

Town of Franklin



Design Review Commission

**Tuesday, June 28, 2022  
Meeting Minutes**

Vice Chair Sam Williams 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 Sam Williams, Gerald Wood, Venkata Sompally. Members absent: Chair James Bartro, Associate Chris Baryluk. Also present: Maxine Kinhart, Administrative Staff.

As stated on the agenda, due to the continued concerns regarding the COVID-19 virus, this meeting will be conducted as a remote/virtual Design Review Commission meeting. In an effort to ensure citizen engagement and comply with open meeting law regulations, citizens will be able to dial into the meeting using the provided phone number, or citizens can participate by using the Zoom link provided on the agenda. This meeting was recorded.

**1. Reilly's Express/Service Solutions – 76 Grove Street – Install new sign faces.**

Mr. Cam Afonso of Signs by Cam, Inc. addressed the Commission. He stated that this application is to install new sign faces on existing cabinets; it is lit.

**Motion:** To **Accept** the sign package as submitted. Motioned by G. Wood. Seconded by V. Sompally. Roll Call Vote: Williams-YES; Wood-YES; Sompally-YES. Voted 3-0-0.

**2. UPS – 206 Grove Street – Illuminated S/F shield flush mount, non-illuminated “Customer Center” letters, non-illuminated aluminum plaque, customer center parking signs, and double-side illuminated directional sign.**

Vice Chair Williams stated that this item was previously before the Commission. He stated that the applicant had some issues with sizes; they are presenting the item again at this meeting.

Mr. Andrew Serrato of Serrato Signs LLC addressed the Commission. He stated that they were asked to adjust the square footage of the signs. He stated that they downsized the two signs and removed the sign with the hours. Vice Chair Williams stated that everything looks in line with the suggestions made by the Commission. He stated that all the signage adds up to work within the guidelines. He noted that the Customer Center signage was determined to be directional, and there are some parking signs that are not branded.

**Motion:** To **Accept** the sign package as submitted. Motioned by V. Sompally. Seconded by G. Wood. Roll Call Vote: Williams-YES; Wood-YES; Sompally-YES. Voted 3-0-0.

**Approval of Minutes: June 14, 2022**

**Motion:** To **Approve** the June 14, 2022 Meeting Minutes as presented. Motioned by G. Wood. Seconded by V. Sompally. Roll Call Vote: Williams-YES; Wood-YES; Sompally-YES. Voted 3-0-0.

**3. Franklin Ford – 175 East Central Street, 9 Chestnut Street** – Add additional service bays and parking.

Attorney Edward Cannon on behalf of Franklin Ford and Mr. Bob Breen, General Manager of Franklin Ford, addressed the Commission. Mr. Cannon discussed the location of the Franklin Ford building as shown on the plans and reviewed the plan elevations and proposed addition to expand to six service bays. Vice Chair Williams stated that much of this is seen from Rt. 140 and it seems set back on the Chestnut Street side.

Mr. Cannon reviewed the site plan, lighting plan, and landscape plan. He explained the overall site as shown on the site plan with the existing building facing East Central Street and the proposed extension of the bays and proposed striped parking at 9 Chestnut Street. He stated that they are aware that BETA and the abutters were concerned about the lighting; he stated that the lighting will be upgraded. He stated that what is currently there is old-school, and the lights sit on telephone poles. Mr. Breen stated that National Grid is sending someone out as soon as possible to review; they are National Grid's poles. Mr. Cannon stated that either the poles will be replaced or repurposed and the lighting will be updated. He noted that currently, Franklin Ford does not control the lights; as National Grid controls the lights, they stay on longer than necessary. He stated that the proposed lighting should be a big improvement over what is there currently. Vice Chair Williams noted that there is lighting spillage on the photometric plan. He stated that before the Commission would approve a lighting plan, they would want to see it updated and the spillage eliminated. Mr. Cannon noted that Mr. Rick Goodreau of United Consultants could not be present at tonight's meeting; however, Mr. Goodreau has assured him that the photometric plan will show no light spillage onto the neighbors.

Mr. Cannon stated that on Chestnut Street there is a curb cut; its location is to improve the function of the intersection. Mr. Breen stated that the curb cut will allow for car carriers to enter; usually this occurs during the day. Vice Chair Williams questioned the possible noise as the curb cut is being located closer to the neighbors. Mr. Cannon stated that at last night's Planning Board meeting, Mr. Keith asked if they could examine the possibility of utilizing other areas of the site to off-load vehicles. Mr. Cannon stated that they told Mr. Keith they would do their best to accommodate that. Mr. Cannon stated that Mr. Goodreau did the planting plan/schedule.

Vice Chair Williams reviewed the planting plan/schedule. He asked if there was any thought given to doing anything along the street front such as for an improved pedestrian experience when walking down Chestnut Street. Mr. Cannon stated that he would make note of that for Mr. Goodreau to look at; however, he explained that the closer it is to the intersection, it is important to make sure sight lines are strong. Vice Chair Williams noted the drainage work in the back area. He noted the buffer between Franklin Ford and the abutters in that area. Mr. Wood reviewed the Chestnut Street curb cut and the busy area of Chestnut Street. He requested that they make it easier for pedestrians to delineate between the driveway for the parking space and the sidewalk as it gets very busy there. Mr. Sompally stated agreement with Mr. Wood.

**Motion:** To **Recommend** the facade as submitted. Motioned by S. Williams. Seconded by V. Sompally. Roll Call Vote: Williams-YES; Wood-YES; Sompally-YES. Voted 3-0-0.

**Motion:** To **Not Recommend** the lighting plan as submitted until the Commission sees an updated plan with the proper photometrics. Motioned by S. Williams. Seconded by G. Wood. Roll Call Vote: Williams-YES; Wood-YES; Sompally-YES. Voted 3-0-0.

**Motion:** To **Not Recommend** the landscape plan as submitted with the idea that the Commission would like to see a little more buffering on the Chestnut Street side. Motioned by S. Williams. Seconded by G. Wood. Roll Call Vote: Williams-YES; Wood-YES; Sompally-YES. Voted 3-0-0.

Mr. Cannon requested the public hearing be continued to the Commission's next available hearing date. Ms. Kinhart stated that the next Commission meeting is on July 12, 2022. Vice Chair Williams stated that a motion/vote was not needed by the Commission to continue the public hearing to July 12, 2022.

4. **Primrose School Franchising Company – 700-712 Union Street** – Proposed 13,525 sq. ft. one-story child day care facility with a 10,242 sq. ft. turf playground area, off-street parking facilities, landscaping, utility services, site lighting, stormwater management facilities, and other related site improvements.

Mr. Joshua Kline of Stonefield Engineering and Design addressed the Commission. He stated that they have worked with Primrose schools across the northeast. He reviewed the project and stated that he would highlight the items he thought the Commission would be most interested in. He reviewed the aerial view provided in the meeting packet. He noted that there are two hotel projects across the street. He noted the significant grade change of 20 ft. to 30 ft. from Union Street; he stated that it is a challenging site to layout. He noted the grading challenges dictate how they can design the site. He reviewed the building, parking, and playground areas. He stated that they have already talked to the fire department regarding access. He discussed that they would be keeping the streetscaping area on Spruce Pond Road. He reviewed the landscaping plan. He stated that Primrose is a high-end product. He reviewed that there will be many new trees and plantings for this project; there will be plantings around the monument sign, flagpole, and retaining wall. He stated that the majority of the back of the site is for stormwater management. He reviewed the photometric plan and stated that they are LED downward facing fixtures. He stated that they are focused on having safe lighting in the parking lot, and there is no spillage on any abutting property. He stated that the playground does not have to be lit as children will not be playing on the playground when it is dark. He reviewed the color renderings and noted the architectural features and elevations. He stated that some of the key elements are the pitched roofs, cupola on the top, and more traditional materials on the front of the building. He noted that this is a one-story structure. He stated they are surrounded by two hotels that are under construction. He noted that this was a previously vacant property. He stated that a monument sign is proposed which is located by the driveway. He reviewed that there are two small signs associated with the project: one sign faces Union Street and one sign is over the door. He stated that they would like to go before the Planning Board and keep the application moving; therefore, if the Commission is looking for more specifics on signage, they would be happy to return to the Commission for that. He stated that the Primrose emblem on the monument sign will be illuminated, and the two emblems on the building will be illuminated as well. He stated that they were in the Commercial II district, and this was noted on the plans. He reviewed other locations of Primrose schools in Massachusetts.

Vice Chair Williams noted that this does attempt to fall within the New England aesthetic design guidelines. Mr. Kline noted that it is a metal awning. Vice Chair Williams asked for a sample board of the actual materials. Mr. Kline said that he would look for a sample; however, since they are meeting virtually, he could provide a photo. He showed on the screen a picture of a completed building. Vice Chair Williams asked about parking. He stated that he is worried that the driveway is multi-directional and day care drop off and pick up can be chaotic. He asked if it would be better to

have the driveway one way; however, he noted that this may be more of an issue for the Planning Board. He stated that he thinks the front of the building is nice enough for the minimal landscaping there.

**Motion:** To **Recommend** the facade package as submitted. Motioned by G. Wood. Seconded by V. Sompally. Roll Call Vote: Williams-YES; Wood-YES; Sompally-YES. Voted 3-0-0.

**Motion:** To **Recommend** the lighting package as submitted. Motioned by G. Wood. Seconded by V. Sompally. Roll Call Vote: Williams-YES; Wood-YES; Sompally-YES. Voted 3-0-0.

**Motion:** To **Recommend** the landscaping plan as submitted. Motioned by S. Williams. Seconded by G. Wood. Roll Call Vote: Williams-YES; Wood-YES; Sompally-YES. Voted 3-0-0.

**Motion:** To **Accept** the sign package as submitted. Motioned by S. Williams. Seconded by G. Wood. Roll Call Vote: Williams-YES; Wood-YES; Sompally-YES. Voted 3-0-0.

**General Matters - New Business**

None.

**General Matters - Old Business**

None.

Commission members thanked Mr. Sompally for his service on the Commission.

**Motion to Adjourn** by S. Williams. Seconded by G. Wood. Roll Call Vote: Williams-YES; Wood-YES; Sompally-YES. Voted 3-0-0.

Meeting adjourned at 8:09 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Judith Lizardi  
Recording Secretary