



CITY OF WATERTOWN
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
WATERTOWN ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
149 MAIN STREET
WATERTOWN, MASSACHUSETTS 02472

Melissa M. SantucciRozzi, Chairperson
David Ferris, Clerk
Christopher H. Heep, Member
Michael E. Brangwynne, Member
Alexander Dale, Member
Gregory Girard, Alternate
Samuel Odamah, Alternate

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

MINUTES

On Wednesday evening, April 24, 2024, at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber of the Administration Building, the Zoning Board of Appeals held a public hearing. The meeting and public hearing were conducted in a 'hybrid' format with options for public participation both in-person and via remote means, in accordance with applicable law.

In attendance: Melissa SantucciRozzi, *Chair*; David Ferris, *Member*; Alexander Dale, *Member* (Remote); Michael Brangwynne, *Member*; Samuel Odamah *Alternate*.

Also present: Gideon Schreiber, *Assistant Director of Planning*; Antonio Mancini, *Zoning Enforcement Officer*; Larry Field, *Senior Planner*; Sameena Pirani, *Zoning Clerk*.

Absent: Christopher Heep, *Member*; Gregory Girard, *Alternate*.

Chair SantucciRozzi opened the meeting and introduced the Board Members and staff. She said that since one of the members was remote (Member Dale), there would be roll call vote for all motions.

Staff explained how the meeting and methods of participation for the public could be accessed remotely.

Chair SantucciRozzi recognized Member Brangwynne for his service to the Watertown ZBA, first as an alternate, then as full member.

Motion to approve the March 27, 2024 meeting minutes was made by Member Ferris and seconded by Member Brangwynne. The motion was approved 5-0 with Member Ferris, Member Dale, Member Brangwynne, Chair SantucciRozzi and Alternates Odamah voting in favor.

The above minutes represent only a summary of the public hearing. For a more detailed account of the meeting, please visit the Watertown Cable Access Corp channel at, vodwcatv.org/CablecastPublicSite/gallery/47?channel=3 where a video of the hearing can be viewed.

Case #1: 3-5 Grenville Rd

Member Ferris read the legal notice. Attorney Terry Morris, (57 Elm Rd Newton) representing the petitioners Susan and Kaspar Torosian explained the scope of the project and the nature of relief sought. This was a non-conforming 2-family dwelling in the single-family zone. A special permit finding was requested for the expansion of two dormers, front and rear. A third one was added to the west side.

Following the presentation, Chair SantucciRozzi opened the discussion to the Board.

Member Ferris asked staff to provide commentary about the existing partially constructed dormers. Staff clarified that construction of the dormers had been stopped when observed to be in violation of the code. The request for a special permit finding was to bring it to code and conformity with the zoning ordinance.

Member Ferris asked if the proposed front dormer was the same width as the one currently framed. Attorney said yes, it would be the same width. Referring to the plot plan dated Feb 20, 2024, Member Ferris noted the dimensional inconsistency between the architectural drawings and the proposed plot plans for this dormer. Also, not shown in the proposed plot plan was the third dormer on the west. Attorney said that there was another survey dated March 12, 2024. Architect Mengting Torosian, attending remotely, confirmed that the more recent survey which was not in the Board's submittal included the third dormer on the west. Looking at the updated survey shared on the screen, Chair noted the inconsistency in square footage of the west dormer on the survey and architectural drawings. She also observed that based on the dimensions, the west-side dormer appeared to be within the rear setbacks. Staff said that relief had been noticed for the front and rear dormers only.

Member Ferris also asked other questions which he said could be answered at the next hearing. He asked if all the windows would be replaced. He noted there were a variety of window styles that were not currently on the house. Will the new siding match the existing or will all the siding be new? Based on the attic plans, it seemed that the upper unit was being expanded. He asked if the petitioners were planning to expand the lower unit into the basement? If the basement was going to be occupied, window wells would be required, and these needed to be shown in the survey. Attorney clarified that the width of the dormer was dictated by the need to create headroom to get from the second floor to the attic space.

Motion to continue the hearing to the next regularly scheduled meeting in May was made by Member Ferris and seconded by Member Brangwynne. Motion was continued (5-0) with Members Ferris, Brangwynne, Dale, Odamah and Chair SantucciRozzi voting in favor. Chair clarified that a unanimous vote would be needed to approve the petition since the Mullin Rule had not been adopted by the city.

Case #2

Member Ferris read the legal notice.

The petitioners Eric and Jenna Figueiredo provided a brief overview of the project.

The above minutes represent only a summary of the public hearing. For a more detailed account of the meeting, please visit the Watertown Cable Access Corp channel at, vodwcatv.org/CablecastPublicSite/gallery/47?channel=3 where a video of the hearing can be viewed.

Following their presentation, the Chair opened questions to the Board. Members questioned a few aspects of the proposed project. Member Ferris confirmed that the new siding materials would match the existing. The petitioners said that the house had been recently re-sided. They had purchased extra siding in anticipation of the proposed project. Member Odamah asked if the project had been discussed with their neighbors. Eric Figueiredo said yes and that the neighbors to the left and front had been supportive of the project. Jenna's parents lived diagonally across from them and the neighbors on the right had no questions. In response to Member Dales's question about roofing materials, he said that rubber or standard roofing material would be used. They planned to match it with the existing one on the house. Chair SantucciRozzi questioned the accuracy and source of the existing and proposed left setback dimensions indicated in the Application Form. She asked if the revised plot plan indicating setbacks of the new enclosure could be provided before filing of the ZBA Decision so that the plans and dates listed were accurate and up to date.

After confirming that there were no additional comments from the public and Board, the Chair requested a motion to approve the application. Member Ferris made a motion to approve the application for a special permit finding to allow the proposed mudroom/side entryway within the pre-existing, non-conforming left side setback, as the requested relief meets the criteria set forth in the Watertown Zoning Ordinance, with modification of Condition 1 as previously suggested. The motion was seconded by Member Brangwynne. Motion was approved 5-0 with Members Ferris, Dale, Brangwynne, Odamah and Chair SantucciRozzi voting in favor. The Petition was approved (5-0) with conditions.

Motion to adjourn was made by Member Brangwynne, seconded by Member Odamah. Motion was approved (5-0) with Members Ferris, Dale, Brangwynne, Odamah and Chair SantucciRozzi voting in favor.

MINUTES APPROVED:-----