

SUDBURY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
MINUTES
October 24, 2016

The Board consisted of:

Jonathan F.X. O'Brien, Chair; Jonathan G. Gossels; Jeffrey P. Klofft; Nancy Rubenstein; Nicholas Palmer, Clerk and John Riordan.

Absent: William Ray (Alternate).

Also present at the meeting on behalf of the Town were: Meagen Donoghue, Director of Planning & Community Development.

The meeting was opened at 7:32 p.m.

Mr. O'Brien opened the hearing by asking the Clerk to read the notice as published in the newspaper.

1. CONTINUATION - Public Hearing Case 16-21 – B'nai B'rith Housing New England, Inc./Covenant Commonwealth Corporation—Post Road Limited Partnership (Owner), Applicants, for a Comprehensive Permit and Substantial Modification of the existing Comprehensive Permit pursuant to Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 40B and 760 CMR 56.04 & 56.05, to allow construction at 187 Post Road of a second 56-unit senior age-restricted housing building. This application constitutes Phase II of the project originally approved in 2011, and includes the subdivision of the 6-acre parcel into two 3 acre parcels to accommodate the new structure. The project is known as Coolidge at Sudbury, Phase Two, and is identified as Assessor's map and parcel K10-0012.

Mr. Klofft motioned to recommend to the Board of Selectmen to have Mr. Riordan become a full member. Mr. Gossels second; vote: all in favor.

Mr. O'Brien reiterated the Coolidge team was to revisit their overview and traffic.

Mr. Fox introduced architect Jim Podeski and traffic engineer Giles Hamm; who both served on the team for Phase I.

Mr. O'Brien stated he wanted to talk about fire truck access and ladder length.

Ms. Grace presented a general update including her team held a second informational meeting at the current Coolidge where residents provided input. She also met with representatives from the Senior Center and the Council on Aging. Additionally, the team attended a joint Planning Board and Design Review Board Meeting in which the overview and a more ceremonial entrance were discussed. They also attended a Conservation Commission meeting and went through the Request for Determination of Applicability process and is conducting soil testing and would like to discuss at the next ZBA meeting. They also met with the Fire Department and had an operational meeting with a few Town department heads.

Ms. Grace introduced Cynthia Howe as well as a brand new property manager and indicated new management protocols are in place to reduce calls to Town services.

Mr. O'Brien asked if there was a new property management company. Ms. Howe stated it was the same management company but new property manager who work on the day-to-day financials. They also have a new resident services coordinator who meets individually with residents in a social worker capacity, and a full time maintenance worker.

SUDBURY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

MINUTES

October 24, 2016

Mr. O'Brien asked for a memo describing the new management strategy. Ms. Rubenstein asked if there was weekend staffing. Ms. Howe stated there is no weekend staffing as it is an independent housing facility, but there is 24-hour contact.

Mr. Gossels asked if there will be an electrical generator. Ms. Grace indicated there will be in the common areas and power at about 50%.

Joe Peznola of Hancock Associates indicated he met on two (2) occasions with the Fire Chief and discussed emergency vehicle access. Specifically, a fire truck needs to be able to turn around, therefore, Mr. Peznola designed a horseshoe loop at the entrance and a grass paved drive directly across from the building. He indicated the Chief said this was acceptable.

Other concerns of the Fire Chief were access to the building on the east side and to third story windows. Mr. Peznola indicated firefighters will have to use 53-foot ladders, not one extending from a truck, so he created a pull-off area that wraps around to the back (west side of the building); half-way down to the garage with a retaining wall to unload ladders to move across to the back. Mr. Gossels noted the reason why Phase I has three (3) stories is because it is built into a ditch, but in the area where Phase II will be will not be the same topography. Mr. Peznola said they will play with the roof lines to make it look like two (2) stories.

Mr. Peznola addressed parking stating Phase I will have the same amount they had prior.

Mr. O'Brien asked about the patio area in the original drawings. Mr. Peznola said there is a recreation area still proposed in the same area.

Regarding architecture, Jim Podeski showed three (3) illustrations of the exterior of the building: one facing the building from Route 20, one showing east to west, and one showing the grand entrance. Mr. Klofft inquired about the distance between the entrance and parking. Mr. Peznola indicated the radius and entrance is due to the fire entrance. Mr. Klofft opined the building doesn't match the site and he doesn't believe the roofline is any lower. Ms. Rubenstein noted the door to the right of the grand entrance is more prominent and aligns with the traffic circle. Mr. O'Brien expressed if the porch was to the right it helps break up the façade.

Mr. Gossels stated the 4th floor is wasted space and makes the building look and feel more massive. Mr. O'Brien asked if the roof design could be lowered. Mr. Podeski indicated he did not want to reduce the pitch of the roof. Mr. Gossels asked the team if they could design the roof differently, so they can keep the number of units, but not have such a huge massing. Ms. Rubenstein would like to see the roof line broken up.

Ms. Grace requested to meet with the Design Review Board. Mr. Gossels suggested morning working sessions to get a design that works with everyone.

Mr. Riordan asked about the access point at the garage level as asked by the Fire Chief. Mr. Podeski stated it is five (5) feet from grade.

Regarding traffic, Giles Hamm noted turning left is difficult but noted there are scheduled improvements for a signal placed at Landham Road. Mr. Gossels stated volume is an issue. Mr. Hamm indicated it is absolutely safe as he performed speed studies the during the traffic study for Phase I. He noted the driveway was designed based on a 500-foot safe site distance while meeting all Federal Highway and MassDOT requirements.

SUDBURY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

MINUTES

October 24, 2016

Mr. O'Brien asked of the timeframe for the traffic signal at Landham Road. Mr. Hamm noted it comes down to funding.

Ms. Rubenstein asked of the traffic near Goodmans Hill Road. Mr. Hamm stated he looked at it in October and noticed the amount of curb-cuts; though independent of the project. He noted more traffic goes left out of Goodmans Hill Road than right. He suggested taking the island out at the end of the road, but added that Goodmans Hill Road is not part of the project.

Ms. Rubenstein asked about the hours when the traffic counts were taken, and added that 7:30 a.m. is too late if anyone is going to Lincoln from Sudbury. Mr. Hamm noted he found the highest peak between 7:30-8:30 a.m.

Mr. Riordan asked how many trips come out from the complex across the street. Mr. Hamm said they did not include that into their counts.

Mr. O'Brien asked about a timeframe for the working session for architecture; suggesting 2-3 weeks. Ms. Grace indicated they will get back to the ZBA about the December 5, 2016 meeting regarding stormwater and wetlands.

Mr. O'Brien motioned to continue the meeting to December 5, 2016. Mr. Klofft second; vote: all in favor.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.