



152-158 Broadway

Somerville, MA 02145

Development Review Application
October 27, 2020

Owner: Broadway Investments Realty, LLC
Developer: Construction Managers & Developers, LLC
Architect: Utile Architecture & Planning
Traffic/Civil: Design Consultants, Inc.
Landscape: Michael D'Angelo Landscape Architecture

PROJECT DIRECTORY

Owner

Broadway Investments Realty, LLC
154 Broadway, Somerville, MA 02145
617-592-7800
patb@cmdboston.com

Developer

Construction Managers & Developers LLC
154 Broadway, Somerville, MA 02145
617-592-7800
patb@cmdboston.com

Architect

Utile Architecture & Planning
115 Kingston Street, Boston, MA 02111
(617) 423-7200
leblanc@utiledesign.com

Civil/Traffic Engineering

Design Consultants, Inc
120 Middlesex Avenue, Suite 20, Somerville, MA 02145
617-776-3350
Civil: SSawyer@dc-ma.com
Traffic: SSiragusa@dc-ma.com

Landscape Architect

Michael D'Angelo Landscape Architecture LLC (M-D-L-A)
732 East Broadway, Suite #3 | Boston, MA 02127
203 592 4788
michael@m-d-l-a.com

PROJECT NARRATIVE



We are excited to present for Development Review our proposed development of 152-158 Broadway. The project will be a 5-story, mixed-use building with rental/commercial space on the ground floor and rental dwelling units on the upper floors. The site is within MR5 zoning district and will be fully compliant with the building envelope and setback requirements described in the Somerville Zoning Ordinance. Broadway has also been identified as a pedestrian zone by the new zoning and we have composed a project which reinforces the pedestrian experience by proposing to eliminate two existing curb cuts and rebuilding and planting an uninterrupted sidewalk in their place.



The facade design is inspired by the vibrant textures, colors and scale of materials observed throughout the neighborhood, and along Broadway. The ground floor is populated with active retail frontage and residential lobby space, with storefront windows throughout to create a visual connection between ground

floor uses and the public realm. The height of the ground floor aligns with a key datum on the building just to our north for street front continuity. The upper floors of the building are clad in a mosaic of rainscreen siding, which reduces the massing by means of relief, shadow and color variation. The front facade takes advantage of the depth of the windows for both shading and play of light throughout the day. The massing of the set-back at the 5th floor recalls pitched roofs from the residential neighborhood, reinterpreted in a contemporary composition.

The 45 rental Dwelling Units provided as part of this project will help to increase Somerville's housing stock and relieve some of the pressure on larger family size units often rented as roommate living to younger professionals by providing a large number of full service, well-appointed studio units. The project includes 40 studios, 3 one-beds and 2 three-beds. Of these units, 9 will be affordable per the Somerville Zoning Ordinance including the 2 three-bed apartments and 7 studios. The project is achieving an 850 GSF/DU average by pursuing Passive House [PHIUS] certification, and will meet the city's requirement for a 'net-zero ready' building. The proposed residential use in this project would be achieved by way of a Special Permit that we are applying for as part of this Development Review.

The project property line abuts the edge of the .5 mile walkshed as indicated in Somerville's Transit Area Maps indicating its connectivity to rapid transit. Additional transit opportunities such as the City's bus system can be accessed at an even shorter distance. For this reason the project proposes no parking by way of a Special Permit. As part of the leasing agreements the tenants will not be able to apply for City resident parking permits to alleviate pressure on neighborhood street parking and disincentivize occupants from using personal vehicles.





City of Somerville

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

City Hall 3rd Floor, 93 Highland Avenue, Somerville MA 02143

DESIGN RECOMMENDATION

152 – 158 Broadway

OCTOBER 8, 2020

Members of the Somerville Planning Board,

The Urban Design Commission (UDC) met virtually via GoToWebinar on August 27, 2020 to review the proposed General Building at 152-158 Broadway.

The purpose of design review, as established by the Somerville Zoning Ordinance, is for peers in the professional design community to provide advice and recommendations during the schematic design phase of the architectural design process. In accordance with the UDC's adopted Rules of Procedure and Section 15.1.4 Design Review of the Somerville Zoning Ordinance, this recommendation includes, at least, the following:

1. Identification of the preferred schematic design concepts supported by the Commission.
2. Identification of all design guidelines that are achieved to the satisfaction of the Commission.
3. Identification of any priority design guidelines.
4. Recommended modifications to the proposed schematic design necessary to remedy outstanding design issues for guidelines that have not been achieved to the satisfaction of the Commission.

Applicable meeting minutes are attached and video recordings of Urban Design Commission meetings are available upon request. Please contact the UDC's Staff Liaison, Senior Planner Dan Bartman for more information: dbartman@somervillema.gov.

Following review of the submitted plans and illustrations and a public presentation by the development team, the Commission provided the following recommendations concerning schematic design options presented:

The Commission voted unanimously (3-0) to recommend the Applicant's preferred façade design option and preferred ground floor elevation for further design development. The Commission voted unanimously (3-0) to recommend that the Planning Board consider 4.3.12.n of the MR5 design guidelines as a priority for the proposed building. The Commission voted unanimously (3-0) that all of the MR5 design guidelines have been met to their satisfaction by the Applicant's preferred façade design option and preferred ground floor elevation. No recommendation was provided for any modifications to the Applicant's preferred façade design option or preferred ground floor elevation, but the Commission did raise concerns about the façade area of the ground story enclosing the transformer room. Please see the attached meeting minutes for additional information.





APPLICABLE DESIGN GUIDELINES:

MR5 – MID-RISE 5 DISTRICT			
LANGUAGE	SATISFIED?	PRIORITY?	NOTES
Facades should be visually divided into a series of architectural bays that are derived, in general, from the building's structural bay spacing.	YES (3-0)		
Piers, pilasters, or other features defining each architectural bay should either extend all the way to the ground or terminate at any horizontal articulation defining the base of the building.	YES (3-0)		
Architectural bays should align, in general, with individual or groups of storefronts and lobby entrances.	YES (3-0)		
Piers, pilasters, or other features defining each architectural bay should always project forward and be uninterrupted by any horizontal articulation, excluding any horizontal articulation used to differentiate the base of the building.	YES (3-0)		

MR5 – MID-RISE 5 DISTRICT			
LANGUAGE	SATISFIED?	PRIORITY?	NOTES
The facade of buildings with five (5) or more stories should be visually divided into, at least, a horizontal tripartite division (a base, middle, and top). The horizontal divisions may not shift up or down across the width of the facade.	YES (3-0)		
Vents, exhausts, and other utility features on building facades should be architecturally integrated into the design of the building and should be located to minimize adverse effects on pedestrian comfort along sidewalks and within open spaces.	YES (3-0)		
Buildings at terminated vistas should be articulated with design features that function as focal points.	YES (3-0)		
Fenestration glazing should be inset from the plane of exterior wall surfaces.	YES (3-0)		
Ribbon windows should be avoided.	YES (3-0)		

MR5 – MID-RISE 5 DISTRICT			
LANGUAGE	SATISFIED?	PRIORITY?	NOTES
Monotonous and repetitive storefront or lobby systems, awnings, canopies, sign types, colors, or designs should be avoided.	YES (3-0)		
Storefronts and lobby entrances should include awnings or canopies to provide weather protection for pedestrians and reduce glare for storefront display areas. Awnings should be open-ended and operable.	YES (3-0)		
Lobby entrances for upper story uses should be optimally located, well defined, clearly visible, and separate from the entrance for other ground story uses.	YES (3-0)		

MR5 – MID-RISE 5 DISTRICT			
LANGUAGE	SATISFIED?	PRIORITY?	NOTES
Lobbies should be limited in both width and total area to preserve floor space and frontage for other ground story uses. Buildings should use any combination of facade articulation, a double-height ceiling, a distinctive doorway, a change in wall material, a change in paving material within the frontage area, or some other architectural element(s) to make lobbies visual and materially distinctive.	YES (3-0)		
The selection of materials, fenestration, and ornamentation should result in a consistent and harmonious composition that appears as a unified whole rather than a collection of unrelated parts.	YES (3-0)	YES	Commission identified this design guideline as a priority consideration for the further evolution of the façade through design development.
The type and color of materials should be kept to a minimum, preferably three (3) or fewer.	YES (3-0)		
Two (2) or more wall materials should be combined only one above the other, except for bay windows.	YES (3-0)		

MR5 – MID-RISE 5 DISTRICT			
LANGUAGE	SATISFIED?	PRIORITY?	NOTES
Wall materials appearing heavier in weight should be used below wall materials appearing lighter in weight (wood and metal above brick, and all three above stone)	YES (3-0)		
Horizontal or vertical board siding or shingles, regardless of material, should be avoided.	YES (3-0)		
Architectural details and finish materials for the base of a building should be constructed of architectural concrete or pre-cast cementitious panels, natural or cast stone, heavy gauge metal panels, glazed or unglazed architectural terracotta, or brick.	YES (3-0)		
Exterior Insulation and Finish Systems (EIFS) should be avoided.	YES (3-0)		



City of Somerville

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

City Hall 3rd Floor, 93 Highland Avenue, Somerville MA 02143

AUGUST 27, 2020 MEETING MINUTES

NAME	TITLE	STATUS	ARRIVED
Sarah Lewis	Co-Chair	<i>Present</i>	
Luisa Oliveira	Co-Chair	<i>Present</i>	
Frank Valdez	Member	<i>Present</i>	
Deborah Fennick	Member	<i>Present</i>	
Andrew Arbaugh	Member	<i>Present</i>	

The meeting was held via GoToWebinar and was called to order by Co-Chair, Sarah Lewis at 7:05pm and adjourned at 8:20pm.

Others present: Senior Planner Dan Bartman, *Planning & Zoning*
Senior Planner Cortney Kirk, *Public Space & Urban Forestry*

DESIGN REVIEW: 71-72 Union Square

(Continued from July 22, 2020)

Adam Dash, Principal Attorney from Adam Dash & Associates, introduced the development proposal site and referenced the events of the previously held design review meeting. William Chalfant, Project Manager from Khalsa Design Inc., presented new information concerning the changes that were made to façade design option #1 based on feedback provided by the Commission at the previous meeting. Particular detail was provided concerning materials, façade relief, articulation, windows, and a wall mural.

The Commission remarked that the revised option #1 was an improvement over previous versions and that the building now has a contemporary interpretation of the use of brick without trying to replicate the historic architectural styles of neighboring buildings. Member Fennick questioned the design team about the relief provided by the building's brick pilasters and the shadow lines provided by the Flemish bond detail located under the upper story windows. Member Arbaugh suggested the ground story canopy appeared thin and could be made thicker, which would also improve the legibility of the signage. Member Fennick suggested keeping the canopy as is, but to locate the signage elsewhere since there are other options for commercial signs provided by the zoning ordinance. Member Valdez requested the Applicant provide material samples for the Commission to approve the color selection of final materials chosen by the design team.

Following a motion by Member Arbaugh seconded by Member Valdez, the Commission voted unanimously (3-0) that design guidelines 6.2.12.a.ii and 6.2.12.a.iv (specifically related to the building's pilasters) be considered priority design guidelines as the building progresses through design development.

Following a motion by Member Valdez seconded by Member Fennick, the Commission voted unanimously (3-0) that all of the applicable design guidelines have been met by the recommended design option and overall design character of the building.

RESULT:

RECOMMENDED

DESIGN REVIEW: 152-158 Broadway

Michael LeBlanc, Principal Architect from Utile, Inc., presented an overview of the proposed 5-story, net zero ready General Building with 45 dwelling units and 4,100 sf of ground story commercial space. The materiality and façade articulation of neighboring structures was reviewed and three façade design options were presented as required by the Urban Design Commission's Rules of Procedure & Policy. Façade design option #1 was identified by the design team as their preferred option.

Commission member Fennick asked for further information about the fiber cement panel comprising the majority of the façade. Mr. LeBlanc explained that the material is through color and will maintain its color over time and that although the fiber cement is itself about ½" thick, the detail of the window assemblies provided about 8-10" of depth between the face of the fiber cement boards and the actual plane of the window glass. Commission member Arbaugh commented that façade design alternate A appeared heavy and out of characteristic with the surrounding neighborhood and that façade design alternate B was a nice design, but felt more appropriate for an civic or institutional building such as a library and create a focal point inappropriate for an general building (with upper story residential). Mr. Leblanc asked for the Commission's advice concerning the materiality of the recessed portions of the 5th floor penthouse façade. Commission member Valdez advised the design team that the colored "Oko Skin" material should turn the corner onto the sidewall of each recessed portion (as shown graphically). Member Valdez raised concerns about the proposed design of the façade masking the ground floor transformer room and whether the design shown will withstand demands of the utility company as the project progresses through to construction and occupancy. He identified past experience with N-Star and Eversource requiring changes to transformer room enclosures from what was originally envisioned due to requirements for air infiltration, size, clearances, etc. and expressed regret if the design of the ground story were to completely change due to the location of the transformer. The design team committed to collaborating with the utility companies to ensure a great solution exists. Member Valdez emphasized that when a transformer room is located immediately behind the façade, that all parties involved must remain in good communication and work together to make sure the resulting design does not disturb the public realm. Samples of the final materials were requested for review by the Commission. Director of Public Space and Urban Forestry (PSUF) and Commission Co-Chair Luisa Oliveira asked for clarification about the landscape design at the rear of the property, including the dog relief area, and reminded the design team of PSUF departmental standards and landscape requirements applicable to the development. Planning & Zoning Director and Co-Chair Sarah Lewis expressed a wish to have seen multiple options presented for the ground story.

Following a motion by Member Valdez seconded by Member Arbaugh, the Commission voted unanimously (3-0) to recommend the preferred façade design option for further design development.

Following a motion by Member Fennick seconded by Member Valdez, the Commission voted unanimously (3-0) to recommend the preferred ground floor elevation for further design development.

Following a motion by Member Valdez seconded by Member Fennick, the Commission voted unanimously (3-0) to recommend that the Planning Board consider 4.3.12.n of the MR5 design guidelines a priority for the proposed building.

Following a motion by Member Valdez seconded by Member Fennick, the Commission voted unanimously (3-0) that all of the design guidelines have been met by the recommended design options for the façade and ground story.

RESULT:	RECOMMENDED
----------------	--------------------

NOTE: Recorded votes from August 27 have been adjusted to correctly reflect the results of the Commission's voting membership.

152-158 Broadway, Somerville
Online Public Meeting

Present

Councilor Matt McLaughlin
Rebecca Cooper, Senior Planner
Pat Buonopane, CMD, Project Owner
Rich DiGirolamo, Legal Counsel to CMD
Matthew Littell, Utile Architecture & Planning
Ian Kenney, Utile Architecture & Planning
Michael D'Angelo, Landscape Architect
Stephen Siragusa, DCI Transportation Engineer
Stephen Sawyer, DCI Site/Civil Engineer

Members of the Community; Colin Christoperson, Cory Mian,
Jesse Moos, John Carlson, Renee Polcaro, Tom Lamar, Leon
Xia

Distribution

City of Somerville Planning Board
Councilor Matt McLaughlin
Pat Buonopane [CMD]
Rich DiGirolamo

Agenda

Pat Buonopane, owner of 152-158 Broadway presented a development proposal for the aforementioned parcel. The concept design for the parcel was developed by Architect; Utile, Landscape Architect; Michael D'Angelo Civil & Traffic Engineers; DCI.

The proposal is for a mixed-use *general building* with ground floor commercial space and upper floor residential units. The program and massing are within compliance of MR5 zoning, as described in the Somerville Zoning Ordinance [SZO].

The residential program includes 45 units, including 9 total Affordable Dwelling Units [ADU].

The total building area of 38,250 GSF permits 45 residential units, at 850 GSF/DU [with net-zero ready GFA reduction]

The development will pursue Passive House [PHIUS] certification and will meet all SZO requirements for 'net-zero ready'

The design includes no on-site parking, and the project owner plans to pursue a special permit for parking relief.

The proponent for the project notified all abutting neighbors of the meeting directly and posted fliers around the neighborhood prior to the meeting.

Comments from the community;

-Concern was voiced about ride share and delivery vehicles obstructing the flow of traffic specifically on Rush St and Cross Street

-Concern was voiced about visitor parking for guests of the residents of the proposed building

-Councilor McLaughlin confirmed that residents of this building will NOT be eligible to apply for Somerville resident parking permits

-Concern was voiced that studio dwelling units were creating a *dormitory*.

The owner reiterates that this proposal is not dormitory housing. The intent is to house young professionals, who value access to Somerville/Cambridge/Boston jobs, utilize public transportation, and take advantage of the existing amenities along Broadway. The units fully amenitized with full kitchens, in unit laundry and spacious bathrooms. The proponent will add two 3 bedroom units to the project without changing overall unit count in response to the neighborhood concerns.

-Concern was voiced about the height and mass of building. One neighbor would 'prefer 18 units' instead of proposed 45
The owner has since reached out to the neighbor at 155 Broadway and discussed the building mass. This neighbor's concerns have been addressed

-Support was given for 45 units at this location, citing that this location and the infrastructure around it (transit, bike infrastructure, retail) can support this additional population

-Support for an additional floor (6th floor) was expressed, for even greater density at this location.

The proponent has not intention of seeking height beyond what the zoning stipulates.

Architecture
& Planning

115 Kingston St.
Boston, MA 02111
(617) 423-7200
utiledesign.com

- Support was voiced for a zero-parking development at this location
- Support was given for the bike storage amenity. A question of configuring the bike lane and parking lane and pick-up/drop off areas was raised. [Since this is outside of our property line, project team will coordinate with the planning dept]
- Support was expressed for smaller dwelling units, to reduce burden on existing family-sized units within the city, currently rented as roommate units
- One neighbor commented that this design is much nicer than some other projects which have been recently proposed/built in the neighborhood
- Neighbors asked to see an illustration of the proposed pick-up/drop-off area.
- Abutter at 160-166 Broadway, RCG, has written a letter of conditional support for this project, to be shared for record. This letter is being sent along with these notes.

End

Architecture
& Planning

115 Kingston St.
Boston, MA 02111
(617) 423-7200
utiledesign.com

Present
Councilor Matt McLaughlin
Rebecca Cooper, Senior Planner
Pat Buonopane, CMD, Project Owner
Rich DiGirolamo, Legal Counsel to CMD
Michael LeBlanc, Utile Architecture & Planning
Petra Jarolimova, Utile Architecture & Planning
Yuting Zhang, Utile Architecture & Planning
Michael D'Angelo, Landscape Architect

Members of the Community: Colin Christoperson, Robert and Pauline Iacopucci, Jon Pucker

Distribution
City of Somerville Planning Board
Councilor Matt McLaughlin
Pat Buonopane [CMD]
Rich DiGirolamo

152-158 Broadway, Somerville
Online Public Meeting #2

Agenda

Utile Architecture & Planning presented design updates to the development proposal for 152-158 Broadway resulting from community comments from the first Neighborhood Meeting held on July 29, 2020. The parcel is owned by Pat Buonopane and design for the parcel is being developed by Architect; Utile, Landscape Architect; Michael D'Angelo Civil & Traffic Engineers; DCI.

The design team discussed how comments from Neighborhood Meeting #1 were being addressed as part of the design. Pick-up/drop-off, building massing and unit mix were discussed in detail. The Mobility Department's preferred pick-up and drop-off scheme was presented as requested by the community previously. The massing of the building was reviewed including scale, setbacks and height. The building height remains at approximately 58 ft with 66 ft allowable as-of-right by zoning. Changes to the unit mix were reviewed to address community concerns about the unit mix consisting of studios only. While the number of apartments has remained at 45, the unit mix has since been updated to include three market rate 1-Bed units as well as two affordable 3-Bed units. The total number of Affordable Dwelling Units (ADU's) remains at 9 but the square footage allotted to affordable units has increased with the addition of the two 3-bed affordable units.

The landscape design and Greenscore (which exceeds zoning requirements) for the building were reviewed by Landscape Architect Michael D'Angelo.

The proponent for the project notified all abutting neighbors of the meeting directly and posted fliers around the neighborhood prior to the meeting. The Proponent also confirmed that he would meet with all abutters prior to start of construction, be present onsite daily during construction, and provide his contact information to neighbors for a direct line of communication in case anything came up during the construction process.

Comments from the Community:

- 1) Clarifications were requested for height of the building and how it compares to others in the neighborhood, type of fence around the property and the distance between the fence in the rear and the building. All clarifications were provided by the design team.
- 2) Clarification was requested for the trash storage strategy, quantity of bins on the street on pick-up day. Additional concern was noted about private haulers not adhering to particular schedule and generating noise during morning/evening.
 - a) *Michael LeBlanc noted that trash will be stored in a well-ventilated, air conditioned room.*
 - b) *Rich DiGirolamo noted that private pickup would be provided - city doesn't pick up anything over 7 units. Rich also noted that the trash pickup will need to be arranged with a private hauler but that all the barrels will not be sitting at the street on trash day.*

Architecture &
Planning

115 Kingston St.
Boston, MA 02111
(617) 423-7200
utiledesign.com

- 3) A concern was voiced about how the project will be addressing rodent issues in and around the site and especially during construction
 - a) *Rich DiGirolamo noted that typically most rodent activity occurs during demolition. We are required to notify everyone around the building within 300 ft before the start of construction. Site will need to be baited before the start of demolition. Construction management plan will have to be put in place and will need to address rodent activity. Inspectional services will be checking to ensure the management plan is adhered to.*
- 4) A concern was voiced about the project creating additional traffic and parked cars in the neighborhood. Additional concern was raised about visitor parking passes.
 - a) *Michael LeBlanc clarified that residents of the building will not be able to apply for on street parking permits. The intention is to tap into existing transit and bike lanes*
 - b) *Rich DiGirolamo clarified that the City is conditioning the No Parking Special Permit to not allow residents the ability to obtain a street parking permit. The new zoning added a provision that if you are within ½ mile of transit stop you do not need to provide parking. We are abutting the edge of the transit walkshed. Additionally, we are adhering to zoning requirements of “pedestrian streets” by filling in our curb cut.*
 - c) *Rich DiGirolamo also clarified that residents will not be able to get visitor passes.*
 - d) *Rebecca Cooper confirmed resident and visitor permits would not be allowed to be applied for by residents of the building*

End

Architecture
& Planning

115 Kingston St.
Boston, MA 02111
(617)423-7200
utiledesign.com



CITY OF SOMERVILLE

Office of Strategic Planning & Community Development

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW APPLICATION • MOBILITY MANAGEMENT PLAN CERTIFICATION

Property Address: 152-158 Broadway		
Zoning District: MR5	MBL: Map 70, Block D lot 213	DRA#:
Applicant: Broadway Investments Realty, LLC		
Address: 154 Broadway		
Phone: 617-592-7800	Email: patb@cldboston.com	

This form is to certify that I have received and approved a mobility management plan for the applicant and proposed development identified above.

Signature: Brad Rawson Date: 11/20/20
Director of Mobility



CITY OF SOMERVILLE

Office of Strategic Planning & Community Development

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW APPLICATION • AFFORDABLE HOUSING MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING CERTIFICATION

Property Address: 152- 158 Broadway, Somerville, MA 02145		
Zoning District: MR5	MBL: Map 90, Block D, Lot 2&3	DRA#:
Applicant: Construction Managers & Developers LLC		
Address: 154 Broadway Somerville, MA 02145		
Phone: 617-592-7800	Email: patb@cmdboston.com	

This form is to certify that I have received and approved an affordable housing memorandum of understanding for the proposed development identified above.

Signature: _____

Patricia B. Brown
Director of Housing

Date: _____

11-18-2020



CITY OF SOMERVILLE

Inspectional Services • Planning Board • Zoning Board of Appeals

CERTIFICATE OF RECEIPT OF REQUIRED MATERIALS BY CITY OF SOMERVILLE DEPARTMENT OF SUSTAINABILITY & ENVIRONMENT

Development Site Address: 152-158 Broadway

Applicant Name: Pat Buonopane, CMD Boston

As required by the City of Somerville's Development Review Submittal Requirements, I certify that I have received and approved the following development review materials for the development proposal identified above:

- ☒ Sustainable & Resilient Building Questionnaire
- ☒ Net-Zero Ready Building: PHIUS+
 - Building Resilience & Sustainability Narrative
 - Copy of signed PHIUS+ Certification Contract
 - Copy of signed PHIUS+ Certification Fee Receipt
- ☐ Net-Zero Ready Building: Zero Carbon
 - Building Resilience & Sustainability Narrative
 - Evidence of ILFI Premium Membership
 - Evidence of ILFI New Zero Carbon Project Registration
- ☒ LEED Certifiability
 - LEED Gold or Platinum checklist
 - LEED Narrative
 - Signed affidavit by LEED accredited professional

Signature: _____

Sustainability & Environment Representative

Date: 2/1/2021



CITY OF SOMERVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS
OFFICE OF SUSTAINABILITY AND ENVIRONMENT
JOSEPH A. CURTATONE
MAYOR

October 28, 2020

152-158 Broadway PHIUS Documentation for DRA

Jeff Geisinger of Utile submitted the following documentation demonstrating 154 Broadway's registration with PHIUS on October, 26, 2020:

- Signed PHIUS contract
- PHIUS payment receipt
- Evidence that 154 Broadway is in the PHIUS project database

This documentation sufficiently demonstrates the project registration with PHIUS and initiation of the PHIUS certification process as required for the Development Review Application submittal.

Reviewed by:
Hannah Payne
Climate Change Program Manager

