



July 30, 2019

Boxborough Planning Board
29 Middle Road,
Boxborough Ma 01719

Re: Site Plan Review
Enclave at Boxborough
Project No. 5249

Dear Board Members:

This office has reviewed the submission for the above referenced project. In this review letter, we have eliminated all items resolved and have incorporated some of the comments from the July 22, 2019 Planning Board meeting.

The following items were reviewed:

- Site Plan, Enclave at Boxborough, prepared by Ducharme and Dillis, Civil Design Group Inc. and revised through 7-15-19.
- Stormwater Report, Enclave at Boxborough, prepared by Ducharme and Dillis, Civil Design Group Inc. and revised through 7-15-19.

At this time we have the following remaining comments and concerns:

1. It is our recommendation that a Phasing plan be added to specifically show which features will be constructed in conjunction with the access road through Sheriff's Meadow. It is recommended that it include:
 - Location of temporary modular building being used for sales and related parking, construction trailer and associated storage, port-a-john etc. (correlate engineering and Landscape plans for these functions)
 - Any required drainage structures, utilities to be completed prior to binder pavement.
 - Provisions to minimize impacts to Sheriff's Meadow residents including screening, dust control and signage.
2. It is our recommendation that a detailed plan at a larger scale be prepared at the entrance at Stow Road to clearly identify which site features are to remain, be relocated or removed including landscaping. In addition, this plan should clearly show the detail of the proposed signs and the sight distance at the intersection. Any additional utilities (i.e. lighting, irrigation) should be indicated on the plan as well. The sidewalks and related crosswalk and handicap ramps should be included as well.
3. Attached at the end of this letter are minor plan revisions.

Landscape Plan Comments:

Comments from Board member, Rebecca Verner:

1. White fencing will be very visible. Consideration should be given to black or green fencing so it will blend better.
2. Two inch caliper trees are too small for street trees and screening. 3 ½" are suggested along entry drive or screening for Sheriff's Meadow.
3. The plans do not provide real screening in front of the sign and evergreens around the detention basins. It was suggested that perhaps screening planted on Sheriff's Meadow property, at the start of construction could provide better screening.
4. A separate lighting plan is requested as the lighting is hard to see on the Landscape Plan.
5. There are a lot of flowering trees on the plan. It is recommended that there are more shade trees in the interior.
6. There are a lot of ornamental trees on the perimeter which are non-native. It is recommended that some of the non-native dogwoods be replaced with redbuds to create a better transition.

Comments from Places Associates:

1. These comments are in addition to those of member Rebecca Verner, eliminating our redundant comments. This office is in general agreement with her comments.
2. The work on site will result in a 15-30' width of natural vegetation along the property line to Sheriff's Meadow and abutting properties which will likely not provide sufficient screening. This office suggests that the applicant work with Sheriff's Meadow owners to plant screening on their property, as early in the construction process as possible, to provide meaningful screening both during the construction process and when completed.
3. The proposed tree line/limit of clearing should be shown in a dark line to clearly show for construction purposes.
4. Plans should indicate the use of silt fence along the property line to control blowing dust. The Contractor should be required to have water in a portable tank with sprayer that can be used to reduce and prevent dust impacts.
5. The entry from Stow Road has too many of a single tree species (Black Gum – *Nyssa sylvatica*) in a row. It is recommended that as series of trees contain no more than 6-8 of a single species in a row.
6. The Colorado Blue Spruce, planted near Infiltration Basin 1, grow to 80'. We recommend a Blue Hills Spruce which grow to 30' maximum as a substitution. This also applies to the blue spruce at the intersection with the cul-de-sac which are planted too densely and too close.
7. Based on weather conditions the past few years, it is recommended that the bottom of the two basins be covered in 3/4 - 1 ½ " washed stone that can absorb the energy from intense rainfall. Any soils on the bottom tend to seal off the basin for infiltration.
8. The plantings to the north of the primary leaching area are not needed as this area will have existing vegetation on the perimeter. It is recommended that these plantings be used elsewhere to "beef up" screening to abutting properties.
9. Behind units 29-32, the fence should be located at the top of the rock slope to provide better screening as well as for safety and maintenance.
10. From Unit 33 to the intersection with the cul-de-sac, there are too many Tilia (TG2) concentrated in one area. It is recommended that they insert another species to provide diversity. This office does like the use of red oak at some nearby units.

PLACES Associates, Inc.

256 Great Road, Suite 4, Littleton MA 01460 (978)486-0334

www.placesassociates.com

11. Behind Units 23-25 is a long expanse of white fence. Additional plantings (if possible with the ledge) are recommended to break up the fence. Please provide a detail for the fence when located in ledge, as sufficient anchoring is needed to resist wind loads. The white color of the fence will draw a person's eye to the fence, the applicant might consider a more neutral toned fence color - tan or grey).
12. The 3:1 slope behind units 25 and 26 should be planted with erosion control mix or the designer should confirm that a manicured lawn is intended for this slope
13. The red maple and the shed are shown on the south side of the community garden which will shade this garden. We also question whether a garden that is 25'x60' is sufficient to serve 50 units. As an example, a single plot in the Chelmsford community garden is 15' x 30'.

In summary, the plans have progressed and the number of comments has diminished. Should the Board close the public hearing prior to receiving revised plans, these comments can be incorporated into a list of conditions for the Board's decision.

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

Minor Plan Items to address:

1. Turn on layer for potential vernal pool and show associated 100' buffer (Local by-law)
2. Where is data for DCB18, DMH 16 and most of the drainage at the clubhouse?
3. The water line shows a tight radius at along the intersection near the clubhouse. Recommend showing it with standard bends so you can trouble shoot any conflicts in the intersection.
4. Grading for HP by clubhouse still not correct. Areas of 2.5% grade along curb, either side of stripped area. Grades not consistent between detail on C8.5 and C6.1. Could not find rim elevations for drainage structures to check for consistency with them.
5. On Grading and drainage, it looks like RD-2 and FD-25 (by unit 1) are connected but do not have pipe data indicating that. Please confirm which is correct or scrivener's error.
6. The FES in Basin 1 (the 15" ADS) hits 311 contour but invert is 313. Also, please have inlet of same pipe to match grade so it doesn't pond water.
7. The Size/model specifications for the VortSentry were not found on the plans.
8. Check for conflicts with water main or service lines:
 - Between DMH 16 to DMH 3
 - Service on Cul-de-sac

Stormwater comments:

1. Stormwater Report 2.2 Standard 2 – please add the volumes for Design Point B to substantiate the conclusion of no increase in volume.
2. The TSS calculations for the access roadway were not included.