



Design Review Board Meeting Minutes

Monday, October 4, 2021

7:30 PM

Board Members:

Mark Gluesing, Chair (P)
Bob Dermody, Board Member (P)
Len Karan, Board Member (P)
Chad Reilly, Board Member (P)
Deborah Robinson, Board Member (P)
Steve Tanner, Board Member (P)
Rana Mana-Doerfer, DRB Recording Secretary (P)
Elisa Litchman, Administrative Assistant, Planning & Community Development (P)

Applicants & Attendees:

1. Tim Parker, Fast Signs representing Systems Design & Integration located at 33 Highland Avenue and applying for signage.
2. Mike Kunz, Mangel Architects representing Fidelity Bank located at 129 Chestnut Street and applying for signage, awnings and façade changes.

Mr. Chair called the meeting to order on October 4, 2021, at 7:33 PM EST.

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

Agenda Item 1:

Fast Signs representing Systems Design & Integration to be located at 33 Fourth Avenue and applying for signage. - Tim Parker

Mr. Parker came before the Board applying for signage. Systems Design & Integration (SDI) is moving from Wexford Street in Needham to Highland Ave.

On the side of the building which faces the entrance to the rear parking lot a lightbox is proposed. Design and scale is proposed as the same as existing lightboxes. The applicant is also proposing on the

front of the building a 3D channel letter, internally lit, LED illuminated sign to be installed on a raceway painted to match the building.

Mr. Tanner noted there is an existing blank sign on the side of the building and asked why the tenants are not using that space. Mr. Parker said the landlord has reserved this sign for another tenant, and he asked that SDI install their own full box sign.

Mr. Tanner asked how the square feet were calculated for the front elevation signage, as it appears the front elevation signage was not added using the method stated in the bylaws. Mr. Parker said that after consulting with the Chair he was advised to bring the sign forth as they would like to submit so the Board can determine whether a special permit is needed.

Mr. Tanner said for the front elevation sign he would like to see the "SDI" and the text underneath brought closer together because there is more space in the middle of the sign and creating more space above and below would improve the design.

Mr. Chair asked what the spacing is between the upper SDI letters and the "lighting shades technology" band. Mr. Parker said the overall height of the bottom (below the text) is 8.4, the top (above SDI) is 20, so there is about 7 inches of spacing.

Ms. Robinson said that the sign on the side of the building it has a lot more text, and it is all very small in font. She would prefer the side-elevation sign to be similar to the front elevation sign with three simple words.

Mr. Karan asked if the color of the graphic to the left of the of the "S" and the "D" is changeable. Mr. Parker said that this color is their logo. Mr. Chair reiterated the premise that logos do not translate to good signage.

Mr. Reilly said that the sign on the front elevation is a bit big. The band on the building is 45 inches, and the overall logo is 35 inches, that leaves only five inches on the top and bottom row, which makes the sign a little crowded. He would like to see the sign shrunk. He would also like to see the words on the side of the sign. He also is not against having the logo centered with the words underneath but given the size of the box the logo may have to be shrunk to give it breathing room.

Mr. Dermody concurred with Mr. Reilly. He also thinks the sign should be smaller for the front façade sign. He also recommends compressing the two different lines to create more negative space at the top and bottom.

Mr. Dermody said for the side elevation sign he would prefer to have the SDI logo to the left, and three lines of text in single words.

Mr. Chair said he had a discussion with the applicants before the meeting about reformatting the "lighting, shades and technology" line to improve the sign. The applicants wanted to put their application in as is and see what the feedback was. There is an issue with the sign area when you review the baseline definition of the area of a sign in the sign bylaw. In the past the Board has approved signs like this if they are comfortable with the composition. If the Building Inspector is not comfortable, he will require the applicant to apply for a special permit. Mr. Chair asked if the Board has any objections to approving it as is? Mr. Dermody objected and preferred the sign goes through the special permit process. The applicant will do so.

Mr. Chair recommended that for the front elevation sign the SDI lettering be smaller, it should be dropped down to the 16-18 inches, and the space between the lines of the sign be reduced to create more negative space top and bottom.

For the side-elevation sign Mr. Chair said he is comfortable with the letter height, but he would like to see the three lines be left justified. Since there will be less text this will allow the letters to be a bit larger.

Mr. Chair asked why a new box is being added, and why SDI is not using the unoccupied box. Mr. Parker said that according to an SDI representative he met with the landlord informed SDI that they are to install their own box and were not at liberty to utilize the existing box.

Mr. Tanner asked about the type of illumination in the side sign box. Mr. Parker said it would be LED. Mr. Tanner preferred that the fourth box be added with LED. He stated that we don't know what's inside the second box, but LED is preferred.

Mr. Dermody commented that having an empty sign is unattractive and adding another box doesn't make sense to him. He would rather see three filled signs and none empty.

Mr. Chair said he would request that the existing box be used, and if they can't for some reason they could come back and let the Board know. The Board can approve a new sign box if necessary. He would prefer a determined effort be made to use the existing box. The bylaws state that "signs pertaining to a business that has closed shall be removed within 60 days." It is unattractive.

Most Board members preferred three boxes only.

Motion to approve the box sign on the side of the building with the condition that the wording matches the wording on the front elevation signage, the sign panel be installed in the existing empty sign box, and that the light source is to be LED lights by Ms. Robinson.

Motion was seconded by Mr. Karan.

Name	Aye	Nay
Mark Gluesing	Aye	
Bob Dermody	Aye	
Len Karan	Aye	
Chad Reilly	Aye	
Deborah Robinson	Aye	
Steve Tanner	Aye	

Agenda Item 2:

Maugel Architects representing Fidelity Bank located at 129 Chestnut Street and applying for signage, awnings, and façade changes. - Mike Kunz

Mr. Kunz on behalf of Fidelity Bank came before the Board applying for signage, new awnings, and façade changes at 129 Chestnut Street. Fidelity Bank has acquired Family Federal. They are looking to renovate this one-story brick building.

At the main entrance on Chestnut Street, they would like to install metal panels at the main entry, and on the drive thru columns, install an awning at the front entry, and painting the existing EIFS fascia the light blue Fidelity colors.

Mr. Reilly said he thinks it is a good idea to clean up this building and freshen it up, he is not a fan of the color, but he understands it is the bank's colors. Mr. Reilly wanted to note that the current proposed location of the sign if installed in the middle of the panels it will seem very high. He recollects that the sign came before the Board previously and they reduced it to make it more appropriate for the building. Otherwise, he is okay with façade changes being proposed.

Mr. Dermody said that sheet A201 shows the sign with dimensions indicating equal spacing, perhaps it is a graphic issue with the other rendering. Mr. Kunz said that the rendering was put together early, and that the sign size was reduced since then.

Mr. Dermody asked some clarifying questions about the installation of the awning. Mr. Kunz indicated that the awning will be a darker charcoal grey, to contrast with the EIFS and it will be centered as it relates to the sign above.

Mr. Reilly suggested that the sign be installed equally spaced or even slightly lower than equal. The way the sign is proposed currently it appears as though there is more space between the awning and the bottom of the bank sign, so it looks a little off.

Mr. Tanner referred to the sign on drawing 3 on sheet A201. The rear elevation sign looks a bit high on the building and should come down a bit.

Mr. Chair said that overall, the façade changes look good. However, for the signage he asked Mr. Kunz review what the DRB requests for information for the signage application and apply separately for the signage. He also suggested that Mr. Kunz refer to the previous approvals for signage for Family Federal to help prepare the new application for signage.

Mr. Tanner pointed out the color of the Sunbrella is mentioned as an ocean blue color, but no specification of the color can be found. Ms. Robinson googled the color "Sunbrella Ocean Blue" and she confirmed it is a darker blue. Mr. Reilly commented that the pylon sign is so dominant that the second sign which will be the wall signs could be more discrete.

Mr. Chair asked whether the awning color will be a grey or blue. Mr. Kunz said he would need to confirm with the bank.

Motion to approve the façade and awning changes with the condition that the Board would allow a change to grey on the awning color by Ms. Robinson.

Motion seconded by Mr. Karan.

Name	Aye	Nay
Mark Gluesing	Aye	
Bob Dermody	Aye	
Len Karan	Aye	
Chad Reilly	Aye	
Deborah Robinson	Aye	
Steve Tanner	Aye	

Minutes:

Motion to approve the minutes of August 9th, 2021, by Ms. Robinson.

Motion was seconded by Mr. Karan.

Name	Aye	Nay
Mark Gluesing	Abstain	
Bob Dermody	Aye	
Len Karan	Aye	
Chad Reilly	Aye	
Deborah Robinson	Aye	
Steve Tanner	Abstain	

Motion to approve the minutes of September 13th, 2021, by Ms. Robinson.

Motion was seconded by Mr. Karan.

Name	Aye	Nay
Mark Gluesing	Aye	
Bob Dermody	Aye	
Len Karan	Abstain	
Chad Reilly	Aye	
Deborah Robinson	Abstain	
Steve Tanner	Aye	

Motion to Adjourn:

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

Motion was seconded by Mr. Reilly.

Meeting adjourned at 8:20 PM.

Name	Aye	Nay
Mark Gluesing	Aye	
Bob Dermody	Aye	
Len Karan	Aye	
Chad Reilly	Aye	
Deborah Robinson	Aye	
Steve Tanner	Aye	

October 18, 2021

Via Zoom

November 15, 2021

Via Zoom

December 6, 2021

Via Zoom

December 20, 2021

Via Zoom