



**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  
Michael E. Brangwynne, Alternate

Telephone (617) 972-6427  
Facsimile (617) 926-7778  
[www.watertown-ma.gov](http://www.watertown-ma.gov)  
Louise Civetti, Zoning

**MINUTES**

On Wednesday evening, May 22, 2019, at 7:00 p.m. in the Town Council Chamber of the Administration Building, the Zoning Board of Appeals held a public hearing. In attendance: Melissa SantucciRozzi, Chair; David Ferris, *Clerk*; Kelly Donato, *Member*; John Gannon, *Member*. Absent: Christopher Heep, *Member*; Michael Brangwynne, *Alternate Member*. Also Present: Mike Mena, Zoning Enforcement Officer.

Chair SantucciRozzi opened the meeting, introduced herself and stated the agenda item for 19 Loomis Ave. was continued. She introduced the staff and members and mentioned that there is only a four member board and all votes will need to be in the affirmative or they have the option to continue to a five member board. She swore in the audience and asked the board to table the minutes as she has not had time to do a thorough review.

---

Member Ferris read the legal notice:

“Jessica Middlebrook & David Weintraub, **649 Main Street**, Watertown, MA 02472, herein requests the Zoning Board of Appeals grant Special Permit Finding in accordance with Watertown Zoning Ordinance §4.06(a), Alterations to Existing Non-Conforming Structures, Rear Yard Setback, to construct a one-story rear addition, maintaining a non-conforming rear yard setback. Located in the S-6 (Single Family) Zoning District. ZBA-2019-08”

Greg Tatnal, GT Building Corp., stated that he is the designer and builder on the project. He apologized for the board receiving the proposed plot plan at such a late date. They worked to come up with the 84 s.f. addition off of the dining room to create a more continuous open space between the kitchen and the dining room. However, after looking at the mortgage plan, they realized the house was non-conforming. There is an addition off of the right side of the house for a mud-room but that is all conforming. It is just the 84 s.f. addition that is continuing the non-conforming setback.

No one spoke from the audience.

Member Gannon asked what the difference between the two plot plans were. Mr. Tatnal said the first one did not have the proposed additions.

Member Gannon asked if the exterior of the new additions will be equal to the existing exterior. Mr. Tatnal said the addition will maintain the character of the existing bump-out with the hip roof and the siding and windows will match.

Member Ferris asked about the vinyl siding and asked if he'd be able to extend that with a match. The existing wall plane will have matching siding.

Member Ferris asked about the tree in the back yard. David Weintraub, resident at 649 Main Street said that the tree is on their property and 6' between it and the ramp and they are moving the house to where the ramp is. They will not be affecting the tree.

Member Ferris stated that the deck goes beyond the rear wall of the house but the size of the deck is not changing just the ramp is being removed.

Member Ferris noted a discrepancy between drawing A1 and the proposed plan, the distance between the garage –on the proposed plan it is 10'4" and A1 states 11'2". It doesn't have a lot of impact, though.

Chair SantucciRozzi said to use the plot plan as it is more accurate. She added that the requirement is 10' and this meets that requirement. Mr. Tatnal agreed.

Mr. Weintraub said the survey shows the incorrect neighbors. Chair said it is okay as it states 'now or formerly' and the board is only concerned with the depicted property.

Chair SantucciRozzi asked the members if they wanted to add a condition regarding the steps to protect the tree. She noted that the board typically requests that the siding match the existing. She asked about the slider remaining in the west elevation. She asked who owns the multitude of fences as none of them appear to be on the property line. Mr. Weintraub said none of the fences belong to them and he proceeded to name the owners of each of the fences. The vinyl fence that separates the yard is theirs. Chair is concerned with the north fences not being in the correct place and since there are four owners, he may want to have a surveyor come out. Mr. Weintraub said one of the fences was just replaced.

Chair said the addition is very reasonable in size and shape and a one-story is not overly aggressive. She asked about the proposed north elevation and asked if there could be more windows added there. Mr. Tatnal said the wall has upper cabinets. He said they could move the lockers in the mudroom and add a window there. Chair said there is a 20' span without a window and if they can reverse the bench and lockers that would add a lot of light. Member Ferris said if you were to flip them, you would lose the window in the front. Mr. Tatnal said they could add a smaller window. Chair said the addition of a window will be a condition but anywhere on the rear façade is fine and augment the front window.

Member Donato said that she was also concerned about that façade not having a window.

Chair SantucciRozzi said adding a window on the rear façade; permission to augment the window in the front and eliminate the window on the east façade.

Chair asked if the board wanted to add anything about the tree. Member Ferris said the area is tight back there but there are still substantial trees in the area. Mr. Tatnal said there will be minimal disturbance back there as it will be on piers. Mr. Weintraub said the tree will have to go in 10-20 years as it is not the healthiest tree and it sits over their roof. It does provide shade but anxiety when the wind blows. Chair confirmed there will not be a condition for the tree.

Chair said the Planning Board and Staff recommended approval with standard conditions.

Member Ferris motioned to approve the request 649 Main Street Special Permit Finding for a non-conforming rear yard setback with the conditions discussed. Member Donato seconded the motion. Members Ferris, Donato, SantucciRozzi and Gannon voted in the affirmative (4-0). Member Heep absent and Alternate Member Brangwynne absent.

Documents reviewed: Supporting Statement, Code Review, Plan of Land, Plan Set, Cover Sheet, Sheet G-01, Sheet L-01, Sheet L-02, Sheet E-01, Sheet A-01, Sheet A-1.1, Sheet EX-02, Sheet A-02, Sheet A-2.1, Sheet EX-03, Sheet A-03, Sheet EX-04, Sheet A-04, Sheet EX-05, Sheet A-05, Sheet EX-06, Sheet A-06.

---

Member Gannon motioned to adjourn. Member Donato seconded. Voted 4-0

---