



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
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, May 22, 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 (remote): Melissa SantucciRozzi, *Chair*; Alexander Dale, *Member*;
In attendance (in-person): David Ferris, *Member*; Gregory Girard, *Alternate*; Samuel Odamah *Alternate*.
Absent: Christopher Heep, *Member*.
Also present: Gideon Schreiber, *Director of Planning and Zoning*; Antonio Mancini, *Zoning Enforcement Officer*; Sameena Pirani, *Zoning Clerk*.

Chair SantucciRozzi, participating virtually, opened the meeting and introduced the Board Members and staff. She said that there would be a roll call vote on all motions as two members were remote. Listing the voting members for the petition, she added that Member Girard would not be voting as he missed the testimony last month.

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

Motion to approve the April 24, 2024 meeting minutes was made by Member Ferris and seconded by Member Odamah. The motion was approved 4-0 with Member Ferris, Member Dale, Member Chair SantucciRozzi and Alternate Odamah voting in favor.

Continued Case: 3-5 Grenville Rd

Chair SantucciRozzi requested Attorney Morris to go over the revisions made to the plans. Representing the Torosian family, he thanked the Board for giving them the opportunity to appear again before them. He believed that the new submittals addressed all the Board's concerns raised at the last hearing. Most

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.

of these concerns related to the inconsistencies between the civil plans and the architectural plans. Describing all the updates, he said that the petition was for the front and rear dormer only as the third dormer had been eliminated. He listed the measurements of the front and rear dormers as they appeared in the civil and architectural plans and confirmed the relevant setbacks included in the civil plans, not shown in the earlier submittal. In response to questions asked about the window replacement, Attorney said that all windows would be replaced, the style would be sympathetic to the existing windows, and the new siding would match the existing. Lastly, he said that staff had confirmed that the proposed attic met the definition of half story, also indicated on the architectural plans.

Following the conclusion of his presentation, Chair SantucciRozzi opened discussion to the Board.

Member Ferris noted the inconsistency in the window appearances in terms of the division of the windows. He asked if the home was going to be fully reroofed. Petitioner Susan, participating remotely, said that she was aware of the split window and planned to make it match. Also, if required to reroof, they would do so. They had reroofed about two years ago and were planning to use the same exact shingles. They were also planning to use the same siding.

Commenting on the inconsistent style of the windows, Member Ferris explained that on page A000 for instance, the upper left drawing showed that there were 2 over 2 or 4 panes of glass, whereas the corresponding photograph showed a full sheet of glass. He clarified that while reviewing projects it was important for the Board to have accurate knowledge of what the petitioners intended to build. In this case he was not sure of what the Board was being asked to approve. The petitioner clarified that they planned to have all the second floor windows be the same style and not different from one another. Based on the petitioner and attorney's comments, Member Ferris was inclined to assume that the windows would be more like the ones on the upper drawing on Page A000, with the 2 over 2 windows, versus the lower drawing with the single sheet of glass.

Staff clarified that if the first floor windows were going to be retained then the second floor and attic would be matched with those. Often the level of plans for 1 and 2 family dwellings were placeholders and may not match the proposed or existing.

Member Ferris observed that based on recent photographs he had taken, the existing style and proposed windows were very different. Currently, the first floor had "hung windows" whereas the drawings showed that they were casement windows.

The Meeting was paused for a couple of minutes as technical difficulties were resolved.

Based on the condition of the current siding as observed during his site visit, Member Ferris expressed concern that the petitioners were planning to match siding that was not in great shape. He wished other members to weigh in on the application.

Member Dale asked if the setback lines in the plot plan were drawn to the dormer. Chair confirmed this and explained that proposed rear setbacks were not accurate; the dormer was kicked in by a foot or so from the roof line.

Chair SantucciRozzi suggested the incorporation of a condition addressing the uniformity of the windows. Member Ferris offered two suggestions. The windows would match either the existing style or

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.

the style depicted in the elevations at the top of Sheet A000. He said that his concerns for the siding were beyond the scope of relief sought.

After confirming that there were no additional comments from the public and Board, the Chair closed the public hearing to go into the Board's business mode. Member Ferris made a motion to approve the application for a special permit finding to allow construction within pre-existing, non-conforming rear and front setbacks for new front and rear dormers, as the requested relief meets the criteria set forth in the Watertown Zoning Ordinance, with addition of the new condition pertaining to the windows, as previously suggested. The motion was seconded by Member Odamah. Motion was approved 4-0 with Members Ferris, Dale, Odamah and Chair SantucciRozzi voting in favor. The Petition was approved (4-0) with conditions.

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

Meeting ended at approximately 7:40 PM

MINUTES APPROVED:-----