

*Town of Norwell*  
**BOARD OF APPEALS**  
**Traffic Working Group Memo**  
**15 High Street**  
**October 14, 2021**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>MEETING DATE:</b>                      | Thursday, October 14, 2021  |
| <b>TIME SCHEDULED:</b>                    | 2:00 P.M.   |
| <b>LOCATION:</b>                          | Norwell Town Hall   |
| <b>PANEL MEMBERS:</b>                     | William J. Lazzaro  |
| <b>On behalf of the Board of Appeals</b>  | John C. Chessia, P.E., of Chessia Consulting<br>John G. Morgan Jr., PE, PTOE, of CHA<br>Chief Edward Lee, Norwell Police<br>Officer Ken Camerota, Norwell Police<br>William Milne, Norwell Fire |
| <b>15 High Street 40B Representatives</b> | Peter Crabtree, Senior Vice President of Northland<br>Steve Gallagher, Development Manager of Northland<br>Scott W. Thornton, P.E., Vanasse & Associates inc                                    |

**Traffic Working Group Discussion:** Scott W. Thornton of Vanasse & Associates inc. and Steve Gallagher and Peter Crabtree from Northland Residential reviewed selected content of three response letters, each dated October 12, 2021, responding to comments regarding traffic impacts of the 15 High Street 40B project as follows:

1. Responses to Peer Review Traffic Comments
2. Responses to Comments from Zoning Board of Appeals Meetings
3. Responses to Comments from Zoning Board of Appeals Traffic Working Group

The three response letters are available to the public on the ZBA website. The discussion focused on content selected by the applicant based on new information and changes to prior traffic commentary and analysis. Members of the Traffic Working Group listened, took notes, and asked clarifying questions. These responses are to be discussed at the October 18, 2021 public hearing.

A summary of Q&A can be found below:

1. Responses to Peer Review Traffic Comments
  - a. Updated crash data, intersection of Washington St. at High St. & Grove St. exceeds MassDOT average for the district but does not show on MassDOT Top Crash Locations.
  - b. Removal of several bushes for sight distance at site driveway B looking left
  - c. North driveway, queue estimates suggest no need for left hand turn restrictions or one-way restrictions (only 9 left hand turns during the peak hour period in morning expected and queue during average peak doesn't extend to driveway)
  - d. Working group questioned whether any field observations of existing queues had been performed on High Street? The Traffic Engineer did not perform any actual observations of the queue, the developer did some observations and stated that 5 to 8 cars can pass in a light cycle.
  - e. Working group thought the new speed data and the bar chart of recent ATR observations would be a good exhibit to present to the public

- f. Visitor parking – units have excess spots and tandem spots for guests. Questions about whether 10 additional visitor spots was sufficient or not
  - g. Washington square business park, only 1 crash in 5 years and there are 61 left turns in the peak hour. Is this a valid argument to the potential safety of adding another road as the conditions doesn't exist yet?
2. Responses to Comments from Zoning Board of Appeals Meetings
- a. High St queue issues, Chief Lee suggested crashes would increase if a left hand turn out of the driveway was into two lanes.
  - b. Open to adjustments to reduce right hand turn speeds from 53 on to High street
  - c. CVS/Marsh, no left hand turn exit and no left hand turn entry, they are willing to work with the Town and Northland provided it is a requirement of their permit, Northland happy to help
  - d. New ATR data taken, as a result 22% increase in peak morning traffic but no increase to peak afternoon or daily volumes
  - e. John Morgan asked location of ATR speed count which was centered in-between project driveways, it was suggested speeds likely increase further from traffic signal toward residential neighborhood
  - f. Applicant open to relocation of pedestrian cross walk toward CVS entry/exit if CVS/Marsh ok with sidewalk extension, also ok with blinking lights, speed radar sign and other traffic calming measures
  - g. Discussed using paint for appearance of cross walk being raised
  - h. Applicant open to requiring all amazon/fedex deliveries to mail pavilion
3. Responses to Comments from Zoning Board of Appeals Traffic Working Group
- a. New adjustments for AM peak time due to COVID
  - b. Applicant reached out to planning board for other project observations and never heard back
  - c. Stress testing: applicant choose to not answer. Town traffic consultant agreed that stress testing unlikely to change conclusions with regards to level of impact project will have on study area roadways. Member Lazzaro wants to know what type of scenario does the current traffic volume rated currently as D (not very good) become E? What if 95% queue during peak morning is actually the average? If this happens can we have a traffic lookback requirement or monitor requirement to make changes?
  - d. Mr Lazzaro also asked to explain how the ITE standard data, average for State?, applies to a unique Town like Norwell where everyone drives
  - e. Applicant willing to install RRFB device and no parking signs
  - f. Applicant is willing to install bicycle "sharrows" on High street, need to be sure this development design doesn't impact the potential Rt 53 corridor project changes to the intersection
  - g. Firetruck turning radius should not go into the opposite lane (Chessia)
  - h. Architecture items to be handled in Architecture discussions (location of buildings from street and expanded sidewalks)