

# CITY OF SOMERVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS JOSEPH A. CURTATONE, MAYOR

### **MEMBERS**

HERBERT F. FOSTER, JR., CHAIRMAN ORSOLA SUSAN FONTANO, CLERK RICHARD ROSSETTI T. F. SCOTT DARLING, III, ESQ. DANIELLE FILLIS ELAINE SEVERINO (ALT.) JOSH SAFDIE (ALT.) Case #: ZBA #2009-18 Site: 65 Lowden Avenue

Date of Decision: August 5, 2009

Decision: <u>Petition Approved with Conditions</u>
Date Filed with City Clerk: August 11, 2009

### ZBA DECISION

**Applicant Name**: Steven Saltman

Applicant Address: 65 Lowden Avenue, Somerville, MA 02144

**Property Owner Name**: Steven Saltman

**Property Owner Address:** 65 Lowden Avenue, Somerville, MA 02144

Agent Name: N/A

<u>Legal Notice:</u> Applicant & Owner Steven Saltman seeks a special permit under §4.4.1

in order to alter a non-conforming garage by constructing a deck on the

roof and a stairway leading to the deck. RA zone. Ward 6.

Zoning District/Ward: RA zone/Ward 6

Zoning Approval Sought:§4.4.1Date of Application:June 2, 2009Date(s) of Public Hearing:7/15 & 8/5/09

<u>Date of Decision:</u> August 5, 2009

<u>Vote:</u> 5-0

Appeal #ZBA 2009-18 was opened before the Zoning Board of Appeals at Somerville City Hall on July 15, 2009. 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 two hearings of deliberation, the Zoning Board of Appeals took a vote.

# **DESCRIPTION:**

The Applicant is seeking a special permit under SZO §4.4.1 to construct a wood 20' by 20' deck above the existing 20' by 20' garage. The proposal includes an exterior stairway which leads from the rear yard up to the deck. The highest section of the deck is proposed to be 15' in height.

Date: August 10, 2009 Case #: ZBA #2009-18 Site: 65 Lowden Avenue

# **FINDINGS FOR SPECIAL PERMIT (SZO §):**

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."

The Applicant requires a special permit under §4.4.1 of the SZO. Under §4.4.1, "the SPGA, as a condition of granting a special permit under this Section must find that such extension, enlargement, renovation or alteration is not substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood than the existing nonconforming structure."

The Board finds that the Applicant's proposal would not be substantially more detrimental to the surrounding neighborhood than the existing structure, as required under §4.4.1 of the SZO. The Board finds that any negative impacts associated with the appearance and/or privacy of the neighbors to be minimal. The deck would be located above an existing garage where there is currently a hip roof. The Board finds that the increased outdoor area would be beneficial to the three families living in the dwelling.

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 Board finds that the proposal **is consistent** with the purposes set forth in Article 1 of the Zoning Ordinance, and with, to the extent possible for a lawful pre-existing nonconforming structure, those purposes established for the Residence A (RA) zoning district in which the property is located, namely "(t)o establish and preserve quiet neighborhoods of one- and two-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 Board finds that the proposal **is compatible** with the site and area. The deck would not be visually intrusive to the surrounding neighborhood.

### **DECISION:**

Present and sitting were Members Orsola Susan Fontano, Richard Rossetti, Danielle Fillis, Elaine Severino and Josh Safdie with Herbert Foster and Scott Darling absent. Upon making the above findings, Richard Rossetti made a motion to approve the request for a special permit. Danielle Fillis 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 the construction of a 20 foot by 20 foot deck above a rear yard garage and an stairway to the deck on the exterior structure. This approval is based upon the following application materials and the plans submitted by the Applicant and/or the Agent:		Building Permit	Plng.	
1	Date(OSPCD stamp)	Submission			
	(6/2/09)	Initial application submitted to the City Clerk's Office			
	5/3/09 (6/15/09)	Plans and elevations A1-A6			
	Any changes to the approved site plan or elevations that are not <i>de minimis</i> must receive ZBA approval.				
	The deck shall not be connected to the primary residence;		Cont.	ISD	
2	access to the deck shall only be from the yard area or from				
	within the garage structure itself unless approved by SPGA  The Applicant shall contact Planning Staff at least five		CO	Plng. /	
3	working days in advance of a request for a final sign-off on			ISD	
	the building permit to ensure the proposal was constructed			100	
	in accordance with the plans and information submitted and				
	the conditions attached to this approval.				

Date: August 10, 2009 Case #: ZBA #2009-18 Site: 65 Lowden Avenue

Attest, by the Zoning Board of Appeals:	Orsola Susan Fontano, Acting Chairman Richard Rossetti, Acting Clerk Danielle Fillis Elaine Severino (Alt.) Josh Safdie (Alt.)
Attest, by the Administrative Assistant:	Dawn M. Pereira
Copies of this decision are filed in the Somerville City C Copies of all plans referred to in this decision and a detai SPGA proceedings are filed in the Somerville Planning I	led record of the
CLERK'S CERTIFICATE	
Any appeal of this decision must be filed with City Clerk, and must be filed in accordance with	in twenty days after the date this notice is filed in the Office of the h M.G.L. c. 40A, sec. 17 and SZO sec. 3.2.10.
certification of the City Clerk that twenty days l Clerk and no appeal has been filed, or that if	o 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's certificate of title.
bearing the certification of the City Clerk that Office of the City Clerk and either that no apprecorded in the Middlesex County Registry of of record or is recorded and noted on the ow	11, a special permit shall not take effect until a copy of the decision to twenty days have elapsed after the decision has been filed in the peal 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 ner's certificate of title. The person exercising rights under a duly court will reverse the permit and that any construction performed
Inspectional Services shall be required in order	ecording or registering. Furthermore, a permit from the Division of to proceed with any project favorably decided upon by this decision, it 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 there has been an appeal filed.	e Office of the City Clerk, or finally dismissed or denied.

Signed City Clerk Date