



TOWN OF WAKEFIELD

TRAFFIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES
February 19th, 2021 | 8:30 a.m.

ITEM 1 | Call to Order

ITEM 2 | Attendance & Approval of Minutes

J. Anderson, W. Renault, D. Benjamin, L. Benjamin, J. Connors, M. Kealey, J. Conway.

Approval of Minutes from September 18th 2020 meeting.

All in favor.

ITEM 3 | Pledge of Allegiance

Led by D. Benjamin.

ITEM 4 | Public Engagement

Any member of the public who wishes to address the Traffic Advisory Committee is asked to submit any comments or concerns to <https://www.wakefield.ma.us/public-participation> at least two hours prior to the start of the meeting. Alternatively, members of the public are invited to participate via the Zoom virtual meeting, using the instructions listed above.

Councilor Paul DiNocco spoke about the traffic potential for the Salem St. area with proposed developments. 128 exit 42 Salem St. area is problematic and has been for some time due to its issues with adjacent Lynnfield. He asked about business parking during snow emergency. He also asked about merchant parking permits lagging behind. Advised parking enforcement usually gives a grace period for expired merchant spaces.

J. Conway spoke about downtown snow removal overnight to not interrupt businesses and its safer and easier for them to remove snow overnight.

Letter from Mark and Susan Mitchell 14 Crescent Hill re: proposed development at 44,46,48 Crescent St. Will speak during public discussion of Item 6C.

ITEM 5 | Parking Restrictions

Request from a business owner for additional 15-minute parking space(s) in downtown district.

Olivia Kahn and Tanner Spees, new owners of Creations Coffee on Main St. request additional 15-minute spaces to help customers picking up online or to-go orders.



Johnathan Spees owner of Creations spoke about trying to be successful with their business and looking forward to serving the community. One way they are trying to do that is through the expansion of online ordering system. It would very helpful for their business.

Lt. Anderson spoke about how adding one additional space to that side of the square would be helpful. He showed the group the current downtown parking map showing five (5) fifteen (15) minute spaces.

The group discussed the location of the space. Lt. Anderson recommended the space be on a corner for ease of enforcement and accessibility. The corner of Princess St. is taken by a handicapped space.

D. Benjamin asked about painting the signs to stand out more to prevent someone from not seeing it's a 15-minute space.

Chief Skory recommended the space be on the first space on Princess St. at the intersection of Main St. to create an accessible, easy space. The spot would service multiple area quick service businesses.

Lt. Anderson agreed and said the space would be easily enforceable for parking enforcement.

Lt. Anderson made a motion to install the 15-minute space on Princess St. by Main St. Moved by W. Renault. All in favor, motion passes.

ITEM 6 | New Development Review

A. 500 Main St. proposed bank with drive-thru.

Attorney Brian McGrail represented the owner along with owner Bob Santonelli. Blighted property of old Napa Auto Parts and adjacent lot. Proposed one story bank to be leased to Santander Bank moving from downtown to this location.

Drive-thru would come off of Richardson St. not full teller service just ATM.

Entrance only off of Richardson St. exit onto Main St.

Parking requirements would be met. W. Renault helped to make sure the proposed bank would not interfere with the proposed Envision plan, bike lane etc.

Adjacent lot would be developed at a later date built to suit to tenant.

Scott Thornton VAI prepared trip generation memo & queuing for drive thru window. Space for 4 vehicles to pull up. Studied transaction times for queuing analysis.

11 parking spaces. 2,500 sq. ft. bank. Should accommodate parking demand.

Trip generation 23-67 in and out. Max 14 cars to enter over the course of an hour.

Signage would be added to help cue.

J. Anderson not so much concerned with cars queuing up for the ATM but the number of turning movements onto Main St. that currently exist and how this additional driveway would work. Also concerned about how it will work with the Envision plan.

W. Renault is not concerned with it working with the Envision plan but more concerned with the rail trail in the back. Concerned with how it is going to work with the parking in the rear.

M. Kealey spoke about only 3 probable spaces and the 4th vehicle may restrict access to the driveway from Richardson St.

W. Renault asked if the traffic configuration could be changed so vehicles would enter ATM from Main St. ATM would have to be part of the building not outside on an island due to maintenance. Scott Thornton will look at data from Galvin Middle School pickup.

M. Kealey spoke about the possible connection to adjacent lot. No internal connection between lots at this point but may be a possibility in the future. Fair amount of activity in a busy area. With the Envision plan the Main St. driveway might end up being a right turn in and right turn out. Envision plan is only at 25% so it isn't etched in stone.

If we were to explore a less restrictive median the TAC would want more of a study on volume and turning movements.

J. Connors asked if it was considered making the traffic flow one direction around the bank. Entrance from Richardson St. and exit onto Main St.

Scott Thornton expects that a lot of traffic would be coming from Main St. to make it easier.

Bronwyn Della-Volpe asked about entrance to ATM only from Richardson St.

Scott Thornton said that it is. Traffic could queue onto Richardson St.

Issue exists with the Envision plan's island in this area.

M. Kealey to produce memo highlighting questions from this meeting and will work with Engineering and developer.

B. 404 Lowell St. 8-unit multi-family dwelling.

Shane Lois filling in for Attorney Michael McCarthy.

Proposal is for 8 units. 6 two bedrooms 2 one bedrooms. Parking is 16 spaces. Requirement is 12. One space is handicapped accessible.

Driveway garage door is about a 12' set back.

No visitor spacing. J. Anderson expressed concern about vehicles exiting onto Lowell St. with no warning in close proximity to school.

S. Lois agreed that warning signal could be added.

J. Anderson also expressed no place for deliveries or short-term visitors.

W. Renault asked about opening up garage.

W. Renault and M. Kealey will provide memo to Board of Appeals regarding the concerns of the TAC.

C. 44, 46, 48 Crescent St. 56-unit apartment building.

Attorney Brian McGrail represented. Crescent Commons Development LLC. 40B development. Authorize construction of one building 56-unit apartment building. Currently before Board of Appeals.

Site approval eligibility letter submitted.

Easily accessible to downtown and public transportation.

Project is exempt from zoning by-laws. Legal presumption is that the need of the project outweighs public concern. 25% of 56 units would be affordable. Seeking preference for Wakefield residents or Town employees. Board of Appeals has concerns about number of units, size and density. Commitment made to adjust or make project fit in.

Rick Salvo Engineering Alliance presented the project. One level of parking is on the Crescent Hill elevation. Other level of parking is toward Crescent St. elevation. 67 parking spaces 40 and 27 combined between both lots.

Scott Thornton of VAI looked at trip generations and area intersections. No change in level of service for Crescent St. and Crescent and Water St.

J. Anderson spoke about several concerns with parking and safety. Doesn't meet available parking by-laws. Potential risk to neighborhood – no real available on street parking. No legal spaces – may encourage illegal parking. Illegal parking behind the Public Safety Building can have an impact on police and fire response time, sightline visibility etc.

M. Kealy spoke about sight distances near Crescent Hill due to high number of crashes for the type of intersection. Would like to see sight distances for driveway. Asked if access to the parking garage would be gated? Hasn't been determined yet.

W. Renault – potential for spillover parking does not exist. Is meeting the on-street parking by-law even viable for this area? Where do the other cars go?

Chief Sullivan spoke about parking difficulties and restriction on their fire apparatus responding to Crescent Hill and other areas of Town. Crescent St. is their main access point to get to any location off of Water St. He echoed Lt. Anderson's safety points. Concerned about response being impeded by this development and spillover parking.

L. Benjamin asked about handicapped spaces, elevators, ADA accessibility etc.

B. Della-Volpe asked to see rendering of development.

Attorney McGrail spoke about how a certain number of units have to be handicapped accessible, compliant or readily adaptable for a handicapped person.

Rick Salvo said 3 handicap spaces are provided.

Mark Mitchell 14 Crescent Hill. Spoke about echoed the concern of J. Anderson and Chief Sullivan. Size of development will present issues with traffic, parking, deliveries, overflow onto Crescent Hill and Crescent St. illegal parking etc. Has concerns with driveway onto Crescent Hill due to roadway width. Crescent Hill already has by his count approx. 30 vehicles. Concerned about the entrance to

the garage on Crescent Hill, the width of the street is too narrow. Crescent Hill isn't a cul-de-sac so not easy to turn around.

Attorney McGrail indicated that his client believes it's good to work with everyone and try to come up with a good project. The Zoning Board has designated two board members to work with their team to try to make the project acceptable.

D. 62 & 76 Foundry St. 58-unit mid-rise apartment building.

Attorney McGrail representing the developer – not ready to go forward on this matter.

ITEM 7 | Traffic Calming Policy Review

Traffic Advisory Committee update on new traffic calming policy.

J. Anderson spoke about the proposed traffic calming policy.

W. Renault spoke about having full neighborhood support for proposed changes.

J. Anderson spoke about adding a parking restriction policy using a very similar process. W. Renault agreed. J. Anderson impressed upon the group that nothing about this policy prevents the TAC from looking into an issue. The policy addresses residents' concerns. The Town and TAC are still free to address concerns as they see fit and isn't restricted by the policy. The hope is to have the final draft by next meeting for approval and submission to Town Council.

Mr. Maio was unable to attend the TAC meeting due to conflict with other meeting but called in to support this policy.

Andrew Simmons asked through chat about defining Town Staff, area of influence to be better defined. He also thought that 75% thought was too high of a bar for public engagement. How to we track the status of projects and requests. We don't require that level of public engagement for developments.

J. Anderson thought there were some good points here.

W. Renault recommended 2/3rds like Town Meeting.

J. Anderson – not looking to make things difficult but want to make sure there is adequate public support.

ITEM 8 | Matters Not Anticipated for Agenda

Any matters not anticipated prior to the 48-hour public notice requirement necessitating immediate action by the TAC.

Meeting adjourned at 10:53