

Present: Chairman Peter Abair, Christopher Morely, Stephen Garvin and John Hincks (Associate Member), Meagen Donoghue (Director of Planning and Community Development) and Beth Suedmeyer (Environmental Planner)

Absent: Dan Carty and Marty Long

At 7:40 p.m., Chairman Abair called the meeting to order.

**Public Hearing: Joint Meeting with the Design Review Board - National Development – Comprehensive Signage Permit- Mixed Use Overlay District - BPR Development LLC – 526 & 528 Boston post Road (Assessor’s Map K07-0011 & K07-0013)**

Present: National Development Project Manager Steve Senna and representative Kate Snyder, the applicant’s signage consultant Chris Sheehan, the applicant’s architect Jenna Miccile, the applicant’s attorney Peter Tamm, Design Review Board (DRB) Members Paula Hyde, Susan Vollaro, Jennifer Koffel and Deborah Kruskal

At 7:40 p.m., Chairman Abair opened a Public Hearing regarding the Comprehensive Signage Permit application submitted by BPR Sudbury Development LLC for 526 & 528 Boston Post Road (Assessor’s Map K07-0011 & K07-0013), and he opened a Joint Meeting with the Design Review Board (DRB), noting DRB members would arrive shortly. The Board was previously in receipt of copies of the Notice of Public Hearing (which Mr. Morely read aloud), a letter from BPR Sudbury Development LLC representative Katie Snyder dated January 6, 2017 and accompanying plans, and a draft “Town of Sudbury Planning Board Notice of Decision Comprehensive Signage Permit.” In addition, copies of a draft “Town of Sudbury Planning Board Notice of Decision Meadow Walk Sudbury Comprehensive Signage Approval” as revised by the applicant’s team and received today and copies of the PowerPoint slides for tonight’s presentation were distributed tonight.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was

VOTED: To appoint Planning Board Associate Member John Hincks as a voting Planning Board member for this Public Hearing.

Through a PowerPoint slide presentation, at 7:44 p.m., National Development’s representative Katie Snyder stated the applicant is here tonight seeking approval of its comprehensive signage application for Meadow Walk. Ms. Snyder provided a summary of the prior meeting with the Board in August 2016, where initial feedback was solicited. She further stated the team has worked to incorporate many of the ideas they have heard

from Town groups. Ms. Snyder displayed slides of renderings of the entry sign, monument signs, vehicular directional signs, street signs, and building signage for the retail units.

National Development Project Manager Steve Senna stated the Avalon signage has been included in tonight's package only as an example, noting it has already been approved as part of the Avalon Comprehensive Permit approval.

The applicant's signage consultant Chris Sheehan provided additional detail regarding the plans for each signage component. He described the entry monument as having a curved stone base with wood panels for the signs. Mr. Sheehan further stated floodlights would be used to light the base and the tenant sign panels would have a LED strip inside for illumination.

Ms. Snyder noted the applicant's team extensively studied the views from Route 20 and grading and determined the entry sign needs to be two single-sided signs.

Mr. Morely referred to some unsuccessful uses of stone in developments in Town. He stated a strong preference for a gray granite stone to be used for the entry sign and not have the brown-tone stones appear to dominate the appearance as they do in the renderings. Mr. Morely believes it is important for the stone color to reflect what is natural to the New England area.

Mr. Hincks referred to the rendering of the four tenant panels on the entry sign, and he asked if other tenants will have the rights to signage at the front entry point. Mr. Senna stated this is not being contemplated. However, Mr. Senna further explained that the sign shown tonight for "Active Adult Residential" is a placeholder at this time, and the applicant would like the flexibility to possibly use it in the future for one or two secondary anchor retail tenants. He explained it is possible future tenants in Buildings 4 and 5 might find this beneficial. Mr. Morely stated that, if a split on one panel sign is to occur in the future, it needs to be a horizontal split. Mr. Senna suggested the applicant would return to show the Board what a split sign would look like when and if there is a requested design for such. Mr. Garvin stated the applicant should work to tie together the panel-split design to appear as if it is a four-panel sign.

At 8:00 p.m., Design Review Board (DRB) members joined the meeting, and Chairman Abair summarized tonight's previous discussions.

DRB member Paula Hyde asked if the Whole Foods sign panel at the front entry would be closest to the road, and she was told it would be on both sides of the sign.

A brief discussion ensued regarding whether the possible two-panel front entry sign should be provisionally approved subject to the Board seeing the sample when ready (as

suggested by Mr. Morely) or whether the applicant should return to the Board with the sample for a modification to the plan discussion (as suggested by Mr. Garvin).

Mr. Sheehan briefly described the plans for street signs and directional signs to parking and residential areas. He also stated there would be seasonal banners placed on lamp posts. Mr. Garvin asked if the banners would also be used to promote tenants. The applicant's team explained the banners would be seasonal or they would be used to promote the Meadow Walk brand, but they would not be used to advertise specific tenants. Ms. Hyde asked how many banners would be on the site. Ms. Snyder stated the team is still working on the layout for the number of lamp poles and banners.

DRB member Jennifer Koffel stated her preference would be for the directional sign arrows to match the other arrow aesthetics as depicted on the color panels.

In response to a question from the DRB, Ms. Snyder explained the applicant plans to work with the Town more on the Trail Markers as the project progresses, and that they have been presented tonight only as placeholders.

Ms. Snyder referenced the last page of her slide package, noting it presents the exterior wall sign parameters for the 35,000 square-foot retail area. She emphasized the team used the Town's sign bylaw as their guide as they established a plan which could work for the Town and be viable for retail tenants. Ms. Snyder described the system used to determine the amount of signage for tenants was based on linear frontage guidelines.

In response to a question from the Board, Mr. Sheehan described the effect of a halo back-lit approach for signs. Mr. Garvin stated it would be helpful for the Board to be provided with a photograph from another site to get a better understanding of how the sign would look.

Mr. Morely suggested, and the Boards concurred, that the applicant should provide the Boards with a comparison sheet which notes what the bylaw calls for and what the applicant has proposed.

Mr. Senna stated the first renderings shown to the Board included very large signage for the retail area, and these dimensions were greatly reduced for the presentation at the May 2016 Town Meeting. He also stated the scale of the retail signs has since been further reduced.

Mr. Morely stated he is generally pleased with the new packet of renderings, noting it all seems reasonable.

Mr. Garvin asked what the timeline is for being able to disclose to the Boards who some of the development tenants will be. Ms. Snyder stated there has been a lot of activity and interest shown regarding the development, but they are not at liberty to disclose any

names until an actual lease has been executed. She stated the developer is in the process of negotiating three leases at this time.

DRB member Susan Vollaro asked a few questions regarding how the proposal for the exterior wall signs fits with the Town's bylaws. Ms. Koffel noted the proposal for secondary side signs is not what would be typically approved. Mr. Morely noted the situation is unusual because the buildings are essentially four-sided. He also stated these signs help to enhance the marketplace atmosphere. Mr. Garvin noted the Mixed Use Overlay District (MUOD) addressed this type of signage flexibility.

The applicant's attorney Peter Tamm emphasized this development is different for signage based on the MUOD, and therefore it does not set a precedent for anything in the future. Anyone interested in implementing similar plans would need to go through a similar zoning process or request a variance.

Ms. Vollaro asked if retail tenants will have signs other than those on their façade. Ms. Snyder stated additional signage is not being considered at this time. Ms. Vollaro questioned whether more directional signage is needed for tenants. Mr. Senna stated they have reviewed this extensively and, given the property's sight lines, the team believes additional direction signs are not needed. Mr. Morely and Chairman Abair stated tenants would be pleased to have shoppers go the wrong way and discover more stores.

Ms. Hyde stated she likes the graphic of the grasses for the signs. She referenced page 9 of tonight's slide packet, asking if the Bridges monument sign seems crowded. Mr. Senna stated that this is the company's logo. Mr. Morely suggested reducing the size of the logo to be more in scale with the wording below it.

The Board returned to the question of provisionally approving the fourth entry sign panel to possibly be split for two tenants or to require a modification application to be filed for this as a condition of a decision. If a modification approach is decided, Mr. Senna requested for the Board to consider having this discussed as a lower-level modification and as a regular meeting agenda item, and not to require a Public Hearing process. It was also suggested to include in the decision conditions that the lamp pole banners not be used to advertise for commercial tenants and that the Board would have the opportunity to administratively review the design layout for the current "Active Adult Residential" sign.

Follow-up items from tonight for the next Meeting discussion regarding this agenda item were noted to include, working to improve the scale of the Bridges logo, the color of stone to be used for the signs, the graphic to be used for the "Active Adult Residential" sign, providing images of examples of the lighting proposed for the retail signage and submission of a comparison summary of the Town's bylaw versus what has been proposed, with the focus on dimensional differences.

Mr. Tamm referenced the draft decision as revised by the applicant and submitted today. The consensus of the Boards was that more time was needed to review the revisions made.

Mr. Morely questioned whether the wording shown on the renderings for the interior Avalon monument signs is correct because he thought it should be “Avalon Sudbury.” Ms. Snyder stated it is possible this is an error and she would check on it.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously

VOTED: To continue the Public Hearing regarding the Comprehensive Signage Permit application submitted by BPR Sudbury Development LLC for 526 & 528 Boston Post Road (Assessor’s Map K07-0011 & K07-0013) to February 22, 2017.

**Joint Meeting with the Design Review Board - National Development – Meadow Walk – Minor Modification to Master Development Plan Permit– BPR Sudbury Development LLC – 526 & 528 Boston Post Road (Assessor’s Map K07-0011 & K07-0013)**

Present: National Development Project Manager Steve Senna and representative Kate Snyder, the applicant’s signage consultant Chris Sheehan, the applicant’s architect Jenna Miccile, the applicant’s attorney Peter Tamm, Design Review Board (DRB) Members Paula Hyde, Susan Vollaro, Jennifer Koffel and Deborah Kruskal

At 9:00 p.m., Chairman Abair continued with the Joint Meeting with the Design Review Board and he opened a discussion regarding a Minor Modification to an Approved Master Development Plan submitted by BPR Development LLC for Meadow Walk, 526 & 528 Boston Post Road (Assessor’s Map K07-0011 & K07-0013), which was continued from December 14, 2016. The Board was previously in receipt of copies of a draft “Town of Sudbury Planning Board Notice of Decision Minor Modification to Master Development Plan Permit” and a letter from BPR Sudbury Development LLC representative Katie Snyder dated February 2, 2017 and accompanying modified architectural elevations and renderings. In addition, copies of a draft “Town of Sudbury Planning Board Notice of Decision Meadow Walk Sudbury Minor Modification to Master Development Plan,” as revised by the applicant’s team and received today and copies of the PowerPoint slides for tonight’s presentation were distributed tonight.

Ms. Snyder stated the applicant has submitted revised elevations and made modifications based on the previous discussion with the Boards in December 2016 and the feedback received.

The applicant’s architect Jenna Miccile summarized the modifications made to the buildings, which included adjusting building heights to enhance the architectural elements and to screen mechanical units, modifying facades, increasing parapet height differential, adjusting vertical trim and detailing at wood façade, increasing roof height

between roof treatments and addressing the concern regarding façade color. Ms. Miccile also displayed revised renderings of elevations.

Ms. Snyder stated the applicant's team has met with the Fire Department to review the requirements for fire truck turning radius and the locations for fire hydrant and building connections.

The Board expressed their satisfaction with the progress made since December and the applicant's responsiveness to feedback received.

Ms. Donoghue referenced the draft Decision as revised by the applicant and received today. She stated Town Counsel is still reviewing the revisions made, which were numerous regarding style and format.

Mr. Morely stated he would need additional time to compare the new revisions received today with the original draft Decision provided in tonight's agenda packet.

Mr. Senna emphasized decision forms are being developed for the first time for this project, and he noted this is not a Public Hearing. He believes it is important to develop a draft form which can also be used for other future minor modification requests.

Mr. Tamm stated this is not a Special Permit process, and the intent of their revisions was to simplify the form.

Chairman Abair stated the Boards need more time to review the revised draft Decision and this Public Meeting would need to be continued to February 22, 2017.

**Joint Meeting with the Design Review Board – The Coolidge Phase II Comprehensive Permit – 189 Landham Road (Assessor's Map K10-0012) Discussion and Recommendations to Zoning Board of Appeals**

Present: Applicant's Attorney Joshua Fox and B'Nai B'rith Project team representatives, and Design Review Board members Jennifer Koffel, Susan Vollaro, Paula Hyde and Deborah Kruskal

Chairman Abair opened a discussion regarding The Coolidge at Sudbury Phase II Comprehensive Permit application process, noting the Board had provided comments and recommendations to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) for consideration. The Board was previously in receipt of copies of its memorandum to the ZBA dated January 25, 2017, a letter from Horsley Witten Group, noting its second Stormwater Peer Review commentary dated January 26, 2017, a memorandum from Sudbury's Conservation Coordinator dated February 1, 2017, a "Stormwater Report in Support of The Coolidge at Sudbury Phase 2 187-189 Boston Post Road Sudbury, MA" prepared by Hancock Associates, a letter from Hancock Associates to the ZBA dated January 20, 2017 and the Site Plans for the Comprehensive Permit received January 23, 2017. In addition, copies

of civil engineering plans from the applicant received February 6, 2017, a letter from B’Nai B’Rith to the ZBA dated February 6, 2017, which responds to the Planning Board’s comments of January 25, 2017, a chart entitled, “The Coolidge at Sudbury - Fire Department Calls August 2015-January 2017” and a letter from Hancock Associates to the ZBA dated February 6, 2017 were distributed tonight.

Ms. Donoghue referenced the Coolidge Phase II Team presented a landscape plan at the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) meeting held on February 6, 2017. Ms. Donoghue asked the applicant’s attorney Joshua Fox to speak of the plan. However, Mr. Fox stated a formal presentation has not been prepared for tonight, but he would try to generally address a few items. Mr. Fox stated he believes the ZBA was generally accepting of the plan, including the density of the plantings proposed for the new project phase. He stated the applicant is also revisiting a better coordination of plantings between Phase 1 and Phase 2 for a cohesive look and their landscape architect will try to enhance some of the Phase 1 plantings.

Mr. Morely stated more mature trees are needed at the corner of Landham Road to replace the large cluster of mature trees which were previously cut down.

Environmental Planner Beth Suedmeyer referenced the applicant’s response letter regarding the Board’s previous comments and the second Peer Review letter from Horsley Witten noting that the applicant has addressed many of the previous concerns. She asked if the applicant’s team could address a few stormwater-management related questions tonight. Mr. Fox stated that, unfortunately, the applicant’s engineer is not in attendance tonight, but they could provide a summary response in writing at a later time

At 9:40 p.m., the members of the Design Review Board exited the meeting.

Mr. Morely expressed his concern regarding the comments presented by Conservation Coordinator Debbie Dineen in her February 1, 2017 memo, and he encouraged the applicant to address the items mentioned. Mr. Fox stated the applicant will respond to those comments in detail and they were broached at the last ZBA Meeting. He also noted the applicant is working with the State’s DEP Office, Sudbury’s Board of Health Director and their legal counsel to address concerns.

Mr. Morely highlighted Ms. Dineen’s comments regarding the septic system and that more cooperation is needed.

Mr. Fox stated he believes the applicant has been cooperative and that the ZBA would attest to this. He also stated a Notice of Intent will be filed with the Conservation Commission. Mr. Fox further stated the level of detail being requested is not typically provided at this stage of a Chapter 40B process. Mr. Garvin disagreed with this statement, stating some friendly Chapter 40B applicants, like Avalon, provide

information including soil erosion plans and other items as requested. Mr. Fox stated the applicant plans to submit a soil erosion plan to the Conservation Commission. Mr. Garvin stated the Planning Board would also like to see this information.

At 9:45 p.m. Chairman Abair thanked the applicant's representatives for coming tonight, and he concluded the discussion.

### **Board Resignation**

The Board was previously in receipt of a letter from Mr. Long, announcing he is resigning his position on the Board due to new work commitments.

Chairman Abair stated the Board will need to coordinate a Joint Meeting with the Board of Selectmen to vote a replacement member for Mr. Long. Ms. Donoghue stated she has already informed the Selectmen's Office of this vacancy.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was

VOTED: To accept Marty Long's resignation as a member of Sudbury's Planning Board.

### **Minutes**

There were no minutes distributed tonight for approval.

### **Upcoming Meeting Schedule**

The next meetings are scheduled for February 22, 2017 and March 8, 2017 at 7:30 p.m. Ms. Donoghue previewed agenda topics for the February 22, 2017 Board Meeting, including Lots E & F and Livermore Estates, and an update on the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail 25% Design phase.

### **Miscellaneous**

Chairman Abair stated he is working on notes to share at a later date regarding Board responsibilities.

Mr. Garvin suggested National Development should be reminded to provide material well in advance of the meetings.

Mr. Morely encouraged the Board to begin the process to replace what will be the open Associate Member position on the Board.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was



VOTED: To adjourn the Meeting at 9:48 p.m.