



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

JUNE 2, 2020 AT 7:00 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 7:00 PM.

Continued Public Hearing – Final Plan Approval, Plan Approval, and Stormwater Management Permits – 16 & 36 North Road (Cold Brook Crossing) (Assessor’s Maps C12-0003, C12-0004, and C12-0100)

Applicants Chris Claussen and Chris Kennedy, Matt Mrva of Bohler Engineering, and attorney William Henchy were present to discuss the matter with the Planning Board. Attorney John Witten from Town Counsel (KP Law) was also present on behalf of the Town.

Mr. Claussen began by going over a presentation and noted he would address the Planning Board’s requests for follow-up regarding the following matters:

- Townhouse Landscaping
- Wastewater
- Signage
- Correspondence from resident Ralph Tyler

Mr. Claussen provided details regarding the landscaping proposal for the townhouses at the site.

Mr. Mrva referred to the specific Landscaping Plan associated with each type of proposed townhouse.

Mr. Duchesneau inquired about the proposed pavement treatment plan and the sidewalks/walkways across Cold Brook Drive. Mr. Claussen responded such planning had not been finalized and noted a paver transition might be used to designate the crosswalk area. Mr. Duchesneau stressed that for safety considerations, the delineation of such a roadway crossing would be important. Mr. Mrva noted stamped asphalt might be an effective solution for this area and Mr. Duchesneau agreed.

Ms. Suedmeyer asked if native plantings had been worked into the Landscape Plan. Mr. Mrva indicated the plantings chosen were adaptive to the New England landscape, if not native.

Mr. Karustis stated his preference for native plant species, if possible.

Mr. Hincks mentioned the Landscape Plan looked like a “representative plan” and not an actual plan. Mr. Mrva presented a more detailed Landscape Plan and Mr. Hincks found the plan to be satisfactory.

Mr. Hincks inquired about evaluating the adequacy of the Landscape Plan post-construction, in consideration of privacy and shade. Mr. Claussen responded it would take several years for the plantings to mature and the cost associated with implementing mature plantings would be prohibitively expensive. He also noted there was currently absolutely no landscaping on the subject property.

Mr. Shah stressed the importance of landscaping and asked if townhouse residents would be allowed to plant or install fencing within their backyards. Mr. Mrva indicated townhouse owners would be able to plant along the foundation of their units, but fencing would not be allowed due to provided landscaping/maintenance service.

Mr. Sugrue agreed that landscaping on the site was critical and stated the landscaping plans seemed reasonable.

Mr. Finnicum noted the first three townhouse units would benefit from additional screening in consideration of headlights from vehicles entering the development. He questioned the privacy aspect with the attached units. Mr. Finnicum also suggested the Applicants tweak the Landscape Plan by providing native species and additional groundcover which would decrease the use of herbicides and maintenance. Mr. Mrva responded such improvements/changes would be seriously considered.

Mr. Garvin suggested the addition of street trees that were more salt-resistant and the inclusion of pollinating vegetation. He asked for additional screening around the wastewater treatment plant and common buildings, as seen from North Road/Route 117. Mr. Claussen responded much of that land was within the Sudbury Water District’s property and the details of additional screening in that area were still being ironed out.

There were no public comments made at this time.

Wastewater Discussion

Mr. Claussen confirmed his team had provided a written response to the peer review comments, as well as the comments from Town staff and the Planning Board which included:

- Item #8 – Switch to Ductile Iron Pipe (DIP).
- Item #9 – Screen system to protect membranes in pre-treatment tanks and provision for affluent filters instead of screen system.
- Item #10 – Granulated Activated Carbon (GAC) inclusion, if necessary.
- Item #24 – Clarification the owner of the wastewater treatment facility (WWTF) was Quarry North Road, LLC (the Applicant) and noted the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) had required a one-time contribution which was 24% of the established construction cost.

Mr. Duchesneau requested related follow-up with Tom Lee of the Horsley Witten Group, the Town’s wastewater peer reviewer, at the next Planning Board meeting on June 10, 2020.

Mr. Garvin recommended the Planning Board hear from the Sudbury Water District regarding the wastewater treatment aspect of the project. Ms. Suedmeyer stated she had spoken with Vincent Roy of the Sudbury Water District and Mr. Roy indicated the Water District would provide the Planning Board with comments by the end of the week.

Mr. Finnicum inquired about GAC treatment. Mr. Claussen replied the treatment would be provided once per year and indicated he would confirm the schedule for the Planning Board.

There were no public comments made at this time.

Comments Regarding Ralph Tyler's Letter

Mr. Henchy provided details regarding the Applicant's submission of an appropriate wastewater management plan, which dispelled Mr. Tyler's suppositions regarding inappropriate affluent treatment. Mr. Henchy also noted the proposed extraordinary wastewater treatment plan exceeded regulatory requirements. The Planning Board agreed with Mr. Henchy's explanation.

Cold Brook Crossing Signage

Mr. Claussen presented the changes to the proposed signage per the Design Review Board's recommendations, including temporary signage.

John Riordan of 12 Pendleton Road and Chair of the Zoning Board of Appeals recommended incorporating signage similar to the signs used at the Paper Store on Boston Post Road/Route 20. He noted the Cold Brook Crossing signage Special Permit application would be discussed by the Zoning Board of Appeals at their meeting on June 8, 2020.

Mr. Sugrue agreed with the appropriateness of the Paper Store signage and appreciated the changes to the proposed signage which had been made. Mr. Sugrue indicated he favored the backlighting concept utilized at the Paper Store.

Mr. Hincks commented he preferred the presented signage plan and would endorse it.

Mr. Karustis indicated the signage plan looked good and he recommended the back lit lighting be used in consideration of dark sky compliance.

Mr. Finnicum affirmed his preference for a simplified entry sign. He stressed the importance of dark sky compliant lighting for the signage.

Mr. Shah stated the entry signage could be further simplified given the character of North Road/Route 117 and recommended the proposed pillars be eliminated and back lighting added. Mr. Finnicum agreed with Mr. Shah's suggestions.

Mr. Duchesneau asked if Mr. Shah and Mr. Finnicum would consider removal of the cap element on the wall as well. Mr. Shah responded the cap feature served a design purpose.

Mr. Garvin also agreed with the elimination of the proposed entry pillars and the inclusion of signage with the backlighting feature.

Mr. Hincks asked if the Planning Board preferred the back-lit lighting for the signage. Mr. Shah, Mr. Finnicum, Mr. Sugrue, and Mr. Garvin favored the back-lit signage.

Mr. Sugrue, Mr. Shah, Mr. Karustis, and Mr. Garvin preferred the elimination of the pillars.

There were no public comments made at this time.

Mr. Shah offered to compile the Planning Board member's recommendations/comments regarding the proposed signage for the project. Mr. Claussen noted the Design Review Board did not want the back-lit signage included due to its commercial nature. Mr. Duchesneau affirmed the Special Permit process for the signage was under the purview of the Zoning Board of Appeals. Mr. Garvin added the Zoning Board of Appeals would be considering the recommendations from the Planning Board and Design Review Board.

Mr. Finnicum stressed the critical importance of having dark sky compliant lighting. Mr. Duchesneau confirmed he would compile the Planning Board's comments, submit them to Mr. Shah for review and approval, and then submit everything to the Zoning Board of Appeals and Mr. Claussen.

Categories to Cover at the June 10, 2020 Planning Board Meeting:

- Wastewater discussion conclusion with written draft including responses
- Stormwater Considerations
- Building Architecture Review
- Summary of Signage determination by the Zoning Board of Appeals

Mr. Karustis requested sidewalks be included on a future agenda for the Cold Brook Crossing project. Mr. Garvin was in agreement and requested the topic of traffic be presented at a future meeting as well. Mr. Duchesneau noted the June 24, 2020 agenda would include the Cold Brook Crossing items of traffic, sidewalks, and any other related items.

A discussion regarding the berm along North Road/Route 117 then took place.

Mr. Hincks motioned to continue the public hearing for the Final Plan Approval, Plan Approval, and Stormwater Management Permits – 16 & 36 North Road (Cold Brook Crossing) (Assessor's Maps C12-0003, C12-0004, and C12-0100) to the Planning Board meeting on June 10, 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

Mr. Duchesneau confirmed the consultants, the Horsley Witten Group, were refining aspects of the draft updated Master Plan. He noted that in several weeks the Master Plan Steering Committee and the Planning Board would get a first look at those revisions and refined plan.

Town Meeting Zoning Bylaw Discussion

Mr. Duchesneau suggested the Planning Board schedule a meeting date to conduct the second proposed Zoning Bylaw amendments public hearing. Mr. Garvin recommended having the public hearing on August 12, 2020.

Janie Dretler of 286 Goodman's Hill Road and member of the Board of Selectmen asked if the Planning Board was considering a joint meeting with the Board of Selectmen to discuss the proposed Zoning Bylaw amendments. Mr. Duchesneau responded he could come before the Board of Selectmen to present the proposed Zoning Bylaw amendments on behalf of the Planning Board.

Ms. Dretler stated she had no preference as to whom would be presenting those proposed Zoning Bylaw amendments to the Board of Selectmen (Mr. Duchesneau or the Planning Board in a joint session meeting).

Mr. Duchesneau agreed to present the proposed Zoning Bylaw amendments to the Board of Selectmen with scheduling direction from Town Manager Henry Hayes. Mr. Garvin stated the Planning Board would be agreeable to a joint meeting with the Board of Selectmen, if ultimately desired.

Administrative Report

Mr. Duchesneau indicated the Town was continuing to evaluate a re-opening process, but no specific timeline had been announced. He noted the state would be progressing to Phase 2 on June 8, 2020, which would allow restaurants and other businesses to open on a limited basis.

Future Meeting Schedule: June 10, 2020 and June 24, 2020

The Planning Board members indicated they had no scheduling conflicts with attending the meetings scheduled for June 10, 2020 and June 24, 2020.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at approximately 9:20 PM.