

<b>Board or Committee:</b>	<b>Design Review Board – Regular Meeting</b>
<b>Date and Time:</b>	<b>Wednesday, December 21, 2022 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, Glenn Kennedy, Catherine Miller, Marc Perras,</b>
<b>DRB Members Absent:</b>	<b>J. Michael Sullivan, Sarah Tarbet</b>
<b>Others Present:</b>	<b>Kate Newhall-Smith, Principal Planner</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. 120 Washington Street: Stonefield**

Justin Richman, engineer at Stonefield Engineering and Design, was present to discuss the project.

Richman proposed installing one 3.9 square-foot sign made of MDO plywood, painted white with vinyl lettering that reads “STONEFIELD” made by Lebel Signs. The two signs will be sandwiched to either side of a bracket attached to the brick façade, the bracket will be like the one used to attach the “Work Bar” sign.

Chair Durand stated that the bracket should be anchored into the mortar joint and not the brick. Perras noted that the bracket is not centered vertically on the sign. Kennedy and Jaquith agreed that the sign should be centered.

Miller asked if Stonefield and Work Bar were the only two companies occupying the space. Richman replied that they are the one two commercial tenants on the second floor with no space for other tenants. Miller raised concerns with installing more than two signs on the building.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

**VOTE:** Miller: Motion to approve the sign with a bracket to match “Work Bar”, the signs to be centered vertically on the bracket, and the bracket is attached to the mortar joint. Seconded by: Jaquith.

Roll Call: Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Durand were in favor. Passes 5-0.

### **2. 311 Derby Street: American Flatbread**

James Withrow and Jim Harrison, owners, were present to discuss the project.

Withrow stated that to signify the name change for the business they replaced the damaged panel and name of the establishment. The two signs are 336-inches X 42-inches.

Perras asked if the previous sign was back lit. Miller noted that only the lettering of the previous sign was back lit vs. a white box with lettering. Kennedy stated that there was some grandfathering from the previous Goodyear sign that was blue with yellow lettering and only the lettering was illuminated.

Withrow noted that this area isn't proposed very much by the city and there are many new businesses in this area investing a lot of money to survive COVID. They've received a lot of comments that people know what their business is now. The only change was to replace the panels. Kennedy replied that the sign ordinances still apply, and the design must be approved. Miller noted that the previous sign still appears on Google maps.

Harrison noted that the blue of the Goodyear sign was also translucent. Kennedy noted that there was a discussion with the previous owner on the translucent elements of the sign they would allow. The inversion of the translucent areas of the sign changes its appearance. Perras argued that the sign change is substantial since the lettering was glowing previously and the entire box is glowing now. He argued that the paneling should have been replaced in the same manner, to allow only the lettering to glow. Harrison he was not aware of the restrictions on the signage. The only style LED modules for the previous signs and the square piercing aisle in the module that threw pointed light where the new ones have a diffuser to cut down on the brightness. Kennedy reiterated that the guidelines do not allow them to approve back lit signage and what was approved was inverse signage to reduce to amount of illumination. Chair Durand asked if any research was done on the sign requirements. Withrow replied that he applied the same methods as a damaged awning with graphics in need of repair and replacement. Chair Durand replied that repair is not the same as installing a new sign.

Withrow asked if an unlit sign would be a problem. Perras replied no and raised concerns with setting a precedent with lit box signs. The Board agreed. Withrow replied that that is not what he wants to do. Miller encouraged the applicant to consider a sign that they would like and that meets the guidelines. Withrow replied that they've invested funds in this new sign and with the unequal distribution of signage, it's a lit sign and the lighting hasn't changed but the consideration doesn't feel fair or pro-business, but they will consider their options. Newhall-Smith suggested installing a spotlight to the tops of the sign. Withrow replied that sign is approximately 43-feet-wide and would be very expensive. Jaquith asked how high the sign was in the air. Withrow replied 28-feet.

Jaquith noted that the design has too much information on it. Kennedy noted that the sign review board is used to guidelines the signs downtown otherwise the downtown Salem would look very different.

Newhall-Smith suggested installed LED strip signing at the perimeter of the sign. Withrow replied that it would not illuminate the sign as well and the area is too large to illuminate from the outside.

Perras stated the review of this sign is difficult for everyone, but it's unfair to not offer an opinion on the sign and to only say that they dislike it. He suggested it return to the SRA for their review as at internally illuminated sign, since there is nothing the DRB can do about it. Newhall-Smith replied that if the DRB cannot positively recommend the internal illumination the applicant could speak to the SRA and appeal the sign.

Jaquith asked why the sign can't be done like it was previously. Newhall-Smith replied that it has a different name. Withrow replied that it is the same business, the sign has existed as illuminated for year and he considered this issue a technicality. Miller noted that if the applicant has come before the DRB before it was changed it is highly likely that they would not have approved it as an internally lit white box.

Chair Durand noted that one option is to not light the sign which the Board agrees with, to request the opinion of the SRA. Withrow appreciated their Boards time and options.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Kennedy suggested a continuance. Harrison stated their preference to consider their options. Jacquith suggested a continuance and the submission of a better sign. Chair Durand and Miller suggested a motion that gives the applicant a way to proceed.

**VOTE:** Miller: Motion to approve with an unlit sign and for the applicant to consider the sign alternatives. Seconded by: Perras.

Roll Call: Jacquith and Kennedy were opposed, Miller, Perras and Chair Durand were in favor. Passes 3-0.

Newhall-Smith stated that the sign must remain unlit; she noted that the SRA has the authority to overrule the ruling of the DRB. Miller noted that the applicant can also return with a new sign for the DRB to review.

Harrison requested documentation on the signage approval for Goodyear that was grandfathered before the restaurant took over the location. Newhall-Smith to provide documentation.

### **3. 119-211 Washington Street: Stained Hourglass Escapes**

Megan Thomson, representing her sister/owner, was present to discuss the project.

Thomson stated that the proposal is for Gorilla Signs to refinish the existing sign with the new business name. The previous sign was white with black lettering and the proposed

sign is opaque black with white lettering and the white is where the illumination will shine through, as will the red in the logo.

Miller asked if the proposed sign fits within the size requirements. Newhall-Smith replied yes. Kennedy noted that the sign will fit above the windows and the Board has reviewed those earlier and the size of the sign does meet the dimensional requirements.

Perras had no issue with the proposed signage. Miller requested the size of the lettering be slightly reduced both height and width wise, to show more of the black border. Kennedy suggested a 10% reduction and to keep the center logo the same.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

**VOTE:** Perras: Motion to approve with a 10% reduction in the business name text size.

Seconded by: Jaquith.

Roll Call: Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras, and Chair Durand were in favor. Passes 5-0.

#### **4. 231-251 Washington Street: The Hive**

Kevin Steele was present to discuss the project.

Steele stated that they are no longer proposing internal illumination after he was advised not to pursue it.

Perras asked if they intend to mount the proposed sign to a panel or within a glass transom above the entry door. Steele replied that this particular door at 227 Washington Street, does not have a transom so the sign would be its own entity mounted onto the face of the building. The sign would be 22-feet-high x 10-feet-long, it will match the width of the door opening. Kennedy stated that since this sign would set a precedent for the other storefront along the building, they should establish a standard design for them, such as a sign frame that matches the frame width of the doorway below. Steele noted that other entranceways have the transom window above and they would like to try and match that look. Chair Durand and Kennedy suggested the sign also be 20-inches-high to leave room between the top of the sign. Miller noted that the thicker frame on the sign should be on all sides to match the door frame.

Miller was in favor of the sign design. Steele noted that the sign would be fabricated by Concept Signs. Kennedy suggested the letter spacing in "workspace" be reduced to it looks more like a word than individual letters.

Perras asked if they considered using the glass to apply signage rather than a sign applied to the building as to not stand out and break up the consistent banding in the façade or to place signage on the window at either side of the entrance. Steele replied that they hadn't considered it, they want to keep the sign as high as possible since their entry is so low, and they want it to stand out. Perras suggested a vertical configuration

to occupy the sidelight of the entry door with the lettering on the door, so it didn't stand out so much. Miller noted that the height of each transom windows increases with the increase in slope around the building and she could see three signs of this type.

Jaquith asked how many storefront windows were in front of their space. Steele replied one section to the right and two to the left, although the furthest to the right is obscured by an electrical box. He noted that the side windows will also be rented offices, but he is open to suggestions. Kennedy stated that a signage program should have been established when the building design was under review.

Perras suggested that if the signs are placed above the storefront they should be disengaged from the storefront, so they float along the spandrel and to prevent any encroachment on the window above. He noted that the sign should float within the frames around it, so it reads as separate and suggested 2-inches above and below. The Board agreed. Steele agreed to an 18-inch-high sign. The board discussed the width of the sign, making it smaller than the framed storefront opening by a minimum of 2-inches on each side. Steele requested maintaining a sign width that matches the width of the storefront opening.

Chair Durand reiterated Perras' concerns of setting a precedent for the building since he likes the façade. Steele noted that lack of feasible signage locations for the other storefronts and the potential requests for signage of the same dimension as his. The Board discussed whether signage location was previously discussed. Kennedy remembered a brief discussion, but the applicant did not return to discuss present designated locations.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

Kennedy presented two design options, one matching the width of the framed storefront opening and other matching the width of the window above. The Board agreed to the wider sign.

**VOTE:** Perras: Motion to approve as designed with the following changes: height reduction to 18-inches to allow façade paneling to be visible above and below the sign, sign shall not be internally illuminated with Kennedy to review the final sign design. Perras amended the motion to include the sign shall match the width of the framed storefront opening and the frame no longer needing to match the mullion width.

Seconded by: Jacquith.

Roll Call: Jacquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras, Chair Durand were in favor. Passes 5-0.

Newhall-Smith requested a revised sign design.

Chair Durand questioned the signs method of attachment to the building noting the lack of joint between the Nichiha panels. The Board suggested adhering it to the building. Steele agreed and noted his representation of the owner.

Newhall-Smith asked if a coffee shop was being pursued. Steele replied that they are still seeking a tenant. Newhall-Smith asked about the restaurant tenant. Steele replied that the restaurant is under construction, has had numerous delays, but may be open by mid-February.

#### 5. **26 Congress Street:** Asado by Antique Table

No one was present to discuss the project.

Newhall-Smith stated that the applicant is seeking a primary wall sign over the entry and two matching wall signs above the side windows. The signs comply with the signage requirements; however, a front and back-lit signs are proposed so both the red and white would glow, but that can be confirmed. She asked the applicant about the possible replacement of the window signage but did not receive a reply and she can send Board comments to the applicant.

Perras noted his preference to not have the front of the sign lit since backlit create more of a halo effect that also illuminates the wall behind it. The letter of the primary sign is over scaled and encroaches upon the brickwork above and below the sign and that sign should fit within the spandrel of the brickwork. He had no concerns with the side signs as long as they were only halo lit. He asked if the blade sign would be changed. Newhall-Smith replied that it wasn't part of the application, but she can confirm that along with the window signage. Kennedy agreed with Perras.

Newhall-Smith noted that all of the letters are outlined in a different color and asked if the Board with comfortable with the red being opaque and the white outline glowing. Kennedy stated that in some respects they cannot allow it to get through because they can't approve it.

Perras questioned how the lettering would be fastened, individually or grouped as words using a bar. Kennedy noted that backlit signs will require a detailed attachment. The Board agreed to continue due to the lack of an applicant to answer their design questions.

Public Comment:

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

**VOTE:** Jaquith: Motion to continue to the next regular meeting. Seconded by: Perras.  
Roll Call: Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras and Chair Durand were in favor. Passes 5-0.

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

---

1. **301 Essex Street:** Schematic Design Review – Erect a one-story addition above the existing building (known as Jerry's Army & Navy Store) with ten (10) residential units and

twelve (12) onsite parking spaces located inside the building at the first-floor rear with retail space fronting on Essex Street, continued from 11/16/22.

Michael Becker and Carissa Vitas (Owners/Developers) and Daniel Ricciarelli and Sanir Latfija of Seger Architects were present to discuss the project.

Newhall-Smith noted that the project description is no longer accurate, and the redesign will be clarified tonight.

Ricciarelli stated that the one-story classic revival building has had several commercial uses over the years, and it was built in 1897. The original building was a three-story Federal style residence. The current building has infill panels above the aluminum storefront framing, cast iron columns and cornice, with a masonry parapet, and an opaque façade along Summer Street. He presented precedent images along Essex Street of varying heights and styles creating an eclectic streetscape. The structure aligns with the property line except for the alleyway along the Salem Inn to the south. 1,500 square-feet of retail space will be maintained along Essex Street and will wrap around Summer Street. Off Summer Street, a garage for 12 parking spaces is proposed. A single-story massing was previously proposed, and the Board raised concerns with what was occurring above the parapet. The owners felt the building requires more height and presence for its corner location. Ten townhomes were proposed with only story visible above the parapet, however, a taller building is now proposed along with programming changes, that includes two stories of flats above the townhomes, for a total of 18-units. The flats would be considered new construction by the Building Inspector with a 1.5 to 1 parking ratio on-site. The townhomes are being constructed inside the existing building footprint, so they will be inter-floored, with their entry level at the mezzanine level and those 10 parking spaces would be located off-site but within 1,000 feet of the building, for a total of 22 parking spaces. The current building proposed conforms to the zoning and parking requirements. The two upper floors of flats would be the same footprint and the result in a 4-story addition.

Ricciarelli stated the Board has previous concerns with the hybrid cladding with glass along Essex and the start of Summer Street with a transition to punched window openings for a more residential feel. The concern with the design may have been due to the look of the one-story addition, so two cladding options were developed. Option 1 included glass fenestration (curtain walls) on both Essex and Summer Streets with areas of recessed brick towards the back of the Salem Inn and at most of the façade facing Bonchon. The existing building has a mix of cast iron, metal and brick so compatible materials have been considered for the façade of the addition. The existing façade will also be completely restored and will be thoroughly studied. Option 2 included punched openings in a brick façade with banding and new cornice lines wrapping the building to match the datum lines across the street. It has a more lift-like feel with much less glass on each façade. This design has a heavier feel, and they believe that lighter is better. Both options are set back from the parapet to pay homage to and respect the existing building below and to open up terrace spaces for the units. The addition would be 3 stories above the parapet and 4 stories in total, and they are seeking approval of the

number of stories for a building of this height and for Board support of the design of such an important building.

Chair Durand asked if the SRA reviewed a single-story building and if they were prepared for a multi-story building to be returned to them. Newhall-Smith replied that this project has had several iterations of various stories, the design changed because of parking challenges which lead the design team to create the inter-floor design with one story above. That design was referred to the DRB with a comment for the DRB to review the proposed height, increasing the height at the corner, increasing the height at the residences and decrease the height at the commercial space. She believed the SRA envisions adding 1 or 2 feet per floor not adding additional floors, but she doesn't know how they would react to the current design. Ricciarelli noted that the SRA was uncomfortable with the cantilever which they removed, but that design element was the result of discussion with HSI who was in favor of pushing the face of the building out towards Essex Street. Their desire for adaptive reuse leads them to push the façade away from the parapet.

Newhall-Smith stated that this building is older and there is an historic inventory form for it, and it has been a one-story building since it was first constructed.

Perras stated that the taller version is much more successful and the view from Summer Street proves that by filling the void that exists on that corner, it has a better urban expression that is helpful. He noted that the DRB received multiple letters that referred to the original hybrid design and he asked that the DRB review it and understand the history that the public is speaking to. Newhall-Smith raised concerns with whether the letters were referring to the one-story addition or the four-story addition. Becker replied that HSI's social media post referred to the hybrid design with the cantilever.

#### Hybrid Design

Ricciarelli stated that they took clues from the proportions of the existing windows, parapet, and cornice, and they tried to introduce them into the addition in a more contemporary expression. Their discussion with HSI is what created the 8-foot-deep terrace beyond the parapet who felt strongly that the buildings upper Essex Street façade would be lost, and a cantilever would bring that forward since the existing parapet would not highlight the addition above as they would like. There were also concerns with the material used at the underside of the cantilever which they never explored since it was considered problematic. They felt the residential aspect next to the Salem Inn should have a more punched opening expression that clued people into what would occur along Essex Street. This scheme also included a penthouse pushed back even further from the building edge and cornice and datum lines to relate to neighboring buildings.

Perras noted that he preferred the cantilever and asked if a hybrid option that was neither all brick nor all curtain wall was being considered. Ricciarelli replied yes, but they have been waiting until they had a viable project before they dove into the details of either design.

Miller asked why the cantilever went away since it helps separate the residential above from the first-floor retail. She saw the addition as connected because of the lower piece, the setback, and the cantilever above, and asked if the SRA and public disliked the cantilever. Becker replied that it was more so a couple members of the SRA that were opposed to the cantilever rather than the public and after 3-months of SRA meetings and their disapproval of the cantilever they removed it from the design. Perras agreed with Miller that the cantilever created a nice reveal. Chair Durand agreed. Ricciarelli stated that the current program/unit styles make more sense with the hybrid design given that a townhouse is below with two levels of flats above.

Miller was in favor of the balance provided using two different materials, the rendering is quite nice, and the vertical elements are aligned. Ricciarelli noted that in the new scheme the stair element no longer is pushed beyond the front façade of the addition. Perras noted his preference for the extended stair wall and stated that regarding the two proposed facades, he'd prefer to see them combined to form a hybrid version, rather than an abrupt change. He suggested the vertical elements continue through the use of brick pilasters rather than horizontal punched brick openings. There are good elements to work with in the hybrid version and the taller version is more successful because it fills the void of space and creates a more urban feature. Kennedy stated the larger mass is more in fitting with the building with either version of the addition. Miller agreed and noted her preference for the hybrid scheme. Jaquith stated that he like the earlier scheme and suggested the cantilever be reduce but preferred the way the design breaks down the scale into three elements rather than one, which is seen elsewhere in Salem. He urged them to continue with the design because this an important corner in Salem.

Kennedy asked if the previous hybrid version is more of the style that the DRB is looking because it was rejected by the SRA and how would the DRB get the SRA and DRB on the same page. Newhall-Smith replied that if the Board is unanimous that the earlier hybrid design is more appropriate design then the applicant should return to the SRA and inform them of the DRB's preference and why, for the SRA to reconsider. Perras asked if the SRA has concerns with the one-story version. Newhall-Smith replied no, the SRA was not in favor of the design, and they sent along the one-story version instead with some height considerations. Becker added that the SRA was specific that they wanted more height and stories. Newhall-Smith believes the SRA did not request more stories. Ricciarelli noted that the SRA wanted the single story higher, but they looked at that and it didn't work.

Kennedy stated that in the Summer Street façade of the newly proposed scheme, the building height is shorter than the Salem Inn and the hybrid version with the penthouse was taller. Ricciarelli noted that the different scheme because the other was not inset. Lutfija added that in the previous version each floor were only flats, and the partial cantilever was only providing outdoor space. Becker noted that some outdoor space is possible for units with areaways to the west and north and stated that he would prefer to put the townhouses back on top to gain more height. He noted that an SRA member stated that if the addition was one story only it must be the best building it could be. The Board reiterated that the hybrid is the better scheme.

Newhall-Smith stated that she didn't believe the SRA would change their mind on the cantilever, the top hat penthouse, or the asymmetry. Perras suggested the principals of these scheme be applied to the latest iteration, multiple materials, townhouses, no penthouse, and the cantilever can be debated. Miller and Jaquith agreed.

Public Comment:

Newhall-Smith stated that she received the following letter prior to the meeting.

1. Linda Ernst, 20 Harbor Street, #9, dated December 19, 2022
2. Peter Crowley, 400 Essex Street, dated December 20, 2022
3. Elaine Whitman and Danielle Hanrahan, 28 Beckford Street, dated December 20, 2022
4. Jane Stauffer, 1 Washington Street, dated December 20, 2022
5. Flora Tonthat, 30 Northey Street, dated December 20, 2022
6. Historic Salem, Inc. dated on December 21, 2022

Emily Udy, Historic Salem, Inc. The Board discussion seems to support the contents of their letter. Regarding the SRA process, in addition to the exterior design discussion there were comments made on the parking and retail space and the change to the single 2-story looking proposal was in response to changes to the parking, which made the retail more successful. HSI and the community were surprised to see the 4-story looking addition replaced by a 2-story single story looking addition, but she didn't believe the SRA would be disappointed to see the additional height in the current 4-story proposal.

No one else in the assembly wished to speak.

Miller stated that the current design has a lot of nice elements, including the combination of the curtain wall and the punched openings, however, there should be more of a conversation between the two new facades with vertical elements at the brick and a less open curtain wall if the curtain colors did not match. The cantilever is nice, and she was in favor of the asymmetry, but if there is a huge objection to those aspects that could prevent the project from being built, they could also not be incorporated. The roofline appears to match that of the building across the street which ties in the new design.

Kennedy raised concerns with sending the current design back to the SRA with comments only and suggested a representative from the DRB attend the SRA meeting to encourage the approval of a viable project rather than have the SRA continue the project for several more months. Becker agreed. Ricciarelli asked if the current scheme or the scheme suggested by Perras be sent to the SRA. Chair Durand suggested revising the latter scheme. Jaquith suggested incorporating all DRB comments in the revised design and returning to the DRB again to present it. Chair Durand agreed. Becker raised concerns with whether the SRA would be in favor of the current massing which was presented to the SRA for 3-months, but they would not recommend approval. When they were presented with the shorter massing the SRA recommended approval despite not being in favor of the shorter massing. The east cantilever is subtler than the one on the north, although both help break up the façade. The Board agreed. Ricciarelli

noted that both provide a shadow line. Jaquith suggested the design team create the best building to meet their program and that all available DRB members attend the SRA meeting since it's the DRB's job to be the judges of good design.

Miller noted that the public comment letters overwhelmingly supported a taller building because it fit into the urban context better. Jaquith noted that property is within the B5 zone and could be a lot taller than what's proposed. Ricciarelli agreed.

Perras suggested a continuance to allow the design team to revise their proposal implementing the DRB's strategies with their current program of townhomes combined with flats. Ricciarelli felt confident in the feedback received by the Board. Newhall-Smith stated that it would be best if the design team spoke with Executive Director, Tom Daniel, because the current design was rejected by the SRA. Perras clarified that the DRB is requesting that the principles be applied to a revised version of the current design, and they are not suggesting an approval of the current design as-is. Ricciarelli noted that program has changed so that the cantilever may be eliminated but many were enamored with the feature.

Becker noted that the better parking configuration, the larger retail space, and the elimination of the cantilever may have been why the SRA pushed the design forward to the DRB. The Board noted that they were in favor of the cantilever but had no issue with eliminating it.

**VOTE:** Perras: Motion to continue to the next regular meeting on January 25, 2023.  
Seconded by: Jaquith.

Roll Call: Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras and Chair Durand were in favor. Passes 5-0.

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

---

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

## **New / Old Business**

---

1. Board Elections:
  - a. Chair
  - b. Vice Chair

Newhall-Smith stated that Paul Durand is the current Chair and Helen Sides was the Vice Chair who resigned from the DRB. Paul Durand has expressed interest in remaining the Chair and Mark Perras has expressed interest in becoming Vice Chair, and these elections would become an annual vote. The Board decided against waiting until all Board members were present to vote. Perras stated that he felt comfortable leading the meetings in Durand's absence. Kennedy noted that Perras does an outstanding job in Durand's absence. The Board agreed.

**VOTE:** Miller: Motion to approve Paul Durand as Chair and Mark Perras as Vice Chair for 2023 with a vote to be continued annually. Seconded by: Jaquith.

Roll Call: Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras and Durand were in favor. Passes 5-0.

2. Approval of Minutes:

a. October 26, 2022

**VOTE:** Perras: Motion to approve the October 26, 2022 regular meeting minutes.

Seconded by: Miller.

Roll Call: Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, and Perras were in favor. Durand recused himself due to his absence. Passes 4-0.

b. November 16, 2022

**VOTE:** Perras: Motion to approve the November 16, 2022 regular meeting minutes.

Seconded by: Miller.

Roll Call: Kennedy, Miller, Perras and Durand were in favor. Jaquith recused himself due to his absence. Passes 4-0.

3. Staff Updates, if any:

Newhall-Smith stated that she's done a lot of enforcement work, such as the recent application for American Flatbread and the owners at Village Tavern filed for a small project review with the SRA for the lattice installed at their patio. The applicant was not able to attend the last SRA meeting, so the matter was continued to January. The banners at 285 Derby Street will be removed soon but required a bucket truck. The owner of Notch has had some sign challenges and she suggested a blade sign like Real Pirates, and he thought it could work. She could work with the owner on their application, and this would eliminate banners being used on the building and blade signs can remain empty if the space is vacant. The Board agreed that it could also eliminate the use of A-frame signs.

Perras noted that the vinyl signs at the UPS store were visible in the 119-211 Washington Street application that changed ownership approximately 1-year ago. Kennedy noted that the previous signs were vinyl, and the current sign is backlit. Newhall-Smith asked if the sign design changed. Miller replied that it was called Mailboxes, etc. prior to the COVID pandemic. The Board agreed that the current sign did not come before the DRB. Perras noted that his issue is with their use of temporary banners.

Kennedy stated that the Starbucks sign also changed, which is also backlit white sign with green letters that was grandfathered in, the DRB reviewed a lit blade sign only.

Miller raised concern with the rental sign at the RCG building above The Derby on the corner of Derby and Washington Street. Newhall-Smith replied that those signs are allowed to remain in place for certain time periods, which she will confirm.

Miller requested the rules related to lattice work that was installed at the Village Tavern. Newhall-Smith replied that the owner has approval for their outdoor dining area but requires approval to change the look of it. Miller noted that outdoor dining

activates the street, but East India Square is a plaza and that's why she has issues with the use of lattice. Perras noted that they had expanded dining and the same lattice was extended out to the edge of the pedestrian walkway. That lattice has now been replaced to on top of the low wall at the patio and that is a precedent they should not allow.

### **Adjournment**

Jaquith: Motion to adjourn. Seconded by: Miller.

Roll Call: Jaquith, Kennedy, Miller, Perras and Chair Durand were in favor. Passes 5-0.

Meeting is adjourned at 8:15PM.

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