TO: Zoning Board of Appeals  
FROM: Jody Kablack, Director of Planning and Community Development  
DATE: March 21, 2016  
RE: Village at Sudbury Station Comprehensive Permit Application

This office is in receipt of revised materials and plans for the above application. I have reviewed the materials, and offer the following comments and recommendations for this evening’s public hearing:

1. The correspondence list indicating materials submitted to the file since the Feb. 22, 2016 hearing is attached to this memo. 

2. Many of revisions made to the site plans are related to recommendations of Town staff and the Town’s traffic consultant. However, many recommendations remain unanswered, most prevalent is the lack of a grading plan and stormwater management plan. The applicant has met with the Fire Chief to discuss the concerns of the Fire Dept. however no meetings have been scheduled with either the DPW Director or myself to discuss the concerns listed in our previous memos.

3. The Town has contracted with Hancock Associates for engineering peer review services, however the Town is not in receipt of adequate plans for these services. The ZBA has set a schedule for review of the physical constraints of the site for May 23. Materials must be received by the Town in advance (approximate date of April 10) to give adequate time for the peer review consultant to report prior to the hearing.

4. There has been discussion between Town Counsel and the applicant’s attorney regarding peer review of the potential visual impacts of the project, particularly on the Historic District and buildings and sites which contribute to its state and national significance. The Town is in the process of obtaining a scope of services from Public Archaeology Lab to conduct a peer review of the applicant’s cross sectional analyses, which were shown to the ZBA at the hearing on Feb. 22, 2016. This issue should be settled in the near future, as the issues of building massing, density, architectural design and landscaping are scheduled to be discussed at the April 25, 2016 public hearing, and adequate time must be given for the consultant to review and report back to the Board. 

5. The applicant is requested to submit an additional funds to cover the estimated costs of the traffic, engineering and visual impact peer review. The original escrow payment of $10,000 will need to be supplemented by an additional $1,900 for the engineering and traffic consultant fees. Additional funds will be needed for the visual impact assessment.

6. Soil test data sheets, witnessed by both DEP and the Sudbury Health Director, were submitted to the ZBA file.

7. The Board of Selectmen and the Conservation Commission have submitted letters to the ZBA on this application. The Applicant should be requested to respond to these letters to the extent necessary.
The Planning Board will submit comments once the grading and stormwater plan has been submitted.

8. The hearing schedule has been revised as follows:
   - Hearing 1, Feb. 22 - Overview of project by applicant; expectations of the board for review fees and consultants; additional information needed; initial public comments
   - Hearing 2, March 21 - Access; traffic; circulation
   - Hearing 3, April 25 - Building Massing/Density; Architectural Design/Landscaping
   - Hearing 4, May 23 - Physical constraints of the site – stormwater, wastewater, clearing & grading
   - Hearing 5, June 20 - Other site impacts – visual, fiscal, historic impacts; Mitigation/Community Needs
   - Hearing 6, July 25 - Additional information

9. Most of the recommendations noted in my memo date 2/17/16 on this application have not been responded to. I will add several other concerns with this application:
   - The Applicant has noted that their wildlife expert, Diane Boretos, Call of the Wild, has previously worked for the Town of Sudbury to complete a 4 season wildlife study along the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. One recommendation from that study, noted particularly in the location of this proposed development, was that no physical barriers should exist on the sides of ROW to allow turtles and salamanders to freely cross the ROW. The proposal includes a retaining wall of unknown height for a length of approximately 750 feet along the railroad ROW. The applicant should address how this impact will be mitigated.
   - Sight distance clearing limits are shown on the revised plan, however it is questioned whether any of the clearing will be on privately owned property? The property lines of the abutting lots are not well indicated. If private property will be used to increase sight lines, easements will be necessary.

cc: DPW Director
    Building Inspector
    Conservation Coordinator
    Health Director
    Fire Chief
    Town Counsel
    Historic Districts Commission
    Historical Commission
    Board of Selectmen
    Planning Board
    Applicant