



# 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 June 1, 2026 AT 7:00 PM VIRTUAL MEETING

**Zoning Board of Appeals Members Present:** Clerk Frank Riepe, Alexander Dorjets, Ian Henchy, Jennifer Pincus and Sumeet Keswani

**Zoning Board of Appeals Members Absent:** Michael Hershberg

**Other Members Present:** Beth Perry, Planning and Zoning Coordinator

Mr. Riepe opened the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting at 7:00 PM by noting the presence of a quorum.

**Public Hearing, Case 26-05 – 11 ELSBETH ROAD, LLC, Applicant and Owner seeks a Special Permit under the provisions of MGL Chapter 40A, Section 9, and Sections 2460B of the Town of Sudbury Zoning Bylaw to demolish and replace existing dwelling in a non-conforming lot to new construction at 11 Elsbeth Road, Assessor's Map C06-0225, Residential A and Water Resource Protection Overlay District Zone II Zoning Districts.**

Joshua Fox represented Octavian Development / Ben Maiden for a proposed new single-family home at 11 Elsbeth Road. He described the project as a rebuild on a nonconforming undersized lot of 32,340 square feet, with a proposed home size of 4,072 square feet. The design was presented as stylistically similar to prior neighborhood projects at 8 Greenwood Road and especially 57 Longfellow Road.

Mr. Fox explained that the house is angled to reduce perceived massing from Elsbeth Road and Bowker Drive and noted that the front setback exceeds the 40-foot requirement, measuring approximately 41 feet from Elsbeth Road and more than 69 feet from Bowker Drive. The ridge line was described as just under 30 feet, with the main ridge lower than that peak.

Vito Colonna from Connerstone Engineering explained that the first-floor elevation is driven by septic design and a high groundwater table, requiring the home to be built up about 5 feet.

The board discussed landscaping, tree removal, and drainage concerns, especially near the rear property line and the Bowker Drive side.

Jennifer Pincus asked about grading, runoff, and screening along Bowker Drive; Vito said stormwater review would occur through the separate town stormwater permitting process and that additional swales or drainage measures could be added if needed.

Frank Riepe raised concerns about potential rear drainage issues and the lack of a subsurface drainage system shown on the plan; Vito said an added drain in the corner was feasible if necessary.

Ms. Pincus also asked whether the 4,072 square feet included a finished basement. Ben Maiden said the basement was not planned to be finished, though it would be buildable for future finishing.

Ms. Pincus made a motion to approve the application as presented on June 1, 2026. Mr. Henchy seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Mr. Riepe – Aye, Mr. Dorjets – Aye, Mr. Henchy – Aye, Ms. Pincus – Aye and Mr. Keswani – Aye

**Public Hearing, Case 26-06 – Hayley Sachs, owner seeks to modify an existing Comprehensive Permit (10-08) pursuant to Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 40B Sections 20-23, 760 CMR 56.00 and Town of Sudbury Zoning Board of Appeals Supplemental Rules for Comprehensive Permits, to modify the footprint of an approved building at 280 Maynard Road, (Assessor’s Map E07-0400), Residential A and Water Resource District Zoning III Zoning Districts**

Haley Sachs, owner requested a modification to the existing comprehensive permit for 280 Maynard Road to add a one-room addition at the back of the house, she explained that the addition is intended to create a safer first-floor space for her youngest daughter, Harper, who has developmental delay and epilepsy.

Frank Riepe questioned why the addition was positioned at the corner rather than farther toward the center of the house, since it appeared to violate setback requirements.

Adam Burney explained that because the home was approved under a comprehensive permit, the issue is not a standard variance analysis; instead, the board is considering whether the change is substantial or insubstantial under the comprehensive permit framework. He noted that the original comprehensive permit for the three-unit affordable housing development already granted broad relief from zoning, and that the proposed addition does not change the underlying use or add units.

Ian Henchy focused on the legal standard and concluded the proposal appeared to be an insubstantial change to the original permit rather than a substantial one.

The board discussed whether a separate variance hardship test was needed; Mr. Burney and Mr. Henchy indicated it was not, because the modification is being considered under the comprehensive permit itself.

Sumeet Keswani asked whether the setback spirit was being violated; discussion centered on the existing shed and the wooded buffer. Ms. Sachs said she could remove or relocate the shed if needed.

Mr. Keswani made a motion to approve the application as presented on June 1, 2026. Ms. Pincus seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Mr. Riepe – Aye, Mr. Dorjets – Aye, Mr. Henchy – Aye, Ms. Pincus – Aye and Mr. Keswani – Aye

**Public Hearing, Case 26-07 – Tina Rivard, DPW Director, Applicant and Town of Sudbury Owner seeks a Special Permit under the provisions of MGL Chapter 40A, Section 9, and Sections 4165 and 4166 of the Town of Sudbury Zoning Bylaw to rehabilitate Sherman’s Bridge at Sherman’s Bridge -Lincoln Road, (Assessor’s Map F14), Residential A Zoning District.**

Tina Rivard, DPW Director, presented for the Town of Sudbury and explained that the project is being developed jointly by Sudbury and Wayland with engineering support from TEC. The project is a bridge

deck rehabilitation/replacement intended to reduce maintenance and upgrade the bridge railings to current standards.

Mike Riccardi and Pete Engle from TEC explained that current bridge rail standards require a crash-tested system, which results in a glulam deck and a 3-inch increase in deck thickness because the bridge sits within the floodplain and floodway, the 3-inch rise constitutes fill and requires zoning review. The project includes approximately 270 cubic feet of fill in Sudbury and 555 cubic feet total between Sudbury and Wayland, with modeling showing less than a tenth of a foot of rise in a 100-year event and no change to horizontal or vertical flood extent. It meets the floodplain district goals and that a FEMA no-rise certificate is in place or being relied upon as part of the floodway review.

The board asked about bridge materials, closing the roadway during construction, and how Sudbury and Wayland would coordinate approvals and costs.

Mr. Riccardi explained that the project is using wood decking and glulam components, not a steel bridge structure, and that the roadway would be closed during construction while the boat launch area on the Wayland side would remain open.

Jennifer Pincus asked about historical review; the team said the Sudbury Historical Commission has reviewed the design and provided comments, and both towns' historical commissions are coordinating on kiosk design and final historical details.

Frank Riepe expressed concern that the proposed railing design would reduce visibility through the bridge and diminish the historic view down the river.

Ian Henchy asked about remaining state and federal permits, citing the bylaw requirement that required permits be in hand before the board can issue its own approval.

Pete Engle said the key remaining federal permit is the Army Corps PCN, along with conservation approvals and other local floodplain review steps.

Mr. Riepe concluded the board should continue the hearing until all approvals are obtained. The hearing was continued to the July meeting. After the continuation vote, the hearing was briefly reopened to allow public comment from two attendees.

Elisa Carter of Sherman Bridge Road in Wayland criticized the proposal for not fully considering a wood-only repair alternative, raised concerns about traffic, historic road context, public process, flood risk, and potential chemical impacts from glulam materials.

Alicia Carrillo of Basswood Avenue spoke in favor of preserving the scenic and historic qualities of the bridge, supported dark-sky lighting and lower vehicle speeds, and encouraged further attention to scenic-road and historic-landscape concerns.

Mr. Henchy made a motion to continue the application until the July 6, 2026 meeting . Ms. Pincus seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Mr. Riepe – Aye, Mr. Dorjets – Aye, Mr. Henchy – Aye, Ms. Pincus – Aye and Mr. Keswani – Aye

**Approval of Meeting minutes from April 6, 2026**

Mr. Riepe made a motion to approve the minutes from April 6, 2026 as amended. Ms. Pincus seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Mr. Riepe – Aye, Mr. Dorjets – Aye, Mr. Henchy – Aye, Ms. Pincus – Aye and Mr. Keswani – Aye

### **Approval of Meeting minutes from May 11, 2026**

To be discussed at the July 8, 2026 meeting

### **Reappointment of Jennifer Pincus**

Mr. Riepe made a motion to make a request to the Select Board to reappoint Jennifer Pincus to the Zoning Board of Appeals for another 5year term. Mr. Keswani seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Mr. Riepe – Aye, Mr. Dorjets – Aye, Mr. Henchy – Aye, Ms. Pincus – Aye and Mr. Keswani – Aye

### **Membership interview with Eddie Maloney**

Eddie Maloney appeared for a membership interview. He is interested in local issues and wants to gain experience with town government and law-related matters.

Board members explained that the Zoning Board typically seeks candidates with background in law, engineering, architecture, construction, or land planning.

Jennifer Pincus and others suggested he might be better suited to the Housing Authority or another board aligned more closely with his interests in affordable housing and conservation.

The board encouraged him to keep attending meetings, stay involved in town government, and potentially reapply later after gaining more experience.

Mr. Keswani made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Pincus seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Mr. Riepe – Aye, Mr. Dorjets – Aye, Mr. Henchy – Aye, Ms. Pincus – Aye and Mr. Keswani – Aye

The meeting was adjourned at 8:26 PM.

**Note:** This summary captures the essential discussions and decisions made during the meeting. For detailed inquiries, please refer to the full meeting transcript.