

TOWN OF WAYLAND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

TO: Robert Hummel, Town Planner
FROM: Design Review Board
DATE: August 21, 2023 REV
RE: Meeting #DRB 2023-4-Review and approval of past minutes

A meeting of the Design Review Board occurred in the Select Board meeting room on August 21, 2023. In attendance from the DRB were Bill Sterling, Marji Ford and Leisha Johnson (a quorum of the 3 person board). The meeting was called to order by Bill Sterling, the Chair at 6:30. There was no public comment.

Review and approval of past minutes:

Meeting dated 8.14.2023- Marji moved to approve the meeting notes. Leisha seconded the motion. Vote was 3-0-0 affirmative. These approved minutes and one agenda amendment may be posted on the Town Website.

Application for 10 Green Way:

Proposed Sign #1.

Question A: The faux stone make, model, color, texture and tooling is not stated. What is the actual proposed stone?

Question B: Is that bluestone cap? If so, what is its thickness and edge finish?

Question C: Would it not be more appropriate and more attractive to make the main entry sign support of brick in a color and size that matches the original mansion, including a blue stone base that is 12"- 16" high that also matches the original mansion in color and chamfered profile on the leading edge and consider a matching stone cap? (See attached photo) Even a brick veneer would certainly look less fake than synthetic stone.

Question D: The proposed glued on sign board noted as "Reserved for tenant sign" begs the question what kind of tenant is contemplated for that sign? Is the purpose of the sign to advertise some kind of independent commercial operation on the property? Does this not constitute a new "Mixed Use" change to the original Site Plan Approval? In any case the location of the proposed sign artlessly tacked onto the stone base detracts from the intended natural finish stone look of the main sign base. Either incorporate it into the main sign or add a new separate sign for that new enterprise on the property, not unlike the separate treatment of the Good Shepherd Community Care sign.

Question E: Regarding the glossy white aluminum main sign, is the applicant not concerned that the glare from sunlight may make the sign illegible at times, especially when the bright portions may be starkly contrasted with the darkness of tree shadows on the sign at the same time

Question F: The external lighting is indicated to be white, yet shown as black in the

rendering. Which color is intended? The DRB members all agreed that flat black would be preferred.

Proposed Sign # 2.

The Board members had no objection to the conservation trail sign design, nor its proposed location and voted to approve it as is 3-0-0.

Proposed Signs # 3, 4, 5 & 6 directional signs.

Question A: What are the lettering heights?

Question B: Do these lettering sizes dictate the size of the signs? Sign #3 appears to be much larger than the existing one that was originally approved. Please indicate the actual approved sign size vs. the proposed new sign area in SF.

Question C: What are the governing guidelines or By-laws that control the site signage? If it is ZBA, then 40 SF total for all signs is the maximum sign sizing allowed on any property.

Opinion on directional sign design character: The directional signs all look like institutional or even highway signs. This seems out of character with the residential park-like feeling of the property. The sign shape, green color and institutional font selection are a major part of this disconnect. You may consider matching the white color signage chosen for the main entry signs. The DRB members question why not match the branding style of the main entry sign? At least use the leaf logo that is already used on every parking lot sign, which are all white like the main sign and have the leaf logo.

Site Plan Review.

The DRB members had no objection to the added units to hospice, nor to the added accessible path to the hiking trails and related sign locations. However, no landscaping plan was included in the package of proposed changes. Please provide us with a plan for review.

Next Meeting:

Bill suggested the next meeting take place in one week, Monday August 28, 2023, 6:30 PM.

The meeting ended at 7:36 PM with Leisha moving to adjourn, and Marji seconding the motion. The vote was 3-0-0 in the affirmative.