

**MELROSE BOARD OF APPEALS  
MEETING MINUTES  
Public Hearing  
Wednesday, December 3, 2025  
7:30 p.m.  
Remote Meeting**

**Present:**

Bryan Thorp, Chair  
Daniel Gelormini  
Jeffery Ugino  
Chris Coughlin  
Benjamin Rosenberg

**Absent:**

David Roache  
Raj Singh

**Staff Present:** Lori Massa, Director and City Planner, & Adam Forrester, Assistant Planner

The meeting was called to order at 7:35 pm.

Pursuant to Chapter 2 of the Acts of 2025, this meeting was conducted via remote participation. Specific information and the general guidelines for remote participation by members of the public and/or parties with a right and/or requirement to attend this meeting were found on the City of Melrose's website, at <https://www.cityofmelrose.org/195/Meetings-of-Boards-Commissions-Committee>. No in-person attendance of members of the public was permitted, but every effort was made to ensure that the public could adequately access the proceedings in real time, or in the event that we are unable to do so, on the mmtv3.org website an audio or video recording, transcript, or other comprehensive record of proceedings was posted as soon as possible after the meeting. A link was also available on [www.cityofmelrose.org](http://www.cityofmelrose.org).

Application materials were posted to the City's website:  
<https://www.cityofmelrose.org/170/Board-of-Appeals>.

**COMPREHENSIVE PERMIT CASE**

**25 014 – 34 & 55 Summit Avenue – (Continued case)**

The application of Summit Development LLC for a Comprehensive Permit pursuant to M.G.L. c. 40B, s. 21 to develop 28 for-sale townhouses and 39 parking spaces (combined garage and outdoor) on two adjacent parcels of land at 34 & 55 Summit Avenue in Melrose containing 115,774 sf and shown on Assessor's Map B13 0, Lots 21-27 and B14 0, Lots 1-2. Seven of the project's units will be affordable as is required and regulated under the law.

Ron Lopez of Summit Development, LLC, Christopher Agostino, Attorney, Jack Sullivan, Engineer, and Michael Malynowski, Engineer, appeared before the Board to present the case.

Michael Malynowski, Engineer, provided an overview of the stormwater management report which included the following:

- Project site and layout of stormwater management design
- Stormwater will be collected on site by catch basins and vein style inlets. The design takes the slope of the site into account.
- Details about infiltration system design and capacity
- Details on concrete wall that encircles infiltration system at the bottom of the site. Fencing will be installed at the top of the wall for safety.
- Comparison of existing conditions and proposed conditions. After installation of stormwater management system, there will be a significant reduction in both rate and volume of runoff.
- Details on the earthmoving summary that was submitted.

The Board had the following questions and comments for Michael Malynowski, Engineer, and the project team. Answers are indicated underneath the question:

- Can you explain the drainage along abutters property lines?
  - Very little runoff will occur behind building A and will not leave the property. Backyards of building A are open space as well.
- What is the grade change between building A and abutter's property?
  - There is a gully there so the backyards of building A are at a slightly lower elevation than the abutter's property.
- Does this project involve removal of existing retaining walls? Will the patios of building A be above the retaining wall?
  - The development team added that the original plan was to keep the existing retaining wall but they have been looking at designs to replace the retaining walls to have a more functional area. The  
?  
development team will provide updated plans with the grading proposed for is area.
- Members noted that it is important to understand the details on grading of abutting properties and more information about the retaining walls.
  - Development team will update plans to show that info
- Board asked for more information on the wall proposed near the infiltration system at the bottom of the site.
- How does the pump station interface with the drainage system since it is shown on top of infiltration systems?
  - Development team has been exploring different locations for the pump station to determine the best location. The team will update location on future plans. The goal is to move pump station away from the abutting properties.

Dominic Rinaldi, Engineer, from BSC Group, who are the peer review consultants hired by the City and paid for by the Applicant under MGL C44 §53G, provided an overview of their review of the project's stormwater management and infrastructure design, as well as the geotechnical requirements of construction, which included the following:

- Updated existing conditions report should be provided to show details on bedrock found on site.
- The Applicant should provide sufficient geotechnical evaluation during the permitting process to determine if a ledge face or wall will be constructed. Additionally, as this ledge face or wall will be as high as 20-feet in areas, we recommend a barrier be installed along the top to protect anyone on adjacent properties.
- We recommend that sufficient ledge mapping be performed so a preliminary estimate of rock/ledge removal can be provided to the City to better understand the impacts of construction.
- Cut and Fill report should be updated to be more detailed.
- The Applicant should provide general details on the pump station including if it is above grade or below grade, sound levels it may generate, and plans to mitigate this noise for neighboring properties. In addition, details on the maintenance plan for the pump station should be provided.
- Area for playground and common gathering area shown on plans are in an area that is too steep for this use.
- Plans should be updated to show more details on grading.
- More details on retaining walls should be provided.
- Fire department should review the location for the hydrant shown on plans to see if it is adequate.
- More details on the installation and maintenance of the proposed stop and waste cocks as this could pose a health and safety risk to the City's water system.
- More clarity on the waivers that are being requested for sewer and water regulations should be provided
- Alternate location for snow storage should be explored.
- The proposed location of the stormwater management system should ensure that there is adequate access for maintenance.
- The peak flow rate and volume tables in the Drainage Report appear to be mislabeled as to the location of each design point.
- We recommend an inlet analysis be performed to ensure that all stormwater runoff is being captured and not bypassing the proposed catch basins and flowing down Summit Avenue.
- Stormwater pipe sizing calculations were not included in the Drainage Report provided. These calculations should be provided for review.
- We recommend that the operation and maintenance (O&M) plan for catch basins require the use of a vacuum truck for cleaning to ensure that outlet hoods are not damaged as they frequently are through clam shell removal of sediments.
- Some of the peer review report information was covered with the Board's questions to the Applicant during their presentation. The full report that included more technical details is posted on the City's website for all to review.

The Board had the following questions and comments for Dominic Rinaldi, Engineer, from BSC Group and Planning Staff. Answers are indicated underneath the question:

- How can they be sure of the catch basin's ability to capture runoff considering the steep slopes?

- They can do an inlet analysis.
- Has the fire department reviewed plans?
  - Yes, at the department head meeting. Planning Staff will follow up with the fire department as the plans have been revised since that meeting.

Christopher Agostino, Attorney, provided an overview of the development team's response to the town of Wakefield's letter submitted regarding access to the site from Wakefield. Members asked that attorney Agostino submit a formal letter that addresses the town of Wakefield's concerns regarding access to the site. A letter will be submitted for further review.

The Board's discussion focused on that the project's current plans are lacking in detail and would like more detail on the following in the updated plan sets:

- Updated grading plan with additional site sections
- Grading of abutting properties included on updated plans
- Landscaping plan that includes any removal of existing trees.
- Detailed cut and fill analysis/ earth moving summary. Critical to understand the amount of blasting and removal of material from site, as well as the level of site disturbance in total.
- Information on the retaining walls both existing and proposed.
- Details on the location of the pump station and how it interfaces with the drainage system
- Updated drainage plan based on feedback from BSC group and Board

The Board received several written comments before the hearing and heard several public comments during the meeting. Chris and Lauren Spendley, 28 Summit Ave, Sean Malkis, 60 Woodlawn Ave, Charles Gill, 160 Main St., Aletta Schnitzler, 26 Woodlawn Ave, and Ruth Greenholz, 68 Woodlawn Ave voiced concern over:

- Plans are lacking in detail
- Negative impact on abutting properties
- Stormwater issues
- Site disturbance
- Landscaping plan is inadequate
- Removal of existing trees and vegetation leading to issues downslope from site
- Construction vehicles impact on neighborhood
- Proposed playground and public gathering area on site are not practical due to grading
- Drainage plan does not provide adequate details
- Safety issues and property damage caused by construction
- Impact on quality of life for area

The Applicant stated that they would have updated materials submitted on January 9, 2026 and would grant a time extension for the public hearing to be opened until March 13, 2026.

The Board voted 5-0, to continue the case to the meeting on Wednesday, February 4, 2026.

Documents:

ZBA Application materials, case 25-014

BSC Group Peer Review, Dec 1, 2025

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **Meeting Minutes**

The Board voted, 5-0, to approve the minutes from October 22, 2025

### **Next Meeting**

The next meeting regarding case 25-014 is scheduled for February 4, 2026.

The meeting adjourned at 9:55 pm.