

MINUTES OF THE DESIGN WORKING SESSION  
SUDBURY BOARD OF APPEALS  
Monday, March 29, 2010

In Attendance:

Jeff Klofft, Chairman, Zoning Board of Appeals;  
Jon Gossels, Zoning Board of Appeals  
Jody Kablack, Planning and Community Development  
Beth Rust, Community Housing Office  
John Burns, Landmarks Construction  
Daniel Hewitt, Sudbury Housing Trust  
Andrew Kaye, Sudbury Housing Trust  
Wayne Keefner, Meridian Associates  
Toby Kramer, NOAH, Inc.  
Frank Riepe, Design Review Board  
Bob Wegener, Narrow Gate

Neighbors in attendance: Nancy MacPhee, 5 Marlboro Road and Steve Tripoli, 31 Marlboro Road.

The meeting began with the distribution of new sketches of a site plan, building elevations, and floor plans. Ms. Kramer explained that the site would consist of a two-unit building at the front of the site and a 4-unit building at the back. The two-unit building would look like a typical single-family house and the 4-unit building would resemble a barn structure. The paved areas had been updated since the last working meeting on March 10 and the driveway plan now shows entry from Maynard Road.

Ms. Rust explained that there have been discussions with the abutting neighbor about a shared driveway. A shared driveway would alleviate the need for two driveways next to each other which would reduce the number of curb cuts. In addition the curve of the driveway into the new units would be less severe. The neighbor was amenable however details are still being worked out.

Mr. Keefner talked about the various sections of the driveway and parking areas, noting that this plan was easier for fire trucks to maneuver around. He said that there could be non-paved surfaces for the two guest parking spots. The bio-retention basin would be located in the lower right corner of the lot. Ms. Rust added that the Housing Trust has met with the Sudbury Fire Chief and he indicated that the proposed plan was far superior to the original plan. Ms. Kablack also said that the Fire Chief confirmed that a width of 18 feet is adequate for the driveway. The original plan showed a driveway width of 22 feet.

Mr. Wegener then described the building features. Locating the four-unit building at the back of the lot is a key solution to grading difficulties as the building itself then does the job of a retaining wall. Large retaining walls would no longer be needed along the sides of the property.

In the four-unit building each unit has tandem parking with one interior parking space at the basement level and one exterior space behind. Landscaping between each parking space would screen cars and add privacy. Each basement would also contain a storage closet that would also house mechanicals and each would have an additional alcove for garbage storage. There would be a mudroom at the level of entry and then stairs leading up to the two-story unit. He noted that the living rooms would be south-facing. A half-bath and washer and dryer would be located on that level. And there would also be a compact kitchen and dining area that would open up to a patio at the back of the units. The second floor would have two bedrooms and a full bath. One bedroom would be larger. There was a discussion about dormers on the second floor.

Mr. Riepe asked about the building height. Mr. Wegener said that the height still needs to be determined. Mr. Klofft said that he would prefer the barn look to remain even if the building needs more height to achieve this. Mr. Riepe agreed by saying that the design is more important than height in this case. He suggested raising the building another four feet. Mr. Wegener felt that the bedrooms would be improved by doing so because the ceilings would be higher and therefore furniture would fit better in the rooms. He also mentioned the potential for skylights in the bathroom ceilings to assist with cooling in the summer.

Ms. Rust said that the Trust would be participating in a green workshop once the design had been determined.

Mr. Kaye suggested flipping the floor plan of the kitchen and dining room to optimize the patio and keep the kitchen plumbing in line with the bathroom plumbing at the common wall. Mr. Wegener said that the plan currently shows a traditional kitchen window at the sink.

Ms. Kramer said that the entries into the units would be covered.

Discussion then moved to the two units in the front building, which was designed to look more like a traditional New England single-family house. Ms. Rust said that the two-story unit would have a similar floor plan as the back units. The other unit is a single story with two bedrooms and is handicapped accessible. Entry to both units is at the Maynard Road elevation. Both have basements for storage and mechanicals.

Mr. Klofft asked about the number of doors that would be visible from Maynard Road. Ms. Rust said that the doors would be perpendicular to one another so that from Maynard Road only one is most visible.

Ms. Kramer noted that there are two parking spaces at the end of the entry walkways with second parking spaces and two guest parking spaces at the rear. In looking at how the plot plan was shaded for paved parking and soft surface guest parking, Mr. Klofft suggested flipping the parking spots so that the two paved spaces would be closer to the units.

Mr. Wegener said that the roof would have dormers, but their style would be dependent upon building height. He noted that materials had yet to be determined for both buildings but the front building would have a traditional residential siding look, and the back building would have a

different treatment and palette of materials such as barn board. Ms. Kramer then asked Mr. Klofft and Mr. Gossels for their ideas for materials. Mr. Gossels said that the preference was for something durable. As a point of process, Ms. Kablack explained that comments about durability were appreciated, however the Housing Trust would ultimately be making several decisions about materials and would propose their ideas to the ZBA at the next meeting.

Mr. Riepe said that he felt that the new design was a good scheme and was well-developed. The new plan appears to have solved many of the problems that had been discussed at the last meeting. He also felt that the common driveway was a good solution. He did note, however, that there would be cost challenges associated with maintaining the aesthetics of the rear building and he hoped that the design could withstand them. He also said that the arrangement of the buildings was successful in that they are off-center from one another and therefore more natural to the site. He felt that minor tweaks to the front building, including perhaps the use of a small retaining wall to define a broader garden and lowering the paved area by two feet, would further improve the design.

Both Mr. Klofft and Mr. Gossels agreed that the plan was a big improvement and complimented the Housing Trust on their efforts.

At this point the neighbors were given an opportunity to raise issues. Mr. Tripoli asked for clarification about parking areas as he did not see where all of the spaces were placed on the plot plan. Mr. Wegener explained that parking had been broken up from a common lot to be dispersed throughout the site. He pointed out where the handicapped spots could be located and clarified for Mr. Tripoli how the tandem parking spots would work. There would be fourteen parking spaces, two for each unit and two unpaved for guests.

Nancy MacPhee asked what a soft parking space would look like. Mr. Wegener said that it might be made with concrete paving units or a concrete grid with grass covering it, something that would allow for water infiltration but could sustain the weight of a car or firetruck.

Mr. Tripoli wanted to know what the outdoor living spaces would look like. Mr. Wegener said that at the back building the patios would be at the rear of the units. At the front building the patio for the two-story unit is at the back near the driveway area and at the one-story unit the patio is off the side of the house, screened by vegetation. The front of the property would be reserved for open recreational space.

Nancy MacPhee wanted to know if anyone had taken a look at the water at the site after the week's heavy rains. Mr. Wegener said that during construction the grading of the site would change the topography and that would affect where the pooling of the water would occur.

Mr. Riepe suggested changing the placement of the storage facilities at the front building and he questioned perhaps using an exterior bulkhead for access to basements.

Nancy MacPhee was concerned about what she thought were bushes along the Maynard Road boundary interfering with sight lines. Ms. Kablack said that with the exception of perhaps two existing trees at the bottom right corner a landscaping plan had not yet been proposed.

Mr. Klofft again stated that the Housing Trust and NOAH had made great progress and suggested that there be one more meeting with neighbors to show changes.

Mr. Tripoli once again brought up his concerns with the site being too dense, comprised of too many units. Mr. Klofft said that his initial concerns about density were due to the massing of buildings. He said that he understands that the neighbors are not happy about there being six units proposed for the site, but he said that he is much more comfortable about having six units with the new proposed design. He also noted that Maynard Road has buildings on it with similar layouts and sizes. He said that the new design was completely different than the original proposal in that the dense feeling of the buildings has been alleviated and there has been a significant reduction in paved area through the new parking plan. Mr. Riepe concurred by saying what people will see as they drive by the property is a house and barn and he felt that the image is coming through successfully. Mr. Gossels agreed. He was concerned by the first proposal, but now, with a clever design his concerns have been alleviated.

Ms. Rust said that there would be one more meeting with neighbors to unveil the new plan prior to the ZBA's next public meeting on April 27. It was also noted that the plan would have to be reviewed by the Design Review Board prior to the ZBA meeting.