

CASES 10-9,10, 11,12,13
Sudbury Housing Authority
11 Ford Road, 19 Greenwood Road,
41 Great Road; 56 Great Road;
and 10 Landham Rd

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING
SUDBURY BOARD OF APPEALS
Monday, February 8, 2010

The Board consisted of:

Jonathan G. Gossels, Acting Chairman; Nancy G. Rubenstein, Clerk; Stephen A. Garanin; Elizabeth T. Quirk; and Benjamin D. Stevenson

Also: Jody Kablack, Director of Planning and Community Development

For the Applicant:

Joshua Fox, Rollins, Rollins and Fox; Jo-Ann Howe, Sudbury Housing Authority; Rebecca Mautner, Affordable Housing Development Consultant; John Gwozdz, Meridian Associates; Carol Burns, Taylor and Burns; Lydia Pastuszek, SHA; and Judy Deutsch, SHA.

Notice was published in the *Sudbury Town Crier* on January 21 and January 29, 2010, posted, mailed and read at this hearing.

Mr. Gossels, acting as Chairman, explained to those in attendance that the Zoning Board of Appeals is governed by M.G.L., chapter 40B, Sections 20-23, the Sudbury Supplemental Rules for Comprehensive Permit Rules and State regulations 760 CMR 31.

Documents received for February 8, 2010 included the following:

- Sudbury Housing Authority Applications
- Exhibit 18: Soils and Structural Report, received 2/8/2010
- 2/5/2010 memo from Jody Kablack, with Feb 18, 2008 pre-application meeting notes.
- 2/4/2010 e-mail from neighbor, Morgan Molloy, expressing concerns for the project
- 2/5/2010 e-mail from Building Inspector Jim Kelly clarifying allowed square footage of sheds
- 1/28/2010 letter from Design Review Board
- 2/8/3020 memo from Health Director Bob Leupold
- 2/8/2010 List of waivers
- 2/1/2010 Letter of support from Thomas B. Arnold, Faith in Action Committee, First Parish of Sudbury
- Undated letter of support from former Sudbury Resident and recipient of SHA benefits
- Undated letter of support from Lisa Caruso, 24 Maybury Road, Sudbury
- Undated letter of support from Roberta Glass, Sudbury League of Women Voters
- 11/4/2009 letter of support from Senator Susan Fargo and Senator James Eldridge
- 11/9/2009 letter of support from State Representative Thomas Conroy
- Undated letter of support from Eric Herstine, Church Council Chairperson and Rev. Joel B. Guillemette, Sudbury United Methodist Church
- Undated letter of support from Rev. D. William McIvor, Presbyterian Church in Sudbury
- Undated letter of support from Pastor Christopher George Hoyer, St. John Evangelical Lutheran Church
- 11/24/2009 letter of support from Rev. Katie Lee Crane, First Parish of Sudbury Unitarian Universalist

CASES 10-9,10, 11,12,13
Sudbury Housing Authority
11 Ford Road, 19 Greenwood Road,
41 Great Road; 56 Great Road;
and 10 Landham Rd

Mr. Fox spoke on behalf of the Sudbury Housing Authority (SHA). He explained that the SHA has proposed five duplexes at five addresses where there are presently single-family houses all owned and managed by the SHA. Four of the duplexes have similar footprints and would require demolition of the existing houses prior to construction. The exception is 10 Landham Road which has a footprint of 850 square feet and would remain in place with a duplex addition attached onto it creating a total of three units on the property. The five duplexes would increase Sudbury's affordable housing stock by six units. Mr. Fox said the waivers to be requested would be minor in scale.

Mr. Fox then provided an overview of the project, describing the SHA, its mission, and other properties the SHA manages in town. He said that while the SHA will also monitor the project, the SHA also plans to hire an owners' representative to oversee the project. State and Town permitting agencies would monitor the sites. He projected that the time frame for the project would most likely be twelve months. Mr. Fox then read nine letters of support that were submitted for the file.

Mr. Fox then gave a site by site analysis. The SHA has met with the Sudbury Design Review Board (DRB) and has obtained a letter of support from the DRB. The DRB suggested that the Zoning Board of Appeals place a condition on the size of the sheds, so that they would measure 100 square feet, which is less than the 120 square feet preferred by the SHA and is allowed by the bylaw. The DRB also requested a handicapped rail for the site that would be designated as an accessible unit.

41 Great Road would have a footprint similar to the existing house. The four bedroom duplex would measure 20,000 square feet and have 100 feet of frontage. Each unit would measure approximately 1,230 square feet, which Mr. Fox said was smaller than most new construction in Sudbury. The front setback would measure forty-five feet, which Jody Kablack, Director of Planning and Community Development, said was farther back than the existing structure, which has a forty foot setback.

Mr. Gossels asked why the duplex would be so close to the road when the traditional front setback is sixty feet. Mr. Fox said that the use of modular construction positioned essentially in the same location as the existing houses would minimize disturbance to the sites. Rebecca Mautner, Affordable Housing Development Consultant, said that moving the house at 41 Great Road back farther would require relocating the septic system and disturb existing trees. Jo-Ann Howe said that shorter driveways allow for easier snow management.

Mr. Fox presented the Board with a list of waivers to be requested.

Carol Burns, architect with Taylor and Burns, discussed the aesthetic features of the duplex. She said that the design attempted to fit in with the existing context. Each unit would have two bedrooms. The model would be similar to the Fairbank Circle development. Materials would include vinyl siding, asphalt shingles, double-hung, vinyl windows, and a block foundation.

Mr. Gossels asked why the roof height proposed was thirty-five feet. Ms. Burns said that she was not aware that the maximum height limit was twenty-eight feet. Mr. Gossels said that he would be more comfortable with a roof height of 30 feet.

Mr. Fox pointed out each duplex had only one front entry to that they would look like single-family dwellings.

CASES 10-9,10, 11,12,13
Sudbury Housing Authority
11 Ford Road, 19 Greenwood Road,
41 Great Road; 56 Great Road;
and 10 Landham Rd

Mr. Fox reported that 56 Great Road, as proposed, is slightly larger than 41 Great Road at approximately 2,000 square feet with a three bedroom and one bedroom layout. The front setback is to measure 49 feet, the rear setback 119 feet, and the side setbacks are to measure 20 feet. Frontage measures 100 feet. The percentage of impervious surface is 17.5 percent. The same construction materials are to be used as at #41 Great Road and the style is to be more of a farmhouse style. This duplex would be constructed for handicapped access. The access ramp would be u-shaped and would be located at the side of the house rather than in the front.

11 Ford Road would also have a three bedroom unit and a one bedroom unit configuration. There would be 150 feet of frontage. The total square feet of finished area would measure 2,000 square feet. The front setback would measure 48 feet, the rear 120 feet, and the side setbacks would measure 43 feet. This proposal meets the 15 percent impervious surface requirement and so a waiver would not be required for this.

19 Greenwood is situated on a corner lot. One driveway is located at Greenwood Road and one is located at Curry Lane. The lot measures 30,000 square feet. The building will have 180 feet of frontage and the finished area would be 2,166 square feet. The front setback will be 50 feet, the rear setback will be 85 feet, and the side setbacks will measure 56 feet. Impervious surface will cover 15 percent of the lot.

The plan for 10 Landham Road calls for preserving the existing house on Eddy Street. The duplex addition would measure 886 square feet, and the two bedroom configuration would be located at the far end of the lot near the Framingham Town Line.

Mr. Gossels asked about landscaping. Mr. Fox said there would be lawn at the septic area. Mr. Gossels wanted more plantings to screen the house from the neighbor. Mr. Fox said that there would be a screen of arborvitae or other evergreens that would diminish the view from the neighboring house. There was approximately 150 feet between the two dwellings. There have been numerous discussion about driveway configurations that would include a turn-around driveway. There would be a significant amount of impervious surface needed but the trade-off is safety for cars entering from and exiting onto a busy road.

Mr. Fox said that the combined structure would total 2,220 square feet. At the Eddy Street side the setback would measure 18 feet. From the duplex side there would be a 31 foot setback from Landham Road. Ms. Quirk asked whether the orientation of the structure was due to driveway placement. Ms. Burns said that it was. Ms. Rubenstein asked whether the house could be turned so that the driveway could be reconfigured. Mr. Fox pointed out the location of the septic system and Ms. Burns added that building placement is somewhat limited by the septic plan. The Board discussed with the applicant the possibility of a variance being needed.

Mr. Gossels asked whether any Board members had additional questions for the applicant.

Ms. Quirk wanted to know whether there were currently tenants in any of the buildings. Ms. Howe said that there were only tenants currently occupying 19 Greenwood.

Mr. Gossels then asked whether any members of the audience had any questions.

Steven Greene, 36 Elaine Road, noted that there are four sites located in North Sudbury. He said that he heard that there were restrictions on building placement caused by septic system locations, but he said

that he did not understand why the restrictions need to remain if the septic systems are going to be replaced with new ones and could changes be made when installing new systems. Ms. Burns said that the septic systems have to be close to the houses so that vegetation is not disturbed and so there will be less overall disturbance on the sites. The intention is that the septic location will be the same but the systems would all be new systems.

Bill Senecal, 20 Elsbeth Road, said that he was concerned that four of the duplexes were located in close proximity to one another. He wanted to know what the overall concept would look like on a small lot. He also wanted to know how the duplexes, in close proximity, would impact the neighborhood complexion.

Mr. Fox said that all of the lots are consistent with other neighborhood lots.

Mr. Senecal said that he felt that the use of the lot was different, however.

Mr. Fox said that the duplexes would comprise the same number of bedrooms as they currently have and due to the re-use of the existing footprints, they have essentially the same configuration as what is currently on each site.

Morgan Molloy, 12 Elsbeth Road, wanted to know the timeline of the projects. He explained that he noticed that 11 Ford Road and other sites have been abandoned since December. He was concerned about the vacant properties.

Mr. Fox explained that the SHA is currently applying for financing with the Department of Housing and Community Development. It would take between four and six months for funds to be awarded. He anticipated that if funded construction could begin in the spring of 2011.

Mr. Gossels then suggested the Board and applicant walk through each of the properties.

Beginning with 41 Great Road he asked if there were any neighbor concerns.

Mr. Fox said that the SHA had three meetings to which the neighbors were invited. He noted that the meetings were not site-specific meetings, but rather "all-project" meetings. He reminded those in attendance that the SHA office is always open for people to come in and discuss the plans.

Ms. Howe said that she did not meet with anyone individually but that abutters did have a meeting.

Mr. Gossels asked if there were any changes to the plans since the neighbor meetings.

Mr. Fox said that tree clearing had been reduced and driveway siting had been changed. Ms. Burns added that the designs have been changing because when there is a change at one site all of the site designs must change. Goals were to leave the tree canopy and add strategic fencing along property lines.

Ms. Quirk expressed concerns about the Great Road properties and about residents backing out onto Great Road. There was discussion about how to handle the driveway when four cars could be using the driveway and there were snowbanks to contend with.

Mr. Fox said that the designers had battled with the amount of impervious surface and where to locate the turnaround which would lessen the impervious surface. Mr. Gossels suggested the use of pavers in some places.

Mr. Stevenson asked about the exterior finish being vinyl. Ms. Burns said that they were also considering hardy-plank, but that it was more expensive than vinyl. Wood poses many maintenance issues.

Mr. Molloy asked whether a landscaping plan had been submitted. Mr. Fox said not at this time. Meetings will be held with the Planning Board and Conservation Commission prior to submittal. He reminded Mr. Molloy to visit the SHA if he had further suggestions. Mr. Molloy was concerned about neighbor input and said that he did not think that neighbor notification about the meetings was timely enough. He added that he thought that things were in place already.

Ms. Quirk reminded the attendees that these were preliminary plans and there were likely to be many revisions to come.

Glen Davis, Trustee for the resident at 35 Greenwood, said that in general his mother is in full agreement with the duplex project. He said that new homes will continue to be built throughout this area but he wanted to ensure that the architecture was thoughtful enough to be nice-looking in fifteen to twenty years.

In regard to 56 Great Road, Ms. Quirk said that she had the same comment as earlier about the amount of impervious surface that would be used.

In the discussion of 11 Ford Road, Ms. Kablack asked whether new addresses were received yet from the Town Engineer. In Ms. Kablack's memo she noted that the Town Engineer had questions about the driveway location. Mr. Fox said that measurements will be on the plan.

John Sorvillo, 27 Ford Road, said that he was concerned about the complexion of the neighborhood. He had concerns about the structure and design and also about the screening process for who inhabits the duplexes. He wanted to know who monitors the residents. Ms. Howe said that the SHA handles all of the screening and monitors the signing of the lease. The SHA also conducts periodic site inspections throughout the lease term. She also said that neighbors are also good at monitoring their neighbors when there are cases of negligent tenants. Mr. Fox added that the SHA has the same interests and is aligned with Sudbury residents in wanting to ensure that good tenants are taking care of the properties. The SHA does give preference to Town employees and those with Sudbury connections.

With 19 Greenwood, Ms. Burns said that after an abutter's meeting the driveway was moved so it was not located directly across from the Curry Road neighbor where headlights could become an issue.

In response to a question that was asked about the number of children that could occupy the duplexes, Ms. Kablack said that single-family houses have more bedrooms typically and therefore more children at each site. With duplexes there are likely to be fewer children due to bedroom number per unit.

In regard to 10 Landham Road, Mr. Garanin said that he was not pleased with the amount of driveway. Ms. Rubenstein asked whether the driveway needed to be as deep as it was. She also suggested turning the house slightly to alter the driveway position. Ms. Kablack noted that it might intrude upon the side yard setback, however she agreed that moving the house might work. Ms. Howe said that the existing

CASES 10-9,10, 11,12,13
Sudbury Housing Authority
11 Ford Road, 19 Greenwood Road,
41 Great Road; 56 Great Road;
and 10 Landham Rd

residents had requested a larger parking area but given that family circumstances had changed perhaps they did not need that large of a driveway. Ms. Burns said that the Fire Chief had discussed the driveway width for the duplex side only.

Mr. Garanin asked about the possibility of tearing down the existing house. Ms. Howe said that the house was left to the SHA in the former resident's will and so the SHA needs to own it and there are deed restrictions on it.

There were no further questions from the Board or audience. The hearing was continued to Monday, March 8, 2010 at 7:30 p.m. in the Lower Town Hall Meeting Room.

Jonathan G. Gossels, Acting Chair

Elizabeth T. Quirk

Nancy G. Rubenstein

Benjamin D. Stevenson

Stephen A. Garanin