



Planning Department

CITY of BOSTON

MEMORANDUM

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

FROM: Joanne Marques
Planning Department

DATE: August 5, 2026

RE: Planning Department Recommendations

Please find attached, for your information, Planning Department recommendations for the August 11, 2026 Board of Appeals Hearing.

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



Case	BOA1851830
ZBA Submitted Date	2026-05-20
ZBA Hearing Date	2026-08-11
Address	415 to 415A Hanover ST Boston 02109
Parcel ID	0303125000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	North End Neighborhood MFR/LS
Zoning Article	54
Project Description	Provision of a seasonal patio for Lucia Ristorante.
Relief Type	Conditional Use
Violations	Use: Conditional (Outdoor Seating)

Planning Context:

The North End is a prominent destination for residents and visitors alike due to the history and culture of the neighborhoods. One of the main attractions of the neighborhoods is the restaurants that are dispersed around the neighborhood. The Multifamily Residential and Local Services subdistrict encourages density and ground floor commercial uses. Hanover Street has a surplus of high density buildings with ground floor uses that are usually either local shops or restaurants. The proposal asks to continue the Lucia Ristorante's seasonal patio that has been established since 2020. The outdoor seating for Lucia Ristorante is held 415-415A Hanover Street, the patios of St. Stephen's Catholic Church. The outdoor space is directly accessible from Hanover St, Harris St, and Clark St.

Zoning Analysis:

The refusal letter states one (1) violation of the Zoning Code: Use: Conditional (Article 54, Section 9). In a MFR/LS subdistrict an accessory outdoor cafe is a conditional use on the basement and first floor. The outdoor patio will hold 48 seats within the patio of the St. Stephen Church. Although the property abuts Hanover Street, the proposed seating is appropriately scaled and has a fence that screens from the public realm. Furthermore, this outdoor seating has been established and greatly used by tourists and residents since 2020. Since the proposal is contextual and adheres to Article 6-3, the Planning Department supports the issuance of this Conditional Use Permit.



Plans were reviewed on 5/20/2026 and are titled "U491715682 Zoning Refusal Stamped ePlans - 05.20.2026." They were prepared by Winter GEC, LLC.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1851830, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1855093, BOA1849656
ZBA Submitted Date	2026-05-27
ZBA Hearing Date	2026-08-11
Address	35 Braddock PK Boston 02116
Parcel ID	0400768000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	South End Neighborhood MFR
Zoning Article	64, 32
Project Description	This project proposes interior remodel, a roof deck, and rear yard improvements including a detached garage.
Relief Type	Variance, Conditional Use
Violations	Rear Yard Insufficient FAR Excessive Roof Structure Restrictions GCOD Applicability

Planning Context:

35 Braddock Park is an existing one-unit rowhouse within the South End Landmark District, less than half a mile from the MBTA Orange Line Back Bay Station. The surrounding area includes a consistent building typology of similar size and scale. Buildings back up to a private alley. The majority of properties have a small, gravel rear yard and rear parking open to the sky, and a few properties have a carport or garage. Roof decks are also common on this block.

The proposed renovation includes a complete interior remodel and basement finish-out, bringing the finished floor grade to one foot lower than exists today. Work will also include construction of a roof deck including a new headhouse. An enclosed garage is proposed in the rear yard approximately five feet from the rear property line, extending the full width of the site. On top of the garage, a covered patio is proposed with a canopy. To access the patio from the primary building, a raised walkway is proposed from a first floor (rear second floor) door with a lower level garden area underneath. The existing primary structure GFA is proposed to be expanded slightly to accommodate a greenhouse vestibule extending from the first floor rear door which one will walk through to access the above-garage patio.

This parcel is located in both the Coastal Flooding Resilience (CFROD) and the Groundwater Conservation (GCOD) Overlay Districts, as well as Restricted Parking and Restricted Roof districts. The work proposed falls below the minimum thresholds that trigger CFROD



applicability and is therefore not subject to Resilience review, although the conversion of the basement space to livable area will create a dwelling more vulnerable to future flooding. The project is also exempt from review by the South End Landmark District Commission (SELDC) as the Office of Historic Preservation determined through site visits that no proposed roof work will be visible from the public street or median park directly in front of the property. The project will be subject to review by the Boston Water and Sewer Commission for the addition of the proposed garage.

Zoning Analysis:

The project was cited for violation to dimensional standard requirements set forth in Article 64, Section 9 of the Boston Zoning Code and cited as applicable for GCOD review pursuant to Article 32, Section 4. In addition to these citations made by ISD, the project also requires conditional approval of the proposed rooftop improvements restricted by the site's location in a Restricted Roof District outlined in Article 64, Section 34.

Rear Yard Setback: Per the Zoning Code, the minimum rear yard shall be 20 feet. Up to 25% of the rear yard may be used for accessory buildings. The 18-foot deep garage takes up approximately half of the existing rear yard and provides a five-foot rear setback. A patio space with a canopy is proposed on top of the garage, spanning the entire surface area of the roof of the garage, giving the visual appearance of a two-story structure. Staff recommends approval of the proposed rear yard garage.

Floor Area Ratio (FAR): While the GFA of the existing structure is already above the maximum allowed FAR, the project proposes increasing the GFA by adding an enclosed greenhouse vestibule attached to the primary structure. While not technically enclosed, the massing of the garage is visually equivalent to a two-story structure due to the rooftop canopy proposed. With the intention of appropriately scaling the proposed improvements and limiting the perceived FAR increase on site, Staff recommends approval of an FAR variance to allow for the attached vestibule.

GCOD: Per Article 32, Section 3, the erection of a new building on the lot covering greater than 50 gross square feet subjects the improvements to review by Boston Water and Sewer Commission and Boston Groundwater Trust. Staff recommends approval of the project conditioned on the aforementioned bodies' approval prior to the release of any construction permits.



Roof Structure Restrictions: Per Article 64, Section 34, "no roofed structure designed or used for human occupancy...headhouse, or mechanical equipment... shall be erected or enlarged on the roof of an existing residential building" without approval of a conditional use, considering "whether such roof structure has the potential of damaging the uniformity of height or architectural character of the immediate vicinity." Furthermore, roof deck balustrades shall be "set back horizontally at least five (5) feet from all roof edges." The work proposes a new headhouse and rooftop railing. Through multiple site visits, Office of Historic Preservation Staff determined that roof improvements will not be visible. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the rooftop improvements reviewed and exempted by the Office of Historic Preservation.

Plans reviewed are titled "35 Braddock Park," prepared by McPhail, Webb Structural Services, Sladen Feinstein Integrated Lighting, and Design Under Sky Landscape Architecture, and dated July 2025.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1855093, BOA1849656, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL W/PROVISO: that plans are submitted for design review approval for the proposed canopy with respect to scale and design.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1749425
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-07-17
ZBA Hearing Date	2026-08-11
Address	425 E Third ST South Boston 02127
Parcel ID	0602965000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	South Boston Neighborhood MFR/LS
Zoning Article	68
Project Description	Construct a new four-story, two-unit building over existing parking.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Parking or Loading Insufficient FAR Excessive Height Excessive (ft) Rear Yard Insufficient Side Yard Insufficient Front Yard Insufficient Usable Open Space Insufficient Lot Area Insufficient Additional Lot Area Insufficient

Planning Context:

425 East Third Street is an undeveloped, 1,600 square-foot lot, with seven striped and numbered parking spaces utilized by an adjacent residential use.

The project proposes a four-story, two-unit residential building with seven parking spaces on the ground floor, maintaining the existing parking spaces' location and angle. As is the case today, parking is accessed via an access easement on the adjacent site's driveway. At the rear of the building, an elevated deck above parking is proposed to be accessed through unit 2 and a rear staircase.

The surrounding properties are all similarly zoned Multifamily Residential and Multifamily Residential/Local Services and are developed with three- to four-story residential buildings. Rear decks and balconies are common, as is surface parking in the rear/interior of lots. Street parking is available, but limited on the adjacent street.

The site is located within the South Boston Restricted Parking and Restricted Roof overlay districts.



Zoning Analysis:

The project was cited for violation to parking minimums and to lot and building dimensional standards set forth in Article 68, Section 33 of the Boston Zoning Code.

Parking: The minimum required off street parking for the proposed use is three spaces. The project proposes seven spaces which are utilized today by the adjacent property. While this is an overall reduction in parking available to the neighborhood, the project exceeds the required on site parking for the proposed use. Parking will be accessed via an access easement on the adjacent lot, as is the case today for the existing parking. However, the existing drive aisle width will be reduced to approximately 11.5 feet and parking spaces to less than 20 feet long to accommodate the residential building support walls. This design is inconsistent with maneuverability standards in Article 68, Section 33, and Staff recommends a reduction and reconfiguration of parking, particularly in the front of the site, to better account for maneuverability in and out of spaces.

Lot dimensions: Lot dimensional standards are outlined in Table D of Article 68. The side yard setback is further detailed in Article 68-34.6. While ISD cited this section for a side yard violation, Staff does not find the proposed development to be in violation of this section as the lot meets the minimum lot frontage. Per Table D, the minimum lot area shall be 6,000 square feet. The minimum front, side, and rear yard setbacks shall be five feet, three feet, and 20 feet respectively. The lot is significantly smaller, measuring approximately 1,600 square feet. Due to the existing, small lot size, the project is proposing no front or rear yard setback and a three foot side yard setback only on the east side. Throughout the immediate neighborhood, zero lot line properties are frequent, however adjacent lots in this area are consistently set back approximately three feet. Frontages are also accessed with exterior stairs giving a softer appearance to the front facade. While the side and rear building lines may be appropriate with a variance to setback requirements, Staff is not in support of the proposed zero front lot line.

Open Space: Table D of Article 68 also cites that a minimum of 200 square feet of open space is required per dwelling unit, totaling 400 square feet for the subject development. A 184 square foot deck is proposed in the rear of the site, attached to the third story and accessible to Unit 2. Due to the existing, small size of the lot, Staff recommends approval of the proposed open space.

FAR: The maximum FAR for the MFR/LS zoning district is 1.5. This project proposes an FAR of 2.0. While a variance to the maximum FAR may be appropriate on the lot due to its small size,

BOA1749425

2026-08-11

2 Planning Department



Staff believes that the front massing of the building is out of scale and maneuverability on site can be improved. Therefore, Staff does not support the requested FAR variance.

Building Height: The maximum building height set forth in Table D of Article 68 is 35 feet. The proposed residential use will be 43 feet measured at the front property line. Due to the slope of the site which is seven feet higher in the rear, this height is necessary to accommodate three stories above the first floor parking without altering the existing grade on site. Due to the drive aisle separation from adjacent buildings and the frequency at which buildings are found above this height minimum throughout the neighborhood, Staff supports the requested height variance.

Plans reviewed are titled "New Two Family Residence 425 East Third St," prepared by Stefanov Architects and dated April 2025.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1749425, The Planning Department recommends DENIAL WITHOUT PREJUDICE to provide for the revision of plans with consideration of the front facade and its relation to the streetscape and adjacent building lines as well as vehicular maneuverability on site.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1820617
ZBA Submitted Date	2026-02-12
ZBA Hearing Date	2026-08-11
Address	722 E Eighth ST South Boston 02127
Parcel ID	0702622000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	South Boston Neighborhood MFR
Zoning Article	68
Project Description	Renovation of an existing 2 stories parking garage into a detached accessory dwelling unit.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Lot Frontage Insufficient Lot Area Insufficient Parking or Loading Insufficient Off Street Parking Two or More Dwelling Same Lot

Planning Context:

The project proposes to change the use of a pre-existing two-floor garage into a detached accessory dwelling with the second floor as a lived-in unit and the first floor for parking. According to the plans submitted, the proposal is situated on a 4,375 sf lot with an existing three-unit building on the front, an existing 1,233 sf open space, with a paved driveway to the side. The renovations for the first floor include automated sprinklers and a new means of egress on the front with an updated stairway leading to the second floor. The renovations on the second floor include, adding three bedrooms each with their own closets, an automated sprinkler system throughout the unit par with firecode standards, updated insulation, a bathroom with ventilation, a kitchen and living room. With the context of the neighborhood, the proposed plans sit in South Boston, a largely multi-family and triple-decker neighborhood. The project is minimally invasive and contextual to the site which is surrounded by similar building typologies and characterized by houses of similar density and scale with a few large housing developments.

Zoning Analysis:



According to Article 68, the lot minimum requirement is 2,000 sq ft with 1000 sq ft per additional units with lot width frontage minimum being 20ft in MFR subdistricts in South Boston, yet, the majority of the established and existing sites along E Eight Street, E Seventh Street, E Sixth Street and K Street are all noncompliant suggesting a zoning code that is overdue for reform. According to the plans and cited as a violation, the lot area is 4,375 sq ft with existing width frontage being 35 ft which is greater than the minimum required. Despite Article 68, Section 8 Table D requiring 1,000 sq ft per additional units, the detached Accessory Dwelling Unit being built here is the renovation of an existing garage and it doesn't require the increase in lot because it is contextual to the site. It's important to note that there could be a discrepancy of the open space between the submitted plans and what's viewable on Google street view. Open space for the lot sits at 1,233 sq ft but it's possibly paved, and per the dimensional regulations, usable open space is a minimum of 200 sq ft per dwelling unit, and so if the proponent leaves it as parking, there's not going to be open space on the property at all.

The changes proposed in this project are aligned with the overall character of the street, will be contextual in design and massing to its surrounding as it resides in a MFR subdistrict.

The plans reviewed are titled, "722R E Eight Street South Boston" and were prepared by Kuhlmann Architecture and dated 04/01/2025.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1820617, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Katerleen Onufra".

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1825854
ZBA Submitted Date	2026-03-06
ZBA Hearing Date	2026-08-11
Address	57 Mount Vernon ST Dorchester 02125
Parcel ID	0702824000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Dorchester Neighborhood 2F-3000
Zoning Article	65
Project Description	Add a curb cut to make the side yard accessible for off-street parking or off-street loading. Pour new concrete to create driveway entrance.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Side Yard Insufficient

Planning Context:

57 Mt Vernon St sits in a mixed use area of the Dorchester Neighborhood. It is surrounded by two- and three-story two- and multi-unit buildings. The project sits a block off of Columbia Road, a major thoroughfare in Dorchester, and on and off ramps for Interstate 93. The project intends to add a less than 10 foot curb cut to the sidewalk fronting Mt Vernon St and add a grade and new concrete to create a driveway entrance. This curb cut will not affect the existing conditions of the sidewalk, including street trees and utility poles. While there are few driveways in this area, there are many similar curb cuts along this street alone to provide vehicle access to alleyways. Additionally, the size of the curb cut is equivalent to just one on-street parking spot and the building is located in a transit-rich area within walking distance of the JFK/UMass stop on the MBTA Red Line.

Zoning Analysis:

This project has one dimensional violation. It violates Article 65 section 42.7, stating that no side yard providing off-street parking or off-street loading facilities shall be less than 10 feet. The current side yard is 8 feet, thus adding access to create a driveway is in violation of 65.42-7. Given the location of the house and the fact that this curb cut will only take up one on-street parking spot, relief is recommended.

Plans reviewed are titled "Plans of proposed driveway" and were reviewed on 01/30/26.

Recommendation:



In reference to BOA1825854, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1835605
ZBA Submitted Date	2026-04-02
ZBA Hearing Date	2026-08-11
Address	10 Northampton ST Roxbury 02119
Parcel ID	0802038000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Roxbury Neighborhood Newmarket IDA
Zoning Article	50
Project Description	The proposed project will be an alteration of an existing building from office to a rental agency for cars.
Relief Type	Conditional Use
Violations	Conditional Use

Planning Context:

The proposed project would convert an existing unoccupied office space into a new location for an Enterprise Car Rental. This project would only be an alteration to the existing building and not expand it or alter the site. The site is located at the corner of Northampton St and Fellows St. There is a one story building on the southeast corner of the site with the remainder being a paved asphalt parking lot that is accessed via two curb cuts along Northampton St. The surrounding uses are a mixture of manufacturing, residential, institutional and commercial. The site is identified as Urban Renewal Parcel 44 that is located in the South End Urban Renewal Plan Area. There are no use or dimensional restrictions for this Urban Renewal Parcel. The site is also located in the Coastal Flood Resiliency Overlay District which is made to protect people and structures from the adverse effects of sea level rise.

Zoning Analysis:

The proposed project would require a conditional use permit to convert the present site to a rental agency for cars use. The project would have minimal impact to surrounding context and would only be an alteration to the existing building. The proposed use would be in line with the current diversity of uses in the surrounding context. The project would meet the conditions outlined in section 6-3 and may be recommended for a conditional use permit.

“Enterprise Holdings Inc.” Drawn by J. Ferrera Associates Inc. Dated February 16th, 2026.



Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1835605, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1820136
ZBA Submitted Date	2026-02-10
ZBA Hearing Date	2026-08-11
Address	1013 Harrison AV Roxbury 02119
Parcel ID	0802445001
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Roxbury Neighborhood Dudley Square EDA
Zoning Article	50
Project Description	The project would update a vacant lot to serve as an open air educational space.
Relief Type	Conditional Use
Violations	Conditional Use

Planning Context:

The proposed project would be converting an empty unused lot to an open space educational area serving as an ancillary use for the neighboring Benjamin Franklin Institute of Technology. The lot will have a parking area for automotive educational use, new fencing to properly correspond with the property line and swing gates with the ability to lock. The next door Benjamin Franklin Institute of Technology, was a project reviewed and approved at the BPDA board in 2021. The project was not a part of PLAN: Nubian Square which encompasses this area however it responded to the objectives outlined in the Roxbury Strategic Master Plan by providing a community anchor and economic driver. The immediate context is made up of local businesses and active developments as part of PLAN: Nubian Square which aim to to create jobs, develop affordable housing and be inclusive of the community.

Zoning Analysis:

The proposed would be an educational/technical college ancillary use which is conditional. Being that this use would be an extension of the approved Benjamin Franklin Institute of Technology it would also successfully respond to the objectives outlined in the Roxbury Strategic Master Plan. The project meets planning goals and the conditions outlined in Section 6-3, therefore can be recommended for a conditional use permit.

“Benjamin Franklin Cummings Institute of Technology” Drawn by Studio G Architects Dated August 1st, 2023



Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1820136, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1774508
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-09-11
ZBA Hearing Date	2026-08-11
Address	37 Kimball ST Dorchester 02122
Parcel ID	1500266000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Dorchester Neighborhood 2F-5000
Zoning Article	65
Project Description	Widen existing curb cut
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Parking in Front Yard

Planning Context:

The proposed project site is located in Fields Corner about a 10-minute walk from Fields Corner MBTA Station and an eight-minute walk from Ronan Park. This is a residential street with two- to three- unit buildings and several lots which are fully paved to provide residential parking.

This project is the same scope of work as 39 Kimball Street (BOA1774510). The curb extension is proposed across two lots that share a common parking area.

Zoning Analysis:

The proposed project is to widen the curb cut from 13 feet to 50 feet in order to increase parking for the residences at 37 to 39 Kimball Street, which use Orchardfield Street to access their rear parking. Because the widened curb cut and new parking spaces are facing the street, they violate Article 65.41.4 standards which prohibit parking in the front yard. The entire yard (facing Orchardfield St) is currently paved for parking.

This is an existing narrow street and sidewalk with existing substandard conditions. The proposed 50-foot curb cut would accentuate unfavorable public right-of-way conditions. Therefore, the parking location violation is not recommended for relief.

Plans reviewed are titled "Proposed Site Certified Plot Plan", by Boston Survey Inc., and dated 10/27/26.

Recommendation:



In reference to BOA1774508, The Planning Department recommends DENIAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1774510
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-09-11
ZBA Hearing Date	2026-08-11
Address	39 Kimball ST Dorchester 02122
Parcel ID	1500266000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Dorchester Neighborhood 2F-5000
Zoning Article	65
Project Description	Widen existing curb cut
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Parking in Front Yard

Planning Context:

The proposed project site is located in Fields Corner about a 10-minute walk from Fields Corner MBTA Station and an eight-minute walk from Ronan Park. This is a residential street with two- to three- unit buildings and several lots which are fully paved to provide residential parking.

This project is the same scope of work as 37 Kimball Street (BOA1774508). The curb extension is proposed across two lots that share a common parking area.

Zoning Analysis:

The proposed project is to widen the curb cut from 13 feet to 50 feet in order to increase parking for the residences at 37 to 39 Kimball Street, which use Orchardfield Street to access their rear parking. Because the widened curb cut and new parking spaces are facing the street, they violate Article 65.41.4 standards which prohibit parking in the front yard. The entire yard (facing Orchardfield St) is currently paved for parking.

This is an existing narrow street and sidewalk with existing substandard conditions. The proposed 50-foot curb cut would accentuate unfavorable public right-of-way conditions. Therefore, the parking location violation is not recommended for relief.

Plans reviewed are titled "Proposed Site Certified Plot Plan", by Boston Survey Inc., and dated 10/27/26.

Recommendation:



In reference to BOA1774510, The Planning Department recommends DENIAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1801106
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-11-25
ZBA Hearing Date	2026-08-11
Address	213 to 221 Bowdoin ST Dorchester 02122
Parcel ID	1501311000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Dorchester Neighborhood LC
Zoning Article	65
Project Description	Construct a second-story addition above the existing commercial building to create seven new residential units (five two-bedroom and two one-bedroom units), while retaining the existing ground-floor commercial use.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	FAR Excessive Usable Open Space Insufficient Parking or Loading Insufficient screening and buffering

Planning Context:

The property contains an existing one-story commercial building occupied by a market and is located within a neighborhood commercial corridor.

The proposal is to construct a second-story addition containing seven residential dwelling units above the existing commercial building while retaining the ground-floor commercial use. The project adds five two-bedroom units and two one-bedroom units without expanding the building footprint.

The proposal introduces additional housing while maintaining the existing commercial use and established neighborhood-serving retail. Similar mixed-use buildings with residential units above commercial space are located adjacent to and in the immediate vicinity of the site, making the proposal consistent with the surrounding development pattern.

Zoning Analysis:

The proposed project constructs a second-story addition above an existing commercial building to create seven residential dwelling units while retaining the existing ground-floor commercial



use. The proposal adds five two-bedroom units and two one-bedroom units without expanding the existing building footprint.

Article 65, Section 16, Floor Area Ratio (FAR): The proposal results in a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1.34, exceeding the maximum permitted FAR of 1.0 within the Local Convenience (LC) Subdistrict. The additional floor area is limited to a second-story addition above the existing commercial building. Similar mixed-use buildings with residential units above commercial space are located adjacent to and within the surrounding area, making the proposed intensity compatible with the established development pattern.

Article 65, Section 16, Usable Open Space: The proposal does not provide the required usable open space for the proposed residential units. The existing building is constructed to the property lines, leaving no available area to accommodate usable open space. Because the proposal consists solely of a second-story addition, the existing building footprint and site conditions remain unchanged.

Article 65, Section 41, Off-Street Parking: Seven off-street parking spaces are required for the seven proposed residential units. The property currently contains three off-street parking spaces, and the proposal does not increase the existing parking supply, resulting in a deficiency of four spaces. The project maintains the existing building footprint and ground-floor commercial use, limiting opportunities to provide additional parking. The property is located in a transit-rich area with access to public transportation, reducing reliance on private vehicles and making the requested parking relief appropriate.

Article 65, Section 39, Screening and Buffering: Zoning relief is required for screening and buffering. The proposal introduces residential units above an existing commercial building while maintaining the existing building footprint and overall site layout. The applicant should work with the City of Boston through the design review process to develop an appropriate screening and buffering plan that is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and minimizes potential impacts on adjacent properties.

Article 79 – Inclusionary Zoning: The proposal creates seven new residential dwelling units and is therefore subject to the requirements of Article 79 of the Boston Zoning Code, as applicable. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall comply with the Inclusionary Zoning requirements, including execution of a Housing Agreement with the City of Boston.



Plans titled "213 Bowdoin Street, Dorchester, MA – Proposed 7 Units Apartments Addition," prepared by M&T Constructions + Design and dated August 18, 2025, were reviewed in support of this recommendation.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1801106, the Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH PROVISOS that revised plans be submitted to the Planning Department for design review and that the applicant execute a Housing Agreement in accordance with Article 79 – Inclusionary Zoning prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1828690
ZBA Submitted Date	2026-03-17
ZBA Hearing Date	2026-08-11
Address	472 Ashmont ST Dorchester 02122
Parcel ID	1602071000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Dorchester Neighborhood 2F-5000
Zoning Article	65
Project Description	Construct a rear yard attached garage with a new third unit located above.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	FAR Excessive Height Excessive (stories) Rear Yard Insufficient Front Yard Insufficient Lot Area Insufficient Lot Frontage Insufficient Lot Width Insufficient Use: Forbidden

Planning Context:

The proposed project would add a rear garage with a single unit above to a currently existing two-unit building. While the proposed project is above the maximum unit count for this area, this reflects a disconnect between the zoning code and the built reality of the neighborhood. Triple-deckers and converted one and two unit buildings are common in this area. This building highlights the potential need for zoning reform in order to bring usage in line with development in the neighborhood. Over half of the requested variances are for prior existing nonconformities that are not being extended in any meaningful way. The proposed building is working to match the scale of its existing neighborhood while increasing overall unit count.

The area is not well connected to public transit. Parking on property is extremely common, with tandem parking and garages being present on most buildings along GarnerSt.

Zoning Analysis:

The area is zoned for up to two units. However, three unit residential buildings are common in this area, with many neighbors being in the traditional triple-decker style. The proposed project



is of a similar scale and density to nearby existing projects. The building manages to fit a unit above the maximum without creating a building that stands out from neighborhood character. The appropriate sizing of the building, with the added neighborhood three family context, points to the appropriate fit of three family residential.

The project has been cited for insufficient lot area. The zoning code requires a lot of 5000 square feet, while the proposed project is located on a lot that is around 4,087 Square feet. This again highlights a disconnect between the zoning code and built reality. The proposed lot is of a similar size to typical lots for the neighborhood. If this regulation were to be strictly followed, none of the existing neighborhood would be allowed to be built. This project is of a similar scale to nearby buildings, on a lot that is similar in scale to nearby lots, highlighting its appropriate fit in the area.

The lot width and frontage is 47 feet while the zoning code requires a frontage of 50 feet. This is also a disconnect between the zoning code and reality. The parcels along Ashmont St are similarly sized. The frontage requirement is the same along all of Ashmont St. This means that almost every building on this road is out of compliance with the existing zoning code. These violations create an unusable parcel and places a hardship on the proponent in order to follow the zoning code.

The proposed project would have an FAR of 0.99. The zoning code requires a maximum FAR of 0.5. The existing building is already above this maximum at 0.77 and is one of the smaller buildings currently located on this block. This again reflects a disconnect between the zoning code and the built reality of the area. Triple-deckers are extremely common and the height of the building creates a situation where FARs are commonly between 0.75 and 1.25 for the area. The proposed project is in line with its neighborhood design characteristics and is an appropriate fit for the development pattern in the area.

The next violation is due to the excessive height of the proposed structure. The neighborhood is zoned for two and a half stories, while the project proposes a full three stories. This is not reflective of the larger built environment. Where two and a half stories is predominant, full three-story buildings are also present within the area. Even though it is half a story above the maximum height in stories, the project is only proposing a building height of 34 —below the maximum of 35 feet—again highlighting the appropriate dimensions of the project. This requirement is not at all reflective of the larger development patterns in the area and highlights the need for potential zoning reform. In addition, the existing building is already a full three



stories and fits within the existing neighborhood character. However, while the rear addition is matching the existing building, the proposed third floor of the addition would be unfinished while the existing third floor is finished. This unoccupied space serves to increase the overall massing of the project without adding additional habitable space. This third floor rear attic should be removed in order to promote a break up in the massing.

The rear yard has a required depth of 30 feet, where the proposed project is leaving a setback of 3.5 feet. The existing setback is currently 26.4 feet, already below the minimum. As with the side yard setbacks, this again highlights the disconnect between zoning code and built reality. The proposed project is being built to a similar scale as its neighbors, on a similar lot size to its neighbors. If this requirement were to be strictly followed, the character of the neighborhood would change drastically. The proposed setbacks are in line with neighboring properties and fits well within established neighborhood design.

The front yard is cited as another violation, as the proposed front yard is 10.7 feet, whereas this subdistrict requires 15 feet at minimum. This violation is an existing nonconformity. Plans show that the front-of-house addition is not expected to worsen front yard dimensions.

Plans reviewed are titled "472 Ashmont St" and prepared by 686 Architects and dated 12/11/25.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1828690 The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH PROVISOS: that plans be submitted to the Planning Department for design review and so that the new addition attic floor be eliminated to reduce the height and break up the massing of the proposed project.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1782691
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-09-25
ZBA Hearing Date	2026-08-11
Address	121R River ST Mattapan 02126
Parcel ID	1703854000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Dorchester Neighborhood 2F-6000
Zoning Article	65
Project Description	The proposal would be the conversion of an existing unattached garage into an ADU.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	FAR Excessive Rear Yard Insufficient Side Yard Insufficient Lot Area Insufficient Two or More Dwelling Same Lot

Planning Context:

The proposed project would be the conversion of an unattached garage in the rear yard of a two and a half story, two-unit dwelling into a Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU). The ADU conversion will not expand the footprint of the garage and will only expand the second floor of it with newly constructed dormers. The property is on the corner lot of River St and Idaho St with the existing residence facing River St and the garage having a direct driveway from Idaho St with existing outdoor surface off-street parking. The surrounding area is mostly residential with a mixture of all scales from one-unit to multi-units. The site is within the Lower Mills West Neighborhood Design Overlay District established to protect the historic character, existing scale and quality of the local environment.

Zoning Analysis:

The proponents are seeking relief for five zoning violations. Two violations of insufficient side yard and rear yard are existing and will not be worsened by the proposed work as the ADU conversion will not expand the footprint of the existing garage. The lot area is insufficient at 5,212 SF due to the minimum required being 6,000 SF, however this is another existing zoning violation that will not be worsened. Due to the new occupiable space developed in the ADU the



proposed floor area ratio is excessive at 0.56 due to the maximum being 0.4. Lastly due to the new ADU, there will be a violation of two or more dwellings on the same lot.

The proposed ADU is in line with the Boston ADU Guidebook for conversion of an existing garage. While the off-street surface parking in front of the ADU is not in line with design recommendations, it is an existing paved area for parking that will not be expanded. The proposal is following the design recommendations and necessary building code upgrades provided by the guidebook. In other zoning districts with updated regulations more reflective of present city and state policy for ADUs this ADU design would be zoning compliant. Zoning reform should be considered in this district to accommodate ADUs in line with City and State recommendations.

“ADU” Drawn by Rosa Design Construction LLC Dated January 27th, 2027

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1782691, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH PROVISIO/S: that plans be submitted to the Planning Department for design review.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1817575
ZBA Submitted Date	2026-01-30
ZBA Hearing Date	2026-08-11
Address	86 Brown AV Roslindale 02131
Parcel ID	1903740000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Roslindale Neighborhood 2F-5000
Zoning Article	67
Project Description	The proposed project will add an addition to an existing two-unit residential structure, increasing the unit count to four units.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	FAR Excessive Rear Yard Insufficient Usable Open Space Insufficient Additional Lot Area Insufficient Use: Forbidden

Planning Context:

The proposed project is located on Brown Avenue in Roslindale across the street from the Brooke Charter School. The area surrounding the property is primarily residential with large, planted lots. The property is located near Cummins Highway which is served by three MBTA bus routes.

The project proposes an addition to the existing structure that will expand it from two to four residential units. There are two, two-bedroom units and two, three-bedroom units proposed. The scale of the addition is similar to the existing structure and its overall scale is consistent with other residential structures in the area.

The lot is within an area proposed to be rezoned under the draft Neighborhood Housing Zoning Initiative which seeks to allow small-scale increases in housing density like the one proposed. The lot is proposed in a Residential Decker-4 District which allows up to four dwelling units per lot while maintaining key standards like permeable area of the lot. This project cannot be reviewed under the proposed zoning but it provides a point of reference for the type of development the initiative has identified as appropriate.



Zoning Analysis:

The project is cited for five zoning violations: forbidden use, and four additional dimensional violations. Of the four dimensional violations, one appears to be incorrect. The project is cited for insufficient additional lot area; the subdistrict separates requirements between one and two family detached structures, semi-attached structures, and other use. The proposed four-unit residential use would fall under the “Other Use” category of Article 67 Table C which requires a minimum lot area of 8,000 square feet and no additional lot area for additional dwelling units. The subject lot is 9,440 square feet which complies with this requirement.

The project is cited for excessive floor area ratio (FAR). The maximum FAR is 0.5 whereas an FAR of 0.68 is proposed. There are examples of properties within the subdistrict with an FAR higher than the proposed 0.68.

The project is also cited for insufficient rear yard, insufficient usable open space, and forbidden use. The existing rear yard is 35.5 feet, below the minimum 40 feet that is required. The addition will comply with the minimum rear yard requirement, but the addition will constitute an extension of a nonconforming building. The subdistrict requires 1,750 square feet of open space per residential unit or a total of 7,000 square feet of open space for a four-unit residential structure. The plans show that 5,955 square feet of usable open space is proposed. Lastly, a four unit, multifamily residential use is a forbidden use in the subdistrict. At 9,440 square feet, the lot is one of the larger residential lots in the subdistrict which make it an appropriate place to add additional residential units while respecting the existing neighborhood context. The minimum rear yard and usable open space requirements show how restrictive the existing zoning is in this subdistrict and present a case for zoning reform. The proposed four-unit structure is a reasonable use of the subject lot, and it will not be injurious to the neighborhood.

Plans reviewed “86 Brown Avenue” prepared by Richard Alvord Architects dated 11/24/2020.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1817575, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.



Planning Department

CITY of BOSTON

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1787126
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-10-09
ZBA Hearing Date	2026-08-11
Address	86 Walworth ST Roslindale 02131
Parcel ID	2001175000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Roslindale Neighborhood 2F-5000
Zoning Article	67
Project Description	Convert an existing two-unit, two and a half-story building to a three-story, six-unit building. Includes eight parking spaces.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Height Excessive (stories) Parking or Loading Insufficient FAR Excessive Usable Open Space Insufficient Use: forbidden (MFR)

Planning Context:

The proposed project is in a residential area just outside of the study area of the Roslindale Square: Squares + Streets Small Area Plan, adopted by the BPDA Board in February 2025. For residential areas in and around the Roslindale Square, the Land Use and Design Framework in the Plan includes the following recommendation: “Where this Plan envisions continued small-scale residential uses and incremental growth, update residential zoning to reflect existing built patterns, support safe walking routes to Roslindale Square, and enable the development of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and small multi-unit residential buildings.”

Draft zoning was released for Walworth Street on July 17, 2026, as part of the Neighborhood Housing Zoning initiative. The goals of this project are to create clear, straightforward rules that better align with how Boston neighborhoods look today, making it easier for homeowners to renovate, put on additions, and adapt their properties over time. In the proposed draft zoning, 86 Walworth St is in an RD-4 district. The proposed project is mostly aligned with the draft zoning, as it complies with the proposed requirements for maximum Height (3 stories with a sloped roof), maximum Building Lot Coverage (30%), minimum Permeable Area of Lot (25%), and minimum Front Yard (8 ft), Side Yard (15 ft cumulative, 3 ft minimum) and Rear Yard (15 ft).



Because of the large rear addition, the project does seem to be above the maximum allowed Building Floor Plate in the draft zoning (2,400 sq ft max, proposed is about 3,625 sq ft).

However, the design of the building means that it reads as two buildings each with compliant floor plates.

The project also exceeds the proposed maximum allowed units of 4. However, the proposed zoning also creates a pathway for projects with additional dwellings units through a conditional use permit. The draft zoning states that “In reaching its decision [to grant a conditional use permit], the Board of Appeal shall consider whether such Proposed Project has the potential of increasing accessibility and affordability in the immediate vicinity as well as compatibility with the surrounding area.”

Zoning Analysis:

The proposed project is three stories with a sloped roof, exceeding the allowed height of two and a half stories. However, there are other three-story buildings on the block, making the proposed height in context with the surrounding area. The sloped roof in the proposed design also helps keep the proposed building in context with the neighborhood.

The project also does not comply with the required usable open space of 1,750 sq ft per dwelling unit. The proposed project includes usable open space in the form of a large backyard and individual decks for each unit, giving it a total of 5,357 sq ft or 888 sq ft per dwelling unit. Although this does not comply with the zoning, this is a substantial amount of usable open space for a small multi-family project and includes quality spaces in the form of both contiguous yard space and private deck spaces.

The project also does not comply with the minimum parking requirement of 2 spaces per dwelling unit, or 12 spaces total. The project does provide a substantial amount of parking with 8 spaces, or a ratio 1.33. However, it also appears that there is not enough space in the drive aisle for cars to turn in and out of the six proposed perpendicular parking spaces. The project should therefore receive design review to ensure adequate maneuverability. If the two visitor spaces at the end of the driveway were eliminated, this may provide space to maneuver in and out of the six perpendicular spaces. This would result in a reduction of parking spaces, however, a lower parking ratio would be appropriate in this area, as it is highly transit accessible (as exemplified by its inclusion in the Squares + Streets initiative).



The project also proposes a multifamily use, which is forbidden in this 2F district. However, this use aligned with the goals of Roslindale Squares + Streets and Neighborhood Housing, which include creating more housing throughout neighborhoods, especially in areas with access to transit and other amenities. This is also an unusually large lot (12,651 sq ft) which makes it particularly appropriate for a multifamily project.

The project also has a proposed FAR of about 0.81 and therefore exceeds the allowed FAR of 0.5. Most of the additional massing would be in the rear of the lot, minimizing the impact of the surrounding area. Additionally, because of the large lot size, there is also room to provide substantial usable open space in addition to the six-unit building.

Plans reviewed "PROPOSED RENOVATION & ADDITION 6 UNIT MULTI-FAMILY" prepared by "Choo & Company, Inc" and dated "7/2/2025"

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1787126, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH PROVISIO/S: that plans be submitted to the Planning Department for design review with attention to parking maneuverability.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1860541
ZBA Submitted Date	2026-06-12
ZBA Hearing Date	2026-08-11
Address	118 Lexington ST East Boston 02128
Parcel ID	0102894000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	East Boston Neighborhood EBR-3
Zoning Article	53
Project Description	The proposal seeks to renovate and expand the existing two-story, one-unit dwelling, including a rear extension of the principal structure, an extension of the existing west-side shed dormer, a new shed dormer on the east side, new skylights, and related interior reconfiguration.
Relief Type	Conditional Use
Violations	Roof Structure Restrictions

Planning Context:

The property at 118 Lexington Street contains a principal structure fronting Lexington Street and a smaller connected secondary structure toward the rear along the eastern lot line. The proposal would extend the principal structure rearward and reduce and narrow the front portion of the secondary structure at the connection, while retaining its rearmost wall.

At the second floor, the proposal would extend the existing west-side wall and shed dormer rearward, add a corresponding shed dormer on the east side, and install skylights on the east roof slope. These changes would expand the building and alter both side roof slopes. The existing front-gabled roof would continue to define the building's appearance from Lexington Street, although the east-side dormer would be visible in angled views from the public way along the eastern side of the property.

The surrounding area is predominantly residential and consists mainly of one-, two-, and three-unit buildings. Narrow, deep lots and closely spaced structures characterize the immediate area. Buildings commonly occupy much of the lot width and extend substantially into the lot, resulting in limited separation and small or irregular rear yards.



The property lies within the East Boston Neighborhood Restricted Roof Area, where alterations to the uppermost roof generally require additional zoning review.

Zoning Analysis:

The proposal received one zoning citation for roof-structure restrictions.

The property lies within the EBR-3 subdistrict and the East Boston Neighborhood Restricted Roof Area. Under Article 53, Section 53-25.1, an addition that alters an existing residential roof requires conditional use approval under Sections 6-2, 6-3, and 6-4. The Board must consider how the work would affect building height and the architectural character of the immediate area.

The second-floor expansion triggers the citation because it alters the uppermost roof. The proposal would extend the existing west-side wall and shed dormer rearward, add a corresponding shed dormer on the east side, and install skylights on the east roof slope.

The work would expand and reorganize habitable space beneath the roof rather than create a new structure above it. The building would remain two stories, with no material increase in overall height. The front-gabled roof form would remain intact, while the proposed work would be concentrated along the side slopes and toward the rear. Although the east-side dormer would be visible in angled views from the public way along the eastern side of the property, it would remain behind the front roofline and integrated into the roof slope.

The scale and placement of the roof alterations appear compatible with the existing building and surrounding residential context. By retaining the front elevation and the building's established relationship to the street, the proposal is not expected to adversely affect the uniformity of building height or the architectural character of the immediate area. The proposal also raises no clear concerns under Section 6-3 regarding residential use, pedestrian or vehicle safety, or nuisance impacts.

Separate from the cited roof condition, the plans indicate an existing rear-yard nonconformity. The rear yard must equal one-third of the 100-foot lot depth, requiring approximately 33 feet, 4 inches. The existing rear yard measures 22 feet, 4 ³/₄ inches, resulting in a deficiency of approximately 11 feet. The proposal would extend the principal structure toward the connected secondary structure and reduce and narrow the front portion of the secondary structure at the



connection. The rearmost wall would remain in place, so the work would not reduce the setback at the deepest point or extend the existing encroachment farther toward the rear lot line.

In summary, the proposal would retain the building's two-story height and primary roof form while introducing subordinate changes along the sides and rear. The roof alterations appear compatible with the existing building and satisfy the considerations applicable to conditional use approval. The rear extension would add building area within an existing nonconforming rear yard, but would not move the rearmost wall closer to the rear lot line.

The reviewed plans are titled "118 Lexington Street, East Boston, MA 02128", prepared by Studio Cann and issued for review on August 22, 2025.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1860541, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1865030
ZBA Submitted Date	2026-06-25
ZBA Hearing Date	2026-08-11
Address	34 Vinson ST Dorchester 02124
Parcel ID	1600807000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Dorchester Neighborhood 1F-6000
Zoning Article	65
Project Description	Renovate the second story of an existing two-unit residential building to extend the livable area.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	FAR Excessive

Planning Context:

The proposed project site is located in Fields Corner about a five-minute walk from Fields Corner MBTA Station and a 15-minute walk from Ronan Park. This is a residential neighborhood with predominantly 2.5- to 3-story residential buildings with modest side yards and deeper rear yards.

The proposed project is to extend an existing roof dormer to increase livable area in the second story unit of an existing two-unit home. The ongoing Neighborhood Housing Zoning Initiative encourages contextually-sensitive infill development and small-scale additions to existing properties, which our current zoning code prohibits.

Zoning Analysis:

The proposed project violates dimensional requirements for Floor Area Ratio in 1F-6000 subdistricts. The allowed FAR is 0.5 maximum. The proposed FAR is 0.91, which is a 0.1 difference from the building's existing FAR. Both the existing and proposed FAR violate standards of the code.

Surrounding residential buildings have a similar FAR to what is proposed. The proposed increase (+70 sq feet) in livable area does not create bulk which is out of context with its surroundings, and the proposed building footprint does not change at the ground level. Because



the proposed dormer extension does not risk the availability of adequate light and air, the zoning violation is recommended for relief.

Plans reviewed are titled, "EXISTING TWO FAMILY RENOVATION 34 VINSON ST, DORCHESTER, MA 02124", prepared by Lighthouse Architecture & Design, and dated 4/3/26.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1865030, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1838409
ZBA Submitted Date	2026-04-10
ZBA Hearing Date	2026-08-11
Address	27 to 29 Ballard ST Jamaica Plain 02130
Parcel ID	1901467000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Jamaica Plain Neighborhood 3F-5000
Zoning Article	55
Project Description	The proposed project will add a new residential unit in the basement of an existing two-unit, 2.5-story residential structure. It will also expand the living area of one of the existing units by adding a dormer and newly finished space to the attic of the building.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	FAR Excessive Side Yard Insufficient

Planning Context:

The proposed project is located on Ballard Street in Jamaica Plain which is a primarily residential area. Structures on Ballard Street are generally 2.5 to 3.5 stories tall and are spaced very closely with one another.

The proposed project will add a dormer to the existing 2.5-story structure to expand the living space for the second story residential unit. It will also add a residential unit in the basement and four new parking spaces built with permeable pavers.

Zoning Analysis:

The project is cited for two violations: excessive floor area ratio (FAR) and insufficient side yard. The existing FAR is 0.56, below the maximum of 0.6. The plans do not show the proposed FAR however, at approximately 1,000 square feet per floor including the expanded attic living space, the 4,902 square foot lot will mean the FAR around 1.0. There are examples of properties in the subdistrict with an FAR higher than 1.0. The goal of FAR is to regulate the bulk of buildings in relation to the lot size. The proposed bulk of the building in relation to the lot size is consistent with properties in the surrounding area. The required side yard in the subdistrict is 7 feet, 10 feet from a neighboring structure, and an aggregate side yard of 17 feet. The existing 2.2 and 12.9



foot side yards are an existing non-conformity. The proposed dormer will extend the non-conformity vertically. However, the dormer is proposed on the south side of the property where the existing side yard is 12.9 feet meaning the dormer will maintain adequate light and air between the subject property and neighboring structures.

Plans reviewed "27-29 Ballard Street" prepared by "Nordesign & Build LLC" dated 2/16/2026.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1838409, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1811706
ZBA Submitted Date	2026-01-13
ZBA Hearing Date	2026-08-11
Address	360 Princeton ST East Boston 02128
Parcel ID	0100269000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	East Boston Neighborhood EBR-3
Zoning Article	53
Project Description	Build three (3) roof decks for each floor of the building.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Rear Yard Insufficient

Planning Context:

This case was deferred from 4/28/2026 and 6/16/2026. No new plans have been submitted so the Planning Department's recommendation remains the same.

The proposed project currently supports three (3) units conforming to its surrounding context of other three- and two-story structures. The project proposes to erect three (3) new rear decks for each floor of the structure. Rear decks and upper story balconies are contextual to the site and can be found in the surrounding area, including on several structures on the proposed projects block. The lot is generally shallower than other properties on the block.

The surrounding neighborhood of East Boston is characterized by medium density residential, industrial and commercial subdistricts including the Logan Airport, and the harbor. The proposed project is about 160 ft to the E Eagle St at Chelsea St MBTA bus stop for bus line 121, 0.16 miles to the Chelsea St at Eagle Square MBTA bus stop for bus line 112, and 0.5 miles from the Wood Island stop for the MBTA Blue Line.

Zoning Analysis:

The refusal letter states one (1) violation of the Zoning Code of The proposed project triggered Article 53, Table F of the Code, which requires the minimum rear yard to be $\frac{1}{3}$ lot depth. In the case of 360 Princeton Street the minimum rear yard would need to be 18 ft, with the building currently sitting at 20 ft. However, the proposed project violates this requirement with the addition of the rear decks as the rear yard would become approximately 8 ft. While the creation



of the rear deck violates the minimum rear yard requirement, the deck does create private, usable open space for all units of the building and accounts for the construction of stairs to the rear of the building. Due to this violation, the Planning Department recommends the plans undergo Design Review, with a specific focus on shrinking the depth of the rear decks.

The plans reviewed are titled ALT1804289 Stamped Set for ZBA and were reviewed 12/12/25. They were prepared by Rangel Planning Design.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1811706, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH PROVISIO/S: that plans be submitted to the Planning Department for design review with a specific focus on the depth of the rear decks to increase the size of the rear yard while maintaining adequate egress.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1844018
ZBA Submitted Date	2026-04-29
ZBA Hearing Date	2026-08-11
Address	7 to 9 Murray CT East Boston 02128
Parcel ID	0104842000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	East Boston Neighborhood EBR-3
Zoning Article	53
Project Description	The proposal seeks to construct a one story vertical addition above the existing three story, three unit dwelling, resulting in a four story, four unit residential building. The existing exterior deck and stair system would be extended to serve the new unit and provide private access to a roof deck. The associated interior work is limited to the existing third floor and the proposed fourth story.
Relief Type	Variance, Conditional Use
Violations	Extension of Non Conforming Use Height Excessive (stories) Height Excessive (ft) Front Yard Excessive Side Yard Insufficient Rear Yard Insufficient Roof Structure Restrictions

Planning Context:

The project was deferred from July 28, 2026 to August 11, 2026. No revised plans have been submitted or reviewed, and the analysis remains unchanged.

The project at 7–9 Murray Court proposes a one-story vertical addition to the existing three-story, three-unit dwelling, resulting in a four-story, four-unit residential building. The existing exterior stair and deck system would be extended to serve the new unit and provide private access to a roof deck.

The surrounding area is predominantly residential and consists primarily of three-unit buildings. One- and two-unit residences, larger multifamily buildings, and mixed-use properties are also present, though less common.



Lots in the immediate vicinity are generally narrow, deep, and closely developed. Buildings typically occupy most of the lot width, are positioned at or near the front and side lot lines, and extend substantially into the lot, resulting in limited side-yard separation and relatively small or irregular rear yards.

The property is within the Coastal Flood Resilience Overlay District. PLAN: East Boston identifies climate-related flooding as a significant risk to housing in low-lying areas, including Paris Flats, Maverick Central, and Harbor View. Development within the overlay is reviewed for building access, ground-floor elevation, and the placement of mechanical systems. New or expanded living space must be located above the applicable Sea Level Rise–Design Flood Elevation.

It also lies within the Groundwater Conservation Overlay District, which is intended to protect wood-pile-supported structures from groundwater depletion, preserve structural integrity, and reduce surface-water runoff and pollution.

In addition, the property is located within the East Boston Neighborhood Restricted Roof Area, which imposes additional limitations on roof structures and upper-level improvements.

Zoning Analysis:

The proposal received seven zoning citations concerning use, building height in stories and feet, front-, side-, and rear-yard setbacks, and roof-structure restrictions. The property is located in the EBR-3 subdistrict. Article 53, Section 53-5.1, Table A, and Table F establish the applicable use and dimensional requirements.

For the use citation, Table A allows “Household Living, 3–6 Dwelling Units” in the EBR-3 Mid-Block Lot subdistrict, subject to Footnote (2). Footnote (2) permits up to six dwelling units on lots with more than 55 feet of frontage but limits lots with 55 feet or less to three dwelling units. Because the subject lot has 29.5 feet of frontage, no more than three dwelling units are allowed as of right. The proposed increase from three to four dwelling units thus exceeds the frontage-based limit.

For the building-height citations, Table F permits a maximum height of three stories and 35 feet in the EBR-3 subdistrict. The plans show a proposed height of four stories and approximately 41 feet 1 inch. The proposal also exceeds both the maximum number of stories and the maximum height in feet.



For the front-yard setback citation, Table F requires a setback of between 3 and 5 feet. The plans show an existing and proposed setback of zero feet along Murray Court. Because the addition retains the existing front wall, the existing front-yard nonconformity would remain.

For the side-yard setback citation, Table F requires a minimum setback of 3 feet. The plans show an existing and proposed setback of zero feet. Because the addition follows the existing building footprint and side walls, the existing side-yard nonconformity would remain.

For the rear-yard setback citation, Table F requires a rear yard equal to one-third of the lot depth. Lot depths of approximately 47 feet along the east lot line and 49.5 feet along the west lot line require setbacks of approximately 15.7 feet and 16.5 feet, respectively. The plans show a setback of 14.1 feet along the east lot line and 16.6 feet along the west lot line. The rear yard is therefore deficient along the east lot line and appears to comply along the west lot line.

For the roof-structure citation, the property lies within the East Boston Neighborhood Restricted Roof Area. Under Article 53, Section 53-25.1, the proposed vertical addition above the existing main roof requires conditional use approval under Sections 6-2, 6-3, and 6-4. The proposed residential use is appropriate for the EBR-3 subdistrict and generally consistent with the surrounding residential context. The proposed fourth dwelling unit, however, exceeds the three-unit limit applicable to the lot based on its frontage.

The proposed vertical addition would introduce one-story massing with no setback from the front roof edge, causing it to appear oversized in relation to the existing building. Because it would be the first vertical addition of this scale along Murray Court, the proposal may also influence the design of future rooftop additions in the area. Similar additions positioned at or near the front roof edge could cumulatively alter the visible roofline and architectural character of the street.

Section 6-4 allows the Board to condition approval by requiring changes to a structure's size and exterior appearance. Accordingly, the addition warrants closer attention to its height, setback from the front roof edge, and relationship to the existing building. Refining these elements would reduce its prominence when viewed from Murray Court, create clearer visual separation between the addition and the existing structure, and establish a more contextually appropriate precedent for similar additions.



The plans also appear to retain habitable first-floor space below the applicable Sea Level Rise–Design Flood Elevation of 19.5 feet. The submitted materials do not indicate how the proposal would address this existing condition, satisfy applicable Coastal Flood Resilience Overlay District requirements, or improve the building’s overall flood resilience. These matters should be clarified in any revised submission.

In summary, the proposal would add a fourth dwelling unit on a lot limited to three units as of right, exceed the permitted building height in both stories and feet, retain existing front- and side-yard nonconformities, and maintain a rear-yard deficiency along the east lot line. The roof addition would place a full fourth story at the front roof edge without sufficient visual separation from the existing building. The submitted materials also do not adequately address the apparent first-floor flood-elevation condition.

The reviewed plans are titled “7–9 Murray Court, East Boston, MA 02128.” They were prepared by 686 Architects and stamped for review on January 13, 2026.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1809938, The Planning Department recommends DENIAL WITHOUT PREJUDICE: The proponent should consider a revised proposal that more closely aligns with the updated East Boston zoning requirements and better addresses the height, massing, placement, and contextual relationship of the roof addition.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1846713
ZBA Submitted Date	2026-05-06
ZBA Hearing Date	2026-08-11
Address	1 to 1H Washington PL Charlestown 02129
Parcel ID	0203882000, 0203864000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Charlestown Neighborhood 3F-2000
Zoning Article	62
Project Description	Erect three single-family townhouses, each with a roof deck.
Relief Type	Variance, Conditional Use
Violations	Roof Structure Restrictions Usable Open Space Insufficient Lot Frontage Insufficient

Planning Context:

This case was deferred from the July 14, 2026 Zoning Board of Appeal Hearing to the August 11, 2026 Hearing. There have been no updates to the plans made by the proponent or new materials submitted since this initial hearing date, as such the recommendation remains the same.

The subject property is a unique through lot with dual frontage on Washington Street and Rutherford Avenue, situated immediately adjacent to the Boston Housing Authority's General Warren Apartments. To the north, the neighboring residence at 104 Rutherford Avenue features a zero-lot-line condition, where the existing building shares two property lines with the subject parcel. The surrounding neighborhood is characterized by traditional Charlestown blocks of row houses accommodating one- to three-family dwellings. These homes typically stand two to three stories tall with pitched roofs and single-story rear additions that extend across most of the depth of their long, narrow lots. Rear yard conditions of these parcels vary significantly, with some having fully paved parking areas, while others have grass-covered yards.

The project proposes replacing the existing single-family dwelling with three single-family townhomes. The new building will face Washington Street and provide three compact off-street parking spaces. Additionally, rather than incorporating a conventional lawn, the proposal utilizes permeable pavers and crushed stone across a majority of the site.

The subject lot is exceptionally well-served by public transit, offering strong connectivity to Downtown Boston. The lot sits just 0.3 miles from the MBTA Orange Line's Community College



Station and within 0.1 miles of two Route 92 bus stops. Finally, the site falls within the Charlestown Neighborhood Design Overlay District (NDOD) and is subject to Roof Structure Restrictions under Article 62-25.

Zoning Analysis:

The Refusal Letter cites two dimensions violations, Insufficient Lot Frontage and Insufficient Usable Open Space, and requires the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit pursuant to Article 62-25 for Roof Structure Restrictions.

The proposed project is located on a through lot with 14.47' of frontage along Washington Street and 19.5' of frontage along Rutherford Avenue. While the 3F-2000 subdistrict requires a minimum lot frontage of 20', the Planning Department supports relief for this dimensional violation due to the unique existing conditions of the lot, especially when compared to the standard surrounding parcels. Furthermore, the existing 14.47' of frontage is adequate to provide functional driveway access to the lot from Washington Street.

The usable open space violation is driven almost entirely by the site plan configuration rather than a lack of lot area outside of the building's approximately 1,800 sq ft floorplate. Meeting the subdistrict's usable open space requirement of 350 sq ft of usable open space per dwelling unit, 1,050 sq ft for the proposed project, is prevented by the inclusion of three compact parking spaces (two 8.25'x18' and one 7'x18'). Per Article 62, Table E, residential projects of zero to six units in Charlestown require no off-street parking, making these spaces excessive given the site's excellent transit access. Importantly, the parking layout offsets Unit #1, forcing the new three-story structure within 3' of the zero-lot-line building at 104 Rutherford Avenue. While this layout remains technically compliant with side yard requirements of the subdistrict, removing these two spaces and realigning Unit #1 with Units #2 and #3 would resolve the usable open space violation while establishing a much more appropriate separation from the adjacent property.

The project requires a Conditional Use Permit under Article 62-25 for the rooftop structures. All three of the proposed roof decks are designed with adequate screening and buffering from their respective roof edges and sit at an appropriate height to avoid impacting any of the surrounding properties. Because all three roof decks align with the design requirements of Article 62-25, the Planning Department supports the issuance of the Conditional Use Permit.



Finally, because the subject lot is located within the Charlestown NDOD and meets the applicability requirements outlined in Article 28-5, the proposed project is required to undergo Planning Department Design Review. This review should focus primarily on the layout of the proposed site plan, especially with respect to the off-street parking configuration and its direct impact on the usable open space provided on the lot.

Plans reviewed are titled "Three Attached Townhouses 1 Washington Place Charlestown, MA.", prepared by Timothy Sheehan Architect and dated 1/14/2026.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1846713, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH PROVISIO/S: that plans be submitted to the Planning Department for design review with specific focus on the quantity and location of provided off-street parking, as well as the overall alignment of residential units across the site.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1833514
ZBA Submitted Date	2026-03-26
ZBA Hearing Date	2026-08-11
Address	176 L ST South Boston 02127
Parcel ID	0702582000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	South Boston Neighborhood MFR
Zoning Article	68
Project Description	This project proposes to add a fourth-story addition to increase the living space of the existing third-floor unit.
Relief Type	Variance Conditional Use
Violations	Parking or Loading Insufficient Height Excessive FAR Excessive Rear Yard Insufficient Roof Structure Restrictions

Planning Context:

176 L Street is located within City Point of the South Boston Neighborhood district. The property is zoned Multifamily Residential and has an existing three-story, three-unit building. This project proposes a fourth-floor addition with both front and rear balconies to increase the living space of the third-story unit. Additional work includes interior renovation to the third-story, modifying size and layout of existing rooms, and rear balcony modifications to all three existing floors, adding an exterior staircase between floors.

The surrounding properties are all similarly zoned Multifamily Residential and are developed as three-unit triple-deckers. Building heights are relatively uniform. Rear balconies are common in the neighborhood, and some surrounding buildings have small roof decks.

The site is located within a Restricted Roof Structure overlay district, requiring that any roofed addition be considered for "the potential of damaging the uniformity of height or architectural character of the immediate vicinity" (Section 68-29) and considered as a conditional use.

Zoning Analysis:

The project was cited by ISD for violation to parking requirements, height maximum, FAR limitation, and rear yard minimums based on Article 68, Sections 8 and 33, of the Zoning Code



as discussed below. Furthermore, the project is subject to conditional use approval based on its location in a Restricted Roof Structure overlay district, discussed in Article 68, Section 29, of the Zoning Code.

Parking: In the MFR subdistrict, the required parking is 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit. However, this building was constructed prior to these regulations and has no on-site parking spaces. While the fourth-story addition proposes additional gross floor area to the building, it does not propose an additional dwelling unit. Therefore, the project is not required to provide any new parking.

Height: The maximum height allowed in the MFR Subdistrict is 40 feet. This project proposes increasing the height from 36'-10" to 45'-5". As the surrounding area is predominantly developed with triple-deckers, this height increase will be inconsistent with the surrounding building heights. However, the additional story is not expected to cause negative impact on light, air, or views of adjacent properties. The proposal is less than six feet above the allowed height and supports changing housing needs in Boston, providing an additional bedroom and living space to support growing households. Furthermore, the additional story is set back approximately ten feet from the front building line and is designed as a hip roof, sloping away from the front and sides of the building. This design further reduces the impact on adjacent properties and view of the additional story from the public realm. For these reasons, Staff supports a variance to the maximum height.

FAR: In the MFR Subdistrict, the maximum FAR is 2.0. The proposed fourth-story addition will increase the existing FAR from 1.74 to 2.15. Although the addition increases the livable floor area, it will not have a significant impact on how the property is used, simply changing the third-floor unit from a two-bedroom to a three-bedroom unit. This is consistent with City goals to increase housing diversity and supports larger households within the existing residential fabric. Furthermore, the fourth floor addition will include two balconies, providing additional open space to the lot. Staff supports a variance for this violation.

Rear Yard: The minimum rear yard required is 20 feet. While the primary structure is set back approximately 24 feet from the rear property line, the existing rear balconies encroach into the rear yard, resulting in an approximately 15-foot rear yard. This is an existing condition, and while the balconies are being renovated, the rear yard encroachment is not proposed to be worsened. Therefore, a variance to this violation is appropriate.



Roof Structure Restrictions: As discussed above, the proposed fourth-story addition will alter the existing uniformity of height within the block and surrounding area. Article 68, Section 29 requires conditional approval of additions or roof decks above existing building roofs. As the height increase is reasonably set back from the building edges, reducing the bulk visible from the public realm, Staff recommends granting approval.

Plans reviewed are titled "176 L Street South Boston, MA 02127," prepared by 686 Architects, and dated February 2025.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1833514, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1835904
ZBA Submitted Date	2026-04-02
ZBA Hearing Date	2026-08-11
Address	105 Pleasantview ST Hyde Park 02136
Parcel ID	1807257000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Hyde Park Neighborhood 1F-6000
Zoning Article	69
Project Description	Convert a one-unit home into a two-unit home via a second story addition.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	FAR Excessive Front Yard Insufficient Rear Yard Insufficient Use: Forbidden

Planning Context:

This project originally went to the ZBA on July 14, 2026, but had to be sent back for an omitted forbidden use violation. This recommendation reflects the updated list of violations.

105 Pleasantville St is located in a residential area of Hyde Park, characterized by a typology of predominantly single-family dwellings with the occasional two-unit dwelling. The area features moderate lot coverage pattern, with homes typically maintaining moderate setbacks.

The subject property itself is a one-unit, one-story building that shares a similar size and character with the surrounding homes on the street. The proponent is seeking to construct a second story addition to become its own unit. This change would be characterized as an external additional dwelling unit. The updates to the home do not noticeably stand out against the existing street environment, as two story homes are already prevalent.

Zoning Analysis:

This proposal has triggered four zoning violations: excessive FAR, front and side yard excessive, and forbidden use.

The existing FAR is 0.24, and the maximum allowed is 0.5. With the proposed second-story addition, the FAR would increase to 0.54. The abutting property at 109 Pleasantville St has an



FAR of 0.53. Because the expansion adds a second unit vertically rather than expanding the building footprint, this increase is reasonable. Relief is recommended.

The existing front yard setback is 19.7 feet, while the side yard setbacks measure 11.5 feet on one side and 14 feet on the other. The required minimum front yard setback is 25 feet.

However, this is an existing nonconformity, as the proposed addition does not further reduce the front yard setback. The required minimum side yard setback is 10 feet. While neither the plans nor the refusal letter explicitly explain how the side yard violation is triggered, the plans indicate that the proposed exterior stairway to the second-floor unit may encroach into the required setback. Because this encroachment is necessary to provide access to the new unit and is modest in scale, relief is recommended.

A two unit home is a forbidden use in this single family zoning district. However, two-unit homes are already a prevalent use on this block, including examples at 80 Pleasantview St, 86 Pleasantview St, and 91 Pleasantview St. Furthermore, the second unit will be added as a second story addition to the existing home. Two story homes are a dominant form in this area and exterior updates made to accommodate a second unit remains aligned with the character of the built environment. Relief is recommended.

Plans reviewed are titled "Certified Plot Plan Located at 105 Pleasantville St", and are prepared by David Harmon Architecture, and dated March 10, 2026.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1835904, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1810051
ZBA Submitted Date	2026-01-07
ZBA Hearing Date	2026-08-11
Address	1 Hopkins PL Mattapan 02126
Parcel ID	1800349020
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Greater Mattapan Neighborhood R1
Zoning Article	60
Project Description	The proposed project is the new construction of a six-unit, three-story residential building.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Off Street Parking Regulations Forbidden Use

Planning Context:

The proposal was originally scheduled for the June 2, 2026, hearing however it was deferred with no new updates. The Planning Department's recommendation remains the same. The proposed project would be developing a six-unit three story multifamily building in a presently unoccupied lot. The lot at 9,084 SF which is about double the typical lot in the neighboring context and is located at the dead end of Hopkins Place surrounded on three sides by the rear yards of numerous homes. The proposed building will occupy about 4,500 SF in the eastern portion of the lot. Adjacent to the street access in the western portion of the lot will be a paved parking area with eight parking spaces. The site is within the catchment area of PLAN: Mattapan, passed May 2023 and the site was rezoned in April 2024. PLAN: Mattapan highlights the need for additional housing stock in the neighborhood; however, it also emphasizes the importance of respecting the neighborhood's historically low-density, low rise nature. This project is filed with 2 Hopkins Place and due to the unit count exceeding seven units, Article 79 Inclusionary Zoning would be applicable to both.

Zoning Analysis:

The project would be a proposed 6-unit building and a front yard facing off street parking surface lot which is forbidden. The project does not have any dimensional violations and accommodates the necessary minimum of parking and beyond by three spaces. The proponent should consider a revised version of the proposal that would instead locate the parking to the



rear of the site with the proposed building facing the front instead. In this adjustment, the proponent should be open to lowering the parking count to an amount that allows more opportunity for reconfiguration but still provides the minimum amount of spaces.

“Proposed 6-Family Development 1 Hopkins Place Mattapan, MA 02126” Drawn by Choo & Company Inc. Dated July 7th, 2025

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1810051, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL W/PROVISO: that no variance be granted for the location of the parking, and that plans be submitted to the Planning Department for review with attention to reducing and reconfiguring the parking to improve the site layout.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1810052
ZBA Submitted Date	2026-01-07
ZBA Hearing Date	2026-08-11
Address	2 Hopkins PL Mattapan 02126
Parcel ID	1800348000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Greater Mattapan Neighborhood R1
Zoning Article	60
Project Description	The proposal is a new three-unit, three-story building.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Rear Yard Insufficient Off Street Parking Regulations Building Lot Coverage Excessive Forbidden Use

Planning Context:

This proposal was originally scheduled for the June 2, 2026, hearing but got deferred. There have been no new updates and the Planning Department's recommendation remains the same. The proposed project would be developing a three-unit three story multifamily building in a presently unoccupied lot. The lot at 5,704 SF which is about the typical lot sizing in the neighboring context and is located at the dead end of Hopkins place. The proposed building will occupy about 1,475 SF in the southern portion of the lot. Adjacent to the street access in the northern portion of the lot will be a paved parking area with four parking spaces. The site is within the catchment area of PLAN: Mattapan, passed May 2023 and the site was rezoned in April 2024. PLAN: Mattapan highlights the need for additional housing stock in the neighborhood; however, it also emphasizes the importance of respecting the neighborhood's historically low-density, low rise nature. This project is filed with 1 Hopkins Place and due to the unit count exceeding seven units across both projects, Article 79 Inclusionary Zoning would be applicable to both.

Zoning Analysis:

The proposed project use of three units is forbidden as the R1 zoning only allows up to two units. The additional third unit is welcomed as it would trigger state building code requirements for development of an accessible unit and sprinkler system for fire safety. The proposed project



also has a violation for the location of the parking being in the front yard of the site. The proponents should consider a new location for the parking which minimizes its location on the front yard.

The Proposed Project also presently has two dimensional violations. One violation being excessive building lot coverage of 33% when the maximum coverage is 30%. The proponent should consider shrinking space in the building to meet 30% maximum. The other dimensional violation is an insufficient rear yard setback of 11'-0" when the minimum depth is 20'. Due to the orientation of the site being essentially a 90 degree rotation of the typical rectangular lot with the long side being front facing, this is a specific challenge of the site and can be recommended for relief.

"Proposed 3-Family Development 2 Hopkins Place Mattapan, MA 02126" Drawn by Choo & Company Inc. Dated July 7th, 2025

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1810052, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL W/PROVISO that plans be submitted to the Planning Department with specific attention to reducing lot coverage amount and improving the parking layout.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1856474
ZBA Submitted Date	2026-06-01
ZBA Hearing Date	2026-08-11
Address	43 Eastwood CC West Roxbury 02132
Parcel ID	2010677000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	West Roxbury Neighborhood 1F-6000
Zoning Article	56
Project Description	The project proposes to erect a single-family dwelling on a newly subdivided lot.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Lot Frontage Insufficient Lot Area Insufficient Lot Width Insufficient FAR Excessive

Planning Context:

This case was deferred on July 28, 2026 due to the need to be in front of the ZBA at the same time as its companion case (BOA1856475).

43 Eastwood CC sits in a low-density residential area of West Roxbury that is made up of largely 1-unit homes. The surrounding dwelling heights are mostly one- to two and a half-story buildings. The existing structure is a one-story building with an attached back patio, the lot also holds a shed in the rear and a detached garage in the front. The existing structure sits on a 10,925 sqft lot. The proposed project includes subdividing the existing lot, demolishing the existing structure, and creating two single-unit dwellings on the newly subdivided lots. The new lot for 43 Eastwood CC would become 5,593 sqft. Many of the surrounding lots on Eastwood Circuit are similar in size to the newly subdivided lot. For example, 30 Eastwood CC (4,763 sqft), 34 Eastwood CC (5,102 sqft), 31 Eastwood CC (4,275 sqft) and 35 Eastwood CC (4,275 sqft). The Zoning Reform team just released new draft residential zoning for West Roxbury, Roslindale, and Hyde Park as part of the Neighborhood Housing Initiative. When looking at the dimensions of this plan against the draft dimensional regulations, the building is aligned to the draft regulations.

Zoning Analysis:



The zoning refusal letter states four violations of the Zoning Code: Lot Area Insufficient (Article 56, Section 8), Lot Width Insufficient (Article 56, Section 8), Lot Frontage Insufficient (Article 56, Section 8), and FAR Excessive (Article 56, Section 8).

The project has been cited for insufficient lot area. The zoning code requires a lot of 6,000 sqft, while the new subdivided lot will become 5,593 sqft. This project highlights a disconnect between the zoning code and built reality. The proposed lot is of a similar size to typical lots for the neighborhood. If this regulation were to be strictly followed, many of the existing lots within this area would not be allowed under this regulation.

The project is also cited for 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 44 feet while the zoning code requires a frontage of 60 feet. There are similar sized lot frontages on Eastwood CC which include 14, 18, 30, and 34 Eastwood CC, which range from 44 feet - 53 feet.

The maximum FAR for this lot is 0.4 and the proposed FAR is 0.495 for the proposed project. There are several examples of homes that exceed the maximum FAR requirement in the immediate vicinity, such as 30 Eastwood CC (0.63), 34 Eastwood CC (0.45), 35 Eastwood CC (0.44). Because the project's FAR would not be out of conformity with surrounding properties and the new building footprint maintains appropriate lot coverage, as additionally evidenced by the fact that there are no violations of required minimum yards.

The plans reviewed are titled "2026.05.04 43 Eastwood Circuit Zoning Refusal Progress Set - Lot A Mirrored Back Stamped_F (1)" and there is no reviewed by date as there is no ISD stamp. The plans were prepared by People Architects.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1856474, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1856475
ZBA Submitted Date	2026-06-01
ZBA Hearing Date	2026-08-11
Address	45 Eastwood CC West Roxbury 02132
Parcel ID	2010677000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	West Roxbury Neighborhood 1F-6000
Zoning Article	56
Project Description	The project proposes to erect a one-unit dwelling on a newly subdivided lot.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	FAR Excessive Lot Area Insufficient Lot Frontage Insufficient Lot Width Insufficient

Planning Context:

45 Eastwood CC sits in a low-density residential area of West Roxbury that is made up of largely 1-unit homes. The surrounding dwelling heights are mostly one- to two and a half-story buildings. The existing structure is a one-story building with an attached back patio, the lot also holds a shed in the rear and a detached garage in the front. The existing structure sits on a 10,925 sqft lot. The proposed project includes subdividing the existing lot, demolishing the existing structure, and creating two single-unit dwellings on the newly subdivided lots. The new lot for 45 Eastwood CC would become 5,330 sqft. Many of the surrounding lots on Eastwood Circuit are similar in size to the newly subdivided lot. For example, 30 Eastwood CC (4,763 sqft), 34 Eastwood CC (5,102 sqft), 31 Eastwood CC (4,275 sqft) and 35 Eastwood CC (4,275 sqft). This case is a companion case to 43 Eastwood CC. The Zoning Reform team just released new draft residential zoning for West Roxbury, Roslindale, and Hyde Park. When looking at the dimensions of this plan against the new dimensional regulations, the building is generally aligned. The one small violation would be the lot coverage of 45 Eastwood CC is 26% and the new requirement is 25%.

Zoning Analysis:



The zoning refusal letter states four violations of the Zoning Code: Lot Area Insufficient (Article 56, Section 8), Lot Width Insufficient (Article 56, Section 8), Lot Frontage Insufficient (Article 56, Section 8), and FAR Excessive (Article 56, Section 8).

The project has been cited for insufficient lot area. The zoning code requires a lot of 6,000 sqft, while the new subdivided lot will become 5,330 sqft. This project highlights a disconnect between the zoning code and built reality. The proposed lot is of a similar size to typical lots for the neighborhood. If this regulation were to be strictly followed, many of the existing lots within this area would not be allowed under this regulation.

The project is also cited for 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 44 feet while the zoning code requires a frontage of 60 feet. There are similar sized lot frontages on Eastwood CC which include 14, 18, 30, and 34 Eastwood CC, which range from 44 feet - 53 feet.

The maximum FAR for this lot is 0.4 and the proposed FAR is 0.52 for the proposed project. There are several examples of homes that exceed the maximum FAR requirement in the immediate vicinity, such as 30 Eastwood CC (0.63), 34 Eastwood CC (0.45), 35 Eastwood CC (0.44). Because the project's FAR would not be out of conformity with surrounding properties and the new building footprint maintains appropriate lot coverage, as additionally evidenced by the fact that there are no violations of required minimum yards.

The plans reviewed are titled Plans for "ZBA-45 Eastwood Circuit" and were reviewed on 3/23/26. The plans were prepared by People Architects.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1856475, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1716446
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-05-01
ZBA Hearing Date	2026-08-11
Address	178 to 180 Weld ST Roslindale 02132
Parcel ID	2004301000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	West Roxbury Neighborhood 1F-6000
Zoning Article	56
Project Description	This project will demolish an existing detached garage and build a new attached garage on a relocated area of the yard.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Height Excessive (ft) Front Yard Insufficient Rear Yard Insufficient Side Yard Insufficient

Planning Context:

The project at 178 to 180 Weld St proposes demolishing a currently existing detached garage and rebuilding it as an attached garage.

The property is located in a residential area of West Roxbury that is made up of primarily one-unit homes with low to moderate lot coverage. While detached garages are a common feature of lots in this area, attached garages are less common.

Zoning Analysis:

This proposal has triggered four zoning violations: height excessive (ft), front, rear, and side yard insufficient. The revised plans have addressed the height and front yard citations. Although the refusal letter cites a rear yard violation, this corner triangular lot does not have a proper rear yard.

The maximum height (ft) allowed in this zoning subdistrict is 35 feet. The existing garage is 27.8 feet in height, and the revised plans reduce the proposed garage height from 16.9 feet to 14 feet. Accordingly, the height citation has been resolved.



The minimum front yard required is 20 feet. The existing front yard setback is 23.2 feet. The revised plans increase the proposed front yard setback from 16.2 feet to match the existing setback (23.2 feet), bringing the proposal into compliance. Accordingly, the front yard citation has been resolved.

The minimum required side yard setback is 10 feet. Although the refusal letter cites a rear yard violation, this corner triangular lot does not have a proper rear yard; therefore, the rear yard violation is incorrectly cited. However, the revised plans increase the proposed garage side yard setback from 2.4 feet to 5.2 feet. While the side yard setback violation remains, the degree of the nonconformity has been substantially reduced. While this may raise concerns, street view imagery shows adequate screening and buffering between the property and the abutting lot through the presence of trees and vegetation. Relief is recommended.

Design review is further recommended to review the driveway paving in relation to its permeability.

Plans reviewed are titled "178 Weld St West Roxbury Massachusetts", are prepared by Peter Nolan & Associates and dated February 10, 2025.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1716446, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH PROVISIO/S: that plans be submitted to the Planning Department for design review to review driveway pavement permeability.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning