

**Sudbury Design Review Board Minutes
December 14, 2016**

DRB Attendees:

Dan Martin, Chair

Jennifer Koffel

Deborah Kruskal

**Joint Meeting with the Design Review Board - National Development – Meadow Walk –
Minor Modification to Approved Master Development Plan – BPR Development LLC –
526 & 528 Boston post Road (Assessor’s Map K07-0011 & K07-0013)**

Present: National Development Project Manager Steve Senna and representative Kate Snyder, VHB Stormwater Management consultant Karen Staffier, landscape architect Chris Jones, and architect Jenna Miccile, Design Review Board (DRB) Chair Dan Martin and DRB members Jennifer Koffel and Deborah Kruskal

At 8:17 p.m., Chairman Abair opened a Joint Meeting with the Design Review Board regarding a Minor Modification to an Approved Master Development Plan submitted by BPR Development LLC for Meadow Walk, 526 & 528 Boston post Road (Assessor’s Map K07-0011 & K07-0013). The Board was previously in receipt of copies of a letter from National Development Project Manager Steve Senna dated October 31, 2016 and an accompanying Application Binder (including plans). In addition, copies of the slides for tonight’s PowerPoint presentation were distributed to the Board tonight.

National Development representative Kate Snyder stated the development team looked more closely at the village retail layout and it has received feedback from prospective tenants. Ms. Snyder also stated the architecture design has been advanced, noting visits were made to other retail centers to determine what features work and what features do not work. She exhibited slides of the Master Development Plan as it had been approved and for what is being proposed. Ms. Snyder emphasized the plan is still for 35,000 square feet of retail space, but the footprint for Building 2 has shifted and parking has been adjusted accordingly. She further stated the architectural footprint for Building 3 was simplified and reduced a bit, and this space was distributed to Building 4 and 5.

Landscape architect Chris Jones summarized the revisions to the landscape plan. He showed slides of the concept plan and the minor modifications proposed. Mr. Jones stated the open space was reviewed to ensure a cohesive look throughout the development. He explained subtle changes were made to the circulation route and to the back sides of Buildings 4 and 5, which they believe enhance safety. Mr. Jones displayed a slide of the type of historic and natural materials and meadow grasses which would be used.

Architect designer Jenna Miccile stated her firm is in Franklin, MA, and it specializes in mixed-use, retail development projects. Ms. Miccile showed slides of the prior renderings, stating they tried to continue the layered look in the revised footprints. She also displayed slides of the façade elevations for Buildings 2, 3, 4, and 5, noting the maximum height was reflected in the renderings. Ms. Miccile also stated a comprehensive sign package will be submitted at a later date. She also showed slides of the view from Route 20 and the adjustments made to Buildings 2

and 3. Ms. Miccile stated the plans have been revised so the architecture works with the landscape to create places where people will want to pause.

Ms. Snyder stated a new public view has been added where Building 4 would have been.

Mr. Hincks asked if tenants will have input in determining their roof lines. He noted that, from an aerial view, the rooflines look the same, and he asked if the heights will vary. Ms. Snyder stated the team is seeking the Board's approval of the proposed design tonight so it can be shared with the marketplace.

Mr. Garvin stated the site plans do not reflect well the looks of the buildings, and, as presented, they appear similar to big warehouses. Mr. Morely concurred, stating they are large warehouses. Ms. Snyder stated the design team believes using different materials for the facades will create a feeling that each building is unique.

With the use of slides, Ms. Miccile explained Building 5 will use more contemporary brick and wood materials to help anchor the open space area.

Mr. Senna stated the revisions made are being presented as a minor modification. He highlighted that their lawyer, Peter Tamm, would argue the revisions do not rise to even the level of a minor modification, and they could be unilaterally implemented based upon the Development Agreement. However, Mr. Senna emphasized the team has worked consistently well with the Town, and it chose to present the changes tonight.

Mr. Morely noted the architectural firm used has changed, which Mr. Senna confirmed to be accurate. Mr. Morely stated modifications were anticipated based on the needs of actual tenants, but there are no tenants at this time. Mr. Senna stated feedback has been received from real prospective tenants, and several letters of intent have been received, but information cannot be shared publicly at this time.

Mr. Morely stated he understands the need for changes, but he believes the revisions made have moved the project closer to a big-box design. He believes there is a distinct difference in what is proposed tonight from the original plan. Mr. Morely believes the development now looks similar to many others, and he believes it has lost some of its uniqueness. Mr. Senna stated he respectfully disagreed. Mr. Morely stated he is annoyed because a lot of time was previously spent discussing the interplay of Building 5 with the open space park, and he believes this no longer exists in the new plans.

Mr. Garvin stated it seems as if a gateway has been created but it does not lead through to the Whole Foods Building. He also suggested Building 5 could have been moved back.

Mr. Senna described some of the limitations of the former layout, and he emphasized the revised plans now provide two public realms for people to enjoy. He also emphasized it is not at all the team's objective to have the buildings have a big-box feel. Mr. Senna cautioned everyone to be careful about using the term big box too loosely, and he reviewed the square footage for the entire retail area versus that of one big-box store.

Mr. Jones stated the intent was to provide better frontage, and the activity space at the corner was increased.

Mr. Morely stated the elevations have a newer more modern period look, and he preferred the original design. He believes the revised design is more contemporary.

Mr. Morely stated the Town would like this development to be the new leader for how Sudbury looks. Mr. Morely stated the roof heights are nearly the same by a foot or two to the eye, and he asked if the heights could be adjusted.

Mr. Senna stated he has learned from the design team that it is important for open spaces to be framed by buildings. He also stated the revised plans provide the opportunity to create a distinct Meadow Walk area between Buildings 4 and 5.

Mr. Carty stated he had concerns about the height of the buildings when looking from above. He also asked if the door for Building 2 is on Route 20. Ms. Miccile and Ms. Snyder stated the goal is to have all the doors in front. Mr. Carty stated he likes the new proposed space between Buildings 4 and 5.

Mr. Garvin referenced the permeable pavers mentioned, and he stated these should be covered in the O & M Plan for treatment. He stated he thinks the changes to the rear of Buildings 4 and 5 are good. However, he asked how the changes might impact circulation routes for the Fire Department. Mr. Garvin stated he thinks the space is nice between Buildings 4 and 5, and he asked if there should be a path to Whole Foods to provide more pedestrian ways for people to get to the store. He also suggested the height articulation for Buildings 4 and 5 could be modified to be closer to what was presented in the former plans. Mr. Senna clarified that what is being asked for tonight is for the tenant-to-tenant building heights to be adjusted, and Mr. Garvin confirmed this to be accurate.

Ms. Miccile stated it was also the intent of the team to try to hide rooftop HVAC units with the decorative cornices used for screening. Mr. Garvin suggested the parapets could be stepped in a bit.

Mr. Morely stated he thinks Building 5 has been improved in the revised plan.

Mr. Long stated he likes the new separation between Buildings 4 and 5, and he views the revisions as a minor modification.

Mr. Hincks stated he likes the new separation between Buildings 4 and 5. However, he asked how someone would get to Buildings 2, 4 and 5 from Whole Foods. Mr. Jones explained why the areas were designed as they are for safety and to guide people to use the crosswalks. Mr. Senna stated textured colored crosswalks are planned.

Chairman Abair referenced a slide of Buildings 2 and 3 from Route 20, noting he did not think the revisions to the corner were an improvement. Mr. Jones explained the building actually sits higher than the street level, and the design was chosen to facilitate sight lines given the steepness

of the corner area. Chairman Abair stated he likes the space created between Buildings 4 and 5 and the changes made to parking.

DRB member Jennifer Koffel stated she agreed with many comments made by the Planning Board regarding Buildings 2 and 3. Regarding Building 4, she suggested reducing the use of trim boards because they seem to be conflicting with the horizontal boards. Regarding Building 5, Mr. Koffel stated the pediment in the front seems not in line with a barn look and it appears more classical. She also thinks the pediment creates a scale issue. She referenced the white building presented in the slides, stating she believes the color augments the building height issue, and she suggested using a darker tone or stone-like colors.

DRB member Debbie Kruskal stated she likes the revisions made to Building 4, and she prefers the revised plans to the original ones. Ms. Kruskal stated she likes the new layout and the space created between Buildings 4 and 5.

DRB Chairman Dan Martin stated he also likes the space between Buildings 4 and 5, and he thinks the new layout and new circulation routes are more appealing. Mr. Martin also stated he thinks the pediment is not a good design option. He suggested putting a slanted roof on either Building 2 or 3. Regarding Building 4, Mr. Martin believes the use of color and certain materials will help to disguise the building heights.

Chairman Abair stated he would like to see Building 2 more integrated into the plan.

Mr. Garvin reiterated his preference for finding a way to include a cut-through.

Mr. Morely thanked the applicant for bringing the revisions before the Board, and he also stated he liked the appearance of the white building in the renderings.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was

VOTED: To continue the discussion regarding a Minor Modification to an Approved Master Development Plan submitted by BPR Development LLC for Meadow Walk, 526 & 528 Boston post Road (Assessor's Map K07-0011 & K07-0013) to a date to be determined with the applicant at a later time.

At 9:30 p.m., the Joint Meeting of the Design Review Board and the Planning Board was adjourned.