

RECEIVED

By City Clerks Office at 10:19 am, May 26, 2026

**MELROSE BOARD OF APPEALS
MEETING MINUTES
Public Hearing
Wednesday, March 18, 2026
7:30 p.m.
Remote Meeting**

Present:

Bryan Thorp, Chair
Chris Coughlin
David Roache
Benjamin Rosenberg
Jeffery Ugino
Raj Singh

Absent:

Daniel Gelormini

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.

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, Michael Malynowski, Engineer, and Louis Rumore & Peter Carlisle, Capitol Rock Blasting Contractors, appeared before the Board to present the case.

Attorney Agostino and the project team provided an overview of the updated plans which included the following:

- Updated plan set
- Details on the ledge cut behind buildings B and C
- Inlet grate bypass check
- Acoustical report on water booster station
- Proposed open rock face cut behind buildings B and C
- Blasting plan

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

- Is there a setback buffer area from the ledge cut for safety?
 - Yes. A fence will be installed at the bottom of rock face 18'8" from buildings B and C
- Why is the fence at the bottom of the rock face not farther from it? How are you sure debris does not fall in unsafe area.
 - The ledge is straight down so the fence will capture rocks at the bottom.
 - The final buffer area will be determined based on final ledge cut. The exact dimensions of the buffer zone will be determined after slope of rock face is known. The rock face should be nearly smooth so the potential for falling rock should be minimal.
- Have you increased the 250 ft buffer for pre-blast surveys to include more abutters?
 - This could be proposed as a condition. The State requires 250 ft.
- Do you have 3rd party monitoring on projects?
 - Yes, some projects require third party monitoring. All projects require vibration monitoring, and some projects require more monitoring. This could be proposed as a condition.
- What is the blasting duration? How long of a process is this?
 - For a site this size, approximately 40-50 days
- Is there on-site crushing of material on site?
 - Yes, crushing of material will happen on site.
- Neighbors should be communicated with for all blasting phases. Conditions should be attached to cover that.
-
- How would the stormwater system be accessed for maintenance?
 - Observation ports would allow for monitoring and maintenance as needed. HOA will contract someone to provide maintenance.
- Has the project team worked with a stormwater system that is similar in design?
 - No, but they have contacted the manufacturer of the system to review the case.
- Members expressed concern with the proposed stormwater system with extreme strong storm events.

- The system is designed to handle storm events including 2-, 25-, and 100-year precipitation rates, and had been peer-reviewed by BSC Group.
- Members expressed concerns about untreated runoff from project site roadways bypassing the catch basins before reaching Summit Ave and other areas off site.

Lori Massa, Director, presented key findings from the BSC Group and Stantec final reports, highlighting the following:

- BSC Group
 - concerns about construction and earthwork
 - concerns about stormwater system maintenance access, blasting logistics
 - fencing to be installed along ledge
 - project team should follow Miller report's geotechnical recommendations
 - recommended waterproofing measures around the infiltration system
 - the need for a construction management plan to be updated and submitted to the City.
 - The report noted that several city stormwater waivers still required review, with some withdrawn by the applicant while others remained under consideration.
 - Behind Building A, a design point should be added to analyze the runoff towards the abutter's property.
- Stantec
 - recommendations for traffic impact and access mitigation, additional safety measures including: warning signals, stop signs, vegetation trimming, and continuous monitoring of traffic volumes.
 - traffic calming measures on Summit Ave should be installed
 - concerns about the proposed street grade exceeding 6% at intersections
 - adequate stopping distance should be verified to ensure safe sight lines and stopping distance at intersections
 - ADA sidewalks on site and along Summit Ave should be installed including adequate sidewalk width, ramps, and resting areas
- Members discussed placing conditions of approval on the project based on recommendations from the peer review reports

Attorney Agostino acknowledged the Board's feedback and expressed that the Applicant had exhausted efforts to address remaining concerns, noting that further modifications requested by neighbors were deemed too extensive.

The Board received several written comments before the hearing and heard several public comments during the meeting. Dan Ferguson, 54 Woodland Ave, Sean Malkus, 60 Woodland Ave, Charles Gill, 160 Main St, and Ruth Greenholz, 68 Woodland Ave voiced concern over:

- Negative impact on abutting properties
- Stormwater issues
- Site disturbance
- Impact of blasting especially property damage
- Lack of community engagement from project team
- Stormwater system is concerning as it is a new system

- The length of blasting work
- Construction vehicle traffic removing material from the site
- Impact on quality of life for neighbors
- Snow storage location and impact of additional runoff on abutters

The Board voted 5-0, to continue the case to the meeting on Wednesday, April 8, 2026.

Documents:

ZBA Application materials, case 25-014

OTHER BUSINESS

Meeting Minutes

The Board voted, 5-0, to approve the minutes from February 4, 2026

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for April 8, 2026.

The meeting adjourned at 9:50 pm.