

**Maynard Planning Board
Minutes of August 1, 2017 (approved)
Maynard Town Hall, Room 101 - 7 p.m.**

Members present: Greg Tuzzolo - Chair, Andrew D'Amour - Vice Chair, William Gosz, Samantha Elliott, Brent Mathison and Megan Zammuto

7:07 PM – Chair Tuzzolo called the meeting to order

Chair Tuzzolo opened the continued public Hearings:

a. 129 Parker Street (Continued from 07.25.17): The Petitioner, Maynard Crossings JV, LLC - Capital Group Properties, 259 Turnpike Road, Southborough, MA 01772, is requesting Site Plan approval for a mixed-use development at 129 Parker Street.

b. 129 Parker Street (Continued from 07.25.17): The Petitioner, Maynard Crossings JV, LLC - Capital Group Properties, 259 Turnpike Road, Southborough, MA 01772, is requesting three, separate Special Permit approvals for a mixed-use development at 129 Parker Street. The Special Permit requests are to allow: i. a Drive-Thru Use (supermarket pharmacy). ii. a Multi-family Dwelling (up to 180 units). iii. a Continuing Care Retirement Community (143 units).

c. 129 Parker Street (Continued from 07.25.17) request for Special Permit for relief from Signage Regulations (allow for internally lighted wall signage on buildings) and relief from Parking Standards to allow for: • a reduction in the number of required parking spaces. • fewer than the required number of raised landscaped islands situated throughout the parking field with dimensions, locations and designs variant from those required. • elimination of light poles in certain raised landscape islands and the installation of light poles in paved areas of the parking field, all as depicted on the submitted Development Site Plans and as consistent with the approved Concept Plan.

Chair Tuzzolo asked Attorney Catanzaro to begin his presentation. Attorney Catanzaro stated that tonight they will be discussing the Special Permit request for relief from signage regulations to allow for internal illumination of the building signs. Boyd Morris of Campbell Design gave a brief statement of the previous sign approvals at Town Meeting, there were different tiers of signs that were discussed, the tiers are specific to square footage, and he showed the layout of what would be proposed for the buildings. In general the sign location plan shows the proposed tiers on each building tenant space. He then showed a picture of the approved signage including lighting for the Market 32 sign. He showed pictures of a sample of a tier 1 sign, the sign size is determined by the fascia area of the building. He then described the lighting of signs, halo illumination which light shines back from a channel letter, very subtle, ineffective for small letter, used mostly for hotels and urban settings, if there are a lot of letters they bleed together, very hard to read. Next he showed a front lit channel letter, one benefit is a translucent letter the light shines out, it is an led light, these can be less deep so don't project out so far

off the building. The board was shown an example of this kind of sign, these lights are also dimmable, on timers this would be beneficial to the signs that face out to Parker Street. The building signs that are proposed are raceway base lit channel letters.

Chair Tuzzolo asked for comments from the public. Several abutters spoke in opposition of the base lit channel letter, one questioning why there is a bylaw that does not allow the internally illuminated signs if it is not enforced. There are lots of businesses that use Halo lit signs. Chair Tuzzolo asked the sign consultant what would be allowed "by-right", the consultant responded the signage lighting would be by down lighting, gooseneck lighting, it would show the junction boxes, it would throw down a band of light, or non-illumination but from a retail standpoint that is not realistic. Chair Tuzzolo commented that a case can be made that for the proposed signage, illumination is inside the sign that shines onto the building. Bill Nemser responded to the comment from the abutter that since the code was written there have been significant changes in lighting and signage, the intent of the code was to not allow box signs, the code is currently under review to be revised, but under current code the special permit is required.

Attorney Catanzaro stated that in the approved concept plan there were no external lighting fixtures shown, as long as properly conditioned they are allowed, they are only prohibited without special permit. We feel it is the most controlled appropriate lighting for the site. The overlay district allows a retail development which requires signage as advertisement. Another abutter commented that this is a neighborhood, there is supposed to be minimal impact on neighborhood, it should be halo or backlit signs. Mr. Morris stated that Halo illumination only works when you have a smooth regular plane behind it if there is any kind of textural facade it does not work. The architectural details of these buildings have been discussed, they are not flat, halo lit would not be appropriate here.

Town Engineer Wayne Amico stated there is only one building that will be open 24 hours, it is within the purview of the Board to condition the lighting on the hours of operation of the mall, other than security lighting which has already been discussed, the condition could be retail lighting out when closed. The applicant responded that lighting on roadway to residential will remain on plus security lighting but building signs off will be off when not open.

The abutter from 119 Parker Street again stated she is against internally lit signs, she says will shine onto her property and keep her awake. The sign representative responded that there is no building lighting to that side of the site, there are no storefronts on that side, there is screening and landscaping that is proposed for the parking lot lighting but there will be no building signs on that side. Attorney Catanzaro stated they had already agreed to additional screening on her property.

Samantha Elliott stated that tenants tend to request the absolute maximum size that they are allowed, is there something that they will follow that will meet appropriately scaled. Attorney Catanzaro stated that the sign company and Mark Rosen shine worked out the details of the tiers which determine the maximum size. The developer is trying to attract tenants, the developers require the tenants to have

sign approval by them before they apply for a building permit. Samantha Elliott commented this is supposed to be a neighborhood project not a mall; signs should not overwhelm the project. It was discussed that maybe will need to add another tier for building R3. The board needs to know the maximum proposed s.f. for each building, they will vote on that.

Draft discussion: Attorney Catanzaro asked for comments on the draft decision from the public who are not available to attend next week. He stated he has sent comments to Town Counsel; they will meet and have revised comments before next meeting. Bill Nemser stated a resident sent some markups, he will forward to the Board and Attorney Catanzaro.

Town Engineer Wayne Amico gave an update to the Board, they have received the updated landscape plan, drainage, on-site and off-site improvement plans, before next week he will have a memo relative to each plan with recommendations and any items that have not been addressed.

A resident asked about the elevation of building R4 and the north driveway, she would like to share her concerns. In the initial plans that were submitted there were site lines that were shown and R4 was 35 ft, in discussing with developer it was discussed that if a single story building how high did it need to be, in the revised concept plan the elevation was 16-20 ft high, during an architectural presentation it was discussed as higher with a tower. Chair Tuzzolo asked if this is a discrepancy between architectural plan and concept plan? The applicant did not have that plan with them tonight but will bring to the next meeting.

A motion was made by Greg Tuzzolo to continue the Site Plan and Special Permit hearings for 129 Parker Street to August 8th at 7 pm, seconded by Brent Mathison. The vote was 5 to 0.

The Board discussed upcoming meeting dates; next meeting is August 8 to go thru the draft decision. Town Counsel Jon Witten stated that once they close the public hearing the Board has 90 days to vote then 14 days to issue the decision. Once the hearing is closed all communication is between the Board and staff, they cannot take any more information or comments from the public or the applicant. Chair Tuzzolo stated the meeting of the 8th will be to go thru the draft decision, at that time the Board will determine whether to keep the hearings open or to close. The Board decided on August 15th if needed and August 29th.

A motion was made by Samantha Elliott to adjourn, seconded by Andrew D'Amour.

Meeting adjourned at 8:52 p.m.