

**CITY OF BEVERLY
PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES**

BOARD OR COMMISSION: Design Review Board
DATE: June 3, 2021
LOCATION: Virtual Meeting via Google Hangout Meets
MEMBERS PRESENT: Sandra Cook (Chair), Ellen Flannery, Caroline Baird Mason, Chelsea Zakas, Joel Margolis, Matthew Ulrich, Emily Hutchings
MEMBERS ABSENT: Rachel Poor
RECORDER: Stacia Chamberlain

Chair Cook calls the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

This is a virtual meeting with a special meeting format as required to honor Governor Baker's State of Emergency declared due to the national crisis of COVID-19.

Signs

1. 41 Enon Street, Dunkin'

This is located in the CG zoning district. One (1) wall sign including the name of the business; the sign is internally illuminated. Four (4) double sided directional signs; the signs are not illuminated. One (1) replacement pylon for double sided freestanding sign; the sign is internally illuminated. The sign complies with the Ordinance.

Bill Gavagin, Poyant Signs, presents the sign proposal. He discusses how the Dunkin' Donuts franchise has recently undergone rebranding, to Dunkin'. The signs are in essence new branding, re-facing on existing sign cabinets and frames.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter:

Flannery: Moves to approve the sign as presented. Margolis seconds. The motion carries 5-0.

2. 317 Cabot Street, U.S. Taekwondo Center

This is in the CC zoning district. One (1) wall sign including the name of the business, the sign is not illuminated. The sign complies with the Ordinance.

The applicant gives an overview of the sign proposal. The sign proposed will be larger than the existing sign. The existing sign, facing the street, is located on the part of the building that can be considered a front facade. Instead of a graphic sign, the applicant intends to install the logo and business name as lettering.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter:

Cook: Moves to approve the sign as presented. Mason seconds. The motion carries 5-0.

3. 232 Rantoul Street, Old Planters Brewery & Taproom

This is in the CC zoning district. One (1) wall sign including the name of the business and type of business; the sign is not illuminated. The sign does not comply with the ordinance due to size,

and requires a special permit. The ordinance only permits a wall sign up to 25 square feet for this location. Since the proposed wall sign is greater than that, it will require a special permit.

Matt Sullivan, applicant and owner of Old Planters, presents the sign proposal. He highlights that they would like to apply for a special permit for the signage, as it's larger than allowed but like the design. It is intended to be painted on the building.

Ulrich asks if the blade sign is necessary. Zakas points out that it's already there and good for foot traffic. Flannery wants to know if Sullivan is presenting because the signage is too large. He says yes, they're presenting to the board because the lettering is too large, but they feel that the proposed signage is balanced, pleasant, and they would like to keep the design, as it's not too much larger than what is allowed by right. Ulrich asks whether having only Brewery & Taproom complies: yes, if 'Old Planters' was not included in the proposal, it would comply without a special permit. The applicant would have to choose between one or the other. Zakas and Cook feel that it looks good and appropriate on the building and the size is right.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter:

Cook: Moves to recommend the Zoning Board of Appeals approve the special permit for the proposed signage as show on the plan. Flannery seconds. The motion carries 5-0.

4. 279 Cabot Street, Sblended

This is in the CC zoning district. One (1) wall sign including the name of the business; the sign is not illuminated. The sign complies with the Ordinance.

Ariana Puopolo, the applicant, speaks about the proposed design. She states that they had held off on signage because the building was under construction above the store and the awning over the building was or was not going to stay. The awning is staying, but the sign is not considered an awning.

Cook wants to know if the sizing of the sign can fit within the awning height vertically; Puopolo says that yes, it will be. Ulrich says that it looks like it's tacked up on the awning and wonders whether it will be flush with the awning. Zakas agrees that the sign is vertically aligned with the band of the awning. All members express that the sign should fit better than it appears in the Photoshop image; Puopolo clarifies that indeed it will fit and not jut above the awning.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter:

Flannery: Moves to approve the sign as presented. Zakas seconds. The motion carries 5-0.

5. 39 Hale Street, Hale Farm

This is in the R-10 zoning district. One (1) freestanding sign including the name of the organization, and slogan; the sign is not illuminated. The sign, being located in a residential zoning district, is legally nonconforming. A special permit is not required as long as the new sign does not exceed the nonconformity of the old sign. The applicant reduced the height of the sign to be the same as the previous sign, therefore a special permit is not required.

Sue Goganian, Director of Historic Beverly, presents the sign proposal. The signs proposed are designed to be more durable.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter:

Margolis: Moves to approve the sign as presented. Mason seconds. The motion carries 5-0.

6. 5 Lakeview Avenue, The Beverly

This is in the R-10 zoning district. One (1) freestanding sign including the name of the business; the sign is internally illuminated. The sign, being located in a residential zoning district, is legally nonconforming. A special permit is not required as long as the new sign does not exceed the nonconformity of the old sign. The previous sign was also internally illuminated. The previous sign was approved, in 1997, as a 6' x 3' freestanding sign. That is just the rectangular sign area including the text, not including the sign post. The new sign is also 6' x 3', not including the sign post.

Alisha Etheredge presents their sign proposal. She remarks that the proposed sign will no longer be illuminated. Zakas clarifies that the proposed sign does comply with the 1997 approval; she wants to know about the illumination. Etheredge says that they changed their mind about the illumination. Zakas and Cook point out that if the sign owner wanted illumination later on, they would have to come back to the DRB for approval. Alisha confirms her understanding of this. Margolis is concerned that if they install the sign now and want to illuminate the sign later, some deconstruction of the sign would need to happen. Cook agrees. Flannery is concerned about the lighting; Ulrich recommends treating the brick for aesthetics, but he defers to the committee about lighting. Cook remarks that the illumination of the sign is ultimately up to the owners to choose and apply for lighting allowances in future.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter:

Cook: Moves to approve the sign as presented, but not illuminated. If they want to add illumination, the applicant will have to come back to the DRB for approval. Zakas seconds. The motion carries 5-0.

7. 730 Hale Street, Achieve Performance + Wellness

This is located in the CN zoning district. One (1) wall sign including the name of the business and logo; the sign is externally illuminated. One (1) window sign including the name of the business, logo, and contact information. One (1) projecting sign including the name of the business and logo; the sign is not illuminated. The sign complies with the Ordinance.

Rob Gagnon, the applicant, presents the sign proposal. There is no existing signage on the facade of the building above the entrance of the business.

Ulrich asks Zakas if the signs are conforming; the small one on the door is under review, not the large sticker on the left-hand facade window. Gagnon confirms that he is currently looking for approval for the three compliant signs: the banner, the blade, and the door. Flannery wants clarification as to what material the banner is made of; as long as it isn't a permanent banner with flimsy material, she's happy with it. Mason says that regarding the large window sticker, she would not support it in future; Rob states that he may change his plan for this window decal later.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter:

Flannery: Moves to approve the signs as presented. Cook seconds. The motion carries 5-0.

8. 211 Rantoul Street, Topp Salad

This is in the CC and Depot Parking Overlay zoning districts. One (1) wall sign including the name of the business and logo; the sign is internally illuminated. One (1) projecting sign including the abbreviated business name and logo, the sign is not illuminated. Ten (10) window signs; two (2) on the doors

including the name of the business and hours of operation, eight (8) on the windows including the business logo. One (1) sandwich board sign including the name of the business and hours of operation.

The signs comply with the Ordinance.

Brandon Currier presents the sign proposal. Ulrich is concerned about the beige paper strip inside the building; Currier states that that's interior brown paper posted by the building owner and will be removed; they are not part of the sign proposal. He's concerned about the blade sign; Zakas states that the only problem they see is that the blade sign cannot be internally illuminated. Currier states that per the design, the proposed sign is internally illuminated. Cook and Zakas clarify that if Currier wanted internal illumination he would need to present this to the Zoning Board of Appeals. Currier says that if they cannot get approval, they do have an alternative plan, to have external illumination. Zakas clarifies that external illumination is allowed and could be approved by the DRB. Mason asks about whether the sandwich board is legal as per the city council, given that there have been special rules due to covid-19. Margolis wants to know if the sandwich sign is allowed by right and if the council will change the legality of sandwich signs outside later. Mason wants to know if they approve the sandwich board sign and the city council would grandfather the rule for having the sandwich board out on display. Cook encourages the applicant to seek a special permit for the internal illumination for the blade sign, as she thinks it looks good. All members agree and support the applicant seeking a permit for internal illumination.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter:

Cook: Moves to approve the sign as presented, with the sandwich board approved subject to city council approval, and they will recommend to the ZBA to approve the blade sign internal illumination. Zakas seconds. The motion carries 5-0.

9. David Cutler --Modification to a Site Plan: 108 Bridge Street

This is in the CC zoning district. This plan is by right and has received approval from the Planning Board. The applicant is returning for a modification to the approved plan that affects all elevations and slightly affects the site layout.

The applicant is requesting a modification to the right facade, because the neighbor at 2 Carleton Ave has expressed concern about all of the windows, and having a lack of privacy as the windows will look down into his backyard. The neighbor had the opportunity to comment on the facade earlier in the process during the Site Plan Review at the Planning Board meeting. The applicant, in place of the windows on the rear facade, extended the length of the deck and added additional trim details.

The applicant is also requesting a modification to the rear facade, in particular to build the rear roofs as shown in the attached rendering in order to meet the code requirements for future solar panel placement and to comply with the building code. He is referring to the State Building Code that Beverly follows and yes, it requires solar-ready roofs, depending on the orientation of the structure.

Mr. Cutler presents the modification plan. Flannery wants to know if the owner at 2 Carleton wanted all 8 windows to be removed from the design; she wants to know if there will be windows on other walls for those rooms. Mr. Cutler says yes, there will still be plenty of windows. Cook wants to know why windows on the lowest level would necessitate a concern for privacy, due to elevation. Mr. Cutler states that the first floor would indeed have a view to his property due to street slope. Cook also expresses that having a deck, as placed in the modification plan, would still have a line of sight into the neighbor's home. Mr. Cutler agrees and adds that not having the windows as the original plan included,

does affect the interior layout of the proposed property. Flannery points out that it may be a drawback to have interior walls with too many windows. Cook highlights how some might purchase end units for extra windows for cross ventilation and lighting. Flannery states that she is less concerned with the aesthetics. Flannery and Cook request to see the floor plan to know how the living space would be affected. Mr. Cutler provides the floor plan and members are satisfied with the amount of natural light from other windows.

The DRB members move on to the second issue about the roof modification. The members have no comments and agree that the modification is necessary.

Mr. Cutler seeks input on the color of the siding, and members agree that the blue/grey color combination is an improvement over the yellow/red/green combination.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter:

Zakas: Moves to recommend to the Planning Board to approve the modifications as presented. Cook seconds. The motion carries 5-0.

10. Joe Skomurski Modification to a Site Plan: 0 Everett Street/718 Hale Street

This is in the CN zoning district. The original plan received approval from the Planning Board. The applicant is returning for a modification to the approved plan that affects all elevations and landscaping.

Dan Ricciarelli, architect, presents the modification proposal. He itemizes the concerns as expressed by the DRB. Mason was offended that they made the changes before they came to the DRB. She expressed that they are not new developers and knew the proper procedure, but she feels that it sets a bad precedent to make changes before presenting them to the Board. Skomurski states that that wasn't his intention. Margolis states that he can't really relate to the changes versus the old approved building the way they have presented the material; he feels that it's an unacceptable way to present the changes. Ulrich asks about the landscaping, saying he's not comfortable with the changes being done already without input. He believes that he may print out the images and go look at the property on-site. Flannery says she's extremely disappointed with what she saw on the property, concurring with Mason in terms of how it was done. Their changes do not represent what the Board approved. Cook is disappointed with the loss of the gables among other details; she feels that it's too modernized and removed from what they previously approved. Margolis states that he is not sure that the modified site plan is not necessarily in the best interest of the city as well as the builder. Zakas takes responsibility for the lack of photos for the presentation; Cook states that it was the responsibility of the builder and not Zakas for having been prepared with images for review. All Board members are disappointed with the presentation. Cook and Margolis would like to continue reviewing the modified site plan and may seek to meet on-site officially. Cook seeks input from Zakas on posting formally online a site visit and some members express that they are willing to organize for such a visit.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter:

Cook: Moves to approve to continue site plan review. They will make time for board members to take a look on-site. The plan should be revisited in next month's meeting and the applicant will come back with materials illustrating side-by-side images of what was approved and what changes were made. Mason seconds. The motion carries 5-0.

11. New/Other Business

· Approve Draft Meeting Minutes:

- April 1, 2021 & May 6, 2021

Cook: Motions to approve April 1, 2021 and May 6, 2021 minutes as presented with edits by Flannery. Mason seconds. The motion carries 5-0.

· Sign located at:

- Margolis asks if they approved the sign that says Montserrat College sign on the corner of Cabot St. and Winter St.; Hutchings clarifies that the sign is exempt as a school sign. It was reviewed by the Planning Department.

12. Adjourn

Cook: Motions to adjourn. Margolis seconds. The motion carries 5-0.

Meeting adjourned at 8:48 pm.