TO:	Joseph D. Peznola, P.E. Hancock Associates	DATE:	March 12, 2024
FROM:	Steven C. Findlen Keri Pyke, P.E., PTOE	HSH PROJECT NO.:	2024004.00
SUBJECT:	Transportation Peer Review – Response to Comments 121 Grove Street, Franklin, Massachusetts		

As requested, ***Howard Stein Hudson (HSH)*** conducted a peer review of the materials prepared for the proposed residential development located at 121 Grove Street (the Project) in Franklin, Massachusetts. The existing site consists of a single-family home with two curb cuts onto Grove Street. The proposed Project would involve the removal of the existing home and the construction of five residential buildings with approximately 330 units and a clubhouse. The Project will also provide 507 parking spaces.

The purpose of this letter is to present a summary of our comments on the most recent response to the comments provided by the Project's team (Applicant) listed below as ***HSH Response 2***. The following is a summary timeline of the correspondence between HSH and the Applicant representatives.

- The review is based on the *Transportation Impact Assessment, Proposed Residential Development 121 Grove Street, Franklin, Massachusetts (TIA),* prepared by Vanasse & Associates, Inc. (VAI), October 2023; and *Grove Street Residences 121 Grove Street – Franklin, MA Plan Set,* prepared by RJO'Connell & Associates, Inc. (RJOC), December 18, 2023.

- Our initial comments were included in a letter dated January 23, 2024 (listed as ***HSH Comment***).

- The Applicant submitted a response to the Franklin Zoning Board of Appeals that included a response letter dated February 8, 2024, from VAI, and a technical appendix which includes site plans prepared by RJOC, revised February 5, 2024, listed as ***Applicant Response 2*.**

- Our supplemental comments were included in a letter dated February 14, 2024 (listed as ***HSH Response***).

Trip Distribution and Assignment

ISSUE 1

HSH Comment: Although HSH generally agrees with the trip distribution methodology, the Applicant did not specify which census data was used to develop the trip distribution. HSH requests the Applicant provide more information on the census tract and year that was used.

Applicant Response: The Applicant asserts that the proposed trip distribution was based on the combination of a review of existing travel patterns and journey-to-work data from Franklin obtained from the United States Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS), for the most recent 5-year average period available (2011-2015). The ACS table was provided in the Appendix.

HSH Response: According to the ACS table provided, approximately 16% of vehicle trips arrive/depart from/to Beaver Street north and approximately 7% of vehicles trips arrive/depart from/to Route 140 east. However, based on the October 2023 TIA, those percentages were flipped (7% arrive/depart from/to Beaver Street north and 16% arrive/depart from/to Route 140 east). HSH requests the Applicant clarify why the percentages in the TIA differ from the ACS table and revise the analysis at this intersection accordingly.

Applicant Response 2: VAI concurs. The distribution was corrected, and the analysis was revised. The overall delay increased by 0.2 seconds during the weekday morning peak hour and decreased by 1.2 seconds compared to the previous 2030 Build analysis. The revised analysis Table 10R and the analysis worksheets are provided in the appendix.

HSH Response 2: ***The Applicant has revised the trip distribution and updated the traffic analyses/tables accordingly. No further action required.***

On-Site Planning and Parking

ISSUE 2

HSH Comment: The TIA states 507 parking spaces will be provided while the Overall Site Plan prepared by RJOC shows a total of 574 parking spaces. HSH request the Applicant confirm the final proposed parking space count. Additionally, HSH asks that the Applicant provide a breakdown of the number of units per building to confirm if the number of parking spaces provided is adequate for each building and confirm if the Project is meeting its parking demand.

Applicant Response: The Applicant confirms a total of 574 parking spaces are proposed. The Applicant asserts that the parking spaces are distributed appropriately and supplemented with sufficient pedestrian connections to allow access if a particular area has more parking available.

HSH Response: The Applicant did not provide a breakdown of the number of units per building to confirm if the number of parking spaces provided is adequate for each building. HSH requests the Applicant update the TIA to represent the number of parking spaces as well as confirm if the Project will meet its parking demand for each building.

Applicant Response 2: According to estimated parking demand for this development, there is ample parking for residents. Residents may have to walk a short distance but the parking is provided, and property management will otherwise manage the parking supply.

HSH Response 2: The Applicant states that there is ample parking for residents. However, it appears that there are buildings that do not have adjacent parking and residents will need to walk from parking provided from other buildings, specifically Building 3 and 4. Given the distances between the additional parking and the entry points for Buildings 3 and 4, it may be unreasonable to think people are going to park and walk. HSH defers to the Board in its deliberation of the parking waiver on this item.

ISSUE 3

HSH Comment: HSH generally agrees with vehicular access and internal circulation. HSH requests the Applicant provide a detailed plan as to where move-in/move-out activity will take place at each building, including a full AutoTURN analysis to demonstrate that all anticipated vehicles (moving, delivery, and trash/recycling trucks) can safely access each building and will not block the driveways and drive aisles while parked.

Applicant Response: The Applicant provided copies of the Site Plan showing turning movements for moving trucks and trash/recycling trucks, and that safe access is provided to all buildings. Move-in/move-out parking will be facilitated as needed by property management.

HSH Response: The turning movements confirmed that moving and trash/recycling trucks can safely access all buildings. Although the Applicant did not locate specific areas where move-in/move-out will take place, the Applicant asserts that property management will facilitate parking for these trucks as needed. **No further action required.**

Pedestrians/Cyclists

ISSUE 4

HSH Comment: HSH requests the Applicant provide more pedestrian accommodation details including Americans with Disabilities (ADA) ramps throughout the site. Additionally, HSH requests that the Applicant confirm if any bicycle accommodations will be provided, including but not limited to, secure bicycle storage for residents and outdoor bicycle racks for visitors.

Applicant Response: The Applicant provided plans showing the locations of accessible ramps and details of the ramps. The Applicant asserts that accessible routes and access will comply with ADA and Architectural Access Board (AAB) regulations. Indoor and outdoor bike storage will be provided.

HSH Response: HSH agrees with the locations of accessible ramps and the corresponding details provided. The Applicant did not specify the location of the indoor and outdoor bike storage on the site plans. HSH recommends that as part of the order of conditions of any approvals that may be granted for the Project, the Applicant provide the location of all bicycle accommodations within the site.

Applicant Response 2: Fairfield provides indoor and outdoor bike storage. The concept architectural plans show the bike storage rooms which can accommodate a minimum of 20 bicycles per room. Final landscape design will include outdoor storage racks, typically one at the clubhouse and one at each of the residential buildings.

HSH Response 2: The Applicant has provided clarification that bike storage rooms will be included as part of the project to accommodate up to 20 bicycles per room. In addition, outdoor bicycle racks will be provided at the clubhouse and at each of the residential buildings. No further action required.

Geometric Design Criteria

ISSUE 5

HSH Comment: HSH requests the Applicant prepare an adequate sight distance plan, showing the appropriate location of the vehicle, which should be behind the proposed stop line, and recalculate the intersection sight distances.

Applicant Response: The Applicant provided the requested sight distance measured in accordance with American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) recommendations. AASHTO guidelines for Intersection Sight Distance (ISD) indicate the ISD measurement is conducted with the driver's eye on the minor street approach located 14.5 feet from

the edge of travel way and at a height of 3.5 feet. The Applicant explains that while the location of the vehicle is beyond the STOP bar and at the edge of the crosswalk, it is anticipated that vehicles will stop at the STOP bar location and yield to any pedestrians in the crosswalk before pulling forward closer to Grove Street and then exit the driveway. The measured ISD is 460 feet looking to the north and greater than 500 feet looking to the south.

HSH Response: HSH generally agrees with the Applicant's sight distance measurement approach. **No further action required.**

ISSUE 6

HSH Comment: HSH requests the Applicant include the maneuvers of the fire truck entering the site from the north (making a right-turn from Grove Street into the site) and provide the exiting maneuvers (left- and right-turn onto Grove Street from the site). Additionally, the Applicant should provide AutoTURN analysis to demonstrate that all anticipated vehicles (large passenger cars, delivery trucks) can enter and exit the proposed site driveway. Large passenger vehicles should include a full-size sports utility vehicle (SUV) and delivery vehicles should include a moving truck as well as trash/recycling truck.

Applicant Response: The Applicant provided a Site Plan showing turning movements for the fire truck including the truck entering from the north and exiting the driveway.

HSH Response: The AutoTURN analysis confirms that fire trucks can safely enter and exit the proposed driveway. Although the Applicant did not provide vehicle maneuvers for a large passenger vehicle, with the provided maneuvers of both a moving truck and trash/recycling truck, we can conclude that a full-size SUV can be expected to enter and exit the proposed site driveway safely. **No further action required.**

Site Improvements

ISSUE 7

HSH Comment: HSH generally agrees with the proposed site improvements; however, the TIA does not explicitly commit to providing ADA-complaint wheelchair ramps at all proposed crossings within the Project site. HSH request the Applicant provide the appropriate wheelchair ramps at all crossing locations.

Applicant Response: See response to Issue/Comment No. 4.

HSH Response: HSH agrees with the locations of accessible ramps and the details provided. **No further action required.**

Transportation Demand Management (TDM)

ISSUE 8

HSH Comment: HSH generally agrees with the proposed TDM measures but encourages the Applicant to consider additional TDM measures, including a vehicle sharing program with dedicated parking spaces on-site for services like Zipcar. The TIA does not explicitly state whether a transportation coordinator will be designated to coordinate elements of the TDM program and help with the loading/servicing activities. HSH requests the Applicant to clarify if a transportation coordinator will be designated. As there are more and more hybrid electric and fully electric vehicles on the roads, we recommend that the Applicant explore the feasibility of constructing electric vehicle (EV) ready parking spaces.

Applicant Response: The Applicant has agreed to the following additional TDM measures:

- A transportation coordinator;
- An Uber waiting area at the clubhouse building; and
- EV parking spaces for residents.

The Applicant asserts that rideshare services such as Zipcar are not likely to agree to placing vehicles in suburban locations such as Franklin. A review of Zipcar locations indicates that most locations in Massachusetts are in or surrounding major urban areas.

HSH Response: HSH agrees that Zipcar vehicles are generally located proximate to major metropolitan areas; therefore, it would most likely not apply to the Town of Franklin. The Applicant asserts that a rideshare pick-up/drop-off area will be provided at the clubhouse building but the site plans do not show this area. HSH requests the Applicant provide a plan that shows the designated rideshare pick-up/drop-off area as well as the number of EV parking spaces for residents.

Applicant Response 2: Specific areas for rideshare pickups and similar are typically determined on an as-needed basis by the onsite management staff. EV parking quantities are an evolving demand and based on recent experience any number of spaces estimated at this time are likely to be short of the demand quantity at the time of occupancy.

HSH Response 2: ***The Applicant has agreed to identify rideshare pick-up/drop-off areas within the project limits based on future demands for these types of services. No further action required.***

Construction Period Issues

ISSUE 9

HSH Comment: HSH encourages the Applicant evaluate the short-term construction impacts of the Project, and provide details of the overall construction schedule, working hours, number of construction workers, worker transportation and parking, number of construction vehicles, and routes to and from the Project site.

Applicant Response: The Applicant asserts that the construction period is anticipated to take up to two years. Working hours will comply with all applicable Franklin bylaws. Construction management and scheduling will minimize impacts on the surrounding area and include construction worker parking areas and routing plans to and from the site for trucking and deliveries. Worker carpooling will be encouraged, and workers will be informed of the public transportation options serving the area. Space on the site will be made available for workers' supplies and tools.

HSH Response: HSH generally agrees with the Applicant's brief summary of short-term construction impacts. HSH suggests that as part of the order of conditions of any approvals that may be granted for the Project, the Applicant provide to the Board the overall construction schedule, working hours, number of construction workers, worker transportation and parking plan, number of construction vehicles, and routes to and from the Project site as part of the Construction Plan to be submitted prior to any construction activities taking place.

Applicant Response 2: Fairfield acknowledges that this information might be a typical requirement as a condition of approval, to be met prior to a Building Permit and will provide upon request.

<u>HSH Response 2</u>: The Applicant has agreed to provide details of any construction impacts as well as schedule to be included as part of the Construction Plan to be submitted and approved in the future prior to any construction activities taking place. No further action required.

If you have any questions or require further information, please feel free to contact us.

Sincerely,

Steven C. Findlen
Manager, Bridgewater Office

Keri Pyke, P.E., PTOE
Principal