
PGC ASSOCIATES, INC.

1 Toni Lane
Franklin, MA 02038-2648
508.533.8106
gino@pgcassociates.com

October 3, 2019

Mr. Andy Rodenhiser, Chairman
Medway Planning Board
155 Village Street
Medway, MA 02053

RE: EVERGREEN VILLAGE MULTIFAMILY SPECIAL PERMIT/SITE PLAN

Dear Mr. Rodenhiser:

I have reviewed the proposed multifamily housing special permit and site plan, for 7 townhouse units on Evergreen Street. The applicant is Sampson Pond, LLC of Medway. The owners are John and Cynthia Shea of Carver, MA.

The proposal is to construct 7 townhouse units in one triplex and one quad building on 62,534 square feet including associated parking, drainage, landscaping, etc. The plan was prepared by Ronald Tiberi of Natick. The plan is dated September 5, 2019.

The property is located at 22 Evergreen Street in the AR-II, and Multifamily Overlay zoning districts.

ZONING

Multifamily Housing (Section 5.6.4)

1. The site is within the Multifamily Housing Overlay District (Section 5.6.4) and thus eligible for a project.
2. The site has more than 50 feet of frontage on Evergreen Street, which has sufficient capacity to handle the additional traffic flow from 7 units. At 62,534, it also meets the minimum area requirement of 22,500 square feet
3. The plan shows a minimum setback of 33.1' from Evergreen Street for the quad building while the triplex is set back 33.3'. The front setback for the AR-II district is 35 feet. The Multifamily Housing bylaw allows the PEDB to adjust dimensional requirements via a 4/5 vote. Such a vote would be needed for this plan to be approved. It should be noted that the table on the cover sheet of the plan set indicates that the front setback is 35. The side and rear setbacks appear to meet the required 15 feet. Lines that appear to be setback lines are shown on the plans but are not labeled and do not show dimensions.
4. The building heights are not shown specifically but the plans indicate they will be 38', under the maximum height limit of 40 feet.
5. The maximum density for multifamily projects is 12 units per acre. With 62,534 square feet (1.44 acres), the site is eligible for 12 units. At 7, the project is under the maximum.

6. The plans indicate that the plans comply with building coverage (16.5% vs. 30% allowed), and impervious surface (29% vs. 40% allowed), and parking (2 per unit vs. 1.5 required). However, the table on the cover sheet indicates no required building or impervious surface coverage requirement. The minimum open space or yard area (minimum required of 15%) is also met.
7. At 7 units, 10% (.7 rounded up to 1) of the units must be affordable. One affordable unit is proposed.
8. Section 5.6.4 E. 7 requires historic properties determined to be a “historically significant building” by the Medway Historical Commission shall not be demolished unless certain criteria are met. The original application had indicated that such a building would be razed. That application was withdrawn, the building demolished, and a new application filed.

Other

9. No photometric plan for lighting has been provided to document that the project complies with the Section 7.1.2 (Outdoor Lighting) of the Bylaw. A lighting plan is listed on the cover sheet but not included in the plan set.
10. No signage is shown on the plans. Any project development or other signs must be shown on the plan.
11. A stone wall is proposed to be reconstructed. Since Evergreen Street is a Scenic Road, an application has been filed to approve the wall reconstruction.

SITE PLAN REGULATIONS

(Note: Site plan issues that have been addressed above are not repeated in this section).

12. Section 204-5 B.1 requires a Site Context sheet indicating features within 2000 feet of the perimeter of the site. This was not provided and no waiver was requested.
13. Section 204-5 C (3) requires an Existing Landscape Inventory. This was not provided and no waiver was requested.
14. Section 205-2 G & H require that ground floor facades have arcades, display windows, entry areas, canopies, awnings or other such features with pleasing aesthetics along 60% of their length and architectural features that provide visual interest at the pedestrian scale and detailing to avoid “massive aesthetic effects.” The elevations indicate that the buildings have some of these features, but clearly not along 60% of the façade. The most prominent and dominant architectural feature of the proposed buildings are garage doors. Perhaps adding some architectural interest to them would at least downplay their significance.
15. Section 205-6 H requires vertical granite curbing “or similar type of edge treatment to delineate the parking lot.” The plan indicates Cape Cod berm and a waiver was requested for this.
16. A waiver was requested to allow 22’ for a driveway aisle rather than 24.’

GENERAL COMMENTS

17. The landscape plan appears to be adequate. It includes a row of arborvitaes along each side lot line as screening, as well as decorative plantings along the frontage and in front of each unit. The project also includes a community garden area.

If there are any questions about these comments, please call or email me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gino D. Carlucci, Jr.", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Gino D. Carlucci, Jr.