



Town of Sudbury

Housing Trust

HousingTrust@sudbury.ma.us

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

MINUTES

67-73 NOBSCOT ROAD SUBCOMITTEE

JANUARY 28, 2022 AT 8:00 AM

VIRTUAL MEETING

Housing Trust Members Present: Vice Chair John Riordan, Kelley Cronin, and Karl Pops

Housing Trust Members Absent: None

Sudbury Housing Authority Members Present: Amy Lepak, Steven Swanger, and Tania Vitvitsky

Sudbury Housing Authority Members Absent: None

Others Present: Director of Planning and Community Development Adam Duchesneau, and David LaPointe and Matt Cote from Beals + Thomas

Mr. Riordan called the meeting to order at 8:02 AM.

2. 67-73 Nobscot Road – Possible Property Acquisition – Status Update, Draft Development Scenarios, and Discussion

Mr. LaPointe described the analysis process they went through and discussed the proposal. Actual wetlands and topography had been delineated for the property. He noted the wetlands on the site appeared to be fairly extensive, and indicated the existing driveway fork to the south may not be feasible to use or expand due to the wetlands. As such, their development proposals called for only using the northern fork of the southern driveway. Mr. LaPointe stated the various development scenarios displayed a looped driveway with one leaching field for all of the dwelling units on the subject property. One proposed development scenario called for freestanding dwelling units between 1,250 and 1,500 square feet with two and three bedrooms, which translated to 17 to 18 units on the subject property. A duplex unit buildout scenario would increase the total dwelling unit count upwards to 28 for the site, but the average unit size would be smaller. Mr. LaPointe indicated his team would be putting together a summary report which would provide more details regarding the engineering analysis they had conducted for the property.

Mr. Pops inquired about the access roadway from Nobscot Road and wanted to confirm the adequacy of the existing access roadway in terms of fire lane access. He wondered if a second access roadway would be required. Mr. Pops also wanted to hear more about the real possibility of

being able to renovate some or all of the existing buildings on the property. Lastly, Mr. Pops also inquired about the ability to bring utility infrastructure to the property.

Mr. LaPointe noted there were some things they had not yet been able to include in their analysis to this point. He also indicated they were not aware some soil testing had already been conducted for the property, but before their firm conducted any testing they would prefer the proposed design for the site be a little more refined. Mr. LaPointe also discussed the ability of home inspectors to gather information about each of the existing buildings and how additional utility analysis needed to be conducted for the property.

Ms. Cronin inquired as to the location of the proposed buildings and the wetland buffer boundary. Mr. LaPointe confirmed all of the proposed buildings were located outside of the wetland buffer area.

Ms. Cronin also noted the very steep hill of the existing driveway and asked how a modified driveway could be accommodated. Mr. LaPointe indicated the existing driveway would need to be expanded slightly, but there was opportunity for wetland replication on the property. He also noted there may need to be some realignment to relax the slope of the proposed driveway.

Mr. Swanger inquired about the location of the proposed expanded driveway and how it would be improved. Mr. LaPointe confirmed the expanded portion of the driveway would be improved on the subject property's land and it could perhaps even be shifted slightly off of the neighbor's property.

Mr. Swanger wondered if the soil testing which had already been conducted was outdated. Mr. LaPointe stated that soils in upland areas did not change rapidly, so the earlier soil tests were still probably very accurate.

There was then discussion regarding any development for the subject property possibly being permitted as a "friendly" Chapter 40B project, working with Town officials (as opposed to an "unfriendly" Chapter 40B project).

Mr. Swanger inquired about any contact with the neighbors at 99 Nobscot Road. Ms. Cronin indicated she had made contact with them and their main concern was a project with a significant number of dwelling units.

There was then discussion regarding using certain parameters of the existing Zoning Bylaw regulations to guide the potential development of the site. Mr. Duchesneau and Mr. LaPointe agreed that pursuing this path would be beneficial to any proposed project at the subject property.

Mr. Swanger inquired about next steps. Mr. LaPointe noted a report still needed to be compiled by his office. Mr. Duchesneau indicated the likely best next steps would be for the Subcommittee to receive that report and then to schedule the next Subcommittee meeting.

At this time Ms. Cronin left the meeting.

Mr. Riordan raised a question regarding the proposed parking at the site and how those spaces could be accommodated. Mr. LaPointe noted the plan was to have driveways with parking for each dwelling unit with potentially one-car garages, if any garages at all.

There was then discussion about coming up with three different development density scenarios. Mr. Pops suggested creating an option which reused the existing buildings under a least developed type of scenario. Mr. Riordan wondered if it was even viable to retain the existing buildings, mostly in terms of cost to make them sound and energy efficient. Mr. Swanger stated saving the buildings would have a minor overall impact on the entire project and felt it would not make much of a difference. Ms. Lepak advocated for a hybrid type of development project which would keep some of the existing buildings and create new ones. Mr. Riordan noted the current market was demanding three-bedroom dwelling units and the Subcommittee should keep that in mind if they wanted to accommodate for new families. He suggested having at least 1/3 of the dwelling units be three-bedroom units.

1. Minutes for Approval: May 27, 2021 and November 12, 2021

Mr. Swanger made a motion to approve the minutes of May 27, 2021 and November 12, 2021. Ms. Vitvitsky seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Mr. Riordan – Aye, Ms. Cronin – Absent, Ms. Lepak – Aye, Mr. Pops – Aye, Mr. Swanger – Aye, and Ms. Vitvitsky – Aye.

At 9:27 AM, Mr. Swanger made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Vitvitsky seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Mr. Riordan – Aye, Ms. Cronin – Absent, Ms. Lepak – Aye, Mr. Pops – Aye, Mr. Swanger – Aye, and Ms. Vitvitsky – Aye.