

Minutes  
Design Review Board  
March 14, 2012

Present: Juan Cruz, Dan Martin, Jane Roddy, Deborah Kruskal, Chris O'Halloran

***Sign Review: PureHD  
348 Boston Post Road***

Thomas Pullen presented the 18 sq' sign. Its style and color is consistent with the other signs currently on the building and complies with the by-laws. The board approved the application pending approval from the Historic Districts Commission.

***Sign Review: New England Garden Ornaments  
81 Union Ave.***

The applicant was represented by Giancarlo Lavini from Sign-A-Rama. The size as presented conformed with the parameters of the by-law. However the following issues were discussed by the board: 1) The name on the sign is not that of the store, but of the company's website. Although the by-law has no jurisdiction on what is exactly said on signs, it seems confusing to have two names identifying the same business. 2) The spacing of the type was tight against the edges of the sign horizontally. It was suggested that either the font size be reduced, the name be put on two lines, or the width of the sign be extended to create some breathing room (an additional 9" would be allowed). 3) It was further noted that there was no illumination of the sign. The board approved the application with the recommendation to adjust the size of the graphics and to reconsider the choice of name on the sign.

***Sign Review: Revo Labs  
114 North Road***

Ed Juvalenwicz presented the application. The business is in an office building and encompasses most of the third floor. Our by-law does not take into account office buildings of this nature and so has no guidelines by which to make a determination for compliance. The frontage of the building is 300', which would allow a first floor business a 33 sq' sign, and second floor one a 10 sq' sign. The

graphic consists of 2 elements mounted on brick. If their square footage is taken separately, their combined total would be 26 sq'. If there was a bounding box including both, it would be more, but the exact amount has not been determined. It was the board's opinion that the scale of the sign on the brick building was perfect and well placed. If the applicant needs to go before the ZBA for a special permit we would recommend that the permit be granted. It was also suggested that there may be precedent in the Emerson Medical Building off Rt 20. Further discussion with Jim Kelly will occur.

### ***Architectural Review: Village Green 29 Hudson Road***

Jeff Walker and Mike Carney, the developers, presented the plans for the Village Green project. The Historic Districts Commission has already set certain requirements on the proposal which brought up some concerns by the board. It was felt unanimously by this board that the site needed to be more inviting from the street. In particular, 1) it was felt that it should have more landscaping in regards to the upper canopy provided by trees, 2) there should be a pedestrian connection from the street, i.e. sidewalks into the site, 3) it was felt that the presence of cars in the center would be a signal that there is activity on the site, rather than a vacant area of cobbles.

Other concerns included handicap access to the eastern most building (office, bank, etc), softening the extensive porch with well thought-out signage and plantings, the question of the effectiveness of a "Christmas tree" in its proposed location, and the monoculture of red maples for the parking in back and along Peakham Road.

### ***Miscellaneous***

The minutes of February 8, 2012 were approved.