August 31, 2016

Milton Planning Board
525 Canton Ave.
Milton, MA 02186

Re: Town Farms/Milton Woods Cluster Development Technical Review

Dear Board Members:

On behalf of the Pulte Homes of New England LLC, we are submitting a response to the Technical Review conducted by your staff dated July 12, 2016. Also enclosed are exhibits which indicate changes Pulte intends to make to the final set of plans. The exhibits submitted are as follows:

Exhibit 1 - Revised Subdivision Plan
Exhibit 2 - Revised Existing Conditions Plan
Exhibit 3 - 200 Scale Locus
Exhibit 4 - Revised Typical Roadway Section
Exhibit 5 - Revised Statement of Development Effects
Exhibit 6 - Revised Preliminary Conventional Plan
Exhibit 7 - Revised Grading Plan
Exhibit 8 – Notice of Intent Narrative

1. Subdivision Review

5.2.11

Question for applicant: Most large trees identified on Boundary and Topographic Survey plan are on Town or DCR land. Are there any large trees on the development parcel?

Response: There are many trees throughout the site. With a cluster development the developed areas are condensed. This makes tree retention difficult in the development areas but maximizes tree retention in the open space areas. We have re-evaluated the proposed grading plan, along the limit of work and other areas where the cuts and fills are close to existing grade to see if the design can be modified to save additional trees. Trees in these areas have been added to the plans (exhibits 2 & 7).

5.2.18

Question for applicant: Street trees are shown on landscape plan. Are there any large trees to be retained?
Response: See response above. We have located additional trees to be saved (exhibit 2).

5.3.6
Question for Board: Locus map on cover sheet of Definitive Subdivision Plan is 1"=800 ft. Is this sufficient?

Response: A 200 scale plan sheet will be added to the plans (exhibit 3).

5.4.2.1
Question for applicant: Statement of Development Effects needs description of surface drainage characteristics

Response: The Statement of Development Effects has been updated with this additional information (exhibit 5).

5.4.2.3.1-8
Question for applicant: These items do not appear to be in Statement of Development Effects. If they are addressed elsewhere in application (stormwater report, etc.), make reference.

Response: The Statement of Development Effects has been updated with this additional information (exhibit 5).

5.4.2.5
Question for applicant: This does not appear to be in Statement of Development Effects. If it is addressed elsewhere in application (stormwater report, etc.), make reference.

Response: The Statement of Development Effects has been updated with this additional information (exhibit 5).

6.1.3
Question for applicant: How does the proposed street and footpath design conform to the Milton Master Plan?

Response: Phase 1 of the Town’s Master Plan suggests that the Town Farm could be utilized to promote more recreation, community supported agriculture and housing. The project as proposed is consistent with these uses. Housing and passive recreation will be provided by the subdivision. Additional recreation and potential community agriculture can be facilitated on the 4 acre parcel that the town will retain.
6.1.10
Waiver required: Applicant is only proposing one sidewalk.

Response: We believe that two sidewalks are not necessary for a development of this size. One sidewalk will reduce site alteration.

6.1.11
Waiver required: Applicant is proposing an approximately 1,850 foot road with no cross streets.

Response: To mitigate the length of road without a cross street, we are proposing a gated emergency access to Governor Stoughton Lane.

6.1.12
Waiver required: Applicant is proposing an approximately 1,850 foot dead end road.

Response: To mitigate the length of road without a cross street, we are proposing a gated emergency access to Governor Stoughton Lane.

6.1.14
Waiver required: 8% grade proposed between 1+40 and 4+80

Response: The town of Milton Subdivision Regulations specifies a 6% max grade along horizontal curves 8% along straight segments. Reduced vertical slope along horizontal curves is more applicable to heavily traveled roads with truck traffic. This road is intended to provide access to the residents. No thru traffic is proposed. A strict application of this requirement in our opinion is not necessary and will result in more earth alteration, blasting & tree removal.

7.4.1
Waiver required: Applicant is only proposing one sidewalk; applicant is proposing reduced pavement width, which will affect placement of utilities; applicant is proposing a reduction in the crown of the road from 5” to approximately 4.25”

Note: Utilities should be shown in cross section detail on Definitive Subdivision Plan, Sheet 14.

Response: These waivers are a result of changing the pavement width of the proposed road. The typical cross section of the proposed roadway has been updated to show the intended location of utilities (exhibit 4).

7.4.5.1
Waiver required: Applicant is only proposing one sidewalk.
Response: See response to 6.1.10 above.

7.4.6.3
Waiver required: Applicant is proposing 2”-2.5” caliper trees.

Note: Planning Staff will arrange consultation with Tree Warden on size, species of trees.

Response: A waiver to the size of trees was not intended to be requested. The plan has been corrected to meet the tree size specified in the Milton subdivision regulations (exhibit 4).

9.0
Question for applicant: A fire alarm pullbox is shown on the plan, but is there a detail for the underground duct?

Note: Planning Staff will arrange consultation with Fire and Police chiefs.

Response: A typical electric trench detail has been added to the detail sheet (exhibit 4).

2. Cluster Development Review

J.4
Some lots on the Preliminary Conventional Subdivision Plan do not seem to have sufficient upland area. However, that plan also calls for fewer lots than are allowed by the current version of the zoning.

Response: The Conventional Subdivision Plan has been revised. The lots have been designed to meet the requirements specified in the Cluster By-Law. All lots have sufficient area for the placement of a dwelling meeting zoning & wetland setbacks (exhibit 6).

J.5
The zoning limits impervious coverage on a Buildable Lot to 35% or less. While building footprints and driveways shown on the plan are only conceptual, it would be helpful to include an estimate of impervious coverage.

Response: The footprint of the homes that Pulte is contemplating range from 2500 – 3000 s.f.. The average driveway will cover less than 2000 s.f. Based on the smallest lot size proposed, this would amount to a little over 26% of the lot with most lots having around 20%.
The application does not include any information on affordable units or a contribution to the Affordable Housing Trust.

Response: The proposal intends to comply with the affordable housing requirement by providing 2 units off-site or by rehabbing the Men’s Almshouse into 2 affordable units. Pulte looks forward to discussing both of these options further with the Board.

J.9-10
The Definitive Subdivision Plan includes land use calculations that indicate open space, wetland, and upland areas. The majority of the Open Land in the development is divided between two large parcels (Parcel 1 and Parcel 2). Those parcels comprise 13.22 acres, or 45% of the 29.69 total acres of the development. The land use calculations also include the green areas in the right of way toward the Open Land calculation. That adds up to 13.88 acres, or 47% of the total. The bylaw stipulates that the total land area of a development should exclude the land set aside for streets; the Planning Board should decide if green space in the right of way can be considered "land set aside for streets," and whether it should be included in the Open Land calculation.

Open Space Parcel 2 is a large parcel in the southern corner of the site, but it also wraps around the southeast and northeast property lines in a 20-foot wide strip. Subsection J.10 says that "narrow strips of land, which are not necessary for a high-quality site design, shall not be a part of the Open Land." The strip is approximately 37,600 sf, or 0.86 acres. If the Board decides that this narrow strip should not count toward the Open Land calculation, the two large open space parcels would still constitute 42% of the total land area, well above the 35% requirement. However, removing that strip from the calculation would affect a further requirement that 35% of the upland area of the site be set aside as Open Land. 8.56 acres of upland area are required. To reach that requirement, the total upland area of the two open space parcels (including the narrow Parcel 2 strip) and the green space in the right of way (itself an even narrower strip) must be included.

While the 20-foot strip is narrow, it may contribute to a “high-quality site design.” The southeast and northeast edges of the property include a 100-foot “neighborhood buffer,” of which the 20-foot strip is a part. While the Board will need to discuss the requirements and parameters of that neighborhood buffer, the 20-foot strip of Open Land would provide an undevelopable natural barrier at the property line.

Response: The open space strip, behind lots 12-23, has been expanded from 20 ft to 40 ft wide. This increased area is almost entirely upland. By adding the additional 20 ft, the upland open space computation no longer relies on any area in the road right of way to meet the 35% of the upland area requirement. It also doubles the width of the open space along the Countryside Road and Whittier Road abutters, adding to the protection of the natural barrier. The total open space will increase to
14.12 ac. (47% of the total site) and the upland area in the open space will increase to 9.25 ac. (38% of the total site uplands) (exhibit 1).

J.10
If the narrow strip of Parcel 2, referenced above, is considered to be part of the Open Land, then 18 parcels in the development would directly abut Open Land. If it is not considered to be Open Land, then only 7 parcels would directly abut Open Land, and the lots at the end of the cul de sac would be more than 700 feet away from the closest portion of Open Land.

Response: With the additional open space area added to the strip, this portion of the open space should be considered to be Open Land under the Cluster By-Law as it contributes to a "high quality site design". Pulte has also committed to restrictions on the proposed lots to prohibit tree clearing beyond the limits of work proposed by Pulte to construct the required improvements (exhibit 1).

J.12-13
The application did not include information about the ownership or continued maintenance of the Open Land or common areas.

Response: The Open Land is intended to be owned and maintained by a Homeowners Association. A perpetual conservation restriction will be granted and recorded providing that such Open Land shall be kept in an open natural state. The right of way of the road will be maintained by the town once it is accepted as a town street.

J.15.A.b
Maps and proposed alterations of wetlands are provided, but the description seems light. Is the Environmental Notification Form sufficient?

Response: A filing was made to the Milton Conservation Commission. We have enclosed a copy of the Notice of Intent narrative which describes in detail all work contemplated (exhibit 8).

J.15.A.c
Some trees are labeled, but mostly on Town or DCR land. Are there large trees on the development parcel?

Response: See earlier response.

J.15.B.a
There seems to be a good deal of earth moving. The Board will have to judge if the site design meets the requirements set out in the zoning.
Response: The site has been designed to balance the cuts & fills on the job and to minimize site alterations to the greatest extent feasible. To that end, we have requested a number of waivers to the subdivision regulations that will help minimize earth moving.

J.15.B.b
Some trees are labeled, but mostly on Town or DCR land. Are there large trees on the development parcel?

Response: See earlier response.

J.15.B.f
Density is increased along the rear property line of Countryside Lane abutters: there are nine lots of less than 40,000 square feet. The plan includes a 100-foot neighborhood buffer meant to mitigate this impact.

Response: The revised Conventional Subdivision Plan shows the same amount of lots, along the rear property line, as the proposed Cluster Subdivision.

J.15.B.h
See subdivision review: sidewalks are only proposed for one side of the street.

Response: See earlier response.

J.15.B.j
The cluster bylaw does not have specific frontage requirements. That said, Lots 5 and 6 and Lots 12-15 have very little frontage on the main road; the applicant proposes access to those lots via shared driveways.

Response: In an effort to reduce the length of the public way and thereby further reduce site alterations, driveways of narrower width than public ways were utilized in the design which allow for less earth moving and site alteration. This allows us to work better with the existing terrain.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to revise our proposal. Should you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,
Marchionda & Associates, L.P.

Michael J. Rosati
Project Manager