

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING
SUDBURY BOARD OF APPEALS
Monday, February 23, 2010

The Board consisted of:

Jeffrey P. Klofft, Acting Chairman; Nancy G. Rubenstein, Clerk; Stephen A. Garanin; Jonathan G. Gossels; Elizabeth T. Quirk; and Benjamin D. Stevenson

Also: Jody Kablack, Director of Planning and Community Development

For the Applicant:

Larry O'Brien, Sudbury Housing Trust; Phil Giffey, NOAH, Inc., Developer; Bob Wegener, Architect, Narrow Gate; Wayne Keefner, Engineer, Meridian Associates; and Toby Kramer, Project Manager.

Mr. Klofft, acting as Chairman, explained to those in attendance that the purpose of this meeting was to address some of the actions from the February 1, 2010 ZBA meeting and to develop an action plan.

Documents received for February 23, 2010 included the following:

- 2/19/2010 Memo from Jody Kablack with corner lot recommendation and map
- 2/19/2010 Memo from Jody Kablack with guest parking comparison
- 2/22/2010 Memo from Bob Leupold, Board of Health
- 2/22/2010 Sudbury Housing Trust Memo with information on Conservation jurisdiction, condo budget, septic feasibility, and financial feasibility
- 2/22/2010 Letter of support from neighbor, Greg Comeau

Mr. Klofft noted that the Board was in receipt of a letter of a February 1, 2010 support from Thomas B. Arnold, the Chair of the Faith in Action Committee at First Parish Sudbury. The letter spoke strongly in favor of the successful Habitat housing project and of the need for affordable rental and homeownership projects in Sudbury.

The Board was also in receipt of a letter from Debbie Dineen of the Conservation Commission. Ms. Kablack noted that Ms. Dineen had been to the site to flag various wetlands in the area. There is a large area of swamp on Marlboro Road to the east of the project and there are wetlands across the street, however it was Ms. Dineen's opinion that there are no wetlands within 100 feet of the property.

As to the issue of whether or not the property comprises a corner lot, Ms. Kablack said that upon review of the 1961 Engineering Plan for Maynard Road the entire frontage runs along Maynard Road, therefore it is not considered a corner lot and so side setbacks are in effect for the elevation facing Maynard Road. A waiver for the side setback would be needed. Ms. Kablack is still waiting for a definitive answer from Engineering about which address is preferred, 3 Marlboro Road or 278 Maynard Road. The address may be dependent upon driveway location.

Mr. O'Brien presented NOAH's condominium budget. He noted that any prospective resident would have to go through the lottery process, working with a bank to ensure that the applicant could meet any mortgage payments. He said that this was only a preliminary budget as the site design may alter the figures.

Ms. Kramer listed the various budget items, including insurance, septic, utilities, trash removal landscaping, snow maintenance, and capital reserves. Mr. Klofft mentioned that fire suppression, Sudbury Water District, and water system flushing are also considerations. Mr. O'Brien said that the Trust would be meeting with the Sudbury Fire Chief later in the process.

Mr. O'Brien then discussed the economics of the project. He said that the ability for the project to be 100% affordable was dependent upon three funding sources: the Sudbury Housing Trust subsidy, the MassHousing grant, and qualified mortgages. He then walked the Board through various handouts showing the financial breakdowns.

Mr. Klofft questioned the expenditure of \$310,000. The cost included funds for lot testing, demolition of the old structure, and the purchase of the property. Mr. Klofft then asked about the development costs per square foot, which he considered quite high. Andrew Kaye, of the Sudbury Housing Trust, said that the numbers are in line with industry expenses. Ms. Rust reminded the Board that the \$154/square foot included both hard construction costs and soft costs, including permitting, etc.

Mr. Klofft requested further cost breakdowns and comparisons with other 40B projects in Sudbury.

Mr. O'Brien reminded the Board that the costs shown at this meeting represent estimated costs. He anticipates that by working with the Design Review Board and Zoning Board the plans will be further defined so that the costs, including breakdowns per unit, can be better determined.

Mr. O'Brien then introduced Daniel Hewett, an architect and member of the Sudbury Housing Trust. Mr. Hewett said that he had met with the Chairman of the Design Review Board, Frank Riepe, to discuss the issues with the initial design concept. As he understood it, the issues raised from the ZBA and neighbors at the February 1 ZBA meeting included: building scale and placement on the site, density of the structures, parking, access and traffic management, building perception from the public way, snow removal, and landscaping. Mr. Hewett said that currently there are two buildings that are mirror images of one another however he anticipated that in the working sessions the building design could be fine-tuned to address the concerns mentioned and to greater reflect Sudbury homes.

Mr. Klofft asked about the location of the driveway. Mr. O'Brien answered that the driveway location is under consideration.

Mr. O'Brien reminded the Board that the original RFP from the Housing Trust was answered by

architects Mr. Eck and Mr. Riepe and in the end the Housing Trust selected Mr. Eck's proposed design. Mr. Hewett said that the new concept now reflects the New England ideal of "big house, back house, barn."

Ms. Quirk asked about the number of units being considered at this point. The answer was six.

Mr. Klofft said that he was encouraged by the information Mr. Hewett presented. He suggested that smaller working sessions with the Housing Trust, NOAH, and ZBA members would be useful. Numbers of units could be considered within the framework of new design schemes.

As to concerns about the proposed septic system, it was noted that the Board was in receipt of a letter from Bob Leupold at the Board of Health. Mr. Leupold said in his letter that the technology proposed has been approved by the Board of Health for use for several single family dwellings in Sudbury and for the Grouse Hill multi-unit development. Given that Board of Health approval can be expected once final design plans are submitted Mr. Klofft said that he was satisfied with information provided on the septic system.

The Board then discussed holding a working session and an information session with the neighbors and ZBA prior to continuing the hearing to April 27 where a presentation of the final proposal would be made.

A discussion ensued about the economic comparison analysis that was produced by the Housing Trust for six and fewer dwellings.

Ms. Quirk asked whether the issue with density was most concerning due to building mass or vehicle trips and parking arrangement. She did not see a great deal of difference between five or six units.

It was agreed that a working session would address a number of issues, including density, and the finances would be better clarified through changes in design. A date and location for the working session would be determined and noticed accordingly.

The public hearing of the ZBA was continued to Tuesday, April 27, 2010 at 7:30 p.m. in the Lower Town Hall Meeting Room.

Jeffrey P. Klofft, Chair

Jonathan G. Gossels

Nancy G. Rubenstein

Elizabeth T. Quirk

Stephen A. Garanin

Benjamin D. Stevenson