

Zoning Board of Appeals

Scott Murphy, Chair
Mary Kate Daly
Shannon Greenwell
Al Porro
Michael Sheehan



**Director of Community
Planning and Economic
Development**

Paul Halkiotis, AICP

Assistant Town Planner

Sarah Dixon Bouchard

**March 8, 2022
Norwood Senior Center
275 Prospect Street
Remote participation available at GoToMeeting**

Minutes

Present: Scott Murphy, Chair
Shannon Greenwell
Mary Kate Daly
Michael Sheehan
Al Porro
Sarah Dixon Bouchard, Assistant Town Planner

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by the Chairman, Mr. Scott Murphy. All members of the Board were present at the Senior Center, members of the public attended on GoToMeeting.

Public Hearings:

Case #22-02 61 East Cross Street

Mr. Murphy read the legal notice into the record.

Mr. Matthew Boschetto, homeowner and applicant, introduced his proposal to install a deck within the setback. He stated he would need a variance as told by the Building Department.

Mr. Murphy asked if the whole home renovation needed a variance; Mr. Boschetto replied that the home construction did not need relief but the deck did.

Mr. Bochetto stated that the lot was nonconforming and the proposed deck was small. He stated they don't believe there will be a detriment to the public good, with no impact to the nearest neighbors whose structures are positioned far away on their lots. The proposed deck would be 10.5 x 6 ft and keep with the aesthetic of the house and neighborhood. He described the lot as L shaped and unusually long for the neighborhood. He stated the deck would provide privacy and

egress from the rear of the home. He stated that his project request does not lessen the intent of the bylaw; rather, it requests lenience to improve their home on a unique shaped lot and promote the community mentality of Norwood.

Ms. Daly asked about the dimensions of the deck and why it is shaped that particular way. Mr. Boschetto responded that an addition was added to the back of the house to the right. He said that the deck is more of a landing spot than an entertaining deck and it is sized to be consistent with the rear house line.

Ms. Greenwell asked if the addition was complete. Mr. Boschetto said it is at the plumbing inspection stage. Ms. Greenwell stated that public good is demonstrated but had a concern about hardship, a variance threshold. Mr. Boschetto asked what hardship meant; Ms. Greenwell and Ms. Bouchard defined the hardship requirement.

Mr. Boschetto asked if the ZBA was the correct board to approach for the project; Mr. Murphy stated yes. He described variance criteria. He stated that he believes the lot and request satisfies the unique factor requirement.

Ms. Greenwell said the proposal is logical and will not be very visible off the property.

Joseph Boschetto, 18 Second Street, identified himself as family and one of the only abutters with visibility.

Mr. Murphy said the lot has a shape issue.

Mr. Porro asked if there was a means of egress out of the deck without the deck; Mr. Boschetto stated that the deck would provide a gradual egress from that space and it did not have another egress point.

Mr. Murphy opened the hearing to the public for comment. Hearing none, Mr. Murphy asked the Board for discussion.

Mr. Sheehan said that if the deck landing isn't installed, the area could be unsafe and crowded. He stated that the proposal meets all the criteria.

Mr. Porro asked about a set of stairs located on the opposite side of the home. Mr. Boschetto replied that those doors are basement access doors.

Ms. Daly stated that the lot shape meets the variance criteria.

Motion:

Ms. Daly made a motion to close the hearing. Ms. Greenwell seconded the motion. A vote was held and the motion carried 5-0.

Motion:

Mr. Sheehan made a motion to approve the variance for the rear setback encroachment of 3.5 feet as proposed. Ms. Daly seconded the motion. A vote was held and the motion carried 5-0.

Case #22-03- 994-996 Washington Street

Mr. Murphy read the legal notice into the record.

Colm Molloy, property owner and applicant, introduced his request for a special permit to increase the building height. He submitted a copy of his comments to the Board for the record.

He stated that the property was purchased a year ago and is in need of significant repair. The new look of the building would improve the property and town. He described the current roof as flat, sloping toward a roof drain in the middle. He stated that snow that collects on the roof blows onto the sidewalk, where a bus stop is located. A pitched roof would increase the height of the structure.

Mr. Murphy asked why the replacement wouldn't work with a flat roof.

Mr. Molloy stated that the entire roof and joists need to be replaced, and that the drainage slope ends up with water in the basement. He stated that a pitch roof is easier to install and drain.

Mr. Sheehan asked where the drain currently goes. Mr. Molloy says the pipe goes around the house into the basement, which is a ½ inch slab. Mr. Sheehan asked if the proposal contains gutters and drains. Mr. Molloy replied that yes, it would. Mr. Sheehan asked where the runoff would go. Mr. Molloy replied around the edges of the property, towards the storm drain. Mr. Sheehan asked if this was to achieve a cathedral ceiling; Mr. Molloy said no, and there will be no access to the ceiling.

Ms. Daly confirmed the existing nonconforming height at 31.5 ft.

Ms. Greenwell was satisfied with Mr. Molloy's explanation of gutters and drainage in the new proposed roof.

Mr. Porro asked how much weight the flat roof is, and how much would be taken off the structure. Mr. Molloy stated that there is maybe 3 inches and 5-6 layers of old roofing on the existing roof. Mr. Porro asked if there would be access to the roof. Mr. Molloy said no, due to the need for sprinkler installation.

Mr. Porro asked if there will be sprinklers in the building. Mr. Molloy responds that units will have sprinklers. Mr. Porro asked about the fire doors and whether they were automatic closures; Mr. Molloy responded yes. Mr. Porro asked about a door on the ground level of the plans; Mr. Molloy replied that the door will be a new walkout exit point from the basement.

Mr. Murphy opened the hearing up to the public for comment. Hearing none, the Board moved to discussion.

Mr. Sheehan asked if the basement would be living space. Mr. Molloy stated that it would be used for storage cages for each unit, not living space.

Motion:

Ms. Daly made a motion to close the hearing. Ms. Greenwell seconded the motion. A vote was held and the motion carried 5-0.

Mr. Sheehan described his concerns over drainage on the property, and whether the new pitch roof will direct stormwater toward neighbors and cause detriment. He suggested a condition that the Building Department or DPW approve the drainage plan to avoid water on abutting properties.

Mr. Molloy stated that there is a storm drain between buildings, and also a berm that would prevent flow. Mr. Sheehan asked if Mr. Molloy had asked DPW to connect to the town drain; Mr. Molloy replied that he had not.

Mr. Porro asked about the impact of ground elevations and whether a pump would be needed to drain. Mr. Molloy stated that the plan is to bring the water to the back of the building where there is space and a drain parcel exists. Mr. Murphy described the property as higher than the road.

Ms. Bouchard recommended that the Board be descriptive of what plans would be necessary for DPW to review. Mr. Murphy and Mr. Sheehan described basic plans, no detailed stormwater report necessary.

Motion:

Mr. Sheehan made a motion to approve the special permit as submitted on the condition that the applicant provides a storm water drainage plan to be reviewed by DPW. Ms. Greenwell seconded the motion. A vote was held and the motion carried 5-0.

Administrative Updates-

Ms. Bouchard reported that participation for hybrid meetings has been strong for land use boards.

Mr. Murphy announced that he would not be seeking reappointment at the end of his term. He stated that the group has been great to work with and that he has enjoyed serving the town through this Board. The Board thanked Mr. Murphy for his years of service.

Adjournment

Motion:

Ms. Daly made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Greenwell seconded the motion. A roll call vote was held and motion passed 5-0.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:45 p.m.

Next meeting April 5th 2022 hybrid.