Design Review Board Meeting Minutes
Monday, June 6, 2022
7:30 PM

Board Members:

Mark Gluesing, Chair (P)
Susan Opton, Board Member (P)
Chad Reilly, Board Member (P)
Steve Tanner, Board Member (P)
Rana Mana-Doerfer, DRB Recording Secretary (P)
Elisa Litchman, Administrative Specialist, Planning & Community Development (P)

Applicants & Attendees:

HEARINGS:

Williston Weaves located at 56 Brook St, has made application to the Design Review Board for a Special Permit pursuant to the Sign By-Law Section 5.5.3.1 (a) The applicant is asking for an additional wall sign not permitted under the By-Law, and any other applicable sections of the Bylaw. This will be heard at the 6/27/2022 meeting.

APPLICANTS:

1. Christina Moreau, Agnoli Sign Co., Inc. representing Williston Weavers located at 56 Brook Road and applying for signage.
2. Rick DeAngelis, Boston Properties applying for exterior work on rooftop at 140 Kendrick Street.
    - Brett Lambert, Stantec Architecture
    - Ellesse Lunde, Construction Manager
3. Justin Savignano, Project Manager for Town of Needham, applying for modifications to Town Common Project located at 1471 Highland Avenue with regard to walkway materials and landscaping.
4. Jonathan Charwick, Activitas Inc. representing Babson College located at 0 Olin Way and applying for signage on batting building.
    - Steve Tolley, Assistant Director B&G
    - Thomas Scarlata, AIA, Principal, BH+A
5. Nicole Handricken, Sign Design, Inc. representing M&T Bank located at 827 Highland Avenue and applying for signage. (Did not attend)

Mr. Chair called the meeting to order on June 6, 2022, at 7:30 PM EST.

Mr. Chair notified attendees of new public meeting orders issued by the governor of Massachusetts.

Agenda Item 1:

Agnoli Sign Co., Inc. representing Williston Weavers located at 56 Brook Road and applying for signage- Christina Moreau, Agnoli Sign Co.

Ms. Moreau came before the Board seeking to replace the existing 3 signs at 56 Brook Road.

Sign A: A 30" X 96" aluminum sign. The sign is 20 sq ft overall, depicting the store name and address

Sign B: A 30" x 168" is a 35 sq foot cover the existing copy on the awning with an aluminum panel.

Sign C: A 48" x 144" Aluminum sign depicting the store name and address. 46 sq. ft. overall.

Mr. Chair informed Ms. Moreau that there was a mix up with the special permit request and therefore that hearing will be continued to the 6/27/2022 DRB meeting. The previous occupants never applied for permits for their signs, so existing signs are not legal. Mr. Chair said the Board can review one of the signs and an awning change this evening, the other two signs would be applied for as a special permit. Ms. Moreau said she spoke with the Building Inspector who told her because she has two entrances, she is allowed by right two signs. She stated that Sign C would be her choice for the special permit application. Mr. Chair said the way the regulation is written she can have a second smaller sign over the second entrance which should be an entrance, not just another sign.

Mr. Tanner discussed the awning and pointed out that the placement of the awning is not something the Board would have approved; it appears that it is installed above the coping line and brick of the building.

Mr. Tanner and Mr. Chair discussed the placement of the awning and the sign on the awning.

Mr. Reilly said the graphics of the sign seems to be one of those that works great on a business card but not for a sign. He would like the size of the band and the address reduced, and the name of the business a little bigger without crowding it, to make it more legible. He also mentioned that it's important to know what material the awning is made as it would be odd to put aluminum over canvas. The "second door" doesn't look like a business entrance but a loading dock and wouldn't be considered an entry door for the public.

Mr. Chair said he would like for Ms. Moreau to come back to the next meeting with a modified application incorporating the comments from this meeting since Ms. Moreau is coming back for a special permit. Mr. Chair asked Ms. Moreau to verify the material of the awning, investigate whether it actually cuts through the coping at the top of the wall, and get the measurement of the awning, and whether it interferes with the top of the door. Also add a photo that shows where the top of the awning is. The Chair would like the sign relocated near or adjacent to the door in the rear of the property, if it is a secondary entrance. If it is not a secondary entrance, the Board recognized there is a reasonable need to identify the entry door from the rear parking lot, and suggested modifications that would help achieve that.

Ms. Moreau asked if one sign could be reviewed and approved, as the business is hoping to have a sign up when they open. Mr. Chair said the Board could approve the sign over the awning but the awning itself would need to be changed or they could have a temporary sign next to the door in the back since the issue is in the parking lot area.

Mr. Reilly said there might be context behind the signs, the previous business tenant may have been using the rear sign facing the parking lot to help customers find the entrance of the building which is around the corner where the awning is located. He asked for more context be provided so they can evaluate the signs. The proposed sign of 20 square feet it is more than a directional sign and would need to be scaled down.

The Board deliberated regarding what they can approve, and what they would like to see modified.

Mr. Chair impressed upon Ms. Moreau that the awning was installed inappropriately, and she needs to investigate that so it can be corrected. He also gave Ms. Moreau the option to recover the awning in a new color, because the color scheme does not work well with the sign she is proposing.

Motion to approve the sign for the awning with the condition that they confirm that it is fabric or aluminum, and whatever overlay sign that they match the existing material, and that they apply for a façade change to review that awning at the next DRB meeting by Mr. Tanner.

Motion seconded by Mr. Reilly.

Name	Aye	Nay
Mark Gluesing	Aye	
Susan Opton	Abs.	
Chad Reilly	Aye	
Steve Tanner	Aye	

Agenda Item 2:

Boston Properties applying for exterior work on rooftop at 140 Kendrick Street- Rick DeAngelis, Boston Properties

Mr. DeAngelis came before the Board for a minor site plan modification. The request is to locate and construct a roof deck for a new tenant in the building. The site plan was originally approved in 1999, and in December of 2020 an amendment was made for exterior improvements.

The applicants are seeking approval to construct a rooftop deck in an area between the parking garage and one of the buildings on the site. The deck will have glass guardrails with stainless steel handrails, and the floor would be pavers.

Mr. Lambert of Stantec Architectural walked the Board through the proposed changes. The roofed platform exists currently but is not usable, a substrate and pavers would be installed, a railing system as well as a gate for maintenance access, glass railings, with stainless steel handrails, will be installed.

Mr. Reilly encouraged the applicants to submit documentation and have the DRB do a preliminary review of the proposed modifications earlier in the process before drawings are done for future reference. He does not have an issue with the deck.

Mr. Tanner asked if there will be an etched vinyl pattern, or some kind of glass application that breaks up the glass panels, so it's more noticeable for people from the inside. Mr. Chair said there will be a 16-inch curb along all the windows between where the doors are.

Motion to approve the 140 Kendrick roof deck as submitted by Mr. Tanner.

Motion seconded by Mr. Reilly.

Name	Aye	Nay
Mark Gluesing	Aye	
Susan Opton	Aye	
Chad Reilly	Aye	
Steve Tanner	Aye	

Agenda Item 3:

Town of Needham, applying for modifications to Town Common Project located at 1471 Highland Avenue with regard to walkway materials and landscaping - Justin Savignano, Project Manager

Mr. Chair started the review with a comment that there was a public committee that studied this design, and former DRB member Nelson Hammer served as a member of the committee. This project was well reviewed and was approved during 2020. The project itself is not up for review, as it has already been reviewed, approved, and funded. The review is for modifications to the original design.

Mr. Savignano came before the Board to discuss some changes to the project due to budgetary constraints. A value engineering process was started to look at some material alternatives to keep the project on track financially.

The first change is for the landscaping and the reduction in caliper size of trees and plants. Initially 3.5" diameter trees were proposed, now they would like to plant some 2" diameter trees. The Planning Board has already reviewed this change and they found no issue with it. The height of the trees will remain the same. This planting mix is noted on the plans.

The second change is for the pavers, instead of using exposed aggregate concrete walkway material, they wish to use concrete pavers. They will be using pavers from the Andover collection which will be placed in a "set-stone" arrangement. These pavers tie in with the walkways aesthetically, tie into the existing streetscape, are permeable and comply with ADA requirements.

Mr. Reilly had a question in regard to the pavers, the pathways are curvilinear, due to the rectangular design of the pavers, it might make sense to angle the pavers at a 45-degree angle, so there isn't a starkness between straight lines and curved edges. He also wanted to know how the pavers will be set and if there is an edge condition. He also suggested that the transition line between the different paving types at the Garrity way entrance to the Green be moved to the edge of the intersecting walkways, not in the middle as proposed.

Mr. Savignano said the pavers will be set into compacted gravel base, where the furniture will be placed the pavers, underneath will be set into a concrete base to accommodate the mounting of the furniture. There will be pavers set linearly along the edge to contain the walkway paving.

Motion to approve changes as submitted by Mr. Tanner.

Motion seconded by Ms. Opton.

Name	Aye	Nay
Mark Gluesing	Aye	
Susan Opton	Aye	
Chad Reilly	Aye	
Steve Tanner	Aye	

Agenda Item 4:

Activitas Inc. representing Babson College located at 0 Olin Way and applying for signage on batting building- Jonathan Charwick, Activitas Inc

Mr. Charwick came back before the Board to present a modification to the batting cage.

A slight modification was made to the orientation of the cage, the design is the same. Mr. Scarlata explained the signage that is to go onto the cage. The DRB had commented on the possible signage when the Board commented on the initial review of the building. The letters of the sign are 16 inches by 12 inches, and the logo is 3 feet by four and a half feet. The material of the sign is going to be a five 16th inch aluminum sheet.

The Board did not have issue with the siting changes. The Board approved the signage.

Motion to approve the signage for the batting cage as submitted by Mr. Tanner.

Motion seconded by Ms. Opton.

Name	Aye	Nay
Mark Gluesing	Aye	
Susan Opton	Aye	
Chad Reilly	Aye	
Steve Tanner	Aye	

Minutes:

Motion to approve the minutes of April 25, 2022 by Mr. Reilly.

Motion seconded by Ms. Opton.

Name	Aye	Nay
Mark Gluesing	Aye	
Susan Opton	Aye	
Chad Reilly	Aye	
Steve Tanner	Did not Attend	

Motion to Adjourn:

Motion to adjourn the Design Review Board meeting by Mr. Tanner.

Motion was seconded by Ms. Opton.

Meeting adjourned at 8:55 PM.

Name	Aye	Nay
Mark Gluesing	Aye	
Susan Opton	Aye	
Chad Reilly	Aye	
Steve Tanner	Aye	

Future Meetings:

July 25, 2022	Via Zoom
Aug. 8, 2022	Via Zoom
Aug. 22, 2022	Via Zoom
September 12, 2022	Via Zoom
October 3, 2022	Via Zoom
October 17, 2022	Via Zoom
November 7, 2022	Via Zoom
December 5, 2022	Via Zoom
December 19, 2022	Via Zoom