

Julie Sullivan  
24 Victoria Cir  
Walpole, MA 02081  
10/6/20

Dear Walpole ZBA,

Appreciate you listening to my concerns on last night's call. This is the first time I've been involved in a 40B proposal, but I'm guessing many of my concerns will be addressed in the peer review. However, I thought it might be helpful to summarize what I discussed to ensure it is included in the respective peer reviews:

1) Traffic safety concerns:

In the traffic assessment done by Green International Affiliates, Inc, they state that the required minimum intersection site distance is 250ft, the recommended ISD is 390ft, and the actual is 350ft. I can't speak to whether 350ft is accurate; however I have many concerns about using the minimum requirements and not the recommended, especially for one of the busiest roads in Walpole, in an area where there are two schools that kids walk to and from.

I looked at the AASTO Green Book. First of all, the recommended stopping sight distances are based on passenger car operation and do not consider design for trucks. We know that there are many trucks that go down 27. Also, this analysis was also done based on posted speed limits and not observed speed limits.

Green International Affiliates states in the assessment that according to the AASTO Green Book, "If the available sight distance for an entering or crossing vehicle is at least equal to the appropriate stopping sight distance for the major roadway, then drivers have sufficient sight distance to anticipate and avoid collisions."

What he failed to include was the rest of the paragraph, which states:

"However, in some cases, a major-road vehicle may need to stop or slow to accommodate the maneuver by a minor-road vehicle. To enhance traffic operations and safety, intersection sight distances that exceed the stopping sight distances are desirable along the major roadways." (2011 AASHTO, 9-29). The Green Book specifically states that "Adequate intersection sight distance can substantially reduce the frequency of crashes."

There are two issues here: 27 is a main road. Cars should not have to stop or slow down if a car is exiting Dupee St. That will create a lot of traffic congestion. The biggest issue, however, is that the Green Book is saying that to reduce the frequency of crashes, the ISD should really be following the recommended ISD and not the minimum (which is the stopping site distance of 250ft for passenger cars). While we definitely don't need anything worsening the traffic congestion, I am deeply concerned about the safety aspect.

If you add snow, rain, people driving over the speed limit, the glaring sun pulling out of Dupee in the morning hours, snow banks, or any other factors, we're not really leaving much of a buffer for safety of the drivers, bikers, those walking their kids to school. An accident as a result of a truck barreling into a car pulling out of Dupee St during morning rush hour could kill pedestrians walking down the sidewalk or children waiting for the bus.

The Green Book's recommended sight distance is 390ft for 35 mph and 445ft for 40 mph for passenger cars taking a left turn out of Dupee. What Green International's traffic assessment basically says (not-in-these exact words) is "that we've met the minimum requirements, but we don't care about making this a safe intersection" if they are using the Green Book as their benchmark requirements.

Sidewalks: I did not mention this last night, but the issue of sidewalks did come up in the previous meeting. On March 17, 2020, the Deputy Chief of Police states in the letter to the ZBA that "When Dupee street is reconstructed as detailed

in the plan, the construction of sidewalks **would be necessary** in the event children would be walking down High Plain St to a bus stop or when walking to school.” In the supplemental traffic information submitted by Green International Affiliates on July 16, 2020, they state: “The Deputy Police Chief raised several items related to pedestrian movement. One was the **possibility** of including a sidewalk along Dupee Street out to High Plain Street. This could potentially be an option along the side of the proposed homes, however, the narrow public layout and the current location of the street within the layout will not accommodate without easements or being able to shift the road layout.”

They basically bypass this safety requirement. The Deputy Chief of Police states that it’s “necessary,” whereas, Mr Scully downplays this to say that the Deputy Chief raised this as a “possibility” (aka an optional request).

Stormwater runoff – I’m looking at site development plan. Obviously there are no elevation figures for my property, but if you follow the trend line, it appears that slopes downward toward my backyard. My concern is that there is no swall behind units 9-12. The developer makes the assumption is that it will flow to Summit, but what it looks like is that it’s going to flow toward my backyard as well.

What I would also really like the peer reviewer to address is whether removing all of the trees will further exacerbate local flooding. Trees, especially pines, are very absorbant. All of the studies I read say that deforestation can cause localized flooding. I’ve also read that removing trees disrupts the top layer of soil and causes soil erosion and water runoff issues.

Lastly, I was looking at the stormwater report from August. On page 8, it shows that 100% of the land for the project falls under 300B soil. If you go to page 10, the hydrologic soil rating for 300B is category C, which is defined as a slow infiltration rate (aka low absorption of water) and high runoff potential. I would be more comfortable if this was category A soil. With all of the existing flooding issues, does the peer reviewer see this as a potential issue that will impact neighboring residences?

Thank you for your time. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Best Regards,

Julie Sullivan