

Present: Chairman Craig Lizotte, Christopher Morely, Peter Abair, Martin Long, Stephen Garvin, Dylan Remley (Associate Member) and Jody Kablack (Director of Planning and Development)

At 7:32 p.m., Chairman Lizotte called the meeting to order.

National Development – Raytheon Property Redevelopment – 526 & 528 Boston Post Road - Introduction and Overview

Present: National Development representatives Jack O'Neill and Ed Marsteiner, National Development's Attorney Peter Tamm, and Avalon Bay Communities representatives Scott Dale and David Gillespie

At 7:32 p.m., Chairman Lizotte recused himself from the first agenda item's discussion.

Vice-Chairman Abair welcomed representatives from National Development and Avalon Bay Communities to the Meeting to provide the Board with redevelopment plans for the Raytheon property. The Board was previously in receipt of copies of a letter to Raytheon from the Sudbury Board of Selectmen and Planning Board dated February 25, 2015 and a letter from National Development dated September 25, 2015.

National Development representative Jack O'Neill stated his company has been chosen by Raytheon as the buyer of the property. He further stated his company is a Newton-based, locally-owned, private real estate development company, working only in the Greater Boston area. Mr. O'Neill stated the company has a 30-year track record working on a variety of projects, and it has a well-established history with retail/mixed-use projects and senior housing projects.

Avalon Bay Communities representative Scott Dale stated his company is a public real estate investment trust, with a local management team. Mr. Dale stated the company specializes in the development, management and acquisition of apartment communities in selected markets in the United States. He noted the company manages 39 apartment communities in Greater Boston. Mr. Dale emphasized the company is committed to quality and long-term investments, noting it cares about its reputation in the industry and the communities where it is represented.

National Development representative Ed Marsteiner displayed aerial photographs of the site, and he summarized the existing conditions and ideas for site planning. Mr. Marsteiner stated mixed-use projects are viable in today's market. He stated plans are to take the site from an industrial use to that of mixed uses, with less pavement and more open spaces. Mr. Marsteiner stated the existing buildings will be demolished in order to construct retail space in front, senior/assisted living services, some age-restricted housing, and a multi-family component. He stated attention has been given to keeping existing, and creating new, buffers, open spaces and amenities. Mr. Marsteiner referenced the proximity of the potential Mass Central rail trail, noting it would have nice synergy with the property. He explained site planning would include connecting active and passive open spaces on the site. Mr. Marsteiner also stated the plan includes a new aligned, signalized intersection with the Shaw's Plaza, pedestrian connections to a future rail trail, and establishes itself as an anchor for a new Route 20 streetscape. He described the plan to develop a "village" retail area of approximately 75,000 to 100,000 square feet, with a high-end grocer using approximately 40,000 square feet of this area. Mr. Marsteiner stated retail is currently an allowed use, but a Special Permit from the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) is needed for any commercial

building over 20,000 square feet. He also mentioned current zoning and dimensional criteria do not allow street retail, so these issues will need to be brought to the 2016 Annual Town Meeting.

Mr. Marsteiner described the second component of the development as a specialty care senior housing community, focusing on Alzheimer's patients. He noted these units would not be part of the Town's housing inventory. Mr. Marsteiner stated this too would need to be brought to Town Meeting, since it is not now an allowable use. He described the third development component as age-restricted housing of 60 units, which is not currently an allowable use, and thus it would need to be brought to Town Meeting. It was noted each development component will be reviewed separately regarding permitting.

Mr. Dale described the fourth development component as 250 rental housing units. He displayed renderings of the planned neighborhood, describing them as having tree-lined streets, sidewalks, benches, streetlights, and smaller building with architectural variety, which would be connected to open spaces. He stated the multi-family apartments would have a smaller footprint, lower heights and density and they would have high-end finishes. Mr. Dale stated all the units will have their own garage and their own front doors, and there are many styles of one and two-bedroom apartments and townhouses. The development will have amenities, including an outdoor pool, a fitness center and the new proposed supermarket and restaurants. Mr. Dale explained the zoning and permitting issues will go through a Comprehensive Permit process with the ZBA, and they will soon submit a Site Eligibility application for approval. He noted all 250 units count on the affordable housing inventory.

National Development's attorney Peter Tamm noted tonight's meeting with the Board is the first of many to follow. Mr. Tamm stated the team has carefully reviewed The Cecil Group's Route 20 Corridor Study Report and the Town's Housing Production Plan. He stated the applicant's intention is to help the Town achieve its goals, including improvements to the Route 20 corridor, but zoning changes will be needed to allow for restaurants, and possibly, an overlay district. Mr. Tamm noted some factors which would need to be changed in order to expand the allowed uses and to adjust setbacks accordingly. He also stated that, in future meetings, details will be delved into, such as discussing whether to extend the Town's two-story limitation, with a condition of sufficient buffers. Mr. Tamm stated the proposed plan provides the net result of an improvement to the amount of impervious surface on site. He emphasized that master planning for a site as large as the Raytheon property must retain an element of flexibility. Mr. Tamm stated the priority in the next few months will be to meet with the necessary Town boards/committees regarding what will be needed for the proposed high-end grocer tenant. He also stated the team is interested to discuss the process for approving the zoning changes, noting their initial suggestion is to request an overlay district at Town Meeting.

Mr. Marsteiner highlighted benefits for the Town as including a new, safer intersection, creating a vibrant streetscape, mixed-use amenities (retail, specialty senior care, age-restricted housing, and a high-quality rental community which provides housing diversity). Mr. Marsteiner stated they were aware of the possible expansion needs of the Fire Station, and thus they have not planned any uses for that part of the property. He further stated the project should create a significant increase in net revenue for the Town, and he noted a detailed fiscal impact study would be provided. Mr. Marsteiner stated the redevelopment team is working to create a "win-win" project for all parties. He summarized next steps in the process as a ZBA meeting in late October for the high-end grocer, site plan review by the Planning Board during this fall and the winter of 2016. 2016 Town Meeting articles will be necessary to address the remaining retail, senior housing, and age-restricted zoning, dimensional requirements and height. The Chapter 40B housing permitting process will occur from the fall of 2015 to the spring of 2016.

Ms. Kablack stated scheduling of future meetings will be a priority to meet the January 31, 2016 Town Meeting warrant deadlines.

Mr. Long asked if there is a sense of how high they would want the proposed structures to be. Mr. Tamm stated three stories (+/- 45 feet) has been considered.

Mr. Morely asked if there is a way to consider more than 250 rental units. Mr. Dale stated that would be more of a master plan question. He further stated Chapter 40B limitations that are based on population must also be considered.

Mr. Morely asked if either company has ever designed a micro-housing development. He suggested it may be a good idea to incorporate some of these types of units. Mr. Dale stated the plan proposes more one-bedroom units (approximately 50%) than is typical. He also stated their market research indicates that 72% of those interested are one and two-bedroom households.

Mr. Morely also asked the development team to consider that there is a constituency in Town which would be delighted to see an adult softball field at this location.

Mr. Abair asked for clarification regarding the need for a retail Special Permit, which Ms. Kablack provided as relating only to the size of the building. He also asked how many other stores are planned other than the grocer. Mr. Marsteiner stated they are not sure of the number because the plans have not been merchandised yet.

Mr. Abair provided a brief summary of The Cecil Group's work done for the Town as Sudbury has tried to consider what would be needed to incentivize re-development on Route 20. He emphasized this will be one of the largest development projects undertaken by Sudbury, and possibly the most important one. Mr. Abair stated the plans for this property need to set a high bar for excellence for the Route 20 corridor. Mr. O'Neill stated the team is here to listen, and the better the Town communicates its needs, the better they can try to respond in a consistent manner. Mr. Tamm stated everyone realizes this project is a huge opportunity for all parties. He further stated an overlay district may be a prudent incremental approach. Mr. Tamm emphasized this plan cannot be a "cure all" for Route 20, but they are open to making expansive improvements.

Mr. Abair asked if anything can be done to move up the expected lead time for State approval of a traffic signal at Landham Road and Route 20 from the estimated date of 2021. Mr. Marsteiner stated a privately-funded intersection tends to get approved quicker, noting they plan to fund the intersection improvements. He emphasized the team also believes this is a very important project for all parties involved.

Mr. Garvin stated he would be interested to see examples of other projects which turned an industrial site into a mixed-use site, and to hear what ideas worked and did not work well. He asked who would be the lead contact for the many issues to be permitted.

Mr. O'Neill stated the two companies are working together as much as possible, and it is anticipated that the same engineering, wastewater, and traffic consultants will be used.

Mr. Garvin stated he would also like to see an athletic component to benefit the Town as part of the plan, and that he looks forward to working with the applicants in the coming months.

Mr. Remley asked if there was anything the applicant thinks should be considered which was contrary to The Cecil Group suggestions. Mr. Marsteiner stated there was nothing conflicting noted, and their recommendations are rather consistent with The Cecil Group's. Mr. Remley stated it would be helpful for residents to see as soon as possible what the retail component might look like.

Sudbury resident Kristin Salerno, 564 Peakham Road, stated she has lived in Town two years. She asked if the applicant has plans to help the Town with a potential issue of oversaturation in the schools from new school-aged children as a result of the development. Mr. Dale stated an analysis of proposed school-aged children will be part of the Comprehensive Permit application to the Zoning Board of Appeals. He noted the analysis is based on many factors, and a rule of thumb for a project this size would be approximately 50-60 children spread across all K-12 grades. Mr. Morely stated the applicant will provide estimates and the Town consultants will also provide numbers to review later in this process. He also noted mitigation from the applicants might be given for schools or other areas which will be impacted by the development.

Sudbury resident Roger Nichols, 220 Old Lancaster Road, asked about the plans for water consumption and discharge. He also asked how many of each type of units are planned by Avalon. Mr. Dale explained the water capacity is adequate for the project and there is a wastewater treatment plant already on site, which is sufficient for anticipated needs. He stated 50% of the 250 apartments would be one-bedroom units, 40% would be two-bedroom units and 10% would be three-bedroom units. Mr. Garvin explained all the wastewater from the proposed development components will be treated by the on-site plant, which already exists, and is permitted through the State's Department of Environmental Protection (DEP).

At 8:37 p.m., Vice-Chairman Abair thanked the development team for the presentation and the discussion was concluded.

Public Hearing: 2015 Walkway Forum

At 8:39 p.m., Chairman Lizotte returned to the Meeting, and he opened the 2015 Walkway Forum. The Board was previously in receipt of copies of a handout entitled, "Walkway Forum, Planning Board Meeting October 14, 2015." He summarized the current process used to fund walkways each year with Town Meeting CPA appropriations and to ask neighbors to work together to obtain acceptance for submittals of walkway petitions.

Ms. Kablack stated her Office has been working with neighborhood coordinators, but, to date, no petitions have met the 75% threshold for neighborhood acceptance, and no petitions have been received. She highlighted there is no deadline for petitions, and they can be submitted at any time.

Sudbury resident Amber Fairbanks, 34 Goodman's Hill Road, stated she moved to Town three and a half years ago, and she tried to start a walkway petition for the very dangerous part of Goodman's Hill without a walkway. She stated she has about 60-70% acceptance from neighbors, but one homeowner located near Walker Lane will not agree to an easement.

Mr. Morely stated the need for a walkway at this location has been discussed for a long time.

Ms. Kablack stated she will ask DPW Director Bill Place if there are any options.

Ms. Fairbanks stated she discussed the situation with Mr. Place as recently as today, but his initial thought is there is not adequate space on either side of the street. Chairman Lizotte noted the ADA and MAAB criteria require a minimum of 42 inches for a sidewalk.

Sudbury resident Ralph Tyler, 1 Deacon Lane, stated he does not believe the yearly appropriations of \$100,000 are adequate. Mr. Tyler stated the sidewalks have been an issue of concern for him since the 1970s. He stated people run and walk unsafely on Concord Road all the time, and a tragedy could occur. Mr. Tyler asked why the Town did not get an agreement for a sidewalk from Pantry Brook Farm, noting the owners will not agree to an easement. He believes the Town should use its power of taking property by eminent domain to get the walkways built, noting Concord and Pantry Roads were always noted as priorities. Mr. Tyler also believes the Town needs a comprehensive plan to fund the needed walkways by bonding the project, since interest rates are low now. He stated walkways increase a neighborhood's value. Ms. Kablack later clarified the Pantry Brook Farm Conservation Restriction allows for a walkway to be built, and she will further research if the Town has an easement.

Chairman Lizotte stated Mr. Tyler's recommendations are philosophical changes to the Town's current process, which might be better suited for discussion at a Town Meeting, since this Board cannot approve such actions. Mr. Tyler suggested the Board could sponsor and/or support an article at Town Meeting. Chairman Lizotte stated he could envision a contentious discussion related to eminent domain at a Town Meeting.

Chairman Lizotte stated there is no one paid by the Town to make sidewalks happen. He highlighted every project which comes to the Town is part of Ms. Kablack's heavy workload, and there is no one else whose time is dedicated to this issue.

Mr. Morely stated there was a comprehensive article brought to a Town Meeting in the past to build walkways, and it failed. He noted the current process, with CPA appropriations each year and neighborhood coordinators, has been the most successful process yet.

Sudbury resident Lana Szwarc, 72 Maynard Road, is a walkway neighborhood coordinator. Ms. Szwarc stated there is no walkway from 51 Maynard Road to Hudson Road (about a ¼ mile, where there are wetlands for the last 1/8 of this mile). She emphasized a walkway here is important for accessibility and safety. Ms. Szwarc asked for consideration to be given to keeping a future walkway here out of the wet area and to build the safest route possible. In response to a question from Mr. Morely, Ms. Szwarc stated she has 42% of neighbors' agreements to easements.

Sudbury resident Sarah Davis, 27 Maynard Road, stated she spoke to DPW Director Bill Place in 2007 about a walkway, but his response was that it was not possible due to the wetlands. She asked if the road and turning lanes could be expanded/adjusted to accommodate a walkway for safety purposes. Mr. Morely stated this location probably has environmental constraints which may not make it feasible.

Chairman Lizotte reiterated what the current system is. He urged residents to bring something to the Annual Town Meeting if they want to change the process by which walkways are constructed.

Sudbury resident Dan DePompei, 35 Haynes Road, stated he submitted a Resolution for walkways at the last Town Meeting, and he is pleased to see the interest in the topic tonight. Mr. DePompei stated the last walkway priority list was developed in 2000, which listed 15 walkways prioritized by Sudbury Police Officer Al Hutchinson as the top needed, of which only five have been built. He stated walkways are

important for safety purposes, but also because of the current inequity for charging for school bus services within two miles of a school, even though families do not have an option for children to safely walk to school. Mr. DePompei stated he would be happy to present an article at Town Meeting, if that is what is needed. He believes this is an infrastructure issue, noting there are environmentally-friendly ways to build boardwalks around wetlands, and it could be done.

Chairman Lizotte stated that, with enough time and money, anything can be built. However, he further stated there are no resources in Town to do what is being suggested. It was noted a consultant would probably have to be hired to design the walkways, if a change of the system were voted at a Town Meeting. Mr. Morely stated there are typically concerns for the issues of funding and private property rights. Chairman Lizotte stated a Resolution does not help because the residents do not vote for funding.

Mr. DePompei stated he will either present an article for walkways or an article to stop charging for buses within two miles. He mentioned he has spoken to personnel from the schools who note it is difficult for students to walk to bus stops. Mr. DePompei offered to help neighborhood petitioners obtain agreements, noting 75% support of neighbors seems too high to him. Chairman Lizotte stated the walkways cannot be built without 100% of the land rights. Mr. DePompei asked if obtaining easements could be accomplished as part of house sales, when properties change hands. Chairman Lizotte reiterated there is no Town staff person who could track house sales and oversee such information and negotiations.

Sudbury resident Bryan Gothie, 18 Arrowhead Road, stated his street is reliant on getting a walkway on Willis Road. Mr. Gothie stated there are the same safety concerns others have mentioned tonight. He stated he is three houses short of meeting the 75% threshold for support, but there is a lack of interest from some neighbors. Mr. Gothie asked if there could be a site review with Mr. Place to hear what plan might be feasible. He believes if a more specific proposal could be described to people, he might be able to get the remaining required number of homeowners to agree.

Ms. Kablack stated she and the Board are gathering input tonight, and she will ask Mr. Place for his opinion regarding the preferred side of the street on that section of Willis Road. She emphasized the input from residents tonight is very helpful.

Chairman Lizotte asked if the Town has funds available to be directed to hire consultants. Ms. Kablack stated this is not currently in the budget.

Sudbury resident Jeff Paquette, 710 Concord Road, stated he agrees with Mr. Tyler that the financing structure for walkways should be revised, and that there should be a limited use of eminent domain power to get the walkways built. However, he believes that, even if a bonding program is pursued, the year-to-year appropriations for walkways should continue. Mr. Paquette listed several reasons why walkways on Concord and Pantry Roads would benefit those neighborhoods. He stated this area includes 45 homes, and he now has agreement from approximately 50-70% (depending if one counts the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail). Mr. Paquette further stated he believes eminent domain should be considered for the Pantry Brook Farm area on Concord Road because he has heard the homeowner is withholding their support due to their displeasure with plans for the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. Mr. Paquette stated he does not believe it should be a criterion that a walkway must connect to the existing network because he believes a lot of residents use walkways for recreation.

Sudbury resident Mary Hyer, 39 Tantamouse Trail, is interested in a walkway on Dakin Road. Ms. Hyer stated she has nearly 100% agreement from neighbors on the east side, and she asked if there could be a site review. She also provided Ms. Kablack with updated neighborhood agreement information.

Sudbury resident Nitin John, 147 Haynes Road, stated many residents are concerned how their stone walls on a Scenic Road would be impacted and mitigated. Mr. Johns stated he currently has support from 62% of the households on both sides of the Road. Ms. Kablack commended Mr. John's on the information he provided, and its format. She also commended the work done by all the neighborhood coordinators.

Mr. Morely stated many of the initial walkways were constructed well off the road. He further stated walkways can be constructed behind a stone wall. Mr. Morely stated the preference is always to not remove an antique stone wall. He also stated walkways do add value to one's property. Mr. Morely suggested the handout the Board received in tonight's meeting packet should be put on the Town's website, noting it provides a good primer on the Town's history for walkway planning and construction.

At 9:30 p.m., Chairman Lizotte thanked the residents for their input and the coordinators for working with their neighbors, and he concluded the Town Forum.

Public Hearing: Varsity Wireless Investors LLC – Site Plan Application – 275 Old Lancaster Road (Assessor's Map H08-0049)

Present: Director of Planning and Community Development Jody Kablack and Varsity Wireless LLC's attorney Francis Parisi

At 9:30 p.m., Chairman Lizotte opened the Public Hearing regarding the application of Varsity Wireless Investors, LLC, applicant, and Town of Sudbury, owner, for Site Plan approval under section 6300 of the Sudbury Zoning Bylaw to install and operate a wireless communications facility consisting of a 140' stealth monopole tower and associated equipment at 275 Old Lancaster Road, Assessor's Map H08-0049, zoned Single Residential-A, and he read aloud the Public Hearing Notice. The Board was previously in receipt of copies of the Public Hearing Notice, the Application for Special Permit, Variance and Site Plan Approval for Wireless Services Facility and accompanying maps and plans, a memorandum from Director of Planning and Community Development Jody Kablack dated October 1, 2015, a letter from the Sudbury Police and Fire Chiefs dated October 2, 2015, a memorandum from Sudbury's Building Inspector dated October 2, 2015, an email from Sudbury's Conservation Coordinator Debbie Dineen dated September 29, 2015 and a report from Radiation Safety Specialist Donald L. Haes, Jr., dated October 1, 2015.

Ms. Kablack stated the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) is the Special Permit granting authority for the Town, and its Public Hearing with the applicant began on October 6, 2015, and it has been continued to November 2, 2015. The ZBA has asked for more information regarding the request for a height variance from 100 feet to 140 feet.

Ms. Kablack explained the Board of Selectmen went out to bid for this cell tower in July 2014 and the applicant was aware of the required permitting. She stated the requested site is within the wireless overlay district, and the 20-year lease provides payments to the Town. Ms. Kablack further stated the cell tower will also enhance the Town's public-safety communications network.

Chairman Lizotte stated tonight's Site Plan review pertains to issues existing on the ground, such as access and changes to the site.

The applicant's attorney Francis Parisi stated his Special Permit application reflects that all requirements have been met except for height. Mr. Parisi used a PowerPoint presentation to display aerial photographs of the 16-acre site, and he described its location. He stated the nearest true abutting property line is over approximately 350 feet. He described the monopole would be within a fenced in compound of approximately 900 square feet, noting the base is not visible by abutters. Mr. Parisi stated access would be off of Old Lancaster Road, and no new impervious surface is being proposed. He explained the monopole would be an unmanned tower, and thus there are no anticipated traffic, parking or noise issues. Mr. Parisi stated existing utility poles will be used, and there will be a generator, as requested by Sudbury's Public Safety Departments, which will be serviced by existing gas lines. He also stated a Stormwater Management Permit is needed.

Ms. Kablack clarified the plan requires a General Stormwater Management Permit. She also read aloud the Site Plan criteria. Chairman Lizotte noted many of the criteria are geared to locations which are not comparable to the DPW site.

Mr. Remley asked if any of the federal regulations preempt any aspects of the plan. Mr. Parisi stated he does not believe the Site Plan is preempted by Federal Law in any way, and as for the Special Permit, the ZBA is cognizant of related factors under its purview.

Mr. Parisi displayed photographs from many location vantage points taken the day of the balloon test. He described the design as a single, non-reflective silver pole, with all wires located inside. Mr. Parisi stated the engineer has determined the base is not visible within a half-mile radius. He further noted he has consulted with State and local representatives to ensure historical resources are not impacted.

Mr. Long asked if there is any monitoring needed, since it is an unmanned site. Mr. Parisi stated monitoring is heavily mandated, and he will provide detailed information to the Building Inspector. In addition, it was noted soil testing will be done regarding the base. Mr. Parisi stated the biggest safety concern is trespassing, and thus climbing pegs will not be stored on the site.

Ms. Kablack and Mr. Morely referenced three concerns mentioned in the Building Inspector's October 2, 2015 memo. Mr. Parisi stated he will work with the Inspector to address all issues, noting he would need to check specific terms in the Lease. Mr. Morely suggested extra barrier protection be added to the base, as suggested by the Building Inspector.

Mr. Parisi stated the request for the height variance is due to the height request mandated by Sudbury's Public Safety Departments. He explained the Town bylaw's limit is 100 feet, but the Public Safety Departments needs their equipment mounted at no less than 120 feet.

Mr. Morely stated he drove the area on the day of the balloon test, and he saw only one house which will see the pole, noting the same home already views the DPW site daily.

In response to a question from Mr. Abair, Mr. Parisi explained trespassing is an issue because the copper grounding is now a hot commodity.

Mr. Garvin asked if security cameras are used. He also asked what the timeframe is for construction, once all approvals are received. Mr. Parisi stated cameras are not planned, and all construction can be completed in about six weeks.

Mr. Remley asked about lighting now or in the future. Mr. Parisi stated 200 feet is the threshold for required lighting, or if the location is close to an airport. He further stated the need for lighting is unlikely.

Sudbury resident John Forino, 15 Pine Ridge Road, asked whether the Board is inclined to postpone its decision, since the ZBA has postponed its process and it is awaiting further information. He also stated the balloon test should have been scheduled in a few months, once the tree leaves have fallen, to have more accurate results. He believes photographs taken in the winter would look different.

Chairman Lizotte stated the application before the Board is such that it could be approved; noting that, if the ZBA were to make a decision which materially changed the plan under review tonight, the applicant would need to come back to the Board for a modification. Ms. Kablack stated the Decision would condition approval of the Special Permit.

Mr. Morely stated the ZBA's decision is not likely to result in a modification needed to the Site Plan. He also emphasized the Town's preference is for monopoles, and not the antenna-type poles.

Sudbury resident Michael Cunningham, 3 Wash Brook Road, stated the balloon test was on September 19, 2015, and very few leaves had fallen from the trees. Thus, he does not believe an accurate assessment of the visual intrusion could be determined.

Sudbury resident John Gannon, 38 Forest Street, stated he observed the balloon test, and he believes these types of tests need to be conducted in December or January to get a true indication of the impact. Mr. Gannon also asked for clarification regarding the needs of the Public Safety Departments, and whether the current Police Station microwaves could be used. Ms. Kablack stated the future use of the current Police Station is uncertain, and therefore alternatives must be found. She also stated she has asked the Police Chief to attend the next ZBA Meeting to better explain the needs. Ms. Kablack also noted the Police Chief has not been able to locate an alternative location to fulfill the system upgrades needed.

Ms. Kablack noted a draft Decision has not been prepared for review tonight, and thus the Hearing would need to be continued.

Mr. Garvin asked what constitutes the difference between the Public Safety request for 120 feet and the application request for 140 feet, which Mr. Parisi clarified. Ms. Kablack also noted there are structural mount issues to be considered.

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

VOTED: To continue the Public Hearing regarding the Site Plan Application submitted by Varsity Wireless Investors, LLC, applicant, and Town of Sudbury, owner, for Site Plan approval under section 6300 of the Sudbury Zoning Bylaw to install and operate a wireless communications facility consisting of a 140' stealth monopole tower and associated equipment at 275 Old Lancaster Road, Assessor's Map H08-0049, zoned Single Residential-A to October 28, 2015 at 7:30 p.m., and to instruct Ms. Kablack to prepare a draft Decision for the Board's review, which includes a condition that, if the plan is materially changed, the applicant will need to submit a modification application.

Sudbury Station LLC – Application for a Proposed Chapter 40B Development – Off Peters Way – Assessor's Map G09-0100 – Discussion

Present: Applicant's developer Chris Claussen

At 10:23 p.m., Chairman Lizotte opened a discussion regarding a new Chapter 40B application received for a site located off Peters Way and Concord Road (Assessor's Map J06-0023). He stated the Board has received limited technical information on the proposal, and the applicant has submitted a project eligibility application to Mass Housing.

Ms. Kablack stated the Town was notified late today that its request to MassHousing for an extension to provide comments was approved. She also stated the Board of Selectmen will review comments received from Town staff, boards, committees and residents at its October 20, 2015 Meeting, and the Selectmen will finalize a letter incorporating the input at its November 3, 2015 meeting to be sent to MassHousing. Ms. Kablack also stated there was a site visit conducted on October 6, 2015, and she and Mr. Morely were among many in attendance.

Developer Chris Claussen stated he is at tonight's meeting to hear input. Mr. Claussen stated the development team is progressing with design work. He further stated it is anticipated that a Comprehensive Permit application with the ZBA will be filed in the next five to six weeks.

Chairman Lizotte questioned how any input could be evaluated and incorporated into revised plans, if the decision has already been made to submit the Comprehensive Permit application so soon.

Mr. Claussen stated he has already heard feedback from Ms. Kablack and at the site visit regarding the concerns related to traffic, visibility, access to Concord and Hudson Roads, the impact in the schools, proximity to a Historic District and stormwater management. He stated he met with wastewater management experts to address what will be required.

Chairman Lizotte asked if soil testing has been completed regarding stormwater management. Mr. Claussen stated he would need to check on it.

Mr. Long stated the concerns regarding the proposed density and size of the project at this location should not be a mystery to anyone.

Mr. Morely stated he shared his concerns on the site visit, noting he is opposed to this proposal for this location.

Chairman Lizotte stated he believes it will be a challenge to provide safe access for this proposed project. He will be interested to see what the traffic engineers suggest. Chairman Lizotte also noted it will take over a year to address wastewater management and leaching field related issues for a 250-unit development. He believes it will be difficult to achieve the plan on the site because the property does not support the proposed density.

Mr. Abair stated the site may be acceptable for some type of housing, but not what is proposed. He asked why another type of project has not been considered.

Mr. Garvin stated he has concerns regarding the visual effects of the proposed project. He also stated he believes stormwater management and traffic issues will be challenging to overcome. Mr. Garvin stated he is interested to see how these issues could be accomplished, and he will want to see detailed

information. He emphasized being able to review fully engineered plans would be helpful.

Mr. Claussen stated they are confident in the work they are doing with The Cecil Group and their other consultants, and that the project is viable.

Mr. Remley stated he will be anxious to see the traffic reports provided to support 250 units. He stated the information provided to date is lacking substantial details.

Mr. Claussen stated they have hired MDM as the traffic engineering firm, and the civil engineer is Michael Sullivan.

Mr. Remley stated he would like to see examples of other similar projects completed by the development team. Mr. Garvin concurred.

Mr. Abair stated the Town has never recommended this level of density for this location, and thus, he does not feel this project has been developed as part of a community process.

Chairman Lizotte urged the applicant to review the quality and safety elements regarding access.

On the site visit, Ms. Kablack stated she was struck by the proximity of the proposed project to the Town Cemetery, noting visitors may be alarmed by the visual intrusion of the development. Mr. Claussen stated screening could be considered.

Chairman Lizotte suggested, and the Board concurred, that Ms. Kablack should draft a letter reflecting the concerns expressed tonight, including, but not limited to traffic, visibility, and engineering for the Board's review.

Sudbury resident Peter Gimber, 377 Concord Road, stated he is an abutter to the proposed project. He believes the proposed density is absurd, given there is already a half-mile traffic back up from the High School to the Town Center at various times throughout the day. Mr. Gimber referenced the Board's September 19, 2012 minutes, when one private lot was discussed for zoning of this property. He believes the proposal is not at all consistent with this information.

Chairman Lizotte stated the Board agrees with Mr. Gimber's opinion, however, he noted the Chapter 40B process skirts the Town's Bylaws, and he summarized the 40B process.

Sudbury resident David Hornstein, 22 Candy Hill Road, asked if there could be a legal opposition to the proposal because the parcel was part of a land swap approved at Town Meeting. He stated the Town is an abutter, and at Town Meeting the voters did not approve the land swap with the intention for a future 250-unit development.

Mr. Hornstein also noted there is a pre-school located in a nearby church, and construction noise for several months could be disruptive. He emphasized it is critically important early on in the Chapter 40B process to identify the broadest and most impactful concerns as possible.

Mr. Morely stated Mr. Hornstein's point regarding the prior land swap voted by Town Meeting is worth further research. The Board concurred.

Sudbury resident Mike O'Malley, 177 Plympton Road, stated this will be a battle fought in inches. He too believes it is important to set a strong tone and position early in the process.

Sudbury resident Kirsten Roopenian, 45 Harness Lane, stated she views the proposed project for the Raytheon property as a friendly 40B project, and she views this one as unfriendly. Ms. Roopenien suggested the Board should at least send a strong message to reduce the density and the outrageous proposal for five-story structures. She urged the Selectmen, Planning Board and abutters to state clearly that this is not the type of project the Town wants.

Mr. Morely stated the project is not acceptable to him, even with reduced density.

Sudbury resident Joseph Sicree, 16 Candy Hill Road, asked what the process is for informing abutters, which Ms. Kablack explained. Mr. Sicree suggested that, perhaps a balloon test should be done for five-story structures.

Chairman Lizotte stated the Board has received very little information to date. He emphasized the Board is highly skeptical that the proposed project is viable, and it is anxious to see further details. He thanked the residents for their input, and he assured them the Board will write a strong letter expressing this is not an appropriate site for the proposed use, and noting the applicant has provided limited information and it has been proposed in an unfriendly manner. Chairman Lizotte noted the Town became aware of this project only on September 21, 2015.

Ms. Kablack advised abutters need to be vigilant in their participation in the process, and the discussion was concluded at 10:50 pm.

Candy Hill Lane (Assessor's Map G10-0505) – Release Existing Performance Bond and Accept Replacement Bond

Copies of a letter from Attorney Philip Lombardo, Jr. received October 9, 2015 were distributed to the Board tonight.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was

VOTED: To release the existing performance bond of \$19,196.27 for Candy Hill Lane (Assessor's Map G10-0505) to the former owners, Patrick and Carolyn Sullivan, and to accept a replacement bond in the amount of \$19,196.27 from the new purchaser, Woodside Development, LLC.

Minutes – September 30, 2015

The Board deferred this agenda item to its next meeting.

Upcoming Meeting Schedule

Ms. Kablack stated the next meetings will be held October 28, 2015, November 17, 2015 and December 9, 2015 at Town Hall beginning at 7:30 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned by Chairman Lizotte at 10:55 p.m.