



Town of Sudbury

Design Review Board

Flynn Building
278 Old Sudbury Road
Sudbury, MA 01776
978-639-3387
Fax: 978-639-3314

DesignReviewBoard@sudbury.ma.us

www.sudbury.ma.us/designreviewboard

Meeting Minutes **April 28, 2021** **Design Review Board**

Meeting format: Zoom Conference Call

Present: Chris Alfonso, Jennifer Koffel, Dan Martin, Jim Parker, and Susan Vollaro

Applicant: Sudbury Historical Society History Center and Museum
288 Old Sudbury Road

The Sudbury Historical Society History Center and Museum was represented by Rachael Robinson. The applicant presented a vinyl window sign consisting of lettering that takes up less than 25% of the window area. After reviewing the town bylaws, the applicant did not believe a permit was necessary and the window sign is already installed. This sign was set for review by the DRB due to the ground lighting that points up to the window. The town bylaws indicate that a window sign can only be illuminated by standard lighting fixtures on the building. The applicant explained that the ground light is one of several that are circuited together and point up to illuminate the building as a whole, and they have been there at least a couple years prior to this window sign being installed. The Board determined that the lighting was not installed for a sign, so this does not require a special permit. The applicant was reminded that they still must present this sign to the Historic District Commission.

A motion was made to approve this sign with the understanding that the light was a part of a pre-existing lighting system meant to illuminate the entire building. All approved this motion.

Applicant: Coldwell Banker
447 Boston Post Road

Coldwell Banker was represented by Vickie Ashmed. The applicant presented new signs in the same size and location of existing ones, updated with the new company logo. The signs consist of a 22.34 s.f. wall mounted sign and a 3.58 s.f. blade sign, totaling 25.92 s.f. With a building frontage of 20 linear feet, this conforms to the maximum total signage size of 33 s.f.

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

**Meeting Minutes
April 28, 2021
Design Review Board**

**Applicant: Bay Path Condo Association
215 Boston Post Road**

Bay Path Condo Association was represented by Seth Adler and Stephen Michels. The applicant presented a new freestanding business center identification sign to replace the previous sign. The proposed sign is 46" wide x 36" high showing the address number surrounded by an oval border. The applicant indicated that this would be replacing an existing sign with the same dimensions but different colors. The application package included a picture of the previous sign showing only the street number as well as the new sign design. This property received a special permit for a freestanding sign in 2007, but there were no allowances for changes to the sign. Therefore, any changes will need to go before the ZBA again for another special permit. The Board noted that the proposed sign had different proportions to the existing, so it appears that there are more modifications being made other than just the finishes. The applicant stated that they would make the new sign match the size, proportions, and location of the existing sign so that this can be treated as sign maintenance rather than sign changes. The Board was provided a copy of the special permit for the original sign, and that sign was described as a business sign with individual panels providing names of businesses. After being told by the applicant that the number sign was the only sign that was there, Charles Orr, a resident of Sudbury and business owner on the property informed the Board that there was a sign with names of businesses. Mr. Alfonso confirmed this after looking at Google street view from 2012. This showed the business sign with business name panels that the special permit described. Given this information, it was clear that the proposed sign is different from the previously approved sign, and a special permit from the Zoning Board of Appeals will be required. The applicant was asked if the signs that have been hanging off light posts still exist, and they stated that those signs are no longer there.

All members of the Board felt that some sort of freestanding sign would be beneficial, given that several of the business on the property are not visible from Boston Post Road. There was disagreement within the Board whether a business sign or a business center identification sign would better serve that location. With regards to the design of the proposed sign, the Board suggested installing the sign a little higher, to avoid being blocked by snow. It was also suggested that the number seems to sit awkward in the oval border, perhaps the sign itself could be oval. The location of the sign is shown on a site plan, but no dimensions to the edge of the property were provided, so the Board cannot confirm if the sign will conform to the minimum setback requirements.

It seemed clear to the Board that a different sign was approved as part of the special permit, but at one time there was also a sign on the property with just the number. The Board determined that given the ambiguous signage history of this location, the building inspector will need to make a determination on the nature of the sign modification and determine if a special permit is required.

No motion was made.

Meeting Minutes
April 28, 2021
Design Review Board

Applicant: Longfellow Glen
655 Boston Post Road

Longfellow Glen was represented by Regional Manager Nellie Sequeira as well as Property Manager Eric Bullock. The applicant presented a new 79" x 43" freestanding sign at the entrance to the apartments. At 23.5 square feet, this sign exceeds the maximum 10 s.f. sign that is allowed in residential districts, so this sign will require a special permit from the Zoning Board of Appeals. Several older residents reside at the property who are often receiving deliveries and rides, and the property managers believe that a large sign identifying the property will better serve its residents. There was previously a freestanding installed decade ago, but no sign has been there for the past few years. The Board overall agreed that the size of the proposed sign was appropriate, especially since the sign location is set back from the road. With regards to the design of the sign, the Board liked the overall aesthetic. It was recommended to remove the phone number because it could be confused with the address, and cars driving by would not be able to copy this information anyway. The Board also recommended to remove the text in the bottom right corner, keeping only the logos. The text is too small to be read anyway, and the logos convey the necessary information. Lastly, the Board strongly recommended making the address much larger, possibly placing it centered on the top of the sign. This would be most helpful for visitors trying to identify the property entrance. The applicant can bring their design modifications when applying for approval from the ZBA.

A motion was made to recommend approval of the special permit by the Zoning Board of Appeals with some modifications including making the address more prominent and reducing the amount of information on the sign. All approved this motion.

The Board approved the minutes for the meeting dated April 14, 2021.