | . 875 | . 000 | . 000 | . 815 | . 250 | . 000 | . 835 | . 000 | . 839 | . 000 | . 725 | . 750 | . 000 | . 729 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 880 |
| Passenger Venicles | 634 | ${ }^{27}$ | 0 | 0 | 661 | 1 | 0 | 187 | 0 | 188 | 0 | ${ }^{28}$ | 6 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 883 |
| \%Passenger venices | 99.1 | 96.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 96.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicles | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| \% Heary Venicles | 0.6 | 3.6 | 0 | 0 | 0.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.4 | 0 | 0 | 2.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.7 |
| Buses | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| \% Buses | 0.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.2 |



|  | Foster Creek Rd From North |  |  |  |  | Tanner Ford Blvd From East |  |  |  |  | Foster Creek Rd From South |  |  |  |  | From West |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 04:15 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:15 PM | 81 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 142 | 0 | 142 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 235 |
| 04:30 PM | 73 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 153 | 0 | 153 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 240 |
| 04:45 PM | 77 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 171 | 0 | 171 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 259 |
| 05:00 PM | 70 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 1 | 0 | 143 | 0 | 144 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 229 |
| Total Volume | 301 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 330 | 1 | 0 | 609 | 0 | 610 | 0 | 22 | 1 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 963 |
| \% App. Total | 91.2 | 8.8 | 0 | 0 |  | 0.2 | 0 | 99.8 | 0 |  | 0 | 95.7 | 4.3 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| PHF | . 929 | . 725 | . 000 | . 000 | . 938 | . 250 | . 000 | . 890 | . 000 | . 892 | . 000 | . 786 | . 250 | . 000 | . 821 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 | . 930 |
| Passenger Venicles | 297 | ${ }^{29}$ | 0 | 0 | 326 | 1 | 0 | 604 | 0 | 605 | 0 | ${ }^{22}$ | 1 | 0 | ${ }^{23}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 954 |
| \% Passenger Venicies | 98.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 99.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicles | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| \% Heary Venicles | 1.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.2 | 0 | 0 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.6 |
| Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| \% Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.3 |



## INTERSECTION VOLUME DEVELOPMENT

Hanahan Thrash Tract TIA
Foster Creek Road at Snake Road AM PEAK HOUR (7:00 AM to 8:00 AM)

| Description | Foster Creek Road Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  | Snake Road Eastbound |  |  | Snake Road Westbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right |
| Raw March 2021 Traffic Count Volumes | 455 | 0 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 139 | 265 | 100 | 104 | 0 |
| Existing 2021 Traffic Count Volumes with 1.15 COVID Adjustment Factor Applied ${ }^{1}$ | 523 | 0 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 160 | 305 | 115 | 120 | 0 |
| Pedestrians | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicle \% | 1.8\% |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  | 0.7\% |  |  | 1.5\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.69 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.86 |  |  | 0.69 |  |  |
| Annual Growth Rate | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |
| Growth Factor | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 |
| Adjacent Site Development Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2026 Background Traffic | 621 | 0 | 143 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 190 | 362 | 137 | 143 | 0 |
| Trip Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Trips IN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20\% | 5\% |  |  |
| New Trips OUT | 20\% |  | 5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass By Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass By IN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass By OUT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Trips | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass By Trips | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Trips | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2026 Buildout Total | 629 | 0 | 145 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 190 | 364 | 138 | 143 | 0 |

1. Traffic counts collected in March 2021 and adjusted by 1.15 COVID factor based on SCDOT guidance

PM PEAK HOUR (4:00 PM to 5:00 PM)

| Description | Foster Creek Road Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  | Snake Road Eastbound |  |  | Snake Road <br> Westbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right |
| Raw March 2021 Traffic Count Volumes | 321 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 161 | 366 | 38 | 203 | 0 |
| Existing 2021 Traffic Count Volumes with 1.02 COVID Adjustment Factor Applied ${ }^{1}$ | 327 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 164 | 373 | 39 | 207 | 0 |
| Pedestrians | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicle \% | 2.2\% |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  | 0.9\% |  |  | 0.8\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.94 |  |  | 0.85 |  |  |
| Annual Growth Rate | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |
| Growth Factor | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 |
| Adjacent Site Development Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2026 Background Traffic | 388 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 195 | 443 | 46 | 246 | 0 |
| Trip Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Trips IN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20\% | 5\% |  |  |
| New Trips OUT | 20\% |  | 5\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass By Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass By IN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass By OUT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Trips | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass By Trips | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Trips | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2026 Buildout Total | 394 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 195 | 452 | 48 | 246 | 0 |

## INTERSECTION VOLUME DEVELOPMENT

Hanahan Thrash Tract TIA
Foster Creek Road at Song Sparrow Way/Williams Lane AM PEAK HOUR (7:00 AM to 8:00 AM)

| Description | Foster Creek Road Northbound |  |  | Foster Creek Road Southbound |  |  | Song Sparrow Way Eastbound |  |  | Williams Lane Westbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right |
| Raw March 2021 Traffic Count Volumes | 8 | 145 | 76 | 64 | 306 | 22 | 55 | 25 | 37 | 190 | 46 | 118 |
| Existing 2021 Traffic Count Volumes with 1.15 COVID Adjustment Factor Applied ${ }^{1}$ | 9 | 167 | 87 | 74 | 352 | 25 | 63 | 29 | 43 | 219 | 53 | 136 |
| Pedestrians |  | 0 |  |  | 12 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Heavy Vehicle \% |  | 0.4\% |  |  | 1.0\% |  |  | 0.9\% |  |  | 2.5\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor |  | 0.83 |  |  | 0.80 |  |  | 0.81 |  |  | 0.53 |  |
| Annual Growth Rate | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |
| Growth Factor | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 |
| Adjacent Site Development Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2026 Background Traffic | 11 | 198 | 103 | 88 | 418 | 30 | 75 | 34 | 51 | 260 | 63 | 162 |
| Trip Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Trips IN |  | 70\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5\% |
| New Trips OUT |  |  |  | 5\% | 70\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass By Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass By IN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass By OUT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Trips | 0 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Pass By Trips | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Trips | 0 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 2026 Buildout Total | 11 | 207 | 103 | 90 | 447 | 30 | 75 | 34 | 51 | 260 | 63 | 163 |

1. Traffic counts collected in March 2021 and adjusted by 1.15 COVID factor based on SCDOT guidance

PM PEAK HOUR (4:30 PM to 5:30 PM)

| Description | Foster Creek Road Northbound |  |  | Foster Creek Road Southbound |  |  | Song Sparrow Way Eastbound |  |  | Williams Lane Westbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right |
| Raw March 2021 Traffic Count Volumes | 40 | 347 | 79 | 41 | 224 | 49 | 25 | 5 | 28 | 40 | 9 | 29 |
| Existing 2021 Traffic Count Volumes with 1.02 COVID Adjustment Factor Applied ${ }^{1}$ | 41 | 354 | 81 | 42 | 228 | 50 | 26 | 5 | 29 | 41 | 9 | 30 |
| Pedestrians | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicle \% | 0.6\% |  |  | 1.0\% |  |  | 3.4\% |  |  | 5.1\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 |  |  | 0.86 |  |  | 0.76 |  |  | 0.78 |  |  |
| Annual Growth Rate | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |
| Growth Factor | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 |
| Adjacent Site Development Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2026 Background Traffic | 49 | 420 | 96 | 50 | 271 | 59 | 31 | 6 | 34 | 49 | 11 | 36 |
| Trip Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Trips IN |  | 70\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5\% |
| New Trips OUT |  |  |  | 5\% | 70\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass By Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass By IN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass By OUT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Trips | 0 | 31 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Pass By Trips | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Trips | 0 | 31 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2026 Buildout Total | 49 | 451 | 96 | 51 | 289 | 59 | 31 | 6 | 34 | 49 | 11 | 38 |

## INTERSECTION VOLUME DEVELOPMENT

Hanahan Thrash Tract TIA
Foster Creek Road at Whispering Oak Drive AM PEAK HOUR (7:00 AM to 8:00 AM)

| Description | Foster Creek Road Northbound |  |  | Foster Creek Road Southbound |  |  | Whispering Oak Drive Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right |
| Raw March 2021 Traffic Count Volumes | 10 | 308 | 0 | 0 | 350 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing 2021 Traffic Count Volumes with 1.15 COVID Adjustment Factor Applied ${ }^{1}$ | 12 | 354 | 0 | 0 | 403 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedestrians | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicle \% | 1.5\% |  |  | 1.2\% |  |  | 4.0\% |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.69 |  |  | 0.87 |  |  | 0.63 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Annual Growth Rate | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |
| Growth Factor | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 |
| Adjacent Site Development Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2026 Background Traffic | 14 | 420 | 0 | 0 | 479 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Trip Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Trips IN | 75\% |  |  |  |  | 25\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Trips OUT |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25\% |  | 75\% |  |  |  |
| Pass By Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass By IN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass By OUT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Trips | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass By Trips | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Trips | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2026 Buildout Total | 24 | 420 | 0 | 0 | 479 | 4 | 17 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

1. Traffic counts collected in March 2021 and adjusted by 1.15 COVID factor based on SCDOT guidance

## PM PEAK HOUR (4:30 PM to 5:30 PM)

| Description | Foster Creek Road Northbound |  |  | Foster Creek Road Southbound |  |  | Whispering Oak Drive Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right |
| Raw March 2021 Traffic Count Volumes | 19 | 360 | 0 | 0 | 305 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Existing 2021 Traffic Count Volumes with 1.02 COVID Adjustment Factor Applied ${ }^{1}$ | 19 | 367 | 0 | 0 | 311 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedestrians | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicle \% | 0.8\% |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  | 7.7\% |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.94 |  |  | 0.88 |  |  | 0.54 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
| Annual Growth Rate | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |
| Growth Factor | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 |
| Adjacent Site Development Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2026 Background Traffic | 23 | 436 | 0 | 0 | 369 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trip Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Trips IN | 75\% |  |  |  |  | 25\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Trips OUT |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25\% |  | 75\% |  |  |  |
| Pass By Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass By IN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass By OUT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Trips | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 7 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pass By Trips | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Trips | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 7 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2026 Buildout Total | 56 | 436 | 0 | 0 | 369 | 19 | 13 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## INTERSECTION VOLUME DEVELOPMENT

Hanahan Thrash Tract TIA
Foster Creek Road at Tanner Ford Boulevard AM PEAK HOUR (7:00 AM to 8:00 AM)

| Description | Foster Creek Road Northbound |  |  | Foster Creek Road Southbound |  |  | Eastbound |  |  | Tanner Ford Boulevard Westbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right |
| Raw March 2021 Traffic Count Volumes | 0 | 29 | 6 | 640 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 187 |
| Existing 2021 Traffic Count Volumes with 1.15 COVID Adjustment Factor Applied ${ }^{1}$ | 0 | 33 | 7 | 736 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 215 |
| Pedestrians |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Heavy Vehicle \% |  | 2.9\% |  |  | 1.0\% |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  | 0.0\% |  |
| Peak Hour Factor |  | 0.73 |  |  | 0.82 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.84 |  |
| Annual Growth Rate | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |
| Growth Factor | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 |
| Adjacent Site Development Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2026 Background Traffic | 0 | 39 | 8 | 874 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 255 |
| Trip Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Trips IN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 70\% |
| New Trips OUT |  |  |  | 70\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass By Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass By IN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass By OUT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Trips | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Pass By Trips | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Trips | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 2026 Buildout Total | 0 | 39 | 8 | 903 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 264 |

1. Traffic counts collected in March 2021 and adjusted by 1.15 COVID factor based on SCDOT guidance

PM PEAK HOUR (4:15 PM to 5:15 PM)

| Description | Foster Creek Road Northbound |  |  | Foster Creek Road Southbound |  |  | Eastbound |  |  | Tanner Ford Boulevard Westbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right |
| Raw March 2021 Traffic Count Volumes | 0 | 22 | 1 | 301 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 609 |
| Existing 2021 Traffic Count Volumes with 1.02 COVID Adjustment Factor Applied ${ }^{1}$ | 0 | 22 | 1 | 307 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 621 |
| Pedestrians | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Heavy Vehicle \% | 0.0\% |  |  | 1.2\% |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  | 0.8\% |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.82 |  |  | 0.94 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.89 |  |  |
| Annual Growth Rate | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |
| Growth Factor | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 | 1.188 |
| Adjacent Site Development Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2026 Background Traffic | 0 | 26 | 1 | 365 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 738 |
| Trip Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Trips IN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 70\% |
| New Trips OUT |  |  |  | 70\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass By Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass By IN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pass By OUT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Trips | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| Pass By Trips | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Trips | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2026 Buildout Total | 0 | 26 | 1 | 383 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 769 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  |  | $\mathbf{- 1}$ | 个 | $\mathbf{7}$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 6 | 23 | 12 | 354 | 403 | 1 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 6 | 23 | 12 | 354 | 403 | 1 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | 155 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 63 | 63 | 69 | 69 | 87 | 87 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 10 | 37 | 17 | 513 | 463 | 1 |



| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 13.5 | 0.3 | 0 |

HCM LOS B

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBL | NBT EBLn1 | SBT | SBR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1097 | - | 468 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.016 | - | -098 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 8.3 | 0 | 13.5 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | B | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | - | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 9.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | a | $\mathbf{r}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ |  | $\boldsymbol{1}$ | 4 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 1 | 215 | 33 | 7 | 736 | 32 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 1 | 215 | 33 | 7 | 736 | 32 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | Yield | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | 150 | - | - | 215 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 84 | 84 | 73 | 73 | 82 | 82 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 1 | 256 | 45 | 10 | 898 | 39 |



## Site: 101 [Existing AM]

Thrust Tract TIA
Site Category: (None)
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ |  | Deman Total veh/h |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Deg. } \\ & \text { Satn } \\ & \text { v/c } \end{aligned}$ | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance ft | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Average Speed mph |
| South: Foster Creek Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 11 | 2.0 | 0.290 | 6.1 | LOS A | 1.5 | 38.1 | 0.43 | 0.30 | 0.43 | 30.1 |
| 8 | T1 | 201 | 2.0 | 0.290 | 6.1 | LOS A | 1.5 | 38.1 | 0.43 | 0.30 | 0.43 | 36.9 |
| 18 | R2 | 105 | 2.0 | 0.290 | 6.1 | LOS A | 1.5 | 38.1 | 0.43 | 0.30 | 0.43 | 33.1 |
| Appr |  | 317 | 2.0 | 0.290 | 6.1 | LOS A | 1.5 | 38.1 | 0.43 | 0.30 | 0.43 | 35.3 |
| East: Williams Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 413 | 3.0 | 0.777 | 18.9 | LOS C | 16.0 | 409.1 | 0.89 | 1.18 | 1.69 | 27.3 |
| 6 | T1 | 100 | 3.0 | 0.777 | 18.9 | LOS C | 16.0 | 409.1 | 0.89 | 1.18 | 1.69 | 23.1 |
| 16 | R2 | 257 | 3.0 | 0.777 | 18.9 | LOS C | 16.0 | 409.1 | 0.89 | 1.18 | 1.69 | 26.8 |
| Appr |  | 770 | 3.0 | 0.777 | 18.9 | LOS C | 16.0 | 409.1 | 0.89 | 1.18 | 1.69 | 26.5 |
| North: Foster Creek Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 92 | 2.0 | 0.723 | 19.3 | LOS C | 8.8 | 223.5 | 0.87 | 1.15 | 1.71 | 28.5 |
| 4 | T1 | 440 | 2.0 | 0.723 | 19.3 | LOS C | 8.8 | 223.5 | 0.87 | 1.15 | 1.71 | 30.1 |
| 14 | R2 | 31 | 2.0 | 0.723 | 19.3 | LOS C | 8.8 | 223.5 | 0.87 | 1.15 | 1.71 | 24.3 |
| Appro |  | 564 | 2.0 | 0.723 | 19.3 | LOS C | 8.8 | 223.5 | 0.87 | 1.15 | 1.71 | 29.5 |
| West: Song Sparrow Way |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 78 | 2.0 | 0.331 | 12.3 | LOS B | 1.4 | 36.4 | 0.72 | 0.78 | 0.85 | 26.2 |
| 2 | T1 | 36 | 2.0 | 0.331 | 12.3 | LOS B | 1.4 | 36.4 | 0.72 | 0.78 | 0.85 | 24.8 |
| 12 | R2 | 53 | 2.0 | 0.331 | 12.3 | LOS B | 1.4 | 36.4 | 0.72 | 0.78 | 0.85 | 25.7 |
| Approach |  | 167 | 2.0 | 0.331 | 12.3 | LOS B | 1.4 | 36.4 | 0.72 | 0.78 | 0.85 | 25.7 |
| All Ve | icles | 1817 | 2.4 | 0.777 | 16.2 | LOS C | 16.0 | 409.1 | 0.79 | 0.98 | 1.40 | 28.6 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 6). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 6).
Roundabout Capacity Model: US HCM 6.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies. Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  |  | $\mathbf{-}$ | 个 | $\mathbf{7}$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 5 | 8 | 19 | 367 | 311 | 7 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 5 | 8 | 19 | 367 | 311 | 7 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | 155 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 54 | 54 | 94 | 94 | 88 | 88 |
| Heavy Vehicles, $\%$ | 8 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 9 | 15 | 20 | 390 | 353 | 8 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | i | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ |  | $\mathbf{1}$ | 4 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 1 | 621 | 22 | 1 | 307 | 30 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 1 | 621 | 22 | 1 | 307 | 30 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | Yield | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | 150 | - | - | 215 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 89 | 89 | 82 | 82 | 94 | 94 |
| Heavy Vehicles, $\%$ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 1 | 698 | 27 | 1 | 327 | 32 |



## Site: 101 [Existing PM]

Thrust Tract TIA
Site Category: (None)
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \hline \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ |  | Deman Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Average Speed mph |
| South: Foster Creek Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 46 | 2.0 | 0.434 | 7.3 | LOS A | 2.9 | 73.1 | 0.34 | 0.18 | 0.34 | 29.5 |
| 8 | T1 | 398 | 2.0 | 0.434 | 7.3 | LOS A | 2.9 | 73.1 | 0.34 | 0.18 | 0.34 | 36.0 |
| 18 | R2 | 91 | 2.0 | 0.434 | 7.3 | LOS A | 2.9 | 73.1 | 0.34 | 0.18 | 0.34 | 32.4 |
| Appr |  | 535 | 2.0 | 0.434 | 7.3 | LOS A | 2.9 | 73.1 | 0.34 | 0.18 | 0.34 | 34.7 |
| East: Williams Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 53 | 5.0 | 0.128 | 5.8 | LOS A | 0.5 | 13.4 | 0.53 | 0.46 | 0.53 | 32.2 |
| 6 | T1 | 12 | 5.0 | 0.128 | 5.8 | LOS A | 0.5 | 13.4 | 0.53 | 0.46 | 0.53 | 26.7 |
| 16 | R2 | 38 | 5.0 | 0.128 | 5.8 | LOS A | 0.5 | 13.4 | 0.53 | 0.46 | 0.53 | 31.5 |
| Appr |  | 103 | 5.0 | 0.128 | 5.8 | LOS A | 0.5 | 13.4 | 0.53 | 0.46 | 0.53 | 31.2 |
| North: Foster Creek Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 49 | 2.0 | 0.309 | 5.9 | LOS A | 1.7 | 43.5 | 0.32 | 0.18 | 0.32 | 34.3 |
| 4 | T1 | 265 | 2.0 | 0.309 | 5.9 | LOS A | 1.7 | 43.5 | 0.32 | 0.18 | 0.32 | 36.7 |
| 14 | R2 | 58 | 2.0 | 0.309 | 5.9 | LOS A | 1.7 | 43.5 | 0.32 | 0.18 | 0.32 | 28.4 |
| Appr |  | 372 | 2.0 | 0.309 | 5.9 | LOS A | 1.7 | 43.5 | 0.32 | 0.18 | 0.32 | 34.8 |
| West: Song Sparrow Way |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 34 | 3.0 | 0.086 | 4.7 | LOS A | 0.4 | 9.0 | 0.47 | 0.35 | 0.47 | 28.6 |
| 2 | T1 | 7 | 3.0 | 0.086 | 4.7 | LOS A | 0.4 | 9.0 | 0.47 | 0.35 | 0.47 | 27.1 |
| 12 | R2 | 38 | 3.0 | 0.086 | 4.7 | LOS A | 0.4 | 9.0 | 0.47 | 0.35 | 0.47 | 28.0 |
| Approach |  | 79 | 3.0 | 0.086 | 4.7 | LOS A | 0.4 | 9.0 | 0.47 | 0.35 | 0.47 | 28.2 |
| All V | icles | 1088 | 2.4 | 0.434 | 6.5 | LOS A | 2.9 | 73.1 | 0.36 | 0.22 | 0.36 | 33.8 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 6). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 6).
Roundabout Capacity Model: US HCM 6.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\mathbf{4}$ |  |  | $\mathbf{- 1}$ | 个 | $\mathbf{7}$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 7 | 27 | 14 | 420 | 479 | 1 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 7 | 27 | 14 | 420 | 479 | 1 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | 155 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 63 | 63 | 69 | 69 | 87 | 87 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 11 | 43 | 20 | 609 | 551 | 1 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 11.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | i | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ |  | $\mathbf{T}$ | 4 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 1 | 255 | 39 | 8 | 874 | 38 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 1 | 255 | 39 | 8 | 874 | 38 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | Yield | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | 150 | - | - | 215 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 84 | 84 | 73 | 73 | 82 | 82 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 1 | 304 | 53 | 11 | 1066 | 46 |



## Site: 101 [2026 No Build AM]

Thrust Tract TIA
Site Category: (None)
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ |  | Deman Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back <br> Vehicles <br> veh | of Queue Distance ft | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Average Speed mph |
| South: Foster Creek Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 13 | 2.0 | 0.358 | 7.1 | LOS A | 2.0 | 49.6 | 0.49 | 0.37 | 0.49 | 29.7 |
| 8 | T1 | 239 | 2.0 | 0.358 | 7.1 | LOS A | 2.0 | 49.6 | 0.49 | 0.37 | 0.49 | 36.3 |
| 18 | R2 | 124 | 2.0 | 0.358 | 7.1 | LOS A | 2.0 | 49.6 | 0.49 | 0.37 | 0.49 | 32.6 |
| Appr |  | 376 | 2.0 | 0.358 | 7.1 | LOS A | 2.0 | 49.6 | 0.49 | 0.37 | 0.49 | 34.7 |
| East: Williams Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 491 | 3.0 | 0.977 | 45.1 | LOS E | 40.6 | 1039.9 | 1.00 | 2.14 | 3.51 | 20.8 |
| 6 | T1 | 119 | 3.0 | 0.977 | 45.1 | LOS E | 40.6 | 1039.9 | 1.00 | 2.14 | 3.51 | 18.3 |
| 16 | R2 | 306 | 3.0 | 0.977 | 45.1 | LOS E | 40.6 | 1039.9 | 1.00 | 2.14 | 3.51 | 20.5 |
| Appr |  | 915 | 3.0 | 0.977 | 45.1 | LOS E | 40.6 | 1039.9 | 1.00 | 2.14 | 3.51 | 20.4 |
| North: Foster Creek Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 110 | 2.0 | 0.952 | 47.2 | LOS E | 22.4 | 568.7 | 1.00 | 1.81 | 3.59 | 21.1 |
| 4 | T1 | 523 | 2.0 | 0.952 | 47.2 | LOS E | 22.4 | 568.7 | 1.00 | 1.81 | 3.59 | 22.0 |
| 14 | R2 | 38 | 2.0 | 0.952 | 47.2 | LOS E | 22.4 | 568.7 | 1.00 | 1.81 | 3.59 | 18.7 |
| Appr |  | 670 | 2.0 | 0.952 | 47.2 | LOS E | 22.4 | 568.7 | 1.00 | 1.81 | 3.59 | 21.6 |
| West: Song Sparrow Way |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 93 | 2.0 | 0.472 | 18.4 | LOS C | 2.3 | 58.3 | 0.81 | 0.97 | 1.20 | 24.5 |
| 2 | T1 | 42 | 2.0 | 0.472 | 18.4 | LOS C | 2.3 | 58.3 | 0.81 | 0.97 | 1.20 | 23.3 |
| 12 | R2 | 63 | 2.0 | 0.472 | 18.4 | LOS C | 2.3 | 58.3 | 0.81 | 0.97 | 1.20 | 24.0 |
| Approach |  | 198 | 2.0 | 0.472 | 18.4 | LOS C | 2.3 | 58.3 | 0.81 | 0.97 | 1.20 | 24.1 |
| All V | icles | 2159 | 2.4 | 0.977 | 36.7 | LOS E | 40.6 | 1039.9 | 0.89 | 1.62 | 2.80 | 22.7 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 6). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if v/c > 1 irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 6).
Roundabout Capacity Model: US HCM 6.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  |  | $\mathbf{\uparrow}$ | 个 | $\mathbf{7}$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 6 | 10 | 23 | 436 | 369 | 8 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 6 | 10 | 23 | 436 | 369 | 8 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | 155 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 54 | 54 | 94 | 94 | 88 | 88 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 8 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 11 | 19 | 24 | 464 | 419 | 9 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 15.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | i | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ |  | $\mathbf{1}$ | 4 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 1 | 738 | 26 | 1 | 365 | 36 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 1 | 738 | 26 | 1 | 365 | 36 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | Yield | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | 150 | - | - | 215 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 89 | 89 | 82 | 82 | 94 | 94 |
| Heavy Vehicles, $\%$ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 1 | 829 | 32 | 1 | 388 | 38 |



## Site: 101 [2026 No Build PM]

Thrust Tract TIA
Site Category: (None)
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ |  | Deman <br> Total veh/h | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lows } \\ & \text { HV } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | f Queue Distance ft | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Average Speed mph |
| South: Foster Creek Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 55 | 2.0 | 0.525 | 8.8 | LOS A | 3.9 | 99.9 | 0.43 | 0.25 | 0.43 | 29.0 |
| 8 | T1 | 472 | 2.0 | 0.525 | 8.8 | LOS A | 3.9 | 99.9 | 0.43 | 0.25 | 0.43 | 35.2 |
| 18 | R2 | 108 | 2.0 | 0.525 | 8.8 | LOS A | 3.9 | 99.9 | 0.43 | 0.25 | 0.43 | 31.8 |
| Appr |  | 635 | 2.0 | 0.525 | 8.8 | LOS A | 3.9 | 99.9 | 0.43 | 0.25 | 0.43 | 33.9 |
| East: Williams Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 63 | 5.0 | 0.169 | 6.8 | LOS A | 0.7 | 17.6 | 0.58 | 0.55 | 0.58 | 31.8 |
| 6 | T1 | 14 | 5.0 | 0.169 | 6.8 | LOS A | 0.7 | 17.6 | 0.58 | 0.55 | 0.58 | 26.4 |
| 16 | R2 | 46 | 5.0 | 0.169 | 6.8 | LOS A | 0.7 | 17.6 | 0.58 | 0.55 | 0.58 | 31.0 |
| Appr |  | 123 | 5.0 | 0.169 | 6.8 | LOS A | 0.7 | 17.6 | 0.58 | 0.55 | 0.58 | 30.8 |
| North: Foster Creek Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 58 | 2.0 | 0.376 | 6.8 | LOS A | 2.2 | 56.6 | 0.38 | 0.23 | 0.38 | 33.8 |
| 4 | T1 | 315 | 2.0 | 0.376 | 6.8 | LOS A | 2.2 | 56.6 | 0.38 | 0.23 | 0.38 | 36.2 |
| 14 | R2 | 69 | 2.0 | 0.376 | 6.8 | LOS A | 2.2 | 56.6 | 0.38 | 0.23 | 0.38 | 28.1 |
| Appr |  | 442 | 2.0 | 0.376 | 6.8 | LOS A | 2.2 | 56.6 | 0.38 | 0.23 | 0.38 | 34.3 |
| West: Song Sparrow Way |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 41 | 3.0 | 0.110 | 5.3 | LOS A | 0.4 | 11.5 | 0.51 | 0.42 | 0.51 | 28.4 |
| 2 | T1 | 8 | 3.0 | 0.110 | 5.3 | LOS A | 0.4 | 11.5 | 0.51 | 0.42 | 0.51 | 26.9 |
| 12 | R2 | 45 | 3.0 | 0.110 | 5.3 | LOS A | 0.4 | 11.5 | 0.51 | 0.42 | 0.51 | 27.8 |
| Approach |  | 93 | 3.0 | 0.110 | 5.3 | LOS A | 0.4 | 11.5 | 0.51 | 0.42 | 0.51 | 28.0 |
| All V | icles | 1293 | 2.4 | 0.525 | 7.7 | LOS A | 3.9 | 99.9 | 0.43 | 0.28 | 0.43 | 33.2 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 6). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if v/c > 1 irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 6).
Roundabout Capacity Model: US HCM 6.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | M |  |  | 个 | 个 | $\mathbf{F}$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 17 | 58 | 24 | 420 | 479 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 17 | 58 | 24 | 420 | 479 | 4 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | 150 | - | - | 155 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 63 | 63 | 69 | 69 | 87 | 87 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 27 | 92 | 35 | 609 | 551 | 5 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 11.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | i | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ |  | $\mathbf{1}$ | 4 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 1 | 264 | 39 | 8 | 903 | 38 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 1 | 264 | 39 | 8 | 903 | 38 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | Yield | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | 150 | - | - | 215 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 84 | 84 | 73 | 73 | 82 | 82 |
| Heavy Vehicles, $\%$ | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 1 | 314 | 53 | 11 | 1101 | 46 |



Site: 101 [2026 Build AM]
Thrust Tract TIA
Site Category: (None)
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov |  | Deman Total veh/h | $\begin{array}{r} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | f Queue Distance ft | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Average Speed mph |
| South: Foster Creek Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 13 | 2.0 | 0.369 | 7.3 | LOS A | 2.0 | 51.6 | 0.50 | 0.38 | 0.50 | 29.6 |
| 8 | T1 | 249 | 2.0 | 0.369 | 7.3 | LOS A | 2.0 | 51.6 | 0.50 | 0.38 | 0.50 | 36.2 |
| 18 | R2 | 124 | 2.0 | 0.369 | 7.3 | LOS A | 2.0 | 51.6 | 0.50 | 0.38 | 0.50 | 32.6 |
| Appr |  | 387 | 2.0 | 0.369 | 7.3 | LOS A | 2.0 | 51.6 | 0.50 | 0.38 | 0.50 | 34.7 |
| East: Williams Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 491 | 3.0 | 0.990 | 48.4 | LOS E | 42.4 | 1085.3 | 1.00 | 2.23 | 3.71 | 20.2 |
| 6 | T1 | 119 | 3.0 | 0.990 | 48.4 | LOS E | 42.4 | 1085.3 | 1.00 | 2.23 | 3.71 | 17.8 |
| 16 | R2 | 308 | 3.0 | 0.990 | 48.4 | LOS E | 42.4 | 1085.3 | 1.00 | 2.23 | 3.71 | 19.9 |
| Appr |  | 917 | 3.0 | 0.990 | 48.4 | LOS E | 42.4 | 1085.3 | 1.00 | 2.23 | 3.71 | 19.8 |
| North: Foster Creek Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 113 | 2.0 | 1.008 | 60.0 | LOS F | 29.8 | 756.4 | 1.00 | 2.07 | 4.41 | 18.9 |
| 4 | T1 | 559 | 2.0 | 1.008 | 60.0 | LOS F | 29.8 | 756.4 | 1.00 | 2.07 | 4.41 | 19.6 |
| 14 | R2 | 38 | 2.0 | 1.008 | 60.0 | LOS F | 29.8 | 756.4 | 1.00 | 2.07 | 4.41 | 17.0 |
| Appr |  | 709 | 2.0 | 1.008 | 60.0 | LOS F | 29.8 | 756.4 | 1.00 | 2.07 | 4.41 | 19.3 |
| West: Song Sparrow Way |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 93 | 2.0 | 0.490 | 19.7 | LOS C | 2.4 | 60.8 | 0.82 | 0.99 | 1.25 | 24.1 |
| 2 | T1 | 42 | 2.0 | 0.490 | 19.7 | LOS C | 2.4 | 60.8 | 0.82 | 0.99 | 1.25 | 23.0 |
| 12 | R2 | 63 | 2.0 | 0.490 | 19.7 | LOS C | 2.4 | 60.8 | 0.82 | 0.99 | 1.25 | 23.7 |
| Approach |  | 198 | 2.0 | 0.490 | 19.7 | LOS C | 2.4 | 60.8 | 0.82 | 0.99 | 1.25 | 23.7 |
| All Vehicles |  | 2210 | 2.4 | 1.008 | 42.4 | LOS E | 42.4 | 1085.3 | 0.90 | 1.74 | 3.15 | 21.5 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 6). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 6).
Roundabout Capacity Model: US HCM 6.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\mathbf{r}$ |  |  | $\mathbf{4}$ | 个 | $\mathbf{7}$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 13 | 29 | 56 | 436 | 369 | 19 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 13 | 29 | 56 | 436 | 369 | 19 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | 150 | - | - | 155 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 54 | 54 | 94 | 94 | 88 | 88 |
| Heavy Vehicles, $\%$ | 8 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 24 | 54 | 60 | 464 | 419 | 22 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 17.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | a | $\mathbf{r}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ |  | $\boldsymbol{1}$ | 4 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 1 | 769 | 26 | 1 | 383 | 36 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 1 | 769 | 26 | 1 | 383 | 36 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | Yield | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | 150 | - | - | 215 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 89 | 89 | 82 | 82 | 94 | 94 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 1 | 864 | 32 | 1 | 407 | 38 |



## Site: 101 [2026 Build PM]

Thrust Tract TIA
Site Category: (None)
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mov |  | Deman Total veh/h | $\begin{array}{r} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance ft | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Average Speed mph |
| South: Foster Creek Road men |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 55 | 2.0 | 0.554 | 9.4 | LOS A | 4.4 | 110.7 | 0.45 | 0.26 | 0.45 | 28.8 |
| 8 | T1 | 507 | 2.0 | 0.554 | 9.4 | LOS A | 4.4 | 110.7 | 0.45 | 0.26 | 0.45 | 34.9 |
| 18 | R2 | 108 | 2.0 | 0.554 | 9.4 | LOS A | 4.4 | 110.7 | 0.45 | 0.26 | 0.45 | 31.5 |
| Appr |  | 670 | 2.0 | 0.554 | 9.4 | LOS A | 4.4 | 110.7 | 0.45 | 0.26 | 0.45 | 33.7 |
| East: Williams Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 63 | 5.0 | 0.179 | 7.1 | LOS A | 0.7 | 18.6 | 0.60 | 0.58 | 0.60 | 31.6 |
| 6 | T1 | 14 | 5.0 | 0.179 | 7.1 | LOS A | 0.7 | 18.6 | 0.60 | 0.58 | 0.60 | 26.3 |
| 16 | R2 | 49 | 5.0 | 0.179 | 7.1 | LOS A | 0.7 | 18.6 | 0.60 | 0.58 | 0.60 | 30.9 |
| Appr |  | 126 | 5.0 | 0.179 | 7.1 | LOS A | 0.7 | 18.6 | 0.60 | 0.58 | 0.60 | 30.7 |
| North: Foster Creek Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 59 | 2.0 | 0.394 | 7.0 | LOS A | 2.4 | 60.8 | 0.39 | 0.24 | 0.39 | 33.7 |
| 4 | T1 | 336 | 2.0 | 0.394 | 7.0 | LOS A | 2.4 | 60.8 | 0.39 | 0.24 | 0.39 | 36.1 |
| 14 | R2 | 69 | 2.0 | 0.394 | 7.0 | LOS A | 2.4 | 60.8 | 0.39 | 0.24 | 0.39 | 28.0 |
| Appr |  | 464 | 2.0 | 0.394 | 7.0 | LOS A | 2.4 | 60.8 | 0.39 | 0.24 | 0.39 | 34.3 |
| West: Song Sparrow Way |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | L2 | 41 | 3.0 | 0.113 | 5.4 | LOS A | 0.5 | 11.7 | 0.52 | 0.44 | 0.52 | 28.3 |
| 2 | T1 | 8 | 3.0 | 0.113 | 5.4 | LOS A | 0.5 | 11.7 | 0.52 | 0.44 | 0.52 | 26.8 |
| 12 | R2 | 45 | 3.0 | 0.113 | 5.4 | LOS A | 0.5 | 11.7 | 0.52 | 0.44 | 0.52 | 27.7 |
| Approach |  | 93 | 3.0 | 0.113 | 5.4 | LOS A | 0.5 | 11.7 | 0.52 | 0.44 | 0.52 | 27.9 |
| All Vehicles |  | 1353 | 2.3 | 0.554 | 8.1 | LOS A | 4.4 | 110.7 | 0.45 | 0.30 | 0.45 | 33.1 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 6). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 6).
Roundabout Capacity Model: US HCM 6.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies. Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## Foster Creek Road at Whispering Oak Drive

9.5-8 INTERSECTIONS March 2017


## Instructions:

1. The family of curves represents the percent of left turns in the advancing volume $\left(V_{A}\right)$. The designer should locate the curve for the actual percentage of left turns. When this is not an even increment of 5, the designer should estimate where the curve lies.
2. Read $V_{A}$ and $V_{O}$ into the chart and locate the intersection of the two volumes.
3. Note the location of the point in \#2 relative to the line in \#1. If the point is to the right of the line, then a left-turn lane is warranted. If the point is to the left of the line, then a leftturn lane is not warranted based on traffic volumes.

Figure 9.5-F
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February 17, 2021

Robert Wall
Stanley Martin Homes
wallrc@stanleymartin.com

Water Availability to TMS: 259-00-01-004 \& 259-03-01-101
41 Town Homes and 40 Single Family lots

This letter is to certify our willingness and ability to provide water and sewer service to the above referenced site in Berkeley County, South Carolina. CWS currently has an $8^{\prime}$ water main in the ROW of Whispering Oak Drive and Crossbill Trail which may be extended to serve the proposed development.

It will of course be a developer responsibility to ensure there are adequate pressures and quantities on the existing mains to serve this site with domestic water/fire flow and not negatively impact the existing developments. Please be advised any extensions or modifications to the infrastructure as well as any additional fire protection will be a developer's expense. All fees and cost associated with providing service to this site will be a developer expense and will be due prior to connection of any Charleston Water System's water system. This letter does not reserve capacity in the Charleston Water System infrastructure and it is incumbent upon the developer or his agent to confirm the availability herein granted past 12 months of this correspondence.

The Charleston Water System certifies the availability of service only insofar as its rights allow. Should access to our existing main/mains be denied by appropriate governing authorities, the Charleston Water System will have no other option than to deny service. This letter is not to be construed as a letter of acceptance for operation and maintenance from the Department of Health and Environmental Control.

If there are any questions pertaining to this letter, please do not hesitate to call on me at (843) 727-6869.
Sincerely,


Lydia Owens
Charleston Water System

## Commercial Letter of Availability

February 15, 2021

Stanley Martin Homes
502 Wando Park Blvd., Suite 101
Mt. Pleasant, South Carolina 29464
Re: TMS 259-03-01-101
Dear Robert:
I am pleased to inform you that Dominion Energy will be able to provide electric service to the above referenced parcels. Electric service will be provided in accordance with Dominion Energy General Terms and Conditions, other documents on file with the South Carolina Public Service Commission, and the company's standard operating policies and procedures. In order to begin engineering work for the project, the following information will need to be provided:
1.) Detailed utility site plan (AutoCAD format preferred) showing water, sewer, and storm drainage as well as requested service point/transformer location.
2.) Additional drawings that indicate wetlands boundaries, tree survey with barricade plan and buffer zones (if required), as well as any existing or additional easements will also be needed.
3.) Electric load breakdown by type with riser diagrams and desired metering specifications.
4.) Signed copy of this letter acknowledging its receipt and responsibility for its contents and authorization to begin engineering work with the understanding that Dominion Energy intends to serve the referenced project.

Dominion Energy construction standards and specifications are available upon request. Please note that for multi-occupancy residential developments per SC Public Service Commission Regulation 103-327(A): All service delivered to new multi-occupancy residential premises at which units of such premises are separately rented, leased or owned shall be delivered by an electric utility on the basis of individual meter measurement for each dwelling. For more information or questions, contact me by phone at (843-576-8452) or at Monique.palmer@dominionenergy.com.

Sincerely,
Monique L. Palmer
Key Account Manager
AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE: $\qquad$ DATE: $\qquad$
TITLE: $\qquad$ PHONE: $\qquad$

## Dominion <br> Energy

02/19/2021

Robbie Wall, Land Development Manager<br>Stanley Martin Homes<br>502 Wando Park Blvd Suite 101<br>Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464

Re: Thrash Property - Foster Creek Rd.
TMS: 259-00-01-004 \& 259-03-01-101
Robbie,
I am pleased to inform you that Dominion Energy will be able to provide natural gas service to the above referenced TMS: 259-00-01-004 \& 259-03-01-101 located in Berkley County. Services will be provided in accordance with Dominion Energy's General Terms and Conditions, other documents on file with the South Carolina Public Service Commission, and the company's standard operating policies and procedures.

Any cost associated with providing service will be determined when a finalized/approved plan is submitted to our office. In order to begin engineering work for the project, the following information will need to be provided:
1.) Detailed utility site plan (AutoCAD format preferred) showing water, sewer, and storm drainage. The finalized/approved plan must include lot numbers, street names, and 911 addresses for each lot.
2.) Additional drawings that indicate wetlands boundaries, tree survey with barricade plan and buffer zones (if required), as well as any existing or additional easements will also be needed.
3.) Copies of the Army Corp of Engineers official delineation and permits. If applicable, OCMR permits should also be included.
4.) Signed copy of this letter acknowledging its receipt and responsibility for its contents and authorization to begin engineering work with the understanding that Dominion Energy intends to serve the referenced project.

Dominion Energy's construction standards and specifications are available upon request. For more information or questions, contact me by phone at (843) 614-0951 or at brittany.fickling@dominionenergy.com.

Sincerely,
Brittany Fickling
Dominion Energy

CITY COUNCIL

To: Mike Kittrell
Senior Landscape Architect
From: Joseph Bowers, Fire Chief 吹B
Date: April 6, 2021

## RE: LETTER OF COORDINATION

The City of Hanahan Fire Department is aware of the project that consists of 81-unit mix of Townhomes and Single-Family residences for Stanley Martin Homes. The property is known as the Thrash Tract-TMS\#259-00-01004. Based on this fact and the layout of the subdivision the following areas are things of concern that must be addressed.
$\square$ Access- The fire department notes the bridge on the drawing and require it to have 80,000 lbs. GVW rating. Also notes that these are all dead-end streets and will have concerns in event of a fire.
Hydrants- The fire department is requesting 7 hydrants.
$\square$ Residential Sprinklers- Due to the design and aforementioned areas the Fire Department is requesting as the AHJ to have sprinklers installed. If this is done the minimum hydrants would be 5 and it would mitigate access issues.

