

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

Sign Application; Sorin Marinescu, 370 Boston Post Road

The Board met with the applicant on site for a continuation of the sign application presented at the July 26, 2006 meeting. The property owner, Sorin Marinescu, was present.

The Board noted the front of the property was recently repaved and the paved area was expanded. The applicant had a copy of the site plan approved by the Board of Selectmen on August 7, 1981, which showed much less paving and fewer signs.

The applicant is proposing to install a freestanding business directory sign with less than the required setback of 16'. The front property line seems to be at the existing stone wall; however, the site plan is not definitive.

The discussion is continued at the Flynn Building conference room where the Board makes the following recommendations to the Board of Appeals:

- The three existing freestanding signs at the front property line are to be removed.
- A new freestanding directory sign may be located in the center of the small grass area at the easterly entrance. It cannot exceed 24 square feet in area, 9' in height and 4' in width.
- The new sign will have two plain square posts with finial or cap. The shape of the sign panel shall be that as shown in a drawing dated 2/9/06 prepared by the Sunshine Sign Company.
- The main panel should be black with gold letters and trim; tenant panels should be forest green with gold letters.

Sign Application; Bella Salon, 348 Boston Post Road

Representing the applicant was Rose Luciano.

The proposal is to relocate blue sign letters from the previous business location. The letters are 10" high. The Board approved the proposal with the understanding they be mounted on a cream color panel 19" high by length as required.

Sign Application; Mahoney Farm

No representative in attendance.

The design as presented does not conform to the bylaw as it has no setback from the property line. The required setback would be approximately 12 feet, but the exact area of the sign panel is not given. In addition, no color samples were provided. The applicant needs to resubmit or apply to the Board of Appeals for a Special Permit.

Board Member Deborah Kruskal (via email) also had comments on the Mahoney Farm Landscape Plan as follows:

- The plan does not have a north arrow so exposure cannot be determined. However, it is cautioned Pachysandra cannot take full winter sun.
- Mt. Laurels may also be subject to winter exposure. With the close proximity of the roadways and the stone wall, deer will most likely not be an issue here.
- The landscaper should guarantee the plants for one year; one winter should determine how well the shrubs will do and they could be replaced if/when they fail. The trees won't show stress for many years.

Grouse Hill Senior Incentive Development – Design Review

No representative present.

The Board finds the image of the houses to be poor as the facades are dominated by garages which are forward of the house entries. The assembly of varying window and dormer shapes and styles is chaotic. The architect needs to work on the design to make the houses dominant and not the garages for a greater sense of community. Using carriage-house style garage doors may be an improvement.

Comments on landscaping plans included (via Board Member Deborah Kruskal's email):

- There are 10 Sugar Maples specified for the landscaped circle at the entrance. Sugar Maples cannot tolerate compaction or salt and so they are not appropriate for a roadside planting. Although they are centered 20' from the road edge, it would be better to make another choice as their roots will eventually extend further than 40' in diameter.
- All the shrubs specified (Rosebay Rhododendrons, Mt. Laurel and Azaleas) also have problems. They do not do well in winter's western exposure (all are deciduous trees, so there will be a big shock with the winter's wind and sun), and they are all preferred choices for deer. Although Mt. Laurel is toxic in summer, it is not in the winter.
- As with the closing comment on the Mahoney Landscape Plans, the landscaper should guarantee the plants for one year.

Sudbury Village Comprehensive Permit Review

No applicant present.

The Board finds the site needs to be unified where it is shown split in two parts. There should be some vistas through the development into the natural area to the south. There should also be common areas for play and for socializing. The plan seems to have been simply conceived as a way to maximize unit count without creating any real design or social amenities.

Miscellaneous

The minutes of the 7/26/06 meeting were approved.