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**TOWN OF DEDHAM**

**COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS**

**DESIGN REVIEW ADVISORY BOARD MINUTES**

**Wednesday, August 2, 2017, 7 p.m., Lower Conference Room**

**Present:** John Haven, RLA, ASLA, Chair

 Bryce Gibson, Vice Chair

 Paul Corey

 Christine Perec

 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. Haven was late due to traffic issues. Mr. Gibson assumed the chair until Mr. Haven arrived during the first meeting. Mr. Davey was not present for this meeting. People frequently pointed to renderings and did not specify the locations, so these could not be identified for the minutes.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Applicant:** |  | **Midway Restaurant** |
| **Project Address:** |   | **269 Washington Street, Dedham, MA** |
| **Case #:** |  | **DRAB-06-17-2241** |
| **Property Owner/Address:** |  | RJ Realty Trust, Robert A. Jenks, Jr., Trustee |
| **Materials Submitted:** |  | * DRAB application
* Rendering of proposed LED reader board
* Existing and proposed photos of signage
* Letter of permission to allow Signarama create the signage
* Petition letter from Mr. Jenks
 |
| **Representative:** |  | * Robert Jenks, owner
* Joe DiRusso, Signarama, 184 Broadway, Route 1 North, Suite 11, Saugus, MA 01906
 |

Mr. Jenks would like to replace an existing sign, and add a reader board below. The size will be the same. The Applicant is going for a waiver from the Sign Code because it is a nonconforming sign in relation to setback, and it is greater than 70% of the sign area of the nonconforming sign that is to be replaced. In this instance, it is all within the existing sign area, so there are legitimate grounds to grant a waiver. Mr. Corey said it should be grandfathered as to the existing sign and frame. Mr. McCarthy said that when the Sign Code was changed in 2015, the grandfathering was removed. Mr. Corey and Ms. Perec said the sign is difficult to read because the font is very thin. Mr. Gibson suggested that it is just the angle, but Mr. Corey said this is the angle seen when driving a car. The size has improved, but it will still get lost. Mr. Gibson suggested making the font bolder or thicker. Mr. DiRusso said they will use the existing frame, and repair and reinforce it. They will install an electronic reader board (EMC) measuring 18” high x 113” wide in place of the regular panel sign that says *“Restaurant.”* This can read various things, i.e., special of the day, hours of operation, or Amber alerts. Mr. McCarthy said that the red will “punch it up.”

The Applicant will e-mail changes to Mr. McCarthy, who will forward them to the Board. He will be going to the Zoning Board of Appeals in September. Mr. Corey moved approval of the signage as presented with the proviso that the “Midway” portion of the top sign be changed to be more legible, and that the Board recommend approval of the waiver to the ZBA. Mr. Gibson seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous at 4-0.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Applicant:** |  | **Chick-fil-A** |
| **Project Address:** |   | **100-140 Providence Highway, Dedham, MA** |
| **Case #:** |  | **DRAB-07-17-2246** |
| **Property Owner/Address:** |  | OSJ of Dedham, LLC, 375 Commerce Park Road, North Kingston, RI 02852 |
| **Materials Submitted:** |  | * DRAB application
* Petition letter prepared by Peter A. Zahka II, Esq., 12 School Street, Dedham, MA
* Letter of Consent from John D. Conforti, Manager, OSJ of Dedham, LLC
* Renderings and specifications for signage
* Photograph of existing conditions
 |
| **Representative:** |  | Peter A. Zahka II, Esq.  |

Chick-fil-A came to the Board with the project in 2015-2016, including a sign package. The Board recommended this and recommended that the Applicant attempt to work out with the landlord having only one free-standing sign; they had originally asked for a separate free-standing sign for Chick-fil-A. This was done. Chick-fil-then went to the Zoning Board of Appeals for relief from the Sign Code. The menu boards were counted as free-standing signs. They followed DRAB’s recommendation that they have one free-standing sign and obtained relief.

At the time of construction, all the drawings showed the existing sign to be 20 feet high. When they measured again, it was found to be 24’ 2.” The Building Department said they have to go through the entire process again for all of the same relief obtained previously because of this height. The sign is actually the same height. The sign will have two separate panels, one for Ocean State Job Lot and one for Chick-fil-A. They will be going back to the ZBA to request relief for a 24’ 2” high free-standing sign. The square footage is the same as previously submitted. The sign will have LED internally illumination. There are no other changes to the other signage, and everything in the application is identical to the last submission. Mr. Haven asked for confirmation that the sign itself is the same height as the existing sign and the same width. Mr. Zahka said it is the same height, and it is not larger in width. The existing supports will be painted black with a new brick base. There will be landscaping at the base, and it has increased since the original application. They had returned to heighten the berm.

Mr. Perec moved to approve the design of the sign as presented, and to support the waiver request before the Zoning Board of Appeals. Mr. Corey seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous at 4-0.

***The minutes for the scoping session for the proposed Public Safety Building were transcribed in a separate set of minutes.***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Applicant:** |  | **John Aplin, Trustee, Aplin Realty Trust** |
| **Project Address:** |   | **331 Whiting Avenue, Dedham, MA** |
| **Case #:** |  | **DRAB-07-17-2249** |
| **Materials Submitted:** |  | Proposed Site Redevelopment, prepared by Henderson Consulting Services, P.O. Box 626, Lexington, MA 02420 |
| **Representative:** |  | Scott Henderson, P.E., Henderson Consulting ServicesJohn Aplin, owner |

Mr. Aplin is going through major site plan review with the Planning Board. The site has two existing uses. There is an existing two-story, two-family home in the front of the site that will remain intact and untouched. There are four buildings in the rear that are part of a landscape contracting operation. The Zoning Board of Appeals approved continuation of the nonconforming use. They are also dealing with the Conservation Commission.

The proposal is to tear down the four commercial buildings and construct a new single 23’ tall garage building. Mr. Henderson showed a photograph. The Planning Board asked for landscaping along the frontage, so there will be a five-foot planting bed with short shrubs. Three sections of a stockade fence will be removed to improve sight lines for traffic. The stockade fence between the property and that of the abutter will remain. Landscaping is proposed along the perimeter of the rear of the site; this will not be much because they need as much pavement as possible for the business operation itself. The building will be a pre-fab steel building painted ash gray on the siding and green on the roof. It is coated galvalume all the way around. There will be a green buffer between the parking and the street. There will be no customers coming in and out. The building sits 5-7 feet lower than the residence next door and the rear abutter because most of the filling was stripped when the property was used as a lumber mill. An existing screening fence will remain. Most of the abutting properties will probably not be able to see the building; if anything, the view will be looking down on the roof a bit. The back building will be five feet from the property line as approved by the ZBA; the existing buildings were also five feet from the property line. The fence is well onto the abutter’s property, but there is an agreement for this, and no work is proposed other than installing some screening plantings on the abutter’s property. The existing retaining wall in the rear will be replaced, and there will be plantings along this for the rear abutter. A fence was also put up to give them screening. All abutters were in favor of the project at the ZBA meeting. A small planting bed will be at the corner of the new building.

Mr. Gibson moved to support the plans as submitted, seconded by Ms. Perec. The vote was unanimous at 4-0.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Applicant:** |  | **Chris Priore** |
| **Project Address:** |   | **918 Providence Highway, Dedham, MA** |
| **Case #:** |  | **DRAB-07-17-2216** |
| **Representative:** |  | * Michael McKay, AIA, 35 Bryant Street, Dedham, MA
* Chris Priore, owner/developer
* Scott Henderson, P.E., Henderson Consulting Services, LLC, P.O. Box 626, Lexington, MA 02420
 |

There was a scoping session in April 5, 2017, prior to development of any site plans. The site is the location of Dedham Cabinet and is next to the former Chili’s, as well as the retail strip along Providence Highway. The site is approximately 56,000 square feet with several nondescript one-story buildings and one two-story building. These will be demolished and a mixed use building constructed.

Two renderings were shown, one from Providence Highway. The building is three stories from the front with two brick towers anchoring each side. The back integrates with the Whole Foods lot. An access road splits the two properties. There is a walkway connection between the two per the Board’s suggestion. There is a ten-foot grade change from the rear to the front. The concept is the same, just more detailed. There will be underground parking in the lower level. The second floor has street parking in the front with a landscaped buffer, and there is a driveway that accesses additional parking in the rear. The project has been submitted for peer review, but has not formally been submitted to the Planning Board, as they are waiting for a fiscal analysis. The project will likely return to DRAB for further review. Mr. Haven asked if it is architectural peer review or site plan review. Mr. McKay said it is site plan.

More detailed plans showed vehicle access and the start of the walkway connecting to Whole Foods. There is additional access to parking along the side. There will be retail space along Providence Highway, and there is parking in front of the building. Mr. Priore will have a showroom on the second floor in back with a ground floor entrance. The drawings show the setback from Providence Highway and from the Whole Foods side. This brought the massing away from the corners. He showed the size of the breaks. Materials included a mixture of brick on all four corners broken up with Hardie siding in the upper level, and smooth metal panels in some of the dark grey areas, giving it clearer line. This will be very visible from the northbound side of Providence Highway. The flat overhangs are held back with eagles so the signage will be individual letters. The storefronts are 10’ with the transom included. Doors will be 8 feet. There is one portion of the rear elevation that comes out; it is otherwise set back. The site is not flat, and has quite a bit of detail change with the windows, brick, and material changes. One cornice will be set back approximately one foot. The lighting plan was discussed and will be submitted for peer review. Some windows will be bronze curtain wall with spandrel glass, and some will be punched windows. These are wood clad windows of the same color. Mr. McKay said that the plans are not schematic at all, but is only design development.

There will be 48 rental. There will be 9,800 square feet of *(unintelligible)*. Mr. Corey asked if this equaled what is there now so that existing stores can have the same space; they will not. He wondered how many would lose their space; Mr. McKay thought they were all leaving. The Dedham Cabinet showroom will be on the new site, but manufacturing will be off-site. The pylon sign will be removed, but signage would not be presented this evening. Materials were not presented at this meeting; this is basically a concept. They have added the awnings. It is important to finish this off in their fiscal study of the aluminum or the metal clad. It is just a matter of executing the materials and the addition of the awnings, an idea from Whole Foods, is a great idea. Mr. McKay looked at LL Bean as a driving force as well. He said the Legacy Place people have seen the renderings and like it. The roof will be flat with parapets that will hide the 48 small condensers and two other units; he will have specifications for this at the next meeting.

Mr. McKay said it was thought best to have some connection to the side, so there are two breaks, both located where there is handicapped parking. Mr. Haven asked if this meets the requirement or if it is wider. Mr. Henderson said it is 19 feet, just shy of 20,’ but there is another 12+ feet within the right of way *(unintelligible)* before you get to the sidewalk. There is no curb line along the frontage, so they will be picking up and continuing the curb line that exists on abutter properties, breaking the sidewalk, then green space, and 19’ on the property as stated. The Providence Highway sidewalk is directly on the highway and it is curbed. There is access to the commercial spaces in front through the back of the building via stair and elevator. They will be working on signage or a visual cue for the retail space in front. This may require a pylon waiver if they do something out front and out back. They could possibly do a monument.

The project has been submitted to the Planning Board, and is under peer review. The clock has not yet started on the permitting because they are waiting for the fiscal impact report. The plans have also been submitted to various Town departments for review. There is no specific schedule. He suggested that the applicant return on September 6, 2017, to clean it up a bit. There could potentially be a Planning Board Public Hearing at the end of September. Mr. McKay said he would like to get feedback from DRAB this evening. They will deal with the massing as compared with other buildings, and will have aerial drone photography for the next meeting. They discussed no parking in front, but there will be some parking so the customer base will be served. The applicant will return on September 6, 2017.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Applicant:** |  | **Supreme Development, LLC** |
| **Project Address:** |   | **360 Washington Street, Dedham, MA** |
| **Case #:** |  | **DRAB-02-17-2193** |
| **Representative:** |  | Michael McKay, AIA, 35 Bryant Street, Dedham, MAGiorgio Petruzziello, Supreme Development, owner |

Mr. McKay showed the fully developed re-design of the four-story building. The first floor has a residential lobby, a driveway into the ground level parking, and approximately 2,000 square feet of commercial space. There will be 27 apartments above. The previous design had wings with balconies, but these have been removed. The five-foot setback in the middle has helped to break up the façade. There was some negative feedback on the driveway that goes down to the lower garage and the driveway coming off Washington Street; it created a bit of controversy, but ultimately the owner, Giorgio Petruzziello, agreed to take a floor off, so now it is a three-story building with 18 apartments and parking only accessible from the back. The entire first floor still has a residential lobby, but the rest is 6,000 square feet of retail. The four metal clad overhangs extend out approximately three feet over each entrance.

Mr. McKay discussed the design perspective; they are looking to make this a cleaner version of 350 Washington Street, which is right next door. By dropping the story, it will appear much less, even though it is on the high side of Washington Street, which drops down approximately eight feet from the residential lobby to the corner of Harris Street. The scale of the building will be 32.5 feet. They have increased the commercial to 12 foot ceilings to give retail more visibility. He discussed each elevation and the materials that they plan to use, i.e., AZEK, Hardie plan, very smooth, clean monolithic red brick with conventional colored grout, and granite based brick. The building will be gray on the bottom and off-white on the top. Windows will be of spandrel glass. The Harris Street side will have the entrance to the underground garage. Mr. McKay pointed to renderings and did not specify the locations, so these could not be identified for the minutes. He felt that the new design produced a much better building.

Mr. Corey said the coping on the crown of the building was too large and out of scale. He said that when Mr. McKay gets something better, the Board can look at it. Mr. Gibson said they had discussed the asymmetry of the towers previously *(unintelligible - multiple people speaking at the same time)*. Mr. Haven agreed. Mr. McKay said that one tower is wider than the other, and it is just a stronger statement. Mr. Haven asked it could be simplified. Because of all the AZEK in the middle and using it for different purposes at either end, he wondered if it could just be a simple brick top. Mr. McKay discussed this, saying it has a cornice because it is a classic design. He said it is exaggerated, somewhat playful, and there is a reason for it. Mr. Haven said he would prefer either nothing or something simpler, all in brick. He asked if there was something he could to with the brick, i.e., layering it, so there can be ornamentation without introducing other material. Mr. Gibson suggested doing it on the residence entrance. Mr. Haven suggested brick again, saying would like to see something craftier and that detailing would be more beautiful. *Ms. Perec made a comment, but it could not be understood because she spoke so softly.* Mr. Corey said the lines of brick, with a light colored course of brick every eight or ten courses up looks very interesting. Mr. Corey said he needs to keep the cap on both because it adds to the building. Mr. Haven asked if there is a building precedent for the cornice piece around the top of these buildings; these are a recurring theme in a lot of Dedham buildings. Mr. McKay said it is seen everywhere in Boston. Mr. Haven said he does not see it in AZEK, but in a more authentic material. *It was difficult to discern what people said because there were multiple people talking at once.* He said that EIFS does not feel authentic to him. He feels there should be something different, i.e., stone or intercast material. Mr. McKay said they used cast stone cornices on the building next door on two levels, mimicking what was done at the smoke shop building to an extent. This building has more contemporary lines. He understood what the Board was saying, and said it is scale more than material. He said he listens to what the Board says even though it is only advisory. He said this is worth looking at, and Mr. Petruzziello agreed. Mr. Gibson questioned the larger flat panels of AZEK not showing as much detail as the brick. This gives it a cheaper look compared to what has been done with the brick and brick detailing. He also did not know if the clapboard all the way around and continuing up top makes sense. Mr. McKay said the panels are small with an 8 inch casing, then a panel that is approximately 14 inches, so he does not think there are big expanses of flat, and there is articulation and depth.

Mr. Haven asked how high the overhangs over the doors are. Mr. McKay said they are a little more than 12 feet. Mr. Haven said it appears that, with this design, the sign band would be on top; Mr. McKay said it would. He said they will return to the Board for signage. Mr. Haven showed the Board a canopy that is more related to the pedestrian scale. He said it is basically like this design but moving it one window down so it feels more in scale with pedestrians. He said there is a really strong detail in how it connects to the building, rather than just being attached to the brick. *It was difficult to discern what people said because there were multiple people talking at once.* This was discussed in detail. Mr. Haven said this feels more connected, and lowering it would help with signage being more visible. This allows the band between the second story window bottom and the second story windows on top of the retail windows to connect better. This was discussed in detail, including how it would be constructed.

Ms. Perec asked about lighting. Mr. McKay said there is lighting on the first and second floors. He said they missed the opportunity on the other building to choose a fixture the provided up lighting. Instead they are up and down lights. They submitted a lighting plan as part of the application.

Mr. Corey moved to approve the building as presented with the recommendation that the cap on the right hand tower be reduced in size. Mr. Gibson seconded the motion. Mr. Corey, Mr. Gibson, and Ms. Perec voted in favor of the motion, but Mr. Haven voted no.

**1000 Washington Street, LLC**, was not present for review of a mixed use, Major Nonresidential Project at **1000 Washington Street**. Mr. McCarthy said they are not yet ready to see DRAB. They hope to come to the Board in September once they develop the building plans

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Applicant:** |  | **Dedham 800, LLC** |
| **Project Address:** |   | **750 Providence Highway, Dedham, MA** |
| **Case #:** |  | **DRAB-09-15-2033** |

Mr. McCarthy presented this application. He oriented the Board as to the location on the TGI Friday site. The Board had previously recommended the project. However, it is in litigation right now, as the abutter, Pearl Realty, appealed the site plan approval by the Planning Board. The project has now changed so that it is an urgent care medical office and retail. The medical office will be 5,000 square feet, and the balance will be retail. The parking configuration has changed a bit. The access road will be staying.

The Applicant came to the Planning Board on July 20, 2017, to get determination of modification without peer review and abutter notice. The Planning Board determined that the abutters need to be notified. Some landscaping was lost, and the Planning Board told them to add this. Mr. McCarthy asked them to put in some walkways because one area of landscaping is a rain garden and cannot be walked through. They changed it to branch out. Mr. Corey asked how this would affect the proposed Rail Trail, which is supposed to go through there. Mr. McCarthy is not sure. A canoe launch is proposed for Wigwam Pond that will go in next spring from Dunkin Donuts. Mr. Corey advised removing water moccasins before this happens. There have been preliminary discussions with Pearl Realty and Papa Gino’s Plaza. They want to re-pave it, and Mr. McCarthy has had discussions with them.

They have not discussed the trail, which is a way off. This is not the Rail Trail, although it could theoretically connect to Memorial Field and then connect to the Rail Trail at some point. The trail would go from Eastern Avenue to the canoe launch. The idea would be to bring it all the way around Wigwam Pond and the back of Legacy Place and go to the ball fields on Rustcraft Road. Mr. Corey asked where the bridge would be to get to Legacy Place. Mr. McCarthy said possibly behind Costco. Mr. Corey said the property is there; whether it can be done with Conservation Commission and everyone else involved is something else again.

The Board returned to discussion about 750 Providence Highway. This is just a simple site modification. The building had been approved by DRAB on October 7, 2015. Mr. Corey moved to approve the drawings as presented for the site plan. Mr. Gibson seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous at 4-0.

**Review of Minutes**

Mr. Corey moved to approve the minutes of June 7, 2017, seconded by Mr. Gibson. Mr. Corey noted that the minutes had ten items that Ms. Webster could not hear. The vote was unanimous at 4-0.

Mr. Corey moved to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Haven. The vote was unanimous at 4-0. The meeting concluded at 9:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John Haven, RLA, ASLA, Chair

/snw