

Design Review Advisory Board

Bryce M. Gibson, Chair
Christine M. Perc, Vice Chair
Steven R. Davey
John C. Haven, RLA, ASLA

TOWN OF DEDHAM
COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS



Dedham Town Hall
450 Washington Street
Dedham, MA 02026-4458
Phone 781-751-9242

Jennifer Doherty
Administrative Assistant
jdoherly@dedham-ma.gov

DESIGN REVIEW ADVISORY BOARD
MINUTES

Wednesday, January 6, 2021

Virtual Meeting Via Teleconference and Telephone

Present: Bryce Gibson, Chair
Christine Perc, Vice Chair
John Haven, RLA, ASLA
Steven Davey

Not Present:

Administrative: Jeremy Rosenberger, Planning Director
Jennifer Doherty, Administrative Assistant
Michelle Tinger, Community Engagement

Pursuant to Governor Baker's March 12, 2020 Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A, §18, and the Governor's March 15, 2020 Order imposing strict limitations on the number of people that may gather in one place, the meeting of the Town of Dedham's Design Review Advisory Board on **January 6, 2021** was conducted via remote participation. No in-person attendance of members of the public were permitted, but every effort was made to ensure that the public could adequately access the proceedings as provided for in the Order.

Members of the public were advised that they could access the virtual meeting a number of ways:

1. Virtually through the Zoom software program, details of which were given on the agenda and the town website prior to the meeting.

Secondly, members of the public can participate via conference call by dialing toll-free, **1-646-558-8656**. The meeting ID is **941 7027 2416**

2. Recordings of this meeting have been made public and are available upon request.

The meeting began virtually at 7:00 pm on January 6, 2021. The Chair Bryce Gibson read a statement regarding meeting protocols. He then asked for a roll call of participants on the call:

- Christine Perc, Vice Chair
- John Haven
- Bryce Gibson, Chairman
- Steven Davey

980 Washington Street, Applicant: Adams | Ahern Sign Solutions, Inc.
99 sq. ft. wall sign

Chris Adams was on the video call representing the applicant. The building was owned by K&S Partners and the tenant for this particular space was Brown & Brown insurance. He explained that the tenant would like to move the current wall sign that is on the side and facing the highway, to the front of the building in the center and still facing the highway. The size of the sign would not change and would just be moved. Because of the height elevations they would need to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a waiver. It is internally illuminated by LED lights with the power coming from the inside of the building.

Bryce Gibson explained that this was one of several businesses in the office park location and he was concerned about setting a precedent for future tenants. He also felt that the top of the sign would look better if it aligned with the lower band of the building. Mr. Adams stated that the landlord has the responsibility of determining how each tenant will receive the allotment of square footage. The landlord had given approval of this signage in writing for the application. This was also a much larger tenant than the others in the building and therefore they desired larger and more signage.

Steve Davey mentioned that the sign was half on the light part of the building and half on the dark. He felt it looked unprofessional. He had questions regarding the Brown & Brown logo and wanting to keep it stacked on top of the building. He felt it would look better laid out horizontally. Mr. Adams explained that the tenant wanted to reuse their sign from another building, they did not want to purchase a new sign. He also mentioned that the sign would not be seen from the highway if it was lowered due to the trees. They wanted to achieve the maximum viewing capability.

John Haven asked if this was the only location the landlord had given them for signage on the building. The answer was yes. It was also the only place on the building that the sign would fit given its measurements. If it were put somewhere else it would be blocking windows on the building.

The applicant explained that he had wrestled with all of the issues the board was currently bringing up, however, taking the client's requests into account, this was the best way he could place the sign. John Haven clarified that the sign could only be seen from Route 128, it would not be seen from Washington Street.

Christine Perc stated that she agreed with the other members. The sign did not fit with the architecture of the building. She understood the restrictions with the tenant, but she did feel it should align with the building.

Steve Davey made a motion to reject the application as presented and instead provide two recommendations:

1. The sign be linear instead of stacked, and arranged across the top of the building, as the "Dedham Executive Center" sign.
2. The sign be aligned with the change in material instead of being mounted across two different materials.

Christine Perc seconded the motion and a roll call vote was taken.

John Haven – yes
Christine Perc – yes
Steve Davey – yes
Bryce Gibson – yes

The motion passed 4-0 and the application was rejected as proposed.

Minutes

There was a problem with the link to view the minutes from the August 5, 2020 meeting, they would therefore be voted on at a later meeting.

A motion was made by Steve Davey to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Christine Perc and a roll call vote was taken.

John Haven – yes
Christine Perc – yes
Steve Davey – yes
Bryce Gibson – yes

The motion passed unanimously 4-0, and the meeting was adjourned at 7:43 p.m.