



# Planning Department

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Sherry Dong  
Chairwoman, City of Boston Board of Appeal

FROM: Joanne Marques  
Regulatory Planning & Zoning

DATE: November 20, 2025

RE: Planning Department Recommendations

Please find attached, for your information, Planning Department recommendations for the November 25, 2025 Board of Appeal's Hearing.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact me.



<b>Case</b>	BOA1784510
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2025-10-01
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2025-11-25
<b>Address</b>	21 to 23 Fairview ST Roslindale 02131
<b>Parcel ID</b>	2005224000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Roslindale Neighborhood 2F-5000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	67
<b>Project Description</b>	Raze existing two-family, 2.5-story residential building to erect two-unit townhouse building with garages.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	Parking or Loading Insufficient FAR Excessive Front Yard Insufficient Rear Yard Insufficient Additional Lot Area Insufficient

#### **Planning Context:**

The site is located in an area of Roslindale that transitions between the more commercial area of Roslindale Square (0.2 miles away) to predominantly residential uses. The houses in this area of Roslindale are predominantly a mix of two- and three-unit detached residences. Most properties in this area have off-street parking for one to two spaces in garages and/or driveways.

#### **Zoning Analysis:**

The proposal seeks relief for five zoning violations of dimensional regulations and parking requirements.

The existing site represents one of the smaller FARs on the street. The area has a mix of medium density housing types, such as 2.5-story homes, triple-deckers, and townhomes. The denser forms have similar yard and lot dimensions to the proposed design. The yards in the proposed design are adequate for the lot and contextual for the neighborhood. The additional lot area requirement for residential buildings with more than one unit causes the required total lot area to be 8,000 square feet. This lot size is not typically found in this area, and it is an existing condition that cannot be changed. The proposed parking ratio is consistent with the off-street



parking provided for nearby residences, and the proposed design provides more parking than the existing structure.

The design and massing is sensical, safe, and consistent with the street it is located on. Therefore, the zoning violations are recommended for relief. Planning Department design review is recommended for site analysis of slope, retaining wall, tree removal, and curb cut length.

Plans reviewed are titled "Fairview St. Townhouse", prepared by Blackbird Architecture, and dated 8/25/2025.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1784510, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH PROVISIO/S: that plans be submitted to the Planning Department for design review of site conditions and design specifics related to curb cuts and retaining walls.

Reviewed,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kathleen Onuf".

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1755449
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2025-07-28
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2025-11-25
<b>Address</b>	82 Sycamore ST Roslindale 02131
<b>Parcel ID</b>	1904156000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Roslindale Neighborhood 2F-5000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	67
<b>Project Description</b>	This project proposes a new sunroom at the rear of a home.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	Side Yard Insufficient Rear Yard Insufficient

**Planning Context:**

82 Sycamore St is a one unit dwelling in a residential area of the Roslindale neighborhood. It is less than a ten minute walk away from Roslindale Square as well as the Roslindale Village MBTA Commuter Rail Station. One- and two-unit homes are the dominant residential typology. Lots in this area tend to have more compact yards and higher lot coverage.

The homes and lots along this street generally share a similar character and size to the subject property. Rear porches, decks, and other exterior elements are common features in this area. The proposed project keeps with the established character of the neighborhood and is not expected to negatively impact the surrounding community.

**Zoning Analysis:**

This proposal has triggered two zoning violations: side yard and rear yard insufficient.

The proposed project's insufficient side yard is 9.9 feet on one side and 3.2 feet on another side, whereas the required side yard is 10' on both sides. However, this is an existing nonconformity as the proposed sunroom would not aggravate side yard violations. The sunroom would leave 8.8 feet on one side and 14 feet on another side. Because the proposal does not worsen this existing side yard nonconformity, relief is recommended.



Rear yard is another violation, as the project proposes a 35 feet rear yard and 40 feet is required for this subdistrict. Many lots within a one to two block radius of this parcel share similar rear yard dimensions. Despite the proposal triggering this violation, the lot has ample space to accommodate this expansion. This violation is a reflection of outdated zoning codes that do not reflect the existing scale of buildings within neighborhoods like Roslindale.

Plans reviewed are titled "Plot Plan No. 82 Sycamore Street Boston (West Roxbury District), Mass" prepared by Land Mapping Inc. and dated December 16, 2024.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1755449, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kathleen Onuf".

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1754871
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2025-07-25
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2025-11-25
<b>Address</b>	198 Metropolitan AV Roslindale 02131
<b>Parcel ID</b>	1804919000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Roslindale Neighborhood 1F-6000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	67
<b>Project Description</b>	Add a rear addition and a shed dormer to an existing house. The existing building is two and half stories in the front and one story with a walk-out basement in the rear. The proposed rear addition would be over the existing first story in the rear and the proposed shed dormer would be on the existing highest story.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	Side Yard Insufficient Height Excessive (stories)

**Planning Context:**

This project is in a residential area in Roslindale characterized by detached, two and a half- to three-story homes. The Planning Department is currently working on the Neighborhood Housing Zoning Initiative, the first phase of which includes Roslindale. The goals of the initiative include creating residential zoning to set clear, straightforward rules that better align with how our neighborhoods look today and make it easier for homeowners to make renovations to existing homes.

**Zoning Analysis:**

Although the provided site plan does not clearly show the side yard dimensions, the existing side yard appears to be about 4 feet, which does not comply with the required side yard of 10 feet. The proposed new addition would be on top of the existing building floor plate, meaning it is within the required side yard and would therefore continue but not worsen the existing non-conformity. In addition, the existing side yard non-conformity results from the fact there is a driveway on one side of the property, resulting in two side yards of varying widths. The zoning requirements should be updated to allow for this common condition.



The project includes the proposal of a large shed dormer on the rear of the building. This would make this story a full story, making the building three stories and not compliant with the height maximum of two and a half stories. However, the addition is all in the rear and would not substantially change the building's appearance.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1754871, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kathleen O'Neil".

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1747236
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2025-07-11
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2025-11-25
<b>Address</b>	5 Prospect Cl Hyde Park 02136
<b>Parcel ID</b>	1810773001
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Hyde Park Neighborhood 1F-9000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	69
<b>Project Description</b>	Expand the second floor to cover the garage and complete an interior remodel of an existing house.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	Front Yard Insufficient Parking or Loading Insufficient

**Planning Context:**

The proposed project is located on a dead-end street in Hyde Park. Houses in this neighborhood vary between one and two and a half stories. Most properties have large front yards and a driveway at one side of the parcel. This proposal intends to increase the height of a one story portion of the existing property to two stories to match the height of the rest of the house. This proposal makes no changes to the setback and/or yard dimensions of the building with respect to the property line.

**Zoning Analysis:**

The proposed project is located in a 1F-9000 subdistrict within the Hyde Park Neighborhood District. The proposal contains two zoning violations, Parking or Loading Insufficient and Insufficient Front Yard Setback. The proposed project does not make any changes to either of these conditions, and thus they persist from the existing condition and are not worsened by this proposal.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1747236, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.





Planning Department

**CITY of BOSTON**

Reviewed,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Kathleen Onuf".

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1747994
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2025-07-14
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2025-11-25
<b>Address</b>	130 to 130B Kittredge ST Roslindale 02131
<b>Parcel ID</b>	1804996000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Roslindale Neighborhood 1F-6000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	67
<b>Project Description</b>	Demolish an existing 2.5-story home and build six new townhomes on the same lot.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	FAR Excessive Height Excessive (ft) Front Yard Insufficient Application of Dimensional Requirements Forbidden Use

#### **Planning Context:**

This recommendation relates to one of two applications tied to a proposed project upon the project site, 128-130 Kittredge St. The project seeks to erect a six townhomes - three units each in two separate buildings - on a lot that hosts an existing 2.5-story, two-unit dwelling that will be demolished for this project. This scope of work is divided into two separate permit applications (BOA1747995 for 128 Kittredge St and BOA1747994 for 130 Kittredge St), each of which will require its own recommendation. This recommendation relates to the 130 Kittredge St portion of the project.

130 Kittredge St is in a residential area of Roslindale characterized by homes with varying lot sizes and degrees of lot coverage. It is approximately a ten- to fifteen-minute walk from Roslindale Square and the Roslindale Village MBTA Commuter Rail Station. One- and two-unit homes are the dominant residential typology.

While a six-unit townhome may appear larger than many nearby structures, its visual impact is softened by the existing diversity of building forms in the area and the depth of the lot, which allows the project to sit comfortably within its setting. From the street, the proposed development will read as modest in scale and consistent with the established context of the neighborhood, minimizing any perceived contrast with adjacent properties. Additionally, satellite imagery suggests the presence of a mature oak tree on the site. The preservation of significant



tree canopy like this supports broader planning goals related to the City of Boston's Urban Forest Plan. Retaining such mature canopy would contribute to the overall environmental preservation of this residential area and complement the project's ability to fit the surrounding context.

### **Zoning Analysis:**

This project has received five zoning citations: application of dimensional requirements (two or more dwellings on the same lot), use regulations, FAR excessive, building height excessive (feet), and front yard insufficient.

Application of dimensional regulations, with regards to "two or more dwellings on the same lot," is triggered due to the project proposing two townhome buildings on the same lot. However, this is an uncharacteristically large lot - more than twice the size of many neighboring lots. The proposed project would be similar in lot density to its neighbors. Furthermore, the front of each building is 30 feet wide which is consistent with the front footprint of neighboring buildings. Relief is recommended.

The FAR, lot area, use, and height (feet) are violations that are all in service of providing additional housing units. Use regulation is triggered because a multi-unit townhome is forbidden in this 1F-6000 zoning subdistrict. The maximum FAR for this subdistrict is 0.5 and this project proposes a 1.18 FAR. The proposed building height is 35 feet, which aligns with the maximum building height of 35 feet allowed in this subdistrict. However, the project proposes 3 stories, above the maximum of 2.5, so the incorrect violation is cited and should reflect the proper violation which is building height (stories). These violations are all justified by the project's goal of delivering high-quality, family-oriented housing on a large lot. In particular, 3-bedroom housing units capable of accommodating families are important to supply in a growing, multigenerational neighborhood. This typology also advances the City of Boston's goals to expand family-sized housing options across the city. Relief is recommended.

Lastly, the front yard insufficient violation was incorrectly cited as well. Plans show the front yard depth will be 25 feet, which matches the front yard minimum requirement of 25 feet for this subdistrict. Furthermore, this new front yard depth surpasses that of the current dwelling, which provides 19 feet of front yard depth.

Plans reviewed are titled "Plan of Land located at 130 Kittredge Street Boston, MA 02131", are prepared by Massachusetts Survey Consultants, LLC, and dated June 24, 2025.

BOA1747994

2025-11-25

2 Planning Department



**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1747994, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH PROVISIO/S: that plans be submitted to the Planning Department for design review with attention to increasing the amount of open space on the site and possibility of preserving what appears to be an existing mature oak tree.

Reviewed,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Kathleen O'Neil".

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1771652
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2025-09-03
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2025-11-25
<b>Address</b>	148 Millet ST Dorchester 02124
<b>Parcel ID</b>	1701553000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Dorchester Neighborhood 3F-6000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	65
<b>Project Description</b>	Erect a new three-story, three-unit residential building on a vacant paved lot.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	Side Yard Insufficient Front Yard Insufficient Height Excessive (stories) FAR Excessive Parking or Loading Insufficient Lot Area Insufficient Lot Width Insufficient Lot Frontage Insufficient Screening and Buffering Required

### Planning Context:

The proposed project is located in the Codman Square neighborhood in an area with mostly three-story residential buildings and within 0.2 miles of Talbot Avenue MBTA Commuter Rail Station. Some lots have driveways and off-street parking, but not all residential buildings in this area have on-site parking. The existing site is a completely paved lot that is similar in size to the other lots on the same block.

Many plans and city initiatives encourage infill development of housing, especially near rail stations, including Housing a Changing City, Go Boston 2030, Imagine Boston 2030, and the Fairmount/Indigo Planning Initiative. The proposed project's choice of site, location, and design are suitable for the area.

### Zoning Analysis:

The proposed project at 148 Millet Street is a three-story, three unit residential building. The design has similar massing, parking, and lot coverage to the property next door. The proposal



violates parking requirements, dimensional regulations, and screening and buffering requirements.

The requirement for off-street parking spaces does not align with the Planning Department's goals or with recommendations from Go Boston 2030 because on-site parking here would increase dependence on private vehicles within proximity to transit corridors. Additionally, providing parking on this site would almost completely diminish the potential to develop housing units there.

The dimensional regulation violations for lot area, lot width, lot frontage, FAR, height, front and side yards are not reflective of the surrounding context. Therefore, these violations are recommended for relief. We are unable to determine the screening and buffering violation from the plans submitted, and believe the proposed design is adequately screened. Because of the proposed project's alignment with city goals and the surrounding neighborhood context, the zoning violations are recommended for relief.

Plans reviewed are titled "Bonifacia Alves 148 Millet Street Dorchester, MA 02124", prepared by 686 Architects, and dated 7/17/2024.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1771652, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kathleen O'Neil".

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1759646
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2025-08-06
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2025-11-25
<b>Address</b>	49 Alpha RD Dorchester 02124
<b>Parcel ID</b>	1701112000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Dorchester Neighborhood 2F-5000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	65
<b>Project Description</b>	Construct new 3-story, 4-unit triple decker style residential building
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	FAR Excessive Height Excessive (stories) Rear Yard Insufficient Side Yard Insufficient Front Yard Insufficient Lot Frontage Insufficient Lot Width Insufficient Lot Area Insufficient Parking or Loading Insufficient Use: Multifamily Basement Unit

**Planning Context:**

The proposed project would construct a new 4-unit multifamily building on a vacant lot. Residential buildings ranging from single-family to large 6+ unit buildings are common in this area. The predominant design form of these buildings is the traditional triple-decker, and this building attempts to match the scale provided by triple-deckers with a more modern design. The proposed project is located in an area of Dorchester that is well-connected to transit. The project is less than a tenth of a mile from the Shawmut MBTA stop, and under half a mile from the active bus routes along Dorchester Ave and Washington St.

**Zoning Analysis:**

The first of these violations is for use. This project is located in a 2F-5000 zoning district, which has multifamily residential as a forbidden use. However, this does not match the built reality of the neighborhood. Triple-deckers are common throughout the area, which contain three or more units. This project is matching the traditional style of a triple decker and fits in well with the



neighborhood context. While three units is typical in a triple decker, this parcel runs perpendicular to a sloped hill. The proponent has utilized this topographic feature in order to fit an extra unit in the building without compromising the typical form. This reflects a disconnect between the zoning code and the character of the neighborhood and is an indicator of needed zoning reform.

The above-mentioned basement unit constitutes its own violation as basement units are forbidden throughout the Dorchester Neighborhood District. However, the slope of the hill this project is located on provides a unique context for the project. The proposed basement unit would be enclosed by the ground on the western side of the project, but on the eastern half of the property, it reads as the first story of an above-ground building. This unit fits within the context of the neighborhood without compromising unit livability. This project additionally is not located in a flood overlay district and is located on the precipice of a hill, minimizing flooding risk.

The next violation is regarding height. The area is zoned for up to 2.5 stories, where this project is a full three stories. This again is a disconnect between the code and the built reality of the neighborhood. Triple-deckers, which are the main built form in the area, are traditionally a full three stories. This project is in line with its neighbors' height and fits within the neighborhood context.

The next violation is due to the FAR being above the zoned maximum. The proposed project has an FAR of 1.91 while the area is only zoned for an FAR of 0.50. This is not reflective of the built environment of the neighborhood. The triple-decker that occupies the majority of the lot is exceedingly common in this area, with FARs well above the 0.50 maximum. If this violation were to be applied to the area, the familiar built fabric would be unrecognizable. This goes against planning goals as the preservation and construction of triple deckers is encouraged. This again highlights the need for zoning reform for the area.

The proposed project also has a violation for insufficient lot area. The proposed project has a lot area of 2,430 SF while the zoning code requires a lot area of 5000 SF. This is a complete disconnect from the built reality of the neighborhood. There are no parcels along this stretch of Alpha Rd that meet this requirement. This proposed project is matching the form of its neighbors on a lot size that is similar to its neighboring parcels. This again reflects a disconnect between the zoning code and the character of the neighborhood and is an indicator of needed zoning reform.

BOA1759646

2025-11-25

2 Planning Department





The next two violations are in regards to insufficient lot width and insufficient lot frontage. In this case, they follow the same dimensional requirements, and the frontage and width are the same measurement at the front of the property. The lot width and frontage is 35 feet while the zoning code requires a frontage of 40 feet. This is also a disconnect between the zoning code and reality. The parcels along Alpha Rd are similarly sized. The frontage requirement is the same along all of Alpha Rd. This means that almost every building on this road is out of compliance, including the triple deckers. These violations create an unusable parcel and places a hardship on the proponent in order to follow the zoning code. A variance should be granted and zoning reform should be explored.

The next set of violations is with regard to the front, side, and rear setbacks of the proposed project. The zoning requires a side yard of 10 feet. There is a side yard of 5 feet on the eastern side and 6 feet on the western side. The minimum front yard setback is 15 feet, while the proposed project only has a setback of 4.5 feet. The rear yard setback has a requirement of 20 feet, while the proposed project only has a rear yard of 11.5 feet. The proposed yards are largely contextual with the surrounding area.

There is a typical front yard setback that the project is meeting with the proposed porch matching the bay window protrusion common in triple deckers. While side yard violations in Dorchester are often due to tandem parking, this is not the case. Side setbacks in this area are extremely small, with almost no tandem parking. By protruding into this side setback requirement, the proposed building better matches the neighborhood context. The rear yard setback is almost matching neighborhood design by ending on the same rear yard as its western neighbor. The project's setbacks are working in tandem to create a project that meets neighborhood design standards, which does not match the zoning requirements.

The next violation regards off-street parking. While it technically does not meet the requirements for parking under the zoning code, little to no off-street parking is common in this area of Dorchester. Street parking is the predominant form of parking, and this project is located within proximity of public transportation options. While this is a violation, BTD parking guidelines have highlighted this as an area that contextually makes sense for a required parking ratio of 0. This project is providing well above that 0 space recommendation, and so a variance is recommended.

Plans reviewed are titled "49 Alpha Road", are prepared by Stack Architecture, and dated March 13, 2025.  
BOA1759646  
2025-11-25  
3 Planning Department



**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1759646, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kathleen O'Neil".

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1711024
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2025-04-21
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2025-11-25
<b>Address</b>	9 Longfellow ST Dorchester 02122
<b>Parcel ID</b>	1501145000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Dorchester Neighborhood 1F-5000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	65
<b>Project Description</b>	Add side dormer to existing building, triggering existing side yard non-conformity.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	Side Yard Insufficient

**Planning Context:**

The proposed project seeks to renovate the existing single-family home at 9 Longfellow St in Dorchester by adding a side dormer. This dormer will create additional living space, including a bedroom and a bathroom, while maintaining the structure's existing floorplate. Many of the properties in the surrounding area have non-conforming side yards on at least one side, and several properties along Longfellow St also have side dormers along non-conforming side yards.

This project would further the goals outlined in Housing a Changing City, Boston 2030 (September 2018) as the side dormer would allow property owners to enhance their living spaces to meet their needs while preserving the existing structure.

**Zoning Analysis:**

Article 65 requires a minimum side yard setback of 10 feet. This project is proposing a west side yard of 5.2 feet and an east side yard of 7.6 feet. However, this is an existing non-conformity as the width of the building remains the same with the proposed changes. This is also a case for zoning reform to allow the extension of non-conformities, when the structure otherwise conforms to dimensional requirements and the existing non-conformities are not increasing, to incentivize retention and improvement of existing structures.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1711024, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.



Planning Department

**CITY of BOSTON**

Reviewed,

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1724120
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2025-05-22
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2025-11-25
<b>Address</b>	157 to 157A Howard AV Dorchester 02125
<b>Parcel ID</b>	1300847000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Roxbury Neighborhood 3F-4000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	50
<b>Project Description</b>	Erect new five-unit residential structure with three off-street parking spaces.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	FAR Excessive Front Yard Insufficient Side Yard Insufficient Additional Lot Area Insufficient Usable Open Space Insufficient Parking or Loading Insufficient Parking design and maneuverabilityand @c Forbidden Use (MFR); Application of Dimensional Requirements (Traffic Visibility Across Corner)

**Planning Context:**

The proposed project sits in an established residential portion of Roxbury's Grove Hall area. Its surrounding context consists predominantly of two- to three-story residential structures, mostly with three- to six-unit residential uses. A number of retail establishments -- including several groceries/markets and restaurants -- can be found within a couple blocks of the site, concentrated on Blue Hill Avenue and Quincy Street. In addition, several transit options and publicly accessible open spaces can be found in direct proximity to the site (quarter mile radius). These include the Beauford Play Area, Dacia & Woodcliff Community Garden, Winthrop Playground, and Ceylon Park, as well as stops for the MBTA's 10, 14, 16, 19, 22, 23, 28, and 45 bus routes. The closest rail option to the project -- the Uphams Corner commuter rail station -- sits a half-mile from the site.

The proposed project seeks to erect a new three-story, five-unit residential structure on its currently vacant corner lot site. Its unit mix consists of three, three-bed units (ranging from 900 - 1,200 square feet of living space) and two one-bed units (each with 450 square feet of living space). The proposed building's style and scale is in keeping with its surroundings. This project



scope aligns with the housing goals outlined in the Roxbury Strategic Master Plan (January 2004), which encourage infill development that: (1) is stylistically compatible with its surrounding context; (2) results in a mix of housing types, including those appropriate for larger living arrangements; and (3) adds density in locales proximal to public transit options.

Despite the contextual appropriateness of the project's proposed scale and land use, additional work is needed to improve its site plan and parking design. As currently proposed, the design features three off-street parking spaces and an entirely paved rear yard (~1,600 square feet of impervious surface). This paved rear yard condition provides excessive space for maneuverability and contradicts the planning goals of both Climate Ready Boston (addressing permeability, heat island effect, and increased tree canopy, 2016) and Boston's Urban Forest Plan (preserving healthy and mature trees/plantings, 2022). To remedy this, it is recommended that the proponent, through Planning Department design review, revise their site plan to significantly reduce the amount of impervious hardscape proposed, either through: the reduction or redesign of off-street parking, the use of permeable pavers, and/or additional landscape and plantings.

### **Zoning Analysis:**

The proposed project's lot area violation is an existing condition. While insufficient by the zoning (4,330 square feet existing/proposed, 10,000 square feet required), the site actually represents one of the larger lots in its surrounding area. Further, several other lots in proximity already feature similar four- to six-unit residential land uses on smaller parcels than what this project proposes. Accordingly, both of these aspects of the proposal are deemed consistent with the existing built context of the area.

The project's FAR, yard, and traffic visibility violations are similar in nature. Its proposed FAR, while technically excessive (1.09 proposed, 0.8 allowed), is on the lower end of the spectrum already existing across the project's surrounding blocks (which range from 1.0 to 1.8, with a median FAR of ~1.3). As the data would suggest, the resulting built scale of the proposal is in keeping its surrounding context. The project's proposed front yard (two feet proposed, twenty feet required) and side yard (three feet proposed, ten feet required) dimensions are also consistent with the area's existing building alignment, with many other nearby structures featuring zero or near-zero lot line conditions for both the front and side yard areas. The proposal also sets back the massing of the building at the corner, which minimizes the building's



potential visual impacts on pedestrians and drivers. Because of these factors, the siting and scale of the proposed structure is deemed appropriate for the surrounding area.

While insufficient by the zoning, the project proposed off-street parking count (three spaces proposed, five spaces required) aligns with the Boston Transportation Department's maximum parking ratios for the area. Additionally, the presence of sufficient street parking and proximal transit options help off-set the impacts of this violation. The parking's design, which paves over roughly 40% of the lot (~1,600 square feet), is the biggest contributor to the site's lack of usable open space. This condition provides excessive space for maneuverability and unnecessarily limits the amount of permeable space and landscaping on the lot. A proviso for Planning Department design review has been added to this recommendation to help remedy this condition.

Plans reviewed titled, "157 Howard Ave Proposed 5 Unit Residential Development," prepared by Hue Architecture on October 9, 2024.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1724120, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH PROVISIO/S: that plans be submitted to the Planning Department for design review with attention to increasing landscaped area and permeability through the reduction or redesign of the project's off-street parking and rear yard conditions.

Reviewed,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kathleen Onuf".

Deputy Director of Zoning

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1734300
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2025-06-16
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2025-11-25
<b>Address</b>	36 Julian ST Dorchester 02125
<b>Parcel ID</b>	1300379000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Roxbury Neighborhood 3F-5000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	50
<b>Project Description</b>	Construct a new three-unit dwelling on the vacant lot at 36 Julian Street
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	FAR Excessive Usable Open Space Insufficient Lot Area Insufficient Parking or Loading Insufficient Additional Lot Area Insufficient Lot Width Insufficient Rear Yard Insufficient Front Yard Insufficient Lot Frontage Insufficient

**Planning Context:**

The proposal is to erect a new three-unit dwelling on a currently vacant lot situated between two existing multi-family residential buildings. The surrounding area is predominantly three-unit and multi-family residential buildings, characterized by wood-frame structures on narrow and irregular lots. Many of the lots, along Julian Street and West Cottage Street, are nonconforming under current dimensional requirements.

The site is approximately 0.5 miles from Uphams Corner Commuter Rail Station, which provides service via the Fairmount Line with direct access to South Station. The area is also served by several MBTA bus routes and is within walking distance of neighborhood parks and mixed-use corridors along Columbia Road and Dudley Street.

While the parcel is included in the Boston Landmarks Commission's Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) Inventory area, it is presently vacant, and no demolition is proposed.

**Zoning Analysis:**





This proposal requires relief for lot area, additional lot area, lot width, lot frontage, front yard, rear yard, usable open space, floor area ratio, and parking.

The first issue concerns the lot area. The 3F-5000 subdistrict requires a minimum of 5,000 square feet for the first two dwelling units, plus 2,500 square feet for each additional unit, resulting in 10,000 square feet required for a three-family dwelling. The subject lot provides only 3,000 square feet, which is significantly below the minimum standard. This represents an intensification of density beyond what the zoning permits. However, the surrounding parcels along Julian Street are similarly undersized, with many existing three-family structures built on lots between 2,500 and 4,000 square feet, reflecting historic development patterns.

The second issue is floor area ratio (FAR). The maximum allowed FAR is 0.8, while the project proposes 0.9. This slight increase is minimal and within the general range of nearby triple-deckers, which often exceed the current FAR limit due to older, denser residential fabric.

The third and fourth issues concern lot width and frontage. Both require 50 feet, while the proposal provides only 30 feet. This is a common condition on narrow infill parcels throughout the neighborhood. For example, several nearby three-family dwellings along Julian Street sit on lots between 29 and 35 feet wide as noticed on 32 and 40 Julian Street.

The proposal also triggers violations for front and rear yards. A 20-foot front yard is required, while 6 feet are proposed, and a 30-foot rear yard is required, while 25.8 feet are proposed. While these dimensions are below the standard, the reduced yard dimensions align with adjacent residential buildings.

Usable open space is also insufficient. The zoning requires 650 square feet per dwelling unit, while the project provides 528 square feet. Given the constrained lot size and the urban context, this shortfall is typical of similar three-family developments nearby.

Finally, relief is needed for parking under Article 23. The proposal provides two off-street parking spaces located in the rear yard, accessed via a driveway along the left side setback. Rear-yard parking is a typical condition on narrow infill lots in Dorchester and maintains the residential character of the street frontage. While the current plan shows two side-by-side spaces, the applicant could consider a tandem configuration in the future to preserve additional rear open space.



In summary, the project introduces a three-family dwelling on a small nonconforming lot and requires multiple dimensional variances. However, the proposed height, massing, and density are consistent with surrounding triple-decker buildings and reinforce the neighborhood's established residential character.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1734300, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH PROVISIO/S: that plans be submitted to the Planning Department for design review with attention to parking design and an the accessibility of the ground floor unit.

Reviewed,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Kathleen Onuf".

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1730941
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2025-06-05
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2025-11-25
<b>Address</b>	36 Gaston ST Dorchester 02121
<b>Parcel ID</b>	1202758000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Roxbury Neighborhood 3F-4000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	50
<b>Project Description</b>	The proponent seeks a Conditional Use Permit for a Community Center; to house an organization providing supportive services for formerly incarcerated individuals. There is no construction proposed at the site.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Conditional Use
<b>Violations</b>	Use: Conditional

**Planning Context:**

36 Gaston Street sits in a 3F-4000 Three-Family Residential subdistrict of the Roxbury Neighborhood. Constructed in 1910, the five-bedroom, single-family Victorian home is in close proximity to public transportation, open space, and Blue Hill Ave. The 45 bus line runs along Blue Hill Ave, and on the other side of Gaston Street - the 14,19,23, and 28 MBTA bus lines run up Warren Street - making this a highly accessible and well-traveled area.

36 Gaston Street is less than 1000 ft from a commercial corridor in the neighborhood where there are markets, barbershops, laundromats and more. There are also a number of local grassroots organizations such as Project Right and the New Vision CDC; both with the established goals of strengthening neighborhood ties and expanding economic investment.

**Zoning Analysis:**

The refusal letter refers to Article 50, Section 28, Use Regulations Applicable in Residential Subdistricts. Community Centers are Conditional within the 3F zones. 36 Gaston Street is just outside of the MFR/LS zone where Project Right and other local services are located, and where such Community Centers are an Allowed use.



Per Article 6-3 of the Boston Zoning code, the Board of Appeal may grant a Conditional Use provided that the specific site is an appropriate location for the proposed use; that the use will not adversely affect the neighborhood; there will be no serious hazard to pedestrians or vehicles from the use; no nuisance will be created by the use; and that there are adequate and appropriate facilities provided for the operation of the use.

The proponent, New Beginnings Reentry Services, is a 501c3 non profit organization that provides services such as mental health and substance abuse counseling, financial and digital literacy training, and other wellness and rehabilitative programs to support individuals leaving incarceration. Given the existing community organizations working to improve the neighborhood, adding another non-profit would be consistent with the current context.

Zoning relief in the form of a Conditional Use permit is both warranted and encouraged.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1730941, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kathleen Onuf".

Deputy Director of Zoning

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1744076
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2025-07-02
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2025-11-25
<b>Address</b>	32 Hanson ST Roxbury 02118
<b>Parcel ID</b>	0305903000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	South End Neighborhood MFR
<b>Zoning Article</b>	64
<b>Project Description</b>	Project seeks to change the use from three to two dwelling units, expand the livable area of unit one into the existing basement, and legalize the existing roof deck for exclusive use by unit two. Project also proposes extensive interior alterations, installing new systems throughout, and the addition of one roof top condenser.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	GCOD Applicability Roof Structure Restrictions

**Planning Context:**

Hanson Street reflects the characteristic South End urban form: narrow lots lined with dense, historic brick rowhomes, most over a century old, and commonly featuring basement levels and setback roof structures. 32 Hanson Street is a six-story, three-family residential building located within the Multifamily Residential (MFR) Subdistrict of the South End Neighborhood Zoning District. The property benefits from close access to neighborhood open spaces such as Ringgold Park and Union Park, and features a shared roof deck and basement used for storage and utilities, both of which are typologies consistent with surrounding buildings.

This site is also located within the Coastal Flood Resiliency Overlay District (CFROD), which is applied to areas of the City projected to experience significant future flooding due to sea level rise and climate-driven storm events. While the proposed work does not meet the threshold for CFROD review under Article 80, the district's purpose provides essential planning context. The CFROD exists to prevent the creation or expansion of vulnerable below-grade living spaces and residential uses, ensure life-safety during flood events, and align local development practices with FEMA and National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) standards. One of its core objectives



is to require new larger-scale residential uses to be constructed above the future floodplain so that residents will not be exposed to future hazards over the life of the structure.

Given the building's location within a mapped flood-risk area, the Planning Department generally does not support proposals that introduce or expand habitable residential space below the Design Flood Elevation (DFE). However, this project does not incur dimensional violations, and so there is not the ability to address this important context within the request for zoning relief. This indicates a clear need for future zoning reform to ensure the safety and resiliency of smaller-scale residential uses in the CFROD in the future.

### **Zoning Analysis:**

The proposed project incurs two citations, neither of which are dimensional. The first relates to the applicability of the Restricted Roof District: South End Neighborhood, pursuant to Section 64-34. Both the existing roof deck and the proposed condenser are fully set back and not visible from the public way, consistent with the intent of the Restricted Roof Structure provisions to limit visual impacts on the streetscape. As such, the scope of the exterior rooftop work presents no concerns related to visibility or neighborhood character.

The property is also subject to the Groundwater Conservation Overlay District (GCOD) pursuant to Section 32-4 of the Zoning Code, due to the scale of proposed interior renovations. The purpose of GCOD, as detailed in Section 32-1 is to: (a) prevent the deterioration of and, where necessary, promote the restoration of, groundwater levels in the city of Boston; (b) protect and enhance the city's historic neighborhoods and structures, and otherwise conserve the value of its land and buildings; (c) reduce surface water runoff and water pollution; and (d) maintain public safety. The project will undergo review by BWSC and the Groundwater Trust to ensure compliance with the GCOD requirements.

### **Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1744076, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH PROVISIO/S: the plans shall be reviewed and approved by the Boston Water & Sewer Commission due to its location within the Groundwater Conservation Overlay District (GCOD) .



*Planning Department*

**CITY of BOSTON**

Reviewed,

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1774198
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2025-09-11
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2025-11-25
<b>Address</b>	2 to 4 Danny RD Hyde Park 02136
<b>Parcel ID</b>	1812783000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Hyde Park Neighborhood 2F-5000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	69
<b>Project Description</b>	Erect a new two-unit residential building.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	Parking design and maneuverability Lot Area Insufficient FAR Excessive Usable Open Space Insufficient Front Yard Insufficient Side Yard Insufficient

**Planning Context:**

The proposed project intends to construct a new two-unit residential structure on a 4,000 SF lot in Hyde Park. Lots in this part of the neighborhood vary between 4,000 and 6,500 SF. Danny Road is divided between two zoning subdistricts. On one side, there are predominantly single-unit residential structures, 1-1.5 stories in height. On the other side, including the proposed development site, residential structures range from 2.5-3 stories. On both sides of the street, parcels have consistent front yards measuring between ten and twenty feet. Structures are generally offset to one side within the parcels, creating one larger and one smaller side yard dimension. The site is located in the Readville area of Hyde Park, approximately 1/3 mile from the MBTA Commuter Rail Station.

**Zoning Analysis:**

The proposed project is located in the Hyde Park Neighborhood in a 2F-5000 subdistrict. There are six cited zoning violations for this project, Parking design and maneuverability, Lot Area Insufficient, FAR Excessive, Usable Open Space Insufficient, Front Yard Insufficient, and Side Yard Insufficient.





As noted in the Planning Context, the lot size is below the required zoning dimension, but this is in keeping with neighborhood context. Based on ongoing analysis by the Planning Department as part of the Neighborhood Housing initiative, lot sizes in Hyde Park are frequently below the required square footage. Such dimensional nonconformities also influence the FAR and Useable Open Space, as those values are related to the ratio between lot area and lot coverage by the structure.

The front yard setback for the proposed project measures ten feet. While this dimension does not meet the zoning requirement of twenty feet, this setback is modal with the existing conditions set by other structures on the block, and therefore in keeping with neighborhood context.

The side yard dimensions measure ten feet on one side and five feet on the other side of the structure. There are two parking spaces provided on either side of the building. This design requires two curb cuts to provide driveway access. Design Review is recommended to improve the design of the parking to limit the curb cut to only one and increase the five-foot side yard to a dimension contextual with the surrounding neighborhood fabric, at least six feet, preferably seven to eight feet.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1774198, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH PROVISIO/S: that plans be submitted to the Planning Department for design review to address the parking and side yard designs, and to limit the project to a single curb cut.

Reviewed,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kathleen O'Neil".

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1754250
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2025-07-24
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2025-11-25
<b>Address</b>	18 Winchester ST Boston 02116
<b>Parcel ID</b>	0500196000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Bay Village Neighborhood RH - Row House Residential
<b>Zoning Article</b>	63-20
<b>Project Description</b>	This project seeks to construct a new headhouse for an existing roof deck.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Conditional Use
<b>Violations</b>	Roof Structure Restrictions

#### **Planning Context:**

The proposed sits in the Bay Village Neighborhood, in the Row House Residential subdistrict and is subject to Article 63 of the zoning code. 18 Winchester Street is also part of the Bay Village Historic District, meaning any work to the exterior must be reviewed by the Bay Village Historic District Commission. The building is a five-story Second Empire style rowhouse that faces residential buildings of similar FAR and height. To the rear of the lot, sits 2 South Cedar Place (which has a roof deck), and beyond that, another continuous strip of rowhouses (many with their own roof decks).

#### **Zoning Analysis:**

The proposal seeks to construct a new headhouse for an existing roof deck, requiring zoning relief for its location in a Restricted Roof District. The refusal letter cites Article 63, Section 20 of the zoning code: Roof Structure Restrictions.

Comments under the Violation mention issues like structural framing and egress evaluation, which are handled by the Inspectional Services Department, and are distinct from zoning requirements. The comments also mention a need for Historical review.

In the Bay Village Neighborhood District, any construction that relocates or alters the profile and/or configuration of the roof or mansard, would require public notice, and a hearing, subject to Sections 6-2, 6-3, and 6-4, of the zoning code. The Board of Appeal would then grant a Conditional Use permit based on whether a roof structure has the potential to damage the



uniformity of the height or architectural character of the immediate vicinity. Additionally, the Bay Village Historic District Commission would issue its own judgement with regard to the exterior design changes.

Similar roof decks can be seen on neighboring properties, making it a common amenity and emergent characteristic of the neighborhood. Considering the proposal is for changes to the headhouse which opens up to an already existing roof deck, zoning relief is warranted.

The design of the headhouse at 18 Winchester Street was Approved with Provisos (that the final placement of rooftop HVAC units be remanded) by the Bay Village Historic District Commission on November 21, 2023.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1754250, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kathryn Onuf".

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1755712
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2025-07-28
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2025-11-25
<b>Address</b>	242 Newbury ST Boston 02116
<b>Parcel ID</b>	0503162000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Boston Proper B-3-65
<b>Zoning Article</b>	8
<b>Project Description</b>	Change use from barber shop to tattoo shop.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Conditional Use
<b>Violations</b>	Use: Conditional (Body Art)

### **Planning Context:**

The proposed project converts a barber shop to a tattoo shop, located on the garden level of a four-story brownstone building on Newbury Street in the Back Bay. The proposal does not require any construction, only a change of use. The building is located between Fairfield Street and Gloucester Street, along a vibrant stretch of active retail stores and restaurants. Given the location along an active mixed-use street and the conversion to a similar use, a tattoo shop is appropriate here.

### **Zoning Analysis:**

Body Art Establishments are a conditional use in B-3-65 districts pursuant to Article 8. In granting a conditional use, the Board of Appeal must find that the site is an appropriate location for such use, that the use will not adversely affect the neighborhood, that there will be no serious hazard to vehicles or pedestrians from the use, that no nuisance will be created by the use, and that adequate and appropriate facilities are provided for proper operation. A tattoo shop does not inherently violate any of these conditions, especially given that this is a conversion from a barber shop, which has similar operations and customer activity. This presents a case for zoning reform, where similar uses with similar impacts have different use allowances. The new land use of "Service Establishment" in Article 8 Table A helps resolve this issue by grouping barber shop and tattoo shop together as the same overall service establishment use in new zoning districts.



Plans reviewed are titled "Proposed Tattoo Shop 242 Newbury Street (Garden Level) Boston, Massachusetts", dated July 24, 2025, and prepared by T Design, LLC.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1755712, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Kathleen O'Neil".

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1755641
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2025-07-28
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2025-11-25
<b>Address</b>	150 to 152 State ST Boston 02109
<b>Parcel ID</b>	0303758000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Government Center/Markets STATE STREET PROTECTION AREA
<b>Zoning Article</b>	45-14
<b>Project Description</b>	The proposal is seeking a Conditional Use permit to allow for Body Art on the third floor of the building, in a space that is currently being used for office space.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Conditional Use
<b>Violations</b>	Conditional Use

**Planning Context:**

The existing building sits in the newly adopted boundary for the Skyline zoning districts as adopted by the Zoning Commission on October 22, 2025. The Conditional Use permit was filed on June 16, 2025 and the refusal letter was issued on July 28, 2025.

Previously the building was within the Government Center/Markets distinct and would have been subject to Article 45 of the zoning code. The building also would have sat within the State Street Protection Area, which provides dimensional requirements to protect existing scale, the quality of the pedestrian environment, and concentrations of historic buildings within and abutting the Area. Under PLAN: Downtown, the parcel now sits within a SKY-LOW District. These are areas characterized by a cohesive historic character in the urban form, with finer-grain parcelization and smaller building sizes.

These new districts continue to be regulated to ensure the same protections they had previously - to advance historic preservation and ensure new developments are compatible with the existing buildings in scale, density, and form. Skyline districts are also those that the City has identified as being high-activity areas, with potential to support a vibrant mix of uses, revitalizing Downtown.



Constructed in 1899, 150 State Street is a 7,980 sq. ft. wood-framed, English Tudor-style building. Historically, it was home to a range of commercial activities, and once even housed the English consulate. Today, 150 State Street is situated next to 8,000 sq. ft. of vacant office space at 148 State Street and the Insurance Library Association of Boston at 156 State Street. Nearby, the area includes 94 residential units at One India Street Apartments. Faneuil Hall Marketplace is less than 250 feet away—less than a minute's walk

### **Zoning Analysis:**

Pursuant to Section 45-14, as cited in the refusal letter, a Body Art establishment is considered a Conditional Use requiring zoning relief. However, within the new Skyline Low zoning district, Body Art establishments are now allowed under modernized land uses.

Historically, Conditional Use permits have been subject to zoning oversight as a means of “protecting public health and safety” and curtailing what were seen as undesirable behaviors. Just as marijuana usage has evolved in legality and social acceptance, so too has Body Art. The changing definition of body art - now encompassing cosmetic tattoos like microbladed eyebrows, lip blush, or permanent eyeliner - demonstrates how its regulation has also adapted over time. Licensing and facility requirements are still overseen by the Boston Public Health Commission, but no longer require close attention from the Planning Department, hence its Allowed status.

Similarly, Downtown and its adjacent parcels in the Government Center/Markets area are also undergoing changes that the zoning seeks to address. In the wake of the pandemic, the primary uses for these buildings shifted from offices, government, and financial services to having a more district “neighborhood” quality with a greater emphasis on restaurants, attractions, and nightlife.

Recent additions to the State Street area's dining scene, such as Tiki Rock and Niku Ramen, have complemented long-standing Boston institutions like Hong Kong, Sissy K's, and The Black Rose; and the emergence of new retail businesses, including Apex Noire Cannabis (at 150 State), indicate opportunities for small businesses to thrive as the area's reliance on traditional office use wanes.



One of the stated goals of PLAN: Downtown planning effort is to diversify entertainment offerings, and to permit the City to develop in a way that appeals to a broader demographic. As such, changes to the zoning code went into effect to better reflect the evolving nature of commercial retail and to support the emergent characteristics of the area.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1755641, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Kathleen Onuf".

Deputy Director of Zoning





<b>Case</b>	BOA1783949
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2025-09-29
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2025-11-25
<b>Address</b>	100 Eutaw ST East Boston 02128
<b>Parcel ID</b>	0103123000, 0103124000, and 0103125000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	East Boston Neighborhood 2F-2000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	53
<b>Project Description</b>	The proposal seeks to erect a four-unit dwelling on a currently vacant lot. No parking is proposed.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	Front Yard Insufficient Rear Yard Insufficient Parking or Loading Insufficient

#### **Planning Context:**

100 Eutaw ST is located in East Boston's Eagle Hill neighborhood. The site is a wide rectangular corner lot that is currently vacant. It is in a primarily residential area ranging from single families to rowhouses & triple deckers. The site is approximately 0.5 miles away from the Airport Blue Line MBTA Station. The project proposal includes a four unit, three story building with no parking.

#### **Zoning Analysis:**

The subject property was cited for three violations: Front yard insufficient, rear yard insufficient, and insufficient parking under the previous 2F-2000 zoning. However, the ZBA case was filed on August 06, 2024, and the new zoning under PLAN: East Boston went into effect on April 14, 2024. As such, the property is subject to the zoning of the EBR-3 district which it currently resides in. In the EBR-3 district a minimum front yard of five feet and a minimum rear yard of 1/3 the lot depth or approximately 19.7 feet (measured from Eutaw St.) The project proposes a front yard of one foot along Eutaw St and front yard of one foot along Brooks St and a rear yard of 10 feet. The rear yard of 10 feet is contextual with the existing neighborhood and provides plenty of space between structures. As such relief for the rear yard setback is appropriate. However, the one-foot setback along Brooks ST and Eutaw ST is not contextual as other neighboring buildings all have a stoop (essentially is the three-foot yard). Increasing the front



yard setbacks along Brooks ST and Eutaw ST will help with buildings entry sequence and public realm and as such zoning relief is not appropriate. Additionally, the project proponent should consider design improvements to the side elevation design along Brooks ST given its long street frontage.

Lastly, the subject property was cited for insufficient parking. The site's insufficient parking violation relates to the project's proposed zero-parking condition. While in violation of the area's zoning requirements (1:1 dwelling/space parking ratio required, totaling seven required off-street spaces for the project), this condition is one commonly found throughout the Eagle Hill area, including on ~85% of the lots on the proposed project's immediately surrounding blocks.

The subject property also falls under the East Boston Neighborhood Design Overlay District and is subject to review by Planning Department Design Review to ensure the property remains consistent with the character of the neighborhood.

The plans submitted are titled "Brooks Street Residences" submitted by Kashala Design, INC.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1783949, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL W/ PROVISIO that the front yards along Brooks St and Eutaw St be increased to at least 3 feet; and that plans be submitted to the Planning Department for review with attention to the the design of the building elevation along Brook St.

Reviewed,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Katelyn Onuf".

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1750079
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2025-07-18
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2025-11-25
<b>Address</b>	2 Bonad RD West Roxbury 02132
<b>Parcel ID</b>	2010835000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	West Roxbury Neighborhood 1F-6000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	56
<b>Project Description</b>	Plans show extension of living space into the basement and attic with renovations to the existing second floor. No exterior work will be done on the building.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	FAR Excessive

**Planning Context:**

2 Bonad Road is a one-unit residence located in a primarily residential area of West Roxbury that borders the Town of Dedham. It borders the Congregation Sharei Sedek cemetery and is in close proximity to Draper Playground. The houses in this area of West Roxbury are predominantly one-unit, detached residences.

The proponent plans to extend living space into the basement by adding a bedroom and bathroom. Mechanical and plumbing will remain in the basement. There would also be a new master bedroom and master bathroom constructed in the attic, which currently is not utilized as living space. No exterior changes will be made, and there will be no additional floor area.

**Zoning Analysis:**

This proposal has triggered one zoning violation: FAR excessive.

The FAR allowed for this lot is 0.4 and the plans do not show a proposed FAR.

According to the assessor's report of the existing property, the current FAR is 0.44. It is reasonable to expect that the proposed renovations will increase the FAR given that the living area will be expanded over two floors without the lot size increasing. The proposed addition creates modest, high-quality living space that allows the property to meet the evolving needs of today's households, which include supporting family growth, multi-generational living, and aging



in place. These are all priorities articulated in the City's housing and planning goals. Because the improvements to the living space are not disruptive to the neighborhood context or compromise the minimum open space, relief is recommended.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1750079, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Kathleen O'Neil".

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1760292
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2025-08-07
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2025-11-25
<b>Address</b>	19 Midland ST Dorchester 02125
<b>Parcel ID</b>	1302181000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Dorchester Neighborhood 2F-4000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	65
<b>Project Description</b>	Change use to a three-family dwelling with off-street parking. Erect a third-story and side and rear additions.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	FAR Excessive Height Excessive (ft) Height Excessive (stories) Forbidden Use

#### **Planning Context:**

The proposed project changes the use from a single-unit to a three-unit residential building, erects a third story with a mansard roof, expands the footprint of the rear portion of the building so that both sides are flush with the sides of the front portion of the building, expands the second and third floors to the rear, and creates three new parking spaces in the rear yard (for a net increase of two parking spaces).

The site is currently occupied by a two-story, one-unit residential building with a mansard roof, a driveway and single curb cut, as well as a vegetated back yard. Abutting the site to the south is a three-story, three-unit residential building with a flat roof and to the north is a two-story, one-unit residential building with a mansard roof. Across the street from 19 Midland is a three-story, three-unit building with a mansard roof, and the rest of the street is lined with one- to three-story residential buildings.

The site is just one block, 0.1 miles from the Savin Hill MBTA Station serving the Red Line. It is also within walking distance of neighborhood amenities, including Savin Hill Beach (0.4 miles) and Cristo Rey Boston High School (200 feet).

#### **Zoning Analysis:**

This proposal requires relief for use, floor area ratio, height in feet, and number of stories.



The 2F-4000 subdistrict allows up to two dwelling units, and the applicant is proposing three. Although Midland Street is zoned 2F-4000, the streets parallel to midland immediately to the east and west are zoned 3F-5000 and are lined with three-story, three-unit residential buildings. Furthermore, immediately adjacent to the south of the site within the 2F-4000 district is a three-unit building, and there are two more buildings with more than two units across the street. The proposed density is consistent with the immediate neighborhood context.

Similarly, the 2F-4000 subdistrict allows up to 2.5 stories, and the applicant is proposing three. Even within the 2F-4000 district along Midland, there are four buildings up to three stories in height, three of which have mansard roofs. In terms of building height, the limit in this district is 35 feet, while the project proposes 38 feet 2 inches. Given this modest increase and the appropriateness of the height in stories, zoning relief is recommended for use, as well as for height in feet and stories is recommended.

The maximum FAR permitted is 0.5, while the project proposes 1.07. The existing FAR is conforming at approximately 0.4. Several other existing buildings on the block also exceed the 0.5 FAR, including at 10, 11, 14, 18, 23, 26, and 30 Midland, as well as at 4-6 Midland which exceeds 1.0 FAR.

In summary, the project introduces a use not permitted under current zoning and increases intensity through FAR, height, and stories. However, these changes align with the existing development pattern in Dorchester and are reinforced by the site's location in a highly transit-accessible area.

The materials reviewed were prepared by 686 Architects dated May 25, 2025 and stamped by City of Boston ISD as "Reviewed for ZBA" on November 12, 2025.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1760292, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kathleen O'Connell".

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1707353
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2025-04-08
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2025-11-25
<b>Address</b>	18 Intervale ST Dorchester 02121
<b>Parcel ID</b>	1202733000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Roxbury Neighborhood 3F-4000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	50
<b>Project Description</b>	The proponent proposes razing an existing garage to erect a three-unit, three-story building, including basement level living area. The current lot has a driveway and garage.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	FAR Excessive Usable Open Space Insufficient Lot Frontage Insufficient Lot Width Insufficient Additional Lot Area Insufficient Parking or Loading Insufficient Lot Area Insufficient Existing Building Alignment Side yard setback for narrow lot Rear yard setback for shallow lot

**Planning Context:**

This case was originally deferred from the August 26, 2025 meeting and then deferred again from the September 23, 2025 meeting. No new plans were submitted; so the Planning Department recommendation has remained the same. The proposed project site is located in a residential subdistrict comprised of mostly 2-, 3-, and 4-plus family residential buildings adjacent to long mixed-use boulevards with higher densities and ground level local services. Intervale Street intersects major bus corridors: Warren Street, Blue Hill Avenue, and Columbia Road. The street contains a mix of residential buildings that include single-family, two-family, mixed-use multi-family buildings, and commercial buildings that include the Masjid Al-Quran mosque and the Community Gospel Church.

The proponent proposes a project with building height, dwelling unit count, parking, and rear yard that are similar, if not exactly the same as the neighboring lots. However, existing lot



conditions and proposed massing create very little room for side yards and overall usable open space conditions that are contextual with neighboring buildings. Side yards and usable open space are important to ensure adequate light and air between buildings and provide space for yards.

### **Zoning Analysis:**

The proposed design has multiple violations related to lot size and coverage. The design was flagged for Insufficient Lot Area. Residential buildings in this zone require a minimum 4,000 square foot lot area for two or less units. Because the proponent seeks to construct more than two units, an additional 2,000 square feet of lot area is required, totaling a 6,000 square foot minimum required lot area. The area of the lot is 1,800 square feet, which is distinctly smaller than the size of the surrounding lots. The proposal was also flagged for violating the minimum lot width standard which requires 45-foot minimum lot width. The existing lot width is 22.5 feet wide. These are specific site conditions that cannot be adjusted. Additionally, the site has Insufficient Lot Frontage at 22.5 feet where 45-foot minimum frontage is required. The other 2- and 3-unit residences on the street have between 39- and 45-foot frontages. This means that the lot is generally half the width and size of surrounding properties, severely out of context with its surroundings.

While the vast majority of residential parcels in the City are nonconforming by at least one dimensional regulation, both the size of the proposed building and the lot size would fall out of alignment with the built environment. According to Article 50, narrow lots are narrower than the minimum lot width required for residential lots. Section 50-44.7 details the minimum width required for a side yard on a narrow lot is 5 feet. The proposed side yards are each 3 feet wide. Surrounding residential buildings the size of this project have at least one side yard that is 5 feet minimum and generally one side yard that is at least 10 feet, totalling 16 feet. According to Article 50, Table F, the maximum FAR allowed for lots in 3F-4000 is 0.8. The proposed FAR is 1.8. While the rear yard is contextual, the side yards are more narrow than the side yards for the surrounding two- and three-unit buildings. The proposed design was also flagged for containing insufficient Usable Open Space. Article 50 requires 650 per dwelling unit, and the proposed usable open space is 440 square feet per dwelling unit.





A lot of this size would better serve as an attached dwelling to an existing structure or a detached dwelling with dimensions similar to that of an accessory unit. The project may also need to be modified to meet building code, accessibility requirements, and design standards.

Plans reviewed are titled "18 Intervale Street", prepared by Civil Environmental Consultants, and dated 7/16/2024.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1707353, The Planning Department recommends DENIAL WITHOUT PREJUDICE. Proponent should consider a project that better incorporates the small size of the lot by reducing the building massing and increasing usable open space to better fit within its context.

Reviewed,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Kathleen Onuf".

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1703445
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2025-03-26
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2025-11-25
<b>Address</b>	100 Huntington AV J5 Boston 02116
<b>Parcel ID</b>	0400985010
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Huntington Avenue/Prudential Center General Area
<b>Zoning Article</b>	11
<b>Project Description</b>	Add window decals for advertisements on both sides of a skybridge over Huntington Avenue, with each occupying 480 square feet.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Conditional Use
<b>Violations</b>	On-Premise Signs in Non-Residential Districts

**Planning Context:**

These plans are identical to those submitted for the October 7, 2025 ZBA hearing where this project was deferred. No changes to the proposed project have been made, and therefore the recommendation of denial still holds.

The proposal includes adding window decals for advertisements on both sides of the skybridge over Huntington Avenue that connects the Prudential Center and Copley Place. The window decals would occupy seven window panels on each side of the skybridge, with each occupying 480 square feet (8 feet tall and 60 feet wide). The proposed location of these window decals means that the signs are not necessarily considered signage for a specific store or location, but rather an advertisement similar to a billboard. The Planning Department does not support signs for businesses without a retail front in that specific location, and further does not support signage attached to sky bridges.

**Zoning Analysis:**

The proposed signage is cited for violating provisions in Section 11-2 for "On-Premise Signs in Non-Residential Districts." Window decals such as this are only referenced in subsection (c), which states "A permanent non-illuminated sign on the inside of the glass of a window, provided that the total area of the sign does not exceed thirty percent of the total glass area of windows appurtenant to the use to which the sign is accessory, and provided that signs on ground floor windows be included in calculating the total area of signs on a sign frontage." The proposed



signage would not occupy more than thirty percent of the windows; however, it is not apparent that these window decals are accessory to a specific use that they are providing advertisement for.

Additionally, while it is difficult to classify this kind of signage related to specific requirements in Article 11, these signs would be larger than other allowable signs. For example, free-standing signs subject to Section 11-2(e) be up to 65 sf, 125 sf, or 250 sf depending on the use(s) that the signs are accessory to.

This presents a case for zoning reform, where the signage regulations are difficult to interpret in unique cases like this.

Plans reviewed are titled "Windowscape Location Plan Pedestrian Skybridge Huntington Avenue Boston, Massachusetts," prepared by Dana F. Perkins, Inc., and dated October 30, 2024.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1703445, The Planning Department recommends DENIAL.

Reviewed,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kathleen Onuf".

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1718356
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2025-05-07
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2025-11-25
<b>Address</b>	25 to 27 Edinboro ST Boston 02111
<b>Parcel ID</b>	0304436000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Chinatown Historic Chinatown Protection Area
<b>Zoning Article</b>	43-19
<b>Project Description</b>	The proposed project includes a change of legal use and occupancy from what is currently a showroom, commercial retail, and restaurant, with unfinished space in the basement. The project seeks a change of use to include a private Ma Jong Club use in the basement, Community Service and Retail on the first floor, office on the second floor, a Pool Hall on the third floor, and office/professional uses on the fourth and fifth floors.; requiring two Conditional Use permits. The proposed project is at 25-27 Edinboro in the Historic Chinatown Protection Area.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Conditional Use
<b>Violations</b>	Use: Conditional

**Planning Context:**

The proposed project exists in the Historic Chinatown Protection Area at 25-27 Edinboro St. The case was deferred at the October 7, 2025 meeting of the Board of Appeal.

To the rear of the building, facing the southwest is Ping On Alley, which has some surface parking. On the northern side, 25-27 Edinboro faces the terminal end of the Rose Kennedy Greenway, less than 100 feet away. Properties on the same western side of Edinboro include small restaurants, cafes, spas, and martial arts schools.

Properties on the other side of Edinboro are zoned for Commercial Chinatown and house a range of professional services including a number of architectural and design services firms. 25-27 Edinboro is close to the Paifang Chinatown Gate, a major tourist attraction and Landmark, and Chinatown's Beach Street, the primary retail and restaurant corridor for the



neighborhood. The proposed project is 0.3 miles from Boston's South Station, and 0.2 miles from the Chinatown MBTA station with Orange and Silver Line connectivity.

**Zoning Analysis:**

The planning history of Chinatown is characterized by a lasting tension between community preservation and necessary development. Memories of "Combat Zone", the seedy adult entertainment district that emerged in the 1960s, linger for residents who have higher aspirations for their neighborhood - to see Chinatown transformed to a vibrant, urban enclave that respects its history, respects its immigrant population, and drives economic prosperity. Hence, under the current zoning code for Chinatown pursuant to Article 43, Section 19 - both Pool halls and social/private clubs are conditional uses subject to review. Community and Cultural Uses are both currently allowed. There is concern that these uses are inherently related to gambling (MahJong) or could lead to gambling (Pool Hall). Gambling activity is regulated at the state level by the Massachusetts Gaming Commission - not through the zoning code.

The conditions in Article 6 include: that the specific site is an appropriate location for such use, that the use will not adversely affect the neighborhood, that there will be no hazard to vehicles or pedestrians; that no nuisance will be created by the use; and that adequate and proper facilities will be provided for the proper operation of the use. There is not sufficient evidence that this use as a form of entertainment will not become a nuisance that could adversely affect the neighborhood.

The plans reviewed are titled 25 EDINBORO STREET and dated June 22, 2020. They were prepared by architect Arthur Choo & Company.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1718356, The Planning Department recommends DENIAL.

Reviewed,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kathleen Onuf".

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1482368
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2023-06-06
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2025-11-25
<b>Address</b>	87 Morris ST East Boston 02128
<b>Parcel ID</b>	0106841000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	East Boston Neighborhood 3F-2000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	53
<b>Project Description</b>	Change of use from a 2-family to a 3-family by remodeling the basement into a new unit.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance, Conditional Use
<b>Violations</b>	FAR Excessive Usable Open Space Insufficient Parking or Loading Insufficient IPOD Applicability GCOD Applicability Lot Area Insufficient Additional Lot Area Insufficient Location of Main Entrance

**Planning Context:**

This case has been previously reviewed and deferred by the ZBA on 4/23/25, 6/24/25, 7/30/25, and again on 9/25/25. No new project plans have been submitted. The contents of this review will remain the same.

87 Morris Street is located in the East Boston neighborhood district. PLAN: East Boston, which was adopted by the BPDA Board on March 14, 2024, encourages the development of Additional Dwelling Units as they offer a sustainable and efficient way to expand housing options and “contribute to more inclusive and adaptable communities”. Further, the PLAN states that, “Homeowners who want to make small changes to their houses—such as adding a dormer, creating an in-law suite in a basement, or building a new deck—will require fewer variances, making it easier for people to stay in their homes as their needs change.”

87 Morris Street is within a 5 minute walking radius of the MBTA Blue Line Airport Station further aligning it with city wide goals for increasing transit oriented development in order to address the ongoing housing crisis. The proponent seeks to change the occupancy of the existing residence from a 2-family to a 3-family. This would involve the remodeling of the basement into a new apartment.



Morris Street contains mostly 3-family residences, including the two residences immediately to the east and west of the plot lines. Majority of the homes along Morris Street are built up to the existing lot lines with little to no side yard allotments. Parking along Morris Street appears to be very congested, with the majority of residences not providing any additional parking within their parcel.

This project is located in the Coastal Flood Resilience Overlay District (CFROD). PLAN: East Boston states that "Climate change threatens existing housing in low-lying areas. Large portions of the Paris Flats, Maverick Central, and Harbor View are at particular risk of flooding—although nearly every part of East Boston has at least some portion located within the Coastal Flood Resilience Overlay District (CFROD). The CFROD plays an important role in shaping new development. Proposed projects within the CFROD are subject to resilience review, which looks at the siting of mechanical systems, access, and ground floor elevation. For proposed projects in the CFROD, new or extended living space must be located above the Sea Level Rise - Design Flood Elevation." The plans do not show the lot's grade in relation to the Sea Level Rise-Design Flood Elevation, so it is not clear whether the proposed extension of living space would be under the SLR-DFE.

It is also not clear whether the project complies with the PLAN: East Boston recommended zoning required for permeable area of lot (30%) because a landscaping plan is not provided. It is especially crucial that this project has adequate permeable area because of its location in the Coastal Flood Resiliency Overlay District and Groundwater Protection Overlay District. PLAN: East Boston states that "permeable areas are needed to support groundwater recharge and limit stormwater runoff that contributes to neighborhood flooding and worsens water quality" and that infill development in Neighborhood Residential areas should preserve privately-owned open space and increase permeable areas.

### **Zoning Analysis:**

New zoning for this area to codify the recommendations of PLAN: East Boston was adopted on April 24, 2024. The notice for this new zoning was advertised on April 1, 2024, therefore projects that applied before this date were reviewed under the zoning in effect at the time. This project applied on May 30, 2023, and therefore the old zoning applies; however the updated zoning provides important planning context. The project is currently undergoing eight zoning violations.



The project does not comply with new Article 53 zoning for off-street parking, as one new parking space would be required for the new 3rd unit. However, due to the narrow shape of the lot, there is no room for a driveway, and therefore a variance would be appropriate.

Any Proposed Project within the East Boston IPOD Study Area seeking to, in this case, enlarge or extend a building or structure so as to increase the gross floor area by more than one thousand (1,000) square feet will be subject to receiving an IPOD permit. However, those interim planning and zoning standards are no longer in effect.

New zoning does not restrict FAR, lot area, or usable open space, and instead regulates building width and depth, building lot coverage, building floor plate, and permeable area of lot. The project seems to comply with all of these dimensional requirements except for the permeable area of lot, which is not shown clearly in the plans. As noted in the planning context of this recommendation, adequate permeable area is vital for mitigating flooding in this area. Also, due to the additional unit, the project does not comply with the requirements for usable open space, parking, and additional lot area.

The project is located in the Groundwater Conservation Overlay District (GCOD). The purpose of the GCOD is to protect wood pile foundations of buildings from being damaged by lowered groundwater levels. Projects that fall within GCOD and involve the erection or extension of any structure designed or used for human occupancy or access, mechanical equipment, or laundry or storage facilities, including garage space, if such construction involves the excavation below grade to a depth equal to or below eight (8) feet above Boston City Base, are required to obtain a conditional use permit.

The project is also flagged for Article 25 (flood hazard district). It appears the project is not in a flood hazard district but is in the Coastal Flood Resiliency Overlay District (Article 25A), which means that the addition or extension of Residential Uses below the Sea Level Rise-Design Flood Elevation (SLR-DFE) (21.5 ft in this case) would be prohibited under new East Boston zoning. The plans do not show the lot's grade in relation to the Sea Level Rise-Design Flood Elevation, so it is not clear whether the proposed extension of living space would be under the SLR-DFE.





Plans submitted by GJ Design Group LLC on March 24, 2023, and last reviewed by the City of Boston Inspectional Services Department on May 30, 2023.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1482368, The Planning Department recommends DENIAL.

Reviewed,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Kathleen O'Neil".

Deputy Director of Zoning