



CITY OF SOMERVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS
PLANNING BOARD
JOSEPH A. CURTATONE, MAYOR

MEMBERS

KEVIN PRIOR, *CHAIRMAN*
JOSEPH FAVALORO
JAMES KIRYLO
ELIZABETH MORONEY
MICHAEL A. CAPUANO, ESQ.
DANA LEWINTER (ALT.)

STAFF

GEORGE PROAKIS, *DIRECTOR OF PLANNING*
CHRIS DI IORIO, *SENIOR PLANNER*
LORI MASSA, *PLANNER*
DAWN PEREIRA, *ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT*
FREDERICK J. LUND, *SENIOR DRAFTSMAN*

PLANNING STAFF REPORT

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Case #: | PB # 2006-59 / R07-2010 |
| Site: | Parcels 85-A-1, 85-A-2, 85-A-2A, 85-A-3, 85-A-4, 85-A-6, 85-A-7, 99-A-2, 99-A-3, 99-A-4 (Part), 99-A-9, 99-A-9A, 99-A-8 (Part), 99-A-11, 101-B-24(Part)), (Parcels 99-A-4 (Part), 99-A-5 (Part), 99-A-6, 99-A-7, 99-A-8 (Part), 99-A-12, 101-B-24 (Part)), (Parcels 67-A-2, 86-A-1), (Parcel 85-A-5), (Parcel 99-A-10). |
| Applicant Name: | Street Retail, Inc. / FR Sturtevant Street LLC (See Section VII) |
| Applicant Address: | 1626 East Jefferson Street, Rockville, MD 20852 |
| Property Owner Name: | FR Sturtevant Street, LLC, Street Retail, Inc., SRI Assembly Row B2, LLC, SRI Assembly Row B3, LLC, , LLC, SRI Assembly Row B5, LLC, SRI Assembly Row B6, LLC, SRI Assembly Row B7, LLC, SRI Assembly Row B8, LLC, SRI Assembly Row B9, LLC, as tenants in common [Parcels 85-A-1, 85-A-2, 85-A-2A, 85-A-3, 85-A-4, 85-A-6, 85-A-7, 99-A-2, 99-A-3, 99-A-4 (Part), 99-A-9, 99-A-9A, 99-A-8 (Part), 99-A-11, 101-B-24(Part)]; IKEA Property, Inc. [Parcels 99-A-4 (Part), 99-A-5 (Part), 99-A-6, 99-A-7, 99-A-8 (Part), 99-A-12, 101-B-24 (Part)] ; FR Assembly Square, LLC (Parcels 67-A-2, 86-A-1); Department of Conservation and Recreation (Parcel 85-A-5); and 99 Foley Street, LLC (Parcel 99-A-10). |
| Property Owner Address: | Various |

Legal Notice: The Applicant, FR Sturtevant Street, LLC, and its Agent, Hugh Hahn, Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. seek approval of a Major Amendment of a preliminary master plan (S.Z.O. §16.11.3.1) for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) project to construct buildings containing a mix of retail, restaurant, business, residential, cinema, office, laboratory, boat storage, research and development, medical office, hotel, manufacturing and other commercial uses. The residential development is subject to inclusionary housing requirements (S.Z.O. §13.2).

The Owners of the parcels within the boundaries of the proposed PUD include (i) FR Sturtevant Street, LLC, Street Retail, Inc., SRI Assembly Row B2, LLC, SRI Assembly Row B3, LLC, SRI Assembly Row B4, LLC¹, SRI Assembly Row B5, LLC, SRI Assembly Row B6, LLC, SRI Assembly Row B7, LLC, SRI Assembly Row B8, LLC, SRI Assembly Row B9, LLC, as tenants in common (Parcels 85-A-1, 85-A-2, 85-A-2A, 85-A-3, 85-A-4, 85-A-6, 85-A-7, 99-A-2, 99-A-3, 99-A-4 (Part), 99-A-9, 99-A-9A, 99-A-8 (Part), 99-A-11, 101-B-24(Part)), (ii) IKEA Property, Inc. (Parcels 99-A-4 (Part), 99-A-5 (Part), 99-A-6, 99-A-7, 99-A-8 (Part), 99-A-12, 101-B-24 (Part)), (iii) FR Assembly Square, LLC (Parcels 67-A-2, 86-A-1), (iv) Department of Conservation and Recreation (Parcel 85-A-5), and (v) 99 Foley Street, LLC (Parcel 99-A-10).

Two Waivers are sought (S.Z.O. §16.5.4) as to maximum height a) for buildings within 150 feet of the Mystic River bank; and, b) for buildings between 150 feet and 250 feet of the Mystic River bank, with respect to a portion of the PUD (S.Z.O. §6.4.6(f); 6.4.12).

Assembly Square Mixed Use District (ASMD); Planned Unit Development Overlay District - A (PUD-A).

I. PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

A. General Description

1. Land Area

Per the application (Section 7.C), the land area of the master plan is 66.9 acres. Once existing permanent highway easements and future street rights-of-way that will be dedicated to the City are deducted, the remaining area is reduced to approximately 56.2 acres of developable land. The property is level, includes former filled tidelands, and is a brownfields site which has been and is being remediated by the Applicant. It is bound by the Mystic River, Orange Line Right-of-Way, Assembly Square Drive, Foley Street, Middlesex Avenue, and Route 28. There are no distinguishing natural features.

2. Parcel Ownership

Several significant land transactions have occurred since approval of the Preliminary Master Plan (PMP) in 2006. In 2007, FR Sturtevant Street, LLC acquired the Spaulding Brick site; in 2008 they acquired the Yard 21 site from the Somerville Redevelopment Authority; and in 2009, they acquired the land previously occupied by the Green Cab company. In 2009, FR Sturtevant Street, LLC and IKEA Property, Inc. successfully implemented their land swap agreement. The land swap transferred IKEA's ownership from property along the waterfront to the inland site where the new store will be built, and vice versa for land owned by FR Sturtevant Street, LLC.

Recently, FR Sturtevant Street, LLC created several wholly affiliated corporate entities (Street Retail Inc. and SRI Assembly Row B2, B3, and B5 through B9) which now own the Assembly Row site along with FR Sturtevant Street, LLC, as tenants in common. "Tenants in common" means each entity owns an undivided interest in the whole project area. The ownership shares and relationships will change over time as the land is subdivided; individual blocks or parcels will ultimately be transferred to the different Street Retail Inc. entities or other buyers. Note that each of the entities remains under the common control of Federal Realty Investment Trust.

¹ The legal notice erroneously included SRI Assembly Row B4, LLC as an owner.

Other parcels in the area are owned by FR Assembly Square (Parcels 67-A-2, 86-A-1), LLC, the Department of Conservation and Recreation (Parcel 85-A-5), and 99 Foley Street, LLC (Parcel 99-A-10) (aka, Central Steel site) as they were during the 2006 PMP. The Applicant has received Article 97 approval for the acquisition of the land held by DCR.

3. Existing Land Uses

Since the 2006 PMP, several structures on the site have been demolished including the former home of Good Time Emporium and two smaller buildings along Assembly Square Drive. Those areas have been and continue to be environmentally remediated and are now vacant land. In addition to vacant land, the site now contains the Assembly Square Marketplace, an active mix of large format retail businesses including Kmart, Bed Bath N Beyond, and Staples. The building previously occupied by Green Cab is now vacant and the Central Steel business remains in operation.

Infrastructure work has been ongoing in the Assembly Square Drive right-of-way throughout 2009-2010 and is consistent with the roadway design approved as part of the IKEA SPSR-A. Required off-site mitigation work began in 2010 and will continue into 2011.

B. History of Property

The PUD property was once one of the largest employment centers in the region. The Ford Motor Assembly Plant, the namesake of Assembly Square, was previously a thriving operation along with other light industrial businesses. By the 1970's, however, Assembly Square had declined and was largely vacant and underutilized. In 1980, the City of Somerville adopted an urban renewal plan for the area. In 2002, the urban renewal plan was extended until 2022 by a Major Plan Change and five acquisition and disposition parcels were named, including Yard 21, and the Amerigas, Spaulding Brick, Central Steel, and Green Cab sites. In 2005, the Applicant (through related entities) purchased the Assembly Square Mall and 34 & 100 Sturtevant Street and was named by the Somerville Redevelopment Authority (SRA) as the designated redeveloper of Yard 21, and the Amerigas, Central Steel, Spaulding Brick, and Green Cab sites. Since that date, the Applicant has secured SPSR-A approval for the Marketplace and IKEA, secured a \$50 million I-cubed award for public infrastructure and received and expended a \$2 million Growth District Initiative grant for remediation and public infrastructure. In addition, the Boston Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) allocated up to \$15 million in American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds for the construction of the rebuilt and extended Assembly Square Drive and for required off-site infrastructure improvements to locations such as Lombardi Street, Assembly Square Drive at Rt. 28, Middlesex Avenue at Rt. 28, and others as required as part of the IKEA special permit. To date, the applicant has acquired all of the identified disposition parcels with the exception of Central Steel, for which a purchase and sale agreement has been signed.

The project has been renamed "Assembly Row". Its most recent name was "Assembly on the Mystic".

II. PRIOR APPROVALS

A. PMP 2006 Approval

On December 14, 2006, the Planning Board granted Planned Unit Development-A-Preliminary Master Plan (PUD-PMP) (PB 2006-59) approval, subject to certain conditions. The application was deemed to meet the required findings and approved subject to conditions. The application also included an approved waiver from the Ground Level Retail Size Cap under Section 6.4.8.D.2.b of the SZO to allow for two

existing stores to continue operation within the Assembly Square Mall (now Assembly Square Marketplace).

B. Marketplace Special Permit (Phase IAAA)

On July 1, 2004 (PB 2004-45) Site Plan Approval-A was granted by the Planning Board for a Retail Priority Permitted Use within the former Assembly Square Mall building. This Site Plan Approval-A permitted the owner to replace existing retail uses and to re-tenant vacant spaces in the former Assembly Square Mall and to perform alterations to the Mall to facilitate such replacement and re-tenanting.

On April 13, 2005, (PB 2005-19) Site Plan Approval-A was granted by the Planning Board to modify parking, elevations and open space plans approved in PB2004-45.

These permits were granted under the "Priority Development Process" (PDP) and the site was developed accordingly. However, in 2006 in the case of *Evarts vs. Somerville*, a Land Court judge ruled that the PDP review process violated the uniformity provision of the Massachusetts Zoning Act (MGL Chapter 40A, Sections 4 and 9). Pursuant to the court decision and subsequent settlement agreements, the applicant subsequently applied for the PMP (as noted above) and then a new SPSR-A review and approval in 2007 without using the PDP provisions of the SZO.

Subsequent to approval of the PMP, on March 15, 2007, the Planning Board granted a SPSR-A (PB2007-10) approval for the development, continued use, and occupancy of the existing 328,806 s.f. Assembly Square Marketplace site.

On December 3, 2009, the Planning Board granted a new SPSR-A (PB2009-13) for the Assembly Square Phase IAAA Marketplace site to apply concurrently with the previously approved SPSR-A application that was approved on March 15, 2007. This permit allowed the Applicant to locate trees and other landscaping elements in the area between the northernmost parking lot and the intersection of Middlesex Avenue and Route 28. This application identified the location of Useable Open Space within the Marketplace area of the original approved PMP.

The proposed amendment to the PMP makes no modification to the 2006 PMP with regard to the Marketplace area (Phase IAAA).

C. IKEA Special Permit (Phase IAA)

On October 18, 2007, the Planning Board granted conditional approval (PB2007-29) of the IKEA store as follows:

- SPSR-A for final level approval of a phase of the PUD (§6.4.9), including construction of an IKEA store up to 340,000 s.f. in size with an accessory restaurant use, 1,287 parking spaces for the store, including 200 spaces for weekday commuter parking for the Orange Line station, and reconstruction and realignment of Assembly Square Drive; and,
- Special Permit for Signage in order to exceed the maximum height and area of allowable signage (SZO §6.4.14.c); and,
- Site Plan Approval for subdivision of parcels (SZO §5.4).

On October 16, 2008, the Planning Board granted approval (PB2007-29-R0908) to revise the SPSR-A to accommodate certain changes to the building and the site including the creation of a multi-use path, reduction and configuration of parking facilities, removal of outside vehicular ramp, alteration of façade (egress stairs and addition of windows to west and north façades), revision of drainage and other

underground utility design to accommodate site changes; and to revise the Special Permit for Signage in order to reconfigure the sign plan.

On December 18, 2008, the Planning Board granted approval (PB2007-29-R1108) for revisions to the layout of Assembly Square Drive with associated revisions to the Site Plan Approval for subdivision.

On August 6, 2009, the Planning Board granted approval (PB2007-29-R0709) for revisions to the gateway elements and landscaping at the intersection of Assembly Square Drive and Mystic Avenue and to incorporate landscaping elements along the eastern side of Assembly Square Drive.

On January 22, 2009, May 13, 2009 and August 13, 2009, *de minimis* revision applications were approved by the Planning Director that slightly altered the alignment of the multi-use use path, building, landscape and Assembly Square Drive plans.

On October 13, 2009, a *de minimis* revision application was approved by the OSPCD Executive Director that slightly altered the drainage, utility and landscaping plans along Assembly Square Drive.

On October 20, 2009, the Planning Board granted approval (2009-05) of a new SPSR-A and Special Permit for signage to replace the previously approved application, as amended, (PB2007-29). The materials submitted for this application included the materials submitted in the original application as revised through prior amendments approved by the Planning Board or *de minimis* changes approved by the Planning Director.

On December 3, 2009, the Planning Board granted approval (2009-05-R1109) for revisions to the Assembly Square Drive Roadway to incorporate various gateway elements, trees, flagpoles in the rotary, and lighting fixtures along Assembly Square Drive.

The proposed amendment to the PMP makes no modification to the IKEA site (Phase 1AA), as permitted to date.

III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. General Description

1. Mixed-Use and Transit-Oriented Development

With the new Orange Line Station, livable streets, significant ground floor retail presence, publicly accessible open space, and mix of commercial and residential uses in close proximity, Assembly Row is a model of mixed use and transit-oriented development. The revised PMP will create nine blocks of predominantly mixed use development, with an additional retail pad (#10) located in a portion of the existing Marketplace parking area, as shown in the 2006 PMP. The project will expand the open space area along the waterfront while activating it with retail along A Street and will encourage transit use through its connectivity of the Orange Line Station including the second headhouse planned next to the IKEA store.

2. Infrastructure

To meet the infrastructure needs of Assembly Row, as well as other future redevelopment of the Assembly Square District, considerable investment in infrastructure is required, a portion of which has

been completed. Infrastructure includes public utility systems that will be eventually accepted by the City of Somerville including potable water, sanitary sewer, and storm water systems and private utility systems such as electrical, gas, and telecommunications.

Assembly Square Drive – existing and extended – serves as the backbone of the project and, after having been approved as part of the IKEA SPSR-A (Phase 1AA), is presently under construction. Sub-surface work took place during 2009, was completed in February 2010, and applicable utilities were accepted by the City in June 2010. The roadway is presently under construction utilizing ARRA funds and will consist of two travel lanes, bike lanes, on-street parking, lighting, street trees, and other landscaping. Electrical conduit that could later be used to install parking kiosks will also be put in place, although no kiosks will be installed when the roadway is completed. At present, the City has been granted a permanent easement for Assembly Square Drive, but it is expected that once construction is complete the roadway will be accepted by the City in fee.

To date, the Conservation Commission has permitted the construction of a 72" storm drain that will discharge into a new outfall on the Mystic River. Under the Order of Conditions (MA DEP file #287-0028), Phase 1AA of the Assembly Square Development (IKEA and Assembly Square Drive) and certain existing development are allowed to be connected to the 72" storm drain pipe. Stormwater from the existing development currently discharges to the Mystic from the Somerville Marginal Conduit so the new outfall will reduce demand on the Marginal Conduit. Future stormwater discharges to the 72" pipe will be treated first by a Water Quality Unit or its equivalent. In addition, 4 new catch basins and the reuse of 10 existing catch basins are permitted, including 3 within the Mystic River Reservation. Best Management Practices have been selected to capture an estimated 84% of the Total Suspended Solids draining off the roadway. Note that the DEP requirement is 80% minimum.

Public and private infrastructure systems will be extended throughout the mixed use component of the project along each of the new streets. All public utility systems and roadway infrastructure will be built to City standard or better and the engineering of utilities and infrastructure will be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer and Director of Traffic & Parking. Preliminary designs have been submitted as part of the revised PMP. Additional permits from the Conservation Commission will be required prior to connecting buildings to the outfall pipe.

3. Open Space

The PUD is oriented around a series of public open spaces connected by pedestrian friendly streets. The total open space for the PUD is approximately 15.3 acres, or 25.1 percent; the useable open space is 11.5 acres, or 18.9 percent. These totals meet the 25 percent and 12.5 percent minimum requirements under §6.4.6 of the SZO. These open space calculations include the previously approved open space areas within the Marketplace (Phase 1AAA) and IKEA (Phase 1AA) approved SPSR-A's. For the purpose of this PMP review, these open spaces are not changing, and the OSPCD staff will only be reviewing the remaining open space commitments within the full build-out area.

The PUD enhances the Mystic River Reservation by creating a 1.8 acre expansion of the park. Improvements to the waterfront open space and activation of the waterfront by residents, employees, and visitors will result in a new community resource. The recreational area along the Mystic River will also improve access to Draw 7 Park and support pedestrian and bicycle circulation throughout the PUD.

The PUD includes two primary public spaces within the full build-out area: Assembly Square and the Main Street² Mall. Directly west of the planned Orange Line station, Assembly Square functions as a gateway to the PUD and a pedestrian friendly community gathering point. The Main Street Mall will accommodate outdoor markets and other events and its fan shape maximizes views and improves pedestrian connections to the Mystic River waterfront. Assembly Square and the Main Street Mall will both be curbless environments in that the vehicular roadway will be elevated to the level of the sidewalk akin to a traffic table (seen in Cambridge and coming to Somerville near Foss Park and Shore Drive), but considerably larger. Drivers will know they are entering a shared space as they rise up into the area and observe the special paving. Pedestrian only areas will be delineated by bollards.

In addition, the Applicant proposes to construct several secondary public open spaces and pocket parks along D Street and throughout the site. The PUD also includes extensive landscaping, which will be reviewed in detail during the SPSR-A phase of the PUD.

The applicant has committed to developing a maintenance agreement that will address open spaces as well as other amenities. This is a condition of the PMP approval, and will be required to ensure that Usable Open Space meets the expectations identified in the SZO.

4. Multi-Modal Transportation and Parking

The PUD is a transit-oriented project that will encourage the use of multiple modes of transportation. Within the PUD, a mix of active ground floor uses and high quality streetscapes will support pedestrian activity and reinforce the site's connection to transit. The new Orange Line station will link the PUD directly to downtown Boston and points north. A shared use path will connect Ten Hills, via the Rt. 28 undercarriage, along the waterfront to the Orange Line station, past IKEA and then into East Somerville. This will dramatically increase the ease of access to Draw 7 Park and the riverfront.

A new internal street network will accommodate cars as well as pedestrians and bicyclists. As can be seen in the design guidelines, the Applicant has categorized the roads as boulevard, main street, primary street, and secondary/local street. All will be built to City standard at a minimum, but the finishes and amenities on higher profile streets, such as Main Street will be different than other streets. D Street will have two central landscaped islands that will make it a rather green, lush street on which to walk. In addition, the last block of Main Street at the waterfront will be divided into two one-way components separated by the Main Street Mall. This is designed to slow vehicular traffic and increase pedestrian safety.

Parking is provided in a combination of below- and above-grade garages and on- and off-street spaces and will total 10,066 spaces, which is a slight decrease from the previous PMP. Overall, this includes 1,121 spaces for the Marketplace, 1,287 for IKEA, and 7,658 for the mixed use component and is beyond what is required in the SZO. The Applicant is also providing the required 28 loading spaces. Interim surface parking lots are anticipated in the PMP, but will be subject to special permit approval by the Planning Board. The location of the interim lots will be contingent upon when different components of the project begin construction.

The Applicant is implementing off-site transportation improvements in addition to those within the PUD. These improvements include lane reconfiguration and optimized signalization at several key intersections along Middlesex Avenue, Mystic Avenue, and Route 28, and at Lombardi Way. In addition to the signal

² Note that Somerville already contains a Main Street, at the top of Winter Hill off of Broadway, so this is just a placeholder name.

work, count-down timers and restriped crosswalks will improve pedestrian and bicycle connections between the PUD and surrounding neighborhoods. The off-site transportation mitigation package is the same as the original PMP approval, as updated in the SPSR-A approvals for the Marketplace and IKEA.

Bus stop locations have not yet been identified, with the exception of the stop in the front of IKEA and staff hope to work with the Applicant and the MBTA to ensure that stops provide safe and convenient access to the T-Station and Main Street.

The Applicant will also facilitate the establishment of an Assembly Square Transportation Management Association, with the goal of encouraging public transit, managing parking, and promoting pedestrian and bicycle access and safety.

The Applicant has committed to developing a maintenance agreement that will address the maintenance responsibilities for amenities and certain infrastructure elements within the public right-of-way. This is recommended as a condition of the PMP approval as it is needed to ensure that streetscapes remain consistent with the quality expectations identified in the SZO and are to City standard or better as determined by the City Engineer and Director of Traffic & Parking.

5. Urban Design

The PUD is designed as walkable, transit-oriented development with a mix of commercial, retail, and residential uses. The PUD is consistent with the design guidelines under §16.7 of the SZO. The Applicant has significantly advanced the design of buildings beyond what was conceived in 2006, although the key principles - that the tallest buildings be clustered around the T-Station and that buildings step down to the river - remain in effect. In general, comparison with the 2006 plan shows that the buildings shown in the revised PMP are more sculptural in nature with defined office towers on key sites such as Block 7 and Block 8, and a residential tower on Block 6 that terminates D Street. The building on Block 2 has changed in massing from an “L” shape to a “V” or chevron shape to maximize views of the waterfront and Block 1 has been reconceptualized with the elimination of former B Street and allows for an expanded open area on the waterfront and increased opportunity for ground floor uses that will activate the waterfront. As the project progresses, it is possible that the massing shown in this version will continue to change and it will be within the Planning Board’s purview to consider those proposals.

The Applicant has proposed that the Planning Board adopt specific design guidelines that will become a component of the plan review of buildings and would be added to the design guidelines already included in the SZO. These guidelines are discussed under “Changes from 2006 Approved Plan” below.

6. Green Development

The revised PUD incorporates low impact development techniques to reduce peak stormwater runoff rates and reduce impact on the Mystic River. The PUD includes five tree box filter units for water quality treatment within the first phase and three units within future phases, a plan that has been approved by the Somerville Conservation Commission. The Applicant is also investigating the feasibility of using green roofs, rain gardens, biofiltration islands, porous pavements, and rainwater recovery on a building by building basis.

In addition to specific green development techniques, the characteristics of the PUD site itself also minimize environmental impact. The PUD is a brownfield redevelopment located on previously disturbed land and remediation will take place as part of the project to state and federal standards. The proposal seeks to reduce overall greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by creating a mix of uses served by multi-modal

transportation options. The introduction of a new MBTA Orange Line station as well as improvements to bike and pedestrian infrastructure will help minimize the total number of single-occupancy vehicle trips to and from the site. The Applicant has also conducted a preliminary GHG benchmarking analysis and found that emissions associated with the project could be 25 percent less than a conventional development.

As noted in the FEIR, the Applicant is committed to pursuing Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification for the entire project under the LEED for Neighborhood Developments (LEED-ND) rating system. A condition is recommended that parallels the commitment the Applicant made in the FEIR.

7. Remediation

As is common in brownfields redevelopment, contaminated soils have been identified at several locations within the PUD site. The contamination is a result of the storage and use of oils and the release of other wastes during former industrial activities. The Applicant is currently addressing these conditions under the Massachusetts Contingency Plan (MCP). The Applicant has already completed remediation on several areas within the site and will continue to address the remainder in accordance with Massachusetts environment requirements and the MCP. The response actions are explained in detail in the March 2010 FEIR. Copies of all remediation documents have been submitted to the City's Planning Division office.

B. Changes from 2006 Approved Plan

Since 2006, the Project design has been refined and improved, in part, as a result of coordination with several state agencies including the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) and City of Somerville officials. While the overall development program remains the same, elements of the Project site layout have been adjusted to improve the urban design relationship of uses, the quality of the open space along the Mystic River, pedestrian and bicycle circulation, and the financial feasibility of the Project. The following revisions have been made since the 2006 approval of the PMP and are depicted in plans and analysis within this application:

1. Use Mix

The proposed revision to the PMP includes the same mix of uses originally approved in 2006 (with four modifications highlighted in ***bold-italics*** in the bulleted points below). The proposed uses include:

- 2,100 residential units
- 1.75 million s.f. of ***commercial*** uses
- ***Up to*** a 340,000 s.f. IKEA
- ***Up to*** a 200-room hotel
- ***512,000*** s.f. of retail space (including restaurants ***and cinema***).

Specifically, the revised language allows ***up to*** a 340,000 s.f. IKEA and ***up to*** a 200-room hotel, and combines the cinema square footage (previously 62,000 s.f.) with the general retail use. These modifications are minor in nature and provide the developer with reasonable flexibility while ensuring the development remains consistent with City expectations. The language relative to the IKEA is consistent with the existing SPSR-A for IKEA.

The revised PMP further replaces the term "office uses" with "commercial uses" and goes on to explain that the 1.75 million s.f. of commercial uses includes, but is not limited to, office, research &

development, laboratory, medical office, manufacturing, and other commercial uses. The PMP application also goes one step further than the previous version and lists all of the uses in the SZO Use Table for which the Planning Board may grant relief within the ASMD District. This more expansive definition of what was previously referred to as “office” was requested by City staff due to the fact that the SZO very specifically and rigidly defines office use as “office, other than medical” in the Use Table. At present, it is not clear how office-type uses beyond “office, other than medical” would be addressed under the approved PMP or whether an amendment would be required for each use. If the Planning Board approves the more expansive commercial use definition, as proposed, it would signal that the Board is willing to give consideration to all of the commercial uses potentially allowable in the ASMD District during its review process. It should be noted that the uses and thresholds specified in the Use Table would continue to apply in this area.

2. Design Guidelines

The Applicant is proposing project specific design guidelines to complement §16.7. The proposed design guidelines address urban elements like streetscapes and public spaces, and the location, size, and relationships of buildings. The guidelines establish façade hierarchies, district gateways, and key building elements to promote a cohesive PUD while still allowing for flexibility and creativity in design. Key principles include concentrating density around the T Station, using vertical articulation to add visual interest and break up long blocks, creating a continuous street-wall, and reinforcing important public spaces through façade details.

The proposed design guidelines represent one of the most significant evolutions in the PMP and a significant advancement in the process by which future SPSR-A projects will be reviewed. The proposed guidelines incorporate the spirit of the Assembly Square District Plan³ and identify the elements that will help to make the remainder of the PMP area into a mixed use transit-oriented place. That said, the proposed design guidelines go beyond the ASD Plan by developing more specific goals and principles for design of Assembly Row and providing more detail about the buildings that are included in the PMP.

The design guidelines will establish a minimum design quality for developers, architects and designers involved in Assembly Row. All participants are expected to meet the threshold and encouraged to exceed it. The PMP does not articulate specific architectural elements at this phase in the project review; instead the guidelines identify the key elements that are most important to the project and ensure that the most significant architectural investment is focused in these areas. These high profile locations include building pieces that are used to terminate view corridors, mark significant edges, streets, and open spaces, or that serve as building level gateways into the mixed use district.

The design guidelines identify building design principles such as rhythm, organization and exterior priorities and then establish a hierarchy of building elevation types: 1) significant corners; 2) primary elevations; 3) secondary elevations; and, 4) tertiary elevations (Design Guidelines Section 3.1-3.11). For each elevation type, possible building materials and design features are identified to address roof treatment, wall and wall opening treatment and treatment of balconies. Parking garages are provided a similar hierarchy, with the establishment of four garage treatments (Design Guidelines Section 4.1). The first has decorative features of the architecture, the second employs banners or other strategies to mitigate the visual impact of open spandrel garages, the third identifies unmitigated open spandrel facades, and the

³ The ASD plan incorporates four documents created to guide development in Assembly Square: Assembly Square Planning Study (2000); Assembly Square Revitalization Plan (2002); Assembly Square Design Guidelines for the Public Realm (2002); and Assembly Square Transportation Plan (2003).

fourth provides guidance for garage stair towers and corner elements. How these principles apply on each building is depicted throughout the design guidelines.

The guidelines also identify design expectations for streetscape elements, storefronts, parks and public spaces that will be a part of the new development.

As the PUD moves forward in the SPSR-A phase, the design guidelines will (if accepted by the Planning Board) provide architects and developers with design principles to help ensure the creation of a high quality urban environment. The guidelines will also become an evaluation tool for the City and the Design Review Committee during PUD implementation.

3. New Building and Block System

For development planning purposes, the Proponent created a new scheme for identifying the buildings and blocks associated with the Project. Each block is labeled 1 through 10 and the different building components are labeled A, B, C. Even with this labeling, it should be recognized that in some instances the towers on certain blocks may all be built on top of the same retail base and a shared parking structure.

2. Shared Use Path

As suggested during the MEPA review process, the Project now includes a shared use path along the eastern edge of the Project along the MBTA right-of-way, G Street and the proposed IKEA store site. The path will create a new pedestrian and bicycle connection linking East Somerville to the riverfront and Draw 7 Park, and will provide public access to pedestrian paths along the Mystic River Reservation and to bicycle facilities at the proposed IKEA store and within the mixed-use development.

3. Expanded Riverfront Area

The reconfiguration of A Street, elimination of B Street, and removal of former Retail Building I results in a more integrated and expanded Riverfront Park near the proposed roundabout. Additionally, the altered shape of A Street results in increased parkland near the Winter Hill Yacht Club.

4. Enhanced Public Open Space

The size of the Main Street Mall has increased from previous plans, from 13,000 square feet to 21,800 square feet. The design of the northern portion of the Main Street which ends at A Street has been widened by approximately 50 feet at the edge and is a fan-shaped configuration adjacent to Block 2. As a result, the roadway width along Main Street between Block 1 and 2 has been reduced, while the plaza area has increased. The redesign also includes a new landscaped area within the new plaza area.

Assembly Square, located within Block 8, has been redesigned to be a curb-less urban plaza area combining hardscape and landscape areas. The redesign includes the use of bollards along Main Street and Foley Street.

5. Removal of Building I and Street B – Redesigned Block 1 and A Street

As suggested during the MEPA review process, Retail Building I has been removed from the location proposed previously. In its place will be additional parkland along the Mystic River and portions of the redesigned riverfront roadway known as A Street (previously listed as B Street in earlier plans).

The size of Block 1 has been enlarged to accommodate the program space from the previously proposed Retail Building I. Additionally, the redesign of Block 1 allows for a more efficient roadway configuration accommodating changes to the intersection of Assembly Square Drive and A Street and elimination of B Street.

6. Assembly Square Drive Reconfiguration

Since the 2006 approval, the design of Assembly Square Drive has been modified to include a roundabout between Block 10 and Block 1 as a significant gateway feature into the Project. The proposed roundabout will allow efficient travel along Assembly Square Drive along the western portion of the project site while improving access to A Street along the riverfront to Draw 7 Park. Additionally, the number of travel lanes within Assembly Square Drive between A Street and New Road has been reduced from four to two. The previous travel lane has been redesigned to be on-street parking. Bike lanes will continue to be included within Assembly Square Drive. These modifications have already been approved in the Phase 1-AA SPSR-A for IKEA.

7. Reduction in Parking Spaces

As a result of a parking needs assessment, the Applicant reconsidered parking needs for the Project. Previously, the Project included 10,278 total parking spaces, while the current design includes 10,066 total parking spaces, which remain in excess of SZO minimum requirements. The current design includes additional on-street parking spaces which are mostly located along Assembly Square Drive.

8. Low Impact Development Techniques

As previously mentioned, the Project has been redesigned to include low impact development (LID) techniques to help manage stormwater more effectively. The Project includes five tree box filter units for water quality treatment within the first phase (Assembly Square Drive and Foley Street) and three units within future phases. These were approved by the Conservation Commission in its case file (# 287-0028) which related to Assembly Square Drive, IKEA, and the Mystic River outfall.

9. Second Headhouse

The Applicant continues to coordinate with the MBTA on design plans for the new MBTA Orange Line Station. A second headhouse has been added to the station and is included in 30 percent design plans for the new station. Construction of the second headhouse is dependent on the Commonwealth providing \$10 million in state highway flex funding toward the cost of constructing the new MBTA Orange Line station. The station design is advancing into 75 percent design. The second headhouse has long been a desire of many community members who believe it will improve transit utilization throughout the site and especially for IKEA shoppers. Advocacy by the Applicant, City, and community members has convinced the Commonwealth to add \$10 million in funding for construction of the second headhouse. Some reconfiguration of the IKEA rain garden may be required to facilitate construction of the headhouse. Depending on the magnitude of this change, it may be subject to Planning Board action or could be a de minimus change that staff can approve.

10. Waivers Requested

The Applicant is seeking relief from Somerville Zoning Ordinance for two purposes which both relate to Block 2. As described in detail in the Zoning Compliance Narrative, the Applicant is seeking waivers to: a) construct a building (underground parking structure) within 150 feet of the Mystic River bank; and, b)

allow a building of a height up to 90 feet within the area between 150 and 250 feet of the Mystic River bank.

The waivers must meet specific findings in the Ordinance and the findings together with details about the waivers are available in Appendix D. In general, the successful application of the design principles for the PUD in Assembly Square require the waivers for optimal success. One waiver is limited to providing an underground parking structure with Block 2 that will not be visible from the street but will accommodate parking demand that will otherwise need to be met through surface or above ground parking. The second waiver allows the two residential development cores on Block 2 to be up to 90 feet in height, thereby exceeding the existing 70 foot height limit within 250 feet of the water. Placing these towers in a different configuration would require the building to encroach on the proposed Main Street Mall area. The proposed design will help activate the Mall area as well as the Assembly Square open spaces, provide residential development in a configuration that makes the most sense for a residential design, and provide an attractive iconic façade along the Main Street Mall. For these reasons, the findings in Appendix D establish the basis for the waivers, and the staff recommends the Planning Board approve the waivers.

The applicant is also requesting a waiver from the requirement of Section 6.4.8B for a conceptual three-dimensional model of the Master Plan. The applicant has submitted significant computer generated three-dimensional images to establish the development envelope and design guidelines, in view of which staff believe this waiver is reasonable.

11. Phasing Reconsidered

The Project is anticipated to be constructed in multiple phases over ten to fifteen years. In the 2006 PMP, the plan included some specifics about which project components were anticipated first and which would be later. However, due to uncertainty about market demand and the resulting need for flexibility in the phasing of the project, a detailed phasing plan cannot be accurately forecast at this time and no project phasing information is included in the revised PMP.

C. Required Future Permits

1. Minor Amendment to the PMP to Subdivide Lots and Develop Streets

The current PMP amendment does not provide a plan for subdivision of lots from roadways, but this will need to occur to transfer roadways to the City while allowing the ownership of individual blocks within the development. In addition to the required plans for subdividing land, the applicant must also work with the City on maintenance agreements for public infrastructure and open spaces. Staff strongly recommend that the Applicant be required to submit a subdivision to separate the road rights of way from the developable blocks no later than when the first SPSR-A is submitted. The Applicant has been so informed and a condition has been drafted to this effect. With a site of this complexity and given the existing parcel configuration, it is very important that development sites be identified and given parcel numbers in order to record any approvals in perpetuity⁴.

In the PMP revision, the Applicant has submitted a series of design plans (architectural plans A100-A104 and A-P-1, engineering plans C1-19, Sv1-Sv5, P-1, and R-1). These are not yet at 100% design although they are progressing in that direction and they identify the logical lines for future subdivision. With

⁴ Note that the MaxPak subdivision occurred after a special permit was approved for the entire site, but all roadways in this site will be privately owned and the permit is for only one use, i.e., residential use.

regard to infrastructure, all roadways and infrastructure elements will be required to comply with City standard or better as approved by the City Engineer and Director of Traffic & Parking and detailed drawings will be provided by the Applicant at a later date. With regard to street furniture, plantings, and other design amenities such as pavers, they will also be required to meet City standard or better. Staff does recommend, however, that these be reviewed informally between staff and the Applicant within the context of the Maintenance Agreement which will identify those elements to be maintained in perpetuity by the Applicant. Conditions have been drafted to this effect

2. Special Permit with Site Plan Review – A

As identified in the SZO, individual projects within the PUD require a Special Permit with Site Plan Review A (SPSR-A). For each of the findings required for the PMP, there will be a subset of those findings required for each and every SPSR-A. These required findings are indicated as such in the Appendixes (see Appendix C). In addition, some PMP findings are contingent on detail to be submitted with SPSR-A applications and are conditioned as such.

The Applicant has identified in the zoning analysis for Section 6.4.7B the process by which the design guidelines may be used to guide the review SPSR-A applications. Any future applicant shall submit proposals for SPSR-A that are consistent with the guidelines or identify any deviation between the guidelines and the submission together with an explanation of the need for these differences. The DRC and Planning Board will need to determine if the solution is within the spirit of the guidelines. Significant changes could potentially require an amendment to the PMP. All proposals shall meet or exceed the minimum acceptable standard of quality identified in the document.

3. Conservation Commission Review

Conservation Commission to date has reviewed some individual projects within the riverfront area as well as the outfall pipe and the low impact design guidelines. Additional activities within the PMP area may require review and approval of the Conservation Commission under Massachusetts law.

IV. FINDINGS FOR PRELIMINARY MASTER PLAN

A. Application Requirements

Application requirements are identified in Section 16.8 of the SZO. Section 16.8.2H identifies that the general information required for a special permit under Section 5.2 is also required at a preliminary level. Section 16.12 requires submittal of a denial letter from ISD. Staff finds the PMP meets the application submittal requirements for a PUD-PMP in the above listed sections. Detailed findings are contained in Appendix A.

B. Required Findings of Fact

Section 16.10.1 of the SZO indicates that PUD preliminary master plan approval shall be considered preliminary approval that recognizes that the plan is in general accordance with provisions of this ordinance. Section 16.11.3 indicates the process for amendments to PUD approvals, including preliminary master plans and makes it clear that the proposal presently before the Planning Board is substantive enough to require major PUD amendment approval. Findings are then required under 16.1, 6.4.1, 6.4.3, 16.4, and 16.7 of the SZO. The ASMD further requires findings to meet development standards and design guidelines under 6.4.7 and 6.4.8. The staff finds the PMP meets the required findings for a PUD PMP. Detailed findings are contained in Appendix B.

C. Future Requirements for SPSR-A

The SZO requires that the PMP be reviewed to ensure that projects under the PMP can meet the standards required for SPSR-A in the ordinance. Section 6.4.9 requires that the requirements in Section 6.4.9C as well as parts a-h of Section 5.2.5 must be addressed when future special permit requests are submitted. The staff finds that projects submitted for SPSR-A under this PMP should be able to meet the findings required for approval if they substantially conform to the PMP and if they address all the necessary findings identified in Appendix C.

D. Waiver Standards

Staff finds that the PMP meets the required waiver findings of Section 16.5.4 and 6.4.12.A and recommends approval of the waivers that have been requested for the underground parking garage and building height on Block B. Detailed findings are provided in Appendix D.

Staff also finds that the requested waiver from the requirement in Section 6.4.8B for a three-dimensional model is reasonable given the extent of three-dimensional computer graphic images provided by the Applicant.

The 2006 PMP approval granted a waiver for a specific circumstance at the Marketplace project, allowing for two stores to receive waivers from the maximum ground floor retail footprint requirement. No additional waivers were granted at that time, and the ground floor footprint waivers were limited to only those specific sites within the Marketplace mall. They will remain in effect.

V. COMMENTS

A. Comments of the Design Review Committee

The Applicant presented the project to DRC on July 22, 2010, and review centered on the proposed design guidelines. The Applicant presented the way that they have used guidelines in the past and how they would like to use them to set a minimum quality standard throughout the site, given that other design firms will be designing individual buildings. DRC members provided the following comments:

- a. The document mentions sustainable design as a guiding principle, but does not call out the commitment to LEED-ND that has been mentioned by the developer. The developer noted that the entire 66 acres will be a transit-oriented brownfield redevelopment and that the commitment to LEED is addressed in the FEIR.
- b. Questions were raised about the design requiring buildings to be shorter as they are further north on the site and therefore subject to shadows cast by buildings to the south. The applicant noted that the tall buildings are near the T station and that Chapter 91 limits height near the water.
- c. Questions were raised about the vista from Main Street towards IKEA. The applicant noted that no changes to IKEA are proposed, there will be an entry feature on the IKEA store that will be visible from Main Street and has already been approved. Furthermore, at Assembly Square, the front of Block 7 steps slightly forward and traffic moves through a curve around that element across the shared space. This feature will limit the effect of the large building at the end of the street.
- d. Questions were raised about MBTA drop-off and busses. The applicant indicated that this is undetermined at this time.

- e. The DRC expressed a concern that there is not enough in the document that implements the goal of incorporating local conditions.
- f. The DRC expressed concern that the visual and compositional reference points and precedents are routed heavily in traditional architecture. The applicant indicated that a more modern aesthetic is permitted if it meets the appropriate tiered level of design and required level of detail. The applicant noted that there is no specific material requirement or total percentage of glass, and that a modern building that fits the required form and quality level could be approved under the guidelines.
- g. A concern was addressed that the design makes Assembly Square Drive into a 'back street' with exposed parking garages. The applicant indicated that they want pedestrian activity on the parallel Main Street and needed to make financial and design priorities.
- h. The DRC expressed a lack of support for vinyl siding as an allowed material, even in tertiary façades, and a preference for fiber-cement as an alternative. Applicant indicated that, while they do not oppose fiber-cement, they would have less money to spend on primary façades if vinyl was to be eliminated from the allowed material list.
- i. The DRC indicated that they did not like the design of the Type 3 garage and that it was more appropriate for a suburban setting than an urban neighborhood. The DRC advocated for language that all garages have a sympathetic context to other buildings and indicated that an open spandrel garage would not be able to address the issue. The DRC recommended more direction for how to address these types of garages. The applicant indicated that they did identify plans to screen spandrel garages in the Type 2 areas and that it was important to invest in primary façades. There was also discussion that the photo in the guidelines may not be the best illustration of the spandrel garage type.
- j. The DRC expressed concern about the quality of exposed garage roofs that will be visible from office towers.
- k. DRC and the applicant engaged in discussion about public art. DRC suggested that the developer work with the community to create a local art commission for the district that can help select any art pieces that are not an integrated part of the landscape. DRC indicated that artwork should be characteristic of Somerville and should showcase local artists where possible.

B. Comments from City Departments

The Applicant met with Traffic and Parking on August 3, 2010 and reviewed the plan. The traffic engineer stated the following:

At a mtg on 7/21/10 Traffic and Parking was requested by SPCD to review the revised Preliminary Master Plan submitted by VHB for the Assembly Square Project. Guidelines for this review consisted of an overall review of the submitted documents for adherence to general Traffic Engineering principles and not traffic engineering concerns issues which could be resolved at a later date. On 8/3/10 a mtg was held at Traffic and Parking with VHB the consultants for the Assemble Square Project. A review of traffic aspects of the above described revised Preliminary Master Plan was presented by VHB. In general all facets of intersections and roadways illustrated on the revised Master Plan are consistent with proper Traffic Engineering design practice.

Pedestrian concerns regarding the raised roadway surface at the same grade with the adjacent plaza surface at the main plaza at Foley St and the smaller plaza at the intersection of Main St and C St. were discussed. These concerns can be resolved at a later date and are not discussed at this time. It should also be noted that a review of all traffic control devices and specific traffic

engineering aspects will be conducted at this later date to ensure conformance to the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices and all other traffic engineering standards.

The applicant met with the Fire Chief on August 3, 2010 and reviewed the plan. The Chief requested that the applicant supply further information on the turning radius at the end of D Street, and the applicant indicated that they would do so. The Chief requested that final roadway design include additional roadway width on the Main Street Mall adjacent to the kiosk, and the applicant indicated that they would meet this request. The Chief indicated that the street treatments on the Main Street Mall and Assembly Square should provide adequate support for firefighting operations, and the applicant indicated that this issue will be addressed when roadway engineering drawings are submitted to the City Engineer.

C. Testimony from the Public Hearing

Public testimony will be provided at the public hearing on August 5, 2010.

VII: LEGAL NOTE

Federal Realty Investment Trust has created various legal entities to hold title to parcels included within the PUD. Although this Application has been submitted in the name of only one of such entity, namely Street Retail, Inc., where the term "Applicant" is used in this Report, and in particular where conditions are imposed upon the "Applicant", said term shall be deemed to include Federal Realty Investment Trust and all current and future related entities created to hold title to parcels within the PUD, and shall also include their successors and assigns. Entities created by Federal Realty Investment Trust to hold title to parcels within the PUD include, without limitation, FR Sturtevant Street, LLC; Street Retail, Inc.; SRI Assembly Row B2, LLC; SRI Assembly Row B3, LLC; SRI Assembly Row B5, LLC; SRI Assembly Row B6, LLC; SRI Assembly Row B7, LLC; SRI Assembly Row B8, LLC; SRI Assembly Row B9, LLC; and FR Assembly Square, LLC.

VIII: RECOMMENDATION

Planning staff finds that the Preliminary Master Plan, as amended, will continue to meet the goals of the City for this site, the purposes of the district, and the provisions and purposes of the Ordinance. Therefore, the staff recommends **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL** of the requested Preliminary Master Plan amendment

Planning staff also recommends that the Planning Board grant APPROVAL of the requested waivers based upon the detailed findings in Appendix D.

This recommendation is based upon the Preliminary Master Plan Application stamped in at the City Clerk's Office on July 23, 2010. Approval would constitute an approval of the Preliminary Master Plan, but shall NOT constitute approval of final site or building design details, which shall be reviewed in subsequent Special Permits with Site Plan Review-A (SPSR-A) for individual phases of the development.

To mitigate potential negative impacts and to provide the best project possible, the staff recommends that the Board accept and incorporate the conditions proposed in Appendix E.

Appendix A: Application Requirements

A.1: Procedures for PUD Applications - Supportive Information (SZO 16.8)

| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
|----------|---|----------|---------|----------------------|---|
| 16.8.2.A | A neighborhood context map, at a scale not less than one (1) inch equals one hundred (100) feet, providing a graphic description of the neighborhood in which the tract lies, including roads, utilities and other public facilities, major existing buildings and structures. There shall also be a statement and/or plan as to the general impact of the proposed PUD upon the area, indicating how the PUD relates to surrounding properties and what measures will be taken to create appropriate transitions and access from the subject property to abutting public properties (i.e. parks, waterfront, etc.) or other neighboring tracts (if applicable) | X | | | Included in application submission |
| 16.8.2.B | A conceptual site plan drawn to a scale of not less than one (1) inch equaling fifty (50) feet, or series of drawings at the same scale, and any necessary supporting information | X | | | Included in application submission |
| 16.8.2.C | Analysis of compliance with regulations as to dwelling units per square feet of lot area, height, building coverage, floor area ratio (FAR) and parking requirements | X | | | See Overall Site Plan |
| 16.8.2.D | Names of all property owners within five hundred (500) feet of the PUD boundary | X | | | Included in application submission |
| 16.8.2.E | Explanation of provisions for the landscaping and maintenance of all open space and drainage areas | X | | X | See Stormwater Management section in Utility Analysis. Other landscaping/maintenance details be addressed in SPSR-A. Condition is recommended relative to preparation of Maintenance Agreement. |
| 16.8.2.F | A traffic analysis and recommendations prepared by a registered professional engineer qualified to conduct such studies, including current traffic counts for streets surrounding the project, analysis of the existing capacity of those streets, projections of the amount of traffic that will be generated by the proposed development, and the ability of the thoroughfare system to absorb the increased traffic without decreasing the level of service below an acceptable level . . . | X | | | A transportation study was completed with 2006 plan. The amended PMP provides current traffic data for 2010, certifying that baseline conditions have not significantly changed since the existing plan was completed, and therefore establishing that the 2006 report remains valid. |

| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
|---|--|------------|----------------|-----------------------------|---|
| 16.8.2.G | A utilities analysis and recommendations prepared by a registered professional engineer qualified to conduct such studies. Said analysis shall contain an inventory of existing utilities including, but not limited to, storm sewers and drains, sanitary sewers, electrical lines, fire alarm boxes and lines, gas lines/mains, water mains, lighting, curb and gutter, etc. Said inventory shall illustrate utility locations, sizes, diameters, carrying capacity and present load on the system. The engineer's report shall state if the current system is capable of adequately serving the proposed development. If the current utility system is found to be inadequate for the proposed development, the report shall confirm the deficiencies and make recommendation(s) as to the infrastructure improvements necessary to properly service the proposed development and maintain the existing service. The report shall also present a formal plan for infrastructure improvements, documenting timing, funding mechanisms and coordination with the City | X | | | See Utility Analysis |
| 16.8.2.H | All applicable information required for special permit with site plan review (See Article 5 of this Ordinance). This information may be submitted at a preliminary level, in consideration that PUD approval is a preliminary approval | X | | | See section A2, below |
| 16.8.2.I | Any other supportive information the applicant feels may be beneficial to the City of Somerville in the evaluation of the request | X | | | Additional information provided includes design guidelines and supplemental detail on individual plans to later be submitted for SPSR-A review |
| <u>A.2: General Information Required for SPSR Applications (SZO 5.2)</u> | | | | | |
| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
| 5.2.3.1 | names, addresses, and telephone numbers of the applicant, the owner if other than the applicant, and other agents for the applicant, such as the architect, engineer and/or attorney, and the name and address of the proposed project | X | | | Included in application submission |
| 5.2.3.2 | plot plan certified by land surveyor indicating total land area, boundaries, angles, and dimensions of the site and a north arrow | X | | | See Existing Conditions Plan |
| 5.2.3.3 | scaled site plans certified by a registered land surveyor, architect, landscape architect or engineer showing present and proposed use of land and existing buildings, if any; dimensions of existing and proposed structures; location and dimensions of any easements and public or private rights of way; and at grade parking and loading areas. | X | | X | See Existing Conditions Plan; Layout and Materials Plan; ROW Plan; Overall Site Plan. Plans are scaled but no dimensions labled for individual buildings. |

| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
|----------------|--|------------|----------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 5.2.3.4 | brief written description of the proposed project, such as proposed construction or demolition, all uses, who the project is intended to serve, expected number of employees, and/or occupants and methods and hours of operation, as applicable | X | | X | Project description, general use mix and development strategy is provided in Section C of PMP. The PMP states that "no specific tenants or other users have been identified," but the more general project description is provided. This is sufficient at this time, before individual SPSR-A's are submitted. |
| 5.2.3.5 | the total floor area and ground coverage ratio of each proposed building and structure | X | | X | Scaled Overall Site Plan with max proposed FAR is provided. Detail for each building is not provided at this time, but will be required with each SPSR-A submittal. |
| 5.2.3.6 | front, side, and rear elevations | | | X | To be provided with SPSR-A application. See Design Guidelines for general development strategy for building elevations. |
| 5.2.3.7 | existing and proposed contour elevations in two foot increments | X | | X | See Grading, Drainage and Utility Plans |
| 5.2.3.8 | provisions for vehicular and pedestrian circulation | X | | X | See Overall Site Plan and Design Guidelines for basic information. Detailed information on pedestrian and vehicle circulation will need to be provided with SPSR-A applications for review by the City Engineer and Traffic Engineer. |
| 5.2.3.9 | color, materials, and exterior features of proposed structures | X | | X | To be provided with SPSR-A application. See Design Guidelines for general development strategy for building features. |
| 5.2.3.10 | landscaping and screening, including trees, stones, walls, fences, and other features to be retained and removed, as well as color, size, and type of landscaped surface materials | X | | X | A general Treescape Plan is provided. Street trees will be reviewed by Planning Director and City Engineer prior to infrastructure construction, but approval shall not be required for trees to be maintained by the Applicant. |
| 5.2.3.11 | measures taken to preserve and protect natural resources | X | | X | Project complies with Waterfront Overlay District. Some SPSR-A applications may require approval of Conservation Commission and environmental remediation in accordance with MA DEP requirements. |
| 5.2.3.12 | outdoor lighting, including location and intensity of lighting facilities | | | X | Lighting on development site is to be addressed in SPSR-A applications. Lighting on City streets will need approval by City Engineer/Public Works prior to infrastructure construction. |
| 5.2.3.13 | dimensions and locations of signs, proposed and existing | | | X | To be addressed in SPSR-A application. City recommends that the development team provide a design guideline for signs to City staff and DRC prior to submittal of first SPSR-A application. |

| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
|----------------|---|------------|----------------|-----------------------------|---|
| 5.2.3.14 | location and significance of historic structures | X | | | This has been addressed in the 2005 VHB study and included in the original PMP document. |
| 5.2.3.15 | method for handling solid waste disposal, and for screening of disposal facilities | | | X | Individual sites will need to provide complete trash and recycling strategies with SPSR-A applications. |
| 5.2.3.16 | description and location of all proposed mechanical and electrical system components, including exhaust and ventilation system, transformers, and satellite dishes | | | X | To be addressed in SPSR-A applications. |
| 5.2.3.17 | locations of and adequacy of existing and proposed on-site public utilities, facilities, and conditions (water, sewerage, and drainage), showing size and direction of flows | X | | | See Existing Conditions Plan; Utility Analysis; Layout and Materials Plans |
| 5.2.3.18 | demolition and construction procedures including impact mitigation measures; an estimate of the time period required for completion of the development | | | X | To be addressed in SPSR-A applications. Demolition permits will require approval of ISD. |
| 5.2.3.19 | a traffic study including estimated peak hour traffic volumes generated by the proposed use in relation to existing volumes and projected future conditions or, if the project is twenty-five thousand (25,000) square feet or more, a traffic impact analysis which is prepared by a professional traffic engineer | X | | | The transportation study was completed with 2006 plan. The amended PMP provides current traffic data for 2010, certifying that baseline conditions have not significantly changed since the existing plan was completed, and therefore establishing that the 2006 report remains valid. Individual projects will need to address local traffic impacts and conflicts with SPSR-A application, but will not require additional study of off-site traffic impact if total impacts remain within the established thresholds. |
| 5.2.3.20 | general summary of existing and proposed easements or other burdens now existing or to be placed on the property | X | | | See Existing Conditions Plan; ROW Plan |
| 5.2.3.21 | wetlands, ponds, and surface water bodies, as defined under the Wetlands Protection Act, M.G.L. Chapter 131, Section 40, and rules promulgated thereunder, 310 CMR 10.00 | X | | | See Existing Conditions Plan |
| 5.2.3.22 | photographs of at least eight (8) by ten (10) inches, showing the development site and surrounding parcels | X | | | Included in application submission |
| 5.2.3.23 | names and addresses of all property owners within three hundred (300) feet of site boundaries | X | | | Included in application submission |

| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
|--|--|------------|----------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 5.2.3.24 | such other information as will aid the SPGA in judging the application and in determining special conditions and safeguards, and as the SPGA should deem necessary, in its determination of completeness of said application as provided in Section 5.3.1 and the SPGA Rules and Regulations | n/a | | | n/a |
| <u>A.3: Denial Letter Requirement (SZO 16.12)</u> | | | | | |
| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
| 16.12 | All applications for a preliminary Master Plan Approval shall be required to include a so-called 'denial letter' from the Inspectional Services Department indicating which aspects of the proposed PUD require approvals from the SPGA | X | | | Included in application submission |

Appendix B: Required Findings of Fact

B.1: General Findings under Section 16 (SZO 16.9 and 16.1)

| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
|---------|--|----------|---------|----------------------|---|
| 16.9 | The SPGA shall review and determine whether a PUD application is complete and place special emphasis in its review as to PUD compliance with provisions of Article 16 herein, including compliance with the purpose and general requirements/features of a PUD | X | | | See Appendix A. Applicant has provided a complete application. See the remainder of Appendix B which establishes that Applicant has provided an application that is in compliance with the provisions of Article 16 and complies with the purpose, general requirements and features of a PUD. |
| 16.9 | The SPGA shall . . . determine whether the proposal is consistent with the most suitable development of the City, and conduct a review in accordance with the requirements for special permit with site plan review as set forth in Article 5 of this Ordinance. The PUD shall comply with all requirements of this Ordinance unless a deviation from these strict requirements is authorized herein in Article 16 | X | | | The proposal to reuse a brownfield next to the Orange Line for a transit-oriented mixed-use, green development is consistent with the most suitable development in the City. It is based upon a long-term set of principles established by the City for redevelopment of the Assembly Square area in the ASD Plan. The applicant is requesting two waivers, which are addressed in Appendix D, and a waiver from the requirement to submit a three-dimensional model, which is addressed in Section IV-D of this decision. |
| 16.1 | The purpose of a Planned Unit Development, or PUD, is to provide for a mixture of land usage at designated locations at greater variety, density and intensity than would normally be allowed . . . to achieve, to the greatest possible degree, land development responsive to an analysis of the environmental assets and liabilities of a site, both natural and man-made. A PUD should be a well-integrated development in terms of land uses, functional activities, and major design elements such as buildings, roads, utilities, drainage systems and open space. A PUD is allowed greater design flexibility so that larger-scale site and master planning for a development may protect natural features and consider most fully the surrounding land use and development context . . . Development should be concentrated in the most suitable and least environmentally sensitive areas of the landscape. Preservation and enhancement of open space is strongly | X | | | The proposed project has benefitted from an additional 4 years of work by the applicant in collaboration with the City and community stakeholders since the original 2006 PMP. The result is a plan for a vibrant, mixed use, urban neighborhood and commercial center providing 9,000 new jobs, increased tax revenues, market rate and affordable housing, improved access to transportation, improvements to regional stormwater systems and enhanced open space amenities. The project mixes uses, provides urban densities, develops according to environmental constraints and opportunities on the site, while ceating a group of urban blocks that concentrate development with the highest densities near the transit station, mid-rise buildings fronting on the Mystic River parks, and expanded open space. The project meets this finding. |

B.2: Consistency Findings (SZO Section 6.4)

| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
|---------|--|----------|---------|----------------------|---|
| 6.4.1 | Purpose. The Assembly Square Mixed-Use District (ASMD) has been enacted to encourage the best use of Assembly Square physically, economically, environmentally and socially while promoting the best interests of residents of the City. The ASMD is intended to fulfill the goals and objectives contained in the Assembly Square District Plan (the ASD Plan, as hereinafter defined). The ASMD zoning is designed to allow the district to reach these goals. | X | | | See comments under Section 6.4.4 below. |

| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
|----------------|--|------------|----------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 6.4.4 | The ASD Plan describes the physical characteristics of the ASMD. The ASD plan establishes a comprehensive plan for development in the ASMD. The ASD plan includes the <u>Assembly Square Planning Study</u> dated October 2000 | X | | | The Assembly Square Planning Study prepared by the Cecil Group in 2000 created a framework for development in the Assembly Square area over the next twenty years and beyond. This Planning Study encouraged mixed- use development, but also recognized that a certain amount of big box retail would be the most feasible use in Assembly Square in the immediate future. The Planning Study specifically supported the redevelopment of the Assembly Square Mall and the proposed new IKEA store to improve Assembly Square's visibility and image, helping to pave the way for more intensive office development in the future. While the ASD Plan's site layout was based upon the ownership arrangement before the IKEA land swap, the general principles and concepts of the plan are supported by the proposed PMP amendment, and this PMP includes all of the physical characteristics, values and goals that were addressed in the Planning Study. |
| 6.4.4 | The ASD Plan describes the physical characteristics of the ASMD. The ASD plan establishes a comprehensive plan for development in the ASMD. The ASD plan includes the <u>Assembly Square Revitalization Plan</u> dated 2002 | X | | | The Assembly Square Revitalization Plan is an approved Urban Renewal Plan under MGL 121B. The 2002 plan is a Major Plan Change to the 1980 Assembly Square Revitalization Plan -- the City's urban renewal plan for Assembly Square. The Major Plan Change built on the foundation of the Cecil Group's Planning Study. The Major Plan Change envisioned a mixed use district with office, retail, residential, cinema, hotel, and restaurant uses -- a vibrant 24-hour district with a density somewhere between Boston's density and level of density in nearby suburbs. The Major Plan Change also envisioned the redevelopment of the Assembly Square Mall and a new IKEA store. The PMP revision is consistent with the overall vision of the Revitalization Plan. Upon approval of this revised Master Plan, the Redevelopment Authority intends to to amend the Revitalization Plan to reflect the latest redevelopment plan as outlined in this PMP and the FEIR |
| 6.4.4 | The ASD Plan describes the physical characteristics of the ASMD. The ASD plan establishes a comprehensive plan for development in the ASMD. The ASD plan includes the <u>Assembly Square Design Guidelines for the Public Realm</u> dated 2002 | X | | | Overall, the revised PUD PMP is consistent with the Public Realm Guidelines. The PUD's four key principles closely align with the goals of the Public Realm Guidelines; both encourage design that supports the PUD's public spaces and achieves sense of place, multi-modal functionality, and 24-hour activity. Both documents give streetscapes and public spaces high priority, stressing the role these spaces plan in the framework of the PUD. Both establish street hierarchies and district gateways for orientation. The PUD PMP is also consistent in its recognition of the Mystic River as a regional amenity, maximizing pedestrian accessibility to the waterfront. The Public Realm Guidelines generally include a greater level of streetscape and building detail, while the PUD PMP establishes complementary detailed design guidelines to drive decisions made at the SPSR-A phase and during streetscape design. |

| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
|---|---|------------|----------------|-----------------------------|---|
| | | | | | For example, the Public Realm Guidelines call for a unified signage system that considers elements like sign character, placement, materials, and typestyle. This issue is addressed through inclusion of a condition that a sign design guideline nr established. The Public Realm Guidelines also place emphasis on creating physical and visual connections between the PUD and its surrounding neighborhoods. The Applicant is undertaking several significant transportation improvements to enhance multi-modal access to the site. These efforts are especially important along the PUD's outer edges. |
| 6.4.4 | The ASD Plan describes the physical characteristics of the ASMD. The ASD plan establishes a comprehensive plan for development in the ASMD. The ASD plan includes the <u>Assembly Square Transportation Plan</u> dated 2003 | | | | The Assembly Square Transportation Plan generally calls out for development of a street grid within the mixed-use area. That grid has changed with the relocaiton of IKEA, but the overall transportation strategy in the PMP meets the spirit of the original Transportation Plan. |
| <u>B.3: General Requirements of a PUD (SZO Section 16.4)</u> | | | | | |
| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
| 16.4a | a designated tract of land meeting the minimum lot size requirements of Section 16.5.1.a for the PUD district | X | | | The parcel size is 2,896,740 s.f., or approximately 66.5 acres. This exceeds the 20,000 SF minimum lot size required for the PUD-A in the ASMD. |
| 16.4b | developed in a comprehensive, design-integrated manner, according to an overall master plan, with two (2) or more types of use | X | | | The Applicant has submitted a revised Master Plan with supporting plans showing buildings and roadways prepared by the architectural firm of Streetworks, Inc. and the engineering firm of Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. The PUD includes the following uses: retail (including restaurant and cinema), commercial (including office, R&D, and other commercial uses), residential, hotel, and parking. This revision to the Preliminary Master Plan is addressing the third phase of the development with the IKEA site and the Marketplace having received prior Special Permit approval. These phases have been approved based on the original Master Plan which has allowed the project to be developed in a comprehensive, design-integrated manner and this current application would improve the original plan and provide further clarity and regarding the Assembly Row development. |

| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
|----------------|--|------------|----------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 16.4c | consistent with the objectives of this Ordinance; | X | | | The Applicant has utilized the increased height and FAR allowed under the PUD Ordinance, proposing buildings ranging from 8 to 23 stories with a maximum height of 250 feet. By contrast, the maximum height permitted as of right is only 40 feet. The proposed PUD has been designed so that each phase, the Marketplace, IKEA and Assembly Row functions well on its own and also in relation to other phases. With Assembly Row, the applicant has the flexibility to design and construct residential, retail and/or commercial, or a mix of all, in response to the market and to other development taking place in Assembly Square. |
| 16.4d | consistent with the goals, objectives and plans of the City for the general subject area | X | | | The goals, objectives, and plans of the City for Assembly Square have been expressed in various public documents. Section B2 of these findings identifies in more detail how the proposed PUD is consistent with the these documents. The previous PUD approval in 2006 met the goals and objectives of these documents and this revision is a refinement of the original PUD approval. Recently, the DRC reviewed the Design Guidelines for Assembly Row which provide greater clarity regarding the future development to take place on the site. The DRC's comments have been included in this report. |
| 16.4e | developed so as to locate or cluster development sites, especially buildings, in a manner that provides usable open space, preserves natural or historic features, and preserves views of such features to the maximum extent possible | X | | | The PUD is oriented around a series of open spaces connected by pedestrian friendly streets. Main Street has been oriented to preserve a view of the Mystic River. The Applicant will widen the existing DCR park as part of the PUD, and this new, expanded park will serve as an anchor to the north end of Main Street. The new park will be lined with a cluster of residential/retail buildings to give it an active edge and it is expected to serve as a place for public enjoyment of the river. Throughout the site, the Applicant proposes to construct a series of additional passive pocket parks for residents, shoppers, office workers, and visitors. Other than the riverfront, Assembly Square does not have any important natural or historic features to be preserved. During SPSR-A review for each component of the Master Plan, the provision of usable open space and the preservation of views will continue to be monitored by the Planning Board, and this Decision includes conditions regarding the Applicant's obligation to submit detailed information for each Special Permit application. |

| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
|----------------|--|------------|----------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 16.4f | an efficient use of land which properly considers topography and protects significant natural features including, but not limited to, waterways, wetlands, floodplains and wildlife | X | | | The existing site is relatively flat, except for the area near the water, where the land slopes to the river. Although there are some former tidelands in Assembly Square (which will subject the project to Chapter 91 review), there are no significant wetlands, floodplains, or wildlife. The most important natural feature is the Mystic River, and the PUD will enhance passive recreational elements of the DCR park, as expanded, with landscaping, public artwork, and associated improvements consistent with a first-class commercial standard for urban public space. Finally, the PUD has been designed to locate the tallest buildings furthest away from the Mystic River. |
| 16.4g | an efficient use of land demonstrating full coordination of its own site development including, but not limited to, the land uses and functions contemplated, architecture, open space and pedestrian networks, vehicular access and circulation, and all other infrastructure | X | | | The Master Plan demonstrates that full consideration has been given to site development as a whole. The project has been phased such that the proposed uses and their associated roadways, parking, and infrastructure are developed in a coordinated manner. During the Special Permit process for developments within Assembly Row, the architecture, open space and pedestrian networks, vehicular access and circulation, roadways, and infrastructure will be reviewed in appropriate detail, and this Decision includes conditions to ensure that these issues are more fully addressed during the Special Permit process. |
| 16.4h | linked and coordinated with surrounding land uses, off-site public facilities, infrastructure and roadway access where appropriate, in a manner that is safe, efficient and non-injurious to the public, and an improvement or benefit to the public where possible | X | | | The Applicant has linked the residential buildings with the existing parkland that abuts the site and has designed a network of roadways and sidewalks which constitute an improvement to the existing conditions and a benefit to the public. During the special permit process links with surrounding land uses, off-site public facilities, infrastructure, and roadway access will be reviewed in appropriate detail. Conditions have been attached to this Decision to ensure that these issues will be fully addressed. |
| 16.4i | designed with sizing of street and other infrastructure systems to accommodate the overall service demand of the PUD | X | | | A full Traffic Impact and Access Study was prepared for the project and was included in the original submission package. The applicant is claiming that neither the underlying traffic conditions near Assembly Square nor the Project itself have changed to the degree that a new Traffic Impact and Access Study is required. The City Traffic engineer concluded that all facets of intersections and roadways illustrated on the revised Master Plan are consistent with proper Traffic Engineering design practice. Recommendations for traffic mitigation and additional analysis are included in the Conditions section of this report. |

| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
|----------------|--|------------|----------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 16.4j | inclusive of provisions for the ownership and maintenance of usable open space as appropriate (see Sec. 16.6 of this Article) | X | | | The Applicant will be required to maintain the usable open space within the PUD subject to a maintenance agreement that must be developed as a condition of this approval. |
| 16.4k | inclusive of appropriate deed restrictions or covenants requiring compliance of all development with the PUD master plan, and any architectural or other guidelines or standards | | | X | The PUD project is in too preliminary a stage to determine what deed restrictions will be required and this will be addressed in subsequent submission for special permits with site plan review. In addition, the PUD is in an urban renewal district and some of the key parcels will be acquired from the Somerville Redevelopment Authority via land disposition agreements containing covenants and restrictions ensuring that the goals and objectives of the City as expressed in the Major Plan Change will be adhered to. The existing covenant from December 2006 remains in effect. |

| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
|---|---|------------|----------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 16.4l | when inclusive of a proposed use allowable under this Ordinance only within a PUD setting, that said use is integrated into the proposed development in terms of function and service to other users of the PUD site and/or to the immediately surrounding area | n/a | | | <u>Not applicable.</u> This finding is not applicable in the ASMD District because all uses in the PUD align with the underlying district. |
| <u>B.4: PUD Design Guidelines (SZO Section 16.7)</u> | | | | | |
| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
| 16.7a | PUD architecture should demonstrate the cohesive planning of the development and present a clearly identifiable design feature throughout. It is not intended that buildings be totally uniform in appearance or that designers and developers be restricted in their creativity. Rather, cohesion and identity can be demonstrated in similar building scale or mass; consistent use of facade materials; similar ground level detailing, color or signage; consistency in functional systems such as roadway or pedestrian way surfaces, signage, or landscaping; the framing of outdoor open space and linkages, or a clear conveyance in the importance of various buildings and features on the site | | | X | Architectural review will occur during the Special Permit review process, using the Design Guidelines in the PMP and SZO as a basis for discussion about architectural design within the PUD area. |
| 16.7b | Buildings adjacent to usable open space should generally be oriented to that space, with access to the building opening onto the open space | | | X | The Design Guidelines submitted in the application identify levels and qualities of façade materials and the location on the buildings where the applicant believes these are appropriate. While the highest quality (primary) facades tend to be oriented towards the open spaces in the guideline drawings, specific openings and architectural elements would be decided during the Special Permit review process. |
| 16.7c | When a building is proposed to exceed the base district height limit, it is intended that buildings be of slender proportions emphasizing the vertical dimension | | | X | The Design Guidelines submitted in the application adhere to the height requirements outlined in the ASMD dimensional requirements with specific height limits based on the distance from the Mystic River bank and the MBTA station. Buildings that substantially exceed the base district limit of 40 feet emphasize the vertical dimension by having slender sides. Architectural elements that also accentuated the verticality of the buildings would be reviewed during the Special Permit review process. |

| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
|----------------|--|------------|----------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 16.7d | It is strongly encouraged that landscaped space, and particularly usable open space, be designed and located to connect as a network throughout the PUD. It is also generally intended that said space be designed and located to connect with existing off-site usable open space, and provide potential for connection with future open space by extending to the perimeter of the PUD, particularly when a plan exists for the location and networking of such future open space | X | | | see 6.4.7.A.4 |
| 16.7e | It is intended that no non-residential structure cause a casting of any shadow on any residential lands between 10:00 AM and 2:00 PM, solar time, on the vernal equinox (March 21); and that any shadow cast by a PUD structure on public usable open space be of minimal impact on the desired functional use of said open space, particularly in the period from March 21 to September 21 | | | X | Shadow review will occur during the SPSR-A review process. In general, shadow impacts have been reduced to the extent possible, with the understanding that the basic design of the site that is stipulated by the zoning, Chapter 91, and the desire for more intense development near the T will result in a plan that puts taller buildings on the southern edge of the site, thereby creating more shadow than would be created if the tallest buildings were near the water. |
| 16.7f | Vehicular access to and from public roads is intended to be consolidated. Vehicular access to PUD lands from a public roadway shall generally be limited to one (1) access point, particularly when PUD frontage along said roadway is three hundred (300) feet or less. When a PUD has more than six hundred (600) feet of frontage on a public road, separation between existing, approved, and proposed curb cuts, whether on or off-site, shall average a minimum of two hundred (200) feet. Consolidation to a minimal number of access points is strongly encouraged | X | | | Vehicular access to this area is primarily provided through Assembly Square Drive, but also through New Road/IKEA Way and Foley Street by way of Middlesex Avenue. The PUD guidelines encourage consolidation of access points to and from PUD lands and a minimum of 200 feet between access points. This proposal meets this guideline while still offering optimal transportation access to the site, and a robust street grid to handle traffic within the site. |
| 16.7g | Internal PUD streets shall consist of local and collector roadways, designed in accordance with standard traffic engineering practice. Any street proposed for public dedication shall meet the standards of the City's Director of Traffic and Parking. | X | | | The internal street layout is proposed in a grid pattern with local and collector streets. The main retail street travels north/south through the center of the Assembly Row development between IKEA Way and the park land adjacent to the Mystic River, supporting a robust street grid that can handle traffic within the site. Other internal streets provide connections to Assembly Square Drive, the MBTA station and perimeter locations. As these streets will be dedicated to the public these streets will be conditioned to meet City standards or better pursuant to review by the Director of Traffic and Parking and City Engineer. |

| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
|----------------|--|------------|----------------|-----------------------------|---|
| 16.7h | PUD block sides should reflect average city block size of Somerville, to maximize a pedestrian-friendly scale in the street grid. Alight streets to give building energy-efficient orientations. | X | | | Block sizes are larger than typically found in Somerville to accommodate buildings much larger than are typical in the City. Though the blocks are larger, the ground floor retail uses proposed and pedestrian friendly architectural elements and designs that would be required during the Special Permit review process will offset the negative effects of the above average block sizes and provide a scale appropriate for pedestrians. |
| 16.7i | The PUD design should preserve and enhance natural features such as topography, waterways, vegetation, and drainage ways. | X | | | The natural features of the site have been substantially altered over the years as an industrial and commercial site. This proposal would expand and improve vegetation on the site as well as expand the open space existing along the Mystic River. |
| 16.7j | The PUD design should minimize impervious surfaces and incorporate other design features to minimize storm water runoff. | | | X | Though this a predominantly urban development and, where possible, the applicant has maximized pervious surfaces. Drainage would be updated to address the non-pervious surfaces and would include natural features to limit stormwater runoff including swales and rain gardens. Specific measures to increase pervious surfaces will be addressed in the Special Permit review process. |
| 16.7k | PUDs should maximize pedestrian transit-oriented development. Specifically they should use "traffic-calming" techniques liberally; provide networks for pedestrians as good as the networks for motorists; provide pedestrians and bicycles with shortcuts and alternatives to travel along high-volume streets, and emphasize safe and direct pedestrian connections to transit stops and other commercial and/or employment nodes; provide long-term, covered, bicycle parking areas; provide well-lit, transit shelters; incorporate transit-oriented design features; and establish Travel Demand Management programs at employment centers. | X | | | Traffic calming measures have been included in the roadway designs that feature combination pedestrian/vehicle streets and open spaces, traffic circles, paver cross walks, intersection bumpouts and street trees. Pedestrians and bicyclists have alternative networks to access the project without travel on the high volume streets and can bypass the entire project on a dedicated bike/pedestrian path around the perimeter of the site. The highest intensity development will be proximate to the MBTA station which will promote rapid transit ridership and is in line with ideals of Transit Oriented Development. |

| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
|---|--|------------|----------------|-----------------------------|---|
| 16.7I | Make shopping centers and business parks into all-purpose activity centers. | X | | | The proposal calls for a wide array of uses that would create a vibrant and sustainable community with amenities and activities that will serve the residents of the development and the surrounding areas. This project is much more integrated than a typical shopping center or business park, allowing for a new community to be developed adjacent to the new T station. |
| <u>B.5: ASMD Development Standards (SZO Section 6.4.7.A)</u> | | | | | |
| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
| 6.4.7.A.1 | <i>Transportation Analysis.</i> All new Developments shall conform to the requirements set forth in any Transportation Study, subject to the approval of the SPGA. | X | | | A full Traffic Impact and Access Study was prepared for the project and was included in the original submission package. The applicant has provided data indicating that neither the underlying traffic conditions near Assembly Square nor the Project itself have changed to the degree that a new Traffic Impact and Access Study is required. The Traffic Engineer indicated that all facets of intersections and roadways illustrated on the revised Master Plan are consistent with proper Traffic Engineering design practice. Recommendations for traffic mitigation and additional analysis are included in the Conditions section of this report. |
| 6.4.7.A.2 | <i>Parking Requirements.</i> Developments shall meet the parking requirements set forth in Section 9.15. | X | | X | Parking requirements were reviewed and approved with the original PMP approval. Total parking has changed slightly, from 10,278 spaces to 10,066 spaces. The current design includes additional on-street parking spaces which are mostly located along Assembly Square Drive. The applicant exceeds parking requirements for the site as a whole, as specified in Section 9.16 of the SZO. Individual projects and phases will need review to ensure that interim parking needs are adequately met before full buildout is complete. Section 9.15 of the SZO identifies required bicycle parking. Bicycle parking will be addressed in the SPSR-A <u>process for individual development sites.</u> |
| 6.4.7.A.3 | <i>Landscaping Requirements.</i> Developments shall conform to the applicable landscaping requirements set forth in Article 10. Open spaces shall be contiguous to the extent practical, in the opinion of the SPGA. | | | X | This application is for an amendment to the approved Planned Unit Development Preliminary Master Plan. Landscaping requirements will be reviewed during the Special Permit process for each building and/or phase. |

| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
|--|---|------------|----------------|-----------------------------|---|
| 6.4.7.A.4 | <i>Pedestrian Connections.</i> Continuous pedestrian connections shall be supported between all major points of pedestrian activity on the Development Site, including, but not limited to, connections to the Mystic River waterfront, connections to all public and private ways abutting the Development Site, and any transit stops. Developments shall support improved access between the ASMD and the Ten Hills and East Broadway neighborhoods by means of sidewalk connections, crosswalks, landscaping, traffic signalization and traffic calming methods as appropriate. | X | | | The project incorporates sidewalks throughout, connecting all parts of the development including to and from the proposed MBTA T stop, the Mystic River and the Assembly Square Marketplace. In addition, a shared use path is planned along the Orange Line right of way that will connect pedestrians along the length of the project to the riverfront. The enhanced riverfront park also provides enhanced and new pedestrian connections to Draw 7 Park and to points within the site. The Proponent has previously provided \$100,000 to the City for the design of a new Mystic River pedestrian/bicycle walkway underneath Route 28 connecting Assembly Square and the Ten Hills neighborhood. The Proponent has also committed to fund construction of the new Mystic River pedestrian/bicycle walkway underneath Route 28 as part of an up to \$2 million commitment to fund pedestrian/bicycle/riverfront park enhancements on DCR land, in addition to other mitigation being constructed by the Proponent in conjunction with the Project. |
| <u>B.6: ASMD Design Guidelines (SZO Section 6.4.7.B)</u> | | | | | |
| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
| Note: The applicant has provided, of its own volition, additional Design Review Guidelines to address the design and massing of the proposed blocks and buildings. The document's specific purpose is to: 1) Establish the standards upon which the Design Review Committee (DRC) will base its recommendations for the implementation of the Assembly Row PUD; 2) Provide viable building solutions for massing, vertical mixing of uses, fenestration and materials, pedestrian lobby locations, parking structure location and entrances as well as building service locations; 3) Establish the guide upon which the DRC and Planning Board will base recommendations for the implementation of the Assembly ROW PUD; and, 4) Provide architects, designers and developers with a document to guide their work as the Assembly Row Project is implemented. These guidelines are generally consistent with all other guideline documents pertaining to the Assembly Row PUD Area and are meant to be the relevant document for the proposed project. While the plans and images within this document represent a minimum of quality in material and design that will achieve the goal of creating a diverse and vibrant mixed-use neighborhood they in no way represent the only viable or acceptable solution. Where design solutions deviate significantly from these guidelines, the Somerville DRC and Planning Board would determine if the solution is within the spirit of the document. If adopted by the Planning Board, these Design Guidelines will become part of the vision and expectation of the project here forward. | | | | | |
| 6.4.7.B.1 | <i>Street and Sidewalk Design.</i> Street and sidewalk design shall be based on the Assembly Square Public Realm Design Guidelines and applicable engineering standards, provided that any street shown in such Guidelines as running through an existing Building is not required to be constructed until such Building is demolished. | | | X | The design of streets and sidewalks will respond appropriately to the Street and Sidewalk design criteria. To the extent that is known at this time, the streets and sidewalks appear to be designed to meet the expectations of the Design Guidelines. Full engineering plans will need to be provided for review to ensure that streets meet City engineering standards. As applicable, existing buildings will be demolished before street construction is required. |
| 6.4.7.B.2 | <i>Building Design.</i> Buildings shall be designed to the highest architectural standards and shall be sited appropriately on the Lot. | | | X | This application is for a revised Planned Unit Development Preliminary Master Plan approval. The final design of the proposed buildings has not been completed. The description and composition of the buildings will be reviewed with each SPSR-A for the individual buildings and phases. |

| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
|----------------|--|------------|----------------|-----------------------------|---|
| 6.4.7.B.2a | Buildings should be located to create a presence on existing street edges or along major internal circulation routes and have maximum building setbacks of five feet except in special circumstances, where greater setbacks would enhance the pedestrian friendly experience of the ASMD, such as dedicated open space; and buildings should be located to reinforce both existing and future circulation patterns that may serve more than one Site. | | | X | This application is for a revised Planned Unit Development Preliminary Master Plan approval. The final design of the proposed buildings has not been completed. The description and composition of the buildings will be reviewed with each SPSR-A for the individual buildings and phases. |
| 6.4.7.B.2b | Buildings should have interesting entrance areas that are visible and directly accessible from major public access points, streets and circulation patterns. Extensive areas of glass and window, providing visual access to interior uses, should be part of all street facades and accompany building entrances. Multiple and frequent entrances oriented to streets are encouraged. Building entrances should be clearly defined, through the use of elements such as canopies, porticos, overhangs, peaked roof forms, arches. Entries set back from the street should have outdoor patios, tile work, moldings, integral planters or wing walls with landscaped areas, or places for sitting. | | | X | This application is for a revised Planned Unit Development Preliminary Master Plan approval. The final design of the proposed buildings has not been completed. The description and composition of the buildings will be reviewed with each SPSR-A for the individual buildings and phases. |
| 6.4.7.B.2c | There should be a clearly defined pattern of bays, rhythms, and dimensions that create continuous visual interest and variety in the design of all facades. | | | X | This application is for a revised Planned Unit Development Preliminary Master Plan approval. The final design of the proposed buildings has not been completed. The description and composition of the buildings will be reviewed with each SPSR-A for the individual buildings and phases. |
| 6.4.7.B.2d | The overall scale of development should be broken down to respond to the pedestrian scale use of open space. | | | X | This application is for a revised Planned Unit Development Preliminary Master Plan approval. The final design of the proposed buildings has not been completed. The description and composition of the buildings will be reviewed with each SPSR-A for the individual buildings and phases. |
| 6.4.7.B.2e | Materials and colors shall be consistent with traditional buildings in the area with historic merit. | | | X | This application is for a revised Planned Unit Development Preliminary Master Plan approval. The final design of the proposed buildings has not been completed. The description and composition of the buildings will be reviewed with each SPSR-A for the individual buildings and phases. |

| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
|----------------|--|------------|----------------|-----------------------------|---|
| 6.4.7.B.2f | Building equipment and service areas should be located away from public streets or major interior circulation routes and provide screening. All storage of items for sale or related inventory should be enclosed unless completely screened from public view with architectural elements meeting the §6.4.7 guidelines. | | | X | This application is for a revised Planned Unit Development Preliminary Master Plan approval. The final design of the proposed buildings has not been completed. The description and composition of the buildings will be reviewed with each SPSR-A for the individual buildings and phases. |
| 6.4.7.B.2g | Preference should be shown for vertical integration of uses. Developments should ensure that development patterns provide active uses on the ground floor that take advantage of the waterfront views and open spaces, and that add presence to public ways and sidewalks. | | | X | This application is for a revised Planned Unit Development Preliminary Master Plan approval. The final design of the proposed buildings has not been completed. The description and composition of the buildings will be reviewed with each SPSR-A for the individual buildings and phases. |
| 6.4.7.B.2h | The façade of a building should not have any uninterrupted or unfenestrated length exceeding thirty-five (35) horizontal feet. Facades greater than one hundred (100) feet in length, measured horizontally, should incorporate wall plane projections or recesses having a depth of at least three percent (3%) of the length of the facade and extending at least twenty percent (20%) of the length of the façade. | | | X | This application is for a revised Planned Unit Development Preliminary Master Plan approval. The final design of the proposed buildings has not been completed. The description and composition of the buildings will be reviewed with each SPSR-A for the individual buildings and phases. |
| 6.4.7.B.2i | All Ground Floor facades that face public ways or the Mystic River should have windows providing visual access to the interior of a space, arcades, display windows, entry areas, awnings, or other such features along no less than seventy percent (70%) of their horizontal length. Forty percent (40%) of this activated facade area+ on the ground floor of building walls along primary and secondary streets shall consist of windows or doors meant for public entry and exit. | | | X | This application is for a revised Planned Unit Development Preliminary Master Plan approval. The final design of the proposed buildings has not been completed. The description and composition of the buildings will be reviewed with each SPSR-A for the individual buildings and phases. |
| 6.4.7.B.3 | <i>Parking Lot Design.</i> Refer to Section 9.15 for parking requirements. Parking Lots shall avoid large expanses that are unbroken by Buildings or substantial landscaped Open Spaces, as set forth in Section 10.4 of this Ordinance. | | | X | This application is for a revised Planned Unit Development Preliminary Master Plan approval. The final design of the proposed buildings has not been completed. The parking lot layouts will be reviewed with each SPSR-A. |

| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
|----------------|--|------------|----------------|-----------------------------|---|
| 6.4.7.B.4 | <i>Open Space.</i> Landscape strips required in parking areas shall not apply to UOS calculations. Developments are encouraged to make significant contributions to Open Space along the Mystic River adjacent to the ASMD. | | | X | This application is for a revised Planned Unit Development Preliminary Master Plan approval. Applicant has met the requirement to provide open space and Usable Open Space (UOS). The areas within the Marketplace and IKEA sites remain unchanged from their special permit approvals. The final design of the open space within the mixed use component has not been completed. It is the Applicant's commitment that they will maintain the open space and plantings throughout the PUD. The open space areas will be reviewed in greater detail by planning staff when it is further developed within the context of the Maintenance Agreement that is to be written. No further action by the Planning Board is anticipated with regard to open space within the street ROW. Landscaping on individual development sites will be subject to PB review and approval as a part of SPSR-A review. |
| 6.4.7.B.5 | <i>Efficiency of Design.</i> Every effort shall be made to design Buildings and use materials and construction techniques to optimize daylight in building interiors, natural ventilation, energy efficiency, and to minimize exposure to and consumption of toxics and non-renewable resources and incorporate appropriate "green" design techniques. In accordance with this principle all Developments within the ASMD in excess of ten thousand (10,000) square feet shall be required to complete an Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (LEED) worksheet and submit the worksheet to the SPGA with permit application materials. This worksheet shall be considered in evaluating whether a proposed Development meets the applicable standards set forth elsewhere in this Ordinance. However, consistency with the LEED standards shall not be a factor in whether or not to permit a Development. | | | X | This application is for a revised Planned Unit Development Preliminary Master Plan approval. The Applicant shall comply with this section during each Site Plan Review Special Permit process and submit the necessary LEED worksheets. A condition is recommended with regard to the Applicant's commitment to apply for LEED ND, which is LEED at the neighborhood level. |
| 6.4.7.B.6 | <i>Contributions.</i> Contributions for Infrastructure and Open Space related to a Development made by an Applicant to the City or its constituent agencies in other agreements or permits shall be credited by the SPGA toward any applicable requirements hereunder for a Special Permit. | X | | X | The Applicant has committed to contributions and mitigation under contracts with the City and the SPGA shall take that into consideration. The applicant will enter into maintenance agreements for useable open space and a portion of the public infrastructure as well. Specific contributions that may be required as a part of individual SPSR-A projects will be reviewed with each special permit. |

| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
|---|---|------------|----------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 6.4.7.B.7 | <i>Loading Spaces.</i> To the extent possible, Loading spaces shall be located away from major Public Ways, the Mystic River and other highly visible locations. Every effort shall be made to incorporate creative design to reduce the negative visual impacts of the Loading space. | | | X | This application is for a revised Planned Unit Development Preliminary Master Plan approval. The final design of the proposed buildings has not been completed and therefore, the loading spaces are not finalized. The loading spaces will be reviewed during each Site Plan Review process. |
| <u>B.7: ASMD Large Project Development Standards (SZO Section 6.4.8.D)</u> | | | | | |
| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
| 6.4.8.D.1 | Transportation Analysis. Large Developments shall provide a Transportation Access and Impact Study. The Director of Traffic and Parking shall approve the geographic scope and content of the study in consultation with the Executive Director of the Planning Department and the Traffic Commission. In addition, the Applicant shall submit a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan tailored to the specific uses and the geographic location of the Development Site. If the Transportation Access and Impact Study indicates a significant impact to the transportation network in the specified study area, the Applicant shall include in the study proposed mitigation measures to address those impacts. | | | | A full Traffic Impact and Access Study was prepared for the project and was included in the original submission package. The applicant is has provided data indicating that neither the underlying traffic conditions near Assembly Square nor the Project itself have changed to the degree that a new Traffic Impact and Access Study is required. The Traffic Engineer indicated that all facets of intersections and roadways illustrated on the revised Master Plan are consistent with proper Traffic Engineering design practice. Recommendations for traffic mitigation and additional analysis are included in the Conditions section of this report. |
| 6.4.8.D.2 | <i>Large Retail Projects.</i> Any Large Development in which any single Retail Use is more than fifty thousand (50,000) square feet of gross floor area shall also be deemed a Large Retail Project. A). Nonretail Component --“No Large Retail Project ... shall be permitted in the ASMD unless permitted as part of a PUD-A which includes 1.5 net square feet of non-retail uses for every square foot over 50,000 net square feet of Retail Use in the Large Retail Project.” B). Ground Level Retail Size Cap-- “In a Large Retail Project, not more than 50,000 square feet of Gross Floor area of any single Retail Use shall be located on the Ground Floor of any Building included in the PUD-A.” | | | X | Section A) The proposed PUD meets this requirement as indicated in the Overall Site Plan breakdown of the proposed uses. Section B) The Applicant received a waiver from this requirement with the 2006 approval of the PMP for the TJ Maxx Store and the Christmas Tree Shop. Otherwise, the proposed PUD meets this requirement and no additional waivers from this provision are requested at this time. |

| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
|---|--|------------|----------------|-----------------------------|---|
| 6.4.8.D.3 | <i>Landscaping.</i> A minimum of fifty (50) percent of the Landscaped Area in a new Large Development shall be Usable Open Space. The SPGA shall have final discretion in deciding if land constitutes Open Space for the purposes of determining whether this requirement has been met. The Open Space requirement may be met with land that is part of the Large Development, or with land that is outside of the Large Development area but is located within the ASMD that was not already Useable Open Space, provided that the conditions of paragraph 2 of Section 16.6.1 of the Ordinance relating to public dedication of such Usable Open Space are met. | | | X | As required, the proposed PMP includes greater than 15% usable open space as shown in D2: Open Space Plan. While the applicant did not include the open space within the D Street islands in this application, they also could qualify as useable open space and be included as such within a useable open space agreement, thereby further increasing the total useable open space on the site even further. |
| <u>B.8: ASMD Large Project Design Guidelines (SZO Section 6.4.8.E)</u> | | | | | |
| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
| 6.4.8.E.1 | <i>Structured Parking.</i> Due to the size and scope of Large Developments, every effort shall be made to provide as much parking as possible underground and/or in structures | X | | | Over 85% of parking spaces are located in parking structures. |

Appendix C: Future Requirements for SPSR-A

| <i>Section</i> | <i>Required Finding</i> | <i>Met</i> | <i>Not Met</i> | <i>To Address in SPSR-A</i> | <i>Comment</i> |
|----------------|---|------------|----------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 6.4.9.C.1 | Traffic impact and proposed mitigation, if any, (should be) consistent with any applicable Transportation Study, Traffic Access and Impact Study and/or Transportation Demand Management Plan, and the goals and objectives of the ASD Plan | | | X | Individual SPSR-A projects will be assessed for any additional traffic impacts that they may create, above and beyond what was anticipated in the original traffic study, with any appropriate mitigation planned accordingly. Review of pedestrian and vehicle entries and exits will be subject to review by the Traffic Engineer and the Planning Board before project approval. |
| 6.4.9.C.2 | The application (should) reflect an overall consistency with the intent and purpose of any applicable Design Guidelines set forth in this Section 6.4 | | | X | The applicant has provided proposed Design Guidelines as Section I of the document. See Appendix B for assessment of the guidelines for consistency with the Design Guidelines set out in 6.4.7B and 6.4.8E of the SZO. Projects developed in accordance with the submitted Design Guidelines should be able to meet the general provisions of these sections. Projects that deviate from the submitted design guidelines will need to be reviewed further for compliance with this provision. |
| 6.4.9.C.3 | The application (should) promote the following objectives: mix of residential, office, research and development, retail, hotels, places of assembly and institutional uses' economic benefits and employment opportunities' structured parking; pedestrian and bicycle access; affordable housing units and project mitigation contribution; view corridors to the Mystic River; enhanced and activated Open Space' creation of new Open Space or enhancement of existing Open Space; and, . . . support transit service at (the MBTA Station). | | | X | The overall development meets these objectives. Individual projects will need review to ensure they are consistent with the PMP and these objectives. |
| 6.4.9.C.4 | Additional Findings and Determinations: Prior to granting a Special Permit with Site Plan Review-A, the SPGA shall make findings and determinations as noted in 6.4.9.C.4 | | | X | These additional findings address submittal requirements, criteria for review, impact on public services, site surface drainage, access to buildings, utilities, signage, transformers, screening, and shadow impacts. The overall development plan does not show any apparent inconsistencies with these objectives. Individual projects will need review to ensure they are consistent with these required additional findings and determinations. |
| 5.2.5.a | <i>Information supplied.</i> Complies with the information requirements of Section 5.2.3 | | | X | Applicants will need to submit all required information for SPSR-A applications. |
| 5.2.5.b | <i>Compliance with standards.</i> Complies with such criteria or standards as may be set forth in this Ordinance which refer to the granting of the requested special permit with site plan review | | | X | Applicants will need to meet individual SPSR-A findings as identified in this Appendix C. |

| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
|----------------|---|------------|----------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 5.2.5.c | <i>Purpose of district.</i> Is consistent with the intent of the specific zoning district as specified in Article 6 | | | X | The overall plan is consistent with the intent of the specific zoning district. Projects that are consistent with the PMP should be able to meet this finding. Projects that deviate from the PMP will need review within the SPSR-A review process to ensure they remain compatible with the purpose of the district. |
| 5.2.5.d | <i>Site and area compatibility.</i> Is designed in a manner that is compatible with the existing natural features of the site and is compatible with the characteristics of the surrounding area, and that the scale, massing and detailing of buildings are compatible with those prevalent in the surrounding area | | | X | The overall plan is compatible with natural features and character of the surrounding area. Projects that are consistent with the PMP should be able to meet this finding. Projects that deviate from the PMP will need review within the SPSR-A review process to ensure they remain compatible with the natural features of the area. |
| 5.2.5.e | <i>Functional design.</i> Meets accepted standards and criteria for the functional design of facilities, structures, and site construction | | | X | Individual buildings will need to be reviewed during the SPSR-A process to ensure that the functional design meets acceptable standards |
| 5.2.5.f | <i>Impact on Public Systems.</i> Will not create adverse impacts on the public services and facilities serving the development, such as the sanitary sewer system, the storm drainage system, the public water supply, the recreational system, the street system for vehicular traffic, and the sidewalks and footpaths for pedestrian traffic | | | X | The applicant has adequately addressed that the overall project, with agreed-upon public service upgrades, will have adequate public services. Projects will be addressed in the SPSR-A process to ensure that their utility impact remains consistent with the PMP and does not have any adverse impacts within the development site. |
| 5.2.5.g | <i>Environmental impacts.</i> Will not create adverse environmental impacts, including those that may occur off the site, or such potential adverse impacts will be mitigated in connection with the proposed development, so that the development will be compatible with the surrounding area | | | X | The applicant has adequately addressed that the overall project mitigates adverse environmental impacts, cleans an existing brownfield and redevelops a waterfront site with future transit access. Furthermore, upgrades to DCR parkland will provide off-site open space for the project as well as the surrounding neighborhood. Individual projects will need review under SPSR-A for consistency with the PMP as well as any unanticipated environmental impacts. |
| 5.2.5.h | <i>Consistency with purposes.</i> Is consistent with: 1) the purposes of this Ordinance, particularly those set forth in Article 1 and Article 5; and 2) the purposes, provisions, and specific objectives applicable to the requested special permit with site plan review which may be set forth elsewhere in this Ordinance, such as, but not limited to, those at the beginning of the various sections | | | X | The project described in the PMP meets this finding, but individual developments in the SPSR-A process will also need to establish that they continue to meet this finding. |

Appendix D: Standards for Waivers

| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
|------------|---|----------|---------|----------------------|--|
| 16.5.4 | <i>Waiver of dimensional standards.</i> In order to maximize flexibility in the application of design standards to PUD projects, the SPGA may waive strict compliance with the standards of Section 16.5 upon making a determination that: (a) such a waiver would result in a better site plan than strict compliance with the stated standards; (b) the proposed PUD design furthers the Purpose and PUD Design Guidelines of this section; and (c) the granting of such a waiver will not cause detriment to the surrounding neighborhood. | X | | | The applicant is requesting two waivers from the standards of Section 16.5 from the dimensional standards in Section 6.5.6 as referenced in Section 16.5.1. The waivers would allow the construction of underground parking and a taller than otherwise allowed structure on Block 2. These waivers both meet the required findings as follows: a) they result in a better site plan, by providing additional parking underground instead of placing it elsewhere in the project where it would be more visible, and providing residential units in two well designed towers with water views rather than allocating those units to a less desirable location within the project; b) they further the design and purpose of the PUD by placing more parking underground, providing a better designed mixed use building on Block 2, allowing for Block 2 to be designed so as to provide frontage on a new open space on 'Main Street' and further activating the waterfront and Main Street with units; and, c) the waiver will allow for underground parking that will not be visible from the surface streets and for two residential buildings to be built up to 90 feet in height less than 250 feet from the Mystic River. These waivers will support the overall design of the site and complement proposed neighboring structures. The total development program remains the same as the 2006 PMP, creating no additional transportation impacts, and the building on Block 2 will be over 700 feet from the nearest neighbor outside of the PUD area. |
| 6.4.12.a.1 | Strict enforcement of such standards or requirements would run counter to achieving the objectives of the ASD Plan; | X | | | The ASD Plan encourages below ground parking and discourages surface parking. The first waiver achieves this objective of the ASD plan. Placing this parking at the surface would not achieve the objectives of the plan. The ASD Plan encourages a variety of block and building scales oriented to pedestrians, with a mid rise building environment and high quality open spaces. The second waiver allows for efficient design of a residential building on Block 2 which helps create a building that is oriented to pedestrians and helps reserve the area along the edge of Block 2 for the high quality Main Street mall. |
| 6.4.12.a.2 | The application is substantially consistent with the objectives of the ASD Plan and advances the objectives of the ASD Plan; | X | | | Both waivers create a development on Block 2 that is part of a true mixed-use program incorporating transit-oriented development, creating a series of new pedestrian oriented public spaces and streets including the Mystic River parks and the Main Street mall while providing a mid-rise building that is in context with the rest of the site and the |

| Section | Required Finding | Met | Not Met | To Address in SPSR-A | Comment |
|----------------|---|------------|----------------|-----------------------------|---|
| 6.4.12.a.3 | In the case of any Alteration of a Nonconforming Structure, a Change of Nonconforming Use, or a Major Amendment to an Approved PUD, such alteration, change or amendment shall conform, to the extent feasible, to the objectives of the ASD Plan | n/a | | | This finding does not apply in this case. |

Appendix E: Assembly Square PMP Revision 07-2010: Conditions

| # | Condition | Completed Since 2006 | No Longer Relevant | To Be Evaluated By: | Timeframe for Compliance | Verified (initial) | Notes |
|---|---|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|-----------------------|-------|
| <p><i>This amended condition list reflects the conditions to the 2006 approval with new additions <u>underlined</u> and removal of conditions or portions of conditions struck out. Items completed since 2006, or no longer relevant under the amended site plan are noted through an 'x' in the appropriate column. The conditions below shall supersede the PMP conditions approved in 2006. The Applicant agrees that if it is determined that if the Planning Board determines that a condition from the 2006 PUD PMP approval decision has been omitted from this decision through error, the Planning Board shall have the right to enforce such condition.</i></p> | | | | | | | |
| A. General | | | | | | | |
| 1 | <p><u>Approval is based upon the revised Preliminary Master Plan submitted by Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. dated July 23, 2010 and stamped in at the City Clerk's office on July 23, 2010, including sections A through J and the site plans bound separately in two bound sets, one being the architectural plan set A-100, A-101, A-102, A-103, A-104, and A-P-1, the other being the Amended Preliminary Master Plan site plans including pages C-1 through C-19, Sv-1 through Sv-5, P-1 and R-1 dated July 22, 2010 and stamped in on July 23, 2010. Any changes to the submitted application material that are not de minimis must receive Planning Board approval, unless such changes are designed only to establish compliance with one of the conditions of this PMP approval.</u></p> <p><u>The approval of this PMP does not incorporate any of the following items: a) Any interior layout of buildings; b) Locations of and specifications for elements of the public right of way to be covered in the maintenance agreement per Condition #3 and #4; c) Design details within individual open spaces to be reviewed per Condition #5; d) Any off-site design including but not limited to design on MBTA and/or DCR land.</u></p> | - | - | Planning Director | Continuous | | |
| 2 | <p><u>The approval of this PMP shall be considered to be approval of the width of roadway and rights-of-ways. For each street, 100% street design plans, consistent with the PMP, must be filed with the City Engineer, Public Works Commissioner, Traffic and Parking Director, and Planning Director for review and compliance with city standards and sound engineering practices.</u></p> | - | - | Planning Director / City Engineer / T&P Director | Continuous | | |
| 3 | <p><u>Applicant will work with the City to develop the long term maintenance agreement noted in Section 12.1B of the application form that will provide for the Proponent's commitments to the City relative to maintenance of the elements of the public right of ways including sidewalk treatments, street trees, landscaping, finishes, street furniture and other amenities. The City will not maintain anything that is not consistent with City standard, unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer.</u></p> | - | - | Planning Director / City Engineer | Prior to trench permit for roadway construction | | |
| 4 | <p><u>Pursuant to #3 above, design of sidewalk treatments, street trees, landscaping, finishes, street furniture and other amenities that are to be maintained by the Applicant will not be subject to City approval but shall be submitted to the City Engineer and Planning Director for comment.</u></p> | - | - | Planning Director / City Engineer | Prior to trench permit for roadway construction | | |

| # | Condition | Completed Since 2006 | No Longer Relevant | To Be Evaluated By: | Timeframe for Compliance | Verified (initial) | Notes |
|--|---|----------------------|--------------------|---|--|--------------------|---|
| 5 | <u>Applicant will work with the City to develop the long term maintenance agreement for the Useable Open Space as required in Article 17 of the SZO. The agreement shall specify the requirements for public access and private maintenance of useable open space in the plan, as required by the SZO. The applicant shall build out and maintain all of the open space and allow public access to all of the useable open space in the plan as required by the SZO. The applicant will submit 100% construction plans for open space to the City for review and comment.</u> | - | - | Planning Director / City Engineer / DPW | Prior to Approval of first SPSR-A | | |
| 6 | <u>The applicant will submit a plan amendment to subdivide all public roadway right of way from development blocks, to be approved by the Planning Board per the SZO, and filed with the Middlesex South Registry of Deeds. Any minor plan changes to this initial subdivision will be reviewed for approval by the Planning Director and Director of Traffic and Parking as a minor plan change.</u> | - | - | Planning Director | Prior to 1st SPSR-A for mixed use area | | |
| 7 | <u>The financial statement submitted by the Applicant with the original PMP shall be considered to be for informational purposes only. No portion of that document shall be a binding upon the Applicant or the City.</u> | - | - | - | - | | |
| B. Transportation / Traffic Circulation | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Applicant shall revise the Traffic Impact Assessment Study (TIAS) in consideration of comments included in the Peer Review memorandums prepared by FST reviewing Existing Conditions, No-Build Conditions, and Build Conditions, consistent with MEPA review. | X | | | | | Completed with IDEA SPSR-A and DEIR |
| 9 | Major actions to be taken prior to Phase 1A include: expanding the impact study area, documenting/justifying trip proposed generation rates, trip distribution, and trip reduction rates. | X | | | | | Completed with IDEA SPSR-A and DEIR |
| 10 | Applicant shall consider issues discussed in Peer Review Memoranda. The Board shall consider the Peer Review Memoranda or any additional information when considering permit applications. | X | - | - | - | | FST reviewed the compliance with the memo prior to approving the 100% design of mitigation associated with the IKEA permit and determined that these comments were addressed. |
| 11 | All mitigation involving traffic signal upgrades must include specific discussion and documentation of the ability of all controllers to be left in place to fulfill the functions required of them by proposed mitigation. | X | - | - | - | | Addressed during review of IKEA mitigation |
| | All traffic control equipment and roadway elements must meet City of Somerville specifications and standards unless they are approved by the City Engineer and are maintained by the applicant under the maintenance agreement. (lost underline?) | - | X | - | - | | Superseded by conditions #2 and #3. |
| 12 | The Applicant shall consider all recommendations referenced in the Traffic Impact and Access Study Memo; On-Site Circulation Memo; and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation Memo prepared by Fay, Spofford & Thorndike (FST). | X | | | | | Completed with IDEA SPSR-A and DEIR |
| | Applicant shall also work with the Massachusetts Highway Department to include visible signage that will direct traffic to the site via highway and keep traffic at a minimum in residential neighborhoods. | - | - | - | - | | Applicant has made diligent efforts to work with DOT to address this issue. DOT will not agree to install highway signage. |

| # | Condition | Completed Since 2006 | No Longer Relevant | To Be Evaluated By: | Timeframe for Compliance | Verified (initial) | Notes |
|-------------------------|--|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|-----------------------|--|
| 13 | <u>Applicant identifies the U-Turn Slot as proposed transportation mitigation. If the Foley Street Connector is proven to be feasible (and is approved by MEPA and MassDOT as an alternative to the U-Turn Slot), the applicant will work with the City of Somerville to substitute the City's proposed Foley Street Connector for the U-turn slot, and provide any mitigation support that was proposed for the U-turn slot towards the Foley Street Connector.</u> | - | - | Planning Director | upon approval by DOT and MEPA | | |
| 14 | <u>Applicant shall work with the MBTA and the City of Somerville to identify a bus route through the site and to provide appropriate bus stops that provide safe and convenient access to the MBTA Station, Main Street, IKEA, and the Marketplace. Any change to the roadway plans to provide bus stops, including the removal of on-street parking spaces, shall require the approval of the City Engineer and Planning Director.</u> | - | - | Planning Director / City Engineer | Prior to first SPSR-A application | | |
| 15 | <u>Applicant shall be required to submit proposed names for all streets for the review pursuant to Section 12.1 and 2-309.5 of the Code of Ordinances. The applicant should note that street names that are the same or similar to names already used in Somerville shall not be permitted.</u> | - | - | Planning Director | Prior to opening of any new street | | |
| 16 | <u>The PMP is approved for no more than 10,066 parking spaces. Amendment to the PMP will be required for any increase. The Applicant is encouraged to decrease the number of spaces provided so long as compliance with the SZO is maintained.</u> | - | - | Planning Director | Continuous | | |
| 17 | <u>The applicant shall include conduits for parking kiosks in street construction plans as required by the Director of Traffic and Parking with review and approval by the City Engineer.</u> | - | - | T&P Director / City Engineer | Prior to trench permit for roadway construction | | |
| C. Water Systems | | | | | | | |
| 18 | <u>Design and construction phasing of the water system shall be subject to review and approval by the City Engineer to ensure compliance with City standards and best practices for design and ongoing maintenance.</u> | - | - | City Engineer | Prior to trench permit for roadway construction | | |
| 19 | Applicant shall conduct additional hydraulic analyses to ensure that the City's system is capable of meeting the adjusted demands throughout the project. Applicant shall meet fire flow requirements while maintaining a minimum pressure of 20 psi at the fire location. In accordance with DEP guideline, a minimum pressure of 35 psi shall be maintained throughout the distribution system during normal demand conditions. | X | - | - | - | | Completed between 2006 PMP approval and application for SP for the IKEA. |
| | Applicant shall have a fire protection engineer determine the fire protection requirement at each individual building and determine whether or not a sprinkler system will be necessary for each building. At the building permit application stages, all fire protection facilities must meet the requirements of the Somerville Fire Department, in compliance with all applicable requirements. | - | X | - | - | | These issues are addressed in the Mass. Building Code. |

| # | Condition | Completed Since 2006 | No Longer Relevant | To Be Evaluated By: | Timeframe for Compliance | Verified (initial) | Notes |
|----------------------------------|---|----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------|---|
| 20 | Applicant shall ensure that all materials shall be in accordance with the City of Somerville Water and Sewer Division's Specifications and/or Rules and Regulations, latest issue. | - | - | City Engineer | Prior to trench permit for roadway construction | | This is complete within Assembly Square Drive, but review will be required for streets in the mixed-use area. |
| 21 | Roadway construction plans shall provide for Applicant shall consider installing new hydrants, in consultation with the recommendations of the Fire Chief, at the following locations: On "C" Street, approximately 100 feet east of the intersection of "A" Street On "G" Street, approximately 180 feet north of the intersection of Ikea Way On Assembly Square Drive, approximately 220 feet east of the intersection of Route 28/Middlesex Fells Parkway On Assembly Square Drive, approximately 550 feet east of the intersection of Route 28/Middlesex Fells Parkway On Foley Street, approximately 80 feet east of the intersection of Middlesex Avenue On Foley Street, approximately 420 feet east of the intersection of Middlesex Avenue as required to ensure adequate fire protection for the site in compliance with applicable local, state, and federal requirements as determined by the Fire Chief and City Engineer. | - | - | Fire Chief / City Engineer | Prior to trench permit for roadway construction | | |
| 22 | Applicant shall install valves at each intersection, and correspondingly show and label on all drawings. All tees, bends, reducers, and other fittings should also be labeled on the drawings. | - | - | City Engineer | Prior to trench permit for roadway construction | | |
| 23 | Applicant shall provide individual calculations to determine the sizes necessary for the connections to each property. The proposed service connections to each of the new buildings shall be shown on further design drawings. | - | - | City Engineer | Prior to trench permit for roadway construction | | |
| D. Sanitary Sewer Systems | | | | | | | |
| 24 | <u>Design and construction phasing of the sanitary sewer system shall be subject to review and approval by the City Engineer to ensure compliance with City standards and best practices for design and ongoing maintenance.</u> | - | - | City Engineer | Prior to trench permit for roadway construction | | |
| 25 | All site plan review SPSR-A submissions shall include profiles of the proposed sewer system. Applicant must ensure that there are no conflicts with other proposed utilities. | - | - | City Engineer | Addressed with each SPSR-A | | |
| 26 | Applicant shall submit details of proposed pipe materials for review and approval during each site plan review SPSR-A process. | - | - | City Engineer | Addressed with each SPSR-A | | |
| 27 | Applicant shall make every effort to comply with DEP requirement that states "whenever possible" a minimum horizontal distance of ten feet shall be maintained between sewer lines and water mains. Exceptions are usually only allowed when there are conflicts with existing utilities or existing structures that would prevent obtaining the proper separation. | - | - | City Engineer | Prior to trench permit for roadway construction | | |

| # | Condition | Completed Since 2006 | No Longer Relevant | To Be Evaluated By: | Timeframe for Compliance | Verified (initial) | Notes |
|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|-----------------------|--|
| 28 | Applicant shall evaluate the impact the proposed project flows will have on the MWRA interceptor and the upstream and downstream municipal sewer system. | X | - | - | - | | This has been addressed with approval of the sewer connection permit for Assembly Square Drive in September 2009 |
| E. Stormwater Management System | | | | | | | |
| 29 | <u>Design and construction phasing of the stormwater management system shall be subject to review and approval by the City Engineer to ensure compliance with City standards and best practices for design and ongoing maintenance.</u> | - | - | City Engineer | Prior to trench permit for roadway construction | | |
| 30 | Applicant shall provide additional information to the Planning Board to verify the adequacy of the existing MWRA 84-inch Somerville Marginal Conduit | X | - | - | - | | New outfall will provide relief to the Marginal Conduit. IKEA is allowed a temporary connection to the Conduit, but otherwise the project will not impact the Conduit. |
| | Applicant shall further investigate the alternative drainage design identified in the PUD application. | - | X | - | - | | |
| 31 | Applicant shall provide the Planning Board with a status report on the receipt of necessary permits from MWRA. | - | - | Planning Director | Continuous | | |
| 32 | Applicant shall provide a more detailed analysis of the site hydrology for existing and proposed conditions during the 2-, 10-, and 100-year storm events. | X | - | - | - | | Addressed in MEPA DEIR and Con. Comm. Review |
| 33 | Applicant shall meet with DCR and obtain any and all necessary permits from DCR. Applicant shall furnish the Planning Board with copies of these permits. | - | - | Planning Director | Continuous | | |
| 34 | Applicant shall supply the Planning Board with copies of all test pit logs and locations for review. Applicant shall furnish health and safety requirements for utility workers for all roadways to be constructed on private property and subsequently dedicated as public ways. | - | - | Planning Director | Prior to dedication of public ways | | |
| 35 | Applicant shall provide a detailed series of Best Management Practices (BMP's) to demonstrate a total suspended solids (TSS) removal rate of at least 80 percent. Plans shall include locations of all proposed BMP's. | X | - | - | - | | BMP Plan approved by Conservation Commission |
| 36 | Applicant shall provide a detailed <u>soil erosion control plan prior to construction of roadways and/or utilities, set of plans identifying items such as sequence of construction, limits of phasing, and placement/type of erosion control measures.</u> <u>Soil erosion plans shall also be required with each SPSR-A application.</u> | - | - | City Engineer / Con. Comm. where applicable | Prior to trench permit for roadway construction and/or SPSR-A | | |

| # | Condition | Completed Since 2006 | No Longer Relevant | To Be Evaluated By: | Timeframe for Compliance | Verified (initial) | Notes |
|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|-----------------------|---|
| | Applicant shall submit a stormwater maintenance program to the Planning Board. The maintenance program shall address the frequency of inspection/cleaning of the proposed water quality units. The plan shall also identify the stormwater management system owner and parties responsible for operation and maintenance of the stormwater facilities. | - | X | - | - | | Conservation Commission has approved a stormwater maintenance plan. Additional Conservation Commission action may be required for development as it proceeds. Planning Board review not required. |
| 37 | Applicant shall submit a soil management to the Planning Board in order to determine if soil conditions will allow for the inclusion of low impact design elements including, but not limited to, bio swales. | - | X | - | - | | DEP will not allow infiltration into existing soils on the site. LID elements have been incorporated where feasible. |
| 38 | <u>Activities within the jurisdiction of the Somerville Conservation Commission shall be conducted subject to applicable requirements of the Commission.</u> | - | - | Con. Comm. | Continuous | | |
| 39 | <u>The applicant shall commit to providing low impact development stormwater management elements in the G Street open space, to be designed with the review and approval of the City Engineer for consistency with best practices for stormwater management.</u> | - | - | Planning Director / City Engineer | Prior to trench permit for roadway construction | | |
| F. Urban Design and Design Guidelines | | | | | | | |
| | All site plan review submittals for each building/phase shall be accompanied by an update of the overall master plan with the following level of information: a) Consistent dimensions between all plans and between sections and plans. b) Street sections with dimensions that indicate travel lanes, parking lanes, bicycle lanes, planting strips, sidewalks, and building edges, among other elements. c) Circulation that clearly shows the operations of all streets on site and surrounding context, showing Existing and proposed traffic signals; Direction of vehicular traffic on street lanes and at parking garage access points; Ikea operations for parking and drop off/pick up for trucks, home delivery, and customers; Operations at all ingress and egress points, including the circulation along the major routes that provide access to the site; Bicycle routes and connections to regional systems; Pedestrian routes and crosswalks and connections to surrounding neighborhoods; d) Proposed building entrances or other indication of primary facades. e) Phased plan of infrastructure improvements tied to building development. | - | X | - | - | - | This condition is replaced with information covered elsewhere in the PMP and this decision. |
| 40 | Applicant shall review with the Fire Chief and the City the geometry of IKEA Way, including its intersection with Assembly Square Drive and Main Street (F Street). | X | - | - | - | | |
| 41 | Applicant shall reconsider the design of Main Street at the back corner of the Ikea loading area in order to create a more positive architectural character at this key corner. | X | - | - | - | | |

| # | Condition | Completed Since 2006 | No Longer Relevant | To Be Evaluated By: | Timeframe for Compliance | Verified (initial) | Notes |
|----|---|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--|--------------------|--|
| 42 | Applicant shall study integrating the T-Station into the site plan and creating visibility for the presence of the T-Station at the terminus of E Street/Foley Street and a plaza and arrival sequence that connects more directly to the Assembly Square Park on Main Street. Maximizing T-Station visibility shall be a factor in considering applicable site plan proposals. | X | - | - | - | | |
| 43 | At each Prior to any SPSR-A Site Plan Review Special Permit submission that involves the use of current DCR land the Applicant shall submit confirmation of legal control of this land the acquisition of the DCR land in the northeast corner of the proposed project or shall reconfigure the development for such phase consistent with <u>within</u> the requirements of the Master Plan and the applicable regulations of the SZO. | - | - | Planning Director | Prior to SPSR-A submission | | |
| | At each Site Plan Review Special Permit submission, the Applicant will consider massing the buildings to create more consistent street corridors with similar heights on both sides of the street, using street walls and step backs where necessary, especially on E (Foley) Street and where buildings exceed six to eight stories. | - | X | - | - | | This information is now covered in the design guidelines provided as a part of the PMP |
| 44 | As part of the Phase 1AA submission, the Applicant shall provide a plan for the pedestrian crossings for the entire project. | X | - | - | - | | |
| 45 | The Applicant shall design and make improvements to the following pedestrian crossings: Ten Hills neighborhood during Phase 1A; Lombardi Drive during Phase 1AA submission; Kensington Avenue during Phase 1AA submission | X | - | - | - | | This condition is complete |
| 46 | The Applicant shall provide funds for design and up to \$1 million in funds for construction of <u>the pedestrian crossing from Assembly Square to the Ten Hills neighborhood.</u> | - | - | Planning Director | Prior to CO for first SPSR-A in mixed-use area | | 25% design is complete |
| 47 | As part of each site plan review submittal, the Applicant shall provide the following information: Calculations showing that the percentage of open space and usable open space meets the zoning requirement for a PUD-A within the ASMD; Confirmation that the setbacks from the Mystic River to the closest buildings are at least 150 feet. | - | - | Planning Director | Addressed with each SPSR-A application | | |
| 48 | At time of submittal of development on Block 1, Block 2, and the Main Street Mall, the Applicant shall submit confirmation that the setbacks from the Mystic River to the closest buildings are at least 150 feet except for the underground parking on Block 2 that has received a waiver to be closer than 150 feet. | - | - | Planning Director | Addressed with each SPSR-A application | | |
| | The applicant shall include illustration on the drawings of the required continuous pedestrian, bicycle, vehicular and Urban Ring connections that need to be made to the destinations enumerated in the ASD Plans as defined in 6.4.2 of the SZO, including: a) Clarification of the pathways and sidewalk systems with notes, dimensions and legends; | - | X | - | - | | Addressed elsewhere in PMP |
| | b) Illustration of how the particular phases affect the accessibility and visibility of the proposed Assembly Square T-Station; | - | X | - | - | | Addressed elsewhere in PMP |
| | c) Confirmation that the zoning requirements related to the minimum shadow cast by buildings onto open space between March 21st and September 21st are met; | - | X | - | - | | Addressed elsewhere in PMP |

| # | Condition | Completed Since 2006 | No Longer Relevant | To Be Evaluated By: | Timeframe for Compliance | Verified (initial) | Notes |
|----|---|----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| 49 | d) Applicant shall ensure that the sunlight conditions shown on the plans are adequate for the tree species proposed within the public right of ways if trees are to be maintained by the City. enumerated in Unifying Design Guidelines for the Public Realm – Assembly Square; | - | - | City Engineer | Prior to trench permit for roadway construction | | |
| | e) Applicant shall provide illustration and notation on the drawings that all shade trees and shrubs required by zoning are shown in all parking lots; | - | X | - | - | | Addressed elsewhere in PMP |
| 50 | f) Applicant shall make reasonable efforts to employ smart growth techniques in overall development, including but not limited to: Low Impact Development for Stormwater Management, bioswales, recycling and sustainable green technologies, and LEED; | - | - | City Engineer | Prior to trench permit for roadway construction or Building Permit, whichever is applicable | | |
| 51 | <p>g) Applicant shall be responsible for all design, construction, maintenance and repair of all roadways, streetscape including street lighting and other street furniture furnishings, and parks and open space which are part of the PUD. Applicant shall be responsible for the design and construction of water, sewer, and storm drainage systems serving the PUD. Applicant shall be responsible for the usage costs of electricity, gas, water, cable and other utilities furnished to the PUD, and for trash removal. The City shall be responsible for the maintenance and repair of water, sewer, and storm water conduits, and traffic signals on public ways.</p> <p>The City shall also be responsible for snowplowing and street cleaning, including the cleaning of catch basins, except that the City shall not be responsible for <u>LID tree boxes, catch basins associated with Smart Sponge Technology, or equivalent technology, unless and until the City has the equipment to clean such “Smart Technology” catch basins.</u>—The Applicant shall be responsible for designing, constructing, maintaining, and repairing similar “Smart Technology” required by MEPA. All utilities shall be designed and installed in accordance with the City of Somerville’s standards and specifications.</p> <p><u>If the maintenance agreement includes provisions that are inconsistent with this condition the maintenance agreement shall supercede this condition.</u></p> | - | - | Planning Director / City Engineer | Prior to trench permit for roadway construction | | |
| 52 | Applicant shall provide details of the pedestrian connection from Assembly Square to Draw 7 Park under the railroad bridge. | - | - | Planning Director | Prior to trench permit for roadway construction in A Street | | |

| # | Condition | Completed Since 2006 | No Longer Relevant | To Be Evaluated By: | Timeframe for Compliance | Verified (initial) | Notes |
|----|---|----------------------|--------------------|--|---|--------------------|------------------------------------|
| 53 | Applicant shall include a landscape buffer between the tracks and the proposed development along the G Street multi-use path that leads to the T-Station. | - | - | Planning Director | Prior to CO for Block 2, 4 or 6, whichever is first | | |
| 54 | Applicant shall show the <u>future potential</u> pedestrian connection from the proposed Assembly Square T Station to Draw 7 Park. The design of the project <u>and T Station</u> shall not preclude the ability for the future design and construction of this a direct pedestrian connection <u>from the Station into the park</u> . (The Applicant is not expected to construct the pedestrian connection, but merely to show it in the plans in the event that enough federal and state monies are available to construct such a connection as part of the T station). | - | - | Planning Director | Prior to trench permit for roadway construction | | |
| 55 | Applicant shall clarify the "Kiss and Ride" drop off and the associated walkways. Applicant shall plan for drop-off location and taxi stand for the MBTA station as a part of roadway design. | - | - | Planning Director / City Engineer / T&P Director | Prior to trench permit for roadway construction | | |
| | Prior to Phase 1A, Applicant shall review the bus drop off and pickup area and modify as needed. Urban Ring bus drop off and pickup is not provided at the Assembly Square T Station along G Street. It appears that dropping off passengers will block the street in its current configuration. | - | X | - | - | | |
| 56 | Applicant will consider plans to link the Mystic River Park clearly to the surrounding street circulation for bicyclists and pedestrians to the T Station prior to Phase 1A. | X | - | - | - | | addressed during IKEA permit |
| 57 | Applicant shall provide additional details to better define the "series of pocket parks" described in the PUD submission. | X | - | - | - | | |
| 58 | Applicant shall depict the locations <u>and design</u> of handicapped accessible curb ramps <u>for review and approval by the City Engineer</u> . | - | - | City Engineer | Prior to trench permit for roadway construction | | |
| | Applicant shall submit detailed landscaping plans that conform to the City's guidelines. The guideline state that streets should be tree lined. Street trees are set back as much as 55 feet from the intersection edge of curbing along Main Street. No trees are shown in the bumpouts at intersections. | - | - | - | - | | Superseded by conditions #4 and #5 |
| 59 | Applicant shall continue to work with the City on the design of the proposed median on Assembly Square Drive in order to maximize the amount of useable open space. | X | - | - | - | | |
| 60 | <u>The applicant shall provide a design guideline for all signage within the PUD area for review by the DRC and approval by the Planning Board.</u> | - | - | Planning Director | Prior to SPSR-A for first development in Mixed-Use area | | |

| # | Condition | Completed Since 2006 | No Longer Relevant | To Be Evaluated By: | Timeframe for Compliance | Verified (initial) | Notes |
|-------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------|-------|
| 61 | <u>The relocation or reconfiguration of temporary boat storage shall require SPSR-A.</u> | - | - | Planning Director | Continuous | | |
| 62 | <u>The applicant shall use reasonable efforts to secure LEED-ND approval for the project.</u> | - | - | Planning Director | Prior to CO for first development in Mixed-Use area | | |
| G. Trash and Recycling | | | | | | | |
| 63 | <u>Each individual building or block must provide interior disposal and storage systems for trash and recycling. These systems must be detailed in the SPSR-A applications</u> | - | - | Planning Director / DPW | Addressed with each SPSR-A application | | |
| H. Maintenance of Facilities | | | | | | | |
| 64 | <u>All City of Somerville traffic control equipment and roadway elements must meet City of Somerville specifications and standards unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer and are maintained by the Applicant under the maintenance agreement.</u> | - | - | City Engineer | Continuous | | |
| 65 | <u>Applicant shall provide street lights that meet City standards on all public streets where lights are to be maintained by the City.</u> | - | - | City Engineer / DPW | Continuous | | |
| I. SPSR-A Reviews | | | | | | | |
| 66 | <u>SPSR-A applications under the PMP shall include information required to ensure compliance with this PMP decision, including but not limited to information noted as required in the findings (Appendix A, B, C and D)</u> | - | - | Planning Director | Addressed with each SPSR-A application | | |
| 67 | <u>The applicant has identified in the zoning analysis for Section 6.4.7B the process by which the design guidelines may be used to review SPSR-A applications. The applicant, or successors and assigns, shall submit proposals for SPSR-A that are consistent with these design guidelines. The SPSR-A application shall identify any deviation between the guidelines and the submission and explain the need for these differences. The DRC and Planning Board will determine if the proposed solution is within the spirit of the guidelines. If not, an amendment to the PMP may be required. All SPSR-A submissions shall meet or exceed the minimum acceptable standard of quality identified in the design guidelines.</u> | - | - | Planning Director | Addressed with each SPSR-A application | | |
| 68 | <u>Interim parking facilities shall require SPSR-A approval from the Planning Board.</u> | - | - | Planning Director | Addressed with each SPSR-A application | | |
| 69 | <u>The building on Block 10 shall be reviewed under SPSR-A for consistency with all findings, including a full design review by the DRC. It shall be limited to 35 feet in height and used for retail or restaurant purposes only.</u> | - | - | Planning Director | Addressed with SPSR-A application for block 10 | | |

| # | Condition | Completed Since 2006 | No Longer Relevant | To Be Evaluated By: | Timeframe for Compliance | Verified (initial) | Notes |
|---|--|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|-----------------------|-------|
| J. Linkage and Inclusionary Zoning | | | | | | | |
| 70 | The applicant shall meet the obligations required by Article 13 and Article 15 of the SZO. | - | - | Planning Director / Housing Director | Addressed with each SPSR-A application | | |