

**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

TOWN HALL • 525 WASHINGTON STREET • WELLESLEY, MA 02482-5918

J. RANDOLPH BECKER, CHAIRMAN
RICHARD L. SEEDEL
DAVID G. SHEFFIELD

LENORE R. MAHONEY
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
TELEPHONE
(781) 431-1019 EXT. 2208

ROBERT W. LEVY, VICE CHAIRMAN
WALTER B. ADAMS
DEREK B. REDGATE

April 2, 2020

7:30 pm

Remote Zoom Public Hearing

Zoning Board of Appeals Members Present:

Richard L. Seegel
David G. Sheffield
Derek B. Redgate
J. Randolph Becker
Robert W. Levy

Present on behalf of the Zoning Board of Appeals office staff were Lenore Mahoney, Executive Secretary & Carol Richards, Technical Administrator.

ZBA 2020-19, STEPHAN GAULDIE, 229 WESTON ROAD

Present at the public hearing was David Hornstein, Lighthouse Design, representing Stephan Gauldie, the Petitioner.

Mr. Hornstein said that when his client bought the house, it had a pre-existing addition that was built with a variance for the left side yard setback to continue the existing plane of the house. He said that the proposal is to build a conforming addition on the right side at the front of the house. He said that the right side yard setback will be 20.6 feet and the front yard setback will be 33 feet. He said that they submitted a surveyor's plan showing that 223 Weston Road, which is within 500 feet, is 32.6 feet. Mr. Seegel said that it appears that the 500 Foot Rule to be met. Mr. Hornstein said that the addition will mimic the existing style of the house in terms of massing and detailing.

Mr. Seegel read the Planning Board recommendation. He said that he concurred with the Planning Board recommendation that the circular driveway is inappropriate at this location. Mr. Hornstein said that the next three houses have a similar driveway, so it is pretty much established on the street. He said that this location preserves more open space than the adjacent properties.

Mr. Seegel said that the basement stairwell appears to be within the setback. Mr. Hornstein said that it is a below grade structure and a railing is required. He said that the railing design is a cable rail that is fairly invisible.

Mr. Sheffield said that he was concerned that on the plans that were submitted, the rooms were not labeled with their functions. He said that he was concerned about the lower level having only one means out and what rooms people will have to go through and what their functions are. Mr. Hornstein displayed the floor

plan of the basement level. He said that Room B5 is meant to be a guest room. Mr. Seegel said that the plans should be labeled correctly. Mr. Hornstein displayed the location of the stairway that leads up to the first floor from the basement level. Mr. Sheffield said that he was concerned about the door opening into the bedroom in the basement. Mr. Hornstein said that it is a compliant egress. He said that door 8 is an internal egress and door 9 is an external egress from Room B5. Mr. Sheffield said that the internal stairway is not shown on his drawing. Mr. Hornstein said that he submitted a simpler version of the plans because he thought that the petition before the Board was dealing only with the new work. He said that there is a doorway part way down the staircase that is shown on the existing and proposed elevation drawings for the left side of the house. He said that they will not be working on the left side of the house.

Mr. Seegel said that he was concerned that the proposed basement plan does not show a stairway going up. He said that the plans that were submitted do not give the Board enough information. Mr. Hornstein said that he thought that the Board would be dealing with issues related to mass and bulk and not the internal structure. Mr. Seegel said that the plans that are submitted to the Board must be the plans that are submitted to the Building Inspector. Mr. Hornstein said that the exterior elevations and the plot plan are what will be submitted to the Building Inspector. He said that he does not typically do a complete set of construction plans prior to approval because of the cost to his clients. He said that the intention was to show in a complete and accurate way all of the information relative to Zoning.

Mr. Sheffield said that on Drawing A4, there is a dimension of 27.4 feet. He said that the dimension should be to average grade of the house. Mr. Hornstein said that the grade varies less than six inches around the entire house.

Mr. Seegel asked if Mr. Hornstein had done any projects in Wellesley before. Mr. Hornstein said that he has done several projects in Wellesley, some of which required variances and special permits. He said that clearly no issue with height. He said that they were not proposing to go higher than the existing structure, which is eight feet below the maximum. Mr. Sheffield said that there is no question that it is an approvable dimension but it is not labeled correctly. Mr. Hornstein said that the height dimension was taken at the worst case position. He said that the average would be three inches less.

Mr. Hornstein said that it would be useful for his client to know whether there are larger issues with the design. Mr. Sheffield said that he agreed with the Planning Board that the layout of the front yard that will be presented to the public is an important feature. He said that there are a great number of circular drives on Weston Road because of the traffic situation. He said that this is a solution that has been used a number of times to deal with the busy road. He said that all of the other solutions along Weston Road have been greatly enhanced by having landscaping. He said that he did not see any landscaping on the drawings that were submitted. Mr. Hornstein said that inside the radius of the circle will be landscaped to shield the road. He said that they kept the driveway as small as it could possibly be and still serve the purpose. Mr. Seegel said that this is the main walking route for children going to Hardy School from that side of Weston Road. He said that he was concerned about adding another driveway that may not be needed. Mr. Sheffield said that he did not view that as a major problem. He said that the drawing set that was submitted is not as persuasive as it might otherwise be. He said that it would help to show an existing condition of the site to prove the point that they will be removing pavement and there will be less paving than what is there now. Mr. Hornstein said that the existing driveway is shown on the plot as a dotted line. He said that it was not his understanding that a landscape plan was required in this step of the process. He said that it is his client's intent to screen the street as much as possible. He said that it would be far more dangerous to back out of a driveway. He said that the circular driveway is more of a safety issue, not just a convenience issue. He said that it is imperative for the driver to see oncoming traffic. He said that creating a turnaround uses much more paving than a circular drive. Mr. Sheffield said that he agrees with that analysis but it incumbent on the applicant to be sure that the documentation addresses all of the issues.

Mr. Seegel asked Mr. Hornstein is he is aware that the property is located in a Water Supply Protection District. Mr. Hornstein said that he spoke with the Building Inspector about subsurface drainage. He said that the Building Inspector indicated that this is an extremely well drained area and no subsurface containment of any kind would be required. He said that downspouts and splash pads would be adequate.

Mr. Redgate asked about the TLAG of the house. Mr. Hornstein said that total living area is 2,591 square feet. Mr. Redgate said that if the TLAG falls below the threshold for Large House Review (LHR), drainage mitigation is not as important. He said that the site plan is unclear on issues that the Zoning Board looks at. He said that there are two dimensions, one at 40 feet and the other at 33.33 feet that are virtually identical, so one is inaccurate. He said that the site plan is very difficult to read for Zoning purposes.

Mr. Seegel said that the plot plan has to state what the Zoning District is and give a lot more information than what was furnished.

Mr. Hornstein said that there appears to be two issues, one is whether this is compliant from a design standpoint and the other is whether his client should plan to go forward with this design or invest more funds for landscape plans without knowing if the basic plan is acceptable. He said that the proposed construction will be conforming but they were required to get relief was due to the existing variance for the left side of the existing structure.

Mr. Seegel said that the applicant should invest in a landscape plan and better survey plan. He asked that the applicant look at the Zoning Board Rules & Regulations so that the Board gets a set of documents that are useful to it and that the Board does not have to do all of the work for. He said that he did not have a problem basically with what the applicant has proposed to do but he has a real problem with the documentation. He asked that the applicant look at the Planning Board's recommendations as well.

Mr. Sheffield said that there is an application required for the Historic Commission's demolition review process. Mr. Hornstein said that the square footage of the demolished area was less than 200 square feet and it was his understanding that the review was not required.

Mr. Seegel asked if the applicant can get a revised set of plans prepared for the June 4, 2020 public hearing. Mr. Hornstein confirmed that the information that the Board was looking for was information about the site regarding the existing parking area, proposed landscaping, show the demolition piece, and additional labeling on the interior plans. He confirmed that otherwise the Board did not have a problem with the basic idea presented for a compliant addition on the side of the house. Mr. Redgate said that the applicant should revise the plans in accordance with the Planning Board recommendation.

Mr. Sheffield moved, Mr. Redgate seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to continue the hearing to June 4, 2020.

ZBA 2020-20, FR LINDEN SQUARE, INC., 180 LINDEN STREET (CVS PHARMACY)

Present at the public hearing was Brian Levey, Esq., Beveridge & Diamond, representing the applicant, CVS Pharmacy, Inc. He said that the request is for renewal of a special permit for a drive through that has been in operation since 2010. He said that this is the second or third renewal of the special permit and the others were approved. He said that because of the current public health crisis, he did not have an opportunity to visit the store site but he did speak with the store manager, who assured him that the drive through has been operating properly and there were no vehicular or pedestrian issues associated with its operation. Mr. Seegel said that the Board members can attest that the drive through is operating properly because they are not going into the store. He said that he has no problems with renewal of the special permit.

Mr. Sheffield discussed the conditions on the previous permit about the light being turned off at 10 pm or at the close of business, right turn only after pick up and drop area, canopy lighting recessed in the soffit, and any additional signage being subject to review by the Board. He said that none of those conditions have changed. Mr. Levey said that his clients do not have any objections to the existing conditions of the permit. Mr. Sheffield discussed extending the special permit from two to three years. Mr. Seegel said that extension would be appropriate for this permit. Mr. Redgate said that he had no issues with granting renewal of the special permit and agreed that it should be granted for three years.

Mr. Redgate moved, Mr. Sheffield seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve renewal of the special permit for a drive through at 180 Linden Street for CVS Pharmacy subject to the same conditions for a three year period.

ZBA 2020-21 SIP PARTNERS 984 WORCESTER ROAD LLC, 984 WORCESTER STREET (CVS PHARMACY)

Present at the public hearing was Brian Levey, Esq., Beveridge & Diamond, representing the applicant, CVS Pharmacy Inc. He said that he checked with the store manager and asked if there have been any issues or complaints. He said that he was told that there were none and that the drive through is functioning just fine.

Mr. Seegel confirmed that it is a double lane drive through. He asked if there has been any backing up in the line. Mr. Sheffield said that he uses that facility quite often and he has never seen a problem there.

Mr. Sheffield said that there were no conditions imposed on the previous renewal of the special permit. He asked about store hours. Mr. Levey said that there are no plans to change anything at the building. He said that the entire site is controlled by a master Site Plan Approval/Special Permit. He said that nothing can be changed without coming back before the Board. He said that he did not have the information regarding store hours but suspects that it is a 24 hour store. Mr. Sheffield said that there are no specific turning directions at this site. He said that the previous renewal was for two years. The Board members agreed that it could be renewed for three years.

Mr. Sheffield moved, Mr. Redgate seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve a three year renewal of the special permit for a drive through at CVS Pharmacy at 984 Worcester Street.

ZBA 2020-22, LOWER FALLS LLC, 10 WASHINGTON STREET

Present at the public hearing was Kathy McLean, owner of Fitness Advantage, located at 10 Washington Street. She said that the request is for a special permit to add another sign on the side of the building that faces oncoming traffic from Newton into Wellesley.

Mr. Seegel said that he drives by there almost daily in each direction. He said that the building is such that he can clearly see the sign coming from Newton. Ms. McLean said that the building is angled so the front of the building is not really visible to oncoming traffic. Mr. Seegel said that it is. He said that the bylaw does not allow two signs on the building unless there are two separate entrances. He said that there has to be a good reason for the Board to allow it. Ms. McLean said that when Zoots owned the space, they had a sign above the door. She said that the sign would be above her front door. Mr. Seegel said that Zoots did not have a sign on the front of the building. Ms. McLean said that they had an awning with a sign on it where her sign is located now. She said that there was a special approval for a second sign. She said that there are existing lights and brackets where the sign was located. She said that the size of her signs will be compliant with the square footage of the building. She said that it will not be a huge sign. She said that she just wanted something over her front door.

Mr. Seegel said that the proposed sign will not comply with Section 22A of the Zoning Bylaw. Ms. McLean said that the size of the signs will be compliant. She said that the letter size will also be compliant. She said that her sign was approved by the Design Review Board (DRB).

Mr. Seegel read the Planning Board recommendation. He said that the Section 22A of the Zoning Bylaw lists specific requirements that have to be met. He said that the Planning Board does not think that this sign will meet the requirements.

Mr. Sheffield discussed a similar situation on Linden Street where the Yoga Studio had two signs on two different walls for a similar reason. He asked about compromising and putting a logo above the door. Ms. McLean said that she could do that. Mr. Sheffield said that the Planning Board was concerned that reading of all of the words could be distracting to traffic. Ms. McLean said that she could do "FA" and "Fitness Advantage" written above it. She said that her concern is that with the way that the building is angled, you have to be right in front of it to see it coming from the Newton Wellesley line. Mr. Redgate said that would be a good compromise. He said that the business is hard to see with its front door inset at an angle. He said that Zoots had a similar setup and it would be good to just have the logo. Mr. Seegel said that he could accept that as a compromise as long as it is in accordance with the dimensions on the plans that were submitted.

Mr. Redgate moved, Mr. Sheffield seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve a special permit for a sign, as applied for, with the changes discussed at the public hearing., i.e. Fitness Advantage and the logo modified to be the same size but without the "boxing" or "personal training" added to it, and located above the front door.

ZBA 2020-23, 44 SABRINA ROAD LLC, 44 SABRINA ROAD

Present at the public hearing was David Himmelberger, Esq., representing 44 Sabrina Road LLC, the Petitioner. He said that the request is for a special permit which is required because the lot is nonconforming due to lot size. He said that the proposed home will be fully dimensionally compliant with all Zoning and complements the neighborhood. He said that all of the roof runoff will be captured in Cultecs to which the water is piped. He said that they submitted additional drawings today to highlight the lighting that was on the building in response to the Planning Board question. He said that there are sconces at all of the doors and downlighting at the garage. He said that they submitted a drawing showing that the TLAG for the structure is 7,074 square feet, which is beneath the permissible 7,200 square feet of TLAG for the 40,000 square foot district. He said that the house is beautifully designed, complements the neighborhood, and would not be substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood than the pre-existing nonconforming structure.

Mr. Seegel asked about the height of the windows in the basement. Mr. Sheffield said that he only saw two small windows on Sheet A7 on the basement side, rear elevation. Mr. Himmelberger said that there are no windows on the front of the basement. Mr. Seegel said that there will be a lot of living space in the basement. Mr. Himmelberger said that it will be fully below grade, consistent with homes in this neighborhood.

Mr. Seegel asked if the property is located in a Water Supply Protection District. Mr. Himmelberger said that he did not believe that it is. Mr. Seegel asked if all the attic was included in the TLAG. Mr. Himmelberger said that all of the livable space was included. Mr. Sheffield discussed Sheet A4, which is the attic. He confirmed that the area outside of the dashed line is below the livable 7.6 feet. Mr. Himmelberger said that Sheet A10 shows a total attic of 920 square feet contributing to the total TLAG. He said that the house has a footprint of 3,243square feet, and that includes the garage. Mr. Sheffield said that the proposed house is close to the scale of other houses in the direct neighborhood. Mr. Seegel agreed.

Mr. Redgate said that the lot is half the size of the minimum lot size in the district. He said that he had no other questions or objections.

Mr. Sheffield moved, Mr. Redgate seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve demolition of the existing structure and construction of a new single family home at 44 Sabrina Road, as presented.

ZBA 2020-24, PAUL & DIAN QUINN, 210 WALNUT STREET

Present at the public hearing was Paul Quinn, the Petitioner. Mr. Quinn said that the request is to build a new detached garage. He said that he came before the Board last year with grander plans that included an attached garage and it was approved. He said that they decided to go with a simpler design that is less expensive. He said that he has an existing that is not in good condition. He said that he would like to build a larger one. He said that the lot is slightly undersized. He said that the new garage will be larger but will maintain the same setback. He said that the project will help them to maximize storage and use of the backyard.

Mr. Sheffield asked if the garage is a packaged product from the Barnyard Company. Mr. Quinn said that was an exemplar that they gave to their architects. He said that they are still undergoing the bid process but what is built will look similar to those plans. Mr. Sheffield said that the drawings by Barnyard show a window and a door on the east elevation and only a door on plans, as presented. Mr. Quinn said that the intent is to use the plan by the architect. He said that the intent is to have a door. He asked if that will require re-petitioning the Board. Mr. Sheffield said that he was just trying to determine whether it will be a door and a window. He said that having the door in the middle might not be the most convenient location for a car inside the garage. He said that they may not be able to swing the door in.

Mr. Redgate asked about requested relief for the setbacks. He confirmed that the 17.1 setback will be maintained and the existing 20.9 foot setback will be reduced to 20.6 feet, which is still compliant on that side of the lot.

Mr. Redgate moved that the Board approve a special permit for a nonconforming lot, maintaining the existing 17.1 foot setback on the Walnut Street side, for construction of a new larger garage. Mr. Sheffield said that there should be flexibility to have a door or a door and window on the east elevation, once the exact location is determined.

Mr. Seegel read the Planning Board recommendation.

Mr. Sheffield seconded the motion to approve, and the Board voted unanimously to approve a special permit.

ZBA 2020-25, JAMES & MAUREEN PARZIALE, 39 JACKSON ROAD

Present at the public hearing was Laurence Shind, Esq., representing James and Maureen Parziale, the Petitioner. He said that the proposal is for replacement of the existing house at 39 Jackson Road, which is small cape of approximately 1,250 square feet. He said that his client would like to replace the existing house with a new house with a TLAG of 4,296 square feet, which is just under the applicable threshold for a 15,000 square foot district. He said that the lot is undersized at 14,857 square feet, and the existing house is nonconforming on the right side yard setback. He said that the new house will be compliant in all respects to dimensional setbacks. He said that Jackson Road has undergone a good amount of transition over the past

few years and there has been a large number of replacement homes or large additions. He said that there are replacements homes on either side of this property. He said that the proposed design is in keeping with the homes that are nearest to it. He said that project was reviewed by the Historical Commission in November for demo delay, which was originally imposed and subsequently granted a waiver.

Mr. Seegel said that the property is located in a Water Supply Protection District. He asked how stormwater will be handled. Mr. Shind said that downspouts from the roof will infiltrate into the ground. He said that his client is amenable to more specific drainage components. Mr. Redgate said that would be appropriate in this location in town to have some stormwater management infiltration as a condition of approval. He recommended an underground infiltration system that would handle a one inch storm, as shown on an engineered plan that is approved by the DPW.

Mr. Sheffield said that the elevation to the ridge was not labeled on the plan as being to the average grade. He said that should be noted on the drawings. Mr. Shind said that they will make that clear.

Mr. Sheffield asked if the trees in the front are to be saved. Mr. Shind said that they will do their best to retain both of them. He said that the one on the left may not be able to be saved due to the construction.

Mr. Sheffield asked about the lights that will be used at the garage. He said that some of the neighbors have used soffit lights over the garage doors and some have used carriage lights on either side of the doors. He said that he wanted to be sure that what appear to carriage lights do not cast a horizontal glare. Mr. Shind said that is the intent and was the request of the Historical Commission as well.

Mr. Sheffield said that the scale of the proposed house is in keeping with the other homes in the neighborhood. Mr. Seegel agreed.

Mr. Sheffield moved, Mr. Redgate seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve a special to demolish the existing structure and build a two-story structure that meets all requirements, subject to the minor modifications that the Board addressed and a condition that the subsurface drainage system shall be approved by DPW.

ZBA 2020-26, JAMES & SHARON MURRAY, 45 PINE PLAIN ROAD

Present at the public hearing was Paul Hemond, Hemond Construction, 247 Bramblebush Road, Stoughton, MA, representing James and Sharon Murray, the Petitioner. Mr. Hemond said that the plan is to remove a 100 square foot bump out at the back and construct a 1.5 story addition with a family room and a master bedroom and bath above. He said that the addition will be approximately 600 square feet.

Mr. Seegel asked about the proposed demolition. Mr. Hemond said that they will demolish a 12 foot by 8 foot family room. He said that the new addition will go in on the same spot on footings, not on a foundation. Mr. Seegel said that the part of the structure that is being demolished should be labeled on the plan. He said that the new addition will be 16 feet wide by 20 feet

Mr. Seegel read the Planning Board recommendation.

Mr. Sheffield discussed the front elevation. He said that the drawing shows the little canopy over the door being removed. Mr. Hemond said that they will not be touching anything at the front. He said that there is a mistake on the drawing. Mr. Sheffield said that the plan should be corrected.

Mr. Sheffield asked if there is a light at the front of the house. He said that there does not appear to be one in the photograph. Mr. Hemond said that they can put one there. Mr. Sheffield said they may want to have a light at the front steps for safety reasons. He said that they may want to have the light on the side of the house where the door number is.

Mr. Sheffield said that a number of houses in the neighborhood have similar conditions where they have gone to the trouble of putting a porch roof rather than a water deflector. He said that the house would be improved with a canopy that extended out and large enough to have a couple of columns on the porch, as the neighbors have already done. Mr. Seegel discussed imposing a condition that the building permit shall not be issued until the light is installed. Mr. Sheffield said that it may be appropriate for the porch with columns to come back before the Board for approval. He said that if the petitioner chooses to build it, it would be under the square footage indicated in the Zoning Bylaw. He discussing having the Board approve the petition subject to allowing the construction of a covered landing that meets the Zoning Bylaw. Mr. Seegel said that the Board can impose that as a condition.

Mr. Sheffield moved, Mr. Redgate seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to a special permit for construction of a 1.5 story addition and porch at the back of the house, subject to conditions that there be a front entrance with a porch cover and a light at the front entry.

ZBA 2020-27, MARTIN TEICHER, 85 WASHINGTON STREET

Present at the public hearing was Paul Hajian, Architect, representing Martin Teicher, the Petitioner. He said that the project is located at the corner of Washington Street and Hillside Road. He said that it is a three-story existing home. He said that when considering the interior renovation of the third floor, he thought that the use of the space would benefit with a small addition at the rear and one that would enhance the visual quality of the building. He said that the home has a nicely detailed circa 1900 style to it with a circular window on the front of the building. He said that an addition was done a number of years ago with a hip roof at the back. He said that he thought that the benefit of the space to the program, which is to renovate a master bedroom with a 4 foot by 13 foot addition, would be a small footprint on the roofline but there would be no additional footprint or lot coverage change at all. He said that after consultation with the Building Department, he was told that this would be a change in the roofline that would need to come under Zoning Board review. He said that a survey was prepared as well as existing and proposed architectural plans to show what the space will be. He said that the plans show three elevations in the rear that are impacted by this change, as well as installation of new, energy efficient windows to bring light into the rear part of the project. He said that the property is located in a 15,000 square foot Single Residence District.

Mr. Sheffield said that the small addition at the third floor will make a very large improvement to that level of the house. He said that he really likes the windows and the treatment that Mr. Hajian devised at the back.

Mr. Seegel read the Planning Board recommendation.

Mr. Sheffield moved, Mr. Redgate seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to approve a special permit to extend the roof at the gable end at 85 Washington Street, as presented.

ZBA 2020-22, LOWER FALLS LLC, 10 WASHINGTON STREET

Present at the public hearing was Kathy McLean, business owner, Fitness Advantage. She said that when the Board approved the "FA" for her logo, the logo that is depicted on the main sign is not really her logo. She

said that a picture of her logo on her phone. Mr. Seegel said that Ms. McLean will have to re-submit her plans if she wants to change them. He said that the Board has to see what is actually going up on the sign. He said that the Board would go back and re-vote the petition for 10 Washington Street. He said that the petition should be continued to the June meeting.

Mr. Sheffield asked if Ms. McLean is asking for just the letters, FA, without the wording. Ms. McLean said that it is the FA and says, "Boxing" underneath. She said that it does not have the letters to the right of it. She said that it is pretty much the same size as her logo and only a slight modification. She said that instead of having, "Fitness Advantage" at the top, it would have, "Boxing" at the bottom. She said that it will have the same dimensions. Mr. Seegel said that the Design Review Board (DRB) has not had an opportunity to review it. Ms. McLean said that the DRB did review it last year. Mr. Seegel said that the DRB recommendation referred to the logo that was submitted to the Zoning Board. He said that Ms. McLean will have to re-submit plans for exactly what she wants to put up. He said that it should go back to the DRB for review.

Mr. Sheffield asked about the logo and the lettering. Ms. McLean said that her logo has a tiny Fitness Advantage that goes straight across with Boxing underneath. She said that it does not have the lettering to the right of it. She said that it was seen by the DRB last year.

Mr. Seegel said that Ms. McLean will have to go back before the DRB.

Ms. McLean said that if there is a problem with the lettering for Fitness Advantage, she would rather just have Boxing because that depicts what they do, whereas Fitness Advantage goes not.

Mr. Sheffield said that the Planning Board complained that there was too much to read for the people driving by. He said that if it just a logo with minimum words to read, that would probably satisfy the Planning Board.

Mr. Redgate moved, Mr. Sheffield seconded the motion and the Board voted unanimously to continue the petition to June 4, 2020.

ZBA 2020-28, PLAYHOUSE NOMINEE TRUST, 380 WASHINGTON STREET

Joan Gaughan, 16 Laurel Terrace, called in to the conference call line but her conversation was garbled and the Board was not able to hear her comments. Ms. Richard repeated Ms. Gaughan's comments to the Board. Ms. Gaughan said that she objects due to the scale and it is more like a sign that would belong at a mall rather than in Wellesley Hills Square. She said that the sign is not necessary because mobile apps are used to find stores. She said that it is also very close to a residential neighborhood. She said that she lives in the last house on the street that abuts Playhouse Square, separated only by the aqueduct.

Present at the public hearing was Richard Perry, who said that he works for Design Communications Limited and is representing Intrum Corp in Needham. He said that the PS2 logo represents the Intrum Corporation. He said that it is a typical logo that they use on many of their properties. He said that it was slightly modified for this location. He said that there the existing sign for Bertucci's was removed from the brick plinth. He said that the sign was completely framed in. He said that the DRB unanimously approved the design but the letters were too big. He said that the maximum allowed letter height of 14 inches is not to scale with the existing plinth. He said that the letters that are shown in the photograph are the actual letters

that would sit on the plinth. He said that the letters will not be within a frame. He said that this will be a free standing monument that represents the corporate logo.

Mr. Seegel asked Mr. Perry if he has read Wellesley's Sign Bylaw carefully. He said that the letters are too big and it does not make a difference if it is a monument. He said that the neighbors strongly object to it and the Planning Board strongly objects to it. He said that the Petitioner will have to go back to drawing board because this is inappropriate for the town and the neighborhood.

Mr. Sheffield confirmed that "PS" represents Playhouse Square. He discussed having a sign that just says, "Playhouse Square." Mr. Perry said that would be up to the Corporation.

Mr. Seegel said that the people from Intrum should be on line with the Board next time. He said that the petition would be continued to the June 4, 2020 meeting to give the petitioner sufficient time to get a modified application with a different sign.

Mr. Redgate moved, Mr. Sheffield seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to continue the petition to June 4, 2020.

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the hearing was adjourned at 9:51 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Lenore R. Mahoney
Executive Secretary

DRAFT