

MELROSE PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
Design Review Subcommittee
Wednesday, January 20, 2021
7:30 PM
Remote Meeting

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

ABSENT: None

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.

Revisions to Case 17-002 – ATI Signage, 419-429 Main Street

Brandon Weis, Signmaker, and Gunnar MacCormick, representative of ATI, appeared to present the proposal. Planning Staff asked them to submit a revised plan that better matched the sign on the approved plan for the building. At the 2018 DRSC review the Applicant reinforced that pin mounted letters will be used for the tenants' signs.

ATI typically has internally illuminated signs. This is a unique area so they have proposal pin mounted letters. The proposed size is allowable. Their logo is the red oval with an apex. They felt that they are aligned with the local ordinance and comfortable that clients will recognize the destination.

Members discussed how the pilaster prevents the sign from being centered above both bays of windows. It makes sense for the sign to be above the one over the door. On the plan the sign is located above the area of the sign band where the brick is vertical. Mr. Weis agreed to reduce it to fit in this sign band. Reducing the height would reduce the width too and they want it to be legible. There is aluminum backer to give depth and character to the sign. The red apex does not

have a backer. Ms. Morelli questioned if the drawing was accurate to reflect the backer. Mr. Cassavoy thought that the backer would make the sign legible. He was not opposed to the logo as it is the brand for the business. Mr. Mercado said that if the sign is only over one bay, only the area of that bay should be considered in the signage size calculation and not the other bay so that it has the right proportions. They concluded that the sign will be approximately 18 inches in the 24-inch-tall soldier course and it will be centered. The logo can be included.

The Re/Max sign on the building was issued a permit in error. It does not conform with the approval.

There was no sign originally proposed on the rear of the building. When there is access in the rear of the building, a sign is allowed to be on that façade. Members discuss how window signs are another option. They cannot take up more than 50% of the area of the window.

The sign on the back of the building would be the same design as the one on the front. The height of the sign on the building makes it look like a billboard as opposed to a wayfinding sign for the door. They agreed to have the sign on the back be the same size as the one on the front. The soldier course in the back is too high to be a sign band. Members asked if the rear could be an awning sign and the applicants were amenable to this idea.

The members did not want to finalize the rear sign location because the rear of the building was not constructed according to the plan and may change. They did find that the sign should be close to the rear door or on an awning.

Mr. Sadowski made a comment that in the future, when the tenants moves out of the building, they should be responsible for filling in the holes in the masonry.

Members asked for a cut sheet for the lighting fixture. If Re/Max does not have lighting it will look strange. Having a building representative at the meeting would be beneficial.

Mr. Cassavoy made a motion to approve the signs as amended above. The lighting fixtures need to be submitted for this tenant and the other tenant. Mr. Welch seconded the motion. By roll call all voted in favor. None were opposed.

The building owner and developer have not yet submitted a complete package to the DRSC that are required to follow-up on the items that were discussed at the last meeting for this property. Some tenants occupied the building prior to final signoff. The City is going to hold back certificate of occupancy for three units until a resolution is found. A meeting will be scheduled with the DRSC once a complete package has been submitted. Ms. Gaffey sent the Building Commissioner an email to document the current status.

Documents: ATI Signage Plan and Photo Rendering – front and rear

The meeting ended at 8:45pm.