

**RECEIVED**

By City Clerks Office at 10:18 am, Mar 27, 2026

**MELROSE BOARD OF APPEALS  
MEETING MINUTES  
Public Hearing  
Wednesday, February 4, 2026  
7:30 p.m.  
Remote Meeting**

**Present:**

Bryan Thorp, Chair  
Daniel Gelormini  
Raj Singh  
Chris Coughlin  
David Roache

**Absent:**

Benjamin Rosenberg  
Jeffery Ugino

**Staff Present:** Lori Massa, Director and City Planner, Maya Noviski, Senior 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, Ken Milender, Engineer, and Michael Malynowski, Engineer, appeared before the Board to present the case.

Ken Milender, Engineer, and Michael Malynowski, Engineer, provided an overview of the updated plans which included the following:

- Overview of project site topography
- Series of ledge probes conducted to determine depth to reach solid rock. Depth was in range of 6"- 6'.
- Not a significant amount of topsoil on site
- Proposed open rock face cut behind buildings B and C.
- Blasting will be required to remove bedrock
- Fencing will be installed on top of ledge cut for safety
- Further analysis of what will need to be done with soil on conservation land above the ledge cut and how it should be controlled/removed. This will be determined during the blasting portion of the project. Project team will update with more information.
- Details on the updated stormwater management system location and maintenance plan.
- Details on the proposed retaining walls
- Revised location and design of water booster pump station.
- Access to stormwater maintenance system and maintenance plan
- Details on retaining walls and drainage system of Building A
- A work session was proposed to work through stormwater management design.

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

- What is the blasting process?
  - Controlled blasting will be done. Site will be flagged by the blasting contractor. Ledge will be blasted and material will be excavated.
- Do you plan on processing material on site?
  - Yes, additional details are found in the construction management plan that was submitted to the City.
- What is the soil profile like on site?
  - Topsoil, subsoil, glacial till, then ledge. A soil scientist is not on the development team.
- Members noted that a soil study by a soil scientist should be conducted to understand what is present on site.
- Has the stormwater system been reviewed to factor in the soil conditions on site?
  - Michael Malynowski explains stormwater management system location and design. It won't sit on ledge. Standards for system to ensure its stability.
- Is the plan to over excavate on site?
  - Yes, deeper excavations will be done for foundations, utilities, and roadways.
- How would the site disturbance effect hydrology?
  - It shouldn't impact drainage patterns due to blasting not penetrating that deep into the rock. The underground drainage patterns are not impacted.

- Does blasting usually occur this close to abutters?
  - Yes, it is common due to location of buildable sites. A pre-blasting survey will be done to document pre-existing conditions for abutters within a certain area.
- Are there alternatives to blasting?
  - Standard practice is drilling and blasting.
- Members commented that blasting/site disturbance near building A should be revised.
- What is the treatment chain for the stormwater system?
  - Project team explains treatment plan
- Members commented that the treatment plan is not sufficient. There needs to be a plan for when chambers are clogged and can no longer function properly.

Dominic Rinaldi, Engineer, from BSC Group, and ,Sarah Borenstein, Engineer, from Stantec, 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, and traffic report which included the following:

- Applicant needs to provide accommodation for tolerance of blasting and provide a cushion along the property line. The proposed work is right up to the property line. They need to make sure there isn’t an impact on abutting properties.
- More information is needed on noise produced by the booster station. Acoustical impact study needs to be submitted and reviewed.
- Public gathering space shown on plans is lacking in detail.
- Recommended that the Board review fire department’s comments. Planning Staff explains that the Fire Department reviewed hydrant location and emergency vehicle access are sufficient.
- Stormwater management system is difficult to access as proposed.
- Recommended that Applicant add detailed pavement markings, signage, and crosswalks.
- Some parking spaces are not appropriately sized, and too many compact spaces are included on plans.
- Recommended that plans be revised to widen sidewalks to 5’. If 5’ can’t be implemented, then sidewalks should be increased to 4’.
- Accessible ramps should be installed.

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:

- Explore stormwater management system redesign
- Share additional details on how stormwater system will be maintained and accessed
- Update plans to respond to peer review reports
- Submit additional visualizations on emergency vehicle access and grading of road
- Update plans to show correct driveway dimensions and parking layout on site
- Show location of generator on plans
- Details on all plans should align
- Respond to peer review of acoustic report

The Board received several written comments before the hearing and heard several public comments during the meeting. Robert carrier, 940 Main St., Dan Ferguson, 54 Woodland Ave, Sean Malkis, 60 Woodland Ave, Charles Gill, 160 Main St., Christine Hotz, 26 Woodland Ave, Paul Robicheau, 60 Botolph St., and Ruth Greenholz, 68 Woodland 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
- Drainage plan does not provide adequate details
- Safety issues and property damage caused by construction
- Impact on quality of life for area
- Updated Renderings should show perspective of project from Woodland Ave

The Applicant stated that they would have updated materials submitted on February 20, 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, March 18, 2026.

Documents:

ZBA Application materials, case 25-014

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **Meeting Minutes**

The Board voted, 5-0, to approve the minutes from December 3, 2025

### **Next Meeting**

The next meeting regarding case 25-014 is scheduled for March 18, 2026.

The meeting adjourned at 10:35 pm.