

**MELROSE PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
Regular Meeting and Public Hearing
Monday, June 24, 2013**

7:45 PM

Mayor's Conference Room, 2nd Floor, City Hall, 562 Main Street

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

ABSENT: None

Denise Gaffey, Director and City Planner, and Adam Duchesneau, Assistant Planning Director, were present.

The meeting was called to order at 7:47 PM by Ms. Morelli.

MINUTES

Regular Meeting, May 20, 2013

Mr. Cassidy MADE a MOTION to accept the minutes of May 20, 2013. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed, Mr. Cassavoy abstained from the vote, and Ms. DeSouza-Ward, Ms. Petrillo, and Mr. Welch were absent from the vote.

Zoning Subcommittee Meeting, May 15, 2013

Mr. King MADE a MOTION to accept the minutes of May 15, 2013. Mr. Cassidy SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed and Ms. DeSouza-Ward, Ms. Petrillo, and Mr. Welch were absent from the vote.

BOARD OF APPEALS

Case # 13-012, 880 Main Street, Metro Sign and Awning

Brian Chipman of Metro Sign & Awning was in attendance to represent the Applicant to discuss the proposed project with the Planning Board. Whole Foods is planning to erect two, 32 inch high, approximately 40 foot long non-illuminated fabricated metal set façade signs as part of the establishment of their business at 880 Main Street. In addition, they also want to replace the old "FOODMASTER" pylon sign panel with a similarly sized "WHOLE FOODS MARKET" sign in the existing footprint. Mr. Cassavoy clarified that the proposed pylon sign panel would be the same size as the old "FOODMASTER" sign. Mr. Chipman indicated that was correct and went on to state that each façade sign was approximately 106 square feet in size including the 1.75 square feet for the squiggle above the "O" in "WHOLE".

Mr. Cassavoy then stated that the Applicant was essentially looking for a 100% variance from the signage ordinance because the ordinance only permits signs up to 50 square feet (or 10% of the façade to which it is attached, whichever is the lesser). Mr. Cassavoy went on to point out that the City had worked hard to craft a new signage ordinance just a few years ago and now the Applicant is asking for double what the ordinance allows. He asked for some more justification from the Applicant as to why the Planning Board should grant this Variance. Mr. Chipman indicated that the substantial setback of the building and the existing traffic conditions at the intersection of Lynn Fells Parkway and Main Street make the business not readily visible to those passing by. Mr. Cassavoy rebuffed this statement indicating that this is a fairly slow (for vehicles) downtown intersection and most residents know about the location of this soon-to-open Whole Foods Market. He went on to state that because of these factors, the setback of the building and the intersection traffic could not be used as justifications for the need for larger signage.

Mr. Sadowski then asked for clarification of the wording in the signage ordinance. Ms. Gaffey confirmed that the ordinance indicates that the size of a sign shall be limited to 10% of the area of the wall on which it is displayed or 50 square feet, which is the lesser. Mr. Sadowski stated that on the one hand, the "FOODMASTER" sign was not a good color scheme, but the Whole Foods Market sign has a reasonable color palette. However, the proposed Whole Foods façade signage is more than double what is currently permitted in the zoning ordinance. Ms. DeSouza-Ward indicated that it is difficult to set a signage size limit on every building, particularly with this structure because it is so large. She went on to note that the Zoning Subcommittee had very mixed emotions about what type of signage should be permitted on this building when they were formulating the new signage regulations. Mr. Cassavoy pointed out that the Zoning Subcommittee had worked very hard to arrive at the current language in the signage ordinance.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward then noted that there is a substantial difference between the old Johnnie's Foodmaster signs and the proposed Whole Foods Market signs. Mr. Chipman pointed out that the proposed Whole Foods façade signs are actually slightly shorter than the old Johnnie's Foodmaster façade signs. Mr. Cassavoy indicated that he felt the Whole Foods façade signs appeared to be a bit longer than the old Foodmaster signs. Ms. Gaffey stated that she thought it would be harder to make the proposed façade signage smaller due to the name of the business. She went on to reinforce what Ms. DeSouza-Ward said earlier about the building being quite large and how there are not many other buildings like it in Melrose. Mr. Mercado pointed out that if only the 10% wall area portion of the signage ordinance were to be applied in this instance, the proposed façade signage would be able to be approximately 160 square feet in size. Ms. Gaffey then noted that the Zoning Subcommittee felt it was difficult to write regulations for the pylon sign at this particular site because of the uniqueness of the building with regard to its size and setbacks. Ms. DeSouza-Ward stated that if any location in Melrose was unique enough to get a Variance from the signage ordinance it could be this building. Mr. King pointed out that the Rite Aid signage is currently very large. He went on to ask the Applicant if they knew what was being proposed to illuminate the signage and he assumed that gooseneck lighting would be used. Mr. Chipman indicated that this was entirely up to the building operator.

Mr. Cassidy stated that he felt the City was very lucky in that there were only two strip mall style shopping plazas in the whole municipality. He went on to state that he felt the Planning Board should simply count its blessings that there so few and support this proposed Variance. He went further to say that the Board should be glad that they do not have a community filled with strip malls and recommended that the Applicant be awarded the Variance to allow Whole Foods to announce their name. Mr. Sadowski noted that he thought there was an opportunity here to create some guidelines for the type of lighting that would be permitted for the signage by recommending that the Applicant be required to return before the Design Review Subcommittee as part of the Variance decision.

Mr. King stated that he felt the lighting between the various signs along the façade is something important that should be considered. He went on to indicate that he felt the proposed façade signage is appropriate for the size of the building and for this location within the City. Mr. Sadowski stated that this proposal was an unusual circumstance and felt that the most relevant comment to this point was the 10% wall area limitation comment. Were it not for the 50 square foot signage size limitation in the ordinance, a much larger sign would be permitted as-of-right in this location. He suggested that the Planning Board recommend approval of the requested Variance. Mr. Welch stated that a small sign on this large building would make the façade look very empty. The proposed sign will add to the attractiveness of the façade of the building he felt.

Mr. Sadowski suggested that the Planning Board recommend a condition be included in the Board of Appeals decision that the Applicant be required to return to the Planning Board's Design Review

Subcommittee relative to the lighting of the signage since the Applicant could not articulate the type of lighting that would be implemented. Mr. Sadowski also suggested that the Planning Board recommend a condition be added to the decision that dealt with the repair of holes and ghosting of letters from the previous signage on the façade. Ms. Morelli then confirmed that Mr. Sadowski was calling for a positive recommendation letter to the Board of Appeals that included both of the conditions. Mr. Sadowski indicated that was correct.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward stated that she felt slightly uncomfortable recommending approval of a Variance request. Ms. Morelli pointed out that the Zoning Subcommittee anticipated an exception to the signage regulations in this area as they knew there would be outliers. She went on to state that she felt the proposed signage met the spirit and intent of what the Zoning Subcommittee was trying to accomplish with the new signage ordinance, and the proposed signage is still less than 10% of the wall to which it will be attached. Mr. Sadowski pointed out that the Planning Board could express concerns that this application not be used as precedent for future cases. Ms. Morelli suggested that the Board use the wording “not opposed” in the recommendation letter as opposed to indicating the Board was supportive of the application. Mr. Sadowski stated that he preferred to use the “not opposed” wording and Mr. Cassidy agreed. Mr. Cassidy also noted that Mr. Welch made a good point that the signage should be proportional to the façade of the building and he felt that this was the case.

Mr. Cassidy then MADE a MOTION to send a letter to the Board of Appeals which indicated that the Planning Board was not opposed to this signage Variance application. The recommendation letter should also indicate that the Planning Board is recommending a condition be included in the decision that the Applicant be required to return to the Planning Board’s Design Review Subcommittee relative to the lighting of the signage. The letter should also recommend a condition be added to the decision that dealt with the repair of holes and ghosting of letters from the previous signage on the façade. Ms. DeSouza-Ward SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Document: ZBA Application Case # 13-012

Case # 13-011, 46 Beacon Street, Robert and Barbara Walsh

The Applicants, Robert and Barbara Walsh, were in attendance and were being represented by their attorney, Robert L. Bell, Jr., Esq., to discuss their proposed project with the Planning Board. Mr. Bell explained that the Walsh’s had bought the house and the extra lot at 46 Beacon Street and would now like to sell off the extra parcel as a buildable lot. In the late 1940’s or early 1950’s, a previous owner had begun to construct a house on the extra lot, however, they were only able to construct a foundation before passing away. The structure was then use as a commercial worm farm and was joined with the lot that contains the residential structure but only for the purposes of zoning. The existing dwelling is in a SR-A district and the extra lot is located in a UR-A district. The Applicants are proposing to take 25 feet of frontage from the lot with the existing dwelling and add it to the extra lot to create a buildable lot with conforming frontage. Other dimensional Variances would be required to make the extra lot buildable. Mr. Bell went on to point out that at the rear of the property there is a difficult grade situation and the adjacent lot to the north is owned by the City. Mr. Bell then stated that when reconfigured, the two resulting lots would be similar in size to other lots in the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Welch noted that there appeared to be a substantial amount of ledge and significant slopes at the site and inquired if there would be problems with regard to those issues. Mr. Bell then indicated that the Applicants are actually looking for a Variance from the Slope Protection section of the zoning ordinance as well as the necessary lot depth and lot size dimensional Variances. Ms. Gaffey asked a clarifying question to confirm that the Applicants were seeking relief in order to not have to return before the Planning Board to seek a Slope Protection Special Permit. Mr. Bell indicated that was correct. Ms. Gaffey

then noted that no topographical information had been provided with the application and therefore it is very difficult to know what the slope situation is at the property. This in turn would make it very difficult for the Planning Board to provide a recommendation on this particular aspect of the Variance request. Mr. Cassavoy agreed and felt that the Board members did not have enough information in the application to make that kind of a determination. Mr. Sadowski indicated that he did not fully understand the Applicants request. Ms. Gaffey confirmed that the Applicants are asking for a Variance from the entire Slope Protection section of the zoning ordinance.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward stated that she would not support a Variance from the Slope Protection section of the zoning ordinance. Mr. King indicated that he felt that that application was unclear. Ms. Gaffey noted that the Building Commissioner's letter only makes reference to the proposed new lot. Ms. DeSouza-Ward asked if the Applicants were requesting lot depth Variances for both of the lots and Mr. Bell indicated that the lot depth Variance would only be for the proposed lot. Mr. Sadowski then clarified that the Applicants were asking for lot size Variances for both of the lots, a lot depth Variance for the proposed new lot, and a Variance from the Slope Protection section of the zoning ordinance. Mr. Bell indicated that was correct.

Mr. Cassavoy noted that the only positive item he could see in the application was that the frontage of each of the lots would still be in compliance. Mr. Bell pointed out that the proposed lot division line appeared to make sense geometrically. Mr. Welch inquired as to where the ledge was located on the site. Mr. Bell stated that most of the ledge in the area was located on the City's property just to the north. Mr. Cassidy stated that it seemed like the Planning Board is being asked to approve something that they do not understand. Mr. Cassavoy noted that the proposal is taking a nonconforming lot and making it less conforming. He went on to state that the existing lot would only be around 66% conforming to create another lot that also does not meet the zoning requirements. Mr. Mercado noted that anyone who was going to build a house on the proposed new lot would likely build it where the existing foundation is located.

Mr. Sadowski stated that most of the consideration would be going towards the request for relief from the lot area and lot depth at the site, but how can the Planning Board consider a Variance from the Slope Protection ordinance? Ms. DeSouza-Ward confirmed that the Slope Protection ordinance factors in the lot area calculations at a property. Ms. Gaffey confirmed that was correct and stated that an Applicant is not allowed to count steeply sloped areas towards their lot area per dwelling unit calculation without a Special Permit from the Planning Board. Mr. Cassavoy rhetorically asked how you can make a nonconforming lot more nonconforming to create another nonconforming lot? He added that he felt this was simply bad planning. Ms. DeSouza-Ward stated that she had less issue with the lot area and lot depth Variance requests if they were consistent with the neighborhood. She went on to state that the Slope Protection Variance request was a very difficult one to support. Mr. Mercado stated that he felt the Planning Board needed more information regarding the Slope Protection Variance request.

Mr. Cassidy felt that the Planning Board was being asked to answer one small question that has several other questions behind it and did not feel this was fair to the Planning Board. He went on to indicate that he felt the Board would be happy to look at a full proposal, but he felt the application needed more information. Ms. Morelli asked if each zoning relief request could be separated out. Mr. Cassidy stated that was a good question because a specific design is one thing, but this application is asking one small question that will have huge impacts. Ms. DeSouza-Ward indicated she too would like to separate out each zoning relief request and asked if the slope at the site met the 25% slope requirement in the ordinance. Ms. Gaffey indicated that there is no way to know this because there was no topographical information submitted with the application. Ms. DeSouza-Ward then stated that she felt it would be hard to separate out each zoning relief request without more information.

Mr. Bell indicated that he and his clients would be comfortable with the Board recommending a denial of the Slope Protection Variance request, but the other Variances that are being requested are consistent with the surrounding neighborhood he felt. The other two Variance requests will only enhance the build-ability of the proposed new lot. He went on to note that the Assessor's Map shows that there are other lots in the area that are smaller or narrower than the proposed lot. Mr. Bell continued on to say that the hardship in this instance is that the parcel needs to be rezoned to become a buildable lot. He felt that it seemed harsh to rule out an entire application with the unknown status of the Slope Protection ordinance requirement. Mr. Bell then pointed out that there may not even be a Slope Protection issue at the site.

Mr. Cassavoy stated that if all of the requests were going to be lumped together that he could not support the application. Mr. Bell then stated that if the Planning Board was asking the Applicants to drop the Slope Protection Variance request, they will do that, but he also stated that he felt it was not appropriate for the Board to request that. He added that he is simply trying to solve his clients overall problems with their property. Mr. Walsh then stated that the ledge in the area is more towards the left of the existing structure on the extra lot. The ledge does not encompass the foundation that is located on the proposed new lot. Mr. Walsh did point out that someone would have to cut into the front slope of the site to create a driveway for any habitable structure at the property. The Walsh's then distributed pictures of the existing site that they had brought to the meeting.

Mr. Sadowski indicated that he was not as concerned about the lot depth Variance request but more so with the lot area Variance request. Mr. Mercado asked for confirmation as to which zoning district each of the lots was located. Mr. Bell confirmed that the lot with existing residential structure was in the SR-A district and the proposed new lot was located in the UR-A district. Mr. Sadowski noted that each of the lots appeared to be close to satisfying lot depth requirement for each of the zoning districts, but a buyer would need to be aware that additional dimensional Variances may be required to build a structure on the new lot. Mr. King asked what the likelihood of a structure being built on the new lot would be and also noted that he was not supportive of the application. Mr. Cassavoy stated that there would probably not be too many other issues with the new lot other than these requested Variances, but he could not support a Variance from the Slope Protection ordinance. He went on to suggest that a neutral letter be sent to the Board of Appeals noting that there are small lots in the surrounding area but that there are also conforming lots in the neighborhood as well. He continued further to say that the letter should state how the lot area and lot depth Variance requests are fairly small for this neighborhood, but that anyone intending to build a structure on the new lot will likely have to return to the Board of Appeals for other setback Variances. Mr. Mercado stated that he agreed with Mr. Cassavoy's suggested letter.

Mr. Sadowski then MADE a MOTION to send a neutral letter to the Board of Appeals which discussed how the application was submitted as a package of Variance relief requests from lot area, lot depth, and for relief from the Slope Protection ordinance. The letter should also indicate that the Planning Board had difficulty separating out the Slope Protection Variance request from the other portions of the application. The Planning Board suggested that the Applicant withdraw their Slope Protection Variance request which the Applicants agreed to do. Then, in considering only the lot area and lot depth Variance requests, the Planning Board felt that the proposed new lots were not out of range with the size and shape of other parcels in the surrounding neighborhood. The letter should then close by noting that the Applicant will be required to return before the Planning Board to seek a Slope Protection Special Permit if they were able to move forward with the construction of any habitable building on the new lot. Mr. Cassidy SECONDED the MOTION. The motion passed 7-2 with Ms. Morelli, Ms. DeSouza-Ward, Mr. Cassavoy, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Mercado, Mr. Sadowski, and Mr. Welch in favor and with Mr. King and Ms. Petrillo opposed.

Case # 13-013, 2 Main Street, W/M Oak Grove Village, LLC

The Applicant, W/M Oak Grove Village, LLC, was being represented by their attorney, Robert L. Bell, Jr., Esq., to discuss their proposed project with the Planning Board. Mr. Bell explained that the Applicant is looking for relief from the original Oak Grove Board of Appeals decision which states that the development shall only have one restaurant of no more than 5,000 square feet. A prospective sushi restaurant is hoping to locate in a currently vacant storefront in the development. The existing Bobby C's Restaurant is only approximately 3,000 square feet and the total of the two restaurants would still be below the 5,000 square foot threshold.

Ms. Morelli asked what the size would be of the proposed sushi restaurant and Mr. Bell indicated that the new restaurant would be 1,251 square feet. Mr. Welch asked if the sushi restaurant would be on the Main Street side of development and Mr. Bell indicated that it would be. Ms. DeSouza-Ward stated that she thought the sushi restaurant was a good idea. Mr. Mercado asked for further clarification on the exact location of the proposed restaurant and Ms. Gaffey stated that the restaurant would be located on the interior of the development where the spa and dry cleaners are currently located. This is the north side of the retail building Ms. Gaffey confirmed. Mr. Cassidy stated that he recalled the size limitation for the restaurant in the development being created in an attempt to avoid a fast food restaurant locating there. Mr. Sadowski indicated that he felt the intent of the restriction was to have a mixed use, service use style development for the project. Ms. Gaffey pointed out that the one restaurant of no more than 5,000 square feet limitation was a Board of Appeals condition, not a condition of a Planning Board decision.

Mr. Sadowski asked if there would be any parking issues associated with the proposal. Mr. Petrillo added that she thought there would be with a new restaurant because of the need for additional staff parking. Mr. Cassidy stated that the off-street parking situation would be a private management issue but that no further relief was needed for parking. Mr. Mercado asked if the Applicant would need to apply for signage relief and Ms. Gaffey stated that was not the case as long as they were in compliance with the signage ordinance and other requirements of the district. Mr. Cassidy stated that he felt the Planning Board should not oppose this application. Mr. Mercado inquired if the restaurant would have any restrooms and Mr. Bell indicated that the restrooms are already located in a common corridor in the building. Ms. DeSouza-Ward indicated that she felt the only issue there may be is one related to parking. Mr. Sadowski pointed out that the initial concerns about limiting the development to only one restaurant of 5,000 square feet stemmed from the Board's attempt to discourage a fast food restaurant from locating there. Mr. Sadowski went on to note that he felt a second restaurant here would only add to the mixed use environment of the area. Mr. Cassavoy agreed and felt that having two restaurants here would allow them to have a symbiotic relationship.

Mr. Cassidy then MADE a MOTION to send a positive letter to the Board of Appeals which indicated that the Planning Board's initial concerns about only having one restaurant of 5,000 square feet in this project stemmed from the attempt to discourage a fast food restaurant from locating in this development. Mr. Cassavoy SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Document: ZBA Application Case # 13-013

Case # 13-014, 16 Ardsmoor Road, Jia-Lin and Kristin Fu

The Applicants, Jia-Lin and Kristin Fu, were in attendance and were being represented by their attorney, Louis P. Izzi, Esq., to discuss their proposed project with the Planning Board. Mr. Izzi explained that the Applicants were seeking a Variance from the Board of Appeals to construct an attached garage on an existing single-family dwelling. The main structure of the garage will sit 12.4 feet from the rear property line but the bulkhead at the rear of the dwelling, which is only 8.5 feet from the rear property line, will also be enclosed.

Ms. Morelli confirmed that the survey had been drawn correctly and Mr. Izzi indicated that it was. Mr. Izzi went on to note that many homes in the neighborhood have attached garages with breezeways. When the previous owners lived at the property, the old garage was struck by a neighbor with her vehicle and ruined. The Applicants are hoping to locate the new garage in the same location on the property as the old garage Mr. Izzi indicated. Mr. King asked if the proposed garage was the same size as the original garage. Ms. Morelli also asked if the Planning Board could assume that this garage was the same size as the original one because the garages that are built today are much larger than older garages. Mr. Izzi stated that he could not confirm the exact size of the old garage but that the proposed garage would not be out of character with other properties in the neighborhood.

Ms. DeSouza-Ward confirmed that the only Variance the Applicants were seeking was for the rear yard setback and Mr. Izzi indicated this was correct. Mr. Morelli asked if the Plot Plan was drawn correctly because she noted that the rear edge of the garage does not align with the bulkhead. After some discussion amongst the Board members, it was shown that the submitted plans confirmed otherwise. Ms. DeSouza-Ward asked what was located behind the existing dwelling and Mr. Izzi stated that Mark Carroll's Upham Street development was located behind this property. Mr. Mercado asked how the patio would be accessed and the Applicants indicated that a few steps would be constructed to access it.

Mr. Cassidy then MADE a MOTION to send a standard letter to the Board of Appeals. Mr. Cassavoy SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

SITE PLAN REVIEW & AFFORDABLE HOUSING SPECIAL PERMIT

Case # 12-004, 160 Green Street, Eric Kenworthy (continued Public Hearing)

The Applicant, Eric Kenworthy, was in attendance, as well as his partner David Ingemi, to provide an update on the project to the Planning Board. Mr. Kenworthy noted that his project team has a new agreement with the current property owner which was finalized earlier in the day. He went on to note that his project team has a list of items they will be addressing which the Planning Board had requested they look at including the proposed parking lot, site grading, egress from the building, etc. Mr. Kenworthy also stated that they have reached an agreement with Franklin Manor and Mr. Cassavoy asked what the details of this agreement were. Mr. Kenworthy indicated that he has agreed to only construct six dwelling units at the property, to pave the rear parking area quarterly, to pull back his parking area 10 feet from the Franklin Manor property line, and also to perform some work on the Franklin Manor property including some parking lot repair, repaving, and sealing.

Mr. Kenworthy then stated that he would like to discuss the affordable housing contribution component of the project with the Planning Board. He noted that there were other projects in the City that have handled this aspect with a 2% total sales price payment to the Affordable Housing Trust Fund. Mr. Kenworthy stated that he felt this would be the best way for him to address this requirement of his project at 160 Green Street. He went on to note that this is an expensive property and it is a difficult site to work with. He also cited high litigation fees with Franklin Manor and the infrastructure and drainage issues at the property as aspects that are putting a financial strain on the project. Mr. Kenworthy stated that he had considered trying to building seven units at the project site and possibly returning to the Board of Appeals in an attempt to help soften his costs for the project, but he ultimately decided not to go this route. He then indicated that he would like to contribute less than 2% of the total sales price of the units for the project into the Affordable Housing Trust Fund to meet the Affordable Housing Incentive Program requirement.

Mr. Sadowski asked if there would be enough room on the site to have a 10 foot setback of the parking area from Franklin Manor. Mr. Kenworthy noted that in the original plan set they had shown a 10 foot

setback so there should be enough room at the property. Mr. Sadowski then stated that the slopes of the ingress/egress driveways, the site lines from the mouth of each driveway, landscaping, and plantings should all be given strong consideration in the next rendition of the plans. Ms. Gaffey pointed out that Mr. Kenworthy has a list of concerns already that the Planning Board compiled at a previous meeting. Mr. Sadowski noted that although Green Street was recently paved the last time the project went to the Board of Appeals, it seems that enough time has now passed where re-opening the street, if necessary, should not be a big issue. Ms. DeSouza-Ward asked how many previous cases had handle the affordable housing contribution with a payment instead of providing a dwelling unit and Ms. Gaffey stated that there were only two previous cases that had done this.

Mr. King confirmed that the grades at the site had not changed from the original rendition, which Mr. Kenworthy said was correct. Mr. King then went on to note that the existing break-over angles do not work and that to fix this the driveway grades will need to be reduced. Mr. Kenworthy stated that he had been looking at similar projects in the area and the development at 560 Lebanon Street (Crystal Lake Condominiums) seems to have a steeper driveway than what he is proposing at 160 Green Street. He went on to note that he felt he could make the driveways at the Green Street project successful. Mr. King responded by saying that the break-over angle situation is exacerbated by the fact that the sidewalks in this area are only about five feet wide. Mr. Kenworthy noted that at this point he really just wanted to get the project back in motion and to be prepared for the next meeting in July, so he did not bring too many materials to this particular meeting. Mr. King asked if the Applicant had considered raising the entire site to help reduce the driveway grades. Mr. Kenworthy indicated that he had considered this but it would require there to be more steps leading up to the front door of each unit. The current design already has four steps leading up to each door.

Ms. Morelli asked Mr. Kenworthy if he would be bringing his full project team to the July meeting. Mr. Kenworthy indicated that his full team would be in attendance at the meeting and he was planning on submitting updated materials to the Planning Office one week prior to the July 29th meeting. Ms. Morelli stated that she felt the project had reached the point of design where there should now be coordination between disciplines regarding all aspects of the project. She went on to note that right now it is impossible to know if the proposed design elements will all fit together out in the field. Mr. Mercado asked the Applicant to please address the pedestrian issues at the mouth of each driveway. Mr. King asked the Applicant to consider the issues around fences and site lines for each of the driveways. Mr. Cassidy indicated that implementing a flashing light and beeper system for the driveways may be necessary for this project.

Mr. Cassidy MADE a MOTION to continue the 160 Green Street (Case # 12-004) hearing to the Planning Board's meeting on Monday, July 29, 2013. Mr. Sadowski SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

OTHER

Case # 13-002, 42 Sylvan Street, Eric Kenworthy

The Applicant, Eric Kenworthy, was in attendance and wanted to discuss the roof shingle selection and sign off by the Design Review Subcommittee. One of the conditions of the project's Design Review Subcommittee sign off was to have members of the Subcommittee visit the project site to determine the most appropriate roof shingle color. Mr. Kenworthy was concerned about leaving the building's roof exposed to the elements for too long while trying to coordinate a site visit for the Subcommittee members. Mr. Kenworthy also indicated that he has a lot of rock at the site and was considering using the rock for his retaining wall at the site, as well as making some changes to the landscaping.

Ms. Morelli asked what type of rock wall Mr. Kenworthy was considering constructing and Mr. Kenworthy indicated a stone and mortar style. Mr. Mercado indicated that he would like to see a sketch of the proposed wall showing the slope and height of the wall. Ms. DeSouza-Ward clarified that the Planning Board usually prefers to see natural stone walls constructed and other members of the Board indicated this was correct. Ms. Gaffey noted that preparing something out at the site for members to view prior to the July 15th Joint Public Hearing with the Board of Aldermen would be preferable.

Mr. Kenworthy then discussed the various roof shingle types that were debated at the last Design Review Subcommittee meeting. He stated that he felt a lighter shingle color would not look good on the building and that a darker gray would be better. After some discussion, the members of the Design Review Subcommittee agreed to the Applicant using the Pewterwood colored shingle.

Mr. Cassidy then MADE a MOTION to approve the Certainteed Landmark Series Pewterwood shingle color for the project at 42 Sylvan Street. Mr. Cassavoy SECONDED the MOTION. All members of the Design Review Subcommittee voted in favor. None were opposed.

Mr. Kenworthy then indicated that he would prepare a small section of the proposed stone and mortar rock wall at the 42 Sylvan Street site for the Design Review Subcommittee members to view prior to the July 15, 2013 Joint Public Hearing in order for the Design Review Subcommittee to vote on the approval of this style of wall on July 15th.

TOD Corridor Study Update

Mr. Duchesneau provided a brief update to the Planning Board regarding the last Commuter Rail Corridor Visioning meeting that was held on Wednesday, June 19, 2013. Approximately 15 members of the public were in attendance at the meeting. A representative from the Metropolitan Area Planning Council made a brief presentation with some recommendations about the corridor and for the remainder of the meeting attendees were allowed to discuss various aspects of the corridor's recommendations with City and MAPC staff. The three areas of discussion for the remainder of the meeting focused on the vision (future) for the corridor, possible zoning changes, and potential transportation and infrastructure improvements. Mr. Duchesneau also noted that the materials from this meeting are available at the following link: <http://www.mapc.org/melrosetod>. Ms. Morelli asked if a link to this MAPC website could be put on the Office of Planning and Community Development's website and Mr. Duchesneau said this could easily be done.

Meeting adjourned at 9:52 PM.