



Town of Sudbury

Zoning Board of Appeals

Flynn Building
278 Old Sudbury Road
Sudbury, MA 01776
978-639-3387
Fax: 978-639-3314

appeals@sudbury.ma.us

www.sudbury.ma.us/boardofappeals

MINUTES

APRIL 21, 2020 AT 7:30 PM

VIRTUAL MEETING

Members Present: Chair John Riordan, Clerk William Ray, Jonathan Gossels, Frank Riepe, Nancy Rubenstein, Associate David Booth, and Associate Jennifer Pincus

Members Absent: None

Others Present: Director of Planning and Community Development Adam Duchesneau, Planning and Zoning Coordinator Beth Perry, and Town Counsel Jonathan Silverstein

Mr. Riordan opened the meeting at 7:35 PM by noting the presence of a quorum. Mr. Riordan then asked Mr. Ray to read the legal notice as published in the newspaper into the record, which noted the following Zoning Board of Appeals applications and opened all of the public hearings listed below.

CONTINUED Public Hearing, Case 20-07 – Quarry North Road LLC, Applicant, and William M. Wagner, Jr., the Sudbury Water District, and the Town of Sudbury, Owners, for Final Plan Approval under Town of Sudbury Zoning Bylaw Section 4700A, Plan Approval under Town of Sudbury Zoning Bylaw Section 4700B, and Stormwater Management Permits under Town of Sudbury General Bylaw Article V(F), Section 5.C to construct 274 dwelling units (81 being age restricted and 26 being affordable) in townhouses and multi-family buildings on approximately 26 acres of land with associated parking, amenities, and infrastructure at 16 and 36 North Road, Assessor's Maps C12-0003, C12-0004, and C12-0100, Research-1, North Road Residential Overlay District, Melone Smart Growth Overlay District, and Water Resource Protection Overlay District Zone II Zoning Districts

Chris Claussen and Chris Kennedy of Quarry North Road LLC, and attorney Bill Henchy were present to discuss their application to the Planning Board with the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. Riordan recapped the discussion on the project from the last Zoning Board of Appeals meeting on April 6, 2020. He also noted the public hearing, review, and commenting to the Planning Board on the project was not a typical task of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. Henchy stated that after the last meeting on April 6, 2020 there was a meeting with the Planning Board and Design Review Board where there had been numerous questions regarding signage for the project. He noted more information would be provided at future Planning Board meetings. Mr. Henchy also indicated the project team had filed a Special Permit application for the proposed signage at the property which would be coming before the Zoning Board of Appeals in the near future.

Mr. Claussen provided a brief presentation noting particular items of the Site Plan regarding pedestrian traffic around the clubhouse, lighting, and the placement of the age-restricted housing. He also clarified

the concern regarding the townhouse “flex room” and the possibility it could be converted into a bedroom. Mr. Claussen indicated there was a deed restriction which limited the total number of bedrooms for the project. He also noted the outdoor light fixtures would be dark sky complaint.

Ms. Pincus asked Mr. Claussen what the expected overall demographics were for the project. Mr. Claussen stated these types of dwellings with less bedrooms would lend themselves to retiree families, families that were downsizing, or couples just starting out. Those families with school aged children would probably utilize the apartment section of the project. Ms. Pincus also noted there was no intent to install a swing set or play area for children, and the project did not seem too child friendly.

Mr. Claussen commented on the connectivity between the proposed project and the Bruce Freeman Rail trail. He also spoke of electronic vehicle charging stations and the requirement of the Fire Department that these stations needed to be outside.

At this time Mr. Gossels arrived at the meeting.

Ms. Pincus raised concerns there was no community space dedicated to the townhouse homeowners aside from their back patios, unlike the apartments and the age-restricted units which had easier access to community spaces.

Mr. Riordan then asked if there were any comments from the public.

Select Board member Janie Dretler of 286 Goodman’s Hill Road noted that Sudbury valued its open space very much and there was a lot of open space around this project site. She advocated for the creation of a connection from the subject property to the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail.

Mr. Riepe noted it seemed none of the townhouses contained any kind of space for a garden for any individual residence.

Mr. Riordan commented on the vegetative berm along North Road/Route 117 and the alternate emergency access location which had been required by the Fire Department. Mr. Claussen displayed an alternative drawing for the emergency access point that would be presented to the Planning Board at their upcoming meeting.

Ms. Rubenstein asked if the parking area for Building A would be overflow parking for any of the other areas of the project. Mr. Claussen stated they were designated for the apartment buildings. Ms. Rubenstein noted there was not much in the way of on-street parking and there was a question of where overflow parking would take place. Mr. Claussen stated the project met the parking requirements of the Zoning Bylaw.

Mr. Riordan questioned the amount of space designated for package drop offs and felt the area was not large enough. Mr. Claussen explained the space was designed by factoring in how often the age-restricted unit owners would be home (more often) as compared to how much the non-age-restricted unit owners would be home (less often).

At this time, Mr. Gossels left the meeting.

Mr. Riordan asked if there were further comments from the public but there were none.

Mr. Riepe made a motion to close the public hearing for Case 20-07, 16 and 36 North Road. Ms. Rubenstein seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Riordan – Aye, Ray – Aye, Gossels – Absent, Riepe – Aye, and Rubenstein – Aye.

There was then discussion as to how the comments on the project from the Zoning Board of Appeals would be finalized and sent to the Planning Board for their review.

Mr. Riepe made a motion to designate Mr. Riordan and Ms. Pincus to compile the final list of comments from the Zoning Board of Appeals regarding the proposed 274 unit residential development at 16 and 36 North Road to be distributed to the Planning Board. Mr. Ray seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Riordan – Aye, Ray – Aye, Gossels – Absent, Riepe – Aye, and Rubenstein – Aye.

Approval of Meeting Minutes for March 9, 2020

Ms. Pincus stated that for Case 20-06, 15 Union Avenue, it would be a good idea to mention Mr. Salvin had noted the enforcement letters from the Building Department were initiated at the request of the Fire Department.

Mr. Ray made a motion to approve the minutes of March 9, 2020 as amended. Mr. Riepe seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Riordan – Aye, Ray – Aye, Gossels – Absent, Riepe – Aye, and Rubenstein – Abstain.

Administrative Report

Mr. Riordan noted the Board of Selectmen's regulations/policies regarding temporary business or industrial trailers had been distributed to the Zoning Board of Appeals members in advance of the meeting. He pointed out how these regulations related to a recent case before the Zoning Board of Appeals, Case 20-06, for 15 Union Avenue. Mr. Riordan discussed how the document indicated what was allowed and not allowed, and how the regulations/policies may be amended in the future. The Zoning Board of Appeals determined they would take up the discussion of this matter at a future meeting.

Mr. Ray made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Riepe seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Riordan – Aye, Ray – Aye, Gossels – Absent, Riepe – Aye, and Rubenstein – Aye. The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 PM.