

Present: Chairman Peter Abair, Christopher Morely, Marty Long, Stephen Garvin, Dan Carty, and Jody Kablack (Director of Planning and Development)

Absent: John Hincks (Associate Member)

At 7:31 p.m., Chairman Abair called the meeting to order.

Wright Farm Childcare – Minor Site Plan Approval Request – 155 Woodside Road Assessor Map M09-0500

Present: Applicant Jennifer Eckler, the applicant's attorney Joshua Fox and the applicant's engineer John Field

At 7:31 p.m., Chairman Abair opened a discussion on the application of Jennifer R. Eckler, Applicant, and Dorothy Wright, Owner, for Minor Site Plan approval in accordance with the Town of Sudbury Zoning Bylaw Section 6300 to construct a new 1,670 square-foot building and associated improvements to be used as a Child Care Center at 155 Woodside Road, zoned Residential A (Assessor Map M09-0500), which was continued from May 18, 2016. The Board was previously in receipt of copies of a letter from Sudbury resident Angela Lee, 42 Hopestill Brown Road.

The applicant's attorney Joshua Fox apologized for not getting the plans to the Board in advance of tonight's meeting.

Through a PowerPoint presentation, the applicant's engineer John Field showed a rendering of the proposed building, which he described as a 1 ½ story rustic building, similar in architecture to the surrounding structures. He showed plans and indicated where the driveway and parking areas would be, noting the property slopes gently by approximately 4 feet in the first 250 feet of the property, and the slope gets slightly steeper as one moves more towards the ravine in the back. Mr. Field showed where the two infiltration basins would be located, and he described how the landscaping would be enhanced. He also showed an erosion control plan and a lighting schedule, noting post lamps are planned for the entrance, lighting will be Dark Sky compliant, and there will be two sconces in the front of the building and one in the rear. Mr. Field stated the wetlands have been flagged, and he showed a hydrology analysis for pre and post-development. He also stated the driveway was analyzed for vehicular access and the turning radius.

Ms. Kablack asked what the width of the driveway is, and Mr. Field stated it was 20 feet.

Mr. Morely asked if the driveway would be one-way, and Mr. Field stated it likely would be.

Mr. Field showed a slide depicting details of the catch and infiltration basins and another slide detailing the septic systems.

Mr. Garvin stated the Board would like to see the queuing plan for parking on the plan.

Mr. Carty noted some parking currently exists. The applicant, Jennifer Eckler stated this is true, and a few spaces will be added.

Ms. Kablack asked if the Conservation Commission had confirmed the wetland line, and she was informed it has not, but it will do so.

Ms. Kablack asked if it will be a paved driveway. It was noted this is yet to be determined.

Mr. Morely suggested the applicant should talk to the Fire Department regarding how much of the driveway needs to be constructed of what materials and about the turning radius.

Mr. Garvin asked for clarification regarding sight distances with the new curb cut, and he asked about what kind of pretreatment would be used for drainage. Ms. Kablack stated this project will be subject to a stormwater management plan.

Ms. Eckler reported there are usually no more than two or three cars in her driveway at a time between 7:15 a.m. and 6 p.m. She stated there may be up to 10 cars a day which arrive, and the new building might increase the number to 15.

Mr. Morely stated he thinks the plans look great.

Ms. Kablack summarized the comments/requests from the Board tonight asking for a queuing plan, for the applicant to speak with the Fire Chief, additional information regarding surface treatment, additional information regarding pre-treatment for drainage, wetland delineation, sight distance calculation and some stormwater management-related information. She also stated the applicant should contact the Town Engineer for a driveway permit.

Mr. Fox stated that, if the driveway is paved, a Stormwater Management Permit would be needed. Ms. Kablack stated it is likely a permit will be needed due to the total disturbance required to construct the addition, septic system and drainage.

Mr. Garvin stated it is possible to pursue whether a 14-foot wide paved driveway with three-foot shoulders on either side would meet the Fire Department's needs. Mr. Fox stated he would discuss this, the surface material and the turning radius with the Fire Department.

Mr. Morely and Chairman Abair expressed their extreme displeasure with parking plan B.

Ms. Kablack suggested, and the Board concurred, that a site visit should be coordinated prior to the Board's next meeting on June 22, 2016.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

VOTED: To continue the discussion regarding the application of Jennifer R. Eckler, Applicant, and Dorothy Wright, Owner, for Minor Site Plan approval in accordance with the Town of Sudbury Zoning Bylaw Section 6300 to construct a new 1,670 square-foot building and associated improvements to be used as a Child Care Center at 155 Woodside Road, zoned Residential A (Assessor Map M09-0500), to June 22, 2016 at 7:30 p.m.

Meadow Walk Conformance Recommendations - Vote

Present: National Development Project Manager Steve Senna, and National Development's Attorney Peter Tamm

At 7:54 p.m., Chairman Abair opened a discussion with National Development representatives regarding the Conformance Review of the Master Development Plan. The Board was previously in receipt of copies of a memorandum from VHB representative Karen Staffier dated June 6, 2016, regarding a response to the

Sudbury Water District Comment Letter and a draft version 6 Conformance Recommendation. In addition, copies of a list of materials received as of June 8, 2016, a “Project Technical Memorandum Environmental Review 528 Boston Post Road, Sudbury, Massachusetts,” prepared by Sudbury’s peer reviewer at GeoInsight, Inc. and dated June 8, 2016, a draft version 7 Conformance Recommendation, a letter from Sanborn Head regarding Fate and Transport of CVOCs- Sanitary Wastewater System to Raymond Road Well Field dated June 6, 2016, a memorandum from Stantec representatives Stephen Calabro and Erica Lotz dated June 3, 2016, a memorandum from Stantec representatives William Beyer and Erica Lotz dated June 7, 2016, an email from Erica Lotz dated June 8, 2016, an email from GeoInc.’s Michael Webster dated June 8, 2016, and an email from Ms. Kablack to National Development Project Manager Steve Senna dated June 8, 2016 were distributed to the Board tonight.

Ms. Kablack reviewed the materials distributed tonight and recently received to the file. She stated she spoke with Sudbury’s peer reviewer at GeoInsight, Inc., who stated that, for a Raytheon site, the property is fairly clean, and it is not considered a brown field. She stated the peer reviewer did identify some data gaps, but no one has been able to locate a source for the contamination materials, which are very deep down. Ms. Kablack stated soil sampling under the buildings once they are demolished is already a condition of the Conformance Recommendation, and groundwater samples, only if a release is suspected, would also be added. Ms. Kablack stated she reviewed the GeoInsight report, and there are “no red flags,” and it essentially reports that there is nothing identified which would prohibit redevelopment of the site. She also stated this report is posted on the Town’s website. Ms. Kablack stated the peer reviewer suggested three items which could be added as conditions to the Conformance Recommendations: (1) groundwater testing under the buildings (which is already a condition), (2) construction management plans to be submitted to the Planning Office, and (3) if irrigation wells are used, to test and treat if anything is found.

Mr. Senna explained how the developer plans to screen the irrigation water which will be done at their LSP’s discretion. He stated the LSP will supervise and identify if groundwater testing meets the threshold and if it is needed during construction demolition. He read aloud from the draft Conformance Recommendation, and the consensus was that a condition for groundwater testing does not need to be added.

Regarding the construction management plans, Ms. Kablack noted a draft one was previously submitted, and thus, a final version is only needed by the Planning Office prior to demolition done on the site. It was also noted that all documents submitted to DEP should be copied and sent to the Board of Health.

It was stated the developer would work with the Board of Health regarding testing of irrigation wells.

Ms. Kablack stated she spoke with the Sudbury Water District (SWD), and they feel this is a complex site, and they are not yet comfortable stating that the redevelopment will not impact the wells. The SWD voted to support the project, subject to six conditions it has presented.

At 8:25 p.m., discussion turned to the SWD–related conditions from the email from Stantec representative Erica Lotz. Reference was made to #14 of the Conformance Recommendation on Page 6 regarding that no irrigation would be provided by the public water supply. Mr. Senna stated the developer needs the opportunity to revisit this with the Board or the SWD if some potable water is needed for irrigation for the current landscape plan. Mr. Tamm suggested he could draft language for review reflecting that water would be restricted for the MUOD, unless specific exceptions were brought before the Planning Board and the SWD. Ms. Kablack noted the Board should be hesitant to vote on a new condition without review by the SWD and peer reviewers.

The Board discussed the other five conditions suggested by the SWD. All agreed that “District staff will receive copies of all WWTP reporting to DEP along with copies of any stormwater inspection reports” could be added as a condition to the Conformance Recommendations and also adding that the Planning Board and Board of Health would also get copies. The development team also stated it was fine adding, “District staff will have an opportunity to conduct periodic inspections of the WWTP,” as long as it is subject to reasonable advance notice. They also stated they could continue peer review of documentation for the DEP Groundwater Discharge Permit Application, but Mr. Senna would like to better understand the scope of continuation.

Mr. Senna suggested a condition could reflect that the developer’s ability to be issued a building permit would be based on a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) being agreed to by the developer and the SWD. Mr. Carty noted the developer assumes the risk that they can agree to a MOU.

Mr. Senna noted he is uncomfortable with a lack of specificity stated regarding additional testing.

Mr. Garvin stated some peer reviewers present the worst-case scenarios, which protect wells in a very conservative manner.

The consensus was that only one SWD condition suggestion regarding limiting the WWTP effluent water quality to below 5 mg/L total nitrogen is difficult to incorporate.

Mr. Garvin asked if the Board should reach out to the SWD for further discussion. The consensus of the Board was that Ms. Kablack and the development team should contact the SWD immediately tomorrow to try to resolve issues and, if needed, revise language prior to Monday.

At 8:54 p.m., Ms. Kablack reviewed the recent changes to the Conformance Recommendation as reflected in the red-lined version 7. Most items were minor and the Board agreed with the wording changes.

Mr. Carty stated he is not overly concerned about enough water on the site, but he is concerned as to whether there is enough water and pressure for the rest of the Town. Ms. Kablack stated this issue has been looked at carefully by the SWD and the best estimate is that both of the large projects in front of the Town will only result in approximately 40% of capacity being used.

Mr. Morely stated he would like to avoid the need to draft a MOU with the SWD if at all possible, and the Board concurred.

At 9:22 p.m., the Board stated it was satisfied with the current Conformance Recommendation as reviewed tonight and it would delay a vote on the Conformance Recommendation tonight to complete the conditions noted by the Sudbury Water District, and take this vote prior to the Special Town Meeting on June 13, 2016.

Chairman Abair asked that version 7 be posted on the Town website for public review.

Special Town Meeting – June 13, 2016 – Discussion and Preparation

Present: National Development Project Manager Steve Senna, and National Development’s Attorney Peter Tamm

At 9:23 p.m., Chairman Abair opened a discussion regarding the June 13, 2016 Special Town Meeting (STM). Copies of a STM Presentation Outline were distributed tonight to the Board. Ms. Kablack stated Mr. Hincks was too busy this week to work on it, so she put together this draft for review tonight.

Chairman Abair stated the plan is for the Planning Board and Board of Selectmen to discuss Articles 1, 2, and 3 together for a total presentation of 30 minutes.

Mr. Senna asked if the development team is expected to present. Ms. Kablack stated probably not, but they can be available for questions. The consensus of the Board was that the traffic and fiscal peer reviewers should also be available for questions.

Sudbury Finance Committee Chair Susan Berry stated there will likely be questions regarding the fiscal impact of the project. She stated the Finance Committee voted to support the articles, subject to hearing the details of the Development Agreement.

The consensus of the Board and development team is that Town Meeting attendees will often need to be reminded of the content of the articles before them.

Mr. Garvin stated he would like to have a slide created which presents that approximately 70% of the project revenue will be generated from the components being voted on at the STM.

Mr. Carty stated he has some ideas regarding how the financial graphics should be presented, and he offered to present this section.

Chairman Abair asked how the joint presentation should be delivered. Everyone agreed the content is not easy, but it needs to be presented in the simplest way possible to accomplish passage of the articles.

Board of Selectman Chairman Susan Iuliano stated she or another Selectman would be willing to present the Development Agreement section and/or the Introduction section.

Chairman Abair summarized what the components of the presentation should include. He believes the combined presentation should be drafted for 15 minutes, with the knowledge that it is bound to run longer. Chairman Abair asked Ms. Iuliano to prepare the Introduction section, and he stated he would be comfortable presenting the section about Raytheon closing and how the project came to be. It was suggested Selectman Haarde could be asked if he would like to present either the Development Agreement section or why the Boards support the articles.

Chairman Abair stated he would like to combine the PowerPoint slides with the presentation notes for presenters, and he offered to revise the material accordingly before Monday and circulate it to Ms. Kablack and the Board. Mr. Carty stated he would be willing to do the same for the financial material in the presentation.

Mr. Morely suggested a better aerial view of the property be shown at STM so people can see the real condition of the current site.

Ms. Kablack stated she would email the slides and accompanying information to Chairman Abair and Mr. Carty tomorrow, and the discussion was concluded.

Arboretum Subdivision- Request for Bond Reduction

At 9:50 p.m., Chairman Abair opened a discussion regarding the request for a bond reduction for the Arboretum Subdivision – Cutting Lane. The Board was previously in receipt of copies of a letter from Town Engineer/DPW Director I. William Place dated May 19, 2016 including a new bond estimate for the construction of Cutting Lane.

Ms. Kablack provided a brief update regarding the subdivision, noting everything has been complied with, and thus, the street acceptance request can go forward. She explained the Town currently holds a bond for \$106,000 for Arboretum Way, but it never held anything for Cutting Lane. Thus, the recommendation is to reduce the Arboretum bond to complete Cutting Lane.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

VOTED: To approve a reduction of the bond for the Arboretum Subdivision – Cutting Lane to \$83,785.75, as recommended by Town Engineer I. William Place in a letter dated May 19, 2016.

Mr. Carty asked for clarification regarding why it is in the Town’s best interest to accept streets, which Ms. Kablack provided.

Minutes

On motion duly made and seconded, it was

VOTED: To approve the meeting minutes of May 18, 2016.

On motion duly made and seconded, it also was

VOTED: To approve the meeting minutes of May 25, 2016.

The Board delayed the vote on the June 1, 2016 minutes until the June 22, 2016 Meeting.

Upcoming Meeting Schedule

The next meetings will be held on June 13, 2016 prior to the Special Town Meeting at the LISRSH cafeteria, and on June 22, 2016. Ms. Kablack stated June 22, 2016 will be her last meeting with the Board and she stated there is a transition plan in place for interim coverage for the Planning Office and this Board.

The meeting was adjourned by Chairman Abair at 9:59 p.m.