



Town of Sudbury

Design Review Board

DesignReviewBoard@sudbury.ma.us

Flynn Building
278 Old Sudbury Road
Sudbury, MA 01776
978-639-3387
Fax: 978-639-3314
www.sudbury.ma.us/designreviewboard

Meeting Minutes November 3, 2021 Design Review Board

Meeting Format: Zoom Conference Call
Present: Susan Vollaro, Jim Parker, and Chris Alfonso

Review Proposed Signage

Applicant: Shaw's Supermarket
507 Boston Post Road

Jamie Fisher with I.D. Sign Group Inc represented Shaw's Supermarket. The newly proposed sign would replace the existing roof mounted "Shaw's" sign. Jamie explained that the Shaw's brand has gone through minor adjustments such as bringing the leaves closer together. The orange color and dimensions remain almost the same. It was clarified that the leaf is approximately 14" taller but the sign is aesthetically the same. The sign previously was approved, but no longer conforms to the current bylaws.

The second presented sign was the monument sign which would replace the current sign the orange logo as opposed to the current beige/yellow sign. The entire monument sign has begun to transition to colored panels. The board recommends that Shaw's orange color conforms to the property standard or toned down to match the other signs. Jamie Fisher mentioned that ORANGE PMS165C is Shaw's orange, so they'd like to keep it.

Blade signs were brought up into question as this board has not received an application for blade signs in the last few years, but they seem to be newly added to all the businesses on the property, presumably by the property owners. Ms. Vollaro recommends that the building inspector should check these signs. It was noted that a cone was observed below the somewhat low Shaw's blade sign, appearing to discourage walking underneath.

The board motioned to recommend to the ZBA to approve the replacement of the roof mounted sign, which is the same overall size and appearance as the existing sign, feeling that this size is appropriate to the scale and location of the business. The board further recommended that the sign at the monument have uniform coloring with the other business signs. This motion does not approve the existing blade sign as it was not presented before the board.

The board unanimously approved the motion.

Review of Proposed Site Plan – Comments to the Planning Board

**Applicant: Town of Sudbury
15 & 40 Fairbank Road, Fairbank Community Center
(Assessor's Maps F05-0005 and F06-0001)**

The site plan application was presented by Joel Bargmann, Kyle Zick, and John Kucich.

The applicant informed the board that in this new plan, there will be fewer parking spots on the building side of Fairbank Road, with the assumption that visitors can utilize the existing large parking lot across the street. This will allow for less hardscape and more green spaces with better drainage. The senior center lot can accommodate senior citizen visitors, who may have mobility issues, so the intention is that seniors would not have to use the lot across the street. Ms. Vollaro indicated that as long as there is enough parking for seniors, she supports the idea of sharing spaces with the lot across the street. This is better for the environment and provides more green space for public outdoor activities.

Mr. Parker asked about sidewalks from the Haskell parking lot and if there would be a paved path from this parking lot. The applicant made it clear there would be sidewalks between the parking lot and the path to the community center entrances. Mr. Parker also mentioned that the intersection is quite congested and asked if it is being moved from its present location. Mr. Bargmann explained that the entrance will be moved, but not any further because it would be too close to the crosswalk if it was not where presented.

Ms. Vollaro asked if there would be lower landscape lighting along the pedestrian sidewalks. The applicant felt that the freestanding pole lights would be adequate.

The board inquired about proposed signage, and emphasized the importance of signage, to identify parking and entrances, especially since the two entrances are for different purposes. Signage at each building entry was also suggested so that the public can confirm that they are using the correct entrance. Ms. Vollaro also noted that the proposed freestanding sign in front of the building may not be visible as it is set back among several new trees. The applicant has not finalized a signage plan at this time and will consider the board's comments.

The location of the dumpsters was questioned. Mr. Parker noted that the dumpsters would be directly adjacent to the pedestrian walkway entering from Hudson Road. Ms. Vollaro also noted that the dumpsters would be directly in your sightline when you turn in using the senior citizens entrance and suggested rotating the dumpster location 90 degrees at that corner. The applicant would consider this, and also noted that the dumpsters would be surrounded by wood fencing.

The lighting for the basketball court was questioned about the impact on the housing located adjacent to the property line. The applicant informed the board that the plan currently does not

show lighting due to budget constraints. However, if budget allows to add or relocate existing lighting, it would not have an impact on the neighboring properties.

Ms. Vollaro questioned the senior center entrance, noting that the door that was directly visible as you approach the building is actually the entrance for the school administration. The large windows at the entrance would showcase stairs that go up to these offices. Senior center visitors would have to look for their entrance, which is to the right. Ms. Vollaro was concerned that seniors with limited mobility and possibly diminishing eyesight might have a difficult time locating their public entrance which is tucked to the side. The applicant informed that board that there was a lot of discussion about this entrance. This design allows for a 90 degree turn within the vestibule to minimize draft into the lobby and allow a viewing area in the vestibule while seniors wait for rides.

The board also noted that architecturally, the senior/school administration office entrance appears as the “main” entrance and the pool/community center entrance seems smaller. The entrances may be confusing since the community center entrance will have much more traffic from the public. The applicant indicated that the building is lower on this side, therefore limiting the entrance height. The board agrees that the entrances could be more equivalent in terms of style and presence.

Ms. Vollaro asked if windows can be added at the pool viewing room. The applicant indicated that this is their preference also, but this is an existing thick wall and budget constraints prevent breaking into it to create windows.

The board noted the area of blank wall at the shelter/storage room next to the gym and asked if shrubs or perennials could be added to the landscaping in that area to break up the façade.

The board felt that the material selections and finishes were appropriate for this facility.

Overall, the board appreciated the thoughtful design choices that have been made for a new and improved Fairbanks Community Center.

Minutes for Approval:

A motion was made to approve the minutes of October 6, 2021. The board unanimously approved the motion.

Other Business/Administrative Report:

The board motioned to approve meeting dates for 2022.
The board unanimously approved the motion.