



January 22, 2018

Westwood Planning Board
c/o Ms. Abigail McCabe, Town Planner
Town of Westwood
50 Carby Street
Westwood, MA 02090

**Re: Hawthorne at University Station
Application for Project Development Review and Special Permit
Response to Comments**

Dear Board Members and Abby:

Pulte Homes of New England, LLC, University Station Phase 2 LLC, Bohler Engineering and Tetra Tech, Inc., have completed a review of the comments provided by BETA Group, Westwood Board of Health, Westwood Conservation Commission, Dedham-Westwood Water District and email comments received from the Town Planner. Each comment has been responded to. For ease of review, comments are provided below. Responses are shown in *italic* font.

Comments provided by BETA Group:

Submission Requirements (§6.0) Rules and Regulations

Comment SR1. Provide name of proponent and property owner on the Cover Sheet. (§6.2.2).

Response: *The information has been provided on the cover sheet.*

Comment SR2. Provide imprint of the professional registration stamp of the person responsible for the preparation of each sheet. Certification is missing on General Layout Map and Partial Existing Conditions survey (§6.2.3).

Response: *A signed and sealed copy of the General Layout Map is included with the revised plan set. The Partial Existing Conditions Survey has been replaced by the Existing Conditions and Demolition Plan.*

Comment SR3. Provide existing conditions plan in sheet set that contains requirements shown in §6.5.1 through §6.5.6. In particular, clarify why only partial survey detail was provided for the site.

Response: *The Partial Existing Conditions Survey has been replaced by the Existing Conditions and Demolition Plan.*

Comment SR4. Cover sheet, General Plan and Existing condition plan should indicate limits of well head zone.

Response: *The limits of the wellhead zone has been added to the Cover Sheet, General Layout Map and Existing Conditions / Demolition Plan.*



Comment SR5. Demolition plan should show all features of existing conditions plan per note SR3. Bearing and distance only partially shown. Either show for entire lot or not at all.

Response: *The Demolition Plan has been revised to show all features of the existing conditions plan. The bearings and distances have been removed from this sheet.*

Comment SR6. Confirm that notes 6.6.16.1 through 6.6.16.5 have been included.

Response: *These notes have been added to Sheet 2 of the revised Site Plans.*

Building Design: (§9.7.11.1)

Comment B-1. Simplify the extent of the balcony railings

Response: *See revised elevations. We have shifted the newel post at the balconies to be in line with the mechanical closet trim and have kept the railings as is in front of the intake grills for the condensing units.*

Comment B-2. Make the side wall enclosure at the balconies flush all the way up/down (without trim or overlapping balcony rails).

Response: *See response B-1. Railing lengths kept as is in front of the intake grills for the condensing units for aesthetic reasons.*

Comment B-3. Change or show the correct stair window placement in elevation and align these windows to the centerline of the front door/portico.

Response: *See revised elevations. The windows above the main front door have changed to double windows and are now centered over the entry doors.*

Comment B-4. Make the top fascia a darker color, more consistent with the tonal range of the stone base.

Response: *The top fascia remains a light color (Arctic White). The design of the buildings has darker tones as the base and lighter tones towards the sky to communicate reduced building massing.*

Comment B-5. Make the top parapet fascia consistent across the top; extend trim to extend the horizontal top fascia.

Response: *See revised elevation. We have made the top parapet fascia consistent across the top frame bays requested.*

Comment B-6. Paint all downspouts to match the background field (not to match the trim).

Response: *See revised elevation. Downspouts now painted to match building background color as close as possible.*

Comment B-7. Increase the outward projection of the "white" bay windows, to increase the depth and articulation of the façade.



Response: Bay windows project out 2 feet providing articulation of the façade, more shading has been added to the colored elevations to better represent this fact.

Comment B-8. Modify the window placement at the building entrances so that the stone veneer aligns across the face of the building.

Response: See revised front elevation. The stone veneer has been modified and now aligns across the face of the front façade above the 2nd level.

Comment B-9. Employ localized symmetries and center windows, or provide mulled windows to center over doors.

Response: See revised elevation for all updates made as discussed herein.

Comment B-10. Organize the building façade into similar module elements.

Response: See revised elevation for all updates made as discussed herein.

Comment B-11. A materials board with photos of proposed materials for reference has been provided. We suggest physical samples be provided to supplement these boards at the public review.

Response: A materials board was provided at the January 9th public hearing. Additional samples or supplemental samples will be brought to the January 30th meeting as well.

Comment B-12. Please clarify the extent to which the exterior of the building is to be lit. Will there be exterior building mounted lighting at each porch/balcony?

Response: See revised Lighting Plan and Lighting Detail Sheet. Wall mounted lights are proposed over each of the 2 garage doors at each of the 2 buildings (4 total wall mounted lights). In addition, each of the two entry doors for each building has a ceiling mounted light can. Every balcony has a ceiling can light in the center of the balcony roof. The balcony lights are switch controlled by the residents.

Comment B-13. Will there be any building mounted lighting for the Brigham and Women's overflow lot parking?

Response: The eight (8) space overflow parking for Bridges will be lit by a pole mounted lighting fixture as shown on the Lighting Plan.

Comment B-14. Will there be building mounted exterior light fixtures at the garage entrances?

Response: Yes, there is a building mounted exterior light above each of the 2 garage doors on both buildings. The light is shown on the Lighting Detail Sheet.

Comment B-15. Modify rendered elevations to show the elevator penthouse.

Response: See revised rendered elevation, however, the elevator penthouse will not be visible from ground level.

Comment B-16. Modify rendered elevation to show the scuppers without the kink.



Response: *The revised elevations have been updated to minimize the downspout kinks as much as possible. Painting the downspouts to match the building background color will also make the downspouts less prominent.*

Comment B-17. Key the materials to the elevations.

Response: *The materials are now called out on the revised elevations.*

Comment B-18. Is there pedestrian access from Bridge Driveway to the courtyard?

Response: *The building design now provides a personnel door out of the garage level to the common driveway. This will allow residents convenient direct access from the buildings to the common drive through their building. There is by design no pedestrian access proposed from the common driveway to the Hawthorne at University Station private courtyard.*

Comment B-19. How will privacy be provided for ground floor units?

Response: *Privacy is provided via elevation, railings, and foundation planting beds.*

Comment B-20. Entry protection is not provided- will there be coverings or canopies or porticos at the entrances?

Response: *The building design has been updated to provide a covered entry now held up by real columns. These modified covered entrances will provide more visible and identifiable entries as well as weather protection. See revised elevations.*

Comment B-21. Update roof plan with notation of material and color for the roofing, also if there will be rooftop services, indicate them and clarify how they are screened.

Response: *Updated roof plan is provided. There are only a couple of minor services/small common ac condensers on the roof and they are screened by the parapet wall.*

Visual Mitigation and Screening of Infrastructural Elements. (§9.7.11.2)

Comment V-1. The slope at the southern end of the courtyard between the two buildings is shown to be a lawn at a 3:1 grade. Consider providing a pedestrian connection (ramp and stair) to a sidewalk along the north side of Bridges driveway for improved, more convenient connectivity.

Response: *A five (5) foot wide sidewalk has been added along the north side of the common driveway. The building design now provides a personnel door out of the garage level to the common driveway. This will allow residents convenient direct access from the buildings to the common drive through their building. There is by design no pedestrian access proposed from the common driveway to the Hawthorne at University Station private courtyard.*

Comment V-2. Consider use of terraced retaining walls, plantings, and lighting to enhance the walkway/slope.

Response: *A retaining wall has been added on the slope behind the gazebo and additional plantings have been added to the slope in the revised plan package per review comment.*

Comment V-3. Clarify the building operation associated with the dumpster pads at the southerly end of the building. We suggest consideration be given to a screening design that may blend with the overall frontage design as compared to highlighting an intention to screen.



Response: *The concrete pads provided at the southerly end of the buildings are there for the short time the small rollout compacted trash and recycling containers are moved outside to be emptied by a private trash hauler. Once emptied, the containers are rolled back inside the garage. No additional screening is necessary.*

Comment V-4. Three Green Giant Arborvitae are shown on the east side of Building 1 and the west side of Building 2. Confirm that these trees will not block windows when mature.

Response: *The condominium through its Property Manager will maintain the arborvitaes so they don't block the windows.*

Comment V-5. Consider increasing planting at the following locations:

- a. To help close off courtyard from the parking, add 2 deciduous trees in between the 2 proposed red maples at the north end of the common area at the parking lot.
- b. At the west ends of the buildings and along the Bridges driveway.
- c. Along the east side of Building 1.
- d. On the north side of the transformer for Building 2.

Response:

- A. *The entry to the courtyard has been redesigned to accommodate access comments from the Fire Department. The new configuration will not allow for trees per the review comment.*
- B. *Planting on the west side of Building 2 has been added as requested.*
Planting along Bridges Drive utilizes street trees in order to reinforce a streetscape. Additional plantings have also been added along the slope between buildings 1 and 2.
- C. *Adequate foundation planting along the east side of Building 1 has been provided as part of the initial submission. However, some pockets of perennials have been added per comment V-9.*
- D. *This area has been modified in the attached plan package per direction from the Fire Department. Additional planting in this area will not be possible as a result.*

Comment V-6. Consider adding an ornamental wall or fencing to separate the parking area and the courtyard.

Response: *Based on discussions with the Fire Department, emergency access to the courtyard is required from the parking area, which prevents additional fencing or walls in this location.*

Comment V-7. Functionality of the mountable curb and acceptability of planting at mountable curb between the projects should be verified with the fire department.

Response: *Based on discussions with the Fire Department, a three-inch mountable curb along with a bollard and chain will be provided to prevent pass through traffic.*



Comment V-8. Clarify whether any form of irrigation is proposed (a note stating that all landscape areas shall be irrigated is on sheet 9 with a reference to details being on sheet 10, however sheet 10 is lighting).

Response: *All landscaped areas shall be irrigated as noted on Sheet 9. The note regarding Sheet 10 detail reference has been removed.*

Comment V-9. Consider adding varieties of ground covers and perennials for seasonal interest.

Response: *Additional perennials have been added to the revised Site Plans*

Comment V-10. Provide details for benches, bike parking, trash receptacles, pavers, stone edge, and plaza.

Response: *Details for these items have been included in the revised Site Plans with the exception of trash receptacles as none are proposed.*

Comment V-11. Provide details for planting of trees, shrubs, groundcovers, lawns (seed mixes), etc.

Response: *Details for these items have been included in the revised Site Plans.*

Comment V-12. The landscape narrative calls for the use of native and drought tolerant plant material. Only 3 of the 14 species shown are native to the northeast and only 6 of the 14 are drought tolerant.

Response: *The plant palette utilized consists of plants commonly selected in the Northeast due to their landscape value and their ability to thrive. Invasive plants have been avoided. We have also substituted some of the non-native species on the revised Site Plan set with native species – European Hornbeam has been replaced with another upright tree, the Armstrong Red Maple. The Kwanzan Cherry has been replaced with the Eastern Redbud, and the Spirea has been replaced with Potentilla fruticosa. The Andromeda has been replaced with Mountain Laurel, and the grasses have been eliminated altogether*

Comment V-13. Consider grouping some of the benches in the courtyard together so that people can sit and talk in a group. Or consider moveable seating, tables, umbrellas, etc.

Response: *Pairs of benches are provided on the revised Site Plan in groupings at:*

- *The gazebo*
- *The drop-off plaza adjacent to the parking area*

Comment V-14. Please clarify why an accessible space is shown at the recycling dumpster.

Response: *This parking space has been removed and is reflected in the revised Site Plans.*

Comment V-15. The pavilion between the two buildings is shown on top of the proposed water line. Consider revising to avoid conflict.

Response: *The water line has been adjusted to avoid this potential conflict.*

Comment V-16. Previous Legacy development projects have implemented concrete curb and sidewalks. For consistency and longevity, concrete curbs (or granite) and concrete sidewalks instead of bituminous are recommended.



Response: *The materials along the Common Driveway are proposed to match the materials previously utilized there (concrete and granite). However, as Hawthorne is a privately maintained condominium, the Applicant prefers to utilize bituminous walks and cape cod berms within the residential condominium. Bituminous sidewalks hold up very well in New England weather and are safer to manage in the winter and are more able to be successfully repaired.*

Comment V-17. The sidewalk along the easterly edge of building 1 is shown as 4.0 feet wide. A minimum of 5.0 feet, excluding the curb, is recommended.

Response: *This sidewalk has been revised to a five (5) foot width and is reflected in the revised Site Plans.*

Comment V-18. Indicate the height of the wall along the easterly edge of the parcel adjacent to the railroad track. Fencing, guardrail, walls and lighting are all proposed along a narrow strip. A critical section should be provided demonstrating all these elements can fit.

Response: *Wall heights are indicated on the Grading and Drainage Plan, Sheet 5. An updated cross sectional detail of the wall area has been provided on Sheet 14 of the revised Site Plans.*

Utilities. (§9.7.11.3)

Comment U1. Telephone and cable utilities are not shown. We recommend these utilities be included in the design plans.

Response: *These utilities have been added to the revised Site Plans.*

Comment U2. Confirm that all hydrants and gate valves are in accordance with Town Standards.

Response: *All hydrant and valves shall be in accordance with Town and DWWD standards.*

Comment U3. For clarity we suggest moving the Stormceptor 450i detail on sheet 13 to sheet 15.

Response: *As suggested, the Stormceptor 450i detail has been moved. For reference sheet 15 is now sheet 16 in the revised plan set.*

Comment U4. Confirm that garage areas will have floor drains connected to the proposed MDC gas traps.

Response: *The covered garage areas will have floor drains and they will be connected to the MDC gas traps.*

Land Uses and Common Areas. (§9.7.11.4) and Public Gathering Areas (§9.7.11.13)

Comment LU-1. Clarify when the central open green space will be constructed relative to development of the Hawthorne Site.

Response: *As discussed as part of the Medical Office Enabling PDR, Phase A of the Linear Park will be completed prior to the Medical Office Building receiving a Certificate of Occupancy. Phase B, which is the southeast quadrant of the park, adjacent to Hawthorne Building 2, will be completed within 60 days after the last Building 2 Certificate of Occupancy. This will allow the planting materials to be installed without being damaged by building construction and within the appropriate planting season.*



Circulation, Traffic Impact & Public Street Access. (§9.7.11.6)

Comment PA-1. Clarify building entrance location, and confirm that an accessible path is maintained from accessible spaces to building entrance.

Response: *Additional information has been included on the Site Plan, Sheet 4, relative to building entrance locations and accessible paths. An accessible path is provided from the accessible parking areas to each accessible entrance.*

Comment PA-2. A sidewalk on the northerly side of the Bridges driveway should be considered.

Response: *A five (5) foot wide sidewalk has been added on the northerly side of the common driveway.*

Comment PA-3. Provide additional detail for the subsurface parking garage, including dimensions of parking stalls.

Response: *A revised garage plan has been provided to show additional detail as requested.*

Comment PA-4. Clarify how an entering vehicle would access spaces 21, 22, 48, 49, 50 or 51 in the subsurface garage.

Response: *As shown on the revised garage plan, the drive aisle is a full 24 feet wide and the parking spaces are standard 9' x 18' in size. Turning movements occur similar to any parking lot / garage. Granted, we acknowledge that an extra turn may be necessary to access spaces 49 and 50, however it is possible and has been done successfully at many other communities.*

Comment PA-5. Clarify whether accessible spaces are provided in the garage. It appears that space #23 could be accessible, as it is located next to the elevator entry. Provide additional grading details for accessible pathway if this is the case.

Response: *The project will provide four (4) accessible parking spaces in the surface parking lot and one (1) accessible parking space in each building for a total of six (6) accessible spaces. The building is constructed on a flat slab and the garage will have pitch to drain to interior floor drains. The slab pitch will be less than 2% and ADA accessible.*

Comment PA-6. Relocate the accessible space located at the northern end of the eastern parking aisle (by the dumpster). CMR 521.23.3.2 requires that accessible spaces serving a facility shall be on the shortest route to an accessible entrance.

Response: *As noted herein, this parking space has been removed. The project will provide four (4) accessible parking spaces in the surface parking lot and one (1) accessible parking space in each building for a total of six (6) accessible spaces.*

Comment PA-7. Clarify intended use and accessibility details of the doorways leading the landscaped area between the two buildings.

Response: *Additional information has been included on the Site Plan, Sheet 4, relative to building entrance locations and accessible paths. An accessible path is provided from each*



accessible parking area to each accessible entrance. The walkway from the plaza to the gazebo will be ADA accessible.

Comment PA-8. Clarify locations of Bike racks. Confirm details are compliant with Town standards.

Response: *Locations for bike racks are shown on the revised Site Plans, refer to sheets 4 and 9.*

Public Safety (§9.7.11.7)

Comment PS1. Regarding access to the adjacent Brigham development, confirm whether or not the fire department wants to take the opportunity to have access to the Brigham site via the easterly parking lot aisle before Phase II of the Brigham Site is completed. With regard to access, the raised curb detail shown on sheet 12 which separates the Hawthorne and Brigham developments appears to be abrupt and may be a concern to the fire department. Verify that access requirements and details are acceptable to the fire department.

Response: *Based on discussions with the Fire Department a three-inch mountable curb will be provided along with a bollard and chain barrier to prevent pass through traffic between the two sites. The Fire Department will be provided keys to the bollard and chain.*

Comment PS2. Provide documentation that the Fire Chief is in agreement with the general site layout and emergency access. Turning templates in accordance with Town fire department equipment should be provided.

Response: *The project team met with the Fire Department to review emergency access on December 21st and again on January 18th. Site plans have been revised to provide emergency access to Brigham and Womens, the Linear Park and between the two Pulte buildings based on the meeting.*

Stormwater Management (§9.7.11.8)

Comment SW1. In comparison to the Master Plan, a small portion of the site now drains to Bridges access drive. Confirm the closed drainage system on Bridges driveway has adequate capacity to handle the new flows from the project site.

Response: *The Master Plan included the small portion of the parking area draining towards Bridges Drive. The May 17, 2017 Stormwater memorandum included Stormcad calculations that identified this area as CB-3000. Therefore, the piping in Bridges Driveway has adequate capacity.*

Comment SW2. Depict all enabling infrastructure that is required for site drainage on the plans (i.e. drainage system connection from Bridges driveway to linear park infiltration system is not shown on sheet 6).

Response: *The enabling infrastructure has been added to the revised plans.*

Comment SW3. Provide siltation barrier along the southerly property line.

Response: *Siltation controls have been added along the toe of slope near the southern limit of work.*



Comment SW4. Revise "straw bales" to "straw wattles" at temporary soil stockpile depicted on sediment control plan to be consistent with details.

Response: *Compost socks are called for at the temporary soil stockpile depicted on the Sediment Control Plan per request of the Conservation Commission.*

Comment SW5. Provide details for the cast in place floor depicted on the Typical Dog House Manhole detail.

Response: *As noted on the detail, a design will be required by a Massachusetts Registered Professional Engineer. This design would be provided as part of the Shop Drawing process. The note on the detail will be updated to clarify this requirement.*

Comment SW6. Clarify if the kor-n-seal boot depicted on the Typical Dog House Manhole detail is intended to be used for HDPE drainage pipe.

Response: *The kor-n-seal boot is not intended for HDPE piping and will be removed from the detail.*

Outdoor Lighting. (§9.7.11.9)

Comment L-1. The proposed parking lot lighting includes 11 single luminaire light poles and 10 lighted bollards. The light poles are 12' tall with the DSS decorative fixtures. The other parking lots have used a LSI type XSB or XPT LED fixture on the poles. This proposed style is different from other parking areas and should be verified to be acceptable to the Town.

Response: *We are now proposing 11 single luminaire poles and 14 lighted bollards. We have updated the 12' tall parking lot lights to different fixtures which allowed us to improve the parking lot lighting levels and better distribute the lighting. We added the additional bollard lights to fill in some of the gaps along the east side of building #1 in the previous design. As discussed with the Board, Acknowledged. the style of light proposed and amount of lighting provided is typical and appropriate for this type of residential development. and will be discussed further with the Board. Our lighting program is designed to reduce light pollution and conserve energy while maintaining reasonable nighttime safety and security.*

Comment L-2. The calculations table provided indicates an average horizontal illuminance of 1.56 fc, with a uniformity ratio of 15.60. The agreed-upon values in the final Table 1 (4/5/2013) for parking areas include a minimum average illuminance of 4.0fc. The average of 1.56fc is too low for a parking area. It is recommended to provide more lighting to increase the average illuminance.

Response: *The April 5, 2013 Lighting Memorandum did not provide lighting levels for residential parking areas applicable to the Development application. Therefore, Pulte relied on their operational experience in order to determine adequate lighting levels and is of the opinion that average light level of 1.5fc +/- is appropriate. Our lighting program is designed to reduce light pollution and conserve energy while maintaining reasonable nighttime safety and security.*

Comment L-3. The agreed-upon values in the final Table 1 (4/5/2013) for parking areas include a uniformity ratio of 4.0. This is the ratio of average to minimum foot-candles to minimize areas that are



either too bright or too dark. It is recommended to revise the design to reduce to the uniformity ratio to closer to 4.0.

Response: *The April 5, 2013 Lighting Memorandum did not provide lighting levels for residential parking areas applicable to the Development application. Pulte feels the lighting proposed provides evenly distributed lights and is appropriate for this residential development. Our lighting program is designed to reduce light pollution and conserve energy while maintaining reasonable nighttime safety and security.*

Comment L-4. The summary table on Sheet 10 lists the minimum illuminance in the parking lot as 0.1fc. There are areas that are shown as 0.0fc and therefore the calculation table does not appear to be consistent with the actual points shown on Sheet 10. Revised calculations should be submitted.

Response: *The lighting has been revised and there are no areas of 0.0fc anymore.*

Comment L-5. No lighting plan was provided for covered parking. We anticipate lighting in those areas will be resolved during the building permit review.

Response: *Interior lighting will be addressed as part of the Building Permit submission.*

Spill Prevention and Response. (§9.7.11.17)

Comment SPR1. Provide information on any portion of the development that will have emergency back-up generators or will store any of the materials listed in Section 9.7.5.2.10.

Response: *No emergency generators are proposed as part of the development. An Operations and Maintenance Plan has been submitted to the Town Planner, and no materials listed in Section 9.7.5.2.10 will be stored on site.*

Signage. (§9.7.10)

Comment S-1. Clarify if other signage is proposed on or around the building. To what extent is directional signage proposed along University Avenue.

Response: *All signage proposed on site is shown on the Site Plan Sheet 4 of 15. Wayfinding signs along University Avenue have reserved space to provide direction to Hawthorne at University Station by the master developer.*

Comment S-2. A separate signage package indicating signage locations, size, content, materials and colors should be prepared for consideration by the Board

Response: *An initial sign package has been submitted as an attachment to this comment letter. A final site sign package will be submitted prior to building permit.*

Comments provided by the Westwood Board of Health:

Comment: The applicant shall use a waste hauler, licensed by the Westwood Board of Health to dispose of construction debris and trash.



Response: *Comment acknowledge. All waste haulers shall be licensed by the Westwood Board of Health.*

Comment: The dumpster provided for the trash disposal shall be sized appropriately, placed on a concrete base and appropriately screened in compliance with Westwood Board of Health Dumpster Regulations.

Response: *Trash receptacles are provided within the garage and will be temporarily wheeled to an exterior concrete pad for removal. There will be no long-term or permanent exterior storage of trash receptacles. No exterior dumpsters are proposed for trash or recycling. Refer to revised plans.*

Comment: If necessary during construction, the applicant shall provide a portable toilet, licensed by the Westwood Board of Health.

Response: *Comment acknowledged. Any portable toilets utilized during construction shall be licensed by the Westwood Board of Health.*

Comments provided by the Westwood Conservation Commission:

Comment 1. This project falls under the Order of Conditions for the University Station project (Order of Conditions #338-0422) for work within 100 feet of a resource area. The Commission issued on the Order on June 28, 2007 with the attached site specific conditions #32 - #42. The Order has been extended under and Extension Permit until June 28, 2019. Thirty (30) days prior to this date a new Extension Permit must be requested.

Response: *The applicant acknowledges site specific conditions #32 to #42. The applicant along with the Master Developer understands an Extension Permit must be requested 30 days prior to expiration of the current Extension Permit.*

Comment 2. All vehicles must exit the construction site via the stabilized construction exit shown on sheet number 8 of 16.

Response: *Comment acknowledged. All vehicles shall exit via a stabilized construction exit.*

Comment 3. The erosion control detail shown on sheet number 8 of 16 shows a straw wattle and silt fence as erosion control. The commission requires compost sock of filter mitt and orange construction fence.

Response: *The straw wattle detail has been revised to show a compost sock and the siltation fence detail has been removed. Siltation barrier is noted to consist of compost sock and orange construction fence on sheet 7.*

Comment 4. The applicant is proposing European Hornbeam and Japanese Andromeda, which are non-native. Only native plants should be introduced.

Response: *The revised plans now include Armstrong Red Maple in place of European Hornbeam, and Mountain Laurel in place of Andromeda.*



Comment 5. The infiltration system should be inspected prior to backfill.

Response: *The infiltration system will be inspected by the Engineer or Record (or their designee) prior to backfilling. The applicant will notify the Town Planner and Conservation Agent of the inspection, so they may join.*

Comment 6. Regarding the dumpster, the applicant may want to consider moving the dumpster closer to the building due to the large wetland area and Area of Critical Concern on the other side of the rail road tracks.

Response: *The dumpster has been removed and this change is reflected on the revised site plans.*

Comment 7. All impervious surfaces shall be kept clean during the duration of the project.

Response: *Comment acknowledged. Construction access will be via the driveway commonly referred to as "Bridges Drive" and will be kept clean during the duration of construction.*

Comments provided by the Dedham-Westwood Water district

Comment 1. We recommend the same operations and maintenance plans as the other University Ave. NED projects.

Response: *An operations and maintenance plan revised to be appropriate for this specific residential development however still consistent with other University Ave. NED projects has been submitted to the Town.*

Comment 2. Although not shown on the plan, please confirm that the water main will be ultimately owned by the Water District with appropriate easement. The domestic and fire service pipes must be connected to a Water District owned water main.

Response: *Confirmed. The water main will ultimately be owned by the Water District with appropriate easement. The easement will be coordinated with the Water District.*

Comment 3. We recommend that dogs be prohibited from these condos because of the proximity to the Public Water Supplies.

Response: *The applicant cannot agree to prohibit dogs from the development. The project is outside the Zone I well radius (400'). Our dog owners will comply with all rules and restrictions regarding dogs that are in place at University Station.*

Comments provided by the Town Planner (email dated 1/10/18)

Comment 1. Update the architectural design of the buildings to implement all of BETA's and Mike Sinesi's recommendations. The Board members asked for improved façade elements mainly with more consistent design and pattern changes of the entrances, downspouts, windows, material changes but they also expect that you'll revise the plans to fully address all of BETA's recommendations. You were also asked to consider having two distinct buildings rather than two of the same.



Response: *Please see revised architectural plans and renderings. We have made many revisions to the design as discussed above based on all the comments received. We are also happy to review the updated drawings with the Board at the next hearing. It is our opinion due to the closeness of the buildings that the design of the buildings should be the same and consistent with each other. We will have additional color palettes for the Board's consideration.*

Comment 2. Revised plans providing the full access the Fire Department requested with the paved access to the buildings with concrete or pavers. The images of the park shown last night did not fully represent the Fire Department's needs to access the building from the park. The truck needs to get closer to the building without driving on grass.

Response: *The plans have been revised to provide appropriate access between the two buildings as requested by the Fire Department. The access will consist of an 18' wide travel way, inclusive of a 6' wide asphalt path in the center, a 2' wide stamped concrete band to either side of that, and a 4' wide reinforced turf band to either side of the stamped concrete. This design has been reviewed with the fire chief and our understanding is that it is acceptable to him.*

Comment 3. Update the plans to provide a package delivery room in each building. The small mail area is not sufficient and there should be enough space to accommodate about 25 packages a day in area that won't block access.

Response: *The mail room as provided is sufficient and will not cause any issues with access. We have updated the design to include a package delivery area in each of the buildings foyer so that the packages have an organized place and will not impede access.*

Comment 4. Provide a loading and loading area

Response: *The plans provide a temporary loading and unloading area in front of the plaza. Two (2) 15-minute parking spaces close to the buildings entrances have also been provided on the revised plans.*

Comment 5. Provide a short term parking area between and closest to the buildings for delivery trucks, taxis/Ubbers, food deliveries and quick visits

Response: *Surface parking provided is intended for all these uses on a first come first serve basis. With that said, in addition, two "15-Minute Parking" spaces have been designated in front close to the Buildings entrances.*

Comment 6. As suggested by BETA provide two options for the Board's consideration; Option 1) the stairs/ramp from the courtyard area to a sidewalk on the north side of Bridges Way and an Option 2) showing the courtyard area with more landscaping and physical separation with a wall. A fence was suggested but a 3-4 ft. decorative wall will block that physical access so that residents can't physically go that way and will be less maintenance than a fence.



Response: *The plans have been revised to show option 2 with a proposed wall providing a physical separation between the courtyard and the common driveway. This is the applicant's preferred design.*

Comment 7. Lighting – the members didn't weigh in too much on the amount of light proposed but there shouldn't be gaps of 0 especially along the sidewalk behind building 1. Typically they require a minimum of 0.5 for commercial areas. They will also want to see the proposed locations of the wall lighting which should also be captured in the photometric plan.

Response: *The lighting fixtures on the plan have been revised to provide a more even distribution of light. There are no longer gaps of 0.0fc on the revised plans.*

Comment 8. Sidewalks – all 5 ft. wide concrete with the ramps down to the drives/parking areas

Response: *All sidewalks have been revised to be 5 ft. wide as requested. The materials along the Common Driveway are proposed to match the materials previously utilized there (concrete and granite). However, as Hawthorne is a privately maintained condominium, the Applicant prefers to utilize bituminous walks and cape cod berms within the residential condominium. Bituminous sidewalks hold up very well in New England weather and are safer to manage in the winter and are more able to be successfully repaired.*

Comment 9. Recycling inside the buildings with a pickup area outside close to the buildings the same as the trash

Response: *Recycling is now proposed inside the buildings and the plans have been revised per this comment.*

As always, please do not hesitate to contact me at (508) 480-9900 should you have any questions or wish to discuss any of the enclosed information in greater detail.

Sincerely,
Bohler Engineering

Nathaniel E. Mahonen, P.E.

Cc: Brian Dugdale, Esq., Goulston & Storrs
Paul Cincotta, New England Development
Mark Mastroianni, Pulte Homes of New England, LLC
Nathan Cheal, PE, Tetra Tech