W-2125-020-09
February 12, 2026

Meghan C. Jop, AICP
Executive Director
Town of Wellesley
525 Washington Street
Wellesley, MA 02482

Re: Transportation Peer Review – Proposed Bank – 26 Washington Street (Route 16) Wellesley, Massachusetts

Dear Meghan:

On behalf of the Town of Wellesley, Tighe & Bond has conducted this Traffic Peer Review for the proposed bank to be located at 26 Washington Street in Wellesley, Massachusetts. The Project involves replacing a vacant building that formerly housed a hardware store with a walk-in bank that consists of a 7,385 sf first floor that will be used for banking functions and a 7,385 sf second floor to be used for office.

Access to the project site will be provided by a single site driveway.

On-site parking is proposed for 32 vehicles. Tighe & Bond visited the project site on February 9, 2026, to review and observe the traffic conditions in and around the project site and to verify and compare the results presented in the evaluation to what was observed in the field.

Tighe & Bond has reviewed the following documents as part of the traffic peer review:

- **Traffic Impact & Access Study (TIAS) for a Proposed Redevelopment of a Walk-in Bank**; prepared by Kimley Horn and Associates, Inc.; dated December 2025.
- **Site Plan Set (28 sheets)**; prepared by Kimley Horn and Associates, Inc, dated January 13, 2026.

Our review focused on the adequacy of the study with regard to industry best practices for analyzing traffic operations, estimating project generated trips and related traffic impacts including pedestrian and bicycle accommodations.

In general, we find that the TIAS has been prepared in a professional manner that is generally consistent with standard traffic engineering guidelines for the preparation of a traffic impact assessment.

We have numbered the comments where we anticipate a response from the proponent.

Study Area

The study area in the TIA includes the following intersections:

- Washington Street at Glen Road/Washington Court
- Washington Street at Ledyard Street
- Washington Street at Mass General Driveway
- Washington Street/ River Street

The study area is sufficient to evaluate the potential impact of the project based on the expected trip distribution pattern for the Project.

Traffic Volumes, Data Collection and Seasonal Adjustment

Traffic volume data was collected at the study area intersections by means of manual turning movement counts and automatic traffic recorder counts in October 2025. Since October volumes are roughly average month conditions, no adjustments were necessary.

The existing traffic volumes are acceptable. No additional information is needed.

Crash Data

Motor vehicle crash data was obtained for the study area intersections from MassDOT for the 5-year period of 2020-2024. The intersection of Washington Street at River Street was noted to have slightly higher than average crash rates. None of the intersections are listed as HSIP eligible crash clusters.

1. **Due to the higher-than-average crash rate at the intersection of Washington Street at River Street (3.2 crashes per year), we recommend further investigation into causes of crashes and potential solutions. A large number (19 crashes) of the crashes were identified as sideswipe crashes. Of particular concern, the highest number of crashes (12 crashes) occurred in the most recent year evaluated (2024).**

Project-Generated Traffic

Weekday daily and peak hour traffic volumes were determined based on ITE *Trip Generation Manual* 12th Edition, using Land Use Codes (LUC) 911 Walk In Bank, 912 Drive In Bank and Small Office Building to develop the basic number of daily and peak hour vehicle trips to the site.

The proponent should only use Land Use Code 912 Drive In Bank for the bank trip generation. The analysis included in the TIAS applied ITE Land Use Code 912 (Drive In Bank) for the weekday AM peak hour, and Land Use Code 911 (Walk-In Bank), for the weekday PM peak hour. However, Land Use Code 911 (Walk-In Bank), has unreliable data, only providing data for three studies during the weekday PM peak hour. Based on ITE guidelines, this data should not be used due to a high standard deviation. Either local data should be collected or ITE Land Use Code 912 (Drive-In Bank) should be used to estimate site-generated trips during the weekday AM, Weekday PM, and Daily Peak Hours.

We have recalculated the anticipated trip generation for the project and have included the results in Table 1. The volumes highlighted in yellow are different than the numbers presented in the TIAS and should be used for the analysis.

The TIAS did not provide daily trip generation calculations.

Table 1 :Trip Generation

	Period	Total Peak Hour Trips	Entering Trips	Exiting Trips
Small Office Building (712)	AM Peak	12	10	2
	PM Peak	16	5	11
	Daily	106	53	53
Drive-In Bank	AM Peak	73	42	31
	PM Peak	155	78	77
	Daily	730	365	365
Gross New Trips	AM Peak	85	52	33
	PM Peak	171	83	88
	Daily	836	418	418
Pass-by Trips	AM Peak	21	12	9
	PM Peak	54	27	27
Total Net New Trips	AM Peak	**64**	**40**	**24**
	PM Peak	**117**	**56**	**61**

Based on the calculated volumes, the project is expected to generate 836 new automobile trips (418 entering, 418 exiting) per day, 64 net new trips (40 entering, 24 exiting) during the weekday morning peak hour and 117 net new trips (56 entering, 61 exiting) during the weekday evening peak hour.

2. **The weekday PM peak hour analysis should be updated using the higher trip generation volumes.**

Project-Distribution

Trip assignments are not accurately distributed. Figure 9 should assign net new trips from Table 3 in the TIAS (superseded by Table 1 in this review letter), not gross trips. Pass-by trips were accurately assigned in Figure 11. Figure 12 shows the pass-by trips added to the total trip generation, resulting in higher volumes at the study area intersection, including the site driveway. This methodology results in higher Build volumes during the AM peak hour. As noted in the trip generation section, the PM trip generation is undercounted, therefore the Build PM volumes are still too low.

3. **Please update the Trip Assignment and projected Build volumes for the project area.**

Traffic Operations Analysis

Based on Table 5 in the TIAS, which should be updated based on comments herein, many of the stop-controlled approaches operate poorly due to heavy volumes on Washington Street, making it difficult for drivers on the side street to find a suitable gap.

The site driveway will operate poorly during the morning and evening peak hours.

The eastbound approach of Glen Road is anticipated to have poor operations under Build conditions during the Weekday PM peak hour. Review potential improvements to operations on this approach.

There may be a typo in Table 5 – it shows the Existing AM eastbound approach of Mass General to be 959 seconds of delay, but the analysis worksheets show this to be 63 seconds.

4. **The Build capacity analysis will need to be updated to reflect required changes to the Trip Generation and Trip Assignment.**

5. **Please verify how many pedestrian actuations were assumed in the capacity analysis. This input was not included in the worksheets.**

PSI Impact

Due to the projected trip generation of the project, the site driveway and the intersection of Washington Street/ River Street meet the volume thresholds to be considered a PSI impacted location. This location meets the following criteria:

Locations through which 30 or more vehicles approach from a single direction in one or more hour(s) of the day. If in the opinion of the Planning Board the data shows that any such location will experience operational problems as a result of the subdivision then not less than two alternative designs shall be proposed and described to address the problem(s). The engineering and cost of construction and implementation of these remedial measures shall be the full responsibility of the applicant.

Sight Distance

The sight distance evaluation was conducted for Stopping Sight Distance only and did not include an analysis of Intersection Sight Distance. Intersection sight distance should be analyzed at the proposed site driveway to provide an overview of the safety and operation of the site driveway.

6. **Please update the sight distance plan at the existing/proposed site driveway to include intersection sight distance. The plan should graphically shows the intersection sight distance, stopping sight distance and restrictions at the driveway.**

Site Plan Review

We have the following comments on the proposed site plans.

7. **The two-way site driveway becomes a one-way circulation within the parking lot. Please add pavement markings, such as a right turn arrow pavement marking, to reinforce the circulation.**

8. **At the site driveway entrance to Washington Street, the sidewalk should be extended across the driveway. Please update the detail shown on Sheet C-321.**

9. **On the site plan (Shet C-300) the wheelchair ramp configuration at the main entrance does not appear to be ADA compliant. Please confirm that a minimum 4-foot pathway is provided. The ramp configuration on sheet A1 appears to have different dimensions.**

10. **Sheet C-321 includes details for a precast wheel stop. These are not needed at this site.**

Conclusions & Recommendations

The proponent should provide an updated analysis to review. Our comments and concerns are as follows.

1. Due to the higher-than-average crash rate at the intersection of Washington Street at River Street (3.2 crashes per year), we recommend further investigation into causes of crashes and potential solutions. A large number (19 crashes) of the crashes were identified as sideswipe crashes. Of particular concern, the highest number of crashes (12 crashes) occurred in the most recent year evaluated (2024).
2. The weekday PM peak hour analysis should be updated using the higher trip generation volumes.
3. Please update the Trip Assignment and projected Build volumes for the project area.
4. The Build capacity analysis will need to be updated to reflect required changes to the Trip Generation and Trip Assignment.

5. Please verify how many pedestrian actuations were assumed in the capacity analysis. This input was not included in the worksheets.
6. Please update the sight distance plan at the existing/proposed site driveway to include intersection sight distance. The plan should graphically shows the intersection sight distance, stopping sight distance and restrictions at the driveway.
7. The two-way site driveway becomes a one-way circulation within the parking lot. Please add pavement markings, such as a right turn arrow pavement marking to reiterate the circulation.
8. At the site driveway entrance to Washington Street, the sidewalk should be extended across the driveway. Please update the detail shown on Sheet C-321.
9. On the site plan (Shet C-300) the wheelchair ramp configuration at the main entrance does not appear to be ADA compliant. Please confirm that a minimum 4-foot pathway is provided. The ramp configuration on sheet A1 appears to have different dimensions.
10. Sheet C-321 includes details for a precast wheel stop. These are not needed at this site.

We appreciate the opportunity to assist the Town of Wellesley in their review of this project. If you have any questions or require additional information, please feel free to contact me directly at any time. Once responses to the initial comments noted above have been received and reviewed, Tighe & Bond will respond to this information as appropriate.

Very truly yours,

Alan T. Cloutier, P.E. PTOE
SENIOR ENGINEER