



## SUDBURY CONSERVATION COMMISSION MINUTES

Meeting Minutes of Monday, March 9, 2026

**Present:** David Henkels, Chair; Luke Faust; Bruce Porter; Kasey Rogers; Mark Sevier; Victor Sulkowski, Associate Member; and Lori Capone, Conservation Coordinator

**Absent:** Ken Holtz, Vice Chair; Jeremy Cook; Harry Hoffman, Associate Member;

The meeting was called to Order by Chair Henkels at 7:00 PM via roll call.

### Minutes

On motion by Comm. Sevier to accept the minutes of the February 23, 2026 meeting, seconded by Comm. Rogers, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

### Wetland Applications:

#### **Notice of Intent: 89 Stone Road, DEP #301-1459**

Chair Henkels resumed the Hearing for the project to construct additions, install associated utilities, construct a stormwater management system, replace existing septic system, and repave driveway within the 100-foot Buffer Zone and local 200-foot Riverfront Area, pursuant to the Wetlands Protection Act and Sudbury Wetlands Administration Bylaw. Ramol Partners LLC was the applicant. This Hearing was continued from January 26, 2026.

Vito Colonna of Cornerstone Engineering introduced himself and the project team, including Olga Ramiro Ban representing the applicant, Ramol Partners LLC, and Sophie Esdale of Goddard Consulting. Chair Henkels invited Mr. Colonna to present the proposal.

Mr. Colonna explained that since the previous Hearing the primary issue had been defining the stream channel associated with Dudley Brook located behind the property. He stated that a large wetland resource area lies behind the site and that the main channel of Dudley Brook runs on the far side of that wetland. However, a secondary channel branches from the brook on the project side, and the Commission had requested clarification of its jurisdictional status.

He reported that Goddard Consulting returned to the site to flag and locate the channel. Based on that work, it was determined to be a perennial stream under the local Bylaw. As a result, the plans were revised to show the 100-foot and 200-foot Riverfront Areas associated with that stream. He noted that most of the site falls within the 200-foot Riverfront Area, while the 100-foot inner riparian runs roughly through the center of the property.

Mr. Colonna stated that the plans were revised substantially in response to the Commission's prior comments. Previously, building additions had been proposed along the rear of the structure, closer to the wetland and stream area. After further consultation with the architect, the design was reconfigured so that nearly all additions would instead be placed on the front of the building, thereby increasing their distance from the stream and wetland resources. He added that a small portion of the existing rear structure would be removed, which slightly increases the setback from the river. The only new construction at the rear would consist of infilling a small corner area of the building that is currently elevated on piers, along with replacement of an existing deck with a slightly larger deck that would be located a few feet farther away from the river.

Mr. Colonna explained that the project qualifies as redevelopment within the Riverfront Area because the site was developed prior to 1996. Under the Wetlands Protection Act redevelopment provisions, projects must demonstrate improvements to site conditions, avoid the inner 100-foot inner riparian area where possible, and move structures farther from the river where feasible. He stated that the revised design meets those standards.

He then described the proposed mitigation plan developed in coordination with Goddard Consulting. A significant area behind the fenced portion of the property contains invasive plant species, including bittersweet, burning bush, and Japanese barberry. The proposal includes removal of approximately 2,300 square feet of invasive vegetation. Mr. Colonna explained that this area was mapped and would be restored with native plantings. The mitigation area represents roughly a two-to-one ratio compared with the disturbed area. The restoration plan also includes a two-year monitoring program to ensure the native plantings establish successfully and to control any regrowth of invasive species.

He stated that invasive removal would be carried out using a combination of hand pulling, mechanical removal, and cut-and-dab herbicide treatment, depending on the size and condition of the plants. Herbicide applications would be conducted by a licensed applicator, with oversight or consultation from the wetland consultant to assist with plant identification and appropriate treatment methods.

Mr. Colonna concluded that the project team had evaluated alternatives and revised the plans to best meet the project objectives while protecting the resource areas. He then invited questions from the Commission.

Coordinator Capone stated that she believed Mr. Colonna and Ms. Esdale had done a good job revising the plan to protect the resource areas and bring the project into compliance with the regulations. She noted that she had raised a few questions about the size of the proposed plantings, and both the applicant and the consultant agreed to use larger plant stock. Rather than revising the plan drawings, she incorporated that requirement as a condition in the draft Order of Conditions.

She added that the only planting species she questioned was lowbush blueberry, as she was unsure whether the site would receive sufficient sunlight for it to thrive. She noted that the planting list had not been modified, but that substitutions with other native species could be made during construction if necessary, based on the judgment of the landscape professionals working on the project.

Coordinator Capone stated that all of her review comments had been addressed. She had provided the applicant with a draft Order of Conditions and invited them to raise any concerns during the hearing. The only substantive difference between the submitted restoration plan and the draft Order relates to plant composition: the restoration plan proposed 75 percent native species, while the Commission's standard is typically 90 percent native species. She therefore included a requirement for 90 percent native plantings in the draft Order of Conditions.

Chair Henkels thanked Coordinator Capone for her comments and invited questions from the Commissioners. He noted that the restoration plan included a two-year monitoring period for invasive species and asked Ms. Esdale whether she had any sense of when that monitoring work would begin.

Ms. Esdale responded to Chair Henkels' question regarding the timing of the monitoring plan, stating that the project schedule would ultimately be determined by the applicant and project engineer, but that the work would likely begin during the summer construction season. Mr. Colonna added that the intent would be to complete the plantings early in the project so that the two-year monitoring period could begin as soon as possible. He explained that if construction proceeds this year, the plantings would likely be installed during the summer so they can establish before winter and start the monitoring period promptly. Mrs. Ramiro Ban, representing the applicant, confirmed that their goal would be to begin the project as soon as all permits are obtained and to complete the plantings during the spring or early summer so they can establish through the growing season.

Chair Henkels then returned to the question regarding the proposed lowbush blueberry plantings. Ms. Esdale explained that the location identified for the species does not appear to have a dense canopy overhead and therefore might support the plant. However, she noted that she had discussed the issue with Coordinator Capone and that the team would be open to substituting American hazelnut, which is more tolerant of partial shade, particularly in the rear portion of the property where canopy cover is greater.

Chair Henkels asked whether Ms. Esdale believed the substitution would improve the likelihood of successful establishment. Ms. Esdale responded that she believed it would be a reasonable substitution and that she could revise the plan and provide an updated version to the Conservation Office before construction if the Commission preferred. Coordinator Capone stated that the substitution would be acceptable and noted that final light conditions will become clearer once invasive vegetation is removed, which will help determine what plant species are best suited for the site.

Comm. Rogers then asked about a drainage feature shown on the plan near the left side of the driveway when facing the house. She noted that the plan shows a roof drain dry well and another drain symbol nearby and asked whether the second drain would connect to the dry well. Mr. Colonna clarified that the label refers to a test pit used during drainage testing rather than a functioning drain structure. He explained that the label was intended to distinguish the drainage test pit from other test pits used during septic system evaluation.

Comm. Rogers then asked whether there would be adequate space to access and remove the existing septic tank using construction equipment. Mr. Colonna replied that a smaller machine would be sufficient for that work. He explained that the tank would be pumped out, the top broken in, and the structure compacted. He stated that there is approximately ten to twelve feet of clearance around the corner of the building, which would allow a small machine to access the area.

Chair Henkels asked whether the necessary Board of Health permits had been secured. Mr. Colonna confirmed that they had. He added that the only remaining permit was the stormwater permit, which had been placed on hold pending completion of the Conservation Commission review. He stated that the stormwater review had already received an initial round of comments and that none of those comments were expected to affect the overall layout or design.

Chair Henkels thanked the project team for the revisions to the plans and asked whether Coordinator Capone had any additional comments. She indicated that she did not.

Chair Henkels then asked whether any members of the public wished to comment. Hearing none, he requested a motion to close the hearing.

On motion by Comm. Faust to close the Hearing, seconded by Comm. Porter, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

Chair Henkels then noted that the draft Order of Conditions had been circulated to the applicant prior to the meeting and asked whether the applicant team had any questions or comments on the draft. The applicant indicated that they had reviewed the document and had no concerns.

Chair Henkels then asked whether any Commissioners had questions or comments regarding the draft Order of Conditions and invited a motion to issue the Order as presented.

On motion by Comm. Sevier to issue the Order of Conditions, seconded by Comm. Rogers, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

#### **Notice of Intent: 32 Emerson Way, DEP #301-1458**

Chair Henkels resumed the Hearing for the project to construct a detached garage within the 100-foot Buffer Zone, pursuant to the Wetlands Protection Act and Sudbury Wetlands Administration Bylaw. Frank Vincentelli was the applicant. This Hearing was continued from December 12, 2025.

On motion by Comm. Sevier to continue the Hearing to March 23, 2026, seconded by Comm. Porter, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

#### **Notice of Intent: 87 Moore Road, DEP #301-1424**

Chair Henkels resumed the project to construct a garage with associated driveway and drainage, relocate an existing fence, and remove trees within the 200-foot Riverfront Area, pursuant to the Wetlands Protection Act and Sudbury Wetlands Administration Bylaw. Dwight D. Henderson was the applicant. This Hearing was continued from August 26, October 21, 2024 and October 20, 2025.

On motion by Comm. Faust to continue the Hearing to April 6, 2026, seconded by Comm. Sevier, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

**Notice of Intent: 94 Pride’s Crossing Road, DEP #301-1455**

Chair Henkels resumed the Hearing for the project to demolish an existing carriage house and construct a single-family house within the 100-foot Buffer Zone, pursuant to the Wetlands Protection Act and Sudbury Wetlands Administration Bylaw. First Colony Development Co. was the applicant. This Hearing was continued from September 29, November 17, December 29, 2025 and January 26, 2026.

On motion by Comm. Faust to continue the Hearing to March 23, 2026, seconded by Comm. Rogers, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

**Enforcement Order Update:**

**73 Wayside Inn Road: Parking Lot Restoration**

Chair Henkels observed that weather conditions were likely still preventing any progress on the required work. Coordinator Capone indicated that there were no additional updates at that time. Chair Henkels acknowledged the lack of progress due to weather and indicated that there were no further comments on the matter that evening.

**Adjourn Meeting**

On motion by Comm. Porter to adjourn the meeting at 7:20 PM, seconded by Comm. Sevier, via roll call the vote was unanimous in the affirmative.