

TOWN OF BOLTON – DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

Remote Meeting held on October 12, 2021 at 12:00 p.m. via Zoom Communications, Inc.

Members Present: Michelle Tuck (Chair), Natalie Gabrielle, Danielle Spicer

Also Present: Valerie Oorthuys (Town Planner)

Pursuant to Governor Baker’s March 12, 2020 Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A, §18, and the Governor’s March 15, 2020 Order imposing strict limitations on the number of people that may gather in one place, this public meeting of the Town of Bolton Planning Board was conducted via remote participation. No in-person attendance of members of the public were permitted, but the public can access this meeting while in progress using Zoom Video Communications, Inc. (Zoom).

Directions to connect to the public meeting were provided on the agenda.

Mallard Lane Comprehensive Permit Review

Age-Restricted Development along South Bolton Road, Map 2.C Parcel 15.1

The applicant submitted a Comprehensive Permit application to the Zoning Board of Appeals and a public hearing regarding this application was opened on August 10, 2021. The public hearing is currently ongoing. The Design Review Board will act in an advisory role to the Zoning Board of Appeals to provide design feedback to the applicant. The Design Review Board will not and cannot issue any approvals for this development.

Present:

Jim Morin, Northeast Classic Builders, Applicant

Jim Morin provided an overview of the project, noting there are 3 house types. Units 1, 8, and 10 will be type A. Units 2, 3, and 4 will be type B. Units 5, 6, 7, 9, and 11 will be type C. Jim Morin indicated four planting areas included on the plants to reflect abutter concerns.

Danielle Spicer noted areas of 2:1 slope and asked if those could be 3:1 or flatter.

Danielle Spicer noted that around units 5, 6, and 7, there is a large retaining wall and asked about erosion and stabilization in that area. Jim Morin said the retaining wall is proposed as a redi-rock wall. The area would have wood chips and ground cover to stabilize. Danielle Spicer said the 2:1 slope could give significant runoff. Jim Morin said a jute matt with seed mixed in would be installed.

Natalie Gabrielle said that she appreciates Units 1 and 2 being located at a distance from the roadway, as other homes in the area are as well. Natalie Gabrielle noted that Units 5, 6, and 7 appear very close together and are all type C. The middle unit could be changed to a type A for more differentiation.

Jim Morin noted that the homes are designed to be single story and inclusive of garage spaces, so the footprint was difficult to work with. Michelle Tuck said that the garages do appear large.

Michelle Tuck asked if Units 5, 6, and 7 are all intended to be the same color. Jim Morin said they are all intended to be white, and stated that the affordable units need to blend in seamlessly to the market rate units.

Approved at the July 6, 2022 meeting via Zoom participation

Members of the DRB suggested that the door colors could be unique to offer some difference between all homes.

Michelle Tuck stated that Unit 7 does not have a tree along the roadway.

The Design Review Board agreed that the front elevations of the three unit types are all very similar and the differences are more evident in the rear elevations, meaning that the homes will look the same to a pedestrian or visitor. A few garages could be moved to the other side of the home for variation. A few homes could be a light or medium gray rather than white.

Members discussed the type A home design, noting that the upper windows could be about 4” wider and taller, without enlarging the gables. The window to the left of the front door could also be made wider and taller. The sconces at the garage could be larger, around 20” or more. A sconce or pendant light could be added to the area by the front door.

Members discussed the type B home design, noting that the window above the garage should be pulled down about 6” and made wider and taller by about 4”. The upper window on the rear elevation should be made larger.

Members reviewed the type C home design, with the comments the same as for the type A design.

Danielle Spicer asked the applicant to double check the water quality calculations for a metal roof, as it is not a ‘clean’ roof.

The Design Review Board’s comments at this time can be summarized as follows:

- Plans should be updated to show individual wells;
- Ensure the metal roofs are included in water quality calculations;
- Review the 2:1 slopes in landscaped areas to see if they can be smoothed to a 3:1 slope;
- Add street trees by homes at the cul-de-sac;
- Increase size of windows;
- Provide ways to differentiate between homes by altering the color of some homes to a very light grey, consider adding colored front doors, consider flipping the location of some garages;
- Provide greater variation in the side and rear elevations between the three unit types;
- Reconsider the proportion of the sconces at the garages.

Respectfully Submitted,
Valerie Oorthuys