

SUDBURY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
MINUTES
MAY 9, 2016

The Board consisted of:

Jonathan F.X. O'Brien, Chair; Jonathan G. Gossels; Jeffrey P. Klofft; Nicholas B. Palmer, Clerk; Jonathan W. Patch (Associate); and Benjamin Stevenson (Associate). For petitions 16-5, 16-12 and 16-13. And John Riordan for petitions for 15-39, 15-40, 15-41.

Also present at the meeting on behalf of the Town were: Jody Kablack, Planning & Community Development Director.

The meeting was opened at 7:30 p.m.

Mr. O'Brien opened the hearing by asking the Clerk to read the notice as published in the newspaper.

1. Public Hearing Case 16-12 – Seaver Properties, LLC Applicant and Owner for a Special Permit under the provisions of Section 2460B of the Zoning Bylaw, to construct a dwelling of approximately 3,625 s.f. after demolition, which will exceed the total floor area of the original structure, property shown on Town Map B07-0138, 12 Maybury Road, Residential Zone A-1.

Paul Carter for Seaver Construction the applicant was present at the Hearing. He is re-submitting this application with minor changes compared to the previous application.

The applicant changed the height of the dwelling to approximately 33 feet; the height before was 34 $\frac{3}{4}$ feet.

Mr. O'Brien noted that the applicant reduced the height of the property by less than two feet. Mr. Klofft mentioned that the design of the house was also slightly changed.

Mr. Carter replied that the roof pitch was changed, the foundation was designed 6 inches further into the ground.

Mr. O'Brien asked specifications about the attic.

The applicant replied that it is an unfinished attic with stairs, and that the application square footage accurately reflects the size of the home.

Mr. Gossels stated that even though the attic is unfinished the stairs that lead to it are finished.

Mr. Carter replied that the designs that Seaver Construction does typically include an unfinished attic. Mr. Klofft stated that he feels comfortable with the size of the house.

No neighbors were present for this case.

Motion was made, seconded and voted unanimously to approve Petition 16-12 with the standard Special Permit conditions.

2. Public Hearing Case 16-13 – David J. Howe, Home Development Corp., Applicant, and James T. Sutherland, Owner, for a Special Permit under the provisions of Section 2420 of the Zoning Bylaw, to permit the extension of a non-conforming lot for the construction of a 24.6 x 31.6 square foot addition to be added to the existing dwelling, which will result in a front yard setback deficiency of

SUDBURY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
MINUTES
MAY 9, 2016

1.6 feet and a side yard deficiency of 9.3 feet., property shown on Town Map F04-0221, 14 Beechwood Ave., Residential Zone A-1.

Mr. Howe was present at the hearing. He began explaining the setbacks of the proposed extension, stating that they are about 11 feet away from the property line with an encroachment of about 9 feet. He stated that this is consistent with the neighborhood, and that this proposal is very much in keeping with the neighborhood.

Mr. Howe explained that he is adding a garage with a master suite above. He tried to keep everything very much in scale with the existing structure and lot; and very carefully considered the design. The height of the proposed addition will be 25 feet, very scaled down for a cape style house.

Mr. O'Brien asked the applicant if he is going to live in this home, and he the replied that he will not.

Mr. O'Brien asked if the applicant would consider planting some trees and shrubs to help with the impact to the abutting homes.

Mr. Howe replied that he is open to adding to the current vegetation.

Mr. Klofft stated that in his opinion, due to the constraints of the site, the applicant should consider installing a fence, along the property line. However, Mr. Klofft noted that this could impact the ability of a ladder to be placed at a proper angle in case of an emergency.

Mr. Gossels thinks that a vegetative screen between this house and the house next door is a good idea and he asked the applicant if he is willing to sit down with the neighbor and together draw an informal landscaping plan.

Mr. Palmer asked if the new plan proposes a new bedroom.

Mr. Howe replied that they are not adding a new bedroom, that they are relocating a bedroom, and that he is ok with the request of submitting a landscape plan as condition for this decision.

Motion was made, seconded and voted unanimously to approve Petition 16-13 as amended with the condition to submit an informal landscape plan to be agreed by the neighbors in order to preserve privacy with and evergreen screen of shrubs, and the standard Special Permit conditions.

3. CONTINUATION - Public Hearing Case 15-39 – Applicant BPR Development LLC C/O National Development, Owner Raytheon Company, for a Special Permit under the provisions of Section 3290 to install an Aluminum sign of approximately 148 square feet on the East Elevation Main Entry at property shown on Town Map K07-0011 and K07-0013, 526 and 528 Boston Post Road, LID and Res A-1. To be immediately continued to March 7, 2016.
4. CONTINUATION - Public Hearing Case 15-40 – Applicant BPR Development LLC C/O National Development, Owner Raytheon Company, for a Special Permit under the provisions of Section 3290 to install an Aluminum sign of approximately 96 square feet on the East Elevation Secondary Entry, property shown on Town Map K07-0011 and K07-0013, 526 and 528 Boston Post Road, LID and Res A-1. To be immediately continued to March 7, 2016.
5. CONTINUATION - Public Hearing Case 15-41 – Applicant BPR Development LLC C/O National Development, Owner Raytheon Company, for a Special Permit under the provisions of Section 3290 to install an Aluminum sign of approximately 96 square feet on the South Elevation Facing Route

SUDBURY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
MINUTES
MAY 9, 2016

20, property shown on Town Map K07-0011 and K07-0013, 526 and 528 Boston Post Road, LID and Res A-1. To be immediately continued to March 7, 2016.

Steve Senna from National Development was present at the hearing. He updated the Board in regards to these applications for signage.

Mr. Senna stated that they have met with the Design and Review Board and with the Planning Board and both Boards have approved their design.

The application for the signs was amended because Whole Foods updated their logo and the design itself is now smaller and more round than rectangular.

Mr. Stevenson had a question about the sign label "D" on the plan.

Mr. Senna clarified that this is not a sign, that the tenant has this by right and described this as a sun-window screen vinyl film on the glass, that will not have a logo on it.

Mr. Riordan asked the applicant about the size of the sign labeled "D", because it appears to be much larger than the other signs, and it seems unnecessary since this window will be facing the Avalon development.

Mr. O'Brien clarified that sign D is not part of this application.

Mr. Senna explained that the sign for the Whole Foods brand actually changed, therefore the signs currently are smaller in size.

Mr. O'Brien read the current sign sizes being discussed: Sign A to be 81 square feet, sign B to be 27.66 square feet and sign C to be 97.24 square feet.

Mr. Gossels asked about the lighting that will be use on this signs.

Mr. Senna replied that the signs will be internally illuminated according to the town's Bylaw.

Motion was made, seconded and voted unanimously to approve Petition 15-39, 15-40 and 15-41 per the Summary of Dimensional Changes, dated February 19, 2016.

6. Public Hearing Case 16-5 - Sudbury Avalon, Inc., Applicant and BPR Sudbury Development LLC, Owner, for a Comprehensive Permit pursuant to Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 40B, Sections 20-23, and 760 CMR 56.04, for the construction of a 250-unit rental apartment community, 25% of which will be affordable, on a 17.4 + acre parcel, property shown on Town Map K07-0011 and 0013, 526 and 528 Boston Post Road, Zoned Limited Industrial District and Residential A-1.

Mr. O'Brien opened the continued 40B hearing by noting the applicant requested closing the hearing after the next meeting on June 6th. Some Board members had a conflict on June 6th, so the next meeting will be rescheduled for June 29th, with hopes for a decision by July 11th.

Mr. O'Brien noted that Nancy Rubenstein was unable to attend tonight's meeting, her second absence for this project. Ben Stephenson would now be stepping in as the voting member. He then noted the following correspondence:

1. Sanborn Associates letter describing environmental conditions dated 2/4/16
2. TRC Environmental dated 4/8/16
3. Vanasse & Associates – email dated 4/26/16

4. MDM conceptual access & egress plan dated 4/29/16
5. Vanasse & Associates traffic & engineering peer review dated 5/3/16
6. Avalon Bay letter in response to memo from Director of Planning & Community Development dated 5/5/16
7. Avalon Bay affirmative fair marketing plan & lottery guidelines sample dated March 2015 received 5/5/16
8. David Gillespie (Avalon Bay) email in response to Bill Place's memo dated 5/6/16

Tonight's discussion will focus on physical site constraints, stormwater, wastewater, clearing & grading. Applicant is also willing to discuss lighting & other matters that may be outstanding. Ms. Kablack added traffic to the discussion list, saying that the traffic peer review consultant was there tonight, as well.

Mr. Gillespie began with updates on the Master Development Plan process. The Whole Foods Market has been approved by both the Planning Board and the ZBA, and is now preparing for demolition and site work. The other elements – the mixed-retail and the senior housing – will be decided at the Special Town Meeting on June 13th. Infrastructure improvements along Rte. 20 are approaching 25% design & will soon be submitted to MassDOT, following final review from Gravistar. The initial feasibility study of the wastewater treatment facility (WWTF) is complete with positive results with the ground's ability to accept the increased amount of effluent. Treatment options are being evaluated with DEP & the Board of Health. They have received their MEPA Certificate, and the Superseding Order of Conditions from the previously appealed Order of Conditions has been received as well.

Avalon Bay is meeting with the Housing Authority on May 10 to go over the fair housing compliance. They are also meeting with the Design Review Board on May 11.

Vinod Kalikiri, the applicant's traffic engineer from VHB, updated the Board on traffic management at the site. This is a comprehensive study of the entire development, not just the residential portion. They looked at traffic and transportation as an overall component of the entire Master Development Plan, not just the residential application that is currently before this Board.

Mr. Gossels asked what was MassDOT's conclusion? Mr. Kalikiri said MassDOT concurred that the improvements outlined in the study were the types of improvements that are needed to offset the impacts of the project and improve existing deficiencies. All details of the design will be worked through with the District and the engineers in the Boston office. The time of day, distribution of trips, the analysis assumptions & the methodology were all vetted by MassDOT before they even prepared the study. They agreed with the methodology & findings. The study area goes from Horse Pond Rd. to Landham Rd.

Findings – entire Meadow Walk site:

- There will be less traffic during peak periods than the existing use currently generates. Traffic trips generated now are more spread out throughout the day, and are more likely to be consolidated trips due to the many destinations within the site.
- Improvements will address existing traffic & safety deficiencies & offset project impacts for the full build-out of the development, not just the residential portion in this application.
- Improvements will have multi-modal considerations.

Findings – Avalon Bay residential portion:

- The residential portion generates only a portion of the full build-out traffic & only a portion of the current office/R&D use, estimated at 20%-35% of the overall traffic in this area.
- The low traffic volumes from the residences alone do not warrant a signalized driveway or other traffic improvements.
- Sight-lines at the driveways are maintained.
- The on-site traffic circulation will integrate the residences with the overall development.

Improvements would line up a signalized driveway with the existing westerly driveway of the Sudbury Plaza. This is a 5-way, fully actuated signal, also integrating Highland Ave., an un-signalized private way. This also includes a pedestrian-actuated signal. There will be turn lane enhancements, so through traffic can flow past those waiting to turn.

Mr. Klofft asked if there were any turning restrictions for Sudbury Plaza, turning left heading westbound? Mr. Kalikiri said that they were currently in talks with Sudbury Plaza/Gravistar to make sure this plan works for them. But currently, there are no restrictions on this plan, which is being advanced to 25% design. The easterly driveway at Sudbury Plaza will mostly serve right-out turns for those heading east. The signalized drive will be more convenient for those headed west.

Mr. O'Brien asked if Rte 20 will be widened to allow for turning lanes? Mr. Kalikiri confirmed yes, it will be widened to the north, toward the site.

Mr. Gossels asked about the drainage in the area, especially since there is additional impervious asphalt being added. Mr. Kalikiri said this was a MassDOT jurisdiction and that everything would have to conform to their standards. Best Management Practices would be used.

Mr. Klofft asked if the development's secondary driveway would be left-turn restricted? Mr. Kalikiri replied no, that the sightlines were clear. This full-access entrance would primarily serve as the delivery entrance. This secondary entrance keeps down the footprint size of the signaled intersection.

Mr. Palmer noted that the new road layout would exceed the existing ROW. Who would be responsible for plowing maintenance and repairs? Mr. Kalikiri replied that it would be a permanent easement to MassDOT.

Mr. O'Brien asked if there would be an increase in speed due to the road widening? Mr. Kalikiri said the traffic flow would be more managed due to the traffic signals & other improvements such as signal progression and coordination of signals.

Highland Ave. will have specific sensors that will implement their own phase in the intersection, otherwise it will act as a 4-way intersection. There will also be a pre-emption signal at the fire station, so the queue will not block access. In an emergency, the fire department has full access to both signals to stop traffic. The preemption light will be in flashing mode most times & will turn red in an emergency.

SUDBURY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
MINUTES
MAY 9, 2016

Mr. Stephenson asked if there had been any discussion to increasing the barrier between the sidewalk & roadway? Mr. Kalikiri noted that this was a pretty generous landscape buffer. Usually, a buffer is 3-5 feet, & this is 7 feet, the most robust they could provide, considering wetland constraints and project limitations. Mr. Klofft said that this was great in this area, but it may be great in isolation, unless the rest of the corridor gets pedestrian upgrades in the future. Ms. Kablack noted that this project would also create some missing links, including a sidewalk in front of the Shaw's Plaza. The Town is also talking with the applicant on a second missing link, from Sullivan Tire to Nobscott Rd. It is the Town's wish to have sidewalks on both sides of the street through the commercial district.

Mr. Kalikiri noted another important transportation improvement is the synchronization of the existing signals. The two new signals at the fire station and access drive will be synched with Nobscott Rd. & Union Ave. This coordinated signal system will be controlled by MassDOT. This coordination will help with queuing and delays from traffic turning left out of un-signalized side streets.

Mr. Klofft asked if the Concord Rd. signal was contemplated for synchronization? Mr. Kalikiri said they looked at Concord Rd., but given the number of curb cuts between Union & Concord, as well as the side streets, you would lose the amount of progression based upon the amount of traffic that gets added between the two.

Mr. Kalikiri continued. There is a network of internal sidewalks and pedestrian walkways within the site that connect all the components of the entire site. There is a connection planned for the future rail Trail on the north side of the property. The development will have connections to the property to the east, as well as the previously mentioned pedestrian connection to Sudbury Plaza to the south. They are also making provisions to have a future on-site bus stop within the site, should the MWRTA ever extend service down to this area of Rte. 20. This will help traffic flow as buses won't have to stop directly on Rte. 20.

Jeffrey Dirk from Vanasse & Associates (V&A), provided the Town's peer review update. He reminded the Board that they received a memo dated May 3, 2016 with the results of the traffic peer review. Unlike many projects, there were many things that were vetted before the development plan was finalized. The applicants had addressed several comment letters along the way. V&A have also reviewed the design plans that will be submitted to MassDOT, and comments have been incorporated, even before submission.

Mr. Gossels asked if Mr. Dirk was comfortable with the design, balancing all the different multi-modal uses here? Mr. Dirk replied yes, the signal design proposed balances all those uses. When a ped signal is activated, all other phases get a red light. Nothing is moving other than pedestrians. The signal also includes a bicycle detection sensor, as well, that will trigger a green phase.

Mr. Klofft asked if the pedestrian signal gave people enough time to cross both Rte. 20 & the driveway? Ms. Kablack noted that it would take two pedestrian phases to cross both signals; however, there are crosswalks on both sides of the driveway. Someone crossing from Sudbury Plaza would enter the site on the easterly sidewalk & would have other opportunities to cross at a crosswalk within the site, not needing a second phased signal.

SUDBURY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
MINUTES
MAY 9, 2016

Mr. Dirk said the coordination of the signals improves the traffic flow through the entire corridor. There will be an overall net reduction in traffic on the weekdays, but there will be additional queuing, for example, on Saturdays. This will be manageable, as your overall travel time will be better. The overall time to travel through the four signals in the corridor is reduced. The way that the signals are timed, if you travel too fast or too slow, you hit a red light. This deters speeding through the corridor. There is no advantage to speeding.

The state will plow the roadway, but the Town must plow the sidewalk. The increased 7-foot buffer between the road & sidewalk provides a snow shelf, so that the state is not pushing snow up onto the sidewalk.

Mr. Stevenson asked the consultant how they felt about the parallel parking on the internal streets within the site? Mr. Dirk said there is plenty of room as the aisles are 24', and the parking ratio provided is more than 2 per unit, including the on-street parking. They are sized & designed appropriately, with no issues getting into or out of the spaces.

Mr. Palmer asked what other intersections in addition to Highland Ave. made MassDOT's high-crash list? Mr. Dirk responded that the Landham intersection is on the list. MassDOT is looking at an improvement project there, with a signal & geometric improvements. Ms. Kablack said there is a public hearing on that 25% design next Tuesday, May 17 at the Grange Hall, 6:30 PM. Mr. Dirk will do one final review once the plans have been finalized to make sure his comments have been incorporated. He will also assist the Town with Conditions in the decision.

Rich Holworth, the applicant's engineer from VHB, updated the Board on stormwater management and other site-related issues at the site. The site will have a significant reduction in overall impervious area as well as a reduction in paved area. They have also undertaken many other best management practices including bio-retention basins, groundwater recharge systems which will protect the underlying aquifer and the tributary to the Town wells by treating the stormwater runoff prior to discharge either into the ground or the on-site basin system.

Mr. Gossels asked how the retention basin relates to the Town wells? Mr. Holworth explained that most of the current the site runoff flows into the retention pond facility. The surface water makes its way to the stream that is part of the watershed. The underlying aquifer is more important from a Town well perspective. The benefit of additional stormwater recharge is there is more water that won't bypass the Town wells & more water goes into the aquifer. And it is clean water which maintains the quality of that asset.

Mr. Holworth went on to explain that there also will be a subsurface water recharge system. There will also be several structural water quality devices to remove detritus within the stormwater runoff. There will be three bio-retention basins, or rain gardens in low-lying areas. The combination of all these elements results in a significant improvement in the water quality that is discharging into the retention pond. The pond itself provides further buffering before water is discharged. Most large sites don't have the opportunity for a feature like this. It is regulated as a wetland today. Raytheon cleaned it before the site transfer.

SUDBURY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
MINUTES
MAY 9, 2016

Mr. Gossels asked if the pond would get silted up with the runoff or do the proposed structural water quality devices prevent this from happening? Mr. Holworth replied that the devices would keep the pond very clean.

Mr. O'Brien asked if the changes in water movement through the site would affect the amount of water that the retention pond is retaining? Mr. Holworth replied that the hydraulic response from the overall system is very similar in performance standards. They have analyzed for intense rainfall conditions seen with today's changing climate conditions.

He went on to say that the Avalon site dovetails into the overall Master Development Plan stormwater management system. Mr. Dale said the intent was to have the peer review complete for the June 29th meeting.

Mr. Palmer asked about the importance of the bio-retention basins to the overall system? Mr. Holworth explained that they are designed like small wetland-like areas that help to treat the first one inch of rainfall. Mr. Palmer asked if they will become protected wetlands? Mr. Holworth replied, no, as there was an exemption for any man-made area created after 1996.

Mr. Stevenson asked if any thought had been given to relocating the retention basin discharge elsewhere, other than the south side of the property or is there an advantage is taking it in that direction? Mr. Holworth replied that gravity plays a big part and that is the best location. In addition, you want to maintain the same water system that is there, for many reasons. If you starve that current system of water, it could negatively impact the wells, the aquifer, the wetlands systems, the wildlife that uses them, etc.

Mr. Steven then asked what the quality of the water would be? Mr. Holworth replied that the water would be much cleaner due to the overall reduction in pavement. Rooftop runoff is considered clean runoff, as it doesn't have sand, salt, oil, gasoline, etc. And the runoff from the newly paved surfaces will be treated at a much higher level prior to discharge. Mr. Stevenson asked what the treatment for the rooftops would be? Mr. Holworth replied that they would be asphalt shingles.

Mr. Gillespie added that they had submitted a stormwater methodology that VHB has used for the entire site. The calculations that back up the Avalon portion are within the entire framework for the Master Development Plan, which has been peer reviewed by Horsley Witten.

Mr. Gossels asked if there were going to be rain gardens throughout the entire development? Mr. Holworth replied no, there are currently only three planned, as the soils in those areas were more conducive and separation from groundwater could be achieved. Where rain gardens couldn't be installed, they would use a structural device. Ms. Kablack added that the developer was utilizing those types of best management practices throughout the development.

Ms. Kablack explained that Horsley Witten reviewed the Master stormwater plan for its methodologies, calculations, & watershed analysis. Then each component has to have a stormwater management plan consistent with the Master stormwater plan.

Mr. Palmer asked about the road widening on the Shaw's side. Do they have an excess of parking spaces that will not cause concern? Ms. Kablack met with the Gravistar representative, Mike

SUDBURY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
MINUTES
MAY 9, 2016

Doherty, this week. They are aware of the project & do have to agree to the signal plan. They will acknowledge support for the project during the 25% design plan submittal. She is currently reviewing the parking regulations under the zoning for Gravistar, but does not think a variance is required. Gravistar is losing approximately only 15 of their 454 spaces. The signal lines up very well.

Mr. Holworth went on to discuss infrastructure at the site. They looked at the adequacy of the water distribution on site. It was designed for a large, robust R&D/office facility. When combined with other improvements the Town has done, such as the Rte. 20 water main, no significant upgrades are necessary. There is adequate pressure & supply. There will be a new distribution system throughout the site that will allow for additional redundancy. They are working with the Fire Chief to make sure hydrants are placed at appropriate locations, close to control panels and building entries.

Mr. Palmer asked if the buildings were sprinkled? Mr. Holworth replied yes.

There is an on-site wastewater treatment facility (WWTF). MassDEP is doing a modification of the existing groundwater discharge permit that will enhance the treatment capability of the existing treatment plant as well as the recharge capacity of the existing leaching beds. Most of the site relies on a gravity system which feeds into the WWTF. There is a portion that, based on the existing topography, collects at a central location and is pumped back to the WWTF. This provides opportunity for future development in this location, and the Whole Foods and other retail collect at this central pump station.

Mr. Gossels asked if there is ever a chance the WWTF will overflow into the retention pond? Mr. Holworth replied that there is an extensive groundwater modelling effort within the leaching areas. Even in shallow groundwater areas, the soils are very permeable, allowing for water to seep vertically, not spread outward horizontally.

Mr. Klofft asked why the pump station is at the location it is in, only to pump it back up to the WWTF? Mr. Holworth replied that it is the low point on the site & prevents the site from having to have two pump stations.

Mr. Dale noted that once effluent reaches the leaching beds, it is all treated. The water quality coming out of the plant will be very high. It is not traditional septic leach. In response to Mr. Gossels' concern for overflow into the pond, the hydrogeological study looks at how the ground water underneath those beds responds to different loading conditions.

Mr. Palmer asked how much bigger the treatment plant needed to be? Ms. Kablack reminded the Board that this application was just for the residences & not the overall site.

Mr. Gillespie responded that the plant is sized for 50,000 gallons per day. It is treated & passes to the sand beds in the back. The plant & beds have been very well maintained. Avalon is looking at several options, including upgrading the technology used in the facility, or perhaps put beds underground. The size of the plant based on Title V flows is going from 50K gal/day to 90K gal/day. Sandborn, with oversight of DEP & BOH, has determined that the ground can accommodate this amount of effluent. But based on real world experience is other developments

SUDBURY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
MINUTES
MAY 9, 2016

they own, Avalon believes they produce about 50% of the DEP Title V projections. There are additional test pits taking place this week to look at soil conditions for putting the beds underground, rather than upgrading the existing beds. Then they will do a cost analysis.

Mr. Gossels asked if there are reserve areas set aside for future development expansion or for work around purposes, in case of a sand bed failure? Mr. Gillespie responded that if the beds are upgraded, two will be used regularly & one will be the reserve bed. If the beds go underground, there will be a subsurface chamber and one bed will remain as a reserve bed.

Mr. Patch asked if there was a way to restrict access to the beds from children, pets, etc.? Mr. Gillespie responded that yes, they could do something like that. Ms. Kablack noted that one of the reasons the Town asked Avalon to look at subsurface chambers was that the area could be a great open space asset. Mr. Gossels noted that there should be more areas for children to play.

Mr. Holworth went on to say that the private utilities – gas, telephone – would be in underground conduit. Fire alarms are radio controlled. One unit has been installed now, in anticipation of demolition. The site lighting will be dark sky complaint, & of pedestrian scale. There will be some bollard lighting & up lighting of trees to provide visual appeal and wayfinding.

Mr. Holworth discussed landscaping & site design. The Master Development Plan aims to connect pedestrian to Rte. 20, the future Mass Central Rail Trail, and Chiswick Park. They have added additional landscape buffers, and endeavor to protect existing natural resources whenever possible.

Avalon will create a vibrant streetscape but provide pedestrian connectivity throughout. There will be sidewalks, pedestrian walkways as well as passive stone dust paths around the pond. There will be a gated fire access lane along the northern edge. This will be open to pedestrians.

Mr. Palmer asked if there would be a fence around the pond? Mr. Holworth replied that a fence could be discussed, and will also look at the density of the plantings to see if it is necessary. Ms. Kablack reminded the board that the pond may not entirely be on the residential parcel, so the appropriate place for this type of Condition should be determined. Mr. Dale said this would be part of the overall Master Plan infrastructure, so the Conformance Review may be appropriate.

Avalon reoriented some of the sidewalks and paths as well as the pool area to configure a larger open space parcel. They added a bus stop & will work with the School Department to make sure it is suitable. There will be a large play structure & tot-lot in that vicinity.

Mr. Palmer asked what the total time for completion would be? Mr. Dale estimated 24-26 months. He said that the first apartments should be ready for occupancy in 10-11 months from start of construction. Buildings will be leased up as they are finished.

Avalon increased the buffer along the northern edge, by the rail trail – increased screening & fencing. One building has been pulled away from the edge & two others have been reduced to 2 stories. The types of screening trees are still being determined.

Mr. Gossels asked what the distance was from the backs of the western buildings and the western property line? Mr. Dale said they pulled the buildings back 2-4 feet, making the buffer 19-23 feet.

SUDBURY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
MINUTES
MAY 9, 2016

Mr. Gossels would like to see a berm, fencing and trees, a combination of elements. Mr. Dale said they are still looking at this edge.

Mr. Palmer said that that the types of trees should be considered, as that the canopies can get so large, they will get too close to the buildings within one generation. Ms. Kablack said the Board could note the issue for the Design Review Board, who are meeting Wednesday May 11th.

Avalon will submit the photometric for all the lighting on site. Mr. Klofft would prefer a warmer light, one closer to 2,700 Kelvin.

The applicant then discussed signage. Locations are in the submitted site plan. Avalon will be on the main entryway sign as part of the agreement with National Development. There will also be a sign as you enter the Avalon residential portion of the site. Ms. Kablack noted that the main sign has not been submitted yet, & will be subject to a public hearing as part of the new zoning bylaw, should it pass at Special Town Meeting in June. Mr. Gillespie went on to say that the internal sign is not illuminated, but will have ground lights. There will be wayfinding & informational signs within the site. Mr. Gossels was concerned about plow damage to signs & wants to see a plan with all locations. Mr. Dale will submit the plan, once the number & type of signs are determined. Streets will have typical street signs & Avalon is working through an addressing plan now with the Planning Director & DPW Director. They will work with public safety & the Fire Department for the building numbering system & signage.

Mr. O'Brien asked Ms. Kablack to invite the public safety departments to the next meeting, if they would like to speak or have any strong concerns or comments. Ms. Kablack said she would do so; however, the development team has been meeting with public safety all along and incorporating suggestions, so there may not be any comments. The Board of Health may have comments even though the WWTF is under MassDEP approval, not local approval.

Mr. Gossels noted again that he is concerned about the massing along the western edge of the site. Mr.'s Klofft and Stevenson were not as concerned as there were no abutters along that edge.

The next meeting is scheduled for June 29, 2016. Items to cover include: refined waivers, stormwater calculations for peer review, definitive subdivision plan, site lighting photo metric, revised site plans, and any additional items requested by the Board.

Ms. Kablack thought the Board may include a Condition to have the photo metric peer reviewed after the fact. She also said that the Selectmen were negotiating the Development Agreement for the entire property. This will include any funds to mitigate negative impacts from the development. If the Board is satisfied with the negotiation, they do not have to do anything.

Mr. O'Brien called a close to the hearing this evening, and a motion was made, seconded and voted to continue the Avalon Sudbury Comprehensive Permit public hearing to Wednesday, June 29, 2016 at 7:30 pm.

SUDBURY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
MINUTES
MAY 9, 2016

Approval of Meeting Minutes – April 25, 2016

Motion was made, seconded and voted to approve Minutes from the April 25, 2016 meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____