



# Town of Ashland

## MASSACHUSETTS

## 9-49 Homer Ave

### Design Review Committee Report #2

Prepared by the Ashland Design Review Committee

Meeting date: August 3, 2023

Submitted to the Planning Board: August 9, 2023


Action items are in **red bold** throughout this document. Items in **black bold** are updates to previous items or newly discussed.

Documents reviewed and presented at this meeting by the Applicant were dated August 3, 2023.

### Architecture / Building Orientation

#### A. Massing & Scale

<b>1-A.1</b>	6.15.2023	Maximum FAR is 1.5. Proposed project FAR is 1. FAR is as of right.
<b>1-A.2</b>	6.15.2023	<p>Building projections and main entrances along Homer could be better organized and simplified to create a consistent streetscape, larger planting beds, and “pocket parks / seating areas” that relate with the building massing and main entrances.</p> <p>Per the Guidelines, “A well-designed storefront minimizes confusion over which doorway belongs to which business.” We spent considerable time during the meeting working through ideas to better locate entrances at the building recesses to improve legibility of the streetscape for patrons and improve the resulting landscape design/organization. <b>Applicant to further study and present these ideas back to us.</b></p> <p>9.6.7.3 Open Space: Complete. Entrances moved. The applicant noted (08-10-23) that the final landscape and furniture would retain some flexibility to best accommodate future tenants.</p> <p>The following are markups providing by the Committee during the meeting:</p>

		 <p>The top drawing is a cross-section of a building facade with three red arrows pointing downwards to specific areas. The bottom drawing is a perspective rendering of a row of houses on Homer Avenue, showing the building's relationship to the street and surrounding context.</p>
	<p>8.3.2023</p>	<p>Requires further discussion as related to site furniture described below in 1-K.1. Extra attention should be given to the street edge and the required setbacks of 8’min/15’max in this District.</p>
<p>1-A.3</p>	<p>6.15.2023</p>	<p>To understand the building in context with the scale of adjacent buildings, we advise that the applicant’s updated renderings (see Item 1-B.2) be put in visual context with the Downtown District and surrounding abbutters.</p> <p><b>Whether provided as a photo-montage or rendered to scale, we urgently request clear and accurate rendered depiction of the project in the greater context.</b> No renderings provided to date indicate surrounding buildings in any detail or materiality. <b>Furthermore, streetscape orthographic elevations are to be provided to understand the relationship between the adjacent context and the alignments between the storefront entrances/features and the residential architecture above.</b></p> <p>Scale acceptably demonstrated in Homer and Alden Street perspective renderings dated 08-03-23 presented to Planning Board 08-10-23.- Complete.</p>
	<p>8.3.2023</p>	<p>Renderings are misleading for understanding the mass and scale of the building. The renderings presented do not represent the context in scale with the building model, namely the telephone pole and wire elevation above the ground. We have concerns about how close the building is to the street and the adequacy to insert street trees and comfortable outdoor seating areas.</p> <p>On Page 6 of the 8/3/2023 Documents supplied by the applicant, the rendered building appears out of scale. The building looks sunken into the street compared to the photographs of the existing one-story brick building west of the project site.</p> <p><b>The applicant should provide revised renderings that take greater care in achieving an accurate representation of the scale.</b></p> <p>Scale is acceptably demonstrated. Complete.</p>

<b>2-A.1</b>	<b>8.3.2023</b>	<p>The western most commercial space appears to be less than 8' from the property line as measured on the plan. Per §8.5 of the bylaws, the building should be set back a minimum of 8'. <b>We recommend that this portion of the building be further set back to comply with zoning.</b></p> <p><b>PLANNING BOARD: Applicant to verify that proposal meets setbacks as per the bylaw.</b></p>
--------------	-----------------	--

**B. Materials & Textures**

<b>1-B.1</b>	6.15.2023	<p>White materiality as rendered is not resolved yet according to the applicant and is only a placeholder for future exploration. <b>We need to see a material palette presented by the applicant.</b></p> <p>9.6.7.2 Building Orientation, iv. Materials, textures, and color. Provided as per drawings dated 08-03-23. See note on 1-E.1.</p>
	<b>8.3.2023</b>	<p><b>Applicant presented 4 material palette options. The option showing the metal panel cladding was not selected to further develop. Applicant to provide a series of renderings for each option for review.</b></p> <p><b>DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE: 9.6.7.2 Building Orientation, iv. Materials, textures, and color. To be provided for DRC review.</b></p>
<b>1-B.2</b>	6.15.2023	<p>Applicant to present 4 or 5 material options for review. White and green awnings that relate to historic precedent (as mentioned by applicant) would be ok; to be reviewed in conjunction with a masonry base. In lieu of presenting just a single rendering, we would like to see options.</p>
<b>1-B.3</b>	6.15.2023	<p>Renderings of the building windows and storefronts should show an accurate representation of the intended tone/color of the glazing.</p>
	<b>8.3.2023</b>	<p><b>Not discussed but we would like this addressed in subsequent renderings.</b></p> <p><b>DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE: 9.6.7.2 Building Orientation, iv. Materials, textures, and color. To be provided for DRC review.</b>          (Note that only significant color differences can be demonstrated in renderings.)</p>

**C. Sustainability**

<b>1-C.1</b>	6.15.2023	<p>Solar panels were not discussed. Opportunity to be reviewed at the next meeting.</p>
	<b>8.3.2023</b>	<p>The applicant is reviewing providing solar panels at as many areas of the site as possible, including parking canopies and all roof orientations.</p>
<b>1-C.2</b>	6.15.2023	<p>EV charging was not discussed. To be reviewed.</p>

	<b>8.3.2023</b>	<p>The applicant is planning on all spaces to be EV-ready (conduit stub-ups at each location). <b>It was unclear how many stations would be provided and the applicant should clarify. See further notes above regarding solar canopies (1-C.1)</b></p> <p><b>PLANNING BOARD: Must meet or exceed current stretch energy code. Note that Ashland Fire Department requests no EV chargers in underground or covered parking. PB to also review possible solar panel locations</b></p>
<b>1-C.3</b>	6.15.2023	Provide more information on how stormwater is treated.
	<b>8.3.2023</b>	<b>Peer review response: parking lot to catch basin and discharge to subsurface infiltration structure. Promote groundwater recharge and</b>

		<p><b>reduce rate of stormwater leaving the site. Report will be submitted to the Town for review.</b></p> <p>Stormwater system to be reviewed by the Conservation Commission. Complete.</p>
<b>2-C.1</b>	<b>8.3.2023</b>	<p><b>The building massing and plan information doesn't appear to indicate wall thickness that would comply with the applicable revised Stretch energy code. We advise that the applicant be aware that one compliance path will be close to Passive House levels of design and detailing.</b></p> <p>The project will be code compliant as per Building Commissioner Review. Complete.</p>

## D. Heritage & Historic Details

<b>1-D.1</b>	6.15.2023	<p>Historic ornament is being proposed. Proposing architectural brackets and dentils. When the applicant adds color and materials to their renderings, we will be able to properly review ornamentation.</p>
<b>1-D.2</b>	6.15.2023	<p>The Applicant noted that the ground floor storefront is intended to relate back to traditionally sized and divided configurations. However, as this was not yet readily apparent in the renderings, we would like to note the Guideline's stance on this issue:</p> <p><i>"New buildings need not, nor should they, imitate the styles or details of the past...Newer buildings, for instance, use more glass than historic structures, yet the use of similar compatible materials and matching cornice lines and setbacks can ensure that new structures contribute to the character of the district."</i></p> <p>A greater amount of glass could be more inviting when considering the contemporary notion of connecting the indoor and outdoor environments. Divided lites and transoms are recommended by the Guidelines.</p> <p>Cornice lines are not to be confused with direct imitation of historic cornice details.</p>
<b>2-D.1</b>	<b>8.3.2023</b>	<p><b>A comment was received from the public about providing a "village" feel and differentiating the massing through various material and textures. The Committee agrees that this would break up the building form and add to the character of the downtown.</b></p> <p><b>In addition to materiality, the public comment was to create multiple buildings on site to further the village character.</b></p> <p>Planning Board is in support of the current approach as per the meeting on 04.27.23. Complete.</p>

<b>2-D.2</b>	<b>8.3.2023</b>	<b>It was presented that the stone pattern at the train station would be used as the basis for the plaza pattern at the pocket park, and would be carried across the commercial plaza spaces. Historically speaking, we take issue with this as the ashlar wall pattern typical of Richardsonian buildings are never found on the horizontal walking surface.</b>
--------------	-----------------	---

		<p>In retrospect, given the scale of the existing commercial building adjacent to the pocket park, it would be impossible to try to bring elements of the historic train station to this space. We advise that the historic building be allowed to stand alone.</p> <p>Page 29 of the 8/3 Documents indicates a seating canopy that has a roof form that relates to the train station. The roofline is not appropriate for the scale of the park. It should be of a different style rather than trying to match the Richardson building directly.</p>
2-D.3	8.3.2023	<p>We would like to entertain the idea of a mural on the existing stucco wall of the commercial building (15 Homer). One option may be a modern interpretive sign/display that explains the history of the train station; see Historic Commission.</p> <p><b>DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE: 9.6.7.2 Building Orientation, iv. Materials, textures, and color. Relative to all of 2-D, DRC to make recommendations to the PB.</b></p>

## E. Signage

1-E.1	6.15.2023	<p>Signs and patios/entrances at the middle of the facade recesses would make sense for the rhythm of the building. <b>Applicant to present a generic indication of signage locations, for tenants and for general Residential building signage.</b></p>
	8.3.2023	<p>Applicant noted that signage for residential and commercial would be together at Homer.</p> <p>Directional signage is lacking given the building plan to date. Signage should be clearly indicated on the elevations and reviewed. <b>DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE: 9.6.7.2 Building Orientation. DRC to review signage that is visible from the street and make recommendations to the PB. During the review, consider the potential use of hard canopies (with metal roofing) at the inner bays, above the retail entrances. These could be used to support signage lettering that is appropriate for downtown. Provide recommendations to the PB for signage materiality, font size, lighting, etc.</b></p>

## Site & Landscape

### F. Existing Conditions / Abutters

1-F.1	6.15.2023	<p>Parking garage comes within 4' of the property line, thus the fire trucks would straddle the wall.</p>
-------	-----------	---

	<b>8.3.2023</b>	<b>We recommend that an Environmental Impact Study be conducted to assess the impact on the surrounding buildings and their foundations. See later dated August 2, 2023 issued to the Planning Board.</b> <b>PLANNING BOARD: To review with CGC.</b>
<b>1-F.2</b>	6.15.2023	We felt there does not need to be a relationship with the train station, as they are different uses and the train station should stand alone as an historic property with cultural significance. The proposed 9-49 Homer design should nod to the historic architecture in materiality rather than

		being in stark contrast to it; see 1-A.3 above as related to contextual renderings that will help in this review.
	<b>8.3.2023</b>	<b>See above comment 2-D.2.</b>
<b>1-F.3</b>	6.15.2023	How are abutting properties impacted by excavation of garage level being so close to the property line? <b>Applicant shall consider constructability of excavation given typical angle of repose required for deep excavations.</b> This falls outside of the DRC review but may impact abutters and project cost if it hasn't been thought about.
	<b>8.3.2023</b>	<b>We recommend that an Environmental Impact Study be conducted to assess the impact on the surrounding buildings and their foundations. See later dated August 2, 2023 issued to the Planning Board.</b> <b>PLANNING BOARD: To review with GCG.</b>

## G. Site Improvements

<b>1-G.1</b>	6.15.2023	Pergolas at the rear seem out of place and too small. Benches located at the sidewalk should maybe be under pergolas. The space is not quite usable.
	<b>8.3.2023</b>	<b>Wasn't discussed. Still needs work.</b>
<b>1-G.2</b>	6.15.2023	We suggest making materials of pavers at pocket park the same as the other hardscapes along Homer within the building recesses. <b>Applicant to provide more information on intended materials both at pocket park and rear fire lane.</b>
	<b>8.3.2023</b>	<b>Applicant to provide further information on materials. Materials not yet received.</b>
<b>1-G.3</b>	6.15.2023	Benches should be part of the interior paver patio space instead of along the sidewalk.
	<b>8.3.2023</b>	<b>We recommend that options are presented for planters with seating to act as a buffer from the street.</b>
<b>1-G.4</b>	6.15.2023	See 1-A.2 for studying a consistent and simplified streetscape with planting beds and walks relating to the building massing. <b>DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE: 9.6.7.3 Open Space. Hard and soft landscaping to be reviewed by DRC. Consider using site materials and paving that match those used in the ongoing downtown renovation project. Additionally, the placement of such pavers must closely relate to the design intent currently implemented in that project. The DRC to review the approach to the proposed exterior hardscape/plazas in front of the proposed retail spaces and provide recommendations to the PB.</b>

<b>1-G.5</b>	6.15.2023	<p><b>Confirm public sidewalk width along Homer Ave provides enough pedestrian clear space between the existing telephone poles and edge of walk, by providing photos and dimensions.</b> Confirm the sidewalk width allows the Town to clear snow without damaging the landscape plantings. Applicant stated they would potentially clear the sidewalk with snow blowers.</p> <p><b>PLANNING BOARD: The project must meet all current building codes, bylaws, and ADA regulations. Reviewed by GCG.</b></p>
--------------	-----------	--

		<u>A note to the Planning Board:</u> to what extent will the underground utilities (as part of the Downtown Revitalization) extend along Homer Ave leading away from the Downtown? The electrical poles will be very close to the residential upper story windows as proposed. On road bicycle traffic as part of the Upper Charles Trail alignment through Downtown Ashland and sidewalk pedestrian traffic could be improved through clarification by the Planning Board of the future parameters around which the 9-49 Homer sidewalk can be designed.
	8.3.2023	<b>We recommend that the sidewalk be labeled as “town sidewalk”. Street edge requires further discussions per 1-A.1 above.</b> <b>Comment unclear.</b>
1-G.6	6.15.2023	<b>Applicant to verify the net change in impervious surface from the existing condition to the proposed.</b> <b>Stormwater system to be reviewed by the Conservation Commission. Complete.</b>
2-G.1	8.3.2023	<b>Site lighting should be shielded from residential apartments. Bollard lighting is recommended rather than pole lighting.</b> <b>We recommend that town street lighting be considered in how it impacts the residential units along Homer and Alden.</b>

## H. Landscape

1-H.1	6.15.2023	<b>How are the plants, lawn and green roof irrigated?</b> <b>Informational as per sustainability. Drawings and details are not required.</b>
1-H.2	6.15.2023	Snow storage and removal is an issue around the building with minimum area and too much planting. Applicant stated that it would be removed and not stored on site.
1-H.3	6.15.2023	<b>Show accurate renderings of the proposed plantings after 5 years of growth. Not required as per Appendix E—Design Review Process.</b>
1-H.4	6.15.2023	Applicant noted that more landscape was added to be inviting and be a buffer against the street. However, the planting palette should be studied in relation to commercial entrances regarding mature heights, maintenance, 70% native, shade, snow, and salt tolerance.
1-H.5	6.15.2023	Committee comment: <b>Add upright, vase shaped, native shade trees along the rear fence instead of arborvitaes and along Homer Ave.</b> Applicant was amenable to this and noted that they could trim the trees for fire truck access. <b>DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE: 9.6.7.3 Open Space. Hard and soft landscaping to be reviewed by DRC.</b>

<b>2-H.1</b>	<b>8.3.2023</b>	<p><b>Assurances were received from the applicant that the critical existing root zones as discussed could be added to the Construction Documents, to protect existing trees on site. See diagrams sent by Design Review Committee that the Planning Board has previously seen.</b></p> <p><b>DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE: 9.6.7.3 Open Space. Hard and soft landscaping to be reviewed by DRC.</b></p>
--------------	-----------------	---

<b>2-H.2</b>	8.3.2023	<p>We requested that the applicant study other tree species that avoid conflict with the wires along Homer.</p> <p><b>DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE: 9.6.7.3 Open Space. Hard and soft landscaping to be reviewed by DRC.</b></p>
--------------	----------	---

## I. Sustainability

<b>1-I.1</b>	6.15.2023	<p><b>Permeable pavers and details should be provided.</b> The DRC cannot select a material that is compatible with such conditions as building a drivable fire lane that straddles an open parking garage below; <b>Applicant must design, detail and submit materials for review.</b></p> <p><b>DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE: 9.6.7.3 Open Space. General hard and soft landscaping to be reviewed by DRC.</b></p> <p><b>PLANNING BOARD: Coordination of structure, drainage, and detailing with GCG.</b></p>
	8.3.2023	<p>Drivable, plantable and permeable pavers were discussed. Pavers are H-20 rated and will be filled with a seed mix, information on which to be provided. We recommend a recycled plastic grid as opposed to concrete permeable pavers.</p> <p>We would like to see more information on the products and the method of clearing the pavers of snow. If plowing, applicant should specify plow shoes on the equipment as specified in their O&amp;M plan.</p> <p><b>PLANNING BOARD: Coordination of structure and drainage with GCG.</b></p>
<b>1-I.2</b>	6.15.2023	<p><b>Civil drawings were not provided. Information on stormwater recharge, etc will be provided in the package to be submitted with revisions.</b></p> <p>Stormwater system to be reviewed by the Conservation Commission. Complete.</p>
	8.3.2023	<p><b>Civil</b></p>
<b>2-I.1</b>	8.3.2023	<p>Project is not pursuing LEED. Items such as # of EV stations could be driven by typical LEED requirements, but the Planning Board should consider if there is a quantity desired from prospective projects.</p>

## J. Safety & Accessibility

<b>1-J.1</b>	6.15.2023	<p>Site is effectively flat. All doors will be accessible without a step. <b>Provide a grading plan to confirm.</b></p> <p>Not required. Project will be code compliant as per GCG and Building Commissioner Review. Complete.</p>
--------------	-----------	--

<b>1-J.2</b>	6.15.2023	There is a loading zone for only 2 vehicles at one time, which require deliveries across the parking lot. This is potentially a conflict between pedestrian, residential vehicular traffic and commercial loading that must be studied. Applicant noted that the delivery times could be staggered and take place before business hours, but we questioned if this was manageable and enforceable.
	8.3.2023	<b>At least one drawing indicates these spaces for Emergency Vehicles; applicant to clarify intent for loading.</b> <b>PLANNING BOARD: To review with GCG.</b>

## Open Space & Community

### K. Open Space

<b>1-K.1</b>	6.15.2023	<p>Extend pocket park along Homer Ave, making the pocket park intentional and connected to the building streetscape. <b>Reduce landscaping and provide a redesigned scheme that relates to the building per notes in section A above.</b></p> <p><b>DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE: 9.6.7.3 Open Space. Hard and soft landscaping to be reviewed by DRC.</b> Applicant noted (08-10-23) that final landscape and furniture would retain some flexibility to best accommodate future tenants.</p>
	8.3.2023	<p><b>Patios were revised but landscape is still quite extensive and could have more space for community and commercial use, with movable planters as a buffer from street. We recommend creative organizing of site furniture to combine functions of planters, benches, bollards and bike racks.</b></p>
<b>1-K.2</b>	6.15.2023	<p>Outdoor green roof is only for residents. Result for geometry of the building. <b>We recommend shifting the north bar to extend the recesses outward to give more space to the green roof.</b></p> <p>1-K.2 through 2-K.3 Not in Scope. As per bylaw 9.6.7.3 Open Space, the DRC and PB review is limited to <i>“All open space, landscaped and usable, shall be designed to add to the visual amenities of the area for persons passing the site or overlooking it from nearby properties.”</i></p>
	8.3.2023	<p><b>North building “bar” moved north 2' per previous comments. Green roof is reconfigured.</b></p> <p><b>Green roof updated to put plantings below living room windows to increase privacy. However, it was noted that the raised planters will contain material that may not grow high enough to provide the intended privacy. Applicant to provide information on the seed mix. Private spaces are outside of the scope of the Design R</b></p>
<b>1-K.3</b>	6.15.2023	<p><b>Applicant to study solar/shade of green roof and provide information at next meeting.</b></p> <p>See above.</p>
	8.3.2023	<p><b>Shadow studies were provided. Some months may have been reversed and should be corrected. Plantings should be studied to be shade tolerant in this generally confined area with periods of a lot of shade.</b></p> <p>See above.</p>
<b>2-K.1</b>	8.3.2023	<p><b>Applicant agreed to study use of Bison wood pavers at green roof in lieu of artificial turf or stone pavers as proposed.</b></p> <p>See above.</p>

## L. Pedestrian Access & Bicycle Accessibility

<b>1-L.1</b>	6.15.2023	Access to Resi is through garage and a main lobby off of Homer Ave.
	<b>8.3.2023</b>	<b>The residential entry sequence is awkward and should be redesigned. Security of residential versus commercial lobby spaces must be thought through.</b>  Not in Scope. The bylaws do not give authority to the DRC or the PB to review the functionality of interior building spaces.
<b>1-L.2</b>	6.15.2023	No public bike parking is provided or discussed. Residential bike parking provided in garage; quantity to be reviewed.  <b>DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE: 9.6.7.5 Pedestrian Access. Public bike rack also appropriate as per Ashland Sustainability Best Practices list.</b>

<b>2-L.1</b>	<b>8.3.2023</b>	<b>Lit pedestrian crosswalks should be provided. Site lighting must be reviewed in conjunction with the town street lighting.</b> <b>PLANNING BOARD: To review with GCG.</b>
--------------	-----------------	---

## M. Site Signage

<b>1-M.1</b>	6.15.2023	[item removed, see Section E above]
--------------	-----------	-------------------------------------

## N. Traffic

<b>1-N.1</b>	6.15.2023	Parking is calculated as a % of building SF as required. ADD District can reduce by 75% and an additional 75%. Applicant has made all reductions allowed by the bylaws.
	<b>8.3.2023</b>	<b>Needs more discussion per GCG report dated June 5, 2023.</b>
<b>1-N.2</b>	6.15.2023	Compact spaces have been removed for reasons that were unclear. Other communities don't allow it but what are our requirements? We suggest to the Planning Board to make determination whether standard spaces can be reduced to 18' depth rather than 20'.
<b>2-N.1</b>	<b>8.3.2023</b>	<b>We agree the GCG report that parking space 17 overlaps with the AASHTO Bus-40 truck turning study and should be reviewed.</b>
<b>2-N.2</b>	<b>8.3.2023</b>	<b>Chamfered curbing to be added at the opening to the drivable fire truck lane.</b> <b><u>N.Traffic</u> PLANNING BOARD: To review with GCG.</b>

## Miscellaneous

## O. Additional Discussion and Recommendations

<b>1-O.1</b>	6.15.2023	<b>Updated plans to be submitted showing location of additional commercial tenant space at Alden.</b> Applicant noted this has been added to the design but was not presented to us graphically.
	<b>8.3.2023</b>	<b>Commercial space updated and stair relocated due to parking radii below. We feel that the eastern most commercial space should have an entrance door off of Homer.</b> <b>PLANNING BOARD: To review.</b>
<b>2-O.1</b>	<b>8.3.2023</b>	<b>3 units have access only from the green roof. This may be an egress and life safety issue that must be reviewed with the building commissioner.</b> <b>PLANNING BOARD: To review with Building Commissioner.</b>

## Planning Board Memorandum Items

<b>* Date of Memo Item from PB</b>		
<b>PB.1</b>	5.31.2023*	<b>Building materials and colors.</b>
	6.15.2023	See section B, above. However, see also 1-A.3 for our request for rendered context. Upon review of materials, we urge the Planning Board to further the discussion massing and scale as related to the context of the Downtown District. We find as a Committee that the Architectural intent proposed is acceptable per the Design Review Guidelines but cannot but accurately reviewed without zooming out and putting the building in context of the community at large.
<b>PB.2</b>	5.31.2023*	<b>Façade details and glazing.</b>
	6.15.2023	See section D above regarding ornamentation. While not commented on the meeting but to be reviewed in more detail was the applicant's mention of the use of traditional historic glazing and window frames at the commercial storefronts. Contemporary aluminum storefronts could be appropriate given the way the applicant has rendered them in the perspective view. To be reviewed as more detail is provided on materials.
<b>PB.3</b>	5.31.2023*	<b>Site materials/paving of the emergency vehicle access proposed to exit onto Alden Street.</b>
	6.15.2023	See section 1-I.1 (Site Sustainability) above.
<b>PB.4</b>	5.31.2023*	<b>Landscaping including pocket parks and public spaces</b>
	6.15.2023	See section G and K, above.
<b>PB.5</b>	5.31.2023*	<b>Signage</b>
	6.15.2023	See 1-A.2 and 1-E.1 for comments on commercial entrance locations. See section M above for our future discussion of overall building signage that was not discussed as it was not explicitly proposed by the applicant.
<b>PB.6</b>	5.31.2023*	<b>Relationship to the train station across the street</b>
	6.15.2023	See 1-F.2 above.
<b>PB.7</b>	5.31.2023*	<b>Sustainability details (see the new best practices document)</b>
	6.15.2023	See section I above. We must review this comprehensively in our next meeting once building form and updated plans are provided.

<b>PB.8</b>	5.31.2023*	<b>Protection needed (if any) for pedestrian/bicycle safety.</b>
	6.15.2023	See section J above. We have concerns about the cross circulation of pedestrians, resident vehicles, commercial patron vehicles and delivery trucks given there is no loading dock. No solution was found during this meeting but an issue exists that must be resolved.