

Concord Square Planning & Development, Inc.

Memorandum

To: Lynnfield Planning Board

From: Angus Jennings, AICP, Project Manager
and Adam Duchesneau, Planner

Date: March 11, 2008

Re: Consistency Review of Meadow Walk PVDD Development Application

The Applicant, National Development, submitted all of the required items demonstrating the completeness of the submission as required by the Planned Village Development District (PVDD) Development Application Form. Concord Square's review of the Site Plans submitted with the Application Form demonstrated substantial compliance with the District's Bylaw and Design Standards and Procedures. All deviations from the requirements of the Bylaw and Design Standards and Procedures are discussed in the itemized list below.

The Lighting section of the Design Standards and Procedures and a portion of the Landscaping section were not reviewed by Concord Square pending the review of a separate consultant hired by the Planning Board. Additionally, the Stormwater Management section of the Design Standards and Procedures was not reviewed by Concord Square because it is already under review by the Lynnfield Conservation Commission and these materials were also submitted as part of the Applicant's MEPA Application to the State.

The following observations, identified by section number of the Bylaw or Design Standards and Procedures and sheet number (if applicable) of the application materials, were derived from Concord Square's review of the application materials. A copy of this report has been provided to the Applicant, and they have been invited to respond as appropriate. We anticipate that this review will comprise a portion of one or more upcoming public hearings of the Planning Board:

General Items

- The scale of sheet LR-5.0A appears to be incorrect. It seems the scale should be 1" = 150' not 1" = 40'.
- Sheet A2.17 (North) and sheet A2.18 (East) display question marks (?) where there should be numbers to indicate the type of material being used on the structure.
- The footprints for Buildings 400 and 1100 on the context map of sheets A2.01 to A2.18 is different from their building footprints in the Site Plans (LR-2.0 to LR-8.4).

- In order to complete our consistency review, the Applicant must provide additional information regarding the total number of parking spaces within each Sub-district, the number of parking spaces per the square footage of each use (commercial, office, etc.), and the number of parking spaces per each residential unit. Furthermore, the Applicant should also provide the number of required spaces that have been provided in accordance with ADA and AAB Standards. This information will be necessary to determine consistency with the parking standards in the Bylaw. The Applicant has agreed to provide a summary table including this information.
- It would be useful to receive a traffic circulation plan with signage, traffic calming devices, etc., that indicates the location of all vehicular traffic control measures in the District. This information will be helpful to review consistency of the plan with the Design Standards. The Applicant has agreed to provide a traffic control and signage plan including this information.
- An agreement needs to be worked out with the Building Inspector to determine how the signage within the District will be regulated. At this time many of the vendors within the District have not been determined and therefore much of the potential signage within the District cannot be reviewed for specifics. The Planning Board needs to determine if they will approve the application with conditions or if the signage in the District will be approved on a tenant-by-tenant basis. In addition, we're aware that the Applicant will submit a complete package of signage standards to be given to future Meadow Walk merchants and others setting out acceptable signage standards. Angus Jennings has spoken with Jack Roberto about this issue and other issues where coordination with the Building Department will be necessary. We have scheduled a meeting to talk through these issues on **Wednesday, March 12 at 2 PM at Lynnfield Town Hall.**

District Bylaw

Section 9.5.7.4.(b) Based on our review, all proposed structures within the TNV Sub-district scale at heights consistent with the approved Zoning and Design Standards.

Section 9.5.7.6. Emergency vehicle easements must be shown on the Site Plans. As stated in the Bylaw, a lot lacking frontage within the PVDD "may be developed and used without regard to the lack of frontage, provided that the Non-Frontage Development has permanent access to a private or public way that is located within the PVDD through easements recorded with the Southern Essex District Registry of Deeds." Recording of the necessary easement documentation should be a condition of any plan approval, to be completed prior to issuance of a building or occupancy permit. It is suggested that the Applicant's legal counsel prepare draft language to address this issue for review by the Board.

Section 9.5.7.9. In order to determine consistency, additional information must be provided by the Applicant regarding the total square footage of the Gross Leasable Floor Area within the District, excluding the fitness facility. This should include a breakdown of non-residential square footage by use.

Section 9.5.7.10(a) Section 9.5.7.10(b)	In order to determine consistency, additional information must be provided by the Applicant for both of these sections regarding the Gross Leasable Floor Area of retail units. Enforcement of this requirement may require creation of an ongoing tracking mechanism for use by the Building Inspector prior to issuance of building permits for specific buildings.
--	---

To ensure continued compliance with Section 9.5.7.9. and Section 9.5.7.10(a) and (b) over time, we recommend establishing an ongoing tracking system for use by the Building Inspector concurrent with issuance of building permits. This will be the subject of discussion in our meeting with the Building Inspector, and our goal is to prepare a suitable tracking mechanism prior to issuance of any decision.

Section 9.5.8.1. In order to determine consistency, the Applicant must provide a breakdown of all the uses within the District according to Section 9.5.8. Parking. These figures must include the square footage of each use (or the number of dwelling units) and the total number of spaces for each use (or dwelling unit). Use of aggregate numbers per use category should be adequate to determine consistency with applicable requirements.

Section 9.5.8.2. N/A. The Applicant has not requested a reduction in the parking requirements for the District.

Section 9.5.10.2. The Applicant must submit the plans and documentation for the proposed private ownership and maintenance of all traveled ways and all proposed public spaces or facilities. This may be addressed as a condition of any plan approval, to be completed prior to issuance of an occupancy permit. The Applicant has agreed to provide this information.

Section 9.5.11. Affordable Housing Documents. A meeting was held with DHCD on February 26th to review the consistency of the draft housing materials submitted with local and state requirements to ensure that the units will be added to the Lynnfield Subsidized Housing Inventory. Detailed correspondence was received, and is outlined in the

accompanying Concord Square Report to the Planning Board dated March 11, 2008.

District Design Standards and Procedures

Section 5.A. *Excerpt from Guiding Principles: “Design of Traveled Ways intended for motorized vehicles should encourage safe vehicle speeds and turning movements through the use of traffic calming design features, lighting, and signage.”* Additional information should be provided regarding traffic calming strategies for the Perimeter Loop and on Meadow Walk Drive. The Applicant has agreed to provide a traffic control and signage plan including this information.

Section 5.A.1.b. *“Transportation Network shall...promote safe and efficient mobility and distribution throughout the District.”* There do not appear to be any ‘STOP’ signs on Main Street (LR-2.5). It would be helpful if the Applicant submitted another plan indicating where all traffic controls and other signage (Wayfinding Signs, Residential Access Signs, etc. (if any)) are located within the District. The Applicant has agreed to provide a traffic control and signage plan including this information.

Section 5.A.3.c. *“Pedestrian crossings shall be installed on the Traditional Main Streets at intersections and intermediate locations.”* There is no crosswalk where a road intersects Meadow Walk Drive at its northeast corner (LR-2.5). Addition of a crosswalk at this location is recommended to achieve consistency with this provision of the Design Standards. However, we note that the entire driving surface in proximity to the so-called “Restaurant Row” is raised, and invite additional discussion from the Applicant regarding this approach to traffic calming.

Section 5.A.3.f. *“On-street parking shall be constructed on both sides of Traditional Main Streets, where otherwise not in conflict with pedestrian or emergency access, sidewalk furniture and plantings.”* Parking is not on both sides of the street for the entire length of Meadow Walk Drive. On-street parking is not located on the northern side of Building 600 or the southern side of Building 1500 (LR-2.5 and LR-2.6). However, the northern side of Building 600 is intended as a pedestrian plaza so on-street parking may present a conflict with pedestrian movement. The Applicant has agreed to add on-street parking to the south of Building 1500.

Section 5.A.5.b. *“Distinction should be made through design of Residential Traveled Ways using signage or other demarcation to identify where the residential component begins and to discourage non-residential traffic from inadvertently accessing the residential areas.”*

There does not appear to be signage noting the entrance to a residential area at the intersection of the Perimeter Loop and Arbor Point Way. The only signage there notes that the driver is entering a “No Sanding or Salt in Use” area (LR-2.3 and LR-2.4). The Applicant has agreed to provide a traffic control and signage plan including this information.

Section 5.A.6.a. *“Pedestrian Network shall provide access to all primary building entries.”*

The Pedestrian Network does not appear to provide access to the entrance of the Boston Sports Club or to the entrances of the MFR Buildings (LR-2.3, LR-2.4 and LR-2.7). Pedestrian access to both sites are indicated on a pedestrian network exhibit submitted by the Applicant; it should be verified that access extends to the building entrances. We note that a pedestrian network was included in the Applicant’s Draft Environmental Impact Report (Fig. 9.2), and we suggest that this exhibit be submitted for the Planning Board public record.

Section 5.A.6.b. *“All elements of the Pedestrian Network...shall be accessible to the handicapped in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and other applicable regulations.”*

Review for AAB and ADA compliance should be verified in the following locations:

- The sidewalk to Meadow Walk Drive from the Gateway entrance from Walnut Street (LR-2.1).
- Access to the handicapped parking spaces to the northeast of Building 200 and the east of Building 100 (LR-2.1).
- Access to the handicapped parking spaces to the north and to the east of Building 1300 (LR-2.2).
- The access driveway to the underground parking of Building 1000 does not have a crosswalk nor is the driveway ADA accessible for someone to cross (LR-2.3).
- Access to the handicapped parking spaces east of Building 400 (LR-2.5).

- Access to the handicapped parking spaces west of Buildings 500, 700, and 900 (LR-2.5).
- The three crosswalks to the west of Building 1100 (LR-2.5).
- The raised crosswalk to the north of Building 1100 across the Perimeter Loop (LR-2.5).
- Access to the handicapped parking spaces east of Building 300 and West of Building 100. There is also no crosswalk to access these spaces (LR-2.6).
- The crosswalk at the western-most entrance to the Boston Sports Club (LR-2.7).
- The Path that leads to the Perimeter Loop from the Boston Sports Club. There is a Sloped Granite Curb here and it should be verified that this meets AAB and ADA Standards. There is also no crosswalk here across the Perimeter Loop to the Meadow Walk Development (LR-2.8).
- The crosswalk where Audubon Road intersects the access road to the District (LR-2.9).

Locations not indicated above appear to comply. The Applicant has agreed to submit a statement verifying compliance with AAB and ADA standards.

Section 5.A.6.g.

“Where Pedestrian Ways cross Traveled Ways, a crosswalk shall delineate the pedestrian crossing.”

Crosswalks do not appear to be delineated at the following locations:

- Where the Pedestrian Way continues across the entrance to the surface parking lot just north of Building 1300 (LR-2.2 or LR-2.5)).
- The entrance to the underground parking of Building 1000 (LR-2.3).
- Where the Pedestrian Way crosses the parking lot (LR-2.4).
- The entrance to the underground parking of Building 2000 (LR-2.4).
- The entrance to the underground parking of Building 3000 (LR-2.4).
- Where the Pedestrian Way crosses the Perimeter Loop at the top of sheet LR-2.5.
- Between Buildings 100 and 300 where a Pedestrian Way provides access to handicapped spaces (LR-2.6).

The Applicant has agreed to add crosswalks at the locations identified above.

- Section 5.A.6.i. *“Lighted walkways should be provided between the TNV Sub-district and the MFR Sub-district.”*
There are light fixtures near the crosswalks between the MFR and the TNV Sub-districts but there is no indication of the height of these fixtures in the Site Plans. Due to their location, these fixtures appear to be intended for vehicles that would pass through this area and not the pedestrians (LR-2.5 and LR-8.4). There seems to be a need for lighting fixtures that are specifically intended to illuminate the pedestrian crossings between the Sub-districts to ensure comfortable pedestrian access between the MFR and TNV Sub-districts after dark. We’re aware that the Applicant will be submitting additional information to the Planning Board regarding lighting detail, and that these materials will be reviewed by the Board’s lighting consultant.
- Section 5.A.8.c. *“Paths should incorporate a meandering design if it results in the preservation of existing vegetation without loss of functionality as a Pedestrian Way.”*
The Site Plans state that the walkway’s exact location will be determined in the field (LR-2.4). Field inspection during project construction should be adequate to ensure compliance with this provision of the Design Standards if the location in the field is staked out prior to path construction.
- Section 5.A.9.b. *“Pass-Through Walkways shall be constructed of a mixture of masonry pavers and poured concrete.”*
The Pass-Through Walkways consist only of Cement Concrete Pavement (LR-2.5). The Applicant has agreed to revise the plans to ensure materials consistent with the Design Standards.
- Section 5.B. *“Building design should be complementary to Lynnfield’s historic character and to the existing architectural contexts in Town, and should provide the District a sense of ‘belonging’ in Lynnfield.”*
Within their review the Planning Board will determine whether or not the building design of the District is complementary to Lynnfield’s historic character as stated (A2.01 to A2.18 and A3.1 to A3.7). However, because of the somewhat subjective nature of architectural review, it is our opinion that determination of consistency will rely

more on the Standards for Compliance than on the Guiding Principles. As the Board is aware, the selection of “shoulds” and “shalls” in the Design Standards was determined in part to avoid impeding creativity in the architecture of the proposed development.

Section 5.B.1.c.(i) *“Roof profiles shall employ varied vertical and horizontal planes for visual relief to the tops of buildings.”*

The Applicant’s architect should be invited to comment on the consistency of the proposal with this design standard, including at least the following building elevations:

- A2.07 (West Elevation)
- A2.16 (East Elevation)

Section 5.B.1.c.(ii) *“Buildings shall, when considered in relation to adjacent structures, incorporate a diversity of roof heights, gable orientations, and volumes.”*

When considered collectively and in relation to one another, it is our opinion that the proposed architectural elevations incorporate a diversity of roof heights, gable orientations and volumes to achieve consistency with this requirement.

Section 5.B.1.d.(iii) *“Recessed doorways are preferred, in order to break up the building façade, provide a welcoming space, and provide protection from sun and rain.”*

It is not clearly evident from the building elevations (A2.01 to A2.18) whether the doorways are recessed or not. The applicant should provide additional information indicating which doorways (if any) are recessed. In addition, the use of awnings, canopies and trellises is recommended in order to meet the preferred design intent.

Section 5.B.1.g. *“Sustainable design principles shall be considered for all buildings to the maximum extent practical.”*

A brief review of the MEPA Draft ENF Application indicates that it contains sustainable design elements that will be incorporated into the development project (p. 1-20 to 1-22). We recommend that the Applicant submit documentation of these elements within the local review process, perhaps in the form of a project narrative.

Section 5.B.1.h. *“Site design shall include adequate water supply distribution and storage for fire protection. Vehicular circulation shall meet the access needs of emergency and public safety vehicles.”*

Compliance needs to be determined by the Lynnfield Police and Fire Departments and each of these entities should be contacted. We understand that hydrant tests have been conducted to determine adequacy for fire flows, and that an Emergency-911 plan and hydrant plan are in process between the Applicant and the Fire Department.

Section 5.B.1.i. *“Location of building and garage entrances. Building entrances should emphasize pedestrian ingress and egress as opposed to accommodating vehicles.”*

There do not appear to be service entrances for Buildings 300 or 400 (LR-2.5 and LR-2.6).

Section 5.B.3.a.(i) *“Building orientation should maximize open space views from residential units.”*

Building 1000 does not appear to maximize the open space views from its residential units (LR-2.3). However, we are aware based on a conversation with the project reviewer at MEPA that siting revisions resulted from their review in order to minimize project impacts on designated resource areas, and that adjustments to the residential building footprints resulted from the (ongoing) MEPA review. We suggest that these siting decisions should take precedence over this recommended provision of the Design Standards.

Section 5.C.3.b. *“Residential Open Spaces shall be served by direct pedestrian access.”*

There does not appear to be direct pedestrian access from the MFR Buildings to the Open Space to the north and west of the dwelling units (LR-2.4 and LR-5.4). The Applicant has indicated an intent to look at improved pedestrian connectivity in this location.

Section 5.D. Plant list needs to be verified for compliance with this section.

Section 5.D.3.a.(i) *“Parking lots with 50 to 200 spaces shall have at least five (5) percent of the interior lot area landscaped.”*

Additional information needs to be provided by the Applicant showing how five (5) percent of the qualifying interior parking lot areas are classified as being landscaped. The Applicant has agreed to provide an exhibit including this information.

Section 5.D.3.a.(ii) *“Parking lots with more than 200 spaces shall have at least seven (7) percent of the interior lot area landscaped.”*

Additional information needs to be provided by the Applicant showing how seven (7) percent of the qualifying interior parking lot areas are classified as being landscaped. The Applicant has agreed to provide an exhibit including this information.

Section 5.E.4.a. *“The Primary Storefront Signs shall be no greater than three (3) feet in height and shall be located within the tenant’s sign band 12 to 20 feet above finish floor.”*
The following signs that are shown in the building elevations do not appear to be consistent with the Design Standards:

- A2.01 (North) – Too High
- A2.02 (West) – Too High
- A2.03 (East) – Too Low
- A2.03 (North) – Too High, Too Low
- A2.04 (South) – Too High
- A2.05 (East) – Too Low
- A2.05 (West) – Too Low
- A2.06 (East) – Too Low
- A2.06 (South) – Too Low
- A2.06 (West) – Too Low
- A2.11 (East) – Too Tall and Too Low
- A2.11 (West) – Too Tall
- A2.12 (South) – Too Low

As previously noted, additional detail regarding signage will be provided, and an enforcement mechanism will need to be implemented to ensure compliance as building permits are issued for specific non-residential tenants.

Section 5.E.4.b. *“The total sign area for the Primary Storefront Sign shall not contain more than one square foot of sign area for each linear foot of storefront.”*
Sheet A2.11 – The sign to the far right of the West elevation appears to be too large and exceeds the allowable total sign area.

Section 5.E.6.a. *“Each non-residential tenant shall display the suite number on their façade to allow for identification of the premises.”*
There are no primary address signs shown in any of the building elevations (A2.01 to A2.18). Primary address signs should be in place prior to issuance of occupancy permits.

Section 5.E.6.b. *“If tenant has a non-customer door for receiving merchandise, tenant shall place only its suite number on that door. Numerals shall be mounted to the exterior face of the door.”*

There are no secondary address signs shown in the following building elevations where secondary address signs could be displayed on service doors:

- A2.01 (South)
- A2.02 (West and South)
- A2.04 (South and Southwest)
- A2.05 (West)
- A2.06 (West)
- A2.07 (West)
- A2.08 (North)
- A2.09 (North)
- A2.10 (East)
- A2.11 (East)
- A2.14 (South)
- A2.15 (South)
- A2.16 (East)
- A2.17 (North)

Secondary address signs should be in place prior to issuance of occupancy permits.

Section 5.E.8.a *“Awnings shall be made of fire resistant, water repellent marine fabric (i.e., canvas) or may be constructed of metal or glass.”*

The Applicant needs to submit more information regarding awning materials. Also, awnings are not well labeled on the following elevations:

- A2.03 (North)
- A2.04 (Northwest)
- A2.07 (East)
- A2.12 (West)
- A2.13 (East)
- A2.18 (East and South)

Section 5.E.8.d. The Applicant should submit additional information regarding awnings, such as detailed drawings that are included in the Site Detail sheets.

- Section 5.E.8.e. The Applicant should submit additional information regarding awnings, such as detailed drawings that are included in the Site Detail sheets.
- Section 5.E.8.g. The Applicant should submit additional information regarding awnings, such as detailed drawings that are included in the Site Detail sheets.
- Section 5.E.9. *“Installation of small, externally illuminated wayfinding signs is encouraged... Wayfinding signs should not exceed seven (7) feet in height, and should be installed for the benefit of both automotive and pedestrian traffic.”*
The Applicant should submit additional information regarding wayfinding signs, such as detailed drawings that are included in the Site Detail sheets. Additionally, it would be helpful if the Applicant submitted an overall wayfinding and traffic signage plan for the District. The Applicant has agreed to provide a traffic control and signage plan including this information.
- Section 5.E.10. *“A permanent, free standing sign shall be permitted at the District boundary along or adjacent to each Gateway for the purpose of Project Identification provided, however, that a single wall or structure may include two sign faces as necessary to provide visibility from multiple directions. The combined area of sign face may not exceed 150 square feet in area and may not be higher than six (6) feet above grade provided, however, that the uppermost point of the wall or structure to which any sign is attached, including the sign itself, may not exceed twelve (12) feet above grade.”*
The Applicant should submit additional information regarding Gateway Signs, such as detailed drawings that are included in the Site Detail sheets. The Site Plans appear to show two Gateway Signs while the Design Standards state that only one is permitted (LR-2.1). The plan should be clarified to indicate which signs are proposed Gateway Signs and which are Internal Identification signs, if any. In the event of inconsistency, the plans would need to be modified unless specifically waived by the Planning Board.
- Section 5.H. *“On-street parking should be provided on the Traditional Main Streets and in residential areas to both reduce the need for larger parking fields... Where larger parking fields are necessary, the balance of such lots should be located in greater proportion within the western portion of the*

District to reduce adjacency to the existing residential neighborhood.”

It appears that no on-street parking is provided on Arbor Point Way (LR-2.3). However, as noted previously, a number of siting revisions resulted from the MEPA process and, generally, these revisions – including reorientation of building footprints, the use of underground parking, and the use of pervious pavers – can be expected to result in reduced project impacts to the natural environment. While the overall distribution of parking appears to be generally balanced, our ability to review this will be improved upon submittal of a consolidated plan sheet showing number and distribution of parking spaces.

- Section 5.H.1.a.(iii) Note: The Site Plans appear to comply, however, the Site Plans (LR-2.5) show parallel parking spaces of 9’ x 22’, while the Meadow Walk Drive Sectional Drawings (LR-6.3) show parallel parking spaces of 8’ x 22’. Clarification of actual parking space size is needed.
- Section 5.H.1.a.(v) *“Handicapped parking spaces shall be provided in compliance with applicable regulations.”*
The Applicant needs to provide additional information regarding the total number of handicapped parking spaces with regard to ADA and AAB Standards as appropriate. The Applicant has agreed to submit a statement verifying compliance with AAB and ADA standards.
- Section 5.H.2.a *“Surface parking lots shall be located to the side and the rear of buildings as oriented toward a Residential Traveled Way.”*
Parking is located at the front of Buildings 2000 and 3000 (LR-2.4).
- Section 5.H.2.e. *“Handicapped parking spaces shall be provided in compliance with applicable regulations.”*
The Applicant needs to provide additional information regarding the total number of handicapped parking spaces with regards to ADA and AAB Standards as appropriate. The Applicant has agreed to submit a statement verifying compliance with AAB and ADA standards.
- Section 5.H.2.g. *“Service and Loading Areas shall be screened from view. Locations shall be designed for ease of trash service to District. Trash areas may be located in the garage of buildings or in freestanding trash houses.”*

There appears to be no indication on the Site Plans as to where the service areas or dumpsters are located (LR-2.3 and LR-2.4). The Applicant has indicated that trash compactors for the residential buildings will not be external, but will instead be located within the building structure.

Section 5.I.3.

“Fencing shall be constructed along the back lot lines of each residential abutter located directly adjacent to the District in order both to restrict potential trespass concerns and to provide need privacy...”

There appear to be no fences shown at the rear of the Walnut Street abutter’s properties on the Site Plans. We are aware that this issue will be the subject of review within the ongoing Conservation Commission public hearing process because one or more rear property lines appear to be located within or near identified wetlands resource areas.

cc: Ed Marsteiner, National Development
Jack Roberto, Lynnfield Building Inspector