



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 • Mark Barbadoro • Robin Lazarow • Rebecca Verner

Approved on August 31, 2020

Meeting Minutes August 3, 2020 7:00 PM Remote Meeting

Members Present: Cindy Markowitz, Mark White, Mark Barbadoro, Rebecca Verner, and Robin Lazarow

Also Present: Simon Corson (Town Planner), Sue Carter (Town Engineer), and Kristan Patenaude (Recording Secretary)

Also present from the Enclave Team: Shawn Nuckolls, Dave Buckley, and Ryan Vickers

Several members of the public were also present

Ms. Markowitz called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

Administrative Business

Finalize Future Meeting Schedule

Ms. Markowitz noted that the Planning Board will have their next meeting on August 31, 2020.

Welcome Recording Secretary Kristan Patenaude

The Planning Board welcomed new Recording Secretary, Kristan Patenaude. Ms. Patenaude lives in Amherst, New Hampshire and joins the group via Zoom.

Town Center/Enclave Project

Ms. Markowitz explained that the group recently received a number of documents for the project, including a cover letter from Ducharme & Dillis, revised site plans, revised landscape plans, and clubhouse plans. She explained that, in July 24, 2020, letter, Ducharme & Dillis addressed some comments made by the Planning Board including:

1. The Planning Board has requested more information on the unit walkways.
 - a. *All unit walkways will be of impervious materials and these have been calculated in the drainage calculations as impervious*
2. The Planning Board has requested the types of streetlights being used are noted on the plan
 - a. *The Streetlight specifications are noted on Landscape Plan sheet SD09.07*

3. The Planning Board requests a note be added to the site plan stating “all proposed lighting is Dark Sky Compliant” in accordance with condition 11 of the Site Plan Approval

a. A note (3.5) has been added to plan sheet C1.1 and on Landscape Plan sheet SD09.07.

4. The Planning Board requests the sight line triangle be added to the Site Plans or Landscape Plans

a. The site line distance has been previously included on Landscape Plan sheet SD09.06. The site line triangle has been added to plan sheet C8.11.

5. The Planning Board asked about landscaping changes made to add Green Giant arborvitae into the plant mix for the buffers at 539 and 571 Burroughs Road and why these changes were not applied to the buffer area between Sherriff’s Meadow and Tisbury Meadow.

a. The buffer areas at Sherriff’s Meadow and Tisbury Meadow were updated based on direction provided by the Design Review Board. This area has some existing buffer and is not as bare as the area noted around 539 & 571 Burroughs Road. The number of plants and species currently specified are more appropriate for this area than the Green Giants.

Shawn Nuckolls explained that, regarding item #3, all of the light fixtures will be dark sky compliant. It was discovered that the previously suggested landscape uplighting is not compliant; it has since been removed from the plan.

Rebecca Verner noted that, regarding item #5, the screening behind Sherriff’s Meadow and Tisbury Meadow is not in question. The item specifically addresses landscaping changes behind units 37-40 to the property line.

Mr. Nuckolls explained that this is a fairly heavily wooded area, so additional plantings in this area were not thought necessary.

Ms. Verner stated that winter screening will be important in this area. The particular plant, Green Giant, suggested gives good screening at the ground level. It was suggested that several clusters of three or four of the Green Giants arborvitae would be most impactful to the screening of the existing buildings along this property line. This is not being suggested as an additional planting, but as a replacement for a line of pines in the area

In response to a question from Mr. Nuckolls, Ms. Verner explained that these plantings should be clustered behind the units and neighboring parcels; three here or four there.

In response to a question from Ms. Markowitz, Mr. Nuckolls explained that the plantings will be done at the appropriate time. He would like for the irrigation on site to be running first. He is willing to have a walkthrough of the area with interested parties once the potential plantings sites are staked and the plantings are ready to go in. The plantings will go in at the right time and when irrigation is available on site. In the best case, this will happen in the fall, but the plantings may happen in the spring.

Ms. Verner noted that spring for the plantings makes sense, based on the heavy construction going on in the area currently.

In response to a question from Ms. Markowitz, Mr. Nuckolls explained that the new access road is partially paved. The existing driveway will have its first 100' or so milled and repaved. Tree plantings in the access road area are about 90% complete. There are no crosswalks in the access way yet; these will be completed once the driveway has been milled and paved.

Ms. Markowitz noted that, initially, the plan was to have the work done along the access easement in three months. Mr. Nuckolls explained that the paving top coat could still be done this season. Mr. Nuckolls explained that he was unclear if the three month window included the top coat or not. Ms. Markowitz noted that the three months completion included everything except the landscaping. She believes that the agreement includes the road work with a base coat, at least, but would need to double check. She is concerned that this change will be an interruption to the abutters. She wants the team to come back to the Board with a timeframe for the work and the potential impact.

Mr. Nuckolls explained that there is about a two day window for when the work will be completed, once started. He believes it makes sense for the binder to settle over the winter and complete the top coat in the spring.

Ms. Markowitz asked that this information be put in a memo to the Board.

Ryan Vickers explained that three new sheets have been added to the plan, ahead of the scenic road, stone wall, and public shade tree public hearing.

Ms. Markowitz explained that the applicant had a traffic study done last year and, as a result, there were slight distances included in the site lines for Stow Road, and additional distances for elderly drivers to allow for sufficient visibility.

In response to a question from Ms. Verner, Mr. Vickers explained that there is a note on the plan describing the driver clearance zone from where the driver is sitting.

In response to a question from Mark White, Sue Carter stated that the plan is in compliance with AASHTO standards.

In response to a question from Ms. Lazarow, Ms. Carter explained that the sight line distances listed in the plan are more than the minimum required by AASHTO standards.

In response to a question from Ms. Markowitz, Ms. Carter stated that this is an in-progress report. There will be a test of the sight distance before finishing the area, so that adjustments can be made as necessary.

Ms. Markowitz noted that the final recommendations for the clubhouse have not yet been received from the Design Review Board. Mr. Nuckolls explained that another look was taken at the clubhouse design. A modification was made to expand the clubhouse size from 1,800 square feet to 2,000 square feet. The layout for outdoor amenities has also been adjusted, including a change in the pool layout, the addition of a grassy area, fire pit, and increased landscaping. These changes have led to five additional sheets added to the landscaping plan, devoted to the clubhouse area. He explained that the design revisions recommended by the Design Review Board will be considered and incorporated into the plan set submitted to the Planning Board. The lighting items for the clubhouse will be dark sky compliant. He still needs to confirm the appropriate ADA and handicap accessibility. The impervious areas on site

have been reduced by about 3,400 square feet over what we previously submitted. The increased amount of landscaping includes 18 trees, 160 shrubs, perennials, and annual grasses.

In response to a question from Ms. Markowitz, Mr. Nuckolls stated that the number of total parking spaces has not changed.

Ms. Verner stated that she has some concerns that the building size has grown, but also likes the increased amount of landscaping, the additional screening/privacy, and the ornamental materials. She explained that the Design Review Board will meet on Thursday to review the additions to the plan set.

Ms. Markowitz and Mr. Nuckolls discussed that exact number of square feet for the clubhouse (1,996 square feet)

In response to a question from Mr. Barbadoro, Mr. Nuckolls explained that the pool will be handicap accessible. There is no final design for this yet, but the pool will either have a walk-in area or accessibility by another device.

In response to a question from Ms. Lazarow, Mr. Nuckolls stated the chairs around the outside of the pool area will be on the stamped concrete

Mr. White moved to approve the modifications for the clubhouse design, pending the Design Review Board Report and condition on any recommendations they might make. Ms. Verner seconded. Motion passed unanimously 5-0.

Ms. Markowitz explained that a new letter was received today in regard to questions the Board rose regarding drainage and post-drainage watershed items. Mr. White stated that he would have liked to have received a copy of the new letter in an email.

Simon Corson explained that he discussed this item with Mr. Vickers, who went through the item with Ms. Carter. He asked that the Board hear Mr. Vickers' response to the questions from the letter.

Mr. Vickers explained that the pre-developed watershed analysis for the site discovered that it drains to a northern wetland (design point A) and a low point to the south (design point B). The original plan looked to shave some of the area off and send the stormwater to infiltration basins using swales. The riprap area on site drains to the south. He explained that the minor amount of increase in post development flow is so minor, 1/100th cubic flow/sec, it is beyond the accuracy the model used can predict. This is why the plan has a footnote that stipulates a minuscule increase from pre to post-development, but, given the accuracy of the model, he truly doesn't believe there will be an increase in flow. He explained that he and Ms. Carter wanted to try to look at this in a more accurate way. In the original model, the ground cover was specified as woods of good quality. It was determined that these woods are not really of 'good' quality. The HydroCAD model was tweaked to list these woods as being of fair quality: little to no leaf litter, fair coverage, and slight herbaceous growth. In rerunning the pre/post-development analysis, the model then showed a net decrease in runoff from pre to post-development. The new results are quite conservative to show a reduction in the post-development flow.

In response to a question from Ms. Markowitz, Mr. Vickers stated that the area around design point B is not a specific area.

In response to a question from Ms. Markowitz, Mr. Vickers explained that elevation 366 is the top of a hill, and that there will be grading built into the area to the north to drain to the infiltration basin.

In response to a question from Ms. Markowitz, Mr. Vickers and Ms. Carter agreed that the post-development model shows a lesser flow to the southern property line.

In response to a question from Ms. Lazarow, Mr. Vickers explained that the 'fair' assessment for the woods area was changed in both the pre and post-development models due to it being an existing woodline.

In response to a question from Ms. Markowitz, Ms. Carter explained that the neighboring abutters will not notice any change due to the spread of flow being spread across such a distance. There is such a small amount of flow here that it was hard for the model to quantify it. If abutters do notice an issue, then the construction is not in compliance with the site plan.

In response to a comment from Ms. Verner regarding the fact that some of the forest area has been clearcut to the property line, Mr. Vickers explained that the forest area there is quite sparse, which leads to it being classified as 'fair.'

In response to a question from Ms. Verner, Mr. Vickers explained that he has been looking at the areas of stone wall and tree impact with Ed Kukkula, DPW Tree Warden; Mr. Corson; Ms. Carter; Bentley Herget, Zoning Enforcement Officer; and Greg Roy, Ducharme & Dillis engineer. In regards to the extent Stow Road will be disrupted, about 1-2' of the road will need to be milled and repaved. The Tree Warden looked at about seven trees along the road that are mostly dead, hazardous, and will probably be removed. He mentioned that there is about 300 linear feet of potential stone wall reconstruction that will all be completed in accordance with the permit.

Ms. Carter explained that a 5' sidewalk is being proposed because it will be ADA compliant and compliant with the town's plowing equipment.

Mr. Corson stated that the Planning Board may choose to endorse the final site plans at its August 31, 2020, meeting, and incorporate all of the modifications as voted on. Ms. Markowitz explained that she didn't want to commit to anything for the August 31st meeting until all of the Board questions have been addressed.

In response to a question from Ms. Markowitz, Mr. Vickers stated that, currently, the work on the entrance is about done and that's where the bulk of the manpower for the project is.

In response to a comment from Ms. Markowitz regarding correspondence from the abutters about stone dust, Mr. Corson explained that it has been very hot recently. The rough grading and stone crushing being done on site has created a lot of dust. The Building Official has been on site a lot this week with reminders to keep watering the stone crushing area to mitigate the issue. The Building Department is working to be proactive with respect to abutters and responding accordingly with the property owner and workers.

The Planning Board thanked the Enclave team for being present at the meeting.

Meeting Minutes

Rebecca Verner motioned to approve the July 16, 2020 Planning Board meeting minutes as submitted. Mark Barbadoro seconded. Motion passed unanimously 5-0.

Correspondence and New Business

Mr. Corson explained that the bill regarding Housing Choice Legislation has two versions: a Senate version and a House version. The Senate version has a controversial piece in it that would require communities within the MBTA region to mandate a multi-family district with certain density requirements. The Massachusetts Municipal Association does not support the Senate version of this bill. There is a penalty as part of the Senate bill that will make towns ineligible for state grants and funding opportunities. The Massachusetts Municipal Association recommends the House version. He questioned if the Planning Board would like to show a united front on this issue and possibly write a letter of support.

Ms. Markowitz stated that the CHAPA website does a great job at laying out the differences between the two bill versions. She asked that Mr. Corson keep the Board apprised of this item.

Ms. Markowitz stated that Cisco has recently accounted that it will be selling its property within a year. The town is currently in discussions to determine if Cisco will work with the town on the sale. The Board may have future discussions about this topic.

Zoning Bylaw Audit

Mr. Corson stated that he had a conversation with the Town Administrator on this item. He will draft a cover letter and come back to the Board with it. As some of the other grants he's currently managing come to an end, he'll have more time to put towards this.

Ms. Markowitz explained that this is not a grant, but an award authorized by Town Meeting for up to \$10,000.

In response to a question from Mr. White, Mr. Corson stated that this project is currently on the Town Administrator's plate to sign the scope of work for this project.

Ms. Markowitz stated that this is a time sensitive project, as there could be zoning bylaw changes that come from the audit. The audit could take about 3-4 months, and she believes the information for potential bylaw changes would be wanted for the spring public hearings. The consultant was ready weeks ago and she would like this expedited.

Planning Board Training

In response to a question from Ms. Markowitz, Mr. Corson stated that he hasn't yet heard back from Attorney Adam Costa on this. Ms. Markowitz stated that she would like for Joe Ferguson, of the Economic Development Committee, to attend some meetings.

Solar Bylaw

Mr. Corson explained that he reached out to MAPC. The best idea is to get an application in on a rolling basis and MAPC will get back to the Board if awarded a grant. The Board should review a project concept and he will submit an application with a narrative from the Board.

In response to a question from Ms. Markowitz, Mr. Corson stated that he will review an existing project concept for the Board. Ms. Verner stated that she will review the existing concept as well. Ms. Markowitz stated that marijuana references should be removed from the existing concept and a scope of the proposed work should be attached. Mr. Corson stated that he would make those changes and send to Ms. Verner for her review.

Planning Board Rules and Regulations

In response to a question from Ms. Markowitz, Mr. Corson stated that he would work with the Chair to get an outline and draft for this document. He explained that he plans to adapt the document from another community and will work to have a draft ready for the August 31st meeting. This is one of his goals for the year and he believes this will be a critical tool for the Board. Ms. Markowitz stated that the Town of Shirley's regulations seem clear and simple. It may be possible to use these as a template for a strong framework.

Municipal Vulnerability Preparedness Project Grant

Ms. Markowitz explained that Phase I of this grant was \$15,000 for educational purposes.

Mr. Corson stated that Phase II of this grant deals with vehicle infrastructure, climate change, etc. He would like to consult with the core team and work on the workshop, which is the last piece for the grant. The Planning Board and public will be invited to this workshop. It will be important for the critical voices in the room during the workshop to discuss the social and environmental vulnerabilities and physical characteristics of Boxborough. The workshop will report potential consensus building activities under the umbrella of general sustainability items for the town.

Committee Reports

Community Preservation Committee (Lazarow) - Nothing new to report; the Committee will meet in early September.

Design Review Board (Verner) - The Design Review Board met a couple of weeks ago to discuss the Enclave submission. It will meet again on Thursday to review any new changes to the submission. The group received correspondence from an abutter to the entry road regarding the installation of a fence.

Economic Development Committee (White) - The group is consumed with the Cisco news. There is a thought to refocus the UMASS study on the Cisco property and what the town might do with it. The Committee will meet next week with UMASS to get better information.

MAGIC Representative (Markowitz) - Nothing new to report; the Committee will gear up again in September.

Water Resources Committee (Barbadoro) - Nothing new to report; the group will set a meeting soon.

LELWD Small Cell Committee (Markowitz) - Mr. Corson stated that he met with Dave Ketchen, Assistant Manager at Littleton Light, regarding the finished document and standards for 5G. He will distribute these documents to the Board. He asked Mr. Ketchen to put together the technical and aesthetic standards for 5G to share with the group. He would then like to have a zoom meeting with himself, Mr. Ketchen and Ms. Markowitz.

Ms. Markowitz explained that the technical documents have been shared. She is more interested in the aesthetic jurisdiction on right-of-way items. 5G would require 3'x3' boxes to be placed on poles, with antennas that go above the current telephone poles. If installed along the right-of-way, these boxes would need to be located every 300-500'. She would like to get back involved in this project, along with Wes Fowlks, of the Select Board.

Building Committee (TBD) - Nothing new to report; there is no Building Committee rep yet.

Planning Board Goals:

Funding - TAP Grants and other Grant Opportunities

Ms. Markowitz stated that she would like this left as an agenda item.

Master Plan Action Item Status - Aspirations 4, 5, 6, and 7

November 9, 2020 Joint Meeting with Select Board

Ms. Markowitz explained that the Planning Board is either the lead or a coordinating entity for action items on the spreadsheet. The Board updated the Select Board in January regarding Aspirations 1, 2, and 3. The Board will speak with the Select Board regarding Aspirations 5, 6, 7, and 8 at a joint meeting on November 9, 2020. She will email all Boards and Committees with action items so that they can each speak to their statuses on these items. The Planning Board should look through the Master Plan Implementation Plan regarding the goals in order to redirect its efforts.

Public Comment

Ms. Markowitz noted that there were no hands raised.

Mr. Corson mentioned that he looked up the email from Liz Nichols. She has had a number of conversations with Bentley Herget. The Town Center plan has been reviewed with her and it seems that her concerns are satisfied.

Ms. Verner explained that an abutter letter addressed a concern regarding the split rail fence installed at the entrance way. Enclave installed vertical columns further apart than shown on the plan. The horizontal columns were then applied to the back of these columns and face the abutting properties. This is not as it was shown in the plan and leaves strange shadow lines. There are a lot of plantings behind this fence. She noted that, apparently, Mr. Corson spoke with the abutter and the abutter is now satisfied.

Ms. Markowitz asked if the Board is okay with the minor construction item being built not as it was approved in the plan drawings. Ms. Verner stated that the Design Review Board reviewed the precedent image, but not details on the fence layout. Comments weren't given because the group thought the fence would be built as presented.

In response to a question from Mr. Barbadoro, Ms. Verner explained that the horizontal posts were applied to the back of the fence. The posts do not appear to be morticed in, but simply applied to the back. She does not believe the installation followed the precedent as it was reviewed.

In response to a question from Mr. White, Ms. Verner stated that the fence is located along the entry way. Mr. White suggested that Board members drive by the see for themselves. Mr. Corson explained that the Building Official can take action if the fence is in violation. The Board agreed to review the precedent drawings, drive by the fence, and discuss this further at its next meeting.

Mr. White motioned to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Mr. Barbadoro. Approved unanimously 5-0 at 9:06PM.

Meeting Documents

Meeting Minutes of July 16, 2020 Draft

Email correspondence between C. Markowitz and C. Biron re: dust issues

Notice to call local legislators to support the House-passed version of Housing Choices Legislation in the Economic Development Bond Bill

Design Review Board Memorandum re: Enclave Project - Design Review Board Application dated 9 July 2020 – Supplemental Documentation for the Community Clubhouse Building Toll Bros.

Memorandum re: Response to DRB Memo dated July 27, 2020 regarding application dated July 9, 2020 for Community Clubhouse Building

Ducharme & Dillis Memorandum re: Revised Site Plans (C1.0 through C8.11) dated July 22nd, 2020;

Revised Landscape Plans (SD09.01 through SD09.08) dated July 24th, 2020 from ESE Consultants; Inc.

Clubhouse Landscape Plans (L09.01 through L09.05) dated July 24th, 2020 from ESE Consultants, Inc.

This meeting was conducted via Remote Participation, pursuant to the Current Executive Order.

Zoom Access Protocols

Join Zoom Meeting: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83291836938>

Meeting ID: 832 9183 6938

One Tap Mobile: +13017158592,,83291836938# US (Germantown) +13126266799,,83291836938# US (Chicago)