MELROSE PLANNING BOARD
DESIGN REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, October 3, 2012
7:30 PM
Mayor's Conference Room, 2nd Floor, City Hall, 562 Main Street

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

ABSENT: None

Denise Gaffey, Director and City Planner, and Matt Hennigan, Assistant Planner, were present.

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

Case # 12-002, 44-48 Grove Street, Shihchi Shieh
Applicant Shihchi Shieh, Attorney Robert Bell, Esq., and architect Michelle Tuck were in attendance to present the proposed design details for the project at 44-48 Grove Street. The Design Review Subcommittee recapped the comments that were made throughout the course of the Site Plan Review approval process in front of the Planning Board. It was noted that this particular building would be a gateway structure to downtown and therefore the Applicant should investigate ways to give the structure more prominence. The Applicant noted that the parapet been raised an additional two feet but it is still approximately six feet lower than the adjacent building to the north. The benchmark for the property was taken within an inch of the Boardman Building.

Ms. Tuck then presented updated renderings for the proposed facades of the building. Standard orange brick would be used at the base of the façade and the majority of the siding would be Certainteed fiber cement smooth siding. The window trim and corner boards would be olive colored Certainteed fiber cement smooth trim. Anderson casement windows would be used with simulated divided light mullions on clear glass. The bay windows and sign band would consist of a pewter colored Certainteed fiber cement smooth panel.

Ms. Tuck indicated that they did not want to attract attention to the gate in the fence between the two buildings as they will not be allowing people to pass through. Therefore, they are proposing a 4 foot high ornamental steel fence which would provide plenty of prominence and interest along Main Street. The fence would be powder coated and the balusters would have 4 inch spacing. Ms. Tuck continued on to note that the roof parapet was approximately 30 inches in height and should almost completely block any visibility of the HVAC units from the street. Additionally, the parapet should either absorb or deflect any sound produced from the HVAC units towards the gas station across Grove Street.

Mr. Cassavoy suggested that perhaps a bollard should be placed on the inside of the fence to protect it and provide additional stabilization. There was then conversation about whether a transformer was required for the project and the Applicant indicated there would not be a need for one, however, they were not sure if the electrical service would be single phase or three phase. Ms. Tuck indicated that gooseneck lighting would be used on the façade of the building near the entrances and above the signage. It was noted that this is not a 24-hour building but that the sign lighting needed to be situated a bit higher to properly illuminate the signage. Mr. Cassidy stated that he thought the light fixtures were attractive.

Mr. Mercado inquired about the handicap parking space and if regulations required it to be wider. The Applicant indicated they would confirm that this space meets the required regulations. It was also noted

that street trees would be implemented in front of the building along Grove Street and that construction for the entire project would take approximately eight months.

Mr. Cassavoy then MADE a MOTION to accept the proposed design items that were presented to fulfill Conditions #2 and #3 of the Planning Board's Site Plan Review decision, which were reflected in the plans presented at the Design Review Subcommittee meeting. Mr. Mercado SECONDED the MOTION. All members voted in favor. None were opposed.

Documents:
- Architectural Rendering and Sheets A1.1, A2.1, and A4.1 dated September 28, 2012
- Landscape Plan Sheet LA.01 revised September 27, 2012
- Memorandum from the Architect dated September 28, 2012

Meeting adjourned at 8:40 PM.