



Town of Sudbury

Housing Trust

HousingTrust@sudbury.ma.us

Flynn Building
278 Old Sudbury Road
Sudbury, MA 01776
978-639-3387
Fax: 978-639-3314
www.sudbury.ma.us/housingtrust

MINUTES

67-73 NOBSCOT ROAD SUBCOMITTEE

MAY 27, 2021 AT 8:00 AM

VIRTUAL MEETING

Housing Trust Members Present: Vice Chair John Riordan, Kelley Cronin, and Karl Pops

Sudbury Housing Authority Members Present: Amy Lepak, Steven Swanger, and Tania Vitvitsky

Others Present: Director of Planning and Community Development Adam Duchesneau

Mr. Riordan called the meeting to order at 8:02 AM.

Minutes for Approval: May 8, 2021

Mr. Swanger made a motion to approve the minutes of May 8, 2021. Ms. Cronin seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Mr. Riordan – Aye, Ms. Cronin – Aye, Ms. Lepak – Aye, Mr. Pops – Aye, Mr. Swanger – Aye, and Ms. Vitvitsky – Aye.

67-73 Nobscot Road – Possible Property Acquisition – Status Update and Discussion

There was discussion regarding the easement over 99 Nobscot Road. Mr. Duchesneau indicated only a crushed stone driveway could be implemented according to easement and approval would be needed from the 99 Nobscot Road property owner to pave the easement. He also stated the Fire Department would most likely require the access driveway be paved. Ms. Swanger thought this information should be to be passed along to the engineering consultant. Mr. Riordan noted the driveway could only be 10 feet wide within the 25 foot wide easement. Mr. Swanger suggested it might make sense to tell the engineering firms the 99 Nobscot Road easement should not be examined as a potential access point because of the various limitations on it.

Mr. Riordan asked the Subcommittee members if they thought not being able to use the 99 Nobscot Road easement would be a deal breaker for the whole project. Mr. Swanger felt it was still worth going forward and hiring an engineering firm to conduct some preliminary analysis for the property.

There was discussion about potentially obtaining an easement from the Boy Scouts to access the rear portion of site which contained higher ground. Subcommittee members noted they might want to follow up with the property owner about the possibility of obtaining such as easement.

Review and Discussion of Engineering Firm Proposal Submissions and Interviews

Mr. Pops indicated all of the firms interviewed understood the analysis of the property would be attempting to identify any risks which might ultimately make the project infeasible.

Mr. Duchesneau provided an overview of the interview process, and stated he and Mr. Pops, overall, felt good about each of the firms. Mr. Duchesneau stated he believed a good high level of analysis of the property could be provided by each firm.

Mr. Pops noted the wetland delineation Beals + Thomas and Bohler Engineering would provide would be good information. He indicated Allen & Major did not provide any meetings in their base fee. Beals + Thomas was the only firm to include an excavator in their base fee. There was then discussion about which firms provided the services of a structural engineer or home inspector. Mr. Pops opined that if the buildings on the site were to be reused at all, they would likely need to be gutted in full and the shell of the buildings would need to be rehabilitated. Ms. Vitvitsky noted Beals + Thomas would do three different possible development scenarios and that was attractive. Mr. Pops stated that for little to no cost, the other two firms could likely produce additional potential development scenarios.

There was discussion regarding the Department of Public Works donating time and an excavator to dig test pits. Mr. Duchesneau noted the Housing Trust/Sudbury Housing Authority could ask, but should not assume the Department of Public Works would be able to provide this service.

Ms. Cronin noted it appeared Beals + Thomas offered all of the services they were seeking for the least amount of money and also would be able to provide multiple potential development scenarios for consideration.

Ms. Pops recommended Beals + Thomas be contacted as a first choice to perform the engineering analysis work with Bohler Engineering as a close second option.

Mr. Riordan made motion to recommend to the Housing Trust and the Sudbury Housing Authority they enter into discussions to engage Beals & Thomas as site feasibility analysis consultant for the property and to negotiate the use of a structural engineer to inspect the existing buildings. Ms. Vitvitsky seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Mr. Riordan – Aye, Ms. Cronin – Aye, Ms. Lepak – Aye, Mr. Pops – Aye, Mr. Swanger – Aye, and Ms. Vitvitsky – Aye.

It was noted the next Sudbury Housing Authority meeting was on June 8, 2021 and the next Housing Trust meeting was on June 10, 2021. Votes would be taken at each meeting regarding the recommendation to hire Beals + Thomas as the consultant.

There was then discussion regarding how public outreach should occur and when it should occur to keep the neighbors informed as to when the site analysis work would be commencing.

At 9:10 AM, Mr. Swanger made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Lepak seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Mr. Riordan – Aye, Ms. Cronin – Aye, Ms. Lepak – Aye, Mr. Pops – Aye, Mr. Swanger – Aye, and Ms. Vitvitsky – Aye.