

You wanted time to do some preliminary deliberations about all the Hannaford issues, and that has been planned for the January 3rd meeting.

We are going to retain Rick Bryant to help sort out the traffic issues, however it isn't clear in my mind what information you need. Below is my list of Traffic issues that appear to be unresolved based on my reading of the latest submissions by the applicant and interested parties. Please use part of the deliberative session to generate a "scope of work" for him, based on your needs. He then can get something together for the January 17 meeting.

Thanks Peter.

December 28, 2011

AMOUNT OF ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC – this must be established before any proposed mitigation can be analyzed.

- 1) Sort out the projected traffic generation numbers so we have a credible baseline
- 2) Determine whether the reductions in traffic that they are claiming will result from their agreement with Lantmans are legitimate.
 - a) There is a second commercial property, the former Vet clinic to the south of the entrance that shares the parking and traffic flow with Lantmans, and potential traffic use from this property has not been included in the calculations and should be
 - b) Is it sensible to reduce the future traffic count because of the Lantmans agreement when all the other inevitable future traffic that will result from the zoning changes cannot be included in those projections? They "don't exist" and as a projection can't be included however the Lantmans decrease also doesn't exist and is a projection as well.
 - c) The route 116 south bound LH Lantmans turning lane has issues that must be resolved before any traffic mitigation resulting from it can be included in the calculations.
 - d) Since the synchronization of the signals can be made at any time with basically no expense, the DRB may want a before picture that includes that change as the "existing" situation, and the increase in Hannaford traffic as the After (built) scenario and not the present improperly programmed situation as the baseline, and then the Hannaford increase traffic actually appearing as improving the situation.

FLOW AND LOCATION OF FUTURE TRAFFIC – this will depend on the actual traffic increases

- 1) 116 South bound LH turning lane
 - a) Will it extend to the north so that south bound, through or RH turn traffic, will be impeded at the Patrick Brook Bridge.
- 2) Commerce Street Stacking
 - a) Will it extend to the east past the eastern Mobil driveway
 - b) The latest Dickenson report insinuates that the DRB, in not limiting the western Mobile driveway to one way has made the situation worse. You determined that the existing traffic situation, with the conditions placed in the approval, would be acceptable. You cannot make an applicant make improvements for projected, unapproved development.

- c) Can Mobil be forced to change their driveways to improve the situation caused by an increase in traffic resulting from Hannaford?
- 3) Mechanicsville Rd.
 - a) Is the projected decrease in the level of service acceptable or should it be mitigated.

COMPLIANCE WITH THE TOWN PLAN AND REGULATIONS

- 1) The town plan is contains numerous sections calling for a pedestrian friendly village growth area.
 - a) Are the ped crossing signal times pedestrian friendly?
 - b) Will the intersection signal timing be exclusively pedestrian or will pedestrians be forced to cross the four lane 116 while traffic is turning at the same time?
 - c) The plan calls for on street parking and adding lanes to 116 will impact this.
- 2) The commercial district purpose statement includes “To provide a wide range of local services and employment opportunities in an orderly, village setting with safe and convenient vehicular and pedestrian access.
 - a) If this store is sized for more than local services, the resulting increase in traffic has the potential to consume 116’s limited ability to absorb traffic, and alternate routes are basically impossible. Furthermore, if this development puts any intersection near the tipping point for an unacceptable Level of Service, a smaller, desired development may have to do unaffordable mitigation, effectively stopping them.
 - b) Will the necessary traffic mitigation end up creating a village (many four lane sections of 116) that doesn’t comply with the town plan and zoning purposes?