

Sutton Planning Board
Minutes
November 27, 2017

Approved _____

Present: W. Whittier, R. Largess, S. Paul, M. Sanderson, W. Baker
Staff: Jen Hager, Planning Director

W. Baker acting as a full member in place of J. Anderson.

General Business

Minutes:

Motion: To approve the minutes of 11/13/17, R. Largess

2nd: S. Paul

Vote: 4-0-1, abstained as he wasn't present at this meeting

Filings:

Pyne Sand (Bedoian) – Earth Removal Permit – Active earth removal south Sutton off Road in Douglas.

Worcester Sand & Gravel – Earth Removal Permit – Inactive earth removal off Hatchery Road.

Special Permit – Large Vehicle Sales – 11 John Road – Request for trash truck vehicle sales primarily for demonstration purposes.

The Board acknowledged the legal filing of the above applications.

Form A Plans: None

Correspondence/Other:

The Board reviewed the tentative 2018 Meeting schedule. It was noted starting next meeting the Board will be using iPads and presentation materials will be viewed and broadcast on the wall mounted television in the meeting room. In response to an inquiry from J. Hager Christine Hicks of the Town's communications department stated that all new audio visual and broadcast equipment was provided through grants from Charter and Verizon, except for the iPads which were in the Planning Department budget.

Motion: To approve the tentative meeting schedule for 2018, S. Paul

2nd: W. Baker

Vote: 5-0-0

Public Hearing – Retreat Lot – Rich Road (part of 571 Boston Road)

R. Largess read the hearing notice as it appeared in The Chronicle.

Byron Andrews, RLS of Andrews Survey & Engineering was present with a plan showing the division of one lot into two lots, one of which is a proposed retreat lot. This retreat lot would have 5.7 acres and 51' of frontage on Rich Road.

In response to comments from the Planning Director Mr. Andrews confirmed missing metes and bounds and distances were corrected, no wetlands effect the frontage of the remainder of land on Boston Road,

and the lot does not narrow to less than 50' at any point. R. Largess read the other departmental comments.

Paul Hare of 12 Burdon Street asked what the setback are for the lot. Setbacks are 50' from the front and rear lot lines and 20' from side lot lines. S. Paul reviewed some of the key requirements of the regulations and confirmed they have been met. It was noted retreat lots were enacted as an alternative to small subdivisions with cul-de-sacs.

The Justus' who live directly next door were concerned with this home being too close to them. It was noted although there is no guarantee, people do not usually buy a retreat lot which contains so much more remote/private land area and then locate their homes near adjacent homes.

Motion: To grant the Special Permit for this 5.7 acre retreat lot 51' of frontage on Rich Road with the following conditions: S. Paul

1. Approval of all other local, state and federal departments, boards and commissions.
2. Driveways shall be of bituminous surface, no greater than twelve percent (12%) grade with a minimum paved width of twelve (12) feet and cleared width of fifteen (15) feet.
3. The house number shall be clearly visible at the street adjacent to the driveway via a permanent post/mailbox numbering that is visible from both directions of travel.
4. Underground utilities shall be required.

2nd: R. Largess
Vote: 5-0-0

Public Hearing (Cont.) – Forest Edge – Ariel Drive (off Blackstone Street) – Amend Special Permit

Two application are before the Board relative to Forest Edge as follows:

1. Application to amend the Special Permit to change four-plex units to duplex units
2. Application to amend the Special Permit to remove area from the open space for a commercial use

The Board reviewed an email from Attorney Klasnick requesting a continuance of the hearing relative to removing area from the open space.

Motion: To continue the hearing relative to removing area from the Forest Edge open space until January 8, 2018 at 7:05 P.M., M. Sanderson

2nd: S. Paul
Vote: 5-0-0

Jonathan and Michael Bruce of the Forest Edge development team were present to continue discussion about the switch from four unit structures to two unit structures. M. Bruce said he would prefer to address all questions and concerns relative to the application at once so he asked if there were any additional concerns.

Scott Alderucchi of 105 Ariel Circle stressed that only constructing duplexes in phase II would damage the cohesiveness of the neighborhood. He noted as original owners who bought into the project as it was approved and have been waiting for some time for the neighborhood to be complete, this proposal is a dramatic change with potential financial ramifications that may devalue his interior four-plex unit.

He felt he and his wife have invested and waited in good faith and there should not be continued changes to the project. He said he understood market forces and the developer's interests, but felt there could be a compromise to move forward with the four-plexes as approved with some duplexes mixed in to keep the neighborhood balanced.

In discussion about why they are proposing duplexes Mr. Bruce re-asserted it is easier to fit these smaller footprint structures into the topography of the site and reduces issues with drainage around the units. Additionally a smaller number of connected units allows for better fire response access. In response to questions about fire protection for the buildings, J. Bruce noted he used 2 hour fire ratings in existing units and was told by the authorities involved that this extra expense above the Code saved additional damage during a fire in the units. This incident and increases protection is now being used as an example at the State level. He maintained he did not know if building phase two as proposed with the four attached units would now require a sprinkler system.

J. Bruce confirmed the architecture is changing to some degree but reminded the Board it was presented to them and approved a while back. M. Sanderson asked if the proposed duplexes will be the same as the two that are in phase 1. Mr. Bruce said they would be the same. He also stressed he is going forward with the same architectural changes to the roof lines and addition of porches the only question is how many units will be attached.

M. Bruce responded to concerns previously expressed noting Ms. Trippi of 113 Ariel Circle misunderstood the documents she referred to when she stated they could not make architectural changes. He stated these notes were taken out of context from the condo trust documents and refer to how owners will treat their units. Development rights are covered in the Master Deed for the project and he presented an excerpt of this document that states the developer may alter the design of the units to be built. In response to concerns expressed by Ms. Sandvick of 103 Ariel Circle about the duplexes, Mr. Bruce could only say he was confused as she actually helped design the units as she was going to buy one.

S. Paul stressed he would think there is an advantage to all parties in finishing the project, although he has no economic real estate expertise. J. Bruce stated one of the inside four-plex units had the highest resale to date. He was confident his proposal will not destroy the value of existing units. There is a demand for duplexes now and he wants to build to this demand so he can finish the project as quickly as possible for everyone's benefit.

Cara Alderucchi agreed it is in everyone's interest to finish building out the project, but she felt strongly that the original owners made an investment in a known product that is now changing and will be detrimental to this investment. She stressed there should be a compromise. J. Bruce noted They are keeping the same setbacks and color. He added a rising tide floats all boats and he is seeking the highest value for everyone going forward.

M. Sanderson asked if Mr. Bruce had considered a mix of unit types? He said he hadn't due to the topographical constraints. He noted the Trustees had no objection to this proposal.

T. Sullivan of 137 Ariel Circle interjected that the Trustee did not ask anyone else's opinion to her knowledge.

J. Hager noted from a planning perspective continuing the same development pattern of four-plexes with duplexes mixed in maintains the sense of neighborhood as originally approved. Changing to an entirely different housing style creates disparity both visually and financially.

S. Pau reviewed some of the bylaw terms to verify the proposal does not violate the bylaw. It was confirmed no 3 bedroom units are proposed.

R. largess said if what is proposed is within the rules it should be allowed to be built out and finally finished.

J. Bruce stated if the Board would grant the waiver to separations of not less than 25' he will look into mixing in different unit configurations. He noted he needs to make adjustments to infrastructure that is in the ground and has even more people interested in phase II units so he wants to get going. The Board reviewed the size of proposed units and the layout. It was noted although there can be windows on one of two units that face each other, Mr. Bruce will keep these walls solid to maintain maximum privacy.

Motion: To grant the waiver to allow as little as 25' separation between buildings, R. Largess
2nd: S. Paul

C. Alderucchi said separating the four-plexes into duplexes increases the feel of the density and changes the flow and look. She felt the Board should visit the site and carefully consider the proposal.

W. Baker stated the gables are different but otherwise the units appear very similar.

2nd: Withdrawn, S. Paul

R. Largess refused to withdraw his motion, but as there was no second the motion did not proceed.

Motion: To continue the hearing to December 11, 2017 at 8:10 P.M., S. Paul
2nd: M. Sanderson

Vote: 4-1-0, R. Largess opposed as he felt the change should be approved and built

Motion: To adjourn, R. Largess
2nd: W. Baker

Vote: 5-0-0

Adjourned 8:30 PM