



Ruthanne Fuller
Mayor

City of Newton, Massachusetts
Department of Planning and Development
Urban Design Commission

Telephone
(617) 796-1120
Telefax
(617) 796-1142
TDD/TTY
(617) 796-1089
www.newtonma.gov

Barney Heath
Director

DATE: March 17, 2021
TO: Urban Design Commission
FROM: Subcommittee for Northland Design Consistency Review
RE: Northland Design Consistency

At its regularly scheduled meeting on October 14, 2020, Urban Design Commission (the “UDC”) appointed a **Subcommittee for Northland Design Consistency Review (the “Subcommittee”)**. The Subcommittee met eight times from October 28, 2020 to February 18, 2021 to review the Northland submission. City’s peer review consultant, Utile (the “Consultant”) also joined the Subcommittee for all eight meetings. The Subcommittee reviewed the drawings and made the following comments and recommendations.

The Subcommittee reviewed the Plan Sets submitted from October 2020 to February 2021 and then at the request of staff, the applicant submitted 3 consolidated documents which are more particularly identified in Exhibit A:

- “Northland_DCR_Record_Guidelines-Templates_Combined_f”
- “Northland_DCR_Record_Presentation-Graphics_Combined_f”
- “Northland_DCR_Record_Technical-Submissions_Combined_f”

Overall Comments and Recommendations

The Subcommittee finds that, while there are some minor variations from the Special Permit, the project is consistent with Special Permit drawings and the Design Guidelines with the exceptions that follow:

- The applicant will need to return to Urban Design Commission for consistency review of several items that were either; a) not yet provided by the applicant for review, or, b) that were presented but deemed to require further design advancement prior to a consistency finding. The following items are included:
 1. Building 2: Needham Street façade, roof, and service access / treatment
 2. Kiosk
 3. Building / site lighting
 4. Comprehensive sign package and retail storefront guidelines

The Subcommittee is very pleased with the evolution of the overall project design and the level of information and cooperation provided by the applicant. During the course of the eight meetings, the Subcommittee and the Consultant made design suggestions. Those comments are captured in the memo below.

Site Design and Open Space

Site Design and Open Space were reviewed at the November 4, 2020 and February 18, 2021 Subcommittee meeting. **The Subcommittee observed that there are some variations as compared to the Special Permit drawings but concluded that the Site Design and Open Spaces are consistent with the Special Permit and the Design Guidelines.**

Overall, the Subcommittee found that the site and open space designs are of very high quality and the project had significantly improved as compared to the special permit drawings.

Although the Subcommittee agreed that the Open Space design is consistent with the Design Guidelines, they would like the applicant to consider the following **design recommendations** as the design moves forward:

Site Design:

- There are very few crosswalks on Main Street. Consider adding more to connect lobbies that are across from each other. Also consider a raised crosswalk and the extension of the Laneway paving (between buildings 6A and 6B) to address the pedestrian desire line between the fitness center and the Laneway.

Open Space:

- The project has elements of continuity and it would also be good to provide appropriate variations in landscape areas around the project as well.
 - **Furniture:** ensure there are some comfortable seats with contoured backs and arm rests, particularly around the Village Green.
 - **Mobility Hub:** ensure safety around the transformer and make it less obtrusive.
 - **Laneway:** ensure safety of pedestrians in the Laneway by delineating space for pedestrians with the help of furnishings, plantings, and pavers.

Building Design

Building 2

Building 2 was reviewed at the December 2, 2020 Subcommittee meeting. **The Subcommittee is not able to find Building 2 consistent with the special permit drawings and the design guidelines, specifically identifying the Needham Street elevation, service entry from Main Street, and rooftop equipment and screening.** The applicant indicated that they will come back to UDC after they have a tenant that can help inform design decisions. At that point, the applicant plans to specifically address the Subcommittee's concerns.

The Subcommittee had the following comments about the building:

- Site grading and elevation changes are well thought through.
- The roof will be very visible from several vantage points. It will have a certain amount of equipment on the roof which is currently not shown in the schematic drawings. The

applicant responded that there will be some HVAC equipment on the roof, but the details need to be worked out and they will be screened from the street if needed.

- There are significant changes in the Needham Street elevation as compared to the Special Permit drawings. The Needham Street elevation in the special permit drawings, is presented as mostly a transparent glass wall, where in the schematic design submission two areas in the middle are solid all the way to the ceiling. Contributing to this was the floorplan that had back of house / service areas on the Needham Street building wall.
- Curbside building service on Main Street needs further evaluation / refinement.

Building 3

Building 3 was reviewed at the November 12, 2020 and February 18, 2021 Subcommittee meetings. **The Subcommittee observed there are some variations as compared to the special permit drawings but concluded that Building 3 is consistent with the Special Permit and Design Guidelines.**

The Subcommittee had the following comments about building 3:

Elevations:

- The Subcommittee appreciates the upgrade in materials (from fiber cement to masonry) for this building. It fits well with the materials expressed in the design guidelines.
- The Subcommittee appreciates the expansion of glass on the north face of this building, it will be an enhancement for the building.
- The vertical shadow elements on North elevation facing Main Street make a better street edge than the horizontal expression as previously shown. From massing and elevation standpoint, it is a better elevation and compliant with the Design Guidelines.
- Windows on the West elevation have changed as compared to the special permit drawings, the windows are now emphasized more on the corners and the Subcommittee supported the change.

Service Entrances:

- The Consultant commented that the contrast between the broken-up volumes and scale of the Main Street with the industrial character on the south elevation is very nicely handled.

Although the Subcommittee agreed that Building 3 is consistent with the Design Guidelines, the Subcommittee would like the applicant to consider the following **design recommendations** as the design moves forward:

Service Areas:

- The Subcommittee had some concerns about all the service entrances next to each other (transformers, garage entrance, and loading dock). The Consultant made a recommendation about the residential garage entrance, if the residential garage door was glazed with a warmer color temperature can help garage lighting be a more positive contributor to the overall character of the public realm.
- It will also help to have variety for the three service entrances (transformer, garage door, and loading dock). If each of the three bays had a different rhythm, it will help to match some of the vision of the storefronts.

- There were questions about the transformer and if the screen can be treated. The applicant indicated that louvers are required but the applicant can put a demountable screen in front of those louvers. The Subcommittee commented that the applicant's approach of a perforated metal panel system as a general solution is appropriate.
- The applicant presented options for the transformer screen at February 18th meeting. Three ideas:
 - Option 1: Patterned perforated metal panels with painted mural
 - Option 2: Custom fabricated layered/textured perforated panels
 - Option 3: Custom fabricated art with potential inclusion of historical relics
- The Subcommittee had the following comments about the screen options presented at the February 18th meeting:
 - Provide movable planters and outdoor seating in front of the transformer screen and the restaurant at the corner to downplay the screen behind.
 - Some members of the Subcommittee commented that the screen option shown without a graphic is preferred because it is the simplest and least intrusive and will draw the least amount of attention to it. It was also noted that the green graphic may not look appropriate in the middle of winter since there won't be much other green around.
 - Some of the Subcommittee members recommended matching the color of the screen to the rest of the façade so it fades in the background.
 - Some of the Subcommittee members liked the idea of an artwork on the screen way but prefer a theme that references the history of the site or Newton.
 - The Consultant commented that an art treatment based on an intentional narrative could be successful with the right artist, since the screen wall is in a prominent location and has the right scale from an urban design perspective. In addition, the Consultant thought that each of rectangles in the composition of Option 3 could tell a different story.

Roof Layout:

- Centralize the mechanical equipment as much as possible and contain those within a screen and insulate so the noise is also contained within the screen as much as possible.
- Pay attention to the plumbing vents through the roof and their locations, to make sure they are minimally visible.

Building 4

Building 4 was reviewed at the February 3, 2021 Subcommittee meeting. **The Subcommittee observed there are some variations as compared to the special permit drawings but concluded that Building 4 is consistent with the Special Permit and Design Guidelines.**

Building 4 is the longest building on the site; as a result, the design team made several positive modifications to the original proposal to better relate the building to its neighbors.

The Subcommittee had the following comments about building 4:

Floor Plans:

- The Subcommittee supported the change of use from retail to residential on the ground floor facing Carden Lane and found it is consistent with the Design Guidelines.

Streetscape:

- The addition of planters in front of the units of Carden Lane is a positive addition. The Subcommittee recommended a similar approach for other buildings along Carden Lane.

Although the Subcommittee agreed that Building 4 is consistent with the Design Guidelines, they would like the applicant to consider the following **design recommendations** as the design moves forward:

Elevations

- The south facing elevation facing Oak Street looks stark and blank on the ground level as compared to the floors above. The ground floor could use some articulation. The Consultant recommended that the south façade could have mounted trellises along the whole façade with a vine pocket, it will help to treat it as a green wall (since it is a south facing façade). The Consultant also recommended making the bike parking area visible through a glass wall instead of being tucked in, make it look like a shop window.

Service areas

- The Consultant recommended a change to the landscape typology of the parking and service space on the south side of Building 4, while retaining its functionality. Currently, it looks like a conventional suburban parking lot and surface area. Instead, it should be treated like the Laneway or a plaza, while it still accommodates the turning radii of service vehicles. Parking spaces should be indicated through a change of materials and other design devices. In addition, paved areas not necessary for vehicular movement should be changed to planted areas.

Building 5

Building 5 was reviewed at the December 9, 2020 Subcommittee meeting. **The Subcommittee observed there are some variations as compared to the special permit drawings but concluded that Building 5 is consistent with the Special Permit and Design Guidelines.**

The Subcommittee commented that the design of Building 5 has evolved nicely since the special permit set, including improvement to the corners of the building and an overall level of design refinement.

The Subcommittee had the following comments about building 5:

Floor Plans:

- The new location for the fitness center is a very good solution, it provides transparency to the street and a direct relationship to open space.

Elevation:

- The new balcony arrangements are an improvement over the special permit drawings. The balconies look very interesting, it's a good rhythm, they have been handled in a thoughtful and unique way.

Although the Subcommittee agreed that Building 5 is consistent with the Design Guidelines, the Subcommittee would like the applicant to consider the following **design recommendations** as the design moves forward:

Elevation:

- Some of the members commented about the strong, dark horizontal line in the middle portion of the building. It seems like the applicant is outlining, maybe to make it more prominent and maybe it doesn't need to be that strong because it is adding another color into the mix.

Transformer:

- The transformer should be treated in a similar way like the discussion for Building 6, in terms of screening.

Building 6a, 6b, and 6c

Buildings 6a, 6b, and 6c were reviewed at the December 2, 2020 and February 18, 2021 Subcommittee meetings. **The Subcommittee observed there are some variations as compared to the special permit drawings but concluded that Buildings 6a, 6b, and 6c are consistent with the Special Permit and Design Guidelines.**

The Subcommittee commented that the buildings have improved significantly as compared to the special permit drawings. The Subcommittee has the following comments:

North Façade for Building 6a:

- The north entrance to the building had an element that runs up the entire façade in the special permit drawings, and that doesn't exist in the schematic design drawings. The applicant commented that having a 7-story vertical element in what is really intended as a pedestrian scaled space felt out of scale and hence the applicant reorganized the façade. The Subcommittee commented that this is a good change and is consistent with the Design Guidelines. It will be important to have the glazing go all the way up so there is some natural light coming into the elevator lobby on every floor, which appears is the only natural light coming into the corridors.
- The Subcommittee raised some concerns and requested the applicant to relook at the north façade of building 6a facing the Laneway and the associated secondary entry to building 6a lobby.
- The applicant presented a revised design for the north façade and the secondary entrance at the February 18th meeting. The Subcommittee had the following comments:
 - The applicant presented a very good solution to the concerns that the Subcommittee had raised earlier, it is appropriate and a significant improvement.
 - Match the height of the screen to the transformer and choose a darker color for the transformer and to match the color of the transformer and the screen. The open nature of the screen is good, as it is not a 6-foot-tall solid wall.

Building 7

Building 7 was reviewed at the November 12, 2020 and December 2, 2020 Subcommittee meetings. **The Subcommittee observed there are some variations as compared to the special permit drawings but concluded that Building 7 is consistent with the Special Permit and Design Guidelines.**

The Subcommittee has the following comments:

Needham Street Elevation:

- There were some concerns raised at the November 12 meeting about lack of enough identity and presence for the Mobility Hub along Needham Street.
- The applicant presented a revised design of Mobility Hub entrance along Needham Street at the December 2 meeting.
 - It will be helpful to provide an opening in the planting area in front of the Mobility Hub, as an indicator of an entrance. It may even help to provide a few steps. The applicant responded that they are working with Mass DOT to check if it's possible to provide some steps.
 - The revised design is a significant improvement on Needham Street elevation.

Although the Subcommittee agreed that Building 7 is consistent with the Design Guidelines, the Subcommittee would like the applicant to consider the following **design recommendations** as the design moves forward:

Transformer:

- There was a concern raised about public safety around the transformer. A child may climb a 6 to 8 feet high transformer, if it is easily accessible. The applicant commented that Eversource has very specific requirements about how to mount transformers. The Subcommittee recommended to make it safer and less obtrusive.
- There was a suggestion about making something of the transformer or making a larger enclosure around it which could be a light feature or something similar, some planting around it may help as well.

Storefronts:

- It will be important to have a high degree of transparency for the storefronts. It will be important to show the key locations for a high degree of transparency in the retail storefront guidelines.

Building 8

Building 8 was reviewed at the February 3, 2021 Subcommittee meeting. **The Subcommittee observed there are some variations as compared to the special permit drawings but concluded that Building 8 is consistent with the Special Permit and Design Guidelines.**

The Subcommittee commented that Building 8 is both handsome and has visual interest because of the way that the angled metal plays off of the wooden box. The Subcommittee also commented that the architectural language of Building 8 complements Building 7. They also appreciated the way that the scale of the Needham Street façade had been broken down, so it looks like two buildings instead

of one. This was seen as a significant improvement from the special permit drawings. The way blocks float above the ground floor space is also nicely executed.

Although the Subcommittee agreed that Building 8 is consistent with the Design Guidelines, they would like the applicant to consider the following **design recommendations** as the design moves forward:

Elevations:

- Consider adding a few clear story windows in the north elevation, facing the adjacent building, to both introduce natural light in the corridors and add visual interest to the façade. The applicant commented that the adjacent existing building has windows only on top 2 floors, the bottom floors are all parking.
- The Consultant recommended placing the windows where there are bends in the corridor, and not opposite the unit entries, since views from the adjacent building might compromise the privacy of the residents. The addition of 2-3 windows at key locations would help with wayfinding and make a huge difference in the quality of the corridors.
- The Consultant recommends rethinking the color and the material palette of the north facing façade because it doesn't get direct natural light and it will always seem dark. This may be an issue of the adjacent parcel gets developed in the future.
- The balconies facing Needham Street could be treated differently, as compared to other balconies, by being recessed or pushed up against the darker tower portion of the building. The balconies are overlooking a very busy street and may not be an appropriate use for that elevation.

Building 9, 10, and 11

Buildings 9, 10, and 11 were reviewed at the January 20, 2021 Subcommittee meeting. **The Subcommittee observed there are some variations as compared to the special permit drawings but concluded that Buildings 9, 10, and 11 are consistent with the Special Permit and Design Guidelines.**

The Subcommittee commented that the buildings are an improvement over the special permit drawings, partly because the materials have a rich, warm, residential feeling. In addition, the revised designs do a better job complementing the character and scale of nearby buildings and the Greenway.

Although the Subcommittee agreed that Buildings 9, 10, and 11 are consistent with the Design Guidelines, they would like the applicant to consider the following **design recommendations** as the design moves forward:

Floor Plans:

- Based on changes with building code, the Subcommittee recommended to investigate having 1 stairwell instead of 2.
- Make the main stairway look like part of the corridor system. It will be good if it didn't look just like an egress stair.

Elevations:

- The Consultant commented that the new elevations give the buildings a rowhouse/townhouse rhythm. Typically, for townhouses, it is recommended to have a small planter at the front that separates back of sidewalk from the building face to get a public realm. It is best if that planter is on a slightly raised bed, 6 to 8 inches from the ground and

can be narrow, maybe around 3 feet. A little bit of that kind of buffer will be appropriate for the scale of these buildings. It may cause some dimensional challenges but something to investigate. The applicant commented that they are exploring moving the building a little closer to the Greenway to get enough space for planters in front of the building.

Landscape:

- Provide green space between the bike path and the buildings with privacy so residents can use it as recreational space.
- Provide year-round shrubbery for the space between the buildings and the Greenway.
- There were questions about connectivity from the Greenway to Northland site. The applicant clarified there will be 5 points of clear connection at the following locations (listed from south to north):
 - Diagonal path running through community playground (splash park)
 - In alignment with Main Street, this one being the biggest and main connectivity to the Greenway and to the heart of the project along Main Street to the Village Green
 - South of building 11
 - North of building 9 (extension of Mechanic Street)
 - Curved point of Lattice Road
- A cross section drawing across the Greenway will be helpful.

Service areas:

- The location of the transformer (between buildings 9 and 10 & buildings 10 and 11) doesn't look appropriate in the middle of green space like they are a feature in the landscape to be observed. It was recommended to move the transformer to the side so the green space can be more functional.
- A question was raised if one transformer can serve all three buildings. The applicant responded that part of the challenge is if they are combined, then the transformers get a lot bigger. The transformer for building 11 is serving the splash park too. The applicant also commented that in their opinion it is best to make them smaller and disperse them and utility company likes them this way too in this kind of condition.

Councilor Crossley also attended the meeting regarding buildings 9, 10, and 11 and had the following comments:

- Councilor commented that the applicant has done a great job of taking simple special permit drawings to very handsome buildings. It will be helpful to go back to the Land Use Committee and show them the evolution of the buildings.
- Councilor commented that it will be interesting to see the landscape plan in more detail showing the area between the Greenway and the buildings. There are some trees that should be saved and there is a lot of junk in that space that will need to be removed. Councilor also asked the applicant if and how they are were planning to mark the line between the Greenway and the property. The applicant commented they don't want to delineate a line and they are working with Parks and Recreation regarding this space since its under their purview.
- Councilor asked if the transformer is just a big metal box, can it be incorporated in a useful outdoor structure. It will be good to place it in a way so it's not a feature in the landscape.

Councilor also suggested to the applicant to investigate an outdoor shelter or a trellis or benches around it so it's less conspicuous. The applicant commented that they need to maintain clearance around the transformer but will check with Eversource regarding what can be done around them.

Building 12

Building 12 was reviewed at the December 9, 2020 Subcommittee meeting. **The Subcommittee observed there are some variations as compared to the special permit drawings but concluded that Building 12 is consistent with the Special Permit and Design Guidelines.**

The Subcommittee commented that the design is an improvement over the special permit drawing set because of its sophistication.

Although the Subcommittee agreed that Building 12 is consistent with the Design Guidelines, they had the following comments:

Elevations:

- Building 12 is perhaps the most sophisticated building because it doesn't have fussy facades, suggesting that it is a higher-end building. Since it's a smaller building, it will also not have very long corridors, which is consistent with the perceived quality of the proposal.
- Balconies work a lot better in this current rendition.

Building 14

Building 14 was reviewed at the January 20, 2021 Subcommittee meeting. **The Subcommittee observed there are some variations as compared to the special permit drawings but concluded that Building 14 is consistent with the Special Permit and Design Guidelines.**

The Subcommittee commented that the building is an attractive residential building, will be a good addition on Oak Street, and relates very well to the other three residential buildings (9, 10, and 11),

Although the Subcommittee agreed that Building 14 is consistent with the Design Guidelines, they would like the applicant to consider the following **design recommendations** as the design moves forward:

Streetscape:

- It will be good if a sidewalk could be accommodated on one side of the drive connecting to the Building 4 site and Village Green because pedestrians are going to use it anyway.
- The Consultant recommended the addition of hedges along the back edge of Oak Street sidewalk to create a clear differentiation between the public realm and the semi-public areas of the project. This hedge will also make Building 14 look more residential and less institutional in character.

Kiosk

Kiosk was reviewed at the February 3, 2021 Subcommittee meeting. **The Subcommittee commented that since the kiosk is an important component of the overall project, and the design is still not resolved, they would like to see an updated design proposal before granting their approval.**

The Subcommittee agreed that this will be an important part of the public realm especially in its location across the street from the Village Green. The applicant acknowledged this was a preliminary design, was looking for input, and assumed they would come back once the design had progressed further.

The Subcommittee had the following comments:

- The Consultant asked the applicant if they have started to work with a structural engineer, worked out the loads of planting material, the cantilevers, and snow loads. The applicant replied that they have been working with a structural engineer. The Consultant commented that solving all the technical problems will be crucial to advancing to a feasible final design.
- Consider winter plantings as well since the residential units will be looking down at this roof year-round.
- The consultant commented that the roof has two potentially competing ideas: 1) Is it the 'Hanging Gardens of Babylon' with plants dropping over the sides of the roof and through the hole in the middle or 2) is it a version of 'The Bean' with a highly abstract sculptural form that isn't compromised by plant material? The Consultant recommended that the design team prioritize one approach or the other, but not try to incorporate both. The Consultant further commented that by putting the plants up there, it may ruin the mysterious effect of the reflective object. Without the plants, the structure will also be lighter.
- It was asked if the applicant had thought about a fountain instead of plants on the roof. The applicant responded that they investigated a fountain and that posed challenges regarding waterproofing and hence decided for a rain garden.
- It will be important to have the right merchant selected for this space, someone who is worthy and sustainable. The applicant commented that this may be a grab and go, associated with one of the restaurants that are already in building 6 or it could be a seasonable pop-up space. They are exploring different options. The Subcommittee commented that this shouldn't just be a grab and go, it is a very aesthetically pleasing space and should have a special merchant maybe like a champagne bar. It's a place where people would like to hangout, sit, drink, and interact with others.
- The Consultant recommended two approaches for the plaza space under the roof: 1) either leave it open so people can stand under the roof and look up into the mirrored surface, take photos, etc. or 2) provide a consistent field of tables and chairs like a French café.
- The Subcommittee commented about the complexity of having concave mirror surface at the bottom and the plants on top of the roof. There are other places with green roofs with greens coming up to the edge with the idea of them hanging over and what ends up hanging over is a lot of the dirt and on a mirror surface, it's going to be a huge technical challenge. The applicant responded that they have thought about it and have spoken to landscape architects about this. The plants may just need to go grow up instead of hanging down, so it's easy to manage the growth and detail out the drip edge how it works. There will be a lot of maintenance required for this. It was also asked how will this area be maintained; how will someone get up there? The applicant responded that there will be site lift available to get to the roof. There will be built in irrigation at the roof.

- There was a question about reflection from the sun, will it be too bright with this reflective mirror surface, light colored paving and sun bouncing off the buildings as well. The applicant responded that they have done a sun study, this space is also south facing, and it doesn't appear that will catch a lot of long sun angles.
- The Subcommittee commented that they would like to see more iterations as the applicant gets further along with the kiosk.

EXHIBIT A

Plan Set Issued for Design Consistency Review

Northland_DCR_Record_Guidlines-Templates_Combined_f

- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW - DESIGN GUIDELINES EVALUATION TEMPLATE - SITE DESIGN - NOVEMBER 04, 2020 – COVER, PAGES 20-29
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW - DESIGN GUIDELINES EVALUATION TEMPLATE – BUILDING 2 – DECEMBER 2, 2020 – COVER, PAGES 30-41
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW - DESIGN GUIDELINES EVALUATION TEMPLATE – BUILDING 3 – NOVEMBER 12, 2020 – COVER, PAGES 30-41
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW - DESIGN GUIDELINES EVALUATION TEMPLATE – BUILDING 4 – JANUARY 20,2021 – COVER, PAGES 30-41
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW - DESIGN GUIDELINES EVALUATION TEMPLATE – BUILDING 5 – NOVEMBER 23, 2020 – COVER, PAGES 30-41
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW - DESIGN GUIDELINES EVALUATION TEMPLATE – BUILDING 6A – DECEMBER 2, 2020 – COVER, PAGES 30-41
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW - DESIGN GUIDELINES EVALUATION TEMPLATE – BUILDING 6AB– DECEMBER 2, 2020 – COVER, PAGES 30-41
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW - DESIGN GUIDELINES EVALUATION TEMPLATE – BUILDING 7 – NOVEMBER 12, 2020 – COVER, PAGES 30-41
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW - DESIGN GUIDELINES EVALUATION TEMPLATE – BUILDING 8 – JANUARY 20, 2021 – COVER, PAGES 30-41
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW - DESIGN GUIDELINES EVALUATION TEMPLATE – BUILDING 9 – DECEMBER 23, 2020 – COVER, PAGES 30-41
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW - DESIGN GUIDELINES EVALUATION TEMPLATE – BUILDING 10 – DECEMBER 23, 2020 – COVER, PAGES 30-41
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW - DESIGN GUIDELINES EVALUATION TEMPLATE – BUILDING 11 – DECEMBER 23, 2020 – COVER, PAGES 30-41
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW - DESIGN GUIDELINES EVALUATION TEMPLATE – BUILDING 12 – NOVEMBER 23, 2020 – COVER, PAGES 30-41
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW - DESIGN GUIDELINES EVALUATION TEMPLATE – BUILDING 14 – DECEMBER 23, 2020 – COVER, PAGES 30-41
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW - DESIGN GUIDELINES EVALUATION TEMPLATE – KIOSK – JANUARY 20, 2021 – COVER, PAGES 30-41

Northland_DCR_Record_Presentation-Graphics_Combined_f

- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT - DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW – URBAN DESIGN AND SITE PRESENTATION – NOVEMBER 4, 2020
 - COVER, PAGES 4-127
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW – BUILDING 2 – DECEMBER 2, 2020
 - COVER – PAGE 10

- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW – BUILDING 3 – NOVEMBER 12, 2020
 - COVER – PAGE 22, 24
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT – OPEN SPACE SUPPLEMENTAL – BUILDING 3 – NOVEMBER 12, 2020
 - COVER, 2, 3, 4, 15,43, 2, 51, 52, 55, 5, 6, 2,
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT – BUILDING 3 TRANSFORMER VAULT – FEBRUARY 8, 2021
 - COVER – PAGE 3
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW – BUILDING 4 – FEBRUARY 03, 2021
 - COVER – PAGE 27
- OPEN SPACE SUPPLEMENTAL - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW – BUILDING 4 – FEBRUARY 03, 2021
 - COVER, 68 - 70, 79, 80
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW – BUILDING 5 – DECEMBER 09, 2020
 - COVER – PAGE 25
- OPEN SPACE SUPPLEMENTAL - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW – BUILDING 5 – FEBRUARY 03, 2021
 - COVER, 68, 69, 77, 79, 83, 89, 90, 91,
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW – BUILDING 06A – DECEMBER 02, 2020
 - COVER – 20, 22
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT – OPEN SPACE SUPPLEMENTAL – BUILDING 06A & 06B – DECEMBER 02, 2020
 - COVER, 83, 21, 7, 8, 84,
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT – SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW – BUILDING G06A LANEWAY UPDATE – FEBRUARY 18, 2021
 - COVER-5, LANEWAY 9/20 SCHEMATIC DESIGN, PLANTING TREATMENT AND LANEWAY INTEGRATION (6 PAGES)
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW – BUILDING 06B – DECEMBER 02, 2020
 - COVER – 20, 22
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT – OPEN SPACE SUPPLEMENTAL – BUILDING 06A & 06B – DECEMBER 02, 2020
 - COVER, 83, 21, 7, 8, 84,
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT – SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW – BUILDING G06A LANEWAY UPDATE – FEBRUARY 18, 2021
 - COVER-5, LANEWAY 9/20 SCHEMATIC DESIGN, PLANTING TREATMENT AND LANEWAY INTEGRATION (6 PAGES)
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW – BUILDING 07 – NOVEMBER 12, 2020
 - COVER - 17

- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT – MOBILITY HUB UPDATE – BUILDING 07 – DECEMBER 02, 2020
 - COVER, 4 - 8
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT – OPEN SPACE SUPPLEMENTAL – BUILDING 07 – NOVEMBER 12, 2020
 - COVER, 20,5, 11, 73, 9, 62, 63, 72, 75, 5,
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW – BUILDING 8 – FEBRUARY 03, 2021
 - COVER - 29
- OPEN SPACE SUPPLEMENTAL - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW – BUILDING 8 – FEBRUARY 03, 2021
 - COVER, 68,76
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW– BUILDING 9 – JANUARY 20, 2020
 - COVER – 17
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW– BUILDING 10 – JANUARY 20, 2021
 - COVER - 21
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW – BUILDING 11 – JANUARY 20, 2021
 - COVER - 20
- OPEN SPACE SUPPLEMENTAL – SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW – BUILDING 9-11 – FEBRUARY 03, 2021
 - COVER, 68, 79, 19
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW– BUILDING 12 – DECEMBER 09, 2020
 - COVER - 19
- OPEN SPACE SUPPLEMENTAL – SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW – BUILDING 12 – DECEMBER 09, 2020
 - COVER, 68, 79,83, 89, 90, 91,
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW– BUILDING 14 – JANUARY 20, 2021
 - COVER - 17
- OPEN SPACE SUPPLEMENTAL – SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW – BUILDING 14 – FEBRUARY 03, 2021
 - COVER, 68, 79,
- NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT - SD DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW– KIOSK –FEBRUARY 3, 2021
 - COVER-10

[Northland_DCR_Record_Technical-Submissions_Combined_f](#)

SITE DESIGN TECHNICAL PACKAGE	
L-0.0	PROJECT NOTES

I-0.1	LAYOUT AND MATERIALS OVERALL SITE PLAN
L-0.2	CORRIDOR DIMENSION PLAN
L-0.3	GRADING OVERALL SITE PLAN
L-0.4	PLANTING PLAN – OVERALL SITE
L-1.1	LAYOUT AND MATERIALS PLAN – SPLASH AND COMMUNITY PARK
L1.6.1	SITE DETAILS – SPLASH AND COMMUNITY PARK
L1-6.2	SITE DETAILS – SPLASH AND COMMUNITY PARK
L-2.1	LAYOUT AND MATERIALS PLAN – MILL PARK
L-2.5	SECTIONS – MILL PARK
L-3.1	LAYOUT AND MATERIALS PLAN – VILLAGE GREEN
L3.5	SECTIONS – VILLAGE GREEN
L-4.1	LAYOUT AND MATERIALS PLAN – OAK STREET PARK
L-4.5	SECTIONS – OAK STREET PARK
L-5.1	LAYOUT AND MATERIALS PLAN LANEWAY WEST – BUILDINGS 5A, 5B, 12
L5.6.1	SITE DETAILS – LANEWAY WEST
L-6.1	LAYOUT AND MATERIALS PLAN – LANEWAY EAST – BUILDINGS 6A, 6B
L-7.1	LAYOUT AND MATERIALS PLAN - MOBILITY PLAZA BUILDING 7
L-8.1	LAYOUT AND MATERIALS PLAN – BUILDING 8
L-9.1	LAYOUT AND MATERIALS PLAN – SOUTH MEADOW BROOK PARK
L-9.5	SECTIONS – SOUTH MEADOW BROOK
L-10.1	LAYOUT AND MATERIALS PLAN, BUILDING S9,10, 11
I-11.1	LAYOUT AND MATERIALS PLAN – BUILDING 14
SD-1	SITE DETAILS-1
SD-2	SITE DETAILS -2
SD-3	SITE DETAILS – 3

BUILDING 2	TECHNICAL PACKAGE SUBMISSIONS 2020.12.02 NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT – DRAWINGS ADAPTED FROM 2020.09.18 SCHEMATIC DESIGN SET
G-001	COVER SHEET
A-101	BUILDING FLOOR PLANS
A-201	BUILDING ELEVATIONS
A-211	BUILDING SECTIONS

BUILDING 3	TECHNICAL PACKAGE SUBMISSIONS 2020.11.12 NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT – DRAWINGS ADAPTED FROM 2020.09.18 SCHEMATIC DESIGN SET
G-001	COVER SHEET
L-2.1	MILL PARK LAYOUT PLAN
A-1G1	LEVEL G1 FLOOR PLAN
A-101	GROUND FLOOR PLAN
A-102	LEVEL 2 FLOOR PLAN
A-103	LEVEL 3 FLOOR PLAN
A-104	LEVEL 4 FLOOR PLAN
A-105	LEVEL 5 FLOOR PLAN

A-106	LEVEL 6 FLOOR PLAN
A-107	ROOF PLAN
A-201	EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS
A-202	EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS
A-211	BUILDING SECTIONS
A-212	BUILDING SECTIONS

BUILDING 4	DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW – DRAWING DATE: 12/18/2020 – SUBMITTED DATE: 01/20/21
A-000	COVER SHEET
A-080	ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN
A-100A	B4 PARKING LEVEL 2 PLAN (LOWER)
A-100B	B4 PARKING LEVEL 1 PLAN (UPPER)
A-101	B4 FIRST FLOOR PLAN
A-102	B4 SECOND FLOOR PLAN
A-103	B4 THIRD FLOOR PLAN
A-104	B4 FOURTH FLOOR PLAN
A-105	B5 FIFTH FLOOR PLAN
A-106	B4 SIXTH FLOOR PLAN
A-107	B4 ROOF FLOOR PLAN
A-201	EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS
A-202	EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS
A-300	BUILDING SECTIONS
A-301	BUILDING SECTIONS

BUILDING 5	SCHEMATIC DESIGN – NOVEMBER 24, 2020
A-000	COVER SHEET
A-001	DRAWING LISTS
L-5.1	LAYOUT & MATERIALS PLAN – LANEWAY WEST
A-080	ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN
A-100A	PARKING LEVEL 2 PLAN (LOWER)
A-100B	PARKING LEVEL 1 PLAN (UPPER)
A-101	FIRST FLOOR PLAN
A-102	SECOND FLOOR PLAN
A-103	THIRD FLOOR PLAN
A-104	FOURTH FLOOR PLAN
A-105	FIFTH FLOOR PLAN
A-106	SIXTH FLOOR PLAN
A-107	SEVENTH FLOOR PLAN
A-108	ROOF PLAN
A-201	EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS
A-202	EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS
A-300	BUILDING SECTIONS

BUILDING 06A	TECHNICAL PACKAGE SUBMISSIONS 2020.12.02 NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT – DRAWINGS ADAPTED FROM 2020.09.18 SCHEMATIC DESIGN SET
G-001	COVER SHEET
L-6.1	LAYOUT EAST LAYOUT PLAN
L-6.2	LANEWAY EAST LAYOUT PLAN
L-6.3	LANEWAY EAST GRADING PLAN
A-G100A	LEVEL G2
A-G100B	LEVEL G1
A.A-101	6A LEVEL 1
A.A-102	6A LEVEL 2
A.A-103	6A LEVEL 3
A.A-104	6A LEVEL 4
A.A-105	6A LEVEL 5
A.A-106	6A LEVEL 6
A.A-107	6A LEVEL 7
A.A-108	6A ROOF
A-A205	BUILDING ELEVATIONS
A-A206	BUILDING ELEVATIONS
A-A207	BUILDING ELEVATIONS
A.A-210	BUILDING SECTIONS
A.A-211	BUILDING SECTIONS

BUILDING 06B	TECHNICAL PACKAGE SUBMISSIONS 2020.12.02 NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT – DRAWINGS ADAPTED FROM 2020.09.18 SCHEMATIC DESIGN SET
G-001	COVER SHEET
L-6.1	LAYOUT EAST LAYOUT PLAN
L-6.2	LANEWAY EAST LAYOUT PLAN
L-6.3	LANEWAY EAST GRADING PLAN
A-G100A	LEVEL G2
A-G100B	LEVEL G1
A-B101	6B LEVEL 1
A-B102	6B LEVEL 2
A-B103	6B LEVEL 3
A-B104	6B LEVEL 4
A-B105	6B LEVEL 5
A-B106	6B LEVEL 6
A-B107	6B LEVEL 7
A-B108	6B ROOF
A-B205	BUILDING ELEVATIONS
A-B206	BUILDING ELEVATIONS
A-B207	BUILDING ELEVATIONS
A-B210	6B BUILDING SECTIONS

BUILDING 07	TECHNICAL PACKAGE SUBMISSIONS 2020.11.12 NORTHLAND NEWTON DEVELOPMENT – DRAWINGS ADAPTED FROM 2020.09.18 SCHEMATIC DESIGN SET
G-001	COVER SHEET
L-7.1	MOBILITY PLAZA LAYOUT PLAN
A-101	GROUND FLOOR PLAN
A-102	LEVEL 2 PLAN
A-103	LEVEL 3 PLAN
A-104	LEVEL 4 PLAN
A-105	ROOF PLAN
A-201	BUILDING ELEVATIONS
A-202	BUILDING ELEVATIONS
A-211	BUILDING SECTIONS
A-212	BUILDING SECTIONS

BUILDING 8	DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW – DRAWING DATE: 12/18/20 – SUBMITTED: 01/20/21
A-000	COVER SHEET
A-080	ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN
A-100	B8 - PARKING LEVEL 1
A-101	B8 – FIRST FLOOR PLAN
A-102	B8- SECOND FLOOR PLAN
A-103	B8-THIRD FLOOR PLAN
A-104	B8-FOURTH FLOOR PLAN
A-105	B8-FIFTH FLOOR PLAN
A-106	B8-SIXTH FLOOR PLAN
A-107	B8-ROOF FLOOR PLAN
A-200	EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS
A-201	EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS
A-300	BUILDING SECTIONS

BUILDING 9/10/11	DESIGN CONSISTENCY REVIEW – DRAWING DATE: 12/23/20
A-000	COVER SHEET
A-001	DRAWING LISTS
A-080	ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN
A9-100	BUILDING 9 – FLOOR PLANS
A10-100	BUILDING 10 – FLOOR PLANS
A10-101	BUILDING 10 – FLOOR PLANS
A11-100	BUILDING 11 – FLOOR PLANS
A9-200	BUILDING 9 – EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS
A10-200	BUILDING 10 – EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS
A11-200	BUILDING 11 – EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS
A9-300	BUILDING 9 – BUILDING SECTIONS
A10-300	BUILDING 10 – BUILDING SECTIONS

A11-300	BUILDING 11 – BUILDING SECTIONS
---------	---------------------------------

BUILDING 12	SCHEMATIC DESIGN – 11/24/2020
A-000	COVER SHEET
A-001	DRAWING LISTS
L-5.1	LAYOUT AND MATERIALS PLAN – LANEWAY WEST – BUILDING 5A, 5B & 12
A-080	ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN
A-100A	B12 – PARKING LEVEL 2 (LOWER)
A-100B	B12 – PARKING LEVEL 1 (UPPER)
A-101	B12 – FIRST FLOOR
A-102	B12 – SECOND FLOOR
A-103	B12 – THIRD FLOOR
A-104	B12 – FOURTH FLOOR
A-105	B12 – ROOF PLAN
A-200	EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS
A-201	EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS
A-300	BUILDING SECTIONS
A-301	BUILDING SECTIONS

BUILDING 14	SCHEMATIC DESIGN – 12/23/2020
A-000	COVER SHEET
A-001	DRAWING LISTS
A-080	ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN
A-100	FIRST & SECOND FLOOR PLANS
A-101	THIRD FLOOR AND ROOF PLANS
A-200	EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS
A-300	BUILDING SECTIONS