



TOWN OF WATERTOWN

Zoning Board of Appeals

Administration Building
149 Main Street
WATERTOWN, MASSACHUSETTS 02472

Melissa M. Santucci Rozzi, Chairperson
Deborah Elliott, Clerk
David Ferris, Member
Suneeth P. John, Member
Christopher H. Heep, Alternate Member

Telephone (617) 972-6427
Facsimile (617) 926-7778
www.watertown-ma.gov

MINUTES

On Wednesday evening, **October 24, 2012** at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers on the second floor of the Administration Building, the Zoning Board of Appeals held a public hearing. In attendance: **Melissa Santucci Rozzi, Chairman; Deborah Elliott, Clerk; David Ferris, Member; Suneeth P. John, Member; Christopher H. Heep, Alternate Member; Also Present: Steve Magoon, Director; Michael Mena, Zoning Enforcement Officer; Danielle Evans, Senior Planner; Louise Civetti, Clerk to ZBA.**

Chair Santucci Rozzi opened the meeting, introduced the board and staff and swore in the audience. She announced pending case #4 on the agenda is a withdrawal and will not be heard and case #5 is a void and will not be heard; under Other Business, 615 Arsenal Street will not be heard, as well. The cases to be heard will be 57-59 Channing Street then 36 Arden Road, 462 Mt. Auburn Street and a continued case from 124 Watertown Street.

Suneeth John, Full Member of the board stated his recusal from 36 Arden Road as he is familiar with the owner of the property, Mark Dawson. Chair Santucci Rozzi explained to the petitioner that with Member John's recusal, his case will be heard by a four-member board.

Chair Santucci Rozzi asked if the minutes have been read and if there is a motion to accept them. Member Elliott motioned to approve the minutes from the September 5, 2012 meeting. Member Heep seconded. Voted 5-0, approved.

Member Elliott read the legal notice:

"57-59 Channing Road - Special Permit Finding

Tracy Grillo herein requests the Zoning Board of Appeals to grant a **Special Permit Finding** in accordance with §4.06(a) (Alts/Additions to Non-Conforming Structures) of the Zoning Ordinance so as to construct a dormer within the existing non-conforming 6.2' easterly side yard setback. T (Two-Family) Zoning District."

Tracy Grillo, owner, stated that she is requesting a special permit finding as she is putting a 12'x10' dormer on the third floor for a future bathroom.

Member Ferris confirmed that the section on the last sheet of the drawings shows the wall being one foot set in from the wall below. He could not decipher from the first sheet which is sort of an elevation plan with framing, what it will look like – specifically, a very small, 1 foot tall window. Ms. Grilo said it would not be in the shower area but when you look into the room, she wanted to have a half-moon window.

Member Ferris said that since they are looking at a framing element, a dormer would normally have a full window in it. If they put the small window in, from the outside it will look like a box on the roof with a small window. It is not an elevation, therefore, they cannot see what it will look like.

Chair Santucci Rozzi asked member Ferris if he would like to condition the plan to have a window that will open up and down.

Mr. Ferris said that would work okay with a typical size window in the dormer. He looked at other houses in the neighborhood and typically, when constructing a dormer, it is for a window.

Ms. Grillo agreed that she does want natural light and could do a full-size window.

Chair Santucci Rozzi said that is reasonable as it is not inside the shower and they could do something that ties in with the dwelling as Mr. Ferris said. Staff can write something to that effect.

Chair Santucci Rozzi read from the Planning Board Report, where the board and the staff are recommending approval with standard conditions. The Zoning Board will add condition #7 as mentioned.

There was no testimony heard from the public. Chair Santucci closed the public hearing and declared a business mode. No further comments from the board were heard.

Member Elliott motioned to approve the request for a Special Permit Finding for a dormer within the non-conforming side yard setback as it meets the criteria set out in the ordinance with the conditions. Mr. John seconded. Voted 5-0, granted.

Documents reviewed: "Plot Plan for Zoning Board of Appeals 57-59 Channing Road, Watertown, Mass." prepared by Field Resources, Inc., dated August 29, 2012 and the architectural drawings depicting the easterly side elevation, third floor proposed bath, and dormer side section prepared by Builder: Bob Terenzoni; Planning Board report 10-10-12.



TOWN OF WATERTOWN

Zoning Board of Appeals

Administration Building
149 Main Street
WATERTOWN, MASSACHUSETTS 02472

Melissa M. Santucci Rozzi, Chairperson
Deborah Elliott, Clerk
David Ferris, Member
Suneeth P. John, Member
Christopher H. Heep, Alternate Member

Telephone (617) 972-6427
Facsimile (617) 926-7778
www.watertown-ma.gov

MINUTES

On Wednesday evening, **October 24, 2012** at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers on the second floor of the Administration Building, the Zoning Board of Appeals held a public hearing. In attendance: **Melissa Santucci Rozzi, Chairman; Deborah Elliott, Clerk; David Ferris, Member; Suneeth P. John, Member; Christopher H. Heep, Alternate Member; Also Present: Steve Magoon, Director; Michael Mena, Zoning Enforcement Officer; Danielle Evans, Senior Planner; Louise Civetti, Clerk to ZBA.**

Chair Santucci Rozzi announced the next case as 36 Arden Road; noted that Member John is recused and asked the petitioner if he is comfortable with the requirement of a unanimous vote by the four remaining members. Mr. Dawson is fine to go forward.

Member Elliott read the legal notice:

"36 Arden Road – Special Permit Finding

Mark Dawson herein requests the Zoning Board of Appeals to grant a **Special Permit Finding** in accordance with §4.06(a) (Alts/Additions to Non-Conforming Structures) of the Zoning Ordinance so as to construct a rear deck maintaining the existing non-conforming northerly side yard setback of 6'. S-10 (Single Family) Zoning District."

Mark Dawson, owner, stated that they purchased the house 9 years ago; the house sits 6' from the property line and the existing deck is still there, the setback is non-conforming with the district.

Ms. Santucci Rozzi noted that the neighbor's driveway is right along the 6' property line and this deck will have a set of stairs coming along the side towards the street and another set of stairs to the back yard.

Member Ferris asked if the main stairway to the back yard will be built according to the survey plot plan or according to the architectural drawings. Mr. Dawson explained that it will be built as it is shown on the survey – to the west side. He asked why the deck wouldn't be shifted over 4'. Mr. Dawson said they wouldn't be able to get onto the deck from the back door and in his opinion, it makes more sense to follow the building line than to jog it out. Mr. Ferris noted that the door is off-center and his neighbor has a deck up in the air close to this. Mr. Dawson said he is a good neighbor and they do not have a problem. The basement door would not be under the deck but the deck will be over the window and the window will be framed as they open it in dry weather. Mr. Ferris said the stoop and the stairway do not show the proper dimensions. Ms. Santucci Rozzi asked staff if the stairs and the landing are counted towards the setback. Mr. Mena explained that the landing is counted and sometimes the stairs. In this case, the setback would still be at 20.7' – still within the required setback. Ms. Santucci Rozzi suggested that staff make a note on the plan that the setback is 20.7' and not 24.7' – still within the requirements of the ordinance.

Without any comment from the public, Chair Santucci Rozzi closed the public hearing and declared a Business Mode. She read from the Planning Board report that the board and staff recommended conditional approval with standard conditions. She added that a note will be added to the plot plan that it is actually 20.7' (not 24.7').

Member Elliott made a motion to grant the Special Permit Finding to allow the construction of the rear deck, maintaining the non-conforming side yard setback of 6'. Member Heep seconded. Voted 4-0, approved.

Documents Reviewed: Plan of Land in Watertown, MA at 36 Arden Road prepared by Wade Putnam, Professional Land Surveyor, June 30, 2012. and the architectural drawings titled Proposed Deck Addition by Construction Design Services: D-1, Deck Plan; D-2, Rear Elevation; and, D3, Deck Framing Plan, all dated February 25, 2012; Planning Board Report 10-10-12.



TOWN OF WATERTOWN Zoning Board of Appeals

Administration Building
149 Main Street
WATERTOWN, MASSACHUSETTS 02472

Melissa M. Santucci Rozzi, Chairperson
Deborah Elliott, Clerk
David Ferris, Member
Suneeth P. John, Member
Christopher H. Heep, Alternate Member

Telephone (617) 972-6427
Facsimile (617) 926-7778
www.watertown-ma.gov

MINUTES

On Wednesday evening, **October 24, 2012** at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers on the second floor of the Administration Building, the Zoning Board of Appeals held a public hearing. In attendance: **Melissa Santucci Rozzi, Chairman; Deborah Elliott, Clerk; David Ferris, Member; Suneeth P. John, Member; Christopher H. Heep, Alternate Member; Also Present: Steve Magoon, Director; Michael Mena, Zoning Enforcement Officer; Danielle Evans, Senior Planner; Louise Civetti, Clerk to ZBA.**

Member Elliott read the legal notice:

“462 Mt. Auburn Street – Amendment to TCA Variance
T-Mobile Northeast, LLC herein requests the Zoning Board of Appeals to grant an Amendment to TCA Variance #05-02 so as to replace 3 existing panel antennas and to add 3 new panel antennas. T (Two-Family) Zoning District.”

Jackie Slaga, representing T-Mobile. They are seeking an amendment. The building currently has 3 antennas on the roof; one located on the north side of the existing chimney; one on the south façade of the penthouse; and one on the east facade of the penthouse. They propose to replace the 3 existing antennas with 3 new antennas of the same size and add 3 additional antennas located adjacent to the existing antennas. On the north face of the existing chimney, it will go from one antenna to two antennas; southern façade of the penthouse – from one antenna to two antennas and the eastern side will go from one to two antennas for a total of 6 antennas; two on each sector on a three sector site. She met with staff early on to discuss the proposal and part of the design proposal is better paint to match the façade of the building, which the Planning Board conditioned and in which they will gladly do. They have also incorporated replacing the pipe-mounts which are bulky and have a significant off-set from the chimney or the penthouse with a flush-mount bracket system. The photo-sims show the antennas as not being out from the building resulting in a positive visual change to the site and surrounding area – that plus the paint condition will result in a positive change to the area. T-Mobile is upgrading their network nationwide and this will enhance call quality, coverage and increase data speed of their network. This will be a benefit to the area and she would recommend approval. The modification will not change the operational requirements – it will still be unmanned with a maintenance visit one or twice monthly. She noted the photo-sims in the board's packets and the RF affidavit to the need of the upgrade; the past decisions and a detailed brief complying with the Zoning Requirements.

Member Heep asked what the difference is between the old antenna and the new replacement antenna. Ms. Slaga said there'd be a slight enhancement to the area. She referred to board members that were here at the start and referenced plots that showed where there isn't coverage and a new plot showing the coverage after installation. She said the radius is about a mile and a half to two miles out in terms of what they cover. This installation will improve call quality, capacity, and increased data speed.

Member Heep asked again what the difference in the antenna itself is that allows this better service. Ms. Slaga said that inside the antenna, they will incorporate remote radio heads which are not located where the cabinets are located, resulting in significant degradation of signal loss – by placing them within the antennas,

they increase the efficiency of the antenna. The panels are largely the same. The height and width are exactly the same. They are a little deeper but they have compensated for that by changing the bracket system, resulting in a better visual of the facility.

Member John stated that they do need two of them although there is an upgrade in the technology. Ms. Slaga said this design calls for two antennas achieve the desired result of increased call quality, capacity and data speed –the two antennas are required.

Member Elliott asked about the better paint to match. Ms. Slaga said the staff recommended a brick color and they are adding a brick pattern to match the facades.

Member Elliott asked if the chimney is real or faux. Ms. Slaga said it is an existing chimney. Member Elliott asked if they could add a false wall around it to cover them all (chimney and penthouse) to hide them completely then they wouldn't have to worry about matching paint. Member Ferris agreed. Ms. Slaga said they would be creating a lot more bulk on the rooftop.

Member Ferris clarified that there are 3 antennas and they are adding 3 antennas. He asked if other vendors have equipment on the wall planes. East elevation, penthouse replacing one, adding one. Upper right hand, south elevation – they are doing nothing. Ms. Slaga stated that the second penthouse structure is another carrier and they are not doing anything there. She added that at the Planning Board hearing there was a couple whose home has a view of rooftop. They reviewed the plans after the meeting with the new paint detail and the revised bracket system, which is a significant improvement and they are not offset from the structure – they were comfortable with the revisions.

Member John asked Staff if it is necessary to have a building permit and structural engineering drawings for the faux chimney – a special permit for height, etc. Ms. Evans stated that a building permit is necessary for this installation. She added that Staff struggles with (whether to) wrapping the antennas sometimes does add bulk and ends up being more visible than the antenna. In this case, they are replacing the mounting fixtures to be more flush-mount and this is a reasonable design. Everything is visible and this is the lesser of the two evils. One person asked why bother to screen them if it just makes it more obvious and would a regular tower be less visible than a pretend chimney. The other carrier on the roof erected the faux penthouse in the front on Staff's recommendation but never got the paint right. It is a preference. It's the will of the board to have the applicant go back and explore a screen.

Member Ferris said there are rooftops in Watertown where you can see there is a lot of stuff up there. This rooftop isn't quite there but it is getting there. It is a hilly neighborhood and people look down towards it.

Mr. John said about a year ago, the board discussed having a database for each building in the town that has antennas. He asked about developing a set of proposals and commented that technology will reduce in size and speed will increase. Mr. Magoon said they do have a study in the works and that will look at the coverage of all carriers and comparing that to town owned property to fill the gaps in service. The study will also show where the coverage is or not. It is a first step.

Mr. Ferris asked about two of the elevations have new equipment and wanted to be sure the cable network enclosures would be faux painted to match the brick. They stand out and are more noticeable - that would be the one to wrap.

Ms. Slaga said the penthouse would have logistical problems as it represents other things and there are stairs coming off of it. Mr. Ferris said the two elements on the chimney are within the neighbors view. Ms. Slaga said the paint-to-match details are hard to show in the photo-sims but it will be painted to match the brick pattern on the façade of the chimney. The photo-sims show the brackets are not off-set from the structure the way they currently are. It is a significant improvement. The radio heads are within the antenna and that's what gives you the enhanced service to the area. All of the providers are upgrading their systems in similar ways with the RHH closer to the antennas. They have incorporated theirs into the antennas so you are not looking at different things coming off.

Ms. Santucci asked where the coverage maps are with this installation. Ms. Slaga said she has copies and asked if she could distribute them. Ms. Santucci Rozzi noted that no one on the board received the coverage maps and as someone coming before the board to add 3 antennas to the site – they do not

She asked if the chimney was built up to have an interior duct for their cables, etc. She said it looked like something was added to the height. She commented that if it is a functioning chimney, they wouldn't be running cables. Mr. Magoon said there are two chimneys, one is functional and this is the lower left elevation is the functional one. Mr. Ferris said it is real, it has a flue sticking out. Ms. Santucci Rozzi refers to drawing E-201 on the west elevation. Ms. Slaga said it is the cable tray she is seeing. When they run cables on the exterior of the building, they paint it to match.

Ms. Slaga explained that this is an existing location for T-Mobile and when they came in originally in 2000, they showed a coverage map where they had a gap in services and how this facility would fill that gap. She added that this is not what they are doing now. This is an upgrade with a slight increase in coverage. Ms. Santucci Rozzi said this is what they want to see; how doubling the antennas is benefitting. She added that although they have seen a lot of upgrades, there have been swap-outs and they have not looked at a site that has doubled their antennas. She added that they are pleased they are improving the brackets but wants to know what the benefits are of the increase in coverage. Ms. Slaga agreed.

Ms. Santucci Rozzi requested coverage maps be shown for the existing coverage with the 3 antennas in multiple colors; adequate coverage and building coverage; and the proposed site.

Ms. Elliott asked to see an alternate of the screening around the chimney confirming the air clearance and circulation to help them understand what something like that would look like. Mr. Ferris agreed.

Ms. Santucci Rozzi said the board will continue the case to the next meeting on November 28, 2012.

Ms. Slaga said she would provide the staff in advance of the meeting with the revised plots; revised photo sims of the design of the chimney; and she asked if the board is comfortable with the design of the penthouse façade. Mr. Ferris said since there is a number of vendors up there and they are doing a number of improvements in the mounting and painting, the chimney is the one that draws your eye. He said if it were wrapped and looked like a bigger chimney, it would be better.

Ms. Elliott motioned to continue the case to the November 28th meeting. Mr. Heep seconded. Voted 5-0, continued.



TOWN OF WATERTOWN Zoning Board of Appeals

Administration Building
149 Main Street
WATERTOWN, MASSACHUSETTS 02472

Melissa M. Santucci Rozzi, Chairperson
Deborah Elliott, Clerk
David Ferris, Member
Suneeth P. John, Member
Christopher H. Heep, Alternate Member

Telephone (617) 972-6427
Facsimile (617) 926-7778
www.watertown-ma.gov

MINUTES

On Wednesday evening, **October 24, 2012** at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers on the second floor of the Administration Building, the Zoning Board of Appeals held a public hearing. In attendance: **Melissa Santucci Rozzi, Chairperson; Deborah Elliott, Clerk; David Ferris, Member; Suneeth P. John, Member; Christopher H. Heep, Alternate Member; Also Present: Steve Magoon, Director; Michael Mena, Zoning Enforcement Officer; Danielle Evans, Senior Planner; Louise Civetti, Clerk to ZBA.**

Ms. Santucci Rozzi stated that this case is continued from last month for **124 Watertown Street**. She asked the petitioner to pick up from the last meeting where the board requested they meet with a sign contractor and present a more formal format.

Attorney Morris Mason, 147 E. Merrimack Street, Lowell, MA stated that the board questioned the material of the sign and requested a rendition. They met with the sign contractor, FastSign, and will be presenting a 2-sided mounted sign with a changeable bar system. It is a 20 s.f. sign area with 4' in height. A red brick border, white background with black lettering with staggered vendor area of 8, reduced from 9 with white background, black lettering for copy area. They presented a full-size, rolled plan with the tenant names imprinted.

After much discussion, the following will be the final design:

- "Watertown Street" shall be removed from the final plans,
- There shall be a maximum of 13 individual tenant signage panels,
- The staggered panel lengths shall be eliminated from the final plans,
- The panel sizes shall be 3.25" x 76" (except for top tiered portion) with an allowance for the lower portion panels to be split in half,
- The monument base shall be a minimum of 5" tall,
- The individual tenant panels shall all be the same font and size,
- Sign background shall be painted a brick color, and
- There shall always be panels affixed to the monument sign. In instances of tenant vacancies, a blank panel or other appropriate panel shall be present.

Ms. Elliott motioned to allow the setback from the street within the Two-Family zoning district. Mr. Ferris seconded. Voted 5-0, Granted.

Documents Reviewed: "Parker Office Building, 124 Watertown Street, Watertown, MA" sheet A-1 dated 6/28/2010, and sheet A-2 dated June 28, 2010 and revised 7/26/2012 prepared by Kanayo Lala-P.E. Four West Road, Acton, MA; Sign design and dimensions by Fastsigns (undated).

Mr. Heep motioned to adjourn. Ms. Elliott seconded. Voted 5-0. The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.