



315 Norwood Park South
Norwood, MA 02062
(781) 255-1982, fax (781) 255-1974
www.BETA-Inc.com

December 1, 2008

Mr. Walter Mirrione, Chairman
Board of Appeals
136 Elm Street
Easton, Massachusetts 02356

Re: **Traffic Peer Review -The Village at Shovel Shop Square Development**

Dear Mr. Mirrione:

As requested, we have performed an updated peer review of the traffic elements of the proposed Village at Shovel Shop Square Development in Easton. This review builds on our previous review of the initial December 2007 Traffic Impact Assessment prepared by Gillon Associates. Our review memorandum, dated January 23, 2008, to the Board of Selectmen of this assessment is attached for your reference.

In addition, we have reviewed the follow-up Traffic Memorandum prepared by Gillon Associates, dated November 7, 2008 and submitted by the Proponent as part of the Comprehensive Permit Application to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Clarification of Development Program

The Comprehensive Permit Application to the Zoning Board of Appeals, dated May 16, 2008 for the Village at Shovel Shop Square proposes the reuse and renovation of an existing industrial site. While the program is clear relative to the Proponent's intent to develop 182 rental apartments, there is variation (between various documents provided by the Proponent) on the other uses to be present on the site in the future. **Table 1**, which follows, summarizes our findings in this matter.

Table 1--Comparison of Program

	Residential Units	Light Industrial /Warehouse (SF)	Office (SF)
Reported Existing	0	77,600	42,100
Currently Occupied	Not Reported	Not Reported	Not Reported
Traffic Assessment December 2007	182	8,400	Additional 500
ENF October 2008	182	0	26,800
ZBA Application May 2008	182	0	0
Traffic Memo Update November 2008	182	0	35,000

Table 2 has been prepared to note the differences in the projected traffic generation between the programs identified in the December Traffic Assessment and in the May 2008 Application.

Table 2--Comparison of Traffic Generation (Vehicle Trips)

	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	Daily
Land Use (Dec 2007)			
182 Apartments	93	118	1,244
8,400 SF Light Industrial	8	8	59
550 SF Office	3	1	6
Total Trips	104	127	1,309
Land Use (May 2008)			
182 Apartments	93	118	1,244
Total Trips	93	118	1,244

As can be seen from Table 2, the December 2007 Proposal results in a slightly greater (5-10%) trip generation than the May 2008 Proposal. Further, there is a question on the Proponent's apparent position of discounting the trip generation of the Program based on the current uses on the site. (Also see Item 1 below)

A recommendation is made for the Proponent to submit a comprehensive formal statement on the quantity and nature the land uses intended for the site (new & existing) in the future and to report on the level of current occupation of space, as well as the nature of these current uses.

**Review November 7, 2008 Memo
by Gillon Associates**

On November 19, 2008, we received from the Proponent a memorandum prepared by Gillon Associates, dated November 7, 2008 with responses/resolutions to our previous comments. Our follow up review is as follows:

Item 1

A revised level of trip generation is now reported based on the Proponent's re-examination of proposed and existing uses. In doing so, the Proponent is seeking to take discount for the level of trip generation currently generated by the site. Trip generation for existing uses was subtracted from the trip generation for the proposed uses in the latest traffic assessment. The result is a substantially lower level of trip generation than the previous estimate shown in Table 2 (517 daily trips versus 1244 trips). The Proponent's basis for this is summarized in Table 3.

Table 3--Comparison of Existing vs. Proposed Uses

Land Use	Existing - Square Footage/Units	Proposed - Square Footage/Units
Apartments	0	182
Office	42,100	35,000
Warehouse	77,600	0

This assumes that the existing office and warehouse space is **currently fully occupied**. In contrast to this, the October 15, 2008 ENF states “**Presently some of the buildings are used primarily for office space along with various other uses; however expansive portions of the buildings are unoccupied and under-utilized.**”

As noted above, the current occupancy should be summarized by the Proponent and a revised estimate calculated, as appropriate. In addition, it is recommended that if credit is taken for existing uses, driveway traffic counts should be taken to verify existing traffic volumes.

Item 2

The trip generation and distribution for Queset Commons development and Winterberry Hills development were presented as requested. **No further comment.**

Item 3

The traffic analysis for the Sullivan Avenue/Mechanic Street/Pond Street intersection was performed, as requested. All movements remain at Level of Service A according to the analysis. **No further comment.**

Item 4

The traffic analysis for Washington Street/Main Street intersection was revised, as requested. **No further comment.**

Item 5

Sight distance analysis was provided, as requested for the three proposed Main Street driveways. The analysis assumed removal of shrubs at the existing driveways. With the removal of vegetation, the analysis showed sight distance on Main Street at the driveways to be adequate for 35 mph design speed. **Recommendation is made for a commitment to remove vegetation.**

Item 6

A peak hour traffic signal warrant analysis was performed for the intersection of Washington Street/Elm Street which shows traffic volumes meet requirements for the Peak Hour Warrant. It is stated that “further examination of this option is held in abeyance pending direction from the Town.” **Recommendation is made for a traffic signal to be installed at this intersection since 35% of the site’s traffic will utilize this intersection.**

Item 7

The Proponent agreed with installation of additional traffic control signs at several locations and agreed to work with the Town to fund installation of the signs. **No further comment.**

Item 8

Proponent investigated conditions at the Main Street/Elm Street intersection as requested in light of a high crash rate. Recommendations were made to remove vegetation and install a “Stop Ahead” sign. **No further comment.**

Mr. Walter Mirrione, Chairman

Page 4 of 4

Item 9

Proponent agreed to provide advance warning signing for the curved section of the roadway. **In addition, BETA recommends that chevron warning signs be considered.**

Item 10

It was stated that the parking issues will be addressed by others. **In light of the revised site plan, it is recommended that the Proponent submit a parking analysis for the site.** This analysis should show the calculation of spaces required as well as inventory the location supply with the location of demand.

If we can be of any further assistance regarding this matter, please contact us at our office.

Very truly yours,
BETA Group, Inc.

Kien Ho, P.E., PTOE
Senior Associate

cc: Dave Colton, Town Administrator

O:\3500s\3518 - Easton Shovel Shop\Reports\Rev Peer Review 11-08r Revised.doc

