



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
Louise Civetti, Zoning

MINUTES

On Wednesday evening, September 25, 2019, at 7:05 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; Michael Brangwynne, Alternate Member. Absent: Christopher Heep, Member. Also Present: Gideon Schreiber, Senior Planner; Louise Civetti, Zoning.

Chair SantucciRozzi opened the meeting, reviewed the agenda, noting the order of the cases being heard has changed to 6 Hovey, 22 Priest, 3 Belknap, 49 Phillips with **19 Loomis Avenue** being **withdrawn** and 101-103 Morse Street not being heard due to the board not having a quorum. She reiterated that if anyone is here for this case, it has been continued. The audience was sworn in and Chair asked the Petitioners for 6 Hovey to come to the podium. She announced their case is a continuance and the legal notice will not be read.

Sharon Seltzer, 4 Hovey Street for **6 Hovey Street**, introduced herself and her architect, stating that they have considered the board's suggestions and have revised their plans accordingly.

Erik Rodin, Architect explained the changes to their plans in accordance with the points the board made at the last meeting. They have removed the dormer from the front of the house; added another dormer to the rear with separation between the two dormers for massing; moved the master bedroom down to the main floor and created two smaller bedrooms on the upper level.

Chair stated there were concerns last time with the dormers, venting, etc.

Member Donato asked if the existing siding is clapboard. Mr. Rodin said it is aluminum and will stay in the areas that the windows are changing. They may remove the siding from the front porch or the side and reuse that material for the infill and replace the siding in the necessary areas. All of the siding will be aluminum – they will salvage where needed.

Member Ferris asked about the replacement of the siding in the front where the two windows will be removed. Mr. Rodin said they may remove and reuse the siding from the side of the house and then replace the siding on the side porch with a similar aluminum siding (found a manufacturer in Canada) or

they could use the garage side. There was further discussion on the rear windows being replaced and they are working with the contractor to match the windows with the rest of the house. Member Ferris reiterated that the siding should match where the new areas are being built. Ms. Seltzer noted that the contractor suggested painting the aluminum siding to have it all match. Member Ferris also noted that some homes have one siding in the front and different around the rest of the home.

Chair thanked the petitioner for listening to the suggestions of the board at their last meeting. She noted that a condition will be added regarding the uniformity of the exterior as the dormers are modest and well designed and the exterior should be.

Member Ferris added that if they are choosing siding to patch the front of the house, to choose from the least visible elevation, which is the side facing the garage. This will be added as a condition.

Chair asked staff to draw up a condition that states the façade that is visible from the street and the rear is uniform and any augmentation is done on the garage elevation.

No one spoke from the audience.

Chair read that the Planning Board and Staff recommended approval with conditions. This board has added condition #6 as discussed.

Member Ferris motioned to approve 6 Hovey Street for alterations to non-conforming structures with the conditions discussed. Member Donato seconded. Members Ferris, Donato, SantucciRozzi, Gannon and Brangwynne voted in favor, 5-0.

Chair announced the next case: **22 Priest Road**. Chair noted updated plans were submitted and asked the representative to speak about the revisions.

Peter Bemis, Engineer Design Consultants stated the last time he appeared before the board, there were discrepancies between the architectural elevation and the site (plans). He stated that they are engineers and surveyors and they went back and measured the field elevations to determine an average grade. Those (numbers) are on their existing and proposed site plan. He had the architect put the same on the architectural plans for consistency. He said they talked about an enclosed area for the toters and they changed that on the plan to not be in conflict with any cars. There was an impervious area in the southern part of the lot and they will remove that to reduce the impervious coverage. The architectural details were properly noted. The bathroom on the third floor was corrected for the shower and window issue.

Member Gannon asked about the consistency of the exterior materials with the new addition. Mr. Bemis said they are replacing everything – all new windows and siding.

Member Ferris asked about the windows appearing to be smaller. Mr. Bemis said they are not being reduced – the windows will be the same size. He then asked about the stairway in the basement not

making sense. Mr. Bemis said the architect is very astute but he will bring it to his attention. Mr. Ferris asked about the trim at the corners and the details and noted that what they approve is usually what is built. Mr. Bemis said they will have trim boards and corner boards but he hadn't noticed they were not on the plans. Member Ferris asked about the door in the basement that the board discussed at the last meeting and it appears to be still there. Chair SantucciRozzi noted that these changes will have to be made to these plans before the decision is finalized. Member Ferris added that the elevations are not reflective of what is being built (details – trim, etc.).

Member Donato thanked him for working through all of the questions. She said she will wait for the chair to ask about the basement door separating the 1st floor unit area. Mr. Bemis stated that there is not ill intent and they are not looking for a separate unit.

Chair stated that the door in the basement is to be removed; the landing of the basement stairs in unit 2 storage area that go up needs to be corrected; add trim and detail work on the elevations and the new plans need to be entered into the record.

Chair closed the public hearing. She noted the special permit finding for non-conforming setbacks. The Planning Board and Staff recommended approval with boilerplate conditions. The plans will need to be updated and recorded in the conditions.

Member Ferris motioned to approve the special permit and finding with the conditions discussed. Member Gannon seconded. Members Ferris, Gannon, SantucciRozzi, Donato and Alternate Brangwynne voted in the affirmative, 5-0. Member Heep absent.

Chair announced that we will move into our new cases and the first is **3 Belknap Terrace**. She asked that the legal notice be read. Member Ferris read the legal notice:

“Mark and Jamie Conti, 3 Belknap Terrace, Watertown, MA 02472, requests the Zoning Board of Appeals grant a Special Permit Finding in accordance with Watertown Zoning Ordinance, §4.06(a), Non-Conforming Setbacks, to construct a second floor addition within the non-conforming front and rear setbacks. Located in the T (Two-Family) Zoning District. ZBA-2019-22”

Mark Conti explained the proposal to expand their existing Cape-style home currently with two bedrooms on the second floor to a larger second floor

Member Ferris asked if the windows will be all new. Mr. Conti said the windows will remain on the first floor and 9 windows will be added to the second floor and will match the first floor. They will match the siding but solar fading is a concern and if there is a noticeable difference, they will reside the entire home.

Chair commented that this is a modest addition for a growing family. She shares the concerns of Member Ferris but they can split the top from the bottom and have shingles on the top.

No one spoke from the audience. Chair closed the hearing.

Chair read from the Planning Board and Staff report where a recommendation of approval with standard conditions was stated. She confirmed with the petitioner that they understood the comments regarding the siding and windows.

Member Ferris added that the project is nicely done.

Chair agreed with Member Ferris adding that it is a difficult lot. She asked why the height on the site plan is different from their elevations, although they are not going over the 35' height requirement.

Norman Kerloff, Architect, said they made an adjustment and submitted an updated site plan. Chair noted the site plan is stamped received on September 20th and dated April 6th. Mr. Kerloff said they should be the same. Chair noted they are not the same and requested Mr. Kerloff to update whichever is correct so they match. Mr. Conti said the plot plan is updated and signed 9/20/19. Chair said the building height is 28.3 and needs to be revised on the plan.

Member Ferris motioned to approve the Special Permit Finding with the conditions, as discussed. Member Donato seconded. Members Ferris, Donato, SantucciRozzi, Gannon and Brangwynne voted in the affirmative, 5-0.

Member Ferris read the legal notice for **49 Philips Street:**

“Ronald Goode II, 55 Phillips Street, Watertown, MA 02472 requests the Zoning Board of Appeals grant a Special Permit in accordance with Watertown Zoning Ordinance §5.01.1(b), Conversion, to allow an addition to and the conversion of an existing single family dwelling into a two family dwelling. Located in the SC (Single Family Conversion) Zoning District. ZBA-2019-21”

Ron Goode said the existing house is about 1,800 s.f. and they are converting a single to a two-family. They want a farmhouse feel with usable back-yard space and parking. The neighborhood is mixed with four-family, two-family, single family, etc. Their house is behind Elan and they bought their neighbor's house when they moved. He has his fifth child on the way and they live right next door now.

Member Brangwynne asked about the plan for delivery of the modular addition. Mr. Goode said there will not be any impact to the neighbors – he's the neighbor and they can put the crane in his driveway. They can pull the trailer into the yard space off-street and a one to two day installation with 4-5 boxes.

Member Gannon said he doesn't like to see the loss of open space but he understands. Mr. Goode commented that he is a landscaper and loves the yard space. Chair noted that it appears more impactful than it actually is when you look at the numbers.

Member Ferris confirmed that the existing front porch and the stonewall will remain.

Member Ferris asked if the trim around the windows will be matched. Mr. Goode said the existing house has shutters and he is not fond of those but all of the windows will have trim.

Member Ferris stated that the master bedroom should have at least one window on the side of the house facing the neighbors. Mr. Goode said it may affect the interior layout but he can add a window. Chair noted two windows can be added on either side of the bed – it is a lot of wall.

Member Donato asked if the vinyl will match the existing. Mr. Goode said he thinks a contrast would be better and he doesn't want to try to match the existing white. He likes the way it breaks up and creates a nice design element.

Member Donato asked if they are putting in granite curbing. Mr. Goode stated that his side of the street does not have curbing but if the city wants to put it in, he is all for it. Mr. Schreiber said the Planning Board had this as a public question and the Staff report commented that if it came up at the DPW's review and they required it, it would have to be installed but it is the purview of this board whether or not to request it. Chair clarified that they are actually talking about the street and not the driveway. The bars on the front of the survey are showing the grass strip (on the sidewalk). She suggested either defaulting to DPW or a condition that states one large curb cut or two driveways with a delineation between them. Mr. Schreiber said there is a concrete apron today. Mr. Goode said there isn't any curbing or even a rise to the driveway.

Member Donato commented that she was glad Member Ferris asked to add something to the left elevation – she would like to see something add to the right elevation, as well. Mr. Goode said they left that as a solid wall as it is the second units egress to the back yard and there is a bathroom – he said he is fine with adding a window in the top right bedroom (bedroom #2).

Member Donato asked what the landscape buffer will be. Mr. Goode does not have a plan yet for the landscaping.

Member Donato asked about the modular delivery – how many trucks for 4 blocks. Mr. Goode said one crane truck parked in his driveway and probably four trucks will be unloaded. They may need a sidewalk closing but they will not have to close the street. Mr. Schreiber noted this has been done in Watertown in the past and Mr. Goode will be required to coordinate police and DPW. Mr. Goode said they will have to find a place for temporary storage until they are ready to be installed and it probably won't be in Watertown but it will be local. Member Donato said the timing of the delivery needs should be considered and not during rush hour. Mr. Goode said he has a storage yard in Needham and may consider that but he doesn't mind waiting until 9:30 or 10 am.

Chair SantucciRozzi said the drawings are showing the addition but no front stairs and asked if the porch on the existing house is going to be redone as the porches should match although different colors of the houses are okay, the hue should be brought up so it is not too dark. She asked if the exposed supports will be shown. Mr. Goode said there will be lattice in the front of that open area and landscaping will be added, as well. Member Gannon stated that the drawing is just what is being delivered by the modular company and the rest will be added. Mr. Goode said the porch will be built on site.

Chair said she had a conversation with Mr. Schreiber regarding the front yard parking as the existing parking is to the side of the existing dwelling and after construction of the second unit, it will all be in front of the dwelling. She said he explained that when it is a rear addition, the parking is not considered front yard parking.

Chair asked about the landscaping. Mr. Goode said the landscaping will look nice with plantings – just look at his own house.

Chair reviewed the notes: adding one to two windows in the master; Member Donato mentioned bedroom number 2 also one to two windows at his discretion; delivery time 10am – 3pm. Mr. Goode said he is not the modular person. Mr. Schreiber said the delivery of the (modular) project on Pleasant Street had flexibility so it could be coordinated by the Watertown Police Department and DPW. If they had to deliver within a window, there will be limitations of certain roads in certain towns. The officials in the towns can coordinate. Chair said the preferred delivery times are 10am – 3pm. She wants to be certain the delivery is done safely. She continued with her notes: lighten up the color of the siding; the porches should match – same stairs, same railings, etc. Member Ferris added that the windows for the master can be smaller but something to break up the wall.

Lisa Feltner, District B Councilor and she lives in the neighborhood said she appreciates all of the comments and about the exterior look; windows, etc. She wants to know how the trucks will turn around on Phillips Street, as a dead-end street. She believes trucks will be backing up and will appreciate it if they could wait until after 7am but states this will be worked out with public safety and police. She said the questions about granite curbing and this being a new addition to an existing house and Morse Street is brand new and other places...she will talk to staff to help constituents understand when granite curbing is required by a petitioner...and sidewalk crossing issues. The front yard parking is confusing. Our driveway regulations state there must be a clear path to the public way from the front of the house. She asked if this can be clear since this is a separate entrance. She said other properties are getting ticketed for not having at least 3' clearance. She will be happy to meet with staff to be clear on this and to explain to the constituents. She asked that this be explained better for fire, ambulance, etc. access. She then clarified for the Chair that zoning requires 3' in front of the entrance and then parking on either side for public safety as that is front yard parking. Mr. Schreiber further explained that in some instances there is a driveway and a walkway within a continuous flush asphalt so cars park on it and block the front entrance to the house and that is the 3' clear path that needs to be maintained on the front of the house. Ms. Feltner said there is not a walkway on this new addition and she appreciates the clear explanation.

Chair asked what the width of the driveway is proposed to be – the curb opening is 22'. Mr. Schreiber stated there is a condition to specify it but there isn't a plot plan. Mr. Goode clarified that there is 22' from the retaining wall to the edge of the landscaped buffer and the depth is 41'. Chair said if there is 22' wide, they can park cars on either side and have enough for a walkway. She asked that they put concrete strip or stamp the middle of the pavement. Mr. Goode said he'd prefer to do grass (Chair said vertical planting in the 4' buffer. Chair said the paver walkway is not in the middle and will impede the parking. She continued to explain the parking of 9.5' on either side and then the paver walkway in the

middle, clearly defining the walkway. She wants to have the paver walkway extended to the stairs. She measured the drawing and determined it is not scalable but the larger drawing is scalable and said the driveway is 22' and the opening is smaller. They do not want to have to remove the existing tree, which is not shown on the drawing. They took some time to determine how they could save the tree and have two parking spaces with a walkway without eliminating the other walkway against the porch.

Chair closed the hearing and read from the Planning Board and Staff reports, recommending approval. This board discussed the conditions regarding the driveway; they discussed the windows in bedroom 2 and in the master with flexibility in the size to meet the needs of the interior space; siding; deliveries with exceptions from public officials; both porches will match and they will have a transition material to show there is a walkway in the middle. The survey plan will need to be updated with the coverages and be submitted to staff. The landscape buffer has to have vertical plantings. The walkway being 3' wide is fine and wider is fine.

Member Ferris motioned to approve 49 Philips Street for the conversion of a single family to a two family with conditions discussed. Member Donato seconded. Members Ferris, Donato, SantucciRozzi, Gannon and Brangwynne voted in the affirmative, 5-0.

Chair noted the withdrawal of 19 Loomis Avenue and the continuation of **101-103 Morse Street** to the October 23, 2019 meeting.

Member Brangwynne motioned to adjourn. Member Donato seconded. Voted 5-0.

