



Town of Medway

**DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
155 Village Street, Medway MA 02053  
(508) 533-3264 • FAX: (508) 321-4988

*Matthew Buckley, Chair*  
*Julie Fallon, Vice-Chair*  
*Rod MacLeod, Member*  
*Karyl Spiller-Walsh, Member*  
*Rachel Walsh, Member*  
*Mary Weafer, Member*

**Approved: 6/29/15**

Meeting Minutes: March 23, 2015  
Medway Library, Cole Room

**Call to Order:** – With a quorum, this meeting was called to order by Chairman Buckley at 7:01 p.m.

**Attendees:**

	1/5/15	1/12/15	2/23/15	3/2/15	3/16/15 Joint w/ PEDB	3/23/15	4/6/15
Matthew Buckley	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Julie Fallon	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Karyl Spiller-Walsh	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Rod MacLeod	X	X			X	X	
Mary Weafer	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Rachel Walsh	X	X	X	X	X		

Stephanie Mercandetti and Susy Affleck-Childs also attended the meeting.

**Design Guidelines Update Work Group:**

The Committee discussed the Design Guidelines Update Work Group and who would represent the DRC. The group will most likely meet on the Tuesday nights that the Planning & Economic Development Board does not meet. The group will meet for the next 3-4 months. The initial meeting will be on April 8, 2015. Chairman Buckley volunteered to join the group. Chairman Buckley will report back to the DRC on the meeting schedule after the initial April 8, 2015 meeting. A second DRC member will be selected at the next DRC meeting. The group will include Planning & Economic Board members, The Cecil Group, and Dan Hooper as a Citizen-at-Large. Throughout the process, the smaller group will meet with the entire DRC to review their progress.

## **Follow-up from the 3/16/15 Joint Meeting with the Planning & Economic Development**

### **Board:**

One of the action items from last week's meeting was for the DRC to draft a document to share their concerns and recommendations with the PEDB after meeting with applicants. The Committee reviewed the worksheet that Susy drafted. The goal is to use the worksheet to guide the discussions with applicants and then use it to create a summary for the PEDB. The worksheet is organized by each section of the Design Review Guidelines. As the Committee reviewed the worksheet, they agreed that some items may be for the PEDB and not the DRC. This should be addressed during the revision of the current Design Review Guidelines. Susy reported that the Public Hearing relative to Tri-Valley Commons opens on April 14, 2015. The group agreed to send their list of concerns and recommendations to the PEDB by April 9, 2015. Julie volunteered to draft the list after tonight's meeting.

### **Review & Discussion of Tri-Valley Commons Site Plan:**

Patrick Finn from Landry Architects and John Kucich from Bohler Engineering attended the meeting on behalf of the applicant. The Committee agreed that they would review the site plan tonight and provide the applicant with their feedback. Mr. Finn and Mr. Kucich said they would address the Committee's concerns and submit an updated plan by April 1, 2015 and then attend the April 6, 2015 DRC meeting to discuss further.

### **Site**

The property is located at 72 Main Street. The applicant will need to secure 2 Special Permits and a Notice of Intent from the Conservation Commission. The property consists of 4.5 acres and is zoned as Commercial 1. Mr. Kucich said he has not been part of the project since the beginning but his understanding is the application was withdrawn previously due to cost concerns. The plan is to build three buildings on the property. Good Year will occupy the west building (Building A), Advanced Autoparts will occupy the center building (Building B), and the building to the east (Building C) will be a mixed use building. The buildings have been rotated 90 degrees and the driveway has been moved further to the east. The Committee agreed that the new location of the driveway is excellent. Karyl asked the applicant to consider adding stone walls at the driveway entrance to enhance the area. They also discussed integrating the monument sign into these stone walls. All loading docks will be at the rear of the buildings. They are proposing to plant 33 trees throughout the site and 22 shrubs. They said they would work with the Committee on the location of the plantings. The Committee encouraged Mr. Kucich to look at the landscape design at the new Cumberland Farms. There will be hedges along Route 109 to screen the parking lots. Mr. Kucich said they are also planning to rebuild the original stone wall along Route 109. The goal is to keep it as feature of the property. They do not plan to make it too high and want to keep the rustic

look of the current wall. They are planning to install 20 foot poles for lighting and said there is zero spillage with the exception of the driveway. The Committee asked them to consider using lights similar to those that are being proposed for the Route 109 project. Chairman Buckley provided them with the specs of the lights for the Route 109 project. They discussed creating pedestrian walkways between the buildings. Mr. Kucich said this is difficult due to the significant grade change. There is about a 6-7 foot grade change between Building B and Building C. The Committee said it is important to create pedestrian access throughout the site or people will walk through the landscaping and create their own paths. Due to the grade change it may be necessary to add a set of stairs between Building B and Building C. Mr. Kucich said they would look at this further. The Committee asked that the safety fence on the east side of the property is decorative as opposed to chain link. In addition, the Committee asked the applicants to preserve the existing tree line on the west side of Building A and to add additional mature trees in this area. The truncated road and green area to the back of the property leads to the detention basin. The basin will need to be unearthed but will remain impervious. This area will be grassed and maintained regularly. The Committee asked them to consider creating a naturalized detention pond similar to the one at Medway Commons. The Committee also discussed planting a mature tree on the east side of Building A. Karyl said this would be an excellent spot for a specimen tree. The applicant said they will work with the Committee on the placement for additional specimen trees. They also suggested possibly adding a decorative stone wall to the east of Building B. The Committee asked the applicant to consider moving the dumpster for Building C to the rear of the building. If the trash must stay at the front of the property the Committee said it would be really important to make sure it is completely buffered. The Committee asked for more detail on the dumpster enclosures. Susy said the storage and disposal of tires would need to be inside of the building. The applicant said they would forward a copy of the conceptual floor plans for Building A to the Committee. Mr. Finn said they do not have the ability to change the floor plan.

#### Architecture:

- Building A (Good Year) – Mr. Finn said they used varying roof lines and dormers to avoid creating boxes. They wanted to create a village feel. He said they are planning to use garage doors that are more residential looking. The Committee discussed the concern about having 7 bays and asked if there was a way to step out some of the bays so that it doesn't look like one long line. The Committee also asked if it is possible to vary the height of the garage doors. They discussed different options; including stepping out the last three bays and changing the materials so it looks like a separate building. They also discussed possibly lowering the gable at the entry so it does not look like a false front. Mr. Finn explained that the gables are just architectural and are

being used to screen the roof. He said he would provide the Committee with the roof plan. Mr. Finn said they cannot make changes to the entrance and the 45 angle is integral to the floor plan. The Committee asked them to look at the large window in the waiting area and consider another style that is consistent with the overall design. Mary added that she does not mind it looking like a garage but possibly add larger windows to make it more attractive.

- Building B (Advanced Autoparts) – The Committee said it is important to break up the ridgeline.
- Building C (Mixed Use) – The Committee suggested using stone that is indigenous to the area on the lower portion of the building instead of brick. Mr. Finn said there would likely be two tenants. Mr. Finn said he was considering alternating 4 and 6 inch shingles similar to a project in Wayland. The Committee agreed that the building may not be large enough to warrant a 6 inch shingle. Mr. Finn said he would bring samples of colors and materials to the next meeting.

Chairman Buckley added that over the next couple of years Route 109 is being reconstructed and one of the goals is to make the area more pedestrian friendly. They asked the applicant to consider creating an outdoor siting area along Route 109 or within the site. The Committee discussed locations, including by the entry or in front of Building B. The Committee said they would also like to discuss the possible future uses of the land behind the buildings.

Signage – The Committee asked the applicant to consider incorporating the monument sign into the decorative stone walls at the entrance. The Committee said they realize there isn't a lot of flexibility with corporate logos but it is important to make sure the size is appropriate to the scale of the building. The Committee suggested choosing one of the Goodyear signs on the front of the building as the main sign and minimizing the other. They wondered if it were possible to put the wing foot of Mercury in a circle without the logo for one of the signs. The Committee asked the applicant to tighten up the lettering on the Advanced Autoparts' sign and consider removing the back panel. They asked if the sign could be uplit from main entrance. Chairman Buckley said he did not have an issue with the back panel as long as it was not internally illuminated. The applicant needs to make sure the proposed signs are in compliance and file a formal application.

DRC will forward their recommendations to applicant in the next couple days. The Committee said overall they are very happy with the new design.

### **The Cecil Group Proposal Relative to Tri-Valley Commons Site Plan:**

The Committee discussed retaining The Cecil Group to consult on the Tri-Valley Commons Site Plan. The Cecil Group is the consulting firm that was chosen to work on the new Design Review Guidelines. The Committee agreed that they are too far into the project to bring them onboard but they need to consider adding this requirement to the process for larger projects. It is critical that this requirement is clear to applicants going forward.

### **Review and Discussion of Proposed Zoning Bylaw Amendments:**

Susy explained that the Public Hearing on the proposed amendments was last week and continued to tomorrow night. The Proposed Zoning Bylaw Amendments will be voted on at the Annual Town Meeting.

The first proposed amendment involves creating a Business Transition District. This would apply to certain parcels in the Restaurant 45 area. All of the properties that this would affect have expressed an interest in having their properties rezoned. The Committee discussed the language concerning building renovations, new construction, and site improvements reflecting the residential character of the adjacent neighborhood. The Committee agreed it should instead say something similar to “embody residential qualities of New England architecture.” Karyl suggested adding a reference to consult the Design Review Guidelines. Applicants will still need to go through a Site Plan Review but would not need a Special Permit.

The second proposed amendment would create a new section for Multifamily Housing. This new section would apply to projects with three or more units and would be for renovations and new construction. This would require a Special Permit and a Site Plan Review. There is a stipulation that no more than 5% of dwellings in Medway could be built or renovated under this section. This would also provide a legal way to convert a single family dwelling to a multi-family. The maximum amount of units per acre would be 20. The Committee discussed the amendment and how this may affect neighborhoods. Their biggest concern was the amount of units per acre that would be allowed.

### **Action Items:**

- Chairman Buckley will get more info on the Design Guidelines Update Work Group and report back to the Committee.
- Nominate 2<sup>nd</sup> member for Design Guidelines Update Work Group.
- Julie will draft a list of the Committee’s concerns and recommendations based on tonight’s informal meeting and forward to Susy for PEDB and applicant.

- Chairman Buckley will put together a quick summary on tonight's meeting for tomorrow night's PEDB meeting.
- Ideas for a message board at Choate Park, including location, design, fonts, illumination etc.

**Schedule:**

The next DRC meeting will be on April 6, 2015 at the Medway Public Library.

**Adjournment:**

With no further business before this committee, a motion was made by Karyl Spiller-Walsh, seconded by Mary Weafer to adjourn at 10:25 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michelle Reed