

**CITY OF BEVERLY  
PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES**

**BOARD OR COMMISSION:** Design Review Board  
**DATE:** July 8, 2021  
**LOCATION:** Hybrid--City Hall & Virtual Meeting via Google Hangout Meets  
**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Sandra Cook (Chair), Ellen Flannery, Caroline Baird Mason, Rachel Poor, Chelsea Zakas, Joel Margolis, Matthew Ulrich  
**MEMBERS ABSENT:**  
**OTHERS PRESENT:** Denise Deschamps  
**RECORDER:** Stacia Chamberlain

Chair Cook calls the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. This is a hybrid meeting, being held at City Hall as well as virtually.

**Signs**

**1. 38 Enon St., Speedway LLC. and 295 Cabot Street, Speedway LLC.**

This is in the CG zoning district. The sign is a replacement facade on the existing pylon and will not be illuminated. The sign complies with the ordinance.

A representative from Sign Design Inc. presents the sign proposals. He describes how the signs are replacements for the gasoline pumps.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter:

Ms. Flannery: Moves to approve the sign as presented. Ms. Mason seconds: Motion passes 6-0.

**2. 152 Conant Street, Mass General Brigham Home Care**

This is in the IR zoning district. The application is for two wall signs, one for the primary and secondary facades. They will be internally illuminated. The signs comply with the ordinance.

Heather Hopkins Dudko, the applicant, presents the sign proposal. These are replacements for existing signs.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter:

Ms. Flannery: Moves to approve the sign as presented. Ms. Cook seconds. The motion carries 7-0 (Ms. Poor arrives late).

**3. 445 Rantoul Street, Beverly Smoke Shop**

This is in the CC zoning district. The application is for one wall sign on the primary facade with internal illumination. The sign complies with the Ordinance.

A representative from Falcon Graphics speaks about the proposed design. He has a prototype of the letter 'P' of the neon sign. Mr. Margolis wants to know if this is the only sign: The applicant confirms that there is only one neon sign. Ms. Zakas clarifies that there is another sign they're considering putting up which isn't on the application and they'll need to return with an application for that sign.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter:

Ms. Mason: Moves to approve the sign as presented. Ms. Flannery seconds. The motion carries 7-0.

**4. 330 Rantoul Street, Garden City Tattoo**

This is in the CC zoning district. The application is for a projecting sign with internal illumination and for one window sign with no illumination. The window sign complies with the ordinance, the projecting sign is legally nonconforming due to existing internal illumination.

Mr. Margolis recuses himself from the voting process due to his involvement in the real estate deal with the applicant.

Andrew Bixby, the applicant, presents the proposed signage. Bixby discusses the window signage and existing internally illuminated projecting sign. Bixby explains the illumination for the projecting sign is on a timer. Flannery asks what hours the projecting sign will be illuminated. Bixby says the sign will be illuminated from sundown until 8:00 PM.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter:

Ms. Cook: Moves to approve the sign as presented. Mr. Ulrich seconds. The motion carries 6-0.

**5. 38 Rantoul Street, Beverly Coin, Jewelry, Records & Estates Appraisals**

This is located in the CC zoning district. The sign application is for one wall sign on the primary facade. It is to have external illumination. The sign complies with the ordinance.

Stephen Eck, the applicant, presents the sign proposal. This is a sign replacement at the existing sign location. Ms. Cook asks whether the initials in the sign are necessary. Eck replies that it's sort of a logo. Ms. Cook replies that it makes the sign look busy and difficult to read; Ms. Mason feels the same. Ms. Poor is asked for her opinion: maximizing the real estate of the sign by changing the layout of the initials and the business name. Mr. Eck feels that this is an appropriate consideration. He thinks that the initials can be eliminated, and are not essential. These are suggestions only, the members mention.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter:

Ms. Cook: Moves to approve the sign as presented but without the abbreviated letters above the words 'Coin and Records'. Ms. Zakas seconds. The motion carries 7-0.

**6. 289 Rantoul Street, Taku Sushi Bar**

This is located in the CC zoning district. The application is for one awning sign with no illumination. The sign complies with the ordinance.

Jinyou Lin, the applicant, presents the sign proposal. Ms. Cook wants to know if there will be a new awning; Lin clarifies that there will not.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter:

Mr. Ulrich: Moves to approve the signs as presented. Ms. Flannery seconds. The motion carries 7-0.

**7. 119 Bridge Street, At Your Convenience Store**

This is in the CN zoning district. The application is for one wall sign on the primary facade that will be externally illuminated, and one sandwich board sign. The signs comply with the ordinance.

Margaret Mulligan, the applicant, presents the sign proposal. This will be a brand new sign at the space. Mulligan describes the dimensions of the sign, and illumination. Ms. Cook wants clarification about the sandwich board: Ms. Zakas clarifies that yes, the City Council will need to approve the sandwich board sign, after the DRB has recommended it.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter:

Ms. Zakas: Moves to approve the signs as presented, and recommend the City Council approve the sandwich board sign. Ms. Flannery seconds. The motion carries 7-0.

**8. 296B Cabot Street, Heavenly Licks**

This is in the CC zoning district. The application is for one wall sign on the primary facade and one projecting sign. The signs will not be illuminated. The signs comply with the ordinance.

Kara Sasso, the applicant, presents the sign proposal. The electrical specifications for the sign have been updated. The 3-dimensional ice cream cone sign would be on the corner of Cabot Street.

Ms. Poor recommends that the sign could benefit from some depth in the logo; Ms. Sasso clarifies that the sign company they are working with has recommended flat letters for the location and the materials being used. Ms. Sasso says that she's open to suggestions. Ms. Poor recommends that Ms. Sasso speak with the sign design company to see if it's possible to have the logo letters protrude somewhat. Ms. Sasso says that she will do so and may return to the board.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter:

Ms. Cook: Moves to approve the signs as presented. Ms. Flannery seconds. The motion carries 7-0.

**9. 281 Cabot Street, Simply Placed**

This is in the CC zoning district. The application is for one projecting sign with no illumination. The sign complies with the ordinance.

Sydney Ortega, the applicant, presents the sign proposal. Mr. Margolis wants clarification on what the business is: Ms. Ortega clarifies that it's a home decor retail store. In the future, Ms. Ortega will return to DRB to seek approval for vinyl window signs with these details as well as contact information.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter:

Ms. Cook: Moves to approve the signs as presented. Ms. Flannery seconds. The motion carries 7-0.

**10. 131 Rantoul Street, Railway Tavern**

This is in the CC zoning district. The application includes two wall signs, on the primary and secondary facades. The signs will be internally illuminated. The signs comply with the ordinance.

Bradley Atkins, of BNR Beverly, Inc., presents the sign proposal.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter:

Mr. Ulrich: Moves to approve the signs as presented. Mr. Margolis seconds. The motion carries 7-0.

**11. 181 Elliott Street, Regina Pizzeria**

This is in the IG zoning district. The application is for two wall signs, one each for the primary and secondary facades, and for one projecting sign. They will be internally illuminated. The signs require special permits.

Michael Goggin, the applicant, discusses the sign proposal. He mentions that the Cummings Center approves of their proposed signage. He states that according to city regulations, the color of the sign lettering on the first floor may need special approval, as the signage with the colors presented are consistent with their corporate logo. Mr. Goggin says that he has spoken with the ZBA and his proposal was received favorably and that there is precedent for the approval. Ms. Flannery wants to know how large the blade sign is; Ms. Zakas clarifies that the sign will need city approval for the protrusion of the blade sign. Ms. Cook wants to know where this location is found in the Cummings Center; it's located straight through the center past the entrance by a few buildings, which is why they would like a larger blade sign for visibility. Goggin clarifies that this isn't a traditional blade sign, it's a projecting sign. Ms. Poor asks about the 'Welcome' signs on the awnings: the presentation on the computer does not show that both awnings have the same text. The documents being passed among members in person do indeed have the same greeting, and there must be a file problem. The members discuss the scale of the projecting sign and the size of the building as well as visibility. Some members feel it should be smaller; Goggin says that they would like approval today for the two wall signs, and they could resize the protruding sign and have it reassessed by the DRB.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter:

Ms. Zakas: Moves to approve, first, the signage as presented with the condition that the building inspector review and approve the signage if the coloring is by right; and second, to recommend that the ZBA approve a special permit for the projecting sign, as slightly reduced in size, as well as colored lettering, if required. Ms. Cook seconds. The motion carries 7-0.

**12. 136 Dodge Street, Grassy Roots**

This is in the CN zoning district. The sign is a wall sign on the primary facade and will not be illuminated. The sign complies with the ordinance.

A representative for the applicant discusses the sign proposal. Ms. Cook wants to know if the letters are painted: the representative clarifies that they are all laser-cut acrylic. Ms. Cook recommends he come back for approval of the window signs; the applicant will do so, as these window signs are only temporary.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter:

Ms. Cook: Moves to approve the signs as presented. Ms. Flannery seconds. The motion carries 7-0.

**13. 50 Dodge Street, Coldwell Banker Realty**

This is in the CG zoning district. The application consists of a wall sign on the primary facade and a

monument tenant panel. They will have external and internal illumination. The sign complies with the ordinance.

Vickie Ashmead, representative from Sign Design Inc., presents the sign proposal. The sign changes reflect a corporate rebranding effort.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter:

Ms. Cook: Moves to approve the signs as presented. Ms. Mason seconds. The motion carries 7-0.

Ms. Cook moves that the board take a 5-minute break. Ms. Zakas seconds.

#### **14. Modification to a Site Plan: 0 Everett Street/718 Hale Street**

Joe Skomurski and Daniel Ricciarelli are present to discuss the site plan modifications. Emily Hutchings is present as a representative for the city planning staff. The board will also allow public comment.

Dan Ricciarelli, senior architect of the property, of 10 Derby Square in Salem, and Joe Skomurski discuss the architectural differences between the original plans and the property as it exists now. Ms. Cook opens the discussion amongst the board. Ms. Flannery wants to know why the changes were made without DRB approval. Mr. Skomurski admits that it was an oversight and an unintentional mistake. Ms. Mason says that the architectural elements they did not include were more attractive and current changes diminish its charm, especially the clapboard design. Mr. Skomurski clarifies that the building is not as large as they anticipated. Mr. Margolis expresses that the architects made significant changes and their efforts look like they were trying to avoid disapproval. Mr. Ulrich seconds that the shingle changes make the building now look like a box and have lost their charm. Ms. Poor concurs; Ms. Cook agrees as well. She would like to see the gable details and shingle flair put back on the building. Mr. Margolis believes the dormer should as well. Ms. Cook states that perhaps certain changes were made due to interior space constraints; Mr. Skomurski clarifies that it was an on-site framing issue. Mr. Ricciarelli concurs that there were on-site constraints. Ms. Cook disagrees that it would not be possible to frame the dormer and roof as originally designed. She is satisfied with the enclosed balconies. Mr. Margolis takes issue with the ability of the architects in this case to do as they please, and if this is a general practice, then their role as DRB is superseded and unnecessary. Ms. Hutchings clarifies that the DRB makes recommendations to the Planning Board and reviews applications. In a case like this, the DRB makes a recommendation, the Planning Board (PB) determines if the recommendations are minor or major; if it's a major change, it needs to go through a public hearing. Ms. Mason wants to know if their recommendations for this property are considered major modifications. Ms. Hutchings says that DRB doesn't make that determination. Ms. Mason wants the board to be explicit about the recommendations to the PB. Ms. Cook looks to all board members. Mr. Margolis would like the gable details to be changed. Mr. Ulrich agrees that the flare on the gables should be changed. Ms. Zakas agrees about the gables.

The board moves on to the topic of landscaping on the property. Mr. Ulrich feels that at the Hale St. elevation, he would like the plants to be put back at that side. Mr. Skomurski says that the area there is actually very narrow and was very crowded. Mr. Ulrich would like for their landscapers to come back and recreate what they proposed for the Hale St. side landscaping. He also mentions that the spot in the back corner, as seen from Hale and Everett Streets, is very tight. Mr. Skomurski responds that that area was compressed in order to have snow storage. Mr. Ulrich was concerned that the spot was shortened to make another parking space, and Mr. Skomurski clarifies that that wouldn't be possible due to property size constraints and the plan for there to be space to move snow that is shoveled or plowed.

Ms. Flannery asks about the stone; it was changed to flagstone from the original proposal. Ms. Cook's concern is the planting along the wall on Hale Street, and she believes that if the landscape architect was able to fit the plants in as illustrated, then it should be able to be done in that way. She would like to see the plantings put back. Ms. Zakas agrees about the Hale Street plantings as well. Mr. Skomurski says that the new owners of the front lot want to do something different with the lawn and would like to put in a fence. Joe says that to put up a privacy fence, it isn't up to the DRB to determine if a fence is allowed. He wants to know if the tenants can change the landscaping as they wish in the future. Emily clarifies that the DRB is not in a position to make that type of decision now and is a separate issue from the current landscaping conversation. A future conversation of this type would also include the Planning Board.

Ms. Cook opens the meeting to the public for comments.

1. Peter Johnson, resident at 77 Hale Street. He is concerned that this area is where children congregate for the school bus. The wall obstructs the ability of children to be picked up at the bus stop due to constraints at that location.

In response, Mr. Skomurski says that the car parked in the way along the sidewalk should not be there. He says that he could ask residents to not park in the way for the sidewalk to be accessed. Ms. Cook believes that something should be done so that a car cannot be parked there. Mr. Ulrich asks Mr. Skomurski what power they have in this situation about the condo rules for this issue. Mr. Skomurski says that the condo rules have not been established yet and the residents were just moving in. He says that he will speak with the new owners. Ms. Cook asks if condo rules and/or deed rules can be revised. Mr. Skomurski details the division of space on the lot, for front and back property ownership. Mr. Margolis wants to know if Mr. Skomurski is part of the condo association: he clarifies that no, he is not a trustee. The owners are aware of this current meeting and understand that the DRB must be satisfied. Ms. Hutchings notes that it's not legal to block a public way and the parking officer will address that issue, and states that the DRB needs to determine whether they recommend the proposed changes with certain conditions as discussed. Returning to the issue of parking, Mr. Ulrich says that the wall should be extended to prevent parking along the sidewalk facing Everett Street. Ms. Cook says that as the parking area was designed, it was not a deterrent to the use of the space illegally. She notes that there is a 'no parking to corner' sign at that corner.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter:

Ms. Cook: Motions to recommend the approval of the original design with the condition that the gables are returned, the horizontal shingle flair on 1st and 2nd floor level are returned, the gable over the Everett St. entrance be changed to a flat panel, the landscaping on Hale St. should be returned as proposed, and stone wall along Everett St. extended to prevent a parking spot. The motion carries 7-0.

## 11. New/Other Business

· Approve Draft Meeting Minutes:

- June 3, 2021 (as available):  
The minutes for June 3, 2021 are not available for review so they will address them in the next meeting.
- Mr. Margolis discusses that he's concerned about the validity of the DRB and its ability to shape design decisions in the city, citing that there is a large, steel structure, about 12 feet tall, located at the Cummings Center that did not require review. Ms. Cook points out that the parties responsible for these sorts of signs should be brought in to have a

discussion with the DRB.

**12. Adjourn**

Ms. Cook: Motions to adjourn. Ms. Mason seconds. The motion carries 7-0.

Meeting adjourned at 9:12 pm.