CUBE3 STUDIO

architecture ▫ interiors ▫ planning

5 August 2016

Chris Claussen
Sudbury Station LLC
2134 Sevilla Way
Naples, FL 34109

RE: Village at Sudbury Station 40B Development
Peer Review Report – CUBE3 Response

Dear Chris:

The following is CUBE3's written response to the Davis Square Architects Peer Review letter dated June 18, 2016 for the proposed Sudbury Station project. Note that the responses in this document are generally focused on the David Square architectural comments. A separate response will be made by Cecil Group, the Master Planner for the Sudbury Station project, on the site-focused comments. Also note that the response herein is limited to the original 250-unit proposal, and does not respond to any subsequent proposed alternative designs mentioned in the Peer Review.

General

The Sudbury Station project is comprised of a series of Townhomes, and of three- and four-story double-loaded corridor residential buildings comprising a total of 250 units. There are several support buildings for utilities and maintenance, and a 2-story Clubhouse building that serves as the gateway structure to the project. The parking is a mix of basement parking and surface parking.

It is worth noting that the project buildings are larger than a typical Sudbury residential building. Many of the comments appear to be trying to hold the project to a standard and scale that is simply unachievable in the proposed project. The desire to turn this project into a 18th or 19th century-scale village, with much lower density of buildings and commensurate parking is simply unrealistic for the times we live in, and location of the site and the economics of the 21st century.

Building Design

We respectfully disagree with the Davis Square Architects' characterization of the residential buildings as "box buildings". There are many examples of residential projects where the exterior walls are flat and unbroken for hundreds of feet, with a wallpaper of repetitive windows, literally a flat box. The proposed Sudbury project architecture is far from a "box building." The building exterior walls are articulated such that every time there is a change in room use within the building – from a living room to a bedroom, or between units, for example - the exterior walls change in plane in or out by several feet. Also, when these changes occur, there is often a change of material and/or a color change as well. This helps break down the scale of the building, create shadows and visual interest and creates a more pedestrian-friendly project. For example, a review of the three-story elevation below shows a building that is approximately 210 feet long. Along that elevation, the exterior wall changes planes a total of seventeen times – hardly a box.

Sudbury Station proposed three-story building elevation showing articulated exterior walls.

The addition of dozens of exterior balconies, including patios at grade-level, will further help activate the street and enhance the pedestrian experience of the project. We agree that additional articulation of the footprints will enhance the project and will review the comment of increasing the number of entries to the building as the plans are developed beyond the conceptual level.

We strongly disagree with the Davis Square Architects' recommendation to eliminate the sloped roofs from the project and create a flat-roofed building. We feel flat-roofed buildings would make the project more urban than desired at this location and would disconnect the project from the residential architecture of Sudbury. While technically true that the overall height of the buildings would be lower with a flat-roofed architecture, we feel the sloped roof approach creates design opportunities to break the roof line, add a variety of dormers and use different roof forms, such as gables, hip roofs and tower elements to create an architectural expression that is tied to the articulated walls below and will be far more varied and interesting than a flat roof building with a strong horizontal cornice line.

A general note about massing. While we feel the buildings are well-articulated, there is a limit to the overall shape and dimensions of the building that is driven by the dimensional requirements of the basement parking garage below. There is far greater freedom to make major massing changes to three and four-story buildings when they are slab-on-grade type buildings vs. basement parking.

<u>Housekeeping Items</u>

- Group 2 Units will be located once the project moves towards construction drawings in accordance with the c.40B regulations.. As required by MA law, these accessible units will represent 5% of all units and will be spread geographically around the site and proportional to the unit types.
- All three and four-story buildings will have elevators serving each floor and the basement parking level below, making every non-Townhouse unit in the project a Group 1, accessible unit.

Conclusion

We appreciate the opportunity to respond to the Davis Square review. We would welcome constructive comments from the Zoning Board of Appeals, which to date seems to have largely declined to give any constructive comment other that that the project and its buildings are “too big”, without specifying what changes might make it more acceptable. Should we receive any specific guidance in that regard, we will be happy to work with you to recommend further refinements to the design.

We believe that the project as proposed is attractive, safe, and will represent when constructed an amenity to Sudbury. It will provide the opportunity to many families to reside in this desirable community who would otherwise, and in the absence of the 40B process, be unable to do so.

If you have any questions about this memo, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Doug Carr
Principal, CUBE3 Studio