

MELROSE PLANNING BOARD
Regular Meeting and Public Hearing
Monday, April 23, 2012
7:45 p.m.
Mayor's Conference Room

PRESENT: Carla Francazio, Mike Cassavoy, John Sadowski, Jack Welch, Bob Mercado, Anne DeSouza-Ward, Paul King, and Sharon Petrillo

ABSENT: Ed Cassidy

Denise Gaffey, City Planner, and Matt Hennigan, Assistant Planner, were present.

The meeting was called to order at 7:53 p.m. by Ms. Francazio.

MINUTES

Annual Meeting and Public Hearing March 26, 2012

Mr. Cassavoy MADE a MOTION to accept the minutes of March 26, 2012. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All voted in favor. None opposed.

ASSENT CALENDAR

Case 12-008, 165 Warwick Road, Yezerki

Ms. Francazio recognized the Applicant, Ms. Yezerki, who was present at the meeting and explained that her case has been placed on the Assent Calendar because the Board believes that his case involves judgments that can best be determined by the Board of Appeals based on the input of the abutters at the public hearing. Mr. Sadowski MADE a MOTION to approve the item on the Assent Calendar and send a standard letter to the Board of Appeals. Ms. DeSouza-Ward SECONDED the MOTION. All voted in favor. None opposed.

BOARD OF APPEALS

Case 12-009, 608-612 Main Street, Shafer

Ms. Francazio noted that the Applicant was not in attendance to present his application. Mr. Cassavoy MADE a MOTION to move the case to later in the agenda to allow for the Applicant to arrive. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All voted in favor. None opposed.

Mr. Sadowski then recused himself so that he could present his Board of Appeals application to the members.

Case 12-010, 89 Lovell Road, Sadowski

The Applicant, Mr. Sadowski, described his application to the Board. After a detailed evaluation of Applicant's proposal by members, Ms. DeSouza-Ward MADE a MOTION to send a letter to the Board of Appeals that noted that while we are always reluctant to endorse front setback encroachments, we find that the Applicant's proposed porch project will have a *di minimis* impact because the dwelling is located on a corner lot and does not encroach on an adjacent property. The Board noted that the proposed extension of the porch follows the line of the existing structure and is consistent with the architectural detail of the existing house. With the above comments noted, we recommend granting the necessary zoning relief. Mr. Cassavoy SECONDED the MOTION. All voted in favor. None opposed.

Document: ZBA application Case 12-010

The members noted that the Applicant for Case 12-009 was still not attendance and elected to revisit the case at the end of the agenda.

Case 12-007, 354 & 360-362 Upham Street, Mark Carroll

The members noted that that the Applicant, Mark Carroll, has also submitted Site Plan Review and Affordable Housing Special Permit applications in connection with the project, which is next on the Board's agenda. The Board elected to review both applications simultaneously.

SITE PLAN REVIEW - AFFORDABLE HOUSING SPECIAL PERMIT

SP-12-001, 354 & 360-362 Upham Street, Mark Carroll (continued public hearing)

The Applicant, Mark Carroll, was in attendance with the Applicant's Representative, Bob Bell, and the Project Architect, Tim Johnson, to present to the Board. Mr. Bell provided a brief introduction and turned the presentation over to Mr. Johnson to address the outstanding items from the previous meeting. Mr. Johnson noted that the revised Landscape Plan now includes a consistent fencing solution comprised of stockade fencing with lattice and use of permeable pavers for the patios and walkways in response to comments from the Board. Mr. Johnson stated that the size of the parking spaces in the surface lot do not meet the dimensional requirements in the zoning ordinance (8.5' x 20' vs. 9' x 18'). Mr. Bell informed the Board that the Applicant shall seek zoning relief to address the substandard size of the surface parking spaces. Mr. Bell noted that increasing the width of the spaces would have a negative impact on the proposed landscaped islands located at the eastern perimeter of the parking lot. The members offered their feedback concerning the substandard size of the spaces with Mr. Mercado, in particular, expressing concern and encouraging the Applicant to design conforming spaces. Mr. Johnson stated that concrete curbing is proposed within the interior of the development. Mr. Mercado noted that the new site layout will require the existing utility pole to be relocated. The Applicant confirmed that all electrical utilities will be below ground. The members and the Applicant agreed that the eventual location of the electrical transformer for the development, if needed, should be as unobtrusive as possible and screened appropriately. The Applicant expressed that his preferred location would be adjacent to the trash storage area and indicated that he has initiated contact with National Grid regarding this issue. Mr. Mercado stated that additional information is required with respect to the proposed invert elevation for sanitary sewer. Mr. Mercado confirmed with the Applicant that test pits and a soil analysis have been performed for the site.

Mr. Johnson noted that color 3-D views of the development have been provided and expressed that the colors shown will likely change. Mr. Johnson stated that the former Periwinkle building is anticipated to be the feature building and a separate color while the other buildings would a quieter shade from the same color family. Mr. Johnson distributed a revised Wall Section plan and noted the proposed use of engineered cellulose insulation to meet the Stretch Energy Code. Mr. Johnson stated that the Applicant's proposal includes hardiboard siding and Anderson 200 series windows (6 over 6 mullion configuration) with 1" x 4" PVC trim that will offer a traditional appearance. Mr. Johnson emphasized the maintenance-free benefits associated with PVC and hardiboard. Mr. Johnson noted that the site lighting plan includes the installment of LED, dark sky compliant, period pole fixtures and building mounted lighting consisting of recessed cans and wall sconces. Mr. Johnson reviewed with members the specifications for site lighting provided in the Applicant's submission for the meeting. The members confirmed that the color temperature of the site lighting shall be consistent throughout the development. The Applicant confirmed the need for the proposed pole fixture at the northern end of the internal roadway. Ms. Gaffey noted that all proposed fixtures are designed to shine down to minimize any light spillover onto surrounding properties. In response to Ms. DeSouza-Ward's inquiry concerning provisions for snow, Mr. Bell stated snow storage shall be accomplished by snow removal due to the nature of the site plan.

Mr. Cassavoy MADE a MOTION to re-open the public hearing. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All voted in favor. None opposed.

Ms. Francazio asked the members of the public present if they would like to comment. No members of the public elected to offer any comments.

Mr. Cassavoy MADE a MOTION to close the public hearing. Mr. Welch SECONED the MOTION. All voted in favor. None opposed.

Ms. Francazio inquired regarding the potential for the use of granite curbing in lieu of concrete curbing within the interior of the development. The Applicant expressed that he will aggressively attempt to install granite if he finds the pricing to be favorable.

Ms. Gaffey reviewed with the Board the suggested conditions drafted by the Planning Staff. Ms. Gaffey verified with the Applicant his intention to install a modest address sign at the entrance to the development. The members discussed additional conditions generated from this evening's meeting.

The Board discussed the Applicant's request for a parking reduction pursuant to section 235-73.1.C of the Affordable Housing Incentive Program. The Board approved the parking reduction on the basis that the one-bedroom units will be allocated one parking space each and the recognition that the townhouse units are capable of parking additional vehicles in front of the garages and the accommodations for visitor parking on the internal roadway, which will minimize the potential for spillover parking onto adjacent streets.

Mr. Cassavoy MADE a MOTION to grant a Special Permit under the Affordable Housing Incentive Program, subject to the terms and conditions discussed above (and stated below). Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION.

Mr. DeSouza-Ward MADE a MOTION to approve the Site Plan Review application for SP 12-001, 354 & 360-362 Upham Street with the following conditions:

1. All new construction and changes to the site shall be consistent with the information delineated on the final set of plans. Any deviation from the approved Site Plan and Engineering & Architectural Drawings must be approved by the Planning Board in advance of construction.
2. A flow test from the nearest hydrant shall be required in coordination with the Water Division of the Public Works Department. This test must be witnessed by the Engineering Division.
3. The Applicant shall install a 2nd hydrant in connection with the residential development proposal. The 2nd hydrant shall be provided by the City and installed by the Applicant at the end of the internal roadway (i.e., water line) for flushing purposes. The final location of the 2nd hydrant shall be determined in coordination with Fire Department and Public Works Department.
4. The water meter for irrigation purposes shall be installed above ground and shall include a back flow preventer.
5. Street trees shall be purchased and installed by the Applicant under the direction of the City Engineer.

6. The Applicant shall work with National Grid to install the electrical transformer, if needed, adjacent to the trash storage area. Final plans for the transformer location and screening will be submitted to the Planning Office for review.
7. Allocation of parking spaces in the surface parking area shall be as follows: 1 space to each one-bedroom unit in the former Periwinkle building, 2 spaces to the two-bedroom unit in the former Periwinkle building, and 2 spaces to the single-family (2-bedroom) dwelling. The remaining space is reserved for handicap use.
8. The maintenance of the stormwater management system shall be the responsibility of the property owners and written into the condominium documents. Annual inspection of the stormwater management system and certification that the system is clean and serviceable shall be required as outlined in the Stormwater Management (Drainage) Operation and Maintenance Plan. In the event the system needs cleaning, it shall be cleaned and made serviceable by the condominium association. A letter certifying that the provisions in this condition have been satisfied shall be sent to the City Engineer annually.
9. The Applicant shall make a financial contribution to the City of Melrose Inflow and Infiltration Fund equivalent to \$2.14 per gallon at 150 gallons per bedroom prior to the issuance of building permits for the entire 11-unit development. The final amount shall be determined by the City Engineer.
10. A sprinkler system and master box shall be installed in connection with the multifamily conversion of the former Periwinkle building. The rest of the units shall be hardwired with smoke detectors and carbon monoxide detectors.
11. At no time shall the open space at the rear of the site be utilized for snow storage. Snow shall be removed off site and is the responsibility of the condominium association.
12. There shall be no signage associated with the development with the exception of a small address sign that shall be located at the driveway entrance.
13. Trash and recycling will be picked up privately by a private disposal company that must be licensed through the City's Health Department. The condominium association shall increase the frequency of the trash pick-up service, if necessary, so that at no time will trash overflow from the designated trash totes.
14. The Applicant shall submit for review and approval by the Design Review Subcommittee the following information:
 - a. Proposed building materials and sample colors including siding, trim, windows, roof shingles, and building-mounted lighting;
 - b. Details regarding the curbs and pavers;
 - c. A signage sketch that indicates the dimensions, materials, and location of the address sign;
 - d. Architectural treatment of south elevation of Unit 7;
 - e. Invert elevation for sanitary sewer.
15. The Applicant shall create and maintain one of the one-bedroom multifamily units in the former Periwinkle Building as the affordable unit for the Project. The affordable unit shall meet the requirements of the Affordable Housing Incentive Program under the Melrose Zoning Ordinance Section 235-73.1.
16. The affordable unit shall qualify for inclusion on the Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development's Chapter 40B Subsidized Housing Inventory. The Applicant shall work with the City to submit an application to the Department of Housing and Community Development Local Initiative Program (LIP) for inclusion of the affordable unit on the City's inventory of subsidized housing. The Applicant shall provide the information needed for the City to submit the LIP application prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy for the project.

Mr. Cassavoy SECONDED the MOTION. All voted in favor with the exception of Mr. Mercado who voted in opposition to the Site Plan.

Documents: Site Plan Review – Affordable Housing Special Permit Case 12-001

BOARD OF APPEALS – Continued

Case 12-007, 354 & 360-362 Upham Street, Mark Carroll

The members revisited the details of the Applicant's proposal related to his Board of Appeals application. Ms. DeSouza-Ward MADE a MOTION to send a letter to the Board of Appeals that noted that Financing requirements, market constraints and structural limitations have apparently proven to be difficult obstacles to overcome and have compelled the Applicant to revisit the development proposal that was originally approved by the Planning Board and the Board of Appeals. While larger in scope, the Board recognized that the revised 11-unit proposal contains many of the same desirable elements and expands upon the framework established in the original application. The Board expressed appreciation for the level of detail and commitment to high quality building materials as with the earlier plan. The expanded development proposal is appropriately scaled and in keeping with the residential character of the neighborhood. While 11 units on this 34,000 square foot site was acknowledged as a dense development proposal for the UR-A zone, the Board noted that the development will not create any negative impacts with respect to municipal infrastructure and will not add appreciably to the level of traffic on Upham Street. In addition, the Board was pleased with the introduction of an affordable unit into the development plan, which was not part of the original proposal. The continued neighborhood support demonstrated throughout the public hearing process reinforces that residential use is more feasible in this location and more desirable to the abutters. The Applicant's revised parking plan includes the provision of 18 parking spaces, which is four less than required by zoning. The Applicant requested a parking reduction pursuant to section 235-73.1.C of the Affordable Housing Incentive Program on the basis that the one-bedroom units will only be allocated one parking space each. The Board approved a parking reduction in this instance based on the recognition that the townhouse units are capable of parking additional vehicles in front of the garages and the accommodations for visitor parking on the internal roadway, which will minimize the potential for spillover parking onto adjacent streets. During our review, the substandard size of the surface parking spaces was noted and the members were not completely unified in our view of its associated impact on the development. With the above comments noted, we support the Applicant's proposal and recommend granting the necessary zoning relief. Mr. Welch SECONDED the MOTION. All voted in favor with the exception of Mr. Mercado who vote opposed.

Document: ZBA application Case 12-007

Case 12-009, 608-612 Main Street, Shafer

The Applicant, Geoff Shafer, was not present to review his proposal with the Board. The members discussed the details involved with the case. Mr. Sadowski MADE a MOTION to send a letter to the Board of Appeals that noted that the Planning Board reviewed the above referenced application at its regular meeting held on April 23, 2012 without the benefit of the Applicant being present. The application involves the request for zoning relief for the installation of a directory sign and five unit identifier signs for a commercial use in a residential district. Because the Applicant was not in attendance at our meeting, the Board encourages the Applicant to request a continuance from the Board of Appeals in order to return to the Planning Board for a more complete evaluation of his proposal. In the event that we do not have the chance to meet with the Applicant, we offer the following comments. While installation of commercial signage on this property is viewed by the Planning Board as reasonable given its location in the downtown business district and history of business uses, the members expressed a preference for a

proposal that is more modest and more conforming with the dimensional criteria in the zoning ordinance. The Board noted that the proposed directory sign does not neatly adhere to the criteria for such signs in the zoning ordinance because of the layout and nature of the building. However, a more modest directory sign which identifies all of the names of the building tenants with individual panels which are affixed to the sign face would appear to be appropriate. Likewise, less obtrusive identification signage would be more suitable for a property in a residential zone than the five individual identifier signs proposed. In terms of materials, the Board does not find the proposed use of aluminum to be in keeping with the character of the Downtown Historic District and supports the use of a more appropriate material, such as wood or sign foam. Based on the availability of information at our meeting and our comments above, we cannot recommend approval of the requested variances should the Applicant decide to move forward with the application as proposed. Mr. Cassavoy SECONDED the MOTION. All voted in favor. None opposed.

Document: ZBA application Case 12-009

Meeting adjourned at 11:00 PM.