



August 25, 2016

Amended September 19, 2016

Lakeland Farms
Townhouse Community
Comprehensive Permit Submission Evaluation
Submission Dated April 19, 2016
Attention: William McGrath
Beta Group Incorporated

We have reviewed the above submission and offer the following comments. In general, we do not feel that this development represents the quality of housing consistent with this community.

In particular:

1 COVER

The image on the cover of the single family suburban residential structure is a handsome home that would be appropriate for this setting. However, the proposed units do not reflect this image and do not include many of the key elements that make this example structure appealing and appropriate to the community.

2 WAIVER 5.2.1.1

While a narrower roadway cross section for this development may be appropriate, sidewalks on both sides of a street are a key element for safe, pedestrian friendly developments.

3 WAIVER 5.12

The design's lack of street lighting, coupled with the lack of sidewalks makes this plan dangerous for pedestrians. Additionally, in spite of structure-mounted lighting, the proposed street trees will result in poor lighting distribution and potentially encourage vandalism and break-ins.

4 PARKING

The design of the site plan and structures interface with automobiles results in two major problems.

- a. Very wide curb cuts make the area potentially unsafe for pedestrians and children on bicycles.
- b. Unlike the image presented, the entire street elevation of this development consists of garage doors and driveways, not front doors and lawns with limited curb cuts.

5 UNIT DESIGN

As stated previously, the proposed units do not represent good design practices for suburban residential neighborhoods.

- a. The elevation identified as “Front Elevation” is not the street elevation. The “Rear Elevation” is the street elevation and represents the view of the neighborhood.
- b. The only major street elevation element are garage doors and parked cars.
- c. While some units have side entries and side yard walkways, most do not. The only way to enter a unit is through the garage. Guest must walk down the street (as there are no sidewalks) to the limited access points to the green and then walk a significant distance to the unit “front” entrance. This is especially inappropriate given the local climate and seasons.

6 INCOMPLETE STRUCTURE DRAWINGS

The presented plans do not identify materials or structure heights. Additionally, there are inconsistencies between proposed elevations and proposed plans. For example, stairs and decks are not accurately shown on the unit or site plans.

7 SITE PLAN

The site plan does not accurately reflect access, grade changes, and stairways. It also appears that several side entrances do not have access to walkways. There does not appear to be a connection from the road to the side entrance at Brown units.

8 SITE PLAN

The site plan does not address safe movement for handicap individuals.

9 TRASH

How is trash collection addressed?

Memo continued after September 15, 2016 workshop meeting.

10

The palette of finish materials presented seems appropriate to the setting. My major concern regarding the materials, is the amount of exposed concrete and prominence of the garage doors.

11

The lack of sidewalks along the road and the long distance between access points to the green creates an unfriendly pedestrian environment. Guests and residents must enter through garages or walk down the road to access the green and walkways to unit entries. This situation is potentially dangerous for strollers, elderly, and mobility limited individuals.

12

The character of the street elevations predominated by asphalt and garage doors with the absence of entrances is out of character with the community.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Glen S. Fontecchio". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Glen S. Fontecchio, Architect