



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

February 13, 2017

Polly Selkoe, Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning  
BROOKLINE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
333 Washington Street  
Brookline, MA 02445

RE: 384 Harvard Street  
Architectural Peer Review Report

Dear Polly:

I'm writing to provide you with a Peer Review Report in accordance with the proposal I submitted dated December 23, 2016. This report is formatted substantially in alignment with the summary of services included in your Scope of Work document that was included in our agreement, but I hope you will contact me if there is any additional information that you require in your consideration of 384 Harvard Street.

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

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

- Site Eligibility Submission from Amy Schectman to Rebecca Frawley Wachtel dated June 28, 2016.
- Letter from Neil Wishinsky and Roger Blood (BOS) dated June 29, 2016.
- Letter from Francis Caro to Board of Selectmen dated August 10, 2016.
- Memo from Roger Blood (Housing Advisory Board) to BOS dated August 25, 2016.
- Letter from Neil Wishinsky (BOS) to Catherine Racer dated September 8, 2016.
- Letter from Catherine Racer to Amy Schectman dated September 9, 2016 (Site Eligibility Letter).
- Comprehensive Permit Application for 370-384 Harvard Street (undated, includes preliminary architectural and engineering plans date 10/28/16).
- JCHE-384 Harvard Street Site Plan dated October 28, 2016.
- 384 Harvard Street Context Plans (2 sheets) dated 10/28/16.
- JCHE Community Meetings & Presentations List for 370-384 Harvard Street (undated).
- Transportation Demand Management Plan dated December 5, 2016.
- JCHE Housing-Site Section along Williams Street dated December 6, 2016.
- JCHE Housing-Site Section along Harvard Street dated December 6, 2016.
- Letter from Deputy Chief Kyle McEachern dated December 9, 2016.
- JCHE Housing: Shadow Studies dated December 2016 (3 sheets).
- Email from Linda Pehlke to Polly Selkoe dated December 11, 2016.
- Letter from Pam Goodman to ZBA dated December 12, 2016.
- Letter to Polly Selkoe from Jennifer Gallop dated December 12, 2016.
- Letter from Nathan Peck to Town of Brookline dated December 13, 2016.
- Letter from David Williams dated December 13, 2016.
- Letter from Ken and Cathy Kaplan to ZBA dated December 14, 2017.
- Letter to Joshua Safer (Transportation Board) and Stantec additional information dated January 4, 2017.
- Presentation to the Planning Board dated January 5, 2017.
- Letter from Beth Kates to Planning Board dated January 5, 2017 (includes PowerPoint, not reviewed).
- Letter from Linda Hamlin (Planning Board) to ZBA dated January 6, 2017.

- Letter from Zoe Weinrobe (JCHE) to Patrick Maloney (Health Department) dated January 9, 2017.
- Letter from Carmine Bruno (HSL) to Polly Selkoe dated January 9, 2017.
- Email from Pat Maloney (Public Health) to Polly Selkoe dated 1/13/17.
- Letter to ZBA from Meghan Hanrahan Richard (Preservation Commission) dated January 17, 2016 (should be 2017).
- KI Campus Plan dated February 8, 2017
- Updated renderings dated 02-08-2107 (Garden Views, View towards Coolidge Corner, View towards JFK Crossing).
- Updated Plans and Elevations (misdated 10/28/16).
- Peer Review of Parking dated February 8, 2017.

#### (REFERENCE MATERIALS)

- Local 40B Review and Decision Guidelines published by MHP and Edith Netter, November 2005
- 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**

Members of the development team conducted a site walkthrough on January 17, 2017. Attendees included Cliff Boehmer (Architectural Peer Reviewer), Polly Selkoe (Town of Brookline), Zoe Weinrobe (JCHE), Steve Allen (PCA), Shan Li (PCA), Jennifer Gilbert (JCHE Attorney).

During the walkthrough, the attending parties discussed design-related aspects of the site and the proposed project as depicted in the then-current documents, most importantly:

- There were inadequate depictions of the development from the east (which is the “gateway” into JFK crossing). The “other half” of the gateway is the existing 3-story, rounded corner, brick apartment block across the street.
- The prominence of the proposed structure and its impact on Harvard Street require careful consideration of the quality of the cladding materials (which can be very challenging given the available sources available for funding the project).
- Consideration should be given to tying together the reading of the one-story commercial space into the temple façade, putting the apartment block more into the background.
- Generally, the design of the various pieces lacks coherence. There needs to be a better integration of the different program parts.
- The proposed structure is replacing another large-scale building on the street that currently together with the temple, create a significant “institutional block”. One of those two structures is clearly architecturally more important, and as such, the existing secondary addition, particularly because of the monumental stair, is “in competition” for prominence. The opportunity that the new assemblage has is to create a more-focused, inviting institutional presence.
- It isn't clear from the documents how the setback of the existing structure that will be demolished relates to the proposed setback of the apartment block.
- While the stepping-in-plan of the main body of the building on Harvard Street respects the importance of the historic temple, the overall perceived scale of the new building does not adequately create the “balance” necessary to create the desired hierarchy. The apartment block should be in the background, creating a backdrop for the temple and one-story commercial/residential piece.
- While the one-story commercial element that meets the sidewalk helps with breaking down the scale of the main structure, the language is not tied in with either the temple or the apartment block. It reads like a transit station.
- The footprint of the commercial piece “bottles up” the sidewalk when coming from Coolidge Corner; there is no perceived connection between the Harvard Street sidewalk and the new proposed JCHE entry and courtyard between the new structure and the temple.
- The apartment block is too commercial in appearance (large windows, smooth skin), and fenestration emphasizes verticality.

- The large step back between the one-story piece and the first plane of the apartment block “dis-integrates” the overall reading of the building (it looks like one building is standing independently behind the other).
- Williams Street sidewalk appears too narrow, given goal of strong connection with Centre Street elder developments towards the south. This is particularly problematic because of the elderly population who will be primary users of the path.
- As what would be the tallest building on Harvard Street, and as another proposed mixed-use structure (which is virtually non-existent on Harvard Street), the proponent should consider how that new scale and typology could enhance Harvard Street.
- The submitted documents do not include plans/renderings for the new addition to the west. This is important to see as part of the evaluation of the JCHE proposed development.

As the design of the development was continuing to evolve as part of the 40B process, all parties discussed the possibility of ongoing discussion(s) between the peer reviewer and the project architect. Accordingly, arrangements were made, with the goal of the proponent addressing the issues that were discussed on site, and subsequently submitting more advanced drawings prior to the peer reviewer’s presentation to the ZBA.

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

(Much of this report section was prepared as part of the analysis of the proposed development at 420 Harvard Street)

Harvard Street/Avenue is an approximately 2-mile stretch of road that runs between Cambridge Street in Boston, south/southeast to Washington Street in Brookline. It passes through several Brookline concentrated commercial areas, including Brookline Village, Coolidge Corner (Brookline’s largest commercial area), JFK Crossing, and then into Boston where Commonwealth Avenue intersects, creating another concentrated commercial area. Generally, on Harvard Street in Brookline, between the more concentrated commercial zones, there are a variety of building types and uses, with some variation in scale and setback. Most prevalent are 1.0 story commercial uses, with little or no setback. There are a variety of 3-story, masonry apartment buildings with no setback, or with modest setbacks adequate for landscaping. Several large “historic” woodframe, former homes exist, generally with significant, landscaped setback. The street wall is periodically broken by parking lots, or atypical, most likely existing non-conforming uses (e.g., gas stations, supermarket with open field of parking along the street, etc.). Taller, civic or religious structures are set back from the street to compensate for their increased building height.

There are also some two-story commercial uses, particularly within the Coolidge Corner area (retail on first level, other commercial use on the second floor). There appears to be very little mixed residential/commercial development (i.e., most commercial buildings are 100% commercial, and most multi-family buildings are 100% residential). There is only one (two, counting the attic level of the S.S. Pierce Building, assuming it is residential), 4-story residential building with no setback from Harvard Street (south of Coolidge Corner at Vernon Street). One other 4-story residential building is just north of Coolidge Corner, but it is set back something like 12 to 15 feet from the sidewalk.

The tallest structure on the entire length of Harvard Street (with the possible exception of the bell-tower at St. Mary’s) appears to be the Brookline Professional Building, a five story (parking at first level) commercial structure set back about 10 feet from the sidewalk. The entire length of Harvard Street is very pedestrian friendly, with fully-adequate-to-broad sidewalks, articulated by some street trees, activated by many commercial storefronts, and some outdoor dining opportunities. The length of Harvard Street is served by buses, and it crosses two Green Line train tracks (B and C), and dead ends in another (D).

So while there is a wide range of building types and scale along Harvard Street, there is a relatively consistent attitude towards maintaining a pleasant streetscape. Larger civic/religious structures are set back with landscaping and/or extended entry zones (e.g., grand staircases, in the case of KI), and smaller scale

residential and commercial uses hold the sidewalk streetwall line, or are set back enough for modest landscaping.

The 2 ½ - block area along Harvard to the west of the proposed JCHE development, which includes half of the block between Williams and Fuller (JFK Crossing) is a virtually unbroken stretch of single-story commercial uses, all with a very strong horizontal expression at the cornice/parapet level, with a consistent storefront head height.

To the east, before reaching Coolidge Corner, the streetscape is less consistent. The north side, at the corner of Stedman and Harvard (currently under renovation) is a significant educational use (Edward Devotion School), with a large setback from Harvard. This segues into a long, two-story commercial structure, followed by a block of one-story commercial, then again two-story that makes up one corner of Coolidge Corner. This stretch of buildings has no setback from the sidewalk.

The south side of Harvard towards Coolidge Corner is more of a patchwork. The immediate neighbor across Williams is a modest 2.5 story wood frame home converted to a commercial use, set back about 25 feet from the sidewalk. Then a very plain, single story brick block, commercial structure, set back about 10 feet with landscaping between the sidewalk and the building. Last on block at corner of Shailer Street is another, one story, brick commercial structure with a very heavy mansard roof. This building is set back about 30 feet from Harvard, with parking in the front setback. It is set back slightly less on the Shailer Street side, but also featuring parking spaces between the building and the sidewalk.

After passing these newer structures, the more typical approach returns with a 3.5 story apartment building with a minimal planting strip in front. Then a more modern, four-story, very simple apartment structure, set back about 35 feet from Harvard, with a paved circular vehicular drop off to the east accessed from Centre Street. The final run of buildings into Coolidge Corner, all with zero setback to the sidewalk, are one and two story commercial uses.

Generally, side streets that intersect Harvard are lined with one and two-family, 2.5 story woodframe homes, hip or gable roofs, with setbacks adequate for landscaping and creation of a semi-private outdoor entry zone. This is the case with the first two homes opposite the proposed project on Williams Street. Following those structures are two, three story residential wood frame buildings. On the same side of the street, on the other side of Centre Street, the scale picks up with a long, four-story masonry apartment building across Williams from HSL's 12-story, concrete-clad elderly apartment block.

On the west side of Williams street, the proposed project's neighbor is a 3-story multi-family, condominium development. It appears to be set back between 15 and 20 feet from the sidewalk, with tall wooden fencing that privatizes the yards along Williams Street. This development reaches all the way to Centre Street, where opposite it on the same side of the street is 100 Centre Street (the HSL tower mentioned above).

Other nearby, typical side street development includes numerous 3-story, typically masonry, flat-roof multi-family structures, with common entry vestibules that create the transition from street to private corridors and stairs. There is a 4-story masonry multifamily building on Fuller across from the intersection of Centre. This building is set back between 15 and 20 feet, and it includes a one story entry piece that brings the scale down to pedestrian level. This pattern of smaller woodframe homes mixed in with three story masonry multi-family buildings on side streets is very similar after passing into Boston onto Harvard Avenue.

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

Subsequent to the January 17 site walkthrough, the peer reviewer was given progress updates at the project architects offices. These meetings occurred on January 26<sup>th</sup> and February 1. Discussions were focused on development of the 3-D model and examination of samples of proposed façade materials. In the opinion of the peer reviewer, the design revisions depicted in the model were moving in a positive direction.

- 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:**  
**(this report will be presented to a ZBA meeting on Monday, February 13, 2017)**

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

(Design commentary is primarily in relation to the latest documents submitted to the Town on February 8, 2017).

The proposal is to build a new six-story, mixed-use building that covers most of the site with either building footprint, pedestrian walking areas and courtyard space, surface parking spaces with building overhead, private courtyard space shared with the temple structure, and some planted buffer areas (along Williams Street). The open-to-the-air courtyard embedded on the west side of the building provides additional lineal footage of building envelope to allow windows into a stack of 5 units, and to make better use of the broad dimension of the site.

The development reportedly includes a total of 62 units (53@1-bedroom; 9@2-bedroom), with 14 covered, at-grade parking spaces beneath the second floor. Access to a loading dock that serves KI is provided at the end of the parking lane within the parking area. No bicycle parking is indicated on the ground level plan. Primary access for the residents is off of Harvard Street, with secondary access off of Williams Street along the covered parking area. Access to the space designated as "Retail" is shown off of Williams, at the corner of Harvard. Secondary access for the commercial area is through a shared lobby with the residential entry. The remainder of the first floor level footprint is designated as "Admin" on the submitted plans. An enclosed passageway/connector joins the at-grade first floor of the new structure to the higher first floor of the temple. This replaces the drive-under passageway that currently exists.

Harvard Street is on the north side of the building. The massing includes a one-story commercial and residential entry piece that reaches most of the way to the public sidewalk, which serves to create a courtyard space to the west, defined by the new construction of the commercial space and connector, as well as the existing monumental stair entry to the temple. The bulk of the residential piece (floors 2 through 5) steps back so that the floor plate is wider at the Williams Street end, and pulls back away from the street as the approach is made to the temple facade. Step backs are increased at the sixth floor through the introduction of an outdoor roof deck area. As depicted on the 10/28/16 drawings, at Williams Street, the step back appears to be 20 feet from first floor face to second floor face, and then another 22'-5" at the sixth floor. At the western end of the building, these step backs increase to close to 30 feet at the second floor, and something like 50 feet at the sixth floor. A parapet continues across the entire length of the building at the top of the fifth floor, presumably serving as a guard wall for the habitable roof deck. The actual dimensions of the step backs are not indicated in the revised drawings, but the basic idea remains the same as depicted in the earlier documents.

A little less than half of the length of the building along Williams Street is open at the ground level to accommodate open-air surface parking (although tall dense shrubbery is indicated along the open elevation except at the curb cut and pedestrian access point that cuts through to the open-air courtyard). The open parking plan extends around on the south elevation that fronts on the parking courtyard of the adjacent condominium development. The condo development appears to be made up of adjacent townhouse units with primary entry off of the parking court. The south elevation of JCHE that faces the courtyard is zero setback, with the development's 14 parking spaces screened from the condos with a masonry wall with some type of large louvers indicated that maintain the open-air requirements of the garage spaces.

The west elevation of the project, in plan, is largely screened from view by the temple structure, but as the architect's rendering depicts, there are important perspectives from Harvard Street that must be carefully considered. This point is discussed in more detail in another section of this report.

Solar impact has been studied, and shadow studies have been included in the submitted materials. Given the orientation of the site, most impact is on Harvard Street, with some afternoon impact during some parts of

the year on the end of Williams Street. Some morning shadows also occur on the streetscape in front of the temple and temple addition. Given the scale of the project, the shadow impact is not significant.

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

The latest submission of drawings includes a "KI Campus Plan" that indicates how the JCHE development is proposed to relate to the project that is already underway at the temple addition, but also with existing pedestrian public sidewalks that connect Coolidge Corner with JFK Crossing, and from Harvard Street along Williams to the existing elderly developments on Centre Street. The concept presented to this peer reviewer was the desire to create a very lively series of outdoor spaces activated by the entry to the JCHE facility, the retail space, the first floor residential common spaces, the temple entry, and the temple addition and associated programmed outdoor spaces to the west. The entire length of the Harvard Street frontage is meant to provide public engagement with all of the functions offered within the campus structures. As such, while the JCHE proposal, standing on its own, "looks" like a mixed-use, residential/commercial proposal, it is actually designed to play a much broader role that helps make the JCHI/KI campus a more connected, coherent facility.

The embedded courtyard between the temple and JCHE is presumably meant for use by building residents. Access is possible from the residential common area, as well as from the Williams Street walkway that passes through the parking enclosure. It will be a shady space most of the year, most hours of the day. There is also an exterior roof deck indicated on the Harvard Street elevation, sixth floor level of the building. As it is mostly north facing, it will primarily be in shade. If it is possible to build the deck, the view will likely include downtown Boston and Cambridge (feasibility of the deck should be confirmed in a preliminary building code analysis).

The sidewalk along Williams Street is an important pedestrian connection between Harvard Street and the existing HSL elderly developments on Centre Street. The importance of this link is increased with the development of the 62 units + commercial program at the JCHE site. As was noted at the site walkthrough and at subsequent meetings with the design team, it is critical to create a generous passageway along that edge of the building, as well as ensuring the safety of pedestrians as they cross the access to the parking area. Renderings reviewed to date do not appear to depict an adequate walkway width, particularly taking into account the importance of maintaining street trees and other plantings, particularly if the landscaping is meant to screen parking spaces from pedestrians (as well as mitigating the impact of the height of the building).

**c. Use and treatment of natural resources.**

This reviewer's understanding is that an existing street tree must be replaced at the location of the curb cut allowing access into the parking area. Two other street trees closer to Harvard Street must be preserved.

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

Generally, the developer's stated intent of the building design is to accommodate a significant, mixed-use program, while being respectful of the architecture and historic significance of the adjacent temple, as well as the character of Harvard Street. In this reviewer's opinion, these goals are achievable if the points that were discussed at the initial site visit and subsequent meetings (noted above) are sufficiently addressed (in combination with other issues that will be raised by other peer reviewers and the ZBA). The current massing and overall "language" of the project as shown in the February revised drawings has advanced from earlier submissions in the following ways:

- There is additional stepping back at the sixth floor level along the Williams Street elevation.
- The commercial first floor has been pulled back further from the street to open up the walkway from Coolidge Corner and to help tie the lower floor into the massing of the upper floors.
- Ground floor entry area and retail space have been integrated into a single massing, tied together with a continuous walkway overhang.
- The introduction of the corner window "bays" in the sawtooth edge break up the strong vertical expression depicted in previous versions, and also help to create a dimensional link to the existing brick apartments directly across the street (helping to create the "gateway to JFK Crossing").

- Greater color variation and thoughtful deployment of a variety of materials facilitate smaller scale readings of the massing.
- By pushing towards a more cohesive reading of the commercial level, the temple façade, and the set-back residential piece, an important, updated institutional presence can be re-created, at a scale similar to what was there before, and to the modernized school diagonally across Harvard Street.
- Smaller windows in the residential block create a less office-building look, and a more appropriate size given the residency of the building.
- Cladding materials indicated in the elevation along Harvard Street include fiber cement siding at the set-back “attic” level, cementitious rain-screen panels and metal panels in the main body, “wood” and textured cementitious panels at ground level, along with fiberglass windows and aluminum curtainwall systems.

In this reviewer’s opinion, the project would benefit from further study of the following:

- The project’s perception from the street would benefit from a reduction in overall building massing and height. Much like the decrease in the size of the first floor element helped to make a more cohesive building, a modest decrease in actual-and perceived height-will help to pull the important elements of the composition into balance (those elements being the commercial/entry band, the temple front, and the housing block). While it is understood that the truck loading dock must be accessed through the parking area, diminishing the first to second floor to floor height from 16’-0”, in combination with decreasing the typical floor to floor height from 10’-8”, could make a significant difference. It is possible that by sloping the parking level floor towards the loading dock could help facilitate lowering the height (while potentially retaining clear ceiling height in most of the space).
- If the roof deck is deemed infeasible, either for financial or building code reasons, the fifth floor parapet level could be lowered along Harvard Street.
- The equipment screen appears to be between 13 and 14 feet tall above the sixth floor roof deck. This is visible from Harvard Street, and should be no taller than necessary.
- No materials designations are shown on the equipment screen.
- The perspective rendering from the west would be improved by carrying the same façade materials further towards the south, creating a simpler, less distracting (“quieter”) backdrop for the temple tower. In addition, setting back the sixth floor on the west elevation would decrease the massing in a highly visible place (while taking some space out of an 872 SF unit).
- Generally, unit gross square footages indicated on plans exceed DHCD standards, which are 600 SF for 1-bedroom, and 800 feet for 2-bedroom units. Decreasing the depth of the units, particularly east to west overall, could provide more open space on the Williams Street side of the building.
- There are no material call outs on the connector piece between the temple and the new structure (the letter from the Preservation Commission requests that “the storefront sections should appear more visually unified with the original synagogue structure”).

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

As noted above, the deployment of façade materials is thoughtful, and generally recognizes the relative public impact of each elevation. Material selection along Williams Street is similar to Harvard Street, with the massing broken up both by articulation along the length of the façade, combined with variation in materials and colors. The “wood” cladding continues all the way down Williams Street at the first level until the resident access into the parking area. One could argue that this elevation and the pedestrian experience would benefit from more building enclosure in the parking area, including a mechanized entry door that would block the view through to parked cars and the loading dock.

As on the Harvard Street elevation, the attic cladding on the Williams elevation is the least precious. That section of the elevation is stepped back from the 5<sup>th</sup> floor which helps with the massing, but as the attic level is highly visible from the Coolidge Corner approach to the project, careful detailing will be required. Alternatively, continuation of the higher quality cladding may be more appropriate, at least back to the end of the first bay area. This may be a consideration from attic areas visible from Harvard Street as well.

The south elevation facing the condominium development is the simplest of all elevations, consisting of fiber cement panels, as well as smooth and ribbed rain-screen panels, with ground face CMU at the garage level. The impact of this elevation is primarily on the condominium development. The submitted materials indicate that there have been two meetings with the condominium association, at which point presumably the treatment of this elevation was discussed.

**f. Pedestrian and vehicular circulation**

Pedestrian circulation around the development has been discussed in sections above, and has improved with further development of the site plan. As noted, this reviewer still has some doubts about the adequacy of walkways on the Williams Street side of the building, particularly given the importance of maintaining significant street trees.

The newer documents include seating for pedestrians integrated into the thick wall along Harvard Street.

Vehicular circulation within the site is limited to the curb cut on Williams Street that accesses 14 parking spaces and the KI parking lot (as well as a trash room). Care must be taken to ensure safe passage of pedestrians in this zone. This aspect of the project is under study by other peer reviewers.

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

The integration of the development into the Harvard Street streetscape, as well as the KI campus, has been discussed above, as has the importance of maintaining two street trees and the provision of at least one replacement street tree along Williams Street.

**h. Exterior materials**

Discussed above.

**i. Energy efficiency**

No information available for review. Brookline has adopted the energy Stretch Code, which will ensure a relatively high level of sustainability, at least from an operating perspective.

While not necessarily an energy efficiency upgrade, the project will reportedly incorporate a "green roof" at the first floor level.

**j. Exterior lighting**

Earlier submission includes a lighting plan that indicates a variety of wall, pole, and bollard mounted fixtures. New lighting plan will be required as the documents approach completion.

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

Site plan discussed above. Planting plan was provided in earlier submission.

**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 information that expresses the developer's desire to design and construct to a third-party-verifiable level is included in the application materials. Given that Brookline is a Stretch Code community, meeting various certification requirements is achievable (although actual certification can often be challenging given budgetary constraints). This project will likely be permitted under a new edition of the building code, which may include revisions to the Stretch Code requirements.

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

- Floor plans are limited to "fit plans" that box out the gross square footage of the units within the proposed overall footprint of the building. It is not possible to review conformance with some code requirements (for example, accessibility). 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.

- Given population of building, this building is a good opportunity to incorporate Universal Design elements.
  - Details as far as how will trash be handled are important, particularly given mixed use aspect of project. A plan has been submitted and reviewed by the Health Department.
  - Given the scale of the proposed development and the constrained site area available for layout, a Construction Management Plan should be submitted for review.
  - Stormwater infiltration appears to be located beneath the garage slab. System will need review/approval of the town. Green roof storage capacity could possibly be integrated into stormwater management.
  - Entry level plans do not designate specific use areas for residents, public vs. private access, etc. Understanding intentions for first level programming will assist in review of the project. Submitted materials include a note that states “Community will have access to programs...”.Nor have specifics related to potential tenants for the retail space.
  - Planning Board memo suggests that access to the green roof area from the second floor would benefit the residents. While that would be the case, this reviewer believes that doing so would negatively impact the appearance of the building. It is important that no rooftop equipment be located on the green roof, as it would be highly visible from the street.
  - The January 9 Trash and Recycling Plan notes that trash pickups may happen “through the garage.” Does this mean a truck waiting on Williams Street, or maintaining a clear ceiling height adequate for a trash truck to enter?
  - A preliminary building code analysis should be provided by the proponent (also a request of the Board of Selectmen).
  - Fire Department letter dated December 9, 2016 expresses “no objections or concerns at this time.”
- n. Techniques to mitigate visual impact**
- As discussed, the project would be a significant presence on Harvard Street. Suggestions for mitigating the scale of the building to provide a better “fit” and balance with the existing temple are described above.

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.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'C. Boehmer', with a long, sweeping underline.

Clifford Boehmer, AIA