

City of Salem Massachusetts Public Meeting Minutes

Board or Committee: Design Review Board, Special Meeting
Date and Time: Wednesday, February 13, 2018 at 6:00 pm
Meeting Location: 120 Washington Street, Third Floor Conference Room
DRB Members Present: Chair Paul Durand, Ernest DeMaio, Chris Dynia, David Jaquith, Helen Sides, J. Michael, Sullivan, Glenn Kennedy
DRB Members Absent:
Others Present: Matt Coogan
Recorder: Colleen Brewster

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

Urban Renewal Area Projects Under Review

- 1. 30 Church Street (East Regiment Beer Company):** Discussion and vote on proposed signage (sign permit) and outdoor seating area (café permit) scheme.

Kennedy recused himself. Glenn Kennedy and Josh Engdahl were present to discuss the project.

Kennedy stated that their initial concept was a large open patio, the second concept was to define the space, an entry point, and to include an awning style covering. The comments of Board members and associates led them to keep designs and styles that would fit in in Salem.

Kennedy stated that they wanted a black awning, and the DRB was concerned with defining and securing the space. Their steps to the revisions were; reviewing other types of enclosures, using black rails to define the space with window openings behind the rails and hard structure roofs, and reviewing various types of panels. They want to define the entry point and the space with a rail to help enclose the space.

Their objectives were; a black awning, established entry, defining and securing the patio, a darkened shelf and counter, darken floor, adding identity, and an enclosure.

Kennedy stated that their revisions were; making the awning black, defining the entry space and having it lined up with the existing building entrance door, adding a wood backsplash on top of the top rail and to keep the beers from falling off the drink shelf, and giving the bar a defined perimeter. The canopy posts will most likely go from round to square, they've darkened the wood to a walnut tone, and they've darkened the floor stain color which will most likely require several coats every year. They will also be closed Mondays and Tuesdays. They've added an identity to the entrance point with the addition of an awning to the canopy and updated the logo so that the "Established 2014" line of text is now at the sides of the entry bump-out at the awning entry point. Lastly, they've added panels that zipper down with a heavy bar to secure the bottom and the

bar will roll-up into the curtain material and secure with clips. The entrance will be closed off with a zip panel and they can use the handicapped entry on the side during the winter when the perimeter entrance is closed. They will need a sign to indicate that that entrance is closed and patrons must enter around the corner. Mr. Perry initially suggested a door although they do not know what that structure would look like. When the occupancy count is under 50 people only one means of egress is needed, although two means of egress would be best.

Chair Durand replied that the design is fine but the process is not. The DRB shouldn't be the designer and he felt that the applicants are taking advantage of the City. He's concerned with the process and the situation they are in. The DRB doesn't give free services. He kept hoping for them to provide the design but that didn't happen and they could have just rejected the proposal. This is a dangerous precedent that should be the SRA's concern. He added that he is in favor of the current design.

Sides stated that this project involves city property so the DRB is covering both the city's and the applicant's interests. It is a much better design but the visual component needs to be incorporated with a plan. The awning may provide the plans for the structure but there needs to be documentation on how it connects to the building, as they would expect in any application. They need to know the pieces and what the plan is. She asked if those plans were available from the awning company and if they still relate to the prior plan. Engdahl replied that the awning company framing drawings are still relevant to what has been presented. Kennedy stated that those connection details should be provided to the SRA.

Chair Durand stated that the old design didn't work and it wasn't fair to other surrounding businesses in Salem. Jaquith noted that he like the new design and the rails has given it a sense of permanence and screening.

Chair Durand asked if the applicant had gone to the Licensing Board to receive a liquor license. Engdahl replied that the meeting will be March 8th.

DeMaio stated that the design is much better although the enclosure material is still a reflective plastic looking curtain that he is not in favor of. Kennedy agreed and replied that it will be black not grey with the option for either grey or black thread. Engdahl replied that the vinyl will provide a weatherproof surface. DeMaio stated that he is unsure of the options but he is not in favor of the reflective plastic. He is also not a fan of adding graphics to the canopy or applying signage, graphics to the railing or bar when the panels are closed up during the winter, or to have signage strung across the bar. The façade reads as elegant and simple but adding those items will make it distracting and take away from the simplicity of the design. Kennedy noted that, like Notch, Gentile, and Bent Water, they don't have vendors to promote because the product is theirs. Engdahl noted that they are in agreement and prefer the clean look.

Chair Durand asked if there will be heaters. Engdahl replied yes.

Chair Durand opens public comment.

Pam Broderick, 28 Federal Street. She asked to clarify that the proposed patio is only going in the landscaped area and the walkway will not be taken away, and whether the patio area will extend in front of the neighboring building. Kennedy replied that the

structure will stop at the wall before the end of the building. She agrees with their signage concerns, and asked if it's within the DRB's purview to set a height requirement for the ledge to keep beers from sliding off since that walkway is a busy thoroughfare with pedestrians, bikers, stake boarders, walking tours, etc. She's like to see a doorman managing the activities in that area. Durand replied that the Licensing Board requires a counter to limit the number of people they can have like Notch. She agrees with the elegant looking black design but asked if promotional banners can be prohibited.

Chair Durand replied that the Licensing Board might be concerned with it being too opened to the public and suggested that the backsplash will be 3" higher than a beer glass. Kennedy replied that that height needs to be determined. Sides noted that this continuous bar has always looked vulnerable and questioned whether The Howling Wolf has a ledge for their outdoor seating. Chair Durand suggested a 12-14" high backsplash. Kennedy replied that the images shows a 1x6 and the entire perimeter panel is 32" high and they shouldn't go much higher than that and the perimeter shelf is already at 42" high. Sides noted that two 1x6's will become an obstruction, there should be some interaction between the street and this space, it should be 4-6" high like a typical backsplash. Chair Durand suggested 6" minimum to keep glasses from falling off or making it too easy for people to take a glass. Sides replied that there is no concern with someone grabbing a glass of a table on the sidewalk and asked why this is different. Chair Durand and Jaquith agree that this is different.

Ms. Broderick noted that there will be bar stools facing the walkway and inviting that interaction. She noted that the old configuration of the Lobster Shanty had only ship rope separating the tables from the pedestrian walkway and the employees were constantly dealing with people climbing over the rope and not using the entrance. She foresees an interaction between people in the space and people on the outside. If it's not designed well that is what it will be inviting. She foresees an easy reach over to grab beer.

Sides asked if they were restricted to 50 people. Engdahl replied their maximum occupancy is 42 people. Sides noted that it won't be jam packed with people and passersby aren't stopping to drink from friends' glasses at sidewalk tables in other locations. Durand replied that area a bar you are addressing the other side and at a table you aren't. Kennedy suggested that they not overexaggerate the design and the difference of a few inches will not keep someone from grabbing a drink. Chair Durand noted that at Tavern in the Square the Licensing Board was concerned with drinks being passed to people on the sidewalk, they will be concerned with having control over the alcohol served within the space which is a liability issue, and the employees will need to be watching the interactions.

Chair Durand closes public comment.

Sides: Motion to approve the proposal a Café Permit and Sign Permit for 30 Church St (East Regiment Beer Company), including the updated aesthetics of the dark awnings, pedimented entry, dark wood, metal rail from this evening's meetings, as well as the previously submitted information regarding lighting, heating, and structure, with the conditions that any banners or signage not included in this application are prohibited and that and all future signage must be presented to the DRB for approval. Seconded by: Jaquith. Passes 5-0.

Old/New Business

Minutes

No minutes to review.

Adjournment

Durand: Motion to adjourn the meeting.
Seconded by: Jaquith. Passes 5-0.

Meeting is adjourned at 6:30PM.

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