

Ref: 7718

November 16, 2018

Mr. Richard L. Seegel, Chair  
Zoning Board of Appeals  
Town of Wellesley  
525 Washington Street  
Wellesley, MA 02482

Re: Response to Transportation Peer Review Commentary  
Proposed Residential Community – 680 Worcester Street (Route 9)  
Wellesley, Massachusetts

Dear Chairman Seegel and Members of the Zoning Board of Appeals:

Vanasse & Associates, Inc. (VAI) is providing responses to the comments that were raised in the October 31, 2018 letter prepared by VHB on behalf of the Zoning Board of Appeals in reference to their review of the June 2018 *Transportation Impact Assessment* (the “June 2018 TIA”) prepared by VAI in support of the proposed residential community to be located at 680 Worcester Street (Route 9) in Wellesley, Massachusetts (hereafter referred to as the “Project”). Responses to the comments pertaining to the Site Plans will be provided by others under separate cover. Listed below are the comments that were identified in the subject letter pertaining to the June 2018 TIA that required a response followed by the requested information.

## 1.0 Introduction

**Comment #1 (PARKING):** *Generally, a parking ratio of 1.5-2.0 is desired for a residential project such as this one. The applicant’s ratio of 1.75 spaces/unit is within normal range of spaces for a development of this type.*

**Response:** No response required.

**Comment #2 (STUDY AREA):** *The intersection of Worcester Street (Route 9) at Kingsbury Street/Pedestrian Crossing is part of the same signal system as the two U-turn locations on Worcester Street that are included within the study area. The Applicant should consider the Project’s impacts at this specific location as well.*

**Response:** The Project is expected to add between 5 and 7 additional vehicles crossing the Kingsbury Street pedestrian crossing during the weekday peak hours, or one additional vehicle every 8 to 12 minutes, a level of impact that would not result in an increase in motorist delays or vehicle queuing when the pedestrian phase is actuated at the intersection. Further, the predicted increase in traffic at the crossing that will result from the Project when the majority of the pedestrian crossings occur (observed to occur between 2:30 and 2:45 PM) will most likely be closer to one (1) to two (2) vehicles. The

Project is also not expected to result in a material increase in pedestrian actuations of the traffic signal system that would induce additional motorist delay along Route 9.

**Comment #2A (STUDY AREA):** *Based on a review of MassDOT safety data, this intersection is located within a 2013-2015 HSIP crash cluster along Route 9. VHB recommends that this location be evaluated to confirm that the proposed project does not negatively impact pedestrian & safety operations at this location.*

**Response:** The Kingsbury Street pedestrian signal and the associated crossing were recently reconstructed by MassDOT and included provisions to enhance safety at the crossing. As stated in response to Comment #2, the Project is expected to add between 5 and 7 additional vehicles crossing the Kingsbury Street pedestrian crossing during the weekday peak hours, or one additional vehicle every 8 to 12 minutes, with the predicted increases when the majority of the pedestrian crossings occur expected to be closer to one (1) to two (2) vehicles. Such increases would not result in a negative impact on pedestrian access or safety at the intersection.

Observations of pedestrian activity at the intersection indicate that the predominant pedestrian flows are southbound in the morning and northbound in the evening, reflecting the travel route of children to the Wellesley Middle School and the Sprague Elementary School. School children residing at the Project will not need to use the Kingsbury Street pedestrian crossing to access these schools.

## 2.0 Existing Conditions

**Comment #3 (TRANSIT):** *The MWRTA Route 8 has been modified and no longer stops at Linden Square. The closest this route comes to this site is along Route 16.*

**Response:** No response required.

**Comment #4 (STUDY AREA):** *As explained in Comment #2, the intersection of Worcester Street at Kingsbury Street/Pedestrian Crossing is not included in the study area but is located between two of the study area intersections. This location is located within a 2013-2015 HSIP crash cluster, and we recommend including it within the study to ensure that the proposed project does not negatively impact pedestrian operations at this location.*

**Response:** See response to comments #2 and #2A.

## 3.0 Future Conditions

**Comment #5 (FUTURE TRAFFIC GROWTH):** *The study indicates that 2017 existing volumes were grown seven-years to year 2025; however, seven years of growth would extend only to 2024.*

**Response:** The June 2018 TIA states that the existing traffic volumes presented therein were projected seven-years from the current year (2018), which would be 2025.

**Comment #6** *VHB concurs with the manner in which all the above data is presented. The information is consistent with the recommended practices of the ITE and the resulting automobile trips all appear to be accurately presented.*

**Response:** No response required.

**Comment #7** *Based on the information presented in the study, no thresholds that would trigger the need for project review under the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) are met from a traffic generation or parking perspective*

**Response:** No response required.

**Comment #8** *The study notes that access will be provided by way of a new driveway located approximately 400-feet to the west of Francis Road and the site plans indicate that the existing site driveway serving the site will be closed.*

**Response:** No response required.

#### **4.0 Intersection Capacity Analysis**

*No comments were provided that required a response.*

#### **5.0 Sight Distance Evaluation**

**Comment #9 (SIGHT DISTANCE):** *The Applicant will need to submit plans to MassDOT for their review and concurrence as part of their Highway Access Permit procedure and may have additional comments on the driveway design as it's currently presented. However, VHB is in general agreement with the methodology that was used to develop the analysis and the findings. The applicant should illustrate sight triangle areas for the Project site driveway on the Site Plans along with a note to indicate: "Signs, landscaping and other features located within sight triangle areas shall be designed, installed and maintained so as not to exceed 2.5-feet in height. Snow windrows located within sight triangle areas that exceed 3.5-feet in height or that would otherwise inhibit sight lines shall be promptly removed."*

**Response:** The sight triangle areas and the requested note will be added to the Site Plans.

#### **6.0 Conclusions & Recommendations**

##### **Project Access**

**Comment #10 (SIGNAGE):** *The Applicant should add a similar note to the site plans that all signs and [pavement] markings within the Site should conform to the MUTCD.*

**Response:** The requested note will be added to the Site Plans.

**Comment #11 (PICK UP/DROP OFF LOCATIONS):** *The Applicant should provide an update to the Board on the discussions with the Town's School Department on the placement of a school bus and other transit services such as the RIDE, Council on Aging, and paratransit operators.*

**Response:** It is expected that school buses will pick-up/discharge students curb-side along Route 9 (to the extent that children will be bused from the Project site) as school buses do not typically enter private property. The Project site is designed to accommodate moving vehicles and trash/recycling trucks and, as such, vans associated with The RIDE, the Council on Aging and paratransit operators will pick-up and discharge passengers from within the Project site.

**Comment #12 (SIGHT DISTANCE):** *Per comment #9, the applicant should illustrate sight triangle areas for the Project site driveway on the Site Plans along with a note to indicate: "Signs, landscaping and other features located within sight triangle areas shall be designed, installed and maintained so as not to exceed 2.5-feet in height. Snow windrows located within sight triangle areas that exceed 3.5-feet in height or that would otherwise inhibit sight lines shall be promptly removed."*

**Response:** The sight triangle areas and the requested note will be added to the Site Plans.

**Comment #13 (ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING STATION):** *The Applicant should provide an update to the Board on the number and location of any electric vehicle charging stations within the garage.*

**Response:** The number and location of the electric vehicle charging stations is being advanced as a part of the pending revisions to the Site Plans.

### Transportation Demand Management

**Comment #14 (TDM RECOMMENDATIONS):** *A number of the TDM recommendations require the owner to become a member of MassRIDES. We recommend including the requirement to become a member as part of the TDM plan.*

**Response:** The Applicant will accept a condition requiring that the owner or property manager become a MassRIDES partner.

**Comment #15 (TDM RECOMMENDATIONS):** *There are a number of recommendations in the TDM section (and throughout the Study in general). Should the Board elect to consider applying conditions to the Project's approval, the recommendations outlined within the TDM section (and elsewhere) should be memorialized.*

**Response:** The Applicant will accept a condition requiring advancement/implementation of the recommendations that are presented in the June 2018 TIA.

Mr. Richard L. Seegel, Chair  
Town of Wellesley Zoning Board of Appeals  
November 16, 2018  
Page 5 of 5

**Comment #16 (BICYCLE PARKING ACCESS):** *The TDM section of the study indicates that secure bicycle parking will be provided within the building; however, the architectural plans do not indicate where this parking area will be located. The Applicant should identify where bicyclists can find secure, weather protected bicycle parking spaces.*

**Response:** The number and location of bicycle parking spaces that are to be provided within the parking garage is being refined as a part of the revisions to the Site Plans.

We trust that this information is responsive to the comments that were raised in the October 31, 2018 letter from VHB concerning their review of the June 2018 TIA prepared in support of the Project. If you should have any questions or would like to discuss our responses in more detail, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

VANASSE & ASSOCIATES, INC.



Jeffrey S. Dirk, P.E., PTOE, FITE  
Principal

*Professional Engineer in CT, MA, ME, NH, RI and VA*

JSD/jsd

cc: R. Nagi, P.E. – VHB (via email)  
J. Derenzo – J. Derenzo Properties, LLC (via email)  
G. Engler – SEB, LLC (via email)  
File