

Town of Franklin



Design Review Commission

**Tuesday, October 28, 2025  
Meeting Minutes**

Vice Chair Andrew Pratt called the above-captioned meeting to order this date at 7:00 PM, as a remote access virtual Zoom meeting. Members in attendance: Vice Chair Andrew Pratt, Kyle Galvin, Derek Darvish, Associate Priya Natarajan. Members absent: Chair Sam Williams, Associate James Bartro. Also present: Morena Zelaya, Director of Planning & Community Development.

The following is stated on the agenda. A Note to Residents: Pursuant to Chapter 2 of the Acts of 2025, this meeting of the Design Review Commission will be conducted via remote participation. Citizens are encouraged to attend via the Zoom platform using the information provided on the agenda. This meeting was recorded.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIR: None.**

**CITIZEN COMMENTS: None.**

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**a. 950 Chestnut Street – Flooring America**

Mr. Cam Afonso of Signs by Cam said the existing signs are white background with bronze lettering which the Town does not allow. They are upgrading to dark blue and red background with white letters and installing new LED bulbs. It is pretty straightforward. Vice Chair Pratt asked to confirm that anything colored on the sign has an opaque backing to it, so lights are only coming through those letters. Mr. Afonso said the blue and the red will light up, and the white will light up; all of it lights up. He confirmed it is going into the same fixture.

**Motion:** To **Approve** the sign package as submitted. Motioned by D. Darvish. Seconded by K. Galvin. Roll Call Vote: Natarajan-YES; Galvin-YES; Darvish-YES; Pratt-YES. Voted 4-0-1 (4-Yes; 0-No; 1-Absent).

**b. 9 Forge Parkway – iAutomation**

Ms. Erica Jacques with iAutomation said this request is based on the need for increased visibility and access to our building. The signage will aid our influx of customers that come in daily and directing them efficiently. The sign will not be illuminated. We hope with the increased size of the signage, we are able to stay within our brand logo guidelines which is essential for our accurate advertising. Mr. Pratt said it looks like there is a sign for the front entrance and rear; where is the additional signage located. Ms. Jacques said there are two distinct buildings that are attached. One is the employee entrance, and one is the customer entrance. She reviewed the two entrances as shown on the screen. She said they are at the same address. Mr. Pratt confirmed the location at 9 Forge Parkway.

Mr. Ryan Beattie said he worked for Sign Design. He said this is on the street side. He said the building is behind trees and bushes, and you would not see it from the road. He said it is for the employees to see when they come in the correct entrance.

Mr. Pratt said the sign bylaws say that for a building in this zone, there can be a single sign less than 60 sq. ft. per address. So, each of them is under 60 sq. ft. on their own, but together they are well over the allowed square footage, and there are two distinct signs. Mr. Beattie discussed if they are shrunken down, the letters will not be able to be read for any of the smaller lettering. He said it would interfere with the branding. He said there are three different companies within the building and asked does that have any effect on the allowed square footage.

Ms. Jacques reviewed they occupy the entire building, but there is a portion unused that could be used for a different section of their business. So, technically, there could be three offices in the building. She said they are two distinct units that are attached, and they use both: the CAS side and iAutomation. Mr. Pratt asked about the actual business addresses. Ms. Jacques said it is all 9 Forge. Mr. Galvin noted the applicant is over the 60 sq. ft. Mr. Beattie noted each sign is just under 60 sq. ft.

Mr. Pratt said he appreciates the intention. If this were two different addresses, there could be a reason to have two signs. But with how the bylaws are written, he does not see a way around this. Ms. Jacques said this is disappointing. Mr. Galvin said it is off the road in that industrial office area, and he does not see the problem with it. Mr. Darvish said he agrees, and he does not think it is anything egregious that it could inspire controversy with others about fairness or anything. He said he would leave that to Mr. Pratt.

Mr. Pratt said in thinking about the bylaws such as if it were on a corner lot. Mr. Darvish confirmed that since it is the one address, they cannot justify the two signs. Mr. Pratt said yes and noted previous cases and one sign per address. Mr. Beattie said that due to the branding, the more you shrink it the harder it is to produce. They have toyed with different options, but none conformed to the brand guidelines. He said they are flat cut letters and non-illuminated. Mr. Pratt noted the employee and customer entrances. He said there is an avenue for way-finding signs, and they have been able to approve smaller way-finding signs, but it could not be branded; it is just to help folks find the correct door.

Ms. Jacques discussed that would not match with their branding. She said she understands the bylaws are not working in their favor but are hoping to get this approved. She said they have no signage at this time. Mr. Pratt talked about the third rental space at 9 Forge that is currently not occupied. Ms. Jacques said there are no plans to occupy that. Mr. Pratt said hearing some of the consensus from the rest of the group, he could foresee just interpreting these a little more loosely here.

Ms. Natarajan said she understands the need for both signs; however, she is stuck a little with the bylaws and trying to see if there is a way we could make it work. Mr. Pratt said which of these three are the buildings that you occupy. Ms. Jacques noted which ones on the screen image. Mr. Pratt said in looking at this he is a little more persuaded by the fact that these are two separate entrances through the actual paved entrance here. He could see the logic here. He said he was going to mull this over. He could see this working with an underlying logic that they appear to be two distinct entrances and units in a building.

Mr. Beattie said he wanted to add that they have in the works decals for each door. He said he thinks they came for one of the doors already and placed it on there. He said the problem is that you cannot see it from the parking lot the way the entrances are set back. He noted the visibility issue. Mr. Pratt said the address seems familiar. He said to triple check, the purposes of the two buildings are distinctly different from each other, is that right. Ms. Jacques said yes, exactly. She said one side is employee offices and reception area, and the other side is our customer experience center. Mr. Pratt said that make sense to

him. Mr. Galvin asked what if this was a 9A and 9B address would this be a problem. Mr. Pratt said he does not think so.

Mr. Pratt said he wants to ensure that they are consistent with how they have interpreted these in the past and will continue to interpret in the future. He said 9A and 9B would have made it clearer. He said the thinks from the architecture of the building with three distinct entrances he is seeing on the map, that speaks to the fact that they are separate units, both occupied, being used for distinctly different purposes. So, in that sense, he is in favor of moving forward with this package. He will take a motion. Mr. Darvish asked if they are making a motion for approving on the consideration that these are units a, b, and c and that is how we are justifying having multiple signs. Mr. Pratt said yes.

**Motion:** To **Approve** the sign package as submitted. Motioned by D. Darvish. Seconded by K. Galvin. Roll Call Vote: Natarajan-YES; Galvin-YES; Darvish-YES; Pratt-YES. Voted 4-0-1 (4-Yes; 0-No; 1-Absent).

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES: September 23, 2025**

**Motion:** To **Approve** the meeting minutes for September 23, 2025, as submitted. Motioned by K. Galvin. Seconded by P. Natarajan. Roll Call Vote: Natarajan-YES; Galvin-YES; Darvish-YES; Pratt-YES. Voted 4-0-1 (4-Yes; 0-No; 1-Absent).

**FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS: None.**

**ADJOURN:**

**Motion:** To **Adjourn**. Motioned by K. Galvin. Seconded by D. Darvish. Roll Call Vote: Natarajan-YES; Galvin-YES; Darvish-YES; Pratt-YES. Voted 4-0-1 (4-Yes; 0-No; 1-Absent).

Meeting adjourned at 7:29 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Judith Lizardi  
Recording Secretary