



Town of Sudbury

Design Review Board

DesignReviewBoard@sudbury.ma.us

Flynn Building
278 Old Sudbury Road
Sudbury, MA 01776
978-639-3387
Fax: 978-443-0756
www.sudbury.ma.us/designreviewboard

MINUTES Design Review Board 5/6/2020

Present: Jen Koffel, Dan Martin, Jim Parker, Susan Vollaro
Absent: Deborah Kruskal

Jaguar Land Rover **Joshua Fox, presenting for Jaguar** **Shelley Bereznicki of Pattison Design Group**

The Board first reviewed the wall mounted, self-illuminated signs on the front elevation. Mr. Fox informed the Board that the previous signage on the front of the building was 93 square feet and the new proposed signage will be 86 square feet. Ms Bereznicki informed the Board that all of the building signage presented is halo lit and are approximately 1 ¼” off of the building, directly attached. The Board was most concerned by the oval Land Rover logo and whether it would have the appearance of a light box. Ms Bereznicki described the oval as being halo lit on the sides. She later described the letters within the oval as having a glow to them. The Board is concerned that the non-letter portion be opaque, even if the letters are lit. The Board offered the example of the large, circular Whole Foods sign that is not channel letters, as required by the bylaw, but has the appearance of such because the non-letter portion is completely opaque. The Board otherwise unanimously agreed that the size, placement, color, and lighting are appropriate as presented.

The Board then reviewed the two logo signs on the East elevation. These two signs, at 28 square feet total, in aggregate with the front signage, exceed the previous ZBA approval of 100sf. There was discussion about the size, location, and lighting of these signs. Several members of the Board expressed a desire to have these signs reduced to the same size as the ones on the front of the Building. Mr Fox said that he would look into that possibility. The Board also commented that internally lit signs are generally sized down when halo lit per the bylaws and the majority of the Board thought that these two signs should not be self-illuminated. The applicants noted that they may want to install the signs with a dimmer to preserve the option for self-illumination.

Window graphics were presented and conform to the bylaws.

Sign Item #12, Freestanding Entry Sign: 10’-9 7/8” tall, 3’ 5 3/8” wide 37.35sf per side. Sign is replacing previously existing sign in the same location. Existing signage was 6.9’ tall by 3’ wide.

The board expressed concern about tree height blocking the top of the sign and recommends that it be designed one panel lower. Mr Fox stated that it is impossible to make any changes per the manufacturer. The board suggests that freestanding signs are not allowed to be higher than 10' per the bylaws and that the ZBA will need to decide if this is acceptable. Ms Bereznicki also noted that the freestanding sign would have the same self-illumination. The Board would have the same concerns about the Land Rover sign opacity as on the front of the building and does not want to see a lightbox effect like on the freestanding sign for Maserati in Wayland. The Board did not discuss the appropriateness of self-illuminating freestanding signs or whether the previous one had been internally illuminated. The sign was otherwise acceptable to the Board.

Sign Item #10: Welcome and directional sign, 23.79sf as presented. This freestanding sign was the most objectionable to the Board. The Board found that its close proximity to the street and other freestanding sign was excessive. Mr Fox noted that the sign is required by corporate, but Mr Martin noted that multiple freestanding signs are prohibited by the bylaw, and that because the sign contains the logos again it is more like a freestanding sign. The Board feels that, given the simple layout of the site and the presence of "Service" on the building itself, the additional sign is not necessary. Otherwise the Board recommends reducing its size.

Sign Item #11, freestanding sign for previously owned vehicles. The Board questioned the necessity for such a sign and the vagueness as to its location on the site plan. The Board questioned the necessity for this as an exterior sign and Mr Fox stated that this is a manufacturer recommendation. The Board recommended that Mr Fox determine where this sign will be located before meeting with the ZBA. If the used vehicles are to be in the rear of the lot, then the Board would not have an issue as it would be less visible on Route 20. Otherwise, if the proposed location is on the front of the parcel, then the board expressed a preference to relocate the sign to the interior. The Board agreed that the ZBA should be the ultimate arbiter of the appropriateness of the sign when presented with the actual location.

Customer parking signage:

The Board's sole comment was that the applicant may want to orientation the signs rotated 90-degrees. Mr Fox agreed that the rotation might be more effective.

No comments on the Charging signage were made.

Staff commented that this application will go Monday May 11 to ZBA.

Cold Brook Crossing:

Chris Claussen with Quarry North LLC

Bill Henchy, Legal Counsel

The Board first reviewed the E and E2 permanent signs. The Board noted that it was unclear from the plans how these two signs would be oriented for visibility and safety. Mr Claussen

supposed that the signs would be at an angle to the street and sufficiently far back for vehicle site-line safety. These signs have been reduced from the previous presentation and front lit. They are made of New England fieldstone with carved text. The Board is satisfied with the changes from the previous iteration.

The Board noted that the sign with three lines of text was a little crowded. Mr Claussen said that was to incorporate “Cold Brook Drive” to conform with the bylaw requirement to have the address on freestanding signs. The Board feels that “Cold Brook Drive” is redundant with the street sign and the name of the development has effectively including the street name. The Board leaves it to the applicant to decide whether it is preferable to remove “Cold Brook Drive” from one or both of these two signs.

Mr Claussen presented the signage location plan. He stated that C1 are apartment leasing signs that are necessary on an ongoing basis as tenants turn over. Setbacks and angles of signs are not indicated in the proposed materials, the board recommends including those moving forward.

Ms Vollaro commented that the E2 sign interior to the property may be too large for the use case. Mr Claussen agreed that this sign is worth having a second look at, and that it may be worth reducing its size to better suit the slower traffic and wayfinding sequence.

Sign F: Permanent Stone Pillars

Mr Claussen clarified they are intended to indicate the boundary of the age restricted units. The board has no objection to these signs.

Sign S: Street identification signs, no comments were made.

Sign A: Temporary marketing sign, no comments were made.

Sign B: Temporary Marketing sign

Mr Claussen said this is Intended to be perpendicular to 117. This sign was consolidated in response to comments from the Board at the previous meeting. The board requests to indicate a specific location on a site plan. The board inquired about plantings nearby and should take under consideration. The Board also found the repetition of the CBC and Cold Brook Crossing text to be redundant. Mr Claussen clarified that the CBC and Cold Brook Crossing text would be replaced with logos to be determined.

Sign C:

Board recommends placement farther from Rt 117.

Sign C1:

DRB Minutes
May 6, 2020
Page 4 of 4

The Board asked whether it would make more sense to incorporate these into the H wayfinding signs or whether they could be reduced in size somewhat as residents may find the large red signs off-putting in comparison to the rest of the permanent sign plan. Mr. Claussen clarified that the third (medium size) C1 sign is no longer proposed in the package.

Sign D:

Emery temp signage. The board did not object to these signs.

Miscellaneous

The Board approved the minutes of its previous meeting, April 8, 2020.