

**Zoning Board of Appeals  
Lakeville, Massachusetts  
Minutes of Meeting  
June 17, 2021  
Remote meeting**

On June 17, 2021, the Zoning Board held a remote meeting. It was called to order by Chairman Olivieri at 7:00 p.m. LakeCam was recording, and it was streaming on Facebook Live.

**Members present:**

John Olivieri, Jr., Chair; Jeffrey Youngquist, Vice-Chair; Nora Cline, Clerk; Chris Carmichael, Member; Christopher Campeau, Associate; Christopher Sheedy, Associate

**Others present:**

Heidi Klein-DaSilva, applicant; Brandon Currier, Barlo Signs; Sara Andrade, tenant; William Mohan, Bruce Benoit property owner; Diane Maturo, Claire LaPointe, Laurel St. Pierre, abutters

**Agenda item #1**

Mr. Olivieri read this item into the record. It was an explanation of how the provisions of Chapter 20 of the Acts of 2021 allowed the Board to continue to meet remotely.

**Klein-DaSilva hearing – 45 Shore Avenue**

Mr. Olivieri opened the Klein-DaSilva hearing at 7:00 p.m. and read the legal ad into the record. Ms. Klein DaSilva was present. She advised that she was looking to remove the existing screen porch and replace it with a porch that would be the same size on the same existing pad. It would be better construction as the existing porch is in poor shape.

Mr. Olivieri then read the June 9, 2021, email from the Health Agent, Edward Cullen. He stated there was no reason for the Board of Health to recommend denial due to public health issues. The June 15, 2021, memo from the Planning Board had no comments on the petition. Mr. Olivieri asked if there were any questions or comments. Mr. Carmichael said if there is no increase in the footprint and they are not expanding the non-conformity, then it is not more detrimental to the neighborhood. Mr. Olivieri agreed. There were no other comments.

Mr. Carmichael then made a motion to accept the proposal as written. It was seconded by Mr. Youngquist.

**Roll Call Vote:** Ms. Cline-Aye, Mr. Youngquist-Aye, Mr. Carmichael-Aye, Mr. Campeau-Aye, Mr. Olivieri-Aye

Ms. Murray explained the timing of the filings, the appeal period, etc.

The hearing closed at 7:06.

**Documents distributed for the hearing:**

- Petition packet
- Legal ad
- Board of Health email of June 9, 2021
- Planning Board correspondence of June 15, 2021

**Barlo Signs, agent for Domino's, hearing – 56 Main Street**

Mr. Olivieri opened the Barlo Signs hearing at 7:07 p.m. and read the legal ad into the record. Mr. Brandon Currier from Barlo Signs was present. He advised a lot of thought and strategy had gone into this master plan for the new drive up locations. They are proposing multiple directional signs to help aid the wayfinding public for this location. By having these signs placed in their strategic locations, this will help direct traffic safely around the back to where the window is.

Mr. Currier then shared his screen and displayed the sign package. Items C and D are placed around the back side of the building to help aid the motorists around the back side. These signs will not be seen from the Main Road. He then displayed the location of the proposed drive-through window. Item E was directional signs that will identify the enter and the exit for motorists to safely enter. Item F was a sign that was going to be illuminated internally but as requested, the side that is facing toward the residents will not be illuminated. With this sign, they are trying to draw traffic from Main Street to enter through this area for pick-up so they don't congest the front. Item H is a new sign. It is a canopy that is going to be going over the drive-up window. It is something specific to most Domino's out there now. This will prevent any type of weather coming down on customers while they are passing money or product.

Mr. Currier said they have spoken with the landlord and the client. He knows that it has been mentioned about deliveries and trash. It has been made clear that deliveries will not be impeding any of this traffic flow as there's dedicated spots for this. Their client and the landlord have made other tenants aware here to be very aware of trash, deliveries, and so forth. He said the signs proposed are critical to help aid the motorist safely around the back side. They are trying to eliminate any congestion, and these signs are not going to be a harm or hinderance, or have any negative effect on the community.

Mr. Olivieri then read the June 9, 2021, email from the Board of Health into the record. There was no reason to recommend denial due to public health issues at this time. The June 15, 2021, memo from the Planning Board recommended the Zoning Board of Appeals not grant relief for the sign proposal. He noted there were also some submittals from the public. The June 14, 2021, letter from the residents at the Woods Edge Condominiums stated they were not in favor of granting relief for the sign proposal. Ms. Claire Lapointe of 61 Main Street was also not in favor of granting relief.

Mr. Olivieri asked if there was a specific reason why relief was needed for the size of the signs. They can put up directional and safety signs by right. Mr. Currier replied that was a very small tile and for them to be able to help aid the motoring public to this location, they need to have something that will grab their attention to try to help find their way to the back entrance. That is the only reason and they are not trying to be disrespectful to the bylaws or anything of that nature. They just want to make sure the customers move safely around the back and do not interfere with other tenants.

Ms. Cline said it appears in the specs that the Domino's logo portion of the directional sign is actually larger than the directional. She believed that one of the letters provided the Board with some examples of some other signage from a drive-through from Dunkin Donuts. It does fit the bylaw and makes the direction and what the customer is being directed to more prominent. She was not in favor of granting these extra logoed signs that are above the bylaw at this point. She then asked for the square footage on E1 and E2. Mr. Currier replied each one of those directional signs comes out to 14 square feet. After being at the property, Ms. Cline felt the number of signs seemed to be a little bit overbearing.

Mr. Sheedy agreed with Ms. Cline. He did not see any compelling reason for the increase in directional signage. He thought the customers would be able to find the pick-up window without a problem. He was not in favor of the request and felt the Domino's logo and directional could be included within the allowed two square feet as other operations in Town have done. Mr. Youngquist also felt it was self-explanatory and that size of sign was not needed. Mr. Carmichael said that he recalled the contentious hearing the Board had on the same property about the original signs to this building and how problematic it seemed to be to the neighborhood. He thought they should stay consistent and stay within the bylaw.

Ms. Laurel St. Pierre, resident and Treasurer at Woods Edge, then spoke. She agreed fully that they did not need huge signs. Ms. Claire Lapointe agreed that once someone drove through, these larger signs were not needed and two square feet was sufficient. She did appreciate all the remarks. There were no other comments.

Mr. Currier asked if there was anything they could do to adjust or possibly revisit. If the Board voted no, then they would not be able to come back to the Board for signs. Mr. Olivieri said that was correct unless there was a substantial change. His options were to move forward with a vote, come back with revisions, or withdraw without prejudice. Mr. Currier then asked if they could withdraw their petition, without prejudice.

Mr. Carmichael made a motion, seconded by Mr. Youngquist, to accept the request to withdraw without prejudice.

**Roll Call Vote:** Ms. Cline-Aye, Mr. Youngquist-Aye, Mr. Carmichael-Aye, Mr. Sheedy-Aye, Mr. Olivieri-Aye

The hearing closed at 7:25.

**Documents distributed for the hearing:**

Petition packet  
Legal ad  
Board of Health email of June 9, 2021  
Planning Board correspondence of June 15, 2021  
Claire Lapointe correspondence  
Woods Edge residents' correspondence of June 14, 2021

**Old Business – Sign bylaw update or discussion**

Mr. Olivieri asked if anyone had a chance to look at the sign bylaw and if there were any comments. It was decided to put this back on their next agenda.

**New Business**

Ms. Murray asked the Board going forward what format they would like to hold meetings in. Mr. Olivieri said although remote is convenient, members of the public might find in person meetings easier to attend. Members did not have a preference and were okay with either format. A hybrid version of meetings was also discussed. Mr. Olivieri suggested for the foreseeable future making a determination based on the social distancing aspect of what they are going to have to comply with on in-person meetings and the number of hearings scheduled per meeting. They will also advocate on getting technology into play for a way to do some hybrid meetings. They also want to make it easier to display items electronically on screens, as opposed to having people bring in large plans for display. Mr. Carmichael noted there are large amounts of money available for just this purpose.

**Adjourn**

Mr. Carmichael made a motion, seconded by Ms. Cline, to adjourn the meeting.

**Roll Call Vote:** Ms. Cline-Aye, Mr. Youngquist-Aye, Mr. Campeau-Aye, Mr. Carmichael-Aye, Mr. Sheedy-Aye, Mr. Olivieri-Aye

Meeting adjourned at 7:36.