

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

Thursday, December 18, 2014

7:30 PM

Basement Conference Room, Lower Level, City Hall, 562 Main Street

PRESENT: Ed Cassidy, Mike Cassavoy, Robert Mercado, John Sadowski, and Jack Welch

ABSENT: None

Erin Zwirko, Assistant Planning Director, was present.

The meeting was called to order at 7:35 PM by Mr. Cassidy

Case 13-003, 2 Washington Street, WP East Development Enterprises

Carolyn Zern was present to discuss the signage proposal and the material mockup which was reviewed in the field on December 9, 2014 with the Design Review Subcommittee. Ms. Zern provided a revised sign plan for the monument sign. Ms. Zern explained that the monument sign was reduced from 8 feet tall to 6 feet tall to be in compliance with the signage requirements of the Smart Growth District. She explained that signage would use a scratched copper material. She referred to the design as “swanky naturalism” which draws influence from the nearby Fells and the history of the neighborhood. Ms. Zern provided copies of the internal signage as well to show the Subcommittee how the design idea is carried through the building. The monument sign will be 4 feet by 6 feet. White vinyl lettering will be applied to the transom above the main entrance to indicate the street address, and it will be used to give information at the leasing office. Parking signage for guest spaces and handicap spaces was provided. Ms. Zern indicated that the retail space will return to the Design Review Subcommittee for signage review at a later date. Ms. Zern thought that the signage has a clean and crisp appearance.

Mr. Cassidy asked if Ms. Zern brought a sample. Unfortunately, she did not have a sample available, but explained that the print out is a good representation of the materials. She explained that there is a nice contrast between the number and the copper material. Mr. Cassavoy asked if it is real copper. It is not.

Mr. Cassavoy asked if the monument sign was illuminated. Ms. Zern explained that the sign will be illuminated with two white lights that are ground mounted. Mr. Mercado asked if the illumination will create glare. Ms. Zern indicated that the sign will be encased with a clear acrylic to absorb light and minimize glare.

Mr. Sadowski noted that the rendering does not show the reduced height of the monument sign. He noted that it will be closer in height to the stop sign.

Mr. Cassavoy stated that the sign was the appropriate height and being double sided will assist vehicles travel north and southbound on Washington Street.

Mr. Mercado asked about the setback. Ms. Zern noted that the signage location plan is not to scale, but she indicated that the sign will be setback 10 feet from the property line as required by the Smart Growth District’s signage requirements. Mr. Mercado asked if pedestrians will be visible on the sidewalk due to the monument sign. Ms. Zern stated that the required setback and the site lighting will assist in visibility.

Mr. Mercado asked if the monument sign will have a footing. It will.

Mr. Cassidy asked where the text 2 Washington Street would be applied. Ms. Zern indicated that it would be used in the transom above the main entrance and above the door at the courtyard.

Mr. Sadowski stated that signage package is attractive.

Mr. Cassavoy MADE a MOTION to approve the signage package for 2 Washington as amended to reduce the height of the monument sign to 6 feet tall as shown on Sheet 1.1, prepared by Advanced Signing, dated October 23, 2014, and to meet all of the required setbacks for standing signs. Mr. Sadowski SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Cassavoy, and Mr. Welch visited the site on December 9, 2014 to view the materials mockup prepared by the applicant. Mr. Cassavoy explained where the various material pieces go. Mr. Cassavoy explained that the members who were onsite determined that the corrugated metal color should be more closely matched to the mortar color, and settled on the middle gray option available, known as Dove Gray.

Mr. Sadowski asked if the lintel is pre-cast concrete. Mr. Cassavoy indicated it is. Mr. Sadowski asked if the sills were pre-cast as well. Ms. Zern indicated that on the ground floor there are pre-cast sills.

Mr. Sadowski asked if the window muntins were bright white. Ms. Zern indicated that the muntin color matches the panel and will not be a bright white.

Mr. Mercado asked when the brick work will commence. Ms. Zern indicated in the spring.

Mr. Welch asked about a completion date. Ms. Zern indicated that July or August 2015.

Mr. Cassavoy MADE a MOTION to approve the material mockup for 2 Washington Street as reviewed in the field on December 9, 2014, and at the meeting on December 18, 2014 with the corrugated metal elements being in Dove Gray. Mr. Welch SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Case 12-004, 160 Green Street, Eric Kenworthy

Eric Kenworthy discussed his project at 160 Green Street with the Design Review Subcommittee. Mr. Kenworthy explained that he would like to revise the retaining wall proposed for the property line with 164 Green Street following discussions with the owners of the Green Street Natural Food Store. The owners, Mr. and Mrs. Cantin, do not want disruptions to their front walkway. The originally proposed poured-in-place concrete retaining wall would have required significant excavation for the footing and construction. Mr. Kenworthy has worked on a solution to use a Shea block wall, essentially guard rail blocks, with a poured-in-place cap.

Mr. Cassidy confirmed that all excavation for the new wall would be completed on Mr. Kenworthy's property. It will be. Mr. Kenworthy explained that there will be no disturbance to the store as a result of the proposal.

Mr. Sadowski indicated that the proposed wall will have significant stability. He indicated that stamped plans prepared by a structural engineer would likely be required by the Building Commissioner. Mr. Kenworthy agreed.

Mr. Mercado asked where the wall would be related to the property line. Mr. Kenworthy indicated that it will be 6 inches off the property line, in the approximate location as an existing wall. It will be tapered.

Mr. Mercado noted that the weep holes may direct water onto the neighbor's property. He inquired whether it was discussed with the Cantins. Mr. Kenworthy indicated that it was.

Mr. Cassavoy asked about the fence to be installed on top of the rear retaining wall. Mr. Kenworthy noted that it would be 6-foot fence, but that may be too tall and imposing. Mr. Cassavoy asked how the fence would be installed. Mr. Kenworthy indicated that it would be drilled into the concrete cap. Mr. Cassavoy thought 6 feet was very high, especially since the retaining wall will be tall. Mr. Cassidy thought that a 4-foot fence would be enough. Mr. Kenworthy indicated that the guard rail blocks will not move. The guard rail will be used on the parking lot side. He agrees that a 4-foot fence is suitable and will provide fall protection.

Mr. Cassavoy suggested that Mr. Kenworthy core drill the fence posts into the retaining wall, line the drill holes with a sleeve, and use epoxy to hold the posts in place. Mr. Cassavoy asked what type of fence would be used. Mr. Kenworthy noted that it will be stockade fence.

Mr. Cassidy suggested reducing the height of the rear fence to the lowest permitted by code.

Mr. Mercado asked about the size of the cap on the retaining wall. It will be about 10 inches wide and 2 feet tall.

Mr. Kenworthy asked if the Design Review Subcommittee was interested in reviewing the color of the pervious pavers. The Subcommittee declined, but suggested that a neutral color was best.

Mr. Kenworthy noted that a vertical granite curb will be used at the right-of-way, but internal curbing would be the Shea blocks as used in the retaining wall. The Subcommittee did not assert any jurisdiction as the approved plans did not specify granite curbing internal to the site.

Mr. Mercado MADE a MOTION to accept the revised retaining wall design at 160 Green Street along the shared property line with 164 Green Street as shown on Sheet 1 of 1, prepared by R&M Engineering Consultants, dated November 20, 2014, with the following additional conditions:

1. The guard rail block coloration shall be substantially the same as in the photo with an OPCD date stamped November 19, 2014;
2. The fence on top of the rear retaining wall shall be the lowest permitted by code;
3. All fences used on the property shall be the same type as previously approved; and
4. All fence posts shall be core drilled into the retaining wall for anchorage.

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

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 PM.