

DRAFT

Sudbury Center Improvement Advisory Committee Minutes March 21, 2007

PRESENT: Frank Riepe, Joe Sziabowski, June Allen, Deborah Kruskal, Jim Hodder, Eva MacNeill, Rich Davison, Jody Kablack

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 pm.

The minutes for December 12, 2006 were approved.

J. Kablack briefly discussed correspondence received by the SCIAC since the last meeting, consisting of a January 17, 2007 letter from Maureen Valente to First Parish, and a letter dated February 7, 2007 from First Parish indicating the results of their congregation vote on the Town Center project.

The committee then discussed the need to complete the project under the scope of work with the Cecil Group. A final report showing the preferred alternative and including many design elements such as landscaping, walkways, pavement options, use of civic spaces, etc. is included in the scope. The issue of how to proceed with Town Meeting was also discussed.

Many members of the committee felt that it would be difficult to proceed with the Attached Common design given the results of the First Parish vote and the reluctance to willingly transfer land for a 3rd lane southbound on Concord Road. Given that they are the major stakeholder, it was felt that a compromise must be reached. The committee discussed the project goals and their priority, which were developed with the input received from the public forum held in May 2006. The intent of the goals is laudable, but given their breadth and complexity, it is difficult to satisfy all of them without compromises and balances.

One of the main areas where the committee felt not enough attention was given was historic preservation. Even though the RFP was explicit in its intent that historic preservation was critical to the project, in the end we only received an inventory of the historic assets, and not enough of the context of history and changes to the center which may have helped in the creation of a design. The speed of the process may have played a part in overlooking some of these areas, as decisions were being made at each meeting and then we moved quickly on.

Another area that is a concern to members is an apparent reluctance by the engineers to design the intersection to minimum standards in order to protect the historic sensitivity of the area. Several times the issue of the signal design was requested to be investigated which may allow pole mounted signals, and it never was. Also, the turning radii for all four corners at the intersection were designed for WB-50 trucks, when the data suggests that there is minimal volume of this type of traffic.

The last issue of concern was that the creation of better civic space seemed to take precedent at the expense of the other project goals, when civic space was the lowest priority. It was also discussed that the No Name Road could likely remain, but be treated differently in order to make it less intrusive and more easily adapted to temporary civic space when the need arises. As we proceed, we need to pay better attention to the 2 major goals which are historic preservation and traffic safety (not speed).

After discussion, the members decided to take the following actions moving forward:

1. Wait until after the town election to decide on whether to request the Cecil Group complete the scope of work by preparing a final report. If the over-ride does pass, we will work with the Cecil Group to complete the report so that we have a good basis for moving forward. The report will include all the alternatives, along with the Photoshop renderings, sample sheets of amenity designs and landscaping recommendations. It will also include Cecil Group's last sketch which includes the changes along the First parish frontage with the bus drop off area, reconfigured parking area, and shorter southbound cue lane. If the over-ride does not pass, we will recommend to the Selectmen that we not complete the report as the approximately \$9,000 we have left in the contract might be better spent on the next phase of the project.
2. If the funding is approved, stress the need for a traffic engineer who is willing to design to minimum highway standards based on the site context. Articulate the need for much more refined engineering which keeps the intersection as narrow as possible but increases safety in any future RFP.
3. Investigate keeping the No Name Road open, but reconstructing it to be more aesthetic and still functional, including narrower width, different pavement type, and moving its location slightly.
4. Continue to pursue the historic context of the area in future designs.

Joe Sziabowski volunteered to speak for the SCIAC in support of the CPC article for funding of the project at Town Meeting. J. Kablack will assist by writing a presentation.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 pm.