



# TOWN OF WATERTOWN

## Zoning Board of Appeals

Administration Building

149 Main Street

WATERTOWN, MASSACHUSETTS 02472

Melissa M. Santucci, 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](http://www.watertown-ma.gov)

### MINUTES

On Wednesday evening, **October 26, 2011** 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*; **Steve Magoon**, *Director, Community Development & Planning*; **Michael Mena**, *Zoning Enforcement Officer*; **Gideon Schreiber**, *Senior Planner*; **Louise Civetti**, *Clerk to ZBA*.

Chair Santucci Rozzi opened the meeting, introduced the board and staff; swore in the audience and asked for a motion to accept the minutes. Ms. Elliott clarified that the minutes have not been distributed. Chair Santucci Rozzi read through the agenda noting the case for 190-192 Arlington Street has been continued at the Planning Board.

Taking the agenda out of order, she read a request to withdraw the case for 326 Belmont Street. Ms. Elliott read the legal notice:

Dr. Mark Strokowski, 326 Belmont Street, Watertown, MA, herein requests the Board of Appeals to grant a **Variance** in accordance with §5.05(j), Notes to Table of Dimensional Regulations, Maximum Eave Height, Maximum FAR; and a **Special Permit Finding**, §4.06(a), Alts to existing Non-Conforming Structures, Side Yard Setback, Zoning Ordinance, so as to add two dormers and alter roof line to third floor, at **326 Belmont Street**, located in the T (Two Family) Zoning District.

Ms. Elliott motioned to accept the written withdrawal request from the Petitioner. Mr. John seconded. Voted 5-0. Withdrawn.

Documents reviewed:

E-mail received from Dr. Strokowski, dated October 26, 2011 requesting to withdraw his request.



**TOWN OF WATERTOWN**  
**Zoning Board of Appeals**  
Administration Building

149 Main Street

WATERTOWN, MASSACHUSETTS 02472

Melissa M. Santucci, 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](http://www.watertown-ma.gov)

**MINUTES**

On Wednesday evening, **October 26, 2011** 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*; **Steve Magoon**, *Director, Community Development & Planning*; **Michael Mena**, *Zoning Enforcement Officer*; **Gideon Schreiber**, *Senior Planner*; **Louise Civetti**, *Clerk to ZBA*.

Ms. Elliott read the legal notice for the next case:

**32 Olney Street – Craig McMahan & Natalya Pushkina – Special Permit Finding**

Craig McMahan & Natalya Pushkina, 32 Olney Street, Watertown, MA 02472, herein request the Board of Appeals to grant a **Special Permit Finding** in accordance with §4.06(a), Alts/Additions to Non-Conforming Structures, Side and Front Yard Setbacks, Zoning Ordinance, so as to raze a non-permitted rear 170 s.f. single story addition and construct a 410 s.f. two-story addition, maintaining non-conforming northerly side yard setback at 1.9', where 1.7' exists and where 10' is required; enclose existing front entry, maintaining 8' front yard setback where 15' is required. T (Two-Family) Zoning District.

Owners Craig McMahan and Natalya Pushkina appeared before the board to request the addition to their newly purchased single-family home as Natalya's parents are living on the first floor with a full kitchen and they are living on the second floor with a kitchenette. They state that although there are two living areas, it is still one family. The addition abuts neighboring back yards, not buildings and there are no windows on the side facing the closest neighbor.

The Zoning Enforcement Officer, Mike Mena explained that the petitioner did not wish to apply to convert the single-family home into a two-family home – knowing that the non-permitted second floor kitchen is illegal and would need to be removed. If the petitioner did decide to apply to convert the single family to two-family, the FAR would require a Variance which would not pass the criteria findings required for a Variance. Senior Planner, Gideon Schreiber noted that the lot is undersized at 4,000 square feet and would not be able to apply for two-family status. The FAR does not apply to a single-family home.

Member Ferris asked the petitioner why they would not consider moving the two-story addition towards the center of the rear of the home to meet the requirements of the ordinance. Ms. Pushkina said it was too expensive to redesign the entire project. Member Ferris stated the single story does not impact the neighbor; however, the second story will appear like a two-story fence next to the direct abutting neighbor. He is not in favor of supporting the proposed addition as presented.

Member John requested the Staff explain what would happen if the house is sold and the new owner assumes this is a two-family home. Mr. Mena explained that the second unit would be illegal as it would be unpermitted. The new owners would be in violation and would be placing the tenants in a safety hazard situation without a second means of egress. Mr. McMahan said that was not their intent.

Mr. Heep asked if they are amenable to the request of the Zoning Enforcement Officer. Mr. McMahan said they have spent a lot of money making the property livable and quality. Ms. Pushkina said it really is not a kitchen it is just a small spot to put things on like hors d'oeuvres instead of going to the big kitchen in the downstairs. They have put marble and granite and cabinets, etc. They had to account for the dips in the floors and they had to pay extra to do.

Chair Santucci Rozzi said the board has been very strict and consistent with not allowing sinks or cooking appliances.

Ms. Pushkina is not in favor of removing the second floor kitchen as she feels it was done with the proper permits. The ZEO investigated and found that a plumber pulled a permit to 'renovate' an existing sink – not to install a new sink for kitchen use. The Plumbing Inspector believed the kitchen to be a renovation as was stated on the application. It was discovered that a sink in that area of the second floor had not existed. Also, an electrician pulled a permit for a higher voltage line without specifying what it would be used for (stove). The Wire Inspector has no way of knowing what the use will be (it could be for an air conditioner) and therefore, did not question the installation. Final inspections have not been done on the property. A building permit was not pulled for the addition of cabinets and counter.

The second kitchen creates a regulatory issue for the town. Therefore, the town has to require the second kitchen be removed. The petitioner understands the kitchen sink must be removed; however, according to the ZEO, a wet bar sink can be placed in the same spot with the counter retrofitted. The stove must be removed and the electric line closed off and removed.

Member Elliott motioned to approve the Special Permit Finding for the Front Yard Setback as presented with the conditions discussed. Mr. John seconded. Voted 5-0. Approved with conditions.

Member Elliott motioned to approve the Special Permit Finding for the Side Yard Setback as originally submitted with the conditions discussed. Mr. Heep seconded. Voted 4-1 with Mr. Ferris voting against. Approved with conditions.

Documents Reviewed: Olney Street Certified Plot Plan prepared by Ronald Simpson, Patriot Land Surveying, LLC dated August 24, 2011 and revised 9/13/2011 and 9/28/2011, as well as the plan set, Proposed - sheets A 1.0 through 1.3 & A 2.0 through 2.3 dated 9/29/2011 and Existing – sheets EC1.0 through 1.3 and EC 2.0 through 2.3 dated 9/12/2011 by TBC Architects LLC.



# TOWN OF WATERTOWN

## Zoning Board of Appeals

### Administration Building

149 Main Street

WATERTOWN, MASSACHUSETTS 02472

Melissa M. Santucci, 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](http://www.watertown-ma.gov)

### MINUTES

On Wednesday evening, **October 26, 2011** 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*; **Steve Magoon**, *Director, Community Development & Planning*; **Michael Mena**, *Zoning Enforcement Officer*; **Gideon Schreiber**, *Senior Planner*; **Louise Civetti**, *Clerk to ZBA*.

Ms. Elliott read the legal notice:

Ada H. Wong, Wong/Perry LLC, 99A Hancock Street, Lexington, MA 02420, herein requests the Board of Appeals grant a **Special Permit** in accordance with §5.04, Table of Dimensional Regulations, Maximum FAR, Zoning Ordinance, so as to construct a two-story with full basement southerly side addition 32'x12' and two exterior stairways, creating an FAR of .59%, where over 50% and less than .625% is allowed by SP at **22 Perry Street**, located in the T (Two-Family) Zoning District.

Ray Siemiakowski, Contractor, appeared before the board to represent the owner, Ada Wong. He corrected the request to state that they are not building a full basement under the proposed two-story addition; it will be a crawl space only. He provided a bit of history on the prior building permits approved for the two enclosed stairways. The already-built stairway in the rear has a full basement; the stairway in the front has a crawl space. After the two stairways were permitted, they submitted the plans for the addition. He submitted to the board another drawing titled "Proposed Elevations", stamped into the record, October 26, 2011. He explained that the first drawing submitted had a flat roof, this revised drawing shows a pitched gable roof, which is more acceptable to the Planning Board and Staff. He stated that the 6 parking spaces shown on the Plot Plan had been requested by Staff to be reduced to 10' wide for safety reasons. He noted the pavement pre-existed his client's owning the property. Other suggestions include adding some landscaping and bringing the driveway in a bit but they do not agree with 10' or a single lane as it currently is two-car wide. The garage was pulled down recently as it was 80 years old and it allowed space for the addition. There also has been siding and a fence installed.

Staff explained that the last two spaces actually park in the required 5' setback; therefore, there is really only space for 4 cars. Also, the ordinance states that if there are changes in the form of a request to the board, in this case to account for the FAR, the board can request that the driveway become conforming. The driveway can be reduced enough to provide the required 4' buffer. Further discussion on alternatives to the driveway parking included striping the spaces; moving the spaces further back onto the lot; reducing the number of spaces, etc. Staff had requested they reduce the curb cut to 10' and eliminate spaces 5 and 6. The Zoning Board does not agree.

Member Ferris suggested he modify the lean-to roof (the second level above and behind the front door elevation) to match the same fascia line as the pitched roof and flow from the valley. Mr. Siemiakowski explained that there is a Stop Work order on roof lines on the building. However, he likes the suggestion and understands the request.

Mr. Ferris stated that he would not like to live next to a house that has 6 cars parked next door. Chair Santucci Rozzi said they could have rebuilt the garage. Mr. Siemiatkowski said the driveway runs the length of the property all the way to the garage that has recently be removed.

The outcome of discussions is that the driveway will be limited to 59' in length by 18' in width with a maintained 4' landscaped buffer along the property line.

New plans will be submitting showing the roofline of the front elevation (above and behind the front door elevation) changed from a shed roof to a roofline matching the fascia line of the existing second floor pitched roof and valley and a new plot plan showing the limited driveway.

Ms. Elliott motioned to grant the Special Permit with the conditions discussed. Mr. John seconded. Voted 5-0. Granted.

Documents reviewed:

"Board of Appeals" Plan of Land in Watertown, MA prepared for Wong/Perry, LLC. Dated June 6, 2011 by Robert Gill, P.E.; and the architectural plan set, P1 "Proposed Additions to 22 Perry St. Watertown, MA. For Liberty House inc." prepared by Wayne M. Ferson, Residential Design, not dated. "Proposed Elevations", stamped in October 26, 2011



**TOWN OF WATERTOWN**  
**Zoning Board of Appeals**  
Administration Building

149 Main Street

WATERTOWN, MASSACHUSETTS 02472

Melissa M. Santucci, 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](http://www.watertown-ma.gov)

**MINUTES**

On Wednesday evening, **October 26, 2011** 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*; **Steve Magoon**, *Director, Community Development & Planning*; **Michael Mena**, *Zoning Enforcement Officer*; **Gideon Schreiber**, *Senior Planner*; **Louise Civetti**, *Clerk to ZBA*.

Chair Santucci Rozzi stated that since 532, 560-580 Pleasant Street

Steve Magoon, Director of the Community Development and Planning Department explained the recent changes to the frontage of this property. Pleasant Street improvements (have been ongoing) and the final pavement is expected to be done this week. Mass. Highway projects require a 5 year moratorium for utility cuts and disturbance in the road once the final pavement has been completed. Therefore, since the Site Plan and Special Permit had been approved for this project and with the cooperation of the applicant, the road contractor and the Department of Public Works (DPW) they were able to put the curb line adjustments into place in a timely fashion.

Dan Bailey, Attorney introduced Fred Keylor, Engineer and Nelson Hammer, Architect. He thanked Mr. Magoon for his coordination and information in regards to the curb cuts and turned the floor over to Mr. Keylor.

Fred Keylor, H. W. Moore Associates, reviewed the revised plans as requested by the board at their last meeting: They have added granite curbing to the east side of Paramount Place; the parking spaces at 532 Pleasant Street previously were proposed at 8' in width and they changed as many as possible to 8.5' with the exception of the row on the southerly and easterly portion of the property designated as employee parking; the southerly row at 560 Pleasant Street have been converted to 8' wide spaces and also designated as employee parking; they have shifted the parking on the south westerly corner to maintain an 8' offset from the property line; adding 5 additional landscape islands and solid wood screen fencing; one cart corral on the east side of 560; increase to outside display area in the front of the building; provide an opening in the parking lot by eliminating 4 parking spaces on the east side of 560 so that you wouldn't have to go all the way to the top of the lot; they will repave the area of Paramount Place that runs along the front of the skating rink. At the request of the DPW, they have added islands at the top of Paramount Place (between 560 and 532 Pleasant St) to channelize the right turn coming out onto Pleasant St., allowing the utility poles and fire hydrant to remain in place; they lost one parking space as a result of removing the corner leaving the total parking at 532 to be 131 parking spaces. They eliminated the cart corral at the top of 532 Pleasant Street to make that change.

Ms. Santucci Rozzi commented that people parking at the top of 532 Pleasant St., will have to walk half-way around the lot to place their cart in a corral. Mr. Keylor said Mr. Russo may reconfigure the cart corrals.

Mr. Keylor stated that the board requested an 8' buffer at the bottom of 532 Pleasant St., and they are not proposing that as Mr. Russo thought they would be losing too many spaces and as a compromise, is paving that area of Paramount Place.

Ms. Elliott asked how many spaces were proposed at 532 when all spaces were 8' wide. Mr. Keylor said 138. Ms. Elliott said 7 spaces were lost – only 6 due to the change in size.

Mr. Heep asked who Mr. Russo had agreed to pave Paramount Place – to whom did he make that agreement with? Mr. Magoon said the agreement is with the Town as part of the improvements on Paramount Place.

Ms. Santucci Rozzi asked if it is anticipated that people will be exiting the 532 parking lot and coming back around Paramount Place to exit onto Pleasant Street. Mr. Keylor said that is not the intention – Paramount Place just needs to be repaved.

Ms. Santucci Rozzi asked if this is a private way. Mr. Magoon said that this is a town-owned private way. Mr. Bailey further explained that this has never been laid out as a town way – not shown on any plan (no subdivision control law in Watertown) but it showed the way to the dump – Russo's shows it as a way and owned by the town but has never acquired the formal status of a public way. Their rights are the same as any abutter on a private way – the right to use it, improve it, etc.

Mr. Ferris clarified that the ordinance would allow 10% of the total amount of spaces to be 8' – which would be 33. They have planned for 86. He then asked about the one-way traffic at 532 Pleasant lot and what keeps cars flowing in the right direction – Mr. Keylor explained that "DCYL" means double yellow center line – just paint, no curb.

Ms. Elliott clarified that if they were to redesign 532 without compact spaces they would lose 2 spaces (at a rate of 16 per space). Ms. Elliott asked why they just didn't make them all conforming. Mr. Keylor said they will have employee parking.

Ms. Santucci Rozzi said the employee spaces will not be enforced. If a customer needs a parking space, they will park there. She added that the other parking lot has one loop and is one-way and someone is always going the wrong way there. At 532, they will have two interconnected loops and she does not see how this is going to work out – especially with the volume. People will be stacked onto Pleasant Street waiting to get into the parking lot. She feels they are restricting themselves in this parking lot and setting themselves up for one big mess. There isn't a design to force the movement.

Mr. Bailey said they tried to consider angle parking but they would lose 40 spaces.

Mr. Ferris said he is there frequently and typically, people respect the one-way; however, with the proposed narrower drive of 20 wide, pulling into an 8' space would be difficult. He does not have a concern with the spaces to the south of the building as there is more area to pull (straight) into the narrow space. Mr. Bailey said that by having additional paved, controlled, signed parking, their hope is to expect people to comply. They are trying to address the fact that there is just not enough parking.

Mr. Ferris said the pedestrian ways at 532 are clear and his only concern is the 8' wide spaces.

Mr. Magoon said there have been significant problems with the existing parking – partially implemented by striping, which fades. The benefits to the new plan is that they have eliminated access points onto Pleasant Street and delineated those with curbing, sidewalks and landscape planted islands and one entrance into the new parking lot. He believes this will function much better in the long term on where it is appropriate to go – more so than the existing situation.

Ms. Santucci Rozzi commented that although they have provided a traffic report stating the number of trips, etc., when they last came to the board, the prominent parking area was going to be controlled by a signalized intersection. The traffic discussion at that time, revolved around those improvements. Now they are creating a much larger entrance and exit area without signalization. Has anyone looked at how the traffic flow will work from this location? What are the gaps like, can they get out, how will that impact Pleasant Street. Mr., Keylor said signal at Repton Place will create gaps in the traffic (coming down) Pleasant Street resulting in an improvement. The parking lot will empty in cycles.

Ms. Santucci Rozzi commented on the exit island at Paramount Place, stating that the cars going right will be hanging out (into Pleasant St) far and questioned what the people in the other lane going left will see. Mr. Keylor said they will have a stop sign and cross walk and will be able to exit at the appropriate gap.

Ms. Santucci Rozzi said she is not in favor of the compact spaces.

Mr. Heep asked Staff if the original staff recommendations on plans, findings, etc., survived the last changes. Mr. Schreiber said the only significant change is the number of parking spaces at 532 is reduced. He added that all of the changes have to go back to the Planning Board for approval to the Special Permit – none of the conditions have changed.

Ms. Elliott stated that she does not support the compact spaces at 532, otherwise she does support the project.

Ms. Santucci Rozzi said that they are running their trip generation on the square footage of the building, noting that ITE has suggestions for parking and local bylaws but she asks if they are double or triple the required parking here. Mr. Bailey said they are more than double the requirement. She asked why the trips have not doubled. Mr. Keylor explained that part of the addition is refrigeration which will reduce the truck traffic to and from the site. The small retail in the front and side and the bakery will not generate a lot more customers, although it will generate some.

Ms. Santucci Rozzi said that they have more than doubled the parking and it still won't be enough. They'd pave over surrounding businesses, if they could. She doesn't see how this could work. She gave an example of someone trying to get to a spot in the first lane in the parking lot but having to go up and down the other lanes to get there. Mr. Magoon suggested they see how it works out and then change it. Ms. Santucci Rozzi said that it would be more difficult to enforce a change to 24' wide aisle widths as they wouldn't be able to use the parking lot. Mr. Ferris said it is mostly painting the spots; Ms. Elliott said there are planting islands to consider. Ms. Santucci Rozzi asked if Paramount Place could be moved over. Mr. Magoon Mr. Bailey said there is a plan that states it is an x' wide 'way'. It is registered land owned by the town which the town sold off separate lots that created the 'way'. Russo's cannot have frontage on Paramount Place as it would not make sense to create a side yard on Pleasant Street. The sidewalk along Paramount Place existed.

Ms. Santucci Rozzi said the 4 members will not support the 8' wide spaces. Mr. Bailey said they would agree to a condition to change the plan to show all of the spaces would have to be 'full size'.

Edward Rabinovitz, Counsel for 594 Pleasant Street, American Venture (southwest corner of Russo's plan), said that last time he expressed concern regarding the southern border and the lack of landscaping and buffer. The original plan called for an 8' fence and now the change is for a wooden 6' fence. There was a question regarding where they would put the snow, as well. When the plow comes toward the back, it will knock down the fence as there is no setback. The board is correct that if they could get 500 spaces, they'd be full. It is a balance of what is what is reasonable for Russo's, the traffic, and the abutters. There should be consideration of a buffer that would ameliorate the effect of all of the spaces and a 6' fence. He mentioned the Staff Report Addendum (July 7) that speaks to that area being an excellent bio-retention area that also would serve as an area for snow removal – it would provide a visual break between the two mostly impervious areas (#6 of the addendum). They do not have a problem with the area to the east.

Mr. Ferris addressed Mr. Rabinovitz stating that he remembers the comments from the last meeting and he has observed his clients property since that time noting the lack of landscaping. Mr. Rabinovitz said the views and the observation from their lot as well as the future use of their property if they change to residential. He said the 0' setback does not allow for any retention, protection of the river area or snow storage.

Ms. Santucci Rozzi asked for them to scale the area between the trailer truck parking and the parking space. Mr. Keylor measured 22' – 28'. She asked why the space is open to regular cars and did they think about adding a buffer as there is enough space for the trucks to maneuver. Mr. Keylor said a truck will come down Paramount Place, pull into the rear area of 560 Pleasant Street, back up along the side of 560 Pleasant Street, pull forward towards Paramount Place and then back into the loading dock at the rear of 560 Pleasant Street. The last three spaces are dry storage and could be cardboard. Mr. Bailey said the trucks frequent 5-6 times a day, mostly in the morning but Russo's is not big enough to demand a specific delivery time. They unload when they get there. The deliveries could fluctuate up to 8-10 per day. There are more direct orders with farms – there is no middle-man. Mr. Keylor said this would be better than what is there today. They reviewed the tractor-trailer plan again. Ms. Santucci Rozzi said that while they are reversing direction, they will be blocking the drive aisle. Mr. Keylor doesn't think that is a problem as it would only take a few minutes.

Ms. Santucci Rozzi asked what the language was in the past to have them come back to the board. Mr. Bailey said that was back in 2001 – that the board retains jurisdiction and the applicant will return at 3,6, 9 month intervals with a mini traffic study at each of these intervals or waiver the reviews at any of the times. Ms. Santucci Rozzi asked if they did actual counts and then add ITE trips. Mr. Keylor said they did counts on Pleasant Street to the east of Paramount Place – recent ones. They compared them to the counts in 2006 to see what the volumes on Pleasant Street was. The can count next week to have a baseline to compare the next report to. Mr. Keylor confirmed there will be 52 more cars in the PMP, according to what the trip generation estimates calculate.

Ms. Santucci Rozzi asked if they checked what Russo's generates to see if it correlated with ITE. Mr. Keyor said they counted Pleasant Street, compare it to the VHB data in 2006 to see if they were comparable and the board decided in 2006 that the traffic was not an impact based on a similar project and that was the basis of their conclusion (this time).

Mr. Bailey said they were not working with Mr. Keyor in 2006. He further stated that any engineer looking at this will state that Russo's is clearly generating more traffic per square foot. It was not compared to the supermarket counts with ITE.

Ms. Elliott asked if they would think Mr. Russo would have a problem removing the snow from the site. Mr. Bailey said there is not a good reason for that. He asked if there is a demonstration of a snow issue at Russo's as that is their slow season. He has had conversations with Mr. Russo about this although Mr. Russo said the snow accumulation is only during their slow sales periods. They do not have a snow storage plan but they push it up against the edges of the property on pavement. Ms. Elliott asked if the wood fence would need to be replaced every year. Mr. Bailey said it would eliminate the ability to park in the spaces where there is snow accumulation. Ms. Santucci Rozzi said a condition of a snow plan showing the visibility, turning radius and drive-aisle widths will be maintained. She added that if snow is going to be stored in space, take the entire space – not a partial space. Ms. Elliott added that the condition would be reviewed by the board, as well.

Ms. Santucci Rozzi declared a business mode (upon clarification that Mr. Rabinovitz had no further comments – no one else present in the audience) and asked the board to review the conditions. She said they just discussed **snow** and asked for comments on the compact parking spaces, stating that 3 members are not comfortable with **8' spaces at 532** (Mr. Heep added himself into the count, making it all 4 members). A condition that that parking lot be redesigned eliminating all compact spaces – if they were employee parking, it is not enforced (confirmed by Mr. Bailey). Employees have been dismissed for not parking in designated areas.

Ms. Santucci Rozzi asked about the southerly landscaped buffer at 532 on the Town's land and what happens if the town takes that portion of land. Mr. Magoon said the town could do that. Ms. Santucci Rozzi asked Mr. Bailey if Russo's would put the landscaping on their property if the town actually took that **landscaped buffer**. Mr. Bailey said he would agree to come back to the board to revisit the issue. Ms. Santucci Rozzi said the Board is allowing a variance for this buffer as they are providing off-site landscaping and if that goes away...Mr. Bailey confirmed that the board will have an enforcement issue. However, he would prefer to **come back to the board** as he will be responding to what is going on there at that time and will be better informed to address it.

Ms. Elliott said the relocating of the cart corrals should be a condition. Mr. Bailey said 50% of the carts end up in the corrals and there are employees scouting the lot for carts frequently. The storing of the carts will remain at the front of the store. Ms. Santucci Rozzi said the corrals and storage should show on the plan. Ms. Elliott said one should be added to the western-most aisle. Mr. Ferris added that closer to the #13 as shown on the plan. **(3 cart corrals in that lot)**.

**Traffic review** as stated in the condition last time. Russo's came back twice and made changes (2000 relief).

Mr. Bailey stated Spring work is expected with the refrigeration units going in first. Work will take several phases; first is the refrigeration units; then the parking at 532; and then the retail.

Ms. Santucci Rozzi said the review will be 6 months after final occupancy and then at that time determine the next timeframe (3 months, 6 or a year).

Mr. Bailey said the traffic figures will be based on next week's base-line data, using the counts on Pleasant Street and creating the count on Paramount Place; to the western side of the private way and counts at the two intersections. There are two points of entry, the private way at the set of lights and the (first part of the 'U') at Paramount Place.

Variance #1: 560 Pleasant – Maximum Impervious Coverage: 86.5% vs. 80% max and

Variance #2: Open Space 13.5% vs. 20% minimum;

Variance #3: 532 Pleasant - Max Impervious coverage: 82% and

Variance #4: 18% Open Space.

Variance #5: 560 Pleasant - Minimum size of parking spaces (8') vs. 8.5'

Variance #6: 532 Pleasant - 6.02K parking area setbacks and

Variance #7: Landscaping

Variance #8: 560 Pleasant - Interior landscaping and

Variance #9: Landscape buffering

Variance #10: 560 Pleasant - 6.04(c) design and layout max driveway width

All above subject to what is "shown on the plan".

The only items changing on the plan is the cart corrals and the size of the spaces.

Per Mr. Schreiber: (as shown on the Planning Board Report, July 13, 2011) Eliminate Condition #27 and 28, as the compact vehicle parking is being removed therefore, the signage is no longer needed

#28 provided a planting strip at 560 along Paramount Place and provided a landscaped entrance point to 560 from Pleasant Street – Eliminate Condition #29.

The cart corrals at 532 will be pervious as suggested by the Planning Board (now including 560).

The Planning Board met in June and July and reviewed the Special Permit and Site Plan Review and recommended conditional approval.

Ms. Elliott motioned to deny the variance at 532 Pleasant Street to allow compact parking spaces at 8x18. Mr. Ferris seconded. Voted 4-0. DENIED.

Ms. Elliott motioned to grant 532 Pleasant Impervious Coverage; 560 Impervious Coverage; 532 Parking area setbacks 4' from western lot line where 8' is required and eastern lot line 6.1 – 10.4 and 560 4.5% interior landscaping; 560 setback of 3' from northwestern side of structure; 560 setback of 0' from rear lot line; 560 setback of 2' from eastern side lot line; 560 – 54' driveway. Mr. Ferris seconded. Voted 4-0. Granted.

Documents reviewed:

"Russo's Market Additions, 532 & 560 Pleasant Street Watertown, Massachusetts" containing sheets C-1 through C-9, dated October 29, 2010 and last revised October 18, 2011 (except C-2 Existing Conditions); L-1 dated October 22, 2010 and last updated August 17, 2011; and A-1 through A-4 dated October 29, 2010 and last revised August 17, 2011.



**TOWN OF WATERTOWN**  
**Zoning Board of Appeals**  
Administration Building

149 Main Street

WATERTOWN, MASSACHUSETTS 02472

Melissa M. Santucci, 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](http://www.watertown-ma.gov)

**MINUTES**

On Wednesday evening, **October 26, 2011** 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*; **Steve Magoon**, *Director, Community Development & Planning*; **Michael Mena**, *Zoning Enforcement Officer*; **Gideon Schreiber**, *Senior Planner*; **Louise Civetti**, *Clerk to ZBA*.

Ms. Santucci Rozzi asked about the pending case that Russo's has against the Zoning Enforcement Officer's determination.

Mr. Bailey requested to withdraw the appeal to the ZEO's Determination at 532-542 Pleasant Street.

Ms. Elliott motioned to allow the withdrawal. Mr. Ferris seconded. Voted 4-0 Withdrawn.

Ms. Elliott motioned to adjourn. Mr. Heep seconded. Voted 4-0. Meeting ended at 10:45 p.m.