

ZBA Work Session
July 6, 2007
Flynn Building

Present: Jeff Klofft, Jody Kablack, Paul Finger, Steve Duffy, Kevin Duffy, Bill Place

Meeting was called to order at 8 am.

The subject of the meeting was to discuss traffic and circulation issues related to the Sudbury Commons Comprehensive Permit application.

J. Kablack began by stating that although the proposed use is a low traffic generator, the traffic circulation in the immediate area needs improvement and that we need to ensure that this development plays its part in improving existing conditions and not exacerbating them. We also need to consider the potential improvements with the Sudbury Center project and how that may affect the frontage of the subject property. The Bruce Freeman Rail Trail is also adjacent to the property and we need to be cognizant of how that will integrate with the site and the immediate area.

Paul Finger outlined the issues that they are aware of – the driveway circulation pattern and what is the best direction for traffic flow, and the Peakham Road/Hudson Road intersection.

B. Place asked if the applicant would agree to grant a 10' wide roadway easement along the frontage of the property for a limited time period. Since we do not know the final design of the Sudbury Center project (which could also include improvements to the Peakham/Hudson intersection), having some flexibility along this stretch of the road would be helpful. The Duffy's replied that they are not eager to grant since they will likely be ahead of the town's construction and would not want the site ripped up. Paul Finger suggested granting the easement but putting specifications for re-landscaping in the easement language.

Circulation in and out of the site was discussed next. After reviewing all the possible scenarios, it was agreed that the applicant will have their traffic engineer review the configuration for a 1 way system - in at the western access and out at the eastern access. It was felt that this scenario would cause the fewest conflicts with the Peakham/Hudson intersection. The cueing lane eastbound on Hudson Road will need to be shortened so that the cars exiting the site turning left will not have to cross 2 lanes of traffic. This should not impact the functioning of the Concord Road intersection. The proposed driveways can both be narrowed slightly for one way circulation, however in order to maintain flexibility if the circulation system does not function well, the driveways may be constructed at 22 feet so that other arrangements can be made. The remainder of the site will allow for 2 way directional traffic. This design will be presented to the ZBA for further comments.

Paul Finger brought up the issue of stormwater management and an issue with the Conservation Commission. Currently a small amount of road runoff from Hudson Road travels across the western-most driveway and flows around the corner onto Peakham Road and into a ditch along the railroad right of way. This is an existing condition, and the runoff supplies water to a wetland in this location. The applicant had proposed capturing this runoff in a catch basin at the driveway entrance so that water is not flowing across the driveway and across the town walkway in this location. ConCom wants to keep the situation as it presently exists. To capture the runoff will require a waiver from the local wetland bylaw. The applicant will flag this issue for the ZBA and request a waiver from the local bylaw.

Unit sizes and the garage buildings were discussed briefly. It was asked whether the footprint of development could be decreased, particularly the size of the new units. The applicant stated that those are their profit units, and that they need them in order to make the renovation of the existing buildings feasible. The cost differential between tearing down all the buildings and new all construction, versus renovating the existing buildings, is not that different. J. Klofft discussed the potential of reducing the number of outbuildings, possibly by combining more garage bays in fewer buildings. J. Kablack brought up the idea of the applicant purchasing the abutting property (and donating it to the town for open space) and adding more density to the project within the current footprint. The applicant stated that they are too far along in their design to radically alter the proposal. They also thought that the Selectmen would not be in favor of increased density, as they had opposed higher density in the beginning of the discussion.

The latest DRB memo was discussed briefly. Frank Riepe will be asked to attend the next hearing on July 25.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 am.

Minutes taken by J. Kablack