Present: Michael Fee (Chairman), Joe Sziabowski, Christopher Morely (arrived 7:43 p.m.), Michael Hunter, Eric Poch (arrived 7:42 p.m.), Lisa Eggleston (Associate), Jody Kablack (Director of Planning and Development),

At 7:38 p.m., Chairman Fee called the meeting to order.

Application For Endorsement of Plan Not Required – 309 Willis Road

Ms. Kablack briefly reviewed with the Board the Form A; Application For Endorsement of Plan Believed Not To Require Subdivision Approval plan submitted for 309 Willis Road by Jonathan and Madeline Swain. Ms. Kablack noted it is a minor request to primarily change the lot lines between 2 existing lots, and she recommended approval.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

VOTED: To endorse the ANR Plan submitted for 309 Willis Road.

Public Hearing Continuation - Stormwater Permit - Northwoods at Sudbury,
Present: Brian Milisci, Whitman & Bingham

At 7:43 p.m., Chairman Fee opened the Stormwater Permit Public Hearing regarding an application submitted by Castagna Construction Corp., to construct 19 new condominium units in seven (7) buildings at Northwood at Sudbury, Northwood Drive, Assessor's Map #C11, Lot 0302, which was continued from May 12, 2010.

Chairman Fee announced that Ms. Kablack and Mr. Hunter have recused themselves from the discussion. He summarized that the Stormwater Permit issues were resolved at the last meeting and a draft decision was prepared for review tonight.

Representing the applicant, engineer Brian Milisci, stated he has reviewed the draft decision and has no objections. Mr. Milisci briefly reviewed the final revisions made to the plan, including water quality units for the three discharge units. He also distributed copies to the Board of a revised planting plan for the rain gardens, which was prepared by Mr. Hunter and reviewed by the Conservation Commission Coordinator. In response to a question from Ms. Eggleston, Mr. Milisci stated that the selected plantings are on the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP's) suitability list. He also stated that the plan has been revised to achieve the 44% removal of Total Suspended Solids (TSS). Ms. Eggleston stated she believes this is appropriate for this application.

Ms. Eggleston noted that the rain gardens will be used to store and infiltrate rain water, and thus should be retained for that purpose in perpetuity. She recommended that the rain gardens be identified as drainage structures, with a condition noted that they cannot be substantially modified without approval of the Board, so that future homeowners are aware that they are not

part of the landscaping, and thereby, cannot be altered in the future. Mr. Morely agreed that the area could appear as if it is landscaping.

Chairman Fee noted that Section II, Condition A of the Draft Decision dated June 9, 2010, states that all construction must substantially comply with the Plan. However, he suggested that a sentence be added to Condition A stating that the bioretention facilities 1-4 as shown on the Plan, shall be substantially retained in perpetuity.

Ms. Eggleston recommended that the O & M Plan be integrated into the Decision, noting that, ultimately, the Condominium Association will be responsible for implementation. Chairman Fee recommended that a Condition "I" be added to Section II on page 4 of the Draft Decision stating that the Condominium Association will be responsible for implementation of O & M in accordance with the O & M Plan, and records should be maintained.

Ms. Eggleston noted that Mr. Hunter's name should be removed from the second paragraph of Page 1 of the Draft Decision, since he has recused himself.

Chairman Fee asked that a sentence be added to the Draft Decision, noting that Ms. Kablack did not participate in the decision.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was

VOTED: To close the Stormwater Permit Public Hearing regarding an application submitted by Castagna Construction Corp., to construct 19 new condominium units in seven (7) buildings at Northwood at Sudbury, Northwood Drive, Assessor's Map #C11, Lot 0302.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was also

VOTED: To approve the Stormwater Management Permit Decision for Northwoods at Sudbury, dated June 9, 2010, for an application submitted by Castagna Construction Corp., to construct 19 new condominium units in seven (7) buildings at Northwood at Sudbury, Northwood Drive, Assessor's Map #C11, Lot 0302, as amended tonight, to reference the bioretention facilities in Section II, Condition A as noted above, and to add Condition I to Section II to require the integration of the O & M Plan as noted above, to delete Michael Hunter's name from the second paragraph of Page 1 of the Draft Decision, and to add a sentence to the Draft Decision noting that Ms. Kablack did not participate in the decision.

Scenic Road Public Hearing Continuation: – 68 Old County Road – Herb Chambers Boston Post Road, Inc.

Present: Herb Chambers BMW Attorney Joshua Fox

At 8:00 p.m., Chairman Fee opened the Scenic Road Public Hearing, which had been continued from May 12, 2010, regarding the removal of the trees at the intersection of Old County Road and Boston Post Road at the request of the applicant, Herb Chambers Boston Post Road, Inc.

The applicant's attorney Joshua Fox summarized the discussion from the last meeting, stating that an amount of $3,500 had been agreed to as a donation to be made by the applicant to the Town. At that meeting, the Board also requested that the applicant replant a few new street trees. Mr. Fox stated that the applicant has agreed to plant two 3 ½" to 4" caliper trees, approximately 40 feet apart, which is consistent with the Town bylaw. The applicant will also informally continue to maintain the area, unless they are asked to no longer do so. Mr. Fox also asked the Board for acknowledgement that the donation and two plantings are sufficient mitigation.

Chairman Fee stated that the applicant's offer is acceptable to him. In response to a question from the Chairman, Mr. Fox stated that the applicant would prefer that the donation be reflected as a voluntary contribution to the Town rather than as a fine for a violation. Mr. Fox further stated that the two trees to be planted would likely be honey locusts, which are prevalent on Route 20 and salt-tolerant.

Chairman Fee asked who would be responsible for planting the trees. Mr. Fox responded that the plantings would be done by the applicant, at their expense, next fall. Chairman Fee also asked when the contribution would be made to the Town. Mr. Fox responded that the contribution would likely be made in the next 45 days.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To close the Public Hearing regarding the premature removal of trees at the intersection of Old County Road (a designated Scenic Road) and Boston Post Road by Herb Chambers Boston Post Road , Inc.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was also unanimously:

VOTED: To approve the Scenic Road application of Herb Chambers Boston Post Road , Inc. to remove the trees as listed in the application, conditional on submittal to the town the amount of $3,500 as a voluntary contribution to the Town's tree replacement fund, and the replanting of two 3 ½" to 4" caliper trees in the area of tree removal, approximately 40 feet apart, to be done by Herb Chambers Boston Post Road , Inc.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was also unanimously:

VOTED: To authorize the Chairman, on behalf of the Planning Board, to execute an acceptance of the extension of time offered to the Town by Herb Chambers Boston Post Road , Inc. for final action to June 11, 2010.

MassHousing - Pine Grove Development – Discussion

Present: Director of Planning and Community Development Jody Kablack and Applicant Peter Karassik, President of The Eligius Homes Company

At 8:30 p.m., Chairman Fee welcomed applicant Peter Karassik, President of The Eligius Homes Company, to the meeting to describe his application for a comprehensive permit pursuant to

M.G.L. c 40B to construct twelve units (three of which will be affordable housing) of detached housing on approximately 7.1 acres of land located at 293/301 Old Lancaster Road.

In the spirit of full disclosure, Mr. Morely stated he lives on Old Lancaster Road, but is not a direct abutter. Chairman Fee researched the appropriate statute regarding conflict of interests and noted that an official must take action if he is involved in a matter that would substantially affect his financial interests. Chairman Fee has determined that Mr. Morely is not an abutter and lives outside of the purview which would allow him any standing on this matter. Thus, Chairman Fee does not believe Mr. Morely has a conflict with this matter. Mr. Karassik concurred.

Mr. Karassik explained his project, noting that he has met with Town Department Heads and the Selectmen in his effort to gather as much information as possible through these working sessions. He highlighted his long history of building approximately 80 homes in Sudbury, which have been received well. However, Mr. Karassik further noted that large, high-end homes are not selling in the current economy, and thus he is proposing his first Chapter 40B project. He stated that the project is in the preliminary stages, with concept plans having been submitted to the State. Mr. Karassik emphasized that the proposed site is ideal in that it is generally flat and has great soils. He also stated he successfully constructed a similar home design on small lots in Wellesley.

Mr. Karassik presented exhibits of the various home designs, stating that each house will be unique, have a $30,000 landscape budget, and will be energy-star certified. He further stated that his proposal has been driven by the current real estate market, where 2,600-3,200 square-foot homes are selling. He believes it may be the right time to build smaller homes in Sudbury. Mr. Karassik also stated that representatives from MassHousing have responded enthusiastically to the proposal. He stated that his market studies indicate that the proposed price of $849,900 for a four-bedroom, two car garage home would be marketable. Mr. Karassik further stated that he estimates an 11% profit on the project, since he will make nothing on the three, three-bedroom affordable homes anticipated to sell for $189,900.

Mr. Karassik referenced his surveyor, Tom DiPersio, and engineering firm, Thomas Land Surveyors, who will work with a Master Planner to be hired to incorporate suggestions from Town staff and the community.

Chairman Fee noted that, in the past, Mr. Karassik had considered presenting a six-lot subdivision plan, with one waiver request, to the Board for approval. Mr. Karassik noted that the waiver request was regarding the offset requirements between the subdivision road and Wildwood Lane. Chairman Fee asked Mr. Karassik which plan he would prefer to pursue, i.e., the subdivision plan or the Chapter 40B development.

Mr. Karassik stated whether a project is financially doable is what will influence his project decisions. He also stated that his advisors are suggesting to him that now is the time to build smaller, and thus he is very enthusiastic about the Chapter 40B development. He stated that the Department of Public Works Director Bill Place and Selectman O'Brien have suggested to him

that he consider other options. Consequently, Mr. DiPersio recently prepared a five-lot plan, which places the entire development outside the 200-foot riverfront zone and possibly creates some land that could be deeded for conservation purposes. However, Mr. Karassik stated that he has not yet completed financial analysis on the plan to know if it financially works as he has done with the Chapter 40B project. Mr. Karassik also stated that he plans to meet with neighbors once his plans are more formalized.

Chairman Fee referenced a letter received from the applicant's lawyer, Paul F. Alphen, stating that Mr. Karassik is not offering a subdivision plan for review in lieu of the Chapter 40B application. Chairman Fee further informed Mr. Karassik that the Chapter 40B approval process could be lengthy and challenging. Mr. Karassik asked why the process has such a bad reputation in Town. Chairman Fee responded that balancing the Town's needs for affordable housing against the density impacts on a neighborhood can be difficult. He clarified that, if Mr. Karassik chooses to proceed with the Chapter 40B development, the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) will be the permitting Board, and the Planning Board will have little impact other than providing commentary for consideration. However, Chairman Fee further stated that, if Mr. Karassik were to choose to submit a new subdivision plan, the Planning Board would be the permitting authority. Chairman Fee opined that he might be inclined to reconsider the waiver request if a five-unit subdivision plan were brought before the Board, because the 40B project has a density level to which the neighbors object. He encouraged Mr. Karassik to further research if the economics of such a proposal are viable.

Mr. Morely opined that it is possible that a five-lot plan could be prepared that is financially profitable and that larger homes would not have to be necessarily built on them. He noted that Mr. Karassik's proposal for four-bedroom homes assumes that these homes will be geared towards families with children, which is not financially ideal for the Town. Mr. Morely and Ms. Kablack explained that the cost of educating a child for grades K-12 in Sudbury is estimated at approximately $13,000 per year. He urged Mr. Karassik to consider other options, with homes constructed on a much smaller scale to perhaps service other populations such as empty nesters. Mr. Morely further stated that there could be other Chapter 40B plans presented that would be better than this one (which presents houses built too close together, one behind the other) possibly clustering the units in the middle of the parcel and farther away from Old Lancaster Road.

Mr. Karassik responded that when he hires a Master Planner they may consider a cluster plan for 12 homes. He reiterated that the State is enthusiastic for the project and believes the proposed density is acceptable. Mr. Karassik further stated that he does not deem 2,800 to 3,200 square-foot homes as big. Mr. Morely and others in attendance responded that homes of that size are large. Mr. Morely suggested that Mr. Karassik accept the creative challenge to design options which present less mass to the public and abutters, such as cottage neighborhoods, with possibly more units. Ms. Eggleston agreed, referencing a similar project underway in West Concord. She stated that attached cottages, clustered around a common area, could create a centralized neighborhood, while being more attractive and still profitable. Ms. Eggleston opined that she perceives the proposed Chapter 40B development as sprawl, and the antithesis of a cluster development.

Ms. Eggleston opined that she would not favor the idea of reconsidering a subdivision plan, since the aspect requiring a waiver has not changed. Mr. Morely opined that he is inclined to agree, since the Board has always held that an applicant must first satisfy that a plan can meet the Town's legal requirements before modifications are negotiated with developers.

Chairman Fee stated that, if the previous subdivision plan were reduced by one lot to five, he believes there could be an argument made for this enhancement constituting a public benefit to grant a subdivision waiver. Ms. Eggleston suggested that the Board be polled regarding the inclination to reconsider granting the waiver.

Mr. Poch stated he is inclined to hold to the Board's precedence of requiring that subdivision regulations be met prior to any waivers granted. However, he later stated that he would be open to the applicant pursuing other options such as the cottage concept.

Mr. Hunter stated that he believes evidence would have to be provided that the subdivision requirements could be met on a five-unit plan. He further noted that currently, the applicant's land consists of two beautiful Approval Not Required (ANR) lots.

At this time, Mr. Sziabowski stated he is unsure of his position regarding a future subdivision waiver request.

Mr. Morely stated he can understand the public benefit argument for considering a subdivision plan anew, however, he also is concerned that a precedence not be set for other developers in the future.

Ms. Kablack distributed to the Board copies of a comparison of Revenue Projections for Single Family Residential homes versus Chapter 40B homes. She noted that a 12-unit Chapter 40B development would be the most costly to the Town of the scenarios presented. Ms. Kablack further noted that a smaller Chapter 40B development of attached homes could be revenue-neutral. Mr. Morely later stated that, for a single-family home to be revenue-neutral for the Town, the home needs to be assessed for approximately $1.6 million.

Ms. Kablack informed the Board that the period for the Selectmen to provide comments regarding the application to MassHousing has been extended. She highlighted that this application has been submitted to the State for site eligibility approval, and it would proceed, in spite of public comment.

Chairman Fee stated that the Board and community could provide feedback, but that the applicant will need to process the information and decide with what type of project he would like to proceed.

The consensus of the Board was that the hiring of a creative land planner to design other options would improve the project. Mr. Sziabowski opined that the current proposal seems to place the homes randomly.

Ms. Eggleston asked if a market study has been performed. A brief discussion ensued as to the types of housing inventory needed in Sudbury. Mr. Morely noted that age-restricted units that are offered at the proper price point are selling. Mr. Karassik reiterated that the finances of a project would have to work.

Chip Ach, 317 Old Lancaster Road, is a direct abutter. He referenced the Town Chapter 40B development guidelines, which recommend that developers work with neighbors early in the process. He urged Mr. Karassik to meet with himself and other neighbors as soon as possible. Mr. Ach emphasized that he supports affordable housing and would be more open to the cluster and cottage developments mentioned tonight. He also expressed concern that there seems to be a large difference in square footage between the market and affordable homes. Mr. Ach's understanding is that the affordable homes should not be discernable from the exterior appearance. He is also concerned that the process is moving along with MassHousing, when there are still many project options to explore. Mr. Ach asked Mr. Karassik to consider delaying the process with MassHousing until further options can be researched. Mr. Ach also expressed concern for the number of people with children that such four-bedroom homes will attract to Sudbury and the burdens that will place on the schools and Town's tax base. He does not believe the proposed development is compatible with the Town's Chapter 40B Development Guidelines

Anne Fischer, 24 Wildwood Lane, has lived in Sudbury for 27 years. A few years ago, she thought Mr. Karassik's proposed six-lot subdivision was too congested, and now believes this proposal is too concentrated. Ms. Fischer understands that Chapter 40B developments do not have to abide by local bylaws, but she has safety and traffic concerns for the area, which already has too many streets near each other. Ms. Fischer later questioned who would want to live in houses so close together for the proposed price.

Ms. Kablack noted that the proposal is within the State's Chapter 40B density guidelines, which allow eight units per buildable acre in unsewered areas.

Katherine Bautze, 482 Peakham Road, is an abutter, who has lived in Town since 1989. Her home is located downhill from the proposed development, and thus has drainage concerns. Ms. Bautze also is concerned about the disruption which would be created so close to wetland areas.

Ms. Eggleston noted that some protection would be available, since the Chapter 40B process must comply with the Wetlands Protection Act State regulations and Title V, the State Sanitary Code. The project would also have to satisfy stormwater regulations.

Robert Gough, 16 Wildwood Lane, is an engineer, who is familiar with European development designs, which utilize the centralized neighborhood concept. He believes the current proposal is unsatisfactory and that a much better project could be achieved by grouping the structures closer together. Mr. Gough emphasized that a more consolidated design would provide more common green space for residents. He too is concerned about drainage issues and that the application process is moving along while project specifics have not been formalized. Mr. Gough also

questions the marketability of these homes, stating he would not pay $900,000 to live so close to another home.

Chairman Fee reiterated that the ZBA process will be lengthy and the design discussions and negotiations will provide many opportunities for citizen input. He encouraged residents to remain involved in the process.

Steve Fischer, 24 Wildwood Lane, stated that he and other neighbors would like to talk with Mr. Karassik as soon as possible so that their input can be part of the decision process. Mr. Karassik stated he would coordinate a meeting and welcomed anyone to visit him at his office on Route 20. Chairman Fee suggested that the neighborhood appoint a contact person and/or develop a list-serve to facilitate communication.

Mimi DiMauro, 588 Peakham Road, has concerns about safety in the area because she has witnessed many traffic accidents. There is a lot of activity in this neighborhood, including children walking to schools. She agrees with Mr. Hunter's assessment that the site is perfect for two beautiful estates. Ms. DiMauro believes the neighborhood is now being asked to bear a density burden because Mr. Karassik did not initially perform adequate due diligence to recognize what construction options would be approved for the site.

Howard Grant, 375 Old Lancaster Road, has lived at this location for 50 years. He believes there are enough people already living on Old Lancaster Road and there are already traffic problems. Mr. Grant does not believe the neighborhood should be ruined to facilitate the developer's marketing strategy. He also believes the proposed homes would attract too many children, who would be costly to educate in the school systems. Mr. Grant stated that Sudbury is not Wellesley, and residents enjoy the rural atmosphere of their Town.

Douglas Grant, 375 Old Lancaster Road, has also lived in Sudbury for 50 years. He is opposed to the volume of homes being proposed on this site. Mr. Grant also believes the State's density guidelines are "insane." He further stated that he is not opposed to affordable housing because he knows empty nesters need options so they do not feel forced to move.

At 9:35 p.m., Chairman Fee closed the discussion and encouraged Mr. Karassik to consider the feedback he has heard tonight. He also stated the Board will consider its comments to the Selectmen regarding the application later this evening.

Later in the meeting, Ms. Kablack briefly reviewed her memorandum to the Board of Selectmen dated May 27, 2010, noting that the total frontage available on the road cannot sustain the proposed subdivision and that the proposal is contrary to smart Growth principles and does not meet the Town's 40B guidelines regarding mix of bedrooms, since all of the affordable units are planned with three bedrooms. It also does not meet DHCD 40B regulations regarding that the affordable units and landscaping not be distinguishable from the exterior. In addition, Ms. Kablack reported that the plan requires a subdivision, but does not meet the Planning Board's requirements regarding road location.

Ms. Kablack suggested recommendations, including that the Town require a more compact design completed by a design professional, attached housing should be considered as an alternative, that the range of home sizes and number of bedrooms be revised, that the affordable units be delineated on the plan and that they be proportionately distributed throughout the project and not distinguishable from the exterior, requirement of conservation permitting and an NRAD to verify the wetland line, setbacks to direct abutters in accordance with the Town's 40B Guidelines, local preference for the affordable units at the maximum allowable limit by law, designation of the Town as lottery agent, correction of the sales price to $182,900, address design impacts, improvements and mitigation for the surrounding area, and compliance with the Stretch Energy Code , if approved and issued a Building Permit after December 31, 2010.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was also unanimously:

VOTED: To instruct Ms. Kablack, on behalf of the Board, to draft a letter to be sent to the Board of Selectman, noting comments to MassHousing regarding the application for a comprehensive permit pursuant to M.G.L. c 40B to construct twelve units of detached housing on approximately 7.1 acres of land located at 293/301 Old Lancaster Road, endorsing the comments and recommendations made by Ms. Kablack in her May 27, 2010 memorandum to the Selectmen.

Public Hearing: Stormwater Permit – Grouse Hill Retaining Wall – Old Framingham Road

At 9:35 p.m., Ms. Kablack reviewed that the Board closed the Stormwater Permit Public Hearing regarding the Grouse Hill retaining wall on Old Framingham Road at its last meeting. The Board was previously in receipt of a Draft Stormwater Management Permit Grouse Hill Retaining Wall Decision dated June 9, 2010, and Ms. Kablack distributed copies to the Board of a revised page three for that document. She briefly reviewed the revisions made and verifications requested within the document. Ms. Kablack visited the site with Mr. Hunter to view the berm and retaining wall. She further stated that Building Inspector Jim Kelly has reviewed the draft decision and that the Town holds a performance bond on the project.

Ms. Eggleston noted that DPW Director I. William Place's name should be corrected in the last sentence of Page 1 of the Draft Decision.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To approve the Stormwater Management Permit Draft Decision dated June 9, 2010, regarding the application submitted by William DiPietri, Capital Group Properties, regarding the Grouse Hill retaining wall on Old Framingham Road, as reviewed tonight, subject to the correction of DPW Director I. William Place's name in the last sentence of Page 1.

Verizon Wireless Site Plan – 199 Raymond Road

At 9:45 p.m., Ms. Kablack explained that the Board of Selectmen will hold a Public Hearing on June 15, 2010 at 9:00 p.m. regarding the application of Bell Atlantic Mobile of Massachusetts Corp., Ltd., d/b/a Verizon Wireless for Site Plan Review under section 6300 of the Sudbury Zoning Bylaws and a Stormwater Management Permit under Article V (F) of the Sudbury General Bylaws, for property located at 199 Raymond Road, Assessors Map L08, Lot 0001, owned by the Sudbury Water District, zoned Single Residential A. She further explained that the proposal is to construct a 90-foot high stealth monopole cell tower and a 360 sq. ft. equipment shelter within a 70 square foot equipment compound area to accommodate three wireless service providers. The Board had been provided copies of the application, and Ms. Kablack distributed copies of correspondence from Dewberry regarding Building Coverage and Open Space and a draft memo from Ms. Kablack to the Selectmen dated June 9, 2010, noting comments and recommendations.

Ms. Kablack reported that a Special Permit has been approved by the ZBA, and she briefly reviewed the plans submitted. She noted that she has recommended that the plans be revised to make the installation less visible by changing the construction and access roads slightly. In addition, Ms. Kablack stated that a Stormwater Permit will be required, and the applicant has requested that the Planning Board delegate its authority to the Board of Selectmen. Ms. Eggleston requested that the permit include the standard conditions, which are part of the Stormwater General Permit.

The consensus of the Board was that authority would be delegated to the Board of Selectmen if no improvements are made to the roadway in order to better preserve the streetscape. However, the Planning Board would remain the permitting authority if the applicant chooses to make road improvements as proposed on the plan.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was also unanimously:

VOTED: To instruct Ms. Kablack, on behalf of the Board, to send her memorandum dated June 9, 2010 to the Board of Selectmen, and including the comments and recommendations reviewed tonight regarding the application of Bell Atlantic Mobile of Massachusetts Corp., Ltd., d/b/a Verizon Wireless for Site Plan Review under section 6300 of the Sudbury Zoning Bylaws and a Stormwater Management Permit under Article V (F) of the Sudbury General Bylaws, for property located at 199 Raymond Road, Assessors Map L08, Lot 0001, owned by the Sudbury Water District, zoned Single Residential A.

Minutes

The Board requested additional time to review the meeting minutes of May 12, 2010.

Miscellaneous
Proposed Creation of a Housing Production Plan – Discussion

Ms. Kablack reported that she and Community Housing Specialist Beth Rust have proposed the creation of a Sudbury Housing Production Plan (HPP). She stated that, due to the increased Chapter 40B activity, the HHP is being proposed as a tool to enable the Town to have more control over 40B development projects and to send a message to the State that Sudbury is continuing its efforts to significantly increase its percentage of affordable-housing stock. She further stated that the Town has never been in the position previously to pursue the required certification. However, with the current projected private 40B applications expected in Town and activities of the SHT and the Sudbury Housing Authority, it is anticipated that Sudbury could produce the required number of units in the next one to two years in order to receive certification.

Ms. Kablack summarized the creation of an HHP process, explaining that Sudbury's 2005 Housing Plan will be used as a basis. The process will also include opportunities for public discussion. She explained that endorsement/approval by both the Planning Board and Board of Selectmen is required and that the Selectmen approved proceeding with the proposal at their last meeting.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was also unanimously:

VOTED: To endorse the creation of a Housing Production Plan as specified and requested by Ms. Kablack and Beth Rust, Community Housing Specialist.

Upcoming Planning Board Meeting Schedule

The Board's next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, July 13, 2010.

The meeting was adjourned by Chairman Fee at 10:15 p.m.