

Present: Frank Riepe (Chairman), Dan Martin, Deborah Kruskal,
Tris Windle, Linda Wade

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m.

Maple Ave Senior Residential Community Site Plan Review - Recommendations to Selectmen

Representatives present for the applicant:

Myron Fox, Attorney
Mike Coutu, Landscape Architect
Warren Daniel, Architect
Bob McGinty, Linbrook Properties
Francis Oboy, Linbrook Properties

The design was presented and questions were posed by the Board and by Maple Ave. property owners including 11, 19, 28 and 34/36 Maple Ave.

The Board's comments include:

- Concern over stone entry walls rendering the feeling of a "gated community"
- The building design has a vast amount of roof; a limited palate of materials, textures and colors; an inadequate architectural identity for individual homes; overly dominant garages; very ordinary windows; inexpensive looking porches and chaotic rooflines.

Neighbors also objected to the entry stone walls, lack of integration with the existing community, loss of major healthy trees, and uniformity of all the buildings (i.e. lack of variety in the architecture).

The public hearing is closed and the Design Review Board develops the following recommendations to the Planning Board and the Board of Selectmen:

1. Delete the stone wall at Maple Ave., stone walls could be used farther down the entry road. The Board suggests use of continuous split-rail fencing rather than the two styles proposed. Picket or board fences could be utilized for the individual unit gardens.
2. In order too mitigate the effect on the Maple Ave. community and allow for future traffic demands, make the drive through the Feeley tennis area a permanent one-way exit as well as an emergency vehicle entrance (paved one lane). A generation from now traffic demands on Route 20 may necessitate a signal at Raymond Road. This would also divert cars from Route 20 that are headed south towards Framingham. Good traffic management requires an integration of roadways affording multiple routes, a practice that has not been adequately considered over the years in Sudbury.

3. Given the nature of this development, we think it is probably not possible for it to feel integrated with the Maple Ave. architecture; however, the architecture could be much better. The visual bulk of roof should be reduced, the rear of the buildings should be as significant as the fronts (many are seen by abutters as well as from Feeley Field), greater architectural identity should be developed for each unit, garages should be more discrete, entry porches should be designed with more care to be important elements, the palate of materials should be expanded, perhaps to include board-and-batten siding as an accent to supplement the red cedar shingles. Each building is the size of a 6,000 to 9,000 square foot house and much more craftsmanship in design is needed to make this comfortable and attractive.
4. Color and material samples should be submitted for approval.

In closing, the Design Review Board would like the opportunity to meet with the applicant with the plan resubmitted in the final form, with greater detail of building architecture and recommendations of the Design Review Board.

Sign Applicant: Salisbury Sales
75 Union Ave.

The sign presented is in conformance to the bylaw. The Board unanimously approves the sign application with the condition one line of text is deleted (either the phone number or the web address) for better readability.