

**City of Salem Massachusetts
Public Meeting Minutes**

Board or Committee:	Design Review Board, Regular Meeting
Date and Time:	Wednesday, January 27, 2016 at 6:00 pm
Meeting Location:	120 Washington Street, Third Floor Conference Room
Members Present:	Paul Durand, David Jaquith, Christopher Dynia, J. Michael Sullivan
Members Absent:	Ernest DeMaio, Glenn Kennedy, Helen Sides
Others Present:	Andrew Shapiro
Recorder:	Colleen Anderson

Paul Durand calls the meeting to order.

Urban Renewal Area Projects Under Review

- 1. 265 Essex Street (Fingerprint Innovations):** Discussion and vote on proposed installation of signage

The submission under review includes; a sign permit application, sign design, and existing condition photos. William LePore and Jennifer LePore of Fingerprint Innovations were present to discuss the proposed signage.

Jennifer stated that their unit is located on the first floor Salem Chamber of Commerce building, however; their unit is located in the addition to the building and customers have difficulty locating their office.

Shapiro noted that this is a multi-story office building with multiple tenants. He also stated that their customers enter the Chamber's office throughout the day and need to be redirected.

Durand questioned the nature of their business. Jennifer responded that they provide fingerprinting services for background checks in Massachusetts.

Durand inquired as to whether their customers are walk-ins. Jennifer responded that their customers have scheduled appointments and are looking specifically for their office. Jennifer added that their customers inability to find their office location creates scheduling conflicts.

Durand questioned whether the landlord provides signage. Jennifer responded that there is a building directory on the side window of the Essex Street entrance that provides unit numbers only. Jennifer added that the building Owner is only currently allowing them to place an A-frame sign within the buildings side entrance only.

William noted that their customers are given the Fingerprint Innovations address through their sub-contractors (ItendoGo) website, so their company has no way of directing customers directly to their location.

Durand questioned whether ItendoGo currently has signage. William stated that they do. Shapiro questioned whether their proposed signage was currently in place on the windows. Jennifer stated that it was. Shapiro stated that he had previously asked the Board to consider the removal of all other window signage and allow the Fingerprint Innovations sign only, but a discussion can be made to include signage for ItendoGo since it is an integral part of the business.

Jennifer noted that their business is open Saturdays as well, and on that day the Essex Street entrance is locked, so their customers are ultimately given no direction. Jennifer added that they cannot monitor that entrance.

Durand stated that if all tenants request signage the building could exceed the maximum signage allowed. Durand added that the building Owner should be handling this matter. Shapiro agreed that other tenants requesting signage is possible, but the Board can make decisions regarding building signage on a case by case basis.

Sullivan stated that two signs are seen in the existing photos. Shapiro added that the photographs were taken by him earlier that day and that the proposed window signage is already in place.

Jaquith questioned if the building Owner will allow a small graphic at the main entrance board directory. Jennifer stated that the Owner currently allows a sign at the directory instructing them to use the side door, however; many customers still cannot find them.

Jaquith noted that this is not a building that currently allows or has a place for signage and approving this would set a bad precedent.

Durand noted that the Board typically reviews Owner requested signage at the main entrance to buildings. Jennifer stated that customers in wheel chairs cannot get to the Essex Street entrance to see the signage because of the step at the entrance, which is also a concern of theirs.

Durand questioned whether there was visitor parking in their parking lot. Jennifer responded that there was street parking only. Durand noted that customers would be trying to find them from Essex Street only. Jennifer agreed.

Sullivan added that if the Board did not approve their proposed signage they would be directing the Applicants to remove their current signage. Shapiro suggests either letting the Applicants keep the window signage in place, now that the Board is aware of their particular issue, or ordering the Applicants to remove the sign and directing to use alternative methods, i.e. giving customers directions via e-mail, providing directions or a map on their website, or asking the Owner to install exterior signage.

Shapiro stated that if the second or third floor tenants were to also request window signage, that the ordinance does not allow signage above a certain height. Durand added that allowing window signage would not be in character with the historic setting of Essex Street, although the sign would also not be directly on the Essex Street facade.

Dynia proposes the use of an alternative sign that will be in character with the building.

Jaquith: Motion for a Continuance to allow the Board members to visit the site and come up with sign alternatives, and to have the building Owner or representative present at the next meeting.

Seconded by: Durand; Passes 4-0

2. 60 Washington Street (Melt Ice Cream): Discussion and vote on proposed installation of signage.

The submission under review includes; a sign permit application, sign design, and proposed photos. Dave and Christiana Kroondyk of Melt Ice Cream, were present to discuss the proposed signage.

Kroondyk stated that they are the new owners of the Salem Screamery, formerly Ben & Jerry's Ice Cream. Kroondyk noted that they took over ownership last spring and are now seeking to change the signage to reflect the new name of their business.

Kroondyk proposed changing the window, door, and ice cream cone blade signage. Shapiro added that although the signs are compliant with sign code, the signage as a whole was slightly over the square footage allotment.

Shapiro stated that the Applicants agreed to reduce the size of their signage from 54 Sq. Ft. to 50 Sq. Ft. Christiana added that the door signage is slightly smaller than the window signage.

Sullivan inquired how their proposed cornice sign compares to the neighboring Boston Hot Dog and Dunkin Donuts signs. Kroondyk responded that that particular sign will be the same length as the neighboring signs but will have their 'melted ice cream cone' image at the beginning of their sign, similar to Dunkin Donuts.

Durand suggested they lower the proposed door signage to below the sightline, to not block the view into the store. Kroondyk agreed.

Dynia suggested they make the window signs the same size as the smaller door sign. All board members are in agreement.

Jaquith: Motion to approve making the round ice cream window signs the same size as the smaller door sign and to lower the door sign. The melt images can stay the same.
Seconded by: Durand, Passes 4-0.

3. 99 Washington Street: Continued discussion and vote on proposed roof deck (small project review).

The submission under review includes; a full set of architectural plans and proposed photos. Dan Ricciarelli of Seger Architects, presented on behalf of the Owner, Lisa Steinberg, who was present, to discuss a proposed roof deck.

Ricciarelli explained that this would be a dedicated roof deck, at the corner of Essex and Washington Streets, with access through a daylitter skylight/roof door assembly at the top of a new stair within the unit.

Ricciarelli noted that the deck would be pulled away from all parapet walls and cornice edges, to include trees in planters at the perimeter of the deck, to provide a green edge and privacy, as discussed at the previous meeting.

Ricciarelli added that the roof and parapet edge tapers from 18" high to flush with the top of the roof.

Ricciarelli noted that although they are still in the design stage, the roof deck assembly will be a pedestal system secured to new steel. Ricciarelli added that a parquet panel deck surface has been chosen.

Ricciarelli explained that the roof has a high pitch, however; the deck surface will be level and will be in line with the skylight/door.

Ricciarelli noted that they are considering planting: Hinoki Cypress or Juniper trees, and possibly installing a drip irrigation system.

Sullivan inquired as to if the planters will be anchored. Ricciarelli responded that the pots they are in would be weighted down. Durand suggested the planters be anchored due to possible high winds. Ricciarelli agreed and suggested including a pipe rail to tie them all together.

Ricciarelli explained the proposed use of a cable rail and post between the roof edge and the tree line that would barely be visible from the street. Ricciarelli added that the cable rail will also confine people to the deck, although there will be a gate to access rooftop equipment. Sullivan inquired about the fence posts. Ricciarelli explained that the posts will be Cedar and anchored to the roof deck.

Ricciarelli noted that ambient light will be integrated into the posts to provide lighting on the deck surface only. Ricciarelli added that lighting is being proposed within the skylight/door to light the steps to the roof.

Shapiro inquired as to whether the edge of the deck had been moved further away from Washington Street. Ricciarelli responded that it had, for structural and sightline reasons.

Jaquith questioned the height of the proposed railing. Ricciarelli responded noting that the railing was 36" above the deck surface and not 42" because the immediate drop off from the edge of the deck is less than 30". Dynia added that due to the fact that the roof deck is set back 5'-0" away from the edge of the building, a guard rail is not required. Ricciarelli acknowledges that he would confirm this with the Building Inspector.

Sullivan questioned whether the plantings will stay during the winter months. Lisa stated that the planting were chosen because they would stay green year round. Jacquith added that there should be drainage holes in the bottom of the pots to allow water to escape and that the plantings should be able to withstand the heat. Lisa asked Jacquith if he could suggest an alternative planting. Jacquith responded that he would make a recommendation.

Jaquith: Motion to approve the roof deck.
Seconded by: Dynia, Passes 4-0.

Old/New Business

Minutes

Jaquith: Motion to postpone approval of minutes from the December 15, 2015 until the next regular meeting.
Seconded: Dynia, Passes 4-0.

Adjournment

Jaquith: Motion to adjourn the meeting.

Seconded by: Durand

Meeting is adjourned at 6:44 pm.

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