

---

**PGC ASSOCIATES, LLC**

1 Toni Lane  
Franklin, MA 02038-2648  
508.533.8106  
[gino@pgcassociates.com](mailto:gino@pgcassociates.com)

---

August 14, 2020

Mr. Andy Rodenhiser, Chairman  
Medway Planning Board  
155 Village Street  
Medway, MA 02053

**RE: HARMONY ESTATES MULTIFAMILY SPECIAL PERMIT/SITE PLAN**

Dear Mr. Rodenhiser:

I have reviewed the proposed multifamily housing special permit and site plan, for 7 units on Main Street. The applicant is Harmony Estates LLC of Milford, and the owners are Eliot Edwards and Linda Resner of Medway. The proposal is to renovate 2 existing houses on the site and to construct a triplex and a duplex (for a total of 7 units) on 1.22 acres with including associated parking, drainage, landscaping, etc. The plan was prepared by Meridian Associates, Inc. of Westborough. The plan is dated is dated June 9, 2020.

The property is located at 218-220 Main Street in the AR-II, and Multifamily Overlay zoning districts. I have comments as follows:

**ZONING**

**Multifamily Housing (Section 5.6.4)**

1. The site is within the Multifamily Housing Overlay District (Section 5.6.4) and thus eligible for a project.
2. The site has more than 50 feet of frontage on Main Street, which has sufficient capacity to handle the additional traffic flow from 7 units. At 52,993 square feet, it also meets the minimum area requirement of 30,000 square feet
3. The existing pre-existing, nonconforming houses do not meet setback requirements. The new buildings do meet them. They are set back 17 feet where 15 is required.
4. The total building heights are not shown specifically but the elevations show the second floor beginning at 10 feet so they are clearly under the maximum height limit of 40 feet. The zoning table on the plans indicate a maximum height of 30 feet.

5. The maximum density for multifamily projects is 8 units per whole acre. With 1.22 acres, the site is eligible for 8 units. At 7, the project is under the maximum.
6. The plans indicate that the development complies with comply with lot (building) coverage (.28% vs. 30% allowed), but does not have a calculation for impervious surface, for which the maximum allowed is 40%). Parking is proposed at an average of 3.7 per unit (based on 2 garage spaces and 2 driveway spaces for the new buildings and 6 spaces for the 2 existing houses) vs.1.5 required). The minimum open space or yard area is shown as 33% vs. the minimum required of 15%. The open space includes the detention basin. It is unclear if that is eligible. However, it appears that the minimum would be met even without including it.
7. At 5 new units, the project does not trigger the Affordable Housing requirement.
8. Section 5.6.4 E. 7 requires historic properties determined to be a “historically significant building” by the Medway Historical Commission shall not be demolished unless certain criteria are met. The project proposes to renovate the 2 existing houses on the site.

### **Other**

9. No photometric plan for lighting has been provided to document that the project complies with the Section 7.1.2 (Outdoor Lighting) of the Bylaw. A lighting plan is listed on the cover sheet but not included in the plan set.
10. No signage is shown on the plans. Any project development or other signs must be shown on the plan.

### **SITE PLAN REGULATIONS**

(Note: Site plan issues that have been addressed above are not repeated in this section).

11. Section 204-5 B.1 requires a Site Context sheet indicating features within 2000 feet of the perimeter of the site. This was not provided and no waiver was requested.
12. Section 204-5 C (3) requires an Existing Landscape Inventory. This was not provided and no waiver was requested.
13. Section 204-5 (8) (a) requires that the Landscape Plan be prepared by a Registered Professional Landscape Architect. This was not done and a waiver is being requested.
14. Section 204-5 (8) (d) requires that a maintenance plan to ensure viability and longevity of the landscape installation. This was not provided.
15. Section 204-5 D (16) requires horizontal sight distances at entrances to be shown.
16. Section 207-4 encourages energy efficiency and sustainability, including orienting buildings along an east-west axis to take advantage of solar gains, and minimizing east and west facing windows. This was not done. The shape of the lot is not conducive to east-west orientation. However, other measures could be adopted to maximize sustainability.

17. Section 207-9 requires pedestrian and bicycle amenities. No such amenities are shown on the plan.
18. Section 207-11 A (4) requires site entrances to be vertical granite curbing or “other approved material.” The plan shows bituminous berm.
19. Section 207-11 B (3) requires internal drive aisles to be 24 feet wide. The plan shows 22-foot wide aisles. Similarly, the aisle in the parking lot serving the 2 existing houses is 22 feet wide versus the standard of 24 feet.
20. Section 207-12 I requires multifamily sites with more than 15 parking spaces to provide electric charging stations. With 26 spaces, 2 charging stations are required.
21. Section 207-19 E requires substantial screening of stormwater detention basins. The Landscape Plan indicates only lawn around the basin, which is in a prime site visible from Main Street.
22. Section 207-19 G requires that trees of 15 inches or more be preserved and 207-19 H requires that those 24 inches or more be replaced with new trees on site. New trees are proposed but without a Landscape Inventory it is not clear if any trees have been preserved or whether an adequate number of replacement trees have been provided.

If there are any questions about these comments, please call or email me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gino D. Carlucci, Jr.", written in a cursive style.

Gino D. Carlucci, Jr.