

**Minutes: Design Review Board  
June 1, 2011**

Present: Dan Martin, Juan Cruz, Deborah Kruskal , Chris O'Halloran

**Sign Application: New England Garden Ornaments  
81 Union Avenue**

Giancarlo Lavini presented a non-conforming freestanding sign for the board's recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals. The freestanding sign would be a second freestanding sign on the property. The applicant believes that the uniqueness of the site with its separate buildings, large trees, and large windows makes a separate freestanding sign necessary for the site. The board finds the design of the sign as presented as professional and appropriate if the building were to have one tenant, but the board is also concerned that a future tenant in the vacant portion of the building will also require a freestanding sign. The board believes that if a variance is granted, a more appropriate solution, and one that is more in accordance with the bylaws, would be for a freestanding sign that identifies the address/business center with two panels for the tenants. The applicant asked whether the board thought it appropriate for the panels to be larger than the allotted 18 inches since there are only two tenants. The board expressed that if the applicant kept the overall height lower than the permitted 10 feet, it would support somewhat larger tenant panels.

The board unanimously voted to support a variance for a second freestanding sign on the property provided that it is a business center identifier with tenant panels of a size to be determined by the ZBA.

**Sign Application: Olympia Sports  
437 Boston Post Road**

Travis Valencourt presented an application for a wall mounted sign and a secondary under-canopy sign. The signs as presented comply with the bylaws.

The board unanimously voted to approve the signs as presented, but noted that the logotype on the under-canopy sign may change to match the logotype on the primary sign.

**Sign Application: Home Sweet Home Décor  
339 Boston Post Road**

Palig Garabedian presented an application for three wall mounted signs that exceed the permitted 39 square feet permitted by the bylaws. The board discussed a number of options to make the signs conform to the bylaws while providing the necessary visibility.

The board questioned the area of the wall sign over the entrance as it did not appear in the drawings to necessarily be the same as the dimensions in the application.

The board also discussed several design recommendations including making the name of the business on one line and adding a border to the signs. The applicant expressed concern that a border was not in designs approved by the Historic Districts Commission.

The board unanimously voted to approve the sign over the door and a second sign to be mounted on the East side of the building at a size such that the combined area of the two signs is 39 square feet. The second sign shall be mounted so that it aligns with either the center or bottom of the second story window to its left and centered under the light fixture. The board further recommends that the second sign have the name of the business on a single line.

**Sign Application: Wellness Medical Supply  
345A Boston Post Road**

Sheryl Kelleher presented an application for a single wall mounted sign. The sign as presented complies with the bylaws. The board noted that in the various drawings included with the application the sign was shown in slightly different locations and overlapping the pediment above the door. The applicant stated that the sign will fit in the space and that it will be centered on the window above it.

The board unanimously voted to approve the sign as presented.

**Sign Application: Independence Corner  
5-15 Concord Road**

David Wallace, Terry Wilkins, and Bob Prendergast presented an application for a freestanding business center sign. The sign complies with the bylaws except for its setback. The applicant presented color samples and noted that the typefaces will match the logotypes of the business at the location.

The board believes that the proposed location is appropriate as it is not near an egress point so it should not interfere with traffic.

The board suggested that the sign may not need to be the full ten feet high as it is already located several feet above the street height as the parking lot is elevated at this location.

The board unanimously voted to recommend to the Zoning Board of Appeals a variance for the setback of the sign. The board also suggested that the applicant evaluate the height of the sign from the vantage point of the street and sidewalk rather than the parking lot.

**Miscellaneous:**

The board approved the minutes of 13 April 2011.

The board met with Gary Hall, an applicant for the vacant position on the board. The other applicant for the vacancy did not attend the meeting.