



February 13, 2025

Ms. Elizabeth Hughes, AICP  
Town Planner  
Town of Concord  
Planning Division  
141 Keyes Road  
Concord, MA 01742

RE: Response to Architectural Peer Review Report  
275 Forest Ridge Road  
Concord, MA

Dear Ms. Hughes,

On behalf of our client, WP East Acquisitions, The Architectural Team, Inc. (TAT) is providing the following consolidated responses from the design and development team to the Architectural Peer Review Report, prepared by Davis Square Architects, dated 11/27/2024.

The response to comments is shown below in **bold** preceded by the original comment shown in *italics*.

**Key Issues/Concerns:**

*Comment 1: Review the Developer's Application, Plans and Drawings, reports from other peer reviewers and Town officials, letters from neighboring residents, etc.*

**Response 1: N/A**

*Comment 2: Participate in an initial meeting at the site with the Developer's Design team and a Representative of the Town*

**Response 2: N/A**

*Comment 3: Conduct site visit of the project site and surrounding neighborhood.*

**Response 3: N/A**

*Comment 4: Submit queries for Applicant's design team via staff only, as appropriate.*

**Response 4: N/A**

*Comment 5: Provide an oral presentation to the ZBA. A written report shall be submitted in advance of the hearing. Said presentation shall include comments and preliminary recommendations on the following. Visuals with annotations may be included to identify issues and convey recommendations. Points from this report will be discussed at a ZBA hearing on December 5, 2024.*

*This reviewer has reviewed recordings of the previous hearings on May 16, 2024 and October 30, 2024.*

**Response 5: N/A**

*Comment 5a: Orientation of building in relation to parking areas, open space, and on-site amenities. All parking for residents is outdoor, surface parking. Some parking spaces are protected by 4 discreet garage structures located on three sides of the development. There are a total of 474 parking spaces proposed, with 40 located within the garage structures. The two residential buildings are surrounded by double-loaded parking lots on all facades other than the facades within the building courtyards (of the total of 16 facades, 10 face parked cars). The northern façade of building B faces a double-double-loaded parking field with virtually no landscaping within the lot. While this parking arrangement typically allows residents to conveniently park near their unit (especially if the spaces are assigned), there are a number of ground floor units that are potentially negatively impacted by headlight intrusion, noise, and privacy diminished by nearby pedestrian walkways (there are 26 ground floor units in this situation). The landscape plans do not provide sufficient information to determine if plantings could mitigate some of these issues.*

**Response 5a: The applicant has worked with the Town to minimize the parking areas onsite to lessen the amount of impervious areas and increase natural buffer zones to the Black Birch Lane residences. Double parking trays are minimized with the exception of parking in the northerly corner of the site. This area will be the locus for the wastewater leaching fields and will require construction to the extent shown. Landscaping and amenities will exist beyond the parking field.**

**Regarding Impacts of parking and amenities near ground level units: Plant beds currently shown around building foundations will be further defined as to the species, size and quantities of the plants proposed. Plants will be selected based on how their physical and physiological characteristics will best satisfy the requirements of the design challenge, the microclimate, the space allotted, and aesthetics. Foundation shrubs will provide some noise reduction by absorbing and deflecting sound, but the majority of noise and headlight glare mitigation and privacy is provided by the walls, windows, blinds and shades. Numerous tall growing shrubs along building foundations and in front of windows provide minimum relief and create excess maintenance and mold damage. This approach to parking is well established in suburban development and in the developer's extensive experience has not proven to deter residents from living at the community or diminishing their experience.**

**The two amenity courtyards allow for trees and large shrubs to be planted away from the buildings, limiting some views into the ground level and upper-level units as well as providing some privacy for the residents in the amenity space.**

*Comment 5a:ii: Both of the building footprints define programmable courtyard spaces, and the ground floor plans of each structure indicate passage from the corridor into the courtyard. There is also courtyard access from the Amenity area on Building A. Building A includes 120 units, Building B is proposed to be 117 units.*

*Building A's courtyard includes a swimming pool, sauna, grilling area with associated tables, a fire pit, a "synthetic turf activity area", and sodded lawn areas that provide some distance between the active areas and unit windows and balconies that face the courtyard. The landscape plan indicates a plant bed that follows the building/unit façade, where presumably planting could be introduced to enhance privacy within the unit (the current plans do not provide sufficient information to make that determination). Nine apartments face the courtyard at Building A. There is no program definition on the architectural plans that indicates how the indoor amenity spaces relate to the outdoor spaces.*

**Response 5aii:** The interior program will continue to be developed in coordination with the site/landscape design as the program is defined. That level of design does not take place until the Comprehensive Permit (in this case) has been issued and the construction drawing process has taken place.

*Comment 5aiii:* Building B's courtyard includes a small seating area, a grilling area, a fire pit, planting beds, and an area labeled "activity lawn." Similar to Building A, there is a planting bed that follow the building edge (also, not well defined as far as proposed plantings). There are 9 apartments that face the courtyard. This courtyard is more "squeezed" than Building A's, specifically with respect to the closeness of the activity areas to the ground floor units surrounding the courtyard. Given that the two buildings are designed with virtually the same number of units, this could be problematic.

**Response 5aiii:** The design of two independent courtyards was intentional and allows for diversity amongst buildings and units to allow residents to have choices between the more active courtyard of Building A and the more "passive" courtyard of Building B. The resident profile at these types of communities is varied. Some residents will prefer the activity and convenience of living beside a more active courtyard while others will prefer the tranquility of a more passive courtyard.

*Comment 5aiv:* In order for Building B residents to have access to the swimming pool, they need to exit their building and travel west through the courtyard, cross the parking lot between A and B, and then go through the eastern leg of Building A into its courtyard. This path is defined on the landscape plans, and appears to be coordinated with the architectural ground floor plan. This proposal, while functionally adequate, does not create a meaningful spatial connection between the two courtyards. This connection was arguably better expressed in the previous, three-building scheme, where two small courtyards between Buildings B and C have a broad parking-lot-crossing that connects with the primary courtyard at Building A.

**Response 5aiv:** See response above – note also that the site plan presented on 1.23.25 included extended, landscaped islands between the two buildings meant to improve on the pedestrian experience and connection.

*Comment 5av:* As far as other areas on the overall site that have designated programs, there are areas reserved for a tot lot and a dog park to the east of Building B, separated from the building by the parking area (which includes one of the garage structures). No detailed plans for these spaces have been provided. The tot lot is not called out on the civil plans.

**Response 5av:** The site plans have been revised to incorporate additional detail on the development for a tot lot/playground, dog park, and a sports court/basketball surface. These will all be connected to both Buildings A & B through pedestrian sidewalk connectivity. The location of these amenities was determined to be proximate to the residential buildings but sufficiently away to lessen noise generated by these uses. They are, however, situated for visibility for a large number of residents within both buildings. Adjacent to the amenities will be a large open field space on top of the leaching fields. This will be an open lawn area separated from the parking area by a split rail fence to delineate the two spaces.

*Comment 5avi:* There are other open areas on the site, most importantly the large areas that have been graded "flat" to provide space for the waste water treatment area and leaching field(s). How these areas are finished (ground cover) and how they may be programmed does not appear to be indicated on the landscape plans. The southeast corner of the site is designed as an infiltration basin.

**Response 5avi:** The waste water systems have not been designed. Once confirmed through the MassDEP permitting process, the development team will review the opportunity for additional landscaping. The program areas shown depict allocation for a series of underground tanks and treatment chambers.

*Comment 5avii:* Currently, the plans do not indicate a connection between the on-site amenity areas with nearby Town paths.

**Response 5avii:** The revised site plan allows for direct connectivity to the existing town paths on the north, south, and westerly portions of the site. The trails shown are part of the Powder Mill Woods trail series, but the lands of the Thoreau Club and the lands of the Residences at Thoreau are designated as private property with no entry as shown on current maps. This is the intent of the trail connections. The southerly connection to the Powder Mill Trail will be used as a secondary fire access road subject to final approval of the Concord Fire Department.

*Comment 5bi:* Function, use and adequacy of open space and landscaped areas. As noted above, the subject site does not have easy, pedestrian or bicycle connectivity with off-site public amenities. As such, it follows that to help to minimize use of motor vehicles, the development should look for a degree of "self-sufficiency" to accommodate predictable, daily needs of its residents. The proposed unit count of 237, with a unit mix that creates 401 bedrooms, results in 164 bedrooms that could potentially be occupied by one or more children. The area designated as "tot lot" seems very small (50' x 40'), and is located in a remote part of the site accessed by crossing one of the parking lots. If there are other areas designated for older children, they have not been called out on the plans.

**Response 5bi:** A tot lot and dog park previously located at the rear of the site has been relocated to the northwest open space closer to both buildings. The tot lot is sized large enough to accommodate play equipment for two age groups. A half-court basketball court has also been added to this location for older children's play. All three spaces are accessed by an ADA accessible walk and

**crosswalk. Level open space at the northeast perimeter will be loamed and seeded with a drought tolerant fine fescue seed mix and maintained as a play lawn.**

*Comment 5bii: The courtyard spaces are designed for passive recreation. As noted above, Building B's courtyard is confined relative to Building A's. This has the potential of creating visual and acoustical privacy issues with the ground floor levels in particular, but for many more residents, smoke from the courtyard grills could negatively impact homes on all levels of the building. (the grills are about 20 feet from the building façade).*

**Response 5bii: The design of the courtyard for Building B is typical for more passive residential courtyards. The development team is comfortable with the proposed proximity of grills to residential units.**

*Comment 5biii: Overall, the current plans that indicate two buildings that are more stories (and that include more dwelling units) than the three structures indicated in the previous design have done a good job of concentrating total building footprint. However, the overall site disturbance required to fit extensive surface parking, sewage treatment, and stormwater management has not drastically changed (reportedly, the undisturbed area has increased by 1.6 acres). Seeing more detail provided by the Applicant on where the increase in undisturbed is located would be helpful.*

**Response 5biii: The enlarged undisturbed area is focused in two locations: 1. The relocation of the site driveway to be sited on top of the existing parking field for the Thoreau Club has allowed for the conservation of trees and earthwork that would otherwise have occurred adjacent to the Forest Ridge Road drainage kettle hole. The relocation has further allowed a reconfigured driveway that seeks to address fire access concerns for width. These would not have been possible under the prior plan. The second area is located northwesterly of Building A. Under the first iteration of the plan that this comment letter was based on, the parking tray was pulled away from the property line and the abutters at Black Birch Lane. Through the design workshops and feedback from the Zoning Board, the applicant has removed one row of parking along this same area that creates an additional 40 feet of preserved trees and approximately 10,000 square feet of natural buffer.**

**Since the original plan, the undisturbed area has increased by approximately 2.1 acres, up from the 1.6 acres noted above by the reviewer.**

**While not directly creating additional open space, the entry to the clubhouse has been altered to improve traffic flow and reduce the intersection movements that would have occurred close to the Black Birch residences adjacent property line. This action further minimizes headlight glare and vehicle noise.**

*Comment 5biv: From this reviewer's perspective, the biggest site-related issue is the very large areas that are dedicated to surface parking. In addition to the impact on individual dwelling units that is noted above, the large parking fields diminish the site landscape buffers, increase the impervious areas (increasing the need for stormwater management), create heat islands, increase the need for site lighting, and more generally, disassociate the buildings from their surroundings.*

**Response 5biv: This project has been designed with surface parking since its inception. Given the cost of land and construction, surface parking multifamily projects allow them to be viable economically**

and less expensive for residents. The design has evolved and improved throughout the hearing process to mitigate any negative impacts of the surface parking to all stakeholders as much as possible. The most important thing is to provide high-quality housing to help alleviate the crisis we have in MA, which is very difficult to do in today's environment.

*Comment 5bv: As has been noted by others, introducing parking in the basements of the buildings would have a very positive impact on the site plan. Even if basement parking only happened at Building A (which is constructed on significant amounts of fill), it may be possible to eliminate the parking field that separates the two buildings, as well as half of the double-double loaded area on the north side of Building B (which could potentially save more of the existing tree buffer between the development and the neighbors on Black Birch). Expanding courtyard space to the interstitial area would ease up the congested plan in B's courtyard and create a central shared court that could include a more generous, easily accessible play space, as well as provide a more generous pathway to Building A's courtyard and shared interior amenities. Ideally, in this scenario, creating an at-grade opening on the north side of Building A that connects directly into the courtyard would be integrated into the plan (as opposed to residents of Building having to enter and exit a corridor to access the shared amenities).*

**Response 5bv: Below grade podium parking has been reviewed in depth throughout the hearing process. Unfortunately, the cost to construct that type of parking would make the project uneconomic. Estimates to build the below grade parking came in north of \$4,000,000 including the associated changes to the building that need to be done to accommodate that change plus soft costs and additional construction time.**

*Note that providing basement parking could obviate the need for the four garage structures.*

**Response 5bvi: See response to 5bv. Additionally, the developer has found that above-grade garage parking is extremely popular with residents as it provides private bays that a common garage does not. There is a feeling that evokes a single-family living situation and they are also able to use excess space in their garage bay for storage**

*Comment 5ci: Review of the existing natural features of the site to help inform the architectural review of the design, massing, screening, layout and materials of the building(s). Because the proposed development is located at a significantly lower elevation from its nearest residential neighbors to the north (see November 13, 2024 site section B), and because there is considerable distance between the neighbors and the development, there are opportunities for providing effective landscape screening (where existing tree growth left in place is insufficient). It is this topographical feature of the terrain (combined with buffering) that helps to justify taller, more concentrated development of the site.*

**Response 5ci: The adjustments made to the site increased the native buffers where it would have the most beneficial effect on the abutters, in this case Black Birch residences.**

**In addition to the site plan revisions that reduce pavement and increase the tree save area between The Residences at Thoreau and the adjacent Black Birch community to the west, 8'-10'**

**tall evergreen trees are proposed to supplement the existing woods and provide year round screening. Similarly, 8'-10' evergreen trees are proposed along the east property line to provide screening for the Thoreau Club.**

*Comment 5cii: It is this reviewer's opinion that a survey should be done of the buffering that will be left in place to assess its effectiveness at screening the development from view from the neighbors on Black Birch. It may be necessary to supplement the existing materials with evergreens to achieve this year-round. This includes screening views of rooftop mechanical equipment, which could be accomplished with properly-placed and scaled landscaping, but also rooftop equipment screens (that are not currently depicted on the building elevations).*

**Response 5cii: The development team would respectively disagree with reviewer on the need for a site specific tree survey as it will result in an unnecessary effort that may not provide material results without assessing every tree from multiple angles. Significant efforts have been made create separation from the property line and retain natural tree buffer and supplement with additional plantings. The existing woodland has a number of high canopy evergreen trees with low growth brush.**

*Comment 5ciii: Note that there is a good chance that without rooftop screening, mechanical equipment will be visible from the entry drive to the new development. This would be unfortunate.*

**Response 5ciii: Mechanical equipment will be located approximately 30' from the roof edge above the corridors with visibility from the ground in mind**

*Comment 5di: Building design, setbacks, massing and scale in relationship to the surrounding context and topography. The revised program for the building includes a total of 237 dwelling units (97@1-BR, 116@2-BR, and 24@3-BR). The schematic architectural plans for Building A indicate an interior amenity area of 9,430 SF. The plans do not indicate what the program is for that space. There is an additional 204 SF, undefined amenity space on the first floor. Building B's amenity area appears to be limited to a 679 SF lobby and mail area on the east side. Missing from the building plans are any indication of where secure bike parking spaces for the residents will be located (as well as outdoor bike racks for visitors).*

**Response 5di: Indoor bicycle storage will be provided in areas designated as "amenity". Final layout has not yet been determined. Additionally, during the construction drawing process the developer will identify locations for outdoor bike racks.**

*Comment 5dii: Generally speaking, the two-piece massing of Building A (a five-story, L-shaped structure, connected to a single-story community building) works very well. As noted above, the impact of the height is mitigated by the local terrain, and the concentrated massing helps with flexibility in site-planning. The bulk of the large piece is broken up with inset corner balconies, large framing of selective areas, horizontal banding, and differentiation of materials and colors. The currently*

*proposed language of the building is contemporary, very much in contrast with the originally submitted historic-ish look. The current path is preferable to this reviewer. Given the degree that the project is insulated from nearby context, a design approach that deviates from other neighborhood residential buildings is appropriate.*

*Building B's massing is less interesting, as it is all a uniform 5-story height (no smaller scale element), U-shaped. The perspective renderings that have been submitted focus on the massing of Building A. It would be informative to have renderings that show the two buildings together, including views within the space between the buildings. This type of analysis might help to advance ideas for creating a more engaging overall composition. As suggested above, converting the space between the buildings to a landscaped area, along with connecting the pedestrian walkways between A and B would be beneficial. Another option for the interstitial area that would help tie the development together is to create a woonerf ("living street") that could accommodate activity space, along with delivery/drop-off/pick-up/move-in space (current site plans are not clear as far as where these functional areas are).*

**Response 5dii:** Through feedback received through the Zoning Board and its consultants, the applicant has added deeper pedestrian connectivity between buildings A and B by eliminating some of the parking and introducing a raised speed table. The table will provide a visual break along this corridor and signify the connection between the buildings while providing traffic control. The table will be patterned with stamped concrete as part of the overall landscape. While not a woonerf, it invites characteristics including low speeds, traffic calming, distinctively different visual features and landscaping. This area also allows for a bus shelter for children to be dropped off and picked up by the school bus. The Town planner has confirmed that the school transportation system will enter the property to pick up children.

*Comment 5e: Impact on streetscape (major thoroughfare and abutting residential neighborhood).*

**Response 5e:** N/A

*Comment 5f: Sensitivity to character defining features on nearby streets, residential multifamily neighborhoods and other developments.*

**Response 5f:** N/A

*Comment 5g: Viewsheds of the project visible from the public street, public areas and from the vantage of nearby residential neighborhoods.*

**Response 5g:** Views into the project from Forest Ridge Road and neighbors have been mitigated by revising the site plan to save more trees and supplementing the existing trees with nursery grown evergreen trees at 8'-10' tall to provide year-round screening. A curvilinear entry drive lined on both sides and in the center island with shade trees eliminates a direct view from Forest Ridge Road to the first building in the project.

*Comment 5hi: Pedestrian and vehicular access and circulation, adequacy of accessible provisions. Of particular interest are the implications of access and egress in terms of pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists. Adequacy of visitor loading, drop-off/pick-up facilities; how lack of parking might serve or not serve the project.*

*Accommodation for bicycles is not addressed in the current plans. Pedestrian circulation within the site could be improved by creating a continuous walkway that circles both buildings, as well as potentially enhancing passage through Building A at ground level to create a better connection to the shared amenities in the courtyard.*

**Response 5hi: Recommended elements have been incorporated into the site plan. Sidewalks encompass both buildings and allow for direct connection to all points of the site and Forest Ridge Road. The front entrance has been reconfigured to allow for a dedicated high turn over space that can address several users including the Post Office, Uber, Amazon, FedEx and other vehicle sharing services. The space will be adequately signed and is tethered to the clubhouse for a coordinated location.**

**Passage through Building A is offered through access doors located near the raised speed table described above.**

*Comment 5hii: Consideration should be given to creating a protected area for a school bus to pick up children (whether it's within the site or near the driveway entry on Forest Ridge Road).*

**Response 5hii: A bus shelter was added to the plans as described above.**

*Comment 5i: Integration of building and site, including but not limited to preservation of existing tree cover, if any.*

*In addition to providing a tree survey to assess the quality of buffering that is proposed to be left in place, the Applicant should provide a tree protection plan that maximizes the likelihood of survival of trees near site disturbances. Relocating some of the surface parking to basement parking would be a very good strategy for increasing the number of trees that can be saved.*

**Response 5i: As noted, the site layout has been adjusted to further preserve trees. A protection plan for trees located adjacent to the work zone where they may be indicated shall be provided as part of the final landscape plans.**

*Comment 5j: Exterior materials.*

*The proposed façade materials are typical for this type of development, however, consideration should be given to introducing some metal in selective locations on the large blocks (specifically, the large accent frames). Similarly, the single-story community building is a good opportunity of limited scale to introduce more durable, higher quality materials.*

**Response 5j: The design intent was to use a combination of fiber cement products on the exterior including lap siding and panel. Different colors and textures were intended to be used as accents in higher visibility locations including the amenity building.**

*Comment 5k: Exterior lighting*

**Response 5k: N/A**

*Comment 5l: Review of landscape elements, planting materials, and planting design to help inform the architectural review of the design, massing, screening, layout and materials of the building(s).*

**Response 5l: N/A**

*Comment 5m: Feasibility of incorporating sustainable building features and energy performance standards in the design, construction and operation of the buildings, such as standards required for LEED certification, Passive House certification, etc.*

*Concord has adopted the Specialized Building Code. This is a very “high bar” from a sustainability perspective, and may well result in these buildings seeking Passive House certification. In addition, we understand that the Applicant is considering a fossil fuel-free design, and may well incorporate roof-top solar panels. A detailed sustainability narrative should be provided.*

**Response 5m: A sustainability presentation was provided on 1.23.25, a narrative can be provided outlining the presentation. The project will be using the Passive House (PHIUS) pathway. The development team will continue to coordinate with the Concord Municipal Light Plant (CMLP) regarding the use of photovoltaic panels and their capacity limits.**

*Comment 5n: Any other design-related considerations identified by me, ZBA, town staff, or ZBA working group.*

- *Applicant should commit to meeting or exceeding all local noise ordinances specific to mechanical equipment.*
- *Building will need back-up generator(s). Where will this be located?*
- *EV spaces should be called out in parking plans.*
- *Because the proposed buildings have elevators, all units are required to conform with MAAB Group 1 requirements. 5% must be Group 2 compliant. No typical accessible unit plans have been provided.*
- *Has a trash and recycling plan been presented to the Board of Health?*
- *A site-specific preliminary Construction Management Plan that includes intentions regarding use of site and street for mobilization/laydown space, proposed earth support systems, excavation methods, and accommodations that must be made to protect neighboring properties, material deliveries, street closures, construction durations, etc.*
- *Connection to nearby trails should be included in the site design.*
- *Can areas of pervious paving be introduced? A good place could be parking stalls, leaving normal asphalt paving in the drive aisles.*
- *Does the walkway from the street meet accessibility requirements (5% or less slope)?*
- *Why are “street trees” only proposed on one side of the entry drive?*
- *Are crosswalk improvements proposed where the project walkway meets Forest Ridge?*
- *Should a “resting place” be provided on the driveway walkway (it is approximately 720 feet long)?*

**Response 5n:** The applicant has incorporated the following into the site plans:

- Backup generators are not required for the buildings since they will incorporate a horizontal egress as allowed by code.
- Electric car charging stations shall be shown on the final plans in conformance with the applicable codes. The locations are currently being assessed.
- 12 Group 2 units shall be provided spread proportionally among the unit types and sizes.
- The trash and recycling has been presented to the Zoning Board. All trash and recycling is internal to the buildings through trash chutes and a trash room. Bins will be rolled out as needed for collection through roll up doors provided. Areas have been identified in the parking tray that will remain available for trash pickup.
- Connection to the Powder Mill Trails are noted on the plans. However, the intent is not for a pass through of the trail system through the private land as noted on the Town's trail system maps.
- The applicant has opted for the use of banked, or reserve parking, in lieu of porous asphalt. This allows for construction only upon confirmed need and eliminates the need for any impervious surface.
- The site driveway meets all ADA guidelines for accessibility.
- Street trees are now proposed for the center divider island and both sides of the entrance drive from for a uniform aesthetic and to provide additional screening of views into the site from Forest Ridge Road, the Thoreau Club and Black Birch. Resting locations have been provided along the site driveway as suggested.

*Comment 5o: Techniques to mitigate negative visual and functional impact. As noted above, the driving design concept is that the project be separated from the neighborhood context. As such, the success of this strategy hinges largely on the effectiveness of landscape screening.*

**Response 5o:** In addition to the site plan revisions that reduce pavement and increase the tree save area between The Residences at Thoreau and the adjacent Black Birch community to the west, 8'-10' tall evergreen trees are proposed to supplement the existing woods and provide year round screening. Similarly, 8'-10' evergreen trees are proposed along the east property line to provide screening for the Thoreau Club.

*Comment 6: Participate in meetings to include at a minimum municipal staff and the Applicant's team ("working sessions") to address the ZBA's charge to the Applicant. Be available to participate in up to four meetings with staff and Applicant. There have been 2 working sessions with the Applicant's team, Town staff, and this reviewer. Both meetings were productive and meaningful changes to address concerns were discussed.*

**Response 6:** The development team had a very productive working session with select ZBA members and Town of Concord department heads on 1.7.25. The development team will continue to make themselves available as needed.

We look forward to continuing to work with you and the Town, should you have any questions please let us know.

Best Regards,

THE ARCHITECTURAL TEAM, INC.



James J. Szymanski, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP  
Principal