



Ref.: 22035

July 7, 2022

Ms. Jennifer Hager, Planning Director  
Town of Sutton  
4 Uxbridge Road  
Sutton, MA 01590

Reg.: Final Traffic Peer Review  
Unified Global Packaging Group  
Boston Road, Sutton, MA

Dear Jennifer:

***Ron Müller & Associates*** (RMA) is in receipt of the supplemental information submitted by the applicant for the above-referenced project in response to our June 24, 2022 second review letter. The following additional document was reviewed as part of our peer review services to the Town of Sutton:

- July 1, 2022 Response to RMA Traffic Comments memorandum from VHB, to Jennifer Hager, Planning Director of the Town of Sutton.

For ease of reading, this letter paraphrases our initial comments where additional information was requested, the applicant's responses, and any additional comments we have at this time (in bold).

Comment 4: Figure 3 shows the Existing adjusted traffic volumes at the study area intersections. The intersections of Boston Road with Route 146, Dudley Road and Galaxy Pass are all within 1,000 feet of each other. There are very few curb cuts between Boston Road and Galaxy Pass and therefore volumes between the three intersections should balance. It is recommended that the applicant balance the traffic volumes between the three intersections. The same comment therefore applies to the No-Build and Build volume networks. The applicant responded that traffic volumes along Boston Road were reviewed and balanced upward where appropriate between Route 146 and Galaxy Pass.

Based on a review of the revised networks, it appears that volumes are still unbalanced traveling westbound between Galaxy Pass and Dudley Road during the Existing Weekday Morning peak hour. It was recommended that the Existing Weekday Morning traffic volumes between Galaxy Pass and Dudley Road be updated to balance.

The Applicant responded that the minor balancing discrepancy has been resolved and revised analysis was submitted based on the updated volumes. **Comment resolved.**

Comment 10: It was recommended that a separate distribution pattern be developed for truck traffic to and from the site as this may differ substantially from the employee distribution. The applicant should submit updated trip distribution and Build volume networks and also include the Unified Parkway and Providence Road intersection as discussed in Comment 29. The applicant responded that 100 percent of truck traffic is expected to/from Route 146. Truck traffic was estimated using the ITE trip generation manual. Updated truck trip assignment networks were included in the Appendix. Updated Build networks were also included in the Appendix. It was recommended that the applicant update the site generated networks to show the volume of trucks as well as the volume passenger vehicles (broken out separately) traveling through the study area.

The Applicant has provided separate site generated traffic networks for trucks and employee vehicles. RMA concurs with these site generated networks. **Comment resolved.**

Comment 12: Existing, No-Build, and Build analyses may need to be re-run based on our prior comments regarding network balancing, traffic adjustments, and trip generation and distribution assumptions. The applicant updated analyses based on the prior assumptions. The existing traffic volume networks may still need to be revised during the weekday AM peak hour as mentioned in Comment 4. It was recommended that the applicant revise the weekday AM peak hour volumes and rerun analyses for that time period.

As noted in Comment 4, this discrepancy has been resolved. Updated capacity analyses were included. **Comment resolved.**

Comment 19: The fire department's largest vehicle should be able to traverse the site. It was recommended that AutoTurn (or a similar program) be used to show a swept-path analysis of the largest fire truck to be used around the site. It was also recommended that the proponent coordinate with the Sutton Fire Department regarding accessibility to all sides of each building. Since the largest fire truck takes smaller turns than a WB-67 any turning movements associated with a fire

truck would be shown in the WB-67 movements. It should still be confirmed that the fire department has adequate accessibility to all sides of each building.

The Applicant responded that the design team is currently coordinating with the Sutton Fire Department regarding the adequacy of accessibility to both Buildings 2 and 3. The fire departments final feedback will be included when it is received.  
**Comment resolved.**

Comment 21: The applicant should investigate the available sight lines at the Building 2 and 3 access driveways onto Unified Parkway. Of particular concern is the driveway to Build 2, where the horizontal and vertical curvature of Unified Parkway may introduce sight line constraints, both for motorists exiting the Building 2 driveway and for motorists making a left turn into the driveway. The site plan should show the sight triangles at these driveways to assure that any proposed landscaping or signs are outside these sight triangles and do not impede driver visibility.

The Updated Site Plans show that the required sight distances, calculated based on AASHTO requirements, will be available at the two Project driveways on Unified Parkway. In fact, the plans indicate that actual available sight lines can be expected to be much longer than the required sight line calculations. While it appears that the minimum required sight distances can be met on the site plan, it was recommended that sight line profiles be developed to ensure that the vertical curvature of the roadway does not impede sight lines.

The Applicant included the requested information regarding sight lines. Based on review of the sight line profiles, both proposed driveway locations show more than adequate sight distance to allow for safe operation. **Comment resolved.**

Comment 22: Based on the site plan and definitive subdivision plan, a sidewalk is proposed along the westerly side of Unified Parkway with a crosswalk across Unified Parkway connecting to a sidewalk along the Building 2 driveway. The location of this crosswalk may not allow sufficient sight distance for motorists to see pedestrians in the crosswalk due to the horizontal and vertical alignment of Unified Parkway. It was recommended that sight distances to the crosswalk be evaluated and corrective actions be taken is a safe crossing at this location is not feasible. Further, all crosswalks should have ADA compliant wheelchair ramps. As recommended in Comment 21, sight line profiles should be developed to ensure that the vertical curvature of the roadway does not impede sight lines.

As noted in Comment 21, sight line profiles were developed. These profiles show that there will be more than adequate sight distance to allow for safe operation.  
**Comment resolved.**

Comment 23: The site plan proposes 493 parking spaces. As labeled on the site plan, per zoning requirements, 323 parking spaces are required for Building 2 and 172 parking spaces are required for Building 3 for a total of 495 parking spaces. It was suggested that the town determine if the number of parking spaces proposed is adequate for the site.

The applicant responded that they are seeking a waiver of these minimum parking requirements pursuant to Section IV.B.6 of the Bylaw. The proposed parking is sufficient to meet employee and operational demands for the project. Furthermore, by providing less than the minimum number of required parking spaces, the project avoids creating unnecessary impervious areas, which will improve stormwater management and drainage performance. It was still suggested that the town determine if the number of parking spaces proposed is adequate for the site.

At the Planning Board hearing on June 27, 2022 the Board voted to approve the reduced parking proposed for the Project. **Comment resolved.**

Additional comments were made regarding the roadway plans. The outstanding comments that pertained to the roadway design specifically included Comment 16, Comment 18 and Comments 24 to 28. The proposed design at the intersection of Boston Road and Unified Parkway is currently being revised to avoid any disruption to a sycamore tree as well as a historic wall. The Applicant proposes to submit the revised intersection design plans as part of a request to amend the previously approved subdivision roadway. The Planning Board voted to allow this withdrawal at the June 27, 2022 hearing and consequently the aforementioned outstanding comments will be addressed under a different application. Therefore, all of the outstanding traffic comments have been resolved.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions regarding this review.

Sincerely,

*Ron Müller & Associates*



Kirsten Braun, P.E.  
Associate