



Design Review Board Meeting Minutes
Monday, February 22, 2021
7:30 PM

Board Members:

Mark Gluesing, Chair (P)
Bob Dermody, Board Member (P)
Nelson Hammer, Board Member (P)
Deborah Robinson, Board Member (P)
Steve Tanner, Board Member (P)
Rana Mana-Doerfer, DRB Recording Secretary (P)
Elisa Litchman, Administrative Assistant, Planning & Community Development (P)

Applicants & Attendees:

1. Special permit application by Becky Fong Hughes, Creative Director, Honorcraft representing the Beth Israel Deaconess Hospital located at 148 Chestnut Street applying for signage.
 - Lillian Anderson, Development Admin, BIDH
 - Samantha Sherman, Chief Development Officer, BIDH
2. Amanda Johnson, Gensler representing Bank of America located at 1455 Highland Avenue and applying for façade work.
 - Amanda Johnson, Gensler
 - Corina Ogescu, CBRE
 - Phillip Wright, Gensler
 - Julie Reker, Gensler
3. Tim Parker, Fast Signs representing Greater Boston Addiction Center located at 322 Reservoir Street and applying for signage.
4. Roy Cramer and Evans Huber, attorneys representing LCB Senior Living to be located at 100 West Street applying for site plan review.
 - Evans Huber, Attorney, Frieze Cramer Rosen & Huber
 - Roy Cramer, Attorney, Frieze Cramer Rosen & Huber
 - Anthony Vivirito, The Architectural Team
 - David Kelly, Kelly Engineering Group

- Brandon Li, Kelly Engineering Group
- Ben LaFrance, Hawk Design Inc.
- Lee Bloom, LCB Senior Living
- Michelle Hobbs, The Architectural Team
- Ben LaFrance, Hawk Design Inc.

Mr. Chair called the meeting to order on February 22, 2021 at 7:30 PM EST.

Mr. Chair notified attendees of new public meeting orders issued by the governor of Massachusetts.

Agenda Item 1:

Public Hearing for Beth Israel Deaconess Hospital at 148 Chestnut St to install additional signage onto the building. -Becky Fong Hughes

Ms. Becky Fong Hughes explained to the Board the donor signage the hospital wishes to install. The sign says, "The Trotman Family Outpatient Clinical Center". The donor name portion will be 8.5" high, the Outpatient Clinical Center will be 6.5" high. Both are made of brushed aluminum, solid cut 3/4" thick. They will be tape mounted to the terracotta wall at the double door vestibule entrance.

Mr. Tanner asked Ms. Hughes if the letters are anodized. Ms. Hughes said yes, they are. Mr. Tanner asked if they would consider using stainless steel to match all the other signs around the hospital complex. Ms. Hughes said they would be open to it.

Mr. Dermody asked if the hospital knows if they will be coming back before the Board for any more signs, as there are a lot of signs on the building currently. Samantha Sherman of BIDH said no, they will not be coming back for any more signs.

Ms. Sherman went on to explain that they wanted to make sure that there was appropriate donor recognition, but more importantly that one could also identify the building as one exits the main hospital building. This proposed sign would direct patients over to the Outpatient and Clinical Center from the main hospital. Currently people exiting the main hospital cannot see the sign that faces Chestnut Street nor the one on the bridge. And they also felt like this was a subtle way to provide some directional signage if you're on the Lincoln Street side of the building.

Ms. Robinson agreed with Mr. Dermody that there are a lot of signs on the building. She did have a comment on a detail on page 5 of the packet. In the elevation view it seems that there is a seam in the panel. She asked Ms. Hughes if this was a mistake. Ms. Hughes said yes, it is a mistake, there is no seam in that portion of the sign that appears to split the word Outpatient into two words.

Mr. Hammer asked if the signs are illuminated? Ms. Hughes said they are not. Mr. Hammer said overall he does not have a problem with signage proposed but agreed the building signage is very busy.

Mr. Chair said that this was a concern he had the last time the hospital proposed signage to the Board. He was worried they would get another donation and offer the donor a sign. The sign as it

is currently proposed is 20 square feet. He understands the purpose behind the sign however, he finds it to be too big. He does have some reservations about it but not enough to deny it. It's redeeming quality is that it is recessed and tucked away under the canopy.

Mr. Chair said he would be happy to walk through the building with Ms. Sherman along with other Board members to discuss any future signs they may come back with. While the Board is not averse to them coming back before the Board, they would like the hospital to think about the building and where the signs might best be placed.

Mr. Dermody asked how the proposed sign compares to the other sign on the awning. Ms. Hughes said it is the same size.

Mr. Dermody said he agrees with Mr. Chair regarding the fact that the sign is recessed.

Mr. Dermody asked Ms. Sherman if the standing letters on the opposite side of the driveway were removed. Ms. Sherman said they haven't had anyone onsite at the hospital in over a year due to COVID, including workers/vendors, so the standing letters are still there.

Mr. Chair said he would like the words "Trotman Family" reduced to 7" and for the Outpatient Clinical Center be scaled down proportionally. He also asked for the sign to be made of ½" thick stainless steel.

Motion to approve special permit signage with the condition that the "The Trotman Family" (top line) be 7 inches high, and for lower line "Outpatient Clinical Center" to be adjusted proportionally and for the letters to be ½" stainless steel moved by Mr. Hammer.

Motion was seconded by Mr. Tanner.

Name	Aye	Nay
Mark Gluesing	Aye	
Bob Dermody	Aye	
Nelson Hammer	Aye	
Deborah Robinson	Aye	
Steve Tanner	Aye	

Agenda Item 2:

Bank of America located at 1455 Highland Avenue and applying for façade work. - Amanda Johnson, Gensler

Ms. Johnson came before the Board and presented the exterior renovations they are proposing at the Bank of America located at 1455 Highland Ave. Currently there is a one-story mansard roof with a brick facade that is painted white and an ATM drive aisle located right along the side the Town Hall parking lot. They are proposing to remove the mansard roofline of the building and reclad the upper wall of the building with aluminum panels. The panels are colored white and a dark gray. They propose installing a canopy which extends along the building. The canopy depth will match the existing on Chapel Street side of building and be extended an additional 2' deeper at the ATM machine section to provide more weather protection. New recessed lighting

underneath that canopy is proposed to replace what is currently there. The lights will be six-inch recessed LED lights in a 4000 Kelvin temperature. Mr. Chair asked about the replacement canopy that appears to not extend the full length along the driveway as what currently exists. Ms. Johnson confirmed that the canopy would wrap in an L shape along each end of the building.

The proposal includes painting the brick a dark gray, replacing the bollards that are existing, installing a new height clearance sign for safety issues at the bank drive thru and downspouts on the exterior for canopy drainage that will be covered in a metal finish to match the paint color of the existing brick.

Ms. Robinson stated that the removal of the mansard roof is very positive. She asked if they are modifying the arched Palladian windows since they're changing the aesthetic of the building. She also expressed her reservations about the dark grey used to paint the building as it is a bit ominous. Ms. Johnson said there are too many windows to replace and it would be cost prohibitive.

Mr. Hammer agreed with Ms. Robinson's comments. The grey selected for the building concerned him the most. The somber tone of the grey façade is too dark for the streetscape and it feels like a naval base.

Mr. Dermody said he agrees with his colleagues as well regarding the roof and the grey color. The adjacent business, PEX has more texture and variety of materials going on with their facade. He is wondering if adding color and/or texture could help improve the proposed renovations.

Ms. Johnson asked if the Board would prefer a light grey or a white.

Mr. Chair recommended that Ms. Johnson leave the dark base and go lighter from the bottom up that way it grades out. The Board members did not agree on where the lighter and darker colors should be located however Mr. Chair did state that they would figure something out.

The safety sign for height is a concern for Mr. Chair. Ms. Johnson stated it is a safety concern and they understand it is obtrusive, but they want to warn drivers about clearance safety due to the wider/deeper ATM canopy. Mr. Chair suggested that maybe the pole can be painted to match the color of the wall of the building. Ms. Johnson agreed. Because the ATM is always open the lights over the ATM would always be on.

Motion to approve with conditions the proposed façade renovations that the painted brick color be a lighter color than the metal panel gray band above. And that on the long open facade section of the drive thru (facing Town Hall) the panel pattern be modified so that there is not just a straight line of white versus gray color but a lighter grey than the metal panel, moved by Mr. Dermody.

Motion was seconded by Mr. Hammer.

Name	Aye	Nay
Mark Gluesing	Aye	
Bob Dermody	Aye	
Nelson Hammer	Aye	
Deborah Robinson	Aye	
Steve Tanner	Aye	

Agenda Item 3:

Greater Boston Addiction Center located at 322 Reservoir Street and applying for signage.

- Tim Parker, Fast Signs

Mr. Parker came before the Board asking to install a sign for the Greater Boston Addiction Center. The GBAC took over the units previously occupied by Waterstone on second floor. They're looking to install a sign between the large vertical windows on the "front" façade. Mr. Parker is proposing a 64 square foot sign to fill the space on the building.

The sign would be a black 1.75" aluminum bar frame with aluminum 040 insert with matte black vinyl overlay and premium white vinyl lettering.

Mr. Tanner said he would like to see a drawing of the construction of the sign. He said because of the size of the sign he would like to see what the frame would be made from. Mr. Parker tried to explain what the frame would be like. Mr. Tanner said he wants Mr. Parker to submit a drawing showing how the frame is to be constructed and the drawing is to have front, side and section views of the sign.

Mr. Parker explained that he constructs the same frame for all his signs, and he has never had to submit a drawing before. Mr. Chair told Mr. Parker he is not correct and that a drawing is typical part of the submissions to the Board. He asked for drawings showing a section of the sign, the material it is being mounted against, the size of the tubes that are part of the mounting and their thickness, and how this is being built.

Mr. Tanner said if the sign is to remain at this size, he would prefer it to be flush aligning with the top window or with the mullion. He finds it would look better if flush with the top.

Mr. Hammer said he would like it either flush at the top or at the mullion.

Mr. Dermody said he would like for the sign to be smaller. He finds the graphics interesting but the arrow through the letter he finds problematic. Mr. Parker said that the graphic is the company's logo. Mr. Dermody said the image does not appear to be to scale so it is hard to assess the sign and how it sits on the building. The drawing doesn't appear to show 30 inches of wall on either side of sign. The black frame is unclear as it appears to show a white line along edge of the sign. Mr. Dermody asked for a drawing with clearer detail so the Board can understand the application. He suggested submitting a street view picture of the building with the adjacent buildings so that it saves time and Mr. Parker doesn't have to orient the Board of its location. Mr. Dermody asked about the drawing of a stone cap on a standard detail of mounting a sign on a brick façade, that doesn't relate to this application. Mr. Parker apologized that this building doesn't have a cap. Mr. Dermody stated that the Board appreciates non-standard details.

Ms. Robinson said she agrees regarding the size, it is too big, and she does not see the need for why it needs to be this big. A more accurate drawing since this isn't to scale, would make it less difficult to decide on the signage and where to locate it height-wise.

Mr. Parker said he was trying to make it proportional to the square footage of the other signage on the building. Mr. Parker asked if the sign is to be reduced would the Board want it to be flush to the top of the windows or center it. The Board said they would rather have it centered.

Mr. Tanner said that the Board cannot really interpret the drawings submitted.

The Board recommended this item be continued to the next DRB meeting on March 8th, 2021. They asked Mr. Parker to return to the Board with a design of a smaller sign, a section with a real understanding of how it is to be fabricated and mounted as well as the drawings showing the details of the sign. An enlarged elevation would be helpful as well.

Agenda Item 4:

Site plan review for LCB Senior Living located at 100 West St. - Roy Cramer and Evans Huber

Mr. Huber spoke on behalf of the applicant, LCB Senior Living. The property is located at the corner of Highland Avenue and West Street, contains an existing three-story brick building approximately 186,000 square feet, outdoor parking areas to the south and west, and an under the building parking area. It was previously occupied by Avery Crossing, which was an assisted living and memory care facility, and Avery Manor, which was a skilled nursing facility, and some medical offices. The property has been vacant since 2017. LCB Senior Living is proposing to redevelop the property to include an 83 unit assisted living and memory care facility, and 72 independent living apartments. The existing three-story brick building will remain; the footprint of the building will not change. As allowed by section of the recently enacted bylaws for the Avery Square Overlay District, a partial fourth story is going to be added to create 10 of the proposed 72 independent living apartments. The footprint of the fourth-floor units will be set well back from the facades on the east, north, and south and will not exceed 35% of the roof area.

Mr. Huber described what they plan on doing with the property. The aerial view of the fourth story was shown to the Board by share screen. The parking lot on the south side of the building will remain unchanged except for some new landscaping and the parking lot on the west, adjacent to the railroad right-of-way will be modified slightly, including some new landscaping.

Ms. Michelle Hobbs of The Architectural Team presented the project to the Board. She helped orient the Board to the plan with Highland Avenue entry to the south, and West Street, which is where the formal entry to this site.

There are two communities that make up this building. On the left in the plan, in the L shape is the independent living side. And then to the right is memory care and assisted living. In 1994, there was an extensive renovation done on the building which included covering quite a few existing window openings at the ground level with EIFS finish on the ground level. There is currently extensive overgrowth of the vegetation on the east (Highland Ave) side and there are no windows facing south. On the ground floor, they propose to reactivate the connection to Highland Ave public spaces. The vehicular path to the facility is remaining with the circulation from West Street through the site as well as into the parking area on the left side. The proposal significantly reduces the amount of parking within the actual structure to create more living units, but not changing the parking or the vehicular path on the exterior.

There is an introduction of patios on the first-floor units of these independent living units along Highland Avenue and the south side of the building. These do align with existing openings that

were covered in the '94 renovation. They are introducing larger windows into those existing openings, and doors to the patios to ultimately bring more light into the building.

On the fourth floor they are providing specific outdoor zones for the two populations: independent living units on the south side that have private terraces and outdoor assisted living terrace on the right. All these terraces have a security screening to manage both access and filter the views. These terraces act as kind of voids that are cut out from the apartment massing to create these outdoor spaces. And then on the right or north end, it is a bar that is split into both interior and exterior space serving the memory unit side of the facility. There's also the addition of skylights that are bringing light in from above.

The building elevations were reviewed. New windows will be installed on the east and south facing first floor walls where the original windows were located in the brick walls behind the EIFS. Some will be enlarged to provide doorways to access small private patios being added to the south and east elevations. They are trying to create a stronger connection to the streetscape with the addition of the windows and patios. The rhythm of the terraces is to breakdown the massing up above. There are two existing porticos on the East elevation (Highland Ave). One will remain an entrance door, the other north portico will contain windows, not doors.

The North elevation (West Street) will have a portion of the EIFS on the first-floor exterior walls removed. With regard to the west facing elevations the porticos over the entrances to the memory care and independent apartment section will be refurbished, and existing canvas awnings to the living units will be removed. This is the formal driveway entry to the facility. The exit from the underground parking will be relocated to the knuckle of the L, in the corner; currently the exit is further to the north and it will be replaced with storefront windows to allow more light into the common space of the building.

The landscaping plan was reviewed. They propose enlarging the amenities and plantings along the parking lot for the two different residencies. They propose new plantings along the Highland Ave side to complement the new façade changes and new patios, which will have a 2-1/2 foot grade change. Decorative railings and green screening are proposed as well for the patios which cover about a third of the length of the building façade. The memory care outdoor areas will be contained by an 8' wood fence. Plantings along Highland Avenue side are designed to complement the more open first floor window and patio concept. The south parking lot and west side plantings along the tracks will be minimally changed. Planters and plant material on the new 4th floor structure are designed to create more of an internal view, or screen, rather than direct view of the roof and allow for filtering view and light.

Proposed materials were reviewed. Those pictures that appeared to show wood grain were described as smooth panels, no grain. The choices of materials proposed attempt to create a cohesiveness between the new materials and those of the original building materials.

Ben LaFrance, the landscape architect then discussed the proposed landscaping. The proposed landscaping has a mixture of evergreens and deciduous plantings, non-invasive, micro-climate for sun and shade conditions, drought tolerant plants, green screening along the MBTA and removing all overgrown trees along Highland Avenue. The proposed trees along Highland Avenue are smaller and low maintenance trees. The concept of allowing more light into the building is further supported with lower growing plants at the first floor. The below grade plantings chosen are to soften the views outward from the patios and inward accounting for

headlights of cars that park along Highland Avenue. The proposal includes supplementing existing evergreens with additional arborvitaes along MBTA adding green to the fencing that exists. Mr. LaFrance provided the Board with all the specific trees proposed.

The brick plaza that exists at the north end along West Street will remain with some supplemental planting modifications. There are two main entrances to the building (memory care, independent living). Some of the parking space will be changed to allow for active and passive recreation as part of the garden/outdoor areas. All new lighting is proposed which include 16' above finish grade lighting, bollards, and building mounted lights at entries.

Mr. Hammer asked about the small courtyard area on the fourth floor and if it overlooks a barren roof would they be open to adding greenery for the people to look at. Ms. Hobbs said the focus is mostly on creating an inward view to the patios and less on looking out onto the roof itself.

Mr. Hammer also pointed out the London Plain trees proposed in the drawings as 25 ft. width can get to be 60 feet in width at maturity. Another issue is that any lawn under those trees will not grow well due to these dense shade trees so he would recommend considering a different tree that allows for more light, will grow taller and less wide. An additional option is to propose more shade tolerant ground cover. He also pointed out that some of the canopies are drawn too closely together on the plans for how big they grow or are shown planted too close together. He thinks it may be overplanted with the proposed plants. Narrower and vertically growing trees would be recommended. Mr. Hammer added that the flagpole has no walkway to access it but shows plantings around it.

Mr. Chair asked if the existing privacy fence on the West Street side is to remain. Mr. Bloom confirmed it is to remain and increase in height for the safety of memory care residents.

Ms. Robinson said the project is well developed and to keep in mind the West Street wall/façade as that is the main entrance.

Mr. Dermody said the presentation was very thorough and professional. At this time, he saw no issues with what was presented. His recommendation for the solid fencing on the West Street side is to add a few more variegated plantings to break it up as it is tall and solid (stockade style) according to the rendering. Mr. Chair agreed.

Mr. Tanner said he agreed with Mr. Hammer.

Mr. Chair asked if the small outdoor patios are private to each unit. Mr. Cramer and Mr. Huber confirmed, yes. Mr. Chair also had a concern about an 18 inch open railing depicted in one of the renderings because it is on a busy street he wonders if they would want to change it to a more private fence after a number of years and if issues arise. Mr. LeFrance said the patios are very small and they're not going to support a lot of people outside so from that perspective they are comfortable with the 18-inch railing. They intend to rent those units to residents comfortable with the exposure.

Ms. Robinson asked whether they know for sure that the material of the EIFS on the first floor is covering the previous brick wall. Ms. Hobbs said yes, that is correct. She is doing some exploratory work to see what the condition is like underneath that.

Ms. Robinson asked if they have considered removing that material. Ms. Hobbs said it is probably cost prohibitive due to the size of the building. Mr. Bloom said he is scheduling an investigation to open up some of those areas and see what is going on under the material covering the brick but at this time they're keeping it as is.

Ms. Robinson asked about the two porticos on the Highland Avenue side and if they are to remain. Mr. Bloom said the entrance on the south side will remain an active access egress. The other door will not be an access but will look the same as an homage to the original building. Ms. Hobbs expanded on this that they are proposing a window to match the ones that are going in in lieu of a door. The structure will not be changed. The Board agreed that they would support removal of the portico that is over windows only (the northern portico on Highland Avenue).

Mr. Dermody said he is concerned about the roof conditions outside of the new units. This is an unusual situation where there is a lot of roof left. He is concerned how the roof will actually look as opposed to in the rendering. Mr. Bloom said the roof will be a light grayish color.

The applicant revised the Landscape Planting Plan based on the comments from this meeting prior to the plans being stamped and approved. The revised plan is included in the approved documents for this project.

Motion to approve the project for site plan review as submitted by Mr. Tanner.

Motion was seconded by Mr. Hammer.

Name	Aye	Nay
Mark Gluesing	Aye	
Bob Dermody	Connection was disrupted	
Nelson Hammer	Aye	
Deborah Robinson	Aye	
Steve Tanner	Aye	

****Mr. Dermody lost his internet connection and was unable to rejoin the Zoom. His connection cut out just after the discussions for the site plan review were wrapped up.**

Approval of Minutes:

Motion to approve the minutes of February 1st, 2021 by Mr. Steve Tanner.

Motion seconded by Mr. Nelson Hammer.

Name	Aye	Nay
Mark Gluesing	Aye	
Bob Dermody	Connection was disrupted	
Nelson Hammer	Aye	
Deborah Robinson	Aye	
Steve Tanner	Aye	

Motion to Adjourn:

Motion to adjourn the Design Review Board meeting by Ms. Deborah Robinson.

Motion was seconded by Mr. Nelson hammer.

Meeting adjourned at 9:38p.m.

Name	Aye	Nay
Mark Gluesing	Aye	
Bob Dermody	Connection was disrupted	
Nelson Hammer	Aye	
Deborah Robinson	Aye	
Steve Tanner	Aye	

Future Meetings:

March 8, 2021	Via Zoom
March 22, 2021	Via Zoom
April 12, 2021	Via Zoom
May 3, 2021	Via Zoom
May 24, 2021	Via Zoom
June 7, 2021	Via Zoom
June 28, 2021	Via Zoom