



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

APRIL 6, 2022 AT 8:00 AM

VIRTUAL MEETING

JOINT MEETING WITH THE SUDBURY HOUSING AUTHORITY

Housing Trust Members Present: Chair Cynthia Howe, Vice Chair John Riordan, Kelley Cronin, Carmine Gentile, Robert Hummel, and Karl Pops

Housing Trust Members Absent: Janie Dretler and Susan Scotti

Sudbury Housing Authority Members Present: Chair Sherrill Cline, Vice Chair Steven Swanger, Treasurer Tania Vitvitsky, Assistant Treasurer Janet Cowan, and Amy Lepak

Sudbury Housing Authority Members Absent: None

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

Ms. Howe called the Housing Trust meeting to order and Mr. Swanger called the Sudbury Housing Authority meeting to order at 8:04 AM.

1. 67-73 Nobscot Road – Possible Property Acquisition

a. Site Feasibility Analysis Status Update, Draft Development Scenarios, and Discussion

Mr. Swanger stated it would be good to discuss the questions which the Sudbury Housing Authority and Housing Trust had regarding the 67-73 Nobscot Road property and he also noted the Cambridge Housing Authority meeting which some members had attended.

Mr. LaPointe introduced himself and noted Beals + Thomas had been conducting the site feasibility analysis for the 67-73 Nobscot Road property. He noted they had started off with field work to delineate the wetland areas, existing buildings, topography, and conducted research regarding other constraints. Beals + Thomas then compiled some concept plans for the property to be developed with a variety of scenarios based on feedback and guidance they were provided regarding unit sizes. Mr. LaPointe stated all of the proposed scenarios used the existing access driveway off of Nobscot Road and included a looped driveway around the property. He indicated that after receiving initial feedback from the 67-73 Nobscot Road Subcommittee, the proposed

scenarios were revised. Mr. LaPointe reiterated the analysis was from a high level and was intended to identify potential constraints and issues of the subject property.

At this time Matthew Cote joined the meeting.

Mr. LaPointe noted there were a number of questions which had been raised by the 67-73 Nobscot Road Subcommittee regarding the endangered species habitat located on the property and how this might impact the potential development scenarios. He stated he had experience with projects where this particular type of habitat did not eliminate potential development at the sites.

Ms. Cronin asked how far along drawings and plans needed to be when someone filed with the Natural Heritage & Endangered Species Program. Mr. LaPointe indicated that in his experience, only rough general plans needed to be submitted in order for the Natural Heritage & Endangered Species Program to understand which land areas would be disturbed. Ms. Cronin noted it would be preferable for Mr. LaPointe to point out which areas on the property were not within wetland buffer areas or endangered species habitat.

Ms. Vitvitsky asked how long the review and permitting process is with the Natural Heritage & Endangered Species Program. Mr. LaPointe indicated it was variable, but he estimated around a few of months. Mr. LaPointe then displayed a map and identified the areas outside of the wetland buffer and endangered species habitat.

At this time Ms. Cowan left the meeting.

Mr. Pops asked if getting a determination regarding the endangered species habitat was the biggest hurdle and Mr. LaPointe agreed. Mr. LaPointe stated there was a chance the Natural Heritage & Endangered Species Program would look more favorably on the proposed project because it would be a project for the Housing Trust and Sudbury Housing Authority.

Ms. Cronin inquired as to what the size of the unrestricted area would be and Mr. LaPointe stated he could calculate that area after the meeting rather easily.

Mr. LaPointe spoke to the existing buildings and felt they were arranged in a somewhat haphazard manner. He noted a new project would likely want to have a more organized and welcoming layout.

Mr. Riordan noted the proposed leaching field for the septic system was located within the wetland buffer area and he wondered if it could be located in the upland portion of the site to take it out of the buffer area. Mr. LaPointe stated that if a looped driveway was still being proposed for the development, the central area of the project could be used for the leaching field. However, he also spoke to gravity flow for the septic system at the property and if the leaching field were to be located in the upland area some amount of pumping may be required for the system. Mr. LaPointe noted this type of system with pumps would be more expensive and need more maintenance in the long run.

Mr. Riordan also inquired if there might be any type of Native American archaeological areas at the property that might greatly restrict or prohibit development at the site. Mr. LaPointe stated there are firms that conduct this type of pre-development analysis work, but it could be fairly costly if there was not a good sense you might find something.

Mr. Swanger asked about the creation of development scenarios with single-family and duplex unit development. Mr. LaPointe stated Beals + Thomas could absolutely look into this a bit more. Ms. Howe indicated that proposed development scenarios with duplexes and triplexes would be preferable. Mr. LaPointe also indicated Beals + Thomas could also provide scenarios with development only in the upland area to get a better understanding of what this might look like.

Mr. Pops noted triplex units would require sprinkler systems and therefore it was probably a good idea to stay away from these types of units in the proposed development scenarios.

There was then discussion regarding potential costs for improving the access driveway and what those improvements might entail.

Mr. Duchesneau indicated the water line would need to be extended about 150 feet southward on Nobscot Road in order to reach the access driveway.

Ms. Cline asked if the Multi-Family Zoning Requirement for Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) Communities could be applied here. Mr. Gentile noted the subject property would meet the 5-acre minimum requirement, but the property would need to be rezoned to implement this type of multi-family zoning. Discussion ensued regarding the parameters of the MBTA Communities zoning regulations and draft guidelines. Mr. Gentile and Mr. Duchesneau discussed the details of these items including the possibilities and timelines of the initiative.

Mr. Pops inquired as to what additional work would need to be conducted in order to complete the analysis report for the property. Mr. LaPointe indicated in order to get a good handle on the viability of where the septic system would be located, the soils in the location of the proposed septic system would need to be tested.

Ms. Howe raised questions regarding the ownership structure of the development and how many units would be rental versus ownership. She wondered how many duplex units there would be, the number of single-family buildings, and the total number of bedrooms. Ms. Howe noted these particular items would need to be fleshed out between the Housing Trust and Sudbury Housing Authority in the near future.

Ms. Vitvitsky wondered if the Cambridge Housing Authority could provide services to assist the Housing Trust and Sudbury Housing Authority to figure out the number of units which could be created at the site. Ms. Howe noted this was possible but could be a costly endeavor.

Mr. Swanger suggested another joint meeting of the Housing Trust and Sudbury Housing Authority be held to further discuss these issues.

Mr. Duchesneau noted he could assist in scheduling another joint meeting for the last week in April of 2022. He also indicated that at some point in the fairly near future, the Boy Scouts should be engaged more to understand what price they are seeking for the land.

Mr. Riordan discussed options for mitigating the risks when seeking to potentially enter into a purchase and sale agreement with the Boy Scouts.

The Sudbury Housing Authority and Housing Trust instructed Beals + Thomas to not develop anything further until after the next joint meeting where additional instructions would be provided.

Pat Brown of 34 Whispering Pine Road asked about the availability of the Land Planning Study for the 67-73 Nobscot Road property which had been prepared by Beals + Thomas. Mr. Duchesneau indicated he would pass the report along to her.

At 9:35 AM, Mr. Gentile made a motion to adjourn the Housing Trust meeting. Mr. Hummel seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Ms. Howe – Aye, Mr. Riordan – Aye, Ms. Cronin – Aye, Mr. Gentile – Aye, Mr. Hummel – Aye, and Mr. Pops – Aye.

At 9:35 AM, Ms. Vitvitsky made a motion to adjourn the Sudbury Housing Authority meeting. Ms. Cline seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote: Ms. Lepak – Aye, Ms. Cline – Aye, Mr. Swanger – Aye, Ms. Cowan – Absent, Ms. Vitvitsky – Aye.