



Transportation  
Land Development  
Energy

November 2, 2019

Timothy Masters  
Code Enforcement Officer  
Village of Williamsville  
5565 Main Street  
Williamsville, NY 14221

Development Review  
Blocher Apartments  
135 Evans Street

Dear Mr. Masters:

We have completed our review of the proposed Blocher Apartments project that is being considered for 135 Evans Street. The development will consist of an apartment complex comprised of 3 buildings with 97 total units. Access to the site will be provided through two driveways onto Evans Street and a potential driveway onto Village Point Lane. 107 parking spaces are shown on the proposed site plan.

We have the following comments on the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) that was completed by SRF Associates, dated July 2019, with revisions on October 7, and October 18, 2019.

**Traffic Volumes**

The traffic volumes presented in the TIS accurately represent the existing conditions of roadway network. It was noted that in general the peak hours of traffic flow were from 8:00-9:00 AM and 4:30-5:30 PM. We noted one discrepancy in the traffic volumes. Figure 3 shows the southbound right turn on Evans Street during the AM peak hour is 79 vehicles per hour (vph) when the counts provided in the appendix show 72 vph. This minor difference will not affect the results of the level of service of this intersection. We also reviewed the growth projections and concur the 0.5% per year growth rate is appropriate for this location, the other outside development that is currently proposed and the general change in traffic over the years.

**Site Trip Generation and Distribution**

We concur with the site trip generation and distribution of site traffic that is presented in the TIS. It is estimated that there will be 47 new trips during the AM peak hour (10 entering and 36 exiting) and 57 new trips during the PM peak hour (36 entering and 21 existing). However, there are some minor discrepancies on Figure 7. When adding the volumes in Figure 7, it shows 11 entering vehicles during the AM peak hour and 35 entering and 25 exiting vehicles during the PM peak hour.

In addition, the distribution of site traffic through the study area intersections does not add up. For example, when heading south on Evans Street during the AM peak hour, 4 vehicles are going through and 4 are turning left from Essjay Road. However when you look at the North Driveway intersection there are only 4 total vehicles going south, where there should be 8. Another example is at the Essjay Road/Village Point Lane intersection. There are 4 vehicles going east during the AM and PM peak hours, but it is unclear where



these vehicles came from because the Evans Street/Essjay Road intersection does not show any traffic turning onto Essjay Road.

### **Capacity Analyses**

We completed a review of the traffic analyses including a review of the 2020 background conditions and the full development conditions. The volumes in Figure 8 (Full Development Conditions) were derived from adding the volumes in Figure 4 (2020 Background Conditions) to the volumes in Figure 7 (Site Generated Trips). Review of Figure 8 shows that there are a number of intersections during the AM and PM peak hours where the volumes do not add up correctly. For example at the Evans Street/Essjay Road intersection, the southbound through movement during the AM peak hour should be 476 vph not 473 vph as shown and the westbound right turn should be 143 vph, not 144 vph as shown in Figure 8. There are inconsistencies at the Essjay Road/Village Pointe Lane intersection and the Evans Street/Eagle Street intersection.

In addition the eastbound left and right turns for the AM peak hour at the Evans Street/Eagle Street intersection are shown incorrectly. These should be flipped, however, this error is not carried through in the level of service analysis.

Finally, the left turns exiting the south driveway during the PM peak hour on Figure 8 are incorrect. Figure 8 shows only 2 left turns while Figure 7 shows 7 left turns. This may impact the results of the level of service analysis.

Review of the level of service analysis for the 2020 Background condition was completed by comparing the volumes on Figure 4 to the capacity analysis printouts that are contained in the appendix. This comparison shows that the volumes shown in the capacity analysis printouts do not match the volumes in Figure 4 for both the AM and PM peak hours. All six study area intersections had discrepancies when comparing the two, therefore we cannot independently verify the results of the level of service analysis for the 2020 Background condition.

We are unable to complete a full review of the capacity analyses for the full build due to the number of inconsistencies in volumes on Figures 7 and 8. The questions that we have regarding the traffic volumes could impact the results of these analyses. In general, from what has been presented in the TIS, we offer the following comments:

- There northbound and southbound movements at the Evans Street/Eagle Street intersection currently operate at level of service F and will continue to worsen as additional traffic is added to these approaches. The impact of having poor levels of service for any movement could create a safety issue as drivers that are forced to wait long periods of time, they become impatient and do not correctly apply the rules of the road when it comes to all-way stops. .

### **Parking Assessment**

The proposed site plan shows 107 parking spaces for the entire development. Current Village code requires 1.5 parking spaces/unit for a total of 146 required spaces. We agree that the ITE Parking Generation calculations present a requirement of 96 spaces, however this is only an average rate. The 95% confidence interval is between 0.89 and 1.09 spaces



per unit (between 86 and 106 parking spaces). The higher range still falls within the proposed number of parking spaces. In addition, it was noted that the development is in a highly walkable neighborhood, therefore a vehicle is not a requirement to living in the proposed development. Therefore we concur that the number of parking spaces being proposed should be adequate for the proposed project.

### **Site Plan Review**

We have reviewed both site plans (with and without the connection to Village Pointe Lane) and agree that having the connection to Village Pointe Lane does provide for improved internal site circulation and also allows users entering and exiting the site a third option instead of having to access the site to and from Evans Street. At a minimum, the two parking lots should be connected to allow vehicles to travel between them without having to access Evans Street. Under the previous site plan (no connection), if a vehicle were attempting to park in the south lot and found that it was full, it would be required to drive back onto Evans Street. With the connection, this does not occur.

### **Summary**

After review of the entire Traffic Impact Study, we have found a number of inconsistencies and errors in both the traffic volumes and level of service analysis. Given the low amount of traffic that will be generated by the proposed development and the current good operating conditions of the study area intersections (with the exception of Evans Street/Eagle Street), it is our opinion, that even though there are some discrepancies in the traffic volumes presented and the levels of service analysis, that there should not be a significant difference in the results of the corrected level of service analyses that would impact the results that are presented and that the proposed development will not have a significant impact on traffic operations on the existing roadway network.

If you have any questions or require clarification of these comments, please contact me.

Sincerely,

**FISHER ASSOCIATES, P.E., L.S., L.A., D.P.C.**

Timothy R. Faulkner, PE, RSP1  
Senior Transportation Manager

