Meeting Minutes August 14, 2019 Sudbury Design Review Board

Present: Jennifer Koffel, Deborah Kruskal, Jim Parker, Susan Vollaro, as well as Adam Duchesneau, Director of

Planning and Community Development in Sudbury

Absent: Dan Martin

Applicant: Loyal Companion
424 Boston Post Rd

Loyal Companion was represented Heather Dudko of National Sign. The applicant is proposing a $24" \times 12"$ freestanding directional sign to be placed at the Union Ave entrance to the parking lot. There is an existing sign from the previous tenant that does not conform to the town's bylaws, and there is no permit for it. This sign will be removed. The proposed directional sign conforms to the town bylaws. Suggestions were made to make the

sign more noticeable and readable.

A motion was presented to approve the signs as presented with the suggestion to modify the color or graphics

to make the sign more readable. All approved the motion.

Applicant: SS Fit Studio

339 Boston Post Rd.

SS Fit Studio was represented by owner Steven SanSoucie. The applicant is proposing a 36" x 36" wall-mounted sign to be mounted over the entrance to the establishment on the second floor from the front of the building. (The site slopes down, so it is on the third floor from the back of the building.) As per the bylaws, a second floor business is allowed a 10 square foot sign, so this sign conforms to the bylaws. The board suggested that the tagline was very small and might not be legible. If this is removed, the top image can be increased a little in size, and will be more readable from the street.

A motion was presented to approve the signs as presented. All approved the motion.

Applicant: 15 Concord Road, LLC

5-15 Concord Rd.

15 Concord Road, LLC was represented by Property Manager Allyson Reed. The applicant proposed updating an existing freestanding monument sign by painting/refacing it. There is existing lighting built into the sign which hasn't been working for several years. The applicant is unsure how the sign is lit, but she believes that the lights are inside the top piece, pointed down towards the panels. The words "Independence Corner" would be removed from the sign and the business name panels would be replaced with new. Currently, there are two large panels and four small panels. Only one panel has a business name already on it, for "Sudbury Dental Excellence". Instead, three larger panels are proposed with the assumption that there would be three tenants

on the property moving forward. One panel would be for "Date & Time", one would be for "Sudbury Dental Excellence", and one would be left blank for a future tenant.

Since the freestanding sign itself is an existing sign that will only have color changes, the board felt that there was nothing required to review, so it would still be bound to what was approved under its original permit. The board did request clarification as to how the sign is lit to ensure that it is allowed under the bylaws. The business owner will find out and notify the town. With regard to the panels indicating business names, individual business name panels are considered secondary signs for each business. Date & Time did not include a panel on the freestanding monument sign on their original sign permit request. The board does not believe that Date & Time has any remaining sign square footage to be allotted for this extra sign. This information will need to be verified before a permit can be allowed on the freestanding monument panels. A special permit may be required if not.

A motion was presented to approve the cosmetic changes as presented, with the caveat that the Date & Time panel must be within the total allowable square footage for that building, with a reminder that the sign panels cannot be internally lit as a lightbox. All approved the motion.

Applicant: Infinity Med Spa
365 Boston Post Rd.

Infinity Med Spa was represented by owner Jasmine Taliadorous as well as Margaret Vosburgh of ViewPoint Signs. The applicant brought to the meeting a revised proposal, showing a wall mounted sign for the second floor business measuring 14" x 102", totaling 9.9 square feet. This sign will be mounted above the second floor windows, centered under a gable facing the parking lot on the back of the building. No lighting was presented for this sign. The board suggested that the sign be mounted slightly higher than what was presented at the meeting, allowing more space between the bottom of the sign and the top of the windows below.

A motion was presented to approve the sign as presented. All approved the motion.

Applicant: House of Dance 387 Boston Post Rd.

House of Dance was represented by owner Travers King as well as Margaret Vosburgh of ViewPoint Signs. The applicant brought to the meeting revisions to the original drawings/photos submitted with the application. The applicant proposes re-wrapping two existing awnings and installing a third awning. All three awnings would have the business name and other graphics. Based on the business building frontage of 90 linear feet indicated on the application, the client would be allowed 42 sq. ft. total signage for the business. The total amount of text and graphics on the awning far exceeded the maximum square footage. The applicant suggested that only the text was considered part of the building signage, and not the additional graphics. After some consideration, the board all agreed that given the context that everything is shown together along each awning panel, the graphics and logos are all a part of the signs. There was discussion as to how to reduce the square footage, such as not having signage on all three awnings or removing the graphics altogether. The applicant decided to rethink their application and with meet with the board again to present a revised proposal.

No motion was made. The applicant will revise the design and meet with the board again.

Applicant: Skybar

365 Boston Post Rd.

Skybar was represented by owner Louise Mawhinney as well as Margaret Vosburgh of ViewPoint Signs. The applicant presented a revised sign showing different sizes from their initial application. The owner proposed three wall-mounted signs, one on each side of the building, as well as possibly a blade sign at the rear entrance. Each of these sides has door to the outside. No illuminations for the signs were presented. The building frontage was not indicated on the original applications, so one of the board members went to the business and measured the lengths prior to the meeting. As per the bylaws, 100% of the length of the main entrance as well as 40% of the secondary entrances are calculated to determine the building frontage. Based on this information, the building frontage was calculated to be 70 linear feet, with the total permitted sign allowance at 39 square feet. The proposed signage far exceeded this maximum, so there was discussion as to how best conform to the size limitations. The wall-mounted sign on the east façade was the most important sign to the business owner, so as the primary sign, the maximum square footage allowed I 29.25 square feet (75% of the total sign face area allowance). Per the discussion at the meeting, the application was ultimately revised to include the following:

- One blade sign to match the building standard at the rear entrance, totaling 2.23 square feet. (This sign was presented at the meeting.)
- One wall-mounted sign on the east façade with the same company logo as shown mounted to the same location as shown on the application, but reducing the size so it totals no more than 29.25 square feet
- Possibly a window sign on the north side facing Boston Post Road. Window signs would not require a
 permit, but the board reminded the owner that the sign area cannot exceed 25% of the window area.

A motion was presented to approve the one wall-mounted sign and one blade sign after the owner submits to the town an updated graphic representation of the wall sign showing the same logo as presented, but with the size scaled down to conform to the size requirements. All approved the motion.

Applicant: Verizon

415 Boston Post Rd.

Verizon was represented by Margaret Vosburgh of ViewPoint Signs. The applicant proposed a primary sign and a secondary sign, each at 9'-9" x 2'-0", each at 19.5 square feet, totaling 39 square feet. Each sign would be wall mounted under the gable and above the north and west façade entrances. No illumination was presented. The primary façade is at 56 linear feet, and the secondary façade is at 38 linear feet. Based on these measurements, the maximum sign face area is 39 square feet. The two signs conform to the sign requirements, with no square footage left over. The mounting locations of the two signs were shown on building elevation drawings, and after comparing these with actual pictures of the building, the board noticed that aspects of the drawings did not match the actual building. The signs would need to be mounted higher than shown. A member of the board suggested that prior to mounting the sign on the north façade, the applicant should check to make sure that the sign on the north façade will fit with enough space around it. Another board member suggested that since the gable at the west entrance is so much larger than the gable on the north façade, the applicant should consider making the west side sign larger and the north side sign smaller. This would ensure that the north façade sign will fit, and the signs will better match the proportions of the gable. However, the total square footage would

still need to fit within the requirements, and the larger primary sign cannot be more than 75% of the total signage. If the applicant wishes to modify the signs, they do not need to meet with the board again; they can provide the town with the revised sizes to confirm that the signs still conform to the bylaws.

A motion was presented to approve the sign as presented with the recommendation to revise the sizes but keeping them within the allowable overall area. All approved the motion.

Applicant: Northeast Dermatology Associates 530c Boston Post Rd.

Northeast Dermatology Associates was represented by Jeff Sarra of Batten Bros. Signs & Awnings. This business will be located in the Meadow Walk Development, and therefore is subject to those standards. The applicant is proposing internally illuminated signs and blade signs. Based on the zoning review, the applicant will need to revise the size of the signs. The applicant became aware of this before the meeting, but came to the meeting anyway to receive input from the Design Review Board. The application will be revised and updated drawings will be provided to the town and will be presented at a future DRB meeting.

The applicant is proposing two internally illuminated primary aluminum signs with routed cutouts for the letters. The sign itself will be opaque aluminum, with no light going through it, and the cutouts will be backed with white acrylic, which will allow light to go through. According to the applicant, the west entrance is 38 linear feet, allowing a max 38 square feet non-illuminated sign or a 30.4 square feet illuminated sign. The east entrance is 34.2 linear feet, allowing a max 34.2 square feet non-illuminated sign or a 27.3 square feet illuminated sign. The proposed sign sizes are too large and will be revised. The applicant was also reminded that according to the Village Retail sign parameters, lettering cannot exceed 24 inches in height. There was some discussion among the board members as to whether this specific type of sign is more like an "internally illuminate box sign" type, which is prohibited, or an "internally illuminated" sign type that is allowed. In the end, the board was split as to whether this type of sign is allowed according to the Village Retail Parameters. The applicant indicated that Whole Foods has a sign of this type, but the board was not sure if this sign had the same requirement s as the rest of the Village Retail businesses.

The applicant also proposed two non-illuminated blade signs, one at each entrance façade. These signs will be 20" x 24", totaling 3 square feet. They conform to the sign parameters.

The applicant is going to discuss all of the above comments with the business owner and return to the Board with proposed changes, so no formal vote was taken. The applicant will need to be advised as to whether the proposed sign type is allowed.

The board approved the minutes for the meeting dated July 10, 2019.

At the conclusion of the meeting with applicants, Adam Duchesneau discussed with the board their role in the sign application process. Adam indicated that it is the role of the Design Review Board to make design recommendations, while the zoning review provided by the town evaluates compliance with town bylaws.