



Stantec Planning and Landscape Architecture, PC
226 Causeway Street, 6th Floor, Boston MA 02114-2171

January 5, 2015
File: 210810271

Attention: Ms. Alison Steinfeld
Planning Director
Town of Brookline
333 Washington Street
Brookline, MA 02445

**Reference: The Residences of South Brookline
Town Staff Drawing Review**

Dear Ms. Steinfeld,

Stantec is in receipt of two Memoranda from town staff, dated December 30 and 31, 2014. These memoranda include comments/concerns regarding the latest plan set for the Residences of South Brookline. This letter, with the accompanying revised plan set, serves as a clarification of the observations made by town staff.

The information below represents the staff's comments/concerns, retyped from the memoranda referenced above, followed by Stantec's responses.

Memorandum of December 30, 2014 – Part I of II

Consistency between Titles and Sheets

1. The newly added Do Not Disturb Zone sheets have the same number as the Existing Conditions sheets (EX104, EX105, EX106). Staff recommends using unique numbers for the two categories of drawings.

Response: *Sheet numbers have been adjusted.*

2. Floor plans and elevations for the infill buildings are not titled as such, although these descriptions are used on the drawings themselves. Staff prefers that the titles of the drawings include "floor plans" and "elevations" in the title boxes of the drawings, so that we can accurately identify sheets titles in the Decision.

Response: *Sheet titles have been adjusted*

Sheet EX100-Overall Site Plan

Design with community in mind



Reference: The Residences of South Brookline

1. Applicant has not resolved the discrepancy between footprint of Building 12 drawn on the Overall Site Plan and that drawn on the rendered site plan EX106, on Exhibit 1, and on the floor plans. Overall Site Plan must be revised.

Response: *Building footprints are identical. The overall site plan shows the building overhang with a dashed outline and no grey screen so that the site improvements below the overhang are visible. The rendered site plan (EX 106) shows the building overhang solid as to give an illustrative image of the proposed condition.*

2. **Lot E2 Parking Spaces:** Chart states 44 surface spaces; drawings shows 43 spaces
Response: *The chart has been revised.*

3. **Lot E3 Parking Spaces:** Chart states 42 spaces; drawings shows 48 spaces
Response: *The chart has been revised.*

Sheets EX101, EX102, EX 103 - Existing Conditions

General Comments:

1. Staff requested that the sheets be stamped. Applicant responded by providing sheets stamped by civil engineer Frank Holmes; however, sheets are based on a survey done by Reed Land Surveying in 2008. Applicant must provide the survey from Reed Land Surveying stamped by professional land surveyor to complement the Existing Conditions sheets and other sheets that reference the survey prepared by Reed in 2008.

Response: *Stamped survey plans by Reed have been included.*

Sheets EX104, EX105, EX 106 – Do Not Disturb Zone

General Comments:

1. Note that these sheets are dated December 23, 2014 – Add date to Index page (and Decision)

Response: *The attached drawing set has a revised date of January 5, 2015.*

2. Limit of Work line goes beyond property line and, in some locations, runs onto the properties of single-family abutters. Applicant should explain what is intended by their extending the Limit of Work line onto these properties. Limit of Work line should coincide with the property line, as no trespassing onto single-family properties will be permitted.



Reference: The Residences of South Brookline

Proposed Condition: No trespassing shall be allowed onto abutting single-family properties during construction of the Project.

Response: The Limit of Work line has been adjusted on the revised plans. The applicant has no objection to this proposed condition.

3. **Lot E1:** Limit of Work line should extend to encompass Fire Lane delineated outside of 40B lot because that area will be re-paved with grass concrete paving.

Response: The Limit of Work line has been adjusted on the revised plans.

4. **Lot E2:** Limit of Work line should extend to boundary of lease-lot line of this lot- current delineation does not include areas where new construction is shown on Overall Site Plan.

Response: The Limit of Work line has been adjusted on the revised plans.

Proposed Condition: The Town Arborist shall visit the Site to ensure that the Project complies with the Do Not Disturb Zone plans during construction and in perpetuity.

Response: The applicant has no objection to this proposed condition.

Sheets H101, H102, H103 – Height Calculation Plan

1. Include on the drawings that the height calculation plans refer to “List of Requested Waivers submitted December 11, 2014.”

Response: Note has been added to the revised plans.

2. In regard to consistency of lot names, note that it is Lot W1 on plans versus Lot W on Waivers list.

Response: We have edited the plans to say ‘W’.

Sheets L104, L105, L106 – Open Space Plan

L106 Open Space Plan Southeast

Chart for Lot E2: 188 Parking Spaces should read 142 or 143 (see discrepancy between label and drawing on Overall Site Plan EX100)

Response: The chart has been revised.

Sheets W101, W102 – Waiver Plans



Reference: The Residences of South Brookline

1. Waiver Numbers (A-S) are marked but corresponding waiver not provided. Include a reference on sheets indicating that the Waiver Numbers correspond to "List of Requested Waivers submitted December 11, 2014."

Response: Note has been added to the revised plans.

2. **W102:** Garage space should separate out community space and factor it into FAR-this calculation affects the amount of the waiver and not the substance of the waiver request.

Response: The Community amenities spaces, fitness area, waiting and mail rooms have been included in the Gross Floor Area of the table. The waiver request for FAR for lot E-2, M-0.5 district changes from 1.44 to 1.55

3. Waivers list should indicate where waivers for retaining walls are requested for the ZBA's reference. For example, on Sheet L403 Retaining wall #1 on Lot E3 will require a waiver (height). Applicant should indicate specific locations of other waivers requested for retaining walls. Not all retaining walls were illustrated in 3D model animation for ZBA to assess visual impact on abutters, so this specificity is necessary for ZBA's reference.

Response: We are not sure which walls you are indicating were not shown in the 3D models with the exception of the Identification sign walls addressed below. We believe all other walls were indicated in the model. We have indicated waiver request for retaining walls on Waiver Plan W102.

Sheets L301, L302, L303 – Layout Plans

Identification Sign Walls

1. Although Staff measures a length of 16 feet on Site Detail sheet, Applicant still needs to confirm length of all five walls proposed site-wide by proving label dimensions. For example, the Identification Sign wall at the corner Independence and Beverly appears to be 32 feet long.

Response: Label dimensions have been included on the revised plan set.

2. Identification Sign Walls at abutters' property lines at (a) Independence and Beverly and (b) Asheville Road at property lines at nearly 5 feet high and ranging from 16 to 32 feet long are intrusive visually. Although a 7 foot tall fence is proposed at the property line, these walls are very likely to add to the visual impact on abutters. The locations of the other Sign Walls adequately serve the function of identifying the development; the



January 5, 2015
Page 5 of 10

Reference: The Residences of South Brookline

presence of the walls at the single-family property line seems extraneous. In addition, these walls are not illustrated in the 3D model presented to the ZBA.

Proposed Condition: (a) Remove one Identification Sign Wall at (a) Independence and Beverly [retain Identification Sign Wall on Lot W1 at driveway leading to Independence] and (b) remove two Identification Sign Walls on the on-site portion of Asheville Road.

Response: *The sign wall at Independence and Beverly is an existing sign wall that will be rebuilt during construction. For wayfinding purposes, it is important to identify the entrance to the community.*



Fences:

3. Legends for 6' and 7' fences have been properly corrected; however, labels on drawings say "solid" not "opaque".

Response: *Drawings have been updated*

4. On Lot E1 (Sheet L302): fence at surface lot is labeled 7 feet fence though symbol for 6 foot fence is used (label should read 6 foot fence).

Response: *Label has been corrected.*

Design with community in mind



January 5, 2015
Page 6 of 10

Reference: The Residences of South Brookline

5. On Lot E2 (Sheets L302 and L303): Wrong symbol is used for fence at surface lot- should use symbol for 6 foot fence (label is correct).

Response: Symbol has been corrected.

Sheets L401, L402, L403-Grading Plan

Retaining Walls and Tree Wells

The majority of the 14 retaining walls and tree walls in the Plan were newly introduced on the December 8, 2014, plans and were not illustrated in any renderings or 3 D models presented to the ZBA. In addition, Staff notes of the 11 site sections illustrated cross-sections of any retaining walls/tree wells. The Director of Transportation and Engineering is reviewing these walls to determine their impact on stormwater management, as well as assessing other design issues. Last, as cited earlier, the Building Commissioner also requests that the waivers request include the specific location where waivers are requested for walls that exceed maximum height. The following list is not complete, pending the review of the Director of transportation and Engineering.

Response: We have indicated waiver request for retaining walls on Waiver Plan W102.

1. Note: 42" high guards will be required per 780 CMR Section 1013 Guards where the walking surface is greater than 30" above grade at any point within 36" horizontally.

Response: Acknowledged

2. Applicant omitted height of retaining wall near Building 1 on Lot W1. Please provide height on drawing.

Response: Height is included on drawing.

3. Applicant omitted height of tree well on Lot E3. Please provide height on drawing.

Response: Height is included on drawing.

4. Part II under separate cover will include the review of the Director of Transportation and Engineering.

Response: See below

Sheets L601, L602, L603 – Landscape and Buffer Plan



Reference: The Residences of South Brookline

1. Joseph Geller, Stantec, confirmed at 12/22/2014 hearing that the plant schedule indicates plant heights and calipers when first planted. Mr. Geller also confirmed that site sections show height of trees five years out and not when first planted. No additional requests.
2. **Grass Concrete Paving:** Staff requested but did not receive maintenance specifications for grass concrete paving.

Proposed Condition: The Applicant shall provide in the Operations and Maintenance Plan in the Stormwater Management Report the manufacturer's specifications for installation and maintenance for grass concrete paving.

Response: The applicant has no objection to this proposed condition

Sheets L701, L702, L703 – Lighting

1. Applicant should respond to previous query: is there any lighting mounted to the exterior of buildings? If so, please indicate where and provide specifications for this type of lighting.
Response: Lighting is mounted at egress doors as to comply with building codes. No light spillage will be resulting from this. The applicant has no objection to this as a condition.

2. Clarify Chart: Are 48 light poles proposed site-wide or per lot? Staff counts 21 light poles site-wide on the lighting plans and not 48 as indicated in the charts. Update quantity in charts or update drawing to show locations of all 48 light poles.

Note: There are no light poles indicated around mid-rise in M-0.5 portion of Lot E2-is this intended? Please confirm.

Response: The chart has been updated. There are no additional lightpoles proposed around the mid-rise building.

3. Staff newly identified an additional violation not cited in December 18, 2014, report: At Building 4, the light pole is not located a minimum of 75 feet from street. Re-locate light pole to eliminate violation.

Response: Light pole has been moved

4. Applicant has not re-designed light poles to meet regulation height of 15 feet tall, as noted in December 18 report.

Proposed condition: The Applicant shall install lighting poles that do not exceed the maximum height of 15 feet tall.



January 5, 2015
Page 8 of 10

Reference: The Residences of South Brookline

Response: *The applicant would like to use light poles that are taller than 15' for decorative purposes. However, the mounting height of the light fixtures will not exceed 15' if so conditioned'.*

Rubbish and Recycling Plan and Schedule

Applicant has not submitted a schedule for trash pick-up. Therefore, Condition 41 (b) was drafted to state:

"[Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit the Applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Building Commissioner that] the Chief of Environmental Health has determined that all rubbish generated from the Project will be handled and disposed of adequately and Applicant has provided the number of trash compactors and location and frequency of trash pick-up and a recycling plan demonstrating compliance with Town bylaws."

Because the Applicant has proposed eliminating Conditions 41 (b) in its comments to the ZBA submitted December 22, 2014, after Staff submitted the results of its review, we are requesting that the Applicant submit a rubbish and recycling plan and pick-up schedule at this time.

Note: This request does not imply that Staff recommends accepting the Applicants proposed deletion of this Condition in the Decision.

Response: *The applicant will use best industry practices in the installation of rubbish and recycling storage and removal systems that meet the needs of the proposed development. Those systems shall include dumpsters and if necessary compactors in secure and screened areas as indicated on the plans. Rubbish and recycling will be picked up on a schedule that insures the rubbish and recycling can be contained in the storage systems. The pickup schedule will be adjusted as needed once the development is occupied. The entire system and maintenance of the facility will be in compliance with all health codes and requirements. A rodent control program will be instituted upon the initial placement of the removal systems and maintained on a regular basis. In addition CHR staff will police the areas on a regular basis to remove any errant trash from collecting on site.*

Memorandum of December 31, 2014 – Part II of II

Sheets L401-L402

- **Condition:** Proposed Compliant ADA wheelchair ramps shall be provided at both driveway entrances on Independence Drive.

Response: *Acknowledged*



January 5, 2015
Page 9 of 10

Reference:The Residences of South Brookline

Sheet L401

1. The grading between tree wells 3 and 4 appears to have a slope of almost 2 to 1 and directs runoff towards the abutters. Is this re-grading going to cause a flooding issue in this area? Will the runoff be able to get to AD1?

Response: *Based on existing conditions topography, it appears that runoff from the slope between tree wells 3 and 4 will drain to AD1. We have added a crushed stone trench with a 6" perforated pipe at the property line to ensure that water will not flow beyond the property line from the project site. The 6" drain will connect to the AD-1*

2. Same concern for area behind Building 2.

Response: *See response above.*

3. Some tree wells and retaining might need guards. See regulation from Building Code cited in Staff Report dated December 30, 2014, Part I.

Response: *Acknowledged. We don't believe that any of the walkways are close enough to walls that guards are required.*

Page L402 – What does the saw tooth line north of Building 12 designate?

Response: *Rock face.*

Sheet L403 – The 20-foot retaining wall (Wall #2 on Lot E2 at the South side of Building 12) should be tiered to break up the massive look of the wall and allow for another layer of landscaping.

Response: *We will take this comment into consideration.*

Sheet L504 – In the Bioretention Basin, how are the inlet pipes terminated? (i.e. flared end, head wall)

Response: *Pipes are terminated with Flared End Sections.*

Sheet L505 – In installing DMH 8, the plans show that no couplings will be used. As an alternative use either an insert tee or core and hydraulic cement. Also, why is the new 10" line perforated?

Response: *If acceptable to the Town, and dependent on the condition of the existing pipe, we will consider an insert tee or a core and hydraulic cement connection. The pipe should not be perforated, and that note has been removed from the drawing.*

Sheet L507 – Why are there so many bends in the water man? (excluding the infiltration area)

Response: *Bends are provided on the east side of Building 2 in order to maintain separation between the water and sewer line, and on the west side of Building 2 to offset line around the infiltration area. Additional bends between Building 1 and the infiltration area can possibly be eliminated.*



January 5, 2015
Page 10 of 10

Reference: The Residences of South Brookline

Sheet L509 – Why is the “Core into Ex. DMH Inv. = 148.84” on this page?

Response: *Near the northwest corner of Building 11, we are tying into an existing sewer manhole with a new 8” sewer.*

Sheet L804 – In Detail 1 specify the manufacture of the frame and cover.

Response: *Manufacturer has been added to the drawing.*

Sheet L808 – In Detail 2 “Water Elev. Meas. 4-29-~~47~~”??

Response: *typo has been corrected to read 4-29-14*

Regards,

STANTEC PLANNING AND LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE P.C.

Theo Kindermans
Principal
theo.kindermans@stantec.com

Attachment: As noted

tk v:\2108\active\210810271\docs\40b response letters\town staff review response 010515.docx