Design Review Board Meeting Minutes
Monday, October 17, 2022
7:30 p.m.

Board Members:
Mark Gluesing, Board Chair (P)
Bob Dermody, Board Member (P)
Deborah Robinson, Board Member (P)
Susan Opton, Board Member (P)
Kristan Patenaude, DRB Recording Secretary (P)
Elisa Litchman, Administrative Specialist, Planning & Community Development (P)

Applicants & Attendees:
1. Chuck Bomley, Plan B Retail – Special Permit request for Roche Bros. located at 377 Chestnut Street
2. Continued: Rick DeAngelis, Boston Properties located at 140 Kendrick Street and applying for site plan review of a solar garage roof with supplemental information.
   - Ben Myers, Boston Properties
   - Jonathan Abe, Sunwealth Power
   - Marcel Rodgers, Sunwealth Power
3. Gunnar MacCormick, Agnoli Sign Co., Inc. representing Supply New England located at 151 Reservoir Street and applying for signage.
4. Evans Huber, attorney with Frieze Cramer Rosen & Huber, LLP representing Coca-Cola located at 9 B Street and applying for site plan review.
   - Matt Labonte, Design Group
   - Mark Nogueira, Design Group
   - Caitlin Glass, VHB
   - Erik Bednarek, landscape architect

Chair Gluesing called the meeting to order on October 17, 2022, at 7:30 p.m.

Chair Gluesing notified attendees of new public meeting orders issued by the governor of Massachusetts.

Agenda Item 1:
Public notice is hereby given that Roche Bros. located at 377 Chestnut Street, has made application to the Design Review Board for a Special Permit pursuant to the Sign By-Law Section 5.5.3.1 a) (More than one permanent attached wall signs) and Section 5.5.4 (Signs exceeding 32 Sq. Ft. in a Business District) any other applicable sections of the By-law.

Chuck Bomley explained that the proposal has been amended to incorporate a number of changes. The main building sign on the façade, Sign A, was originally submitted as 71.25 s.f. This how now been reduced to a size of 57.8 s.f., centered into the façade panel, as suggested by the Board. Sign B was originally submitted as 17.5 s.f.; this has been reduced from a 14" letter text to a 12", bringing it down to 12.1 s.f. The redemption sign on the side of the building was originally proposed to be 13.42 s.f. This has also been reduced from 14"to 12" text, reducing the sign down to 9.1 s.f. The Board previously seemed agreeable to the 64 s.f. stencil-type text painted on the brick at the far-right side of the store. An originally proposed additional stencil-type text on the side of the building has been eliminated from the plan. There has been one addition to the plan, the addition of the number 377 in glazing right above the front entrance door.

Chair Gluesing noted that the number was proposed to be added in that location instead of on the canopy with the Chestnut Street wording because they are branding the store with an additional Roche Bros. building in another part of Town.

In response to a question from Ms. Robinson regarding the joints on the background of Sign A, Mr. Bomley explained that this will be a limestone veneer panel. The color will be contrasting with the brick facade. The joints in the limestone will be the same color as the limestone. Regarding Sign D1, Mr. Bomley explained that the black line work is proposed to be painted with stencil-type text. This was intentionally set off-center, to work with a weather canopy which extends 6" into the brick.

Board members voiced their agreement that sign D1 should be centered.

In response to a question from Mr. Dermody, Mr. Bomley stated that the Roche Bros. sign and the logo over the main door are internally illuminated. All other signs are not illuminated.

In response to a question from Mr. Dermody, Mr. Bomley stated that the limestone panel will have a setback with a 2"-3" reveal.

Upon motion duly made by Mr. Dermody and seconded by Ms. Robinson, it was voted to approve all of the proposed signs, with the condition that Sign D1 be centered on the brick façade. Susan Opton – aye; Deborah Robinson – aye; Bob Dermody – aye; and Chair Gluesing - aye. Motion passed 4-0.

Agenda Item 2:
Continued: Rick DeAngelis, Boston Properties located at 140 Kendrick Street and applying for site plan review of a solar garage roof with supplemental information.

Chair Gluesing noted that Bob Dermody would Chair this item, as he was not present at the last meeting where this item was initially discussed.

Marcel Rodgers showed the Board renderings from up the hill on Kendrick Street, and from the ground to show the electrical equipment. He showed that there was a large amount of existing trees and vegetation concealing the garage. This continues to be the case travelling further east on Kendrick Street. On the ground floor just outside the garage structure there are three parking spaces in which electrical equipment will be placed that will supply the energy storage components of the project, as well as the main inverter and connections to the transformer. This will be surrounded by bollards to protect the equipment. The Board previously requested a lighting plan, which has been submitted. This shows 35 light fixtures, to be high efficiency LED lights, which have a lifespan of approximately 100,000 hours. If run for 10 hours a day, this will yield a lifespan of approximately 27 years. These are proposed to have a low profile and be flush mounted to the underside of the rails on the canopy structure.

Mr. Dermody stated that the energy storage facilities seem to be tucked away and placed in the best location for the purpose they serve. The proposed lighting looks appropriate.

In response to a question from Mr. Dermody, Mr. Rodgers explained that all of the existing lighting on the top deck of the structure will be removed and replaced by the lighting proposed under the canopy structure. This will recreate the existing amount of watts of lumens and coverage.

In response to a question from Ms. Robinson regarding glare issues, Mr. Myers stated that the solar panels are designed to maximize the absorption of light. His company has found zero glare issues in the 13 solar projects it has completed, three of which were garage canopies.

In response to a question from Ms. Robinson regarding enclosing the battery containers in the parking lot, Mr. Rodgers explained that a certain amount of clearance around the components is required for the purposes of servicing the equipment. This dictates how closely they can be spaced. There was an attempt to minimize the footprint to the greatest extent possible and maintain it within these three parking spaces. Adding something to the front of this area could impede on the drive aisle, potentially making it harder to access the storage. The applicant is comfortable with the proposed aesthetics, as battery storage is something it wants to highlight. Part of the mission of this project is to complete a NetZero project.

Mr. Dermody asked about placing some fencing along the south side of this area, near a fourth parking space. Mr. DeAngelis explained that this could result in the loss of a fourth parking space, which would need to be made up elsewhere on site. The Board discussed other possible screening approaches. The applicant wants to highlight the solar strategy and is comfortable with this approach. The DRB concurred.

Chair Gluesing explained that, as the applicant is currently in a site plan review process with the Planning Board, the Design Review Board will draft a memo for the Planning Board. It will record the discussion regarding different options for screening of the battery containers.

Agenda Item 3:
Gunnar MacCormick, Agnoli Sign Co., Inc. attended the meeting and explained that the proposal is for a non-illuminated aluminum belt sign, 42”x 96”. This is proposed to be located on the wall of the building at 151 Reservoir Street.

In response to a question from Ms. Robinson, Mr. MacCormick stated that the letters are proposed to be flat vinyl on an aluminum back, with aluminum molding around it.

Board members expressed interest in seeing the location of this sign proposed over the entry door of the building instead.

In response to a question from Mr. Dermody, Mr. MacCormick stated that the color of the letters has not yet been finalized but will be kept as close to the rendering as possible.

In response to a question from Mr. Dermody, Chair Gluesing stated that he is okay with the proposed tag line on the sign, as this is a private area, but he would prefer to see the sign placed over the main door at the same proposed mounting height.

Upon motion duly made by Mr. Dermody and seconded by Ms. Robinson, it was voted to approve the sign with the condition that it be relocated and centered over the entrance door. Susan Opton – aye; Deborah Robinson – aye; Bob Dermody – aye; and Chair Gluesing -aye. Motion passed 4-0.

Agenda Item 4:
Evans Huber, attorney with Frieze Cramer Rosen & Huber, LLP representing Coca-Cola located at 9 B Street and applying for site plan review.

Mr. Huber stated that this project is a major upgrade of the site, including reducing the building footprint, increasing the parking, upgrading the façade, redesigning interior portions of the building, and increasing the open space and landscaping.

Mark Nogueira explained that this location is highly focused on distribution. This project is a 40-year investment in the site, primarily to modernize operations.

Caitlin Glass explained that the existing site is largely covered by pavement, concrete and building areas. There are a number of loading docks and truck parking spaces, particularly located along the Third Avenue side of the site. There is an existing employee entrance off B Street. The frontage on B Street is mostly a grassed area with a chain link fence. The project proposes to improve the landscaping along the employee access area and also install decorative fencing along B Street. There is a grass landscape area with a chain link fence along Third Avenue, along with truck parking and an existing guardrail. Similar to B Street, the project is proposing to install decorative fence along Third Avenue. At the existing corner of Kendrick Street and Third Avenue, the project is proposing to reclaim a portion of pavement and turn it into a landscaped area. The project is proposing to remove portions of the building, introduce new landscaped areas, and reduce the total amount of impervious area on the site. The reworked employee entrance will include new landscaped islands and a bioretention basin.

Erik Bednarik stated that there are currently no parking lot islands with trees, shrubs, or ground cover. This project is a nice opportunity to allow for those items, along with an enhanced entrance at the northwest corner of the building, with an entrance patio, and bio-infiltration area. The majority of the proposed plant list is native, with a few plants proposed to enhance the brand identity of Coca Cola. Along B Street, the proposal includes a line of street trees.

Matt Labonte stated that the existing fleet service area is proposed to be demolished, along with two small outbuildings. A front office, one-story section of the building will be removed. The existing fleet service area is proposed to be replaced with a 14,000 s.f. single-story building. This will be modernized and more applicable to the business' required functions. Some of the building will be reskinned, and anything that is not will be color matched and coordinated with the new materials. Approximately two thirds of the existing mechanical equipment on the roof will be removed, as it is nonfunctional and antiquated. This is proposed to be replaced with minimal additional equipment. A dark, monolithic benchmark-type panel is proposed as an accent to the building. The remaining metal panel is proposed to be insulated, and two toned, with the 'Coca Cola red' color running horizontally to continue the brand identity. The new sign proposed is a lighthouse, which is part of Coca Cola's brand image. In the southern corner of the building, an accent is proposed to be made up of two different types of metal panels to mimic panels on the other elevation of the building. All of the glazing on the building will be replaced, and some will be added in the office area. The current proposal includes reworking all of the lighting on the front side of the building, as it faces Route 128. This will fully comply with the Town's requirements for lighting, including keeping the poles at 20', Dark Sky compliance, and no spillovers over the property line.

In response to a question from Chair Gluesing, Mr. Nogueira stated that there is no change proposed for the truck entrance. Currently, trucks primarily turn into the facility from Kendrick Street and Third Avenue.

In response to a question from Chair Gluesing regarding lighting on the truck bay side of the building, Mr. Nogueira stated that no changes are proposed to the orientation or the flow of the truck court. The lighting in that area was revamped to LED lights within the last two years.

In response to a question from Ms. Opton, Mr. Nogueira stated that trailers coming onto the property are of a variety of sizes between 35' and 53', mostly in the 45' to 48' range.

In response to a question from Ms. Opton, Ms. Glass stated that an 8' decorative fence is proposed along Third Avenue and a portion of B Street.

Ms. Opton noted that some of the existing shrubbery screening in one corner of the site is not particularly attractive, and she is unclear if the proposal will add to this. Erik Bednarek stated that the intention is to tuck evergreens into any open areas and trim out unsightly/dead material.

Ms. Opton suggested planting a type of grass that does not require regular mowing or watering. Maintenance may be an issue with the turf grass proposed along the site edges that have not been well maintained in the past and it may not last very long. In response to the branding with red for Coca-Cola a maintenance plan will be a key issue as some of the plants will not maintain their red color unless they are cut down every two or three years. New growth is what appears red.

In response to a question from Mr. Dermody regarding existing large concrete blocks at the corner of Kendrick Street and Third Avenue, Mr. Labonte stated that these will be removed.

Mr. Dermody noted that the roof might be a good place for a solar array, once all of the old equipment has been removed.

In response to a question from Mr. Dermody, Ms. Glass stated that a bioretention system is proposed in an L-shaped area of site, and the applicant is considering a retention area in the triangle-shaped landscape area. The Planning Board asked the applicant to examine other areas where infiltration could be provided.

Mr. Dermody suggested that the applicant discuss potential improvements to the Kendrick Street and Third Avenue corner with the Planning Board.

In response to a question from Ms. Robinson, Ms. Glass explained that an existing shed, and other outbuilding structure are proposed to be removed and replaced with parking and a sidewalk.

In response to a question from Ms. Robinson, Mr. Nogueira stated that the door south of the main entrance will primarily be used by warehouse and office workers. There is a second entrance for truck drivers along with other office staff. The door under the Coca Cola sign will be the main public and visitor entrance.

Chair Gluesing noted that applicants are typically required to complete a façade review for a commercial building such as this. The Board would need more information on proposed materials, color samples, an enlargement of the long elevations, etc. He would prefer the applicant to come back to examine this architecture further. Mr. Huber noted that the applicant will be before the Planning Board for site plan review on November 1st and will have to come back before the Design Review Board for sign permits.

Mr. Dermody stated that he would also like to see cut sheets and specs for the panels. He would like to know dimensions, support, and drainage for the canopy over the front door.

Chair Gluesing asked if there is any reason the applicant is not proposing to extend the landscaped islands further south into the other parking area on the west side. Ms. Glass noted that the existing parking area is being restriped only.

Chair Gluesing stated that he would like to see the corner of Third Avenue planted a bit more extensively, and maybe even up closer to the truck entrance. The proposed planting bed along Third Avenue could be widened enough to support a tree every 30' or something similar.

Mr. Huber explained that the applicant will be coming back before the Board for two sign permits. The Coca Cola sign is proposed to be approximately the same size as the existing sign, which is substantially larger than what is allowed by right. The second sign permit request will be for the lighthouse logo sign. He asked for the Board's informal comments on these items. Mr. Nogueira stated that the main entry sign is approximately 200 s.f. The lighthouse is approximately 250 s.f. The existing Coca Cola sign is approximately 450 s.f. The proposal is for approximately 100 s.f. less signage than currently on the building.

Chair Gluesing stated that he believes the lighthouse sign, if slightly smaller, would be more easily categorized as a graphic element. He believes the Coca Cola sign fits the façade.

Mr. Dermody stated that he would like to see a close up drawing of the Coca Cola sign to get an idea of the negative space around it. He would also like more information on the dimensions. He would like to see a close up of the lighthouse sign, as it appears to be floating,

Chair Gluesing stated that the Board will prepare a memo for the Planning Board to review prior to its November 1st meeting.

Minutes:
None to review at this time.

Chair Gluesing stated that, unfortunately, Steve Tanner has resigned from the Board. Chad Reilly has decided to take a 3-month sabbatical and sign into Board meetings as needed.

Upon motion duly made by Mr. Dermody and seconded by Ms. Opton, it was voted to adjourn at 9:43 p.m. Susan Opton – aye; Deborah Robinson – aye; Bob Dermody – aye; and Chair Gluesing -aye. Motion passed 4-0.

Next Public Meeting – November 7, 2022 at 7:30pm via Zoom Webinar