

Present: Christopher Morely, Peter Abair (arrived 8:38 p.m.), Martin Long, Stephen Garvin, Dylan Remley (Associate Member arrived 7:43 p.m.), Jody Kablack (Director of Planning and Development arrived 7:40 p.m.) and Jim Kupfer (Assistant Planner)

Absent: Chairman Craig Lizotte

At 7:36 p.m., Mr. Morely called the meeting to order.

Candy Hill Lane Subdivision – Request for Extension

Present: Attorney for the Property owners Philip C. Lombardo and property owners Patrick and Carolyn Sullivan

The Board was previously in receipt of a letter from Lombardo DeVellis & Smith LLP dated November 12, 2014, requesting an extension until May 12, 2019 to complete the subdivision improvements.

Mr. Kupfer stated the request is consistent with the Permit Extension Act and its amendments, and that the Board has the option of considering an extension to 2019 or to 2017 and then asking the owner to come back in 2017 for a further extension.

Attorney for the Property owners Philip C. Lombardo stated the extension is being requested to allow for more time for market conditions to improve and to find time to possibly hire a new engineer, who may want to confirm their own new measurements.

A brief discussion ensued as to how to encourage the former engineering firm to provide the necessary outstanding information. Mr. Garvin suggested that, if the former engineer is unresponsive, perhaps a letter could be written to the State Board of Registration explaining the circumstances. Mr. Lombardo stated they will continue to pursue contact with the former engineer. Mr. Morely suggested the sooner contact is made the better.

Mr. Long asked if there are immediate plans to move forward with the plans. Property owner Carolyn Sullivan stated they had forgotten there was a deadline on the previous extension until May 12, 2015. She stated they may now want to sell their home and this lot at some point. She noted that it didn't make sense to install the driveway without having a buyer for the lot.

Mr. Garvin asked what work could get done in the next two years. Mr. Lombardo stated it is possible some site work could be completed, but he is not sure it would be wise to do so without a plan for constructing the house.

Mr. Morely reviewed the original request for a turnaround for the one-lot subdivision, but without a house there, and agreed it did not make sense to complete the work at this time.

Mr. Garvin asked the length of time usually granted for extensions. Ms. Kablack stated it is typically two to four years.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To approve an extension to complete the subdivision improvements on Candy Hill Lane Subdivision, Assessor's Map #G10, Parcel 0505, until May 12, 2019.

The Cecil Group – Route 20 Zoning Project – Discussion

At 7:48 p.m., Ms. Kablack stated several revisions were made to the presentation provided by The Cecil Group based on the Oct. 22 meeting discussion, but she wanted to go through the presentation again to get more feedback from the Board. The Board was previously in receipt of copies of the slide presentation to be given tonight entitled "Sudbury Route 20 Corridor Urban Design Studies and Zoning Evaluations."

Ms. Kablack explained the initial thought was to create large overlay districts, however, now the thought is that the current zoning may just need to be tweaked. She noted one benefit of creating overlay districts is that the Planning Board could be the Special Permit Granting Authority, versus the Selectmen.

Mr. Garvin suggested researching whether transfer of development rights (TDR) could be done to allow for more development without acquiring the properties. Ms. Kablack will pursue more information with The Cecil Group.

Mr. Morely expressed concern regarding small, non-performing commercial parcels, noting a good incentive would have to be offered to them.

Ms. Kablack requested a slide-by-slide review of the presentation and asked the Board for its input, noting Mr. Abair had already provided her with some suggestions. She stated The Cecil Group would provide a final report as well.

Mr. Morely noted a correction needed on slide 7 regarding Nobscot Road and not Nobscot Road Extension.

Regarding Regulatory Options, Mr. Long suggested adding that granting authority be delegated by the Selectmen to the Planning Board. Mr. Morely and Ms. Kablack stated this has been previously broached with the Selectmen, but they do not foresee a change being made to the current structure.

Mr. Kupfer explained the focus for the first regulatory option is to change the dimensional requirements, including the open space requirement and setbacks. For instance, combining the use of rain gardens or other Best Management Practices and allowing them to count as open space.

Ms. Kablack stated it should be considered whether the entire project area should be under one large overlay zone versus having three different overlay districts - A, B and C.

Mr. Remley questioned whether the three overlay districts could be collapsed and still maintain a consistent theme. It was noted light industrial cannot be added to Area A because of proximity to Town water wells.

Mr. Kupfer suggested possibly listing only combining Areas A and B.

In response to a question from the Board, Ms. Kablack confirmed Area B allows retail.

Mr. Morely suggested combining Areas A and B and providing an incentive for combining parcels. He suggested language to encourage redevelopment of small parcels into larger projects.

Ms. Kablack noted Route 20 is the right location for multi-family housing, but it is an unpopular idea which would need to be overcome.

Mr. Remley questioned whether the examples provided in the Cecil presentation are appropriate for Sudbury. Some should be removed from the presentation, and possibly others which have more local relevance added

Ms. Kablack stated it should be considered if four-stories will be allowed with certain setback requirements in certain locations. It was suggested the northeast corner of the Raytheon property might be a good location for four story buildings.

Mr. Morely offered to work with Mr. Kupfer regarding establishing a minimum lot size by looking at the two existing smallest parcels.

Mr. Remley noted that if the Special Permit authority was moved to the Planning Board, the Board would have the ability to grant waivers. Ms. Kablack noted that such a provision would need to be included in the zoning.

Mr. Morely asked if the proposed parking requirements are lower than what currently exists, and Ms. Kablack responded affirmatively.

The consensus of the Board was that all of the examples of developments other than Linden Square in Wellesley should be removed from the presentation.

Mr. Morely asked if the Raytheon property could be tweaked as an example of what has been presented.

Ms. Kablack asked the Board to let her know any other thoughts to be included in the final report. She stated The Cecil Group has already been asked to provide elevational perspectives, design guidelines, and to discuss traffic calming and connections to bike trails in the final report.

Raytheon Property Redevelopment - Discussion

At 8:45 p.m., Mr. Morely opened a discussion regarding the redevelopment of the Raytheon property. Copies of a memorandum from Ms. Kablack dated December 10, 2014 and a potential scenario report were distributed to the Board tonight.

Ms. Kablack reminded the Board the goal of tonight's discussion is to prepare suggestions for potential tools and strategies the Town can use to define the best future options for influencing the redevelopment of the property for a joint meeting with the Board of Selectmen in January 2015.

Mr. Garvin noted age-restricted housing was popular ten years ago, but many developments built did not sell because of alleged flooding of the market. He asked if there is an over-age-55 market today for this type of development.

Ms. Kablack stated prospective developers of the Raytheon property have indicated that some age-restricted housing may be marketable on the site.

Mr. Kupfer stated he has received numerous phone calls requesting information on age-restricted housing opportunities in Sudbury. Ms. Kablack stated she has also received many inquiries from developers in the last 12 months.

Ms. Kablack stated she believes the Town would be in the best position to influence the future of the property if it provides a range of uses and clear path for permitting.

Mr. Morely asked if any of the developers have expressed interest in a continuing care facility. Ms. Kablack stated she has not heard this option mentioned so far.

Mr. Morely stated it is possible a four-story, high-end rental housing development could be constructed on the property with still plenty of room for other uses. Ms. Kablack agreed that there is a lot of potential for use of the approximate 50 acres.

In response to a question from Mr. Garvin, Ms. Kablack stated she would further research Chapter 40R information. However, she further noted the fastest and most predictable choice will undoubtedly be a Chapter 40B development.

Mr. Abair explained that Chapter 40R was intended to be more than what it currently is. He thinks a housing project at Raytheon would help make the rest of the Route 20 commerce work better and be more successful.

Mr. Remley referenced a suggestion from the last joint meeting with the Selectmen, which recommended swapping the current CVS and Shaws locations to the Raytheon property and using their current locations differently.

Ms. Kablack stated the Board and Town are going to have to become more comfortable with a friendly Chapter 40B scenario. It was suggested it be marketed to the public more as a Local Initiative Program (LIP) project. Ms. Kablack stated the Raytheon marketing company is marketing the property for Chapter 40B development. She further noted this could help the Town get to its 10% requirement, if a developer is willing to construct rental housing. Ms. Kablack also highlighted there is not enough wastewater disposal capacity currently available on the property to solve the Town's 10% housing requirements.

Mr. Morely suggested the potential scenario be revised to add a phased approach for future wastewater capacity if, and when, a Route 20 sewer is constructed, and to possibly add a planned space on the map for a future continuing care-type facility.

Mr. Kupfer stated he would further research District Increment Financing opportunities. He also explained if a DIF is considered, we may want to add other possible properties (Chiswick Park) to allow the district to expand. This could produce additional revenue opportunities for infrastructure financing.

Ms. Kablack stated there is a lot of public apprehension regarding Chapter 40B developments, and she believes it will take a lot of time to educate the public that the Town needs to partner with a "friendly" developer.

Mr. Remley stated he believes the public does not fully understand the tax implications of single-family housing, which is a significant net loss for a town.

Mr. Garvin stated he received information that only 11 school-aged children reside at Sudbury Landing.

Mr. Abair stated the Board needs to anticipate there will be public feedback that too many of the recent developments have had an impact on the Loring School.

Ms. Kablack stated she has asked the Sudbury Public Schools to determine which school district the Raytheon property would be in should it be developed into housing.

Mr. Morely stated he believes the Raytheon property should be presented to the public as the appropriate location for solving the Town's Chapter 40B issues, and that the Town will work to reduce the impact such development will have on the schools by also encouraging the development of a mix of uses. He emphasized the message to the public must be positive and that the time is now. Mr. Long stated it will be important to educate the public on the Chapter 40B parameters.

Mr. Remley stated the public also needs to understand surrounding communities such as Concord and Lincoln have insulated themselves by meeting their 10% affordable housing goal by targeting particular properties, and it is time for Sudbury to take a similar approach.

Mr. Abair stated construction of senior housing makes more sense on this property than at the Melone location. Mr. Morley concurred, stating senior citizens want to be close to grocery stores and other shops to which they can easily drive.

The consensus of the Board was that a "friendly" Chapter 40B partnership with a developer would be a positive path to pursue for the Raytheon property.

Community Preservation Act Proposals – Vote Positions

At 9:29 p.m., Mr. Morely opened a discussion to vote the Board's positions on three Community Preservation Act (CPA) proposals. The Board was previously in receipt of copies of the Community Preservation Committee Project Submission Form submitted for the Mass. Central Rail Trail Design/Build – Phase 1 request for \$300,000, the Community Preservation Committee Project Submission Form submitted by the Department of Public Works for \$100,000 for construction of Town-wide walkways, and the Community Preservation Committee Project Submission Form submitted by the Town for 100,000 for the Town Center Landscaping and Historic Restoration – Part 2.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was

VOTED: To support the Community Preservation Committee Project Submission request by the Department of Public Works for \$100,000 for construction of Town-wide walkways.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was also

VOTED: To support the Community Preservation Committee Project Submission request by the Town for 100,000 for the Town Center Landscaping and Historic Restoration – Part 2.

Ms. Kablack stated the Board should hold on its vote regarding the CPC request for the Mass. Central Rail Trail (MCRT) because it is possible Town staff will be changing its recommendations as to how the project should proceed. She explained it is possible NStar will take on a project to expand its transmission line along the railroad corridor which could fund the entire MCRT project from Sudbury to Hudson. The

consensus of the Board was that it would be foolish to spend \$300,000 if it is possible NStar could fund the project in a reasonable timeframe.

Confirmatory Release of Covenant – 41 Chanticleer Road, Lot 116, Bowker V Subdivision

On motion duly made and seconded, it was

VOTED: To approve the confirmatory release of covenant for 41 Chanticleer Road, Lot 116, Bowker V Subdivision.

7 Newbridge Road – Stormwater Permit - Accept Bond

The Board was previously in receipt of copies of a letter from Director of Public Works/Town Engineer I. William Place dated November 28, 2014 recommending \$16,706.45 to complete the stormwater requirements at 7 Newbridge Road in accordance with the stormwater management permit.

Ms. Kablack stated she is recommending reducing the amount proposed by Mr. Place at the request of the owner. Ms. Kablack has reviewed and adjusted the information to a recommended figure of \$9,431.65.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

VOTED: To accept the surety bond of \$9,431.65 to complete 7 Newbridge Road in accordance with the stormwater management plan as recommended by Director of Planning and Community Development Jody Kablack tonight.

Minutes

On motion duly made and seconded, it was

VOTED: To approve the meeting minutes of November 12, 2014.

Annual 2015 Town Meeting Articles – Potential Articles - Discussion

At 9:48 p.m., Ms. Kablack stated she is beginning to collect ideas for potential articles for the Annual 2015 Town Meeting. She stated there may be amendments to the Accessory Dwelling Unit Bylaw suggested by the ZBA, as well as some minor zoning changes submitted Building Inspector Mark Herweck.

Mr. Morely stated he has concerns regarding creeping size of accessory units, which are really two-family homes and not accessory dwellings.

Application Not Required Application – Macone Property – Concord Road

Ms. Kablack briefly explained this plan is submitted by the Macones and the Sudbury Water District and shows changes in lot lines between land owned by the parties. No additional lots are being created. The land is registered at the Land Court, which is reflected by all the notations on the plan. The Board's signature is required with the Land Court.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To endorse and sign the Form A Application For Endorsement of Plan Believed Not To Require Subdivision Approval plan submitted for the Macone property on Concord Road.

Upcoming Meeting Schedule

Ms. Kablack stated the next meeting will be held January 14, 2015, with subsequent meetings on February 11, 2015, March 4, 2015, March 25, 2015 and April 8, 2015.

The meeting was adjourned by Mr. Morely at 9:56 p.m.