



August 10, 2023

Mr. Doug Mclean, Planning Director
Town of Coventry
Town Planning and Zoning
1675 Flat River Road
Coventry, RI 02816

Re: Traffic Engineering Peer Review Services
Coventry Crossings – Harkney Hill Road
Coventry, RI
Responses to Traffic Review Comments

Dear Mr. Mclean:

BETA Group, Inc. (BETA) is pleased to submit the following responses to review comments received from Pare Corporation dated August 2, 2023, for the above referenced development project in the Town of Coventry. We offer the following responses to address these comments:

Section 1.0 Introduction

1. The purpose of the study and the description of the proposed development are clearly identified.

Response: No Response is necessary.

2. The limits of the study area and the steps to complete the study are acceptable.

Response: No Response is necessary.

Section 2.0 Project Area

3. The description of the site development and the surrounding area is acceptable.

Response: No Response is necessary.

Section 3.0 Existing Conditions

4. The description of the study roadways (*3.1 Roadways*) including Nooseneck Hill Road (Route 3), Harkney Hill Road (Route 138), and Hill Farm Road are acceptable.

Response: No Response is necessary.

- The descriptions of the study intersections (*3.2 Intersections*) including the Nooseneck Hill Road at Harkney Hill Road and Ocean State Credit Union Driveway intersection and the Harkney Hill Road at Hill Farm Road intersection are acceptable.

Response: No Response is necessary.

- Section 3.3 Traffic Data*-BETA collected the following data:

TYPE	LOCATION	DAY	TIME
Automatic Traffic Recorder Counts(ATRs)	Nooseneck Hill Road (Route 3)(North of Harkney Hill Road)	• Tuesday 1.10.23- Tuesday 1.17.23	• Noon to noon
	Harkney Hill Road (Route 118)	• Wednesday 1.11.23- Tuesday 1.17.23	• Noon to midnight
Intersection Turning Movements Counts (TMC)	Nooseneck Hill Road (Route 3) at Driveway/Harkney Hill Road (Route 118)	• Thursday 1.12.23 • Saturday 1.14.23	• 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. • 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. • 12:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.
	Harkney Hill Road (Route 118) at Hill Farm Road	• Thursday 1.12.23 • Saturday 1.14.23	• 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. • 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. • 12:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

The counting locations and time periods are more than adequate. Due to the time of year that the counts were performed, the traffic counts were correctly adjusted with the RIDOT adjustment factors for urban arterials. BETA should provide the Adjustment Factor Table to the appendix.

Response: RIDOT 2017 Adjustment Factor Table has been provided to the appendix.

- Please verify the ADTs for Nooseneck Hill Road and Harkney Hill Road. The 12,900 vpd and the 9,000 vpd seem high compared to the traffic count data provided. This will not impact the analysis performed.

Response: Volumes in the report were adjusted based on the seasonal adjustment factor of 0.96 for urban principal arterials.

- The hourly traffic volumes on Nooseneck Hill Road, Harkney Hill Road and Hill Farm Road are accurate.

Response: No Response is necessary.

Section 4.0 Safety Analysis

- 2nd paragraph – Revise last sentence to “The stopping sight distance is the minimum distance that a vehicle driving along the roadway requires to adequately react and safely come to a stop and avoid a collision.

Response: The sentence has been updated accordingly.

10. The measured sight lines for the proposed driveways at Nooseneck Hill Road at Harkney Hill Road and the Harkney Hill Road / Hill Farm Road intersection appear accurate. The sight distance at the proposed driveways far exceeds AASHTO guidelines. During final design and construction, the sight lines need to be clear of signage, vegetation, etc. to ensure safe access.

Response: No Response is necessary.

11. Table 1 – Crash Data Summary identifies the wrong number of total crashes. Please revise.

Response: Results in Table 1 have been updated to match those found in the appendices

12. Revise the number of injury crashes from “five” to “six”

Response: The reference has been updated.

13. Pare is in agreement that based on the existing volume of traffic and the limited number and type of crashes, there appears to be no trends in crash patterns or severity that would require additional safety improvements.

Response: No Response is necessary.

Section 5.0 Impact Analysis

14. *Section 5.1 Trip Generation*- The proposed retail use has been calculated as a Strip Retail Plaza <40,000 square feet. I would assume the proposed tenants of the retail portion of the project are uncertain at this time. The trips for the Strip Retail Plaza as presented are acceptable. It should be noted however that there are other retail uses that could be developed which could generate significantly more traffic during certain peak periods, i.e. LUC 850 Supermarket or LUC 880 Pharmacy. Once the proposed tenants are known, dependent on the tenants proposed, it may be necessary to rerun the analysis of the proposed generator based on that actual proposed use.

Response: No Response is necessary.

15.

- a. *Section 5.2 Future Traffic Conditions*- A conservative 1.0% annual growth rate has been used for future build conditions which is acceptable.

Response: No Response is necessary.

- b. Please provide a table detailing traffic to be generated from the other three proposed developments identified in the report.

Response: Table has been added to the report.

- c. The assumed trip distribution is acceptable.

Response: No Response is necessary.

16. 4th paragraph – Revise “...critical movements experience LOS C or better” to “critical movements experience LOS D or better”. LOS D is still considered an acceptable level of service.

Response: The reference has been updated.

17. *Section 6.0 Conclusions and Recommendation* – Based on the data provided, Pare is in agreement with the Conclusions and Recommendations stated. Based on the speeds and sight distances measured, the applicant has verified that more than adequate sight distance will be available to provide safe access and egress from / to the site for motor vehicles. The additional traffic being projected for the site, does not result in any significant decrease in level of service.

Response: No Response is necessary.

Other

18. This development with its 146 residential units and retail uses could generate a significant amount of pedestrian traffic. The applicant should discuss potential pedestrian accommodations on-site and off-site.

Response: Item to be addressed by the site engineer.

19. Parking on-site for visitors should be identified on the plan.

Response: Item to be addressed by the site engineer.

20. The applicant should verify that turning radii can accommodate emergency vehicles and large trucks on site.

Response: Item to be addressed by the site engineer.

Should you have any questions or require additional information or copies of the revised report, please contact us at your earliest convenience in order to facilitate review of the application.

Very truly yours,
BETA Group, Inc.



Paul J. Bannon
Associate