

<b>Board or Committee:</b>	<b>Design Review Board – Regular Meeting</b>
<b>Date and Time:</b>	<b>Wednesday, February 28, 2024 at 6:00 pm</b>
<b>Meeting Location:</b>	<b>Remote Participation via Zoom</b>
<b>DRB Members Present:</b>	<b>Chair Paul Durand, David Jaquith, Leeann Leftwich, Catherine Miller, Elizabeth Murray, Marc Perras, Sarah Tarbet</b>
<b>DRB Members Absent:</b>	<b>None</b>
<b>Others Present:</b>	<b>Kate Newhall-Smith</b>
<b>Recorder:</b>	<b>Colleen Brewster</b>

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

### **Signs in the Urban Renewal Area**

---

#### **1. 1 Derby Square:** Salem Plant Witch, continued from 01/24/24.

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

McTague stated that's trying to find the right signage arrangement for the building has been a struggle, and he decided to mirror the blade sign placement on the opposite side of the archway and to relocate the antique bracket to above the archway. All building tenants agree with this new arrangement. Acorn will remain in place, and a matching bracket would be placed on the right side of the arch for Salem Plant Witch's revised sign design.

Perras asked if other tenants would request a blade sign at a later time. McTague replied that the owner has one other space to rent that may also require a sign, and if that were to occur, that new sign would be placed at the current wall mounted marquee sign location. Perras was in favor of the newly proposed layout. McTague noted that the new sign will match the size of the Acorn's sign.

Leftwich was happy that the sign background was black and asked if the lettering would be tan or gold. McTague replied tan, and the lettering would be raised not flat.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

**VOTE:** Jaquith: Motion to approve, with the changes as presented. Seconded by: Perras.

Roll Call: Jaquith, Leftwich, Miller, Murray, Perras, Tarbet, and Durand were in favor. Passes 7-0.

#### **2. 14 New Derby Street:** Garcon Super Slice

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

McTague stated that the previous sign was presented several months ago, the owner changed the sign design immediately and he, Ken, forgot to notify the DRB of the new proposed changes. The size and shape are the same, but the layouts of the sign are different.

Tarbet stated that she noticed the changes, which do look good, although she misses the previously proposed pizza slice shape. Chair Durand was in favor. Leftwich also liked the pizza slice image. McTague noted that the revisions were because the owner's business plan is to sell slices of pizza rather than whole pizzas.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

**VOTE:** Tarbet: Motion to approve as presented. Seconded by: Perras.

Roll Call: Jaquith, Leftwich, Miller, Murray, Perras, Tarbet, and Durand were in favor.

Passes 7-0.

### **3. 18-20 Front Street: Nocturne**

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

McTague stated that he created the existing sign 2 years ago, but the owner wanted to change it. The double-sided sign will have 3 layers with the gold leaf and carvings creating 5 levels.

Leftwich loved the colorful and playful sign design. Chair Durand requested the thickness of the new sign. McTague replied that each layer will be ½-inch thick. Tarbet asked if the flames, business name, and outline will be all gold leaf, raising concern with the use of too many colors. McTague replied yes, all three will be gold leaf.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

**VOTE:** Perras: Motion to approve as submitted. Seconded by: Jaquith.

Roll Call: Jaquith, Leftwich, Miller, Murray, Perras, Tarbet, and Durand were in favor.

Passes 7-0.

### **4. 28 Norman Street: Blood and Thorn**

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

McTague stated that a third sign was proposed close to the Crombie Street side of the building that would push them over their signage allotment. They are currently only proposing a lightbox sign and window graphic. The awning has painted lettering on it

although he is not sure if it will be replaced, but it's so small it shouldn't push them over the signage limit. The lightbox sign is internally lit, and the background black will be opaque so only the letters will light up. Leftwich asked if the grey background was proposed at the window graphic or the graphic only. McTague replied that the grey background was only to cover up existing signage captured in the photo. Perras raised concern with readability and legibility. Leftwich agreed. McTague also agreed, noting that the previous tenant also had difficult to read signage.

Miller asked if the tenant would be located on the right side of the building. McTague replied yes. Miller noted that the signage placement for the entire building is a concern. McTague agreed, noting that signage was an afterthought.

Leftwich asked if all tenants had signage on the awning. McTague replied yes and suggested the entire awning needed to be redone.

Tarbet requested the type of business this signage is for. McTague replied tattoo artists although they didn't want to add the word tattoo onto their signage, only to use an angel and devil cherubs. He suggested leaving the cherubs gold and the lettering white lettering for better visibility and readability. Perras preferred white lettering throughout. McTague noted that using gold cherubs will make them stand out. Leftwich and Miller agreed.

McTague noted that the dark background on the lightbox sign is the best option to make it stand out from the other white lightboxes.

Miller suggested not adding telephone numbers.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Leftwich agreed that the new signage stands out the most. Miller noted that this will be the best-looking sign.

**VOTE:** Perras: Motion to remove wall sign on Norman Street, change the "Blood and Thorn" text to white, and to leave the cherubs gold. Seconded by: Jaquith.

Roll Call: Jaquith, Leftwich, Miller, Murray, Perras, Tarbet, and Durand were in favor. Passes 7-0.

## **Projects in the Urban Renewal Area**

---

1. **289 Derby Street:** Small Project Review – Construction and installation of seasonal shade structure at Charlotte Forten Park

Megan Tomkins of CBA Landscaping and park designer was present to discuss the project.

Tomkins stated that they worked on the original design of the park, and have been working with Ms. Newhall-Smith, Mr. Daniel, and Ms. Barry to develop the shade structure and combat the heat island effect, making the park more comfortable. They are proposing a large monolithic cantilevered shade sail fabric covered structure and have completed shade studies to maximize shade. They didn't want to completely block 289 Derby Street, their closest neighbor, and there are still views into and through the park. They are developing an alternative for adding down lighting to the structure for night-time use. The overall length is 80-feet-long, and the height of the new structure will range from 13-feet at the ends to 17-feet at the center. They will minimize disruptions to the plaza surface for park use by keeping a clear route for maintenance vehicles. The structural supports are metal with exterior gunmetal grey polyester coat with a light blue sail color for a maritime look.

Miller asked if the continuous horizontal piece at the front would also be placed at the rear. Tomkins replied at the front only. Perras asked if another color was considered besides light blue. Tomkins replied that the light blue color was preferred but they could consider other colors. Newhall-Smith stated that the planning staff selected light blue due to the potential impacts of fading due to sunlight. The shades are seasonal and will be removed over the winter, which will be included in a maintenance package to extend their life.

Miller noted that the posts are 13-feet tall and with the existing seat wall the back of sail would be 11 1/2-feet above the ground, raising a concern with vandalism. Tomkins replied that the back height is off the seat wall and not the plaza level and typically the lowest they would use is 8-feet at the rear.

Jaquith asked if light would transmit through the sail. Tomkins replied that the sail is semi-transparent providing a decent amount of shade.

Perras asked if the front struts are necessary because they don't help the elegance. Tomkins replied that due to the size of structure they are needed to support the cantilevered arms but can investigate their removal. She suggested beefing up the structure to eliminate the need for them.

Perras asked if the structure color would match other park elements. Miller noted that they are silver not stainless steel. Tomkins replied that it would be in the same color family only. Miller suggested color matching and noted that the historic lamp post with the acorn fixtures is black and overtime the colors fade.

Perras noted a consideration for graffiti. Tomkins replied that the powder coat finish is proposed, and they've considered a clear anti-graffiti coating allowing graffiti to be power washed off.

Miller questions the size of the structural steel. Chair Durand noted that on windy days there would be some torque on the structure. Jacquith agreed. Miller suggested the columns be tapered to eliminate some of the chunkiness making them more elegant. Tarbet suggested a round or W-shape. Murray requested to review the footing detail.

Jaquith believed round columns would make it difficult to secure the cantilevered even if it were welded. Perras noted that the flange in the connection detail is very beefy and suggested that it could be more elegant if welded and brought on site in one piece rather than bolted on site. Chair Durand noted that field welding and shipping it in one piece would be difficult. Miller had no concern with the connection details since they will be up in the air. She agreed that the columns are more important, they could be round, tapered or oval making them longer in the direction of the cantilever. Jacquith suggested they become rectangular in the direction of the cantilevered arm.

Perras appreciated the sun studies, noted that nothing in the park is symmetrical, and asked if an asymmetrical canopy was considered. Tomkins replied yes, they went through several rounds of design and several types of asymmetries, but they felt this was the best concept. Perras noted that the design was nice and suggested that the details need work.

Tarbet asked if the alternate for lighting was not guaranteed, noting that they would be removing an existing park light fixture to install this. Tomkins replied that they decided to keep the existing post lighting but adding the alternate depends on pricing.

Tarbet asked if they would still remove and replant a tree. Tomkins replied yes.

Tarbet asked if the metal structure would remain throughout the winter. Newhall-Smith replied yes, only the sails would be removed.

Miller asked if uplighting or downlighting was proposed. Tomkins replied that downlights are the proposed alternate. Miller requested use of full cut-off fixtures.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

**VOTE:** Perras: Motion to continue to the March 27, 2024 meeting with revised connection details, structure steel shape, and lighting. Seconded by: Jacquith. Roll Call: Jacquith, Leftwich, Miller, Murray, Perras, Tarbet, and Durand were in favor. Passes 7-0.

## **2. 2 Lynde Street:** Outdoor Dining – Review of proposed outdoor dining area for Settler

Shana Chambers, co-owner of Settler, was present to discuss the project.

Chambers proposed patio seating to the left of the restaurant, where 18 seats are proposed, with a capacity of 44. It will include 1 large round 6-foot diameter table and various groupings of 2-feet x 2-feet tables with 18-inch x 24-inch chairs. They purchased new tables and chairs last year; the patio barrier has long black planters that alternate and outline the area that are maintained each week.

Perras requested a review of the ADA complaint entry and patio use. Chambers replied that they measure every year, all guests enter through the front accessible entry. Perras noted that the use of portable heaters can obstruct access. Chambers replied that they've used 1 or 2 but they haven't worked well because their customers don't really feel the heat they generate, but they are also not fixed in place.

Tarbet asked if the asphalt patch at the front sidewalk level with the neighboring concrete, and who would be responsible for making sure a hazard wasn't created. Newhall-Smith replied that if it is a public sidewalk, it would be the city's responsibility and if it were private property the owner would be responsible.

Newhall-Smith noted that this is the first ever outdoor dining reviewed by the DRB. All owners need to meet with the Commission on Disabilities so it will be looked at for accessibility and sign-off would be required by the Building and Plumbing Inspectors for meeting the plumbing code and restroom count if an expansion of permitted occupancy were proposed.

Perras requested the proposed perimeter treatment. Chambers replied 2-feet x 3-feet staggered planting boxes to provide privacy that are placed within the red line for a nicer look, where in the past they used metal chain barriers. They are using the same chairs and table tops, but purchased new table bases, and navy blue and white pinstripe umbrella to match the interior.

Perras, Chair Durand and Jaquith were in favor of the plan.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

**VOTE:** Miller: Motion to approve. Seconded by: Jaquith.

Roll Call: Jaquith, Leftwich, Miller, Murray, Perras, Tarbet, and Durand were in favor. Passes 7-0.

### **3. 125 Washington Street: Outdoor Dining – Review of proposed outdoor dining for Ledger**

Kelsey Tenore of Ledger was present to discuss the project.

Ms. Tenore stated that they are proposing the same outdoor seating layout as last year. They have their existing patio close to the building and two years ago the city built a wooden deck over 6 parking spots, creating a bike lane and new loading zone. The existing patio is still used, they have taken over the brick sidewalk and part of the wooden deck that is also a public sidewalk. They have 70 seats, with the same black tables and chairs proposed as last year but have replaced the wood tables with metal for ADA compliance. They will use the same plain red umbrellas, that are secured to the wooden deck, but are removable. The posts have string lights for more visibility, and they will also maintain their existing HC entrance.

Tarbet noted the previous use of an ornate screen and perimeter lattice, and asked if those two screening types will remain in use. Tenore replied that the lattice screen was used pre-COVID and was decorative only, but it doesn't need to be used, only the lattice at the perimeter is proposed.

Miller noted that the posts now have beefier bases that recreate tripping hazards. She suggested it all be painted black.

Perras stated that when full of customers, the patio is difficult to negotiate from an accessibility standpoint and with heaters in place. He suggested creating a true aisle. He was not in favor of the lattice which feels like it belongs in a back yard and suggested they consider alternatives. Tenore suggested faux shrubs, noting that lattice was the sturdiest option with Halloween crowds and strong winds for the past 6 years, but she was open to other ideas. Tarbet was not in favor of lattice but understands its use. Chair Durand and Leftwich agreed. Tarbet suggested it all be painted dark. Chair Durand suggested adding bottom rails. Tenore agreed, noting that they have them on site and will have them reinstalled.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

**VOTE:** Perras: Motion to approve, adding bottom rails to the lattice, painting the posts bumpers black, and monitoring accessibility. Seconded by: Jaquith.

Roll Call: Jaquith, Leftwich, Miller, Murray, Perras, Tarbet, and Durand were in favor. Passes 7-0.

Newhall-Smith noted that there will be 5 or 6 more outdoor dining reviews in March. Miller asked if future restaurants not be reviewed. Newhall-Smith replied that applicants can sign an affidavit if nothing changes each year. The DRB would only review a new restaurant or changes to an existing restaurant's outdoor dining setup. Miller asked if any new applicants were applying. Newhall-Smith replied not yet.

## **Projects Outside the Urban Renewal Area**

---

There are no projects outside the Urban Renewal area to review.

## **New / Old Business**

---

1. Approval of Minutes:
  - a. January 24, 2024

**VOTE:** Perras: Motion to approve the January 24, 2024, meeting minutes. Seconded by: Tarbet.

Roll Call: Jaquith – recused himself due to absence, Leftwich, Miller, Murray, Perras, Tarbet, and Durand were in favor. Passes 6-0.

2. Update on Sign Manual

Murray stated that their sub-group has reviewed previous comments and will return with a proposed draft.

3. Staff Updates, if any:

Newhall-Smith stated that:

Schematic design of the courthouses are likely to be reviewed by the DRB in April.

She met with a PEM rep regarding several vinyl building wraps. Miller noted that the PEM just added a large sticker in their shop window, promoting the Bat Box exhibit, that was not reviewed by the DRB.

Salem Cinema removed the out-of-date banners. Perras believed that several banners were still in place.

Settler owners purchased the commercial space at Brix, and they hope to open in late July or early August.

There is around a 2% vacancy in downtown Salem, which is good.

**Adjournment**

Jaquith: Motion to adjourn. Seconded by: Perras.

Roll Call: Leftwich, Miller, Murray, Perras, Tarbet, and Durand were in favor. Passes 7-0.

The 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