

John Haven, RLA, ASLA, Chair
Bryce Gibson, Vice Chair
Paul J. Corey
Steven Davey
Christine Perec

Richard J. McCarthy, Jr.
Director of Planning
rmccarthy@dedham-ma.gov



Dedham Town Hall
26 Bryant Street
Dedham, Ma 02026-4458
Phone: 781-751-9242
Fax: 781-751-9225

Administrative Assistant
Susan Webster
swebster@dedham-ma.gov

TOWN OF DEDHAM
COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

DESIGN REVIEW ADVISORY BOARD MINUTES
Wednesday, November 1, 2017, 7 p.m., Lower Conference Room

CLERKS OFFICE

2017 DEC -8 PM 12: 27

TOWN OF DEDHAM

Present: John Haven, RLA, ASLA, Chair
Bryce Gibson, Vice Chair
Christine Perec
Steven Davey
Richard J. McCarthy, Jr., Planning Director

Call to order 7 p.m. The plans, documents, studies, etc. referred to are incorporated as part of the public record and are on file in the Planning and Zoning office. Mr. Corey was not present for this meeting.

Applicant: Dedham Shell Station
Project Address: 885 East Street, Dedham, MA
Case #: [DRAB-10-17-2273](#)
Property Owner/Address: George and Paul Pagounis, 137 Baldpate Hill Road, Newton Centre, MA 02459
Materials Submitted: DRAB application
Photograph of existing signage
Renderings and specifications for proposed signage
Representative: Albert Whiting, Contractor, Ready Imaging, Inc., 68 Loomis Street, Manchester, CT 06042

Mr. Davey was not present for this meeting. Mr. Whiting explained that the entire site is required to undergo an upgrade to the new Shell image. There are two components: (1) upgrade of the canopy over the gasoline pumps, and (2) upgrade to the identification sign that is mounted to a pole. There is no change in the canopy size or the size of the fascia. There are two sets of "Shell" letters on the canopy, which will be removed. They will then install two 4' x 4' shell Pectens that will be nonilluminated. The identification sign is an existing manual price sign mounted to a pole. It is the wrong color, so they plan to install a nonilluminated replacement. It will continue to be a manual price sign, not LED.

Mr. Haven asked if the canopy will be lit. Mr. Whiting said that when they were in the process of discussing permits, they were told that the canopy signs were not allowed to be illuminated in

that zoning district. However, the existing red band and the “Shell” letters are lighted. Mr. Whiting was not sure if the application obtained a variance for that. He said there would be no point putting the red band around the canopy if it was not lit. He is proposing nonilluminated fascia and nonilluminated signs because they were told they could not have it. He said it is confusing as to whether it is an illuminated canopy and they are going backwards with a nonilluminated canopy. He asked if anyone knew about this. Mr. McCarthy did not know, but asked, hypothetically speaking, if the Pecten could just replace “Shell.” Mr. Whiting said this is what they are proposing. The red decal would replace the illuminated band. However, Shell would not want to take a step backwards if illumination at the site was allowed. Mr. Gibson asked if they want to take the letters down, put up the Pecten, and leave the band as it is. Mr. Whiting said they cannot do that. If a red band is put on the canopy now, you cannot use flat fascia. The red illuminated band now is only used with a curved fascia, not a flat fascia. It cannot be done half-way, so they cannot swap the “Shell” for the Pecten. This is corporate identity. If they used the square Pecten, they have to put up new fascia. Mr. McCarthy said illumination by right is not allowed in this zone; they could go to the Zoning Board of Appeals to seek a waiver from the Sign Code. Mr. Whiting said he did not think they want to do that, so they would probably just do what is proposed.

Mr. Gibson moved to approve the signage as presented. Ms. Pereg seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous at 3-0.

Applicant:	Fabian Oil Co., Inc.
Project Address:	694 Washington Street, Dedham, MA
Case #:	DRAB-10-17-2281
Property Owner/Address:	NPL Real Estate Trust, M. Nesterenko and R. Luvishchuk, Trustees, 52 Sharpe Road, Newton, MA 02459
Materials Submitted:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRAB application • Petition letter from Ronn R. Gifford, President, Wholesale Sale, Fabian Oil, Inc., 20 Oak Street, Oakland, ME 04963 • Letter of Permission from Alexander Nesterenko, Business Owner, AIM Perfection Auto, 694 Washington Street, Dedham, MA • Photograph of previous conditions (old signage) • Photographs of present conditions (new signage, already installed) • Specifications for new signage
Representative:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ronn R. Gifford, President, Wholesale Sale, Fabian Oil, Inc., 20 Oak Street, Oakland, ME 04963

Mr. Davey arrived late for this meeting. Mr. Gifford said that the new signage was already installed due to miscommunication. The permitting process had already begun to make these changes. They have worked with Building Commissioner Kenneth Cimeno, Mr. McCarthy, and Peter A. Zahka II, Esq., 12 School Street, Dedham, MA, to make the necessary adjustments to come within the Sign Code.

The canopy is white with maroon, and has “Fabian” on all four sides. They have replaced the lenses in the pylon sign. The manual diesel sign on the pylon has been replaced with a digital

price sign. The AIM Perfection sign was updated on the building, replacing the old Jenney Gasoline lens. It is the same size. There are no structural changes, just an image change. There are some things that do not meet the Sign Code, i.e., total linear footage. The proposal is now the following:

1. Removal of two "Fabian" signs from the front and back of the canopy.
2. The identification sign and building sign would remain the same.
3. Elimination of a manual price sign on the left of the property
4. Move the two digital panels off the pylon sign and put them on the canopy, if possible. Another option would be to put up manual signs that would not be lit.

Mr. Gibson asked why they want to move the digital sign to the canopy. Mr. Gifford said that his understanding is that the pylon sign is on either a piece of land that is owned by someone else, possibly the Town, and they want to bring it back to the original state on the canopy. There was a diesel manual sign mounted on that previously. Ms. Percec asked about the square footage requirements. Mr. Gifford said that by removing the small sign from the corner and taking away two of the "Fabian" signs, they now are below the maximum of linear footage. Mr. Gibson said the question now is just the lighting. Nothing else is lit on the site other than the price signs. Mr. McCarthy said this requires a waiver from the Sign Code. There are price signs on the canopy, but they are not lit. Mr. Gifford asked if there was an option for a manual, non-digital, non-lit sign instead that would not need a ZBA waiver. The location of the pylon sign is the issue; it may not be on the property, but on the adjacent lot, and would therefore be an off-premises sign. That, coupled with illumination, would make it more complicated. Mr. Gifford said the sign has been there all along. Mr. McCarthy said a plot plan would be necessary to know if the sign would be on the property. If a survey was done and it was found to be on the property, it would be one thing, but he would still need a waiver for the lighting.

Mr. Gibson thought the price sign looked worse and disruptive of the canopy, especially when the "Fabian" is taken off the front. Mr. Haven suggested keeping the sign on the pylon, if possible, and clean up the canopy. If it is possible to seek a waiver on the pylon sign, he said he would rather it be on that than the canopy. Mr. Gibson agreed. Whether it is on their property or off the property is a whole different topic. Mr. McCarthy said that, from the operative's standpoint, it is not a good idea for it to be manual. Mr. Gifford agreed. Mr. Gibson said it would be better to see the pylon when approaching from the other direction; it would not be seen on the canopy.

Mr. Haven clarified the application:

1. Change the digital pricing to a manual sign, property issues aside. This negates the need to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals. If they want digital pricing, they would have to go to the ZBA.
2. Remove the two "Fabian" signs from the front and the back of the canopy. Support reduction of signage on the canopy, then decide if any illumination is to be supported.
3. Remove the pricing from the canopy.
4. Remove the pricing signage from the corner of the property on the left.

Mr. Gifford proposed:

1. Take the extra signage off the canopy.
2. Eliminate the pricing sign in the corner on the left.
3. Eliminate the pricing signs on the canopy.

4. Change the pricing on the pylon from digital to manual operation. If they want to move forward with digital pricing, they will go to the ZBA for a waiver for illumination. They will return to DRAB if the latter is their decision, and DRAB would need to write a letter in support to the ZBA.

The pylon sign may or may not be on their property. Mr. Cimeno is letting them proceed with the refacing of the pylon regardless of the location since they are putting back what is currently there. There was a lengthy discussion on whether DRAB would support digital pricing. Mr. Haven said he did not think he would. Mr. Davey said there are a lot of bushes on the left side of the property, so he would not have an impact on the residential property there, and the right side of the property is on a corner across from a medical building. Mr. Davey said he would support digital pricing, saying it looked fine from a design standpoint, and there is already a sign there. Ms. Perec said she would agree. Mr. Gibson said he did not. Mr. Davey said these signs do not put out a lot of light, so it is not an internally illuminated sign. Unfortunately, Mr. Corey was not present to break the tie and ultimately it is up to the ZBA.

Ms. Perec moved to approve signage as presented with the same logo on the canopy, removing the free-standing sign with the recommendation that the pricing be manual. Mr. Gibson seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous at 4-0. If they decide to go with an illuminated sign, they will return to DRAB in December.

Applicant:	Blue Ribbon Barbeque
Project Address:	350 Washington Street, Dedham, MA
Case #:	DRAB-09-17-2269
Property Owner/Address:	Petruzziello Properties, LLC, 21 Eastbrook Road, Dedham, MA
Materials Submitted:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• DRAB application• Letter of Permission from Giorgio Petruzziello, Petruzziello Properties, LLC• Renderings and specifications for proposed signage
Representative:	Scott Gubitose, Manager, Blue Ribbon Barbeque

Mr. Gubitose is here for follow-up of his scoping session. They would like to add a sign above their windows. It would have back-lit letters. They are proposing an internally illuminated blade sign above the door, and will be going to the Zoning Board of Appeals on November 15, 2017. He said they felt that they needed to define the whole space because it is 48 feet long. The font is the same as that on the blade sign. The challenge is that on the face, there is a beam that goes about three-quarters of the space where the letter is going to be. All the light for the line has to go up and into the lights, so this is the reason why the letters will be back-lit. He has been told that gooseneck lamps would not fit up there. The effect would be that the light would create a halo effect with the light behind each aluminum letter and spill around each letter, creating a silhouette of each letter at night. The space will be 27 inches high, and the sign is proposed to be 23 inches. Each letter will be 2 inches thick. It will be about 1.25 inches off the wall. The only thing changed from the scoping session is the Q on the BBQ. It is hoped that the wall sign will be ready by opening day on December 1, 2017. The blade sign will not be ready. These will be the new logo for this restaurant. Mr. Gubitose said that they will have 31 square feet of signage, well

under the allowed 48 square feet. The wall sign will be 13 square feet, and the blade sign will be 18 square feet.

Mr. Davey said he thought Mr. Petruzzello was going to sink the wires in front of his building. Mr. McCarthy said he did say that when he came before the Board. Ms. Pereg asked if there are any standards for the building signage. Mr. McCarthy said he does not have a sign program. Mr. Gubitose said they have no plans for window signage at this time. He said there will be four mid tops along the window on the inside. They had discussed frost on the windows for privacy, and he asked if that went toward signage. Mr. Davey said it was fine as long as there was no writing. Mr. Gibson asked if the new logo had a graphic with it. Mr. Gubitose said there was a jagged blue ribbon and a "swoosh" under it that says "Barbeque." Mr. Gibson said there is a lot going on with the blade sign, as discussed at the last meeting, and wondered if anything needed to be incorporated on the wall sign. Mr. Gubitose said they want to keep it simple. Mr. Gibson asked if the blue ribbon and the red lines on the blade sign were lit, or if it was just the letters. Mr. Gubitose said they would be lit. It is back-lit around the ribbon itself, making it a soft halo. It will have two sources of light: internal and halo. The halo is not a bright line, but will be a shadow effect, so the ribbon itself will be visible. These were the Board's recommendation at the last meeting.

Mr. Davey thought the sign was too much, and wondered if it was even necessary, given that they will have the blade sign. Mr. Gubitose wanted him to keep in mind that the wall sign is 10.5 feet in the air, and in a really big space. Mr. Davey said people will see the blade sign. Mr. Gubitose had suggested an awning or something like that, but Mr. Petruzzello said no to that. Mr. Davey wondered if a better solution would be some frost on the windows for pedestrians. Mr. Gubitose said they did not want to do that. He has worked very hard with Mr. Petruzzello and the sign company. Mr. Petruzzello likes what they have come up with, and submitted a letter of consent to the Board. Mr. Davey said that the neon sign goes with the other location, as does the tile. He felt that this sign does not fit the building, saying they are trying to work with the space they will be in. Mr. Gubitose said they want to reflect what the space will be before you walk in. The building is modern, but this is a vintage type of industrial, raw metal and concrete inside. They want to reflect that on the outside before people come in, but to work with the building as well. Mr. Haven said that at night, when you can see the interior, the sign will work with the building. Mr. Gubitose said it really will be muted and not overly bright. The blade sign will be over the door between the columns.

Mr. Gibson moved to approve the wall sign as presented. Mr. Davey seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous at 4-0.

With regard to the blade sign, Mr. Davey still thought there was a lot going on with it, but if Mr. Petruzzello approved it, he is fine. Mr. Gibson moved to approve the blade sign as presented and to support the waiver from the Sign Code for internal illumination. Ms. Pereg seconded the motion. The vote was 3-1, with Mr. Davey voting no. A recommendation letter will be sent to the Zoning Board of Appeals for the hearing on November 15, 2017.

Applicant: El Centro
Project Address: 337 Washington Street, Dedham, MA
Case #: DRAB-10-17-2282
Property Owner/Address: Petruzzello Properties, LLC, 21 Eastbrook Road, Dedham, MA
Materials Submitted:

- DRAB application
- Renderings and specifications for proposed signage

Representative: Rabi Islam, 27 Marcus Road, Sharon, MA 02067

Mr. Islam proposed a sign over the door measuring 128 inches long with letters measuring 16 inches high. He also proposed a black vinyl design at the bottom of each window with four inch gold window signs saying “El Centro” above. He said that the owner has approved these. The black vinyl is a privacy screening for patrons sitting by the windows. He proposed two alternatives for lighting, black gooseneck lamps or LED lighting inside the letters that would be halo-lit. His electrician has checked to be sure that the sign will fit on the sign band. They do not have the metal bar. Mr. Haven asked, based on the amount of height he has in the sign band, whether the gooseneck lamps would fit. Mr. Islam said they would since they have over four feet altogether. Mr. Gibson noted that there are 27 inches from the top to the bottom of the moulding.

Mr. Gibson said he liked the gooseneck lamps, but he is not sure how it will fit, even if there are 27 inches and the letters are 16 inches. Mr. Haven agreed, saying he is afraid it will look jammed into the space, and he thought the goosenecks would cover the sign. Mr. Gibson said he thought the goosenecks would fight with the lighting on both sides of the door, which light up. Mr. Haven asked what the lettering material was. Mr. Islam said it is PVC, and it would be black like the frame. Depending on how they are lit, the letters would be set half inch from the building. Mr. Gibson said, assuming it is approved, that the window lettering will go toward the linear footage of the signage. Mr. McCarthy said it would not; only the lettering goes toward signage. Mr. Islam said that if the Board did not like the lettering, he could just have the vinyl at the bottom of each window. Mr. Haven thought it was better to have the lettering because the site is so long and wraps around, and it makes it read more cohesively. He thought it would be nice to see it consistent when coming up the street. He also liked the black vinyl.

As for the lighting, the Board needed to decide if it preferred the gooseneck lamps or the back-lit halo letters. Mr. Haven preferred the back-lit halo letters because it keeps the building consistent with the neighboring tenant. He did not think the goosenecks would fit, and it might look squashed. Mr. Gibson agreed.

Ms. Pereg moved to approve the signage as presented with the recommendation that illumination be from behind. Mr. Davey seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous at 4-0.

Applicant: Dedham Marketplace, LLC
Project Address: 95 Eastern Avenue and 600 Providence Highway, Dedham, MA
Case #: DRAB-10-17-2280
Property Owner/Address: Dedham Marketplace, LLC, 69 Great Road, P.O. Box 2350, Acton, MA 01720
Materials Submitted:

- DRAB application
- Project Narrative prepared by Peter A. Zahka II, Esq., 12 School Street, Dedham, MA 02026
- Sign package, including list and photographs
- Owner's Authorization and Consent, signed by Stephen P. Steinberg, Esq., Manager, Dedham Marketplace, LLC

Representative: Stephen Steinberg, Esq.

Mr. Zahka was unable to be at the meeting due to a death in his family. Mr. Steinberg said the complex is 40+ years old. They have never had trouble with signs as tenants came and went. Salon Centric moved to their location, and he said it appeared that they are not allowed to get a sign. They currently have a temporary banner. Another tenant, Barre, a workout business, will be coming in and they will also have trouble obtaining a sign. Mr. Zahka has recommended that they go to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a comprehensive sign package for all future signs.

Mr. McCarthy gave some background. The properties are two separate parcels. The Town of Dedham Sign Code is based on the property itself, and signage is distributed based on the property. As tenants have come and gone, there was a tipping point as far as how it related to the Sign Code, whether it complied with the old rule amount of signage. The Providence Highway parcel is perpendicular to the highway with Papa Gino's at one end and Orangetheory Fitness at the other end. Each tenant has its own sign band on the building, and signage must go in that. Most signs are internally lit, and some have no lighting at all. Mr. Steinberg did not think that any sign is exterior lit.

Mr. Haven said there was probably a technicality in terms of allowable square footage. Mr. McCarthy said it was an issue of frontage along Providence Highway and then frontage along Eastern Avenue. The idea is to distribute the signage for the entire property based on those two frontages. The property will remain two separate parcels, but for signage purposes, they want to be able to combine the frontage so they can distribute the signage more toward the Providence Highway side as far as the building goes. The building wraps around, and the Eastern Avenue building is split through the property line. The advantages of a sign package are: (1) it distributes the amount of allowable signage between the two streets for the property itself, and (2) the sign package would, as tenants come and go, not require new tenants to come to DRAB. The Town has sign packages for Dedham Plaza, Ursuline, and Legacy Place, and has been trying for years to get the Dedham Plaza to have one.

Mr. Haven asked what DRAB would be voting on. Mr. McCarthy said it would be voting on the waivers requested in the letter. This will then develop a significant package, which will come back before DRAB. Mr. Haven said that the existing sign bands and the two free-standing signs will not have signage added. They will be replacing tenants that have left. Mr. Haven asked about

window signage, and Mr. McCarthy said they have done that as well, and some tenants have removed window signage. Mr. Davey asked if the signage has been approved by DRAB, Planning Board, and the Building Commissioner, or if people just open and start putting up signage. Mr. McCarthy said the Planning Board is in favor of this. In this case, research was done to check for compliance relative to the amount of allowable signage and its noncompliance. This was based on an audit of window signage, wall signs, and pylon signs throughout the entire property. Papa Gino's, as it relates to the Sign Code, uses up a lot of square footage of signage, i.e., the awning has their branding colors, etc.

Mr. Haven clarified that the additional square footage is for two tenants to fill their sign band. Mr. Steinberg said that at this time, everything is leased. There are two new tenants, one open and one not yet open, who would like to put their sign on the sign band. He believes that the latter is waiting for this process. They are ready to open, so they will need to have a temporary banner. The Board would essentially voting to support the preparation of a sign package and waivers. Mr. McCarthy said the Board would look at the waivers as though it was one property, and to draw the total amount of allowable sign area off the two streets, Eastern Avenue and Providence Highway, to be distributed across the property. Mr. Gibson asked how this got factored into the sign package, and whether the Board is approving more square footage than they are allowed because they are asking for a waiver. Mr. McCarthy said the sign package would be giving them more sign area by taking the frontage on both streets, adding them up, and distributing it across the board. Mr. Gibson asked if, by distributing it, this was above and beyond that if they approve the waivers. Mr. McCarthy said there would not be additional signage. If they get the waiver to combine the two frontages, there is enough sign area total to distribute across the property.

Mr. Haven said it sounded like they have done the process of removing window signage, which would be his issue. Mr. McCarthy said he went through the entire site with someone from their office. Mr. Steinberg said the leases all require the tenants to have proper permits and to ask their permission. However, they have not been doing that. He said they can get offending window signs removed. Mr. McCarthy said that some of the signs are, for instance, two feet behind the back of the window, but this counts as signage. He said it is hard to police these.

Mr. Gibson moved to approve such relief or waivers as required for the signs at 95 Eastern Avenue and 600 Providence Highway to be in accordance with a Sign Package that includes a total sign area of 1,433 square feet inclusive of wall signs with a total area of 1,174 (including awning signs with a total area of 252 square feet and window signs), three (3) free-standing signs with a total area of 249 square feet (one at 113 square feet, one at 130 square feet, and one at 6 square feet), two (2) free-standing signs with a height of 23 feet, and free-standing signs with a front yard setback of 15 feet and 1 foot. Mr. Davey seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous at 4-0.

Applicant:
Project Address:
Case #:
Representative:

ACP Properties, LLC (Chris Priore)
910-928 Providence Highway, Dedham, MA
DRAB-07-17-2216

- Kevin F. Hampe, Esq., 411 Washington Street, Dedham, MA 02026
- Scott Henderson, P.E., Henderson Consulting Services, LLC, P.O. Box 626, Lexington, MA 02420

Mr. Hampe explained that the architect, Michael McKay, was out of town and could not make the meeting. This project is for a mixed use building with 48 apartments and commercial space on the first floor. They have been to the Planning Board twice, and are close to approval if all the conditions that were requested are met. They are scheduled to meet with them on November 9, 2017. They have also been to the Conservation Commission for storm water management. They are before DRAB to go over some of the materials that will be used and to show some landscaping, which was not shown at the previous meeting. They also want to discuss the overall design of the project on the site; this is now in its final stage.

Mr. Henderson said the layout has been discussed briefly. Nothing substantial has changed. They have produced a landscape plan, but it is not a rendered plan; it is an actual planting plan. The main component is along the frontage on Providence Highway. For the first 20 feet of the property, there will be a bioretention area, which is undergoing storm water management. There will be landscaping as well. They are going through the MassDOT process for the curb cut, and still need to do some work with them to finalize how it will work. He is comfortable with what is depicted on the plan, however. There will be a five foot wide concrete sidewalk, then about 12 feet of sod and grass before they hit the frontage and some areas of plantings. These will be mulch-based beds with small shrubs and maybe some grasses. It will not look like a rain garden. They do not propose any trees within the 20 foot strip. There is a sewer easement along the frontage with a main trunk line that serves a large portion of Providence Highway. There are a couple of pin oak trees on the side. There is a small buffer along the southern property line. There is a ten foot grade change on the left from the front of the property to the back of the site. Traffic cannot get from the front to the back. The only landscaping will be along that frontage.

There is limited landscaping in the back of the site. The residential entrance to the property in the back is approached via an extension, which is a private road, off Legacy Boulevard. There are two small landscape strips along the front that will flank the pedestrian access; they will be trying to connect Legacy Place with this site. There is no sidewalk on Legacy Boulevard or on the private road. There are two existing trees just off the property on the right side; these are the only trees in the area, and they are behind the retaining wall at the former Chili's building. These will remain, as they will not be making a significant grade change there. They propose three trees in back.

Mr. Haven discussed the bioretention area. It is a large area of mulch, and he asked why it cannot be planting with grasses. Mr. Henderson said the plan shows those shrubs along the edges. He is not sure that the landscape architect understood exactly what he wanted to do from a design perspective. He showed him the storm water management handbook from DEP. The plan will be to pepper the area with grasses, not just shrubs. The Planning Board asked them to try to come up with a rendering, and they are in the process of doing that. Mr. Haven said his only comment would be to fill in the mulched area with appropriate plantings. Mr. Henderson said they are

catching the run off from the pavement via perf grates as shown by the riprap areas. They will use a rounded river stone rather than the angular stone that is typically used. This has been a point of discussion for aesthetics in bioretention areas on other projects in Dedham. They are trying to find a middle ground between Conservation and Planning.

Mr. Henderson provided samples of the materials they will be using for the building. The brick will be full brick. The areas between the brick are curtain wall glass that has shading to it. The dark gray is metal siding. The boards are cement fiber that he believes is Hardie plank siding. The colors of the siding were shown to the Board. The trim is the light tan, and the darker accent is weathered copper. The finish is smooth. Mr. Henderson showed the view from Whole Foods coming into the residential entrance. All the tenants will park in the garage at this level and at the surface lot to the left. The crowns in the mouldings will be pre-cast concrete. Pre-cast concrete bands will also be in between the brick runs. The top will be metal. Many of the areas on the building were pointed to, so the Administrative Assistant could not determine where they were. They will return to DRAB for signage. A sign band will be present. Mr. Haven said they will talk at length about signage on the back of the building for the tenants in the front. Mr. Henderson said there would be a free-standing sign in the front. They do not have detailed design for the back yet. There will be a flagpole per the request of the Planning Board. There is lighting on the sides of the building in the rear. There are sconces along the sides of the building to light the pedestrian way along the rear of the building to get to a vestibule to take an elevator up to the front retail stores. There are sconces on the other side by the 50's Diner, and some on the front. There are two poles along the frontage and two in the landscape islands in the back to light up the parking lot. The site is adequately lit, and there is no spill over to other properties. Mr. Henderson said the design of the sconces has not been determined. This will be reviewed when the applicant returns for signage.

Mr. Gibson commented on the colors on the top, saying they seem quite different from the renderings. They are warmer and yellower than the renderings and the clapboard colors below, and it is tough to tell what they really are. He said it might look beautiful on the building, but it is different from what was presented so far and it seems out of the range of the rest of the palette. Mr. Henderson said he will consult with Mr. McKay about this. Mr. Haven agreed, saying that having an actual sample of the material would be best.

Ms. Percec asked if there is an opportunity to add any landscaping on the perimeter of the building. She realized that it is tight, but thought this be a good idea. She suggested the pedestrian walkway or the parking lot area. Mr. Henderson said the pedestrian walkway goes all the way around the building coming from the Whole Foods area. It is fully ADA compliant around the side of the building and along the parking. They will be requesting a waiver for parking space dimensions in that parking lot, and he said he does not have a single inch to spare width-wise to fit in more landscaping. There is only one additional parking space beyond what is required by the Zoning Bylaw. He does not believe they would be granted a waiver for this. They investigated adding a landscape island in the parking area, but it cannot be done, particularly on the south side. On the north side by the 50's Diner, they have granted a 20 foot access/egress easement to them, and they cannot encumber that. This runs right out to where there is curbing and landscaping along the building. He said they have taken every square inch that they can to add landscaping. As an aside, the existing site is 100% paved, so this will be a marked improvement.

Mr. Haven clarified that the Board will be voting on materials, the landscape plan, and the site layout in general. After discussion, Mr. Gibson moved to approve the proposal with the following recommendations:

1. That the water retention areas in the front are further landscaped or scattered with grasses
2. That the colors presented for the metal panels are not up to the Board's liking compared to the renderings that were previously presented
3. That the applicant come back with more relevant material samples at the next meeting
4. That the lighting presented is just a placeholder at this time, and will be reviewed further.
5. That the applicant return for signage.

Mr. Davey seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous at 4-0.

Review of Minutes, October 4, 2017: Mr. Gibson moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Ms. Perec, and voted unanimously 4-0.

Mr. Gibson moved to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Davey, and voted unanimously 4-0. The meeting ended at 8:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



John Haven, RLA, ASLA, Chair

/snw