



Town of Sudbury

Planning Board

PlanningBoard@sudbury.ma.us

Flynn Building
278 Old Sudbury Road
Sudbury, MA 01776
978-639-3387
Fax: 978-639-3314

www.sudbury.ma.us/planning

MINUTES

APRIL 8, 2020 AT 7:30 PM

VIRTUAL MEETING

Members Present: Chair Stephen Garvin, Vice Chair Charles Karustis, Clerk John Hincks, Justin Finnicum, John Sugrue, and Associate Member Anuraj Shah.

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 – Stormwater Management Permit – 197 Landham Road (Assessor's Map L10-0502)

Lindsay Philbrick and Erick Storer, Owners; James Tetreault from Thompson Liston Associates, Inc.; and Mike DiGiorgio, from Land Pro, Inc. were present to discuss the application with the Planning Board.

Mr. Tetreault summarized the concerns presented at the March 25, 2020 Planning Board meeting as well as the comments addressed by the Horsley Witten peer reviewer in their April 1, 2020 memorandum as follows:

- Landscape Plan – including some 22 trees and 130 shrubs
- Drainage specifications
- Information sheet detailing the infiltration plan, site entrance, piping of run-off drainage, and stock-pile information

Mr. Tetreault stated the remaining areas mentioned by Horsley Witten included:

- Sports Court base and underlying material
- Construction entrance resurfacing
- Pre- and Post-Construction Operation and Maintenance Plan to be signed by owners
- Elicit Discharge Statement

Ms. Suedmeyer stated the Conservation Commission had requested a condition requiring the restoration of the Town parking area after construction was completed.

Mr. Hincks inquired about the landscaping between the trail and the subject property. Mr. Tetreault responded landscape screening would include the transplanting of Spruce trees.

Mr. Shah asked about additional plantings between the sports court and the trail. Ms. Philbrick commented there was sufficient vegetation and trees within the meadow.

Mr. Finnicum questioned the severity of the retaining wall and acknowledged evergreen plantings with smaller vegetation in front of the evergreens could help. He stressed the area between the patio and the public trail was very close and noted the open back yard in relation to the trail.

Mr. Sugrue agreed with the comments made by Mr. Finnicum.

Mr. Shah indicated his preference for retaining the natural appearance of the parking lot.

Mr. Karustis stated he felt the distance between the sports court and the trail parking lot was too close, and questioned how one would get to the sports court from the house. Mr. Tetreault responded access could be from the driveway or around the patio.

Mr. Karustis inquired about Horsley Witten's comment regarding stormwater runoff to Landham Road.

Mr. Finnicum noticed a slight discrepancy in the Landscape Plan regarding the sports court surface and the retaining wall.

Mr. Garvin questioned where the stockpile area would be and Mr. DiGiorgio responded a stockpile area would not be necessary for this project.

Ms. Suedmeyer reiterated the Town did not have a Stormwater Management Permit on record which reflected when the home was originally constructed.

Mr. Garvin stated the public hearing would be continued and noted the Applicant would need to address the following items at the upcoming Planning Board meeting:

- Include all details and proposal aspects on one plan
- Include an updated Erosion Control Plan
- Include measurements reflecting distances from the trails

Mr. Finnicum confirmed it would be much easier to understand if all of the information were included within one plan.

Mr. Hincks motioned to continue the public hearing for the Stormwater Management Permit application for 197 Landham Road (Assessor's Map L10-0502) to the Planning Board meeting on April 29, 2020. Mr. Sugrue seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Mr. Garvin – Aye, Mr. Karustis – Aye, Mr. Hincks – Aye, Mr. Finnicum – Aye, and Mr. Sugrue – Aye.

Immediately Continued Public Hearings – Scenic Roads (Tree Removal)

- **528 Dutton Road, Stearns Pond (Assessor's Map G05-0026)**
- **1 Morse Road, Featherland Field (Assessor's Map G10-0002)**
- **215 Morse Road (Assessor's Map E09-0505)**
- **107 Plympton Road (Assessor's Map G10-0019)**
- **95 Goodman's Hill Road (Assessor's Map J10-0005)**
- **224 Goodman's Hill Road (Assessor's Map J09-0039)**

Mr. Duchesneau referred to the document from Rafael Luna of the Department of Public Works entitled "Scenic Roads Application – Time Extension Form After Legal Notification," stamped and dated April 1, 2020. The document requested a continuation of the public hearings for these applications to the Planning

Board meeting on April 29, 2020 and to extend each of the application review periods until May 31, 2020.

Mr. Hincks motioned to continue the public hearings for the following Scenic Roads (Tree Removal) applications to the Planning Board meeting on April 29, 2020 and to extend each of the application review periods until May 31, 2020:

- 528 Dutton Road, Stearns Pond (Assessor's Map G05-0026)
- 1 Morse Road, Featherland Field (Assessor's Map G10-0002)
- 215 Morse Road (Assessor's Map E09-0505)
- 107 Plympton Road (Assessor's Map G10-0019)
- 95 Goodman's Hill Road (Assessor's Map J10-0005)
- 224 Goodman's Hill Road (Assessor's Map J09-0039).

Mr. Karustis seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Mr. Garvin – Aye, Mr. Karustis – Aye, Mr. Hincks – Aye, Mr. Finnicum – Aye, and Mr. Sugrue – Aye.

Public Hearing – Final Plan Approval, Plan Approval, and Stormwater Management Permits – Joint Meeting with the Design Review Board – 16 & 36 North Road (Cold Brook Crossing) (Assessor's Maps C12-0003, C12-0004, and C12-0100)

Design Review Board Members Present: Chair Daniel Martin, Jennifer Koffel, Deborah Kruskal, James Parker, and Susan Vollaro

Chris Claussen, Developer; Chris Kennedy, Developer; William Henchy, Attorney; Matt Leidner, Engineer from Civil Design Group; Jeff Renterghem, Architect from Pappageorge Haymes Partners; Leslie Fanger, Landscape Architect from Bohler Engineering were present to discuss the application with both the Planning Board and Design Review Board.

Mr. Martin confirmed the Design Review Board meeting was already in session.

Mr. Claussen stated the development had formerly been known as the "Melone Property" and "Quarry North", but moving forward it was going to be called "Cold Brook Crossing." He continued on with his presentation and described the Cold Brook Crossing development as a 274 unit residential project on approximately 26 acres of land; 10 acres to be held as Conservation Land by the Town and 3 acres owned by the Sudbury Water District. Mr. Claussen noted the inclusion of age restricted dwellings units and Chapter 40R units as part of the two zoning overlay districts. He shared the proposed phasing plan with a leach field location and wastewater treatment plant.

Mr. Claussen affirmed a traffic study and traffic light study had been completed.

Mr. Claussen noted a few changes to the plans since the Town Meeting approval:

- A leach field change was made on the Chapter 40R parcel due to Sudbury Water District wells
- Reduced the number of residential buildings in the Chapter 40R overlay district from three to two due to presence of bedrock
- Wastewater treatment plant at the proposed clubhouse
- Emergency safety/fire access change

Ms. Fanger reviewed several aspects of the Cold Brook Crossing plans including the screening from Route 117/North Road, tree plantings, open space areas, dog runs, garden plots/shed, and parking provisions.

Emery

Mr. Renterghem detailed the Emery phase design and materials used for the 81 age-restricted units in the four-story condominium building and 31 townhouses. He noted the parking configuration at Emery and the community building/club house, connection to the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail, and open space area over the leach field.

Mr. Martin commented the recent renderings of the four-story Emery building were much improved and helped to minimize the massing. He suggested the building's entrances be better defined. Mr. Claussen responded the team would examine that aspect of the design.

Ms. Koffel agreed the design was improved and provided some color suggestions. Mr. Claussen was receptive to exploring such changes.

Pines

Mr. Claussen presented the proposed design for the non-age restricted townhomes located within the North Road Residential Overlay District. He provided an explanation of the building materials to be used, landscape schedule, and proposed lighting on the site.

Mr. Garvin affirmed a Photometrics Plan should be provided and Mr. Claussen indicated they would provide such a plan.

Mr. Henchy noted the earthen berm along Route 117/North Road would be maintained with additional screening.

Ms. Fanger described the pedestrian and vehicular circulation within the development. She indicated the majority of roadways were two-way with one cul-de-sac in the development. Ms. Fanger referred to the diagram which depicted walking connectivity throughout the development, with easy access to the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail.

Mr. Finnicum indicated his approval of the pedestrian and vehicular circulation plan. He opined Building 1 of the Emery plan presented an opportunity to extend the tree line. He also claimed the parking area was too close to Route 117/North Road. Mr. Claussen stated he would re-examine the area.

Mr. Finnicum inquired about public parking to access the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. Mr. Claussen replied he was working with Mr. Duchesneau, Ms. Suedmeyer, and Conservation Coordinator Lori Capone to explore further possibilities.

Mr. Hincks noted the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail was not adjacent to the site and there was not a walking trail at the present time. Mr. Kennedy stated trail access from the Frost Farm residential development could be clarified.

Mr. Sugrue indicated the new plans improved the overall massing of the project.

Mr. Shah stated the gable ends helped to break up the massiveness and a Cape-style rake trim would be more preferable.

Mr. Karustis endorsed the connectivity concept to the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail and asked if a sidewalk provision along Route 117/North Road could be included. Mr. Karustis also inquired about the possible inclusion of roof top solar panels for the project. Mr. Claussen responded such solar panel implementation was not preferred with this project and its proposed roof lines. Mr. Renterghem maintained the units were energy efficient with energy-efficient insulation, windows, and each unit had its own heating system and thermostat.

Mr. Garvin stated he believed the layout was quite good and felt the suggested roof overhang did breakup the massing of the buildings. He also felt the stone materials to be used should be a New England style/coloring, and recommended walkways and pavers incorporate these materials as well. Mr. Garvin acknowledged the connection to the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail would be great.

Mr. Hincks motioned to continue the Planning Board meeting since it was after 10:00 PM. Mr. Karustis seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Mr. Garvin – Aye, Mr. Karustis – Aye, Mr. Hincks – Aye, Mr. Finnicum – Aye, and Mr. Sugrue – Aye.

Mr. Claussen presented the signage proposal which included permanent and temporary signage.

Mr. Martin indicated he felt the proposed signage was excessive, particularly signage on Route 117/North Road. He inquired about the dimensions/sizes of various signs and stressed the backlighting was overkill.

Ms. Kruskal felt the main entrance sign was rather overwhelming and suggested the use of up-lighting rather than what was proposed.

Mr. Parker agreed the scale of the main entrance signage was excessive. Ms. Koffel concurred with comments made about excessive signage. Mr. Claussen felt the temporary signage could be removed when the units were sold.

Mr. Finnicum agreed with Design Review Board's signage comments.

Mr. Sugrue was also in agreement with Design Review Board's comments/concerns and felt the wayfinding signage was overdone.

Mr. Garvin recommended a reduction of the proposed signage and the implementation of up-lighting. He wondered if the duplexes could be multi-colored. Mr. Claussen agreed to re-evaluate the use of several colors.

Mr. Henchy recommended the signage be addressed at the start of the next Planning Board meeting. Ms. Suedmeyer stated Horsley Witten's stormwater peer review and MacMahon Associates' traffic peer review would be completed in the near future. Mr. Duchesneau commented the Zoning Board of Appeals Cold Brook Crossing public hearing would be continued on April 21, 2020, and he also discussed the possible trail connections and Route 117/North Road sidewalk.

Mr. Duchesneau stated the development's total bedroom count appeared to be off when compared to the Land Disposition and Development Agreement between the developer and the Town. Mr. Claussen

provided an explanation regarding this matter. Mr. Garvin suggested a memorandum be prepared which laid out the explanation in writing and that it be submitted to the Planning Board.

Mr. Henchy inquired as to when the traffic peer review would commence and be completed. Ms. Suedmeyer responded the traffic peer review would likely take place later in the week. Mr. Garvin mentioned Town staff customarily authorized approval of such peer reviews.

Mr. Hincks motioned to continue the public hearing for the Final Plan Approval, Plan Approval, and Stormwater Management Permits applications for 16 & 36 North Road (Cold Brook Crossing) (Assessor's Maps C12-0003, C12-0004, and C12-0100) to the Planning Board meeting on April 29, 2020. Mr. Karustis seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Mr. Garvin – Aye, Mr. Karustis – Aye, Mr. Hincks – Aye, Mr. Finnicum – Aye, and Mr. Sugrue – Aye.

Master Plan Update with Horsley Witten Group – Annotated Outline

Nate Kelly from the Horsley Witten Group was present to discuss the matter with the Planning Board. Mr. Kelly noted the Master Plan Steering Committee (MPSC) critical conversations had already taken place, with the exception of the 'Housing' topic which was scheduled for the April 17, 2020 MPSC meeting.

Mr. Kelly summarized the Annotated Outline, which included:

- Route 20 Corridor
- Economic Development
- Connectivity
- Historic and Cultural Identity
- Natural Environment
- Conservation and Recreation Land
- Town Facilities, Services, and Infrastructure
- Resiliency and Sustainability
- Public Health and Social Wellbeing
- Governance
- Future Land Use
- Housing

Mr. Kelly informed the Planning Board there was an opportunity to submit related comments. He confirmed it would be several weeks before the outline would be presented to the MPSC for review.

Mr. Garvin asked how the COVID-19 pandemic effected the Master Plan Annotated Outline and questioned if the topic would be included in the updated Master Plan. Mr. Kelly replied the inclusion of the pandemic in the Master Plan could be assessed once a state of "normalcy" was attained. He indicated such inclusion would likely be in the area of Resiliency, Public Health, and Town Facilities.

Mr. Hincks stated he felt the Annotated Outline reflected the appropriate topics. Mr. Sugrue echoed the comments of Mr. Hincks and would look forward to additional discussion regarding the Route 20 topic. Mr. Finnicum indicated he believed the topics were comprehensive. Mr. Karustis stated the outline covered important topics and was summarized effectively.

Mr. Garvin opined the Annotated Outline reflected areas of importance for the Town and the COVID-19 pandemic, and the overlay districts (Meadow Walk, Cold Brook Crossing, etc.) could be separate topics within the Annotated Outline, or could be included as subtopics. Mr. Hincks agreed with such considerations.

Mr. Finnicum asked how implementation of the Master Plan's action items would be worked into the current Annotated Outline. Mr. Kelly responded additional topic details would be thoughtfully integrated within the outline.

Mr. Kelly stated the Master Plan document would be finalized in three parts: Baseline Report (facts and figures of where Sudbury is today), Policy Framework (important issues and strategies), and Implementation (how to institutionalize plans in consideration of timeframes, etc.).

Mr. Duchesneau noted Town staff made several tweaks to the well-defined outline and expressed interest in the conversations/suggestions regarding the upcoming 'Housing' topic.

Ms. Suedmeyer commented she was pleased with the Annotated Outline and looked forward to the advancement of the plan.

Resident, MPSC member, and Zoning Board of Appeals Chair John Riordan of 12 Pendleton Road noted he did not see a separate topic for transportation included in the Annotated Outline. He felt this topic was relevant to areas outside of Route 20 in Sudbury. Mr. Riordan made comments regarding the difficulty associated with including the topic of overlay district zoning within the outline. Mr. Kelly responded the mentioned topic would be included primarily in the 'Connectivity' chapter and the 'Town Facilities, Services, and Infrastructure' chapter as well.

Resident, MPSC member, and Selectman Janie Dretler of 286 Goodman's Hill Road asked where the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail/future Mass Central Rail Trail were included in the Annotated Outline. Mr. Kelly responded the trails topics would be included in the 'Connectivity' and 'Town Facilities, Services, and Infrastructure' chapters.

Mr. Hincks confirmed the mentioned topics were well-detailed/addressed in the 'Connectivity' and 'Town Facilities, Services, and Infrastructure' chapters, as provided to the Planning Board. Mr. Kelly stressed any suggested language changes could be implemented to help advance and clarify the Annotated Outline.

Mr. Garvin stated comments would be sent to Ms. Suedmeyer and Mr. Duchesneau.

Town Meeting Zoning Bylaw Discussion

Mr. Duchesneau indicated there was a possibility the public hearing which had been held in January of 2020 regarding the proposed Zoning Bylaw Amendments would have to be conducted again if the postponement and rescheduling of the Annual Town Meeting went beyond June of 2020.

Administrative Report

There were no items to report under this topic.

Minutes for Approval: January 8, 2020

Mr. Hincks motioned to approve the January 8, 2020 minutes. Mr. Karustis seconded the motion.
Roll Call Vote: Mr. Garvin – Aye, Mr. Karustis – Aye, Mr. Hincks – Aye, Mr. Finnicum –
Recused, and Mr. Sugrue – Aye.

Future Meeting Schedule: April 29, 2020 and May 13, 2020

Mr. Garvin confirmed the future meeting schedule of April 29, 2020 and May 13, 2020. The Planning Board members agreed to start the April 29, 2020 meeting at 7:00 PM.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:10 PM.