

SUDBURY HOUSING AUTHORITY

55 HUDSON ROAD
SUDBURY, MASSACHUSETTS 01776
director@sudburyha.org

PHONE: 978-443-5112
FAX: 978-443-5113

SHEILA M. CUSOLITO
Executive Director

MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING Sudbury Housing Authority and Sudbury Housing Trust April 6, 2022

The SHA and SHT met by remote participation open session at 8:00 a.m. Those present for the SHA were: Chair: S. Cline; Vice Chair: S. Swanger; Treasurer: T. Vitvitsky; Assistant Treasurer: J. Cowan; Member: A. Lepak.

Those present for the SHT were: Chair: C. Howe; Vice Chair J. Riordan; Trustees K. Cronin, C. Gentile, R. Hummel, K. Pops.

Absent: SHT Trustees J. Dretler, and S. Scotti

Others present: Matthew Cote and David LaPointe, Beals + Thomas, Director of Planning and Community Development Adam Duchesneau

Ms. Howe called the Housing Trust meeting to order and Mr. Swanger called the Sudbury Housing Authority meeting to order at 8:04 a.m.

67-73 Nobscot Road – Possible Property Acquisition: Site Feasibility Analysis Status Update, Draft Development Scenarios, and Discussion

Mr. Swanger stated it would be good to discuss the questions which the Sudbury Housing Authority and Housing Trust had regarding the 67-73 Nobscot Road property and he also noted the Cambridge Housing Authority meeting which some members had attended.

Mr. LaPointe introduced himself and noted Beals + Thomas had been conducting the site feasibility analysis for the 67-73 Nobscot Road property. He noted they started off with field work to delineate the wetland areas, existing buildings, topography, and conducted research regarding other constraints. Beals + Thomas then compiled some concept plans for the property to be developed with a variety of scenarios based on feedback and guidance they were provided regarding unit sizes. Mr. LaPointe stated all the proposed scenarios used the existing access driveway off Nobscot Road and included a looped driveway around the property. He indicated that after receiving initial feedback from the 67-73 Nobscot Road Subcommittee, the proposed scenarios were revised. Mr. LaPointe reiterated the analysis was from a high level and was intended to identify potential constraints and issues of the subject property.

At this time Matthew Cote joined the meeting.

Mr. LaPointe noted there were a number of questions which had been raised by the 67-73 Nobscot Road Subcommittee regarding the endangered species habitat located on the property and how this might impact the potential development scenarios. He stated he had experience with projects where this particular type of habitat did not eliminate potential development at the sites.

Ms. Cronin asked how far along drawings and plans needed to be when someone filed with the Natural Heritage & Endangered Species Program (NHESP). Mr. LaPointe indicated that in his experience, only rough general plans needed to be submitted in order for the NHESP to understand which land areas would be

disturbed. Ms. Cronin asked Mr. LaPointe to point out which areas on the property are not within wetland buffer areas or endangered species habitat.

Ms. Vitvitsky asked how long the review and permitting process is with the NHESP. Mr. LaPointe indicated it was variable, but estimated around a few months. Mr. LaPointe then displayed a map and identified the areas outside of the wetland buffer and endangered species habitat.

At this time Ms. Cowan left the meeting.

Mr. Pops asked if getting a determination regarding the endangered species habitat was the biggest hurdle and Mr. LaPointe agreed. Mr. LaPointe stated there was a chance the NHESP would look more favorably on the proposed project because it would be a project for the Housing Trust and Sudbury Housing Authority.

Ms. Cronin inquired as to the size of the unrestricted area and Mr. LaPointe stated he could calculate that area after the meeting rather easily.

Mr. LaPointe spoke to the existing buildings and felt they were arranged in a somewhat haphazard manner. He noted a new project would likely want to have a more organized and welcoming layout.

Mr. Riordan noted the proposed leaching field for the septic system was located within the wetland buffer area and he wondered if it could be located in the upland portion of the site to take it out of the buffer area. Mr. LaPointe stated that if a looped driveway was still being proposed for the development, the central area of the project could be used for the leaching field. However, he also spoke to gravity flow for the septic system at the property and if the leaching field were to be located in the upland area, some amount of pumping may be required for the system. Mr. LaPointe noted this type of system with pumps would be more expensive and need more maintenance in the long run.

Mr. Riordan also inquired if there might be any type of Native American archaeological areas at the property that might greatly restrict or prohibit development at the site. Mr. LaPointe stated there is a State database that can be consulted. He noted that hiring a firm to conduct further research would be costly and is not recommended unless there is good reason to believe artifacts would be found.

Mr. Swanger asked about the creation of development scenarios with single-family and duplex unit development. Mr. LaPointe stated Beals + Thomas could absolutely look into this a bit more. Ms. Howe indicated that proposed development scenarios with duplexes and triplexes would be preferable. Mr. LaPointe indicated Beals + Thomas could also provide scenarios with development only in the upland area to get a better understanding of what this might look like.

Mr. Pops noted triplex units would require sprinkler systems and therefore it was probably a good idea to stay away from these types of units in the proposed development scenarios.

There was then discussion regarding potential costs for improving the access driveway and what those improvements might entail.

Mr. Duchesneau indicated the water line would need to be extended about 150 feet southward on Nobscot Road in order to reach the access driveway.

Ms. Cline asked if the Multi-Family Zoning Requirement for Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) Communities could be applied here. Mr. Gentile noted the subject property would meet the 5-acre minimum requirement, but the property would need to be rezoned to implement this type of multi-family zoning. Discussion ensued regarding the parameters of the MBTA Communities zoning regulations and draft guidelines. Mr. Gentile and Mr. Duchesneau discussed the details of these items including the possibilities and timelines of the initiative.

Mr. Pops inquired as to what additional work would be required to complete the analysis report for the property. Mr. LaPointe indicated in order to get a good handle on the viability of the septic system location, the soils in the location of the proposed septic system would need to be tested.

Ms. Howe raised questions regarding the ownership structure of the development and how many units would be rental versus ownership. She wondered how many duplex units there would be, the number of single-family buildings, and the total number of bedrooms. Ms. Howe noted these particular items would need to be fleshed out between the Housing Trust and Sudbury Housing Authority in the near future.

Ms. Vitvitsky wondered if the Cambridge Housing Authority could provide services to assist the Housing Trust and Sudbury Housing Authority to figure out the number of units which could be created at the site. Ms. Howe noted this was possible but could be a costly endeavor.

Mr. Swanger suggested another joint meeting of the Housing Trust and Sudbury Housing Authority be held to further discuss these issues.

Mr. Duchesneau noted he could assist in scheduling another joint meeting for the last week in April of 2022. He also indicated that at some point in the fairly near future, the Boy Scouts should be engaged more to understand what price they are seeking for the land.

Mr. Riordan discussed options for mitigating the risks when seeking to potentially enter into a purchase and sale agreement with the Boy Scouts.

The Sudbury Housing Authority and Housing Trust instructed Beals + Thomas to not develop anything further until after the next joint meeting where additional instructions would be provided.

Pat Brown of 34 Whispering Pine Road asked about the availability of the Land Planning Study for the 67-73 Nobscot Road property which had been prepared by Beals + Thomas. Mr. Duchesneau indicated he would pass the report along to her.

ADJOURN

For the SHA: a motion was made by T. Vitvitsky, seconded by S. Cline, and unanimously voted, to adjourn the April 6, 2022 joint meeting of the Sudbury Housing Authority and Sudbury Housing Trust. The time was 9:35 a.m.

Yes: S. Cline

Yes: A. Lepak

Yes: S. Swanger

Yes: T. Vitvitsky

Absent: J. Cowan

For the SHT: a motion was made by C. Gentile, seconded by R. Hummel, and unanimously voted, to adjourn the April 6, 2022 joint meeting of the Sudbury Housing Trust and Sudbury Housing Authority. The time was 9:35 a.m.

Yes: K. Cronin

Yes: C. Gentile

Yes: C. Howe

Yes: R. Hummel

Yes: K. Pops