



Town of Sudbury

Master Plan Steering Committee

MasterPlan@sudbury.ma.us

Flynn Building
278 Old Sudbury Road
Sudbury, MA 01776
978-639-3387
Fax: 978-639-3314
www.sudbury.ma.us/masterplan

MINUTES

FEBRUARY 28, 2020 AT 8:45 AM

POLICE STATION MEETING ROOM, 75 HUDSON ROAD, SUDBURY, MA

Members Present: Vice-Chair Susan Asbedian-Ciaffi, At-Large; Dan Carty, Board of Selectmen; Janie Dretler, Board of Selectmen; Nathalie Forssell, At-Large; Patricia Guthy, Commission on Disability; Jan Hardenbergh, At-Large; Dave Henkels, Conservation Commission; Ellen Joachim, Lincoln Sudbury Regional High School Committee; Lisa Kouchakdjian, Sudbury Public School Committee; Amy Lepak, Sudbury Housing Authority; Robert May, Council on Aging; John Riordan, Zoning Board of Appeals; and Dick Williamson, Park and Recreation Commission.

Members Absent: Chair John Sugrue, At-Large; Lee Swanson, Historic Districts Commission; and Fred Taylor, Historic Districts Commission.

Others Present: Fabiola Alikpokou, Staff Planner, Horsley Witten Group; Adam Duchesneau, Director of Planning and Community Development; Tom Dworetsky, Camoin Associates; Rory Fitzgerald, Fitzgerald & Halliday, Inc.; John Hincks, Planning Board Member; Nate Kelly, Principal, Horsley Witten Group; Krista Moravec, Senior Planner, Horsley Witten Group; Jennifer Roberts, Board of Selectmen; and Beth Suedmeyer, Environmental Planner.

Welcome

Ms. Asbedian-Ciaffi called the meeting to order at 8:45 a.m.

Regular Meeting Business

Approval of Meeting Minutes – November 15, 2019

Mr. Hardenbergh motioned to approve the minutes from November 15, 2019. Mr. May seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 11-0, with Ms. Dretler and Ms. Joachim absent from the vote.

Review of Packet Materials

Ms. Moravec stated the focus of the meeting would be the issues and possibilities on and along Boston Post Road/Route 20. She outlined meeting objectives:

- Confirm the type of development envisioned for Boston Post Road/Route 20 and what it should look like in the future.
- Confirm the level of commitment from the Town (public investments).

At this time Ms. Dretler arrived at the meeting.

Ms. Moravec reviewed draft formative issues related to Boston Post Road/Route 20:

- Economic Development
- Housing
- Transportation
- Potential for Redevelopment of Existing Sites: Site Capacity
- Relationship between Zoning and Sewer Improvements
- Potential Zoning Overlay District Provisions
- Potential Revised Dimensional Standards
- Potential Revised Parking Standards
- Potential Open Space Requirements
- Potential Zoning Bylaw Definition Changes
- Observations on Potential Standards for Minimum Parcel Size
- Comments on Potential Procedural Changes

Mr. Dworetsky provided an overview regarding Boston Post Road/Route 20 considerations:

- What is the current trajectory of the Town's operating budget?
- What does this mean for taxpayers?
- How do different types of development impact the Town's fiscal situation?
- How can new development lower the burden on existing taxpayers?

At this time Ms. Joachim arrived at the meeting.

Mr. Dworetsky highlighted Fiscal Year 2019 expenditures and revenues, and the 2020 Budget. He reviewed potential tax revenue trends and new growth (additional development).

Mr. Hincks asked if all Town growth was attributed to the development of single-family homes. Mr. Dworetsky responded single-family dwelling development accounted for approximately 66% of the new growth and 33% reflected new commercial development.

Mr. Dworetsky questioned the type of fiscal impact created by development in the town in consideration of revenue generated. He noted single-family dwellings with greater than two or three bedrooms tend to pose more of a negative impact on the Town's budget, especially regarding educational costs. Mr. Dworetsky stressed commercial development had the least impact on Town expenditures followed by one-bedroom senior housing units.

Ms. Lepak questioned the applicability of senior housing apartments versus condominiums. Mr. Dworetsky replied that the distinction was not distinguished. Ms. Lepak commented condominiums in the town had increased value.

Mr. Hincks inquired about the average per student expenses in Sudbury. Mr. Dworetsky indicated he did not have that answer off hand. However, he stated that on average, two school-age children per household in Sudbury was common, noting that as the population ages the number of school-age children decreases. Related discussion took place.

Ms. Kouchakdjian stated there were other expense impacts that increased as more senior housing units were developed in town, namely public services (Emergency Medical Technicians, ambulance, fire stations, accessibility, etc.).

Ms. Dretler noted the 55+ population could have children and Mr. Dworetsky recognized that fact.

Ms. Asbedian-Ciaffi indicated many seniors were aging in place, staying in their three (or more) bedroom homes, and not intending to sell these properties.

Mr. Carty stressed that all numbers mentioned were estimates. He noted increased commercial development appeared to be more beneficial than housing unit development in consideration of the return to the Town. Mr. Dworetsky confirmed the statement.

Mr. Dworetsky then provided detail regarding a proposed 4% Town budget increase in consideration of additional development as opposed to an increase in property taxes. He noted a 2% tax increase was common and would also indicate the likelihood of substantial development. Mr. Dworetsky emphasized the Town budget had increased at a significant rate over the past several years and if more improvements were made the Town would likely raise taxes and increase development. He stressed that mixed-use development was becoming increasingly popular.

Mr. Riordan asked if residential taxes were currently covering the expenses of school-related costs. Mr. Dworetsky responded in the affirmative. Mr. Riordan asked about state aid provided to education and Mr. Dworetsky indicated Sudbury did not receive much state aid. Ms. Kouchakdjian stated state aid was minimal at around \$8.00 per student and likely would be less for the upcoming year.

Mr. Hardenbergh asked if any other economic modeling for Sudbury was being considered and Mr. Duchesneau indicated there was none at the time.

Mr. Henkels stated individuals who came to work in Sudbury had annual incomes of approximately half of the resident incomes and queried about Sudbury's demography. Mr. May noted the income of Sudbury residents over 60 years old was approximately \$80,000 per year and taxes reflected a very considerable reduction of that income. Mr. Carty commented about the usual elimination of mortgage payments by retirement age.

Ms. Asbedian-Ciaffi asked if Union Street could be included in the discussions and Ms. Moravec responded affirmatively.

Mr. May asked about related zoning aspects. Ms. Moravec referred to the included zoning materials which emphasized the regulatory aspects. Mr. May stated he felt the existing zoning appeared to be very restrictive. Mr. Hincks stressed the possibilities of zoning changes and cited the Meadow Walk development as a positive example.

Mr. Riordan spoke of the expenses associated with wastewater planning and a treatment center, and noted the cost of water should be a consideration when planning for additional development along Boston Post Road/Route 20 and the surrounding area. Mr. Hincks stated Sudbury water was less costly when compared to the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority (MWRA) serviced communities.

Small Groups

Small group discussions took place.

At this time Mr. Carty left the meeting and Ms. Roberts arrived at the meeting.

Report Out & Discussion

Ms. Fitzgerald stated her group had concentrated their discussion on an area east of the Wayside Inn and the old landfill site, while also noting increased traffic congestion in town. Ms. Fitzgerald also mentioned her group had discussed various ways to attract businesses to Sudbury including complete corporate service centers and the rail trails.

Mr. Dworetsky indicated his group had focused on the types of preferred development including sites that would attract entrepreneurship and innovative companies who sought access to amenities (developing restaurants, small-scale manufacturing, etc.). He stated the group highlighted the sewer aspect, pedestrian/bicycling infrastructure, connections along Boston Post Road/Route 20, broadband access, commuter shuttle improvements, and the need to reach out to private property owners to advance partnerships for redevelopment goals.

Mr. Kelly noted his group had explored the Master Plan document in further detail. He indicated the group wanted the benefits of Boston Post Road/Route 20 development included in the Master Plan document and a listing of those benefits over a twenty or thirty year period. Mr. Kelly stated his group had indicated the Town should invest in a marketing strategy to attract prospective businesses.

Mr. Kelly stated two groups had mentioned the prospect of a marketing staff person to advance the redevelopment of the Boston Post Road/Route 20 area, including marketing and outreach. He agreed that such a staff person would be of great assistance to the Town in the long term.

Ms. Roberts commented on the development versus the redevelopment of Boston Post Road/Route 20. She suggested making better use of the existing commercial spaces along the roadway.

Next Steps

Ms. Moravec indicated the Master Plan Steering Committee (MPSC) meeting on March 13, 2020 would focus on the topic of housing and the meeting on April 17, 2020 would examine/discuss an annotated outline for the updated Master Plan. She also noted planning for public input would commence after the April meeting.

Ms. Moravec asked the MPSC members to submit comments regarding the draft Baseline Report dated February 27, 2020. She noted the draft Baseline Report would also be circulated to Town Departments for their comments and requested all comments be submitted to Mr. Duchesneau by March 20, 2020.

Mr. May asked how the Master Plan would deal with North Road/Route 117 and indicated the topic needed to be further explored by the MPSC. Ms. Asbedian-Ciaffi indicated her group discussed potential uses on North Road/Route 117; such as small, non-retail businesses and housing.

Ms. Dretler commented about the traffic implications on North Road/Route 117 and stressed the benefit of discussions with neighboring Towns regarding this matter.

Ms. Roberts asserted the Master Plan document should address what the citizens wanted for North Road/Route 117. Ms. Dretler emphasized the need for Sudbury to decide and plan for what North Road/Route 117 should be in the future or the Town would lose its preference for such planning. Various planning concepts were discussed briefly.

Adjourn – Next Meeting March 13, 2020

Mr. Hardenbergh motioned to adjourn the meeting at approximately 11:30 a.m. Mr. Williamson seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 12-0, with Mr. Carty absent from the vote.