

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

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
webster@dedham-ma.gov

TOWN OF DEDHAM
COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

DESIGN REVIEW ADVISORY BOARD MINUTES
Wednesday, May 25, 2016, 7 p.m., Lower Conference Room



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

Mr. Haven called the meeting to order at 7:00 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. It must be noted that a great deal of conversation could not be understood due to multiple people speaking simultaneously.

Applicant: Dunkin' Donuts
Project Address: 36 Sawmill Lane, Dedham, MA
Case # and Zoning District: DRAB-04-16-2087- General Business
Property Owner/Address: Roma Realty Trust, Renato Reda, Tr., 15 Felix Street, Dedham, MA
Representative: Sean Donovan, Viewpoint Sign and Awning, 35 Lyman Street, Northboro, MA 01532
Chris Dacosta, owner of Dunkin' Donuts
Materials Submitted: DRAB application
Renderings of proposed signage
Letter of authorization from Renato Reda, Tr.

Time: 7:01 to 7: 18 p.m. Mr. Davey joined the Board late due to a Selectmen's meeting. The pylon sign and one of the building signs had previously been reviewed, but the applicant now wishes to change the pylon sign. The monument sign was added after the Board approved the sign package. The style has been changed and will match the "Welcome to East Dedham" sign. The Board now needs to approve the mounting posts for the sign. There is no change to the sign otherwise. At the request of Building Commissioner Kenneth Cimeno, the ZBA reviewed the sign on May 18, 2015, and was fine with it. They do not need to go back to the ZBA for this new sign, but they will need to go back to the ZBA for other waivers. They want to open the store before that, however, with what DRAB has already

recommended. Their target installation date is June 30, 2016, provided there are no issues. The double-sided directional signs on Milton Street and Sawmill Lane will need waivers and recommendation from DRAB, and will also need to go to the Planning Board to make sure it does not block line of sight. The canopy and the clearance bar all need DRAB approval as well. None of the additional signs put the applicant over the square footage allowed. The applicant also wants to put an additional wall sign on the building facing Milton Street. They have not yet submitted this. They will return to DRAB on June 1, 2016, for this.

Mr. Corey moved to approve the pylon changes with the changes to the structure (two granite posts), seconded by Mr. Gibson, voted unanimously 3-0. Mr. Corey moved to approve the two double-sided exits signs on Sawmill Lane and Milton Street pending approval by the Planning Board for line of sight. Mr. Gibson seconded the motion, voted unanimously 3-0. Mr. Davey was present for this discussion. He noted that there is no location for the "Welcome to East Dedham" sign on the plans. Mr. McCarthy said it is on the most current site plan, and filled Mr. Davey in on tonight's meeting. The Board then briefly discussed the additional wall sign on Milton Street. Mr. Davey did not think it was necessary and said there was sufficient signage. There was no vote on this sign.

Applicant:	Riverview Office Park
Project Address:	270-280 Bridge Street, Dedham, MA
Case # and Zoning District:	DRAB-04-16-2092 - LMA
Property Owner/Address:	MarBridge, LLC, 160 Federal Street, 11 th Floor, Boston, MA 02110
Representative:	John M. Sisk, Asset Manager, Marwick Associates, 80 Hayden Avenue, Lexington MA 02421 Scott Henderson, P.E., Henderson Consulting, Civil Engineer
Materials Submitted:	DRAB application Letter from John M. Sisk, Asset Manager, Marwick Associates, 80 Hayden Avenue, Lexington MA 02421 Hand-drawn rendering of proposed monument sign

Time: 7:20 to 7:32 p.m. The applicant came in for site plan review and for replacement of an existing monument sign. There was no better rendering of the monument sign other than the hand drawn rendering. The size of the sign will remain the same. There will be an insert into a stone monument. Mr. Corey was concerned about line of sight. Mr. Henderson said the sign will be about 12.5 feet back from the back of the sidewalk, so from a line of sign perspective, there will be no issue. The sign is 10 feet wide x 4'6" tall and will be ground lit. Mr. Haven asked if they would be extending the existing landscape bed to incorporate the sign, but Mr. Sisk said it would be 7-8' away from the bed and stand on its own. Mr. Corey asked how the tenants on the property would be identified. Mr. Sisk said their intent is not to have any tenant identification on the sign. Riverside Community Care, the largest tenant, will have a sign on the building. In addition, the monument sign will actually be changed to *Riverside Office Park*.

The Board also reviewed the site plan, which will be going before the Planning Board in June 2016. The rear parking lot will be paved with pervious pavement, and lighting will be added. Mr. Haven asked if the additional landscaping was related to the new parking, or if it

was site-wide. Mr. Henderson said that the limit of work on the site was the rear corner where the asphalt is going in. A landscape plan was produced and more or less represented the existing conditions. They have since added plantings after acquiring the property. They are full compliant with the Zoning Bylaw with regard to interior landscaping and buffers along the front and sides. No new landscaping is going in. Four new lights are going in, including three in the back.

Mr. Haven moved to approve the proposed site plan changes with the addition of the parking and lighting as submitted, seconded by Mr. Corey. The vote was unanimous at 4-0. Mr. Haven moved to approve the signage as depicted in the submitted rendering, seconded by Mr. Gibson. The vote was 3-1 with Mr. Corey voting nay.

Applicant:	Toward Independent Living and Learning, Inc. (TILL)
Project Address:	83 Washington Street, Dedham, MA
Case # and Zoning District:	DRAB-05-16-2097 , Single Residence B
Property Owner/Address:	Till, Inc., 20 Eastbrook Road, Dedham, MA
Representative:	Dafna Krouk-Gordon, President of TILL, Inc. Jim Burke, Civil Engineer with DeCelle-Burke Associates, Inc., 1266 Furnace Brook Parkway, Quincy, MA 02169 Brian Donahue, Donahue Architects, 21 McGrath Hwy., Quincy, MA 02169

Materials Submitted: Narrative and photographs of corporation and plan

Time: 7:34 to 8:05 p.m. The applicant has not gone before the Planning Board yet, but is here for site plan review and a new building on the site of the former Oasis Club. Ms. Krouk-Gordon explained the organization and how it works. The building will be two stories, but the primary emphasis will be on the first floor. The individuals do not drive, and are brought to the site by either "The Ride" or a transportation network; only employees will use parking. The building will be a significant upgrade to the surrounding area.

Existing conditions were shown. New electrical services will be brought into the building. The building will be two floors of 3,600 square feet per floor, and a 13-space parking lot with a handicapped space. There will be three access points. Traffic flow will be one-way for 36' nonarticulated trucks. The parking spaces will be 19' and the aisle 24 feet. Stormwater will be updated with several catch basins and CULTEC chambers. They propose five chanticleer pear trees, nine rhododendrons, seven mountain laurels, five azaleas, and six arborvitae throughout the site. Flower beds will be in front. Mr. Haven thought the amount of plantings was light. He liked the locations proposed, but thought the street plantings would be a little out of scale. He suggested bigger plant beds with the trees, or just the street trees. He advised against pear trees, which can split over time. He encouraged a shade-type tree, i.e., a maple, that will provide a canopy over time. He would avoid mountain laurel and broad leaf evergreens, as it is a difficult site more suited to deciduous varieties. He suggested clustering the plants, especially in front of the building, and expanding the plant bed in the corner, considering how the tree is incorporated into the overall plantings.

The building is driven by the kitchen layout on the first floor; this is very fixed. Elevator and stair access are in the corners of the building, and there is a small café in the front; this is open to employees. The second story is an open floor plan with different functions. The

building is a long, thin box, and they will use materials with different shapes and forms to break it up. They plan to use maintenance-free vertical wood siding with a coating on it, vertical glass, and corrugated metal siding. They will use a horizontal siding material in back. The roofs are relatively flat with a slight pitch for drainage. They may have wall-mounted lighting at the door and at the delivery entrance. There will be no pole lighting. They have discussed site lighting shining up at the building or having a couple of bollards. Otherwise, they plan no other lighting. The building will not be open at night.

Mr. Haven thought the landscape plan should reflect the quality of the materials and architecture of the building. He said that the site plan does not make as much sense based on the building. He encouraged them to retain the services of a landscape architect or qualified landscape designer to play it up. He suggested ornamental grasses in front, as an example, and very simple, clean landscaping. Ms. Krouk-Gordon asked the Board not to consider landscaping at this time, and to trust them in this regard. Mr. Haven said the Board would have to see the final landscape plan for approval to provide direction. Further discussion about the building took place. Mr. Davey asked about the café and the hours, and if the operation would be day and night; Ms. Krouk-Gordon said it will be open until about 5 p.m. He suggested that they look at lighting more. Mr. Haven also suggested lighting from within the building, i.e., a lit box in the atrium. Mr. Corey asked about signage, and there will only be signage on the building. He said they need to submit the design to the Board.

Mr. Corey moved to recommend that the Design Review Advisory Board approve the plans for the TILL building on the Oasis site as presented. Recommendations were made and the applicant will return to the Board with the final plans. Mr. Gibson seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous at 4-0.

Applicant:	Dedham Square Coffeehouse
Project Address:	565 High Street, Dedham, MA
Case # and Zoning District:	DRAB- 05-16-2098 , Central Business
Property Owner/Address:	L & M Partnership, 43 Stearns Street, Newton, MA 02159
Representative:	Ali Koushan
Materials Submitted:	DRAB application Rendering of proposed signage

Time: 8:08 to 8:36 p.m. Mr. Koushan is in the process of putting up a new sign. Yoga Now occupies the back part of his shop, and patrons must go through the coffee shop to get there. The current signage is confusing because of the two businesses, so a sign design that reflects these two entities is needed for clarification. The Town installed a light pole in front of the shop, which is a huge problem for signage and affects visibility. Mr. Koushan had considered an awning over part of the store to separate his business from the yoga studio. Mr. Corey wondered how this would work since patrons enter the same door. There was a lengthy discussion about an awning with Mr. Davey suggesting one from end to end with the name of the coffeehouse centered on it. Mr. Haven suggested an awning with a clean line and not as heavy as the previous one. Mr. Koushan said he would only do an awning that is two-thirds of the front. Mr. Davey thought the yoga sign was oversized, although he said they would probably not take it down. He suggested that the applicant work with them to find something that would work for both of them and the building. Mr. Haven said this has already been discussed, and the yoga studio wanted their own signage. There will always be

two signs. They could put an awning up with both names, but this would be more confusing. The awning will draw attention to the coffeehouse, but it would probably look strange. Extensive discussion took place regarding the awning.

Mr. Corey suggested making the sign mounted vertically on the awning like those across the street, rather than writing on the awning. The Board agreed that this would be a very good alternative. Colors were discussed, as were fonts. Mr. Davey suggested that he hire someone to do the design; he felt that the proposed design was not appropriate. Mr. Corey said that he came before the Board in hopes that they could help design it, but Mr. Davey said that was not why people come to the Board; he said they come for consultation and advice. Mr. Koushan appreciated the Board's guidance and suggestions. He will determine what is best for his budget by getting prices. He will decide on colors and fonts as well. He will return to the Board on June 1, 2016.

Applicant:

Project Address:

Case # and Zoning District:

Representative:

Chick-fil-A

140 Providence Highway, Dedham, MA

DRAB- 12-15-2056, Highway Business

Peter A. Zahka II, Esq., 12 School Street, Dedham, MA

Anthony Donato, Bohler Engineering, 352 Turnpike Road, Southborough, MA 01772

Matt Berberich, Bohler Engineering, 352 Turnpike Road, Southborough, MA 01772

Time: 8:39 to 8:51 p.m. The applicant is here for landscaping. They are in process with the Planning Board, having had one Public Hearing and another scheduled for May 26, 2016. There has been an upgrade of the existing conditions on the site, specifically along the Providence Highway corridor, so it blends in with the area in front of the Dedham Mall and Stop and Shop.

Mr. Donato said that the Board had suggested a brick wall in front of the seating area to separate the parking and the drive-thru, and this has been provided. The site had 11% landscaping, and it now has 20%. The new plan provides landscape berm along one edge (pointed to on the screen, but not identified) and over 130 shrubs and perennials along it in groupings with seasonal interest. Seven Linden street trees have been provided along the frontage. Shade trees will be provided in the parking areas and ornamental trees at the buffer. There are about 25 new trees proposed for the site, approximately 170 evergreen shrubs, 170 deciduous shrubs, and groupings of ground covers, perennials, and ornamental grasses. They will collect surface run-off into small rain gardens within the parking area, which will contain species that will take that inundation. They feel that this plan will provide a much more appealing "front door" for both properties. Mr. Zahka said that Ocean State Job Lot has agreed to a combined sign where the existing sign is. Mr. Davey thought the signage was crowded, and suggested that the scale be reduced. Mr. Haven said the list of plants looks acceptable. He thought the Linden trees were a great choice.

Mr. Haven moved to approve the landscape plan as shown on the plan dated 5/23/16, seconded by Mr. Corey, voted unanimously 4-0.

Mr. McCarthy said that Noble & Greenough School, 10 Campus Drive, was not going to come before the Board. Under the Zoning Bylaw section on design review, it triggered site plan review, bringing it into the Board's jurisdiction. However, because of the nature of the project, that is, being internal to the campus and not visible from the road, it was not necessary for DRAB to review it. He showed the Board the renderings. After review, Mr. Corey moved approval of the plan presented, seconded by Mr. Gibson, voted unanimously.

Applicant: Brothers Roast Beef and Pizza
Project Address: 356 Bridge Street, Dedham, MA
Case # and Zoning District: DRAB-11-14-1916, General Business

Time: 8:52 to p.m. Mr. McCarthy showed the board what was recommended/approved. There was essentially all grass around the perimeter of the property. He went out to the site, and noted that the grassy areas are now landscape beds, which was not on the plan. The Planning Board approved the change. Mr. Corey thought the plants looked great against the fence. Mr. Haven never remembered the lawn or the landscape plan. He said it would be interesting to see if the Planning Board raised an issue that DRAB approved an all-lawn landscape with one tree and some shrubs in front of the building. He wanted to make sure it was accurate. Mr. McCarthy said the Planning Board did, and were not particularly happy, but approved the plan with all lawn. He can check DRAB's recommendation. Mr. Davey noted that there is no lawn now other than a small area. Mr. McCarthy said the Board could drive by and look at the property. Mr. Haven also noted that the sign has a stone base on it. This was not shown on the approved plans; it only showed a pole. He said the Board spent a lot of time on the sign, and he was sure that they would have discussed the stone. Mr. Corey said that nothing can be done.

As a result, the Planning Board would like to come before DRAB on June 1, 2016, to talk about the design review process and what they will be doing moving forward. They want to have an architectural peer review on new buildings as the level of detail that DRAB wants to do should have that kind of review. The applicant would be responsible monetarily for the review. Mr. Haven said he understood engineering reviews, but questioned how this would work. Mr. McCarthy said it can be fashioned in different ways. Town Meeting approved funding to do design guidelines for Dedham Square. When they were first done, it was a town-wide effort that, in concept, made sense. The end product did not really reflect architectural designs and what they mean to people from different areas. Since then, there has been a lot of public feedback and commentary on architectural design of buildings. The idea is to have architectural design guidelines for particular areas, and this monetary allocation is for Dedham Square. There need to be new guidelines and a review process. The design guidelines would be what the community wants to see for architectural design. The reviewer would then have an insight, not just architectural opinion per se. The Board discussed this issue in detail, questioning whether it was worth spending the money to do something that would happen by itself when peoples' ideas change. Architectural design is subjective. An applicant would like some feedback and direction, and Mr. Davey agreed with that. However, he said there are social and environmental issues that arise over mixed use. Mr. McCarthy said these will be incorporated into the design guidelines. He said there is also money allocated to do design guidelines for East Dedham Square. He pointed out the section in the Zoning Bylaw, 9.5.7, relating to what the Board

must give consideration when approving a site plan. One of them is "minimize unreasonable departure from the character, materials, and scale of buildings in the vicinity, as viewed from public ways and places." DRAB had done that through its review, but when a project needs to have a deep review, the Board wants to make sure that the plan and the building they approved match what was presented. Mr. Gibson thought it was good for a trained eye to look at something in detail. He did caution not to take the design guidelines too specific to the materials in the Square. Mr. McCarthy said they have to write a scope of service, which is where DRAB will come in.

Mr. Corey said that hiring a reviewer will have a major impact on builders because of the cost. This was discussed extensively. Mr. McCarthy said the first step is to have a strategic plan for Dedham Square, more improved than the existing one. It would be more of a vision plan for the Square, and then the design guidelines would back up that vision. Mr. Gibson said it could be done in a way that it would be enough without having an architectural review process. Mr. Corey said that if there was an architect on the board, the peer review would be done only on the architect's taste or education. Mr. Gibson said that, whether there is an architectural review process or one relies on the opinion of DRAB, the guidelines are the key important, objective pieces.

Mr. Corey moved to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Haven. The vote was unanimous at 4-0. End 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,


Steven Davey

/snw