

**Community Preservation Committee  
Minutes  
October 17, 2002  
Town Hall**

Present: Mark Kablack, Sigrid Pickering, Carole Wolfe, Steve Swanger, Judy Sheldon, , Kirsten Roopenian, Chris Morely, Sheila Stewart, Paul Griffin, Jody Kablack (Town Planner)

Sigrid Pickering opened the meeting at 7:35 pm. The committee reviewed the minutes of Oct. 2, 2002 and approved them with minor corrections.

**CPA Proposals**

S. Pickering described the protocol for conduct of the presentations. A public hearing style will be used, with the proponent making a brief presentation, questions from the CPC and then questions from the public.

**Dickson Property**

Debbie Dineen, Conservation Coordinator, Bridget Hanson, Chairman of Conservation Commission and John Fraize, Chairman of Sudbury Historical Commission were present to discuss. This will be a joint submission by Conservation and Historical Commission.

2.35 acres of land on Water Row. Adjacent to King Philip Woods which was purchased in 1987 by the town from Dickson family. The family held onto 1 building lot at the time. Family has now offered it to the Town for \$440,000. There is a \$10,000 commitment in funds from neighbors for preservation, which will be used as a down payment if the CPC agrees to bring the proposal to Town Meeting. Parcel is not specifically on Open Space Plan. Taken off Open Space Plan when the larger Dickson parcel was purchased. Development would go into rear of property overlooking Haynes Garrison site. Although it is a small parcel, it has large protection value – surrounded by protected land (Sudbury River flood plain, USFWS, Piper, Sears open space, Wolbach property across Route 27). Libby property (approx. 40 acres) also adjacent and is a priority parcel on the Open Space Plan. Most critical areas for preservation on Libby are the ravine and stream. Development on Dickson property would overlook critical lands. Trail from King Philips Woods crosses Dickson property.

J. Fraize stated that the Historical Commission is supportive of this proposal due to its proximity to the Haynes Garrison site, but they will also be submitting a proposal to the CPC for repairs to the Hosmer House, which is their first priority. Property is within the Historic District (check this!).

Application will be submitted to CPC next week. Only documentation submitted was aerial photo of site. A map was shown describing adjacent open space lands surrounding property.

S. Pickering asked why an application has not been submitted. D. Dineen stated that ConCom wants to take an official vote before the application is submitted.

Both J. Fraize and D. Dineen mentioned that they are asking for specific percentages of their allotments from the CPA. D. Dineen stated that COnCom is interested in funding this purchase without bonding. M. Kablack asked the ConCom to prioritize all their projects that they anticipate submitting this year. He also asked applicants to minimize their focus on cost considerations, that is the work of the CPC.

B. Hanson stated that this is an excellent project since it has joint support, connects other protected properties, and has funding commitment from private citizens. She also stated that although this is a small parcel, its ecological value is high and it is only being offered to the Town now. D. Dineen stated that the ConCom has several large, high priority parcels in its scope – Waite farm, Libby, Nobscot Boy Scout Reservation. These will require large expenditures and may require coordination with state and regional agencies. No specific negotiations on-going currently.

R. Payne, citizen, stated that he thinks this is a good project, but wonders where the money to purchase Libby will come from. Isn't it better to save the funds to purchase larger properties, such as Cutting, rather than spending it on small parcels? S. Pickering stated that the CPC is under no obligation to spend all its allotment each year.

#### Cutting Proposal

J. Kablack described the proposal and offer submitted to the town. She stated that no application to the CPC has been submitted to date. The Town Manager is gathering information before a proposal can be submitted. The offer was only received on October 11, 2002.

- ◆ Approximately 77 acres
- ◆ A-Residential zoning district
- ◆ Property currently enrolled in Chapter 61A
- ◆ Property is adjacent to new Assabet River Wildlife Refuge, is considered to be within expansion boundaries for WR
- ◆ Owner wants to sell development rights to the Town
- ◆ Value based on a 32 lot preliminary subdivision plan
- ◆ Preliminary cost of property at full value is \$9.4 million (@ \$293,750/lot). This includes all development approvals and costs and infrastructure installation.
- ◆ Cost to purchase development rights offered at \$6.434 million
- ◆ Offer excludes 5 lots which would be developed by owner into single family subdivision to defray owner's cost of development rights.
- ◆ Offer includes a right for the Town to lease approximately 12 acres of upland for recreation fields for a 3 year period. No other access to the property is authorized.
- ◆ Offer includes right of owner to construct 1 single family dwelling on approximately 21 acres located in the southwestern corner of property. Remainder of 21 acres would be deed restricted to prohibit any further development.
- ◆ Offer is contingent on the submission of an article at the 2003 Annual Town Meeting

Considerations:

- ◆ Wetland buffer encroaches onto 9 lots (6 significantly)– these may or may not be buildable
- ◆ Blandings turtles sighted on property – endangered species
- ◆ Recreational lease term very short – may not be worth the capital investment
- ◆ Need to investigate reality of constructing recreation fields – wetlands considerations, need adequate parking on property
- ◆ No public access to property – will continue to be owned by Cutting
- ◆ What other options the Town might have if this offer is refused – right of first refusal, purchase portion of property
- ◆ Little chance of federal funding to supplant local funds

D. Dineen described the extent of the wetlands on the site, and stated that approximately 6 lots might not be buildable. She also did a similar analysis for the recreation fields, and the area might sustain 2-3 large fields plus parking.

S. Swanger stated he thought this might be a great parcel to mix 3 uses on this site – open space, recreation and affordable housing. Is he correct that there is no affordable housing component? (Yes)

R. Payne asked how residents can get this information. The presentation tonight was difficult to understand. Ms. Dineen stated that he can get copies in her office and the Planning Board office. The Selectmen, Conservation Commission, Planning Board and Park and Rec. Commission will all be discussing this proposal in public session next week, schedule to be published in newspaper.

B. Hanson asked how the ConCom can help the CPC with this proposal. Should they go through the open space criteria and outline where this project meets those criteria? (Yes)

D. Mannone, Recreation Director, was asked if he had any feedback. Park & Rec has questions about the time and money involved in developing this land as fields given the short lease term, and how it fits into the schedule of other town fields on and off line right now. P&R will be meeting next week to discuss.

R. Payne asked if the CPA allowed funds for recreation use. S. Pickering stated that it is an allowable use.

J. Cutting stated that the 3 year term for recreation would be from the time that the fields are ready for use. He also stated that the appraisal was developed from the standpoint of a developer purchasing the land from the owner. Does not take into account that the family owns it and would be the developer of the parcel. They have experience in developing land, and would be able to do it at a higher profit margin. Although the appraisal came in at \$9.4 million, they feel it is worth \$12 million if they developed it themselves. He is willing to attend any meeting to answer questions on the offer.

K. Roopenian stated that the property is within Chapter 61A, but that the offer is different from other Chapter 61A offers. We have not been given the right of first refusal based on a bondafide offer from a developer. This is a unique opportunity in that this offer has been generated directly from the landowner to the Town.

#### Friends of Water Row, Sudbury Pedestrian Park

Laura McGrath and Margaret Castoldi were present to discuss. This is a proposal to dedicate and close portions of Water Row and Lincoln Road for pedestrian, non-motorized use on Sundays between the months of April and November. Memorial Drive, Cambridge and Rock Creek Park, MD are 2 similar examples. They have spoken with other communities as well. Surveyed residents for comments and are generally favorable. They feel that this is a simple, low cost method to create recreational opportunities for a large range of residents who may not be using existing recreation areas in Town. Great bird watching for persons of limited mobility. They have experienced periods of limited vehicular traffic during flooding and found it very enjoyable. Water Row is not heavily traveled on weekends. They see many people recreating on the weekends on the road. Costs will include signage, police detail to direct traffic and town staff time to put up/remove traffic barriers, plus other equipment.

S. Swanger thinks it is a lovely idea. He has not heard of it before, but sees from the application that it has been around for a little while. He asked if there are identified funding sources other than the CPA? The proponents are still looking into this, as identified in the proposal.

Other CPC members thought it a very creative proposal as well. Park & Rec. has not seen this proposal before. M. Kablack stated that the police detail will be a large cost item and this needs to be investigated. He also stated that this should be brought to P&R for their input and potential support. J. Kablack noted that there may be legal issues with closing a public road. K. Roopenian stated the Safety Officer, Rocky Conrado, should be brought into the discussion. She also requested that the proponents discuss this with the Sudbury Foundation.

B. Hanson remembers that the closing of Memorial Drive was a unique proposal when it was started, and encouraged the proponents to move forward with this idea.

#### Park & Recreation Projects

D. Mannone, Recreation Director was present to discuss. He has been the Director since June. Hoping to develop a recreation master plan for the Town. Proposals submitted to CPC are to create additional field space in Town.

Davis Field – current problem is wetness in spring which makes most of the field unusable. Project is to rehab field by improving drainage. Preliminary estimate is \$150,000, with an additional \$50,000 funding from user groups. Allows expanded use of fields, also allows fields at Davis to rest.

M. Kablack asked if this proposal would increase the area of the field space. Yes, due to the ability to use space that is currently not usable. P&R is not sure if it will be a whole field extra. M. Kablack asked to see a plan of the area. What type of drainage improvements are contemplated? Just reworking the soil, no structures to be added. That would have a larger price tag associated with it.

J. Sheldon stated that a wetland resource area surrounds the area and this proposal would require approval from the Conservation Commission. Park & Rec is aware of this requirement.

K. Roopenian asked if these improvements would necessitate further improvements to the area in general, including parking and sanitary facilities? From her standpoint, improvements are necessary up there. This would be looked into.

M. Kablack asked how realistic the anticipated user group contribution is. Based on what has been given in the past, it is probably quite realistic. They would inquire to several groups.

D. Dineen stated that there has been no discussion tonight about the contamination from the Sperry Rand property. Mr. Verrill was denied by DEP recently to upgrade his drainage, and she is not sure that DEP would approve this project.

Curtis Middle School Field – Current condition of field is bad. It is used only out of necessity. School contractor is being asked to come back and restore the field. However, no irrigation was installed when field was first constructed. Proposal is to rework the field and install irrigation. Without these improvements, the field will denigrate and will cost even more to rehabilitate. Already town owned. Relatively small cost. This recreation area services a wide range of users. User group contributions may be possible. This issue is in litigation between the town and the contractor.

C. Morely asked if this has been discussed with the School Committee? They have made a request of the School Superintendent to investigate finishing the field, but no action has been taken yet. Initially they were supportive. Could CPA funds be used and then rebated back from the settlement with the contractor?

M. Kablack asked if this would be the first joint project between the town and the school committee? P. Griffin replied that he thinks it is.

D. Dineen is concerned whether this would affect the wetlands behind the school.

R. Payne believes that this type of project is a misuse of CPA funds. It should be primarily used for open space projects.

North/South Rail Trail –Proposal is for design costs for a portion of the rail corridor from Hudson Road to Morse Road. Proposal might also include signage and parking. This would link Hudson Road and future town fields behind Ti-Sales and Featherland Park.

Estimates being researched right now. It is anticipated to have costs in time for the CPC to make a decision on this for the 2003 Annual Town Meeting.

J. Kablack stated that this rail corridor runs the length of Sudbury from the Framingham Town line to Concord, and that a proposal to design and construct the entire length may be forthcoming to the CPC in phases.

C. Wolfe asked if the abutters have been notified? (No). She also inquired as to what the width of the trail would be, and if it would be paved.

D. Dineen stated that this rail trail is a portion of the Bruce Freeman Trail that runs from Lowell to Sudbury. The northern portion of that trail has been constructed. A feasibility study was conducted in the 1970's, but the southern portion did not receive any funding. If federal funds are used, the design standards are quite wide and require pavement. The Town may be interested in a range of surface treatment.

D. Mannone urged the CPC to be conservative in allocating money in these early years. He foresees larger projects in the future that would benefit larger segments of the population, and would not want to overlook development of those opportunities.

No other proposals were submitted.

Spring Meeting Schedule (tentative)

Wed. January 15, 2003

Wed. January 29, 2003

Wed. February 12, 2003

Wed. February 26, 2003

Next Meeting: Wed. October 30, 2002, 7:30 pm, Goodnow Library.

Meeting adjourned at 9:30 pm.

Minutes taken by J. Kablack. Approved by CPC on 10/30/02.