

Kevin R. Walker
1776 Canton Avenue
Milton, MA 02186

October 1, 2018

Via Email & First Class Mail

Northland Residential Corporation
80 Beharell St. Suite E
Concord, MA 01742

Re: Devens Cluster Architectural Review

Mr. Dawley,

Attached please find a preliminary peer review of your Special Permit Application only as it relates to the Devens Cluster, by a local professional architect whose services we have retained. As you will note from this review, your Special Permit Application doesn't comply with the Town Bylaw and Development Agreement, and/or is lacking required information per those two important documents.

Also, be advised that at the appropriate time you will be receiving further architectural and civil review comments from me regarding the other aspects of this project as a whole.

If you have any questions, don't hesitate to contact me.

Thank you,

Kevin Walker

Cc: Neighbors/Abutters/Interested Parties
Cheryl Tougias, Chair, Milton Planning Board
April Lamoureux, Board Member, Milton Planning Board
Bryan Furze, Board Member, Milton Planning Board
Denise Swenson, Board Member, Milton Planning Board
Richard Boehler, Board Member, Milton Planning Board
Richard G. Wells, Jr., Chair, Milton Board of Selectman
Michael F. Zullas, Vice Chair, Milton Board of Selectman
Melinda A. Collins, Secretary, Milton Board of Selectman
Kathleen M. Conlon, Member, Milton Board of Selectman
Anthony J. Farrington, Member, Milton Board of Selectman

Stephen O'Donnell, Chair, Milton Historic Commission
And Commission Members

September 27, 2018

Mr. Kevin Walker
1776 Canton Avenue
Milton, MA 02186

Re. **Carberry Estates Design Review/ Devens Cluster**
Milton, MA

Dear Mr. Walker,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide additional design review services for the proposed Carberry Estates project in Milton, MA. The following comments are based on a review of the following documents:

705 centre street
boston ma 02130
t 617 522 2593
f 617 522 2591
www.fortearch.com

(Referenced documents):

<u>Date</u>	<u>Description</u>
05/08/2017	Executed Development Agreement with associated Exhibits between the Town of Milton (Town) and Wolcott Residential, LLC/ 'Northland' (Developer)
11/30/2017	Public Notice of Amendment to the Town By-Law/ Public Notice (Article 51 Amendment) as voted and passed on May 8, 2017 (<i>Town By-Law</i>)
08/31/18	'Wolcott Woods' Architectural Design Set, Drawings C,H1,H2,A6 and A7; prepared by Grazardo Vellero Architects
08/31/18	'Devens House', Drawings L-1.2, L-2.1, L-3.0, L-3.1, L-3.2 prepared by Ryan Associates

We understand that the Town of Milton Article 51 Amendment ('Town By-Law') and the Development Agreement and associated Exhibits ("Development Agreement") taken together will govern the special permit application process, as well as the planning, design, construction and maintenance of the Carberry property should the proposed project be approved and implemented.

The By-Law and the Development Agreement require the *preservation* of the Devens house, as well as other historic structures on the property. By doing so, the town has set a very high standard for treatment of the historic properties, consistent with *US Secretary of the Interior Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties ('Preservation')*, standards which have been adopted here as a guidepost for our comments.

Where language in the aforementioned documents is unclear, or where guidelines or standards for design are not specifically defined, we have used our best professional judgement in our review.

Certain information is not yet provided in the developer's documents, or not provided in sufficient detail to make an adequate review or assessment of the proposal vis-à-vis the town By-Law and Development Agreement. We have noted these accordingly below.

Specifically, our comments are as follows:

Site Plan/ L-2.1

1. Siting of new dwelling units appears to be in non-conformance with the Town By-Law design standards, specifically 13(a)v - ('garage doors shall not dominate the appearance of a unit when seen from the street'). We understand the buildings are sited to satisfy this criteria as seen from Canton Avenue, but they do not conform from the new (unlabeled) street. The rendered vignette highlights this condition – only garages are visible in this view.
2. 'Reasonable visual and audible privacy' – conformance to this standard is not able to be reviewed fully as details of construction are not provided. The Master Bath of Building #1 appears to be about 20' from the abutter's kitchen window in the two new townhomes.
3. Building #1 appears to require a cut and fill greater than 3' – has the developer demonstrated that this is unavoidable?

Devens House

4. Existing and proposed materials should be clearly labeled or given. Provide.
5. The drawings indicate 'no work', however the 'Outline of Renovation' describes new work not indicated in the drawings (ie. window and roof replacement). Clarify.
6. Roofing. Outline of work proposes replacement of entire existing roof with '3 tab asphalt shingles' but no specification is given. We understand the existing roof material to be slate. Stripping the roof of sound historic material is inconsistent with US Secretary of the Interior Standards for Preservation of Historic Structures and will diminish the historic character of the building.
7. What is the proposed restoration or treatment of existing brick?
8. Fiber cement clapboard – damaged clapboard siding should be replaced with like materials only if repairing existing wood using recognized preservation methods cannot be achieved. The proposal to replace existing wood with fiber cement is inconsistent with 'historic preservation' language of the Development Agreement and the Town By-Law, as well as Secretary of the Interior Standards for Preservation.
9. Comment #6 also applies to replacement of running trim with CPVC or PVC.
10. What is the proposed method of repair for any damaged architectural mouldings, or other exterior carpentry at Devens House?

11. More generally, how will the condition of existing exterior materials be evaluated? Will a detailed historic structures assessment / report be provided?
12. All windows are proposed to be replaced with 'Anderson' (*sic*) windows. This description of proposed replacement windows is insufficient to evaluate for conformance with the Development Agreement/ By-Law. Replacement of entire windows should only be permitted when limited replacement of deteriorated or missing components cannot be achieved. How will this be evaluated?
13. Window sizes are shown as changed in the proposed rear elevation, but not indicated as such – clarify. Changing the appearance of historic windows is contrary to language in the By-Law and Development Agreement ('preservation').
14. 'Therma-tru' doors – This description of proposed replacement door(s) is insufficient to evaluate for conformance with the Development Agreement/ By-Law.
15. Second floor of the Devens House appears to be unused or proposed as unoccupied space. Clarify.
16. Proposed 8' door opening at Devens House is not suitably proportioned to the building. (By-Law13/v.), and diminishes the character of the historic building (US Secretary of the Interior Standards).

New Townhomes

17. Missing exterior elevations (not all are shown); need all to complete review (openings/ flat surfaces, etc.).
18. 'Similar color' proposed is inconsistent with design standards. The town By-Law calls for variety in color, massing, roof lines, design features.
19. Lower level floor plans are not shown – provide.
20. Area calculations must include basement areas intended to be finished – provide.
21. Both buildings are labeled "A" – two 'Type A' units next to one another. This does not satisfy the By-Law standards regarding repetitiveness. The By-Law calls for variety in color, massing, roof lines, design features.
22. What is the proposed material below the water table at walk out level?
23. The garage side elevation side/ side elevation facing the road presents an appearance of a 'flat elevation' in non-conformity with design standards of the By-Law.
24. Exterior lighting locations or specifications are not provided. Need more information to review for compliance.
25. Provide existing roof top of ridge/ building heights of the Devens house as well as scaled elevation drawing(s) showing the relationship of the Devens house to the proposed new construction with finished grades to enable review for conformance (scale of buildings in context).
26. The By-Law calls for use of traditional materials of high quality. Fiber cement/ PVC are not traditional materials, but modern materials intended to mimic the appearance of traditional materials. Both are typically specified as less expensive alternates.

27. Windows. The Town By-Law standards mandate several requirements for windows which cannot be evaluated given the information furnished, including: windows that open; window surrounds; openings relieved to prevent flatness.
28. No garage door specification or description is provided. Required to evaluate compliance for openings.

General

29. The Development Agreement mandates new development adjacent to the historic structures to have a 'character consistent with a great estate dwelling or compound'. This language may be open to broad interpretation; however we do not see how the proposed siting or design of the new townhomes addresses this. For example, one might expect to see the design of the proposed cluster buildings to resemble more of an agricultural outbuilding (barn) or caretaker's residence; or that the buildings might be of varied scale sited in relationship to the main house in a manner more consistent with this language.
30. The Town By-Law design standards call for architectural design that is 'coherent'. The Devens House displays a mix of architectural styles - (Colonial/ Federal; Georgian/Gambrel). The new townhomes appear to introduce a third or fourth style(s), using architectural features evoking a southern plantation dwelling (hip roof) not characteristic to New England in general, or more specifically to the abutting historic building. We question if taken together, that the combined cluster will satisfy the goal of coherency enumerated in the design standards.

Thank you again for the opportunity to be of service. Do not hesitate to contact me with any questions to the above, or if I can be of any further assistance at this time.

We will be pleased to provide additional or ongoing design review for further submissions from the Town or Developer as they become available.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'E. Forte', written in a cursive style.

Forte Architecture + Design
Edward P. Forte, AIA LEED AP
Principal