

Red Robin Pastures

Davis Square Architects' Preliminary Architectural Design Comments on 9/21/21 drawings (many of which were presented at 9/30/21 ZBA hearing):

Previous conclusions carried forward from 6/14/21 drawings are in black. New comments are in green:

PRELIMINARY SITE ISSUES:

- Better consolidation of open space: Remains the case in 9/21 set.
- Form and Orientation of building much better: Remains the case in 9/21 set.
- More realistic use of "front yard": 9/21 set has not incorporated suggestion of U-shaped vs. circular drop off area in front yard. Applicant was encouraged to explore that option, along with re-organization of entry level plan to improve functionality of drop off and interior support spaces. As an alternative, there was also discussion at 9/30 hearing suggesting a total elimination of front drop off. This modification could potentially provide more usable outdoor space in lieu of paved area.
- If drop off area is eliminated at street side of building, will there be modifications to drop off area(s) on parking lot?
- Screening more effective. Remains the case in 9/21, however, necessity of grass pavers on west side of building will limit scale of landscape screening. There were also some concerns brought up related to functionality of grass paver emergency access (given that it does not appear to be wide enough for a fire track to deploy outriggers).
- Modify shape of entry drive? Maybe oval shaped with 2 curb cuts? Applicant will study this. See comments above.
- Sidewalks along roadway? Currently, proposed paving appears to be limited to area of school bus waiting area. There does not appear to be any type of structure proposed to provide protection from the weather at the waiting area.
- Need better site plan with outdoor amenities detailed There are now program elements indicated in the outdoor spaces. This reviewer suggested that a tot lot would be better utilized than a community gardening area.
- Note that all resident amenities, interior and exterior, must be fully compliant with MAAB requirements. This reviewer suggested a plan that shows accessible pathways to exterior amenities (which likely cannot include a gravel walk as indicated on the landscape plan).
- Tot lot? Not in current plans.
- Where is back-up generator? Not shown in current plans.
- Where is transformer? Indicated on site plan, will need to be confirmed with utility.

- Bike racks missing **Exterior ramps now shown at front and rear entries. Resident bike storage in basement accessed by elevator.**
- Zip car space? **Not shown in current plans.**
- Consider site wall along roadway to mitigate noise? May need acoustical study **No indication that this has been studied.**
- School bus drop off? **Shown on current plans.**
- Railing on retaining wall? **Shown on current plans.**
- EV parking? **Shown on current plans.**
- Any ground-mounted mechanical equipment? **No ground mounted equipment is indicated on plans. Applicant noted that there is adequate roof space for mechanical equipment. This should be shown on a roof plan, as well as elevations. Concern was expressed about sound levels of equipment and potential impact on neighbors. Applicant to provide more information.**
- All proposed fencing should be indicated on plans.
- No lighting plan was submitted as part of current plans.
- Tree preservation plan needs to be included in set (assuming that some existing materials will be left in place).
- Landscape screening on parking lot side very “linear.” A more 3-D arrangement should be considered (as there is generous space between the building face and the parking area).

PRELIMINARY BUILDING ISSUES

- More detailed building drawings required, including roof plans with mechanical equipment indicated. **This remains the case. Building elevations need to be coordinated with the grading plan (current drawings imply that the site is flat all around the building).**
- Building elevations need to be coordinated with utilities plan, specifically, gas meter and electric meter locations.
- Articulation of building footprint necessary? **No apparent changes made from previous plans. This can be better studied by reviewing a 3-D model of the building. The model will also facilitate understanding the view of the building from critical locations (neighbors to the west, from the roadway, from the resident parking area).**
- Building elevations that show actual grades **Already noted above.**
- Material selections need to be on elevations. **Currently indicated on elevation. These are not the same as original color renderings that indicated large areas of shingles mixed in with clapboards.**

- How many and mix of Group 2 units? Applicant has indicated that there will be 2 Group 2 units provided (although it is not clear which unit types they will be, which is a determinant in whether or not the proposal meets MAAB requirements).
- Bike storage for residents? Shown in basement.
- Consider relocating meeting room to rear of building to have direct connection to outdoor space?
- Is there a basement proposed? Full basement indicated, with very large spaces dedicated to storage.
- Parking lot entry is very weakly articulated on the building elevations, although this is likely the entry that will be predominant. Also, there are large areas that are not fenestrated on that elevation. At a minimum, one would expect a protected entry for residents.
- Entry level plan must be coordinated with a clearer, more legible grading plan. Grades not clear, including proposed interior finish floor level. As currently indicated, very awkward entry sequence shown at street side (18" of steps to get up to floor level, then ramping down two feet on interior).
- Egress stair on west side of building is exiting onto landscape area. No walkway indicated to get residents to street.
- Is a package room proposed?