



TOWN OF WATERTOWN
Zoning Board of Appeals
Administration Building
149 Main Street
WATERTOWN, MASSACHUSETTS 02472

Melissa M. SantucciRozzi, Chairperson
David Ferris, Clerk
Christopher H. Heep, Member
John G. Gannon, Member
Kelly Donato, Member
Neeraj Chander, Alternate
Jason D. Cohen, Alternate

Telephone (617) 972-6427
Facsimile (617) 926-7778
www.watertown-ma.gov
Louise Civetti, Zoning Assistant

MINUTES

On Wednesday evening, January 24, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. in the Richard E. Mastrangelo Council Chamber on the second floor of the Administration Building, the Zoning Board of Appeals held a public hearing. In attendance: Melissa SantucciRozzi, *Chair*; David Ferris, *Clerk*; John G. Gannon, *Member*; Christopher Heep, *Member*; Neeraj Chander, *Alternate Member*; Jason Cohen, *Alternate Member*. *Absent*: Kelly Donato; *Member*. Also Present: Gideon Schreiber, *Senior Planner*; Louise Civetti, *Zoning Assistant*.

Chair SantucciRozzi opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.; noting one case on the agenda; introduced the board and staff noting Alternate Member Chander will be voting. She swore in the audience then asked for a motion on the minutes.

Member Ferris motioned to approve the minutes of November 29, 2017. Member Gannon seconded. Voted 5-0, approved.

Chair SantucciRozzi requested the petitioner step forward for the case on 15 Arden Road and then asked Member Ferris to read the legal notice:

“Richard Williams and Jeanne Segal, 15 Arden Road, Watertown, MA 02472, herein request the Zoning Board of Appeals grant a Special Permit Finding in accordance with Watertown Zoning Ordinance §4.06(a), Non-Conforming Front and Side(s) Setbacks and Maximum Building Coverage, so as to construct second, third floor and garage additions within the non-conforming front and side yard setbacks, and to increase the non-conforming building coverage from 20.02% to 20.35%, where 20% maximum is allowed. S-10 (Single Family) Zoning District. ZBA-2017-05”

Keith Brown, Architect for the owners, seeking three main elements, raising the ridge height to allow for a legal ½ story with a dormer on the rear and a single dormer on the front for a conforming stair case to the third floor; add 2' forward to the underground garage; and a pergola and new railing above the existing sunroom. They will totally reside the building to bring it back to its' original view. They have been before the planning board and received approval.

Chair SantucciRozzi opened it to the public:

Anthony Donato stated that he is a neighbor of Dick and Jeanne and as new property owners, they were the first to welcome him and his wife to the neighborhood. They have shown great concern to the neighbors regarding this project – they have held open houses for the owners to come and tour the property and walk through the house. He added that the dormer on the rear of the house overlooks Oakley Country Club and not a neighbor and other houses in the area that overlook the country club have rear dormer. The “eyebrow” dormer on the front will only add to the character of the house. The third

floor stairs are not usable. Their plans are keeping in with the character of the neighborhood and are not more detrimental.

Member Cohen asked if the FAR is not required for this project. Mr. Schreiber stated that FAR is not required for single family districts.

Member Cohen noted the clapboard siding on the first floor and the shingles above are not stated on the elevations. He said it is a very attractive design and appreciates the details.

Member Heep had no questions.

Member Gannon stated that the project refers to a pergola and asked Mr. Brown to define that. Mr. Brown defined a pergola as an opened roofed lattice structure – he added that the second floor deck on the south side receives a lot of sun and is close to the neighbor. He designed the railing so planting boxes could be placed and vines could grow up and along those beams for a bit of shading and privacy.

Member Ferris asked if the property is vinyl sided and if that will all be removed and clapboard replace it. Mr. Brown added that the clapboard would be painted.

Member Ferris said the third story has a mass to it. He stated the 'uphill' side elevation (left) provides a good view from the street and requested the skirt be maintained with both sides having matching wood shingles. The rear elevation dormer doesn't extend as far as the house although it is tucked back 1.5' from the edge of the house, it should be shown on the plan. He suggested a hip roof on the middle dormer vs. a gable roof. The 3rd floor room that is on the pergola side may need to have egress windows. He further clarified that the exiting condition has a screen on the pergola side which will not be kept (that is the reason for the pergola).

Member Chander had no questions.

Chair SantucciRozzi does not see the 32' height on the plan A5. Mr. Brown said the lot varies from side to side. He calculated the average height of all four corners and calculated the center of the ridge. He has added 2'9" to the overall building height.

Chair SantucciRozzi said she has never seen this style of house with a third floor. She complimented Mr. Brown on the details of the plan and remembers a similar case. She added that this looks top-heavy and will look larger once it is built. She is concerned about the massing. She recommends that he match the columns on the pergola with the columns on the front of the house. Mr. Brown said he drew simple columns as a minimal concept; the one on the lattice columns was to make them appear lighter as opposed to a solid door column, which is on the front of the building. He explained that the lattice idea is often seen on Victorian homes and wanted to keep a 'lighter' design. Member Cohen stated that the columns shown on the last page of the drawings is simple and more in keeping with the rest of the house and in line with the portico at the front of the house. Mr. Brown would like to do a down-scaled version of the columns on the portico.

Member Ferris stated that the density on the third floor is not typical and the initial view of what you will see is the smaller dormer. The primary impact will be the shallow dormer from the upper part of the street. He said he may have seen a house in the neighborhood with this type of dormer. Mr. Schreiber agreed that the house next door is similar and did come before the board for a shed dormer. Chair SantucciRozzi added that the houses are close together and the area gets crowded. Mr. Brown said these houses are often built with a higher ridge and a shed dormer can be added easily. This house is not open to that option. He added when you look at the property, you are down on the street as the entire house rises up due to the topography. He designed the eyebrow dormer instead of a straight dormer as the latter would bring your eye up, where the topography is already bringing your eye up. Chair added that the other plans were not in front of this board so they cannot see the changes/improvements. She stated that Mr. Brown made a good point about not being able to see the roofline as you are down on the

street. She likes the character in the neighborhood and appreciates his design and warns against filling the neighborhood with changes that do not match the neighborhood.

Mr. Brown wanted to add that the drawings proposed Tesla solar shingles; however, they will not be available during this project's construction. They solve a problem on a south facing room that look like slate and are one and a half years out. They are the only manufacturer. They will go with a conventional asphalt shingle or an artificial slate.

Member Ferris asked about the second story dormer where the cornice meets the gambrel on both sides and the right hand doesn't match. He added that there should be a similar skirt on both sides. The dormers do not have a cornice line that matches up. Mr. Brown explained his reasons for doing this. Member Ferris agreed that matching is not the right way to do it.

Chair SantucciRozzi said the pergola is drawn three different ways – lattice does not look architecturally pleasing. The last drawing is simple.

Mr. Schreiber suggested the board be general and then Staff can decipher easily instead of detailed conditions.

The board discussed the type of structure the pergola will be and decided that the style/design should match the portico on the front door.

Chair SantucciRozzi read from letters submitted in support of the project from 29 Arden Road, 46 Arden Road, 22 Arden Road, and 65 Oakley Road. She then closed the public hearing and noted this project has been in the works since April and the Planning Board report and Staff report both recommend approval with 'boiler-plate' conditions. Tonight the board discussed the columns on the porch, the change on the dormer to a hip roof, full new exterior siding with clapboard and shingles, the shingle detail between the 1st and 2nd floors and matching architectural features. The columns will be a solid column that will closely match the portico. She added that a complete set of revised plans are to be submitted.

Member Ferris motioned to approve 15 Arden Road for special permit finding for front and side yard setbacks and lot coverage with the comments made this evening. Member Heep seconded. Voted 5-0 with Alternate Member Chander voting as full member. Member Donato absent.

Member Heep motioned to adjourn. Member Gannon seconded. Voted 5-0. The meeting ended at 8:10pm.