

City of Salem Massachusetts Public Meeting Minutes

Board or Committee:	Design Review Board, Special Meeting
Date and Time:	Wednesday, June 11, 2020 at 6:00 pm
Meeting Location:	Remote Participation via Zoom
DRB Members Present:	Chair Paul Durand, David Jaquith, Glenn Kennedy, Catherine Miller, Marc Perras, Helen Sides, J. Michael Sullivan
DRB Members Absent:	None
Others Present:	Kate Newhall-Smith
Recorder:	Colleen Brewster

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

Signs

- 1. 72 Flint Street (Halstead Salem Station Apartments sign):** Discussion and vote on signage – *Continued from May 27, 2020.*

Tom Mazza (Owner), Bronwyn Hershberger (Director of Design), Attorney Michael Spillane, and James Emmanuel (Landscape Architect) were present to discuss the project.

Mazza stated that they appreciated the guidance and comments received from the Board, reviewed the Board remaining issues, and created a design that will fit in with their brand and the Boards goals. Hershberger noted that they've used a mock-up to determine visibility signage for drivers and the proposed sign location is to the right-side of the drive aisle, 5-feet away from the inside edge of the sidewalk so exiting vehicles won't have their view of traffic on Flint Street blocked. The previously proposed tree in this location has been moved to the left-side of the drive aisle and it will have a canopy higher than 6-feet to not create any visual impairment of traffic on Flint Street. Low plantings will be placed around the tree and the new monument sign, they will be green year-round, produce some color in the summer months and conceal the light fixtures.

Hershberger stated that the size of the monument sign has been revised, the base has been lowered 6-inches, from 22-inches to 16-inches, for a total overall height of 66-inches. The width of the sign is 102-inches wide and the sign with the base has an overall width of 114-inches. The lettering has been spaced out, despite these changes not being consistent with their Halstead branding and logo. There will be three up-lite lights per side on the sign to be covered by shrubbery.

Hershberger noted the signage of the other multi-family developments in the City and the North River Apartments sign was comparable in size. The North River sign is 11-feet 4-inches wide x 6-feet 4-inches high and their proposed sign is 9-feet 6-inches wide x 5-feet 6-inches high. This sign is their brand, marketing, and will create a sense of entrance to their project.

Miller appreciated the lettering alignment, size of the sign, and proposed location 5-feet away from the sidewalk, plantings to conceal the lighting, and relocating the tree to the opposite side of the drive aisle. She noted that the sign is the same on both sides, with the large "H" on the left and she asked if the "H" can always be closest to the street making it a mirror image of itself.

Sides appreciated the improvements.

Kennedy agreed with the previous comments, particularly the suggestion of locating the "H" on the street-side of the sign. The spacing still seems off between some of the letters but that may just be the rendering. Hershberger replied that the spacing will be handled in the shop drawings. Kennedy added that the amount of lettering appears to be trying too hard to fill up the space and the text can be reduced by 5% to create a bit more space between the edge of the lettering and the edge of the sign, to make it more readable and breathable.

Jaquith agreed with the sign improvements and the need for additional spacing around the lettering which will also improve the readability.

Sullivan agreed with the previous comments and the suggestion of placing the large "H" on the street-side of each sign, so it acts as a beacon. Hershberger replied that it would take away from their logo.

Perras and Chair Durand agreed with the sign improvements and comments.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Sides: Motion to approve the sign as presented.

Seconded by: Jaquith.

Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Sides, Sullivan, Durand in favor. Passes 7-0.

Urban Renewal Area Projects Under Review

1. 144 Washington Street: Installation of Dutch door at Haus Witch

Erica Feldman was present to discuss the project.

Newhall-Smith stated that the applicant wishes to install a Dutch door at her store entrance. Feldman stated that they want to install a curbside pick-up option during the Covid-19 phases of reopening. Sides requested images of the store with the door in place. Feldman replied that the door would need to be approved by Goldberg properties and she doesn't know which type of door to order.

Sides asked if a Dutch door was a lockable egress. Jaquith replied yes if it is not open to the public. Miller noted that all of the doors on the building are the same style and painted green, but the one in the middle is wood and go to the upstairs levels. The new door would need to be consistent with the other doors in style and being a commercial

space, a door that fully opens would need to open outward, unlike an inward opening residential Dutch door. The matter should be pursued with the property owner and the applicant should return to the Board, with a proposal that meets the fire code. Chair Durand agreed, the proposed door would need to be custom and fit within a metal frame, and swing within the direction of egress – outward, and towards the patrons. Once you touch the door the result will have to be code complaint.

Jaquith added that the jamb of the current door is set up for an out-swinging door and the proposed door should match the current style door, with plain glass and rails. Chair Durand noted that the upper part of the door could swing both inward and outward, and the entire door could swing outward, making the overall door even more complex.

Miller noted the interesting solution, her lack of concern with an outswing top half of the door that can be secured in place, but this is a lot of money to spend for a relatively short period of time.

Jaquith stated the applicant may be able to keep the current door and add another interior door to keep people out.

Feldman stated that she doesn't want to throw her money away, but the cost is for her to worry about.

Perras stated he liked the concept, there are many details to work out, and there must be an interior latch that someone could reach in and open. Jaquith agreed. Sullivan noted the glass door that could hit the existing glazing, given the tight space they must work in. The glazing could just be on the top of the Dutch door only. Feldman replied that she will explore having it open just on the top and will look into costs.

Chair Durand suggested approving the concept, but the applicant must return to ensure the design meets the various codes.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closed public comment.

Sides: Motion to continue to the next regular meeting

Seconded by: Jaquith.

Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Sides, Sullivan, Chair Durand in favor. Passes 7-0.

Entrance Corridor Projects

1. **602 Loring Avenue:** Advisory design review of new three-story apartment building with 20 residential units and associated site improvements – *Continued from May 27, 2020*

Peter Pitman, of Pitman & Wardley, was present to discuss the project.

Pitman stated that they have used the constructive criticism they received on the tile façade proposed and create several color patterns, which Perras reviewed and gave his

comments and preferences to their top three options. Option #2 was preferred, and the Board agreed. He noted that the trees will be 3" caliper due to the ground conditions, not 3 ½".

Pitman stated that their option 2 has added 2-3 courses of terra cotta rainscreen at the top so it reads as a lintel, they simplified the pattern, added black base to reinforce the tripart system of elevation, and the venting of the garage through the rooftop, as determined by their MEP engineer.

Perras stated that the red is not captured at the bottom and a couple of courses of red could place them below the first-floor windows to mirror the courses above the top floor windows. They could be aligned with the sills of the windows at each end. Pitman replied that it would be revealed differently at each elevation due to grade changes, and the façade would be red down to the patio. The Board agreed with Perras. Pitman noted that the terra cotta tiles are 8-inches x 54-inches.

Perras stated that the cornice doesn't look appropriately scaled in the renderings, as if it's projected out too far, but it does look appropriate in elevation. Pitman replied that the cornice extends 18-inches.

Perras stated that the overall design has improved. Sides agreed.

Miller stated that the landscaping and signage will return, but the fence should not be vinyl or chain-link. Pitman replied that the fence will be 4-feet-high powder coated aluminum along the East property line. It will have 2-inch x 2-inch balusters with a 4" spaces, and a catalog cut can be submitted.

Miller stated that numerous trees are proposed, and she has not issue with it if it meets the code requirements for the site. Pitman replied that their Landscape Engineer, Jim Emmanuel, has worked with the Tree Warden Bob LeBlanc and the Civil Engineer to balance the trees and landscaping. The Warden has approved of their planting design and size and the Planning Board will review the site plan too.

Chair Durand open public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closed public comment.

Sides: Motion to approve as submitted with the change of adding a base of black tiles to align with windowsills.

Seconded by: Jaquith.

Miller amended the motion to include the applicant submitting the fence cut sheet.

Amendment seconded by: Jaquith

Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Sides, Sullivan, Chair Durand in favor. Passes 7-0.

Perras amended the motion to include adding two rows of red tiles below the lower level windows and if the material changes again, it must be reviewed by the DRB.

Amendment seconded by: Jaquith

Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Sides, Sullivan, Chair Durand in favor. Passes 7-0.

Pitman stated that the owner thanked the Board for their time and efforts.

Old/New Business

Minutes

Sides: Motion to approve the February 26, 2020 minutes with Chair Durand's edits.

Seconded by: Perras. Passes 7-0

Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Sides, Sullivan, Chair Durand in favor. Passes 7-0.

Miller stated that applicants come to the board for review with a desire to just meet code but the DRB aren't code reviewers. This happens especially when it comes to signage requirements. Chair Durand replied that many Board members know the code and can comment and highlight the items that do not meet code, but the Building Inspector will review the technical code.

Adjournment

Jaquith: Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Seconded by: Sides. Passes 7-0.

Meeting is adjourned at 7:00PM.

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