TOWN OF BOXBOROUGH
NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

BOARD/COMMITTEE: Planning Board
MEETING DATE: May 18, 2020
TIME: 7:00 PM
PLACE: Remote Meeting through Zoom

AGENDA

Public Comment (3 mins per commenter)

Review 1 Paddock Lane Scenic Road Permit and Stone Wall Alteration Decision

Review 700, 750, & 800 Massachusetts Avenue
- Review of Sidewalk Plans, Condition 12 of Approval Decision (August 19, 2019)
- Review of Landscaping Plans, Condition 19 of Approval Decision (August 19, 2019)
- Review of Architectural Designs, Condition 20 of Approval Decision (August 19, 2019)

Zoning Bylaw Presentations
- Review timeline for presentations

<u>Administrative Business</u>
Meeting Minutes
Correspondence and New Business (if any)
Town Center/Enclave Project
Zoning Bylaw Audit
Schedule Future Planning Board Meetings
Planning Board Training
Solar Bylaw

Committee Reports: Community Preservation Committee
Design Review Board (Verner)
Economic Development Committee (White)
MAGIC Representative (Markowitz)
Water Resources (Fillmore)
LELWD Small Cell Committee (Markowitz)

Planning Board Goals: Master Plan Action Items

A quorum of the Economic Development Committee may be present.
A quorum of the Select Board may be present.

Planning Board Meetings:	**Future Meeting Dates:**
June 1, 2020	

Topic: Boxborough Planning Board Meeting of May 18th 7pm
Time: May 18, 2020 06:00 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81389608271?pwd=aWpvYlZyZkJLL3AyUGs2am1acCtqZz09

Meeting ID: 813 8960 8271
Password: 198272
One tap mobile
+13126266799,,81389608271# US (Chicago)
+19292056099,,81389608271# US (New York)

Dial by your location
+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)
+1 929 205 6099 US (New York)
+1 301 715 8592 US (Germantown)
+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)
+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)
+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)
Meeting ID: 813 8960 8271
Find your local number: https://us02web.zoom.us/u/kcRdhqTz9F

BOXBOROUGH PLANNING BOARD
29 Middle Road, Boxborough, Massachusetts 01719
Phone: (978) 264-1723 · Fax: (978) 264-3127
www.boxborough-ma.gov

Cindy Markowitz, Chair - Mark White - Rebecca Verner - Nancy Filmore - Joe Ferguson, Assc.

Filed with the Town Clerk
May x, 2020

SCENIC ROAD & STONE WALL ALTERATION PERMIT

1 Paddock Lane

This decision is in response to an application filed by Morgan L. Scott on March 12, 2020 in accordance with MGL Chapter 40, Section 15C, the Boxborough Scenic Road Requirements, and the Boxborough Stone Walls Bylaw to remove approximately 10 feet of existing stone wall to allow for a trail head to access a trail easement granted to the Town of Boxborough.

The subject property is located at 1 Paddock Lane, on the northeast corner of the parcel on Hill Road and is identified as Assessor's Parcel # 08-0014-000, and is owned by Jefferson at Beaver Brook, LLC.

After causing notice of the time and place of the public hearing and of the subject matter thereof to be published, posted, and mailed as required by law, the public hearing was conducted on April 6, 2020 and April 27, 2020. The following members of the Planning Board were present throughout the proceedings: Cindy Markowitz, Mark White, Nancy Fillmore, and Rebecca Verner. On April 27, 2020, the Planning Board closed the public hearing and voted 4 to 0 to **GRANT** approval of the Scenic Road and Stone Wall Alteration Permit based on the following findings and conditions:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. As proposed with the conditions below, the new stone wall opening does not require the removal of any public shade trees.

2. A stone wall opening width of 42 to 48 inches is consistent with the scenic character of Hill Road.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Approval is based upon the following Plans and Documents:
   a. "Proposed Conservation Easement Plan" in Boxborough, Massachusetts located at 1 Paddock Lane prepared by Hancock Associates, Inc. dated April 19, 2018 with a Planning Board date stamp of March 12, 2020.

2. The Applicant/Owner shall be required to keep Hill Road clean of dirt and debris from the site at the end of each day.

3. Upon completion, the Town Planner shall confirm that the maximum stone wall opening width is 48 inches feet along the property line.

4. Any stones which are moved to create the new opening in the stone wall shall be reincorporated throughout the length of the existing and remaining stone wall at the property.

5. No public shade trees shall be removed as part of creating the opening in the stone wall.

On behalf of the Planning Board:

_____
Simon Corson, Town Planner

_____ _____
Elizabeth Markiewicz, Town Clerk Date Filed

TOWN OF BOXBOROUGH
PLANNING BOARD
29 Middle Road, Boxborough, Massachusetts 01719
Phone (978) 264-1723 • Fax (978) 264-3127
www.boxborough-ma.gov

Cindy Markowitz, Chair Mark White, Clerk Nancy Fillmore Abby Reip Rebecca Verner

Approved on [DATE]

Meeting Minutes
April 6, 2020
7:00PM
Remote Meeting

Members Present: Cindy Markowitz, Mark White, Nancy Fillmore, Rebecca Verner
Also Present: Simon Corson (Town Planner)
Not Present: Abby Reip

Ms. Markowitz called the meeting to order at 7:10PM.

Administrative Business

Meeting Minutes March 9, 2020

> Mr. White motioned to approve the March 9, 2020 meeting minutes as amended. Seconded by Ms. Verner. Motion passed unanimously 4-0.

Silas Taylor Farm Road
Extension of Definitive Subdivision Plan and Private/Common Driveway Special Permit

Mr. Corson presented the letter submitted by Mr. Glen Kaufmann. Ms. Markowitz outlined that the applicant is seeking a 24-month extension of the Decision and Certificate of Conditional Approval for the Silas Taylor Farm Road Definitive Subdivision Plan and Private/Common Driveway Special Permit.

Mr. White motioned to approve the 24-month extension of the Silas Taylor Farm Road Definitive Subdivision Plan. Seconded by Ms. Fillmore. Mr. White amended his motion to include the approval of a 24-month extension of the Private/Common Driveway Special Permit. Amendment was accepted by Ms. Fillmore. Motion passed unanimously 4-0.

Public Hearing Scenic Road Permit and Stone Wall Alteration Application Paddock Lane

Ms. Markowitz opened the public hearing which had been continued from April 6th, regarding the request for a stone wall permit at Paddock Estates. Mr. Corson presented the application received.

Owen Neville, from the Agricultural Commission, outlined the contents of the application and status of the proposal. He shared that the Town owns the easement and Paddock Estates is cooperating with the effort for the opening in the stone wall to accommodate a trailhead. He also spoke to the photographic submissions and referenced estimated dimensions of the trailhead opening of an approximate three- and one-half-foot width. He noted that the proposal will allow for handicapped accessible trail access.

Ms. Markowitz asked if the width of the trail will be also three and one-half-foot or if the width only pertains to the access point. Mr. Neville responded that the access point would be three and one-half-foot wide and that the width would vary along the trail. He noted that generally it would be three to four feet wide which would be sufficient to accommodate a wide wheelchair.

Ms. Fillmore asked if this will impact the horse pasture. Mr. Neville responded that the fence posts along with the electric fending at the trailhead will be moved a few feet to the south of the easement.

Ms. Verner asked if the stone wall or trees in the provided image will be impacted by this trailhead installation. Mr. Neville responded that the trees in the space will not be impacted and that only a small portion of the wall will need to be reincorporated into the larger wall. He noted that foot traffic accessing the trail will go through the horse pasture-side of the stone wall.

Mr. White asked about parking availability by the access points. Mr. Neville responded that there is no parking at the access points.

Ms. Verner asked about the plan for restacking the walls. Mr. Neville responded that this was the best strategy and the right thing to do with the project.

Ms. Markowitz asked if the horse and equipment entrance at the pasture could also be used for access. Mr. Neville responded that it is not part of the easement and is not ideal for the trail access.

Ms. Fillmore motioned to continue the hearing to April 27, 2020. Seconded by Ms. Verner. Ms. Verner asked if there was a timeline for the project. Mr. Neville shared that the owner wants to move forward with the project and has received bids for the proposal. Motion passed 3-1 (Mr. White, opposed).

<u>Boxborough Meadows Homeowners Trustees: Road Acceptance Discussion</u>
Members of the Boxborough Meadows Homeowners Trustees in attendance seeking direction from the Planning Board regarding road acceptance

Jessi Robinson, President of the Boxborough Meadows Homeowners Trustees, outlined the request for any outstanding items from the Planning Board regarding closing the process for road acceptance.

Mr. Corson outlined the process with respect to the project and presented the Town of Boxborough Road Acceptance Procedure. He shared that the Trustees need to receive a Certificate of Compliance from the Conservation Commission, this will include monitoring the restoration area for invasive plants during the 2020 growing season and then submitting the monitoring report at the end of the 2020 season.

Ms. Markowitz asked if there were any further outstanding requirements for the Trustees. Mr. Corson responded that the road acceptance procedure is the outstanding matter, but it involves other boards in addition to the Planning Board.

Jessi Robinson provided an update of the current condition of the road and discussed the history of the road conditions.

Ms. Markowitz requested that Mr. Corson provide the Board a copy of the road acceptance requirements and a status of each item within 60 days. Mr. Corson noted that any required action from

the Planning Board be done after the anticipated Certificate of Compliance is issued by Conservation Commission by year end.

Citizen's Petition to Amend Zoning Bylaw Definition
Life Sciences and Footnote Zoning Bylaw Amendments

Ms. Markowitz outlined that the Planning Board had not yet determined if it will make a recommendation in the Warrant on the Citizens Petition.

The petitioner, Sue Schmitt, updated the Planning Board on her communications with the Finance Committee regarding the Citizen's Petition. She shared that the Committee cited its concerns and that updates were made to the Petition to address them. She asked the Planning Board what, if any, further reservations it has, so those can be addressed prior to Town Meeting.

Rebecca Neville (Finance Committee member) shared the that the Finance Committee voted down the recommendation because the Citizen's Petition had inconsistencies requiring further changes on the floor at Town Meeting.

Ms. Markowitz shared her suggested modifications to resolve the Finance Committee's concerns and cited interest in receiving input from the Fire Department and Board of Health.

Ms. Verner raised her support for requesting comments from the Fire and Police Departments. She outlined her reservation from the unknown impact it may have towards businesses in Town and noted that including the definition for "Life Sciences" within the use table as its own use would be beneficial. Ms. Markowitz noted her recommendation to include the term "Life Sciences" in the existing "Research and Development" definition and thus it would be included in the "Research and Development use within the use within the table.

Mr. White shared that he is interested in the Petition being brought forward at Town Meeting to understand the feelings from the community. He noted that addressing the issues brought forward by the Finance Committee would be beneficial before bringing it to a vote.

Rebecca Neville called attention to the procedure that requires if the Petition fails, it cannot be brought back again for two-years. She cited that preparing the Petition to be presented in its final form is the best course of action to support Ms. Schmitt's efforts.

Ms. Markowitz presented her recommendations regarding the Petition. The Board reviewed the proposed changes with Ms. Schmitt and suggested that changes to be made to the Petition to further ready it for Town Meeting Floor. Ms. Markowitz offered to support Ms. Schmitt in further revising the wording before this date.

Ms. Verner noted that that Board should provide a statement in the Warrant outlining its decision to defer a recommendation on the Petition until Town Meeting. Mr. White shared that the statement should be expanded to highlight the general support but cite that there are necessary details which will need to resolved at Town Meeting. Ms. Markowitz confirmed that the Board is generally supportive of the Citizen Petition by Ms. Schmitt with the expectation that some further details will be resolved at Town Meeting.

Review of Public Hearings and Annual Town Meeting Presentations

Ms. Markowitz explained that Annual Town Meeting is scheduled on June 15, 2020. She addressed the need for the Planning Board members to create presentation slides for each of the Zoning Bylaw Amendments. The Board reviewed the Articles and determined the topics each member will prepare to present.

UMASS Study and Charrette Update

Mr. White shared that he and fellow Economic Development Committee (EDC) member, Rich Guzzardi met with the UMass professor conducting the study. The EDC has also convened following that meeting. Discussions included the expectations to seek alternative hosting avenues for the charettes and other opportunities for the Town to provide input. The EDC members determined that under the current circumstances, the best way to progress is to determine viable areas for UMass to research during the summer. He noted that when the Fall semester begins the charettes can be hosted to collect input on the research conducted over the summer.

Mr. Corson highlighted the need for the EDC to continue to progress with the study to receive recommendations from research. Then the charettes can tentatively be hosted in the early Fall as an opportunity for community engagement. The students can gather results and to continue forward with only select options and receive feedback on any further progress that has been made.

Ms. Markowitz asked what the Phase II survey response rate was. Mr. Corson responded that he does not know the response rate but is expecting to receive a report with the results soon.

Ms. Markowitz cited the need to maintain the engagement and support for the study. She suggested that a presentation of the scenarios outlined in the Phase II survey could be beneficial. Mr. Corson supported the idea for project updates and presentations on results. He noted the need for additional community engagement since the charettes have been put on hold. Mr. White shared that the momentum of the study has fallen, he suggested waiting until early Fall to rebuild the community engagement outreach.

Citizen Owen Neville asked if there has been any consideration to pause the study as it stands and request the researchers to explore economic realities of the Town in the recent months. Mr. White responded that there have been discussions to pause the effort, but considerations have also been made to maintain the momentum.

Ms. Verner asked how the EDC determined the list to be further researched. Mr. White responded that items on the list were viewed as realistic opportunities and that they aligned within the desires of the community.

Water Resources Committee Update

Ms. Fillmore shared that the Water Resources Committee (WRC) received a letter from Cisco's legal team outlining that well water exploration will not be permitted on their property. She noted that this decision has remained unchanged since August of 2019.

Ms. Markowitz cited that there is an Article in the Warrant pursuant to funding for initial exploration of a public water supply in that area of Town.

Mr. Corson outlined that he will be providing the WRC with the result of the GIS project he has undertaken. The project will include tools to provide answers to frequently asked questions and a baseline analysis. He noted that he expects further analysis and graphics to be added, in addition to information on water quality and availability within the Town.

Administrative Business Continued

Town Center/Enclave Project

Mr. Corson provided an update that the Fire Department is now unable to provide resources to detail the site blasting so work has since paused. He shared that he has received one inquiry from a resident in the area of the blasting. He noted that due to the reduction in work site capacity and the changes to current work on the project, an estimated date for a submission to the Design Review Board and Planning Board is unknown.

Zoning Bylaw Audit

Mr. Corson provided that no decision has been made on hiring a firm, but he has received references from a firm and plans to reach out.

Planning Board Training

Mr. Corson shared that he has communicated with facilitator and that at this time they are unavailable to support a Planning Board Training.

Ms. Markowitz proposed providing online information such as the Citizen Planner Training Collaborative and other resources on the Town's website. Mr. Corson shared that he plans to provide additional planning information in a resource library there as well.

Solar Bylaw

Ms. Markowitz noted the Board's desire to retain this item on the agenda with the expectation to return to it in the future at the appropriate time.

Upcoming Meetings

Future Planning Board meetings were reviewed. The Board revised its upcoming meeting calendar. Meetings are now scheduled for: April 27, 2020, May 11, 2020, and June 1, 2020.

Committee Reports

Community Preservation Committee (Reip) – No update, not present.
Design Review Board (Verner) – Met on March 10 and reviewed submittals from the Enclave Project. The committee plans to provide a full report to the Planning Board once it receives a second submission.
Economic Development Committee (White)

MAGIC Representative (Markowitz) – Nothing new to report.
Water Resources (Fillmore)
LELWD Small Cell Committee (Markowitz) – Nothing new to report.

Mr. White motioned to adjourn. Seconded by Ms. Verner. Approved unanimously 4-0 at 9:40PM.

Meeting Documents
1 Paddock Lane: Scenic Road Permit and Stone Wall Application & Photographs
Boxborough Meadows Homeowners Trustees: Road Acceptance Application Requirements
Citizen's Petition: Notes by the Chair
Correspondence: Places Associates – Taylor Farm Road
Longwood Homes LLC Memorandum: Silas Taylor Farm Road Definitive Subdivision Plan – Extension Request
Planning Board Draft Meeting Minutes: March 9, 2020

ZOOM ACCESS PROTOCOLS
https://zoom.us/j/930041284?pwd=SGRxU25relFMSE1icFJjS0NoajVBZz09
Meeting ID: 930 041 284
Password: 580235
One tap mobile +13126266799 US (Chicago) +19292056099 US (New York)
Dial by your location +1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago) +1 929 205 6099 US (New York) +1 253 215 8782 US +1 301 715 8592 US +1 346 248 7799 US (Houston) +1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

Boxborough Town Center, LLC
PO Box 985, W. Acton, MA 01720
978-266-9751 authhomes@msn.com

April 28, 2020

To: Sheriff's Meadow Condominium Association

Tisbury Meadow Condominium Association

Re: Boxborough Town Center, LLC; Toll Brothers, Inc.
Agreement Executed September 5, 2019

This letter will certify that, in addition to the terms of the agreement referenced above, the communities of Sheriff's Meadow and Tisbury Meadow agree to and approve of the Enclave at Boxborough Landscape Plan, entitled Enhanced Entrance Exhibit, Dated March 20, 2020.

Signed:

SHERIFF'S MEADOW CONDOMINIUM ASSOCIATION

By: _____

Its: PRESIDENT + CLERK

TISBURY MEADOW CONDOMINIUM ASSOCIATION

By: _____

Its: President

SMCA - Please Share with Planning Board

SMCA BOARD <[redacted]>
Today, 2:21 PM
S Corson

Reply all

Action Items

Heilo Simon,

I just left you a voicemail message regarding the construction of the easement roadway through Sheriff's Meadow's property. The postponing of the roadway construction last fall was disappointing. It's almost May and all we think about is how wonderful it will be to sit outside on our decks and enjoy the outdoors. Please don't let any more time pass before giving the OK to proceed with the Enclave project.

Thank you,
Janice Yakel
President, SMCA
[redacted]

Fenton and Son Contracting Inc [redacted]

Mon 5/11/2020 12:49 PM

To: S Corson; Ryan Ferrara

Reply all

Organize

[redacted]

I'm writing to once again pass on our frustration with the Planning Board regarding the approval of the Enclave at Boxborough Project.

Since the Settlement Agreement signed in January, 2019, and the court remand order generated at the same time, Boxborough Town Center and Toll Brothers have been trying to work with the Planning Board to obtain final approval. Unfortunately, it's becoming clear that the Board has little or no intention on getting this resolved which is unfair to both my company and Toll Brothers.

The most recent delay relating to information pending from the Design Review Board is unjustified. The DRB information is used for input only and should not hold up the decision process. We also feel that the Planning Board is overstepping their authority when it comes to input on the design of the project. My experience is the Planning Board's focus is and should be zoning and permit approvals. It now appears the current Board is holding up the project despite Toll Brothers' willingness to respond to each and every change that's been requested.

Tisbury Meadow and Sheriffs Meadow Condominiums are getting impatient and want the project to get underway. This process has dragged on for over five years and has been reviewed by three different Planning Boards.

We're hoping for a final decision at the meeting scheduled for May 18th.

Thank you
Jim Fenton

Boxborough Town Center, LLC

Sheriff's Meadow Easement Roadway

Paul R Kerrigan <[redacted]>

Thu 4/30/2020 1:44 PM

To: S Corson

Cc: Janice T. Yakel <[redacted]>

Reply all

Action Items

I write this to support the prompt building of the easement roadway in Sheriff's Meadow to the Toll Bros. condo construction area. The sooner the roadway is built the sooner Sheriff's Meadow area is returned to a (new) normal.

I should add that the blasting has been of minor influence to us. I am in the condc nearest to the construction and have found the blast vibration and acoustic noise to be minimal. I have been more aware of thunder from passing weather storms than the noise etc. from the blasting!

I ask that you pass on these comments to the Planning Board. Thank you.

Paul R. Kerrigan

125 Stow Road

TOWN OF BOXBOROUGH DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Design Review Report
Enclave at Boxborough
700, 750, & 800 Massachusetts Avenue

Revised and Approved by the Boxborough Design Review Board May 13, 2020

This report updates the May 10, 2019 Design Review Board input for the application.

Design Attributes and Guidelines

The Design Review Board derives its authority and responsibilities from Boxborough Zoning Bylaw Section 8100. The Design Review Board is acting on an application for a modification of architectural designs and is providing input on the landscape plans for the Enclave at Boxborough project located at 700, 750 and 800 Massachusetts Avenue. The Design Review Board has reviewed the project and recent submittals, taking into account the design attributes listed in Section 8105 of the Zoning Bylaw and further defined within the Design Review Board Design Guidelines, and has compiled its advisory recommendations to the Planning Board below.

The Applicant has provided an updated submittal of the Design Review Application consisting of the following documents:

1. A Design Review Board Application from Toll Bros., Inc. reflecting project updates to previously approved plans which include additional unit types, material details, colors and optional building additions – dated 2/11/2020
2. Cover Letter – DRB response 042820 – dated 4/28/2020
3. Presentation Plan, Sheet 1 - dated 4/22/2020
4. Architectural Plan Updates - dated 4/15/2020
5. Stow Road Sidewalk Plan - dated 4/23/2020
6. Site Plan and Photos - dated 4/21/2020
7. Ducharme & Dillis Letter 031820 – dated 3/18/2020
8. Landscape Plans 1 – 8 – dated 4/28/2020
9. Revised Landscape Plans 1 and 2 of 8 – dated 4/28/2020, received by the DRB 5/6/2020
10. Places - 5249 Enclave – Review of April 2020 Submission – dated 5/4/2020

Upon receipt of the Design Review Board Application, the Design Review Board convened on March 10th, 2020 to review preliminary materials submitted by the Applicant. At this meeting, the Design Review Board requested additional materials and various clarifications. Following the March 10th meeting, the Design Review Board issued a memorandum dated March 25th, 2020 outlining the Boards request for additional information. On May 6, 2020, the Design Review Board met to review the updated application and supporting documentation provided by the Applicant. Following is the Design Review Board findings and recommendations to the Planning Board as assessed by the attributes of the Design Review Board Design Guidelines:

1. <u>Rhythm of Solid and Voids</u>

   Findings: Per the Design Review Board Guidelines, “The architectural quality of building elevations is determined, in large part, by the “rhythm” or “patterns” of the architectural elements on the elevation.” The architecture for this proposed development is not entirely consistent with the “forms” from the target Colonial to Greek Revival architectural period (1760s – 1840s), it is noted that this is challenging to accomplish with the offering of multiple unit alternatives within a two-unit building.

   Though the side elevations of the proposed buildings remain largely unbalanced and lack symmetry architecturally, the Design Review Board believes that these elevations will be primarily inward facing towards the other development inhabitants rather than the neighboring community. The Design Review Board notes that the Applicant has made a significant effort to improve the architectural composition of solids and voids in the more prominent front and rear elevations.

2. Façade and Openings

Findings: The facades continue to have some elements that are inconsistent with the Design Guidelines target architectural period of Colonial to early Greek Revival, most notably due to the more modern window sizing and layouts. The two and three overhung windows ganged together is not representative of colonial symmetry with regard to spacing. A number of the window proportions do not appear to meet the maximum and minimum height/width ratios from the Design Guidelines (height 1.5 to 1.9 times the width).

Though the side elevations lack much interest, the Design Review Board notes that the Applicant has made a significant effort to improve the composition of the façades with thoughtful placement of door and window openings on the more prominent front and rear elevations of the proposed buildings.

3. Massing and Spacing of Buildings

The Design Review Board Design Guidelines states the following for large buildings within the Town Center Zoning District:

"Large Buildings - The intention is to promote a scale and massing of a small rural town representing styles extending from roughly the middle of the Colonial period to the early Greek Revival period (1760s-1840s). In this era, the largest buildings were either meetinghouses or agricultural buildings such as barns. The size and scale of these traditional structures will indicate the size of the largest building footprints in the Town Center Zoning District. The recommended largest footprint would approximate 45 feet x 65 feet. Commercial buildings of residential character, including residential-scale elements and features that complement local tradition and character, are encouraged."

Findings: The presented architectural options suggest a possible building footprint of either 76 feet x 78 feet or 80 feet x 78 feet[1] far exceeding the Design Guidelines recommended dimensions by up to 33 feet x 15 feet (the DRB noted that the plan drawing for the Wetherbee model lacked the width of the unit. The Applicant confirmed an individual unit width of 39 feet for the Wetherbee unit during the May 6, 2020 meeting).

The table below summarizes the potential increase in square feet from the approved Site Plan Decision of August 19, 2019 to the new Presentation Plan in the event that all options were selected for all units.

[1] Dimensions based upon the August 19, 2019 Site Plan Decision which approved standard 62'd x 78'w units, plus the potential selection of all optional add-ons and the August 19, 2019 approved 10' x 12' rear deck for each unit.

Square Footage Comparison of Enclave Duplex Units with Proposed Options

Original footprint (sf)	Unit Type	Proposed Duplex Footprint (sf)	Duplex Unit Combinations	Increase (sf) / % increase
(62'd x 78'w) for two units = 4,836	All	6,084	Davis / Wetherbee, Wetherbee/Fifer, Wetherbee/Hager, Wetherbee/Steele (Assumes Wetherbee max. (39' x 80') and Davis max. (39' x 76')) 3,120 + 2,964 = 6,084	1,248 / 25.8%
4,836	All	78' x 76' = 5,928	Fifer/Davis, Hager/Steele, Davis/Davis, Fifer/Fifer, Steele/Steele, Davis/Hager, Davis/Steele, Fifer/Hager, Fifer/Steel	1,092 / 22.5%
4,836	All	78' x 80' = 6,240	Wetherbee/Wetherbee	1,404 / 29%
Total - 25 Duplex Units = 120,900 sf				Total potential added sf for 25 Duplex Units = 27,300 sf to 35,100 sf **22.5% - 29% increase from original footprint**

During the May 6, 2020 public meeting, the Design Review Board asked the Applicant if the proposed screen porches have the potential to become three season porches or habitable space. The Applicant confirmed that the screen porches could potentially become habitable space, however, a conversion of this type would require a building permit approval through the Town. It is noted that a conversion of this nature would increase the gross area floor ratio for such a unit.

As visible in the document titled "5. Site plan and photos" these units, with the proposed building options, will be significantly out of scale in relation to the neighboring homes surrounding the development, making them less than harmonious with the character of the surrounding residential neighborhood per the Design Review Board Design Guidelines and as stated in Criterion 3. Of the Settlement Agreement dated January 25th 2019, "Architectural style shall be in harmony with the prevailing character and scale of buildings in the neighborhood and the Town through the use of appropriate building materials, screening, breaks in the roof and wall lines, and other architectural techniques. Proposed buildings shall relate harmoniously to each other."

As can be seen from the table below, when adding the proposed options, the square footage of the duplex units may range from 5,928 sf to 6,240 sf. These buildings would far exceed the scale of the surrounding neighborhood residences.

Address	Dimensions	Total SF
101 Stow Road (Tisbury Meadows) – Single Story Units	36'x40'	1328 sf
109 Stow (Sheriffs Meadow) – Single Story Units	42'x42' (inc. att. garage)	1389 sf
145 Stow Road – Two Story Unit	36'x24' + (14'x24' deck)	1555 sf
155 Stow Road – Two Story Unit	42'x35' + (6'x10' deck)	1128 sf
181 Stow Road – Two Story Unit	42'x28'	1386 sf
197 Stow Road – Two Story Unit	50'x27'	1394 sf
511 Burroughs Road – Two Story Unit	49'x26' (+16'x36' garage)	1300 sf
539 Burroughs Road – Two Story Unit	30'x34' + (12'x14' porch)	2070 sf
571 Burroughs Road – Two Story Unit	44'x20' + (17'x20' porch)	2508 sf

Source: Boxborough Web GIS

Further the proposed expansions appear to be in conflict with prior agreements and approvals, as noted below:

a) Per Condition 3 of the Settlement Agreement, "Building designs for the senior housing would reflect the alternative duplex townhome designs, with front porches, as submitted to the Town of Boxborough on October 31, 2018". The Building footprint shown in the Building elevations submitted to the Town on October 31, 2018 (Models A, B and E) show a building footprint depth(d) and width(w) of 62'd x 76'w[2].
b) Per the Site Plan Approval and Special Permit Decision from the Planning Board filed on August 19, 2019, the referenced plan set (dated October 25, 2019, received by the Town November 14, 2019 and endorsed by the Planning Board on January 6, 2020) indicates a building footprint of 62'd x 78'w.
c) Per the architectural plans and elevations dated 4/15/2020 and titled "2. Architectural Plan Updates", it appears that the buildings have the potential, with the various options presented, to extend to a footprint of 76'd x 78'w or even up to 80'd x 78'w, a potential addition of 18 feet in depth to the approved footprint depth of 62 feet.

These dimensions far exceed Design Review Board Guideline recommendations, the Settlement Agreement-referenced building footprints, and the Planning Board's approved building footprint.

[2] This document is on the town website at:
https://www.boxborough-ma.gov/sites/boxboroughma/files/file/file/700_750_800_mass_ave_-_alternate_duplex_townhome_designs_181031_stamped.pdf

Footprint Increases of Proposed Duplex with Options vs. Design Review Board Guidelines

Document	**Footprint (depth x width)**	**Increase from Design Review Guidelines**
Design Review Guidelines [3]	45' x 65' (no d or w provided)	------
Condition 3 of the Settlement Agreement dated January 25th 2019 - Building Elevations submitted to the Town on October 31, 2018 (Models A, B and E)	62'd x 76'w	+17' d + 11'w
Site Plan Approval and Special Permit Decision from the Planning Board filed on August 19, 2019, the referenced plan set (dated October 25, 2019, received by the Town November 14, 2019 and endorsed by the Planning Board on January 6, 2020)	62'd x 78'w	+17' d + 13'w
Presentation Plan 700-800 Massachusetts Avenue Boxborough, Massachusetts Sheet No. 1, dated December 13, 2019	of 78'd x 78'w or up to 88'd x 78'w	+33' d + 13' w or up to + 43' d + 13' w

Per the site plan most recently submitted by Ducharme & Dillis to the Design Review Board titled "Presentation Plan 700-800 Massachusetts Avenue Boxborough, Massachusetts Sheet No. 1", and per document titled "Cover Letter – DRB response 042820, Exhibit A Master Deed Condominium Document excerpt definition of Limited Common Elements", it appears that the units have the potential to include an area of impervious improvements of built structure and/or paved area of up to 78 feet x 88 feet which will further increase site density and drainage impacts due to added impervious surface area potential as follows per unit selections:

- Davis, Hager, Steele combinations: Potential increase of 1,092sf of impervious surface area
- Davis/Wetherbee, Wetherbee/Fifer, Wetherbee/Hager, Wetherbee/Steele: Potential increase of 1,248sf of impervious surface area
- Wetherbee/Wetherbee combination: Potential increase of 1,404sf of impervious surface area

The Design Review Board recommended at the May 6, 2020 meeting, that within "Exhibit A" of the "Master Deed Condominium Document Excerpt" provided in the "Cover Letter – DRB response 042820" document the term "patios" as listed beneath the definition of "Limited Common Elements" sub. b be further defined to be made of porous pavers or materials.

The Design Review Board asked the Applicant about the second floor plans specific to the Davis, Hager, Steele and Fifer units (no second-floor plan provided for the Fifer unit). These models suggest an option for a finished space that is the size of a bedroom. The Design Review Board asked if these rooms could be converted into bedrooms, the Applicant replied that the total project's septic system was being designed to accommodate 100 bedrooms (i.e. 2 bedrooms per unit for 50 units) and suggested that this would limit the ability to turn these spaces into additional bedrooms.

[3] Per Design Review Guidelines, page 7, the recommended largest building footprint in the Town Center Zoning District would approximate 45 feet x 65 feet.

4. Placement and Orientation of Buildings within a Lot

   Findings: The Design Review Board notes that the proposed building units are much closer in proximity to one another contrasting to the neighboring rural residential setting, however, all dimensional requirements of the zoning bylaw appear to be met.

5. Architectural Details, Materials, and Color

   Findings: The provided architectural elevations labeled “2. Architectural Plan Updates” appear to show a mix of vertical board and batten and horizontal clapboards. The creative use of these two materials helps to break down the elevational scale of the building’s frontage.

   The Design Review Board notes that the Applicant has made a significant effort to integrate the Boards cladding recommendations. Further the Applicant has provided adequate representation of appropriate material and conformant color selections for roofing, siding and building colors.

6. Roof Slopes and Shapes

   Findings: The proposed roof slopes are low compared to guideline proportions. The roof pitch appears to be far less than 8 over 12 (rise over run) on buildings. Square dormers, also do not meet the same standard (being primarily flat). The Design Review Board notes that the larger the building footprints become, paired with building height limitations, the flatter the roof slopes become and the less they follow the Design Review Board Design Guideline recommendations for Roof Slopes and Shapes.

7. Signage and Lighting

   Findings: For safety reasons, the Design Review Board made a recommendation to the Applicant to add one additional street lamp in the vicinity of units 29 and 30. Per the Site Plan Approval and Special Permit Decision from the Planning Board filed on August 19, 2019, the referenced plan set (dated October 25, 2019, received by the Town November 14, 2019 and endorsed by the Planning Board on January 6, 2020) all proposed lighting fixtures are to be “Dark Sky Compliant”. The Design Review Board noted that this has not been documented in the provided lighting plans sheets 6 and 7 of 8.

   Signage details and materials have been provided to the Board and described as being made from a wood and plastic composite material with a simulated wood grain appearance. Though the Design Review Board understands the added durability of this proposed material, it is recommended that constructing the signage out of natural wood would be more appropriate given the architectural character of the Town Center District. Further, the Board understands that wood is the current material being used for the existing Sheriffs and Tisbury Meadows signage.

   The Design Review Board again questioned traffic visibility exiting the project site to Stow Road. As proposed, the project entry sign stands 7’-4” tall atop a grade being retained at an additional 2’ (as suggested by the Applicant at the May 10, 2020 Design Review Board meeting) or less than 18” (as suggested by the Applicant via “Cover Letter – DRB response 042820”). The Applicant indicated that this item is currently being addressed with Places Associates, the consulting engineer.

8. Landscaping

Findings: As identified in the Design Review Board Guidelines under General Character, the town of Boxborough "highly prizes its open spaces and areas that remain agricultural or wooded in nature."

Per Criterion 3. Of Section 8007 of the Zoning Bylaw, "Architectural style shall be in harmony with the prevailing character and scale of buildings in the neighborhood and the Town through the use of appropriate building materials, **screening** (*emphasis added*), breaks in the roof and wall lines, and other architectural techniques. Proposed buildings shall relate harmoniously to each other."

Per the Landscape Plan Sheet 2 of 8 and following the site clearing, the Design Review Board has identified two areas that require additional evergreen screening with the same sizes, species and spacing of the mixed evergreen screen reflected on Sheet 1 of 8 proposed behind units 37, 38, 39 and 40, dated 4/28/2020 (first submittal).

The Design Review Board recommends the addition of a mixed evergreen screen (install height of 8 feet –10 feet) including the following plant species already identified on the landscape plans and planting schedule: Pinus Stobus, Picea Glauca 'Densata', Picea Pungens 'Glauca' mixed with Thuja Standishi x Plicata 'Green Giant'. It is recommended that this mixed evergreen screen be installed along the full length of the property lines identified below:

539 Burroughs Road – Along the full length of the shared property line to the North of named property behind Enclave units 29, 30, 31 and 32.

571 Burroughs Road – Along the full length of the shared property line to the East of named property behind Enclave units 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27 and 28.

Subsequent to the receipt of the 4/28/2020 landscape plan submittal, the Design Review Board received two amended Landscape Plans Sheets 1 and 2 of 8 during the May 6, 2020 meeting. These two amended plans reflected a **reduction** of the number of evergreen screen trees from 29 to 17 behind units 37, 38, 39 and 40 as well as the **addition** of some minimal evergreen screening between the Enclave parcel and the neighboring 539 Burroughs Road and 571 Burroughs Road properties. The Design Review Board recommends a strong preference for the screen planting reflected in the 4/28/2020 sheet 1 of 8 behind units 29, 30, 31 and 32 rather than the reduced screening of evergreen counts, density and species as shown on landscape plan 1 of 8 received May 6th, 2020.

The Design Review Board recognizes the Applicants efforts to provide some screening to mitigate the tree removals on the Enclave property for 539 and 571 Burroughs Road in the later landscape submittal, however, the screening of these two properties should be extended the full length of the identified property lines to screen the units as outlined above.

Design Review Board Recommendations

Boxborough's general character is summed up in the phrase "scenic, historic, and rural character." With regard to several of the Design Guideline Attributes, provided plans and details indicate significant improvement from the earlier reviews submitted to the Design Review Board. However, the Design Review Board would share the following recommendations for the Planning Boards consideration.

3. Massing and Spacing of Buildings

   The Design Review Board has carefully considered the appropriateness of the proposed increase of building footprints and impervious areas. The Design Review Board does not believe that these 25 units will "be in harmony with the prevailing character and scale of buildings in the neighborhood and the Town", nor that they will "promote a scale and massing of a small rural town" as currently proposed.

   The Design Review Board recommends that, while the Site Plan Approval and Special Permit Decision endorsed by the Planning Board on January 6, 2020 approved building footprints of 62'd x 78'w which exceeds the Design Review Board Design Guideline recommendation of 45' x 65', this building footprint is far more appropriate to the scale of the existing surrounding neighborhood than the currently proposed architectural modifications in the Presentation Plan and Architectural Plan updates.

   Further, the Design Review Board recommends that within "Exhibit A" of the "Master Deed Condominium Document Excerpt" provided in the "Cover Letter – DRB response 042820" document, the term "patios" as listed beneath the definition of "Limited Common Elements" sub. b be further defined to be made of porous pavers or materials.

   Should the Planning Board decline the Design Review Board's recommendation and allow the enlarged building footprints and architectural modifications, the Design Review Board recommends that the optional rear facing add-ons are not allowed on units 15 through 40 due to their adverse visual and privacy impacts on private residences along Stow Road, Burroughs Road and Priest Lane.

6. Roofs Slopes and Shapes

   The proposed building roof slopes do not appear to meet the Design Review Board Design Guidelines as outlined above. The Design Review Board recommends limiting the building footprint size to 62'd x 78'w per the Planning Board endorsed site plan decision in order to better meet the steeper 8 over 12 (rise over run) recommendation for roof pitch.

7. Signage and Lighting

   The Design Review Board recommends that one additional street lamp be added in the vicinity of units 29 and 30. Further, the Applicant shall confirm that lighting is meeting "dark-sky" compliancy.

   The Design Review Board recommends that the multi-neighborhood entry signage at Stow Road be constructed out of natural wood rather than a wood and plastic composite material with simulated wood grain appearance to better maintain the architectural character of the Town Center District.

   Further, the Design Review Board recommends that the Applicant update plans indicating required visibility cone and or clear sight lines at the Stow Road access point to the property.

8. Landscaping

To ensure adequate evergreen screening along the perimeter of the Enclave development and to provide vegetative buffer to both the neighboring properties and to the development itself, the Design Review Board recommends the addition of a mixed evergreen screen (install height of 8 feet –10 feet). Such screen shall include the following plant species already identified on the landscape plans and planting schedule: Pinus Stobus, Picea Glauca 'Densata', Picea Pungens 'Glauca' mixed with Thuja Standishi x Plicata 'Green Giant'. It is recommended that this mixed evergreen screen be installed in a triangulated planting pattern along the full length of the property lines as identified below:

- 539 Burroughs Road – Along the full length of the shared property line to the North of named property behind Enclave units 29, 30, 31 and 32.

- 571 Burroughs Road – Along the full length of the shared property line to the East of named property behind Enclave units 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27 and 28.

The Design Review Board further recommends that the screen planting reflected in the 4/28/2020 sheet 1 of 8 behind units 29, 30, 31 and 32 reflecting the addition of 29 mixed evergreen screen trees be approved rather than the reduced number of trees as shown in revised sheet 1 of 8 received May 6, 2020.

To: Simon Corson, Town Planner

From: Cindy Markowitz, Planning Board Chair

Date: May 11, 2020

Subject: 700, 750 and 800 Massachusetts Avenue – Recent submittals from Owner/Applicant and status in advance of May 18, 2020 Planning Board meeting

The Planning Board has received the materials from the Owner /Applicant submitted April 28, 2020 and supplemental review letters from Places Associates on May 4 and 7, 2020 and Ducharme and Dillis from May 5, 2020 (see full list of Recent Information Submitted below).

In order to facilitate the Planning Board's review and meeting on May 18th it would be helpful to understand what the Owner/Applicant is *specifically* requesting from the Planning Board at this time.

It *appears* that the Owner/Applicant is seeking approval of the following Conditions from the August 19, 2019 Site Plan Approval, but this should be clearly specified by the Owner/Applicant, for this and for future requests.

Condition / Approval	**Relevant Submitted Items (April 28, 2020 and Subsequent Documents)**
Condition 12 – Applicant/Owner must construct a sidewalk, in accordance with the design standards in the Town of Boxborough Planning Board's Rules and Regulations Governing the Subdivision of Land, Section V.A. or to alternate construction standards that limit environmental impacts and are acceptable to the Planning Board, from the Project Site, along Access Easement C to Stow Road and then from the intersection of Access Easement C and Stow Road to Route 111/Massachusetts Avenue. The sidewalk design shall also include: a. any improvements needed at the intersection of Stow Road and Massachusetts Avenue to comply with the standards of the American with Disabilities Act (ADA) and the Massachusetts Architectural Barriers Board (MABB) regulations and; b. a rapid-flashing LED sign as requested by the Boxborough Chief of Police in his letter dated August 9, 2019 or any safety measure alternative otherwise approved by the Police Chief.	**Item 5** – Stow Road Sidewalk Plan **Items 8, 9 and 10** Note: Places indicates that this Condition only requires a submittal (not a detailed review or site plan modification) and therefore that this condition has been met. Ducharme and Dillis indicated they would be addressing outstanding issues (e.g. line of sight) at the Driveway/Stow Road intersection with revised plans. No information has been provided regarding item b., the flashing LED sign.
Condition 19 – All site work must be completed in accordance with the plans listed in Condition #1 of this Decision unless a change is requested in writing by the Applicant/Owner and is subsequently approved by the	**Item 4** – Updated Landscape Plans Sheets 1 through 9 – sheet 9 is new. Revised Sheets 1 and 2 provided on May 8, 2020 reflecting partial screening at 539 and 571 Burroughs

Planning Board. This includes ornamental landscaping throughout the Project Site and adequate landscaped screening along all of the property lines that abut other residential properties and along the internal roadway and Access Easement C.	Road and reduced screening from the previous plan at the entrance to the Enclave. **Item 6** - Site plan showing site relationship to adjacent structures with photos of site conditions and adjacent structure elevations. **Items 8, 9 and 10**. Note: Places indicates documentation meets the intent of this Condition but requested additional screening at 539 and 571 Burroughs Road as did the Design Review Board. Will revised Landscape plans be submitted to reflect this?
Condition 20 - Minor modifications resulting from scrivener's error or items not addressed in the approved plans or unforeseen field conditions, may be approved by the Building Inspector, upon consultation with the Planning Board's review Engineer, if they do not alter the nature, intensity or visual impact of the approved plans and conditions outlined in this decision. Landscape substitutions may be allowed if healthy specified plant materials are not readily available only with the review and approval of the Planning Board's Consulting Landscape Architect. Any Modifications that are not deemed minor by the Building Inspector shall be presented to the Planning Board for their review and approval. **The Planning Board shall determine whether the requested modification requires an amendment to this Approval.**	**Item 2** – Updated Presentation Plan **Item 3** – Updated Architectural Plans **Item 6** - Site plan showing site relationship to adjacent structures with photos of site conditions and adjacent structure elevations. **Item 1** – Itemized responses to March 25 DRB letter **Item 7** –May 18, 2020 letter from Ducharme and Dillis on drainage impacts associated with Arch drawings provided Feb 12 (and subsequent Arch drawings provided (Item 3) **Items 8, 9 and 10**

It appears that per **Condition 20**, the items submitted to address this Condition do warrant a request for a **Site Plan Modification**, as the proposed modifications alter the nature, intensity or visual impact of the approved plans and conditions outlined in the Decision**.** As such, the Planning Board will need to review again the requirements associated with Site Plan Approval. The Board may waive any procedural and filing requirements that would require duplication of actions already taken, or are otherwise unnecessary for it to decide the Owner/Applicant's request. However, it appears that several items under **Site Plan Review Submission Requirements (Section 3.1)** are relevant to this modification. These include:

- 3) Dimensions of the lot, frontage location and footprint of all structures, existing and proposed *[Owner/Applicant has submitted a Presentation Plan and Architectural drawings]*

- 11) Building Elevation plans (scale of ¼" = 1') showing elevations of all proposed buildings and structures *[Owner/Applicant has submitted building elevations]*
- 12) Evaluation of impact on Water Resources – The applicant shall submit materials on the measures proposed to prevent pollution of surface and groundwater, erosion of soil, excessive runoff of precipitation, excessive raising or lowering of the water table, or flooding of other properties. Necessary but has not been submitted. The evaluation shall include the predicted impacts of the development on the aquifer, and if applicable, compare the environmental impacts to the carrying capacity of the aquifer. *[Owner/Applicant has not provided revised drainage calculations for expanded building footprints-just a letter opinion that impacts will be minor]*
- 13) Evaluation of impact on Landscape – The applicant shall submit an explanation of design features intended to integrate the proposed new buildings structures and plantings into the existing landscape to preserve and enhance existing aesthetic assets of the site, to screen objectionable features from neighbors and public areas. *[Owner/Applicant has submitted revised Landscape Plans – needs to explain how revised plan addresses these items for expanded building footprints]*

Under Section 8007 of the Zoning Bylaw for Site Plan Review, the Board will need to find the proposed Site Plan Modification complies with the following criteria:

1) Comply with purpose and intent of zoning bylaw

2) The development shall be integrated into the existing terrain and surrounding landscape and shall be designed to protect the abutting properties and community amenities. To the extent possible, building sites shall be designed to minimize the use of wetlands, steep slopes, floodplains, hilltops; minimize obstruction of scenic vistas from publicly accessible locations; preserve unique natural, scenic and historical features; minimize trees, soil and vegetative removal; and maximize open space retention.

3) Architectural style shall be in harmony with the prevailing character and scale of buildings in the neighborhood and the Town through the use of appropriate building materials, screening, breaks in the roof and wall lines and other architectural techniques. Proposed buildings shall relate harmoniously to each other

4) Adequate measures shall be proposed to prevent pollution of surface and ground water, to minimize erosion and sedimentation, to prevent changes in groundwater levels, to minimize potential for flooding and to provide for stormwater drainage consistent with the functional equivalent of the Planning Board's Subdivision Rules and Regulations.

5) Roadway circulation

6) Adequate buffers shall be provided to protect abutting properties from lighting, sight, sound, dust and vibration

7) Adequate facilities for water supply and handling and disposal of waste and other production by products

8) Adequate access to each structure for fire and service equipment

9) Architectural Standards in Town Center District Only - Materials shall be harmonious with existing buildings. In the interest of maintaining a sense of history, vertical siding shall be discouraged and synthetic siding shall imitate the character and dimensions of traditional clapboards. Masonry block buildings should be faced in an appropriate material, such as horizontal wooden siding or brick of a traditional red color. Buildings shall fit in with exiting architecture in terms of height, massing, roof shapes and window proportions.

At Town Counsel's recommendation, the Planning Board should file a written decision with the Town Clerk on the Owner/Applicant's request once it completes its review, and in that decision indicate that it is deciding a request for modification of the original Site Plan Approval.

In order to assist the Board with making the above findings for the proposed Site Plan Modification, the **Planning Board requests the following from the Owner/Applicant (note additional information may be requested at the May 18, 2020 meeting):**

- Any new information regarding the proposed Landscape Plans (including any revised sheets after May 8, 2020) and a narrative describing the changes from the Landscape Plans that were conditionally approved on January 6, 2020.
- A table identifying the square footage associated with the proposed building footprint additions and options, by unit type. Such table should note which options are considered impervious and which are considered pervious. Table should provide the total amount of building footprint additions and include the maximum total amount of impervious and pervious area (square footage) possible, if all the options for all 50 units were selected.
- Drainage calculations that address the maximum amount of impervious area associated with the above configurations. Ducharme and Dillis letters and Places Associates letters indicate drainage calculations will be provided after Planning Board approval; however due to the apparent substantive nature of the building additions, these calculations are necessary prior to the Planning Board granting a Site Plan Modification.
- Update on the status of the Board of Health's permit/approval for the wastewater system and information regarding the number of bedrooms that the wastewater system is being sized for (we assume it was being sized for two bedrooms per unit). It should be noted that the revised architectural drawings appear to allow sufficient room for a third bedroom to be added in some units.
- Any responses from the Owner/Applicant to the latest Design Review recommendations from DRB meeting on May 6, 2020.
- Other information as requested by the Planning Board at, or subsequent to, the May 18, 2020 meeting.

In addition to the items above, the Planning Board is awaiting the report and recommendations from the Design Review Board from its May 6, 2020 meeting, which you have indicated will be available on Thursday, May 14, 2020.

Thank you.

700, 750 and 800 Massachusetts Avenue
Site Plan Review and Modification
Recent Information Submitted (2020)

April 28, 2020 information submitted:

1. Cover Letter with itemized response to March 25th letter from DRB
2. Updated Presentation Plan as prepared by Ducharme & Dillis dated 4/22/20
3. Updated Architectural Plans as prepared by Toll Architecture dated 4/15/20 and 4/27/20
4. Updated Landscape Plans (sheets 1 – 9) as prepared by ESE Consultants dated 4/28/20 which includes updated access easement along with supplemental screening plantings as referenced in the August 7, 2019 review letter by Places Associates. **Note updates Landscape Plans sheets 1 and 2 were provided on May 8, 2020. Will these be updated again to reflect recent Design Review Board and Places Associates comments regarding perimeter screening?**
5. Stow Road Sidewalk Plan as prepared by Ducharme and Dillis dated 4/23/20
6. Site plan showing site relationship to adjacent structures with photos of site conditions and adjacent structure elevations.
7. Letter from Ducharme & Dillis regarding Drainage relative to Building Options dated 3/18/20 – regarding increase relative to the impact on the proposed drainage systems. "We have confirmed that only minor revisions to the plan will be required. The drains for the roof leaders and the foundations drains will need to be shifted to accommodate some of the proposed building options. Our intention is to submit a revised set of plans and drainage calculations upon receipt of the Board's approval."
8. Letter from Places Associates May 4, 2020
9. Response Letter from Ducharme and Dillis, May 5, 2020
10. Letter from Places Associates, May 7, 2020

Feb 12, 2020 submitted information

F1. Project Update Letter from Ducharme and Dillis - Feb 12, 2020
F2. Presentation Plan – December 13, 2019 (superseded by Item 2)
F3. Architectural Drawings/Elevation Drawings from Toll Bros – January 28, 2020 (superseded by Item 3)

DUCHARME & DILLIS
Civil Design Group, Inc.
CIVIL ENGINEERS • LAND SURVEYORS • WETLAND CONSULTANTS

WWW.DUCHARMEANDDILLIS.COM
1092 MAIN ST • PO BOX 428 • BOLTON, MA 01740
PH. 978.779.6091
F. 978.779.0260

March 18, 2020
6092-T

Boxborough Planning Board
29 Middle Road
Boxborough, MA 01719

RE: Drainage relative to Building Options
Enclave at Boxborough
Boxborough, MA

Dear Members of the Board,

On behalf of our Client, Toll Bros., Inc. (TBI), Ducharme & Dillis has prepared this letter to supplement the information provided in our February 12, 2020 letter to the Board relative to the proposed building options to be located in the Exclusive Use Areas (EUA).

As mentioned in the letter and communicated on the updated Architectural drawings, there are several building options that would result in an increase in the rooftop/impervious areas of the site. We have reviewed this increase relative to the impact on the proposed drainage systems. We have confirmed that only minor revisions to the plan will be required. The drains for the roof leaders and the foundations drains will need to be shifted to accommodate some of the proposed building options. Our intention is to submit a revised set of plans and drainage calculations upon receipt of the Board's approval.

We look forward to presenting these items in more detail at an upcoming Planning Board meeting.

Regards,
DUCHARME & DILLIS
Civil Design Group, Inc.

Gregory S. Roy, P.E.
Principal

April 28th, 2020

Enclave at Boxborough – Design Review Board supplemental information

As a follow up to the March 10th, 2020 Design Review Board Meeting and corresponding memo from the DRB dated March 25th, 2020, Toll Brothers is providing the following supplemental documentation:

1. Updated Presentation Plan as prepared by Ducharme & Dillis dated 4/22/20 showing location of proposed options and limited common element areas
2. Updated architectural plans as prepared by Toll Architecture dated 4/15/20 and 4/27/20 providing supplemental front and rear elevations as requested along with additional dimensions and modified side elevations.
3. Updated Landscape Plans (sheets 1 – 9) as prepared by ESE Consultants dated 4/28/20 which includes updated access easement along with supplemental screening plantings as referenced in the August 7, 2019 review letter by Places Associates.
4. Stow Road Sidewalk Plan as prepared by Ducharme and Dillis dated 4/23/20
5. Site plan showing site relationship to adjacent structures with photos of site conditions and adjacent structure elevations.
6. Letter from Ducharme & Dillis regarding Drainage relative to Building Options dated 3/18/20

Below is an itemized response to the DRB letter of March 25th, 2020

1. Additional documents requested per attachment 1 of DRB application. See supplemental Site plan, photos, and other plans submitted to address items a. through d.
2. DRB requested additional information and clarification. Supplemental architectural and landscaping plans submitted to address Items a. through e.
    f. **CLARITY REGARDING THE SCREEN PORCH OPTION -** The Optional Covered Porch and Screened-in porch are the same size and layout (10' x 21') of unconditioned space built on footings with a roof covering the space. The only difference between the two options is the addition of screens around the porch area.
    g. **CLARITY REGARDING THE BUILDING FOOTPRINT -** See updated presentation plan prepared by Ducharme & Dillis. The optional 4' extensions noted on the plans would include full foundations. The optional 10' extension of the covered porch or screened-in porch would be on footings (similar to a deck).
        i. In regards to the DRB building footprint recommended in the Town Center District, it is important to put this in context of the zoning which allowed a significantly higher density of buildings than the current compromise of a 25 building plan.
        a. At the time of the settlement agreement Toll Brothers provided preliminary architecture to be reviewed which did not contain available options. What we have presented now is the fully developed architecture with options.
        b. Please note that in addition to the 62 x 78 footprints, the approved site plans included a 10 x 12 deck on the back of each unit. These deck areas are now part of our defined "limited common element"
        c. See updated "Dimensions of Models" on Presentation Plan
            i. This front 4' x 17' option would expand towards the road (only available on one unit type)

ii. Rear options allow for a 4' expansion of foundation. The covered porch/screen porch adds a roof over the previously approved area of the deck which extends 10' off the rear of the foundation

iii. Limited Common element area as shown on sketch.

d. The Limited Common Elements are those areas and facilities of the Condominium that are designated for the Exclusive Use of the Unit Owners. A draft of the Condominium Master Deed language addressing the Limited Common Elements are included as **Exhibit A** to this document.

e. Draft condominium documents per the requirements of Special Permit Condition #41 are in progress and will be submitted prior to first building permit is issued as required.

An updated Presentation Plan is provided for clarity on the options and limited common element areas. Each of the units have the ability to add 4' option extensions in the rear of the unit with full foundations which have the ability to run the length of the rear of the unit. Only one unit, the Wetherbee, has the option to extend 4' to the front of the unit across a 17' width of the unit with a full foundation. Each unit has the ability to add a 10' deep by 21' wide covered porch or screened porch on the rear of the unit which would be built on footings only (NO Foundation). The Limited Common Element area of this sketch would allow for pervious outdoor living features such as decks, patios, fences, and supplemental landscaped areas.

h. **IMPERVIOUS AREA -** The calculated potential impervious area stated in the DRB memo is incorrect. For 4 of the 5 unit types, the proposed options allow for an additional 366 square feet of impervious area per unit (732 square feet for a duplex building). One unit, the Wetherbee, with the additional front option allows for an additional 434 square feet of impervious area per unit (868 square feet for a duplex building). The potential impact if every unit chose to build the Wetherbee with all options would be an additional 21,700 square feet of impervious area. Based on our experience with similar projects and options, we would expect to sell approximately 30% - 40% of these potential expanded options across the entire project which would project to an added 6,510 - 8,680 square feet of impervious area for the entire project.

A letter has been provided by Ducharme and Dillis addressing this item.

Supplemental responses below from ESE Consultants, Inc.

i Regarding plan, precedents, and rendering submitted by ESE Planning documents titled Enhanced Entrance Exhibit, Enclave at Boxborough, dated 2020.03.05:

i. Plan does not reflect side walk extension to Stow Road.

Response: *Plans have been updated to show sidewalk extension to Stow Road.*

ii. Per the signed agreement dated September 5th 2019 between Sheriff's Meadow Condominium Association, Inc., Tisbury Meadow Condominium Association, Inc., and Boxborough Town Center, LLC, Item number 14 and Planning Board requirement, proposed trees are required to be planted at 12'-14' in height; in plan they are reflected with a 6' planted height.

Response: *The agreement references deciduous "street" trees to be planted at a height of 12' to 14'. The proposed street trees along the access road are specified as required per the September 5th 2019 agreement between the noted parties. Any additional trees/shrubs shown on the plans along the access road are not subject to the terms of the agreement.*

iii. The Design Review Board requests a copy of any more recent agreement (subsequent to the September 5, 2019 agreement) between Sheriff's Meadow Condominium Association, Inc., Tisbury Meadow Condominium Association, Inc., and Boxborough Town Center, LLC.

Response: *The September 5, 2019 is the most current agreement.*

iv. The Design Review Board questions the selected plant material proposed in plan. Though the effort to provide screening is reflected, underplanting street trees with Green Giant Arborvitae which are quick growers that will mature to a height of up to 60' will create conflict with the street trees if not kept pruned to a height below the street trees in a form such as a hedge. The suggested plantings will suffer due to competition for sunlight as they grow. The Design Review Board recommended during the meeting on March 10, 2020 that a Landscape Architect make appropriate recommendations for these planting additions.

Response: *The landscape plans have been updated to show plant material that is appropriate for both screening and as underplanting to the proposed street trees. Thuja occidentalis 'Homstrup' and Chamaecyparis pisifera 'Dow Whiting', both evergreens that only reach a mature height of 10', are deer resistant and can tolerate both sun and shade, have been proposed to replace the previous selection of Green Giant Arborvitae.*

v. Illustrative view, titled Enclave at Boxborough – Entrance Rendering – View #1, is not site specific nor reflective of actual topography and / or surrounding buildings.

Response: *The Illustrative view has been removed from the submission.*

vi. Illustrative view, titled Enclave at Boxborough – Entrance Rendering – View #1, does not correlate to provided precedent imagery and materials are conflicting. Clarity is being requested regarding the following:

a. Is a three-rail fence or a two-rail fence being specified? The Design Review Board recommended that a two-rail fence would be more appropriate given the architectural character of the Town Center District (aka Village Core, per the Design Review Board Guidelines).

Response: *A detail has been added to the plans showing that a two-rail fence has been specified between the stone piers along the access road.*

b. Are the stone piers proposed as reflected in the illustration, titled Enclave at Boxborough – Entrance Rendering – View #1, or in the precedent image provided, titled Stone Pier and Rail Example? The Design Review Board suggested the piers in the Entrance Rendering are preferable to the piers in the Stone Pier and Rail Example image provided as they would be more appropriate given the architectural character of the Town Center District.

Response: *A detail has been added to the plans indicating the stone pier will measure 2'-4" square with a finished height measuring approximately 42". The stone veneer, as shown on the supplemental detail exhibit, will be a fieldstone pattern in grey. The proposed piers will be capped with blue stone.*

c. Is the proposed fence made out of wood as shown in plan or in a synthetic material? The Design Review Board recommended at the March 10, 2020 meeting, that constructing the fence out of natural wood would be more appropriate given the architectural character of the Town Center District.

Response: *A detail has been added to the plans showing that the proposed fence will be made of pressure treated wood.*

d. Is the proposed fence to be painted or left to silver naturally? If painted what color is being proposed?

Response: *The proposed fence rails will be painted white.*

vii. Regarding the disclaimer beneath the illustrative view stating "Disclaimer: Design of landscape enhancements subject to change based on final approval from town. Design subject to change based on input from utility company(s)." The Design Review Board has requested that should the current proposal change significantly due to the reasons stated or for any other reasons, the Design Review Board would have another opportunity to review the proposal.

Response: *The disclaimer and the illustrative view have been removed from the submission.*

j. Regarding section and precedents submitted by ESE Planning documents titled Entrance Feature, Enclave at Boxborough, dated 2020.03.05: i. The Design Review Board requests clarity regarding the following:

a. Is the proposed sign made out of wood as shown in section or in a synthetic material as reflected in the precedent imagery? The Design Review Board recommended that constructing the fence out of natural wood would be more appropriate given the architectural character of the Town Center District and is the current material being used at Sheriffs and Tisbury Meadows for signage.

Response: *The propose sign will be made from a wood composite with a simulated wood grain appearance.*

b. Though the section calls out that the wood post and beam of the signage is to be painted black, what colors are proposed for the three signs? The Design Review Board Guideline recommends "Colors used for the sign should match either the background or the trim color of the structure that it serves."

Response: *The signs will feature a 1" perimeter band in white with a recessed blue interior; similar to the Regency at Stow sign as shown in the supplemental detail exhibit.*

c. Specifics regarding the lettering style is requested, are they to be painted or engraved?

Response: *The lettering will be raised, painted white.*

d. The corresponding plan submitted by ESE Planning titled Enhanced Entrance Exhibit, Enclave at Boxborough, dated 2020.03.05 suggests that there is a retaining wall at the base of the proposed sign, the Design Review Board requests that this be reflected in elevation with corresponding dimensions. If this retaining wall is required on one side, the Design Review Board would recommend that a second stone wall on the opposite side of the entry from Stow Road be added so that both sides are consistent with one another.

Response: *The proposed wall near the base of the sign is an extension of the existing dry-stack wall along Stow Road. While the applicant would like to mirror the condition on the opposite side of the access road, this is simply not feasible due to the proposed sidewalk extension, existing boulder and existing utilities in the space.*

e. In regard to the placement of the signage, as proposed, the sign stands 7'-4" tall atop a grade being retained at an additional 2' (as suggested by the Applicant). At the March 10, 2020 meeting, the Design Review Board questioned traffic visibility exiting the project site to Stow Road.

Response: *The plans have been updated to show the required site distance triangle at the intersection with Stow Road. The proposed wall extension will simply match the existing wall height along Stow Road (assumed to be less than 18") while the proposed sign is located outside of the site triangle so as not to interfere with traffic visibility.*

Places Associates – 9/7/19

10. Additional screening, including evergreens, shall be required to create an opaque screen between the residences in Sheriff's Meadow and the proposed project. This screening may be on either the project site or the Sheriff's Meadow site.

Response: *The landscape plans have been updated to show any new plantings, proposed after the 07-31-2019 submission, in bold to show compliance with the comments being addressed herein. After plans receive approval, the applicant will issue an updated plan set for record and construction showing all proposed plant material and landscape features in same color tone.*

Twenty-nine (29) additional evergreens, to be field located, have been added to the landscape plans along the property line from behind Unit 37 up to the access road to provide screening.

11. Evergreens used for screening shall be 8-10' height and the deciduous street trees along the access driveway shall be increased in sizer to a 3-1/2" caliper.

Response: *The plant schedule has been updated to indicate the evergreens proposed for open space and buffering will be installed at a height between 8'-10'.*

The plant schedule has been updated to indicate the deciduous street trees along the access road will be installed with a caliper of 3-1/2".

Exhibit A

Master Deed Condominium Document excerpt

Limited Common Elements

The Limited Common Elements are those areas and facilities of the Condominium that are designated for the exclusive use of the Unit Owners (subject to Section 5). For each Limited Common Element, a right of use is reserved as an appurtenance to the particular Unit or Units as described above. The fee ownership of the Limited Common Elements, however, is vested in all of the Unit Owners. As of the date of this Master Deed, the Limited Common Elements include the following:

(a) If any pipe, chute, flue, duct, wire, septic system connections, water service connections, propane tank and gas connections, conduit, bearing wall, bearing column or any other fixture lies outside the designated boundaries of a Unit, any portion thereof serving only that Unit is a Limited Common Element allocated solely to that Unit, the use of which is limited to that Unit, and any portion thereof serving more than one Unit or any portion of the Common Elements is a part of the Common Elements. [The propane tank fixture, while contained within a Limited Common Element limited to the Unit, shall remain the property of the propane supplier pursuant to a propane service agreement executed by the Condominium Trust];

(b) Any shutters, doorsteps, stoops, steps, porches and sidewalks leading to Units and serving only one Unit (and immediately adjoining said Unit), decks (including area beneath decks), patios, privacy fences, external gas firepits and/or fireplaces, and gas generators (constructed either by the Declarant or Unit Owner with prior approval as set forth in Section 10., and all exterior doors, windows and skylights or other fixtures designed to serve a single Unit, but located outside the Unit's boundaries, are Limited Common Elements allocated exclusively to that Unit and their use is limited to that Unit. In addition, each Unit shall have a designated area at the rear of the Unit, as reflected on the recorded Floor Plans for such Unit, which shall be designated as a Limited Common Element for such Unit;

(c) Any space heating, water heating and air conditioning apparatus including air compressors and the pad on which said compressors are situated, and any other heating and cooling apparatus, and all electrical switches and receptacles, television, telephone, telecommunications and light switches serving one Unit exclusively, but lying outside of the boundaries of the Unit, are Limited Common Elements allocated exclusively to that Unit and their use is limited to that Unit;

(d) External stove vents and dryer vents; gas fireplaces, and/or fire pits (external and internal to the Unit, gas vents and chimney exhaust pipes (in Units with gas fireplaces) are Limited Common Elements allocated to the Units which they serve;

(e) The driveway located in front of the garage portion of any Unit is a Limited Common Element allocated exclusively to that Unit.

DUCHARME & DILLIS
Civil Design Group, Inc.
CIVIL ENGINEERS • LAND SURVEYORS • WETLAND CONSULTANTS

WWW.DUCHARMEANDDILLIS.COM
1092 MAIN ST • PO BOX 428 • BOLTON, MA 01740
PH. 978.779.6091
F. 978.779.0260

May 5th, 2020
6092

Boxborough Planning Board
29 Middle Road
Boxborough, MA 01719

RE: Response to Review of Modified Sidewalk, Site and Landscape Plans
Enclave at Boxborough
Boxborough, MA

Dear Members of the Board:

We have received review comment responses from the Places Associates Inc. regarding the Modified Sidewalk, Site and Landscape Plans. We have addressed all plan modifications in the latest revision of plans and have summarized the changes below. The review comments are *italicized* with the responses from Ducharme & Dillis below them in **bold**.

Sidewalk Plan:

1. *Plans indicate that existing transformer, telephone and cable boxes are to be relocated. Given that these utilities serve the existing Tisbury and Sheriffs Meadow communities, it is strongly recommended that the sidewalk location be shifted rather than utilities moved. It is our belief that this is more cost and time effective rather than purely aesthetic aspect of the sidewalk location.*
   CDG Response: Discussions between the applicant & associated utility companies have been on-going regarding the relocation of the cable & telephone boxes. The proposed alignment as shown on the plans has been reviewed by the Utility companies and is the preferred location. It does not require relocation of the transformer, only a few pull boxes for telephone and cable.

2. *The sidewalk plans do not reflect the grading as previously recommended. This grading would identify areas where easements are needed, where the existing stonewalls/trees would be negatively impacted or any other areas of concern. Large existing trees should be reviewed to realistically determine if they will survive construction or if they should be removed. These trees may be subject to the Shade Tree Act and will require a public hearing for their removal.*
   CDG Response: Proposed contours will be added to the Sidewalk Plan as requested. The applicant agrees to walk the subject portion of Stow Road with the Tree Warden to determine the health / longevity of trees within the limits of disturbance.

3. *Sidewalks do not appear to meet MAAB and ADA criteria. No ramps are indicated with tactile warning strips. Crosswalks should be shown with a level landing outside of the travelled way. Handicap ramps should be provided at the two commercial driveways along Stow Road. (Buildings are incorrectly labelled as dwellings).*

CDG Response: It is our intention to have handicapped ramps in the above referenced locations. The plan will be updated accordingly. The mentioned structures shall be re-labeled as commercial (not dwellings) and will include handicap ramps where the sidewalk crosses their two separate driveways.

4. *The construction details for the sidewalks calls out a paved width of 5'. The plan portion labels the sidewalk width as 4'. It is our recommendation that the sidewalk along Stow Rd be increased in width to 5' to accommodate not only the proposed increased width for ADA but also the current municipal sidewalk plowing equipment.*
   CDG Response: Due to limited space between the Stow Road pavement and the westerly right-of-way line in front of Tisbury Meadows, permission to work on the Tisbury Meadows property will be required to allow for a 5' sidewalk to be constructed in this location. There are discussions ongoing with Tisbury Meadows relative to the landscaping along the proposed entrance drive, this issue will be raised to the Condo Board.

5. *The construction detail for the sidewalks is insufficient. The rebar should be identified as to its composition or type and placement within the slab. Concrete sidewalks require expansion joints at regular intervals to prevent dis-similar settlement, expansion and contraction of the concrete through the seasons, etc. We recommend that the detail be revised to show what steel reinforcement is proposed, a standard expansion joint detail (with dowels) should be added. The concrete for the sidewalk should be noted as a minimum of 3,000 psi, air entrained concrete to prevent salt impact in the future. A reference to a construction standard such as the new MassDOT Standard Specifications or a similar standard would accommodate these requirements.*
   CDG Response: The proposed sidewalk is intended to be comprised of bituminous asphalt, not concrete. The Sidewalk Plan will be revised to reflect this material change to stay consistent with the approved Enclave development.

6. *The sidewalks are proposed as concrete with bituminous concrete curbs. It is strongly recommended that if they are pouring concrete, that they have an integrated, reinforced vertical concrete curbing as it is more durable with snow plowing.*
   CDG Response: The applicant agrees to consult with the DPW Superintendent to determine the proposed curbing along Stow Road.

7. *The curbing will prevent "country drainage" and will direct runoff into abutting driveways and create the potential for ponding at the low point by the existing culvert. Drainage should be addressed.*
   CDG Response: The drainage will be analyzed to ensure that the curbing will not negatively impact abutting driveways or pose any flooding hazards.

8. *Stow Road is a scenic road and there is a portion of stone wall to be removed. It is recommended that the stones be removed, set aside and wall re-built/restored 1' off the back side of the sidewalk when grading is completed. The plans should also specify the length of wall to be removed and clearly identify the stone walls to be protected and retained.*

CDG Response: It is the intent that if a stone wall must be disturbed, the materials will be stockpiled a rebuilt in the same location. The Sidewalk Plan will be revised to identify the length of wall to be disturbed & which portions shall be protected and retained.

9. *Plans should show the limit of work in the roadway and address any repairs in Stow Road which may be needed if the edges of pavement are in poor condition or irregular in alignment/width. Plans so show erosion control barriers but it is unclear as to whether this is the limit of work (grading needed).*
   CDG Response: The limit of work within roadway will be identified when contours are added to reflect the proposed spot grades as currently shown. This revision will highlight any irregular alignment/width along Stow Road.

10. *The relocation of two mail box units is described and depicted. These should be placed at an area where someone pulling to the side of the road to get their mail will not impact routine traffic (a pull out or bump out). They should be connected to a sidewalk system and need to be handicapped accessible as well as meet the Postmaster's requirements. We believe that additional details on the placement, construction and related criteria should be shown.*
    CDG Response: The applicant has discussed the relocation of the mailboxes within the Tisbury / Sheriff's Meadow entrance with the Post Master. The proposed locations were agreed upon by the post office to provide the most efficient route for the postman. The remaining mailboxes located along Stow Road that will require relocation due to construction of the sidewalk will need approval from the post office & owner for final locations. The applicant agrees to reach out to the Post Master.

Driveway Intersection at Stow Road:

1. *The plans should clearly show the necessary line of sight for the intersection and clearly identify the height of the stacked stone wall. Note the site distance is measured 15' back from the edge of pavement on Stow Road with an eye height of 3.5' viewing an object 4.25' high. The bottom of the sign is 2.2' above grade, set 10' from the edge of Stow Road pavement.*
   CDG Response: Site triangles will be added to the Sidewalk Plan to ensure no visual obstructions.

2. *No stop sign, or stop line are indicated as recommended in the traffic study.*
   CDG Response: The Sidewalk Plan will be revised to reflect the controls stated in the traffic study.

3. *It is recommended that the height (or maximum height) of the extension of the fieldstone wall be clearly specified as it could impact sight distances.*
   CDG Response: The maximum height will be specified to ensure that the sight distances are not obstructed.

4. *See note above regarding the proposed re-location of utilities.*
   CDG Response: Please see CDG comment response for #1.

Landscape Comments:

1. *(Previous comment) The landscaping shows evergreen trees between the street trees Sherriff's Meadow resulting in these evergreen trees being located on both the southerly and northerly side of the shrubs and street trees. The varieties of evergreens selected have been modified to be a lower growing species that are tolerant of partial shade and are "deer resistant" we are still of the opinion that this will create a conflict for space and light for the evergreens*
   CDG Response: Revised Landscaping Plans will be provided per ESE Consultants, Inc. to accommodate that above-mentioned request.

2. *It is noted that the landscaping plans are not consistent with the photographs of existing properties, specifically 539 and 571 Burroughs Road. It does not appear that there has been any additional screening added to the landscape plans given the lack of natural vegetative screening to the abutters. We recommend more screening along the property lines or more shrubs etc to give a greater visual barrier to the development. In the alternate, the applicant should obtain a letter from the abutters indicating that no additional screening is needed. It is recommended that the grading, and screening to these two properties be installed as soon as feasible (even prior to building construction) to provide a visual, noise and dust barriers to the construction.*
   CDG Response: Revised Landscaping Plans will be provided per ESE Consultants, Inc. to accommodate that above-mentioned request.

Building Comments:

1. *We note that Ducharme and Dillis have indicated that the drainage calculations and the roof drain system will be modified once the Planning Board has approved the changes. This office will also review whether any propose drainage modifications will impact the individual unit plantings or adjacent screening at that time.*
   CDG Response: Acknowledged.

We trust this meets your needs at this time. If you have any questions or require any additional information. Please contact the undersigned.

Regards,
DUCHARME & DILLIS
Civil Design Group, Inc.

Ryan Vickers, E.I.T.
Civil Engineer

Gregory S. Roy, P.E.
Principal

Planning
Landscape
Architecture
Civil
Engineering
Surveying

PLACES Associates, Inc.

Certified WBE

May 4, 2020

Mr. Simon Corson via email
Boxborough Town Planner
29 Middle Road,
Boxborough Ma 01719

Re: Enclave – Review of Modified Sidewalk, Site and Landscape Plans
Project No. 5249

Dear Mr. Corson:

As requested, this office has reviewed the submitted information for the requested Modification to the Enclave at Boxborough project. These items include the following:

1. Cover letter to the Planning Board from Ducharme & Dillis dated 3-18-20
2. Plans:
   a. Presentation Plan by Ducharme & Dillis dated 4/22/20
   b. Architectural Plan Updates
   c. Stow Road Sidewalk Plan
   d. Site Plan and Photos
   e. Landscape Plans (9 sheets) dated 4/28/20
3. Sheriffs Meadow Tisbury Meadow Agreement updated 4-28-2020
4. Enclave at Boxborough- Design Review Board supplemental information dated 4/28/20
5. DRB Letter dated 3/25/20

A. Based on our review of the plans, we offer the following comments relative to the **Sidewalk Plan**:

1. Plans indicate that existing transformer, telephone and cable boxes are to be relocated. Given that these utilities serve the existing Tisbury and Sheriffs Meadow communities, it is strongly recommended that the sidewalk location be shifted rather than utilities moved. It is our belief that this is more cost and time effective rather than purely aesthetic aspect of the sidewalk location.

2. The sidewalk plans do not reflect the grading as previously recommended. This grading would identify areas where easements are needed, where the existing stonewalls/trees would be negatively impacted or any other areas of concern. Large existing trees should be reviewed to realistically determine if they will survive construction or if they should be removed. These trees may be subject to the Shade Tree Act and will require a public hearing for their removal.

3. Sidewalks do not appear to meet MAAB and ADA criteria. No ramps are indicated with tactile warning strips. Crosswalks should be shown with a level landing outside of the travelled way.

You created this PDF from an application that is not licensed to print to novaPDF printer (http://www.novapdf.com)

Handicap ramps should be provided at the two commercial driveways along Stow Road. (Buildings are incorrectly labelled as dwellings).

4. The construction details for the sidewalks calls out a paved width of 5'. The plan portion labels the sidewalk width as 4'. It is our recommendation that the sidewalk along Stow Rd be increased in width to 5' to accommodate not only the proposed increased width for ADA but also the current municipal sidewalk plowing equipment.

5. The construction detail for the sidewalks is insufficient. The rebar should be identified as to its composition or type and placement within the slab. Concrete sidewalks require expansion joints at regular intervals to prevent dis-similar settlement, expansion and contraction of the concrete through the seasons, etc. We recommend that the detail be revised to show what steel reinforcement is proposed, a standard expansion joint detail (with dowels) should be added. The concrete for the sidewalk should be noted as a minimum of 3,000 psi, air entrained concrete to prevent salt impact in the future. A reference to a construction standard such as the new MassDOT Standard Specifications or a similar standard would accommodate these requirements.

6. The sidewalks are proposed as concrete with bituminous concrete curbs. It is strongly recommended that if they are pouring concrete, that they have an integrated, reinforced vertical concrete curbing as it is more durable with snow plowing.

7. The curbing will prevent "country drainage" and will direct runoff into abutting driveways and create the potential for ponding at the low point by the existing culvert. Drainage should be addressed.

8. Stow Road is a scenic road and there is a portion of stone wall to be removed. It is recommended that the stones be removed, set aside and wall re-built/restored 1' off the back side of the sidewalk when grading is completed. The plans should also specify the length of wall to be removed and clearly identify the stone walls to be protected and retained.

9. Plans should show the limit of work in the roadway and address any repairs in Stow Road which may be needed if the edges of pavement are in poor condition or irregular in alignment/width. Plans so show erosion control barriers but it is unclear as to whether this is the limit of work (grading needed).

10. The relocation of two mail box units is described and depicted. These should be placed at an area where someone pulling to the side of the road to get their mail will not impact routine traffic (a pull out or bump out). They should be connected to a sidewalk system and need to be handicapped accessible as well as meet the Postmaster's requirements. We believe that additional details on the placement, construction and related criteria should be shown.

B. Comments on the **Driveway Intersection at Stow Road**:

1. The plans should clearly show the necessary line of sight for the intersection and clearly identify the height of the stacked stone wall. Note the site distance is measured 15' back from the edge of pavement on Stow Road with an eye height of 3.5' viewing an object 4.25' high. The bottom of the sign is 2.2' above grade, set 10' from the edge of Stow Road pavement.

2. No stop sign, or stop line are indicated as recommended in the traffic study.

PLACES Associates, Inc.
256 Great Road, Suite 4, Littleton MA 01460 · (978) 486-0334 · www.placesassociates.com

You created this PDF from an application that is not licensed to print to novaPDF printer (http://www.novapdf.com)

3. It is recommended that the height (or maximum height) of the extension of the fieldstone wall be clearly specified as it could impact sight distances.

4. See note above regarding the proposed re-location of utilities.

C. **Landscape Comments**:

1. (Previous comment) The landscaping shows evergreen trees between the street trees Sherriff's Meadow resulting in these evergreen trees being located on both the southerly and northerly side of the shrubs and street trees. The varieties of evergreens selected have been modified to be a lower growing species that are tolerant of partial shade and are "deer resistant" we are still of the opinion that this will create a conflict for space and light for the evergreens

2. It is noted that the landscaping plans are not consistent with the photographs of existing properties, specifically 539 and 571 Burroughs Road. It does not appear that there has been any additional screening added to the landscape plans given the lack of natural vegetative screening to the abutters. We recommend more screening along the property lines or more shrubs etc to give a greater visual barrier to the development. In the alternate, the applicant should obtain a letter from the abutters indicating that no additional screening is needed. It is recommended that the grading, and screening to these two properties be installed as soon as feasible (even prior to building construction) to provide a visual, noise and dust barriers to the construction.

D. Comments on **Buildings**:

We note that Ducharme and Dillis have indicated that the drainage calculations and the roof drain system will be modified once the Planning Board has approved the changes. This office will also review whether any propose drainage modifications will impact the individual unit plantings or adjacent screening at that time.

Please contact this office should you have any questions regarding this review or the project in general.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,
Places Associates, Inc.
BY:

Susan E. Carter, P.E., LEED AP
Director of Engineering, President

William E. Murray, RLA
Director of Planning and Landscape Architecture

PLACES Associates, Inc.
256 Great Road, Suite 4, Littleton MA 01460 · (978) 486-0334 · www.placesassociates.com

You created this PDF from an application that is not licensed to print to novaPDF printer (http://www.novapdf.com)

Planning
Landscape
Architecture
Civil
Engineering
Surveying

PLACES Associates, Inc.

Certified WBE

May 7, 2020

Mr. Simon Corson via email
Boxborough Town Planner
29 Middle Road,
Boxborough Ma 01719

Re: Enclave – Review of Modified Sidewalk, Site and Landscape Plans
Project No. 5249

Dear Mr. Corson:

As we have discussed, Places Associates has reviewed the April submittal and participated in the Zoom conference with the applicant and their team to review the items in our May 4, 2020 letter. This office feels that their team is working towards addressing our concerns but some of them will require coordination with others - the DPW regarding the condition of Stow Road, the Tree Warden regarding the street trees being impacted with the sidewalk and Tisbury Meadows regarding a potential construction easement.

As you will note, the outstanding comments relate to the Stow Road sidewalk. This sidewalk plan was required in the Planning Board site plan decision (condition # 12) and must be completed prior to the tenth Occupancy Permit (condition #44). Places has been concerned that the sidewalk design was needed to coordinate the intersection of the driveway and Stow Road. These items are being addressed. The actual sidewalk plans will need several permits to implement – Scenic Road Special permit from the Planning Board, Shade Tree Act hearings for the removal of street trees and a permit to work within the public right of way. The decision only required the **submittal,** not detailed review or site plan modification, **of** the sidewalk plan and it is our opinion that this condition has been met. More detailed reviews will be via the other permits and based on the current plans, we believe that any remaining issues can be addressed at that time.

Any changes in the Landscape plans required review by the Planning Board (condition# 19 requiring the site to be built according to the approved plans) . The submittal of a revised Landscape plan was anticipated to allow the coordination with Tisbury and Sheriff's Meadow Condominium Associations. The applicant has submitted multiple signoffs from the Associations as the plans have evolved. These plans will provide the framework for construction and ultimately the final site inspections/review of as-built plans. It is our opinion that the plans and documentation submitted meets the intent of condition 19 to have the plan reference updated.

The question of the additional trees is the result of an enforcement letter from the Building Commissioner and under his review and purview. These trees are shown on the Landscape Plans to make them a comprehensive plan set. At the request of Places, some of these additional trees were shifted from the property line with Sheriff's Meadow to the property lines with 539 and 571 Burroughs Road abutters to provide/augment their screening of the construction site. The Building Commissioner will have the ultimate

You created this PDF from an application that is not licensed to print to novaPDF printer (http://www.novapdf.com)

authority (with advice from the Planner and Places Assoc. Landscape Architect) for the placement of these trees. In addition, Criterion 6, e. requires an opaque landscape buffer, giving the Building Commissioner the ability to require additional plantings, if necessary, to provide an opaque buffer.

The changes to the architectural designs are in keeping with discussions during the public hearings and was included in the decision as condition 41, section b.ii:

> ii. Building additions, including porches and decks and privacy fences, are limited to exclusive use areas as defined by the Owner/Applicant except as otherwise prohibited. Patios and other allowed structures shall incorporate pervious materials.

As far as impacts to the site plan, the impacts stem from the addition of impervious surfaces and minor impacts to grading directly adjacent to the building. The design Engineer has indicated that the additional impervious areas will be amongst multiple drainage areas and will have no impact. While we understand that not all units will have the additional bump outs, we have asked that they identify, by drainage areas, the units in that area and any limitations on the number of bump outs which will help the Building Commissioner track the units as building permits are issued. This will also facilitate the final review of as-built plans for compliance.

The common use area was not a requirement for the site plan review process and was offered by Toll Brothers during the public hearing process. From a permitting process, as long as the alteration of those areas is limited to the above-mentioned bump outs or pervious patios (see condition #41.b.ii.) then their use/size is not regulated by the Planning Board but the future Homeowner's Association.

Please contact this office should you have any questions regarding this review or the project in general.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,
Places Associates, Inc.
BY:

Susan E. Carter, P.E., LEED AP
Director of Engineering, President

PLACES Associates, Inc.
256 Great Road, Suite 4, Littleton MA 01460 · (978) 486-0334 · www.placesassociates.com

You created this PDF from an application that is not licensed to print to novaPDF printer (http://www.novapdf.com)