Town of Northwood
Planning Board Meeting
February 13, 2020

Chair Strobel called the meeting to order at 6:35 PM.

PRESENT: Chair Bob Strobel, Selectmen's Representative Hal Kreider, Betty Smith, Joe McCaffrey, and Victoria Parmele.

TOWN STAFF PRESENT: Linda Smith and Susan Austin, Land Use Department. James Burdin, Town Planner.

VOTING DESIGNATION: Chair Bob Strobel, Selectmen's Representative Hal Kreider, Betty Smith, Joe McCaffrey, and Victoria Parmele.

MINUTES:

December 19, 2019

Ms. B. Smith made a motion to approve the minutes of December 19, 2019 as amended. Selectmen Kreider seconded. Motion carried 5/0.

January 23, 2020

Ms. B. Smith made a motion to approve the minutes of January 23, 2020 as written. Selectmen Kreider seconded. Motion carried 5/0.

CONTINUED CASES:

Case 19-12
Michael Sullivan (Aroma Joes) 8 Bow Lake Road Map 222 Lot 61. Applicant is proposing to build a drive thru and walk up coffee shop on a lot that has an existing seasonal green house and single-family home that will have an office.

Mike Sullivan, applicant, Steve Pernaw, Traffic Engineer, Scott Frankiewicz, from NH Land Consultants and Phil Corbett, Engineer from CMA Engineering were present for traffic discussion.

Chair Strobel stated that at the last meeting, the board decided that this meeting would be about traffic. They have had two reports from Mr. Pernaw, and replies and reviews from Mr. Corbett and information from DOT, as well as another independent review. The board was charged with questions regarding traffic.

Mr. Kreider stated that it would help him to understand what the consequences of the information is. For example, if the traffic study shows that the traffic will go from X to Y, and it turns out to be the double the way times turn out instead they are triple or quadruple of something like that. What happens if that turns out to be the case, and they have approved the application. Chair Strobel stated that he would like to keep things in mind as they ask questions. Mr. Kreider stated that if they are the ultimate

decision makers, then he has a different set of questions than if the numbers are different than what was projected, then it's a cease and desist and they move on. Similarly, if the number of customers turns out to be different than what is given to them, what happens in that situation. He wants to make sure that he understands what they are basing the decision on, and what the consequences of that decision are. If the data is squishy, then he will ask more questions, or is it at the detriment of the applicant if the numbers are wrong?

Mr. Burdin stated that site plan review and the whole purpose of zoning ordinances, is to have rules in place to protect the health, safety and general welfare of the public, so that concepts in the abstract in general apply, and then all of the specific rules that they have put in place apply. When an applicant is submitting information to the board, this included, some of those are commitments, some of them are just the best information that they have available so that the board can make an informed decision about whether this 1.) complies with the regulations, and 2.) does not have negative implications for health, safety and general welfare. As far as a traffic study is concerned, the study and the projections are the second. They are the information to help you make the best decision about what the likely result of this development will be. If the estimate is that they are going to have ten cars per hour right now, and this is installed and in 15 years they are seeing 30 or 40 per hour, that's not a cease and desist scenario, it's not an enforcement scenario because these numbers aren't commitments. These numbers are doing their best to predict what the reasonably foreseeable future if this development goes through would be like. There may be some what ifs, but they shouldn't be going down every conceivable what if scenario. No model is going to be perfect, they are just doing their best to make an educated guess as to what level of inconvenience they might see, or what level of change to safety, and if they see neither of those or if it's not reasonable to project either of those, then they should feel comfortable moving forward with an application. If they see things that suggest that there could be safety implications or massive level of service declines, then those would be reservations that they need to think about as far as issuing an approval or making offsite improvements to mitigate those.

Ms. Parmele stated that the data was collected in the proper way by Mr. Pernaw, so for her the question is about interpretation. So, it makes the most sense to hear from the people who are analyzing this data so they can get a better sense of what is what. To the best of their ability, they will make a decision based on that.

Chair Strobel stated that he read DOT's comment that the right turn lane on Route 4 for westbound traffic is already warranted. He believes that the applicant has agreed to donate a ten-foot right of way.

Mr. Frankiewicz stated that one of the things on the DOT comments was that the cost of a right turn lane would be extraordinary for one person to take on, so what they suggested was a ten-foot strip along Route 4. Ms. Parmele asked what does the ten-foot strip donation mean in terms of whether the road actually gets widened?

Mr. Burdin stated that the phrase that DOT used was for "future widening by others" He sent an email back to DOT earlier this week. He was looking for general feedback of assuming that this is approved with this solution in mind, what is the process for moving forward? He hasn't received an answer, but speaking with two of SRPC's transportation planners, they both agreed that adding one right turn lane was not going to rise to the level of a ten-year plan project. It might be able to fit into district paving maintenance and striping programs. Regardless of what the solution is, the town would have to advocate for that.

Mr. Corbett stated that he understands, DOT is suggesting the right turn lane, there is a National Highway Cooperative Research Program (NHCRP) that develops parameters where they say at this point, based on the speed of the roadway and the number of cars that are going in the stream and the number of cars that are turning, based on that information, a turn lane is warranted or it isn't. The idea is that if you have a high-speed roadway with a lot of cars and a lot of cars turning right, there is a higher chance of accidents because of cars slowing down and interrupting that flow. They develop those parameters based on likely separation of cars and those considerations. Today, if you plug in the parameters based on existing traffic to Bow Lake Road, it meets the requirements to have a right turn lane already, before development.

Chair Strobel asked if there was any question about that warranting? He stated that he knows DOT has stated that. Mr. Corbett stated that unlike signal warrants, it not as federal of a standard, often states adopt their own provisions and that is commonly what is incorporated in what is used.

Mr. Pernaw stated that it was a guideline, not a standard. Mr. Corbett stated that based on those requirements, it is warranted and this project, adding the peak hour right turning vehicles, if it's 105% warranted now, it will be 125% after development. In a perfect world, you would try to increment the cost associated with the right turn lane evenly, the town is not in that situation, there is a development that is put forth and the question is, is there a way to allocate a percentage of this to the applicant. Donating land to accommodate the future expansion is certainly great to get if this development moves forward so eventually, they could accommodate the right turn lane. As far as getting it into a program, he's seen everything from the developer is 100% responsible, even if they take it from 99% to 101%, even just 2% of the vehicles going over the threshold. He's also seen it in a ten-year plan, or HSIP projects that are paid for by DOT or the federal grant programs. Those are not for certain, and you are competing against other towns with other safety issues.

Mr. McCaffrey asked what might it cost a town to build this lane? Mr. Corbett stated that he's seen it done for $300,000 to $400,000 with utility relocation and full widening. Mr. Pernaw stated that his office does not do cost estimates, but when you move a utility pole it is very expensive. The numbers that Mr. Corbett just said are very much in line with that cost. Not being derogatory to the DOT in anyway, when they get into a project like this, he calls it "mission creep". They start off changing the

radius, and widening two feet, and it goes from $400,000 to $600,000. He stated that he cautions anyone when you are dealing with cost estimates from the DOT.

Chair Strobel asked if they are in a build situation and the right turn lane is warranted, and is included at some point in time in the future, but they don't have a time frame on building it, how can they proceed with the plan?

Mr. Burdin stated that he feels it gets back to his response to Mr. Kreider's question. If they have a scenario where they have decided that this is important for the health, safety and general welfare of the people accessing this site and passing this site. The board's options are; approve, approve with conditions requiring things to mitigate the problems that they see, or if they see no way to mitigate the problems, that would be grounds to deny this application. He stated that if they cannot get a straight answer from DOT on whether its paid for with District 6 funds or they have to apply for HSIP, they would have to go through that process and manage it that way. It's a competitive process and they might not even get approved. It's going to take at least 3 years after the opening of the site to implement. The board either needs to make a plan to make something certain, or they need to acknowledge that they are proceeding with some uncertainty. It's up to the board to decide where they come down on that.

Mr. Pernaw stated that in his response dated January 16, on page 2, there is an excerpt from the DOT design plan. They used it in the early 2000's to upgrade this intersection. The lane widths. It talks about a ten-foot shoulder and a twelve-foot lane, a twelve-foot center turn lane and another twelve-foot lane. In the early 2000's they did there counts and they came up with this design which allows for right turns to come from that ten-foot shoulder. Noting the photo above the diagram, it was from their counts done on the 9th of September that shows it being used as a through lane and to the right and exclusive right turn lane. It's not the full right turn lane with the painted arrows. On the last page of that handout titled Attachment 2, on the last page, they put an example of a typical DOT design of deceleration lanes for right turns. In their design guidelines it talks about a width of 10 to 12 feet. His answer to the board is that they already have a ten-foot deceleration lane. The DOT designed it and put it there based on whatever counts they came up with. That approach already has a deceleration lane for right turns consistent with DOT guidelines because they designed it and they built it. That is why he believes it's perfectly fine for this board to approve it without any concerns that the existing 10-foot lane can exist as a right turn lane for the next 100 years. It will continue to function as shown in the photograph. He will also point out the DOT memo where they talk about NCHRP 457 and yes, the Cadillac design would be a couple feet wider with turn arrows, but then they start to move poles and sidewalks, and that is a big effort. That's why the recommended the donation of the right of way so in the future, whenever they can get to it, it can happen without having to go to landowners and pay for right of way acquisition costs.

Ms. Parmele stated that even though Mr. Pernaw calls it a "defacto" turning lane, DOT is saying that it is needed.

Mr. Pernaw stated that they are all saying the same thing, and if you look at their guidelines, it says that right turn lanes can be between 10 and 12 feet.

Chair Strobel stated that the existing defacto turn lane is 10 feet wide and DOT and CMA made the comment that a 12-foot turning lane is needed. Mr. Pernaw stated that it was a guideline for when you provide right turn deceleration.

Chair Strobel asked if it was possible to fit a stripe indicating that it was a turn lane, without narrowing Route 4? Mr. Corbett stated that the issue was that the width that is out there now does help, certainly adds safety for people that can pull off into the shoulder. They aren't calling it a deceleration lane or a turn lane, it is a shoulder. The issue that they are getting away from when it's used as a turn lane is that you don't have that refuge as a breakdown lane or a bicycle lane. It certainly does help that they have the width there now, so they don't have a situation where cars can't pull off without cars going around. It's just not the same accommodation that you would have in an officially striped right turn lane.

Mr. Kreider stated that his concern was that he regularly sees people making their right-hand turn and the following cars and trucks will move into the middle lane. He's seen several near head on collisions because the person turning left thinks that they can do a two-stage turn. So, they pull into the middle lane going east, then the person behind them is moving into the center lane and they don't see another car headed their way. He understands the defacto part of it, but he has concerns because of what he's observed. The issue he observes is with such a narrow lane and the curb being right there, the far right which is really the shoulder, doesn't get completely used because of the curb cut, so they are only using half that lane. It is not a right-hand turn lane and then some (room) and that's what he is concerned about.

Mr. Corbett stated that that was the difference between a shoulder and a right turn lane. A right turn lane would be 11- or 12-foot lane and additionally a shoulder. Ms. Parmele stated that for example, the gas station on the Ridge where there is no right turn lane and into the gas station and it's kind of a free for all there. It tends to be chaotic. She stated that she feels there are three different movements that they are looking at. One is what they have already talked about, the other is the left hand turns out of Bow Lake Road, and then there is the right turns and the queuing issues. She asked if anyone else had any traffic issues of concern to add to that.

Mr. Kreider stated that he would like to understand the wait times. Chair Strobel stated that he would like to talk about queuing in the lanes on Bow Lake Road approaching Route 4 turning left. His first question is about queuing lanes on Bow Lake Road are 100 feet, is there enough right of way or is it geometrically possible without taking land beyond this site?

Mr. Frankiewicz stated that they had submitted a drawing in the packet that shows the current striping that goes back to the first driveway on the left. The yellow line for the two lanes stops way up. What they propose is to bring it back to where there are

two full lanes until it eventually tapers back. He stated that Mr. Sullivan has agreed to move a few things around in order to bring the three lanes back to the beginning of his driveway, which has been suggested in all three reports.

Chair Strobel stated that he wanted to bring up the difference in the observed queuing distance and what was designed, just so people will start thinking about it.

Mr. Pernaw stated that as far as queuing goes, when you look at the results in the report, understand that it's based on 2030 projections. It's also described as the 95th Percentile Queue. That is the longest queue length that will happen 95% of the time. That number pertains to the AM peak hour in the year 2030. It's not for the whole hour, they look at the highest 15-minute period and multiply that by 4. As traffic engineers, they are pretty conservative. When a queue comes back in theory to nine vehicles, it automatically starts dissipating it hits the max, and then it dissipates, then it builds and dissipates. 15 minutes later they are dealing with shorter queues. He's pleased to hear that his client is providing 2 exit lanes all the way back to the site driveway, although it will look like an empty runway. That queue of 9 is instantaneous, and could happen a few times, but what they are going to have is a long empty right turn lane.

Mr. Corbett stated that if someone s approaching Route 4 and they want to turn right; they are used to making that turn easily without much delay. In the 20 or 30 build, a left turning vehicle might have 3 minutes of delay, and if you are stuck behind that person for a minute and you are used to getting right into that right turn lane, that's where the issue is. That was their comment. The key links are based on the 95th percentile, if that's some compromise in between there, that is reasonable. What is out there now certainly seems like it's going to be impacted more often than not. He stated that while Mr. Pernaw is correct, there isn't a big queue of right turning vehicles, it's a matter of trying to get around the queue of left turning vehicles.

Ms. Parmele asked if Mr. Pernaw could explain his response to DOT comment on page 3. Mr. Pernaw stated that they struggled on Table 3 last meeting about the delay estimates. He researched it to the point where they went back to films and calculated it, but he is stuck using the highway capacity manual so that's what they did. He did explain it ad nauseum at the last meeting he attended. With a little extra effort, they have another model and much better results in terms of delays. They went to two stage gap acceptance, which is where there is a center lane where a left turner will wait for a gap in the westbound flow and pull out and sit in the middle and then look for a gap in the eastbound flow and then pull out, so it's two stages. He stated that they have no evidence of that happening, but they explored that possibility trying to come up with a better delay estimate, and that delay estimate was too low. In the report, the best he could say is that the answer was going to be somewhere in between. The DOT commented on that. The third model at least gives much more reasonable estimates.

Mr. Kreider asked if he could go back over the models again. If they are responsible for understanding the data, he's like to be able to understand the models. He's a little disconcerted because Mr. Pernaw had said that the original model didn't seem to work at the low end, and at the high end it tends to blow up a bit so maybe those numbers aren't that good. He stated that he would like some sense of comfort that they have the right model and the numbers are good. He's a little uncomfortable with plugging in data into two different models and they got two different results. He's not used to seeing that kind of discrepancy in the models.

Mr. Pernaw stated that when they do traffic studies for DOT, they follow the same procedures as if this was an Aroma Joes on a state highway. The DOT requires the use of the Highway Capacity Manual. Within that software, you can add the turning volumes, peak hour factors, percent trucks, speeds, lanes etc. The two-stage gap acceptance is something they can adjust. One of the reasons why that model gave high results is the critical gap. What is the gap that is needed in a two-way flow for someone to take a left out of Bow Lake Road? His sense is that the default gap in the software is high. People drive this intersection all the time. He thinks they accept gaps that are shorter than what the national average is. That gap size affects everything. He has never tampered with the gap size in the 30 years he's been doing this, because the DOT will be right on it. They go with the standard default parameters and they publish the results. When they have a problem, they explain it.

Mr. Kreider asked where the model that they ultimately used came from? Mr. Pernaw stated that particular model is a microscopic traffic simulation model, much more detailed. But, again, this is all theory. When the volume reaches capacity, all of the delay formulas go out the window.

Mr. Kreider asked Mr. Corbett what his experience was with the second model. Mr. Corbett stated that it is a different approach to using the same thing that they used before, but he suggests that it may not be critical what the delay is, more what the delay difference is between build to no build. Something that Mr. Pernaw didn't really touch on was that a signalized intersection is much easier to measure a delay. In this instance you are relying on people's behavior more than at a traffic signal. The difference is that you get to a level of service F at 50 seconds and people start to accept smaller and smaller gap. That's the issue because you don't want people accepting unsafe critical gaps. While there are discrepancies in the delay, they are still really long so it's probably not very important whether it's 150 seconds or 250 seconds.

Mr. Kreider asked what data is input into the model? Is this what is called a bypass business? Meaning that the business volume is related to the number of cars on the road. He is assuming that means Route 4 and Bow Lake Road. How do you factor up the number of cars going in and out of the business based on the increase in traffic along Route 4 over the next ten years? What numbers did they use as numbers going into the business in 2020 versus 2030? Mr. Pernaw stated that on page 11 of his

original report, it shows AM peak hour 2020 estimates of just the coffee shop is 82 trips. By 2030, they expect it to go up to 90 trips. What they did in the report in order to keep it simple, they used the 90 for both.

Mr. Kreider asked what level of service F meant from a practical standpoint in terms of what somebody would expect you to do from a safety perspective. Chair Strobel stated that that was what Mr. Corbett was talking about when it is already at level of service F, and the gap acceptance becomes less and less.

Mr. Corbett stated that Level of Service was as follows:

Level of Service A is under 10 seconds

Level of Service B is 10- 15 seconds

Level of Service C is 15-25 seconds

Level of Service D is 25 -35 seconds

Level of Service E is 35-50 seconds

Level of Service F is greater than 50 seconds

Seconds is the amount of time you would wait for a gap to turn.

Mr. Corbett stated that this is done because that is the expectations of drivers is that there is some sort of delay. It's often used when once you get to some level of service you need to get to some level of service you need to start mitigating those improvements because you start creating unsafe situations.

Chair Strobel stated that when Academy Way was built in 2009, DOT realigned Bow Lake Road and the Route 4 intersection and they included infrastructure to add future signalization. Where does that threshold come in as far as needing a signal? Mr. Corbett stated it could be a town development that impacts and intersection or something that has to be done as part of a development. There are signal warrants that they use, but signals can also create accidents, so engineers typically stand behind legal justification. There are all sorts of considerations that go into it, but generally that is the process for determining whether they would consider installing a signal or not.

Mr. Burdin stated that he wanted to acknowledge that they had an additional report submitted by Attorney Manzelli, prepared by TEPP LLC. It had been forwarded to the board and the applicant. His initial reaction is that it appears to be more reviewing the conclusions of the other reports as opposed to preparing an additional set of data on top of it.

Chair Strobel stated that he had one more question pertaining to level of service. If the levels are exceeded after this site plan is approved, what happens then? How does that review determination come into play? Mr. Burdin stated that as far as offsite exactions

go related to the building permit or a site plan application, if the board requires an improvement related to a project, it needs to have a rational nexus to the project they are proposing, i.e.; they are making traffic worse and the town wants traffic improvements as opposed to they are making traffic worse and the town would like welcome to Northwood signs. There needs to be rough proportionality to what can reasonably be expected as a result of that development. The numbers that they are talking about as far as levels of service, counts and delays, those are their best guess at measuring what is the scale of the potential impact. Once you get beyond having something you can tie that to, be it a building permit or a site plan application, any changes over time are basically the responsibility of the Town and DOT through the normal Capital Planning process.

Chair Strobel opened public comment:

Amy Manzelli, attorney for the Severance Family.

Ms. Manzelli stated that the Severances apologize, they wanted to let the Board know that they are still very concerned about this project but unfortunately, Mrs. Severance had emergency surgery this weekend. She is on the road to full recovery, but she was not in a condition to make it to the meeting tonight.

Ms. Manzelli stated that she wanted to walk through the TEPP, LLC memo. This is from Kim Hazarvartian, a traffic engineer with similar credentials to the two who are present tonight. The Severances wanted to have someone looking at this on their behalf. Kim came up with no different conclusions based on the data.

1. He agrees with what CMA and DOT say that a right turn lane is warranted
2. He agrees that the calculated queue distance on Bow Lake Road need to be increased because the projections exceed what is there today.

On page 2, he talks about three potential benefits about having a turn lane.

1. Separating faster through traffic from slower right turn traffic.
2. Reducing the potential for rear end collisions
3. Making the intentions of right-turn drivers clearer to drivers waiting on Bow Lake Road.

In the preface to this bullet list, all of these things improve traffic safety. She stated that she doesn't feel the need to go over the turn lane length on Bow Lake Road given the applicant's offer tonight to extend that up to 200 feet, except to note that Mr. Hazarvartian's analysis actually would have that 225 feet. Mr. Hazarvartian put in some figures that really help communicate the issue with some very effective graphics. The first one, figure 2-6, which is labeled Guideline for determining the need for a major road right turn bay at two way stop controlled intersections. At the bottom of that sheet it is labeled 2020 No Build Weekday AM Street Peak Hour. She stated that she wanted to draw their attention to the red triangle. That triangle is the conditions for the 2020 no build AM street peak hour. The blue line is the guideline that indicates

when a right-hand turn lane is warranted. As indicated here, without the project, they are already well into that right turn lane being needed. In fact, if you look at the number to the left, when you hit 15 vehicles an hour is when you trip that guideline. This shows six times that amount of vehicle traffic. The comparable version of this, the 2020 Build Weekday AM Street Peak Hour, so same time, but this is with the project. This is a depiction of what the board and the engineer have been talking about tonight. It gets worse. Now it is 8.1 times what is indicated for having a right turn lane.

The traffic evidence that the board has before it is voluminous and paints a picture and it provides two major considerations. A legal consideration and a practical consideration. Starting with legal, you have the CMA information, you have the DOT information, you have the TEPP memo, and you have Mr. Pernaw saying adding a right turn lane on Route 4 is warranted. You also have everyone saying that the turning lanes on Bow Lake Road are too short. These are clear pieces of information that are in the record before the board tonight. It's very hard for her to see legally, if the board concludes that a right turn lane is not required for this project, or that the turning lanes on Bow Lake Road do not need to be extended, it will be really hard for her to see how either of those conclusions would stand up in court given the weight of the evidence that the record contains. To be clear, the Severances believe that this board should deny the project. That is their position and she has talked about lots of different angles about why, but in the event the board would consider voting to approve the project, legally what the board should do is account for this evidence of traffic and put on conditions of approval that the project can not go forward unless a right turn lane is added to Route 4, and that the turning lanes on Route 4 should be extended by at least 100 feet. She stated that she would like to talk more about the practicalities of these considerations, because she thinks that is a more important point here. Of course, she acknowledges that Mr. Sullivan wants this development to be approved. There are competing interests at play here. It will be a personal economic advantage to him to have this project approved. She stated that she can understand the pull that this board would feel wanting to approve this application and give Mr. Sullivan the economic advantage. But what she would ask is, what personal economic advantage to Mr. Sullivan is worth compromising public safety of the many, many commuters and students who travel Route 4 every single day? She would urge the board to err on the side of public safety. Guided by their own engineer, who had no one's interest in mind when doing his analysis except the towns, when they concluded atht adding a right turn lane was warranted, and extending the turning lanes on Bow Lake Road. She would like to end her comments by reminding the board of the one single thing that the town's police department said it was concerned about, because this evidence has borne this out. "Serious concerns regarding traffic at the Bow Lake/Route 4 intersection"

Thank you for your attention to this.

Jim Hadley, Old Mountain Road

Mr. Hadley stated that he has provided the board with a handout. He stated that he works in Boston and he has to drive through Chester, New Hampshire to and from the train station. At an intersection in Chester, he thought there was a turning lane, but it wasn't a turning lane. A policeman stopped him a few months ago and informed him that it was a shoulder. A car was in front of him with a blinker going left. He has a small car so he was able to use the shoulder, and the police officer told him that he could write him a ticket. The idea of a shoulder versus a turning lane, if someone doesn't have a small car could be very dangerous. He still believes that this proposal does not currently meet the site plan regulations in Northwood. If it is approved, he has provided an excerpt from the state's website, planning and zoning. The current law on the planning board's authority to authorize off-site improvements to be paid for by the developer. It mentions the senate bill. The attorney brought up the police department's statement about serious concerns. He also thinks traffic is a problem that is only going to get worse. If this project is approved, it's going to be there forever. The town may have to make improvements down the road, and it shouldn't be the town's responsibility. The board should take note of the issues that the CMA engineer has brought up in his review of November 18, and make this as safe as possible.

Karen Brieger, Ravenwood Drive.

Ms. Brieger stated that there have been a lot of questions about the future and what would it take to get a turning lane put in and things rest on forces beyond this town and the planning board. She would just request that decisions not be made on a hope and a prayer. That some other organization or DOT or grant money or whatever may come into existence and all of the sudden a decision and construction happen to create a turning lane. That shoulder is, in fact, used as a right turn lane today and she will say its far from safe. She stated that she is one of the commuters that Attorney Manzelli referenced. She commutes that every single day, peak and off-peak hours, and she has come close to being hit attempting to use that shoulder as a turn lane. It is not safe today. The idea of turning a shoulder into a turn lane just trades one safety issue for another, because then there is no room for the shoulder or snow. It is treacherous in the winter with people trying to use it for turning purposes today, so please don't trade one safety issues for another and don't make decisions based on a hope and a prayer that some other organization or entity comes along to make the necessary adjustments that are needed. She would remind the board of the planner's comments in terms of if this cannot be done safely with what is in existence today, the board cannot approve it. Thank you.

Chair Strobel closed the public comment.

Mr. Burdin stated that he wanted to make it clear that any statements he makes are not advocating for the board to make one of those three decisions, his statements are merely intending to outline their three possible decisions and it was Ms. Breiger's statement that the board should take it to the conclusion of rejecting the application.

Ms. B. Smith stated that at one point the peak hour was stated from 8 AM to 9AM, was that changed along the way? Mr. Pernaw stated that it is stated in figure 2 in their report from October, so that hasn't changed.

Mr. Pernaw stated that he would like to point out that looking at the 2030 projections, the build versus the no build and talking about the right turn lane, site traffic represents 17% of that right turn volume in the morning peak hour. The total right turn volume in 2030 is 131 cars. Site traffic is 22 of the 131, or 17%. That dedication of a right of way that would have a value that should be used to offset the fair share contribution. When they look at the existing volumes, they did a count on Academy Way. Today, the raw number of left turns into Academy Way during the morning peak hour was 81. Where do you think most of those 81 cars are coming from? They are coming from the right turn lane. Because the total volume they counted in the right turn lane was 94. The impact on the right turn lane is Academy Way. Comparatively, its apples and oranges.

Mr. Burdin stated that they will need a request to continue since they are beyond the 65-day clock. He stated that the board has received a lot of information about this case, and it feels like they are reaching a point that even if there are differences of opinions in the conclusions to be drawn from the facts, it feels like they have reached a net total of the facts. He would suggest that they consider a path towards reaching a conclusion on this case. What he suggests is, that after tonight they should take one additional meeting for public input on any or all topics, and if the board is not ready to reach a decision then, there will be one further meeting at which they do not take public comment and they only take the time to deliberate all of the information they received. Those dates would be March 12 and April 9.

Mr. McCaffrey made a motion to continue Case 19-12 until March 12, 2020. Ms. B. Smith seconded. Motion carried 5/0.

INTERNAL BUSINESS
The board created a timeline of what they would like to accomplish this year. Mr. Burdin will distribute the finished calendar to the board via email.

Adjournment

Ms. B. Smith made a motion to adjourn at 9:37 pm. Selectman Kreider seconded. Motion carried 5/0.

Respectfully Submitted,
Susan Austin, Land Use Assistant.

Approved by the Northwood Planning Board on March 12, 2020