



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
John G. Gannon, Alternate Member

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

MINUTES

On Wednesday evening, **May 22, 2013** 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; John G. Gannon, Alternate Member (arriving later);** Also Present: **Steve Magoon, Director, Louise Civetti, Clerk to ZBA.**

Chair Santucci Rozzi opened the meeting, introduced the board and staff and swore in the audience.

Chair Santucci Rozzi reviewed the agenda, noting 27 & 29 Union Street and 40 Union Street will not be heard as they have been continued at the Planning Board.

Member Elliott read the legal notice:

90 Westminster Avenue

Michael Bedig, 90 Westminster Avenue, Watertown, MA 02472 herein requests the Zoning Board of Appeals grant a **Special Permit Finding** in accordance with Watertown Zoning Ordinance §4.06(a), Alterations to Non-Conforming Structures, so as to construct a 13'x26' second floor addition over existing non-conforming structure, with 8' on both sides, where 12' on northerly side and 10' on southerly side is required. T (Two-Family) Zoning District. ZBA-2013-08

Carl Dumas, Kneeland Construction spoke for Mr. Bedig and submitted letters in support for the record. He explained the lot setback and size are the reason they have to come before the board and they are trying to add a bedroom on the second floor, over the existing footprint. The neighborhood has similar houses. They believe this addition will enhance the looks of the house by creating a larger second floor instead of the center addition from the first enhancement. He said they have the support of their neighbors and read a letter from Jeanine Patricas, a direct neighbor. He said they also have the support of the Planning Board and a supportive report from staff. The addition is not any more detrimental than the existing non-conformity. He added that Mrs. Devaney, their other neighbor attended the Planning Board in their support but is not here tonight.

Chair Santucci Rozzi noted that the plans show 8' on one side and 6' on the other, although the reports and legal notice state 8' and 8'. Mr. Dumas agrees that the plot plan is correct, there is 6' on one side and 8' on the other.

Mr. Magoon agreed that the plans do say 6' and 8'.

Member Elliott asked if they are removing the existing chimney. Mr. Dumas said they may end up leaving the chimney as when they looked at converting to a high-efficiency heating system, they would not need

the chimney; however, the length of piping would be too long and they are not able to remove the chimney.

Member Elliott said the elevations will need to show the chimney extended (above the roofline at least 2' per building code).

Member Ferris said the original house is wood and grey and the second floor addition is aluminum siding and grey – he asked if they are going to replace the second floor siding so the second floor will match all around instead of having 3 different types of siding. Mr. Dumas said they are hoping to make it seamless. He will blend in from old to new.

Member Ferris said there is an existing air conditioner sleeve on the second floor and the plan is to add another – would they consider moving this to the rear of the house. Mr. Dumas asked Mr. Bedig if that would be an issue and they do not have an issue with moving it to the rear. Member Ferris said visually, it would be better on the outside and if placed between the two windows in the rear, it will condition the room better. He added conditions to reflect the a/c sleeve be moved to the rear and the siding match. Mr. Magoon suggested transitioning on a corner (with the siding) instead of trying to blend from old to new on one plane. Mr. Dumas said they want it to match and they will try to match, as opposed to having multiple colors. Member Ferris added that there is already two colors of siding on the house.

Chair Santucci Rozzi closed the public hearing as no one spoke; she read from the planning and staff reports with testimony being spoken at the planning board and the letter submitted from the neighbor. There are conditions added tonight with the consistent appearance of the siding and the a/c cutout moved to the rear, noting there is already one cut-out on the side; and she told them they may need to update their plans showing the chimney is remaining (and asked that they submit those revised plans).

Member John added that they also have missing walls and doors on the second floor bathroom plan.

Member Elliott motioned to accept the petition for special permit finding with the conditions just reviewed. Member John seconded. Voted 5-0 (Member Heep voting).



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
John G. Gannon, Alternate Member

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

MINUTES

On Wednesday evening, **May 22, 2013** 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; John G. Gannon, Alternate Member (arriving later);** Also Present: **Steve Magoon, Director, Louise Civetti, Clerk to ZBA.**

Member Elliott read the legal notice:

65 Main Street

New Cingular Wireless, LLC by and through its' manager, AT&T Mobility Corp., c/o Brown Rudnick LLP, 10 Memorial Blvd., Providence, RI 02903 requests the Zoning Board of Appeals to grant a **Special Permit** in accordance with the Telecommunications Act and the Watertown Zoning Ordinance §5.13, Wireless Telecommunications, so as to install 12 panel antennas, an equipment shelter with back-up generator within faux chimneys and screened all on the rooftop of the Armenian Library & Museum of America. CB (Central Business) Zoning District. ZBA-2013-09

Edward Pare, Attorney with Brown Rudnick, representing New Cingular Wireless PCS LLC through its' manager, AT&T. They are upgrading and filling in AT&T's coverage. AT&T is licensed through the FCC to provide adequate coverage throughout Massachusetts. AT&T is suffering a significant gap in coverage and he will have the RF engineer review the colorful plot maps. Based on the gap and trying to find a location to fill the gap, their research showed Verizon and Metro PCS already on the roof of the Armenian Library. Their initial meeting with staff resulted in a couple of adjustments, a shelter to house all of their equipment on the roof and to use the shelter to attach one of the antenna sectors. The LC4 antennas are attached to the shelter. Originally, they had the shelter closer to the roof edge and based on the photo sims, they acknowledged there was a lot going on on the roof and therefore, moved the shelter closer to the center of the roof. They also screened the antennas from view. They will build a stealth (fiberglass) wall outside of the shelter to hide the antennas attached to it. The other two sectors - originally proposed façade mounts for the data sector shown on sheet Z1 but they are becoming less favored. They moved that sector up onto the roof inside of a faux chimney 3'x10'x10'. The alpha sector will be within a faux chimney as well – they feel these will blend better than the faux flue (which is what Metro PCS uses) looks industrial. They are adding 12 antennas for long term evolution, high speed 4G, they'll be installing remote radio units (they have been upgrading this system in front of this board); 3 GPS antennas attached to the shelter; a generator will be added on the roof for emergency power, powered by natural gas and these are becoming critical in keeping these sites on line during power failures. He then reviewed the photo sims.

Umjahl (?), RF Engineer for AT&T said the maps show the current coverage. He said their objective is to keep good in-building coverage around Main Street (the green coverage is in-building; blue is in-car;

yellow is out-side coverage; red is poor coverage). The northeast side of Main Street has a lot of commercial buildings and they were getting a lot of complaints about coverage there. He then said the site labeled S2935 the new site with orange dots and the green dots are the sites that are already there.

Chair Santucci Rozzi asked if they did an alternative site analysis showing that there were not any other locations that met their needs. Mr. Pare said they chose this site because it was already zoned for wireless and there were already existing base stations. This was an ideal location – it had the height and satisfied the coverage requirements and they could negotiate with the building owner and their installation would be better than the Metro PCS flues. He added that once site 2925 is active, there will be coverage through to 2935 (the condo complex they were before the board for a few months ago).

Member Gannon asked about tab 14 vs. tab A – and asked about the façade mount antennas. Mr. Pare said those are owned by Verizon. He does not believe T-Mobile and Sprint are on this facility.

Member John asked about the shelter. Mr. Para said it houses all of their equipment – where the heart of the facility is, the battery back-up, the power switching, the electronic gear to attach it to the network, etc. They are using the shelter to house all of their equipment and then attaching the antennas to it. He said there isn't any room inside this facility for their equipment and the other carriers could have their equipment elsewhere on or in the building. The shelter measures 12x20. The installation at 2925 (the condos) has the shelter on the roof and they do install within a room, if possible. Every site has this equipment.

Member John said this (shelter) changes the entire roofline of the building. If they are changing the antennas and becoming smaller, the equipment shelters are becoming larger and changing the roofline of this building. Mr. Pare said the roofline has been changed by other carriers and they are trying to improve what the other carriers will eventually do and get off the façade of the building. From the street view you don't see the antennas. They are putting up more bulk but you don't see the antennas because of the screening. Everything will be inside the shelter and the antennas will be outside of the shelter and the screen wall will be outside of the antennas. So you do not see any AT&T antennas. There will be 12 antennas disbursed in three groups of 4. He added the screen will be a lighter tone because the parapet on the rooftop is lighter color. If they left the equipment exposed, you would see all of it.

Member John said he understands that the screen is a better option but he wants to know how they can make it better so it fits with the building - smaller - is the best that they can do with consolidating the new technology instead of something that totally changes this building.

Mr. Pare said this is the best they can do because they are screening the equipment and antennas and that is the goal. If the alternative is to expose the antennas – this is a vast improvement over their competitors and they are spending a lot of money to do this. The existing roof shows MetroPCS is not a design they want to mimic and the façade mounts were something not even put on the table.

Member Elliott said she is comfortable with the shelter being proposed. She is curious about how many antennas they have on the existing sites labeled 'mau' – is there 12 antennas? Mr. Umjahl said MAU2011 they have 3 antennas on one sector that is equal to 9. Member Elliott asked why the existing site 2011 covers a much larger area with 9 antennas vs. what is being proposed. Mr. Umjahl said the coverage is not in-building there and there are no tall buildings. Member Elliott stated that the number of antennas seem high – 12 is a lot. Mr. Pare said 12 is typical for AT&T and the board will see this as an average. The science is based on typography. What type of clutter is out there – buildings, trees, etc.

Member Ferris said the roof plan, Z1 and the proposed photo, location 1, there is white volume on the roof that is already there – the new illustration extends so far in relation to the existing volume. The enclosure of the shelter is much further back and it not making sense. Mr. Pare said there is a faux chimney being added. They determined that the photo sim is showing two separate items. Member Ferris asked why it had to be a separate structure and not just attached. Mr. Pare explained that they do not own that structure. Member Ferris said there is a lot on the roof – he is in not opposed to enclosing the equipment but painting it white on top of a concrete building makes it have faux characteristics – it

may be up to the landlord to have some white boxes on the roof and some that match the concrete. He is not happy about a bunch of white things on top of a concrete building. Mr. Pare said they can add color to darken it up. This seems to fit. It is not a brick situation. They were trying to come up with something that does not attract the eye. Member Ferris said it would not catch the eye if it were the same color as the building. However, if they do not own the other item on the roof, there will still be a white element. Mr. Pare said there is a number of colors up there and it is not their equipment.

Member Ferris said he would be in favor of the new equipment being a matched color of the building and when the other carriers come in, to have them use the same coloration.

Member John said it looks like part of the building instead of an add-on. Mr. Pare said they will chose a color that will blend.

Chair Santucci Rozzi said she assumes the Verizon equipment is in the basement of this building and asked if there is any way AT&T could make their 11.5x20 equipment any smaller. She added that when you consider mechanicals on the roof, there is a size you think of – 11.5x20 is larger than that. Can they decrease these – they used to be 10x10. Mr. Pare said there will be 5 cabinets the size of a refrigerator, vertical. They will lose the ability to attach the antennas and screening. There is a trade-off between the bulk and the screening. It would not be significantly smaller if they stick-built the shelter. There is no room inside the building. It is not possible to place the equipment inside. They cannot decrease the height as it is needed for headroom - they might decrease a little but they may come back and asked for a larger shelter in the future .

Member John asked what the gas generator is for. Mr. Pare said it is the back-up generator. If electricity fails, it is fueled by natural gas. Verizon's generator can be seen as you come up Main Street.

Member Gannon said he has concerns about the bulk and if this is the trend- 11.5x20' shelters, it is similar to adding another story to the building. He asked if another company could co-locate within their shelter. Mr. Pare said no as it will be full of their equipment. It is not another story – it is not occupied.

Chair Santucci Rozzi asked for a plan for the inside of the equipment cabinets. She asked if they still use the battery-packs. Mr. Pare said they still use the battery packs for back-up if the generator doesn't work, the battery packs will kick-in but they only last for 6-7 ours. All carriers will look for gas generators, especially with the storms lately. The FCC was going to require these back-up generators. Chair Santucci Rozzi asked if the battery back-up could be eliminated since the gas in connected to the building and will not need to be refueled. Mr. Pare said he does not believe AT&T will be interested in getting rid of the battery back-ups. Chair Santucci Rozzi asked if they are interested in this site. Mr. Pare said he doesn't think there is a substantial difference in the MetroPCS equipment and theirs. He said it depends on what you consider a substantial change. He added that he mentioned in his brief about the new Federal Law out there.

Jonathan McNeil, SAI Communications for AT&T, said the generator powers or recharges the batteries so there are not two sepate ways to charge the facility – The generators charge the battery and the batteries power the radio equipment. If there isn't a generator, they have to bring a generator in to recharge the batteries until the power is restored. They may have 10 batteries up there – he is not certain. They are the size of car batteries.

Mr. Pare offered to bring in the plan of the interior of the cabinets and he will ask if they can reduce the size of the cabinets. Chair Santucci Rozzi said it may not be as small as the Metro one but she'd like to see what is causing it to be so large – the height is understandable but the 20' is getting away from a mechanical.

No one spoke from the audience and Chair Santucci Rozzi stated they will continue this in order for AT&T to provide as much information as possible as to the equipment cabinets, its' contents, the ability to reduce the size, the re-treatment of the cabinets to match the building elements and asked for a motion.

Member Elliott motioned to continue the case to the next meeting. Member Gannon seconded. Voted 5-0. The meeting is continued to Monday, June 24, 2013.

The Comprehensive Plan:

Mr. Magoon gave an update on the second public comprehensive plan meeting from last Monday night. There were about 100 people - a bit fewer people than the first meeting but still a good crowd for a public comprehensive plan process. He said there was a good discussion on a draft vision and some overarching draft goals. There is good support for the draft vision and lots of questions on the draft goals. They had voting by the public of whether or not they were on the right track and the vision had positive voting and not so much on the draft goals. There were concerns that there were particular interests represented more than others and that they need to reach out to some segments of the community that were not represented. He added that getting people to these meetings is a challenge. They will debrief and start to strategize on how to draft the next parts of the plan and finalizing visions and goals and getting into more detail and invite focus groups in with expertise. The next public meeting will be at the end of the summer when they have a full draft together.

Chair Santucci Rozzi asked if there is any out-reach – not that there is a problem seeing the same faces at all of these meetings but maybe a flyer for students to take home to their parents to get newer population and people that are raising families in this community and vested in the long-term. Is there anything running on the local cable channel? Mr. Magoon said they are putting it on there and the actual recording of the meetings is there. They sent it to the staff of the school board and they distributed it. Some feedback of younger families is that it is difficult to get out to another meeting. At least a third of the people there were not at the first meeting. There were a lot of faces that were not the regular faces.

Member John said the graphics are nicely done.

Mr. Magoon said Mindmixer is a website that is more interactive and gives an opportunity for people to vote. There is a kiosk in the library and you can drop comments in there. Some have taken photos and attached comments.

Member John said you can earn points for suggestions being added to Mindmixer and he is number 7 with points.

Chair Santucci Rozzi is looking forward to the next one and September would be a good time as people are back into the swing of things then.

Chair Santucci Rozzi motioned to adjourn. Mr. Gannon seconded. The meeting ended at 8:10 p.m.