



Town of Sudbury

Planning Board

PlanningBoard@sudbury.ma.us

Flynn Building
278 Old Sudbury Road
Sudbury, MA 01776
978-639-3387
Fax: 978-443-0756
www.sudbury.ma.us/planning

MINUTES

AUGUST 21, 2019 AT 7:30 PM

LOWER TOWN HALL, 322 CONCORD ROAD, SUDBURY, MA

Members Present: Chair Stephen Garvin, Vice Chair Charles Karustis, Clerk John Hincks, Justin Finnicum, and Nancy Kilcoyne.

Others Present: Director of Planning and Community Development Adam Duchesneau and Environmental Planner Beth Suedmeyer.

Mr. Garvin opened the meeting at 7:30 PM

Continued Public Hearing – Site Plan Review, Stormwater Management Permit and Water Resource Protection Overlay District Special Permit – 554 Boston Post Road (Assessor’s Map K06-0602)

Quentin Nowland of 554 BPR LLC, potential buyer of 554 Boston Post Road, and Bob Pouliot of Boardwalk Storage Solutions, LLC were present to discuss the application with the Board.

Mr. Nowland provided a summary of the Site Plan, including the incorporation of the following recommended changes to plans:

- Inclusion of only two cupolas per the recommendation of Diana Warren of the Historical Commission.
- Increased evergreen trees for improved year-round screening.
- Inclusion of granite facade material as recommended by Mr. Finnicum.
- Utilization of galvanized roof panels (aluminum alloy roof) to reduce roof massing with a less reflective finish.
- Inclusion of solar panels on the roof as recommended by Mr. Karustis.
- Addition of a walkway from Boston Post Road/Route 20 to the farm stand as recommended by the Design Review Board, as well as an adjacent bicycle rack.

Mr. Nowland presented a site illustration which displayed the placement of utility lines, cupolas, solar panels, vegetative screening, natural stone (granite) veneer, and altered roofing material. After checking with the Fire Department, Mr. Nowland assured the Planning Board that plowing of the easement on site was not required. He also indicated the original cupola will be memorialized with a plaque per the recommendation of Fred Taylor of the Historic Districts Commission, as depicted in the amended plans.

Mr. Pouliot provided details regarding the proposed fencing and lighting. Mr. Nowland noted the engineering plan changes reflected a decrease in the amount of asphalt and concrete. He also discussed snow storage and detailed the various areas for snow storage. Mr. Garvin asked about the snow

calculation study and Mr. Nowland responded their engineer would provide that determination for the Planning Board.

Ms. Suedmeyer stated the peer review consultant had indicated the Applicant met the requirements for the treatment of stormwater. Mr. Garvin commented that for Zone 2, one-inch treatment must be met and continued with further regulation detail. He wanted to be certain the application met the required pretreatment calculations. Ms. Suedmeyer referred to page 5, item 6, and mentioned the Applicant did meet the criteria. Mr. Garvin stated he wanted to see the actual calculations.

Mr. Duchesneau discussed the Fire Department's need for access to the back portion of the site and indicated Fire Chief John Whalen had stated if access was needed, it would occur from Horse Pond Road or through the Meadow Walk development. Fire Chief Whalen had indicated he did not want fire trucks to ride off-pavement and would not want a gravel roadway used unless it was well-packed.

Mr. Duchesneau asked about the newly proposed walkways and requested a walkway be added from the handicap parking space to the farm stand.

Ms. Suedmeyer was appreciative of the planting list which had been provided, but noted some of the vegetation listed was not native and she suggested the inclusion of such native plants.

Mr. Karustis thanked the Applicant for the changes they had made to the plans and commented he had concerns about the amount of exposed roofing in relation to glare which might affect neighbors. Mr. Pouliot indicated the newly proposed roofing was a duller material. Mr. Karustis asked about the life of the roof and Mr. Pouliot responded the roof had a 20-year guarantee minimum, stressing roof longevity plus the solar benefit. Mr. Karustis asked if standard roof shingling could be used on the sloped part of the roof in order to minimize or eliminate its glare. Mr. Nowland responded such a roof had not been considered.

Mr. Karustis asked if some year-round tree screening could be added to the front of the site. Mr. Nowland indicated more trees could be considered, but additional evergreen trees might conceal the farm stand somewhat. A related discussion unfolded.

Mr. Hincks asked if fencing would be included at the front of the site and Mr. Nowland replied it would not. Mr. Hincks asked about the strength of a storage business in this location in consideration of the storage businesses in the area. Mr. Nowland responded an extensive market analysis had been conducted, and the increase in local condo and apartment developments would contribute to the success of the storage building. He stressed the proposed storage building was not the typical storage facility and would be the premier storage facility in the state.

Ms. Kilcoyne expressed her appreciation regarding Mr. Nowland's flexibility and endorsed the changes made. She mentioned the massiveness of the building and wanted preservation of the agricultural land vista. Ms. Kilcoyne stated she would like to revisit the archeological dig suggestion she had mentioned previously. She also requested restrictions on what could be stored at the facility.

Mr. Finnicum stated he too appreciated the changes made by the Applicant and felt the metal roofing was appropriate for the building. He mentioned the centering of the cupolas and noted the height of the eaves had increased by several feet, which he felt overshadowed the farmhouse/tavern. He recommended decreasing the height of the eaves around the building.

Mr. Finnicum asked if additional landscaping could be brought closer to the building. Mr. Nowland responded such proximity had been previously discussed and with the need for large vehicle accessibility (loading and unloading) it was not possible. Mr. Finnicum stated he understood the situation.

Mr. Finnicum asked if the lighting would be on at all times. Mr. Nowland stated the lighting would correlate to the business hours. Mr. Duchesneau noted a draft condition specifies that on weekdays the office hours would be 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on weekends. Mr. Duchesneau indicated that after the first anniversary of the business, the Applicant may request extension of hours of operation.

Mr. Finnicum confirmed storage clients would not be spending much time in the storage units and Mr. Nowland confirmed that statement.

Mr. Garvin asked if any members of the public wished to speak on the matter.

Andrea Holland of 31 Woodland Road stated she appreciated the changes the developer had made, and stressed that reducing the size of the proposed building would solve many issues and would be better for the town. Mr. Nowland pointed out this was a business, the project had gone through four iterations, and has been reduced by approximately 30%. He added that the size was reflective of the cost of the land and construction. Mr. Karustis questioned if a smaller footprint would be more economically viable and Mr. Nowland said it would not.

Mr. Hincks noted the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) aspect and indicated the metrics for the project also had to be considered. Mr. Pouliot commented the type of business had impacts on the FAR computation. Group discussion took place.

Mr. Garvin maintained the Applicant needed to provide additional details regarding stormwater performance standards and the findings in the Zoning Bylaw for Special Permit approvals. Mr. Nowland affirmed the project engineer would provide the requested information.

Mr. Hincks moved to continue the public hearing for the Site Plan Review, Stormwater Management Permit, and Water Resource Protection Overlay District Special Permit application for 554 Boston Post Road (Assessor's Map K06-0602) to the Planning Board meeting on September 11, 2019 and to extend the application review period to September 30, 2019. Mr. Karustis seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 5-0.

Continued Public Hearing – Site Plan Review Request for Modification – 155-159 Woodside Road (Assessor's Map M09-0500)

Present to discuss the request with the Planning Board were Attorney Joshua Fox of Rollins, Rollins & Fox, P.C. and the owners of Wright Farm Child Care, Richard and Jennifer Eckler. Mr. Fox indicated Wright Farm had been in the family for four generations and in 2016 the Town approved a new 1,670 square foot structure for the business. He stated Ms. Eckler was seeking to modify Condition 11 of the 2016 Site Plan Review decision for the subject property. Mr. Fox explained the Applicant was requesting the removal of the 20-student enrollment limit and that only the Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care (MassEEC) should determine that enrollment number per the Dover Amendment. Mr. Fox stated MassEEC would likely approve the enrollment of 28 or 29 students, and asked the Planning Board to vest such decision to MassEEC. He also discussed the related parking aspect and affirmed the farm had considerable space for additional parking.

Mr. Garvin stated many members of the current Planning Board had not seen the 2016 Site Plan and the Board had requested a copy of the Site Plan at the last public hearing. Mr. Eckler stated the Site Plan remained unchanged. Mr. Fox stated the Applicant could provide the requested document to the Planning Board.

Mr. Duchesneau asked what the exact modified language for Condition 11 would be and Mr. Fox provided the language being proposed.

Mr. Karustis asked if Town Counsel had offered any opinion on the modification and Mr. Duchesneau responded Town Counsel had not been presented with the proposed language.

Mr. Garvin stated the duty of the Planning Board was to understand how the student increase might affect parking and other items at the site. Mr. Karustis suggested the possibility of adding more students in the existing house, beyond the 29 optimum student enrollment. Mr. Fox reiterated there was adequate parking at the site if increased enrollment was allowed.

Mr. Eckler asserted the student enrollment would not be over 30 per MassEEC approval. Mr. Fox suggested a middle ground agreement.

Mr. Hincks stated he agreed with Mr. Garvin's assertion that the Planning Board had an obligation to the Town.

Ms. Kilcoyne stated she wanted to be able to review the Site Plan.

Mr. Finnicum added he wanted to see the Site Plan as well and suggested language be included which stated the home would not be used for child care. Mr. Karustis agreed with the suggestion.

Mr. Duchesneau asked the Applicant if there were concerns involving the number of students permitted in the new building. Mr. Eckler stated there were currently child care centers in town with half the land area and a much greater student enrollment, which did not seem fair.

Ms. Eckler noted that if she wanted to increase the student population, she would have to come back before the Planning Board since the existing square footage would not allow for more than 32 students.

Mr. Fox asked the Planning Board if there were concerns regarding the prospect of enrolling 10 children in the main house and up to 30 children in the new structure. He added there had been no complaints from Town officials or neighbors regarding the existing child care center. Mr. Karustis stated he would have objections because the potential for a 40-student enrollment was not presented to the Planning Board as part of the request.

Mr. Hincks objected to the fact the request appeared to have evolved from the application presented at the initial meeting where it had been discussed.

Mr. Garvin stressed the Applicant was requesting a change to a condition and not a new application, although another public hearing could be scheduled. Mr. Fox recommended a continuance of the public hearing. Mr. Karustis stated that due to the change in the request, a new application and public hearing would be preferable. Mr. Fox confirmed he understood the situation. Mr. Garvin noted the presentation of a Site Plan or As-Built Plan would also strengthen the determination process.

Mr. Hincks moved to continue the public hearing for the Site Plan Review Request for Modification for 155-159 Woodside Road (Assessor's Map M09-0500) to the Planning Board meeting on September 11, 2019. Mr. Karustis seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 5-0.

Selection of Planning Board Associate Member

Mr. Hincks stated all the candidates were highly qualified and indicated planning experience was highly desirable.

Mr. Karustis noted all applicants were qualified and planning experience was very important.

Mr. Garvin stated he had inquired if more than one person could be selected to be an Associate Member, but Town staff informed him the Planning Board could only choose one of the candidates. He detailed other Town board, committee, and commission membership opportunities which the candidates should consider if not selected for the Associate Member position.

Mr. Finnicum emphasized the Planning Board needed a candidate who would be very involved in the Master Plan update process and implementation.

After the ballots from each member were reviewed and tallied, Mr. Duchesneau announced the Planning Board had voted to appoint John Sugrue as the new Associate Member.

439 Boston Post Road – Minor Site Plan Review

Bill Johnson, Contractor at NPC&M, LLC, and Jeff Farrington, Director of E-Commerce at Roche Bros., Inc. were present to discuss the application with the Planning Board. Mr. Johnson provided a summary of the proposed request which consisted of enclosing an existing canopy space with glass windows and brick to accommodate an E-commerce area. He indicated the proposed plan called for four dedicated parking spaces for the E-commerce service. Mr. Johnson also explained the total square footage of impervious area would remain the same.

Mr. Duchesneau noted the proposed extended planter would provide additional pedestrian buffering/protection and the planned walkway was ADA compliant.

Mr. Karustis confirmed there would be no additional impervious area and Mr. Johnson indicated that was correct. Mr. Karustis noted the proposed glass treatment was not the same size as the existing glass windows. Mr. Farrington responded the glass had to be somewhat downsized in order to accommodate the pillars and new doorway.

Ms. Kilcoyne asked if the proposed walkway could be adjusted to decrease the congestion in that area. Mr. Johnson suggested perhaps incorporating speed bumps or painting a crosswalk. Mr. Farrington stated a yellow walkway could be included. Ms. Kilcoyne asked if a different type of walkway surfacing could be utilized. Mr. Farrington suggested pavers and paint might be effective. Mr. Garvin indicated a speed table (an elevated crosswalk) would be preferable.

Mr. Finnicum noted the proposed extended planter would likely create a pedestrian pinch point when factoring in shopping carts and suggested the plan be reworked. Discussion ensued regarding this topic.

Mr. Garvin questioned the necessity of allocating four existing parking spaces to the E-commerce service. Mr. Farrington responded four spaces were currently being utilized in six other Roche Bros. E-commerce locations and four spaces would allow more control with the timed grocery pick-ups.

Mr. Hincks moved to approve the Minor Site Plan Review for 439 Boston Post Road as amended, including conditions regarding the installation of a perpendicular raised crosswalk and reduced planter size to allow a wider pedestrian isle space of at least six feet between any portion of the building and the planter. Mr. Karustis seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 5-0.

Mr. Johnson confirmed the raised crosswalk would be painted yellow or white. Ms. Suedmeyer suggested a discussion with the Fire Department would help to finalize the details associated with the elevated crosswalk. Mr. Garvin acknowledged Ms. Suedmeyer's comments and stated a 6-inch raised crosswalk was probably the best solution.

Mr. Hincks moved to continue the August 21, 2019 Planning Board meeting beyond the normal adjournment time of 10:00 p.m. Mr. Karustis seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 5-0.

565 Concord Road (Assessor's Map F10-0013) – Approval Not Required (ANR) Plan

Anthony Bloom of 565 Concord Road was present to discuss the matter with the Planning Board. Mr. Bloom indicated the ANR Plan displayed the division of his property into two buildable lots; one of which would still contain his current dwelling.

Mr. Duchesneau stated Town Engineer Bill O'Rourke had highlighted several important considerations regarding the proposed plan:

- Adherence to the Town's Driveway Rules and Regulations would be difficult due to the steep slopes along Concord Road
- Any proposed new driveway location at the property would have difficulty meeting the minimum site distance requirements and driveway radius standards for safety
- A preliminary driveway plan should be submitted to Town staff to determine conformance with the Town's regulations

Mr. Bloom stated he had spoken to Mr. O'Rourke and his engineer was already looking into revising the plan in order to address the concerns which had been raised. Mr. Duchesneau explained the ANR Plan procedure process and timeline. Mr. Garvin indicated the Planning Board would endorse the ANR Plan for 565 Concord Road as presented.

Greenscape Park Subdivision (Powers Road) – Request to Extend Definitive Plan Endorsement Timeframe

Geoffrey Cronin of Greenscape Property & Building and Dan Carr, P.E. of Stamsky & McNary, Inc. were present to discuss the request with the Planning Board.

Mr. Cronin explained he was seeking an extension of the plan endorsement timeline in order to complete all the requested aspects of the Definitive Subdivision decision.

Mr. Duchesneau noted the timeline in the decision and stated the Definitive Subdivision Plan must be presented within 90 days of the decision to the Planning Board for endorsement or a time extension for the endorsement must be approved by the Board. He indicated the Definitive Subdivision decision had been issued on April 10, 2019, filed with the Town Clerk on April 18, 2019, and, as such, the 90-day timeframe had already elapsed.

Mr. Hincks moved to extend the endorsement timeframe for Definitive Subdivision Plan for the Greenscape Park Subdivision (Powers Road) to October 31, 2019. Mr. Karustis seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 5-0.

Master Plan Update – Meeting In a Box

Mr. Garvin stated Planning Board comments regarding the Master Plan update process and what topics the Master Plan should be examining should be submitted to Mr. Duchesneau.

Special Town Meeting Zoning Bylaw Discussion

Mr. Garvin decided to postpone the discussion of this topic until the Planning Board's next meeting.

Administrative Report

Planning staff stated there was nothing to share at this time.

Minutes for Approval: May 6, 2019 and June 12, 2019

Mr. Hincks moved to approve the meeting minutes for May 6, 2019 and June 12, 2019. Mr. Karustis seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 5-0.

Future Meeting Schedule: August 26, 2019 – Joint Executive Session, September 11, 2019, and September 25, 2019

Ms. Kilcoyne noted September 11, 2019 was the Sudbury Public Schools "Back to School Night."

Mr. Garvin adjourned the meeting at 10:15 PM.