

**MELROSE PLANNING BOARD**  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
**Regular Meeting**  
**Monday, July 22, 2019**  
**7:45 PM**  
**Cassidy Conference Room, City Hall, 562 Main Street**

**PRESENT:** Mike Cassavoy, Anne DeSouza-Ward, Paul King, Robert Mercado, Carla Morelli, John Sadowski, Greg Sampson & Jack Welch

**ABSENT:** Sharon Petrillo

**STAFF PRESENT:** Denise Gaffey, Director, Emma Schnur, Senior Planner & Lori Massa, Planning Coordinator

The meeting was called to order at 7:50 PM by Ms. DeSouza-Ward.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Planning Board Regular Meeting Minutes June 17, 2019

Mr. Cassavoy proposed an edit to make it clear that the whole board expressed that retaining walls and fences should not be required to have the same dimensional regulations as accessory structures. Mr. Mercado MADE a MOTION to approve the regular meeting minutes from June 17, 2019 as amended. Mr. Welch SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor, except for Mr. Sadowski who was not present at the meeting and abstained. None were opposed.

**ASSENT CALENDAR**

*Board of Appeals Public Hearing, August 14, 2019*

Case 19-022, 11 Fields Court, Rebecca O'Grady

Case 19-023, 12 Fields Court, Rebecca Sandlin

Mr. Sampson MADE a MOTION to send the Board of Appeals a letter stating that the Planning Board did not object to the applications and believed the cases involve judgments that can best be determined by the Board of Appeals based on the application materials and the information provided by the applicant and abutters at the public hearing. Ms. Morelli SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Documents: ZBA Applications, Case 19-022 & Case 19-023

**RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD OF APPEALS**

*Board of Appeals Public Hearing, August 14, 2019*

Case 19-019, 8 Spear Street, Elm Capital and Investments, LLC

Attorney McAvoy appeared to explain the proposal. The purpose of the application was to get dimensional approval to be able to subdivide the lot and sell the vacant land for construction of a single-family house. He would be back before the Planning Board for subdivision approval. The application was coming in parts in an attempt to reduce opposition. Attorney McAvoy said that the SR-A zoning district sweeps in from the east and the lots in this area do not come close to the required minimum lot size.

The Board discussed how the current property owner bought the property in 2017 and there has not been a rezoning of this residential area. The SR-A district was established in 1972. The current owner should have been aware of the dimensional and slope protection requirements for the property. The subdivision would cause a divergence from the Zoning Ordinance in many ways and the result of the application would be to create a lot that would be very difficult to develop. A member mentioned that it would have helped to see what was planned for the lot.

Mr. Sampson MADE a MOTION to send the Board of Appeals a letter stating that the Board did not support the application. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Documents: ZBA Application, Case 19-019

Case 19-020, 20 Faxon Street, Caroline Petrovick

Ms. Petrovick, Applicant, appeared to explain the application. She said that they were limited in the location of the addition because there is a two-car garage with an entrance at the back of the house. They are friendly with their neighbors and see the proposed porch at the front of the house as a space to interact with them.

The Board discussed how the lot would continue to meet the open space requirement with the addition. The property extends back farther than the paved area where there is a lawn and large trees. They asked Ms. Petrovick about the setback of the structures on either side of her property. The house to the left of the subject property has a similar front yard setback to the setback of the proposed addition. The house to the right is just a few feet from the front property line. They found that because the houses on the block do not have a consistent setback, a front addition will not be imposing or inconsistent with the neighborhood. The addition is small and fits with the style of the house. Members understood the approach that was taken here considering the layout of the house and the location of the garages that are in the basement with entrances at the back of the structure.

Despite these positive attributes, the Board found it difficult to support front yard variances and the creation of a new dimensional variance.

Mr. Sadowski MADE a MOTION to send the Board of Appeals a letter explaining the Board's observations and belief that this case involves judgments that can best be determined by the Board of Appeals based on the application materials and the information provided by the applicant and abutters at the public hearing. Mr. Cassavoy SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Documents: ZBA Application, Case 19-020

Case 19-021, 67 & 73 Lovell Road, Bradley & Kristen Shreck

Mr. Sadowski disclosed that he lives close to the subject property. He has no personal agenda with this application and will participate as a Planning Board member in making a recommendation to the ZBA.

Attorney McAvoy appeared to explain the proposal. The purpose of the application was to allow for each of the single-family houses to have their own driveway. They currently share a driveway that leads to two garages. The proposal included constructing new garages on each lot that have nonconforming side and rear yard setbacks.

The Board was not supportive of the accessory structure setback variance requests. The garages on both lots will be new construction and members could not find any reason why they could not be built with conforming four foot side and rear yard setbacks.

Members felt that the plan for the proposed driveway and lot line shift could be changed to reduce the degree of the variances requested while continuing to achieve the goals of the application. The changes included reducing the width of the driveway on 67 Lovell Road to 11 feet. This would allow the lot line to move closer to 67 Lovell Road, increasing the side yard setback, lot area and frontage for 73 Lovell Road. Increasing the side yard would create space to maintain the side of 73 Lovell Road when the properties have different owners in the future.

Mr. Sadowski MADE a MOTION to send the Board of Appeals a letter stating that the Board recommended denial of the variances for setbacks for the proposed garages and, with the changes noted above, they were inclined to recommend approval of the variances related to the lot line adjustment. Mr. Welch SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Documents: ZBA Application, Case 19-021

## **SITE PLAN REVIEW**

Case 19-001, 8 Greenleaf Place, Boghos Properties

This case was discussed and continued from the May 20 and June 17, 2019 public hearings. At the June meeting the Planning Board approved the affordable housing special permit for the case.

Attorney Patrick McAvoy, Roy Tiano of Engineering Alliance, and Raymond Boghos, Applicant, appeared to explain the proposal.

Mr. Tiano reviewed the contour plan that included the land around the site that the Planning Board requested at the last meeting. The original site plan only included spot grades. The grades will not be altered significantly onsite and the development will not require land alteration for the abutting properties. The proposed building acts like a retaining wall in that it covers where the grade changes the most on the site.

The Board discussed and was satisfied with the minimal grade changes, rainwater storage system for driveway runoff, asphalt curbing to match the existing along the street, and snow storage that is in the yard or removed for large storms. The Applicant asked that the proposed condition regarding snow change to only require removal when the storage areas are not sufficient.

Members noted that they reviewed the comments from the City Engineer. Her comments and requirements are captured in the proposed conditions. They also noted that they reviewed the transportation management plan. They discussed how the parking spaces would be allocated and Mr. Boghos said that he would give preference for the covered parking spaces to anyone with special needs. Members brought this up because the accessible entry to the front door is far from the parking lot and therefore it is particularly important to have the closest and most convenient parking for those who need to use that entry.

Mr. Tiano also reviewed the revised landscape plan that was requested by the Planning Board that labels the vegetation as existing and proposed. The trees near the back of the lot that were originally thought to be on the subject property are on abutting land. Those trees will not be impacted by the development. The retaining wall along the southwestern property line will not be impacted either. The neighbor built this wall but it is actually on the subject property. The grading of the yard takes the wall into consideration so that it can remain as is. The arborvitae near the wall will also remain. They will plant a total of 10 shrubs on the lot. Shrubs will block the headlights from shining onto the neighbor's property. The arborvitae that they will be planted will be 5 to 6 feet tall. There will not be an irrigation system but there will be outside spigots to water the landscaping.

The Board requested adding more variety of plants in the front of the building because the proposed plans have the same color and shape. One idea was to plant a flowering tree in the front yard to add color and reduce the perceived massing of the building. Mr. Tiano did not think that there was room to plant a small tree in the front yard. He said that they could plant azaleas or other plants to add variety.

The Board reviewed the lighting specifications, building materials and colors. There will not be signage on the building except that required by code. Mr. Boghos assured the Board that the building constructed will match the renderings. The windows will be 2 over 2. There will be three wall mounted lights in the garage that will shine down. Members discussed if they should add a condition about lightings turning off at a certain time or having the lights on motion sensors but decided that the proposed condition about light transfer onto neighboring properties was sufficient to require that the owner address a problem if the lights are too bright. They discussed removing proposed condition 4, which requires review by the Design Review Subcommittee, because they received and were satisfied with all of the specifications that the Subcommittee typically reviews.

John Savarino of 2 Greenleaf Place appeared to speak during the public hearing. He wanted to be sure that the proposed lights would not be too bright while at the same time they need to be sufficient to reach the parking space in the lot. If they were not sufficient, he was concerned that future owners would add lights that are too bright. The Planning Board let Mr. Savarino know

that a change to the lighting would need their approval. Mr. Boghos said that the proposed fixtures on the building will provide sufficient lighting for all of the parking spaces. Mr. Savarino also expressed concern about cars driving over the retaining wall onto his property. He said that he hopes that the wheel stops are enough. Board members said that the proposed wheel stops will stop a car from going beyond the parking spaces.

Mr. Sampson MADE a MOTION to close the public hearing. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All members present voted in favor. None were opposed.

Mr. Cassavoy MADE a MOTION to APPROVE the Site Plan attaching the conditions in the Staff Memorandum as amended by removing condition 4 and changing the wording of condition 26 to state that snow will be removed when it cannot be contained in the snow storage area. Mr. Welch SECONDED the MOTION. All members present voted in favor, except for Mr. Sadowski and Mr. Mercado who abstained because they had missed past hearings. None were opposed.

Documents: Site Plan Approval and Affordable Housing Special Permit Application, Case 19-001  
Perspectives 1 & 2  
Transportation Management Plan dated July 11, 2019  
Landscape Plan with a revision date of July 11, 2019  
Existing Conditions contour Site Plan dated March 11, 2019

## **NEXT MEETING**

The next Regular Meeting is scheduled for Monday, August 26, 2019, at 7:45pm.

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 pm.