

Present: Eric Poch (Vice-Chairman), Christopher Morely, Michael Hunter, Craig Lizotte (Associate), and Jody Kablack (Director of Planning and Development)

Absent: Michael Fee (Chairman) and Joseph Sziabowski

At 7:39 p.m., Vice-Chairman Poch called the meeting to order.

Ms. Kablack announced Mr. Morely and Mr. Poch are up for re-election this year, and she reminded them to submit the required paperwork if they are seeking re-election.

Maple Meadows Senior Residential Care – Bond Reduction Request

At 7:39 p.m., Vice-Chairman Poch opened the discussion regarding the bond reduction request made by Maple Meadows LLC for the extension of Maple Avenue by developer Robert Roth. The Board was in previous receipt of copies of a letter from Department of Public Works (DPW) Director Bill Place dated December 19, 2011, estimating the cost to complete work for the Maple Avenue private way at \$7,186.41.

Ms. Kablack stated Mr. Roth has also requested a site visit by the Board in order to finalize modification plans. The site visit is scheduled for January 18, 2012, at 8:00 a.m.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

VOTED: To approve the request made by developer Robert Roth for a bond reduction for the Maple Road extension to \$7,200.00, as recommended by DPW Director Bill Place.

2011 Planning Board Annual Report

The Board was previously in receipt of a Draft 2011 Sudbury Planning Board Annual Report. Ms. Kablack stated the final report is due at the end of the month.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

VOTED: To approve the 2011 Planning Board Annual Report as reviewed tonight.

Potential Articles for 2012 Annual Town Meeting

The Board was previously in receipt of copies of a listing of “2012 Potential ATM Articles” and copies of a relevant section of the Board’s November 8, 2006 Meeting Minutes regarding decreasing the parcel size requirements for SRC developments.

Ms. Kablack stated the Board had decided to not proceed this year with articles regarding inclusionary zoning, wind energy and portable signs. She summarized potential articles for the Board's consideration as follows:

Senior Residential Community (SRC) Bylaw Modification – Ms. Kablack stated the Council on Aging (COA) has suggested a proposal to reduce the SRC parcel size from 20 acres to five or ten acres. She noted the Board had considered this in 2006, but decided to not proceed with an article at that time. Ms. Kablack and Chairman Fee have discussed this issue with the COA, and they believe it should be reconsidered.

A brief discussion ensued regarding the minimum parcel sizes for Flexible Developments, Incentive Senior Developments (ISD) and cluster developments, which was determined to be ten acres versus the twenty-acre minimum required for SRCs.

Mr. Hunter and Mr. Morely thought it would be more consistent to have the same minimum requirement for all such developments. Mr. Morely noted the Board would need to present an argument for the revision. Ms. Kablack will prepare some information for the Board's review at a later date.

Later in tonight's meeting, COA Vice-Chairman Bob May addressed the Board to express the Council's interest in working with the Board to provide opportunities to help senior citizens stay in Sudbury. Mr. May noted senior citizens want more options for less expensive homes in Town. The COA believes an article shrinking the minimum size of SRC developments might help accomplish this with developers. Mr. May emphasized the cost of Sudbury's housing stock needs to be reduced for the senior population. He also stated the COA will help research anything needed to prepare an article for Town Meeting.

Mr. Morely asked if there is a strong feeling with seniors that they want to stay, but that they cannot find enough affordable housing options in Town. Mr. May stated 20% of the Town's population is over 60 years old, which indicates seniors want to live in Sudbury. However, they do believe there are not enough housing options available below \$500,000. Mr. Morely informed Mr. May that, earlier tonight, the Board discussed the parcel size requirements and is inclined to consider a modification to the bylaw.

Ms. Kablack stated it is possible to draft an article for the 2012 Town Meeting, which she will prepare for the Board's next meeting.

Mr. May thanked the Board for its attention to this matter. He further stated the Town should consider encouraging a broader range of housing options be made available in Sudbury, including multi-family housing.

Stormwater Bylaw – Revision – proposing changes to the threshold regarding repaving.

Ms. Kablack explained the Town's stormwater management bylaw threshold is very low, and it requires compliance for very small projects on commercial land.

Mr. Lizotte stated this repaving is a regulated activity under the state stormwater regulations, and encouraged the Board to keep some regulation for this activity. The Board agreed that it is difficult to require residents to submit a permit for repaving a site, but will revisit this issue once Ms. Kablack gives them the specifics.

Ms. Kablack will work with Lisa Eggleston and Debbie Dineen to provide the Board with information to review at the next meeting.

Agricultural Lot Exemption – minor revision to Appendix A, use #B.6 - proposed to accommodate a Massachusetts General Laws revision in the size of agricultural lot exemption (from five acres to two acres + revenue production). A draft will be prepared for review at the Board's next meeting.

Agricultural Bylaw – possible revision to add the notation to use #C.1 (non-exempt agricultural use) regarding section 2313 and the raising and keeping of animals. Ms. Kablack stated Building Inspector James Kelly discussed with the Agricultural Commission the suggestion to allow chickens by right, but to require a permit for roosters. The Commission may be amenable to this proposal. A draft will be prepared for review at the Board's next meeting.

Town Center Intersection – Ms. Kablack has asked the Selectmen to consider submission of an article for this project as a debt exemption, since the Town was not awarded the Massworks grant earlier in the fall.

Adoption of 2012 Bonding Policy

The Board was previously in receipt of a letter, dated December 14, 2011, from Town Engineer/DPW Director William I. Place, which updated the 2011 Bonding Policy to reflect 2012 unit prices and a copy of the current 2011 unit prices as presented in a letter from Mr. Place dated December 28, 2010.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To accept the 2012 Bonding Policy unit prices as presented by Department of Public Works Director/Town Engineer William I. Place, in a letter dated December 14, 2011.

Public Hearing: Stormwater Management Permit – 56 Bigelow Drive

Present: Applicant William Senecal

At 8:00 p.m., Vice-Chairman Poch opened the Public Hearing regarding an application submitted by William Senecal, Trustee, to construct one (1) new single family dwelling on Lot 56, Bigelow drive (Assessor's Map L-03, Lot 356), which will involve the disturbance of approximately 18,725 square feet of land with slopes greater than 10%, and he read aloud the hearing notice. The Board was previously in receipt of copies of a letter from DPW Director Bill Place dated December 13, 2011, requesting the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan and the Operation & Maintenance Plan be modified, a letter from Stephen E. Poole, PE from Lakeview Engineering Associates dated December 23, 2011 and accompanying revised Site Plan, Erosion Control Plan and Construction Inspection Report which address Mr. Place's issues, and an application for a Stormwater Management Permit.

Applicant William Senecal provided the Board with a brief summary of the proposal. He believes the plan is in compliance and that he has addressed all issues broached by the Town Engineer Bill Place.

Ms. Kablack stated she forwarded the file material to Mr. Lizotte for review this week. She noted the Town hopes to staff a position to be able to oversee and review stormwater-related applications in the near future.

Mr. Lizotte stated Sudbury's stormwater regulations require State compliance. He noted the report presented does not comply with Sudbury's bylaw and that it does not include an explanation of how it does or does not comply with the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) standards. Mr. Lizotte stated it is a good preliminary submission for a single-family house lot, but more information is required.

Mr. Senecal reiterated that he believed the plan had addressed all of Mr. Place's concerns. However, Ms. Kablack and Vice-Chairman Poch noted the Board is the permit-granting authority.

The Board requested the applicant ask his engineer to contact Ms. Kablack who will explain that the Board is requesting a narrative be provided identifying the DEP standards and how this application does and does not meet those standards. Mr. Morely opined the engineer likely has researched these issues, and thus it should not be difficult to provide.

Vice-Chairman Poch noted the proposed plan seems reasonable, but the documentation provided does not meet the Town's standards. He also noted the Board is not inclined to grant waivers without appropriate and sufficient documentation.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To continue the Public Hearing regarding the application submitted by William Senecal, Trustee, to construct one (1) new single family dwelling on Lot 56, Bigelow drive (Assessor's Map L-03, Lot 356), which will involve the disturbance of

approximately 18,725 square feet of land with slopes greater than 10% to January 25, 2012 at 8:15 p.m.

Community Preservation Act Project Submissions

The Board was previously in receipt of copies of a listing of the FY13 Community Preservation Act (CPA) Proposals noting the projects, proponents, CPA category and amount requested, and copies of abridged project descriptions.

Ms. Kablack stated the Community Preservation Committee (CPC) will vote its recommended CPA warrant articles next week, and that all of the projects submitted are consistent with the Town's Master Plan.

Mr. Morely, who also serves as CPC Chairman, provided a brief summary of the CPA articles. He noted two projects have unknown funding amounts (the acquisitions of Pantry Brook Farm and 15 Hudson Road) at this time. Ms. Kablack stated discussions regarding 15 Hudson Road are progressing in a timely manner. She further stated the Pantry Brook acquisition is taking longer, but the property owners are committed to presenting an article at the 2012 Town Meeting. The other projects were summarized as follows:

Walkways - for \$100,000 for construction purposes for this program, which is popular with residents.

Town Center Landscaping – this relates to several landscape issues which are integral to the Town Center restoration project. Ms. Kablack stated this article would be withdrawn if the Selectmen decide not to proceed with a Town Center improvement article.

Town Hall Restoration – Mr. Morely and Ms. Kablack stated the project requests \$50,000 to further study the future and best use of Town Hall. Ms. Kablack stated the project is now overseen by Building Inspector Jim Kelly. She noted the majority of money for this type of project would be from non-CPA funds, however the initial study is eligible for CPA funding.

Town Clerk Historic Document Restoration – Mr. Morely stated this request for \$106,000 should be the last request by the Town Clerk for a while to preserve historic documents.

Historic Projects - Mr. Morely stated \$67,000 has been requested by the Sudbury Historical Commission for three projects: Hosmer House Fire Suppression System, Continuation of the Old Home Survey, and the Restoration of Wooden Structure Component of the "Pound."

Sudbury Housing Trust (SHT) – 10% allocation – Mr. Morely stated the SHT has submitted its customary annual funding request.

Sudbury Housing Authority (SHA) – Mr. Morely stated a request has been submitted by the SHA for a modification to previously appropriated funds for unit purchases.

The Board decided it would determine its position regarding the projects at its next meeting.

Minutes

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

VOTED: To approve the regular meeting minutes of December 14, 2011.

Miscellaneous – Delegate Stormwater Review for Buddy Dog Permit Application

Ms. Kablack stated a Stormwater Permit application was recently submitted by Buddy Dog. She displayed plans to the Board, and she briefly summarized the proposal to upgrade the wastewater and stormwater systems and add 16 parking spaces. Ms. Kablack stated the proposal is anticipated to disturb approximately 41,000 square feet of land. Ms. Kablack recommended the review be delegated to the Conservation Commission.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

VOTED: To delegate the Planning Board's Stormwater Permit review authority to the Conservation Commission regarding the application submitted by Buddy Dog.

Public Hearing: Stormwater Management Permit – Lot 16 Kato Drive

Present: Applicant Perry Beckett and Property Owner Martin Young

At 8:30 p.m., Vice-Chairman Poch opened the Public Hearing regarding an application for a Stormwater Management Permit submitted by Beckett Associates, LLC, applicant, and Martin and Maureen Young, owners, to construct one (1) new single family dwelling at 23 Kato Drive (Assessor's Map J10, Lot 616), which will involve the disturbance of approximately 3,500 square feet of land area with slopes greater than 20%, and he read aloud the hearing notice.

Ms. Kablack stated a new application has been filed following the Board's denial, without prejudice, of the previous submission. The Board was previously in receipt of copies of the Application for Stormwater Management Permit, the site design plan, a letter from property owners Martin and Maureen Young dated January 9, 2012 requesting waivers related to recommended source control measures listed in Section II D and a

draft Decision Stormwater Management Permit, 23 Kato Drive, Sudbury, MA, dated January 11, 2012.

Property owner Martin Young stated he has reviewed the draft decision and is only proposing revisions in language to three source control measures related to picking up of pet waste, use of alternative deicers rather than sodium-based deicers and coal tar-based pavement sealers. He stated he views it difficult to guarantee compliance at all times for these issues, while also keeping one's property safe. Mr. Young stated his revisions would comply with State standards, which allow more flexibility for single-family homes on these matters. It was noted that the report provided by the applicant's engineer did provide a narrative which included how the plan complies with the DEP standards.

Mr. Hunter noted the Town's stormwater regulations overrule those of the State.

Ms. Kablack noted, and the Board concurred, that the Town routinely prohibits the use of sodium-based deicers and coal tar-based sealers. Mr. Morely noted that alternative solutions are readily available, and thus the Board would not be inclined to waive these requirements.

An unidentified male Sudbury resident from Walker Farm Road, who is an abutter, stated he has concerns regarding the disturbance of vegetation in this area. Vice-Chairman Poch stated tonight's hearing is only for stormwater-related issues. The gentleman stated that he had no such related concerns.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To close the Public Hearing regarding the application for a Stormwater Management Permit submitted by Beckett Associates, LLC, applicant, and Martin and Maureen Young, owners, to construct one (1) new single family dwelling at 23 Kato Drive (Assessor's Map J10, Lot 616), which will involve the disturbance of approximately 3,500 square feet of land area with slopes greater than 20%.

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

VOTED: To approve the Stormwater Management Permit Decision, 23 Kato Drive, Sudbury, MA dated January 11, 2012 reviewed tonight, subject to the revision made to the language in Section II. D. 5) to reflect that picking up pet waste is encouraged rather than required.

Public Hearing: Mahoney Farm Senior Residential Care (SRC) – Special Permit Modification and Stormwater Management Permit Application

Present: Developer Martin E. Loiselle, Jr., Capital Group Properties

At 8:48 p.m., Vice-Chairman Poch opened the public hearing regarding the application of Mahoney Farms LLC for a modification to an approved Senior Residential Community Special Permit, Mahoney Farms, dated June 22, 2005, and a Stormwater Management Permit, and he read aloud the hearing notice. The Board was previously in receipt of copies of a letter from developer Martin E. Loiselle, Jr., Capital Group Properties, dated December 8, 2011, requesting a modification of the original Special Permit to reflect the revised Phase III layout for the 13 remaining units at Mahoney Farms and accompanying revised site plans, a letter from Department of Public Works (DPW) Director Bill Place dated December 2, 2011, requesting the applicant's engineer provide a detail of the drywell units, the amount and size of stone around the perimeter and under the recharge system along the minimum depth to groundwater, and an application for Stormwater Management Permit. Additionally, Mr. Loiselle distributed copies tonight of a "Project Narrative" and accompanying sketches, including the front and side elevations. Copies of a letter from Sullivan, Connors & Associates dated December 13, 2011 and accompanying revised plans were also distributed.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To appoint Associate Member Craig Lizotte as a voting member of the Planning Board for the applications of Mahoney Farms LLC for a modification to an approved Senior Residential Care Special Permit, Mahoney Farms, dated June 22, 2005.

Mr. Loiselle displayed site plan exhibits, and he summarized the revisions to the plan. Given the current economy, Mr. Loiselle stated the revisions will allow the project units to be more marketable. He also stated the revised plan has 3,300 square feet less of impervious surface area. Mr. Loiselle stated he has reviewed the plan with DPW Director/Town Engineer Bill Place, and he has addressed any concerns broached.

Ms. Kablack asked Mr. Loiselle to indicate which units were walk-outs, which he did. Ms. Kablack noted the architectural drawings from December 2010 show side elevations which are quite different than those presented tonight. Mr. Loiselle explained the December 2010 plans referenced were abandoned a while ago.

Mr. Morely asked if the rear elevation of the walk-out units were revised. Mr. Loiselle stated they have remained the same. Ms. Kablack stated it would be beneficial for the Board to see a comparison of the three-unit façade from the rear to the two-unit version. Mr. Morely emphasized the importance of this view, since it is the "public face" of the project. Mr. Loiselle stated the revisions have improved the appearance of the project.

Mr. Lizotte noted a statement regarding stormwater management as presented in the applicant's "Project Narrative". However, he further noted the State regulations have changed dramatically since 2008. Thus, Mr. Lizotte suggested the applicant's engineer provide the Board with backup to the statement that the current plans comply with the current standards.

Mr. Morely expressed his concern regarding whether the old plan can accommodate the larger volumes of runoff being experienced in shorter periods of time, as has been occurring over the last 2 years. Mr. Lizotte stated the applicant's engineer should provide the analysis done to reach their conclusions and document the 72-hour draw down data. He suggested more infiltration and soil rate information be provided. Ms. Kablack stated she believes much of the information has been accumulated, but was not attached to this application.

Mr. Morely stated he is also concerned about the appearance of the basin along Nobscot Road, which he thinks does not look finished. Vice-Chairman Poch and Mr. Hunter agreed. The consensus of the Board was the landscape architect should propose something better for the basin area as part of the modification application.

Mahoney Farms resident Ted Bially, 30 Nobscot Road - Unit 3, opined the single unit appears to have been sliced off from a double unit. He asked if it will now appear like a large blank wall. Mr. Loiselle stated it is possible to add projection to improve appearance and/or windows could be added. Mr. Morely requested the Board be provided with a side elevation of this building as well as the rear elevation.

Mahoney Farms resident Joel Goldstein, 30 Nobscot Road - Unit 11, stated there are inaccuracies noted on the plan presented tonight. Mr. Goldstein stated a retaining wall is depicted which is no longer there, and there is no landscaping plan. He also stated there are existing drainage issues behind units 11, 12, and 13. Mr. Goldstein stated the revised plan indicates a home will be built much closer to his residence than was previously explained to him. Mr. Loiselle stated the original plan included a new home within 80 feet of Mr. Goldstein's unit, and the revised plan will locate a new home 87 feet away from him.

Mr. Goldstein stated Mr. Dipietri promised the units would be built on different levels, which has not occurred. He has lived at Mahoney Farms for five years and has had to endure the blowing dust from dirt piles. Mr. Goldstein asked what the stabilization plan is for the soil stockpile areas in the construction area and who is responsible for monitoring the situation. Ms. Kablack stated the Board could consider establishing restrictions as part of the stormwater management permit approval. Mr. Loiselle stated the project has already been graded, and thus there will not be a lot of dirt piles created at this point. Mr. Goldstein stated the dirt has been blowing for years, and it should be covered or planted. Ms. Kablack asked if the dirt would be removed from the site. Mr. Loiselle responded affirmatively, although some temporary stockpile areas will need to be created as the basements are excavated. He also noted that the layout for Phase III was all that has been revised.

Mr. Lizotte stated a wetlands' delineation is only effective for three years, and questioned if any Conservation Commission permitting has occurred recently. He also

believes the applicant needs to submit an updated existing conditions plan to determine if the grading is still accurate. Ms. Kablack and Mr. Lizotte suggested the applicant confirm with their engineer what the existing condition plan is, since there is clearly inaccurate information noted for the area between the old and new units. Vice-Chairman Poch emphasized the need for an updated existing conditions plan and a landscape plan for the basin area. He also stressed the wetlands in the middle should be delineated again. Mr. Morely concurred, stating the grading plan, landscape plan and wetlands delineation should be reviewed behind units 11, 12, and 13.

Mahoney Farms resident Mike Coutu, 30 Nobscot Road - Unit 6, asked Mr. Loiselle to describe where the 3,300 square feet of impervious surface area was reduced, which he did (smaller buildings, smaller driveways). Mr. Coutu asked if the original buildings facing Nobscot Road were walk outs, and Mr. Loiselle responded affirmatively.

Mr. Couto emphasized he does not wish to delay the process, but he believes an informed decision cannot be made on this plan without an existing conditions plan being submitted. He believes the plan must be prepared according to an as-built plan. Mr. Couto stated the current roof gutter systems do not function well, and that relief pipes had to be added to the downspouts. He asked if the project is subject to a peer review, and whether an as-built plan exists for Phase I. Mr. Loiselle stated most of the information is available and could be obtained. He further stated the specifications for the Cultec units were reviewed and found to be acceptable by Mr. Place.

Mr. Morely stated it would be beneficial to know if Phase I of the project was built as it was designed. He noted the Cultec units require maintenance, and he asked if they have been maintained to date, given Mr. Couto's performance observations. Mr. Loiselle stated he is unsure of the maintenance record. He further stated the project has not yet been issued a Certificate of Compliance.

Mr. Coutu asked who has responsibility for oversight of these maintenance issues. Ms. Kablack stated the Town's Stormwater Management Bylaw was not in place for Phase I, so these matters were more informally handled. However, with the new Bylaw in effect, she stated inspections are now required.

Mr. Couto stated he has tried to ask the developer some of these relevant questions because of the known bad percolation rates and the hard-clay quality of the soils. He believes more data should be available for review. Mr. Couto suspects there has been no implementation of an Operations and Maintenance Plan done in the past three years. He reiterated his belief that an as-built plan for Phase I should be requested, particularly because maintenance of these matters will become the financial responsibility of the homeowners. Mr. Morely agreed that the homeowners need to know where the systems are in order to properly maintain them. Vice-Chairman Poch stated he also believes it is important to know what is in the ground and whether it is functioning properly. The

consensus of most in attendance and from the Board was that additional test pit data is needed.

Mr. Morely asked if a peer review should be requested now. Vice-Chairman Poch suggested the Board wait to review additional information it has requested tonight. Mr. Lizotte opined that, if the Board is inclined to believe a peer review will be beneficial, then the process should begin sooner rather than later. Mr. Morely stated the project is complicated and the current performance is a concern. He also stated the State regulations have changed a lot in the past six years. Mr. Lizotte stated peer reviews are common practice in the industry.

Mr. Couto suggested that, at a minimum, the applicant's engineer should attend the next Planning Board meeting. The Board concurred.

Vice-Chairman Poch asked what the timeline is for the requested modification. Mr. Loiselle stated construction is planned for the spring. He also stated he could start with the units which have had no revisions made to them. Ms. Kablack stated this approach would not be possible because all of Phase III is now subject to the Stormwater Management Permit review.

Vice-Chairman Poch informed the applicant the Board is inclined to request a peer review, and he advised the applicant to proceed accordingly.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To require a peer review regarding the stormwater management application of Mahoney Farms LLC and submittal of funds for this review, and to request an as-built plan and existing conditions plan be submitted.

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

VOTED: To continue the public hearing regarding the application of Mahoney Farms LLC for a modification to an approved Senior Residential Community Special Permit, Mahoney Farms, dated June 22, 2005, and a Stormwater Management Permit to February 8, 2012 at 8:00 p.m.

Landham Crossing Comprehensive Permit - Discussion & Comments for Zoning Board of Appeals

Present: Developer Ben Stevens and Landscape Architect Wesley Wirth

At 9:31 p.m., Vice-Chairman Poch opened a discussion regarding the revised plans for the development of a Chapter 40B project at 192 Boston Post Road, Landham Crossing. Developer Ben Stevens distributed copies to the Board of a Maps OnLine of the site area and an "Elevation from Route 20" sketch.

Ms. Kablack stated the discussion is to provide the opportunity for the Board to determine if it has comments it would like to share with the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). She stated the project has been issued an Order of Conditions, and the ZBA is progressing towards approval of the project.

With the use of exhibits, Mr. Stevens provided a brief summary of the site plans for the Chapter 40B development proposed for 31 units. He stated the site is relatively flat, and thus there would be minimum handling of fill. Mr. Stevens noted the project complies with all setback requirements. He indicated where the septic system is planned, and he briefly reviewed the stormwater management plan for the site.

Mr. Stevens stated the project complies with all Town and DEP stormwater regulation for 2, 10, and 25-year storms. However, he stated for 100-year storm events, the DEP calculations have been used. He explained it is his engineer's belief that it would be best for those closest to the river to eliminate runoff more quickly than would be allowed by the Town's regulations.

Mr. Lizotte noted that because the project is a Chapter 40B development, the Town's bylaws do not apply.

Ms. Kablack asked for additional information regarding what the impact for the direct abutters would be from the proposed stormwater management system and the waiver sought. Mr. Morely concurred, stating the Board should recommend to the ZBA that the applicant's engineer address this issue to ensure the impact on abutters is negligible.

Mr. Lizotte suggested another option for compliance with the Town's 100-year event calculations would be for the overall impervious area to be reduced.

Landscape architect Wesley Wirth provided a summary of the planned landscaping for the site. He stated rain gardens are planned near the street. Mr. Wirth explained which existing trees would remain, and which species would be added. He believes the plan will provide a pleasing scale and character for the development.

In response to a question from the Board, Mr. Wirth and Mr. Stevens stated a berm is intended along Route 20. Mr. Wirth also described the range of seasonal blooms, which are all native, to be planted under the tall trees.

Mr. Morely asked if irrigation is planned. Ms. Kablack stated irrigation is allowed, except for behind the units. All in attendance, and the Board, agreed it is best to allow plant irrigation during an establishment period.

Mr. Morely asked for shorter versions of white pines to be considered for more effective screening purposes rather than the traditional tall variety.

Mr. Wirth stated a fence and retaining wall is planned for behind the units to protect and separate the living area from the wetlands. He also displayed a typical plant-out sketch for the front of the units.

The consensus of the Board was that M. Kablack should draft and send a letter to the ZBA, encouraging the ZBA to conduct a peer review on developments of this type and magnitude and urging the ZBA to request the applicant's engineer to address what the impact for direct abutters would be from the proposed stormwater management system to ensure it is negligible.

Mr. Hunter suggested that irrigation be allowed permanently on this site because of the amount of salt used on Route 20.

In response to a question from Mr. Lizotte, Mr. Stevens stated a Massachusetts Highway Permit has not yet been issued.

At 10:03 p.m., Vice-Chairman Poch closed the discussion.

Miscellaneous

Friends of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail – Donation Proposal

Present: Sudbury resident Dick Williamson

The Board was previously in receipt of copies of an email from Conservation Commission Coordinator Debbie Dineen dated December 15, 2011, stating several reasons why the Commission unanimously believes the Friends of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail (FBFRT) offer is premature, and that the Board of Selectmen, while thanking the FBFRT for their offer, should reject it based on the reasons stated within the email.

Ms. Kablack stated implications have been noted regarding parking issues if a section of the trail were stopped at Davis Field. In addition, the location has wetlands' issues and the usability of the playing fields would need to be considered. She stated it is unknown how many parking spaces would be adequate for the proposal made by the FBFRT.

Ms. Kablack stated the Town has yet to decide whether it would build a rail trail according to its own standards or those of Massachusetts Highway, and that perhaps this decision should be made before any portion of a trail is constructed. She also stated there is no Town staff member who has time to dedicate to the time-consuming process this project would entail.

The consensus of the Board was that the Board of Selectmen need to decide if it wants to prioritize for the Town a project of this magnitude.

Sudbury resident Dick Williamson suggested that perhaps others could oversee the project as was done in Concord by its Rail Trail Committee. In response to a question

from the Board as to whether Sudbury's RTCAC would be interested in this responsibility, Mr. Williamson stated the topic would require further discussion.

Mr. Morely stated the Selectmen need to make a decision about the Town's willingness to proceed with the project.

Vice-Chairman Poch stated it does not help Sudbury's opportunities for State funding if the Town does nothing. He believes the Selectmen need to determine who and what the resources are for the project.

Mr. Lizotte asked if the proposed donation covers all anticipated expenses. Mr. Williamson stated it would cover the anticipated 25% design costs. Mr. Lizotte stated that, if the Selectmen would decide to prioritize this project as important for the Town, then the Planning Board appears to support staffing the project.

Ms. Kablack questioned whether constructing a project of this magnitude in sections is the best approach. Mr. Hunter emphatically stated that to parcel out this project in sections is an inefficient approach. He stated it is time for the Town to make the larger "big" decision.

The consensus of the Board was to send a letter to the Board of Selectmen expressing the Planning Board's opinion that a decision needs to be made regarding the importance of a project to construct a rail trail for Sudbury based on financial and staffing resources, the needs and resources of the Park and Recreation Department and the will of the Town, and further suggesting that a non-binding referendum be held to determine the interest of Sudbury residents in this project before proceeding with a proposal.

At 10:26 p.m., Vice-Chairman Poch closed the discussion.

Upcoming Meeting

The Board's next meeting will be held at Town Hall on Wednesday, January 25, 2012 at 7:30 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned by Vice-Chairman Poch at 10:30 p.m.