

**MELROSE PLANNING BOARD  
DESIGN REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES**

**Monday, September 29, 2014**

**7:30 PM**

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

**PRESENT:** Ed Cassidy, Michael Cassavoy, Paul King, Robert Mercado, John Sadowski, and Jack Welch

**ABSENT:** None

Erin Zwirko, Assistant Planning Director, was present.

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 PM by Mr. Cassidy

Case # 14-001, 92 Franklin Street, SIG-O Properties, LLC

Brian McCaffrey, the applicant, and Kanoyo Lala, the project engineer, presented to the Design Review Subcommittee. Mr. McCaffrey indicated that the fence and retaining wall have been clarified on the plans. The fence would be installed on top of the retaining wall using a PVC sleeve for anchoring. Mr. McCaffrey stated that a 6-foot privacy fence would be installed on the shared property line with 108 Franklin Street. A 4-foot privacy fence would be used on the share property line with 8 Greenleaf Place. The shorter fence was chosen as it would be installed on a 6-foot high retaining wall. The retaining wall ends around parking space 6. Beyond the retaining wall, there is a 1:3 slope which will be protected from erosion by a Cape Cod berm. The privacy fence ends approximately 8 feet from the property line to accommodate sight lines. The retaining wall will have a 6 inch reveal, but there is no guardrail proposed.

Mr. McCaffrey noted that the inverts for the catch basin and the trench drain were reassessed and revised. Mr. McCaffrey also noted that the catch basin will have a solid steel cover installed to match the finished grade of 95.5 feet.

Mr. Sadowski noted that the catch basin will act essentially as a manhole. Mr. McCaffrey indicated that Mr. Sadowski's statement is correct. Mr. McCaffrey also noted that it would provide an access point for cleaning by catching sediment prior to the sediment getting into the drywell and clogging the drywell.

Mr. Cassidy asked about the capacity of the drywell. Mr. Lala indicated that the calculations were presented as part of the Site Plan Review Application reviewed by the Planning Board. Mr. Lala indicated that at the time of installation, a percolation test will be completed to confirm that the capacity is adequate as required by the Site Plan Review Decision. Ms. Zwirko noted that the City Engineer reviewed the stormwater management plan and is comfortable with the system.

Mr. Mercado asked for a detail of the trench drain. Mr. Lala noted that trench drains come in differently sized pieces, which snap together to achieve the desired length. The proposed trench drain will be set in a concrete base. The proposed trench drain will be 6 inches by 6 inches. Mr. Mercado thought that it may need to be widened at the end prior to release into the catch basin.

Mr. Sadowski asked about the Grasspave proposed for the parking spaces. Mr. Lala explained that a concrete structure is installed and grass is grown through the structure. The product is designed for vehicle loads.

Mr. Cassidy asked where the high point is on the property. Mr. Lala indicated that it is between parking spaces 3 and 4.

Mr. Sadowski agreed that lowering the height of the fence is a good idea on the Greenleaf Place side.

Mr. Cassidy asked about the safety aspect of a 6-inch reveal. He thought that 6 inches would not stop a vehicle from driving over the curb. He noted that there is a decent drop on the other side of the fence. Mr. Cassidy suggested that the curb should be a bit higher, and the fence height reduced to compensate.

Mr. Mercado asked what type of wall is proposed. Mr. McCaffrey indicated that a decision has not been made, but it will be either a stone wall or a pre-cast wall. Mr. Cassidy noted that the plans indicate that the wall is to be a mortared stone wall. If Mr. McCaffrey wants to use a different material, the Decision will have to be modified. Mr. Cassidy indicated that he is not a fan of pre-cast walls.

Mr. King indicated that he has some questions related to grading at the driveway exit. Mr. King calculated a 19 percent grade from the high point to the street. He also noted that there is a crest in Greenleaf Place that needs to be accounted for when grading, as vehicles will bottom out at the driveway end. Mr. Cassidy agreed that the slope should be kept to a minimum and the inverts and RIM should be adjusted. Ms. Zwirko asked Mr. King to suggest an appropriate grade. Mr. King suggested an average of 8 percent as the pitch of the slope will have to be designed so as to still direct runoff toward the trench drain and the other structures.

Mr. Cassidy indicated that he would like to see the reveal have more substantial height. Mr. Cassidy suggested that the alternative would be to install a heavy duty fence, but that will have the appearance of a jail, or a guardrail. If the reveal was increased to 18 inches, the fence on the Greenleaf Place side would be reduced to about 30 inches for a total of 48 inches.

Mr. Cassavoy MADE a MOTION to accept the design subject to the following modifications:

1. Increase the height of the retaining wall reveal to 18 inches and correspondingly reduce the height of the fence to a maximum of 48 inches on the shared property with 8 Greenleaf Place.
2. Revise the grading at the driveway exit to have an average 8 percent slope. Submit the revised plan to the Office of Planning and Community Development.
3. Submit a manufacturer's specification for the trench drain to the Office of Planning and Community Development.

Mr. Welch SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 PM.