



January 24, 2022

Board of Survey and Planning
City of Waltham
165 Lexington Street
Waltham, MA 02452

RE: 21 Newton Street, 40B Comprehensive Permit Application
Response to Board of Survey and Planning Comments

Dear Board Members,

Thank you for your comments submitted to the Zoning Board of Appeals dated January 19, 2022 regarding our Comprehensive Permit application for the proposed Leland House development - 68 all-affordable, 100% handicapped adaptable, senior supportive apartments at 21 Newton Street. This letter serves as a response to the comments and concerns raised by the Board:

1. Set-Backs - the parcel is very large and we don't see why the setback requirements can't be met with minor changes to the plans. We recommend against approving those waivers.

The Leland House building was located in the best location on the site from an engineering and architectural perspective and based on an extensive community process with the Ward Councilor, neighbors and abutters that resulted in a significant reduction in size from the initial proposal before the Community Preservation Committee and the City Council. Redesign of the building included reduction of the building size from 79 units to 68 units, lowered height from 4 stories to 3 stories, and an increase in the parking from 40 spaces (0.5 ratio) to 51 spaces (0.75 ratio). It should also be noted that the proposed development maintains or increases setbacks over existing conditions to abutting residential properties. Both setback requests are on the Stanley Senior Center side of the lot, which is all surface parking abutting the locus.

2. They can't meet the setbacks, but their planting plan calls for the trees to overlap onto other people's property. We recommend against approval of the setback waivers.

Tree symbols on the plan depict the potential 10-15 year mature canopy size. All proposed tree planting locations are within the Leland property.

3. We would be ok with the lot coverage and open space waivers as long as the main building was adjusted to properly fit the site.

As described above, the current location of the proposed building is the best location possible on the site from an engineering and architectural perspective, and based on an extensive community process with the Ward Councilor, neighbors and abutters. Further, as noted above the proposed development maintains or increases setbacks over existing

conditions to abutting residential properties and proximity to residential abutters was a primary focus in designing the proposed building.

4. We don't allow accessory buildings to be placed anywhere they want. Accessory building should be adjusted to meet the city requirements, recommend against 4.221.

The current locations of the two (2) accessory buildings (small storage sheds) are the best location possible on the site based on their intended use (storage of maintenance and snow removal equipment) and proximity to the building. Similar to the above, proximity to residential abutters was a primary focus in determining the location of both the principal and accessory buildings based on an extensive community process with the Ward Councilor, neighbors and abutters.

5. We can agree with a reduction in parking spaces but it should be at least 1.0 per unit)

The number of apartments and parking spaces provided at Leland House was negotiated as part of an extensive community process with the Ward Councilor, neighbors and abutters, which included a reduction of the building size from 79 units to 68 units and an increase in the parking from 40 spaces (0.5 ratio) to 51 spaces (0.75 ratio). Further, based on the parking ratio of 2Life's other communities (average ratio of 0.4), the proposed parking will be more than sufficient for residents and their guests.

6. By meeting the setbacks, there should be no issue with no paved areas within 5 feet of a property line or street, especially if the sidewalks are straight - recommend against 5.42.

Relocating the paved areas 5 feet from the property line is not possible without relocating the building. As described above, the current location of the proposed building is the best location possible on the site, based on an extensive community process with the Ward Councilor, neighbors and abutters.

7. Since the loading area does not meet the requirements because of an accessory building, we recommend against 5.91 and suggest they move the accessory building to a different location on the site so the loading area requirements can be met.

The loading area as currently designed is more than sufficient for the delivery vehicles (box trucks) expected to come to the site. The current locations of the two (2) accessory buildings and loading area are the best location possible on the site based on their intended use and proximity to the building. As described above, the current location of the proposed building is the best location possible on the site, based on an extensive community process with the Ward Councilor, neighbors and abutters.

8. There is no reason they can't apply for a new sign permit, Petitioner shall apply for a new sign permit, just like everyone else, recommend against 6.31.

One of the primary purposes of a comprehensive permit pursuant to M.G.L. c. 40B is that all permitting is wrapped into the comprehensive permit, rather than requiring the affordable housing developer to navigate multiple permitting processes. Accordingly, this is a standard waiver request that simply allows the Petitioner to include signage as part of its building permit pursuant to the comprehensive permit rather than a separate sign permit application. The Petitioner is proposing a modest premises identification sign at the front of the building, and will include a detail of the same in the revised Plans to be submitted at a later date.

Please contact either me or Zoe Weinrobe (617-912-8406, zweinrobe@2lifecommunities.org) with any questions or if you need any additional information that will assist in your review of this important project.

Sincerely,



Lizbeth Heyer
Vice President
2Life Communities

Cc: Waltham Zoning Board of Appeals