



DAVIS
SQUARE
ARCHITECTS

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

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

September 11, 2016

Alison Steinfeld, Director
BROOKLINE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
333 Washington Street
Brookline, MA 02445

RE: 40 Centre Street
Architectural Peer Review Final Report

Dear Alison:

I'm writing to provide you with a Peer Review Final Report in accordance with the proposal I submitted dated July 4, 2016. For my "Final Report", I will incorporate new comments within my previous Peer Review Report that was dated July 31, 2016. In addition, I have added another section that includes design-related recommendations for conditions that could potentially be included in an approved Comprehensive Permit. *All new comments and report section(s) will be highlighted in italics (blue, if printed in color).*

1. Review of the Developer's Application, Plans, and Drawings (and other related documents)

Documents reviewed (comments on documents contained in Section 5 below):

- BOS letter to MassHousing re: Response to Notice of Application for SEL, dated March 8, 2016.
- 40 Centre Place Comprehensive Permit Application dated April 2016 (16-section binder including the PEL from MassHousing, project preliminary architectural drawings dated 04.11.2016, and other documents that may be referred to in this Peer Review).
- Landscape Plan produced by Ryan Associates dated May 3, 2016.
- 40 Centre Street presentation to ZBA dated May 23, 2016.
- Letter from Maria Morelli (Planning Department) to developer regarding additional required submission elements, dated May 21, 2016.
- Email from Chuck Schwarz with comments on proposed development dated June 1, 2016.
- Letter from Planning Board (signed by Linda Hamlin) re: 40 Centre Street Comprehensive Permit Application dated June 3, 2016.
- Letter from Robert Roth to Maria Morelli describing submission of additional materials, dated June 6, 2016.
- Letter from Robert Roth to Maria Morelli responding to May 23rd Planning Board Draft memo, dated June 7, 2016.
- Memorandum to ZBA from Jonathan Simpson (Office of Town Counsel) re: potential MHC review of the proposed project dated June 10, 2016.
- Email from Al Yerkes to Maria Morelli re: to ZBA review of 40 Centre Street proposal, dated June 11, 2016.
- Letter from Peter Ditto (DPW) to Jesse Geller dated, June 15, 2016.
- Letter from David King (Brookline Preservation Commission) to Jesse Geller, dated June 15, 2016.
- Letter from Derek Chiang to ZBA re: pedestrian safety, etc. dated June 17, 2016.
- Letter to Jesse Geller from Neighbors for Coolidge Corner re: MHC review, dated June 19, 2016.
- Letter to ZBA from 19 Winchester House Condominium Trust, not dated (drafted for presentation at June 20 ZBA meeting).

- Neighbors for Coolidge Corner Petition to ZBA dated June 20, 2016.
- Letter from Linda Hamlin, Planning Board, to Mark Zuroff, ZBA, dated May 19, 2016
- Letter to ZBA from Daniel Hill (Hill Law) dated June 20, 2016.
- Presentation of Planning Department to ZBA, dated June 20, 2016.
- “Neighborhood Concerns about 40 Centre Street Proposal” presentation to ZBA dated June 20, 2016.
- [Letter from Robert Roth to Maria Morelli dated July 25, 2016.](#)
- [Memorandum to Alison Steinfeld from Jonathan Simpson, Associate Town Counsel, dated August 10, 2016.](#)
- [Interoffice Memorandum from Daniel Bennett, Building Commissioner, to ZBA dated August 15, 2016.](#)
- [Memorandum from Vanasse & Associates to Robert Roth dated August 22, 2016.](#)
- [“40 Centre Revised Massing + Plans + Mix” set of drawings dated 23 August 2016 prepared by Cube 3.](#)
- [Letter from Derek Chiang to ZBA dated August 30, 2016.](#)
- [Email from Elissa Rosenthal to Maria Morelli dated August 31, 2016.](#)
- [Email from Don McNamara to Maria Morelli dated September 1, 2016.](#)
- [Traffic Peer Review dated September 1, 2016 prepared by Environmental Partners.](#)
- [“40 Center Street, Brookline, MA” drawing set and presentation prepared for the September 1 ZBA Hearing prepared by Cube 3.](#)
- [“Traffic Impact Statement, Abutter input” document prepared by Don Sherak, not dated.](#)

(REFERENCE MATERIALS)

- Coolidge Corner District Plan dated March 2007.
- Handbook: Approach to Chapter 40B Design Reviews, prepared by The Cecil Group, Inc. for DHCD, MassDevelopment, MassHousig, and MHP, January, 2011

2. Initial Meeting at the site with the Developer’s Design team and Representative of the Town

The development team conducted a site walkthrough on Wednesday morning, July 27, 2016, followed up with a brief meeting at 40 Centre Street, as well as a visit to a comparably sized new development designed by Cube 3 at 45 Marion Street. This building reportedly was the inspiration for the proposed structure at 40 Centre Street. Attending included Cliff Boehmer (Architectural Peer Reviewer), Alison Steinfeld (Brookline Department of Planning & Community Development), Maria Morelli (Brookline Department of Planning & Community Development), Bob Engler (consultant to the proponent), a representative of Cube 3 (architect for the proponent), Robert Roth (the proponent), and one other representative of the proponent (not all attendees were present at all locations visited).

Most of the visit consisted of walking the length of Centre Street (up to 112 Centre, and back towards the eastern end where 40 Centre is located) observing and commenting on existing context. The rear parking area of 40 was also observed, as well as the parking lot on the western side of 40 Centre that serves the high rise structure at 19 Winchester Street.

[No new comments.](#)

3. Conduct site visit and reconnaissance assessment of surrounding residential and nonresidential areas within one mile of the project site.

The site is located within Coolidge Corner, a part of Brookline well served by a high density and variety of retail businesses, religious facilities, restaurants and entertainment, as well as excellent access to public transportation (the Green Line stop is approximately 1000 feet away, bus service on Harvard Street about 500 feet away).

Corey Hill, a primarily one and two-family residential neighborhood, is immediately to the west of the site. Dense, mixed scale residential areas on both sides of Harvard Street extend to the north for about 2/3 of a mile before hitting Commonwealth Avenue, and somewhat larger scale (but still mixed) residential development is to the south off of Harvard Street. Various landscaped streetscapes and public open spaces are included within walking distance that greatly enhance the pedestrian experience. Brookline High School is approximately a mile to the south.

While Centre Street does not appear to fall within any Brookline Historic Districts, there are a number of well kept, largely intact large wood-frame Victorian homes on Centre Street (7 on the north side, 3 on the south side). Most of the larger scale, newer buildings are located on the south side of the street (the same side as the proposed project at 40 Centre), most notably, proceeding westward, a 7-story structure, a 4-story, an 11-story, and a 12-story structure near the intersection with Fuller Street. The tallest buildings on Centre Street, both owned by Center Communities of Brookline, reportedly house something like 500 elderly people.

No new comments.

4. Consult with the Applicant's design team, as appropriate.

As noted above, there was a brief meeting with the developer's team following the walkthrough on July 27. The first working session is scheduled for August 2. There have been no communications with the applicant or his design team since the walkthrough on the 27th.

Since the presentation of the Peer Review report to the ZBA on August 1, there have been four "working sessions" held at Town Hall, attended by the developer, architect, and development consultant, the Peer Reviewer, and various mixes of town staff (August 2, August 11, August 25, and September 7). Design related issues that were discussed included overall building height and massing, façade design, balconies, setbacks, landscaping, vehicular ingress and egress, unit mix, parking ratio, stormwater management, rubbish and recycling systems, HVAC noise, placement of transformer, bike parking, Zip cars, potential future development on adjacent and nearby sites, etc.

5. Provide an oral presentation to the ZBA within approximately one month of the notice to proceed.

Said presentation shall include comments and preliminary recommendations on the following:

(the comments in this report will be presented to a ZBA meeting on August 1, 2016)

a. Orientation of buildings in relation to each other, and to streets, parking areas, open space, and on-site amenities, and to solar access.

The proposal is for a single, six-story structure, with a footprint that occupies 82% of the 10,889 SF lot.

Current proposal is also six-story structure; new footprint occupies 72% of the site @ 7845 SF.

The building's total gross square footage, including the parking level, has dropped from almost 52,000 to about 46,000. Unit mix is now 20 studios, 17@1-bedroom, and 8@3-bedroom (previous mix was 5@studio, 20@1-bedroom, 15@2-bedroom, and 5@3-bedroom). The building height to parapet level, as noted on elevations, has dropped from 68'-0" to 66'-4".

Proposed setbacks from lot lines are minimal, 2'-7" at the front, 4'-10" to 5'-4" at the sides, and 5"-2" at the rear. There is no useable open space in the current plan, and no significant opportunities for landscaping.

Current proposal now has 5'-0" front setback to a one-story lobby/vestibule space that extends over a little more than half the width of the building, and a 15'-0" setback to the main volume of building extending from the second floor up through the fourth floor. At the fifth and sixth floors, half of the elevation is set back 15 feet, and the other half is set back 26'-10" (in the area where the roof deck is located and above).

The garage entry door has been significantly recessed from the front lot line (approximately 45 feet at its furthest edge), and angled so that it is not parallel to the street. Side setbacks vary from 5'-1" to 6'-3" (with some additional recesses in the façade that are set back approximately an additional 1'-0"). The four balconies that occur on the fifth and sixth floors extend into the side setbacks.

Rear setback remains at 5'-2" in the current proposal. There is a planted area in the 5' front setback and the setback all along on the building's east side.

There are no on-site amenities proposed, although the application materials do mention the possibility of a rooftop patio space available to the residents.

The space between the public sidewalk and the recessed garage door, while not programmable beyond the potential placement of a bench for residents, creates a sense of protected outdoor space that belongs to the building. The developer has expressed an interest in using contrasting paving materials in that area (cobblestones, pavers, etc.) along with a planted space. While there is no upper roof deck proposed (reportedly because of

the construction type), the current proposal includes a shared fifth floor balcony recessed from the front façade (10'-10" deep by approximately 25 feet wide).

All parking is within the footprint of the building, and accessed from a twenty-foot-wide garage door that opens directly onto Centre Street. The residential entrance is to the west of the garage door, with the lobby area taking up the rest of the footprint on the street elevation.

An additional parking space is included in the current plan (10 typical, 7 compact, and 1 HC), up to 18 from 17 indicated in the previous proposal). As noted above, the garage door is recessed into the body of the building, effectively taking it off of the street as was previously depicted. The current parking level plan indicates a sloped floor section that reportedly provides the option to add up to 12 additional spaces by installing stacking mechanisms.

There is some impact on 40 Centre to direct sunlight access from the taller condominium building on Winchester to the south. The long elevations of the proposed new building essentially face east and west, which means good solar access, perhaps excessive to the western afternoon light. The shadow studies included in the submitted materials appear to be properly conceived (although see note below regarding potential errors in proponent's analysis of existing building heights in the neighborhood). Significant shadow impact from the proposed building is predominantly on the streetscape in front of the building. For the residents at 19 Winchester, visual access to the open sky and views to downtown Boston are diminished by the presence of 40 Centre.

The additional front setback, lower overall building height, combined with pulling back the 5th and 6th floors at the balcony location will diminish the shadow impact on Centre Street, most noticeably in morning hours. Change in shadow impact due to the increases in side setback will likely not be perceptible.

b. Function, use and adequacy of open space and landscaped areas.

As noted above, there is very little opportunity for landscaping the site. A Landscaping Plan was submitted that indicates a row of Rhododendron plantings along the lot line to the east. A street tree is shown at the front of the building.

See comments above regarding open space and landscaping.

c. Use and treatment of natural resources.

N/A

No new comments.

d. Building design, massing and scale in relationship to the surrounding context and topography.

The most notable aspect of the proposed building is the virtually flat, 6-story elevation that rises up less than three feet from the front lot line, and occupies 60 feet of the 72-foot frontage. While 40 Centre represents a continuation of the larger scale development on the south side of Centre Street, it is unique in its lack of front setback that allows a more human-scale connection with the streetscape. It has the feeling of an urban infill building, as opposed to an element in a more spacious, well-planted streetscape. As such, it is an anomaly that will prominently extend into the public's visual realm, clearly intruding when approaching from either direction.

The increased setback in the revised plans, combined with the smaller scale entry piece and 5th floor balcony space, will greatly improve its "fit" on the street and create a more human-scale presentation.

The proposed building, the front elevation in particular, has an office/commercial building look to it, which is foreign to Centre Street.

The language of the building has radically changed from the previous version. The use of significant areas of masonry, change of window types, addition of decorative cornices, and strong horizontal expression has changed the reading from "office" to "clearly residential".

The street façade is subdivided across its width, which increases the verticality of the composition. In addition, horizontal subdivisions occur on most of the façade that tie together two floors at a time, suggestive of a non-residential program for the building. The remainder of the façade unites five stories of windows into a narrow vertical expression, extending a few feet out over the broad garage door. Because of the minimal

overall setback, articulation of the entry beyond a small cantilevered canopy is not possible, leaving the garage door the most visually important entry statement.

See comments above.

Perhaps most importantly, while the other buildings along Centre Street vary in scale and typology, all of them make gestures towards shaping and engaging the public realm, some, of course, more successfully than others. As was reported by the developer of 40 Centre Street, the genesis for the building is a very similar structure recently completed by the same architect on Marion Street. In fact, the surrounding neighborhood context for that structure is quite different from Centre Street, and it is not surprising that a direct transfer of that building to a very different type of site will have difficulties “fitting in.”

See comments above.

Many reviewers have expressed concern with the demolition of the existing historic structure at 40 Centre Street. Its small scale, generous landscaped front yard, along with a well-expressed entry, enhance the pedestrian environment. While adaptive re-use may not be realistic for the structure, consideration should be given to incorporation of some of the façade elements into the new structure.

The current proposal includes a “bumped out” entry area, similar in concept to what exists in the existing structure.

e. Side and rear elevations visible from the public street, public areas and from the vantage point of nearby residential neighborhoods.

At ground level, the side elevations for most of the length of the building are occupied for parking. Large areas of the envelope at that level are reserved for providing ventilation for the parking area. Both east and west elevations feature balconies that extend into the setback space.

West elevation now includes 4 balconies (only on 5th and 6th floors), down from 12 in previous version on floors 3 through 6. East elevation also includes 4 balconies on 5th and 6th floors, while previous version had 4, one on each floor 3 through 6. The necessity for ventilation louvers remains, but the masonry base in the revised version is more-strongly expressed.

The west elevation faces the parking lot for 19 Winchester, and is clad in vertically oriented panels, with a pattern established by color variations from panel to panel. This is the more visible side elevation, given the presence of the open, grade level parking lot. The east elevation is more subdued, with the multi-hued panels extending a little more than ¼ of the way down the elevation to the south. This elevation is partially obscured by the neighboring structure. Window patterns are essentially the same on both side elevations. The multi-colored aspect, combined with balconies, some simply cantilevered, and some semi-recessed, along with the clear delineation of each floor, makes the side elevations more visually successful (and residential-looking) than the main street elevation.

The masonry that predominates the front elevation carries around approximately 1/3 of the way around both side elevations at the 2nd through the 4th levels, and all around the sides and half the rear elevation at the base of the building. Horizontal masonry banding is included that accentuates a horizontal reading. Areas of the elevations not clad in masonry are depicted as fiber cement lap siding with varying exposures (rendered a deep brick red), and grayish colored metal panels are indicated at the upper two floors. The same window pattern carries across all floors 2 through 6 (with the exception of the common room fenestration where it opens out onto the 5th floor balcony/roof deck at the front of the building). All eight unit-dedicated balconies and the common balconies are shown with glass guardrails. The overall reading of the side elevations is horizontal, with banding at levels 2 through 4, and a horizontal joint dividing panels at floors 5 and 6. There is a one-foot deep recessed area occupying about ¼ of the length of the building on the upper two levels that provides some articulation. At the street end of the recess, the top roof projected trim transitions to a simpler version that continues throughout the depth of the recess, and all the way around the back of the building.

The rear elevation that faces the tall condominium structure (and its swimming pool) on Winchester Street has windows that are associated with 5 units. It is broken into two equal, vertically oriented pieces. The multi-color cementitious panels wrap half way around, the proposed material for the other half is lapped cementitious clapboards. The rear stairwell is located in the southeast corner, with single windows at landing levels that look back to Winchester.

This elevation still has a small break in plan along its length, but it now carries the same strong horizontal-banded floor delineation along its entire length (although the masonry base only is half of the width wrapping around from the west, and a short length on the east corner). Materials are masonry at base, lapped siding in the main body (floors 2 through 4, and part of 1), and metal panels at the top two floors. Windows at the stairwell have been eliminated from the previous version.

f. Pedestrian and vehicular circulation

Several reviewers of this project have commented on the issues of pedestrian circulation in front of the building, largely citing poor visibility as cars are exiting the garage. This is of particular concern given the large number of elderly residents in the neighborhood.

Sight lines when exiting the building have been greatly improved towards the east because of the garage door setback. The revised stepped back lobby/vestibule design, along with the increased overall setback (compared to the original May 23rd version) also improves the motorists view of pedestrians to the west.

This reviewer concurs that this is a significant problem that can only be addressed by increasing the front setback. There has also been concern expressed about the relationship of the driveway to the entry point of the parking lot across the street.

The location of the driveway relative to the parking lot entry has not changed.

An additional concern, in addition to cars safely entering and exiting, is that pedestrian movement may be impeded by large scale trash collection required for a 45-unit building.

Main trash room location has not changed since original submission. Not clear to peer reviewer if this issue has been addressed.

g. Integration of buildings and site, including but not limited to preservation of existing tree cover

As discussed above, the model for this structure was proposed for a different site. It has not been adapted to the different limitations and opportunities that exist on Centre Street.

As noted above, plan and massing changes on the building have "adapted" the concept of the building to specific conditions on Centre Street.

There is no area available in the current site plan for the provision of tree cover (that would be very useful on the long, west-facing elevation to help deal with excessive solar gain).

No new comments.

h. Exterior materials

Façade material include multi-colored fiber cement panels, metal infill panels, with a brick façade indicated on the street elevation, wrapping around the western end for approximately 17 feet. Balconies are proposed to be metal, with mesh railing systems. Fiber cement lap siding is indicated on half of the south elevation, and 2/3 of the east elevation. An area of brick masonry is shown as the base on the east elevation. In general, the building has more of a commercial look than residential, with a wider variety of materials proposed than what is typical for the street.

See comments above about elevations and materials.

i. Energy efficiency

Not really possible to tell in any level of detail from submitted materials. Brookline has adopted the Stretch Code, which will ensure a relatively high level of sustainability, at least from an operating perspective.

No new comments.

j. Exterior lighting

Not possible to tell from submitted materials. As there is very little site to light, it is likely that site lighting will be limited to illumination of the walkways on the south, east, and entry elevations. This should be confirmed by the proponent.

No new comments.

k. Proposed landscape elements, planting materials, and planting design

As noted above, a Landscaping Plan was submitted. Very little available space for plantings.

No new comments.

l. Feasibility of incorporating environmental and energy performance standards in the design, construction and operation of the buildings, such as standards required for LEED certification

No detail included in the application materials.

No new comments.

m. Any other design-related considerations identified by the consultant in the course of its review

- Floor plans that are submitted include some enlarged typical unit floor plans in addition to “fit plans”, that box out the gross square footage of the units within the proposed overall footprint of the building. It is not really possible to review conformance with some code requirements (for example, accessibility) in any level of detail. Fit plans do not indicate locations/types of proposed Group 2 accessible units. Note that all units in elevator-fed buildings must be at a minimum, Group 1 units.

No new comments.

- Parking plan indicates one accessible space. The MAAB will require two fully accessible, Group 2 units, with an additional requirement to provide accessible parking “...in sufficient numbers to meet the needs of the dwelling unit occupants.” This language suggests that two accessible spaces must be included in the plan. At least one of the spaces must be van accessible.

Inclusion of another accessible space that would presumably share a van-accessible width aisle, could potentially increase the number of compact spaces vs. typical size. This could be compensated for by the introduction of stacking space(s).

- The construction type is reportedly a Type I podium first floor, with five floors of Type III above. Setbacks are minimal on all sides. Can the proponent provide a preliminary building code analysis verifying that the building as proposed is allowable, including material selections and percentage of openings?
- Is the proposed construction type the only type that should be considered, given that it can limit building form because of height restrictions?

No new comments.

- Neighborhood Building Height analysis as presented in proponent’s May 23 presentation does not appear to be entirely accurate (for example, 112 Centre Street is listed at 150 feet, when its height according to construction documents is 103 feet, 120 feet to the top of the elevator penthouse). Other building heights indicated for smaller structures also appear questionable. If the inconsistencies are significant, the 3-D model and shadow studies may be misleading.

No new comments.

- It is possible that the Fire Department will have concerns about not having access to all elevations (there did not appear to be commentary from the building department or fire department in the materials posted for 40 Centre)?

See comment above regarding request for code analysis.

- Is there a detailed narrative describing how trash will be handled on the site?

No new comments.

- There have been concerns expressed about potential structural impact of the project on the neighboring buildings to the south and east. Has this been studied by the developer?

No new comments.

- Given the intensive use of the site, what is the plan for stormwater management (given that Brookline reportedly does not allow infiltration structures within the building footprint)? This reviewer concurs that a civil engineer peer reviewer should be retained (as well as structural).

Infiltration system is now depicted in driveway area that is open to sky in 15’ setback.

- Numerous reviewers have expressed concern about the very low parking ratio. Has the proponent developed any plan for mitigating this issue (diminished unit count, subsidized T-passes, shared car parking, off-site leasing of spaces with subsidized membership, targeted tenant marketing, etc.)?

- While the number of proposed units has not changed, the unit mix has been modified to reduce overall bedroom count from 70 to 61, which could decrease demand for on-site parking spaces. The proposal to slope the parking level floor down to potentially accommodate stacked parking (while not increasing the overall height of the structure) could radically change the parking ration if the stacking system is installed.*
- Has the developer drafted a Construction Management Plan that describes community impact during the construction period?
No new comments.
 - Will the developer be responsible for Town road damage resulting from heavy trucking?
No new comments.
 - Is a roof deck included in the developer's proposal?
Developer has included a roof deck on the 5th level, and has stated that a high roof deck will not be included.
 - Has the developer engaged with neighbors on Centre Street, most importantly the Center Communities facilities that reportedly house 500 elders, many of whom traverse 40 Centre Street?
No new comments beyond recognition that increased set back and enhanced sight lines indicated in new plans will address some concerns about pedestrian safety.
- n. Techniques to mitigate visual impact**
- Take visual cues from existing buildings on the street, in particular, recognizing and strengthening the existing streetscape by providing a consistent set back and breaking down the scale of the front elevation with entry elements, step backs, etc.
See comments above regarding revised façade treatment.
 - Consider elimination of garage door by providing rear, at grade parking, or ramping down to underground parking with a side entry to the parking floor. Underground parking option can open possibility of ground floor units and facilitate decreasing the building footprint, perhaps enabling front elevation step backs.
Ground floor parking arrangement has been modified. See comments above.
- 6. Recommendations relative to design-related conditions to be incorporated in a potential approval of the Comprehensive Permit including but not limited to modifying specific aspects of the site and building design in order to improve the overall development and its relationship to its surroundings and to mitigate potential negative impacts.**
- *Developer has made substantial progress in developing facades and massing that will better fit into the existing, very pedestrian friendly context of Centre Street. While creating a tripartite reading by the use of contrasting materials and horizontal banding, the proportions of the elements (base, body, and top) should be modified to look less top-heavy. The need to study this is most evident in the front elevation, particularly in the section where the top two floors are not set back from the primary elevation. The lack of full-width setback contributes to the perception that the elevation issues/building height can only be resolved by removal of the entire sixth floor. Cues for how to resolve the street elevation may exist in the adjacent building to the east.*
 - *Consideration should be given to setting back all across the width of the top two floors on the Centre Street elevation, perhaps in lieu of the provision of the shared roof deck.*
 - *Articulation along the side elevation is enhanced with the indentation at the top two levels, but the gesture is not strong enough to read very well.*
 - *Masonry base should be extended around entire perimeter of the building.*
 - *Building elevations should have a more unified look. Consider elimination of lap siding, and replacing main body and "attic" levels with cementitious "rain screen" style panels.*
 - *Balconies at the top levels are "tacked on", and encroach on the side setbacks. These would be greatly improved by being recessing into the body of the building (which would also improve the articulation of the long side elevations, particularly if recessed balconies occurred on all residential levels).*
 - *Stacking system for parking should be included in the project (as opposed to developer's current position that stackers will be added if necessary after occupancy).*

- *Financial incentives for use of mass transit and shared car systems by residents, and/or subsidy for parking space rental should be considered for all affordable units.*
- *Submission of a detailed Construction Management Plan and approval by the Building Department should be required prior to issuance of a building permit for the project.*
- *Visual and noise impact of all rooftop and ground-mounted mechanical equipment must be reviewed and approved by the Building Department prior to issuance of a building permit for the project.*
- *Paving materials for driveway area visible from the sidewalk should be consistent with a “patio-like” appearance (as opposed to asphaltic concrete or Portland cement concrete paving).*
- *If building requires a ground mounted transformer, it should be shielded from view in a manner similar to masonry wall as indicated in project renderings.*
- *Glass balcony guardrails are out of character with the building language and should be reconsidered.*

I hope you will contact me to discuss this memo in detail, or to talk about issues that I have failed to cover. Thank you very much. *I look forward to presenting my findings and opinions at the ZBA hearing scheduled for September 12, 2016.*

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Clifford Boehmer', with a long, sweeping horizontal stroke at the end.

Clifford Boehmer, AIA