

Minutes  
Design Review Board  
May 15, 2013

Present: Dan Martin, Paula Hyde, Jen Koffel, Juan Cruz, Deborah Kruskal

***Sign Review: 344 Boston Post Road  
Sudbury Eye Care***

Lorraine Labiento presented an application for a wall mounted sign and freestanding sign for Sudbury Eye Care on a parcel that contains both her residence and a second building in the rear that houses her practice and an additional second floor tenant. The site is in a historic district.

The wall sign was shown on the application with a primary sign for the second floor tenant, should that tenant so desire one. Several Board members indicated that the two signs appeared crowded in the space available. As the second floor business also is restricted to smaller dimensions, the two signs are not particularly in harmony.

The Board further discussed the visibility of the wall signs given the restricted site lines to Route 20. The applicant indicated that she thought the signs were necessary so that vehicles entering would know to go to the rear building. The Board is of the opinion that direction signs and/or signs on facing the parking area, but not visible to Route 20, would be preferable for this purpose.

The application also includes a freestanding sign that is not permitted under the bylaws due to insufficient road frontage. The Board unanimously agreed that due to the nature of the site, with the business in the rear and the awkward location at the intersection of King Philip Rd, that a freestanding sign is almost necessary at this location. The applicant noted that she made every effort to otherwise comply with the bylaws.

The Board suggested that, rather than having the second floor tenant have a sign on the rear building, a small panel on the freestanding sign would be preferable. This would make the tenant's sign more visible and reduce the crowding that results from the two wall signs mounted together.

The bylaw states that when a business center is named on a freestanding sign, such panels can be added identifying the tenants. As the site is also the home of the applicant, the Board is of the opinion that the copy should remain "Sudbury Eye Care" as presented, with just a single panel for a tenant of the approximate height of 8-16".

The Board unanimously voted to approve the wall mounted sign as presented for Sudbury Eye Care subject to Historic Districts Commission approval. The Board suggested to the applicant that she consider additional directional signs either on the drive or on the rear building that also indicate the tenants.

The Board unanimously voted to recommend a variance to the ZBA for a freestanding sign as presented with an additional panel space below it for listing the single tenant subject to Historic Districts Commission approval.

The applicant asked about an appropriate height for the sign as she was concerned about its visibility over snow. The Board indicated to her that the bottom of the lower panel cannot be more than 40% of the height. The applicant also indicated that she intended to use halogen landscape lighting on the sign.

***Sign Review: 83 Boston Post Road***

***Herb Chambers Jaguar***

Joshua Fox, Heather Dudko of National Sign, and Peter O'Callaghan of Herb Chambers presented a sign application seeking recommendation to the Board of Appeals for sign variances.

Mr. Fox presented a "Jaguar" and a "Sudbury" sign that are backlit halo letters that are of the same size as the existing signs, a chrome sculpture Jaguar sign to be located above the portico, a "Service" sign of reverse channel lettering, and key lit "Land Rover" and "Range Rover" signs to be located on the green column.

Mr. Cruz finds the Jaguar to be in poor taste and not appropriate for the location. Mr. Martin agreed, finding it too literal as a hood ornament on the building. The Board was in unanimous agreement that the Jaguar sculpture is inappropriate and cannot recommend a variance for it. The Board suggested using the profile logo on the front of the building incorporated with the Jaguar sign as is evidently used based on a Google search of images. The applicant indicated that corporate dictated that the Jaguar is necessary, and the profile logo is only acceptable if the portico is made taller, to match the height of the green column. This prompted Mr. Martin to ask whether the building changes were also to be discussed at this meeting as it was evident that there were fairly substantial changes to the façade.

Mr. Fox indicated that the meeting was about signs, but was open to discussion about the building changes. Mr. Cruz and Mr. Martin indicated that the structural changes were integral in determining appropriate size and location for the building. A discussion of the façade changes ensued.

Mr. Cruz expressed a strong dislike for the EIFS synthetic material being used on the façade. He says that the material is too artificial and it is a shame that they would replace the clapboard that is currently there with the synthetic material.

Ms. Hyde and Mr. Martin also noted that the façade facing Route 20 was getting approximately three feet taller with the installation of the EIFS, and that the roof line would now be partially blocked by the raising of the front facing wall. Ms. Koffel and Mr. Cruz questioned the logic of this given drainage and snow build up issues. Mr. O'Callaghan explained how the drainage would be handled, and said that similar work has been done on a building in Maine.

A discussion of the portico ensued. Mr. Cruz wondered if the radius could be changed so there would be less intrusion into the setback, and perhaps easier installation of the sign. Mr. Martin suggested that the setback is less of an issue than the massing that the applicant desires to offset eliminating the sculpture. Mr. Martin indicated that the portico was twice as wide as the green column, and having it match the height would introduce too much massing, and that until the portico size and design can be resolved, the type, size, and location of the Jaguar sign cannot be determined. Mr. Cruz also noted that the building is elevated from the road by approximately 6 feet, further enhancing the increase height adjustments that the applicants propose.

Mr. Fox then asked the Board for opinions on the portico itself. The members of the Board agreed that a portico of appropriate scale would serve the applicant's needs for a unique entrance and give some added relief to the long wall as it currently exists, and is therefore open to adding a portico.

The Board returned to the proposed changes to the façade. Mr. Martin found that there was a great variety in the textures that lacked cohesiveness in the various proposed EIFS changes. Ms. Hyde suggested that the overall design seemed appropriate for a different climate and not a small New England town.

The discussion then returned to the signs.

Several members of the Board questioned the purpose and necessity of the "Sudbury" sign. The applicants indicated that it is fairly standard to have the city name as an identifier on the buildings. The applicants also indicated that the sign is of the same size as the existing sign, but with halo lit letters. The Board unanimously agreed that the location as presented has little relationship with the building. It appears to just float, and while it is centered, it is misaligned with the windows. It is also out of proportion with the building at the location indicated. Mr. Martin suggested that the size and/or type face should be addressed so that it better fits in with the building. Ms. Hyde also questioned the need for the wide line below it which further loosens its relationship with the building. The Board suggested that the applicants reconsider placing it back on the green column where it currently exists.

Mr. Fox indicated that the Range Rover and Land Rover signs had already been approved by the DRB and ZBA when they were previously submitted. Members of the Board were in agreement that the Land Rover and Range Rover signs are too high on the building. Mr. Fox indicated that these signs were drawn too high on the submitted materials and showed the board a drawing of the location previously approved. Seeing as the Board had already commented on and approved these signs, Mr. Martin indicated that no further discussion was necessary provided that they would be located at the height previously approved.

Mr. Martin questioned the need for the "Service" sign. The applicants indicated that vehicles approaching the building for service do indeed drive under the canopy where the sign is proposed to go. The Board had no objections to this.

Mr. Martin asked Mr. Fox what the applicant's objectives were for the meeting. Mr. Fox said that the applicants sought the Board's approval of the changes when they meet with the ZBA on Monday, and indicated that he realized that would not be possible given the issues that were raised.

The Board took no action on the application and told the applicants that it would pass its concerns on to the ZBA.

### ***Miscellaneous***

The Board approved the minutes of April 24.

The Board agreed to meet on the regularly scheduled 4<sup>th</sup> Wednesday, May 22.