

**Marion V. McEttrick**

Attorney at Law  
10 Crown Street  
Milton, MA 02186  
617-696-5569  
Fax 617-696-0552  
Cell 781-308-7912  
[mmcettrick@gmail.com](mailto:mmcettrick@gmail.com)

October 22, 2021

Milton Planning Board  
525 Canton Avenue  
Milton, MA 02186

RE: Updated Information for Site Plan Application, 193 Central Avenue, for Hearing Oct. 28, 2021

Dear Members of the Planning Board:

To respond to questions and requests made at the prior hearing and the site walk on Saturday, October 16, 2021, I have enclosed the following documents:

1. A memo from the Project Manager, Jon Tilton, describing changes shown on an updated Site Plan
2. Updated 193 Central Avenue Site Plan
3. Plan showing turning widths and direction of travel for public safety vehicles
4. Rendering of protective stonewall on Columbine Road side with dimensions

In addition, these are responses to additional questions the applicant has received.

1. The fence on the right side next to the old stone wall has been changed to a dark mesh/vinyl fence, not the white privacy fence, so that it will blend in with the existing wood fence and the old stone wall. The additional short retaining wall lengths shown on that side on the plan are located there because when work began last year, the engineer became concerned that the old stone wall was not well supported. These are to shore up and maintain the old existing wall.
2. The lighting consultant is working on whether there is a way to reduce the level of illumination in the parking area without adding more light poles. Any changes will be provided before the next hearing.

3. The heating system for this building will be gas, which is currently less expensive than an all-electric system.
4. The shingles on this building are “fiber cement shake”. This is a new type of superior quality shingle that looks very much like wood but is much more durable. The trim is similarly durable material.
5. After reviewing with the architect, the applicant would like to keep the stone facing in the front middle of the building. The Hoosic building had a lot of stone on parts of the building and this was designed in to be somewhat similar. It will be carefully maintained.
6. After discussing with the architect, the applicant will not add shutters, which are more suitable to a different type of architecture and typically installed on traditional/colonial homes with single windows. There were no shutters on the Hoosic Building.
7. Windows are to be an “Anderson Type” composite windows which will be required to be very energy efficient to comply with state building code and Milton’s requirements
8. Privacy fence along rear lot line: we discussed this with Bill Atwood at the site walk; his request is that it be elevated, if possible, on the top of the retaining wall. It turns out that this is exactly where it is on the site plan and the retaining wall is on the applicant’s property.
9. Adding water loving trees to left rear corner: River Birch trees which like an ample supply of water have been added just outside the privacy fence at that corner, as shown on the updated plan.
10. The applicant has provided hourly trip projections for this school on a typical day. These are based upon actual trips at four other Goddard Schools, similar in size and operation to the one proposed for this site. Unlike public schools, Goddard school parents drop off and pick up children at different times; some children are registered for only a half day and the scheduling for families may change at different times of the year. These trip generation tables show that traffic is distributed during a three-hour period at the beginning and end of the day and are superior to the standard tables used by traffic consultants, to predict trip impact from a use.

The access to the school has been designed to meet public safety requirements, and to minimize impact from car headlights in the late afternoon in the winter on the Russell residence across the street. The condition imposed on this site plan approval last year, that these projections will be reviewed after the operator provides actual trip numbers six months after the school opens, for comparison, is still in effect. At that

time the school will work with the Town to determine if any adjustments in this access design are necessary

In addition to the changes addressed in the site plan, these are the applicant's responses to the remaining questions that were asked at the prior hearing and at the site walk.

The applicant respectfully requests that the Planning Board approve an amendment to the site plan approved in July, 2020, based on the updated site plan and information provided for the hearing on October 28, 2021.

It is very important the contractor be able to begin work on this site and building as soon as possible this fall, after the catastrophic fire, which caused a year's delay and a substantial financial loss for the applicant.

Sincerely,

*Marion V. McEttrick*

Marion V. McEttrick