



240A Elm Street
Somerville, MA 02144
617.628.5700, tel
davissquarearchitects.com

Clifford J. Boehmer, AIA
Ross A. Speer, AIA
Iric L. Rex, AIA

MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 13, 2020 Annotations November 4, 2020
FROM: Cliff Boehmer
TO: Ashley Clark
CC:
RE: PAGES: 2
PROJECT: Walpole Summer Street 40B PROJECT No. 2020038

We are in receipt of the below letter and would like to thank Cliff Boehmer and the Board for providing the feedback. Please see our comments below in red. Please note that "Aesthetic issues concerning building design can only be raised to extent that aesthetic considerations are imposed on market rate developments by specific regulations" See discussion in Oceanside Village LLC v. Scituate ZBA under heading of Building Design Issues. As Walpole has no specific regulations regarding aesthetic requirements, the review for aesthetics would be inappropriate, and the applicant should not be charged for such review.

Ashley: I'm in receipt of revised design and other documents related to the proposed Summer Street development. The purpose of this memo is to briefly outline some of my responses to the newly submitted materials by annotating (in blue) my memo from August 13, 2020 (as well as deleting some sections that are no longer pertinent). My understanding is that these new comments will likely be discussed at the ZBA hearing scheduled for this Thursday evening, November 5th. The new materials I have reviewed are as follows:

Presentation Plan (rendered overall site plan) prepared by Howard Stein Hudson dated 10/14/20.
Proposed Subdivision/Overall Plan with annotations prepared by Howard Stein Hudson dated 10/14/20
Cedar Crossing/Cedar Edge Overhead View prepared by Mauge Architects dated 20 October 2020
Cedar Crossing/Cedar Edge Entry View prepared by Mauge Architects dated 20 October 2020
Cedar Crossing/Cedar Edge Multi Family (rendered building elevations) prepared by Mauge Architects dated 20 October 2020.
Cedar Edge Model G Plans & Elevations prepared by HPA Design, Inc. dated October 16, 2020.
Cedar Edge Model F Plans & Elevations prepared by HPA Design, Inc. dated October 16, 2020.
Cedar Crossing Multi-Family Building 1 drawing set (12 sheets) prepared by Mauge Architects dated 10/20/2020.
Cedar Crossing Multi-Family Building 2 drawing set (11 sheets) prepared by Mauge Architects dated 10/20/20.
Cover letter to ZBA from David Hale dated September 15, 2020 (with numerous attachments, including a response to my peer review memo from August 13, 2020).
Cover letter to ZBA from David Hale dated October 21, 2020 (attachments included drawings noted above).
Memo to David Hale from Bayside Engineering dated September 28, 2020.
Memo to David Hale from Bayside Engineering dated October 16, 2020.

I'm writing to summarize the points that we reviewed, as well as adding a few additional thoughts that were not discussed or detailed. As I mentioned, I have spent very little time looking at the proposed buildings, so you will notice that most of my comments are related to site planning issues. I look forward to reviewing the proposed buildings once the site plan is finalized. Several changes have been made to the proposed buildings that improve the site plan, in all cases, reducing the overall built footprints. The large multi-family buildings are now 6 residential floors (with parking beneath), and a number of the single family homes have been converted to two-family homes (14 have been converted). The most significant changes in the appearance of the larger building in the transition from four to six stories has been the addition of two-story "base" of the building (that appears to be clad in a different finish), and a change in the roof that places the 6th floor within a mansard-like form (the original schemes for the larger buildings featured hip roofs with dormers).

I will also take this opportunity to strongly suggest that the ZBA request a computer-generated 3-D model of the development. This is not an unreasonable request for a development of this scale, and it is the only way that will make it possible for the Board to accurately visualize this proposal. It is evident from the submitted materials that the architect is using a modelling software (my guess is that it's Revit), so the next step is to place all of the buildings on a topographically accurate site plan, odd roads, vegetation, etc. With the model, the Board will be able to "walk through" the development and assess the quality of the proposed design(s). This request has not changed. The aerial view and limited eye-level perspectives included in the submitted materials are not sufficient for evaluating the quality of the proposed development. There is no regulatory requirement for 3-D modeling for market rate housing in Walpole, so the applicant is not required to produce 3-D models.

Here is the summary of my thoughts:

- Overall site plan, particularly in the area of the multi-family buildings is not pedestrian friendly. Partridge Lane is a series of connected parking lots (as opposed to an attractive, landscaped street). There are walkways indicated along one side of all of the roadways and along one or both edges of parking lots that make it possible to walk throughout the site. However, there do not appear to be any trees indicated within or along the large parking fields, and there does not appear to be a landscape plan included in the new documents. The landscaping will be of type and materials shown on the 5-1-20 plans but adapted to the revised site plan. The revised landscape plan will be in the final set of building permit plans.
- Sidewalks in area of large buildings follow along the fronts of parked cars, with no area for planting trees between the walks and parked cars. This remains on issue. There is no regulatory requirement concerning this comment.
- There is minimal space for landscaping between buildings and the sidewalks. No apparent change, although overall there is more "breathing room" throughout the site because of the taller buildings and consolidation of some of the single-family homes into two-family homes. This is a typical design element in multi-family housing and there is no regulatory requirement concerning this comment.
- Headlights from parking cars are directed into ground floor units (with some exception where buildings may be elevated for parking beneath). No change in the situation in the impacted ground floor units, although fewer units are now directly facing parking lots. This is a typical design element in multi-family housing and there is no regulatory requirement concerning this comment. The applicants experience and the advice of our property manager is that tenants prefer a design where they can park close to their units or an entrance and walk directly into their unit if it faces the parking lot on the first floor or into a building entrance.
- Spruce Lane sidewalk on one side only, regularly interrupted by numerous brood driveways. Slightly changed with consolidation of 14 single family homes. It is typical for SFH neighborhoods to have a sidewalk on just one side. There is no regulatory requirement for sidewalks on both sides of a driveway. (This is referred to as Driveway "E" on plans dated 5/1/20 and subsequent submissions).
- Courtyard defined by three tall buildings is grossly undersized (it is defined by 144 apartments and the clubhouse, with 48 other units nearby). Buildings are crowded together, particularly given their height. This is a significant positive change in the new plan. There are now only two large multi-family buildings that are spaced far apart, and oriented to increase residents' views of the wetlands. The new plan includes a large shared green space that is adjacent to the Clubhouse. No response necessary
- Placement of tall buildings chaotic, no obvious organizing element. New placement of buildings make significantly more sense, as they are oriented to take advantage of views across undeveloped areas of the site on several of the building elevations. No response necessary
- More than half of all units face parking lots. While the proportion of units facing parking lots has not

- significantly changed, the remainder of the units now have landscape views. In addition, the impact of facing the parking lots has been mitigated by the increased height of the buildings (a smaller percentage of units are ground floor units facing parked cars). No response necessary
- 3/8 of units in tall buildings face other tall buildings across the undersized open space. This is no longer the case given new site plan. No response necessary
 - Clubhouse location not logical, no connection with usable outdoor space. Crowded onto site. This concern has largely been addressed, as the clubhouse is the sole "occupant" of the shared green space. No response necessary
 - Long stretches of single-loaded parking inefficient, creating additional impervious areas. This condition appears to have been diminished. No response necessary
 - Number of single family homes sited very near infiltration ponds. See civil engineering peer review. No response necessary
 - Inadequate view corridors to wetland areas between single family home (space between buildings is too tight). As noted above, there is more "breathing room" on the site that has improved views between buildings. In addition, the inclusion of two different two-family home types has decreased the monotony of the previous plan. No response necessary
 - Redtail wetland crossing is in a location that creates the need for two large, un-landscaped cul-de-sacs. See civil engineering peer review. Note that Redtail lane is referred to as Driveway "A" on plans submitted b-1-20 and subsequently. The interior of the cul de sacs will be grass.
 - 5 homes near site entry point "orphaned" from rest of development. No change, but developer claim is that this is a feature requested by neighbors. No response necessary
 - Awkward intersection of Spruce, Redtail, and Partridge. See civil engineering peer review. The intersections of driveways C and A and driveways D and A have been revised and are now greater than 100 feet from center line to centerline.
 - Entire site accessed at only one point. No change. The access meets NFPA standards

Some thoughts about potential modifications (some of which are shown on the 7 / 19 /20 Summer Street Sketch):

- Create variety of parking types (including some under-building if desired), turn Partridge into a true, pedestrian friendly "lane", create building-specific, landscaped satellite parking area to break up huge parking lots (potentially all building-specific spaces assigned to residents), significantly enlarge shared open space, give more space to clubhouse. As noted above, more landscaping within and around drives and parking areas would greatly enhance the pedestrian experience. Updated landscape plan will be provided in building permit set.
Add planting strip between curb and parallel parking spaces. No change, need detailed landscape plan. Updated landscape plan will be provided in building permit plans set. There is no regulatory requirement concerning this comment.
- Narrow down curb cuts at single family homes (create fan-shaped parking areas if multiple cars need to be accommodated). No change in current plans. There is no regulatory requirement concerning this comment.
- Add sidewalks on both sides of all streets. No change in current plans. Not required by regulations.
- Potentially move swimming pool to area along railroad tracks. Revised location of swimming pool and clubhouse is satisfactory in this reviewer's opinion. No response necessary
- Open up views to wetlands through single family homes. Consider side to side garages to cut down on curb cuts, create more usable open space and improve views. See notes above re: two-family homes and more "breathing room". There is no regulatory requirement concerning this comment.
- Re-shape infiltration ponds to create more distance from homes. See civil engineering peer review. No response necessary
- Integrate bio-swales in place of some of infiltration pond square feet. See civil engineering peer review. No response necessary
- Consider walking trails within 25' no disturb zones. Not aware that this has been integrated into the plan. The applicant will not restricted access to the existing trail along Cedar Brook however users will walk the unimproved trail at their own risk.
- Commercial use should be considered at Summer Street entry point. Reportedly this is not something the neighborhood supports. No response necessary
- Create an internal protected bus stop area. Not aware that this has been integrated into the plan. The applicant has met with the school transportation department and bus company and has integrated the bus requirements into the site design.

- Move entry to Balsam Lane to eliminate one cul-de-soc. Not adopted by developer, however, cul-de-soc design has changed to include green space in centers. No response necessary
- Consider another crossing to make Balsam a loop road, eliminate both cul-de-socs. Not adopted. Project designed to minimize impact on wetlands and green space. An additional crossing is not necessary or required by regulation.
- Re-work intersection of three roads. See civil engineering peer review. The intersections of driveways C and A and driveways D and A have been revised and are now greater than 100 feet from center line to centerline.

END OF I I .4.20 MEMO