

**City of Salem Massachusetts
Public Meeting Minutes**

Board or Committee:	Design Review Board, Special Meeting
Date and Time:	Wednesday, June 26, 2019 at 6:00 pm
Meeting Location:	98 Washington Street, First Floor Conference Room
DRB Members Present:	Chair Paul Durand, David Jaquith, Glenn Kennedy, Catherine Miller, Marc Perras, Helen Sides, J. Michael Sullivan
DRB Members Absent:	Glenn Kennedy
Others Present:	Kate Newhall-Smith
Recorder:	Colleen Brewster

Chair Durand calls the meeting to order at 6:00PM. Roll call was taken.

Signs

1. 125 Washington Street (Ledger): Discussion and vote on signage. – *Continued from May 22, 2019*

Kelsey McCallan, General Manager, was present to discuss the project.

Ms. McCallan stated that one sign will be placed on the brick and three will go below the clock. Miller asked how high the bottom of sign is above the ground. Sides replied just below 7 feet. Ms. McCallan note that they shrank the sign in width and height. Chair Durand noted that Kennedy is okay with it. Miller suggested it be mounted higher. Chair Durand agreed that it could be a few brick courses higher and asked how it would be mounted. Ms. McCallan stated that they did a mock-up to place it and it will be anchored to the wall and indicated in the application. Chair Durand stated that the sign should be mounted into the mortar joints and not the brick. If the round buttons are visible, they should be painted black. Perras suggested they use hidden fasteners such as Z-clips. Chair Durand agreed that they wouldn't want the anchoring visible.

Perras asked if the signs are two different colors. Ms. McCallan replied that the white sign will stand out better and match the clock. The wall mounted sign will be black to match the doors.

Miller stated that the lighting they installed should have gone through the application process because it looks like an after afterthought.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Miller: Motion to approve with the following conditions; any exposed anchor to be black or hidden, sign to be mounted in mortar joints, and the applicant will follow up on the installation of lights.

Seconded by: Jaquith. Passes 6-0.

2. 192 Essex Street (Angelica of the Angles, Salem Smugglers Tou, Miss Betty's Hat Emporium): Discussion and vote on signage.

No one was present to discuss the project.

Jaquith: Motion to continue to the next regular meeting.
Seconded by: Sides. Passes 6-0.

3. 232 Essex Street (Fountain Place): Discussion and vote on signage.

Brian Brinkers of Acme Sign Company, was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Brinkers provided a sample of the letter and noted that the proposed would be black. Perras asked if the lettering will be tight to the surface. Mr. Brinkers replied yes, it's also non-illuminated. Miller noted that the rendering says the width will be 11'-8" and asked if it will fit the within the space. Mr. Brinkers replied 140-1/2", the rendering shows the placement not actual design. Miller asked if the signage will it be centered. Mr. Brinkers replied yes, it will be centered between the door and the edge of the building. Sullivan noted that the one sign is 140" and will be centered on 40 linear feet. Chair Durand noted that they are within their maximum allowable signage allowance. Sides noted that she is pleased it's not as large as it looks in the image, but it should be presented as it will look when installed. Jaquith noted his preference for matte lettering rather than glossy. Mr. Brinkers noted that it doesn't come in matte unless it is painted. Perras asked about the longevity of the painted finish and if they considered metal. Mr. Brinkers replied that they want to match the neighboring signage, like what he completed for Opus and Mr. Crepe. Miller noted that the matte finish will look like wood. Sullivan stated that he is not in favor of the use of two different fonts. Chair Durand and Sides noted that they have no issue with the different signage. Perras questioned whether the use of two different fonts sets a precedent. Mr. Brinkers noted that the finish isn't matte. Chair Durand stated that he's not opposed to the finish which will weather. Sullivan noted that the large lettering could be closer to 10" in height.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Sides: Motion to approve as presented, accurate scale image, both centered on façade, and centered vertically

Seconded by: Jaquith. Passes 6-0.

4. 30 Church Street (East Regiment Beer Company): Discussion and vote on signage.

Josh Engdahl, was present to discuss the project.

Chair Durand stated that the sign should be anchored in the mortar not the brick. Mr. Engdahl replied that the wrought iron anchors will be reassessed and reused. LED's will be installed in the wrought iron onto the side wings. Sullivan asked how power will be provided. Mr. Engdahl replied that there is 4 feet of dead space above the ceiling on the other side of the archway. They will run electrical through the brick façade and will use black wiring. They hope to run it through the wrought iron or will use black conduit to help conceal it. Concept Signs suggested they mount it directly to the brick. Jaquith suggested they drill from the outside in to ensure that it's mounted in the right location. Mr. Engdahl replied that they will mount lights to the brick not the wrought iron. Newhall-Smith stated that they must direct the lights to the sign only. Mr. Engdahl noted that they will update the folding sign with chalk based on what they are serving that day. Miller noted that the A-frame sign must be in front of their establishment. Perras stated that the lighting should be installed above the brick belt course. Chair Durand suggested

between the top and bottom of the bracket. Mr. Engdahl replied that since they own the building, they have the options to install the light at the second floor.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Jaquith: Motion to accept the A-frame sign as presented.

Seconded by: Miller. Passes 6-0.

Jaquith: Motion to accept the blade sign with following conditions; sign must be anchored to the mortar joints, lighting to be installed above the brick band, wiring to be run through the brick façade and into the wrought iron with black wiring, and lighting to be directed only at the sign.

Seconded by: Sides. Passes 6-0.

Urban Renewal Area Projects Under Review

1. 217-221 Essex Street: Development Project Review – Restoration of Exterior Façade

Vu Alexander was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Alexander stated that they are restoring the building's exterior and renovating the interior of the existing 3 story colonial revival with a cast iron front. Phase 1 will be an exterior restoration with historic tax credits. The new windows will be aluminum frame to match the existing window profile, and the window surrounds are in good shape with traditional brick molds and windowsills and cast-iron details to be restored. A new roof and balustrade will be installed. At 221, the aluminum storefront infill with cast iron is not a traditional design. The cast iron trim will remain, and the storefront will be replaced with wood and true divided lite windows. The two existing recessed entries at both will remain but the doors replaced with mahogany, the fan window above will be restored; however, the wood paneling at recess will be refinished and painted. At 217, the entry door will remain as it is in good condition. The brick will be cleaned and repointed. The accent molding will be painted grey to enhance the details of the façade. Perras asked if the existing paint will be removed. Mr. Alexander replied they will be scraped to remove rust, repaired and repainted. They will most likely not be able to remove all the paint on the smaller details. Mr. Alexander noted that the façade is white from above the first floor and black at the storefront. They will use Diamond Windows out of Dorchester for the replacement. Chair Durand asked if they will remove or reuse the fire escapes. Mr. Alexander replied that they can be reused but want to remove them and add a new second egress. The building is switching from a commercial to residential use. Chair Durand added that that will require need a second means of egress. Mr. Alexander noted that at the rear of the building a glass block infill will be replaced with a new door to create another access point. There are also fire escapes on Higginson Alley. All windows will be custom made to fit within the window surrounds. Miller asked if the yellow gas line will remain yellow. Chair Durand replied it might be a recent requirement.

Chair Durand asked if the cell phone towers will remain, even though they are pursuing historic tax credits. Mr. Alexander replied that they are still waiting for feedback. Miller asked if the lighting in Higginson Square will remain. Mr. Alexander replied yes, the City lighting will remain. Miller asked if the Derby Square landscaping will remain. Mr. Alexander replied that they would like to use that area for staging during construction and the owner would re-landscape and maintain the area after. Miller noted that the plantings would need to be as good or better than

the existing. Jaquith questioned whether that area was City property. Mr. Alexander stated that they are using the Hotel Salem as a landmark for this building however the interior structure can only be minorly touched. There will be a new elevator, hallway, egress, and interior renovation must be under 30%. Miller asked if the vault alarm box will remain and if painted, the lettering should remain.

Mr. Alexander requested feedback on the front digital clock. Chair Durand, Sides, Perras, and Miller stated that they are in favor with the clock being removed. Mr. Alexander would need to go to the MHC to approve keeping it. Sullivan asked if the three center windows to be removed. Mr. Alexander replied that they will use the opening to move construction material and new windows will be installed after. They are unsure if the security bars will remain. Miller noted that Ledger also had bars as a former bank. Chair Durand suggested the applicant investigate the change of use requirements and conduct a code review. Mr. Alexander replied that they've hired Stantec as their code consultant and will approach the Building Inspector to discuss demotion. He noted that the third floor was an addition and the top floor roof bows upward and the truss transfers much of the load. They need to find someone with experience on cast iron restoration and with historic tax credit they can't change much. Chair Durand asked if the existing commercial tenant stay during construction. Mr. Alexander replied that is being determined since that level and the basement tested positive for asbestos. The museum tenant installed fire protection in their space, but the entire building needs to be up to code.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Sides: Motion to approve as presented

Seconded by: Sullivan. Passes 6-0.

2. Artists' Row: Discussion and vote on Installation of Infrastructure for Comcast Service

Dave Flewelling of Comcast was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Flewelling stated that Comcast received a request to install a new pole from 21 Front Street, with lines strung to each of the 5 buildings. Miller asked if the lines can be strung along the rear of the buildings because she doesn't want to see more wire. Many items get hung on them and she wants to minimize the impact of the utilities. Mr. Flewelling replied that they can power lines run along the rear of the buildings as much as possible. Miller why a 35-foot-tall pole would be installed. Mr. Flewelling replied that they could use a 30-foot-high, but the wires need 15-18-feet over the alleyway. Sullivan asked where the wires could come from. Mr. Flewelling replied a new pole in a planter area. Miller stated there is one tree still in good shape and it's right next to that tree. She requested that it be moved further away to where a tree was recently removed. Mr. Flewelling replied that the conduit coming from the building would still need to reach the pole and would still require some excavating since the poles are set 5-feet deep. The wires are 3/4" small black cable. Perras asked if there was an all underground option. Mr. Flewelling replied that they would need to take out all the bricks but can look at all their options to find the best installation location and method. He suggested a meeting on site with Miller on site to determine the location. Chair Durand requested a 20-foot-high not 35 feet.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Jaquith: Motion to approve with a 20-foot-high pole, the wiring to extend as the rear of each building, and the installer to meet Board Member Miller on site to determine the best location. Seconded by: Sides. Passes 6-0.

3. 300 Derby Street (Casa Tequila): Discussion and vote on Patio Improvements

Attorney Chad Colarusso and Gilberto Reyes, owner, were present to discuss the project.

Atty. Colarusso stated that there was a slight deviation on the patio, the original plan called for there to be 1 level and his client added tiers to create a flower bed on the higher bed. Dimensions have been provided of the wall that runs, 24-feet-long, is 5 ½ feet high, and 5-feet from the existing cemetery retaining wall. Chair Durand asked why it was done. Atty. Colarusso replied that the area will be mulched, and it was installed to introduce some greenery to the patio. They consulted with an engineer who stated that it wouldn't have been an issue to remove the soil. The area was originally a pile of dirt, it would have been a flat and drab patio that wasn't aesthetically pleasing. Sides noted that the two trees were existing and not added. Mr. Reyes added that he was concerned with the cemetery wall and the new retaining wall is concrete blocks that lock together.

Sides stated that this is not an insignificant change, it's substantial; the applicant constructed something so different than what was applied for without returning to have it reviewed. Mr. Reyes replied that he didn't want the cemetery wall to push the forward. Miller added that the concrete block stone is the bottom of the barrel and covers a historic granite cemetery wall. Mr. Reyes should have consulted the Board regarding options to change it, because the Board wants care taken to the existing wall. Miller is in favor of the restaurant and renovation to liven that corner, but the new wall upsets her. The retaining wall has concrete spilling out and it needs to be addressed. There should be some plantings added, such as Boston Ivy, or other creeping plants, to cover the new wall. Sullivan agreed and asked if it was needed, why was it installed, and if it can it be removed. Sides agreed with Miller's suggestion of creating planting zones to allow plants to obscure the wall. Miller suggested he cut concrete out on each side to create a planting area in the ground and plant something aggressive that will grow up, down, and over the wall so it can become a green wall. Jaquith suggested he hire a landscape architect and present it to the DRB again. Mr. Reyes noted that he wanted to help support the existing historic wall. Sullivan noted that there are multiple types of retaining walls and the Board is okay with trying to cover it. A landscape architect could also consider changing the stone material. Atty. Colarusso asked if the wall surface is covered with greenery could the stone remain.

Newhall-Smith noted that the applicant swapped out umbrellas which is good. A landscape architect should explain when the best time to plant them, so they have the best chance of survival. The Board needs to know the timeline of when the plantings will happen.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

Gary Gill, Ward 3. He met the owners, they did a nice job on the renovation, but he asked they how the wall and trees would be maintained. It was told that a new retaining wall would be constructed in front of the graveyard wall. Chair Durand noted that the Board raised concerns about the cemetery wall and the Board asked the applicant to consult a structural engineer on whether another retaining wall would be a good idea. Gill suggested they add more planting, but the owners said they would install a new wall and he couldn't understand why when they could have left the existing vine covered cemetery wall. Their additional work did not go as

planned but the Board is asking them to spend more on a landscape architect. Also, the umbrellas came from a distributor when Brodie's has words on their umbrellas. Why is this applicant being asked to change something that other establishments aren't changing? Jaquith replied that the Board has never allowed words on the umbrellas unless it's their company name and all businesses should follow the same rules. Sides noted that because it exists doesn't make it acceptable. There are violations all around and this was found during a follow-up to their application where the applicant was told it wasn't allowed. These issues come to light with active applications, and it gives the department the chance to address it as the work is being approved; however, the DRB is not an enforcement entity. Newhall-Smith stated that complaints regarding other establishments can be made to the Building Department and they can send out an enforcement letter.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Jaquith: Motion to continue to the next regular meeting.
Seconded by: Sides. Passes 6-0.

4. 9-11 Dodge Street, 217-219 and 231-251 Washington Street, Hampton Inn/Mixed Use Development: Discussion and vote on Proposed Modifications

Ken McClure, PM and Andrew Queen of Opechee Construction Corporation were present to discuss the project.

Mr. McClure stated that the 231 Washington Street residences and retail are still under construction. The transformer to power the entire building was deemed insufficient by National Grid, so they were forced to move it to a new location to present to the Board.

Mr. Queen noted that the masonry base remains unchanged. The cembrit panel façade with darker material around the windows would be changed to an aluminum composite alucabond (AMC) at the hotel corner and around the larger scale windows. This is by a different manufacturer and is a better-quality product. The window frames will remain charcoal. The white was the bay window and will be aluminum composite. The lighter color will wrap around the window and darker color around the interior of the window. Sides stated that this change is a significant lightening up of the façade when she preferred the darker color over the light grey that will cover a large amount of the façade. Perras asked if there are additional color options. Mr. Queen replied that there are, but they wanted to add texture/depth to the building. Sullivan noted that the previous color changes were much subtler. Perras noted his concern with the change of detail at joints, an open rain screen is now a closed joint and a much flatter aesthetic. Mr. Queen replied that the cembrit is applied with exposed fasteners and the corners would create a joint that highlights the thinness of the panel. In the ACM application the aluminum panel wraps the corner so only the joint between panels are visible. Perras noted that the cembrit has a texture that breaks down the overall mass of the façade and you can see the individual parts. Using a metal product changes the read of the corner and makes it feel more massive. This is not a positive change. Mr. Queen noted that it was designed as a mass with windows that are carved out.

Chair Durand asked why this change is proposed. Mr. Queen replied that as an overseas product it has a longer lead time. Mr. McClure added that the ACM were a premium product, but the tariffs placed on overseas made the pricing even-out. They decided to upgrade the product to the aluminum, and they prefer the cleaner look with less fasteners, but want the DRB's suggestion. If preferred, they will keep the cembrit. The number of fasteners at the ends and mid-span would call attention to the studs within the façade. The lighter grey is still available in a darker grey. Mr. Queen noted that they wanted to add visual texture. Sides

stated that in the daytime the façade will look large, flat and almost reflective. This is very different from the earlier combination of colors, but this is also a full story above the ground. Mr. Queen noted that the joints in the aluminum panels can be color matched or black sealant used which might make them more pronounced. They could make it appear to have the same joint.

Perras noted the inherent difference between having thin black lines and thin joints. The alucabond is an expensive quality product and this doesn't feel like the right application for it. Sullivan noted that the alucabond wraps around the corners so there is no seam like with the cembrit. Chair Durand noted that this product might be beneficial for the corners which were always a concern to him. Sullivan stated that he is in favor of the alucabond corners, but they will lose the character of the connectors. Perras suggested that if alucabond is approved they use a color match and make it a mass, so the window really appear to be carved out of the façade. Mr. McClure agreed that this looked cleaner than the other. Sullivan noted that the cembrit would create a lot of dots on the façade. Sides reiterated her preference to use a darker color. Jaquith agreed.

Mr. Queen stated that the interior U-shape of the building, the two cembrit facades would be aluminum composite in red to match the brick of the residential side, while the hotel would use the grey.

Mr. Queen stated that at the retail façade they were going to use a pearl colored cembrit cut into strips would now be a cementitious Nichiha panel, mounted vertically. They are made by the same manufacturer as the horizontal material at the base. Perras asked whether the DRB advocated for the use of this many materials to break up the façade. Jaquith replied that they've asked similar questions in the past. Mr. McClure noted the Nichiha panels have hidden fasteners. Sides asked what material would be installed at the recessed areas within the balconies. Mr. Queen replied the previously approved Pearl cembrit that would have been cut in 12" strip with visible fasteners. The 1-inch deep slats won't change in depth. Sides stated that she is not in favor of the lines which are at a residential scale and is too busy. Perras asked if they could be custom made with wider spacing. Mr. Queen replied no. Sides asked if they could use the previously approved material there instead. Mr. Queen noted that since they are substituting the cembrit out, they could use a Nichiha material or ACM. Sullivan agreed that they should reduce the business of the building. Sides asked if the joints could be flat. Mr. Queen replied yes, and they can control where the joints fall. Sides noted that the scale of the vertical joints can be more consistent and be more in scale with the projecting bays, the base, tower, etc. The dimensions of the verticals should be like the dimensions of the horizontals. The color distinctness, surface and shadow lines will be easily read on this large building. She finds the material change acceptable but there should be the same distinction between surface material, color and reveal. The Board has worked hard at the acceptance of the materials and it's hard to see another change and contrast of color, as it relates to the overall massing and the stepping of recesses and projections.

Mr. Queen stated that at the residential wing, there was a cembrit material at the top above the red brick, that they are proposing to use a grey AMC above it. The coping edge would match the new material color. The windows are black at the residential wing. Perras asked if the windows are all same color on the entire building. Mr. Queen replied the windows at the retail and residential are black and charcoal at the hotel.

Sides asked if there would be a shift in the panel material. Perras asked if they've researched other cement board panels. Mr. McClure replied that the Nichiha was already selected in a natural/rugged finish, and a significant portion of the building would be faced in one single product, but they did investigate other options. Sullivan stated that he is okay with the change.

Perras noted that he was not in favor of the change. Chair Durand stated that he preferred not having the joints and connectors that could be bothersome. He is in favor of the simplicity of the aluminum panels. Jaquith note that although it is different, he is okay with the change, but the color isn't right. Sides noted her preference to substitute the materials for darker colors closer to what was previously approved and no stripped panels. Mr. Queen replied that they will get as close as possible to the original colors. Sides noted that a subtle difference is okay, and recesses will be shadow. It will unify the building. Perras requested that the sealant match the panel and not contrast with the proposed colors. Chair Durand agreed, but stated that he wants to see samples of both matched sealant and accent color sealant.

Mr. Queen stated that they've relocated the transformer. It was originally on the uphill side of Washington Street in front of the residential wing, but it is now at the corner of upper Washington Street. The gates opened onto the street and they're proposing to put them on the other face to add landscaping in front of it. The bus cabinet doesn't require gates. Mr. McClure noted that the reason for the move was proximity to the residential windows. Mr. Queen stated that two screens are proposed. Option 1, matching the horizontal color change using continuous 18-inch-high Nichiha panels to a height of 6-8-feet that you can't see through. The bend in metal will provide some rigidity and it would be detailed so the gates match. The previously proposed fencing was a cembrit panel fence in front of the brick. Option 2, a metal panel with vertical ribs and steel posts, with a variation in dimensions. The color can be dark or light green and a backdrop to the landscaping. Sides noted that green fences don't work behind landscaping. Miller asked if the fence could be one color. Mr. Queen replied yes, and the panels would be 18" high and match the lines of the façade.

Perras asked if a wall was necessary if landscaping was being added. Mr. McClure replied that the transformer would be 6-feet-high, and they could plant Arborvitaes tightly together. As a landscape architects, his preference is for a feather reed grass in different colors that will be able to take salt in the winter. With the transformer relocated, the path to the residential entrance has improved and become a more private. The blocks are granite seats to mimic what is proposed off Washington Street. The fence will be high enough, so you don't look down into it from upper Washington Street with landscape and pervious pavers. The transformers will have a hum. Miller asked if the transformer will cut down vehicle site lines at the corner. Mr. McClure replied it wouldn't cut off the view any more than the building. Sides noted that the transformer and fence shouldn't read as part of the building, it should be separate. There should also be a screen only that slightly pervious to see what's in it. Sullivan asked if the fence needs to connect to the building or if it could be 1-foot away. Mr. McClure replied that they created it to recess at the corner, but it could be open. Sides agreed that it shouldn't touch the building. Perras suggested the fence follow the line of the curb but in a different material. Mr. McClure replied that curved fences aren't always successful and can be a complicated installation. Perras requested that the mesh material be dark bronze or black.

Mr. McClure stated that the Washington corner hotel rooms were designed with two Juliet balconies for one room. The second balcony also looked onto the restaurant patio, so they wanted to eliminate the balconies at the four locations on that face only and replace them with windows.

Signage:

Mr. McClure stated that they've reached out to Hampton Inn and there will be no integral lighting at the blade signs. They suggested banners on both sides of the building, Washington and Dodge Street, but are limited to the Washington Street sign only, mid-block. They also have a large blue P to indicate parking. Hampton Inn denied their request to add Salem to the large

banner so they are now proposing a smaller banner style sign below the banner that will give a nod to Salem. They could use the Destination Salem logo with an established date, that could receive halo lighting for illumination. The second sign would be tucked into the opening to the first-floor garage. It's a large blue sign over the entrance that will be halo lit like the banner. The third sign are placeholders for restaurant signage above their entrance on Washington Street and Dodge Street, there would be two. Each tenant will return to the DRB for approval, but they are shown for placement and dimension only. The lighting location needs to be determined. The fourth sign is the blue parking P, that will be placed at the opening to the first-floor parking entrance. The fifth sign is for the 231 Washington Street entrance. It will be mounted to the 4-foot deep glass awning with black steel to match the curtain wall. Holes in the glass will hold a metal channel and independently mounted letters, and the '231' will be mounted onto its own backer panel. They extruded plastic panel could also be metal and they could change the color to blue to match the Hampton Inn. The "Washington Street" will stand in front of the backer panel and the numbers will be mounted above it. They will be an LED light strip to highlight the sign, but they are undecided on whether light will be added behind or in front of the "231."

Sides noted that the '231' sign should be reduced in height. Jaquith stated that the "P" is too tight to the wall and the "P" in the parking circle is too far to the left, but overall the signage has improved. Miller asked if the '231' was tied to the Hampton Inn. Mr. McClure replied that as market rate apartments the blue would provide some connection to the rest of the building, but it could be a different. Sides stated that blue is dated and is not right for this style sign. Mr. McClure noted that the metal could be the same powder-coated bronze or stainless steel. Sides replied that they need to see how it reads, if too dark it might disappear.

Newhall-Smith stated that the Hampton Inn projecting sign is vertical, and the sign manual doesn't look fondly on vertical signs. It is also large, and 24 SF is the maximum allowed for the blade sign, so it would require a variance. Sides noted a lot of study regarding City signage so perhaps the Planning Department can respond to what can be added to the small Salem signage. Newhall-Smith noted that the blade sign should be counted toward Washington Street not Dodge Street, but they are not over their signage allowance.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

Gary Gill, Ward 3. Prefers the previously approved building materials. He likes the color insert to give some depth to the building and provide some texture, but the mounting buttons would be overwhelming. He agreed that the P needs to be in the middle of the circular sign. He thinks the mounting bracket takes away from the word 'Washington,' it shouldn't be blue, and have the '231' be a cut-out in the metal and illuminated from behind.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Jaquith: Motion to continue the review of the building materials.
Seconded by: Sides. Passes 6-0.

Jaquith: Motion to accept the change from Juliet balconies to windows.
Seconded by: Sides. Passes 6-0.

Sides: Motion to approve the Hampton Inn blade sign, but additional information will be required on the separate Salem sign, although ZBA approval on the Hampton Inn sign above is required.
Seconded by: Miller. Passes 6-0.

Sides: Motion to approve sign over the retail spaces.

Seconded by: Jaquith. Passes 6-0.

Sides: Motion to approve all general restaurant signage and location.

Seconded by: Jaquith. Passes 6-0.

Jaquith: Motion to center the P on the parking sign and adding twice as much space on the building side of the sign.

Seconded by: Sides. Passes 6-0.

Jaquith: Motion to continue the design of the '231 Washington' sign.

Seconded by: Sides. Passes 6-0.

Perras requested a better rendering of the address sign to understand the details of it. Sides noted that smaller numbers and more field will make it look less crowded.

Sides: Motion to continue with transformer fencing.

Seconded by: Miller. Passes 6-0.

Old/New Business

Minutes

The minutes of the May 22, 2019 meeting were reviewed.

Jaquith: Motion to approve.

Seconded by: Sides. Passes 6-0

Adjournment

Jaquith: Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Seconded by: Sides. Passes 6-0.

Meeting is adjourned at 8:50PM.

Know your rights under the Open Meeting Law M.G.L. c. 30A §18-25 and City Ordinance Sections 2-028 through 2-2033.