

Present: Frank Riepe (Chairman), Tris Windle, Dan Martin, Giancarlo DeIVita
Absent: Deborah Kruskal

Sign Application: Paris Trust; 25-33 Union Ave.

Representing the applicant was Brett Taylor.

The proposal is for a directory sign on Union Ave. to replace the existing address sign of approximately the same width. The proposal does not conform to the bylaw because of limited street frontage. Also proposed are two directional signs for the interior of the property. Discussion favors the implementation of the signage. The Board recommends that the Board of Appeals grant a special permit for the directory sign with the following revisions to the design:

1. The color scheme be limited to two colors, which would be the same two colors used on the existing sign
2. There should be no name panels left blank
3. The space from the ground to the bottom of the sign not exceed 40% of the total 10-foot height of the sign
4. A different type face be chosen for the tenant name panels

It is further noted that the directional signs have 3" steel posts as illustrated and the address numbers be in the center of the panels.

**Sudbury Inn & Suites Exterior Building Changes
738 Boston Post Road**

Present on behalf of the applicant were Jim Loft, Mike Meyers and Eric Anderson of ProCon, Inc.

The applicants presented drawings for the complete renovation of the property with a sign application to be submitted at a later date.

It is the opinion of the Board the proposal is favorable and recommendations for permits to be granted are made.

**Comprehensive Permit, 3 Marlboro Road: NOAH – Review of design drawings
(materials only, no representative present)**

The Board finds that the general style of architecture is undistinguished. Six units on a site zoned for one house seems excessive, and the complexity of the forms only emphasizes that there is extreme density for this neighborhood, resulting in repeated infringement on the required property line setbacks. Emphasis should be placed on

making the houses compact with simple forms and closely clustered in order to fool the eye that six dwellings are on this site. The proposed planting is sparse and needs a significant row of trees and shrubs along Maynard Road to provide screening. The Board finds significant fault with the grading plan and the placement of the buildings and pavement. Extreme excavation is proposed for the rear of the site with high retaining walls on two sides directly on the property lines. There should be no retaining walls on the property lines, both for aesthetic and safety reasons. The excavation is extreme with a cut of approximately 16 feet proposed in the rear of the site. This non-conforming proposal should be doing everything possible to minimize visual impact, and this does not do that. There is an excess of pavement to achieve a mere 12 parking places and it has the appearance of a commercial development. This is a challenging site and a successful design will work with the nature it.

The Board recommends that the project be redesigned with the goal of greatly reducing visual impact and creating a more natural setting. Because of the challenges of working on this tight site, it is probably not practical to angle the structures for solar orientation, particularly since it is unlikely there will be a budget for solar panels. There seems to be no particular passive solar features in the design of the houses. The achievement of a LEED Silver rating seems unlikely with the extreme disturbance of the site. The submission materials offer no indication as to how this rating would be achieved. We assume that this proposal would have to go before the Earth Removal Board for approval.

The Board recommends to the Board of Appeals that the project be redesigned with the goal of greatly reducing visual impact and creating a more natural setting.

Miscellaneous:

The minutes of September 9, 2009 were approved.

Board member Tris Windle noted there is a new, non-conforming sign on Route 117 that was not approved by the Board. It is the Frank Maurer property near Davis Fields. This should be brought to the attention of the Building Inspector.