

**MELROSE PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
Regular Meeting and Public Hearing
Monday, August 25, 2014
7:45 PM**

Mayor's Conference Room, Second Floor, City Hall, 562 Main Street

PRESENT: Carla Morelli, Anne DeSouza-Ward, Ed Cassidy, Paul King, Robert Mercado, Jack Welch, Michael Cassavoy, Sharon Petrillo, and John Sadowski

ABSENT: None Absent

Denise Gaffey, Director and City Planner, was present.

The meeting was called to order at 7:45 PM by Ms. Morelli.

MINUTES

Planning Board Regular Meeting and Public Hearing, July 28, 2014

Ms. DeSouza-Ward MADE a MOTION to accept the minutes of July 28, 2014. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed and Mr. Sadowski, Ms. Petrillo, and Mr. Cassavoy abstained from the vote.

Design Review Subcommittee Meeting, August 11, 2014

Mr. Mercado MADE a MOTION to accept the minutes of August 11, 2014. Mr. Welch SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

BOARD OF APPEALS

Case # 14-009, 458 Upham Street, James and Kathleen Murphy

Ms. DeSouza-Ward MADE a MOTION to send a letter to the Board of Appeals which indicates that the Planning Board has no objection to the application. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Document: ZBA Application Case # 14-009

SITE PLAN REVIEW

Case 14-001, 92 Franklin Street, SIG-O Properties, LLC (continued public hearing)

Brian McCaffrey and Attorney Russell Bodnar appeared at the continued public hearing for the project at 92 Franklin Street. Ms. Gaffey provided a summary of the proposed project.

Attorney Bodnar noted that the trees along the shared property line with 8 Greenleaf Place will be removed in accordance with the property owner's wishes. The Applicant will remove the trees as it will be easier to build the retaining wall without the trees. Attorney Bodnar also noted that the abutting property owner on Franklin Street did not have any objection to building the wall around the existing tree. The Applicant prefers to save this tree.

Mr. King distributed a markup of Sheet C3.0 with grades that he took at the project site. The grades presented by Mr. King differ from the grades shown on the plan sheet. Mr. King suggested that the catch basin needs to be relocated to the low point of the property, which is closer to approximately 93 feet or 92.5 feet. Mr. King thought the trench drain could remain where it was proposed.

Mr. Mercado thought that there needs to be more clarity to the limits of the wall on the plans submitted. Mr. McCaffrey indicated that a planter berm would be installed on top of the retaining wall and a fence would be installed inside of the wall.

Mr. Mercado suggested that there should be an ornamental guardrail on the wall. Mr. Mercado suggested 42-inch black steel guardrail. Mr. Cassidy suggested a powder coated aluminum guardrail with balustrades.

Mr. McCaffrey indicated that a Cape Cod berm would be used within the property, and a granite curb will be installed on Greenleaf Place. Mr. McCaffrey indicated that some stones would be reused in the field stone wall.

Renee Chrisholm, 8 Greenleaf Place, explained that she did not know about the meeting until that morning. Ms. Chrisholm indicated that she has a different survey, and claims that there is a 2.5 to 3 foot difference. Ms. Chrisholm indicated that the Applicant may be taking advantage of her elderly father. Ms. Chrisholm would like to see the fence tapered down at Greenleaf Place.

William Doe, 8 Ireson Court, indicated that he also has problems with property lines in his neighborhood.

Attorney Bodnar explained that Mr. Chrisholm, Ms. Chrisholm's father, approached the Applicant and asked many questions. Attorney Bodnar indicated that Mr. Chrisholm appeared to be lucid during those conversations.

Mr. Cassidy also noted that there was a different person representing Mr. Chrisholm at the last meeting. Mr. Cassidy also noted that the date of the meeting was announced and posted.

Attorney Bodnar also indicated that the Applicant had a legitimate survey completed of the property.

The Planning Board members indicated that the outstanding items for the proposed project include the length of the wall, its precise location, the height, the location of the catch basin, and the style of guard rail. Mr. Mercado suggested that a condition be included for the height and length of the wall. Both the guardrail and retaining wall will taper down at the street. It was suggested that the guardrail be powder coated aluminum.

It was also suggested that the southeast corner of the property be regraded and the catch basin be located to the lowest spot. A revised Site Plan should be submitted.

The Planning Board members agreed to add a condition to the project requiring the Applicant to receive approval from the Design Review Subcommittee on the retaining wall and the drainage system and grading in the southeast corner of the property.

A condition was also added regarding removal of snow if the snow storage areas reach capacity.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward MADE a MOTION to grant the waiver requests. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward MADE a MOTION to approve the site plan review subject to the conditions that were discussed. Mr. Welch SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Documents: Site Plan Review Application Case # 14-001

Letter to Denise Gaffey, City Planner, from Andrew Street, City Engineer, dated August 19, 2014.

Letter to Andrew Street, City Engineer, from Kanayo Lala, PE, dated August 11, 2014

SITE PLAN REVIEW & AFFORDABLE HOUSING INCENTIVE PROGRAM SPECIAL PERMIT

Case 14-003, 124-138 Tremont Street, Tremont 130 Development, LLC (public hearing)

Jack Wise and Tom Bucknall, Burkhard Corporation, and Attorney Bob Bell presented the proposed project to the Planning Board and members of the public in attendance. Mr. Wise explained that he began the project about 10 months ago. Their aim is to market the condominium units to existing Melrose residents who are looking to downsize as well as younger professionals who are looking to enter the Melrose market. Mr. Wise explained that since the submittal the design has been revised to increase flood storage and retention onsite.

Mr. Wise explained that the proposed project includes 26 units. The onsite circulation is one-way, with a single entry and a single exit. The original proposal included 52 parking spaces, which was reduced to 51 parking spaces following the Department Heads meeting in early August. The building is proposed to be 4 stories.

Peter Ogren, the project engineer, indicated that the project requires approval from the Melrose Conservation Commission due to the presence of bordering land subject to flooding. Mr. Ogren noted that the proposed site plan now includes infiltration at the rear of the site. There is also a particle separator proposed. Mr. Ogren indicated that new water and sewer service will be brought to the building. The water service will be split between a 6-inch fire service and a 4-inch domestic service. Mr. Ogren indicated that a flow test will be completed.

Mr. Cassavoy noted that the cars parked in the garage would be under water in a flooding situation and that he has observed catch basins overtopping during storms. Mr. Ogren indicated that the trench drain at the garage entrance has a valve. Mr. Cassavoy did not think a valve would work in this case because the trench drain is below the flood level.

Mr. Cassavoy indicated that he was unimpressed by the project design. He asked what materials are proposed to be used. The siding will be Hardie Plank clapboard, and in certain areas a board and batten system will be used. At the base of the building, cement board panels will be used. The height of the wood frame building is 55.7 feet.

Mr. Cassidy thought that the building has a relatively weak architectural statement. There is not a lot of imagination in the building. Mr. Cassidy suggested using masonry and other materials. He also suggested altering the roof expression. Mr. Wise indicated that the roof lines were established to mimic typical residential roofs.

Joanne Conboy, 116 Tremont Street, asked if there will be a fence installed between her property and the proposed project.

Joe Sullivan, 10 Birch Hill Road, asked what the selling price would be for the units and how much parking is proposed per unit.

Peter Lasaffre, 188 Vinton Street, noted that the proposed building will be his new view. He is concerned about the height, the appearance, and the roof top AC units. He is happy the units will be condos and

would like to know the potential sale price as well. He stated that his and his neighbor's property values are at stake.

Greg Zysk, 18 Maple Road, is concerned about the scope of the project. The building is going into a congested area, and he is concerned about traffic and the kids crossing at the Lynn Fells Parkway/Tremont Street intersection to go to the High School/Middle School complex.

Ms. Morelli noted that the existing heights of the buildings on the property are 2 to 2.5 stories. The proposed building is 55 feet to the top of ridge. Attorney Bell noted that the building is designed consistent with the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Wise noted that the units will likely be priced consistent with other condominium projects in the area. Cedar Crossing condominium units with 2 bedrooms were listed for approximately \$375,000.

Ms. Morelli expressed concern regarding the large amount of parking provided. Mr. Wise indicated that it would be a detriment to the project to take away too much parking. Ms. Morelli asked if the Applicant was open to a compromise regarding the parking; for example, additional parking could be built at a later date.

Ms. Petrillo asked what would happen to the excess parking spaces. Mr. Wise indicated that they will become visitor parking. The condo association documents would indicate how excess parking spaces would be used.

Mr. Wise indicated that the traffic impact study showed a negligible increase in traffic during the peak hours. The intersection at the Lynn Fells Parkway and Tremont Street does not function well during the AM peak hours due to the school crossing. Mr. Wise noted that this one project will not fix the problems with the intersection.

Mr. Cassavoy indicated that he would like some additional information including sections and details on the trim both horizontally and vertically, more information on the roof treatment, a view from the rear, acoustical considerations, and window treatments.

Mr. Cassidy noted that recent successful projects went in one of two directions: either with clear respect for historical context, or new modernism vernacular. Mr. Cassidy did not feel that the proposed project fit into either context. Mr. Cassidy thought that the proposed design leaves him cold, and suggested continuing the vertical elements to the ground and consideration of using masonry. Mr. Cassidy also suggested regrading. Mr. Wise indicated that regrading would not be possible due to needing to provide compensatory flood storage.

Mr. Welch asked about the height of the trees. He is interested in gaining perspective of the view from Vinton Street.

The Planning Board and the Applicant discussed a variety of other items related to the Site Plan. The Applicant explained that there will be an 8-foot fence surrounding the property. Snow storage would be provided onsite in the area of three parking spaces. If the amount of snow exceeds the available on site storage, it would be removed off premises. The Applicant is working with the utility to locate the transformer to the rear of the property in the area of parking space 31.

Mr. King asked for clarification on the infiltration. He would like to know what storm it would be designed to. Mr. Ogren indicated that the infiltration system is not designed for a particular storm as the system will reduce the flow and volume.

Mr. Ogren indicated that the soil is good, although there is a small section that is soft. In this area, piles would be driven to stabilize the foundation.

The Planning Board and Applicant discussed the August 20, 2014 letter from the City Engineer. Mr. Ogren has not yet had a chance to respond to the letter. Attorney Bell objected to the City Engineer's statement that the Applicant would be responsible for deficiencies in the water main. Attorney Bell objected to similar statements made by the City Engineer regarding the drainage system.

Attorney Bell noted that the proposed condition of approval regarding a contribution to the I/I Fund is incorrect. It should be \$2.14 per gallon at 110 gallons per bedroom, not 150 gallons per bedroom. Attorney Bell also noted that the calculation should consider the existing residential land use, and be the net result.

Ms. Morelli would like a more robust landscape plan, particularly in the front lawn, as there is little to break up the long foundation wall.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward also asked for more discussion on parking. She thinks it is too high. Ms. Petrillo and Ms. Morelli agree.

Mr. Cassavoy MADE a MOTION to continue the public hearing to September 15, 2014. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Documents: Site Plan Review Application Case # 14-003
 Tremont Street, Additional Information
 Letter to Denise Gaffey, City Planner, from Andrew Street, City Engineer, dated
 August 21, 2014

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 PM.