

# **TOWN OF MEDWAY**

## **ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

### **MINUTES OF MEETING OCTOBER 30, 2013**

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 7.45 p.m. with all five members present.

The Board reopened the hearing on the Petition of GCCF New England, LLC, on whose behalf Mr. Peter Paulousky and Mr. Philip Henry appeared. Mr. Henry presented a detailed analysis of the location of the proposed sign in relationship to the travel lanes of the roadways adjacent the lot, and demonstrated that, because of the distance between the edge of the lot and the edge of the travel lanes, drivers would be viewing the sign from distances of about 95 feet, instead of about 63 feet that would be expected on a “normal” lot. Mr. Henry then pointed out that, despite the approximate 50% increase in viewing distance, the applicants were only requesting a 50% increase in total sign area, and thus approximately a 22% increase in the linear dimensions of the sign. Mr. Paulousky then discussed the history of the development, explaining that the present application reflected the results of discussions between the applicants and the Design Review Committee, according to which the area of signage on the buildings in the development would be reduced while the area of the monument sign would be increased. In response to a question from a Board member, Mr. Paulousky confirmed that the applicants would not object to a condition tying a variance increasing the area of the monument sign to a decrease in the area of the signage on the buildings below that permitted by the Zoning ByLaw. Mr. Paulousky also argued, with the aid of photographs showing internally and externally lit signs at night, that an internally illuminated sign produced a “cleaner” image which would assist drivers in reading the sign at the increased viewing distances required by the peculiarities of the lot.

When questions and comments from the public were invited, Ms. Tracy Stewart urged the Board to hold the hearing open until the proposed letter from the Design Review Committee had been received. However, following the period for public comment, on a motion made by Mr. Biocchi, seconded by Mr. Cole and passed by a vote of 4-1 (Mr. Olsen dissenting), the Board voted to close the hearing but to leave the record

open for any letters from the Design Review Committee or Planning Board. The Board then decided, on a motion made by Mr. Biocchi, seconded by Ms. Doherty and passed by a vote of 4-1 (Mr. Cole dissenting) not to deliberate on the application of Cumberland Farms at this meeting of the Board.

The Board then proceeded, on a motion made by Ms. Doherty, seconded by Mr. Cole and passed unanimously, to deliberate on the application of Mr. and Mrs. Mele. After some members of the Board expressed a need for input from Town Counsel regarding this matter, it was agreed that the Chairman be instructed to approach the Town Administrator to permit the Board to secure the services of Town Counsel in relation to this matter. By unanimous consent, the Board postponed further deliberation until the opinion of Town Counsel was received.

By unanimous consent, the Board accepted the application of Miranda and set the hearing for November 20, 2013 at 7:45 pm.

A motion was made by Mr. Biocchi, seconded by Ms. Gould and passed unanimously to accept the Minutes of the October 16, 2013 meeting as presented by the Chairman.

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Biocchi, seconded by Ms. Gould and passed unanimously, and the Board adjourned at about 9.15 p.m.