

CITY OF SOMERVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS OFFICE OF STRATEGIC PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT JOSEPH A. CURTATONE MAYOR

PLANNING DIVISION

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEMBERS

HERBERT F. FOSTER, JR., CHAIRMAN ORSOLA SUSAN FONTANO, CLERK RICHARD ROSSETTI T. F. SCOTT DARLING, III, ESQ. DANIELLE EVANS ELAINE SEVERINO (ALT.) JOSH SAFDIE (ALT.) Case #: ZBA # 2012-39 Site: 86 Hudson Street

Date of Decision: June 6, 2012

Decision: <u>Petition Approved with Conditions</u> **Date Filed with City Clerk: June 11, 2012**

ZBA DECISION

Applicant Name: James Piwinski

Applicant Address: 90 Hudson Street, Somerville, MA 02143

Property Owner Name: Alison Cromer

Property Owner Address: 86 Hudson Street, Somerville, MA 02143

Agent Name: N/A

<u>Legal Notice:</u> Applicant, James M. Piwinski, seeks a Special Permit to alter a

nonconforming structure under SZO §4.4.1 to expand an existing

dormer on the left side of the dwelling.

Zoning District/Ward: RB zone/Ward 5

Zoning Approval Sought: §4.4.1

Date of Application:May 3, 2012Date(s) of Public Hearing:June 6, 2012Date of Decision:June 6, 2012

Vote: 5-0

Appeal #ZBA 2012-39 was opened before the Zoning Board of Appeals at Somerville High School Auditorium on June 6, 2012. Notice of the Public Hearing was given to persons affected and was published and posted, all as required by M.G.L. c. 40A, sec. 11 and the Somerville Zoning Ordinance. After one hearing of deliberation, the Zoning Board of Appeals took a vote.





DESCRIPTION:

Applicant, James Piwinski, an abutting neighbor, proposes to expand an existing shed dormer on the left side of this two-family dwelling to create a new bathroom. The current dormer is 8'-6" in width and extends to the ridgeline of the house. The face of the dormer is six feet in height and includes two windows that extend the height of the dormer.

The extension of the dormer will result in a 15'-10" shed dormer located in the center of the roof slope. The length of the extension would be 7'-4" and would include a skylight placed above the bathtub near the front façade. Construction will consist of 2" x 6" rafters and sheathing as well as new asphalt shingles. The usable square footage of the property will increase by 40 square feet (from 3,179 square feet to 3,221 square feet) and the floor area ratio (FAR) will increase from 1.2 to 1.21. The dormer will not consist of more than 50% of the roof slope and is more than three feet from either gable end.

The Applicant, James Piwinski, is the owner of an identical house next door at 90 Hudson Street, which is visible in the photograph. James expanded a dormer, in the same location, on his own house during 2010. The result of this neighboring expansion was the catalyst to modify the current proposed dormer, at 86 Hudson Street, in the same manner. Due to the proximity of the buildings, the visibility of the expanded dormer is minimal and the installation of a skylight in this space will reduce the necessary use of electricity.

FINDINGS FOR SPECIAL PERMIT (SZO §4.4.1):

In order to grant a Special Permit, the SPGA must make certain findings and determinations as outlined in §5.1.4 of the SZO. This section of the report goes through §5.1.4 in detail.

- 1. <u>Information Supplied:</u> The Board finds that the information provided by the Applicant conforms to the requirements of §5.1.2 of the SZO and allows for a comprehensive analysis of the project with respect to the required Special Permits.
- 2. <u>Compliance with Standards:</u> The Applicant must comply "with such criteria or standards as may be set forth in this Ordinance which refer to the granting of the requested special permit."

In considering a Special Permit under §4.4 of the SZO, the Board finds that the alterations proposed would not be substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood than the existing structure. The dormer is not expected to impact the house adjacent to the nonconforming side yard. The use of the proposed area with a skylight rather than windows will provide privacy for both structures. While Staff does not encourage shed dormers extending from the apex of a roof, the Board finds the design acceptable as the dormer is an extension of an existing form, does not compose more than 50% of the slope of the roof, and is placed more than three feet from either gable end. The increase in the floor area ratio is negligible as the dwelling already exceeds the maximum FAR of 1.0 allowed in a RB district.

3. <u>Consistency with Purposes:</u> The Applicant has to ensure that the project "is consistent with (1) the general purposes of this Ordinance as set forth in Article 1, and (2) the purposes, provisions, and specific objectives applicable to the requested Special Permit which may be set forth elsewhere in this Ordinance, such as, but not limited to, those purposes at the beginning of the various Articles."

The proposal is consistent with the general purposes of the Ordinance as set forth under §1.2, which includes, but is not limited to "promoting the health, safety, and welfare of the inhabitants of the City of Somerville; to protect health; to secure safety from fire, panic and other dangers; to provide adequate light and air; to conserve the value of land and buildings; to preserve the historical and architectural resources of the City; and to preserve and increase the amenities of the municipality."





The proposal is consistent with the purpose of the district (6.1.2 RB – Residence Districts), which is, "[t]o establish and preserve medium density neighborhoods of one-, two- and three-family homes, free from other uses except those which are both compatible with and convenient to the residents of such districts."

4. <u>Site and Area Compatibility:</u> The Applicant has to ensure that the project "(i)s designed in a manner that is compatible with the characteristics of the built and unbuilt surrounding area, including land uses."

The expansion of the dormer has been designed to be compatible with the building and unbuilt surrounding area and land uses. The form of the building would remain consistent with other structures along the street and in the neighborhood. The dormer is not expected to impact the streetscape or the surrounding neighborhood as the dormer is already minimally visible. Expansion of the dormer with a skylight rather than windows will provide privacy for both structures.

DECISION:

Present and sitting were Members Herbert Foster, Orsola Susan Fontano, Richard Rossetti, Danielle Evans and Scott Darling. Upon making the above findings, Susan Fontano made a motion to approve the request for a Special Permit. Scott Darling seconded the motion. Wherefore the Zoning Board of Appeals voted **5-0** to **APPROVE** the request. In addition the following conditions were attached:

#	Condition		Timeframe for Compliance	Verified (initial)	Notes
	Approval is for relief from the provision of SZO §8.5.E. (FAR) and to alter a nonconforming structure under SZO §4.4.1 to expand an existing dormer on the left side of a two-family dwelling. This approval is based upon the following application materials and the plans submitted by the Applicant:		BP/CO	ISD/Plng.	
1	Date (Stamp Date)	Submission			
	(May 3, 2012)	Initial application submitted to the City Clerk's Office			
	November 2, 2011 (May 29, 2012)	Plot plan submitted to OSPCD			
	April 24, 2012 (May 29, 2012)	Site plans submitted to OSPCD (C0.0, C1.0, A1.3, A1.4, & A3.1)			
	Any changes to the approved site plan or elevations that are not <i>de minimis</i> must receive SPGA approval.				
2	A code compliant fire alarm system is required and shall be installed as part of this project.		СО	FP	
3	New siding type and color, roofing, trim, and materials of the dormer expansion shall match or be complimentary to the rest of the existing structure.		СО	Plng.	





	The Applicant shall contact Planning Staff at least five	Final Sign	Plng.	
	working days in advance of a request for a final inspection	Off		
4	by Inspectional Services to ensure the proposal was			
	constructed in accordance with the plans and information			
	submitted and the conditions attached to this approval.			





Attest, by the Zoning Board of Appeals:	Herbert Foster, <i>Chairman</i> Orsola Susan Fontano, <i>Clerk</i> Richard Rossetti T.F. Scott Darling, III, Esq. Danielle Evans
*** Need all board signatures if registered land	d (check deed) ***
Attest, by the Administrative Assistant:	Dawn M. Pereira
Copies of this decision are filed in the Somerville City Copies of all plans referred to in this decision and a det SPGA proceedings are filed in the Somerville Planning	ailed record of the
CLERK'S CERTIFICATE	
	hin twenty days after the date this notice is filed in the Office of the th M.G.L. c. 40A, sec. 17 and SZO sec. 3.2.10.
certification of the City Clerk that twenty days Clerk and no appeal has been filed, or that it	no variance shall take effect until a copy of the decision bearing the have elapsed after the decision has been filed in the Office of the City such appeal has been filed, that it has been dismissed or denied, is Deeds and indexed in the grantor index under the name of the owner r's certificate of title.
bearing the certification of the City Clerk th Office of the City Clerk and either that no ar recorded in the Middlesex County Registry of of record or is recorded and noted on the ov	11, a special permit shall not take effect until a copy of the decision at twenty days have elapsed after the decision has been filed in the speal has been filed or the appeal has been filed within such time, is Deeds and indexed in the grantor index under the name of the owner wner's certificate of title. The person exercising rights under a duly a court will reverse the permit and that any construction performed
Inspectional Services shall be required in orde	recording or registering. Furthermore, a permit from the Division of r to proceed with any project favorably decided upon by this decision, nt evidence to the Building Official that this decision is properly
This is a true and correct copy of the decision and twenty days have elapsed, and FOR VARIANCE(S) WITHIN there have been no appeals filed in the any appeals that were filed have been FOR SPECIAL PERMIT(S) WITHIN there have been no appeals filed in the second s	ne Office of the City Clerk, or in finally dismissed or denied.



Signed_

_ there has been an appeal filed.



City Clerk

Date_