



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 February 23, 2022 Design Review Board

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

Review of Proposed Signage

Applicant: Compass
353 Boston Post Road

Compass was represented by Bob Lanigan of Bob's Sign Service Inc. The applicant presented two new signs to replace existing ones in the same locations. One 36"x96" sign will be mounted on the roof over the entrance, and one 14"x36" sign will be mounted on the side of the building. With a building frontage of 20 linear feet, this business is allowed to have a maximum total sign face area of 33 s.f., with the primary sign having a maximum of 24.75 s.f. The proposed signs conform to the bylaws. The board suggested that the sign have a white border to help define it better and provide a more finished look. A suggestion was also made to change the proportion or shape of the sign, making it slightly wider and less tall but not increasing the total area. This sign will require the approval from the Historic Districts Commission. There was no lighting proposed.

A motion was made to approve the signs as submitted with the suggestion of adding a border and considering an alternate sign shape or proportion. All approved the motion.

Review of Proposed Signage

Applicant: Post Road Pediatrics, Sudbury Medical & Dental
616 Boston Post Road

Sudbury Medical and Dental was represented by John Peterson of Metro Sign. The applicant proposed revised signage based on the last meeting with the DRB. A new 48" x 42" freestanding business center identification sign is proposed to replace the existing sign on Boston Post Road. An additional new 42" x 42" freestanding business center identification sign is proposed at the property entrance on Horse Pond Road. Two 76.5" x 54" wall-mounted signs are proposed listing the tenants with directional arrows pointing in the direction of their corresponding entrance. Post Road Pediatrics is listed on both signs with an entrance on each side. These signs would require a special permit from the Zoning Board of Appeals based on the two freestanding signs as well as the size of the two large wall-mounted directional signs. The board felt that given the fact that the property has a Boston Post Road address with a Horse Pond Road entrance, two freestanding signs are justified for this property. However, the signage as proposed

still didn't seem to work as a coherent signage package. The board felt that the two directional signs were much too large, and it is confusing that one business is listed at both entrances. It seems as if the directional signs are being combined with the business signs. The board questioned why Post Road Pediatrics was listed on both entrances, since it is well known that their main entrance faces Boston Post Road, but the applicant did not have an answer. The board felt that the logo and extra expository text around Post Road Pediatrics could make also make it harder for a person pulling into the lot to read. Mr. Parker suggested that the directional signs should not be on the building. Ms. Vollaro explained to the applicant that the board's assumption is that there are two purposes for these signs. One is for the visitor to see that the business is located there, and one for visitors to know which entrance to use once they are on the property. A Freestanding Business Center Identification sign would be best suited to the Horse Pond Road entrance. As per the town bylaws, section 3265A, 3265B, and 3266. This would have a larger panel identifying the property as "Sudbury Medical and Dental Center". Underneath would be smaller panels listing all the tenants on the property once. (This would be more similar to the original application submittal but without directional information.) After the visitor safely turns into the property, either smaller directional signs can point to the proper entrance based on business name, or wall-mounted business signs can be installed over or near the entrances. The applicant's representative at the meeting was not able to give the owner's feedback on the DRB's suggestions. The applicant was informed that since these signs will need a special permit, this application can be submitted to the Zoning Board of Appeals, or a revised application can be presented to the Design Review Board to review. If a revised proposal is presented to the DRB, it is highly recommended that representative that can provide feedback and discuss options and attend the meeting in order to facilitate the process. At the current design, the board does not recommend approval by the ZBA.

Review of Proposed Signage

Applicant: **Tilt Cycle/Crossfit Cycle**
 60 Union Ave

Tilt Cycle/Crossfit Cycle was represented by Elias De Aquino of Ultra Signs. The applicant provided a revised application for a freestanding building center identification sign. The building has multiple tenants, and the street frontage of the lot is 100 linear feet. On the application, the business center was identified as "Tilt Cycle Plaza", but the main panel on the sign had the Tilt Cycle logo. Per section 3265A of the bylaws, a freestanding business center identification sign on a lot with a street frontage of 100 linear feet can have a maximum size of 16 square feet and must be set back 8 ft. from the front of the lot. No lighting was presented. If the Tilt Cycle sign was considered to be the freestanding business center identification sign, then at the proposed 72"w x 30"h, it would conform to the bylaws. The sign includes for four 10" high tenant panels. It is proposed to be installed 8 ft. back from the front of the lot. The board felt that the design of sign itself was fine, but there was a question of whether the main panel of the sign actually identified the business center or one of the businesses on the property. The applicant was informed that this determination would need to be made by the building inspector.

A motion was made to approve the sign as a freestanding business center identification sign with the understanding that the main panel of the sign conveys the name of the center. All approved the motion.

Minutes for Approval, February 9, 2022:

The Board unanimously approved the minutes for the meeting dated February 9, 2021.

Other Business:

Kay Bell, Sudbury resident and chair of the Sudbury Commission on Disability, attended the meeting to discuss the DRB's previous comments regarding the entrance to the proposed senior center. Ms. Bell asked the board members to provide a summary of their feedback on the new senior center and asked if these comments were incorporated into the new design. Ms. Vollaro expressed her concern on the complicated sideways entry access for the seniors who are more prone to be dealing with balance, vision, and stamina difficulties. The board received updated plans prior to this meeting and noted that the entrance was modified, but still seems difficult for seniors to navigate. The bulk of the entrance area still seems to be dedicated to the second-floor occupants with their separate entry and immediate access to the stairs and elevator.