

TOWN OF AMHERST

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT – 1100 NORTH FOREST ROAD, WILLIAMSVILLE, NEW YORK 14221
TRAFFIC SAFETY COORDINATOR - TELEPHONE 631-7154 - FAX 631-7222

RAMONA D. POPOWICH
**Councilmember &
Liaison Officer**

March 8, 2016

LAWRENCE J. HUNTER
Chairman

TO: Ellen M. Kost, AICP - Associate Planner
Brian Andrzejewski – Commissioner of Buildings

JEFFREY S. BURROUGHS, P.E.
Vice Chairman

FROM: Christopher P. Schregel – Traffic Safety Coordinator *CP*

CHRISTOPHER P. SCHREGEL
Traffic Safety Coordinator

SUBJECT: Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement (DGEIS)
Proposed – Westwood Multi-Use Development

MEMBERS

ADDRESS: 772 North Forest Road and 385 & 391 Maple Road

SYLVIA J. JONES
MICHELLE NAGEL
ERIC FRAAS

PETITIONER: Mensch Capital Partners, LLC

NIEL J. RIDER, P.E.
HERSCHEL GELBER
JOHN RADENS
KENNETH A. SMITH

The following are compiled comments and questions of the Traffic Safety Board after review of the above referenced project's Traffic Impact Study as revised in February 2015:

DEPT. LIAISONS

SCOTT MARSHALL
Planning

CAPT. PATRICK McKENNA
Police

JOE FRESE
Building

AL SPOTH
Highway

- 1.) Looking at the overall development it would be advisable to have more than two (2) ingress/egress points for a development of this size (170 acres). Review additional ingress/egress points for the development for easier access and emergency response vehicles. Possible locations are the existing driveway to North Forest or possibly an access point to Frankhauser / Fairway Blvd, especially in the commercial end of the proposed development.
- 2.) It is strongly recommended that the petitioner pursue a solution that eliminates the Frankhauser/Sheridan traffic signal by connecting the Frankhauser/Fairways subdivision into the Westwood Development to make use of the proposed signal.
- 3.) Proposed signals should be installed with the first phases of the main north/south roadway development.
- 4.) Traffic Impact Study indicates an exclusive right turn lane would be difficult to construct on Maple Road without impacting existing property owners. However, given the lower volume of right turning traffic (54 AM and 53 PM) during the peak hours it would not be necessary.

- 5.) Sheridan Drive at Fenwick Road/New proposed Roadway - The right turn lane should be constructed to accommodate peak traffic and to current design standards. The existing two-way left turn lane should be reconfigured to accommodate a left turn storage lane at the new proposed roadway.
- 6.) Given the commercial and retail uses at the south end of the development, it may be necessary to lengthen the throat length longer than the recommended 200 feet. The length should be calculated based on the peak hour volume while making sure that the queues will not back up past the first access entrance for the proposed parking lots.
- 7.) The proposed roadway between Maple to Sheridan drive, at all the juncture points (internal intersecting roadways), should have left turn storage lanes except for where the round-about is proposed.
- 8.) Eliminate all proposed perpendicular or angled parking shown on proposed public roadways. ATSB is not in favor of parked vehicles having to back into oncoming traffic.
- 9.) Page 7, third paragraph, in the TIS indicates that bicycle signage along the north/south internal road can be used to increase driver's awareness as well as encourage bicycle ridership. To further promote a multi-modal community, add designated bike lanes on the new proposed roadway from Sheridan Drive to Maple Road.
- 10.) ATSB supports the use of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) throughout the development.
- 11.) ATSB does not agree that parking spaces should be reduced based on the multi-use nature of the development.
- 12.) Page 16, Sheridan Drive at Frankhauser Road - Report indicates an overall LOS of "E" when it is actually LOS "A".
- 13.) Page 2, fourth paragraph, N. Forest Road is posted 35 mph, not 30 mph as the study indicates.
- 14.) Page 2, under planned/programmed highway improvements, add that the Town of Amherst is replacing the traffic signal equipment at the intersection of Maple Road and Maplemere Road in Spring/Summer of 2016.

- 15.) Confusion on the data presented for the Maple Road / N. Forest Road intersection. Are the reported Delay and Accidents before, during, after the County's reconstruction project?
- 16.) On Figures 7C and 7D, explain how several of the entering trips indicate a negative value at several intersections.
- 17.) The TIS is missing a figure showing the Trip Distribution by percentage for all combined site generated traffic.
- 18.) Page 22, Planning Dept. comment bullet 1, traffic data on Maple Road appears dated 2010. Traffic counts should be updated. Furthermore, do the counts take into consideration the recent development at the once vacant plaza on the southwest corner of N. Forest / Maple?
- 19.) The multi-use and pass-by trip reduction percentages that were chosen by the traffic engineer are on the high side. Provide back-up materials that support the percentages in the report given that the nature and type of commercial development is unknown at this time. The ATSB recommends the TIS use a more conservative, lower percentage value assigned to these variables.
- 20.) Does the petitioner have a desired speed limit of the proposed north/south roadway?
- 21.) TIS indicates synchronization of Sheridan Signals. Is there a possibility and benefit to synchronizing Maple Signals as well?
- 22.) General concern over the proximity of the proposed Sheridan Drive Signal during the peak travel hours. Traffic is currently backed up on Sheridan Drive past Frankhauser Road. Unsure how a new signal isn't failing during the peak hours if a back-up is occurring now.
- 23.) Question the distribution percentages of outbound trips using the I-290 eastbound versus I-290 westbound. The distribution split should favor I-290 eastbound to a greater degree.
- 24.) The section of Sheridan Drive between Harlem Road and the I-290 west ramp has failing level of services and vehicles are often observed queued into the I-290 ramp intersection. TIS does not provide mitigation and has traffic adding to this pre-existing problem area. Report does not provide any recommendation or conclusion at this location.

- 25.) A Traffic Safety Board member is skeptical on the overall Level of Service at the Sheridan Drive / Harlem Road during the peak proposed hour with mitigation.
- 26.) Provide additional information on how public transportation will be scheduled at this location.
- 27.) Provide further information and projections on how many vehicles are expected to cut-through the development and removed from N. Forest Road.
- 28.) Is there a plan in place for public school transportation?
- 29.) Table IV in the TIS indicates a 'Northbound Left/Thru/Right' movement at the Sheridan Drive / I-290 WB (S) intersection. It is unclear as to what this movement is referring to as there is no Thru movement allowed at this intersection leg.
- 30.) The plan shows a Synagogue with assumed trips during the weekend. Question if other activities or events would be scheduled during the week that would add to the number of weekday generated trips. If so, adjust analysis accordingly.

Please call me at my office should you have any questions on the above questions and comments generated by the Traffic Safety Board.

CPS/ch

cc: Ramona D. Popowich, Councilmember
Sean Hopkins, Esq., 5500 Main Street, Suite 343, Williamsville, NY 14221
Brad Packard, Ciminelli Development Co., 350 Essjay Rd., Williamsville, NY 14221
Mensch Capital Partners, LLC, 5477 Main Street, Williamsville, NY 14221
Kim Utech, 74 Brookedge, Williamsville, NY 14221
Kathy Aquilina, 215 Maple Road, Williamsville, NY 14221
SRF Associates, 3495 Winton Place, Building E, Suite 110, Rochester,
NY 14623, Attn: Amy Dake., P.T.O.E, Senior Traffic Engineer