

TO: Cape Cod Commission  
FR: John Miller, Mashpee [REDACTED]  
DT: December 8, 2022  
RE: Falmouth Road Market (CCC File # 21015)

This is a follow up to my verbal comments at the November hearing, with the added benefit of seeing recently posted comments available on the Commission's website.

I have been a Mashpee resident for more than 20 years, have lived at the Deer Crossing condo complex for 10 years, and own a small business (J Miller Pictureframer) at the Deer Crossing shopping plaza (since 2003). I am a former Trustee of the Deer Crossing condo HOA. I am also Mashpee's Town Moderator.

The more I see and learn about this project, the more I conclude that it's simply too much to be accommodated in the available space and adequately deal with the significant limitations of infrastructure to support such a business at this location. Traffic being among the most prevalent concerns. I offer the following comments (in no particular order of importance):

- 1) I am pleased to see that the applicant has dropped the plan to provide a new and second entrance to the parcel from Shellback. That would have required considerable fill among other complications, not to mention yet another curb cut in an already saturated space.
- 2) I consider it unlikely that MA DOT would approve the proposed curb cut on Route 28. There are already ten (10) existing or potential entrances/exits off Route 28 in the short distance between the Mashpee rotary and the Stop & Shop gas station. Including two on either side of the subject property.
- 3) Note that the engineering plan dated 6-24-22 (and presumably back on the table) references a "No Driveway Access to Rte 28" provision along the Rockland Trust frontage. For similar reasons, that may also prove to be the case on the subject property.
- 4) The applicant concedes there is reluctance by Mashpee Commons to grant an easement for additional access off of Job Fishing Road, despite an assertion that talks continue. Compensation is surely a factor here. However, the Commons will be facing its own traffic volume issues as its retail/residential build-out materializes.
- 5) Even if that easement existed, it would reduce traffic counts on Shellback but certainly not improve the overall congestion in this area. Consider: if Shellback becomes the sole access to the grocery store, here's what we're dealing with on Shellback Way: two-way from TWO banks, plus Deer Crossing at the Ace Hardware store, plus commercial traffic to the Upper Level of commercial Deer Crossing, plus 166 residential condo units, plus the loading dock for Ace Hardware (with at least weekly tractor-trailer activity), plus \_\_\_\_\_ ??? \_\_\_\_\_ vehicle trips to what will surely be a popular grocery store. Furthermore, as a business tenant here, I've observed that as much traffic entering the parking lots here use the Ace Hardware/Shellback access vs. Route 28.

And the Ace Hardware entrance is a constant bottleneck anyway to due parking being allowed in the narrow roadway at the store entrance. (And, for that matter, this entire area would benefit from traffic study...including Deer Crossing commercial...though that appears currently to be beyond the scope of the applicant's interests).

- 6) The 12/5/22 McMahon traffic mitigation report is interesting but focuses heavily on signage and line painting more that truly engineered solutions. Its earlier memorandum of 10/7/22 focuses primarily on crash incident history for many intersections along Route 28.
- 7) Where is the study that projects vehicle counts, both present and probable, once this store is in operation? Seems to me that without knowing the likely volume and type of added traffic, no intelligent conclusions can be reached about the suitability of the proposed use of the site. I can foresee a perpetual nightmare of congestion...especially on Shellback, but also nearby intersections and road. The applicant references a Traffic Impact Assessment that will be forthcoming and revised. I would think/expect this would feature a traffic volume/type analysis. This would seem prudent as a cornerstone before any other decision making is undertaken.
- 8) The business/tenant proposes likely hours of 8am to 9pm daily, so the impacts could be relentless.
- 9) I also question the exceedingly limited provision for truck and other delivery access to the store. It will take a skilled 18-wheeler driver to maneuver not only around customer vehicles, and backing into the narrow slot leading to the sole loading dock. And what about other vendor vehicles that may have to wait for the loading dock to clear. Where will they be staged while waiting?
- 10) Another commentator at the last hearing mentioned the commercial lighting that will likely remain on at night and overnight. Not a pleasant view for the people living in Building A at Deer Crossing condos.
- 11) If this project does move forward, I would also urge a condition that the applicant and/or tenant assume responsibility for the maintenance of Shellback Way from Route 28 to the top of the hill. Ownership of this road section is reportedly unknown. It was not designed nor building to accommodate highly vehicular volume, let along regular visits by tractor trailers and other commercial vehicles. The road needs repairs, line painting, catch basin cleaning, clearing sidewalks/snow, and the like.
- 12) Among the evaluation topics, THE ECONOMY is largely dismissed by the applicant as being a pertinent component. The reluctance to be forthcoming with comprehensive data on projected employment opportunities, head counts, payroll, property taxes and the like fails to demonstrate or quantify just how much economic benefit this store would bring to Mashpee and surrounding areas.

In conclusion, this proposed use at this location is simply not a good fit. Literally. The infrastructure simply does not exist at a suitable level and the mitigation proposals do little to change that basic fact. I can see that the architects did their best to shoe-horn the needs of this business onto less than 4 acres with highly constrained access/egress. There are numerous other potential uses of this parcel that would have far less impact, and likely touch more favorably on the essential elements of the Regional Policy Plan goals. I urge non approval of the application and plans as submitted. Thank you for your consideration.