

MELROSE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, April 8, 2025
7:00 PM
Cassidy Conference Room
City Hall, 562 Main Street

PRESENT: Chair Michael Coleman, Richard Curl, Kevin Erb, Lindsay Toghill & Robert Tullis

ABSENT: None

Lori Massa, City Planner, & Adam Forrester, Assistant Planner, were present.

The meeting was called to order at 7:02 PM by Chair Coleman.

I. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Tullis made a motion to approve the January 14, 2025 meeting minutes. Mr. Curl seconded the motion. All voted in favor. None were opposed.

II. Applications for Certificate of Appropriateness

675 Main Street, Sign System Solutions of Ashland for Pediatric Health Care Associates

Richard Cameron of Sign System Solutions appeared to present the case for the signage for the business, Pediatric Health Care Associates, at 675 Main Street. Mr. Cameron presented the sign design submitted with the application and provided photos and dimensions of the previous tenant's signs.

Members discussed how for both signs, the material is high-density urethane, which will appear to be wood. They asked about the finish and mounting. The paint will be acrylic. The logo will be raised and letters will be carved and paint filled. The signs will be face mounted with painted screws. They discussed if the sign on Main Street should be shifted to be above the door but decided against it because it would signal that the door is the main entrance and it is not usable.

Members discussed the proposed design and suggested some alterations. They suggested the following:

- The Main Street sign should match the dimensions of the previous tenant's signs.
- The Main Street sign should have an inch of brick visible on the top and bottom of the sign, and the sign width extend to align with the mullion of the flanker windows on either side of the door below.
- The Main Street/East Emerson Street corner entrance sign should be re-sized so it sits on the architrave and allows there to be a white border on the sides and top of sign that matches the width of the window trim below.

No one from the public appeared to speak about the case.

The Members discussed approving the proposed project with the designed alternations mentioned above as conditions.

Mr. Tullis made a motion to approve the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the signage proposal with conditions. Mr. Curl seconded the motion. All voted in favor. None were opposed.

Documents: Application for Certificate of Appropriateness
Revised Signage plan dated March 25, 2025

III. Determination on Replacement

662 Main St.

Members reviewed the specifications of the proposed gutters for 662 Main St. Members discussed the material and color of the new gutters and determined them to be the same material and color as the existing gutters. Therefore, the Applicant does not need to apply for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the gutter replacement.

IV. Review of Application Fee

Members reviewed the current fee for Certificates of Appropriateness and discussed potential fee increases for FY26 in response to the Mayor's request. Members discussed the potential impact on homeowners versus commercial properties in the Historic District. Members were concerned with an increase in cost for a small project being potentially burdensome to homeowners. Also, they discussed the length of time since the last fee increase which was in 1979. Members came to an agreement on proposed fees for FY26. The proposed fees are in the table below:

Type of Application	Date of Implementation / Increase	Current Fee	Proposed Fee
Certificate of Appropriateness	1979	\$20	One- or Two-Family Properties - \$50 Commercial Wall Signs (not including awning or standing) - \$50 Other - \$150

V. Discussion of Mullin Rule

Lori Massa, Planning Director, provided an overview of Massachusetts General Law (MGL) Chapter 39 Section 23D, otherwise known as Chapter 79 of the Acts of 2006, or the “Mullin Rule”. Staff will request that the City Council adopt this provision in the state law that allows for members to miss one public hearing, listen to a recording of the session and review the materials from it, and vote at a future meeting. The City Council adopted the rule in 2006; however, the Council did not specify which boards or commissions that hold adjudicatory hearing this rule applies and so it will be back before them. Members were supportive of the Commission being included in the adoption of the Mullin Rule.

Mr. Curl made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Toghill seconded the motion. All voted in favor. None were opposed. The meeting adjourned at 7:45pm.