

City of Salem Massachusetts Public Meeting Minutes

Board or Committee:	Design Review Board
Date and Time:	Wednesday, February 24, 2021 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. **1 Derby Square (Maison Vampyre):** Discussion and vote on signage.

Ken McTague of Concept Signs was present to discuss the project.

McTague stated that the landlord has agreed to let the new tenant reuse the existing bracket. Black carved gold leaf sign.

Perras asked about second floor lettering. Newhall-Smith replied that their second-floor window signage will be removed. McTague asked if scroll work would be allowed on second floor windows. Chair Durand – anything applied to the window would need to be reviewed.

Board members were in favor of the sign.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Kennedy: Motion to approve as presented and to remove the vinyl sign from the window on the second floor which are not allowed.

Seconded by: Sides.

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

2. **32 Lynde Street: Small Project Review – Window replacement on a portion of the building's windows, continued from January 27, 2021**

Newhall-Smith noted that she spoke with the owner, Sides visited the site and recommended simulated divided lites. Window World can create the windows in cream

for \$325 per window and add 6 over 6 simulated divided lite windows will be \$150 per window, however there are 14 windows to replace which is too much of a financial burden on the owner. Sides asked if the muntins were applied to the exterior or between the glass and noted that the rear windows have interior grids while other houses on the street have replaced their windows without review. Jaquith requested that the new windows have exterior applied muntins.

The Board discussed sending welcome letters to new home buyers so they know prior to making changes, that their homes are in specific zones and/or districts and that changes would require review.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Sides: Motion to approve white windows and to ensure that 6 over 6 muntins are permanently applied to the window exterior.

Seconded by: Jaquith.

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

3. 234 Bridge Street: Small Project Review – Installation of cellular infrastructure on existing historic light pole

Daniel Klasnick and Sean Conway, of Verizon Wireless, were present to discuss the project.

Klasnick stated that they wanted to place small cell equipment on a replacement light post. There is an agreement between Verizon and the City of Salem to address network service requirements in this area so there are fewer service disruptions during peak times. The proposal is to replace and replicate the design and appearance of the decorative light pole. The grey device in a 12-inch-diameter x 28.7-inch-high canister and lower on the pole is a 22-inch-wide x 12-inch-deep x 48-inch-high enclosure. The lower box will be 8-feet above grade and both enclosures can be painted black. No ground equipment is proposed, and they are trying to maintain consistency while meeting the demand needs of the City.

Perras asked why 8-feet above grade was the selected. Klasnick replied that they approached the manufacturer on how to address the load, but the existing light posts have a less substantial base, so the new equipment is lower to support the loading capacity of the pole. Perras asked if the canisters can be narrower. Sullivan asked if the square canister could match the width of the light pole because it appears to stick out approximately 5" on either side of the pole. Sides asked if there an alternate plan for where to place them. Chair Durand asked if it be ground mounted. Klasnick replied that it would be an encumbrance on the sidewalk to pedestrians.

Klasnick stated that they went through a lengthy process to reach an agreement with the City of Salem and this improvement would be owned by the City. They considered the overall context of the network with different pieces that need to fit together. This location

has a good line of sight, they can off-load traffic and the City requested a way to manage excessive usage during peak time. They met with the City Council and it meets the guidelines of City and accommodates rites of way.

The Board asked if the replacement light pole will match the other. Klasnick replied it's been designed to match the appearance of the others and won't detract from the surroundings along Bridge Street. Chair Durand noted that he wants to match the diameter of the other poles. Miller asked if the device can, go on the intersection pole rather than the light pole, which are much wider and will hide that box even better.

Conway noted that the box cannot be slimmer and since the light pole base isn't larger they can't conceal it within the base. Sides requested clarification that the light pole be an exact match. Conway replied that the light pole will mimic and match the other light poles. Sides noted her preference for the larger intersection light pole option proposed by Miller. Conway replied that they did not consider that location but would need to test it or replace the pole. In New England they have been placing them on light poles and the City of Salem came to them with this request. Sides recommend three options to place the equipment, 1) the larger pole closer to 30 Federal Street, 2) a light pole closer to the T parking garage, or 3) on the parking garage.

Miller stated that the Boards don't rubber stamp anything the City wants, they review and make recommendations as they've done tonight.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Jaquith: Motion to continue to the next regular meeting on March 24, 2021.

Seconded by: Sides.

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

New / Old Business

Sides stated that more information needs to be given to applicants and there is more to consider in the alterations they propose. Chair Durand noted that something sent to home in Salem may not be read by the building owner and sometimes changes are made with and forgiveness rather than permission is used as tactic by some applicants. Kennedy suggested notification of changes requiring City review be associated with the Registry of Deeds paperwork when purchasing a home. Newhall-Smith noted she gets notified of items that she normally wouldn't though online permitting and many of them are handled internally. The process is triggered by addresses. Miller suggested the owners e-mail address be added to the on-line permit. Newhall-Smith replied it would be a good way to stop a building permit from being approved so it can be reviewed.

Sullivan questioned why the City went so far with the light pole process that are an important part of the City streetscape. Sides noted that with more of these on the way there should be guidelines on how they are attached to buildings because. Often they try to make them resemble something they are not and antennas could be a much better

design rather than tacked onto other items. Jaquith agreed. Newhall-Smith stated that this project went to the City Council and Councillor Riccardi continued their review until the end of March so the DRB could review it.

Jaquith left the meeting.

Perras asked why some projects come to the DRB after they've completed their design, or the project is already under construction. Newhall-Smith replied that the SRA has two different types of review, both are a three-step process. More elaborate projects require a multi-phase review, but some projects slip through the cracks and are reviewed after the fact. Miller reiterated that some applicants take the calculated risk and ask for forgiveness rather than permission.

Newhall-Smith stated that the courthouse concept plans will come before the board in March or April and Atty. Grover will be bringing a couple new projects before the board soon.

Newhall-Smith stated that the DRB will get a referral from the PB for the former HMA site.

Newhall-Smith stated that the Smoke Shop adjusted their signage but didn't eliminate it so she reached out to the building owner.

Sullivan asked about progress with the Hampton Inn sign. Newhall-Smith replied that she's received no new update.

Miller asked about Santander signage application. Newhall-Smith replied that it was approved but internal review by Executive Director Tom Daniel is required for the blade sign and he doesn't believe internally illuminated signs are appropriate for downtown.

Kennedy stated that signage is being installed at Cilantro.

Newhall-Smith noted that Bit Bar will move into the old Salem Beer Works space once the square footage has been reduced.

Miller stated that 285 Derby Street has a "For Lease" sign in their storefront. Newhall-Smith added that she sent some interested potential tenants to the building owner and they need an active tenant to bring life to Charlotte Forten Park.

Perras asked how the committee for outdoor seating is progressing. Newhall-Smith replied well, the process will be streamlined, restaurants can start applying in the next couple weeks. They will do a rollout of jersey barriers, etc. and the DRB will be included when required. All ADA rules will need to apply, and they know which areas will require review and approval.

Kennedy stated that a meeting between the City and Turner's will be held tomorrow to determine a permanent rear outdoor seating and ADA requirements. The owner is open to relocating the rear ramp. Newhall-Smith noted that a design will come before the DRB. Chair Durand added that the owner should look into changing the grade to eliminate the rear step.

Meeting Minutes:

January 27, 2021

Sides: Motion to approve the regular meeting minutes of March 24, 2021.

Seconded by: Miller.

Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Sides, Sullivan, and Chair Durand all in favor. Passes 6-0.

Adjournment

Sides: Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Seconded by: Miller.

Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Sides, Sullivan, and Chair Durand all in favor. Passes 6-0.

Meeting is adjourned at 7:20PM.

Know your rights under the Open Meeting Law M.G.L. c. 30A §18-25 and City Ordinance Sections 2-028 through 2-203