Katherine Miller, Planning & Programs
MassHousing
One Beacon Street, 26th floor
Boston, MA 02108

Dear Ms. Miller,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposal by 518 South Ave LLC to develop 275 rental housing units off of South Avenue in Weston by the Hanover Company. The application is dated March 19, 2019.

Town of Weston officials have had the opportunity to learn more about this proposal in a presentation to the Board of Selectmen on March 26, 2019, and at a site walk on April 8, 2019. Please note that the town has been working aggressively, as described below, to make progress towards meeting the housing needs of the Town and the region. For the reasons detailed below, the Town cannot support the development as proposed and requests that MassHousing deny the Project Eligibility Letter (PEL) application and require resubmission for a PEL for a 200 unit project with financials for a proper review.

The Selectmen would like to present the Planning Board’s findings as the main reason for their decision to request that the PEL be denied outright. The Planning Board has presented, and the Selectmen fully agree with and adopt, a compelling case against the PEL, including but not limited to a side-by-side comparison of this project in relation to the Town of Weston Policies and Preferences for Affordable Housing. There are many aspects of the project that are not compatible with the development of surrounding areas of Town, primarily due to the size, height, density, and massing of the development. There are extensive safety concerns and inconsistencies within the applicant’s materials which are well documented by the Planning Board in its findings.

Among the Planning Board’s (and in turn our) objections are:

- The project fails to meet the requirements set forth in 760CMR56: “Conceptual Project Design is Generally Appropriate.”
The project fails to meet the requirements set forth in 760CMR56: Integration into Existing Development Patterns.”

- The Town of Weston’s previous and current actions to meet the affordable housing needs of the community.
- The confusion placed upon the Planning Board and the Town in their review of a 275-unit project compounded by the applicant’s mid-stream shift, after the Town already received notification from MassHousing to begin the review, that it is going to seek a 200-unit development (a development for which the Town has received no plans or other documentation) instead. (We did receive an updated presentation deck for 200 units, which were disseminated to the town boards, but Hanover outright refused to represent the updated information and details.)
- More specifically, despite emphasis by Hanover on the Sustainable Development Criteria Scorecard for “concerted public participant effort (beyond minimally required public hearings),” they have refused any further meetings with the Planning Board regarding a 200-unit proposal.

The Planning Board’s full response is attached and incorporated herein by reference.

Residents and Town officials support the creation of more affordable housing units in Weston, as demonstrated by the adoption of the Weston Housing Production Plan on May 25, 2016, and approved by the State on June 28, 2016. Weston’s Town Meeting has repeatedly voted to support affordable housing initiatives over the past few years and we are proud of the continuing work between the Town, the Weston Affordable Housing Foundation, Inc., a non-profit organization in Weston, and the Weston Affordable Housing Trust, which both receive Town-appropriated Community Preservation Act funds to develop and maintain affordable rental units in Weston. The Town recently invested significant time and resources in working towards our affordable housing goal by partnering with Boston Properties at 133 Boston Post Road until the applicant abruptly stopped pursuing the project. Additionally, there is currently a 180 unit project under consideration at 751 Boston Post Road (for which the Board of Selectmen sent a letter of support to MassHousing, dated April 1, 2019) that will provide significant progress toward that goal. In stark contrast to the proponent of the South Avenue proposal, the 751 Boston Post Road applicant has designed a project that is sensitive to the concerns of the Town.

Additional comments received by the Board of Selectmen concerning this project are also attached for reference and review by MassHousing. We urge MassHousing to take the Town’s concerns into consideration when reviewing 518 South Ave LLC’s application for Site Approval at 518 South Avenue. The Town’s position is that the proposed site is not appropriate for this project as currently presented; and when taking into account the Town’s previous municipal actions and near future plans, a PEL should not be issued.

To reiterate, based on the massing and potential impact of the proposed Project, along with the regulations and guidelines governing and advising the issuance of a PEL, the proposed site is not appropriate for this project. Finally, the Town respectfully requests that the applicant be directed to submit a new application for a PEL if it decides to reduce the density of the project to 200 or fewer units. Though such a project change might mitigate some of the Town’s concerns, it would render meaningless MassHousing’s review process. Developers should be
required to seek a project eligibility determination based upon the actual intended application they intend to submit to the local Zoning Board of Appeals – and not based upon a project that is nearly 40% larger, that they know could not be the basis of a comprehensive permit application, and that would be different from the application in numerous respects (which could be positive or negative, the key being that it is impossible to know without seeing the details of any proposal for so many fewer units).

Sincerely,
WESTON BOARD OF SELECTMEN

[Signature]

HARVEY BOSHART
Chairman

Attachments: Town of Weston Policies & Preferences for Affordable Housing Planning Board memorandum and attachments Additional Town comments (including selected substantive comments from residents)


**TOWN OF WESTON**

**Policies and Preferences for Affordable Housing**

**Introduction**

This working paper contains a set of draft policies that are intended to serve as guidance for affordable housing developers and Town boards that have a role in development review. The policies are also intended to inform Town voters about the general approach and criteria that may be used by the Trustees of a Housing Trust for affordable housing, if such an independent legal entity is created by vote at a Weston Town meeting. The draft policies were vetted, modified, and tentatively approved by the Weston Housing Partnership in a series of meetings commencing in March 2009 and continuing into 2010.

**Background.** Weston is an exceptionally beautiful town. It is also one of the Commonwealth’s most expensive towns to live in, with land values and home prices exceeding those of many nearby towns. The pressures on Weston’s housing market are intensified by its location along two of Greater Boston’s most important highways – Route 128 and the Massachusetts Turnpike – which also play a role in Weston’s desirability. Many of the obstacles to affordable housing in Weston seem comparable to the barriers found in other high-end suburbs around Boston. However, many of these affluent suburbs communities have somewhat greater social and economic diversity.

Weston has taken steps to address affordable housing needs. Over time, Weston has created 140 units of affordable housing, mainly for senior housing. (Appendix A.) In 2004, the Town commissioned a needs analysis, focusing on municipal employees and the families of METCO students attending the Weston Public Schools. Four years later, the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) prepared a housing study, *Weston Affordable Housing: Present and Future*, which identified several barriers that will continue to impede efforts to create affordable housing units in Weston:

- The lack of “construction-ready” land and the extraordinarily high cost of land;
- Low-density development regulations;
- Lack of local development capacity; and
- Difficulty in siting septic systems that will comply with Title V.

In 2009, the Town established the Weston Housing Partnership, to establish a strategic plan for preserving and increasing affordable housing in Weston, to prepare for the establishment of a Weston Affordable Housing Trust Fund, and to suggest priorities and criteria for use by such a Housing Trust. The task for the volunteer Housing Partnership is to strategize to overcome the physical, market, and regulatory barriers noted in MAPC’s study. The creation of policy will be a first step toward the stated goal. Increasing the supply of affordable housing will require local commitment,
leadership, thoughtful public education, and patience. This applies in all communities, including those with long-standing track records in affordable housing development.

**Proposed Policies.** The Partnership has initiated steps to formulate and document policies that describe its view of what Weston would like to see in affordable housing developments. This includes where developments should be located, how it should be designed to fit within Weston’s physical and cultural landscape, and what types of needs it should address. The “Policies and Preferences” that appear on the following pages speak to qualities considered essential for the success of any affordable housing development; from one-unit to multi-unit projects, and qualities considered advantageous, but not necessarily essential. The main purpose of the policies is to convey a consistent message to developers and guide the work of Town boards that have roles to play in development review and permitting. Many of the criteria described below could serve as tradeoffs in negotiations with developers.

The Policies and Preferences appear first in narrative form and second, in a chart designed to function as a checklist and evaluation tool (Appendix B). The chart subdivides the policies into more finely-tuned categories and identifies the types of projects to which they apply, e.g., many policies that relate to multi-unit developments are not germane to single-unit developments. To transform the Policies and Preferences from a working paper to a formal policy statement for the Town, this document needs to be reviewed, discussed, and modified as necessary, and ultimately adopted by the Housing Partnership, the Board of Selectmen, and the Planning Board, and other relevant Town committees.

These Policies and Preferences will then be offered to the town residents as context if a vote at town meeting is requested for the creation of a Housing Trust, as a legal entity intended to attract and provide financial support for the construction and maintenance of affordable housing in Weston.

**Policies and Preferences**

**Location**

**Policies.** Weston encourages the reuse of existing houses and buildings for affordable and mixed-income housing. This redevelopment and reuse are preferred, as much of the Town is already developed, preservation of undisturbed open space is a priority, and affordable housing options should be distribution throughout the Town. General areas which have been identified as possible sites for accommodating a variety of housing options include land that is in, or within, one-half mile of the following: the Town center (including affordable units in mixed-use buildings), the commuter rail stations, or the public schools and other municipal facilities. Established areas along the town’s major roadways are also deemed preferential.
Affordability and Housing Needs

Policies. Weston has a significant shortage of units that are both affordable and appropriate for senior citizens and families. The Town encourages developments that address these specific local needs. All affordable units must be protected by a perpetual affordable housing deed restriction accepted by the Weston Board of Selectmen and approved by the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) under M.G.L. c. 184, §§ 31-32.

While at least 25 percent of the units in a Chapter 40B comprehensive permit development must be affordable, Weston encourages developers to provide more affordable units whenever possible. An increase in density may be considered in order to achieve this end. Weston would want the following types of households to have priority access to the additional affordable units that exceed the 25 percent minimum, to the extent permitted by law:

- Low- and moderate-income households;
- Senior citizens;
- Municipal employees; and
- METCO families.

Additional Preferences. A development that provides a wider range of affordability will be considered more responsive to the Town’s housing needs. “Wider range of affordability” means the inclusion of units for “subsidized” households with very low incomes – below 50 percent of Area Median Income (AMI) – and units for “moderate income” households, that do not qualify under Chapter 40B income limits, but are nonetheless priced out of Weston’s housing market. These households typically have incomes between 80 and 120 percent of the Boston statistical area median income (AMI), as defined by Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

Density

Policies. Affordable housing should be developed at a moderate density and in buildings that will blend harmoniously and unobtrusively with surrounding neighborhoods. In Weston, “moderate density” means that on any given site, the average or gross density will not exceed four dwelling units per acre, and new buildings will not exceed three stories in height. However, the Town will consider higher density housing in the town center and near the train stations, or in an adaptive reuse development. Example: If given the choice between a higher-density development in a preferred location and a development of four units per acre elsewhere, the Town would look more favorably on the higher-density development, unless the project failed to address many other policies described in these guidelines.
Site Planning and Design

Architectural and site design choices are critical to the success of affordable housing proposals. A development that closely adheres to the Town’s design policies and preferences is more likely to receive a favorable review. A development that is out of character with surrounding areas, and designed without sufficient regard for its impacts on neighboring properties, will be discouraged, and will likely not receive Town support.

Policies. The Planning Board’s review of site plan applications is guided by standards set forth in Section XI (F) of the Weston Zoning Bylaw. These standards matter because they address a development’s physical, operational, and aesthetic compatibility with surrounding land uses, and help to ensure public safety. Developments that include affordable housing, whether proposed under a Comprehensive Permit or another permitting mechanism, should comply with the Town’s site plan standards. In addition, the following factors need to be addressed in a developer’s submission to the Town:

- Minimize land disturbance;
- Choose building designs that are similar to single-family homes, and substantially consistent with the principles described in Preserving Weston’s Rural Character;
- Minimize massing and bulk;
- Design for safety, considering safety to the occupants both within the structure (building layout) and on the exterior (site layout);
- Utilize stormwater management during, and post construction. Use best management practices wherever possible.

Additional Preferences: Moderate affordable workforce housing, in addition to traditional affordable housing: tiered eligibility

Weston would like to see several preferences addressed in proposals for affordable housing. The Town understands that some of the following preferences will not apply in all cases. However, developers should respond to as many of these preferences as possible, and note those which are either irrelevant or infeasible.

- Provide accessible or adaptable units. (Multi-family developments may be required to provide accessible housing under the Massachusetts Architectural Access Board’s regulations, the State Building Code, or both.)
- Locate parking on the side or rear of buildings.
- Design for walk ability by providing sidewalks or informal pathways, or both.

---

1 Preserving Weston’s Rural Character, photographs and text by Pamela W. Fox, prepared for the Weston Planning Board, November 1998
Design for a sense of community. Consider building and site layouts that encourage communication and interaction among residents of the development (e.g., common space within buildings, or common facilities, open space, or recreation areas).

Protect historic resources by designing projects to avoid adverse impacts on structures with historic or architectural significance.

Employ “green” development practices, considering both buildings and the site.

Address sustainability in the design, construction, and operations/maintenance of the project.

Conserve water and protect natural vegetation with:
- Landscaping consisting of low-water-use plantings
- Landscaping consisting only of non-invasive species
- Stormwater management during and post construction, use BMPs wherever possible
- Outdoor irrigation system that conserves water and relies on a private well
- On- and off-site impacts during construction.

Some developments – especially if they involve new construction on vacant land – may be able to protect open space by design. In these cases, clustered buildings and compact building forms could help to achieve an average density of four units per acre, and still leave much of the site undisturbed. Furthermore, developers should try to respond to the following open space preferences:

- Preserve at least 40 percent of the site as common open space;
- Design common open space so that it will be accessible to all residents of the development
- Comply with the Town’s minimum setback requirements

Additional Benefits to the Town

Policies. Like any other development submitted for review and approval by the Town, developments that include affordable housing may be required to provide mitigation (e.g.: traffic and/or infrastructure) at a level appropriate to the size and location of the project. Developers will also be expected to pay the reasonable cost of peer review services deemed necessary (e.g.: traffic or infrastructure).

Affirmative Marketing and Local Preference

Policies. Weston wants to ensure that affordable housing meets local housing needs, and also creates opportunities for new people to move into the community. Affirmative marketing plans, a lottery process, and monitoring for rental (long term) and
homeownership units must be designed, and should provide a significant inclusionary role for the Town. Developers shall retain a competent, experienced lottery consultant acceptable to the Town, in order to insure compliance with all fair housing and marketing requirements, in addition to qualifying applicants. To the maximum extent permitted by law, at least 50 percent of the affordable units in a development should be offered, on a priority basis, to Weston residents or people with direct ties to the Town, including:

- An individual or family legally residing in the Town of Weston;
- A household with at least one person employed by the Town of Weston
- A family with a child attending the Weston Public Schools under the METCO Program.
- A person with disabilities (or a household with a family member with a disability);
- Single parent families
- Military personnel

**Further Preferences.** Weston will also encourage developers to provide other public benefits in addition to affordable housing, such as:

- Preservation and reuse of existing structures;
- Pedestrian amenities;
- Contribution to address capital improvement needs directly related to the project; and/or
- Contribution to Town’s affordable housing fund.
According to the Weston Census data of 2008/9:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-17 yrs</td>
<td>2909</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>2278</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-59</td>
<td>3937</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>2751</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 11,876 residents

Presumption: All of the individuals aged 0-17 live with an adult. Many in the age category 18-34 are not homeowners, so to get a ‘ball park’ family percentage (added 0-17 + 35-59 + ½ 35-59 age categories)= approximately 70%

Weston Affordable Housing Data: Total Housing Units = 3,828
Total Affordable Units = 140 or 3.5%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3 Rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>113 Rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>140*</td>
<td>3 Ownership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Rental units: 115, or 82% Ownership units: 26, or 18%]

DHCD credits Weston with 3.5% affordable housing. The State goal is 10%.

Weston has 83% of their affordable units reserved for approximately 25% of the population (55+), and 16% affordable for 75% of population (family)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Percent Affordable Units</th>
<th>Density</th>
<th>Approved Housing Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weston</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>686/sq mi</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2,867/sq mi</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>1,838/sq mi</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>412/sq mi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayland</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>865/sq mi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>4,550/sq mi</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natick</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>1,980/sq mi</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Average</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weston's tear down average is approximately 30 homes per year. Approximately 75% of new homes constructed are a result of tear downs.

According to 2007 US Census, the median income is Middlesex County is $88,100. The average home price in Weston is $1.3 million.
### Appendix B: Project Review Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY/PREFERENCE</th>
<th>Single-family dwelling or group home</th>
<th>Group Home</th>
<th>Small projects (≤ 8 Units)</th>
<th>Larger projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is in or within ½ mile of the town center, the commuter rail stations, municipal facilities, or public schools</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is in another preferred location (the town’s major roadway corridors)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is already developed and involves reuse of an existing building</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUILDING &amp; LANDSCAPE DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building designs substantially consistent with principles described in “Preserving Weston’s Rural Character,” Vol. 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building(s) are very similar to single-family homes</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massing and bulk are minimized</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project designed for safety, both interior (building layout) and exterior (site)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes accessible or adaptable units</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side and/or rear parking</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkability: sidewalks, internal pathways</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design reinforces sense of community; encourages communication, interaction</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No adverse impact on historic/architectural significance</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and site employ green features (design, construction, operations/maintenance)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPEN SPACE &amp; NATURAL RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserves at least 40 percent of the site as open space</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space is accessible to all residents of the development</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adheres to town’s minimum setback requirements</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping composed of low-water-use plantings</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping composed only of non-invasive species</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor irrigation system designed to conserve water, relies on private wells</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SITE PLAN STANDARDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantially conforms to ZBL Section XI(F), Standards and Criteria</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimizes land disturbance</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimizes construction impacts</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DENSITY AND SCALE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density does not exceed an average of four units per acre, except that:</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near the town center, in the vicinity of the train stations, or for projects involving redevelopment and reuse of existing buildings, more than four units per acre will be considered</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For new construction, building height does not exceed three stories</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY/PREFERENCE</td>
<td>Single-family dwelling or group home</td>
<td>Group Home</td>
<td>Small projects (≤ 8 Units)</td>
<td>Larger projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUSING DIVERSITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project increases the types of housing options available to one or more of the following groups:</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with disabilities</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC BENEFITS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate funding for town boards to obtain project review assistance from independent consultants</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation and reuse of existing structures</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian amenities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic mitigation</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to a local capital improvements project appropriate to the scale of proposed development</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to Town’s affordable housing fund</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUSING AFFORDABILITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Affordable Units</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development provides 25% or more affordable units</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To the extent allowed by law, affordable units over the 25% minimum will be offered on a priority basis to:</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low- and moderate-income households</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal employees</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METCO families</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with disabilities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Targets</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more units priced for households at/below 70% area median income (AMI)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes any units priced for households at or below 50% AMI</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>High priority</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes any units priced for households with incomes between 81-120% AMI</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term of Affordability</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAIR HOUSING &amp; LOCAL PREFERENCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Preference Units</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers up to 50% local preference units</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Marketing Experience</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team includes town-approved consultant/organization with prior affordable housing lottery experience</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town will have a significant role in affirmative marketing, lottery process</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

DATE: May 1, 2019
TO: Weston Board of Selectmen
CC: Jonathan Buchman, David Hall
FROM: Imaikalani Aiu, Town Planner
RE: 510, 518 and 540 South Avenue Project Eligibility

The Weston Planning Board (the Board) wishes to offer the following comments regarding Hanover’s Project Eligibility application with MassHousing for the creation of 275 apartment rental units (206 market rate, 69 affordable) at 510, 518 and 540 South Avenue. The applicant presented the project to the Planning Board at its April 10, 2019 meeting, and the Board has reviewed the Project Eligibility application to Mass Housing. In reviewing the application, the Board performed an analysis of the project via the Town of Weston Policies and Preferences for Affordable Housing, 760 CMR 56.00 and relied on past MassHousing Eligibility determinations (attached) in reaching its conclusions.

We've included A. Project Recommendations, B. Clarification on Project Density and Project Eligibility, and C. a Conclusion.

A. Project Recommendations

The Board believes Project Eligibility should be denied for the following reasons:

1. Failure to meet 760CMR56 criteria: “Conceptual project design is generally appropriate.”

The building massing and footprint are inconsistent with the surrounding pattern of development. A Weston resident calculated the floor-area ratio (FAR) of surrounding residential and institutional uses and found aggregate FARS of .04 and .06 respectively (attached). The FAR of the proposed project is .75. The Board reviewed this calculation and would consider the finding to be understated. The Gross Living Area used to calculate the residential FAR includes garages, while the living area of the proposed project does not include parking structure. A more apples to apples comparison would include the parking area of the proposed project, raising its FAR to 1.15, or 23X higher than the surrounding pattern.

The development footprint covers practically all the developable area of the site; the building footprint is limited only by those areas necessary for circulation, leaching fields and parking. The building is between four and six stories high, far taller than even the surrounding institutional uses. The height of the building requires large plantings for screening, but the development footprint leaves inadequate room for such screening.
The building massing has no breakdown or variation in height, the four to six story facades vary only by material. There is no-step down transition to the surrounding single family residential homes.

Similar criteria have been used in previous denials of Project Eligibility including:

- **Washington Street Apartments, Norwood (SA-13-005):** Mass Housing noted that “The proposed four-story apartment structure is not compatible with nearby structures in terms of height, mass and scale,” and reinforced this stating, “Despite efforts to vary exterior cladding, the Project's proposed building facades lack sufficient variety and articulation…”

- **Medfield Meadows (MH# 873):** Mass Housing sited criteria relating to the transition to existing development stating “… revised site plans do not adequately mitigate the impact of the proposed building's connection to the existing neighborhood from the initial proposal… Project still fails to make a reasonable transition to this well established residential neighborhood.” This denial also noted similar concerns with regard to overall mass and scale “The proposed three to four-story apartment structures are not compatible with nearby structures in-terms of height, mass and scale.”

Regarding density on **Medfield Meadows,** MassHousing noted “that the Project is simply too dense for the lot on which it is located; nearly the entire Site is occupied by the proposed building program and the limited areas for open space are not sufficient to mitigate the project's effective density.”

2. **Failure to meet 760CMR56 criteria: “Integration into existing development patterns”**

The proposed entrance to 510, 518 and 540 South is adjacent to a slip-lane intersection of South Avenue and Highland Street. Due to safety concerns, this intersection has already been cited for redesign by the Town’s consultants working on South Avenue.

The site is isolated from services and is primarily auto-dependent. Only the Weston High and Middle Schools and Regis College are within a walkable distance. Other services are within a bikeable distance; the Town Center is 2.5 miles away, but there are no bike lanes or paths to safely accommodate those trips. The nearest state transit nodes are 3.5 miles away and similarly lacking any bicycle accommodations.

Similar criteria have been used in previous denials of Project Eligibility including:

- **Saw Mill Village, Easton (PE-512):** MassHousing cited “the proposed access and egress to the site is not ideal given the existing road layout of Foundry Street and the volume of traffic typical during peak hours.” The denial also sites “no safe means to accommodate pedestrian trips to and from the proposed development.”

3. **"Municipal actions previously taken to meet affordable housing needs"**

The Town of Weston has an approved Housing Production Plan and has been working to implement its Housing Strategy. For over two years and over 50 public, neighborhood, and internal meetings, the Town worked to negotiate an acceptable housing project with Boston Properties at their site at 133 Boston Post Road. This development was the largest piece of the Town’s Housing Strategy. The Town and Boston Properties had all but reached an agreeable project of 125 age-restricted units and a 195,000 sf office building when Boston Properties withdrew their application due to a softening of market conditions for the co-located building. While the Town’s primary project is no longer active, the Town is not without large and
supported options – there is currently a large 40B proposal, also in its comment period, at 751-761 Boston Post Road. This project has been strongly supported by the Town in its comments to Mass Housing.

By comparison, the proposed project at 751-761 Boston Post Road is on a far larger (30 acres) and more connected site. It directly abuts the Mass Central Rail Trail and is a mile from the Town Center. The development is more appropriately scaled at 180 units (2.91 units per acre) and between 2-1/2 to 3 stories in height, and fits with the surrounding character much better than the proposed 510, 518 and 540 South project.

The Town is also in early and friendly discussions with a large landowner in south Weston regarding a large, senior 40B development that could fit the pattern of the surrounding area. The Town of Weston also has an active Housing Trust, which was recently given an endowment of $900,000 by the Town to carry out its activities and land at the corner of Wellesley Street and Route 20 on which to develop affordable housing.

Similar criteria have been used in previous denials of Project Eligibility including:

- **Saw Mill Village, Easton:** The Town of Easton, in its February 8, 2012 comments on, noted that it was choosing to focus housing in areas “adjacent to existing development, and sites with the potential for walkability and direct public transit access.” Mass Housing supported this assertion stating it its denial that the preferred Shovel Works project was “directly adjacent to a proposed Commuter Rail Station and within walking distance of the mill village commercial and civic district, including the Municipality's main public education complex.”

- **Washington Street Apartments, Norwood:** Mass Housing noted the “Approval by the Norwood Board of Selectmen of a Housing Production Plan on September 3, 2013. This plan was certified by DHCD on September 19, 2013” as a local action taken in support of affordable housing.

- **Medfield Meadows:** Mass Housing noted that “municipal actions to date have not yet resulted in the production of housing required ‘to meet the municipality's need for affordable housing as measured by the Statutory Minima,’” yet there was still adequate grounds to deny Project Eligibility.

### B. Clarification on Project Density and Eligibility

The Board has been confounded by the changing project density claims of the developer on this Project Eligibility process, to recap:

1. The Town and Board received an Project Eligibility application and full Project Eligibility application set for a 275-unit project.
2. As directed in 760CMR56 regulations, the Town shared the information with residents, several boards (including this Board) and committees studied the documentation, and several boards (including this Board) and held hearings with the applicant and residents.
3. At the end of the Board's hearing, the applicant suggested reducing the density to 200 units and indicated they would like us to comment on that project.
4. We immediately responded that we had no Project Eligibility documentation on a 200-unit project and would be unable to comment.
5. In return, the applicant immediately agreed to that necessity and committed to providing the Board with a full Project Eligibility documentation set and attend another hearing with the Board and residents to review and provide comments on the 200-unit project – as a part of this Project Eligibility process.

6. Days later, the applicant's lawyer sent the Board a letter claiming that the prior hearing was actually for the 200-unit project and rescinded their agreement to provide further documentation or attend further hearings.

7. We responded to the applicant's lawyer and Mass Housing that his claim was entirely untrue and that we would continue our work to provide comments on the Project Eligibility application for 275-units.

8. Finally, Mass Housing confirmed to us that they were seeking comments on the Project Eligibility application for 275-units.

We've found the above applicant behavior not just confounding but very wasteful for the Board and residents, particularly in a very condensed, regulated, and demanding Project Eligibility process.

That said, if the applicant now wishes to pursue a 200-unit 40B project on this site, the Board strongly contends that the applicant must file a Project Eligibility Application, provide the full Project Eligibility documentation, and support a full set of PEL hearings on that 200-unit project.

Our reasons for this position include:

1. According to 760CMR56, the full PEL documentation includes: "approximate number of units", "proforma", "Conceptual site plan, elevation drawings", "number of parking spaces", as well as "description of the approach to architectural massing" – all are critical to the review and comments by the Board and residents, as well as the "coherent response" by the Board of Selectmen. None of those documents have been provided to the Town.

2. According to the Handbook and the Regulations, Mass Housing uses Town comments in determining: "that the site of the proposed project is generally appropriate for residential development", "that the conceptual project design is generally appropriate for the site on which it is located, taking into consideration factors that may include proposed use, conceptual site plan and building massing, topography, environmental resources, and integration into existing development patterns", and "that an initial pro forma has been reviewed, including a land valuation determination consistent with DHCD’s guidelines, and the project appears financially feasible and consistent with DHCD’s guidelines for Cost Examination and Limitations on Profits and Distributions (if applicable) on the basis of estimated development costs." Mass Housing will have no Town comments on these critical matters.

3. The applicant has suggested that, because they are proposing a reduction, it will have less impact and therefore will not require its own Project Eligibility process – we strongly disagree, it would not be a REDUCED project, it will be a DIFFERENT project.

The 200-unit project is a 27% difference and would have very different massing, traffic, and other impacts issues. Also, depending on the design, some aspects may get better and
others may get worse. Also, the developer and the state's "Chapter 40B Handbook" clarify that the Town input should not just be a "yes" or "no" but should include feedback on how to make the project better – we have not seen the 200-unit project and cannot provide that critical feedback.

4. Overall, if the Town is served with an application for a 200-unit Comprehensive Permit without a 200-unit Project Eligibility process, the Town will have been deprived of its right for a required Project Eligibility process, Mass Housing and the applicant will have been deprived of the "coherent response" from the Town, and the 760CMR56 Project Eligibility requirements will not have been fulfilled – therefore, that application would be invalid.

C: Conclusion

The project size, massing, and density in relation to the surrounding context and an isolated, primarily auto dependent location, with an entry at an intersection already saddled with safety concerns meet or exceed the failure thresholds established by previous denials and should also be denied eligibility.

Should the applicant wish to pursue a 200-unit project on that site, a new eligibility process should be initiated whereby its issues can be fully considered and addressed.

Attachments

Analysis of project relative to “Town of Weston Policies and Preferences for Affordable Housing”

Project Eligibility

- Project Eligibility (Site Plan Approval) Application PE -512, Sawmill Village, Easton - March 1, 2012
- Project Eligibility (Site Plan Approval) Application MH 873, Medfield Meadows, Medfield - January 31, 2017
- Project Eligibility (Site Plan Approval) Application SA-13-005, Washington Street Apartments, Norwood – November 13, 2013
- Town of Easton Comments, Sawmill Village – February 8, 2012

Resident Comments

- Letter from Louis Mercuri dated April 5, 2019
- Letter from Paul and Susan DiBenedetto delivered at March 10, 2019 hearing
- Letter from Lise Revers dated April 16, 2019
- Email from Linda Johnson Angelucci dated April 16, 2019
### Affordable Housing Policies and Preferences Analysis 5/1/19

510, 518, and 540 South Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Complies</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION <em>(Supporting Text)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is in another preferred location (the town’s major roadway corridors)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Project accesses via Route 30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is already developed and involves reuse of an existing building</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The project site is largely undeveloped and heavily wooded with two existing residences which will be removed. The eastern portion of the property, approximately 1/3, is wetlands with an intermittent stream. This portion will remain undeveloped. The majority of the area outside of the wetlands and associated 25’ No Disturb area will be cleared.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING &amp; LANDSCAPE DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS <em>(Supporting Text)</em></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building designs substantially consistent with principles described in “Preserving Weston’s Rural Character,” Vol.2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Building design incorporates a modern aesthetic. The wastewater treatment building, which has the most prominent frontage to South Avenue is designed to incorporate elements appropriate to Weston’s design vernacular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massing and bulk are minimized</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The building’s bulk is consistently out of scale with the surrounding neighborhood and uniform across its facades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project designed for safety, both interior (building layout) and exterior (site)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The main entrance of the site is across from the triangle intersection of Route 30, Highland and Winter streets, which has been cited as a safety concern, and the proposed project entry would not be allowed under the Planning Board Rules and Regulations 4.07. The project should coordinate with and contribute to the DPW’s proposed improvements. The project’s secondary emergency access will require widening an existing driveway in the 25’ No Disturb Wetland Area. While the design ostensibly meets safety requirements, the fact that it must do so by compromising protected wetland area questions the suitability of this site for a large project. Project will have to comply with state building codes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Complies</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes accessible or adaptable units</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Accessible and Adaptable units will be required by law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side and/or rear parking</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Parking is located within the courtyard form of the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkability: sidewalks, internal pathways</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Applicant proposes to build new sidewalks between the project and High School. Eventual additions of sidewalks and bike facilities on South Avenue will enhance connectivity; however, the project site lacks bike and pedestrian connections to services and transit nodes and contributions to providing such should be part of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design reinforces sense of community; encourages communication, interaction</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Both internal and external common facilities are provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No adverse impact on historic/architectural significance</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>No historic resources are on either lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and site employ green features:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design,</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Applicant has committed to a number of green building strategies including PV panels for the building, electric vehicle charging stations, energy star appliances and low impact design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction,</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operations/maintenance)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEN SPACE &amp; NATURAL RESOURCES (Supporting Text)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserves at least 40 percent of the site as open space</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The 2.7 acres of wetland or 28% of the site will be preserved as open space. The remainder will be developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space is accessible to all residents of the development</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>No recreational amenities, i.e. trails, are proposed through the open space and the open space is all wetland and intermittent stream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adheres to town’s minimum setback requirements</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The main building overlaps into the 45’ setback at two points, both of which are relatively minor to the overall project footprint, however the overlap is for the full height of the five story building. The wastewater treatment plant at 540 South will intrude significantly into the side setbacks. It should be noted that this lot is non-conforming with regard to lot width and the existing house is within the side setbacks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nonetheless given the size of the overall development and the nature of the building, consideration should be given to reorienting the building to meet setbacks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Complies</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping composed of low-water-use plantings</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Applicant has stated intent to use low water and native species. Project should be peer reviewed for conformance with these landscape criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping composed only of non-invasive species</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor irrigation system designed to conserve water, relies on private wells</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Applicant has committed to using irrigation wells instead of town water, however a project of this size will have significant draws on a well and the local water table. Well water use itself should be minimized in favor of low water plantings and minimizing lawn area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SITE PLAN STANDARDS (Supporting Text)**

Substantially conforms to ZBL Section XI(F) Standards and Criteria

1. Site Integration                                      N

   a. Site Sensitivity

   b. Preserve Natural/Historic Features                  N
      The site contains approximately 2.7 acres of wetlands. The wetlands themselves are not being disturbed but the applicant is proposing to widen an existing driveway which passes through the 25’ No Disturb Area adjacent to an intermittent stream. The road widening is required as a secondary emergency access. The fact that the only way to facilitate site safety is by further compromising wetland resources, questions the suitability of this site for such a development.

   c. Maximize Open Space                                  N

   d. Preserve Scenic Views                                 N
      The development is set back from South Avenue, however the overall height of the building will make it visible over the existing houses between the subject property and South Avenue.

   e. Minimize Site Disturbance                             N
      Practically all of the buildable area on the lot will be cleared.

   f. Screen Objectionable Features                         N
      The wetland area will act as screening to development on the east side of the property,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Complies</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>however the development footprint does not provide room for screening at the other property boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Adequate Water/ Sewage</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Wastewater treatment will be provided on site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Storm Water/ Erosion Mgmt.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Project will need to comply with state wetland protections requirements. Peer review will be necessary for stormwater management and compliance with Weston’s stormwater management policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Minimize Town Services</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Large population will have impact on Fire, Police, and Schools, which will need to be evaluated by a fiscal analysis and mitigated as necessary. The DPW has expressed concerns about the water demand which will need to be evaluated as part of the Comprehensive Permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Vehicular/ Pedestrian Safety</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Project entry will need to be designed to comply with MassDOT safety standards and peer reviewed for safety. We understand that the applicant is conducting a traffic study and that counters were placed on South Avenue during a school vacation week. If this is the case then the counts and study must be redone to obtain accurate counts for safety mitigation. Internal walkways will need to be designed to accommodate pedestrian access to proposed sidewalks along South Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Design Harmony</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The wastewater building fronting South Avenue will be consistent in size and style with neighboring houses, however the size of the main residential building will overshadow even the larger surrounding religious and agricultural buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Utilities Underground</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>All utilities will be underground. Additional conduit capacity should be provided for future changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Setback of Objectionable Features</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The main residential building is setback approximately 400’ from the road, but is setback approximately 45’ from the common property line with the seminary and the residential properties fronting South Ave. Generators will likely be near property lines and condensing and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Complies</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>air handling units will likely be roof mounted. Testing of emergency generators needs to be limited to certain times. Comprehensive Permit review should include a noise mitigation summary outlining the noise generating equipment, location, Dcb and frequency, and number and length of cycles – along with the method of mitigation and expected reduction, resulting in the amount of noise generated at any time and the pitch/frequency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Minimize Shadows</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>The height of the building raises shadowing concerns which should be modeled as part of the Comprehensive Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Limit Glare</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Lighting should be conditioned to California Title 24 compliant. Careful attention should be paid to large expanses of glass, upper story glass, and skylights to either screen or orient as to minimize light spillage to South Avenue and neighboring properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Zoning Requirements</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Practically the entire buildable area will be cleared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimizes land disturbance</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>The construction of this proposed development will take between 2 and 3 years, imposing commercial scale construction onto a residential neighborhood. Impacts will include major site disturbance such as re-grading and tree removal, massive quantities of material being transported to the site and stockpiled, hauling away of site debris, construction waste, demolition materials, trash, etc., continual use of heavy machinery including cranes, and large work crews working and parking on the property. Such activities create an unhealthy environment and can harm the neighbors by exceeding residential norms for air and noise pollution. A constant flow of trucks, workers cars, heavy equipment etc. add significant danger to bikers and pedestrians. To minimize the duration of these effects, modular construction, where most of the fabrication of a building is done offsite in a factory, should be a condition of approval. Modular construction significantly reduces the negative impacts a commercial construction project has on a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
residential neighborhood. Factory constructed “boxes” come to the site with installed windows, cabinets, finished interior and exterior walls. Months and/or years of conventional on-site stick-built construction activities are reduced since the majority of work is done in a factory. The daily deliveries of building materials, outdoor stockpiling, outflow of construction waste, managing large work crews and their cars, etc. is minimized significantly. The Comprehensive Permit review should include a detailed construction and phasing plan as the constrained site will have limited flexibility for staging and stockpiling. The Permit will need adequate conditions to ensure construction impacts are minimized and comply with Town Bylaws for construction activity.

### DENSITY AND SCALE (Supporting Text)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Complies</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Density does not exceed an average of four units per acre.               | N        | Parcel Size = 9.44 acres  
# of Units = 275  
275/9.44 = 29 |
| For new construction, building height does not exceed three stories     | N        | Project is between four and six stories.                                                                                                                                                            |
| Project increases the types of housing options available to one or more of the following groups: | Y        | The unit mix which is largely one bedroom and studios which provide downsizing options to seniors, however no age restriction is planned. The lack of connectivity to services by any other means but car does limit the projects viability as an option for seniors and other supports such as shuttles should be considered. Such services would provide mitigation for traffic concerns regardless of resident age. |
| Seniors                                                                 | TBD      | Project is designed as family housing, however the unit size and mix do not present as many options for families.                                                                                   |
| Families                                                                | TBD      | Project provides public benefits in addition to affordable housing, such as: Accessible units would be required and increase available units for people with disabilities. |

### PUBLIC BENEFITS (Supporting Text)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Complies</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Complies</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate funding for town boards to obtain project review assistance from independent consultants</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Consultants would be procured as part of the Comprehensive Permit process and should include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Civil Engineering (Stormwater and Infrastructure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Financial (Fiscal Impact)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation and reuse of existing structures</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Existing homes are to be torn down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian amenities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>New sidewalk on South Avenue would provide a safe route to school, however there are no other pedestrian connections to other services or transit and none are located within a walkable distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic mitigation</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>A robust Transportation Demand Management program will need to be implemented to manage traffic from the project, particularly given the project location from services; the project is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 2.5 miles to the Town Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 5 miles to Market Basket in Waltham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 4.5 miles from Stop and Shop in Wayland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 3.7 miles to Star Market and other commercial establishments in Auburndale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 3.5 miles to commercial establishments on Route 30 in Wayland. train station is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 3.7 miles to both the Kendal Green and Wellesley Hills train stations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MassDOT considers a three mile trip as bikeable for their Bike Master Plan, meaning a trip to Town Center could be made by bike but improvements to the bike network would be necessary. Improvements to Route 30, which would provide bike access to Auburndale, are being designed by the DPW, but are likely on a five year timeline to implementation. As it currently stands, the project lacks multi-modal connectivity to services and transit and is likely to remain lacking for at least five years. The Comprehensive Permit process should evaluate the proposed measures, coordinate them with efforts by the town to relieve traffic congestion and peer review the overall effect. Comprehensive Permit conditions should include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Complies</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to a local capital improvements project appropriate to the scale of proposed development</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Applicant has committed to building a new sidewalk as part of eventual improvements along Route 30, however to truly provide multi-modal transit options the project should contribute to other infrastructure improvements such as bikes paths and a town shuttle service. Intersection improvements may be needed as part of the project access and addressing safety concerns at Highland Street and South Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to Town's affordable housing fund</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HOUSING AFFORDABILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development provides 25% or more affordable units</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>25% of the units will be affordable.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To the extent allowed by law, affordable units over the 25% minimum will be offered on a priority basis to:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Preferences may not be allowed under the Fair Housing Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low- and moderate-income households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METCO families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Targets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more units priced for households at/below 70% area median income (AMI)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes any units priced for households at or below 50% AMI</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes any units priced for households with incomes between 81-120% AMI</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term of Affordability, Use restriction will be perpetual</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Maintaining all 275 units as qualifying for the Subsidized Housing Inventory, meaning units stay affordable and the project remains rental is critical to the Town. Town Counsel should be actively involved in review of deed restrictions and permit conditions to ensure perpetual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Complies</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affordability and rental operation, especially in the event that the project ownership changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FAIR HOUSING & LOCAL PREFERENCE (Supporting Text)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Preference Units</th>
<th>TBD</th>
<th>Preferences will need to be a condition of the Comprehensive Permit and carried out by lottery consultant.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offers up to 50% local preference units</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Preferences will need to be a condition of the Comprehensive Permit and carried out by lottery consultant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Marketing Experience</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Town participation and selection of lottery consultant will need to be a condition of Comprehensive Site Plan Approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team includes town-approved consultant/ organization with prior affordable housing lottery experience</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Town participation and selection of lottery consultant will need to be a condition of Comprehensive Site Plan Approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town will have a significant role in affirmative marketing, lottery process</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Town participation and selection of lottery consultant will need to be a condition of Comprehensive Site Plan Approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TOWN OF WESTON
Policies and Preferences for Affordable Housing

Excerpts

Location
Policies. Weston encourages the reuse of existing houses and buildings for affordable and mixed-income housing. This redevelopment and reuse are preferred, as much of the Town is already developed, preservation of undisturbed open space is a priority, and affordable housing options should be distribution throughout the Town. General areas which have been identified as possible sites for accommodating a variety of housing options include land that is in, or within, one-half mile of the following: the Town center (including affordable units in mixed-use buildings), the commuter rail stations, or the public schools and other municipal facilities. Established areas along the town’s major roadways are also deemed preferential.

Affordability and Housing Needs
Policies. Weston has a significant shortage of units that are both affordable and appropriate for senior citizens and families. The Town encourages developments that address these specific local needs. All affordable units must be protected by a perpetual affordable housing deed restriction accepted by the Weston Board of Selectmen and approved by the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) under M.G.L. c. 184, §§ 31-32.

While at least 25 percent of the units in a Chapter 40B comprehensive permit development must be affordable, Weston encourages developers to provide more affordable units whenever possible. An increase in density may be considered in order to achieve this end. Weston would want the following types of households to have priority access to the additional affordable units that exceed the 25 percent minimum, to the extent permitted by law:

- Low-, and moderate-income households
- Senior citizens
- Municipal employees
- METCO families.

Additional Preferences. A development that provides a wider range of affordability will be considered more responsive to the Town’s housing needs. “Wider range of affordability” means the inclusion of units for “subsidized” households with very low incomes – below 50 percent of Area Median Income (AMI) – and units for “moderate income” households, that do not qualify under Chapter 40B income limits, but are nonetheless priced out of Weston’s housing market. These households typically have incomes between 80 and 120 percent of the Boston statistical area median income (AMI), as defined by Housing and Urban Development (HUD)
Density

Policies. Affordable housing should be developed at a moderate density and in buildings that will blend harmoniously and unobtrusively with surrounding neighborhoods. In Weston, “moderate density” means that on any given site, the average or gross density will not exceed four dwelling units per acre, and new buildings will not exceed three stories in height. However, the Town will consider higher density housing in the town center and near the train stations, or in an adaptive reuse development. Example: If given the choice between a higher-density development in a preferred location and a development of four units per acre elsewhere, the Town would look more favorably on the higher-density development, unless the project failed to address many other policies described in these guidelines.

Site Planning and Design

Architectural and site design choices are critical to the success of affordable housing proposals. A development that closely adheres to the Town’s design policies and preferences is more likely to receive a favorable review. A development that is out of character with surrounding areas, and designed without sufficient regard for its impacts on neighboring properties, will be discouraged, and will likely not receive Town support.

Policies. The Planning Board’s review of site plan applications is guided by standards set forth in Section XI (F) of the Weston Zoning Bylaw. These standards matter because they address a development’s physical, operational, and aesthetic compatibility with surrounding land uses, and help to ensure public safety. Developments that include affordable housing, whether proposed under a Comprehensive Permit or another permitting mechanism, should comply with the Town’s site plan standards. In addition, the following factors need to be addressed in a developer’s submission to the Town:

- Minimize land disturbance;
- Choose building designs that are similar to single-family homes, and substantially consistent with the principles described in Preserving Weston’s Rural Character
- Minimize massing and bulk
- Design for safety, considering safety to the occupants both within the structure (building layout) and on the exterior (site layout);
- Utilize stormwater management during, and post construction. Use best management practices wherever possible.

Additional Preferences: Moderate affordable workforce housing, in addition to traditional affordable housing: tiered eligibility Weston would like to see several preferences addressed in proposals for affordable housing. The Town understands that some of the following preferences will not apply in all cases. However, developers should respond to as many of these preferences as possible, and note those which are either irrelevant or infeasible.
• Provide accessible or adaptable units. (Multi-family developments may be required to provide accessible housing under the Massachusetts Architectural Access Board’s regulations, the State Building Code, or both.)

• Locate parking on the side or rear of buildings.

• Design for walk ability by providing sidewalks or informal pathways, or both.

• Design for a sense of community. Consider building and site layouts that encourage communication and interaction among residents of the development (e.g., common space within buildings, or common facilities, open space, or recreation areas).

• Protect historic resources by designing projects to avoid adverse impacts on structures with historic or architectural significance.

• Employ “green” development practices, considering both buildings and the site.

• Address sustainability in the design, construction, and operations/maintenance of the project.

• Conserve water and protect natural vegetation with:
  o Landscaping consisting of low-water-use plantings
  o Landscaping consisting only of non-invasive species

• Stormwater management during and post construction, use BMPs wherever possible

• Outdoor irrigation system that conserves water and relies on a private well

• On- and off-site impacts during construction. Some developments – especially if they involve new construction on vacant land – may be able to protect open space by design. In these cases, clustered buildings and compact building forms could help to achieve an average density of four units per acre, and still leave much of the site undisturbed. Furthermore, developers should try to respond to the following open space preferences:
  • Preserve at least 40 percent of the site as common open space;
  • Design common open space so that it will be accessible to all residents of the development
  • Comply with the Town’s minimum setback requirements

**Additional Benefits to the Town**

**Policies.** Like any other development submitted for review and approval by the Town, developments that include affordable housing may be required to provide mitigation (e.g.: traffic and/ or infrastructure) at a level appropriate to the size and location of the project. Developers will also be expected to pay the reasonable cost of peer review services deemed necessary (e.g.: traffic or infrastructure).

**Affirmative Marketing and Local Preference Policies.** Weston wants to ensure that affordable housing meets local housing needs, and also creates opportunities for new people to move into the community. Affirmative marketing plans, a lottery process, and monitoring for rental (long term) and homeownership units must be designed, and should provide a significant inclusionary role for the Town. Developers shall retain a competent, experienced lottery consultant acceptable to the Town, in order to insure compliance with all fair housing and marketing requirements, in addition to qualifying applicants. To the maximum
extent permitted by law, at least 50 percent of the affordable units in a development should be offered, on a priority basis, to Weston residents or people with direct ties to the Town, including:

**Further Preferences.** Weston will also encourage developers to provide other public benefits in addition to affordable housing, such as:

- Preservation and reuse of existing structures;
- Pedestrian amenities;
- Contribution to address capital improvement needs directly related to the project; and/or
- Contribution to Town’s affordable housing fund
March 1, 2012

Saw Mill Pond Village, LLC
85 Chestnut Street
Shrewsbury, MA 01545
Attention: Mr. Iqbal Ali

Re: Saw Mill Village
Easton, MA
PE-512
Project Eligibility (Site Approval) Application

Dear Mr. Ali:

This letter is in response to your application for a determination of Project Eligibility (Site Approval) pursuant to Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 40B and 760 CMR 56 (the “Comprehensive Permit Rules”) under the following programs:

- Housing Starts Program of the Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency (“MassHousing”)

The proposal is to build 36 affordable homeownership units (the “Project”) on approximately 12.94 acres of land (the “Site”), of which 10.72 acres are buildable, located on Foundry Street in Easton (the “Municipality”). The project is located within the Canoe River Aquifer Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) and adjacent to the Hockomock Swamp ACEC. Much of the land surrounding the site is identified as Bordering Vegetated Wetlands (BVW) and riparian zones.

As a result of our evaluation of the information that was presented and the site reviews conducted by MassHousing staff, we are unable to approve your application for a determination of Project Eligibility.

MassHousing staff has performed an on-site inspection of the Site, which local officials were invited to attend, and reviewed the pertinent information for the Project submitted by the applicant, the Municipality and others in accordance with the Comprehensive Permit Rules and the Guidelines.
MassHousing staff revisited the Site on February 1, 2012. MassHousing staff also reviewed the revised plan that you submitted that reduces the number of units from 44 in the original proposal to 36 in the current plan in addition to reconfiguring the layout of the previous site plan.

The reasons for our denial of your application for Project Eligibility are as follows:

1. We consider the design of the buildings and the proposed site layout to be inconsistent with the design requirements outlined in 760 CMR 56.04(4)(c) and the related Comprehensive Permit Guidelines ("the Guidelines") dated July 30, 2008. In particular, we focus on the poor relationship to existing building typology and to adjacent streets as factors in our determination. Also, the proposed access and egress to the site is not ideal given the existing road layout of Foundry Street and the volume of traffic typical during peak hours. Regardless of the site's relative proximity to commercial districts, there is no safe means to accommodate pedestrian trips to and from the proposed development. The introduction of a new housing type, fundamentally designed to maximize the number of units it may yield, into this neighborhood is not consistent with local needs, given the Town of Easton's recent progress in meeting affordable housing goals.

2. In accordance with 760 CMR 56.04(4)(b) and the associated Guidelines, we have taken into consideration the previous municipal actions by the Town of Easton. Our review of the Town of Easton's formal response to your application indicates that:

(a) The Municipality has approved a Smart Growth Overlay Zoning District under M.G.L. c.40R. This district permits a total of 158 units of housing by right and includes a requirement to include affordable housing within the district. The developer is currently in the process of preparing a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR). This district is in close proximity to the only existing public transit in the Municipality and is located within walking distance of a nearby commercial & employment center.

(b) The Town of Easton also has recently approved a Comprehensive Permit for 113 units within the Shovel Works development in the heart of the Municipality's historic mill village. This site is directly adjacent to a proposed Commuter Rail Station and within walking distance of the mill village commercial and civic district, including the Municipality's main public education complex. Approval of this development has enabled the Municipality to have its Housing Production Plan certified by the Department of Housing & Community Development (one of only four communities statewide currently certified). The Municipality also has made a significant financial contribution to the Shovel Works development, with the commitment of $7.5 million in Community Preservation Act (CPA) funds and an additional $3.5 million appropriation for the development of a wastewater treatment facility.
Taken together, these municipal actions demonstrate to MassHousing that the Town has made measurable progress in creating opportunities for affordable housing and multi-family housing that address the purpose of M.G.L. c. 40B, and has committed significant local resources to advance these efforts.

We do not focus, in our analysis, upon any one factor in isolation. We look at a site as a whole, as well as other factors such as municipal actions, and ask ourselves whether, after considering everything, the development of a site would advance the affordable housing policy that our agency was created to support. We cannot make that conclusion in favor of this Site.

If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact Greg Watson, Manager of Comprehensive Permit Programs, at 617-854-1880.

Sincerely,

Gina B. Dailey
Director of Comprehensive Permit Programs

cc: Mr. Aaron Gornstein, Undersecretary, Department of Housing and Community Development
Ms. Colleen A. Corona, Chair, Easton Board of Selectmen
Mr. Walter Mirrione, Chairman, Easton Zoning Board of Appeals
January 31, 2017

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Medfield Meadows LLC
18 Forest Street
Dover, MA 02052
Attention: John Kelly, Principal

RE: Medfield Meadows
Medfield, MA (MH# 873)
Project Eligibility (Site Approval) Application

Dear Mr. Kelly:

This letter is in response to your application for a determination of Project Eligibility ("Site Approval") pursuant to Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 40B ("Chapter 40B"), 760 CMR 56.00 and the Comprehensive Permit Guidelines issued by the Department of Housing and Community Development ("DHCD") (the "Guidelines" and, collectively, the "Comprehensive Permit Rules"), under the following program (the "Program"): 

- New England Fund ("NEF") Program of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Boston.

The original application proposed to build two hundred (200) units of rental housing in two (2) buildings on individual parcels separated by North Meadow Road (Route 27) (the "Project") at 39-41 Dale Street and 49 Dale Street (the "Site") in Medfield, Massachusetts (the "Municipality"). Subsequent to an initial review of the Site and the proposed plans and comments from the Municipality regarding the site plan, MassHousing requested that the applicant reconsider the Project and its compatibility with adjacent uses and compliance with 760 CMR 56.04(4)(c), the applicable regulations that govern the design elements of a 40B proposal.

On January 5, 2017 the Applicant submitted a revised proposal to MassHousing that purported to respond to concerns regarding the original site plan, reduced the proposed height of the buildings and the number of units from two hundred (200) to one hundred eighty two (182) rental apartments units in three separate three and four-story buildings on a total of 6.24 acres of land, which only reduced the density from 32 units per acre to 29.17 units per acre on the Site.
MassHousing staff has performed an on-site inspection of the Site, which local boards and officials were invited to attend, then revised the Site in connection with the revised application, and has reviewed the pertinent information from both the original and the revised applications for the Project submitted by the Applicant, and comments submitted by the Municipality and others in accordance with the Comprehensive Permit Rules.

As a result of MassHousing's evaluation of the information that was presented, and the Agency's evaluation of the Site, MassHousing is unable to approve your application for a determination of Project Eligibility. While it is expected that a Project proposal submitted in accordance with the zoning and regulatory relief available under Chapter 40B will differ from the surrounding context in many fundamental ways, the Subsidizing Agency must also address matters regarding the Project's relationship to existing development patterns in the surrounding area. This Site appears to be generally appropriate for residential development and while municipal actions to date have not yet resulted in the production of housing required, "to meet the municipality's need for affordable housing as measured by the Statutory Minima"; nevertheless MassHousing has determined that the conceptual project design for the proposed development is not appropriate for this Site.

The reasons for MassHousing's denial of your applications are as follows:

MassHousing considers the design of the building and the proposed site layout to be inconsistent with the design requirements outlined in 760 CMR 56.04(4)(c) and the related Guidelines dated May, 2013. Specifically:

- The proposed apartment structure is inconsistent with nearby existing residential building typology. This is particularly true for the rear portion of the north parcel and the proposed building's relationship to the existing neighborhoods closest to the Site along Joseph Pace Road, John Crowder Road and Dale Street. The applicant's revised site plans do not adequately mitigate the impact of the proposed building's connection to the existing neighborhood from the initial proposal; the Project still fails to make a reasonable transition to this well established residential neighborhood.

- The proposed three to four-story apartment structures are not compatible with nearby structures in terms of height, mass and scale. Building elevations indicate that the proposed buildings (the three proposed buildings range in height from 60' to 77.5' tall depending on the topography of the Site) are at least triple the height of most surrounding 1-2 story structures. The building massing in the original submission was entirely inappropriate for both the Site and its relationship to the adjacent residential neighborhood. While the revised site plan, particularly that of the north parcel, has addressed some of the most glaring impacts to its closest abutters, the overall perception of the massing has not been adequately reduced to make the findings required under the regulations. The proposed massing on the south parcel is not significantly improved by the revised site plans and the presence of wetlands on that portion of the overall development Site is a constraint to a more logical relationship to the Grove Street neighborhood.
• Appropriate density of residential development depends on a number of different factors, and must be reviewed on a case by case basis. In this case, however, it appears that the Project is simply too dense for the lot on which it is located; nearly the entire Site is occupied by the proposed building program and the limited areas for open space are not sufficient to mitigate the project’s effective density. While there are no maximum density thresholds, it is advisable to develop at a density that takes some cues from the existing community context. The nearest rental development is the Parc at Medfield which has a considerably lower density of approximately 10 units/acre as compared to the almost 30 units/acre proposed for this Project.

• The site plan does not provide a satisfactory design treatment of the edge between the Site and the surrounding streetscape and does little to enhance the visual quality of the streetscape. The northern and southern building facades face Route 27, which is the principal access to downtown Medfield, and create a poor visual relationship to this adjacent roadway.

In MassHousing’s review of any application for Site Approval under Chapter 40B, the Agency does not consider any one factor in isolation. Rather, the site as a whole is considered as well as whether the development proposal is consistent with applicable Regulations and Guidelines. After a thorough review of your application, MassHousing does not find that your proposal is able to meet all of the required findings. Therefore, your application is denied.

If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact Greg Watson, Manager of Comprehensive Permit Programs, at 617-854-1880.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Timothy C. Sullivan
Executive Director

cc: Chrystal Kornegay, Undersecretary, Department of Housing and Community Development
The Honorable James Timilty
The Honorable Denise C. Garlick
The Honorable Shawn Dooley
Mark L. Fisher, Chairman, Medfield Board of Selectmen
Michael J. Sullivan, Medfield Town Administrator
Sarah Raposa, Medfield Town Planner
November 13, 2013

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Folsom Development Corporation
54 Broadway
Norwood, MA 02062
Attention: Robert Folsom, President

RE: Washington Street Apartments
Norwood, MA (SA-13-005)
Project Eligibility (Site Approval) Application

Dear Mr. Folsom:

This letter is in response to your application for a determination of Project Eligibility ("Site Approval") pursuant to Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 40B ("Chapter 40B"), 760 CMR 56.00 and the Comprehensive Permit Guidelines issued by the Department of Housing and Community Development ("DHCD") (the "Guidelines" and, collectively, the "Comprehensive Permit Rules"), under the following program (the "Program"):

- New England Fund ("NEF") Program of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Boston.

The proposal is to build forty-two (42) rental apartments units (the "Project") in a four-story building on 26,113 square feet of land at 862-878 Washington Street (the "Site") in Norwood, Massachusetts (the "Municipality").

MassHousing staff has performed an on-site inspection of the Site, which local boards and officials were invited to attend, and has reviewed the pertinent information for the Project submitted by the Applicant, the Municipality and others in accordance with the Comprehensive Permit Rules.

As a result of MassHousing’s evaluation of the information that was presented, and the Agency’s evaluation of the site during its visit, MassHousing is unable to approve your application for a determination of Project Eligibility.

The reasons for MassHousing’s denial of your applications are as follows:

1. In accordance with 760 CMR 56.04(4)(b) and the associated Guidelines, MassHousing has taken into consideration the previous municipal actions by the Town of Norwood. Specifically, the Norwood Board of Selectmen provided a response to your application, dated
September 18, 2013. This letter outlined the following local actions taken in support of the creation of affordable housing in Norwood (listed in chronological order):

- Creation of the Downtown Overlay District, in which multi-family units are permitted by-right, by a vote of Norwood Town Meeting on June 12, 2000;

- Creation of the Saint George Smart Growth (40R) Overlay District by a vote of Norwood Town Meeting on June 27, 2006, which was the first 40R District in the Commonwealth and in which 20% of all housing produced must be affordable;

- Approval by the Norwood Board of Selectmen of a Housing Production Plan on September 3, 2013. This plan was certified by DHCD on September 19, 2013;

- Issuance by the Norwood Zoning Board of Appeals of a Comprehensive Permit for the Upland Woods 40B, a 262 rental development, on September 5, 2013;

- Submittal by the Norwood Board of Selectmen of an application to DHCD for approval of the Plimpton Press Smart Growth (40R) Overlay District on September 26, 2013. The proposed development would include 271 rental apartments with 60-75 affordable units. If approved by DHCD, the District would require approval by the Norwood Town Meeting; and

- Submittal by the Norwood Board of Selectmen of an application to DHCD for approval of the Guild Street Smart Growth (40R) Overlay District (Regal Press) on September 30, 2013. The proposed development would include 70 rental apartments. If approved by DHCD, the District would require approval by the Norwood Town Meeting.

Taken together, these municipal actions demonstrate to MassHousing that the Town of Norwood has made measurable progress in the creation of opportunities for affordable housing and multi-family housing that address the purpose of M.G.L. c. 40B. It is clear that the Town of Norwood has committed significant local resources to advance these efforts.

Along with the specific actions identified by the Selectmen in their letter, MassHousing also took into account the following characteristics of Norwood’s housing stock when considering whether the proposed project was consistent with local needs:

- The percentage of rental housing in Norwood (43%) exceeds that of all neighboring communities, the Boston Metro area, and the Commonwealth;

- The percentage of multi-family housing in Norwood (56%) exceeds that of all neighboring communities, the Boston Metro area, and the Commonwealth; and
Of the 705 units of affordable housing currently listed on the state’s Subsidized Housing Inventory (“SHI”), 98.6% are rental, while only 1.42% of existing affordable units are homeownership. This gap will widen further with the inclusion of the additional 262 units of rental housing at the Upland Road 40B on the SHI.

2. MassHousing considers the design of the building and the proposed site layout to be inconsistent with the design requirements outlined in 760 CMR 56.04(4)(c) and the related Guidelines dated May, 2013. Specifically,

- The proposed apartment structure is inconsistent with nearby existing residential building typology. The portion of Washington Street where the Project is proposed includes a mix of residential and commercial structures, clearly distinguishable by differences in massing, bulk and façade. Whereas the majority of nearby residential structures feature peaked roofs, dormers, front porches, steps and articulated front facades, the proposed elevations show a structure that is more similar in form to nearby commercial structures. (A notable exception is the two-story, flat-roofed, brick housing complex at 863 Washington Street.)

- The proposed four-story apartment structure is not compatible with nearby structures in terms of height, mass and scale. Building elevations indicate that the proposed building (over 50’ tall on the street side, and 55’-3” at the rear) is significantly taller than most of the surrounding 1-3 story structures. The relative height difference is compounded by the minimal front setback (5’) separating the building’s front facade and the public sidewalk on Washington Street, as well as the lack of screening or notable landscaping. The proposed building footprint is approximately 72’ wide and 170’ long, which is comparable in mass to the nearby Ramo strip center but notably larger than that of other residential and non-residential structures in the immediate area.

- Appropriate density of residential development depends on a number of different factors, and must be reviewed on a case by case basis. In this case, however, it appears that the Project is simply too dense for the lot on which it is located; nearly the entire Site is occupied by the building or paved parking. While there are no maximum density thresholds, it is customary to provide at least some usable open space such as a play area or sitting area for the benefit of building residents.

- The site plan does not provide a satisfactory design treatment of the edge between the Site and the surrounding streetscape and does little to enhance the visual quality of the streetscape. The northern and western (front) building facades are in very close proximity to the property boundaries, with little or no landscape screening or buffering. Despite efforts to vary exterior cladding, the Project’s proposed building facades lack sufficient variety and articulation, particularly on its north and south sides.
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- The proposed front setback is minimal and lacks the residential-style, front-yard landscaping characteristic of nearby residences. The parking area on the Site's southern side lacks sufficient screening, leaving open views to the parking lot and the building's deep southern façade.

In MassHousing's review of any application for Site Approval under Chapter 40B, the Agency does not consider any one factor in isolation. Rather, the site as a whole is considered and consideration is also given to other factors, such as actions that have been taken by the city or town in which the development would be built. After a thorough review of your application, MassHousing does not find that your proposal will advance the affordable housing objectives in Norwood. Therefore, your application is denied.

If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact Greg Watson, Manager of Comprehensive Permit Programs, at 617-854-1880.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Thomas R. Gleason
Executive Director

cc: Aaron Gornstein, Undersecretary, Department of Housing and Community Development
William J. Pasko, Chairman, Norwood Board of Selectmen
John J. Carrol, Norwood General Manager
Stephen Costello, Norwood Planning and Economic Development Director
February 8, 2012

Gregory P. Watson
Manager of Comprehensive Permit Programs
Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency
1 Beacon Street
Boston, MA 02108

Re: Saw Mill Village

Dear Greg:

I write to provide comments on the proposed Saw Mill Village project at 578 Foundry Street in Easton in light of changes submitted by the proponent since last summer. In a letter from July of last year from the Chair of Easton’s Board of Selectmen to you, a number of concerns forming the basis of the Town’s opposition to the development were outlined. These include: the site’s location outside appropriate areas for substantial housing development as identified in Easton’s state-approved housing plan; the plan’s inconsistency with smart growth principles; and the large difference between the project’s proposed density with that of existing development in the adjacent historic neighborhood.

These concerns all remain with the most recent concepts provided by the proponent [in an email dated February 6]. The reduction in number of units still leaves the project at a much higher density than its environs, and at many more bedrooms per acre than could be permitted under local zoning. Residents of this area of Town are completely dependent on automobiles for transportation, even to the closest commercial centers. Areas adjacent to existing development, and sites with the potential for walkability and direct public transit access will continue to be the focus of the Town’s affordable housing efforts. While the proponent has stated some willingness to address concerns regarding architecture and low impact development, I note that these are of secondary importance to the Town’s overall objections to dense residential development at this site.

Thank you and please feel free to be in touch with any questions.

Sincerely,

Brad Washburn
Planning Director
Queset 40R District

- Proposed & adopted in 2008
  - Bylaw drafted to allow for appropriate density and design. Language prepared with DHCD oversight.
  - Received unanimous support of the Board of Selectmen and support from other Town Committees. Town meeting required a 2/3 vote for adoption; vote was 608 to 254
  - Most opposition came from nearby abutters who expressed concern over wastewater disposal. The proposal includes a wastewater treatment plant with excess capacity.
- District includes several parcels with a single owner. A phased development is proposed.
- Under a development agreement, the developer donates conservation land and commits to infrastructure improvements.
- Closest development site in Town to the only existing public transit in Town: a bus stop on a route connecting to Brockton. Roadways within the site could accommodate a bus stop on site, and the Town plans to pursue an extension of the bus route into the development.
- Smart growth:
  - near a commercial & employment center
  - one of the few areas of town with existing sidewalks connecting to commercial & educational sites
  - preservation of open space
  - on 2 major transit corridors, close to route 24
  - LID techniques will be incorporated; including rain gardens and under-structure parking
- Mixed uses: 158 homes (40 affordable units) & 116,000 feet of retail and commercial space
- The Queset Commercial District study, funded as part of the state’s South Coast Rail effort, seeks to improve traffic, sidewalks, and business zoning in the adjacent commercial area.
- Despite unanticipated delays, the developer continues to pursue the project. Currently in process of preparing FEIR.

Smart Growth Site

Location Features
- 60.7 acre size
- 27% Pond / Wetlands
- 24% Developed
- Access to Major roads / Route 24
- Near BAT service
- Area of concentrated development
- Good water supply
- Suitable soils & geology
Shovel Works

- A vacant industrial facility at the heart of the Town’s historic mill village.
- Slated for preservation and re-use as mixed-income housing.
- Final approval through the Comprehensive Permit process in 2010.
- Town support includes:
  - A substantial investment of Community Preservation Act funds ($7,500,000) toward residential development – the largest in the Town’s history.
  - Appropriations of approximately $3,500,000 to develop a wastewater treatment facility, to be used by Shovel Works and adjacent businesses and residences in North Easton.
  - A 5-year TIF agreement.
  - Significant Town staff time and citizen volunteer hours devoted to proposal development, preparation of legal documents, obtaining necessary approvals & securing outside funding commitments.
- Smart Growth:
  - Directly adjacent to future Commuter Rail station
  - Directly adjacent to commercial & civic district
  - Directly adjacent to the Governor Ames Estate (to be purchased by TTOR in Feb 2012). This property will have a Conservation Restriction and will be open to the public for recreational use.
  - Within walking distance to Town’s main public education complex & farmers’ markets
  - Close to several of Town’s major transportation corridors
  - Use and density – parcel is currently in an industrial zone (residential use not permitted). Approximately 14.7 units/acre – represents higher density than would be allowed even for apartments in appropriate zone.
- Parallel efforts with state financial support include parking, sidewalk and utility improvements (via MassWorks) and a historic property survey of the village and adjacent neighborhoods.
- 113 units total:
  - 30 affordable units
  - 18 designated for households below 60% AMI
  - 12 designated for households below 30% AMI
- Developer intends to close on the site and begin construction in early spring of 2012
Weston Affordable Housing Trust

April 26, 2019

To: Weston Board of Selectmen
    selectmen@westonmass.org

Re: Proposed 40B Development – Hanover Weston – 518 South Avenue

The Weston Affordable Housing Trust (“Trust” or “HT”) is charged with performing housing-related review and making recommendations to the Board of Selectmen (BOS) for all Chapter 40B proposals in Weston. The Trust has evaluated the proposed Hanover Weston development located at 510, 518 & 540 South Avenue, meeting with the owner and developer on two occasions, reviewing their presentations and conceptual plans, and letters and comments from Town residents who have attended the Trust meetings. After careful review and discussion, the Trust has prepared the following comments and recommendations for your consideration as the BOS prepares its formal comments to MassHousing on the Site Approval application submitted by the owner and developer seeking a Project Eligibility Letter for this project.

The developer seeks a Project Eligibility Letter for both a 275 unit and a 200 unit project, in the alternative, arguing that it would be willing to pursue a larger 275 unit project if the Town were to support it. The Trust has considered this request, and would not support a 275 unit project at this site, both because such a project would be too large (in terms of density (number of units) and size (mass, bulk, height, and setbacks), and because Weston is currently evaluating several other potential large rental projects that are likely to add significant numbers of new units to the Town in a short-window of time. Accordingly, it is not an appropriate site or time for such a large development.

The Trust has also carefully considered the developer’s application for a 200 unit project, and has concerns and recommendations which the Trust would like to see considered and incorporated by the developer as it pursues the smaller (200 unit) project. Although the Trust has significant concerns, we do note that the project would bring much-needed affordable housing to Weston, providing 50 units of deed-restricted, affordable rental housing to households earning 80% or less than the area median income (AMI). The project is sited in a preferred location along a major roadway (South Avenue) and could (if the developer were required to fulfill its promise to construct a sidewalk along South Avenue to Wellesley Street) provide enhanced walkability from the project to the intersection of Wellesley Street, and the Weston High School.

* Approved by a vote of the Weston Affordable Housing Trust at meeting held on April 24, 2019.
The Trust is concerned that the 200 unit project, as shown in the plans submitted to MassHousing and presentations to the Trust, does not align with the needs identified in the “Town of Weston Housing Production Plan” (HPP), dated November 2015, and does not meet many of the metrics set out in the Town of Weston Policies and Preferences for Affordable Housing (Housing Partnership, 2/25/10) (the “Policies and Preferences”), which are the Town's guidelines by which we are to review all Chapter 40B and other affordable housing proposals. The Trust would urge would urge the Selectman to request the developer to modify the proposal to be more responsive to the identified community needs (in the HPP) and development preferences (in the Policies and Preferences).

The Trust offers the following comments and recommendations:

1. **Modify project to align with more of the metrics set out in the Policies and Preferences:**
   a. Reduce unit count density (current proposal is approximately 21 units/acre). Guidelines seek no more than 4 units/acre
   b. Better align with Site Planning and Design Policies (e.g., adhere to minimum setbacks, minimize land disturbance, and modify building design to minimize building massing, bulk and height).

2. **Modify unit mix to provide for a more balanced mix of unit sizes, providing more diversity in housing types (i.e., more 2-bedroom and 3-bedroom units):** The proposed unit breakdown shows one-bedroom units accounting for over 60% of units in the project, does not provide enough units that would be suitable for a family with children. Similarly, one-bedroom units will not meet the needs of current residents (elders and others) seeking to downsize but still wanting room for belongings and guests. The HPP identified both the need for family-friendly rental housing (due to the current market “pricing-out” families) as well as elder-friendly housing (where there is the greatest documented need among current residents for additional rental housing). The Council on Aging’s recent study: Aging in Weston: Needs Assessment Study, further documents this need.

3. **Provide broader range of affordability:** The HPP and Policies and Preferences both encourage developers to seek to provide workforce housing, by which we mean units that may provide a wider range of diverse affordable housing options in Weston targeted to individuals and families with incomes of 61% to 120% AMI. The Trust recommends that the BOS request the developer to provide workforce housing, potentially through a program such as MassHousing’s Workforce Housing Initiative.

* Approved by a vote of the Weston Affordable Housing Trust at meeting held on April 24, 2019.
4. **Provide unit features and amenities to enhance quality of life for all residents:** While the developer proposes luxury amenities and common spaces, including a pool within a courtyard, the current plans appear not to have planned for adequate and desirable amenities and common spaces geared to families with younger children (with a playground space at the rear in the shade of the parking garage) or elders. Similarly, the siting of the building does not take advantage of the natural surroundings or provide on-site pedestrian pathways, or otherwise encourage residents to enjoy outside spaces. It appears as if the developer took its usual “wrap building” design and dropped it on the lot, without careful planning or consideration for these quality of life concerns. The Trust’s concern is for the long-term viability and quality of life for residents.

5. **Provide universal and age-friendly design:** The developer is also encouraged to employ universal and age-friendly design throughout the development and provide for all units to be adaptable to allow for accessible features, as may be need by individual residents.

   The Trust requests the Selectman to require the developer to modify project as requested above and urge the developer to be more responsive in working with local boards to address community concerns.

   Respectfully Submitted,

   Trustees of the Weston Affordable Housing Trust

* Approved by a vote of the Weston Affordable Housing Trust at meeting held on April 24, 2019.*
MEMORANDUM

TO: WESTON BOARD OF SELECTMEN
FROM: LAURIE BENT, WESTON CONSERVATION COMMISSION CHAIR
SUBJECT: HANOVER WESTON – COMPREHENSIVE PERMIT SITE APPROVAL APPLICATION
DATE: APRIL 10, 2019

The Weston Conservation Commission (WCC) reviewed the Site Approval Request submitted by 518 South Ave LLC to the Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency. The WCC offers the following comments regarding the proposed project at 518, 510, and 540 South Ave.

Existing Conditions

The property consists of 9.54 acres located south of Route 30. The eastern portion of the property contains a Bordering vegetated wetland and an intermittent stream.

Proposed Project

The preliminary plan shows that development will be situated on the majority of the upland portions of the property. The existing driveway to 518 South Ave is approximately 11-12 feet wide. Approximately 380 linear feet of this driveway currently falls within 25 feet of the wetland edge. The former owner was only allowed to build this driveway so close to the wetland edge since he was mandated by court to relocate his driveway onto his land, and this section of his land is all within 25-feet of the wetland edge. The Conservation Commission worked hard to minimize any work within 25 feet of the wetland, which is why there is a small retaining wall in one area (to minimize grading and disturbance).

The Applicant has expressed his interest in using this driveway for one-way public access (exit) and to allow for emergency access (by police and fire) in either direction. In addition, the applicant wishes to install a 4-foot wide sidewalk.

Weston Fire department (WFD) requires two means of emergency access onto the property. If this driveway is to be used only for emergency vehicles (police/fire), WFD recommends a
driveway width of 16 feet. If the driveway would also be available for public use, WFD requests the driveway be widened to 20 feet.

The Conservation Commission provides the following comments:

- The Conservation Commission generally does not permit new activity within 25 feet of the wetlands edge. Therefore the applicant will be asked to avoid or minimize new disturbance in this area.

- Since the main access road is proposed to be located at 540 South Ave., completely outside of the 100-foot buffer zone, the Applicant will be asked to consider allowing all public access through this one location. This would eliminate the need for a 20-foot wide road within 25-feet of the wetland edge.

- It seems probable that the sidewalk could also be moved to the proposed main entrance at 540 South Ave. (thus eliminating the increase of even more work along the wetland edge).

Since work is proposed within 100 feet of BVW, the Applicant is aware that the project must be reviewed by the Weston Conservation Commission. The Commission will look closely at the project to ensure that all aspects of the Wetlands Protection Act Regulations are thoroughly adhered to, including Stormwater management and construction period erosion and sedimentation controls.
Fleming, Kara

From: Cullen.Thomas
Sent: Monday, April 01, 2019 8:56 AM
To: Fleming, Kara
Cc: Fogg, Steve; Sullivan, Rich; Fava, David
Subject: RE: Proposed 40B - Hanover Weston

Kara,

We met with Mr. Jonathan Buchman several weeks ago on the proposed project and we discussed several topics:

1) The proposed Route 30 Roadway Reconstruction TIP Project as currently under design by HSH;
2) The ongoing W-P Master Planning for the Water Distribution System;
3) To those two topics we had initial comments concerning:
   a) Sight distance based on existing geometry of the roadway and the proposed driveway(s) locations;
   b) Concerns about water capacity and some coordination that would need to happen with our consultant to assure capacity does not become an issue;
   c) Not sure what is happening with septic, but always a consideration;
   d) I/We have not heard any complaints about stormwater/groundwater issues in this areas, but always should be a consideration;
   e) Any planned improvements along Route 30 that would service this development and Weston as a whole (e.g. sidewalk improvements, decel lane(s) into the development, landscape improvements, etc.)? If this project moves forward could it assist with getting the proposed Route 30 Roadway Reconstruction project funded through the TIP process.

Tom Cullen, P.E.
Director of Operations
Department of Public Works
Town of Weston

From: Fleming, Kara
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2019 2:31 PM
To:

Subject: FW: Proposed 40B - Hanover Weston

Hello All

We have received notice from MassHousing, which starts our 30-day clock to respond to the PEL application for the 518 So. Avenue project.

There is a site walk scheduled for April 8th at 1:30 p.m. Please let me know who will be attending so I can forward that information to MassHousing.

The developer presented to the Board of Selectmen on March 26th (video begins @35m/m)
The developer will be meeting with Planning Board on April 10th
And I believe they’ll meeting with Traffic & Sidewalk on April 24th (I need to get confirmation on that)
May 2, 2019

Leon Gaumond  
Town Manager  
11 Town House Road  
Weston MA, 02493

RE: 40B Proposal at 518-540 South Avenue

Leon,

The Weston Fire Department has performed preliminary reviews of the plot plan for the 40B proposal at 518-540 South Avenue and recommendations moving forward prior to any application for fire prevention permits but not including fire sprinkler, commercial fire detection plan review and compliance.

Emergency access to the proposed property has been updated to now reflect a secondary emergency entrance/exit and bridge which the Fire Department has approved as sufficient for our needs.

We request that the architect and building contractor during the design and build out phase follow all NFPA codes pertaining to fire protection systems. Some examples listed: (fire sprinklers, stand pipe systems, fire detection systems, and carbon monoxide detection systems) This includes the fire protection of unoccupied spaces such as attics and loft type areas.

We request that the architect design and building contractor follow NFPA 241 and CMR (Code of Massachusetts Regulation) 1, Section 16 for construction fire safety and fire protection systems during construction.

If necessary the Fire Department will contract a third party Fire Protection Engineer to review all plans and ensure fire safety related code compliance is met at the expense of the contractor or builder

Sincerely,

[Signature]
David B. Soar
Chief of Department
MEMO

To: Weston Board of Selectman
From: Board of Health

RE: 518 South Ave. 40B

At the Board of Health meeting today the Weston Board of Health met with the Jonathan Buchman and David Hall regarding the 40B project proposed for 518 South Ave. At the meeting it was noted that soil testing indicates that there will be no undue constraints placed on the property by the existing soil conditions. The project proposes to use a treatment plant that will be permitted by the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection.

The Board of Health looks forward to reviewing the project details as they become available.
Date: May 1, 2019

Re: 518 South Ave - Hanover Weston - Development Application

To the Board of Selectmen,

The Weston Historical Commission offers the following comments about the proposed 275 unit 40 B development at 518 South Ave:

1. The proposed buildings are massive and inappropriate large for any site in our historic town. The scale of the structure including its height does not fit in Weston.

2. South Avenue is a Scenic Road per the Zoning by-law provisions, and was one of the earliest streets constructed in town. Though it is a state route (30), it is comparatively delicate in nature, curved and tree-lined. A two-hundred-and-seventy-unit complex with parking, even if it is set far back from the street, will overwhelm the historic road with increased traffic.

3. A Mid-century Modern house is located at 518 South Ave. It is in excellent condition, and the original portion seems especially well designed. While this house does not fall within the period of the Demolition Delay by-law, the Commission recognizes the importance of this Modern Movement period house. The house and its setting deserve respect for their uniqueness in Weston.

4. There is a vibrant residential community in the area, which includes several historic houses, whose character could be negatively impacted by the proposed development. Among the closest historic houses are 425, 461, and 465 South Ave. The house at 465 South Ave, known as the Isaac Train Tavern http://mhc-macris.net/Details.aspx?MhclId=WSN.6 dates from 1802 and is a well preserved Colonial period house on the corner of Wellesley St and Rt 30. Just around the corner on Highland St. are many other historic houses, including the Anza House and Cow Barn Complex at 390 Highland St. http://mhc-macris.net/Details.aspx?MhclId=WSN.1224 and http://mhc-macris.net/Details.aspx?MhclId=WSN.1225 This is an important working farm with a 2 ½ story Colonial Revival farmhouse and long barn. At the very least these houses will all be impacted by increased traffic in the area.

5. The proposed site is diagonally across the street from Weston’s South Burying Ground at 15 South Ave. http://mhc-macris.net/Details.aspx?MhclId=WSN.802 This nearby setting should be preserved, including its quiet atmosphere. Again, the increased traffic presents an antithesis to the tranquility there.

Phyllis Halpern and Steven Wagner, Co – Chairs for the Commission
Dear Leon,

The Traffic and Sidewalk Committee met on April 24th and we provided the owner/proponent Jonathan Buchman and Stephen Dazzo of Hanover Development time to provide an informational update to the Committee and members of the public who were in attendance. No vote was taken relative to the development. He and his consultant walked through a handful of basic slides showing the proposed development in plan view. It was difficult to see anything in detail on the boards but they did provide a summary of basic facts and figures, from my notes:

- 200 total units
- Apartment style wrapped around a central concrete parking garage
- 3 stories high
- A mix of 1, 2, and 3 bedrooms. Average monthly rental $3,200
- 100% rentals
- Not age restricted - expect some families with school-age children
- Parking ratio of 1.6 spaces per unit
- 326 total parking spaces on site (300 in resident and 26 visitor)
- New, single driveway on Rt. 30/South Ave. with one lane each direction for ingress and egress
- Plus, a single lane fire access road on the east side of the site on the alignment of an existing driveway/road

Committee members asked questions, and members of the public also had the opportunity to ask questions. The primary concern of the Committee, and those in attendance from the public, was and remains traffic impacts. The developer said that a traffic study was nearly completed and would be available in about two weeks. The Committee needs to receive a copy of it. Is the Town's (Planning Board's) Traffic Engineering consultant going to review it? We are interested in what they find.

As with the other proposed 40B on the Rt. 20, in the absence of a traffic report to review we simply raised the common sense questions that members of the public in attendance also raised, including:

- How are vehicles exiting the complex via a single unsignalized driveway in the morning going to get across busy Rt. 30 to make a left turn?
- In the evening, how will westbound through-traffic get around left turning vehicles that are waiting for a gap to enter the driveway?
- The proposed fire lane (which they said the Fire Dept. requested) is not for general access but seemed unclear how it will be used. Would it be controlled by a gate?
- The septic treatment building at front of complex needs to be pumped/serviced periodically but they show no driveway or pullout for such a truck, which means the truck could be blocking one lane of the driveway when present creating a safety and traffic hazard.
- Are there any comparable (#of units) sized developments in town that use a single unsignalized driveway on a busy state numbered route?
- What will the impact be of project-related traffic on the Rt. 30 intersection with Wellesley Street? Will this add to cut-through traffic on Brown Street to Wellesley Street?
- The developer did not mention any Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies to reduce the number of single occupancy vehicle trips generated by its residents and its only
mention of any mitigation was to help pay for a sidewalk along the south side of Rt. 30 (for unspecified length)

- Is the traffic volume the developer is citing as an existing condition on Rt. 30 accurate? One member of the public repeatedly asked for confirmation of that, as well as an indication of existing crash data for this area of Rt. 30 and how the project might impact that.
- Are the total number of units and total parking count too high for this site given the constraints?

Again, the Committee will really need to see the traffic study and see additional details regarding traffic impacts, proposed mitigation, and the validity of such analysis before offering further comment. As a Committee, we are concerned that this developer, as well as the other one on Rt. 20 (751-761 Boston Post Road), are submitting their traffic impact reports AFTER we as a Committee are being asked to provide you and others with comments. Again, our comments noted above are very general at this point because necessary data and analysis from the traffic impact report are not yet available to us.

**In short, we have serious questions about the traffic impacts of this project based on the limited amount of information presented by the developer and the lack of detail in its responses to our Committee's questions and those of the public who attended our meeting.**

I have copied fellow Committee members who are welcome to add or clarify if I missed something.

Thank you,
Jay Doyle, Chair
Traffic & Sidewalk Committee
April 5, 2019

Harvey R. Boshart, Chair
Board of Selectmen
Weston Town Hall
Weston, Massachusetts

Re: 510-518-540 South Avenue 40B Development Project

Dear Chairman Boshart,

I and many of my neighbors have been discussing our concerns about the proposed Chapter 40B development project at 510-518-540 South Avenue. The preliminary concept plan for this high-density rental complex would house 275 units built in a single up-to-6-story building and include a 400+ space parking garage in an elevated structure. The developer has already met with some town boards and committees and there are other meetings planned to fast-track this project.

I attended and briefly commented to the Board of Selectmen at your regularly-scheduled March 26, 2019 meeting regarding this matter. This letter is offered to the Board and other Town Boards and officials for consideration during the 30-day Mass Housing comment period. My interest is to put forward what I consider to be significant inherent land use deficiencies in the proposal to use this site for a high-density rental residential project.

By way of background, my analysis of this matter is based on a nearly 40-year professional career as a practicing municipal land use planner and consultant specializing in transportation, land use zoning, and housing issues. During this time, I have served directly in several diverse communities and most recently in the City of Newton as a Senior Land Use and Transportation Planner. I have held positions with titles such as Town Planner, Community Development Coordinator, Senior Transportation Planner, and Fair Housing Officer. I have drafted hundreds of development review memos for all types of land use projects including at least 10 Comprehensive Permits. With respect to 40B and other multi-family developments, I have often advocated for specific affordable housing projects and initiatives through the technical review process and ultimately drafting memos of support for such projects. In three communities, I worked in collaboration with other planners to identify possible public and private sites for multi-family affordable housing developments. In Newton I worked extensively on their accessory apartment zoning by law to make it more user-friendly and to encourage this type of affordable housing. I helped develop many affordable housing projects, working side by side with developers and neighbors to achieve desirable projects. I have seen the rewards of lots of hard work, careful planning, and the proper addressing of legitimate concerns. I have spent my entire professional planning career advocating for development that adheres to sound land use practices in the communities I’ve served.

I grew up in Weston at 502 South Avenue and graduated from Weston High in 1976. My family returned to live in Weston in 2012 because of so many positive community virtues that we came to enjoy. After the former owner of 518 South Avenue passed away in the summer of 2018, in no conceivable way could I have visualized drafting this letter just months later months to your honorable Board with great
concerns about a high-density 275-unit 40B rental housing development on my neighbor's beautiful property.

Before moving to a discussion of this project, I have heard from Town officials that the Pope John Seminary at 558 South Avenue (an immediate abutter to the current project) is considering a 150-unit age-restricted housing development on its own site using Chapter 40B. Although every project needs to be evaluated on its own merits, there exists the possibility of 425 (275+150) rental housing units being developed on essentially the same site – an incredibly large number that would have cumulative impacts extending well beyond the project boundaries. I would respectfully request that the Town monitor the possibility of a Seminary development closely and consider both developments in a coordinated, comprehensive fashion.

**Existing Conditions**

The following summarizes many of the key attributes about the current conditions at 510-518-540 South Avenue and the neighboring area (lot sizes are from the Final Fiscal Year 2019 Property Valuations found on the Town of Weston website):

- 510 South Avenue is an approximately 225,600 square foot parcel (5.18 acres) that is generally wetland and mostly not developable. The residential properties at 500 South Avenue, 502 South Avenue, and 419 Wellesley Street are immediate abutters.
- 518 South Avenue is an approximately 174,200 square foot (4.0 acres) parcel where a two-story single-family residential structure is present. A long, single-lane driveway in the 100-foot conservation buffer provides access to South Avenue. The properties at 526, 534, 540 and 546 South Avenue are immediate abutters.
- 540 South Avenue is an approximately 40,800 square foot (.94 acre) parcel where a one-story single-family structure is present. The properties at 534 and 546 South Avenue are immediate abutters. Combined, the three parcels (510, 518, and 540) contain approximately 440,600 square feet of land, or 10.1 acres total.
- All three parcels are in the Single Residence A zoning district where 60,000 square feet is the minimum lot size. Therefore, three or possibly four single-family residences on these three parcels could be an allowed as a “by-right” use of the land.
- The three parcels front on South Avenue (Route 30). The road possesses two single direction east-west travel lanes. The closest opposing intersection is at Highland Street and South Avenue, an unsignalized intersection with a stop sign at Highland Street entering South Avenue. The posted speed limit along both sides of South Avenue at the site location is 40 miles per hour.
- The nearest signalized intersection is the 4-way crossing at South Avenue and Wellesley Street, approximately .3 miles from the site.
- There are no sidewalks on South Avenue in front of the site. A sidewalk does exist on the opposite or westbound side of South Avenue which connects to the Wellesley Street/South Avenue intersection.
- The Pope John Seminary abuts 518 South Avenue and is located at 558 South Avenue. There are approximately 60 seminarians housed on the 23.5-acre campus.
• The subject site is remote to most services and amenities that are usually found near proposed large-scale multi-family residential housing sites. To illustrate, the nearest land uses to the site are the following distances away:
  ▪ Nearest grocery store: 2.6 miles
  ▪ Nearest post office: 2.7 miles
  ▪ Nearest service station: 2.7 miles
  ▪ Nearest hospital: 4.4 miles
  ▪ Nearest library: 1.8 miles
  ▪ Town Hall: 2.6 miles
  ▪ Nearest community playground: 2.6 miles
  ▪ Nearest bank: 2.6 miles

• There are no public transportation services on South Avenue near the site. These services are preferably accessible to residents of multi-family housing developments. From the subject site, the Riverside MBTA Green Line station is 4.2 miles away and the Wellesley Farms MBTA Commuter rail station (closest station) is 3.1 miles away.

• The closest access to the Massachusetts Turnpike is located at the Route 30/128 interchange in Weston and is approximately 2.5 miles from the site. Access from the site by auto to the Turnpike entrance ranges from approximately 6 minutes during off-peak times to 15 minutes or longer during the peak morning commute hours in the eastbound direction, while similar conditions prevail on the westbound side of South Avenue during the evening peak hours.

• There are no bicycle lanes or designated facilities for bicycles along any portion of South Avenue in Weston.

• In front of the proposed site, eastbound morning peak hour traffic often stops or slows to a crawl approaching the signal at Wellesley Street and South Avenue. These eastbound delays can extend beyond Highland Street and Winter Street, and on occasion extend to Brown Street all the way to the signalized intersection.

• The closest schools to the site are the Regis College Campus, which is .7 miles away or an approximately 12-minute walk, and Weston High School which is approximately .5 miles from 518 South Avenue.

Comparisons with Neighboring Residential and Institutional Land uses, Other Weston 40B projects, Similar High-Density Residential Developments Outside of Weston and Lot Coverage Calculations

From Chapter 40B law, 760 CMR 56/07(3)(e), the framework by which these developments are reviewed, and local concerns addressed include the following areas:

1. Height, bulk, and placement of the proposed project
2. Physical characteristics of the proposed project
3. Height, bulk, and placement of surrounding structures and improvements
4. Physical characteristics of the surrounding land
5. Adequacy of parking arrangements
6. Adequacy of open areas, including outdoor recreational areas, proposed within the site
With this perspective in mind, I will analyze: 1.) the surrounding single-family land use development patterns, 2.) the development of the institutional uses in the area and their size and scale, 3.) the comparison with other approved and pending 40B developments in Weston, and 4.) the land use features present in other similar sizes large scale high-density residential developments in other communities.

1. Single Family Residential Analysis in Project Area

Using 2019 Board of Assessors data, 31 nearby and abutting single residence properties in the Single Residence A Zoning District were analyzed to determine the lot area per dwelling unit and the average gross square footage per residence compared to the lot size, otherwise known as a FAR (Floor Area Ratio or building massing) calculation. These properties are located on South Avenue, DiBenedetto Drive, Highland Street, Brown Street, Wellesley Street and Winter Street. The results revealed:

- The 31 single family residences are located on 2,617,044 square feet of land, or 60.1 acres. This equates to 1.62 acres per unit or 84,421 square feet per dwelling unit.
- The 31 residences have a total gross floor area of 103,043 square feet, or an average of 3,324 square feet per dwelling unit.
- Therefore, the FAR (ratio of floor area to lot size) average is .04 in the project area.

By comparison, the proposed 275-unit development at 510-518-540 South Avenue creates 331,600 square feet of floor space (Site Approval Application, page 10) on the combined 440,600 square feet of lot area, thus yielding a FAR of .75, which is 18.8 times higher than the project area.

A detailed parcel-by-parcel breakdown (with an area map) is included as Appendix A to this letter.

2. Institution Uses Survey in the Project Area

The project area includes as many as 5 nearby institutional uses and the following data summarizes these uses and their development envelope.

### Institutional Uses Surrounding Project Area

**Source: Town of Weston Assessor’s FY 2019 Final Property Valuation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>STREET</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>SQFT LOT</th>
<th>GLA</th>
<th>STORIES</th>
<th>FAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>400-412</td>
<td>HIGHLAND ST</td>
<td>Beechwood Stables</td>
<td>15.83</td>
<td>689,555</td>
<td>2,505</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558</td>
<td>SOUTH AV</td>
<td>Pope John Seminary</td>
<td>23.54</td>
<td>1,025,402</td>
<td>62,100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>BROWN ST</td>
<td>St. Demetrios Greek Church</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>250,906</td>
<td>33,907</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>BROWN ST</td>
<td>Wightman Tennis</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>659,063</td>
<td>37,600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>BROWN ST</td>
<td>Mormon Church</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>196,020</td>
<td>22,543</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,820,946</td>
<td>158,655</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AVG GLA**: 31,731  
**AVG SQ FT LOT**: 564,189  
**AVG FAR Institutional**: 0.06

FAR (Floor Area Ratio) = Gross floor area (GLA) / Lot area (SQ FT LOT)

*Data is from the Final Fiscal Year 2019 Property Valuations found on the Town of Weston website*
The average FAR of these 5 institutional uses is .06, only slightly higher than the single residential average of .04. It is also noteworthy that none of these uses exceed 3 stories, whereas the proposed development provides for up to 6 stories of development, which approximately double the building height for the existing institutional uses.

3. Comparison of Existing and Pending 40B Projects in Weston with Proposed Development

The following table details the units per acre for approved or pending affordable housing projects in Weston:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET/MAP LOCATION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>TOTAL UNITS</th>
<th>TOTAL ACRES</th>
<th>UNITS PER ACRE (TOTAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44 School St</td>
<td>Brook School Apartments</td>
<td>Rental</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore Ln</td>
<td>Dickson Meadow</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter St</td>
<td>Winter Gardens</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Ln</td>
<td>Merriam Village</td>
<td>Rental</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>15.51</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Jones Rd</td>
<td>Jones Rd</td>
<td>Rental</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>809-811 Boston Post Road</td>
<td>809-811 Boston Post Road</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680 South Ave</td>
<td>680 South Ave</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>5.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Church St</td>
<td>45 Church St</td>
<td>Rental</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Meadows</td>
<td>Highland Meadows</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Pine St</td>
<td>23 Pine St</td>
<td>Rental</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Ave</td>
<td>Warren Ave</td>
<td>Rental</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126 Viles St</td>
<td>Viles St</td>
<td>Rental</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255 Merriam St*</td>
<td>Village at Silver Hill</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269 North Ave*</td>
<td>Kendall Village</td>
<td>Rental</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>10.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751-761 Boston Post Road*</td>
<td>751-761 Boston Post Road</td>
<td>Rental</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>61.79</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*<em>510-518-540 South Ave</em></td>
<td><strong>510-518-540 South Ave</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rental</strong></td>
<td><strong>275</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.10</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = proposed

Data compiled from information found on the Town of Weston website.

Thus, the proposed South Avenue project would create a density nearly 3 times any pending project in Weston and would be over 9 times the density of the largest comparable pending project at 751 Boston Post Road. The Town of Weston Policies and Preferences for Affordable Housing from 2010 (page 3) states that “...the average or gross density will not exceed four (4) dwelling units per acre” for affordable housing. At a density of 27.2 units per acre, the proposed density for the 510-518-540 South Avenue project is nearly 7 times higher than the stated guideline.

4. High Density Residential Comparison

Several other comparable high-density projects in the Boston area (most of which were mentioned in the developer’s application and presentation to the Board of Selectmen on March 26) were examined with respect to zoning classification, proximity to major highways, and proximity to MBTA public transportation services. The chart below illustrates these findings:
# High Density Residential Development Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th># Units</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Distance to major highway</th>
<th>Public Transportation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gables University Station</td>
<td>85 University Ave, Westwood</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0.5 mi to Rt 95/128</td>
<td>MBTA Commuter Rail - 0.3 mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AMTRAK - 0.3 mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBTA Bus - 0.3 mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles River Landing</td>
<td>300 Second Ave, Needham</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>0.8 mi to Rt 95/128</td>
<td>MBTA Bus - 0.3 mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBTA Commuter Rail - 1.7 mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland Station</td>
<td>1940 Washington St, Newton</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Multi-Res</td>
<td>0.6 mi to Rt 95/128</td>
<td>MBTA Green Line - at site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBTA Shuttle - at site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBTA Bus - 0.2 mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover at Andover</td>
<td>30 Shattuck Rd, Andover</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0.7 mi to Rt 93</td>
<td>MBTA Commuter Rail - 4.0 mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gables Residential</td>
<td>204 Arsenal St., Watertown</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1.3 mi to Rt 90</td>
<td>MBTA Bus - at site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avalon Bear Hill</td>
<td>1449 Main St, Waltham</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>Multi-Res</td>
<td>1.0 mi to Rt 95/128</td>
<td>MBTA Bus - 0.3 mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBTA Commuter Rail - 0.8 mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518 South Ave</td>
<td>518 South Ave, Weston</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>Single Family Residential “A”</td>
<td>2.5 mi to Rt 90</td>
<td>MBTA Commuter Rail - 3.1 mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBTA Green Line - 4.2 mi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data compiled from site web pages, zoning maps, MBTA website, and online maps (Google and Bing)*

The South Avenue project is clearly inconsistent with the model for approved and developed high-density residential projects. The lack of convenient and proximate public and private transportation options combined with the complete mismatch of the single residence zoning classification is clear and apparent.

## Areas of Concern, Study and Potential Impact

In initial meeting with neighbors of this project and Town officials, the following areas have been identified as areas of concern, and it is anticipated that each of them will require scrutiny by the Town and assessment of potential impacts related to this 40B development. These areas are not identified in any particular order or by their relative importance. It is also likely that additional study areas will be identified.

1. The size and scale of all proposed buildings and structures on the surrounding neighborhood.
2. Provisions for a stormwater management plan and how drainage will affect surrounding properties.
3. The proposal for a sewage and wastewater treatment facility identifying visual, odor, and noise concerns.
4. The proposal and capacity for use of public water and gas utilities and how neighboring residences will be affected.
5. A detailed landscaping plan showing proposed trees, plantings, buffering, and existing trees and vegetation slated for removal. Colored ribbons can be used to identify all trees slated for removal, to provide a visual reference for the scope of tree and vegetation clearing proposed for the site.
6. A plan and its compliance with all related conservation, environmental wetland protection, and wildlife protection laws and regulations.
7. A fully-developed plan related to noise, lights and site lighting as well as visual impacts and how nearby properties would be affected.
8. A full-scale traffic and safety study conducted in collaboration with the Town, based on a Town-approved scope of services and areas of study. In particular, the proposed site driveway(s), the intersection with Highland Street and South Avenue, the signalized intersection at Wellesley Street and South Avenue and the intersection of Winter Street and South Avenue are critical.

9. A plan detailing site access, mobility, and circulation that incorporates use by the Town’s emergency responding departments.

10. A plan that addresses and promotes bicycle and pedestrian usage to and from the site.

11. Detailed architectural plans with enough detail to identify elevations of every building from all vantage points, unit square foot breakdowns, setback distances between structures, and the locations and dimensions of all exterior equipment.

12. Verification of lot coverage, open space and adequacy of usable open space on the site, consistent with surrounding parcels.

**Public Participation/Community Involvement Component**

In mid-January, a small group of direct abutters to the project were notified by mail by the developer regarding an introductory meeting to introduce the project. This initial letter expressed a stated desire to “work collaboratively” with neighboring residents. At this initial meeting on January 24, 2019, attended by a handful of people, the spokesman for the project from Hanover Development laid out their pursuit of a 40B 260-275-unit single building 5-story rental scheme. The possibility of a 400+ space parking garage attached to the building was also mentioned. Subsequently, three of the neighbors requested a follow-up meeting with the developer to discuss initial concerns about the project and to try and establish lines of communication regarding upcoming public meetings with Town Committees and Boards. That meeting was held on February 14, 2019. The meeting was short and tense and proved to be unproductive. Since that meeting, to my knowledge no formal or informal meetings with any group of abutters or neighbors have been offered or held. Additional communication with concerned neighbors has been non-existent.

While neighborhood involvement and input has been shut off since the February 14 meeting, the developer and his group have worked at warp speed to meet with as many Town Boards and Committees as possible to introduce the project and advance their plans for development. As recently as the week of March 11, traffic counters and video recording devices were placed in the vicinity of the site along South Avenue to record and monitor traffic movements in the area. While these activities were ongoing, I inquired of two Town officials with potential knowledge of these matters as to the source of these studies and what their purpose was. I was surprised to hear that neither official was initially aware of them, ultimately one of the officials confirmed after a couple of days that the originator was indeed the development interest for 518 South Avenue. Thus, it appears some type of traffic study has already been undertaken without knowledge, input, or discussion of a possible scope of work from critical Town officials. Residents in the area were certainly not notified that such actions were being taken.
Summary and Conclusion

The goal of developing quality, desirable, affordable housing in every community is a worthwhile and desirable goal. The ways to achieving that at 518 South Avenue or at any other site in Town are open to discussion and interpretation. Ultimately it is up to the developers of these projects to put forward their best efforts to achieving these goals in ways that are aligned with the character of the community, to meet community standards, to reduce impacts in the areas where they are located, and to work closely with those most impacted. It is still much too early to assess the current proposal in a specific, definitive way as many, many details are lacking. From a land use perspective, it is safe to say, however, that a massive up-to-6-story stand-alone building with hundreds of rental units and a 400+ space parking garage in a Single Residence zoned area in no way even begins to resemble the character of Weston.

As explained in this report, the site is sorely lacking the key attributes typically found in high-density rental housing developments. The site is close to 100% auto dependent, basic and vital services and amenities are located miles away, public transportation is non-existent in the area, there is no sidewalk in front of the site, and public safety and site access considerations are not easily resolved.

The key points described in this report have identified the following areas of initial concern regarding the viability of a high-density 275 rental unit proposal in this location:

1. At 275 units the proposed development Floor Area Ratio (FAR, building massing) is .75, while the FAR for the 31 Single Family residential homes in the area around it is .06 – thus, the development as proposed is 18.8 times higher in building mass than the area around it.
2. The FAR among the 5 institutional uses in the area is .04, and none of these existing uses exceed 3 stories; up to and including 6 stories is contemplated at the development site, which is double the height of the existing institutional buildings.
3. At a density of 27.2 units per acre, the development is nearly 3 times higher than any pending 40B project in Weston and would be over 9 times the density of the largest pending project at 751 Boston Post Road.
4. The development proposal is totally inconsistent with the typical land use characteristics of 6 other high-density residential developments in area communities, most notably due to the lack of convenient and proximate public and private transportation options. This missing transportation element and the driving distances to basic community amenities and services render this site extremely difficult to impossible for a rental proposal of this scale.
5. The Single Residence zoning classification and a 275-unit proposal is an entire mismatch with the uses that exist in the area and with the wholesale exceptions and waivers to the zoning requirements that are being sought. Typically, these large-scale developments (as noted in the table earlier) are in Industrial or Multi-Family zoning districts, which is appropriate.
6. The plan for 275 units is at significant odds with the Town's own stated guideline of a not to exceed “4 units per acre” density published in the Town of Weston Policies and Preferences for Affordable Housing from 2010 (page 3).
The public participation and community involvement component, which is so vital to seeking input and valid comments regarding the plan from those in the area, is effectively shut down. A single proponent-sponsored meeting of a handful of direct abutters with few details about the project hardly constitutes active community participation and can certainly not be masqueraded as “support” for the project.

With that in mind, as a starting point, would the Town be open to exploring with the developer (and with considerable input from the neighbors and others in the community) an affordable housing plan for the site that would create an ownership model and drastically reduce the number of units as well as creating buildings much more consistent with the size, height, and scale of those found in the area?

I realize this letter has been long. I’m hopeful that I have raised a range of valid points that could serve as a basis for a better discussion about this project.

Sincerely,

Louis Mercuri

Weston

CC:
Planning Board, Alfred Aydelott, Chair
ZBA, Winifred I. Li, Chair
Affordable Housing Trust, Sarah Rhatigan, Chair
Affordable Housing Trust, Hugh Jones, Chair
Conservation Commission, Laurie Bent, Chair
Traffic and Sidewalk Committee, James Doyle, Chair
Conservation Coordinator, Michele Grzenda
Town Engineer, Stephen Fogg
Building Inspector, John Field, P.E.
Town Planner, Imaikalani Aiu
Appendix A: Single Family Residential Survey in Project Area (With Area Map)

Single Family Residential Sample In Project Area

Source: Town of Weston Assessor’s FY 2019 Final Property Valuation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>STREET</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>SQ FT LOT</th>
<th>GLA</th>
<th>FAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>SOUTH AV</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>66,970</td>
<td>5,664</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>SOUTH AV</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>60,871</td>
<td>2,214</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>SOUTH AV</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>82,651</td>
<td>2,716</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518</td>
<td>SOUTH AV</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>174,127</td>
<td>3,153</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>526</td>
<td>SOUTH AV</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>1,656</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531</td>
<td>SOUTH AV</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>40,200</td>
<td>2,790</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534</td>
<td>SOUTH AV</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>42,400</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540</td>
<td>SOUTH AV</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>40,800</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>546</td>
<td>SOUTH AV</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>40,500</td>
<td>3,682</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>WINTER ST</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>67,841</td>
<td>2,933</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>WINTER ST</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>52,096</td>
<td>2,452</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>WINTER ST</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>83,087</td>
<td>1,728</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>WINTER ST</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>60,436</td>
<td>2,736</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>WINTER ST</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>60,871</td>
<td>3,050</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>WINTER ST</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>60,871</td>
<td>5,748</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>WINTER ST</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>60,436</td>
<td>2,206</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>WINTER ST</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>71,761</td>
<td>2,384</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>WINTER ST</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>86,572</td>
<td>4,210</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BROWN ST</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>84,394</td>
<td>4,650</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BROWN ST</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>107,045</td>
<td>5,075</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>BROWN ST</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>127,518</td>
<td>6,644</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>BROWN ST</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>2,152</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>BROWN ST</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>81,780</td>
<td>3,026</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>BROWN ST</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>99,204</td>
<td>2,048</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>BROWN ST</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>75,682</td>
<td>2,994</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>BROWN ST</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>95,284</td>
<td>3,018</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>BROWN ST</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>60,871</td>
<td>2,084</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>WELLESLEY ST</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>217,687</td>
<td>5,372</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>HIGHLAND ST</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>56,854</td>
<td>3,206</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>DI BENEDETTO DR</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>63,049</td>
<td>6,215</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>DI BENEDETTO DR</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>275,186</td>
<td>4,119</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,617,044</td>
<td>103,043</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| AVG GLA (SQ FT) PER RESIDENCE | 3,324 |
| AVG SQ FT LOT                  | 84,421 |
| AVG FAR                        | 0.04 |

FAR (Floor Area Ratio) = Gross floor area (GLA) / Lot area (SQ FT LOT)

Data is from the Final Fiscal Year 2019 Property Valuations found on the Town of Weston website
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Dear Weston Mass Board of Selectmen:

Thank you for the two meetings that you have held on the project at 510, 518 and 540 South Avenue. They have been quite helpful in understanding the project and related process. I have lived at 78 Pine Street for just about 10 years, run my business from my home office at that location, and have a daughter that is has been at Country School since Kindergarten. I wanted to share a few comments that I hope you will consider in your comments to MassHousing.

At both Board of Selectmen meetings on this project, which I attended, it was made clear that MassHousing has requested that the town is only being asked to comment on a 275 unit project. My concern is that by not providing MassHousing with comments based also on a project of 200 units, any concerns specific to a 200 unit development will not be considered by MassHousing. You noted last night that there were several comments in the ConCom letter to the Board of Supervisors related to a 200 unit development, but you indicated that you did not consider those comments relevant because you have not been asked to comment on a 200 unit development. My view is that those comments should also be included in the comments to MassHousing given that we have a clear indication from Hanover in the letter from Nutter to the planning board dated April 17, 2019 (the “Nutter Letter”) that they will only be submitting an application to the zoning board for a comprehensive permit for a 200 unit project. If the past is any guide, MassHousing, if they issue a Project Eligibility Letter (PEL), will issue it for "no more than 275 units" (similar to what they did for Weston Quarry) and Hanover will take that and submit an application for comprehensive permit to the Zoning Board for 200 units. If we do not include comments specific to a 200 unit project, MassHousing will not have an opportunity to consider those comments before issuing a PEL. While I understand that there may be a later step in the process where Mass Housing will issue a final approval, it is not clear to me whether the town will have the ability to provide additional comments prior to such final approval and whether the project will have already progressed so far at that point that it will be too late for such comments to have a meaningful impact.

In addition, it is quite clear from the tone of the Nutter Letter that Hanover no longer desires to cooperate with the town. They refused to provide updated financials based on a 200 unit project and clearly stated that they “see no benefit to any further meetings with the Planning Board with respect to this Project.” I believe that the Nutter Letter should be shared with MassHousing and it should be made clear that Hanover is no longer interested in cooperating with the town. In its Sustainable Development Criteria Scorecard, Hanover highlighted their “Concerted public participation effort (beyond the minimally required public hearings.” While there were several meetings and initially they appeared cooperative, I believe that the very strong change in attitude and desire to no longer meet with the planning board should be highlighted for consideration by MassHousing.

Note that I have copied Chris Houston on this as I have not sent a message to the Board of Selectmen before, and it is a bit strange that the e-mail domain is @westonmass.org, when the domain for the town website is @weston.org. I just want to make sure that it at least gets through to one of the Selectmen at least. I am sorry, Chris, if this is not preferred.

Best regards,

David