

**City of Salem Massachusetts
Public Meeting Minutes**

Board or Committee:	Design Review Board, Regular Meeting
Date and Time:	Tuesday, November 17, 2015 at 6:00pm
Meeting Location:	Third Floor Conference Room, 120 Washington Street
Members Present:	Paul Durand, Glenn Kennedy, Ernest DeMaio, David Jaquith, Christopher Dynia, Helen Sides
Members Absent:	J. Michael Sullivan
Others Present:	Andrew Shapiro
Recorder:	Jennifer Pennell

Paul Durand calls the meeting to order.

Urban Renewal Area Projects Under Review

1. **318 Derby Street (Salem Hotbox):** Continued discussion and vote on proposed installation of signage.

The submission under review includes a letter, drawings, and photos of the proposed signage. Yadav was present on behalf of Salem Hotbox.

Shapiro explained that after last month's meeting where an original proposal was shown, some communication occurred over email between him, Glenn Kennedy, Yadav, and Concept Signs (the applicant's sign designer). The applicant did not work with Kennedy on any revisions but the designer provided three new signage schemes, which are before the board this evening. Shapiro noted that the square footage of the proposed signage is in compliance with the City's sign ordinance and that the applicant has expressed a willingness to work with the DRB on an acceptable plan for signage.

Sides commented that the proposed black and red signs are more legible. She commented that the black scheme with gold letters is her preferred choice.

DeMaio asked whether the letters on the glass would be the same font as what would ultimately be chosen for the blade sign.

Yadav responded noting that he would follow any format preferred by the Board.

Jaquith commented that he agrees with Sides and that the proposed black and yellow sign is more legible than the red sign. The typeface could be cooled down a bit.

Dynia agreed that the black sign reads best.

DeMaio agreed that the black and yellow is the most promising scheme. He continued by noting that he would like the text on the glass to match the text on the primary blade sign/logo. He noted that he does not prefer the signs being centered on the doors the way they are currently shown.

Kennedy noted that the proposed black signage is the most legible. Text on the window sign and the blade sign should all coordinate. The original design with the box without the red ring could be incorporated on the window if the text scales down a bit, or the box could be eliminated altogether and just the smoke graphic could be included. Window decals do not need the red backing. The letters located on the door could be scaled down a bit but should remain at eye level.

Kennedy: Motion to recommend approval based conditional upon the following (final review to be conducted by Glenn Kennedy):

- Use black and gold scheme.
- Use smoke graphic without box from original design and move it onto the black background, eliminate ring
- Just yellow typeface located on windows (similar to “Salem” on black background design) with no red backing
- Door typeface should be scaled down slightly

Seconded by: Sides, Passes 6-0.

2. 25 Front Street (The Lobster Shanty): Discussion and vote on proposed outdoor seating deck and fence for storage area (small project review).

The submission under review includes a letter, cut sheet, and drawings of the proposed seating layout and storage area. Lee and Diane Wolf, and architects Bill and Alexandra Peterson were present on behalf of Lobster Shanty.

Diane Wolf noted that the restaurant recently signed a long term lease with the City, which requires that the restaurant make investments and upgrades to the building and exterior areas. She noted that the proposed design of the new outdoor seating area would make the area more visually inviting and would open up Artists’ Row for more activity. The design utilizes the space located on the Front Street side by incorporating the addition of a deck.

Alexandra Peterson noted that the design still maintains a rustic appearance but provides a more defined and open plan. The deck would provide a stronger connection to Artists’ Row and its configuration would more easily enable emergency vehicles to pass through.

Bill Peterson noted that the design incorporates three major components; 1.) the addition of a front deck with 2.) fixed railings and 3.) a wooden fence to conceal garbage on the end of the building closer to the center of Artists’ Row. The deck would consist of pressure treated wood decking over concrete piers. He noted that they had consulted the

City's Assistant Engineer to ensure that no sewer lines or other in ground infrastructure would be compromised. Peterson noted that a lamppost would need to be removed and an existing sign would be relocated. The design uses reclaimed wood planks to act as a screening material. The decking material would be "Timber Tech" composite in a weather grayed color. Wood posts would hang light fixtures, draped string-lights, and jelly jars.

Shapiro asked if the architects had sought out the opinion of the Building Inspector on this project.

Bill Peterson responded noting that he had spoken with the Assistant Building Inspector and that he was generally in favor of everything being proposed. He did ask that the plumbing code be adhered to.

Shapiro also noted that he had forwarded the plans to the Health Department but had not yet heard any feedback. He also confirmed that a recently completed plan for Artists' Row, done by the Cecil Group, called for reorienting the Lobster Shanty's outdoor seating in a way similar to what is being proposed.

Sides commented that she likes that it organizes the outside space. The existing space is very crowded and spilled out. Sides questioned if this design would leave space for the farmers market.

Diane Wolf responded by noting that the intention is to open up more space for farmers market vendors, including in an area across from the building that was being used for performances. The new deck will have a built-in space for performances.

Sides questioned if the deck would be closed to the ground to keep critters out.

Bill Peterson noted that a wooden skirt board would be used.

Peterson then noted that the applicant would also like to have planter boxes around the deck in which to plant herbs.

Jaquith noted that he thinks this design is great. Jacquith questioned if there is enough lighting.

Diane Wolf noted that each raised pillar would have lighting along with stringed lights above the deck. Right now the patio area has no lights, so this would be an improvement.

DeMaio noted that overall he really likes the scheme. He continued by noting that it is important to get more definitive about the appearance of proposed light fixtures, furniture, and the potential for umbrellas. The Board would need to review these items at a future meeting. DeMaio then questioned if signage of any kind would be located on the screening or surrounding fence.

Bill Peterson noted that there would be no additional signage.

Durand questioned if power to lights would be internal or through an exposed conduit.

Bill Peterson noted that an exposed conduit would be used to create a rustic look.

Diane Wolf added that they would also be considering options for outdoor seating, including perhaps one larger unit that would be hung above the seating area.

Dynia questioned whether the rustic looking reclaimed wood could be brought down closer to the seating area in front, instead of the metal railings.

Bill Peterson responded by noting that it was purposely not used because of durability issues, specifically with respect to snow removal and snow being pushed up against it in the winter.

Sides: Motion to recommend approval conditional upon applicant returning to the Board for review of furniture, lighting, umbrellas, and additional heating equipment.
Seconded by: Jaquith, Passes 6-0.

3. 217 Essex Street: Discussion and vote on proposed revisions to Verizon rooftop wireless antennae installation.

The submission under review includes drawings of the proposed rooftop wireless antennae installation. Attorney Tom Hildreth and Liam Sewall was present on behalf of the applicant.

Shapiro explained that the DRB and SRA had approved a proposal to installed exposed antennae on the rooftop last year, but that the local Historical Commission had asked that the antennae be shielded with a faux chimney. The Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) asked that the issue be resolved by the two boards.

Select members of the DRB and local Historical Commission were gathered to discuss the possibility of revisiting the idea of shielding the antennas with a faux chimney and with revisions being shown this evening, there was general agreement that this could be acceptable.

Sides asked why the Historical Commission has oversight.

Shapiro explained that the requirement for federal permitting with this project requires that MHC approves the project. MHC asks that the local Historical Commission provide comment. The project is being performed in a National Register Historic District, therefore these requirements apply given the involvement of federal permitting.

Hildreth noted that the installation includes 6 antennas with three faces, two antennas per face. Each face would be painted to match the brick to which they would be mounted.

What are being presented this evening are two options for a faux chimney to be installed that would shield the identified four antennas - it would be square to the roof of the building.

Option A

Single faux chimney right up against building. A bit smaller than previously presented. Fiberglass brick and real brick meet in a plane that is very unnoticeable. Flush to façade.

Option B

Faux chimney to sit back four inches to reveal existing flashing etc. Separating elements would be preserved.

The Historical Commission was somewhat split on which option to select and were comfortable allowing the Design Review Board to make its preferred selection.

Dynia raised the issue of whether the existing flashing could be removed and patched properly if option A was selected.

Sewall responded by noting that they could remove the flashing and properly patch it; no water would enter the building and compromise the existing masonry.

Dynia then said that he felt that process was reason enough to have the chimney set back.

Sides noted that fiberglass brick is not going to match the real brick below. The faux chimney should be set back and maintain the stepped back façade. Sides questioned if the balustrade would be painted wood.

Jaquith noted that the fiberglass brick would probably not match.

Kennedy and Sides both expressed support for seeing the chimney set back.

In regards to a proposed balustrade, Durand expressed that he thinks it is an improvement and that it helps screen what one does not want to see.

Sides asked what the balustrade would be made out of.

Hildreth responded that it would be made out of wood.

DeMaio questioned what the cornice work on the rest of the building does and if it is painted in a certain way. The new balustrade should fit in with the rest of the existing building in regards to height and color.

Shapiro noted that the drawings indicate that there is an existing balustrade on another portion of the building.

Kennedy questioned whether four inches is enough of a setback.

Jaquith noted that it is a normal amount.

Sewall explained that any increased setback could compromise structural integrity.

Shapiro noted that the decision rendered last year with regard to this project included a condition about having a planned gas run-up placed as close as possible to the two building portions' seams and that it should be painted to match the brick exterior. He expressed wanting to ensure that that portion of the decision would remain in force.

Sides: Motion to recommend approval of setback chimney of at least four inches, balustrade scheme that matches the existing balustrade on the building, and maintaining the original decision regarding gas run-ups.

Seconded by: Jacquith, Passes 6-0.

Minutes

Approval of the minutes from the October 28, 2015 regular meeting.

Shapiro explained that he made some revisions to the portion of the minutes that discussed approval of minutes from the meeting prior.

Durand: Motion to approve.
Seconded by: Jacquith, Passes 6-0.

Adjournment

Jaquith: Motion to adjourn,
Seconded by Kennedy. Passes 6-0.

Meeting is adjourned at 7:00 pm.