

**CITY OF BEVERLY
PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES**

BOARD OR COMMISSION: Design Review Board
DATE: January 7, 2021
LOCATION: **Virtual Meeting**
MEMBERS PRESENT: Sandra Cook (Chair), Joel Margolis (Vice Chair), Ellen Flannery, Emily Hutchings, Caroline Baird Mason, Rachel Poor, Matthew Ulrich, Chelsea Zakas
MEMBERS ABSENT:
RECORDER: Sharlyne Woodbury

Chair Cook calls the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m.

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

Signs

1. 407-409 Cabot Street **Fuji Hibachi & Sushi**

This is in the CG zoning district. The application includes one wall sign internally illuminated, and one replacement pylon panel with business name with internal illumination. Both signs comply with the Ordinance. A window sign is proposed but not included with the current application. No special permits.

Vi at CT Signs & Graphics represents the applicant. Straightforward design concept. They are replacing an existing sign with same style channel letters and measurements. The colors are black and white.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter.

Margolis: Motion to approve the sign as presented. Flannery seconds. The motion carries 7-0.

2. 407-409 Cabot Street **Azad's Barbershop**

This is in the CG zoning district. The application includes one wall sign and one replacement pylon panel with business name both with internal illumination. Both signs comply with the Ordinance. A window sign is proposed but not included with the current application. No special permits.

Vi at CT Signs & Graphics represents the applicant. Straightforward design concept. They are replacing an existing sign with same style channel letters and measurements. The colors are blue and white. Cook inquires about the business address. The sign designer clarifies this business and the previously discussed business are both located in the same plaza.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter.

Cook: Motions to approve the sign as presented. Poor seconds. The motion carries 7-0.

3. 377 Cabot Street **377 Cabot Street**

This is in the CN zoning district. The application includes one free standing sign for multi-business names with internal illumination. The sign complies with the Ordinance. This is a pre-existing, legal nonconforming sign. No special permits.

Vasu of Fast Signs represents the applicant. Presents to the Board simply design plan discussing the freestanding sign with font variances between the business names and street number. Simple construct and design for a succinct presentation.

Poor offers comments to the sign font stating the art deco appearance is out of place with the rest of the mall. Poor suggests changing the numbering font to a modern font or "Sans Serif". A bolder font is better. Members review and discuss agreeing with Poor's comments. Discussion and suggestions are made with the coloring, material, and illumination for the free-standing sign. Members and Vasu debate the lettering height and limitations for the numbering of the street address. Vasu believes there is not enough space for everything to fit on one line. Members propose keeping everything on one line with Mason's idea of simply "377 Cabot" as sufficient for identifying the street address. Ulrich inquires would there be issues for light refraction. Vasu replies the sign will be aluminum with a matte black finish and steel tubing for the frame. Margolis inquires about additional signage for new stores. Hutchings explains the ordinance and the "anchor" store. Members discuss how a new sign would have to be created since no more slots are available.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter.

Hutchings: Motions to approve the sign as presented with the condition the applicant submit an alternative/revised design for administrative approval. Mason seconds. The motion carries 7-0.

4. 131 Brimbal Ave

The Local Shoppe

This is in the IR zoning district. The application includes replacing one free standing sign for gas price listing with business name, internally illuminated; and wall sign on the primary façade with wrap around text, no internal illumination. Both signs comply with the Ordinance. The Building Inspector determined the signs comply with the ordinance and do not require a special permit.

Mark at Metro Sign and Awning represents the applicant along with Jim Kahl and Liz. Liz begins to present the design until Mark is able to rejoin the meeting after technical difficulties and makes his presentation to the Board. He details the change in sign colors from blue to pink/red with blue accents. This will be an aluminum composite sign with wrap around banner.

Cook inquires how the sign sizes and square footage was determined. Zakas reviews the ordinance and measurements for the Board. Hutchings interjects and notes how the building inspector calculates his measurements, and explains the building inspector determined the wrap around band and arch sign to be one sign. Zakas notes a correction to the square footage of the sign in the staff notes. Hutchings confirms the building inspector reviewed the sign and approved the square footage.

DRB members do not like the wrap around sign with the additional words. Mason and Flannery concur it's too busy noting prior sign did not have writing on the banding. Per Poor, this is out of context with the area. Members particularly do not like the word "Tobacco" advertised. Mark interjects letting the Board know the point is to change to a convenience store with more merchandise possibilities. Poor inquires if the company has a tag line. Hutchings redirects the Board from the content of the sign, to the layout and context, which is the Board purview. The Board should focus on bringing the sign design into context with the area. Members discuss how many words would be appropriate for the band. Mason said the sign speaks for itself as "The Local Shoppe". Members agree. Flannery notes with the name change there's product inside and it's not just a cigarette and gas station. Margolis suggests moving the

words to the windows. Liz wonders if moving the words to the windows is an option. Board members confirm that is an option. There could be a strip at the top and small font. Flannery points out the windows and how they're completely covered currently. Cook instructs applicants are only allowed 20% of each window pane space. Vendors cannot come in and put up posters all over the windows. Hutchings notes window signs must come before the Board for approval. That is a separate process.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter.

Cook: Motion to approve the sign as presented for the space of signage in arched area over the window/door, and the pylon sign above the gas prices, no words on the band, with the condition they return to the Board for approval of additional window signage. Flannery seconds. The motion carries 7-0.

5. 181 Elliott St/500 Cummings Ctr

Merrill Lynch

This is in the IG zoning district. The application includes two wall signs with internal illumination and business name. The signs comply with the Ordinance for a previously approved variance for Cummings Center signage. No special permits.

Heather Dudko represents the applicant and explains the two existing wall signs on the building. They'd like to be replaced at 82 sq ft each, with internal illumination. Bank of America has taken over the branches and which is the reason for the rebranding. Margolis notes the building faces a residential area. Dudko suggests they will conform to the residential area.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter.

Cook: Motion to approve the sign as presented with the condition the illuminated sign be shut off by 10 pm. Mason seconds. The motion carries 7-0.

8:10 pm Hutchings notes Mr. Ibrahim commented publicly on his sign. Hutchings informs Mr. Ibrahim his sign maker spoke on his behalf informing the applicant of the Board's decision.

6. 278 Cabot Street

Nest/Compass

This is in the CC zoning district. The application includes one wall sign and window signage both with no internal illumination and features business name, description, and store hours. The signs comply with the Ordinance.

Margolis recuses himself from this item.

Syndi Zaiger presents for the applicant. Nest is team within Compass. They share the business front with the Cabot Lodge. Poor notes that this sign does not inform the public what the business does. Zaiger notes that they wanted to have some listings on the window. Poor notes that the business name is not self-explanatory. Mason agrees. Mason questions difference between two names, Nest and Compass. Zaiger notes Compass is the broker and Nest is the team working for Compass. Members discuss how the sign is not notable nor informative. Zaiger maintains Compass is one of the biggest real estate brokers in Boston. Members affirm something of better marketability would work for the business. Hutchings reviews the ordinances and sign windows as well as temporary signs with Zaiger.

Cook inquires if this sign is like the other signs in Boston. Zaiger explains Compass is the parent company, and Nest is a team within Compass. Zaiger explains this is what the parent company wants

them to use. Poor explains the sign has too many mixed messages. Hutchings to the Board, if this is what the parent company is allowing, this is it. If Nest would like to return and discuss potential window advertisement geared toward real estate that is welcome. Cook suggests returning with a new design concept for the windows. Zaiger maintains they seek to have the door signage approved as presented. Mason suggests make the bird bigger as a door sign and return with new window design concept.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter.

Hutchings: Motion to approve the wall sign and window signage on the door as presented noting the applicant will return with revised signage for the window.

Mason questions keeping the signage for the door window the same, or if it should be larger. Cook agrees the applicant should return with a larger window sign proposal along with other window signage and real estate listings. Flannery suggests the applicant return with finalized window signage concept, Cook agrees.

Motion amended by Hutchings: Motion to approve the wall sign as presented, and to continue the window signage to the next meeting.

Cook: Motion to continue the window signage to the next meeting. Flannery seconds. The motion carries 6-0.

7. 150 Brimbal Ave

uBreakiFix

This is in the IR zoning district. The application includes one wall sign with business name internally illuminated also featuring parent company business name not internally illuminated. The sign complies with the Ordinance. No special permit. Applicant received landlord conditional approval based upon the raceway being removed with the letters individually lit to match the rest of North Shore Crossing.

Hugh Brown represents the applicant. Simple presentation and straightforward sign. The business is located in the Whole Foods Plaza and maintains continuity with the plaza signs. Board members have little commentary and appreciate the design plans as presented.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter.

Cook: Motion to approve sign as presented. Flannery seconds. The motion carries 7-0.

8. Modification to Site Plan: Site Plan review #141-19

108 Bridge Street

The applicant returns to the Board for approval of the minor modifications. This plan has already been approved by the Planning Board. The proposed modifications affect the street facades on Bridge Street and Carlton Avenue, along with all four building sides; and in general, the architectural details, roof slope, and the front layout.

Tom Alexander represents the client. David Cutler and Daniel Ricciarelli are both present. The property sold from the Frates family to David Cutler. Daniel Ricciarelli presents with Alexander. Alexander addresses the parking issue and notes they went before the Parking and Traffic Commission to which they approved the parking configuration noting it meets all requirements. Ricciarelli reviews the presentation. They reviewed the prior architectural submission and brought back many of those elements. Larger corner boards were presented, carriage house style doors, recessed entryways and more uniformity amongst the windows. Board members appreciate the changes and note that they

brought back the spirit of the original approval. Members agree the changes are a vast improvement. Reintroduction to the architectural details and individual colored units promote neighborhood context and unit individuality. There are no vinyl corners, all full composite trim. Cook notes the balconies provide texture and appreciates the color scheme presented. Flannery inquires if the landscape plan is submitted or if this was for presentation only. Ricciarelli notes the landscape plan is part of the original proposal and carried over. Members approve of the plan improvements.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter.

Cook: Motion to recommend to the Planning Board they approve the minor modifications to the site plan and project as presented. Ulrich seconds. The motion carries 7-0.

9. Supplemental Review to Site Plan: Site Plan Review #140-19 Depot Square Phase II, LLC

The applicant returns to the Board as part of a previous condition placed by the Planning Board. The condition references the applicant must return to the DRB for a final review of vent location prior to issuing a building permit.

Cook recuses herself from this item.

Krista Ziemba from SV design and Kristen Poulin with Beverly Crossing, represent the applicant. Ziemba notes they return to the Board to satisfy a condition from a prior meeting and presents to the Board the proposed vent locations for the buildings. Members review the renderings and note they are difficult to read, however; appreciate the attention to detail regarding the vent design and placement. Hutchings comments they've done well consolidating the vents and locating them under the balconies. As long as the ducts are painted to camouflage into the building the vents are well disguised per the condition. Flannery notes this task is not easy to make these ducts invisible. They accomplished their task and brought forth a clean look.

Flannery points out per staff note no action required at this time. The Board notes the condition has been met, Hutchings will make a note and go forth before the Planning Board.

There being no further comments or questions regarding the matter. No action required at this time.

10. New/Other Business

Sidebar:

Mason proposes the Board be bolder in the future for projects when structure interrupts the scenscape. Mason refers to two corner lots as examples of discussion emphatically noting the front of the building is an issue. Members discuss the issue of corner lots particularly discussing the front and back of each structure. Mason heavily advocates for a way to review context for these applications as they are contentious. Corner lots are a difficult entity to review. Members debate the pros and cons of having site visits as a Board for contentious projects. Hutchings notes the appropriate context for the Board to conduct site visits in their official capacity.

Margolis, Zakas, and Hutchings discuss meeting evites and the digital packet contents.

a. Draft meeting minutes

Cook: Motions to approve November 5, 2020 minutes as presented with edits by Flannery. Flannery seconds. The motion carries 7-0.

Cook: Motions to approve December 3, 2020 minutes as presented with edits by Flannery. Mason seconds. The motion carries 7-0.

b. Election of Board Chair and Vice Chair

Mason: Motions that Sandy Cook remains Chair through 2021. Poor seconds. The motion carries 7-0.

Cook: Motions that Joel Margolis remains as Vice Chair through 2021. Ulrich seconds. The motion carries 7-0.

11. Adjourn:

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

Meeting adjourned 9:11 pm.

Next meeting February 4, 2021.