

To: Milton Planning Board; Steve Connolly (Applicant); William Clark (Planning Director)

From: Emily Keys Innes; Chairman, Milton Planning Board

Date: April 26, 2012

Re: 131 Eliot Street Application – outstanding items from discussion on March 1, 2012

---

The intent in writing this memorandum is to identify the outstanding questions that have arisen during the ongoing public hearing for the 131 Eliot Street Application for a Special Permit under *Section III.J. Central Avenue Planned Unit Development* and Site Plan Review and to identify any documents that are missing or need to be revised as a result of changes to the project made during this period.

This memorandum is provided to the Planning Board (“Board”), William Clark (Planning Director) and Steve Connolly, who is representing Carrick Realty Trust (“Applicant”), for discussion at the meeting of April 26, 2012. The discussion on April 26 should ensure that at the end of that meeting, the Applicant has a complete and final list of required items.

Section 1 identifies outstanding zoning questions that need to be resolved. Section 2 lists the documents received as part of the Application in September 2010 and identifies any missing documents or documents that may need to be revised based on the changes made during the ongoing public hearing process. It may be that some of the documents identified in Section 2 cannot be completed until the questions in Section 1 are resolved.

The information provided in this memorandum is based on the Planning Board’s discussion of the *131 Eliot Street: Matrix of Zoning Requirements* (“Matrix”) with the Applicant and his team at its meeting on March 1, 2012. This Matrix was provided to both the Applicant and the Board prior to the meeting and was used as the basis of discussion to identify outstanding items with respect to the joint application for site plan review and a special permit under *Section III.J. Central Avenue Planned Unit Development*.

This Matrix contains a summarized version of the zoning requirements, a summary of the memo by Alexander Whiteside, then Chairman of the Planning Board dated May 2011, and a summary of the Applicant’s response to that memo. The Applicant and his team have updated their response to reflect changes made during the public hearing process – the most recent version, which was used for the Matrix, was dated January 27, 2012.

#### 1. Outstanding Questions

During the public hearing on March 1, the Board identified the following outstanding questions with regard to *Section III.J. Central Avenue Planned Unit Development* and the related zoning provisions. The Board and Mr. Connolly were unable to complete the discussion due to the lateness of the hour. The following questions remain unresolved:

Zoning Reference	Outstanding Question
4.a.	Provision of public amenities such as an atrium or public meeting space
4.b.	All drawings to date based on Floor Area Ratio bonus provision – Applicant has not met 3-part test that would allow the Board to consider such a request
4.c.	Possible need for relief regarding parking requirements as the Applicant is unable to provide the required parking within the required setbacks on the residential lot (under Section VII F, G, and H). The Board and the Applicant did not discuss Section VII. F, G and H at the March 1, 2012 meeting due to time constraints. Please see number 7 below for further details on parking.
4.d.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether the Application was in compliance with the height and story requirements. The Building Commissioner has indicated that the Application is not in compliance.</li> <li>• The height and placement of mechanical equipment on the roof</li> </ul>
4.e.	The adequacy of set-backs of Third and Fourth stories on Central Avenue
5.	Compliance with Design Standards cannot be fully discussed until the Board receives the updated plans, sections and elevations detailed in Section 1 of this memorandum. Mr. Whiteside’s May 2011 memo listed some concerns which were summarized in the Matrix, and it should be possible to determine compliance with most of the provisions by using the current set of documents. Final compliance can be determined once the final documents are received.
6.	Whether DHCD will permit all three affordable units as one-bedroom units or require that one unit have two bedrooms
7.	Location of business parking and number of spaces required – the Application is currently deficient, but the Board has the ability to grant relief if certain conditions are met. The Applicant must submit the types of proposed businesses and a Shared Parking Schedule. This item is also governed by Section VII.C.
10.	The Applicant submitted a Traffic Study dated December 2011 and a revised Traffic Study in February 2011. Public discussion on March 1 identified some questions regarding calculation methodology that remains to be clarified.
Section VIII.D.2.2	Site Plan – discussed under Section 2 below. However, note that the list in the Matrix should also have included lighting fixtures and patterns and signs on the lot under this section.
Other Boards	The Conservation Commission held a joint meeting with the Planning Board on March 1, 2012 to discuss their concerns regarding replacement of the black oak that was cut down in March 2011 and asked that the Board take that into consideration when reviewing site and landscape plans.

## 2. Outstanding Documents

The Board’s discussion with the Applicant included a review of the documents required for a site plan application and the documents provided to date. Both the Board and the Applicant, with the assistance of the Planning Director, identified information that was either missing or needed to be revised in light of previous discussions with the Board. As noted above, the Applicant has proposed changes to the original Application as a result of the ongoing public hearing process and discussions with the Board. The Applicant has not yet submitted a full set of drawings

(plans, elevations, and sections, if necessary) that reflect those changes. Some of the questions in Section 1 above, such as 5. *Design Guidelines*, require these updated documents prior to resolution.

However, it might be premature to require that all of the documents be updated prior to the resolution of other items in Section 1, such as the height limitations. The Board and the Applicant need to discuss the process of resolving these questions during the April 26 meeting.

The list below is not a complete list of all documents submitted by the applicant but rather a list of those that need to be revised based on either missing information that has been identified or on changes made during the ongoing public hearing process. The initial list of plans is taken from the September 2010 submission. The list of revisions for each drawing should be considered an evolution of the ideas as discussed with the Board during the public hearing process, unless otherwise noted. The Board and the Applicant should discuss the completeness of this list and the required revisions on April 26.

<b>Document Name from September 2010 submission</b>	<b>Revision History and Known Required Changes (as of April 26, 2012)</b>
<b>Civil/Site Design</b>	
Site Plan <i>Rev. Aug. 24, 2010</i>	<p><b>Revision history:</b>            SK-? Context Site Plan, Scheme "C", 07/28/2011            SK-1 Site Plan, Scheme "C", 07/28/2011            Site Analysis, 8/22/2011            Massing "A" 01/27/2012            Massing "B" 1/26/12</p> <p><b>Known required changes:</b>            At the meeting on March 1, 2012, the Director of Planning identified the following deficiencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The dimensions of the residential lot are incorrect</li> <li>• The following items are missing:</li> <li>• Square footage of the lots</li> <li>• Survey control points</li> <li>• Hydrants</li> <li>• The business lot line</li> <li>• Location of the existing stairs</li> <li>• Location of the existing sidewalk</li> <li>• Location of the existing driveway opening</li> <li>• The 100' and 200' lines from Pine Tree Brook</li> <li>• Average grade (there was some discussion of average grade vs. average elevation which is of importance in the discussion of height mentioned in Section 2 below.</li> </ul> <p>Any other revisions required in clarifying and resolving the issues in Section 1 above.</p>
Layout <i>September 23, 2010</i>	<p><b>Revision history:</b>            L-1 Parking Schedule, "Scheme B", revised March 24, 2011</p>

<i>Revised Submission</i>	<p><b>Known required changes:</b> Any revisions required in clarifying and resolving the issues in Section 1 above.</p>
Grading and Drainage <i>September 23, 2010</i> <i>Revised Submission</i>	<p><b>Revision history:</b> None</p> <p><b>Known required changes:</b> The Town Engineer submitted a memo on October 27, 2010 listing a number of deficiencies on the site plan submitted in September 2010 – these deficiencies are listed on the Matrix.</p> <p>Any other revisions required in clarifying and resolving the issues in Section 1 above.</p>
Utility <i>September 23, 2010</i> <i>Revised Submission</i>	<p><b>Revision history:</b> None</p> <p><b>Known required changes:</b> Any revisions required in clarifying and resolving the issues in Section 1 above.</p>
Construction Details <i>July 1, 2010</i>	<p><b>Revision history:</b> None</p> <p><b>Known required changes:</b> None</p>
Construction Details <i>July 1, 2010</i>	<p><b>Revision history:</b> None</p> <p><b>Known required changes:</b> None</p>
Building Height Plan <i>September 23, 2010</i>	<p><b>Revision history:</b> December 13, 2010</p> <p><b>Known required changes:</b> Will need to be revised once the Board and Applicant have resolved the issue of compliance with the height limitations.</p>
Existing Building Profile <i>Undated but included in September 2010 submission</i>	<p><b>Revision history:</b> None</p> <p><b>Known required changes:</b> None</p>
Proposed Energy Conserving Features <i>Undated but included in September 2010</i>	<p><b>Revision history:</b> None</p> <p><b>Known required changes:</b></p>

<i>submission</i>	None
<b>Landscape</b>	
Landscape Plan <i>July 1, 2010</i>	<p><b>Revision history:</b> None N.B. The Matrix incorrectly mentions a Landscape Plan submitted in December 2011. This appears to have been the July 1, 2010 Plan.</p> <p><b>Known required changes:</b> Any revisions required in clarifying and resolving the issues in Section 1 above.</p>
Lighting Plan <i>July 1, 2010</i>	<p><b>Revision history:</b> None N.B. The Matrix incorrectly mentions a Lighting Plan submitted in December 2011. This appears to have been the July 1, 2010 Plan.</p> <p><b>Known required changes:</b> Any revisions required in clarifying and resolving the issues in Section 1 above.</p>
Layout Plan with June 21 Noon Shadow <i>July 1, 2010</i>	<p><b>Revision history:</b> None</p> <p><b>Known required changes:</b> Any revisions required in clarifying and resolving the issues in Section 1 above.</p>
Layout Plan with December 21 Noon Shadow <i>July 1, 2010</i>	<p><b>Revision history:</b> None</p> <p><b>Known required changes:</b> Any revisions required in clarifying and resolving the issues in Section 1 above.</p>
<b>Building Plans</b>	
A-1 Ground Floor Plan <i>06/02/2010</i>	<p><b>Revision history:</b> A-1 Ground Floor Plan, Scheme "B", March 24, 2011 SK-1 Scheme "C", 07/28/2011 Undated color rendering over A-1 06/02/10 showing business area Undated color rendering over A-1 06/02/10 showing business area, including proposed commercial area on corner of Central Avenue and the track</p> <p><b>Known required changes:</b> Any revisions required in clarifying and resolving the issues in Section 1 above.</p>
A-2 First Floor Plan <i>06/02/2010</i>	<p><b>Revision history:</b> A-2 First Floor Plan, Scheme "B", March 24, 2011 Undated color rendering over A-2 06/02/10 showing business area Undated color rendering over A-2 06/02/10 showing business area,</p>

	<p>removing proposed commercial common area next to Unit 102</p> <p><b>Known required changes:</b> Any revisions required in clarifying and resolving the issues in Section 1 above.</p>
<p>A-3 Second and Third Floor Plans <i>06/02/2010</i></p>	<p><b>Revision history:</b> A-3 Second and Third Floor Plans, Scheme "B", March 24, 2011</p> <p><b>Known required changes:</b> Any revisions required in clarifying and resolving the issues in Section 1 above.</p>
<p>A-4 Fourth Floor Plan <i>06/02/2010</i></p>	<p><b>Revision history:</b> A-4 Fourth Floor Plan, Scheme "B", March 24, 2011</p> <p><b>Known required changes:</b> Any revisions required in clarifying and resolving the issues in Section 1 above.</p>
<p>A-5 Roof Plan <i>06/02/2010</i></p>	<p><b>Revision history:</b> None</p> <p><b>Known required changes:</b> Any revisions required in clarifying and resolving the issues in Section 1 above.</p>
<b>Building Elevations</b>	
<p>A-6 North and South Elevations <i>06/02/10</i></p>	<p><b>Revision history:</b> Site sections A, B, and C dated 01/27/2012 Three site sections dated 02/09/2012</p> <p><b>Known required changes:</b> Any revisions required in clarifying and resolving the issues in Section 1 above.</p>
<p>A-7 East and West Elevations <i>06/02/10</i></p>	
<b>Renderings</b>	
<p>Renderings <i>Undated but included in September 2010 submission</i></p>	<p><b>Revision history:</b> Renderings, Scheme "B" March 24, 2011: View from bridge; View from corner SK-3 Perspective Sketch, Scheme "C", 07/28/2011 Perspective Sketches 08/22/11 Concept Images 10/28/11, pages 1 and 2</p> <p><b>Known required changes:</b> Any revisions required in clarifying and resolving the issues in Section 1 above.</p>
<b>Photos</b>	
<p>Existing site photos <i>Undated but included</i></p>	<p><b>Revision history:</b> None</p>

<i>in September 2010 submission</i>	<b>Known required changes:</b> None
<b>Traffic Study</b>	
Traffic Assessment Residential and Retail Use 36 Central Avenue <i>No date but sometime in 2007</i>	<b>Revision history:</b> Update Traffic Assessment provided December 2011 Memo February 8, 2012  <b>Known required changes:</b> There are outstanding questions raised during the public hearing on March 1, 2012 which need to be clarified.
<b>Shared Parking Schedule</b>	
Missing	Required to determine parking requirements