

MELROSE PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
Design Review Subcommittee
Thursday, December 17, 2020
7:30 PM
Remote Meeting

PRESENT: Robert Mercado, Carla Morelli, John Sadowski, Jack Welch

ABSENT: Michael Cassavoy

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

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 PM by Ms. Morelli.

Pursuant to Governor Baker's March 12, 2020 Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A, §18, and the Governor's March 15, 2020 Order imposing strict limitations on the number of people that may gather in one place, this meeting was conducted via remote participation to the greatest extent possible. Meeting access and the general guidelines for remote participation by members of the public and/or parties with a right and/or requirement to attend this meeting was found on the City of Melrose's website, at www.cityofmelrose.org/remote-meetings. No in-person attendance of members of the public was permitted, but every effort was made to ensure that the public could adequately access the proceedings in real time. An audio or video recording, transcript, or other comprehensive record of proceedings was posted on the mmtv3.org website as soon as possible after the meeting. A link was also available on www.cityofmelrose.org.

Case 17-004, 524-530 Main Street, Wise Construction

David Rudloff, project manager, appeared to present materials that need review as certain elements of the project were not yet complete when the DRSC last met. He also presented items that were already build and proposed changes. The approval of the project included conditions that the Applicants would supply the Design Review Subcommittee with design details for their review and approval. Mr. Rudloff started working on the project after the permitting for the development was complete.

The material board that was presented to the Planning Board during the Site Plan Approval process remained the same except for a few changes. The retail storefront that was installed was not Pella as was previously noted because Pella windows were not recommended for storefronts. The color and pattern of the storefront system was the same. There were no changes to the front of the building. The soldier course was changed to a running bond pattern with prior DRSC approval because it did not look good in the mockup. Three different mortar colors were in the mock-up and the one that the DRSC chose was used.

Mr. Rudloff explained the changes to the rear of the building, which are documented in a presentation. They submitted these changes in March but due to the pandemic the review of them was delayed.

The DRSC had the following responses to the changes to the back of the building. They felt that the profile of the fascia of the rear canopy was not successful and should have the same style as the building's cornice. The size of the door at the rear balcony could have been made more substantial by installing transom windows to make this opening match the scale that it had on the approved plan. They agreed with the Historic District's Commissions determination that adding a longer metal panel at the second floor intersection with the brick will improve its appearance. Also, the workmanship is not great on the metal panels in the rear.

They discussed the dumpster and how it shifted back so that the doors can open. There will be enough space for trash and recycling. They estimate that it will be picked up three times a week. Members said that the mahogany on the trash enclosure will get dirty.

Ms. Gaffey met with the utility company and there was no other option for the transformer than to be in the two parking spaces. They had planned for an 84 square foot easement to have the public parking spaces on the subject property but now it is just a small triangle that is needed.

The planters in the wall on the patio were not installed. They expect that the tenants will put out planters.

The Subcommittee asked about exterior lighting. There is a strip of lighting in the fascia on the front of the building. The third floor balconies have low lights pointed down. In the rear there are subtle LED surface lights under the cap of the walls. These are the same fixtures that were in the approvals.

Members asked that the columns holding up the rear canopy are made to look sleeker. Their design is too classical for this building. They would read better as thicker columns. Removing the upper capital may help.

Overall they understood why the changes were made. They said that the building is a handsome addition to Main Street. It has classical detailing yet it's modern.

They decided to write a memo to the Building Commissioner stating that they approve of the plan for the trash and recycling area, the guardrail, lighting and the modifications outlined with the following amendments. The item marked as W-1, 'tenant signage area, beam header under canopy', on the design change list should be altered as noted above. W-3, 'bump out at B-4-B-5 line, 2nd floor', would change as shown in the presentation and as was approved by the Historic District Commission. Another item not labeled on the list is to alter the rear columns as noted above.

Documents: Presentation including the design change list dated October 27, 2020

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 pm.