



DRB Memorandum

Project: 267 Great Road –Housing
Project Location: 267 Great Road – Rear portion of lot
Memorandum Date: 11.20.15

Drawings Reviewed:

Acton Management, Inc, 267 Great Road – Permit Package	
Existing Conditions Plan C2	Date: 6-27-14, Rev. 10-30-15
Grading & Drainage	Date: 6-27-14, Rev. 10-30-15
Layout Plan	Date: 6-27-14, Rev. 10-30-15
Landscape Plan	Date: 9-18-15

Proponent Representatives:

Not Present – Reviewed Drawings

DRB Members:

Holly Ben-Joseph (HBJ), Kim Montella (KM), Michael Dube (MD), Peter Darlow (PD)

Date of DRB Review: 11-20-15

The DRB met on November 18, 2015 to review the second phase of development of 267 Great Road by the Proponent. The DRB has previously reviewed the office building at the front of the lot. In addition, the same proponent has developed the 40B project directly to the west of this project. The DRB has reservations about this proposal for four single-family homes replacing a single home. The DRB has the following comments on the drawings:

Site Comments:

1. The four buildings are placed very close together with little space between the buildings. From the building footprint, it seems like the buildings will be similar in size and scale to the buildings of the adjacent development (by the same developer), which the DRB feels is too dense. The DRB recommends reducing the number of units to two, or maximum three buildings.
2. If the proponent does not reduce the number, the DRB recommends converting the buildings to townhomes instead of single family homes, which would free up space for driveways, plantings and the road.
3. In addition, the DRB feels the access road is squeezed in behind the existing commercial building parking lot; the close proximity is exasperated by a three foot grade change between the parking lot and the road. The DRB recommends that in the future, even if the developer doesn't plan to build out a lot or adjacent lots at one time, they should be designed at one time to enable the planning of a cohesive site layout. This layout reads as an afterthought.

4. The DRB questions whether the driveways are long enough for one car to park, the drives in Units 3 and 4 in particular seem too short. The DRB would like to see dimensions on the lengths of the driveways.
5. The DRB notes Unit 1 and Unit 2 are located within the 75' setback line of the wetlands. In addition, the access road is within the 75' setback line.
6. The landscape plan is appropriate for the site and many native species are used. The DRB notices that some of the ornamental plantings are within 50' setback line; generally these plants require yearly fertilization which is not recommended within 50' buffer as the chemicals will drain into the wetland.

Building Comments:

1. No architectural drawing submitted to review.

The DRB in general supports the addition of a few housing units, especially since they are linked to the adjacent housing development. However, as submitted, the plan seems too crowded, with limited buffers between all site elements. As shown in the drawings, the DRB believes this new development will be similar to the adjacent 40B project which, we believe is too dense for the scale of the buildings as built.

Respectfully Submitted,

Design Review Board