

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, May 3, 2017, 7 p.m., Lower Conference Room



Present: John Haven, RLA, ASLA, Chair
Bryce Gibson, Vice Chair
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. Ms. Perec and Mr. Corey were not present for the meeting.

Applicant: Oakdale Square Alliance
Project Address: 7 Sanderson Avenue, Dedham, MA
Case #: [DRAB-04-17-2222](#)
Property Owner/Address: 77 Cedar Street, LLC, 23 DeFrancesco Circle, Needham, MA
Materials Submitted:

- DRAB application
- Rendering of mural
- Letter of authorization from Paul DiCamillo, 23 De-Francesco Circle, Needham, MA

Representative: Christine Ryan, 57 Oakdale Avenue, Dedham, MA

The mural, which is currently in place, is located on the Sanderson Avenue side of the building, which houses Tedeschi's Food Shoppe. Several murals have been cropping up in town, and Mr. Haven felt they should have been approved prior to being painted. Ms. Ryan said the actual rendering, which was started about a year-and-a-half ago, was completed last summer. Outreach to the public and the Town occurred regarding any public art policy in place. Everyone felt that this was a public art project, not a sign. The mural is to commemorate the neighborhood and welcome people to Oakdale Square. The neighbors and Oakdale Square Alliance decided on a mural, did some fundraising, grant work, and worked with the designer, including doing a vision board on Pinterest. They settled on a mural that said "Welcome to Our Neighborhood." It was felt that it unified the neighborhood. Four vignettes commemorated important things that have happened, i.e., a Flag Day Parade, the Church of the Good Shepherd, the Veterans Monument containing an image of a long-time neighbor, Joe Pagliuca, who served in World War II, and the

Oakdale School. In addition, a couple of “nods” were made to the neighborhood, i.e., Easter eggs of the traffic dummy, Leroy the Bunny, who was part of the bunny project, and a Tedeschi’s logo.

Mr. Davey said the reason they are here is that they never went through the DRAB process. However, the Town does not have any bylaw or system of dealing with murals as art work. Someone was on Facebook and the issue was raised about how to deal with these things. There is currently no strict format or system in place for this. Everyone is in agreement with doing research and study, and putting some protocol in place. Mr. Davey said that the other thing is, because it is in Oakdale Square, which designates it as a “place.” Ms. Ryan said she would argue that it is not for retail or commercial purposes.

Mr. McCarthy said that the Sign Code defines a sign pretty broadly written (*unintelligible – multiple people speaking simultaneously*), which brought this mural to the Board as a sign. The Mother Brook Arts and Community Center is actually art, although Mr. Davey said it is now a façade change. The Board does not have a mock-up to know what the final product is, so it could theoretically turn into a sign. However, it is considered public art for now. Ms. Ryan said that the conversation on Facebook was about the façade, and that needs definition. It brings up a lot of good questions, i.e., whether painting a house is a façade change. Mr. Davey agreed, saying there needs to be more direction. Ms. Ryan suggested getting a group together to discuss this.

Mr. Davey said that the Facebook conversation also said they wanted “Welcome to Oakdale Square” because they knew people who did not know where Oakdale was. Therefore, this mural is also a wayfinding entity, giving it a dual purpose, rather than it being strictly a piece of art. Someone in the audience questioned the “Welcome to Dedham” signs and the Endicott Estate sign and whether they, as signs, need to go through the DRAB process. The “Welcome to East Dedham” sign did go through DRAB because it is a wayfinding function. Mr. Davey said the mural can serve that purpose as well, so it is not totally out of bounds that it would be there. It has been two years since it went up and it has been well received, so he wondered if the conversation was more about the Mother Brook mural, which had raised questions, than the Oakdale mural.

Ms. Ryan recommended that the Board look at grandfathering certain things as well so other people do not have to go through this process in the future. She said there is a lot of public art out there, i.e., the free library and the utility boxes, and there is much more that people want to do. She said that once the sign is done and see what the process will be in the future, people will become comfortable with guidance, standards, and protocol. She would like to exempt what is already done, and if people are happy and the neighborhood is brought together to celebrate the neighborhood, that would be a great thing. Mr. Davey agreed.

Mr. McCarthy said there are two phases to Design Review Advisory Board review. The Board needs to review the design, but, more importantly, waivers from the Sign Code will be needed for the percent of wall area; this was explained to Ms. Ryan in detail. The waiver must be obtained in order to allow the 7-Eleven, which is taking over Tedeschi’s, to open.

Mr. Gibson said he liked the mural. He thought it fit the location. His only concern was whether this would set a precedent going forward, and whether it would allow anything that is not this attractive on a building. Otherwise, he thinks it is fine. Mr. Haven said it would be a lot different if it had Tedeschi or 7-Eleven as the primary focus when it is not about that. He had no other questions. Mr. Davey asked whether the little reference to Tedeschi’s will be painted over now

that it will be 7-Eleven. Ms. Ryan said that Tedeschi's was good enough to choose the store and re-do the façade and signage at great cost. This was the catalyst for improving the neighborhood. As a result, even though Tedeschi's is selling to 7-Eleven, it will remain on the mural.

Mr. Davey moved to leave the mural on the building as is, and to support the waiver request. Mr. Gibson seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous at 3-0. Mr. Haven encouraged Oakdale Alliance to attend a meeting or have a representative attend if there is ever a signage issue or signage coming up in Oakdale to express support or opposition. It would help the Board with its decisions. General discussion took place regarding the Board's advisory status.

Applicant:	Chick-fil-A
Project Address:	100-140 Providence Highway, Dedham, MA
Case #:	DRAB-12-15-2056
Property Owner/Address:	OSJ of Dedham, LLC, 375 Commerce Park Road, Kingston, RI 02852
Representative:	Anthony Donato, P.E., Bohler Engineering, 352 Turnpike Road, Southborough, MA 01772

Mr. Donato said the Applicant had been before DRAB about a year ago, and there have been a couple of minor changes to the project. They had to go to MassDOT because they made some additional (*unintelligible*) holes. They had some comments about pedestrian access to the public sidewalk on Route 1. They provided a link to the sidewalk from the restaurant. They have turned the spaces on either side of the lot into additional landscaping. They had previously planned to use parking in the Ocean State Job Lot (OSJL) parking lot. There was a piece of land that was under agreement by another lessee, and the Applicant has now acquired it as part of their lease. Additional parking was planned for that area, and they now comply with parking regulations. They have added 25 additional spaces and more landscaping (*unintelligible due to a truck or motorcycle driving by an open window in the conference room*) that is kind of like a snow pile area. They are creating an additional bioretention area, and will be going before the Conservation Commission for an additional storm water management improvement.

Mr. Haven asked if anything had changed in the Ocean State Job Lot parking lot, and nothing has. Mr. Donato said they have added more green to the plan, and they are now in compliance with the approved plan. There will still be landscaping in the OSJL. Mr. Haven said it looked like there is more of a buffer between Route 1 and the parking directly adjacent to Chick-fil-A. There is more green because the entrance would now be further to the right. The Board thought the parking plan was fine. Mr. McCarthy said they would have to go back before the Planning Board for the parking. (*Mr. McCarthy's comments regarding signage were unintelligible due to mumbling, plus several people were speaking simultaneously*). Mr. Donato said the site is presently under construction.

Mr. Gibson moved to approve the changes in additional pedestrian passage and additional parking spaces as presented. Mr. Davey seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous at 3-0.

Applicant: Brockton Area Multi-Services (BAMSI)
Project Address: 280 Bridge Street, Dedham, MA
Case #: DRAB-04-17-2227
Property Owner/Address: MarBridge, LLC, c/o Valerie Reid, Colliers International, 160
Federal Street, Boston, MA 02210
Materials Submitted: Design Review Advisory Board application
Rendering of proposed signage and location on building

Mr. McCarthy said he did not have 280 Bridge Street come in because the signage was at the back and did not front on Bridge Street. There are two signs, and they will not be visible at all. One sign says "Dedham Day Habilitation" and the other says "Dedham Enrichment Center." There were no comments from the Board. Mr. Davey moved to approve as shown on the renderings. Mr. Gibson seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous at 3-0.

Applicant: Henri Gough d/b/a The Total Image
Project Address: 485 High Street, Dedham, MA
Case #: DRAB-04-17-2220
Property Owner/Address: Paul McMurtry, P.O. Box 628, Dedham, MA
Materials Submitted: DRAB application
Renderings of proposed signage
Representative: Henri Gough, business owner

Mr. Gough has rented space in the building since approximately 1998. He would like to reface his sign and keep the same location, which is higher than the lower edge of the roof of the building. He will be going before the Zoning Board of Appeals for a waiver from the Sign Code for this. In addition, two other tenants, both sub-leases, will be occupying space. The proposed Total Image sign is oval with a green background. The other two signs will be added below. Mr. Gough said the sign for the eyelash business was changed at 6:50 p.m. tonight, so it will be withdrawn from this meeting. These two businesses had come under the umbrella of Total Image in the past, but they now want their own signs.

With regard to the Total Image sign, Mr. Davey thought it appeared that they are pasting a square sign onto an oval sign. Mr. Gough said that the lettering of the previous "The Total Image" sign does not stand out at all; this way, it shows up much clearer. Mr. Gibson asked if the black lettering on the white oval is helping more, and whether the whole oval could be white. Mr. Gough said it could be white, except that it is against a white building. He said he could put a black border around it. Mr. McMurtry's sign was originally green, so that is why he picked green. He wants to put up a simple, clean, clear sign. He took the phone number off as well. Mr. Gibson said the message would be clearer if he took the green away and just used a black and white sign and possibly a black border. Mr. Haven agreed, saying the green and the white are not balanced, and having it float on the white would be nice. He said that even a light gray instead of the green would be better and cleaner. Mr. Gough is fine with that; he prefers clarity and simplicity. Mr. Davey said that the box inside the oval goes in the other direction from what Mr. Gough wants to do, and adds a level that does not need to be there. The Victoria Hair Salon sign also be white with black lettering. It is clean and simple, and measures 2' x 3.' The Lash Station sign will come to DRAB separately.

The Board agreed that the signs with the changes proposed will make a difference to the building. Mr. Davey moved to accept the Total Image sign with the understanding that the green background be removed, that the square sign be removed and that the writing just live within the oval, and that the Board recommend the waiver be approved on the basis that it is the same size and shape sign that was there previously. Mr. Gibson seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous at 3-0. Mr. Davey then moved to approve the Victoria Hair Salon sign as shown. Mr. Gibson seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous at 3-0. Mr. Gough will update the image and send it to Mr. McCarthy for Board approval.

Mr. Gough said that Civic Pride basically does all the "Welcome to Dedham." The money is usually raised by the residents. He was not sure they ever came to DRAB for approval. They have a couple of more signs they are interested in putting up. They are usually done in conjunction with the Town. He asked if, in the future, they would need to come to DRAB. Mr. Haven asked Mr. McCarthy if they need to come before DRAB for these. Mr. Davey said they did go to DRAB for the East Dedham sign, but that was on someone else's property. The Endicott sign did go before DRAB, and it is possible that the Dedham Square sign did as well. Mr. Gough said that, in the future, they will make sure to go to DRAB. Mr. Haven read the Sign Code as it pertained to town-owned property, sponsorship signs, temporary signs, exempt signs, etc.:

Section 237-13 Exempt signs.

The following do not require a permit under this chapter:

- A. Any sign erected or required by public agencies pursuant to federal, state, or local law.
- B. Public signs erected by or on behalf of a governmental body to post legal notices, to identify public property, to convey public information, and to direct or regulate pedestrian or vehicular traffic.
- C. Any sign inside a building, not attached to a window or door, that is not visible from a distance of more than three (3) feet beyond the lot line of the lot or parcel on which such sign is located.
- D. On-premises traffic control devices on private property, the face of which meet Department of Transportation standards and which contain no commercial message of any sort.

Applicant:	The Vitamin Shoppe
Project Address:	800 Providence Highway, Dedham, MA
Case #:	DRAB-04-17-2217
Property Owner/Address:	Dedham 800, LLC, P.O. Box 90, Norwood, MA
Materials Submitted:	DRAB application Renderings of existing and proposed signage

The Board determined that this was simply refacing the existing sign without any changes. Mr. Davey moved to approve the sign change as presented. Mr. Gibson seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous at 3-0,

Applicant: Panera
Project Address: 725 Providence Highway, Dedham, MA
Case #: DRAB-01-17-2213
Property Owner/Address: Federal Realty Investment Trust, 450 Artisan Way, Suite 320, Somerville, MA 02145-1203
Materials Submitted: Site plans for proposed new building

The Applicant is proposing a drive thru and signage. Mr. McCarthy reviewed the façade meeting for Mr. Davey, who was not present for that. He explained the drive thru route and where the previous board, canopy/speaker, and menu board will be. None of these faces the highway. They had had Panera's logo on them, but that has been removed. Discussion took place regarding additional waivers for free-standing signs (*much of the conversation could not be understood due to mumbling*). The menu board is static. There is a canopy on top that has Panera's name on it. Patrons pick up their orders on the Providence Highway side. Mr. McCarthy said the Board had made suggestions regarding the façade, and the Applicant followed through with them. Mr. Haven said the Board made it much better (*again, there were several people speaking simultaneously, so the conversation could not be understood*). Mr. Gibson, however, still thought the orientation would be a problem.

Mr. Haven asked the Board to focus on the signage. Mr. Davey asked about the menu board. Mr. McCarthy pointed out that the main sign on the building will require a waiver because it is above the roofline on the parapet wall. Mr. McCarthy had requested another elevation in which "Bread" was brought down so they did not need a sign waiver. Mr. Haven said it is clear that the Applicant is forcing the Board to (*unintelligible*). He did not accept the second elevation as an alternative. He was not pleased that the Applicant was absent from the meeting. He asked Mr. McCarthy if he had spoken to them, and Mr. McCarthy said he had already relayed the message to them when he saw this issue. He said he would reinforce the alternate means to them. Mr. Gibson said there is still a question of the drive-thru positioning as well. He said it seems out of place, and asked if it is meant as an advertisement at the drive-thru. Mr. Haven said he thought they discussed omitting that at the last meeting. Mr. McCarthy said he would double-check on this. Mr. Haven said that the only thing he noted on the sign package is that the menu board and other signage shows a different Panera bread logo than what is on the new building; this is the same as what is on the existing building. He said that the logo should be consistent throughout. Mr. Davey said this makes the assumption that they are not sure what to do and just decided to use both. Mr. McCarthy will get this clarified.

Old/New Business

- The next meeting will be on May 11, 2017, at 7:00 p.m. with the Planning Board to discuss the East Dedham Design Guidelines.
- If the Board is interested, the Planning Board will meet at 6:30 p.m. for a presentation by MAPC on the Transit Oriented Development planning study around Legacy Place/ MBTA commuter rail lot. The subject area is out to Providence Highway, down Legacy Boulevard, across to the MBTA commuter line. This area will be transformed into a transit oriented development area to become a more connected neighborhood. It may potentially lead to new zoning. The main thing will be connectivity.
- Art in relation to the Sign Code was discussed briefly and needs to be addressed.

- Signage in relation to the roofline. There have been quite a few cases in which there are different rooflines on buildings. Some of the locations make sense, but it forces them to go a spot that may not make sense. This came up more recently with Hooters. There is a vestibule in front that projects out, and the sign needs to be above the roofline. However, it still requires a waiver from the Sign Code. The Zoning Board of Appeals sent an e-mail requesting that the Sign Code be examined and perhaps adjustments made. This was discussed in detail.

Mr. Davey moved to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Gibson, and voted unanimously. The meeting ended at 8:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



John Haven, RLA, ASLA, Chair

/snw