



Planning Department

MEMORANDUM

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

FROM: Joanne Marques
Regulatory Planning & Zoning

DATE: July 25, 2025

RE: Planning Department Recommendations

Please find attached, for your information, Planning Department recommendations for the July 29, 2025 Board of Appeal's Hearing.

Also included are the Board Memos for:
586 Canterbury ST Roslindale 02131
134 Hampden ST Roxbury 02119

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



Case	BOA1674561
ZBA Submitted Date	2024-11-26
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-24
Address	18 to 20 Crestway RD East Boston 02128
Parcel ID	0102283000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	East Boston Neighborhood 1F-4000
Zoning Article	53
Project Description	Add a roof deck and an external stair to existing building
Relief Type	Variance, Conditional Use
Violations	Height Excessive (ft) Roof Structure Restrictions Extension of non conforming use

Planning Context:

The proposed project would erect a new roof deck and associated outside access stair on an existing building. The proposed project triggers zoning violations, these are either extensions of previously existing non-conformities and dimensional violations that can be resolved through the reconfiguration of the proposed roof deck through the design review process. These violations are not reflective of an inappropriate fit for the project overall, but evidence that the newly adopted zoning is having its intended effect on building design.

These plans were submitted to ISD on March 19, 2024 under the previously existing 1F-4000 zoning district. PLAN: East Boston was adopted by the BPDA board in March 2024, and the Plan and its zoning was adopted by the Boston Zoning Commission in April 2024. This project was reviewed under the previously existing zoning as plans were submitted before the adoption date. If a ZBA were to be resubmitted, it would be under the new zoning adopted in 2024.

Zoning Analysis:

The proposed project triggers three separate citations. The first is conditional use for extension of non-conforming use. The area was previously zoned for single-family dwellings, while this is an existing nonconforming nine unit dwelling use. This proposed project would have no material impact on the existing nonconforming use, as no new units are being added.



The second and third citations are directly related. The roof structures restriction section of the code (53-25) outlines a series of design guidelines that, if followed, create a situation where the roof deck is not counted towards the overall building height. These guidelines are:

1. The deck is to be erected on the main roof of a Building with a flat roof or a roof with a slope of less than five (5) degrees;
2. The deck is less than one (1) foot above the highest point of such roof;(iii)access is: (a) by a roof hatch or bulkhead no more than thirty (30) inches in height above the deck; or (b) by a stairway headhouse no greater than ten (10) feet in height, eight (8) feet in width, and ten (10) feet in length;
3. The deck be set back horizontally at least ten (10) feet from the roof edge(s) facing the public right of way;
4. And any appurtenant hand rail, balustrade, hatch, or bulkhead is set back horizontally at least five (5) feet from all roof edges.

While the proposed project complies with one of these guidelines, it is not setback five feet from the street-facing edge of the building, the roof is accessed by a side stair and not a hatch or headhouse, and the proposed pergola would count towards height and trigger a new building violation. The roof deck is only 4 feet setback from the edge. If the pergola was removed, the height violation would be resolved. With access moved from the side stair to roof based access, then all dimensional violations will be resolved.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1674561, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL W/PROVISOS: that the rooftop pergola is removed;the front facing edge of the deck is set back at least five feet from the building edge;access is moved from a side stair to an internal stair leading to a headhouse or hatch; and zoning relief shall only be granted for extension of non-conforming use.

Reviewed,

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1728524
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-05-30
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-24
Address	389 Maverick ST East Boston 02128
Parcel ID	0105162000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	East Boston Neighborhood 3F-2000
Zoning Article	7
Project Description	To removed proviso granted to this petitioner only Under BZC32368
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Conditions for Variance

Planning Context:

389 Maverick Street is located in the East Boston neighborhood district. The proponent seeks to change the legal use from restaurant to restaurant with take-out use. Take out uses in this area are consistent with similar uses in the surrounding neighborhood. The proponent also notes that this site was previously operated as a take-out restaurant. Tawakal Cafe is a small family owned business that serves authentic Somali cuisine. Permitting these services to continue will not be detrimental to the neighborhood.

Zoning Analysis:

PLAN: East Boston was adopted by the BPDA Board on January 18, 2024. Its accompanying zoning amendments were adopted by Boston Zoning Commission on April 24, 2024. 389 Maverick Street is now located in the EBR-4 which allows for take-out use. As a result, this request for zoning relief would no longer be needed.

Given the fact this is an allowed use now, it is fully appropriate for the board to remove the previous proviso limiting zoning relief to only the petitioner, if this action is necessary.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1728524, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.



Planning Department

CITY of BOSTON

Reviewed,

Kathleen Onuf

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1715590
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-04-29
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-24
Address	30 Harvard ST Charlestown 02129
Parcel ID	0203723000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Charlestown Neighborhood 3F-2000
Zoning Article	62
Project Description	Expand the existing rear dormer and extend living space into the existing basement space.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	FAR Excessive Height Excessive (stories) Rear Yard Insufficient

Planning Context:

The proposed project sits in an established residential area of the Charlestown neighborhood. Its surrounding context consists of a mix of 3.5- to 4-story structures, housing a range of single-dwelling to multi-dwelling (4+ units) residential land uses. In addition, the project sits directly across the the street from Charlestown's Harvard Mall park.

The project site is currently occupied by an existing 3.5-story, two-unit residential rowhouse structure. The proposed project seeks to expand the structure's existing rear window dormer into a shed dormer and convert its existing basement storage space into livable area. These alterations, together, add 637 square feet of living space to the structure. Aside from the dormer alteration, no exterior changes are proposed through the project. The site's existing two-unit land use is also proposed to remain.

This project scope is supported by the planning goals of PLAN: Charlestown (September 28, 2023), which prioritize the creation or expansion of larger housing units to accommodate growing living arrangements and families and encourage projects that maintain and improve the existing built fabric to protect the neighborhood's existing design character and historic structures.



While the proposed project sits within both the Charlestown Neighborhood Design Overlay District (NDOD) as well as an area subject to Ordinance 7.4-11 (Parks Design Review), the Planning Department does not recommend the project receive a proviso for additional design review. This is because the project: (1) reached out for pre-emptive design feedback from both Landmarks Commission and Planning Department, of which the proponent adhered to; and (2) proposes a small rear alteration not visible from either the public right of way or the nearby public park.

Zoning Analysis:

The proposed project's rear yard violation is an existing nonconforming condition on the lot, not proposed to be worsened by the project. Zoning requires fifteen feet, and twelve feet is existing and will continue. Accordingly, its impacts are null.

The project's excessive building height is triggered by the expansion of the structure's existing rear roof dormer. This expansion, which adds 62 square feet of gross floor area to the structure, changes the categorization of the structure's top floor from a half-story to a full-story. While this represents a net increase to the structure's existing nonconforming height from three stories allowed, three and a half stories existing, and four stories proposed, the alteration does not actually increase the total height of the existing structure's roofline of 35 feet allowed and 50 feet existing/proposed. Additionally, the proposed project abuts several other existing four-story structures. Because of these factors, the dormer addition is contextual to the surrounding area.

Similarly, the project's FAR violation is an existing nonconforming dimension that is proposed to be increased from 2.0 allowed and 2.5 existing to 3.1 proposed). This increase is triggered almost entirely (575 / 637 square feet added) by the project's proposed extension of living space into the structure's existing basement, which is currently used as storage space. This violation is considered noninvasive to the surrounding neighborhood because it involves little to no changes to the building's massing and results in a FAR figure similar to the project's context, which have an average range of 2.6 - 3.3 FAR.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1715590, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.



Planning Department

CITY of BOSTON

Reviewed,

Kathleen O'Neil

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA172933
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-06-02
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-24
Address	78 to 80A Salem ST Boston 02113
Parcel ID	0302478000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	North End Neighborhood SALEM ST NS
Zoning Article	54
Project Description	This Appeal seeks a change of use and occupancy of the existing restaurant at the property to remove a “for this petitioner only” proviso regarding takeout use at the property (no work to be done).
Relief Type	Conditional Use
Violations	Other Protectional Conditions

Planning Context:

The project is asking to remove a proviso that limits the approved use at 78-80A Salem Street to a specific petitioner. The use was approved before, but with conditions, including this proviso that ties it to a certain petitioner. Now, the applicant is asking to remove the proviso so the takeout use can continue under new ownership or management without needing a new conditional use permit. There is no new construction in this proposal—just a request to change the proviso of the prior zoning relief.

Zoning Analysis:

The request to remove the proviso that limits the use to the previous owner is reasonable. The proposal does not ask for a new use, any expansion, or any construction that would change the building or site. This zoning relief would let the same approved use continue with a new owner or manager, just as the Board allowed before. Since this change would not create new impacts on the neighborhood and matches the zoning relief already given, staff recommend approval.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1729339, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.



Planning Department

CITY of BOSTON

Reviewed,

Kathleen O'Neil

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1709052
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-04-14
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-24
Address	32 Saint Stephen ST Boston 02115
Parcel ID	0401498000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Fenway Neighborhood MFR-1
Zoning Article	66
Project Description	Install a greenhouse on the rooftop.
Relief Type	Conditional Use
Violations	Roof Structure Restrictions

Planning Context:

The proposed project is to install a glass bulkhead on the rooftop of an existing three-story single family building that will act as a rooftop greenhouse. The proposed greenhouse will be set back from the rear and front of the building to minimize visibility from street level. The greenhouse is also proposed as full glass also minimizing its visibility and impact. The proposed project will not trigger any dimensional violations. The surrounding context is dense and is made up of homes with the same mass, height and typology.

Zoning Analysis:

Section 66-38 expresses that any new addition to an existing roof occupiable or unoccupiable that will make alterations to the existing roof profile must receive a conditional use permit. The proposal will increase the height of the building to 51'-3" but this will not exceed the zoning maximum height of 60'. The proposal also follows the other conditions in Section 66-38 such as not exceeding 330 square feet with an area of 231 square feet. Staff recommends approval for conditional permit due the project following zoning with minimum impact to the surrounding context.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1709052, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH DESIGN REVIEW with attention to ensuring no negative impact on surrounding structures.



Planning Department

CITY of BOSTON

Reviewed,

Kathleen O'Neil

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1697496
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-03-07
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-24
Address	12R Union AV Jamaica Plain 02130
Parcel ID	1102574000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Jamaica Plain Neighborhood 2F-4000
Zoning Article	55
Project Description	Construct a building in the rear lot, including a pool house and second-story dwelling unit.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Rear Yard Insufficient Side Yard Insufficient Height Excessive (ft) Parking or Loading Insufficient Lot Area Insufficient Two or More Dwellings on Same Lot

Planning Context:

This site sits within a residential neighborhood of Jamaica Plain, approximately 750 feet from the Green Street Orange Line MBTA station. This particular midblock location on Union Ave includes approximately 25 residential properties of varying size and scale; there is a mix of one- and two-unit buildings and multi-unit buildings (including several townhouse-style properties). The surrounding blocks along Washington Street, Green Street, and Amory Street include larger multi-unit apartment buildings, some light industrial uses, and commercial uses.

The proposed project includes constructing a new pool house in the rear of a property with an existing two-unit building. The plans indicate a pool on the property, although there is not one built today. The pool house includes a bathroom and storage room on the first floor, and an approximately 450 sf dwelling unit on the second floor with a bathroom, kitchen, living space, and a dedicated separate entrance. Although the stated project description from the applicant states this is a pool house project, it would also be considered as another dwelling unit on the property.

The two-story building could be considered an accessory dwelling unit (ADU), however there is no indication by the proponent that this is the case and there are no provisions for the Jamaica



Plain neighborhood to allow ADUs that are not internal to the main structure. The ADU Guidebook (2024) states specific fire access requirements for a building like this, including that it must be sprinklered, have a 10'-wide access point from the street that is unobstructed from objects like trees or vehicles, and a lighted path to provide wayfinding to the unit. Additionally, a new dwelling unit like this must have appropriate means of egress, which should be confirmed through building code review.

The Jamaica Plain Neighborhood Article does allow for three dwelling units in this 2F-4000 subdistrict as a conditional use, provided that the third dwelling unit is within the same structure as the other two dwelling units. There are, however, several other properties in this same zoning subdistrict and block that have a similar pattern to an ADU or a second dwelling on a lot. For example, 26-28R Union Ave has a primary building at the front of the property and a smaller accessory building at the rear. 32 Union Ave is a one-unit building, and immediately to the rear is 30R Union Ave, with a one-unit building. This area is appropriate for more housing units, given the existing context of multi-unit properties on the immediate block and proximity to high-frequency transit service.

Zoning Analysis:

Given that this second structure contains another dwelling unit, it is subject to the provisions of Section 55-41.12 Two or More Dwellings on Same Lot, which states that the lot area, rear yard, and side yard requirements shall apply as if such Dwelling were on a separate lot. The minimum side yard required would be 10' and the proposed side yard is 5'.

The maximum height for dwelling units in this subdistrict is 35', and the proposed building height is 20'. Section 55-41.12 also states that a second dwelling on the same lot must also be treated to have the same minimum lot area; this means that the existing two-unit dwelling must have at least 4,000 sf of lot area and the additional proposed dwelling must have 3,000 sf of lot area, for a total of 7,000 sf; the existing lot area is 5,600 sf.

Section 55-41.12 also states that a dwelling may not be built to the rear of another Dwelling, Accessory Building, or Main Building, although as previously mentioned, this condition exists on several other properties in the surrounding area.

This is a case for zoning reform, where the regulations regarding multiple buildings on a property and what dimensional regulations they are subject to are unclear in the zoning. Section



55-41.12 Two or More Dwellings on the Same Lot also states that the Board of Appeal may grant permission for a variation in requirements for the aforementioned Section 55-41.12 if it finds that open space for all occupants, and light and air for all rooms designed for human occupancy will not be less than it would be provided if the requirements of that section were met.

Finally, the minimum required number of parking spaces for three dwelling units is three, and the proposed project does not include additional parking beyond the existing two spaces in the side yard driveway. Given the location of this site in proximity to transit, a lower-than-required parking is recommended and represents a case for zoning reform.

Plans reviewed are titled "O'Brien Residence", prepared by Shane O'Brien, and dated January 2, 2025.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1697496, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH PROVISIO/S: that no building code relief be granted.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1686770
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-01-30
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-24
Address	294 West ST Hyde Park 02136
Parcel ID	1811349000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Hyde Park Neighborhood 1F-6000
Zoning Article	69
Project Description	Remove existing shed and replace with a new 1.5-story shed with electric utility connections.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Application of Dimensional Requirements: Accessory Buildings in Side or Rear Yard

Planning Context:

The proposed project is a trapezoid-shaped approximately 6000 square foot, 1-unit dwelling lot in Hyde Park on West St, directly abutting the George Wright golf course on its northeastern edge. The rear of the lot has an approximately 200 square foot shed with a concrete pad at its entrance. The proponent seeks to demolish the existing shed, and replace it with a new shed with the exact same floorplate and location, but increasing the height from one story to one and a half stories.

This is an example of the kind of change the Neighborhood Housing zoning initiative, launched in November 2024, seeks to enable by-right. Zoning reform should consider enabling modifications to existing accessory structures without the need for zoning relief.

Zoning Analysis:

Article 69, Section 30.7 states that "Accessory Buildings may be erected in a Side or Rear Yard; provided that no such Accessory Building is more than fifteen (15) feet in height, or nearer than four (4) feet to any side or rear Lot line, or closer than sixty-five (65) feet to the front Lot line."

The proposed new structure would violate the first two dimensional requirements of this provision. The existing structure's site has a setback of 1.5' from a side lot line, which violates the 4' minimum side yard, and the new structure on the same footprint would maintain that violation. Given that this is effectively a continuation of existing conditions, relief is appropriate. The new structure would be 17'-7" in height, which would violate the 15' maximum. Given the



pitched roof with small dormers, this allows for two usable storage floors on this accessory structure: a ground floor of 8'-3" and 9'-3" (to the top of the roofline.) This violation over 15' is minimal and provides substantial additional benefit to the property owner. As the abutter is a golf course, this small additional height should have no adverse effect.

Lastly, the refusal letter notes a third violation of the same provision, saying that the 8' required distance between structures in the rear yard and accessory buildings is not met. This distance, from the accessory structure to the back of the main structure's rear yard, is 6', and is not being worsened by the proposal. While this provision does not in fact exist in Article 69, Section 30.7, nor do required distances between main structures and accessory buildings appear to be present in Article 69, to the degree such a violation does exist, relief is appropriate.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1686770, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1700082
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-03-18
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-24
Address	34 Bradeen ST Roslindale 02131
Parcel ID	1903370000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Roslindale Neighborhood 3F-4000
Zoning Article	67
Project Description	The proposed project would add a shed dormer to an existing roof, install windows, and relocate the stairs.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Side Yard Insufficient Front Yard Insufficient

Planning Context:

The proposed project would add a shed dormer to an existing roof, install windows, and relocate the stairs in a 1.5 story, single-family house on a residential block in Roslindale. The existing house is smaller than most of the other properties on the block, which are mostly 2 to 2.5 stories.

Zoning Analysis:

None of the proposed changes would worsen the existing yard nonconformities that trigger two violations: an insufficient side yard and an insufficient front yard.

Based on submitted plans of the existing property, the current front yard is roughly 11', and the smallest side yard is about 6', with adequate space to surrounding properties. In this subdistrict a minimum front yard of 20' and a minimum side yard of 10' are required. Front and side yards are smaller than what zoning allows are a normal condition on this block, so this represents an opportunity to reform the Code to better match existing yards.

As a smaller house than most other houses on the block, the addition of the dormer would grant the owner more space while still staying within the height and story confines of the Code. As such, it is in harmony with the general intent and purpose of the Code.



The plans are titled "34 Bradeen Street", are undated, and were prepared by Oak Hill Construction.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1700082, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1703635
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-03-26
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-24
Address	9 Cutter RD West Roxbury 02132
Parcel ID	2008770001
Zoning District & Subdistrict	West Roxbury Neighborhood 1F-6000
Zoning Article	56
Project Description	The proposed project includes the construction of an approximately 800 sq ft second-story addition to an existing single-family dwelling. The scope also includes reconfiguring the interior staircase from the first floor to the new second floor and relocating the basement stairs.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Rear Yard Insufficient

Planning Context:

The project is located in West Roxbury, the immediate area is predominantly single-family homes on medium-sized lots, with traditional New England architectural styles including capes, colonials, and ranches.

The proposal to add a second story to the existing single-family home is consistent with the surrounding built environment. Several homes on Cutter Road and nearby streets have been modified with similar additions, maintaining the residential scale while increasing usable living space. The project preserves the existing footprint, aligning with neighborhood development patterns that prioritize vertical over horizontal expansion to retain yard space and neighborhood character.

Zoning Analysis:

The proposal to add a second story onto an existing single-family home at 9 Cutter Road has been reviewed against the dimensional requirements of Article 56 for the West Roxbury Neighborhood District (1F-6000 Subdistrict). The review has identified the following zoning issue:



Rear Yard Requirements: Under Article 56, Table D, the minimum required rear yard depth for properties in the 1F-6000 subdistrict is 30 feet. The existing rear yard is 10 feet, and the proposal involves constructing a second-story addition while retaining the existing 10 foot non-conforming rear yard. The addition maintains the existing footprint of the structure, with vertical expansion reflecting a common pattern of modest home enlargement observed throughout West Roxbury's one-family residential areas. Zoning relief is warranted, and the project further reflects the need to modernize dimensional regulations to better reflect the existing built fabric in West Roxbury.

The plans, entitled "Proposed Renovation and Addition at Residence at 9 Cutter Rd," prepared by Scot William Grady, Architect, dated February 22, 2025.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1703635, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1699328
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-03-14
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-24
Address	11 Durland ST Brighton 02135
Parcel ID	2203960000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Allston/Brighton Neighborhood 1F-5000
Zoning Article	51
Project Description	Expand the second story and create a new deck in the side yard of an existing building.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Front Yard Insufficient Side Yard Insufficient

Planning Context:

The existing structure is one and a half stories tall, whereas most structures in the area are two and a half stories tall. The proposed second-story addition would thus bring the overall building more closely in line with the surrounding context. The subject lot is similar in size to other parcels in the area, but its orientation means that the existing structure fills the depth of the lot while maintaining a large side yard on one side. Many of the surrounding structures have patios and decks in their rear and side yards.

Zoning Analysis:

The proposed project has been cited for insufficient front and side yards. The requirement for front yards in the subject district is twenty feet. The existing front yard is 10.1 feet and the increase in structure height will extend this nonconformity. The project also proposes a 14-foot-wide deck in the east side yard that will be 11.4 feet from the front lot line, similarly extending the existing non-conformity.

The requirement for side yards in the subject district is 10 feet and the existing structure is 8.7 feet from the west lot line at its nearest point. The proposal does not encroach any closer to the west lot line, however because the structure is increasing in height the existing nonconformity will be extended.



The cited violations are largely due to the abnormal, trapezoid shape of the subject parcel. The proposed deck is located in the least impactful location with respect to surrounding properties in the east side yard. The increase in height of the primary structure is consistent with the surrounding area. Both the increase in height and the proposed deck allows the owner to improve their property while maintaining adequate light and air between the subject property and surrounding properties. This is a case for zoning reform given the degree of existing non-conformity with respect to front and side yards.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1699328, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1667778
ZBA Submitted Date	2024-10-31
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	263 to 265 N Beacon ST Brighton 02135
Parcel ID	2202716000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Allston/Brighton Neighborhood 3F-4000
Zoning Article	51
Project Description	Construct a new four-story, six-unit building to replace an existing two and a half story, two-unit building that will be demolished.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Additional Lot Area Insufficient FAR Excessive Height Excessive (stories) Height Excessive (ft) Usable Open Space Insufficient Side Yard Insufficient Rear Yard Insufficient Parking or Loading Insufficient Use: forbidden (MFR) Two or More Dwellings on Same Lot

Planning Context:

This project is in a primarily residential area at the edge of the Boston Landing area. The surrounding properties are mostly two and a half to three story residential buildings, including one, two, and three unit buildings as well larger apartment buildings containing over 20 units. The project is also directly across the street from the Faneuil Gardens BHA property, which was recently approved to be redeveloped with buildings up to seven stories after a year-long public process. The proposed project is also 0.6 miles from the Boston Landing MBTA Commuter Rail Station, 1.1 miles from the MBTA Green Line, and within 0.2 miles of the 64 and 86 bus lines.

The Allston-Brighton Needs Assessment was adopted by BPDA Board on January 18, 2024 and was the result of ten months of research and engagement in uplifting and assessing the community's assets and needs across the neighborhoods of Allston and Brighton. The multi-family use proposed in this project is supported by the Needs Assessment, which established



the need for housing production in the Brighton neighborhood and found some community support for updating zoning.

The project does not seem to comply with accessibility requirements. For new construction of multifamily buildings, the Architectural Access Board requires that the ground floor unit entrances and the common entrances must be accessible. There also must be an accessible route from the sidewalk to the common entrances. The bathroom for the first floor units also must have at least 30"x48" clear floor space for each of the fixtures.

Zoning Analysis:

The project proposes six units, which is a multi-family residential use and therefore forbidden in this three-family zoning district. However, there are multi-family residential use buildings existing in the surrounding area and in this zoning district (such as at 251-253 N Beacon St and 245 N Beacon St). This indicates that the zoning should possibly be updated to better align with existing conditions. In addition, the Allston-Brighton Needs Assessment, while highlighting the need for more affordable housing in the neighborhood, notes in the Qualitative Responses from Engagement Events, that "Participants promoted supply-side solutions to the housing crisis, recommending an end to parking minimums, relaxation of zoning rules, and other measures to increase housing production in the neighborhood." This indicates that there is community support for allowing more multi-family housing in the neighborhood.

The project is flagged for insufficient parking. The required parking is 1.75 per dwelling unit or 10.5 total. There is no parking shown in the plans. However, as noted above, Allston-Brighton Needs Assessment highlighted that there is some community support for ending parking minimums to increase housing production in the neighborhood. In addition, as noted in the Planning Context, this area has reasonable access to public transit and therefore a lower parking ratio is appropriate for this location.

The project is cited for insufficient Usable Open Space. The zoning requires 650 sq ft of Usable Open Space per dwelling unit, or 3,900 sq ft total for this six-unit project. It is not possible to determine the exact amount of Usable Open Space provided because the plans do not include a landscape plan. In addition, the plans do not list the amount of parking provided and the lot currently includes parking on the majority of the unbuilt lot area (used for both the existing building and neighboring lot). If this parking is to be maintained, there would be a very small amount of Usable Open Space on the lot (as parking does not count as Usable Open Space).

BOA1667778

2025-07-29

2 Planning Department



The project site is less than quarter of a mile from a large city park (McKinney Playground), which provides additional open space for residents and minimizes the need to comply with the full Usable Open Space required by zoning. However, the parking should be minimized in order to have more Usable Open Space on the lot.

One of the existing residential buildings on the abutting lot partially encroaches into the rear of the lot of the proposed project. Section 51-57.13 of the code states that if two dwellings are built on the same lot, the requirements with respect to Rear Yard shall apply as if such Dwelling were on a separate Lot. This means that there should be at least 60 ft between the proposed building and the existing building so that both buildings have the required 30 ft Rear Yards. The actual space between the two buildings is approximately 15 ft. However, Section 51-57.13 states that the Board of Appeal may grant permission for a variation from this requirement if it finds that open space for all occupants, and light and air for all rooms designed for human occupancy, will not be less than would be provided if the requirement were met. Therefore, this rear yard is appropriate if the project provides sufficient open space.

This project exceeds the maximum zoning height in both stories and feet. The maximum allowed stories is three and this project is four. Although the exact height in feet is not clear on the plans, it clearly exceeds the zoning maximum of 35 feet as well. However, this higher height is appropriate given the relatively small lot and the need to relax zoning rules in order to increase housing production noted in the Allston-Brighton Needs Assessment. In addition, there are existing trees in the front that seem to be maintained, which would also minimize the impact of the building height from the public right-of-way.

For the Side Yard requirement, the zoning requires that the building is at least five feet from a side lot line and ten feet from an existing structure on an abutting lot, and the aggregate side yard is less than fifteen feet. The main massing of the buildings does comply with these side yard requirements. However, the roofed decks/balconies encroach into this required Side Yard, making the Side Yards zero feet in these areas. Although the balconies are beneficial given the limited open space available on the lot, the close proximity of the balconies to the lot line would restrict the feasibility of future development on the neighboring lot. The building should therefore be reconfigured so that the balconies are at least three feet from the lot line.

The zoning requires that lots in this district be 4,000 sq ft for one or two units with 2,000 sq ft for each additional unit, which means a lot with six units must be 12,000 sq ft. The lot of the proposed project is 7,536 sq ft. However, over 3,000 sq ft of open space could be provided on

BOA1667778

2025-07-29

3 Planning Department



this lot while maintaining the proposed building floor plate (if parking is removed). Because there is space for the building and sufficient open space, the lot area is sufficient for this number of units in this case. Relatedly, the project has an FAR of 0.98 and therefore does not comply with the FAR maximum of 0.8. Because the proposed units are relatively small, the FAR is a result of the number of units and the size of the lot. However, as previously stated, the number of units and lot size are appropriate.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1667778, The Planning Department recommends DENIAL WITHOUT PREJUDICE. The proponent should consider a project with increased side yards and access design to comply with accessibility requirements. A revised project should also be designed to maximize Usable Open Space.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1709899
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-04-16
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	55 Boylston ST Jamaica Plain 02130
Parcel ID	1900653000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Jamaica Plain Neighborhood 3F-5000
Zoning Article	55
Project Description	The proponent seeks to add a third floor to the existing two-story home. They are also seeking to include an open porch and two-story garage with an in-law suite on the second story, which will replace the existing one-story garage.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	FAR Excessive Side Yard Insufficient Front Yard Insufficient Rear Yard Insufficient

Planning Context:

55 Boylston Street is located in the Jamaica Plain neighborhood. Side yard, rear yard, and front yard setbacks in this area of the neighborhood are limited. Many of the existing homes have little to no setbacks at all. FAR for the neighborhood also widely varies, but tends to fall more on the higher end.

The proponent seeks to add a third floor to the existing two-story single-family home. They are also seeking to include an open porch and two story garage, which will replace the existing one story garage. The use is not changing.

Zoning Analysis:

There are four zoning violations related to building dimensions and yard setbacks, many of which are existing non-conformities. The maximum FAR for the neighborhood subdistrict is 0.6. They are proposing an FAR of 0.99. The required front yard setback for the neighborhood is 15 feet. The project is located on the corner of Dresden Street and Boylston Street. The existing front yard setback on Boylston Street is 9.7 feet and they are proposing a setback of 1.6 feet once the front porch is added; this is in line with neighboring properties. The required side yard setback for the neighborhood is 7 feet. The existing side yard setback is 4.5 feet and they will



extend that existing nonconformity by adding the third floor in line with the lower floor building massing. The required rear yard setback is 20 feet, and the existing rear yard setback is 5.9 foot setback, which will become 5 feet once the proposed second story addition is built out. This is a negligible change to the existing non-conformity.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1709899, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1697493
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-03-07
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	51 to 51E Fuller ST Dorchester 02124
Parcel ID	1704505000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Dorchester Neighborhood 1F-7000
Zoning Article	65
Project Description	Demolish a single-family residence and build new six 3-bedroom townhomes, each around 1500 sq ft, on the same lot.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Parking or Loading Insufficient Lot Width Insufficient Lot Area Insufficient Lot Frontage Insufficient FAR Excessive Side Yard Insufficient Rear Yard Insufficient Use: Forbidden (Multifamily) Number of allowed stories has been exceeded

Planning Context:

51E Fuller St is situated in the southern area of the Dorchester neighborhood and a five minute walk from the Ashmont Red Line station. In addition, this lot is within a five minute walk from the 12, 21, and 26 bus lines, making this a high transit access area.

There is a commercial corridor on Dorchester Ave within a 5-10 min walk of the parcel. A YMCA, school, and nursing homes are also nearby, suggesting a multigenerational demographic. Although the area primarily consists of single family residential lots, there are six multifamily homes within a 1-2 block radius of 51E Fuller St, suggesting that adding new housing on this site aligns with the existing development pattern, as several multifamily and townhomes already exist within a 1-2 block radius of 51E Fuller St.

The parcel includes underutilized rear yard space that can accommodate additional family-sized units, such as 3-bedroom townhomes, without displacing existing structures. A similar project at 67 Fuller St on the same block demonstrates how multifamily housing can make more efficient



use of lot space while creating opportunities for home ownership and meeting the area's needs for larger households. In particular, 3-bedroom housing units capable of accommodating families are important to supply in a multigenerational neighborhood.

The additional housing units proposed in this project aligns with the City's goals to develop more housing, per *Housing a Changing City: Boston 2030* (2018). The plan notes the importance of supporting "projects and planning that create additional density in locations with good transit that are affordable to the middle class". The plan also expresses the intent in making "improvements to the permitting process to help smaller builders create more housing on small, privately-owned parcels".

Zoning Analysis:

This project triggers nine violations because it proposes six, 3-story, 3-bedroom townhomes, invariably altering the use and dimensional regulations of the underlying zoning.

The proposal comes under the required minimum lot area, which is 7000 square feet, as opposed to the 5250 sq feet that is being proposed. While this falls short of the minimum required by zoning, this project aligns with Boston's goals to add family-sized housing. Multifamily and townhouses are already present on nearby lots, and the design respects the surrounding scale and character. Therefore, relief is recommended.

70 feet of lot width and lot frontage are required in this zoning subdistrict, and this project proposes 35 feet of lot width and frontage. Surrounding lots also appear to have narrow lot width and frontages, so this design respects the surrounding scale and character. Relief is recommended.

A minimum of 12 feet for side yard and 50 feet for rear yard is required for this zoning subdistrict, and this project proposes side yards of 3-5 feet and a rear yard of 15 feet. Many parcels within a 1-2 block radius of this parcel share similar side and rear yard dimensions. Despite the proposal triggering these violations, the parcel has ample space to accommodate this growth, especially if the purpose is to provide additional housing units for the neighborhood. Relief is recommended.

Eight off-street parking spots are required for this lot under existing zoning regulations, but this proposal has none. Considering this lot is within a five minute walk to the Ashmont Red Line station and three different bus lines, it is reasonable for this lot to have no off-street parking

BOA1697493

2025-07-29

2 Planning Department



spots, especially as there is not enough lot space to provide 8 off-street parking spots. Not providing off-street parking allows for more livable area for each unit as opposed to garage space. Relief is recommended.

The lot area, use, and number of allowed stories are additional violations that are all in service of providing additional housing units. In particular, 3-bedroom housing units capable of accommodating families are important to supply in a multigenerational neighborhood.

A proviso for Planning Department design review has been added to this recommendation due to the exterior staircase going down the front lot having implications on open space and permeability in the front yard. This review should focus on ensuring it is necessary for the exterior staircase to be where it is proposed. Otherwise, it is recommended the staircase is removed or placed elsewhere.

This project supports Housing a Changing City: Boston 2030 which advocates for increased housing production, especially of multifamily projects in an area where single family lots are predominant. This proposal exemplifies a case for zoning reform.

Plans reviewed are titled "51 Fuller Townhouse Development, 51 Fuller St, Dorchester, MA 02124" prepared by "Monte French Design Studio" on November 19, 2024.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1697493, 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	BOA1716486
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-05-01
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	24 Angell ST Dorchester 02124
Parcel ID	1404258000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Greater Mattapan Neighborhood 3F-5000
Zoning Article	60
Project Description	Construct a new four-story, four-unit residential building.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Height Excessive (ft) Height Excessive (stories) Side Yard Insufficient FAR Excessive Parking design and maneuverability Additional Lot Area Insufficient Use (Forbidden)

Planning Context:

The proposed project would construct a new four-story, four-unit residential building on Angell St in Dorchester. The proposed project is located just south of Franklin Park and a block north of Harambee Park. This area of Dorchester is characterized by smaller residential buildings, with one-, two-, and three-family residential buildings being the predominant form. The proposed project is situated less than 100 feet from Blue Hill Avenue, a major thoroughfare in the area and the local commercial hub.

The area is well connected to public transit due to its proximity to Blue Hill Avenue and associated bus routes. Parking on property is extremely common, with tandem parking being present on most buildings along Angell St.

Zoning Analysis:

The proposed project triggers six dimensional violations as well as a forbidden use. The forbidden use is for a four-unit (multifamily) residential building in an area zoned for up to three units. While one-unit and three-unit buildings are the most common form on Angell St, there are examples of multifamily residences. The property directly across the street, as well as a few



properties closer to Blue Hill Ave have four units. While the dimensional requirements make it difficult to properly design space for four units, the added density of an extra unit fits within the context of the neighborhood. By allowing for the increase in height one story over the maximum, it will have the space to create a fourth unit without compromising on good design. The additional unit will trigger the need for sprinklers, and an accessible unit for those with disabilities or mobility issues.

The next violation is in regards to off-street parking and maneuverability. This is triggered by the tandem parking proposed for the project. While tandem parking technically does not have the turning dimensions required under the zoning code, it is extremely common throughout the city, and in this area in particular. This feature is in line with neighborhood standards.

The next two violations are in regard to the height of the structure. The project has violations for both "Height in stories" and "Height in Feet". The project is proposing a full four-story, 39-foot building. The zoning code allows for a 3-story, 35-foot structure. While two-and-a-half and three-story buildings are much more common along the street, the unique topography of this lot suggests that this is a good fit for the property. The lot is currently uneven and hilly. To construct the building, there will be an excavation that lowers the lot and levels it off. This will allow for the four-story building while keeping it in line with the heights of neighboring properties. The natural slope of the hill allows for the extra floor, without disrupting the overall design feel of the neighborhood.

The next violation is in regards to FAR for the project. The area is zoned for a maximum FAR of 0.80, while the proposed project has an FAR of 1.12. This is reflective of the extra story that this project is proposing above the zoned height limit. Since the extra height makes contextual sense on this lot, and its proximity to Blue Hill Ave, this additional FAR makes sense for a project in this location.

The next violation is due to insufficient additional lot area per additional unit. The zoning requires 2,500 square feet per unit. The proposed project has a total of 5,381 SF, which translates to around 1,300 Sf per unit. While this is under the minimum, the peculiarities of the project's height create a situation in which the additional density for this location makes sense within the context of the neighborhood.

The final violation is in regards to the side yard setback. There is a zoning requirement of a 10-foot side yard, while the project only has a 3-foot side yard on the right side of the property,



facing Angell St. The other side yard has the required depth of 10 feet, 6 inches. This is reflective of the larger trend on Angell St.. As tandem parking is dominant in the neighborhood, many of the buildings along the street are shifted to one side of the property in order to accommodate the drive lane for parking. The proposed setback makes sense within this context and points to the potential need for zoning reform in the area.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1716486, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1719239
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-05-08
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	6 Gleason ST Dorchester 02121
Parcel ID	1402659000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Greater Mattapan Neighborhood 3F-5000
Zoning Article	60
Project Description	Proposal to add an additional dwelling unit in the basement of an existing three family residential structure. Filed in conjunction with 6R Gleason Street.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Parking or Loading Insufficient Use: Forbidden

Planning Context:

The subject lot is located in a medium density, residential area within walking distance to the Talbot Ave MBTA Commuter Rail Station, Blue Hill Avenue, and Harambee Park. No significant exterior changes are proposed.

The ADU Guidebook, approved in November 2024, provides a number of schemes to enable the addition of a housing unit on various lot types across Boston. More specifically, the guidebook describes the conversion of a basement into an additional unit as a suitable renovation for medium-density lots. The guidebook does note that building and fire code requires consideration during basement renovations, as will be addressed below.

The subject property is also located in the Fairmount Indigo Corridor Planning Area. The Corridor Plan seeks to link culturally rich residential areas with mixed-use amenities in settings that are accessible and affordable. The development of an additional dwelling unit within the existing floor plan of a three-unit building directly contributes to the goals of the plan because it adds an additional residential unit to the neighborhood which contributes to affordability. It also adds an additional unit in an area close to transit and open space, increasing accessibility to services for residents.



Zoning Analysis:

The subject property is located in the Greater Mattapan Neighborhood 3F-5000 zoning subdistrict and is an existing three-family detached dwelling. Section 60-3 states that an additional dwelling unit shall be an allowed use provided that the addition of gross floor area does not result from an extension of the building envelope to create a new dwelling.

The proposal includes an exterior stairwell down to the basement unit with a railing which does not constitute an extension of the existing building envelope. Apart from the proposed stairs and new egress windows, all improvements are within the existing structure. The necessary means of egress for each bedroom and additional two means of egress for the unit are provided. Additionally, an adequate ceiling height of eight feet, two inches is proposed. The project will also provide sprinklers within the basement unit but not throughout the building which meets fire code requirements.

The interior renovations will result in an addition to the floor area ratio (FAR) given that the basement is currently unfinished, however, no change to the building envelope is proposed. Deciding the permissibility of the project on whether the basement is finished or not would mean that the proponent could finish the basement, then reapply for zoning relief which would be an unnecessary delay for a project that proposes an additional residential dwelling.

The plans submitted do not show detail for the parking area beyond a statement that there are six parking spaces. Article 60 Table H requires 0.75 spaces per unit. With five total units proposed, four parking spaces are required. Visual inspection of the property shows at least four parking spaces if cars were parked in tandem. Visual inspection of surrounding properties with two to six residential units suggest that off-street parking is limited in this area and that street parking is more common. The Planning Department supports a variance given the project's contribution to goals for transit oriented, affordable housing through the adaptation of existing residential structures.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1719239, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.



Planning Department

CITY of BOSTON

Reviewed,

Kathleen O'Neil

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1719245
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-05-08
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	6R Gleason ST Dorchester 02121
Parcel ID	1402659000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Greater Mattapan Neighborhood 3F-5000
Zoning Article	60
Project Description	Renovate existing detached garage into single residential unit. Plans filed in conjunction with 6 Gleason Street.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Parking or Loading Insufficient Lot Area Insufficient Lot Frontage Insufficient Lot Width Insufficient Usable Open Space Insufficient Side Yard Insufficient Rear Yard Insufficient Use: Forbidden

Planning Context:

The subject lot is located in a residential area less than a half mile from the Talbot Ave MBTA Commuter Rail Station, Blue Hill Avenue, and Harambee Park. The corner lot is large for the neighborhood where closely spaced triple-deckers with narrow driveways and limited parking are common. The project proposes an Accessory Dwelling Unit in an existing garage (barn) in the rear yard of a two and a half-story structure with three existing residential units; the project also proposes a new basement unit.

The ADU Guidebook, approved in November 2024, provides a number of schemes to enable the addition of one unit of housing on various lot types across Boston. More specifically, the guidebook describes the conversion of an existing accessory structure into an ADU as a suitable renovation for larger lots. The guidebook does note that building and fire code require consideration during renovations, as will be addressed below.



The subject property is also located in the Fairmount Indigo Corridor Planning Area. The Corridor Plan seeks to link culturally rich residential areas with mixed-use amenities in settings that are accessible and affordable. The development of an ADU within the existing accessory structure directly contributes to the goals of the plan because it adds an additional residential unit to the neighborhood which contributes to affordability. It also adds an additional unit in an area close to transit and open space, increasing accessibility to services for residents.

Zoning Analysis:

Section 60-33.11 (see also Section 14-6) provides regulations for Detached Accessory Dwelling Units stating that dimensional regulations shall apply as if the accessory dwelling were on a separate lot. The section specifically states that the distance between the main dwelling and accessory dwelling must be twice the minimum side yard depth, and that a new dwelling cannot be built in the rear of a primary dwelling. It also grants the Board of Appeal permission to grant a variance “if it finds that open space for all occupants, and light and air for all rooms designed for human occupancy, will not be less than would be provided if the requirements” for the section were met.

The project is in violation of the following dimensional requirements: lot area, lot frontage, lot width, side yard, and rear yard because the proposed structure must be treated as if it were on a separate lot. Many of these dimensional requirements are infeasible for the project to meet because the garage is existing.

Given that this is an adaptation of an existing structure, a main concern that arises is associated with fire safety, specifically Fire Department access and if the buildings have sprinkler systems installed. Located on a corner lot, the proposed ADU has adequate frontage and is 48 feet from Gleason Street. This is less than the 50-foot threshold for additional fire safety measures in fire code, as cited in the ADU guidebook. The plans do not show a proposed sprinkler system for the garage ADU; a sprinkler system is proposed for the basement unit proposed in conjunction with this application. Ultimately, the Fire Department will also need to approve this plan.

Section 60-33.11 also cites minimum side yard requirements between the existing and proposed structure with the intent of maintaining adequate light and air for rooms designed for human occupancy. The existing structures are nine feet apart and there are existing units within the primary structure adjacent to the garage. This suggests that adequate light and air exist between the two structures and this application should not be denied on that basis.



At 11,013 square feet with a large shady grass area and a porch, the lot has more than twice the 2,000 square feet of open space required for the five units. No violation is found for inadequate open space.

The project is also in violation of the off-street parking requirements. Article 60 Table H requires 0.75 spaces per unit, meaning four parking spaces are required. Parking details are not shown on the proposed plans beyond text that states there are six parking spaces. Visual inspection of the property shows at least four parking spaces if cars were parked in tandem. Visual inspection of surrounding properties with two to six residential units suggest that off-street parking is limited in this area and that street parking is more common.

Relief for the violations for lot area, lot width, lot frontage, side yard, rear yard, use, and parking requirements is supported by the Planning Department because the project contributes to the goals for transit oriented development and the adaptation of existing accessory structures to create residential units.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1719245, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1719974
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-05-12
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	96 W Concord ST Roxbury 02118
Parcel ID	0900605000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	South End Neighborhood MFR/LS
Zoning Article	64
Project Description	Convert partially occupied basement until a full additional unit.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	CFROD Applicability Basement Dwelling Unit Forbidden

Planning Context:

The proposed project would convert a partially occupied basement into a fully occupiable additional unit in a three-unit residential building. The surrounding context is made up of residential buildings with a similar mass varying in unit counts. This location is within the Coastal Flood Resilience Overlay District (CFROD) which covers areas that can be impacted by sea level rise and flooding.

Zoning Analysis:

The proposed project is in violation of the South End regulation that makes all basement dwelling units forbidden. Along with this it is not advisable to create basement units within CFROD due to the dangers of flooding and sea level rise. It is recommended the proposed project is denied.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1719974, The Planning Department recommends DENIAL.



Planning Department

CITY of BOSTON

Reviewed,

Kathleen Onuf

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1598199
ZBA Submitted Date	2024-05-03
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	223 to 225 Bunker Hill ST Charlestown 02129
Parcel ID	0200056000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Charlestown Neighborhood NS
Zoning Article	Article 62, Section(s) 12, 13, 29.2
Project Description	<p>The applicant proposes to construct a new three-story townhouse building on a newly created 2,071 square foot lot at 223–225 Bunker Hill Street in Charlestown. The proposed building includes three attached townhouse units, each designed as a three-story building with one unit, basement-level living space and private roof decks.</p> <p>This development is associated with an application to subdivide the existing lot (ALT1592346), and an application to build a three-story, two-unit townhouse (ERT1576719) on the other newly created lot (1A/1B Mystic Street). Demolition of the existing structure on the site (a dry cleaners) will be filed separately under a forthcoming demolition permit.</p>
Relief Type	Conditional Use,Variance
Violations	FAR Excessive Rear Yard Insufficient Use: Conditional 3F (Bsmt. & First Story) Use: Conditional Townhouse (Bsmt. & First Story) Use: Conditional 3F (Second Story & Above) Traffic Visibility Across Corner

Planning Context:

This project was reviewed by the Planning Department for the Zoning Board of Appeal hearings on April 29, 2025 and June 3, 2025 where it was deferred. Since the June 3 hearing, no new plans have been submitted and so the Planning Department recommendation has remained the same.



The project site is located in the Charlestown neighborhood, within the Neighborhood Shopping (NS) subdistrict, a traditionally commercial district that includes a mix of neighborhood-serving retail and residential uses. The property also lies within the Charlestown Neighborhood Design Overlay District and the Charlestown Restricted Roof Overlay District, which aim to preserve the character and scale of existing development.

The site has frontage on both Bunker Hill Street and Mystic Street. Bunker Hill Street is a mixed-use corridor, with many multifamily residential as well as commercial buildings, including a salon and restaurant on the block adjacent to the proposed project. The proposed project abuts three-story residential buildings on its rear and one side, and there are several larger four-story multifamily buildings located nearby along Bunker Hill Street. The scale of the proposed development is consistent with the surrounding three- and four-story multifamily residential buildings and aligns with the established scale, lot pattern, and yard configurations of the neighborhood.

PLAN: Charlestown, and updated zoning to implement the plan, was adopted by the BPDA board on September 28, 2023. The PLAN highlights that “residents’ feedback about retail has centered on four concerns: 1) the loss of small businesses; 2) vacant storefronts; 3) missing essential retail like laundromats, and 4) a lack of food options.” Because of these concerns, particularly loss of retail space, the plan includes zoning recommendations to make residential uses conditional on the ground floor in the commercial districts. This zoning was intended to “reduce existing pressure on the real estate market to convert retail spaces into housing units, which has led to the loss of several retail spaces in the neighborhood in recent years... it will allow for the Zoning Board of Appeals to deny variances for residential uses on the ground floor in some instances, where a conversion from retail is required, without prohibiting residential uses from occupying ground floors universally, such as in locations where residential is already or historically has been the ground floor.” Because this project would include converting the location from a service use (dry cleaning) to fully residential, it does not align with the plan goals of preserving retail in the NS district along Bunker Hill St. However, the Office of Neighborhood Services (ONS) has highlighted that this project was previously proposed with retail on the ground floor and was changed to fully residential based off of direct feedback from abutting residents. While the Planning Department still considers retaining existing ground floor commercial spaces to be an important planning priority for this area when possible, the project’s fully residential use is responding to direct community feedback and concerns on the site.



PLAN: Charlestown also sets recommendations to address neighborhood housing needs, including to “Prioritize the creation of larger housing units with 3+ bedrooms,” which this project does.

The plan does not include additional specific land use recommendations for the Original Peninsula of Charlestown (where this project is located), but does include specific design guidelines for infill projects within the Original Peninsula. Because of this project's location within the Neighborhood Design Overlay District, it should receive design review to ensure compliance with the design guidelines established in PLAN: Charlestown.

Zoning Analysis:

Floor Area Ratio (FAR) Compliance: Per Article 62, Table D, the maximum FAR allowed in the NS subdistrict is 2.0. The proposed project exceeds this limit, triggering a zoning violation. While the structure adds density, it does so in a manner that aligns with the surrounding three and four-story residential buildings, indicating that the FAR is consistent with the neighborhood character and built form.

Rear Yard Requirements: The ordinance requires a minimum rear yard depth of 20 feet, while the proposed rear yard is 3 feet. However, because this is a corner lot, this rear yard also acts as a side yard, and the required side yard in this subdistrict is zero feet. Therefore, this smaller yard is reasonable. In addition, small rear yards is a common condition among rowhouse lots of similar depth in Charlestown, where zero-lot-line rear walls are often observed due to constrained block dimensions and historic patterns of development.

Use Compliance: The project is cited for three conditional uses. Firstly, it is cited as a conditional use for “Three family detached dwelling” on Second Story & Above. One to three unit dwellings are conditional (while multifamily is allowed) in this subdistrict in order to encourage higher density projects. However, the unit count of this project is appropriate, given that the larger size of the units (four bedrooms) is aligned with the goals of PLAN: Charlestown, and the size of the building already exceeds the maximum FAR.

It is also cited for the conditional use of “Rowhouse” on the Basement and First Story and for the conditional use of “Three family detached dwelling” in the Basement & First Story. All residential uses are conditional on the ground floor in order to encourage mixed use and commercial projects in the NS subdistrict. As discussed in the planning context, PLAN: Charlestown states that this zoning exists to “allow for the Zoning Board of Appeals to deny



variances for residential uses on the ground floor in some instances, where a conversion from retail is required.” However, because this project is in a transitional area where fully residential projects should be considered carefully, and this project's fully residential use responds to direct community feedback, the Planning Department supports the granting of the conditional use.

This project is within a Neighborhood Design Overlay District and proposes the erection of a building with a gross floor area of three hundred (300) or more square feet which is visible from a public street. Therefore, it is subject to the Design Component of Small Project Review and any approved plans must be subsequently reviewed by the Planning Department (Section 80E-2 of the Zoning Code).

Reviewed plans: “Three Townhouses, 223–225 Bunker Hill Street” and prepared by Timothy Sheehan, Architect, dated December 11, 2024.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1598199, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH PROVISIO/S: that plans be submitted to the Planning Department for design review because of the projects location with a Neighborhood Design Overlay District (NDOD), with attention to compliance with the design guidelines established in PLAN: Charlestown.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1685140
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-01-21
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	4 Springer ST South Boston 02127
Parcel ID	0701961000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	South Boston Neighborhood MFR
Zoning Article	68
Project Description	Demolish the existing structure under a separate permit and construct a new single-family dwelling, as shown on the submitted plans.
Relief Type	Variance, Conditional Use
Violations	Parking or Loading Insufficient Roof Structure Restrictions Side Yard Insufficient Rear Yard Insufficient Lot Area Insufficient

Planning Context:

The project site is located in South Boston, a dense neighborhood of narrow lots, attached rowhouses, and a walkable streetscape. Springer Street is primarily residential, with a mix of triple-deckers and newer single- and multifamily infill that reflect ongoing densification. Rooftop decks are common on both renovated and newly built homes, and a recently constructed house on the block includes a similar feature, establishing precedent for vertical additions. While rooftop decks are typical, the proposed dormer design is less common, giving the project a more distinctive profile.

The existing structure is a 900-square-foot single-family home that no longer meets modern standards for space or functionality. The proposed replacement will provide 2,199 square feet of living space, maintaining the same number of bedrooms but significantly improving layout and livability. It will also include two off-street parking spaces in a ground-floor garage. Demolition and reconstruction allow for a more efficient use of the lot while remaining consistent with the neighborhood's evolving built form.

Zoning Analysis:



The proposal to construct a new single-family dwelling at 4 Springer Street has been reviewed against the dimensional and use requirements of Article 68 (South Boston Neighborhood District), Table D, for properties located in the MFR (Multifamily Residential) subdistrict.

Lot Area Requirements: The proposed lot contains 1,158 square feet, which is below the minimum required 2,000 square feet for a single-family dwelling. Although this constitutes a dimensional violation, undersized lots are common in South Boston due to historic parcel configurations. Similar relief has been granted for other residential infill projects on constrained lots.

Side Yard Requirements: The proposed side yard setbacks are insufficient: the structure provides a 3-foot setback on one side and a 0.8-foot setback on the other, where a minimum of 3 feet is required on both sides. Relief is required. However, this condition aligns with the prevailing built form of South Boston, where narrow side yards or attached buildings are typical, and there is still adequate distance to surrounding structures.

Rear Yard Requirements: The proposed rear yard depth is 11 feet 7 inches, which does not meet the required minimum of 20 feet. Relief is required. This reduced rear yard reflects the neighborhood's narrow lot depths and high-density residential development pattern, where similar conditions are widespread.

Roof Structure Restrictions: Relief is required for the proposed roof structure. Under Article 68, roof structures must be located on the top roof. In this case, the proposed structure extends from a dormer on the upper level onto a flat roof. While it meets the guideline for placement on a flat roof, it does not conform to the definition of being on the topmost roof plane. Relief is sought due to this interpretation.

Off-Street Parking Requirements: The project does not provide any off-street parking spaces, triggering a violation of the minimum parking requirement for a single-family dwelling. Relief is required. Given the site constraints and the neighborhood's walkability and transit accessibility, variances for parking are commonly granted in similar contexts throughout South Boston.

The proposal requires zoning relief for insufficient lot area, side yard setbacks, rear yard depth, off-street parking, and roof structure placement. Despite these violations, the proposed single-family dwelling maintains a use, form, and scale consistent with the surrounding residential



fabric. It supports ongoing neighborhood infill and revitalization, and reflects broader planning goals to modernize dimensional regulations to better reflect existing built conditions.

The architectural plans, entitled “New Structure, 4 Springer Street,” were prepared by Design by Sami LLC, dated November 6, 2024, and revised on February 6, 2025, and April 16, 2025.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1685140, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1672611
ZBA Submitted Date	2024-11-20
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	245 to 249 E ST South Boston 02127
Parcel ID	0600956000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	South Boston Neighborhood MFR/LS
Zoning Article	68
Project Description	This project proposes a change of use from a mixed-use building containing a store/restaurant on the first level and five residential units on upper levels, to a fully residential building with six apartments. The scope includes interior renovations to construct a new bathroom and kitchen, and two new bedrooms.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Parking or Loading Insufficient Usable Open Space Insufficient Additional Lot Area Insufficient

Planning Context:

The proposed change of occupancy at 245–249 E Street in South Boston presents an important opportunity to add much-needed housing in a highly connected and desirable part of the city. The project would convert a mixed-use building, formerly containing a commercial storefront and five apartments, into a fully residential building with six apartments. Modest interior renovations include the installation of a new bathroom and kitchen, and two new bedrooms, enabling the building to accommodate additional residents while maintaining its existing footprint.

This site is ideally situated to support new housing without requiring additional off-street parking. The property is located within walking distance of both Broadway and Andrew Stations on the Red Line. It is also well-served by several bus routes, including the 5, 9, 10, and 11, which connect to key job centers and commercial areas. Additionally, the site is just a few blocks from West Broadway, one of South Boston’s primary commercial corridors, offering a wide range of



neighborhood amenities. This area does not require ground floor commercial continuity, as many nearby properties already feature residential uses at the ground level.

Given its central location and proximity to transit, this is a great place to add new housing. South Boston remains a neighborhood with strong housing demand, and small-scale conversions like this are a sustainable way to help meet that need. Allowing the renovation and change of use of existing buildings is also critical to preserving and adapting the neighborhood's historic building stock, ensuring that these structures remain functional, safe, and viable for years to come.

Zoning Analysis:

The proposed project at 245–249 E Street triggers three zoning violations under the South Boston Neighborhood District: insufficient parking, insufficient usable open space, and insufficient additional lot area. These violations reflect long-standing mismatches between current zoning requirements and the built form and housing needs of South Boston.

The site is located within a Restricted Parking District, where off-street parking is conditional and subject to special approval. Zoning requires 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit (or 1 space for studios and 1-bedrooms), but no new parking is being proposed. This is reasonable given the building's proximity to Broadway and Andrew Red Line stations and several bus routes (including the 5, 9, 10, and 11), making it a transit-accessible site where car ownership is not a necessity. Requiring parking on this site presents a clear zoning hardship, as it would necessitate the demolition of the existing building.

The proposal also cannot meet the zoning requirement of 200 square feet of usable open space per dwelling unit. With an existing structure that covers nearly the full lot, there is no opportunity to meet this requirement without demolition. This highlights a key challenge in adapting older urban buildings to meet contemporary zoning, and points to the need for updated regulations that acknowledge existing lot constraints and the goal to preserve existing structures.

Lastly, the zoning code requires 1,000 square feet of additional lot area for each additional dwelling unit beyond the first. The lot is just under 2,500 square feet—well below the 5,000 square feet that zoning would require for six units. However, this is not a new condition created by the proposal; rather, it reflects the legacy lot size of much of South Boston, where many similar buildings already exist with comparable or greater unit counts. This project underscores



the need for zoning reform to bring regulations into better alignment with historic development patterns and current housing needs.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1672611, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1724134
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-05-22
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	193 W Springfield ST Roxbury 02118
Parcel ID	0402549000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	South End Neighborhood MFR
Zoning Article	64
Project Description	Construct a new roof deck and rear deck addition.
Relief Type	Conditional Use
Violations	Roof Structure Restrictions

Planning Context:

The proposed project is to add a rear deck and roof deck to a single family dwelling. To build the rear deck, which would be accessed from the first floor, a rear yard storage storage shed on the basement level will be demolished. Many of the surrounding buildings have existing roof decks

Zoning Analysis:

The proposed project is within a Restricted Roof District with specific regulations on the construction of roof decks. In those regulations any roof deck hand rail, balustrade, hatch or bulkhead must be set back at least 5 feet from the front and rear roof edge. In the proposed project the current handrail is located within 1 foot from the rear edge. Zoning relief is appropriate provided the front setback is expanded to 5 feet and undergoes design review.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1724134, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH PROVISIO/S: that plans be submitted to the Planning Department for design review with attention to increasing the setback from the rear roof edge to 5 feet.



Planning Department

CITY of BOSTON

Reviewed,

Kathleen Onuf

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1729459
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-06-03
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	89 Condor ST East Boston 02128
Parcel ID	0103572000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	East Boston Neighborhood EBR-4
Zoning Article	53
Project Description	Construct a four-story residential building with four dwelling units.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Parking or Loading Insufficient Front Yard Insufficient Side Yard Insufficient

Planning Context:

The proposed project is located in East Boston within the planning area of PLAN: East Boston, adopted by the BPDA Board in March 2024. The project site measures twenty-five feet wide, and is located in an area of relatively narrow parcels, many of which also measure about twenty-five feet wide. New zoning to follow PLAN: East Boston was adopted for the neighborhood in April 2024. The planning and zoning for East Boston work in conjunction to affirm the existing environment while providing opportunities for expanded development of housing. Proposed projects in East Boston should conform to recent planning and zoning of the area.

Zoning Analysis:

The proposed project contains three zoning violations. In an EBR-4 Subdistrict, per Article 53, Table F, the front yard requirement is 3' minimum and 5' maximum depth, with the exception that a bay window may protrude into a front yard. The proposed project includes a front yard depth of 2'-5 1/2" to the outside of the proposed bay window. The depth of the window exceeds 6 1/2" thus creating a building setback of at least three feet. Given the exception for bay windows, the front yard violation appears to be issued in error.

In an EBR-4 Subdistrict, per Article 53, Table F, the side yard requirement is five feet. The proposed project contains side yards measuring 3'-6" and two feet on either side of the building.



The zoning in East Boston was adopted recently and is informed by existing conditions and contemporary planning, however, the extraordinary narrowness of lots in this block and the existing multi-unit context reflects a mismatch between the application of the dimensional regulations and the neighborhood context. Side yards on this block typically measure between two and three feet on either side of the property. The proposed project, as designed, aligns with this neighborhood context.

The proposed project contains four dwelling units, and therefore contains a minimum parking requirement of 1.0 spaces per dwelling unit. Relief is recommended for the number of parking spaces given as many of the lots on this block, including this lot, are not wide enough to support both a driveway and sufficient accommodations for housing.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1729459, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1671558
ZBA Submitted Date	2024-11-15
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	390 Meridian ST East Boston 02128
Parcel ID	0103621000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	East Boston Neighborhood EBR-4
Zoning Article	53
Project Description	The proposed project is to subdivide a through lot. No construction or alteration is being proposed within the boundaries of the new proposed lot.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Building Lot Coverage Excessive Permeable Area of Lot Insufficient Rear Yard Insufficient

Planning Context:

This case (390 Meridian Street, referred to in the plans as Lot A and comprising 2,986 square feet) is being considered in conjunction with a second BOA case (355 Border Street, BOA1671561, referred to on the plans as Lot B).

390 Meridian Street is the site of an existing two-story house. While this project is solely to propose the subdivision of the current through lot (which includes both 390 Meridian Street and 355 Border Street), a new four-unit building is also being proposed under a separate BOA case and parent permit application number at 355 Border Street. All violations related to the proposed new building will be addressed in the planning recommendation for BOA1671561.

The house at 390 Meridian Street sits within a Neighborhood Design Overlay District, and is surrounded by other one- to two-story residential properties.

Zoning Analysis:

The proposed project received violations for excessive building lot coverage, insufficient permeable area of lot, and an insufficient rear yard. The violations are mainly triggered by the subdivision. The existing width of the lot, at 5 feet' narrower than the average lot width on the



block, contributes to the permeable area and lot coverage violations. These violations would require a variance to overcome.

This lot is one of only a handful of through lots on the block; the majority of lots are of similar size and orientation to the resulting subdivided lot. Additionally, satisfying these violations would require demolition of a property built in 1880. The plot plan is titled "Subdivision Plan", was prepared by George C. Collins, and is dated June 24, 2024.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1671558, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1671561
ZBA Submitted Date	2024-11-15
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	355 Border ST East Boston 02128
Parcel ID	0103621000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	East Boston Neighborhood EBR-4
Zoning Article	53
Project Description	The applicant is proposing the construction of a four-story, four-unit residential building.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Parking or Loading Insufficient Front Yard Insufficient Rear Yard Insufficient

Planning Context:

This case (355 Border Street, referred to on the plans as Lot B and comprising 2,675 square feet) is being considered in conjunction with a second BOA case (390 Meridian Street, BOA1671558, referred to on the plans as Lot A). This case addresses the construction of a proposed four-story building and is dependent on the outcome of the proposed subdivision case.

The proposed four-story, four-unit residential building would be on a mixed-use block with mainly multifamily residential buildings, within a Neighborhood Design Overlay District (NDOD). A 350 sq. ft. roof deck facing Border Street is also being proposed. If approved, the proposed building would replace an existing one-story garage.

Zoning Analysis:

Three violations are cited for the proposed building at 355 Border Street: insufficient loading or parking, an insufficient front yard, and an insufficient rear yard. It would be situated within the EBR-4 (Medium Residential) subdistrict.

This subdistrict requires a rear yard that is 1/3 as deep as the lot. While the proposed stairs provide an additional means of egress to exit the building, they also extend into the rear yard by roughly 7'. Without the stairs, the rear yard would be 35'; with them, the yard would be 28'. That would make it one foot less than the Code requirement (29' with this lot depth).



Three feet is the minimum front yard in this subdistrict. While the first floor of the building would be set about 3' further back from the sidewalk than the garage that currently exists there, the other floors include a 3' bump out. This would bring the second, third, and fourth stories roughly as close to the sidewalk as the existing garage. This bump out should be removed to provide the necessary 3 foot front yard; or the building should be shifted to preserve a 3 foot front yard while increasing the severity of the rear yard violation.

In this subdistrict, one parking space is required per dwelling unit for buildings with four units or more. Four off-street spaces would be required by the Code this project. However, considering the slightly narrower configuration of this lot (30') compared to the average lot width (33') on this block, adhering to this rule would only serve to trigger a new violation for an insufficient side yard, a requirement that is being met by the proposed building. Additionally, based on the provided plans, it is not physically possible to fit four cars on this lot in a non-tandem configuration with the proposed project.

The plans are titled "Multi Family Residence Building", were prepared by Latitude Architecture, and are dated July 16, 2024.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1671561, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH PROVISIO/S: that the front yard setback be increased to 3 feet; and that plans be submitted to the Planning Department for design review with attention to site planning/design, including detailed views of the the ground floor and entrances, as well as building placement.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1708672
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-04-12
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	203 Bigelow ST Brighton 02135
Parcel ID	2203238000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Allston/Brighton Neighborhood 1F-5000
Zoning Article	51
Project Description	Permit existing condition created by previous addition to a building.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Front Yard Insufficient Extension of Non Conforming Use

Planning Context:

The proposed project is located on a residential block in the Oak Square neighborhood of Brighton. There are two other residential buildings on the odd-numbered side of the 200-block of Bigelow Street. This application has been submitted to the ZBA to correct an existing condition containing a violation for which a permit was not issued. The project proposes no further changes to the property beyond those which were made previously and constitute the existing condition. Such changes included an extension of the building to provide additional living space for the second unit of the two-unit dwelling.

Zoning Analysis:

This project contains a zoning violation for an insufficient front yard and an extension of an existing non conforming use. The front yard violation was already existing prior to the work to extend the building. The extension of the building does not further encroach on the front yard area from the previous condition of the building.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1708672, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.



Planning Department

CITY of BOSTON

Reviewed,

Kathleen O'Neil

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1718169
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-05-06
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-24
Address	12 Havey ST Roslindale 02131
Parcel ID	2001157000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Roslindale Neighborhood 2F-5000
Zoning Article	67
Project Description	Proponent is seeking to completely replace the existing roof structure to accommodate a living space on the third story by adding dormers to the attic level.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	FAR Excessive Height Excessive (stories)

Planning Context:

The Proponent is seeking to fully replace the existing roof structure at 12 Havey Street in order to create living space on the third story. The proposal includes adding dormers at the attic level to accommodate this expanded use. The property is located in a residential area of Roslindale characterized by a mix of 2.5- and 3-story buildings, many of which include attic-level living space through similar roof modifications.

Several nearby properties, including 15, 19, 23 and 27 Haslet Street, feature gabled roofs with dormers that are similar in character to what is being proposed at 12 Havey. These nearby examples demonstrate a local precedent for upper-story expansions that maintain the overall residential scale and architectural character of the neighborhood.

The site is also located within close proximity to several bus routes and the Roslindale Village and Bellevue commuter rail stations, making it a well-connected part of the city. Allowing homeowners to extend their living space in these well-located neighborhoods supports housing stability and flexibility for growing families, multigenerational households, and others who need additional space. Encouraging modest expansions in existing housing stock is one way to support the city's goals around housing affordability and neighborhood vitality, particularly in areas with strong transit access.

Zoning Analysis:



The property at 12 Havey Street is located in the 2F-5000 zoning subdistrict, which permits a maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.5 and a maximum building height of 2.5 stories. The proposed project exceeds both of these limits, with a total of three stories and an FAR of about 0.7.

Despite exceeding these dimensional requirements, the proposal remains consistent with the surrounding context. The project creates additional living space within the existing building footprint by modifying the roof, rather than expanding outward. The overall scale and form remain compatible with neighboring homes, many of which also feature attic-level living space through similar roof configurations. For all of the reasons mentioned above, this is a case for zoning reform.

Given this context, the requested zoning relief supports continued residential use and reinvestment in the property without disrupting neighborhood character.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1718169, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1694461
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-02-25
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	28 Carolina AV Jamaica Plain 02130
Parcel ID	1901288000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Jamaica Plain Neighborhood 3F-5000
Zoning Article	55
Project Description	The proposal involves a change of use to convert the existing roofing contractor commercial building into a three-unit residential dwelling. The building is one of two detached structures located on the same lot.. A total of six units will be created between two structures. Six shared off-street parking spaces are proposed to serve both buildings. This application is filed in conjunction with ALT1681326.
Relief Type	Variance, Conditional Use
Violations	Side Yard Insufficient Parking or Loading Insufficient Dimension Regulations Reconstruction/Extension of Nonconforming Bldg.

Planning Context:

The site is located in the Jamaica Plain neighborhood of Boston, specifically within a residential block characterized by a mix of triple-decker homes, two-family dwellings, and small multifamily buildings typical of the neighborhood's urban fabric. The lot itself is notably larger than most in the area and currently contains two existing commercial buildings, which are proposed to be converted into residential units as part of this project. This approach reflects an adaptive reuse strategy that will better align these structures with the predominantly residential character of the surrounding neighborhood. There are similarly large lots nearby that already accommodate multiple residential structures, demonstrating a local precedent for this type of development. The proposal aligns with ongoing City goals and local planning objectives to support housing production within established residential areas in a manner consistent with the existing built environment. Recent planning initiatives in Jamaica Plain, such as the Plan: JP/Rox adopted in 2017, emphasize the importance of infill residential development and adaptive reuse that complements neighborhood character while providing additional housing opportunities.



Zoning Analysis:

The proposal involves both the conversion and expansion of an existing commercial building previously used by a roofing contractor. Specifically, the project seeks to convert the structure into a three-family dwelling and includes the addition of an upper story. While the proposal increases the building's residential capacity through this vertical addition, it does not propose changes to the existing building footprint. The project has been reviewed against the requirements of Article 55 for the 3F-5000 subdistrict.

Side yard requirements: A minimum side yard of 6 feet is required. The proposed upper-story addition extends an existing nonconforming side yard of 4 feet, resulting in a deficiency of 2 feet.

Main entrance orientation: Article 55 requires that the main entrance face the front lot line. The proposed plans show the main entrance oriented toward the side lot line, which requires relief. However, this orientation is due to the existing building configuration, which was constructed as a commercial structure with its primary entrance on the side. Maintaining the existing entrance location avoids significant structural alterations and supports the adaptive reuse of the building. Given that the lot has street frontage along both the front and side lot lines, and that nearby buildings exhibit varied entrance orientations, this design is not out of character with the surrounding context.

Off-street parking requirements: Six parking spaces are proposed across both buildings, resulting in one parking space per unit, which meets the numerical requirement for the six total dwelling units. Under Article 55-40, however, parking is not permitted within the front yard except for up to two spaces with a maximum width of 10 feet. Relief is required for the proposed location of parking within the front yard.

While there is no precedent for front yard parking in the immediate residential context, the proposed parking plan supports the adaptive reuse of existing commercial buildings on the site by utilizing an area already paved for commercial vehicle use. This approach avoids creating new curb cuts or paving additional yard areas elsewhere on the lot, thereby minimizing site disturbance and maintaining as much open space as possible. Additionally, reusing the existing parking area helps facilitate the conversion from commercial to residential use in a way that is functional for future residents while supporting city goals for adaptive reuse and housing production.



Extension of nonconforming structure: Because the proposal includes an addition to an existing nonconforming building, relief is required under Article 9, Section 1.

The proposed project therefore requires variances for side yard, entrance orientation, parking location, and extension of a nonconforming structure. Despite these violations, the project maintains a use and scale consistent with the surrounding residential context and supports adaptive reuse and neighborhood revitalization. Zoning relief is warranted, and the project further reflects the need to modernize dimensional regulations to better match the existing built fabric. The plans, entitled “28-30 Carolina Avenue,” were prepared by Hendren Associates, Gary Hendren, Architect, dated December 2024.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1694461, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL W/ PROVISIO that plans be submitted to the Planning Department for review with attention to the screening and landscaping of the parking area, including the possible reduction in total number of spaces if needed to achieve adequate screening.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1694471
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-02-25
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	30 Carolina AV Jamaica Plain 02130
Parcel ID	1901288000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Jamaica Plain Neighborhood 3F-5000
Zoning Article	55
Project Description	The proposal involves a change of use to convert the existing garage structure at 30 Carolina Avenue into a three-unit residential dwelling, as detailed in the submitted plans. The site currently contains two detached buildings on the same lot. Six shared off-street parking spaces are proposed for use by both buildings. This application is filed in conjunction with ALT1682244.
Relief Type	Variance, Conditional Use
Violations	Side Yard Insufficient Rear Yard Insufficient Usable Open Space Insufficient Parking or Loading Insufficient Extension of Nonconforming Building

Planning Context:

The site is located in the Jamaica Plain neighborhood of Boston, specifically within a residential block characterized by a mix of triple-decker homes, two-family dwellings, and small multifamily buildings typical of the neighborhood's urban fabric. The lot itself is notably larger than most in the area and currently contains two existing commercial buildings, which are proposed to be converted into residential units as part of this project. This approach reflects an adaptive reuse strategy that will better align these structures with the predominantly residential character of the surrounding neighborhood. There are similarly large lots nearby that already accommodate multiple residential structures, demonstrating a local precedent for this type of development. The proposal aligns with ongoing City goals and local planning objectives to support housing production within established residential areas in a manner consistent with the existing built environment. Recent planning initiatives in Jamaica Plain, such as the Plan: JP/Rox adopted in



2017, emphasize the importance of infill residential development and adaptive reuse that complements neighborhood character while providing additional housing opportunities.

Zoning Analysis:

The proposal to convert the existing garage into a three-family dwelling has been reviewed against Article 55 requirements for the 3F-5000 subdistrict. No changes are proposed to the existing building footprint.

Side yard requirements: a minimum setback of 6 feet is required, while the existing and proposed condition provides only 5 feet, resulting in a deficiency of 1 foot. Relief is required for this minor shortfall, which is common among existing structures in this part of Jamaica Plain where lot widths constrain side yard setbacks.

Rear yard requirements: the minimum required depth is 20 feet, whereas the existing and proposed condition provides 9 feet 6 inches, resulting in a deficiency of 10 feet 6 inches. Relief is required, reflecting existing conditions where the current structure is set closer to the rear lot line than allowed under current code.

Regarding usable open space: the requirement is 750 square feet for the first dwelling unit plus 500 square feet for each additional unit. With six total dwelling units proposed across both buildings, the required open space is $750 + (5 \times 500) = 3,250$ square feet. The plans provide 8,972 square feet of usable open space, exceeding minimum requirements.

For off-street parking, Six parking spaces are proposed across both buildings, resulting in one parking space per unit, which meets the numerical requirement for the six total dwelling units. Under Article 55-40, however, parking is not permitted within the front yard except for up to two spaces with a maximum width of 10 feet. Relief is required for the proposed location of parking within the front yard.

While there is no precedent for front yard parking in the immediate residential context, the proposed parking plan supports the adaptive reuse of existing commercial buildings on the site by utilizing an area already paved for commercial vehicle use. This approach avoids creating new curb cuts or paving additional yard areas elsewhere on the lot, thereby minimizing site disturbance and maintaining as much open space as possible. Additionally, reusing the existing parking area helps facilitate the conversion from commercial to residential use in a way that is



functional for future residents while supporting city goals for adaptive reuse and housing production.

Finally, as the proposal changes the use of an existing nonconforming structure (garage), relief is required under Article 9, Section 1 for extension of a nonconforming structure.

The proposed project requires dimensional variances for side yard, rear yard, and parking location, as well as relief for the extension of a nonconforming structure. Despite these violations, the project maintains a use and scale consistent with the surrounding residential context and supports adaptive reuse and neighborhood revitalization. Zoning relief is warranted, and the project further reflects the need to modernize dimensional regulations to better reflect the existing built fabric. The plans, entitled "28-30 Carolina Avenue," were prepared by Hendren Associates, Gary Hendren, Architect, dated December 2024.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1694471, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1730651
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-06-05
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	16 Patterson ST Dorchester 02124
Parcel ID	1604933000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Dorchester Neighborhood 1F-6000
Zoning Article	65
Project Description	In conjunction with BOA1730659, subdivide the existing lot to accommodate a new residential dwelling. To enable the subdivision, the existing garage and side entrance at 16 Patterson Street will be removed.
Relief Type	Variance, Conditional Use
Violations	Lot Area Insufficient Lot Width Insufficient Lot Frontage Insufficient Nonconforming Use Change Use: Conditional (Ancillary Parking)

Planning Context:

The proposed project seeks to subdivide an existing lot in conjunction with BOA1730659, which plans on erecting a new two-unit residential dwelling at 18 Patterson Street. The original lot was approximately 6,092 square feet, and the new lots will be 3,361 square feet at 16 Patterson Street and 2,731 square feet at 18 Patterson Street. 16 Patterson Street currently contains a two-story single-unit residential dwelling with a garage in its rear. The garage will be razed to accommodate the subdivision and the new residential dwelling at 18 Patterson Street. In its place, there will be two off-street parking spaces. This portion of Patterson Street intersects with Brookvale Street and contains a mix of single-unit and two-unit residential dwellings with lot sizes that vary between 2,000 square feet to 6,000 square feet. The proposed lot sizes are consistent with the surrounding area.

This project supports the goals outlined in Housing a Changing City: Boston 2030 (September 2018,) where allowing this nonconforming use change to retain the existing residential property is an important anti-displacement measure to ensure that existing residents can continue to live in their homes.



Zoning Analysis:

The refusal letter states five citations: insufficient lot area, insufficient lot width, insufficient lot frontage, nonconforming use change, and a conditional use for the ancillary parking.

Under Article 65, for an area zoned as 1F-6000, the minimum lot area is 6,000 square feet, and the minimum width and frontage for a one-unit detached dwelling is 50 feet. The proposed subdivision would create a lot with an area of 3,361 square feet and a lot width and frontage of 36 feet. While these dimensions do not meet the dimensional requirements, zoning relief is still warranted, as other properties in the area also do not meet these requirements for similarly sized residential dwellings. This can be seen with properties such as 14 and 22 Patterson Street and 10 Brookvale Street. These properties have lot areas of less than 6,000 square feet with lot width and frontages of around 40 feet.

Regarding the nonconforming use change, the refusal letter cites the lot reduction as a cause. However, the existing residential use at 16 Patterson is a single-unit residential dwelling, which is an allowed use within the 1F-6000 subdistrict. Even with the reduced lot size, the use remains permitted and therefore should not be considered a violation.

Because both 16 and 18 Patterson Street will share a curb cut and a driveway, a portion of the parking spaces for 18 Patterson Street are included within the property line of 16 Patterson Street. Since ancillary parking is a conditional use, a conditional use permit is required. Section 6-3 notes that a conditional use permit may be issued if it meets the following criteria: a) specific site is an appropriate location for such use, b) use will not adversely affect the neighborhood, c) there will be no serious hazard to vehicles or pedestrians from the use, d) no nuisances will be created and e) adequate and appropriate facilities will be provided for the proper operation of the use. As this change is to accommodate off-street parking to create housing on an underutilized lot, a conditional use permit should be issued.

The plans reviewed are titled ALT1694288 ISD Refusal Stamped Drawings 05.19.2025 and are dated February 18, 2025. They were prepared by Boston Survey, Inc.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1730651, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.



Planning Department

CITY of BOSTON

Reviewed,

Kathleen O'Neil

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1730659
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-06-05
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	18 Patterson ST Dorchester 02124
Parcel ID	1604933000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Dorchester Neighborhood 1F-6000
Zoning Article	65
Project Description	In conjunction with BOA1730651, subdivide the existing lot to accommodate a new three-story, two-unit residential dwelling at 18 Patterson Street.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Lot Area Insufficient Lot Width Insufficient Lot Frontage Insufficient FAR Excessive Height Excessive (stories) Side Yard Insufficient Rear Yard Insufficient Parking or Loading Insufficient Existing Building Alignment Use: Forbidden (Two-Family) Dimensional Regulation: Location of Main Entrance

Planning Context:

The proposed project seeks to erect a new two-unit dwelling building at 18 Patterson Street. This is in conjunction with BOA1730651, where it sought to subdivide the lot. The proposed residential building will be a three-story, two-unit residential dwelling. Each residential unit will contain three bedrooms. The subdivision under BOA1730651 created a lot that is 2,731 square feet at 18 Patterson Street. There will also be two off-street parking spaces that will be accessed via a shared driveway and curb cut with 16 Patterson Street.

While Patterson Street is zoned as 1F-6000, this portion of Patterson Street intersects with Brookvale Street and contains a mix of single-unit and two-unit residential dwellings. This project supports the goals outlined in Housing a Changing City: Boston 2030 (September 2018) as it would increase the housing stock by building a contextually-appropriate infill housing units on an underutilized lot.



Zoning Analysis:

The refusal letter states a total of 11 violations: insufficient lot area, insufficient lot width, insufficient lot frontage, excessive FAR, excessive height in stories, insufficient side yard, insufficient rear yard, conformity with existing building alignment, forbidden use, off-street parking regulations, and the location of the main entrance.

Regarding the use, for an area zoned as 1F-6000, a two-unit residential building is a forbidden use. However, zoning relief is still warranted. Although this site is within a 1F-6000 subdistrict, it directly abuts two other zoning districts, 2F-3000 and 2F-5000 subdistricts, where two-unit residential dwellings are allowed. As a result, the surrounding area already contains several two-unit buildings, and therefore, zoning relief is warranted. Additionally, 18 Patterson is located at the corner of Patterson and Brookvale Street, and this corner location helps to visually and functionally absorb the additional density from the two-unit building.

Regarding lot area, lot width, and lot frontage, for an area zoned as 1F-6000, the minimum lot area is 6,000 square feet, and the minimum width and frontage are 60 feet. The proposed subdivision would create a lot with an area of 2,731 square feet and a lot width and frontage of 28.36 feet. While these dimensions do not meet the dimensional requirements, zoning relief is still warranted, as other properties in the area also do not meet these requirements for similarly sized residential dwellings. For example, 14 Patterson Street has a lot of area of less than 6,000 square feet and a lot width and frontage of 45.80 feet.

The maximum allowed FAR for an area zoned as 1F-6000 is 0.5, while this project proposes an FAR of 1.39. Although this exceeds the maximum allowed amount, relief is still warranted because this project is proposing two new residential units on a lot that is smaller than most lots in this area, in a building that is a comparable size to the existing residential buildings in this area.

The maximum allowed height is 35 feet or 2.5 stories, while this project is proposing 34.5' and 3 stories. While the proposed project surpasses the maximum height in stories, it is still under the maximum allowed height in feet. Relief is warranted because the location at the corner of Patterson and Brookvale helps reduce the impact and would not have the same amount of impact as it would if it were mid-block.



Although the property is addressed as 18 Patterson Street, the main entrance of the proposed dwelling is located on Brookvale Street. As a result, the project notes that it is proposing a west side yard of 11.92' and an east side yard of 14.80'. However, while these appear to meet the dimensional requirements, the refusal letter states that the side yard with the property's frontage on Patterson Street is noncompliant as the west side would be under 10 feet. Because this is a corner parcel, the side fronting Brookvale Street would need to follow front yard requirements. Despite this, zoning relief is still warranted due to the size of the proposed lot. The reduced side yard dimensions are necessary to accommodate the shared driveway with 16 Patterson Street and provide access to off-street parking, while still maintaining an appropriate scale for the neighborhood.

Regarding the rear yard, the minimum required amount is 40 feet, while the project plans note that it is proposing a rear yard of 4.6'. While it is unclear where this rear yard is located, as the main entrances are located on Brookvale Street, while this property is addressed as 18 Patterson Street, zoning relief is still warranted. Many properties within this area do not meet the minimum required 40 feet. If the property remains addressed at 18 Patterson Street, then the reduced rear yard would align with the other properties along Patterson Street.

Section 65-9.2 notes that the main entrance of a dwelling shall face the front lot line. However, while this project is addressed as 18 Patterson Street, the main entrance is located on Brookvale Street. Zoning relief is warranted for this, as the current entrances on Brookvale Street help accommodate family-sized residential units on a small, corner lot. Having the entrances on Brookvale Street helps allow for better unit configuration while enhancing the housing diversity in the neighborhood.

Section 65-42 notes that the minimum front yard depth shall be in conformity with the existing building alignment. Given the unique corner-lot conditions, the property has two street frontages, on Brookvale and Patterson, creating ambiguity regarding which alignment controls. Zoning relief is still warranted due to the small size of the lot and the need to accommodate the shared driveway with 16 Patterson Street. These constraints influence the location of the building on the lot and thus warrant zoning relief.

The last violation is in regard to off-street parking regulations. Section 65-41.4 (b) notes that the off-street parking shall be provided on the same Lot as the main use to which they are accessory. However, in order to accommodate the parking, portions of the proposed parking spaces are within the property line of 16 Patterson Street. Section 65-41.4 (b) notes that the



Board of Appeal shall decide whether it is impractical with respect to a particular Lot and may grant permission for such facilities to be on another lot in the same ownership where the main use on a lot is for residential uses and the other lot is within 400 feet of that lot. Relief should be granted as this is within 400 feet of the lot and is ultimately due to the small size of the lot. In order to accommodate the shared driveway and adequate parking spaces, the parking spaces could not fit completely on this lot.

The plans reviewed are titled ERT1694292 ISD Refusal Stamped Drawings and are dated January 24, 2025. They were prepared by 686 Architects.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1730659, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1703866
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-03-27
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	99 Hutchings ST Dorchester 02121
Parcel ID	1203116000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Roxbury Neighborhood MFR
Zoning Article	50
Project Description	Existing two-unit building on a lot where a conjoined case, BOA1695630, renovates a carriage house into a dwelling unit. No changes are proposed for the two-unit building.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Rear Yard Insufficient Two or More Dwellings on Same Lot

Planning Context:

This site is located one block north of Franklin Park in the Washington Park sub-neighborhood of Roxbury. The property has a two-unit building and an accessory carriage house to the rear. The related BOA1695630 case for 99R Hutchings St renovates and converts the carriage house into a one-unit building. There are no changes proposed to the existing two-unit building, but because there would be another detached dwelling on the site, this building would have a rear-yard dimensional violation. Introducing more housing units while retaining existing structures advances planning goals outlined in Housing a Changing City (2018).

Zoning Analysis:

The project is cited for violations related to two buildings on the same lot, due to the conjoined case converting a carriage house into a dwelling unit. Due to the resulting two dwellings, this project requires relief from the provisions in Section 50-44.13 Two or More Dwellings on Same Lot, specifically for insufficient rear yard according to Article 50 Table F. Section 50-44.13 states that "Dwellings shall be separated from each other and from such other Buildings by yards of the same minimum depths as if each Dwelling were on a separate lot." The minimum rear yard measured from the existing building to the converted carriage house is 30 feet; the existing rear yard is 62.3' and the proposed rear yard measured to the carriage house is 19.3'.



Section 50-44.13 also states that "a Dwelling shall not be built to the rear of another Dwelling, Accessory Building, or Main Building. The Board of Appeal may grant permission for a variation in this requirement if it finds that open space for all occupants, and light and air for all rooms designed for human occupancy will not be less than it would be provided if the requirements of that section were met. Given that there is no change to the existing built form of either building and that there is substantial separation between the buildings, this is an appropriate condition.

Plans reviewed are titled "99 Hutchings St. Existing Front Building Documentation (1 of 2 Buildings on the Same Lot)", are prepared by Derek Rubinoff Architect, and dated February 11, 2025.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1703866, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1695630
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-02-28
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	99R Hutchings ST Dorchester 02121
Parcel ID	1203116000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Roxbury Neighborhood MFR
Zoning Article	50
Project Description	Convert a carriage house into a one-unit dwelling on the same lot as a two-unit building. This case is in conjunction with BOA1703866.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Lot Frontage Insufficient Front Yard Insufficient Rear Yard Insufficient Two or More Dwellings on Same Lot

Planning Context:

This site is located one block north of Franklin Park in the Washington Park sub-neighborhood of Roxbury. The property has a two-unit building and an accessory carriage house to the rear. This application renovates and converts the carriage house into a dwelling unit; introducing more housing units while retaining existing structures advances planning goals outlined in Housing a Changing City (2018).

This type of project is similar to detached ADUs like those illustrated in the ADU Guidebook; the ADU Guidebook (2024) states specific fire access requirements for a building like this, including that it must be sprinklered, have a 10'-wide access point from the street that is unobstructed from objects like trees or vehicles, and a lighted path to provide wayfinding to the unit.

Zoning Analysis:

The project is cited for violations related to two buildings on the same lot. Due to the resulting two dwellings, this project required relief from the provisions in Section 50-44.13 Two or More Dwellings on Same Lot, specifically for insufficient rear yard and insufficient front yard according to Article 50 Table F. Section 50-44.13 states that "Dwellings shall be separated from each other and from such other Buildings by yards of the same minimum depths as if each Dwelling were on a separate lot." The minimum front yard is 20 feet; the proposed front yard as



measured from the carriage house to the existing two-unit building is 19.3'. The minimum rear yard is 30 feet; the proposed rear yard as measured from the existing carriage house structure to the rear lot line is 19.3'. Because there is no change to the existing structure, this is not introducing a new condition.

Section 50-44.13 also states that "a Dwelling shall not be built to the rear of another Dwelling, Accessory Building, or Main Building. The Board of Appeal may grant permission for a variation in this requirement if it finds that open space for all occupants, and light and air for all rooms designed for human occupancy will not be less than it would be provided if the requirements of that section were met. Given that there is no change to the existing built form of either building and that there is substantial separation between the buildings, this is an appropriate condition.

Finally, the project is cited for insufficient lot frontage due to the carriage house being at the rear of the property and has no lot frontage. Again, this is not a change in condition from today, and would be impossible to achieve. It is also a common condition for detached ADUs (although this project has not stated this would be an ADU), and is a more common condition across the City, presenting a case for zoning reform.

Plans reviewed are titled "99R Hutchings St Carriage House Renovation and Conversion," prepared by Derek Rubinoff Architect, and dated January 6, 2025.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1695630, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1716327
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-04-30
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	263 Clarendon ST Boston 02116
Parcel ID	0502893000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Boston Proper H-3-65
Zoning Article	Boston Proper
Project Description	Complete renovations, converting a building to elementary school and offices.
Relief Type	Conditional Use, Variance
Violations	FAR Excessive Parking or Loading Insufficient GCOD Applicability Rear Yard Insufficient Conditional use: (elementary school)

Planning Context:

The building is a four-story brick building in the Back Bay being renovated as a private elementary school with associated office space. While the bulk of the renovations are internal, an external stair and fence are being proposed. The Learning Project is an elementary school in the Back Bay, and is seeking to expand its elementary school use on this parcel, so this use is already present in the area. As a fairly compact facility occupying one single building with a floorplate of 1400 square feet, this should be a compatible use in a residential area. Landmark review is required, given placement in the Back Bay Architectural District.

Zoning Analysis:

Conditional Use: Per Article 6, a conditional use needs to be in an appropriate location, without adverse effect to the neighborhood, with no serious hazard to vehicles or pedestrians, with no created nuisance, and in a situation where adequate and appropriate facilities are being provided. Based on plans provided, levels 1-4 are single-classroom floors, with administration and office space on the top floor. This appears to meet all conditions for a conditional use. This building is suitable for a small elementary school, its scale is appropriate to the neighborhood, the proposed fence is a design solution to minimize impact on the surrounding context and



reduce hazard to cars or pedestrians, and the facilities appear appropriate. Relief in the form of a conditional use permit is appropriate.

Dimensional Regulation: Two dimensional violations have been noted. The proposal increases FAR from 3.00 to 3.67, which would create a violation. No exterior additions are being proposed, causing this violation to present itself due to the reclassification of existing space from storage to occupiable space. Zoning reform should reconsider the use of FAR going forward. Relief is appropriate. Additionally, the rear yard is required to be 25% of the lot depth. With the proposed brick wall, the new rear yard would be 4', a violation. This is a fairly small worsening of the existing rear yard of approximately 10' with a brick patio. Given the substantial benefit to neighbors in terms of containing school activities, and the relatively small impact of a one-story wall -- with brick materials aligned with contextual construction -- relief is appropriate.

Parking: Article 23 notes that this type of use requires that one space per 1800 square feet be provided for a building where zoning allows a maximum FAR of 3, allowing that to be halved when the use is an elementary school. At four spaces for a building with a gross square footage of 6751, halved to 2, this proposes 0. No parking is being provided, and no space is available on this lot to provide parking without demolishing the building. Relief is appropriate.

GCOD: The site is within the Groundwater Conservation Overlay District. No plans show any renovations below ground. While a new wall is proposed, no specific notes about regrading any surfaces are present. The building is substantially being renovated, triggering the need for a conditional use permit. This relief is appropriate, but GCOD review is appropriate to ensure that all requirements are met.

The refusal notes that building code review has been deferred at this time.

Plans submitted by Michael Leblanc of Utile, reviewed by Frank D'Amato on April 25, 2025.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1716327, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH PROVISIO/S: that plans shall be submitted to the Boston Landmarks Commission for design review, and that the plans shall be reviewed and approved by the Boston Water & Sewer Commission due to its location within the Groundwater Conservation Overlay District (GCOD).



Planning Department

CITY of BOSTON

Reviewed,

Kathleen Onuf

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1683385
ZBA Submitted Date	2024-09-17
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	240 to 246 Commercial ST Boston 02109
Parcel ID	0303508000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	North End Neighborhood Waterfront NS
Zoning Article	54
Project Description	Change use of upper stories of a five-story mixed-use building from office to residential with 8 units, and erect two roof decks.
Relief Type	Variance, Conditional Use
Violations	GCOD Applicability Roof Structure Restrictions Parking or Loading Insufficient Rear Yard Insufficient Height Excessive (ft) Usable Open Space Insufficient

Planning Context:

The proposed site is located at the intersection of Commercial Street and Atlantic Avenue on the eastern edge of the North End less than 500 feet from the Harbor. The existing building is a five-story brick building built in 1910 located within a stretch of attached, historic brick buildings in the North End. Currently, the building is occupied by a restaurant on the ground floor, and according to the Assessing Office, the building is used for commercial purposes. Like the other buildings on the block and throughout the North End, the existing use provides no off-street parking spaces, and the building has no front, side, or rear yards.

The proposed project would change the occupancy of the second through fifth floors from commercial to residential uses by adding two units per floor. In addition, the proposed project would add two new roof decks. There are no proposed changes to the basement or ground floor uses or design nor any changes to the building footprint.

Based on research conducted in 2022, the City launched the Office to Residential Conversion Program in 2023 to encourage the conversion of underutilized office space into housing in downtown Boston. The Conversion Program provides tax incentives and an expedited Article 80 permitting process for eligible projects. Although the Proposed Project is below the size



thresholds for these benefits, it is entirely consistent with the goals of the Conversion Program to increase housing options and support economic growth.

Zoning Analysis:

Per Section 54-18, a conditional use permit is required for any roof structure designed for human occupancy or access. The proposed roof deck meets all the specific dimensional requirements per Section 54-18, including being less than one foot above the highest point of such roof, accessed by bulkhead no more than thirty inches in height above such deck, and the hand rail is set back appropriately from the roof edge. A conditional use permit for the roof structure is recommended.

The proposed roof deck is within 20 feet of the rear lot line, triggering a violation of the minimum 20 foot rear yard. However, the existing building has no rear yard, therefore the existing non-conformity is being extended but not worsened. Similarly, the existing building is 60 feet, 3 inches in height, violating the 55 foot maximum building height. The proposed roof deck will extend but not worsen this condition. Dimensional zoning relief is recommended.

The addition of eight residential units would require 300 square feet of open space. The proposed roof decks meet the required open space per unit for two of the units, yet the proposed project still violates the required 50 square feet of open space per unit. Similarly, the zoning requires one parking space per unit. Currently, the proposed project is non-conforming without any off-street parking spaces. Converting office space to eight units will worsen this condition. However, given the need to demolish some of the existing structure to provide open space or off-street parking, zoning relief is recommended.

Although the proposed project is below the size thresholds of Article 25A, the proposed project is located within the Coastal Flood Resiliency Overlay District (CFROD) meaning that it is anticipated to be flooded with a 1% chance storm event in 2070 with 40 inches of sea level rise. All proposed uses below the Design Flood Elevation are non-residential and thus acceptable. However, dry floodproofing strategies for the basement and ground floor and wetproofing for all residential egress points is recommended.

The proposed project is also within a Groundwater Conservation Overlay District (GCOD). GCOD requires that projects apply to obtain a Conditional Use Permit from the Boston Water & Sewer Commission.



Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1683385, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1730230
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-06-04
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	3 to 7 Eden ST Charlestown 02129
Parcel ID	0200969000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Charlestown Neighborhood 3F-2000
Zoning Article	62
Project Description	The project proposes to combine two lots and demolish the existing two-unit structure to replace it with a three-unit residential structure.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	FAR Excessive Rear Yard Insufficient

Planning Context:

Located just off Main Street in Charlestown, 4-7 Eden Street is a two and a half story, two-unit Greek Revival style residential structure. The project proposes to merge the subject lot with a vacant lot to the southwest, demolish the existing structure and replace it with a three story, three-unit residential structure. The new structure is proposed in the existing footprint with an addition onto the merged parcels. The lot is located across the street from Edwards Playground and adjacent to several semi-attached, three-story brick residential structures, the predominant housing typology on the block.

The lot is within PLAN: Charlestown in the Original Peninsula area which prioritizes the production of housing units and the preservation of existing structures when possible. The project's proximity to open space and the Number 92 MBTA Bus Route mean that it is a fitting location to increase housing density in Charlestown. The PLAN: Charlestown Design Guidelines for the Original Peninsula area seek to ensure that new development is compatible with the massing and character of neighborhood areas, and that wherever possible, existing historic structures are preserved. The massing of the proposed structure is consistent with the surrounding area, however, the removal of an existing structure that currently adds architectural variation to the block through its historic significance does not achieve the goal of preserving structures when possible. The proponent should consider if an addition can be made to the



existing structure to achieve the goals for preservation and additional housing units in PLAN: Charlestown. The guidelines for roof decks, open space, and roof lines are also applicable to this application.

Zoning Analysis:

The project has been flagged for excessive Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and insufficient rear yard. The maximum FAR in the 3F-2000 subdistrict is 2.0. The existing FAR is 1.2 and the proposed is approximately 2.34. The block primarily consists of three story buildings, many of which surpass the 2.0 FAR maximum. This suggests that the proposed FAR is consistent with the neighborhood's established character, and thus presents a case for zoning reform.

The minimum rear yard requirement is 20 feet and the existing rear yard is 4.8 feet in depth. The project will expand the degree of non-conformity within the existing building footprint given the increase in structure height, and will also increase non-conformity with the building addition which is 4.6 feet from the property line at the nearest point. At approximately 53 feet deep and 55 feet wide, the combined lot is about half as deep and twice as wide as many surrounding residential lots. There are examples in the surrounding area of residential structures that are built up to rear property lines, however, these examples are not abundant and new development should maintain adequate light and air between lots. As a result, it is important that any project in this area not worsen the existing nonconforming rear yard and look to keep a rear yard of close to 5 feet.

The building is located within the Neighborhood Design Overlay District (NDOD) and any significant changes to it would need to complete design review. Design review in a NDOD prioritizes preservation of the existing building to the extent possible, including Greek Revival structures like the existing building. Because the existing building is more than fifty years old, it is subject to Article 85 Demolition Delay.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1730230, The Planning Department recommends DENIAL WITHOUT PREJUDICE. The proponent should consider a project that preserves the existing structure alongside the addition.



Planning Department

CITY of BOSTON

Reviewed,

Kathleen O'Neil

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1719788
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-05-09
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	24 Washington ST Charlestown 02129
Parcel ID	0203930005
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Charlestown Neighborhood 3F-2000
Zoning Article	62
Project Description	Proposal for the new construction of a 3,860 sq. ft. single-unit dwelling on a vacant lot at 24 Washington St. The project would consist of a basement, two-car garage, two levels of above grade living space, and a roof deck with a headhouse.
Relief Type	Variance, Conditional Use
Violations	Parking design and maneuverability Roof Structure Restrictions Location of Garage Entrance

Planning Context:

This project proposes the new construction of a 3,860 sq. ft. single-unit dwelling at 24 Washington St., a vacant lot within a residential neighborhood of Charlestown between Union St. and Rutherford Ave. The proposed construction includes a finished basement, two-car garage, two levels of living above grade, and a roof deck with a headhouse. The surrounding buildings are being used as a mix of single-unit, two-unit, and three-unit dwellings as well as residential condos.

The PLAN: Charlestown planning initiative highlights the importance of revitalizing housing near MBTA Orange Line stations, which this project meets as the proposed construction site is less than 1/2 mile from the Community College station. The proposed construction area is less than a block west of Rutherford Ave which additionally has been designated as an area in need of housing within PLAN: Charlestown. The alignment with planning goals found in PLAN: Charlestown along with the prevalence of other single-unit dwellings in the area supports that the proposed construction is appropriate for this site.



This lot, known as parcel R-59-B2 in the Charlestown Urban Renewal Plan Area, is associated with a Land Disposition Agreement (LDA) which designates its use as "parking and recreational space". The BPDA Board must approve a minor modification to the Charlestown Urban Renewal Plan allowing residential uses on the site, as well as modify the existing LDA or enter into a new LDA outlining dimensional requirements and allowing residential uses on the site before the project can proceed.

While the lot is currently vacant, there is a mature street tree located along Washington Street that could be at risk through the construction. Given the original intent of the Land Disposition Agreement to preserve open space, the design review process will be particularly focused on ensuring the design has the best chance of preserving this tree, which would require a permit from the Parks Department to remove.

Zoning Analysis:

The project is cited for violating curb cut width limitations, roof structure restrictions, and limitations for the location of the garage entrance. The location of the garage entrance violation stems from the fact that the proposed garage entrance would be facing the rear lot line which faces a public street. However, multiple properties in the surrounding area including the abutting parcel are also in violation of this restriction by having a garage entrance facing a rear lot line which faces a public street. This reflects the fact that Arrow St and Lynde St are used more so as alleys or accessways for properties located on Washington St. Additionally, the lot's abnormal shape and location on a corner of the block suggests that the options are quite limited for where to put the garage doors. The proposed curb cut would be off of Arrow St., and the width would be greater than the 12 feet maximum mandated in 62-28.3(e). Given the prevalence of properties on Washington St. that have curb cut offs off of Arrow St and Lynde St as well as garage entrances that face rear lot lines facing those two public streets, the proposed construction is appropriate for this site. While the abutting parcel also has a curb cut width that exceeds this limit as well as multiple other properties on the block, the Public Works Curb Cut Guidelines (2013) state that residential driveways serving one or two parking spaces should be a maximum of 14 feet, with a preferred width of 10 feet. Additionally, the proposed bay hanging over the Arrow St public right-of-way must meet minimum clearances established by the Public Improvement Commission.



The roof structure restriction violation refers to the proposed construction of a headhouse, which must be conditionally granted by the Board of Appeals. Other properties in the area, including on Washington St., utilize a headhouse for roof access which makes this proposition consistent with the surrounding area and highlights an area for potential zoning reform.

This property falls within the Charlestown Neighborhood Design Overlay District and as an urban renewal parcel with an active Land Disposition Agreement, must undergo design review.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1719788, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH PROVISIO/S: that following the BPDA Board approving a minor modification to the Charlestown Urban Renewal Plan allowing residential uses on the site as well as modifying the existing LDA or enter into a new LDA allowing residential uses on the site that plans be submitted to the Planning Department for design review with attention to reduction of the curb cut length, ensuring that the proposed bay hanging over the Arrow St. public right-of-way meets minimum clearances established by the Public Improvement Commission, and making design adjustments to preserve the mature street tree on Washington Street.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1598189
ZBA Submitted Date	2024-05-03
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	1A to 1B Mystic ST Charlestown 02129
Parcel ID	0200056000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Charlestown Neighborhood NS
Zoning Article	62
Project Description	<p>The applicant proposes to construct a new three-story duplex on a newly created 2,643 square foot lot at 1a-1b Mystic Street in Charlestown. The proposed building includes two attached buildings, each designed as a three floor building with one unit, basement-level living space and private roof decks. The project also features projecting window bays over the public right-of-way.</p> <p>This development is associated with an application to subdivide the existing lot (ALT1592346), and an application to build a three-story, three-unit townhouse (ERT1576719) on the other newly created lot (223–225 Bunker Hill Street). Demolition of the existing structure on the site (a dry cleaners) will be filed separately under a forthcoming demolition permit.</p>
Relief Type	Variance,Conditional Use
Violations	FAR Excessive Rear Yard Insufficient Use: Conditional (Two Family Detached Dwelling - Basement & First Story) Use: Conditional (Two Family Detached Dwelling - Second Story & Above)

Planning Context:

This project was reviewed by the Planning Department for the Zoning Board of Appeal hearings on April 29, 2025, and June 3, 2025 where it was deferred. Since the June 3 hearing, no new plans have been submitted and so the Planning Department recommendation has remained the same.



The project site is located in the Charlestown neighborhood, within the Neighborhood Shopping (NS) subdistrict, a traditionally commercial district that includes a mix of neighborhood-serving retail and residential uses. The property also lies within the Charlestown Neighborhood Design Overlay District and the Charlestown Restricted Roof Overlay District, which aim to preserve the character and scale of existing development.

The site fronts onto Mystic Street. Mystic Street is a residential street adjacent to Bunker Hill Street, which is a mixed-use corridor with many multifamily residential as well as commercial buildings. The proposed project abuts three-story residential buildings on its rear and one side, and there several larger four-story multifamily buildings located nearby along Bunker Hill Street. The scale of the proposed development is consistent with the surrounding three- and four-story multifamily residential buildings and aligns with the established scale, lot pattern, and yard configurations of the neighborhood.

PLAN: Charlestown, and updated zoning to implement the plan, was adopted by the BPDA board on September 28, 2023. The PLAN highlights that “residents' feedback about retail has centered on four concerns: 1) the loss of small businesses; 2) vacant storefronts; 3) missing essential retail like laundromats, and 4) a lack of food options.” Because of these concerns, particularly loss of retail space, the plan includes zoning recommendations to make residential uses conditional on the ground floor in the commercial districts. This zoning was intended to “reduce existing pressure on the real estate market to convert retail spaces into housing units, which has led to the loss of several retail spaces in the neighborhood in recent years... it will allow for the Zoning Board of Appeals to deny variances for residential uses on the ground floor in some instances, where a conversion from retail is required, without prohibiting residential uses from occupying ground floors universally, such as in locations where residential is already or historically has been the ground floor.” Although this project would be in the NS district, the new parcelization means that this project would front onto Mystic Street, which is a residential area where ground floor residential uses are appropriate. In addition, the Office of Neighborhood Services (ONS) has highlighted that the companion case (223–225 Bunker Hill Street) was previously proposed with retail on the ground floor and was changed to fully residential based off of direct feedback from abutting residents, indicating that there is a community desire for fully residential development in this area.



PLAN: Charlestown also sets recommendations to address neighborhood housing needs, including to “Prioritize the creation of larger housing units with 3+ bedrooms,” which this project does.

The plan does not include additional specific zoning dimensional recommendations for the Original Peninsula of Charlestown (where this project is located), but does include specific design guidelines for infill projects within the Original Peninsula. Because of this project's location within the Neighborhood Design Overlay District, it should receive design review to ensure compliance with the design guidelines established in PLAN: Charlestown.

Zoning Analysis:

Floor Area Ratio (FAR) Compliance: Per Article 62, Table D, the maximum FAR allowed in the NS subdistrict is 2.0. The proposed project exceeds this limit, triggering a zoning violation. While the structure adds density, it does so in a manner that aligns with the surrounding three and four-story residential buildings, indicating that the FAR is consistent with the neighborhood character and built form.

Rear Yard Requirements: The ordinance requires a minimum rear yard depth of 20 feet, while the proposed rear yard is 11.1 feet. However, small rear yards is a common condition among rowhouse lots of similar depth in Charlestown, where zero-lot-line rear walls are often observed due to constrained block dimensions and historic patterns of development.

This project is within a Neighborhood Design Overlay District and proposes the erection of a building with a gross floor area of three hundred (300) or more square feet which is visible from a public street. Therefore, it is subject to the Design Component of Small Project Review and any approved plans must be subsequently reviewed by the Planning Department (Section 80E-2 of the Zoning Code).

Use Compliance: The project is cited for two conditional uses. Firstly, it is cited for the conditional use of “Two family detached dwelling” on Second Story & Above. One to three unit dwellings are conditional (while multifamily is allowed) in this subdistrict in order to encourage higher density projects. However, the unit count of this project is appropriate, given that the larger size of the units (four bedrooms) is aligned with the goals of PLAN: Charlestown, and the size of the building already exceeds the maximum FAR.

It is also cited for the conditional use of “Two family detached dwelling” in the Basement & First Story. All residential uses are also conditional on the ground floor (while commercial uses are



allowed) in order to encourage mixed-use and commercial projects in the NS subdistrict. However, as discussed in the planning context, the new lot subdivision means that, although this new lot is still within the NS subdistrict, it now fronts onto Mystic Street rather than Bunker Hill Street. Mystic Street is a residential area where ground floor residential uses are appropriate.

Reviewed plans: "Two Townhouses, 1A-1B Mystic Street" and prepared by Timothy Sheehan, Architect, dated December 11, 2024.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1598189, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH PROVISIO/S: that plans be submitted to the Planning Department for design review because of the projects location with a Neighborhood Design Overlay District (NDOD), with attention to compliance with the design guidelines established in PLAN: Charlestown.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1694412
ZBA Submitted Date	2025-02-25
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	84 to 86 Blue Hill AV Roxbury 02119
Parcel ID	0802992000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	Roxbury Neighborhood MFR
Zoning Article	50
Project Description	Change use from one-family residence plus a church and a garage, to a six unit residence. This will involve expanding the second and third floors over the rear first floor garage.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Lot Area Insufficient Lot Width Insufficient Additional Lot Area Insufficient FAR Excessive Usable Open Space Insufficient Side Yard Insufficient Parking or Loading Insufficient Insufficient rear yard setback on a shallow lot Corner lot: insufficient front yard setback

Planning Context:

The property is a three-story brick building on Blue Hill Avenue in Roxbury, approximately five blocks south of the St Patrick Neighborhood Shopping District. The lot is in the MFR subdistrict, which while primarily residential also contains non-residential uses like corner stores, salons, and gas stations. The proponent seeks to change the use of the building to be a six-unit residential structure, which in addition to interior renovations also involves extending the three-story portion of the structure to the rear of the parcel currently occupied by a one-story garage. Such a change of use is allowed in MFR districts, and this is a way to provide an allowed use while adapting an existing structure.

While the envelope of the structure is changing, it is changing in a way that is fully contextually appropriate given the existing structure. Zoning reform should consider how to enable the adaptive modification of structures without the need for such substantial zoning relief.

Zoning Analysis:



Dimensional Requirements

Per Article 50, Table F, this project has a number of dimensional regulation violations, many of them preexisting. The minimum lot size is 3000 square feet for 1 or 2 units, while the existing lot is 2037 square feet. Most surrounding lots are similarly sized. At 6 units, with the requirement of 4000 square feet for the first 3 units and an additional 1000 square feet for each additional unit, this proposal would require 7000 square feet. The refusal notes this as insufficient lot width based on additional nonconformity, but likely is referring to the additional requirements of lot area. 40 feet are required for any use other than a rowhouse, while the existing width is 29 feet. Most neighboring lots are even skinnier, at 20 feet wide. The maximum allowed FAR in this subdistrict is 1.0, and the existing building already exceeds it at approximately 1.2. While the full building square footage is not provided in the proposal, a rough estimate based on building footprint suggests that the resulting FAR would be approximately 2.0, which is in line with many of the multifamily buildings on small parcels in the area. While no specific open space is noted in the proposal, it is likely smaller than 200 square feet, the required amount of open space per unit. At 6 units, the zoning would require 1200 square feet, which is approximately 60% of this parcel. Design review should look at the specific provision of open space and its siting. Finally, the refusal letter notes that a multifamily dwelling would require a side yard minimum of 10 feet. While the exact lot boundaries are not noted on the plans, it is very likely a side yard of close to 0'. Across all of these dimensional violations, a common pattern is that they are fully misaligned with current context in this subdistrict. This addition is fairly modest and only extends height in one direction, in line with the existing height at the front of the building. Relief for all of the noted violations is appropriate. As noted in the refusal letter, to the degree that the addition extends any other existing dimensional nonconformities not noted, relief is appropriate.

There are two additional dimensional nonconformities not listed in Table F but noted in the refusal letter: per section Section 50-44, corner lots treat both street edges as front yards, which would require that both corner edges have a setback of 20', which is triggered by the new addition. Given that the width of the parcel is 29', this is wholly out of scale with existing building typologies and relief is appropriate. Additionally, the same section notes that rear yards are still required to be no less than 10', a condition that is additionally not met by the new addition. This is also wholly out of context, and relief is appropriate.

Parking



Per Article 50, Table H, one parking space is required per unit. This project proposes zero, which would be a violation. While not part of the portion of Blue Hill Avenue subject to the Blue Hill Avenue Transportation Action Plan, this site is still directly on the MBTA 45 bus route. Approximately 0.7 miles walking route from Uphams Corner and Newmarket commuter rail stops, this project is still well within the urban core of Boston where it is common that providing parking would require demolishing the existing structure. Relief is appropriate. The site is within Roxbury's Boulevard Planning District, which requires the Article 80 Small Project Design Review component for projects that affect, among other things, the shape of the roof of a structure. This is the case with this project, and design review is appropriate.

Finally, the refusal notes that Public Works and the Public Improvement Commission need to review documentation around a new stair and encroachments onto the city sidewalk. Review by both departments is appropriate.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1694412, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH PROVISIO/S: that plans be submitted to the Planning Department for design review with a particular focus on screening and buffering, placement of open space, effect on city sidewalks, and review from Public Works and the Public Improvement Commission on impacts to accessibility and existing street infrastructure.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1677881
ZBA Submitted Date	2024-07-02
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	155R Princeton ST East Boston 02128
Parcel ID	0106656000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	East Boston Neighborhood EBR-3
Zoning Article	53
Project Description	Build a new three stories containing three units on top of an existing garage. Also includes a roof deck.
Relief Type	Conditional Use,Variance
Violations	Roof Structure Restrictions Height Excessive (stories) Side Yard Insufficient Rear Yard Insufficient Height Excessive (ft) Usable Open Space Insufficient FAR Excessive Two or More Dwellings on Same Lot

Planning Context:

This project was deferred from the ZBA hearings on March 25, 2025, May 20, 2025, and June 24, 2025. New plans have since been submitted.

This application proposes building three-stories containing three-units on top of an existing garage. This would be on a new lot (155R Princeton St) which would be created through a subdivision proposed on a companion case (BOA1677882). The other part of the proposed subdivided lot (157 Princeton St) contains an existing three-story, three-unit building.

Plan: East Boston, which was adopted by the BPDA Board on March 14, 2024, states that in the subarea where this project is located ("Eagle Hill"), "Most buildings are close to the sidewalk edge, if not immediately abutting it, and are close to each other." In the immediate surrounding area, nearly all existing buildings fit this description, with front yards between 0 and 5 feet and narrow side yards with few driveways. There is one other building in the area (216 Saratoga St) with a typology similar to what is proposed in this project, with a dwelling built at the rear of



another dwelling. This building (built in 1910) is an outlier among dwellings otherwise built to the edge of the lots.

Plan: East Boston states that one of the key land use and built form recommendations for neighborhood residential areas is to "allow for a mix of housing types within a limited range and affirm the physical characteristics that define lowscale neighborhood fabric. These limits would be set by using existing built forms as a guide, ensuring that the size and scale of new development are consistent with what already exists." This proposed project does not support this plan recommendation, as the proposed project is significantly different in form from what currently exists in the area and updated zoning.

Zoning Analysis:

New zoning for this area to codify the recommendations of PLAN: East Boston was adopted on April 24, 2024. However, because this project was filed in October, 2022, the previous East Boston zoning applies.

The proposed new building would not comply with the rear and side yard requirements. The zoning requires a 30 feet rear yard for this lot, while the proposed rear yard is 0 feet. The zoning also requires a side yard of 3 feet, while the proposed side yard is 0 feet. While an accessory building like a garage is allowed to be located within a required side or rear yard, the proposed new building would violate the yard requirements.

The project also does not comply with the Usable Open Space requirement of 350 sq ft per unit, or 1,050 sq ft total. Because all of the unbuilt area on the lot is used for vehicular access, there is no Usable Open Space. This could be remedied if the building were set forward on the lot to limit the driveway distance and if the existing garage were replaced with Usable Open Space.

The proposed building would be a total of four stories (three new residential stories on top of the existing garage). This means it does not comply with the maximum height of three stories.

However, because of the slight downwards slope of the lot, the four stories (not including the roof deck) is about the same height as the existing building on 157 Princeton, and it therefore fits in the context of the area in terms of height. Because of the proposed roof deck, the building also does not comply with the maximum height of 35 feet. However, given the limited Usable Open Space provided on the lot, a roof deck here may be appropriate if it were to receive design review to help mitigate the impacts.



Section 53-29.13 of the Code states that “A Dwelling shall not be built to the rear of another Dwelling.” The Code further states that the Board of Appeal may grant zoning relief for this requirement “if it finds that open space for all occupants, and light and air for all rooms designed for human occupancy, will not be less than would be provided if the requirements of this Section 53-29.13 were met.” This project would cut off all access to light from the rear for the existing building on 157 Princeton St. Therefore, the Board of Appeal should not grant this zoning relief.

Plans reviewed: “PROPOSED THREE FAMILY RENOVATION” prepared by “SLHG” and dated “6/16/25.”

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1677881, The Planning Department recommends DENIAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1677882
ZBA Submitted Date	2024-12-12
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	157 Princeton ST 1 East Boston 02128
Parcel ID	0106656000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	East Boston Neighborhood EBR-3
Zoning Article	53
Project Description	Subdivide an existing lot into two lots: 155R Princeton St and 157 Princeton St. 157 Princeton St contains an existing three-story, three-unit dwelling.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Building Lot Coverage Excessive Permeable Area of Lot Insufficient Side Yard Insufficient Rear Yard Insufficient

Planning Context:

This project was deferred from the ZBA hearings on March 25, 2025, May 20, 2025, and June 24, 2025. No new plans have been submitted and so the Planning Department recommendation has remained the same.

This application proposes subdividing an existing lot into two lots: 155R Princeton St at the southwest and 157 Princeton St at the northeast. 157 Princeton St contains an existing three-story, three-unit dwelling. A companion case (BOA1677881) proposes adding three-stories containing three-units on top of an existing garage on 155R Princeton St.

Plan: East Boston was adopted by the BPDA Board on March 14, 2024. The Plan states that one of the key land use and built form recommendations for neighborhood residential areas is to "preserve privately-owned open space and increase permeable areas. The spaces between buildings created by front, side, and rear yard setbacks contribute to neighborhood open space and provide the space needed for trees and other plants to grow. Permeable areas are needed to support groundwater recharge and limit stormwater runoff that contributes to neighborhood flooding and worsens water quality." This proposed subdivision does not support this plan



recommendation, as it does not preserve adequate space to the side and rear of the existing building on 157 Princeton for trees and other plantings or for permeable area.

Zoning Analysis:

New zoning for this area to codify the recommendations of PLAN: East Boston was adopted on April 24, 2024.

The proposed lot subdivision would create two new lot lines, one at the rear of the existing building and one on the west side of the existing building. This would create new rear yard and side yard violations for the existing building, as the new side yard would be 2.7 feet (while the zoning requires 3 feet) and the new rear yard would be 3.7 feet (while the zoning requires 10 feet).

Additionally, the new proposed lot dimensions for 157 Princeton St would mean the existing building would not comply with the building lot coverage or permeable area of lot requirements, as the building lot coverage would be 80% (the zoning maximum is 60%) and the permeable area of the would be no more than 20% (the zoning minimum is 30%).

Plans reviewed: "SUBDIVISION PLAN" prepared by "SLHG" and dated 11/22/22.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1677882, The Planning Department recommends DENIAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1482368
ZBA Submitted Date	2023-06-06
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	87 Morris ST East Boston 02128
Parcel ID	0106841000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	East Boston Neighborhood 3F-2000
Zoning Article	53
Project Description	Remodel the basement into a new apartment, converting a 2-unit building to 3 units.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	FAR Excessive Usable Open Space Insufficient Parking or Loading Insufficient IPOD Applicability GCOD Applicability Lot Area Insufficient Additional Lot Area Insufficient Location of Main Entrance

Planning Context:

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

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

87 Morris Street is within a 5 minute walking radius of the MBTA Blue Line Airport Station further aligning it with city wide goals for increasing transit oriented development in order to address the ongoing housing crisis. The proponent seeks to change the occupancy of the



existing residence from a 2-family to a 3-family. This would involve the remodeling of the basement into a new apartment.

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

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

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

Zoning Analysis:

New zoning for this area to codify the recommendations of PLAN: East Boston was adopted on April 24, 2024. The notice for this new zoning was advertised on April 1, 2024, therefore projects that applied before this date were reviewed under the zoning in effect at the time. This

BOA1482368

2025-07-29

2 Planning Department



project applied on May 30, 2023, and therefore the old zoning applies; however the updated zoning provides important planning context. The project is currently undergoing eight zoning violations.

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

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

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

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

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



Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1482368, The Planning Department recommends DENIAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



Case	BOA1575584
ZBA Submitted Date	2024-02-28
ZBA Hearing Date	2025-07-29
Address	81 Lexington ST East Boston 02128
Parcel ID	0102918000
Zoning District & Subdistrict	East Boston Neighborhood 2F-2000
Zoning Article	53
Project Description	Erect a 3.5-story multifamily dwelling with 7 residential units on a newly created 3,706 square foot lot. The project scope includes bike storage and rear decks. The project's proposed subdivision of the existing parcel and demolition of the existing building are tied to separate permits.
Relief Type	Variance
Violations	Parking or Loading Insufficient Height Excessive (ft) Height Excessive (stories) Side Yard Insufficient Existing Building Alignment Forbidden Use (7 Units); Traffic Visibility Across Corner

Planning Context:

The proposed project has its ZBA hearing deferred eight times: on September 24, 2024; October 29, 2024; December 3, 2024; February 4, 2025; March 25, 2025, April 8, 2025, May 20, 2025, and June 24, 2025. The Planning Department provided recommendations for denial without prejudice for each project iteration, citing design concerns relating to the project's proposed scale, setbacks, and excessive unit count as grounds for the denials.

The first five iterations of this recommendation related to the project's original set of plans, which was submitted on December 12, 2023. The four most recent iterations of this recommendation (for the April 8, 2025, May 20, 2025, June 24, 2025, and July 29, 2025 hearings) related to the project's updated project plans. The proponent submitted these updated project plans to ISD and received an updated zoning refusal letter and set of refused project plans on March 4, 2025. These plans, which have been unchanged since April, made amendments to the



building's design, addressing some of the aforementioned concerns of the project's initial proposal, particularly building setbacks. Despite this, the updated proposal falls short of meeting the standards for approval previously set forth by the Planning Department in past iterations of this recommendation. These standards relate to the project's proposed unit count (seven units still in excess of zoning maximum) and overall building scale (excessive height increased, building width remains excessive). The contents of this recommendation have been updated from its original form to reflect the details of this amended project design, though remain largely unchanged from its recent April 8, 2025, May 20, 2025, and June 24, 2025 iterations (as no new materials have been submitted since).

The proposed project sits in an established residential area in the Eagle Hill area of East Boston. Its surroundings consist of 2.5-story to 4-story structures with single-family to multi-family residential uses and limited retail, restaurant, and commercial uses on the ground floors of several nearby corner lots. The site sits within a quarter-mile of several bus stops - including those for the MBTA's 114, 116, 117, 120, and 121 routes - and is a half-mile from the MBTA's Airport Blue Line Station. It is also close (within a quarter-mile walk) to two community child care centers, Hugh R. O'Donnell Elementary, Mario Umana Academy K-8, Central Square Park, Eastie Farms, and East Boston's Shaw's grocery store.

The proposed project is sited on a corner parcel currently occupied by a 2.5-story three-family residential structure and a 38' x 50' surface parking lot. It seeks to demolish the site's existing structure and surface parking to erect a new 3.5-story multifamily residential building, consisting of seven dwelling units (including private decks and bike parking). This scope of work removes the project's previously proposed ground floor commercial space, reduces its proposed unit count by one, and increases its proposed height by one story.

The recommendations of PLAN: East Boston promote the development of appropriately-scaled low-density residential infill, as a way to expand housing opportunities for East Boston residents and affirm the neighborhood's existing built character. Where possible, however, the PLAN recommends that preservation / renovation of the neighborhood's existing housing stock be utilized to accomplish these goals. While the proposed project does expand residential uses on the site (three dwelling units existing, seven dwelling units proposed), it does so in a way that exceeds the area's typical scale of building, with an occupancy greater than what currently exists in the site's surroundings (the area's largest residential structures have occupancies



ranging from four to six dwelling units), and includes the razing of an existing residential structure. As a result, the proposed project creates a built scale that is out of scale with the area's existing urban form, and ultimately deviates from PLAN: East Boston's planning recommendations for residential areas.

The recommendations of PLAN: East Boston (adopted January 2024) also outline a need to improve access to neighborhood-serving retail and service amenities in residential areas, and support the development of small-scale commercial spaces on corner parcels within East Boston's neighborhood fabric (to support uses such as coffee shops, laundromats, etc.). The project's updated designs, which remove its previously proposed ground floor corner commercial space, backtrack from this goal. While ground floor commercial uses are not required for residential corner lots, the scale of infill proposed by this project aligns with the type of development where such uses were contemplated as appropriate by the PLAN, thus representing a missed opportunity by the project to further this planning goal.

Zoning Analysis:

The proposed project has been cited with seven zoning violations relating to use, scale, and parking regulations. These citations are listed upon the project's most recent refusal letter, dated March 4, 2025. While the project's cited zoning subdistrict (2F-2000) relates to East Boston's zoning at the initial date of project filing (December 12, 2023), the listed violations for the project's updated plans relate to East Boston's updated neighborhood zoning, which was adopted by the Zoning Commission on April 24, 2024.

East Boston's updated zoning places the proposed project within an EBR-3 subdistrict. EBR-3 subdistricts allow a maximum building height of three stories/35' and permit residential uses up to six dwelling units on lots with a frontage greater than 55' (of which 81 Lexington Street complies). The proposed project, with a height of 3.5 stories/40' and seven dwelling units, exceeds these permitted maximums. It also proposes building width in excess of the area's zoning (50' permitted, 68' proposed). These violations, together, result in an excessive building scale, out of context with both zoning and the built character of the surrounding neighborhood (which consists predominately of three-story structures with two to six residential units).

The site's insufficient parking violation relates to the project's proposed zero-parking condition. While in violation of the area's zoning requirements (1:1 dwelling/space parking ratio required, totaling seven required off-street spaces for the project), this condition is one commonly found

BOA1575584

2025-07-29

3 Planning Department



throughout the Eagle Hill area, including on ~85% of the lots on the proposed project's immediately surrounding blocks. Similarly, the project's violation for insufficient traffic visibility across corner is not met by any of the area's corner parcels. While the project's 3 foot front yard setback varies from the block's predominant existing building alignment (zero foot front setback), the additional space provided by the proposed dimension actually represents a preferable design outcome that conforms with the front yard requirements of the area's zoning as well as its broader planning goals to create additional street-facing open space (especially upon corner lots).

The project's insufficient side yard violation is incorrectly cited on its refusal letter, as each of the proposed structure's side yards meet the minimum three foot setback requirement by zoning.

While the project's proposed setbacks and parking are common neighborhood conditions contextual to the site, its dimensional violations point to a proposed building scale that exceeds the site's surrounding built context. Because of this, the proposed structure is deemed an inappropriate addition to East Boston's Eagle Hill area.

Plans reviewed titled, "81 Lexington Street, Boston, MA 02128," prepared by 686 Architects on May 15, 2024.

Recommendation:

In reference to BOA1575584, The Planning Department recommends DENIAL WITHOUT PREJUDICE. The proponent should consider a project that reduces its residential use to no more than six dwelling units and, preferably, retains the project's initially proposed ground floor corner commercial space. Such a project should also amend the proposed structure's height and footprint to better align with the dimensional regulations of East Boston's updated zoning.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning

MEMORANDUM**APRIL 10, 2025**

TO: **BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY**
D/B/A BOSTON PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT AGENCY (BPDA)
AND KAIROS SHEN, DIRECTOR

FROM: CASEY HINES, SENIOR DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT
REVIEW
NUPOOR MONANI, SENIOR DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT
REVIEW
JASON MCDONALD, PLANNER I
ISABELLA FRONTADO, URBAN DESIGNER I
JILL ZICK, ASSISTANT DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC REALM REVIEW
COLIN FREDRICKSON, TRANSPORTATION PLANNER II
ERIC BOATRIGHT, SENIOR ARCHITECT
EBONY DAROSA, SENIOR PROJECT MANAGER

SUBJECT: 586-598 CANTERBURY STREET, ROSLINDALE

SUMMARY: This Memorandum requests that the Boston Redevelopment Authority d/b/a Boston Planning & Development Agency ("BPDA"): authorize the Director of the BPDA (the "Director") to (1) issue a Certificate of Approval for the proposed development located at 586-598 Canterbury Street in Roslindale (the "Proposed Project"), in accordance with Article 80E, Small Project Review, of the Code; (2) enter into an Affordable Rental Housing Agreement and Restriction, (3) enter into a Community Benefits Agreement; and take any other actions and execute any other agreements and documents that the Director deems appropriate and necessary in connection with the Proposed Project.

PROJECT SITE

The Proposed Project is located on a site that encompasses three vacant parcels at 586, 594, and 598 Canterbury Street (the "Project Site"). The Project Site is bounded by St. Michael's Cemetery to the South, a commercial car wash to the north, the Tabernacle Baptist Congregation church to the west, and a residential building with over one-hundred (100) units to the east.

DEVELOPMENT TEAM

The Development Team for the Proposed Project consists of:

Proponent/Applicant: The AD Group Co. d/b/a Aponte Development
Neselle Aponte
Andreas Hwang

Architect: Sousa Design Architects
Stephen Sousa

Legal Counsel: Pulgini and Norton, LLP
John Pulgini

Civil Engineer: Boston Civil
Kevin Quetti

Landscape Architect: Verdant Landscape Architecture
Katya Podsiadlo

PROPOSED PROJECT

The Proposed Project consists of an approximately four (4) story residential building totaling approximately 45,600 square feet of gross floor area. The building will contain approximately forty-six (46) residential rental units, thirty-two (32) off-street parking spaces, forty-six (46) resident bicycle parking spaces, and eight (8) visitor bicycle parking spaces. The residential rental units include ten (10) studio units, twenty-six (26) one-bedroom units, seven (7) two-bedroom units, and three (3) three-bedroom units.

The total development cost is approximately \$13,000,000

The table below summarizes the Proposed Project's key statistics.

<u>Estimated Project Metrics</u>	Proposed Plan
Gross Square Footage	46,021
Gross Floor Area	46,021
<i>Residential</i>	46,021

<i>Office</i>	0
<i>Retail</i>	0
<i>Lab</i>	0
<i>Medical Clinical</i>	0
<i>Education</i>	0
<i>Hotel</i>	0
<i>Industrial</i>	0
<i>Recreational</i>	0
<i>Cultural</i>	0
<i>Parking</i>	32
* Development Cost Estimate	\$13,000,000
Residential Units	46
<i>Rental Units</i>	46
<i>Ownership Units</i>	
<i>IDP/Affordable Units</i>	8
Parking spaces	36

ARTICLE 80 AND PUBLIC REVIEW PROCESS

On January 27, 2025, the Proponent filed a Small Project Review Application (“SPRA”) with the BPDA for the Proposed Project, pursuant to Article 80E of the Code, which initiated a public comment period that concluded on March 5, 2025. The SPRA was sent to the City’s public agencies/departments and elected officials pursuant to Section 80A-2 of the Code.

On February 26, 2025, a Virtual Public Meeting was held. The Virtual Public Meeting was advertised in the local Roslindale newspaper, listed on the BPDA website, and distributed to those enrolled in the BPDA Roslindale email lists.

PLANNING AND ZONING CONTEXT

The Proposed Project is located in the Roslindale Neighborhood Zoning District’s Community Commercial - 1 subdistrict, governed by Article 67. The site is presently a set of three vacant parcels formerly used for parking and storage. The rear of the

longest parcel that borders the adjacent American Legion Highway contains a portion of a stream that passes through the site. The Proposed Project is surrounded by a mix of residential, cemetery and commercial uses. To the north of the site, there is a three-story multi-family building and further past that a recently completed 118,815 SF 4- story residential building at 289 Walk Hill Street. South of the site is a recently completed three-story multi-family residential building.

The Proposed Project will be accessed from Canterbury Street but also has frontage on American Legion Highway. Consistent with the underlying zoning, the adjacent portion of American Legion Highway is primarily characterized by commercial uses, including a car wash that immediately abuts the Proposed Project.

The proposed project seeks zoning relief for maximum height, maximum FAR and a minimum off-street parking ratio that requires 68 motor-vehicle parking spaces. Approval for a conditional use permit is also sought due to the proximity to a Greenbelt Roadway. The Roslindale Neighborhood Strategic Plan (2007) envisioned this area as a continued use of the local community commercial that existed when the plan was drafted. Accordingly, while multifamily residential is an allowed use, the community commercial zoning implemented with this plan was intended to shape low density commercial uses. In recent years the surrounding context has changed to become more of a residential neighborhood. Staff help shape the proposed design to ensure that building dimension is contextually appropriate, and the site plan provides adequate open space and setbacks between the neighboring parcels. Likewise, the proposed parking count and design is aligned with contemporary best practices and Boston Transportation Department policy for this area.

Due to the stream in the rear end of the site the proponents have worked with the Conservation Commission to limit impact around the wetland area. Approval was provided by the Commission for the proposed work.

PROJECT BENEFITS AND MITIGATION

The Proposed Project will provide community benefits for the Roslindale neighborhood and the City of Boston. The Proponent has made the following commitments:

- Setting back the proposed building to provide needed dimension to create a Boston Complete Street compliant sidewalk along Canterbury Street that extends and matches the streetscape created at the neighboring approved project at 289 Walk Hill Street.
- In compliance with Boston's Complete Streets Policy, the Proponent will setback their building to create a new sidewalk on Canterbury Street within the bounds of their property within the public way. The Canterbury Street sidewalk will have a minimum width of nine (9) feet. All sidewalks will maintain clear, accessible paths of travel absent vertical elements, that are at least five (5) feet wide and made of concrete monolithic sidewalk space. All sidewalk setbacks are subject to design review and will require approval for a Pedestrian Easement with the Public Improvement Commission (PIC).
- The Proponent has committed to installing at least six (6) street trees in and around the Project Site as part of the site plan improvements and mitigation associated with the Proposed Project. The installation of the proposed street trees, in coordination with the Public Improvement Commission and/or Parks Department, shall be completed before Certificate of Occupancy issuance for the Proposed Project.
- Clean up and on-going maintenance of the adjacent Canterbury Brook buffer, including identification of invasive species and a removal plan, per the direction of the Boston Conservation Commission.
- Maintenance of the vegetated buffer between the project parking area and the existing neighboring building at 582 Canterbury Street.
- Surface lot will be designed to reduce area of impermeable surface.
- The developer will provide improvements to a minimum of one (1) existing bus stop at the intersection of American Legion Highway and Walk Hill Street or at the intersection of American Legion Highway and Canterbury Street, to be completed before issuance of Certificate of Occupancy. The proponent will follow the guidelines described in the MBTA Bus Stop Planning & Design Guide for all identified stops.
- A commitment of \$12,650.00 to the Boston Transportation Department ("BTD") to be contributed upon issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for the Proposed Project to support the bikeshare system. Sufficient space for a 15-dock bikeshare station will be provided on site/nearby, as determined by BTD.
- PIC approvals for proposed improvements shall be completed before building permit issuance for the Proposed Project. The physical mitigation improvements must be completed upon Certificate of Occupancy. These proposed improvements are subject to design review and approval by the

Boston Transportation Department (BTD), Public Works Department (PWD), Public Improvement Commission (PIC), and the Planning Department.

INCLUSIONARY DEVELOPMENT POLICY

The Proposed Project is subject to the Inclusionary Development Policy, dated December 10, 2015 (the “IDP”) and is located within Zone C, as defined by the IDP. The IDP requires that 13% of the total number of units within the development be designated as IDP units. In this case, the Proposed Project has committed to providing eight (8) units, or approximately 17.39% of the total number of units within the Proposed Project, to be created as IDP rental units (the “IDP Units”). All eight (8) IDP Units will be made affordable to households earning not more than 70% of AMI, as published annually by the BPDA and based upon data from the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (“HUD”).

The proposed locations, sizes, income restrictions, and rental prices for the IDP Units are as follows:

Unit Number	Number of Bedrooms	Unit Size (Sq Ft)	Percent of AMI	Rent	Group-2
101	Studio	527	70%	\$1,383	
106	One-Bedroom + Den	916	70%	\$1,621	Group-2A
202	One-Bedroom	734	70%	\$1,621	
204	Studio	519	70%	\$1,383	
307	One-Bedroom	771	70%	\$1,621	
406	Two-Bedroom	1,002	70%	\$1,837	Group-2A
408	Three-Bedroom	1,180	70%	\$2,057	
413	One-Bedroom	618	70%	\$1,621	

The location of the IDP Units will be finalized in conjunction with BPDA and Mayor’s Office of Housing (“MOH”) staff and outlined in the ARHAR, and rental prices and income limits will be adjusted according to BPDA published maximum rental prices and income limits, as based on HUD AMIs, available at the time of the initial rental of the IDP Units. IDP Units must be comparable in size, design, and quality to the market-rate units in the Proposed Project, cannot be stacked or concentrated on the same floors, and must be consistent in bedroom count with the entire Proposed Project.

The ARHAR must be executed along with, or prior to, the issuance of the Certification of Approval for the Proposed Project. The Proponent must also register the Proposed Project with the Boston Fair Housing Commission ("BFHC") upon issuance of the building permit. The IDP Units will not be marketed prior to the submission and approval of an Affirmative Marketing Plan to the BFHC and the BPDA. Preference will be given to applicants who meet the following criteria, weighted in the order below:

- Boston resident; and
- Household size (a minimum of one (1) person per bedroom).

Where a unit is built out for a specific disability (e.g., mobility or sensory), a preference will also be available to households with a person whose need matches the build out of the unit. The City of Boston Disabilities Commission may assist the BPDA in determining eligibility for such a preference.

An affordability covenant will be placed on the IDP Units to maintain affordability for a total period of fifty (50) years (this includes thirty (30) years with an option to extend for an additional period of twenty (20) years). The household income of the renter and the rent of any subsequent rental of the IDP Units during this fifty (50) year period must fall within the applicable income and rent limits for each IDP Unit. IDP Units may not be rented out by the developer prior to rental to an income eligible household, and the BPDA or its assigns or successors will monitor the ongoing affordability of the IDP Units.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the foregoing, BPDA staff recommends that the Board: (1) authorize the Director to issue a Certificate of Approval in accordance with Article 80E, Small Project Review, of the Code; and (2) take any and all actions and execute any and all documents deemed necessary and appropriate by the Director in connection with the foregoing including, without limitation, executing and delivering a Community Benefits Agreement, an Affordable Rental Housing Agreement and Restriction, and any and all other documents and agreements as the Director deems appropriate and necessary in connection with the Proposed Project.

Appropriate votes follow:

VOTED: That the Director be, and hereby is, authorized to issue a Certification of Approval pursuant to Section 80E-6 of the Boston Zoning Code (the "Code"), approving the Proposed Project consisting of 45,600 square feet at 586-594 Canterbury Street in Roslindale (the "Proposed Project") in accordance with the requirements of Small Project Review, Article 80E, of the Code, subject to continuing design review by the BPDA; and

FURTHER

VOTED: That the Director by, and hereby is, authorized to enter into an Affordable Rental Housing Agreement and Restriction in connection with eight (8) on-site Inclusionary Development units, a Community Benefits Agreement, and to take any and all other actions and to execute any and all other agreements and documents that the Director deems appropriate and necessary in connection with the Proposed Project.

586-594 Canterbury Street



586-594 Canterbury Street



**Boston Water and
Sewer Commission**



980 Harrison Avenue
Boston, MA 02119-2540
617-989-7000

February 26, 2025

Ebony DaRosa
Senior Project Manager
Planning Department
One City Hall Square
Boston, MA 02201

Re: 586-598 Canterbury Street, Roslindale
Small Project Review Application

Dear Ms. DaRosa:

The Boston Water and Sewer Commission (Commission) has reviewed the Small Project Review Application (SPRA) for the proposed residential development located at 586-598 Canterbury Street in Roslindale. This letter provides the Commission's comments on the SPRA.

The proposed project site consists of an approximately 41,732 square feet (sf) lot. The site contains vacant land. The project proponent, The AD Group Co., proposes to construct a new four (4) story, forty-six (46) unit residential rental apartment building. There will be thirty-two (32) off-street at-grade vehicle parking spaces and fifty-four (54) bicycle parking spaces.

The Commission owns and maintains a 12-inch Southern High DICL water main installed in 2016 in Canterbury Street.

For sanitary sewer and storm drain service, there is a 15-inch sanitary sewer and a 15-inch storm drain in Canterbury Street.

Water usage and sewage generation estimates were not provided in the SPRA.

The Commission has the following comments regarding the SPRA:

General

1. Prior to the initial phase of the site plan development, The AD Group Co. should meet with the Commission's Design and Engineering Customer Services to review water main, sewer and storm drainage system availability and potential upgrades that could impact the development.



2. All new or relocated water mains, sewers and storm drains must be designed and constructed at The AD Group Co.'s expense. They must be designed and constructed in conformance with the Commission's design standards, Water Distribution System and Sewer Use regulations, and Requirements for Site Plans. The site plan should include the locations of new, relocated and existing water mains, sewers and drains which serve the site, proposed service connections, water meter locations, as well as back flow prevention devices in the facilities that will require inspection. A General Service Application must also be submitted to the Commission with the site plan.
3. The Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), in cooperation with the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority and its member communities, is implementing a coordinated approach to flow control in the MWRA regional wastewater system, particularly the removal of extraneous clean water (e.g., infiltration/inflow (I/I)) in the system. In April of 2014, the Massachusetts DEP promulgated new regulations regarding wastewater. The Commission has a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit for its combined sewer overflows and is subject to these new regulations [314 CMR 12.00, section 12.04(2)(d)]. This section requires all new sewer connections with design flows exceeding 15,000 gpd to mitigate the impacts of the development by removing four gallons of infiltration and inflow (I/I) for each new gallon of wastewater flow. In this regard, any new connection or expansion of an existing connection that exceeds 15,000 gallons per day of wastewater shall assist in the I/I reduction effort to ensure that the additional wastewater flows are offset by the removal of I/I. Currently, a minimum ratio of 4:1 for I/I removal to new wastewater flow added is used. The Commission supports the policy and will require proponent to develop a consistent inflow reduction plan. The 4:1 requirement should be addressed at least 90 days prior to activation of water service and will be based on the estimated sewage generation provided on the project site plan.
4. The design of the project should comply with the City of Boston's Complete Streets Initiative, which requires incorporation of "green infrastructure" into street designs. Green infrastructure includes greenscapes, such as trees, shrubs, grasses and other landscape plantings, as well as rain gardens and vegetative swales, infiltration basins, and paving materials and permeable surfaces. The proponent must develop a maintenance plan for the proposed green infrastructure. For more information on the Complete Streets Initiative see the City's website at <http://bostoncompletestreets.org/>
5. The water use and sewage generation estimates were not included in the SPRA. The Commission requires that these values be calculated and submitted with the Site Plan. The AD Group Co. should provide separate estimates of peak and continuous maximum water demand for residential, irrigation and air-conditioning make-up water for the project. Estimates should be based on full-site build-out of the proposed project. The AD



Group Co. should also provide the methodology used to estimate water demand for the proposed project.

6. The AD Group Co. should be aware that the US Environmental Protection Agency issued the Remediation General Permit (RGP) for Groundwater Remediation, Contaminated Construction Dewatering, and Miscellaneous Surface Water Discharges. If groundwater contaminated with petroleum products, for example, is encountered, The AD Group Co. will be required to apply for a RGP to cover these discharges.
7. It is The AD Group Co.'s responsibility to evaluate the capacity of the water, sewer and storm drain systems serving the project site to determine if the systems are adequate to meet future project demands. With the site plan, The AD Group Co. must include a detailed capacity analysis for the water, sewer and storm drain systems serving the project site, as well as an analysis of the impacts the proposed project will have on the Commission's water, sewer and storm drainage systems.

Water

1. The AD Group Co. must provide separate estimates of peak and continuous maximum water demand for residential, commercial, industrial, irrigation of landscaped areas, and air-conditioning make-up water for the project with the site plan. Estimates should be based on full-site build-out of the proposed project. The AD Group Co. should also provide the methodology used to estimate water demand for the proposed project.
2. The AD Group Co. should explore opportunities for implementing water conservation measures in addition to those required by the State Plumbing Code. In particular, The AD Group Co. should consider outdoor landscaping which requires minimal use of water to maintain. If The AD Group Co. plans to install in-ground sprinkler systems, the Commission recommends that timers, soil moisture indicators and rainfall sensors be installed. The use of sensor-operated faucets and toilets in common areas of buildings should be considered.
3. The AD Group Co. is required to obtain a Hydrant Permit for use of any hydrant during the construction phase of this project. The water used from the hydrant must be metered. The AD Group Co. should contact the Commission's Meter Department for information on and to obtain a Hydrant Permit.
4. The Commission is utilizing a Fixed Radio Meter Reading System to obtain water meter readings. For new water meters, the Commission will provide a Meter Transmitter Unit (MTU) and connect the device to the meter. For information regarding the installation of MTUs, The AD Group Co. should contact the Commission's Meter Department.



Sewage / Drainage

1. A Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for Nutrients has been established for the Lower Charles River Watershed by the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP). In order to achieve the reductions in Phosphorus loading required by the TMDL, phosphorus concentrations in the lower Charles River from Boston must be reduced by 64%. To accomplish the necessary reductions in phosphorus, the Commission is requiring developers in the lower Charles River watershed to infiltrate stormwater discharging from impervious areas in compliance with MassDEP. The AD Group Co. will be required to submit with the site plan a phosphorus reduction plan for the proposed development. The AD Group Co. must fully investigate methods for retaining stormwater on-site before the Commission will consider a request to discharge stormwater to the Commission's system. The site plan should indicate how storm drainage from roof drains will be handled and the feasibility of retaining their stormwater discharge on-site. Under no circumstances will stormwater be allowed to discharge to a sanitary sewer.

In conjunction with the Site Plan and the General Service Application The AD Group Co. will be required to submit a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. The plan must:

- Identify best management practices for controlling erosion and for preventing the discharge of sediment and contaminated groundwater or stormwater runoff to the Commission's drainage system when the construction is underway.
 - Include a site map which shows, at a minimum, existing drainage patterns and areas used for storage or treatment of contaminated soils, groundwater or stormwater, and the location of major control or treatment structures to be utilized during construction.
 - Provide a stormwater management plan in compliance with the DEP standards mentioned above. The plan should include a description of the measures to control pollutants after construction is completed.
2. The Commission encourages The AD Group Co. to explore additional opportunities for protecting stormwater quality on site by minimizing sanding and the use of deicing chemicals, pesticides, and fertilizers.
 3. The discharge of dewatering drainage to a sanitary sewer is prohibited by the Commission. The AD Group Co. is advised that the discharge of any dewatering drainage to the storm drainage system requires a Drainage Discharge Permit from the Commission. If the dewatering drainage is contaminated with petroleum products, The AD Group Co. will be required to obtain a Remediation General Permit from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for the discharge.



4. The AD Group Co. must fully investigate methods for retaining stormwater on-site before the Commission will consider a request to discharge stormwater to the Commission's system. The site plan should indicate how storm drainage from roof drains will be handled and the feasibility of retaining their stormwater discharge on-site. All projects at or above 100,000 square feet of floor area are to retain, on site, a volume of runoff equal to 1.25 inches of rainfall times the impervious area. Under no circumstances will stormwater be allowed to discharge to a sanitary sewer.
5. The Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) established Stormwater Management Standards. The standards address water quality, water quantity and recharge. In addition to Commission standards, The AD Group Co. will be required to meet MassDEP Stormwater Management Standards.
6. Sanitary sewage must be kept separate from stormwater and separate sanitary sewer and storm drain service connections must be provided. The Commission requires that existing stormwater and sanitary sewer service connections, which are to be re-used by the proposed project, be dye tested to confirm they are connected to the appropriate system.
7. The Commission requests that The AD Group Co. install a permanent casting stating "Don't Dump: Drains to Charles River" next to any catch basin created or modified as part of this project. The AD Group Co. should contact the Commission's Operations Division for information regarding the purchase of the castings.
8. If a cafeteria or food service facility is built as part of this project, grease traps will be required in accordance with the Commission's Sewer Use Regulations. The AD Group Co. is advised to consult with the Commission's Operations Department with regards to grease traps.
9. The Commission requires installation of particle separators on all new parking lots greater than 7,500 square feet in size. If it is determined that it is not possible to infiltrate all of the runoff from the new parking lot, the Commission will require the installation of a particle separator or a standard Type 5 catch basin with an outlet tee for the parking lot. Specifications for particle separators are provided in the Commission's requirements for Site Plans.



Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'John P. Sullivan', written over the typed name.

John P. Sullivan, P.E.
Chief Engineer

JPS/afh

cc: Andreas Hwang, The AD Group Co.
Colleen Rizzi, MWRA via e-mail
S. McFee, BWSC via e-mail

MEMORANDUM

May 15, 2025

TO: **BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY**
D/B/A BOSTON PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT AGENCY (BPDA)
AND KAIROS SHEN, DIRECTOR

FROM: CASEY HINES, SENIOR DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT REVIEW
NUPOOR MONANI, SENIOR DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT
REVIEW
ALEXA PINARD, ASSISTANT DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF DESIGN REVIEW
COLIN FREDRICKSON, TRANSPORTATION PLANNER II
JASON MCDONALD, PLANNER I
SAM VALENTINE, SENIOR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT II
TRAVIS ANDERSON, SUSTAINABILITY REVIEWER
DYLAN NORRIS, PROJECT ASSISTANT

SUBJECT: 120-134 HAMPDEN STREET, NEWMARKET

SUMMARY: This Memorandum requests that the Boston Redevelopment Authority (“BRA”) d/b/a Boston Planning & Development Agency authorize the Director to: (1) issue a Scoping Determination waiving further review pursuant to Article 80B, Large Project Review of the City of Boston Zoning Code (the “Zoning Code”) for the 120-134 Hampden Street project (the “Proposed Project”, defined below) in the Newmarket neighborhood of Boston; (2) issue a Certification of Compliance under Section 80B-6 of the Code upon successful completion of the Article 80 review process; (3) enter into a Cooperation Agreement for the Proposed Project; and (4) take any other actions and execute any other agreements and documents that the Director deems appropriate and necessary in connection with the Proposed Project.

PROJECT SITE

The project site includes four (4) parcels of land of approximately 29,603 square feet, with an existing non-conforming records warehouse and vast unimproved surface area located at 120-134 Hampden Street (the “Project Site” or “Site”). The Site is located in the Newmarket Creative Industrial Zoning Subdistrict of the Newmarket 21st Century Industrial Zoning District, which is regulated pursuant to Article 90 of the Zoning Code. The Project Site is within walking distance to the MBTA’s Newmarket Commuter Rail Station and is also in close proximity to four (4) MBTA bus routes along Melnea Cass Boulevard and Dudley Street, providing access to the Nubian Square Station.

The surrounding neighborhood context is well-suited to the scale and scope of the Proposed Project, with the nearby 101 Hampden Street 82,762 square foot warehouse, and other long-existing industrial buildings along Hampden Street, Howard Street, Gerard Street, and Kemble Street flanking the Project Site to the north, south and east, respectively. The edge of the neighborhoods along Hampden Street contains a mix of residential and industrial/commercial uses with good transit connectivity, access to green space and recreation and walkability to education, institutions, and job centers, respectively.

DEVELOPMENT TEAM

The Project Team consists of the following entities:

Proponent:	Bahlmann Capital Group LLC 101 Winthrop Road, Suite 2 Brookline, MA 02445 Casper Bahlmann
Legal Counsel:	McDermott Quilty Miller & Hanley LLP 28 State Street, Suite 802 Boston, MA 02109 Nicholas Zozula, Esq. – Partner Kevin Butler, Esq. – Associate
Architect:	RODE Architects Inc. 535 Albany Street, #405

	Boston, MA 02118 Kevin Deabler, Jonathan Quinn, Alex Zee
Article 80 Permitting Consultant:	Mitchell L. Fischman Consulting ("MLF Consulting") LLC 41 Brush Hill Road Newton, MA 02461 Mitchell Fischman – Permitting Project Mgr. Mark Feldman – Assist. Permitting Project Mgr.
Transportation Planner / Engineer:	Howard Stein Hudson 11 Beacon Street, Suite 1010 Boston, MA 02108 Melissa Restrepo
Civil Engineer:	Howard Stein Hudson 11 Beacon Street, Suite 1010 Boston, MA 02108 Madison Blanchard, James Downing
Landscape Architect:	Michael D'Angelo Landscape Architecture LLC 840 Summer Street, Suite 201A Boston, MA 02127 Spencer Beebe, Michael D'Angelo
Geotechnical/Hazardous Waste Consultant:	Haley & Aldrich Inc. 465 Medford Street Suite 2200 Charlestown, MA 02129 Marya Gorczyca, P.E.
Sustainability Consultant:	Soden Sustainability Consulting 19 Richardson Street Winchester, MA 01890 Arran French, Colleen Ryan Soden
Energy Performance Consultant:	Robinson Energy Services 2434 1st Ave W

Seattle, WA 98119
Ian Robinson

Noise Consultant:

Tech Environmental, Inc.
1 Meeting House Road
Unit #1
Chelmsford, MA 01824
Marc C. Wallace

DESCRIPTION AND PROGRAM

The Proponent is proposing an approximately 105,607 gross square feet ("gsf") mixed-use self-storage facility and commercial development. This includes a change of use for approximately 73,280 existing gsf of the existing six (6) story building at the 134 Hampden Street portion of the Project Site from the existing Records Warehouse Use to a Self-Storage Use. Along with accompanying changes of use to a wine storage use of approximately 434 gsf and to a business use of approximately 2,544 gsf, all on the 134 Hampden Street Portion of the Project Site. In addition to new construction of a six (6) story addition at the 120-126 Hampden Street portion of the Project Site, including approximately 32,327 gsf of retail/office/self-storage uses in order to better activate the street corner, approximately 3,665 gsf of retail space, and approximately 500 gsf of office space (for the self-storage uses) on the first level, approximately 3,712 gsf of office use on the second floor, and approximately 24,000 gsf of self-storage space on the second thru sixth levels (again, the "Proposed Project"). The Proposed Project will also include a new canopy for loading/unloading to the building and an outdoor pocket park at the corner of Hampden Street and Norfolk Avenue, which will better activate and landscape the street corner than its existing condition.

The Proponent plans to commence construction of the Proposed Project in the third quarter of 2025. There are an estimated 100-150 +/- construction jobs contributing to the Proposed Project and potential for several new permanent jobs in the property management and leasing areas, and in the retail space of the building addition. The total anticipated development cost is approximately \$10,000,000.

The table below summarizes the Proposed Project's anticipated key development metrics.

<u>Estimated Project Metrics</u>	Proposed Plan
Gross Square Footage	108,806
Gross Floor Area	105,607
<i>Industrial</i>	97,730
<i>Office</i>	4,212
<i>Retail</i>	3,665
<i>Mechanical/storage</i>	3,209
Development Cost Estimate	\$10,000,000
Parking spaces	17
Bike Parking Spaces	6 Indoor spaces 3 exterior racks (6 spaces)

ARTICLE 80 REVIEW PROCESS

On November 22, 2024, the Proponent filed a Letter of Intent (“LOI”) in accordance with the BPDA’s policy regarding the Provision of Mitigation by Development Projects in Boston. On November 29, 2024, letters soliciting nominations for the Impact Advisory Group (“IAG”) were delivered to local and state elected officials. On February 20, 2025, the IAG was finalized with five (5) members.

The Proponent filed a Project Notification Form (“PNF”) for the Proposed Project on February 21, 2025, which initiated a public comment period with a closing date of March 31, 2025. Notice of the receipt of the PNF by the BPDA was published in the Boston Herald on February 21, 2025. The notice and PNF were sent to the City’s public agencies/departments and elected officials.

Pursuant to Section 80B-5.3 of the Code, a Scoping Session was held on March 20, 2025, with the City’s public agencies and elected officials to review and discuss the Proposed Project.

The BPDA also held the following public meetings on the Proposed Project: an IAG meeting on March 24, 2025, and a public meeting on March 25, 2025. The meetings

were advertised in local newspapers and on the BPDA website and distributed to the BPDA's Roxbury/Newmarket email list.

PLANNING AND ZONING CONTEXT

The Proposed Project is located in the Newmarket Industrial Zoning District's Creative Industrial Subdistrict, governed by Article 90. The site presently has four separate parcels with an existing six story warehouse on the largest parcel. The remainder of the site is paved surface parking. The site is at the edge of the industrial focused Newmarket District bordering the primarily residential Roxbury neighborhood.

The Proposed Project will establish a new self-storage use and build new retail, office space, and an outdoor pocket park along the street front facing the residential buildings across Hampden Street in Roxbury. On the other side of the building the main entrance and parking for the newly extended storage facility will be accessed from Norfolk Avenue adjacent to the neighboring industrial buildings.

The Proposed Project seeks a conditional use permit for self-storage use. It also seeks zoning relief for building lot coverage, front setback, and height. Self-storage was made a conditional use to differentiate this use from active warehouse use. Given Newmarket's industrial planning context, both PLAN: Newmarket (2023) and current zoning encourage warehouse use due to the positive economic benefits derived from direct job creation, and the manner in which warehousing can support a range of businesses. In contrast, the more limited economic benefits of self-storage make this use permissible in Newmarket under a narrower set of circumstances. Because of the edge condition of the Proposed Project, directly across the street from a residential neighborhood, self-storage represents appropriate transitional use from more high impact industrial uses found in the Newmarket core. Further, the proposed use is appropriate in this instance as it aligns with PLAN: Newmarket and emphasizes facilitating adaptive reuse of existing structures in the Creative Industrial District. In regard to the front setback and the height, these are existing nonconformities that will not be worsened by the new construction.

ZONING

The Project Site is located within the Newmarket 21st Century Industrial Zoning District and the Newmarket Creative Industrial Zoning Subdistrict (the “NCI”). The Project Site is not regulated by any Zoning Code Overlay Districts. The Newmarket 21st Century Industrial Zoning District was established to reflect more contemporary uses of the present-day economy, ease permitting, retain and protect core industrial uses, and support the growth of arts, creative, and maker workspaces.

The Proposed Project includes a change of use from Warehousing to Self-Storage (as a distinct type of Warehousing) under the newly enacted Article 90, Section 5 of the Zoning Code. In this regard, although Warehousing (Indoor) is categorized as an Allowed Use, Self-Storage is categorized more specifically under the Warehousing (Indoor) category and is itemized as a “Conditional Use” pursuant to the new Article 90 of the Zoning Code. However, the Proposed Project’s contemplated Office and Retail Uses (Retail if less than 20,000 square feet) are Allowed Uses under the Zoning Code in the NCI Subdistrict.

With respect to the dimensional regulations of the Zoning Code in the Creative Industrial Zoning Subdistrict, as applicable to the Project Site, maximum height allowed is no more than 5-stories; the Proposed Project’s addition is 6-stories. The allowed building height is 65-feet and the Proposed Project’s addition is 67’8” (the same as the existing building at the Project Site). Finally, lot coverage allowed is 50% while the Proposed Project’s addition is 59% (slightly more than the existing building coverage of 54%, which is an existing nonconformity). Therefore, Variances will be required for Article 90, Section 6 – Maximum Building Height (Stories); Article 90, Section 6 – Maximum Building Height (Feet); and Article 90, Section 6 – Maximum Building Lot Coverage.

MITIGATION AND COMMUNITY BENEFITS

The Proposed Project will provide a number of benefits to the Roxbury/Newmarket neighborhood and the City of Boston as a whole, including the following:

- Revitalizing a Project Site with the rehabilitation, adaptive reuse, and expansion of an existing industrial warehouse building from a more internally facing Records Warehouse to a more public-facing Self-Storage Warehouse;

- Activating the street frontage along Hampden Street with new and vibrant ground floor commercial retail and/or marketplace space;
- Improving setback/streetscape on the Project Site's surrounding streets (i.e. Hampden Street and Norfolk Avenue) including meeting modern accessibility standards;
- Providing a building setback sufficient to create a wider sidewalk on Norfolk Ave, extending from the public right of way and into the bounds of the Project Site, in compliance with Boston's Complete Streets Policy. Norfolk Ave will have a minimum sidewalk width of seven (7) feet, inclusive of a TK foot setback. All sidewalks will maintain a clear and accessible path of travel, absent vertical elements and made of concrete monolithic sidewalk space, with a minimum width of five (5) feet clear in any location. All sidewalk setbacks are subject to design review and will require approval for a Pedestrian Easement from the Public Improvement Commission (PIC).
- Adding much-needed landscape buffering, streetscape improvements, with landscape buffering, bike racks per Boston Transportation Department ("BTD") requirements, and streetscape improvements including a pocket park at the corner of Hampden Street and Norfolk Avenue
- Implementing crosswalk improvements and improvements to the public right away along Hampden Street, Norfolk Avenue, and Howard Street, prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy:
 - Designing and implementing one (1) new crosswalk Across Hampden Street at the connection to Norfolk Ave and Keegan Street intersection.
 - The crosswalk will be a high visibility "Ladder" style crosswalk, with thick white bars and parallel lines, to help improve pedestrian visibility and safety. The crosswalk will require the addition of compliant split pedestrian curb ramps equipped with yellow tactile warning strips. Crosswalks must be designed with review from the Disabilities Commission, PWD, BTD, and Planning Department.
- Improving two (2) crosswalks across Norfolk Ave at the Hampden St intersection and across Howard Street at the Hampden Street Intersection. The crosswalk will be a high visibility "Ladder" style crosswalk, with thick

white bars and parallel lines, to help improve pedestrian visibility and safety. The existing non-compliant pedestrian curb ramps at these locations will be reconstructed and equipped with yellow tactile warning strips. All crosswalks must be designed with review from the Disabilities Commission, PWD, BTB, and Planning Department Staff.

- Providing \$100,000.00 for one (1) year of free rent for a retail tenant to activate street corner following issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy;
- Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy the Proponent commits to allocating \$20,000.00 to develop and complete a Conceptual Design and Final Design Commission, including Fabrication, Installation, Maintenance, and De-installation plans and Fabrication and Installation, for Artwork to be installed by an artist(s), for the pocket park at the corner of Hampden Street and Norfolk Avenue. In the selection process, where possible, the proponent will prioritize selecting advisors from Roxbury residents and/or Boston based students; in order to facilitate this allocation, the proponent will work with the Mayor's Office of Arts and Culture (MOAC) during the selection and permitting process, and secure MOAC sign off on all related plans, including artist selection, conceptual artwork design, final artwork design, fabrication, installation, and ongoing maintenance plans, and the final artwork before and after installation from MOAC.
- Allocating up to \$10,000.00 to fund installation of a security video camera on Norfolk Avenue from Hampden Street to Shetland Street, either to be installed by Newmarket Business Improvement District or the Boston Police Department;
- Contributing up to \$60,000.00 of free self-storage for Boston based businesses, including providing self-storage units to ten (10) new businesses in the Newmarket area at no cost for one (1) year following the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy, with said program to be finalized with the Office of Inclusion/Economic Opportunity. The final business selections will be coordinated with the Office of Inclusion/Economic Opportunity and based on declarations from possible tenants that they are Boston based businesses.;

- Upon issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy, the Proponent will make a one-time “bikeshare” contribution of \$49,000.00 to Boston Transportation Department (“BTD”) per the City’s Bike Parking Guidelines
- Upon issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy, the Proponent will identify and make improvements to a space within one quarter of a mile of the Project Site that is suitable for the installation of one (1) fifteen (15) dock bike share station. Improvements must be sufficient to satisfy the design requirements outlined in the Boston Transportation Department’s Bike Parking Guidelines. The proponent will work with BTD and the Planning Department to site the station appropriately. Bike share stations may require Administrative Review by PIC.
- 60 days following issuance of a building permit, the Proponent will make direct contributions of \$90,000.00 to local schools and community organizations, as follows, with proof of same provided to the Planning Department upon payment:
 - \$15,000.00 for the Samuel W. Mason Elementary Pilot School;
 - \$15,000.00 for the Orchard Garden Pilot School;
 - \$15,000.00 for the Roxbury Prep Charter School Middle & High-School);
 - \$15,000.00 for the Orchard Garden Tenants Association;
 - \$15,000.00 for the Base (Youth Organization); and
 - \$15,000.00 for the Newmarket Business Improvement District Homeless Work Program.
- Temporarily creating many jobs in the construction and building trade industries and prioritizing local permanent job hiring to the extent possible; and
- Providing a substantial addition to real property taxes for the City of Boston.

The details of any in-kind work and the allocation of any financial contributions shall be incorporated into the Cooperation Agreement between the Proponent and the BPDA. To the greatest extent possible, the Proponent will provide the BPDA with evidence indicating that the previously referenced mitigation and community benefits have been satisfied.

All aspects of the proposed new construction are subject to continued design review with the Urban Design staff.

All improvements to the public realm are subject to continued design review with the BPDA and Public Improvement Commission (PIC). Additionally, these improvements may require approval for Specific Repair Plans with the PIC.

BPDA-approved construction signage must also be installed at the project construction site before and during the construction of the Proposed Project. The signage must be in the form of panels at highly visible locations at the construction site or around the construction site perimeter and must be adjacent to each other. The BPDA will work with the Proponent to provide high-resolution graphics that must be printed at a large scale (minimum of 8 feet by 12 feet).

SUSTAINABILITY & RESILIENCY

Article 37

In support of Boston's carbon neutrality goals the Proposed Project will reduce the overall carbon emissions via energy-efficient building systems, prioritizing building enclosure solutions and low window-to-wall ratios. The buildings will be designed and constructed utilizing the following criteria:

- Designed and constructed to be all-electric and LEED BD+C Gold certifiable (60+ points).
- The proposed building will include a well-insulated, low-infiltration enclosure with efficient all-electric heat pump space conditioning and DHW heating systems, energy recovery ventilation and EnergyStar rated appliances,
- The proposed building has a forecasted EUI of 11.6, significantly lower than the Energy Star median EUI for Self-Storage Facilities of 20.2.
- The Proposed Project has a 2035 pCEI of 0.3 kg CO₂e/ft²-yr, significantly lower than the 2035 BERDO threshold.
- Additionally, to minimize embodied carbon impacts, the building's existing structure will be reused to the furthest extent possible. Structurally unsound

portions of the façade will be repaired. Additionally, as the Proposed Project progresses, the Proponent will explore low-carbon material options such as concrete and steel to reduce its embodied carbon impact even further; and

- Finally, the Proponent is in contact with Mass Save regarding Path 1 or 2 incentives.

Smart Utilities

The Proposed Project will comply with the Smart Utilities requirements found in Article 80B of the Code. The Proposed Project should meet or exceed the 1.25" of stormwater infiltration per square inch of impervious development standard. Utilities in any City right-of-way will be designed to conform with Public Works Department standards and will undergo further review to ensure they are not in conflict with any landscape design feature, such as tree pits and/or other green infrastructure elements.

The Proponent agrees to complete the Smart Utilities review prior to obtaining a Certificate of Occupancy. The items to be reviewed include:

- On-going review of on-site stormwater management equivalent to 1.25" of retention over the total impervious area of the Project Site.
- Confirmation on updated Utility Site Plan that the proposed infrastructure does not conflict with other existing utilities.
- On-going review of site tree and street tree specification; design of tree soil volumes; permeable pavers, if used; and other green infrastructure features within the right-of-way, where applicable based on the scope of work; (to be reviewed as part of on-going review processes with Urban Design and the PIC).
- Verification of compliance with the City of Boston EV Readiness Policy for New Developments, including EV chargers and needed infrastructure. Project shall provide 25% of total parking EV charging space on site. The Proponent will outfit the remaining 75% of parking spaces to be EV ready as defined by the BTD EV Readiness Policy for New, Large Developments.

- Location of transformers and critical infrastructure so as to ensure coordination with Eversource and “right-sized” infrastructure.
- A Utility Site Plan showing the infrastructure in the bullets above, as well as all other relevant utility infrastructure, as needed in ongoing future reviews with Urban Design and PIC, including electric connection for streetlights; and
- A plan to address relevant conflicts reported through COBUCS if/as relevant. Project team and the contractor will continue to work with BTU and Smart Utilities, as needed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Approvals have been requested of the BPDA pursuant to Article 80, Section 80B of the Code for the issuance of a Scoping Determination waiving further review pursuant to Article 80, Section 80B-5.3(d) of the Code, and for the issuance of a Certification of Compliance under Section 80B-6 upon successful completion of the Article 80 review process.

It is, therefore, recommended that the BPDA approve the Proposed Project and authorize the Director to: (1) issue a Scoping Determination waiving further review pursuant to Article 80, Section 80B-5.3(d) of the Code; (2) issue a Certification of Compliance under Section 80B-6 upon successful completion of the Article 80 review process; (3) execute and deliver a Cooperation Agreement (referencing, among other things, the Boston Residents Construction Employment Plan ordinance), and (4) enter into any and all other agreements and documents upon terms and conditions deemed to be in the best interest of the BPDA.

Appropriate votes follow:

VOTED: That the Director be, and hereby is, authorized to issue a Scoping Determination waiving further review under Section 80B-5.3(d) of the City of Boston Zoning Code (the “Code”), which (i) finds that the Project Notification Form (“PNF”) together with any additional material and comments received by the BPDA adequately describes the potential impacts arising from the proposed 120-134 Hampden Street project (the “Proposed Project”), and provides sufficient mitigation measures to minimize these impacts, and (ii) waives further review of the

Proposed Project under Section 80B-5 of the Code, subject to continuing design review by the Boston Redevelopment Authority ("BRA") d/b/a Boston Planning and Development Agency ("BPDA"); and

FURTHER

VOTED: That the Director be, and hereby is, authorized to issue a Certification of Compliance for the Proposed Project upon the successful completion of all Article 80 processes; and

FURTHER

VOTED: That the Director be, and hereby is, authorized to execute a Cooperation Agreement, and any and all other agreements and documents which the Director deems appropriate and necessary in connection with the Proposed Project, all upon terms and conditions determined to be in the best interests of the BPDA.

134 Hampden Street



134 Hampden Street





CITY of BOSTON

Michelle Wu, Mayor

To: [Dylan Norris],
From: [Rihabe Oulal], PWD
Date: [3/3/2025]
Subject: [120-134 Hampden Street - PNF] - Boston Public Works Department Comments

Included here are Boston Public Works Department comments for the 120-134 Hampden Street PNF.

Project Coordination:

The developer should coordinate with BTM and PWD to develop safety and accessibility improvements for pedestrians and cyclists in the area. The developer shall contact the developer at 100 Hampden Street to coordinate the reconstruction of the pedestrian ramps and their reciprocals at Hampden street and Norfolk Avenue.

Project Specific Scope Considerations:

The developer should coordinate with PWD in regards to reconstructing all the pedestrian ramps and their reciprocals at the intersection of Hampden street and Norfolk Ave and Keegan street and the intersection at Hampden street and Howard street and Buboia Street. The developer shall coordinate with the developer at 100 Hampden Street in the reconstruction of the ramps at Hampden and Norfolk. The developer shall also coordinate with PIC in regards to any changes in curb geometry. Lastly, the developer should coordinate with the BTM in regards to relocating traffic signal lights.

Site Plan:

The developer must provide an engineer's site plan at an appropriate engineering scale that shows curb functionality on both sides of all streets that about the property.

Construction Within The Public vs Private Right-of-Way (ROW):

Although the general comments below apply specifically to work associated with the project within the public right-of-way, it is preferred and encouraged for construction in the private right-of-way to be consistent with City standards for public ways, as well, to the extent possible. Should these streets ever become public ways, they must conform to the City standards as outlined below.

All proposed design and construction within the Public ROW shall conform to PWD Design Standards (<https://www.boston.gov/departments/public-works/public-works-design-standards>). Any non-standard materials (i.e. pavers, landscaping, bike racks, etc.) proposed within the Public ROW will require approval through the Public Improvement Commission (PIC) process and a fully executed License, Maintenance and Indemnification (LM&I) Agreement with the PIC. Please note that the comments below are specific to proposed work within the Public ROW.

Sidewalks:

The developer is responsible for the reconstruction of the sidewalks abutting the project and, wherever possible, to extend the limits to the nearest intersection to encourage and compliment pedestrian improvements and travel along all sidewalks within the ROW within and beyond the project limits. The reconstruction effort also must meet current Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)/Massachusetts Architectural Access Board (AAB) guidelines, including the installation of new or reconstruction of existing pedestrian ramps at all corners of all intersections abutting the project site if not already constructed to ADA/AAB compliance per Code of Massachusetts Regulations Title 521, Section 21 (<https://www.mass.gov/regulations/521-CMR-21-curb-cuts>). This includes converting apex ramps to perpendicular ramps at intersection corners and constructing or reconstructing reciprocal pedestrian ramps where applicable. Plans showing the extents of the proposed sidewalk improvements associated with this project must be submitted to the PWD Engineering Division for review and approval. Changes to any curb geometry will need to be reviewed and approved through the PIC.

Please note that at signalized intersections, any alteration to pedestrian ramps may also require upgrading the traffic signal equipment to ensure that the signal post and pedestrian push button locations meet current ADA and Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) requirements. Any changes to the traffic signal system must be coordinated and approved by BTM.



PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Boston City Hall • 1 City Hall Sq Rm 714 • Boston MA 02201-2024
The Office of the Streets, Transportation, and Sanitation
(617) 635-4900



All proposed sidewalk widths and cross-slopes must comply to both City of Boston and ADA/AAB standards.

The developer is encouraged to contact the City's Disabilities Commission to confirm compliant accessibility within the Public ROW.

Driveway Curb Cuts:

Any proposed driveway curb cuts within the Public ROW will need to be reviewed and approved by the PIC. All existing curb cuts that will no longer be utilized shall be closed.

Discontinuances:

Any discontinuances (sub-surface, surface or above surface) within the Public ROW must be processed through the PIC.

Easements:

Any easements within the Public ROW associated with this project must be processed through the PIC.

Landscaping:

The developer must seek approval from the Chief Landscape Architect with the Parks and Recreation Department for all landscape elements within the Public ROW. The landscaping program must accompany a LM&I with the PIC.

Street Lighting:

The developer must seek approval from the PWD Street Lighting Division, where needed, for all proposed street lighting to be installed by the developer. All proposed lighting within the Public ROW must be compatible with the area lighting to provide a consistent urban design. The developer should coordinate with the PWD Street Lighting Division for an assessment of any additional street lighting upgrades that are to be considered in conjunction with this project. All existing metal street light pull box covers within the limits of sidewalk construction to remain shall be replaced with new composite covers per PWD Street Lighting standards. Metal covers should remain for pull box covers in the roadway. For all sections of sidewalk that are to be reconstructed in the Public ROW that contain or are proposed to contain a City-owned street light system with underground conduit, the developer shall be responsible for installing shadow conduit adjacent to the street lighting system. Installation of shadow conduit and limits should be coordinated through the BPDA Smart Utilities team.

Roadway:

Based on the extent of construction activity, including utility connections and taps, the developer will be responsible for the full restoration of the roadway sections that immediately abut the property and, in some cases, to extend the limits of roadway restoration to the nearest intersection. A plan showing the extents and methods for roadway restoration shall be submitted to the PWD Engineering Division for review and approval.

Additional Project Coordination:

All projects must be entered into the City of Boston Utility Coordination Software (COBUCS) to review for any conflicts with other proposed projects within the Public ROW. The developer must coordinate with any existing projects within the same limits and receive clearance from PWD before commencing work.

Green Infrastructure:

The developer shall work with PWD, the Green Infrastructure Division, and the Boston Water and Sewer Commission (BWSC) to determine appropriate methods of green infrastructure and stormwater management systems within the Public ROW. The ongoing maintenance of such systems shall require an LM&I Agreement with the PIC. Effects of water infiltration with respect to the adjacent underpass structure and underground MBTA tunnels that may be negatively impacted by infiltration may impact the ability to install such systems and should be considered. Coordination with PWD and MBTA will be required.

Resiliency:

Proposed designs should follow the Boston Public Works Climate Resilient Design Guidelines (<https://www.boston.gov/environment-and-energy/climate-resilient-design-guidelines>) where applicable.



PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Boston City Hall • 1 City Hall Sq Rm 714 • Boston MA 02201-2024
The Office of the Streets, Transportation, and Sanitation
(617) 635-4900



CITY *of* BOSTON

Michelle Wu, Mayor

Please note that these are the general standard and somewhat specific PWD requirements. More detailed comments may follow and will be addressed during the PIC review process. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at jeffrey.alexis@boston.gov or at 617-635-4966.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Alexis
Principal Civil Engineer
Boston Public Works Department
Engineering Division

CC: Para Jayasinghe, PWD
Todd Liming, PIC



PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Boston City Hall • 1 City Hall Sq Rm 714 • Boston MA 02201-2024
The Office of the Streets, Transportation, and Sanitation
(617) 635-4900

**Boston Water and
Sewer Commission**



980 Harrison Avenue
Boston, MA 02119-2540
617-989-7000

March 19, 2025

Mr. Dylan Norris
Project Assistant
Planning Department
One City Hall Square
Boston, MA 02201

Re: 120-134 Hampden Street, Roxbury
Project Notification Form

Dear Mr. Norris:

The Boston Water and Sewer Commission (Commission, BWSC) has reviewed the Project Notification Form (PNF) for the proposed 120-134 Hampden Street project located at 120-134 Hampden Street in the Roxbury neighborhood of Boston.

The proposed project is located on an approximately 29,292 square foot (sf) site currently occupied by the existing former Iron Mountain storage facility. The project proponent, Bahlmann Capital Group LLC (Bahlmann), proposes an adaptive reuse of the storage facility to a self-storage warehouse and the construction of a six-story addition with approximately 32,327 gsf including ground floor retail, office and storage use. The project will include 17 surface parking spaces.

According to the PNF, the project's proposed water demand is approximately 2,121 gallons per day (gpd). The Commission owns and maintains a 12-inch Southern Low DICL water main installed in 2014 in Norfolk Avenue, a 12-inch Southern Low DICL water main installed in 2015 in Hampden Street and an 8-inch Southern Low DICL water main installed in 1994 in Howard Street.

According to the PNF, the proposed sewage generation is 1,926 gpd, an increase of 863 over existing conditions. For sewage and storm drainage service, the site is served by a 12-inch sanitary sewer and 24-inch storm drain in Norfolk Avenue, a 15-inch sanitary sewer and a 30-inch storm drain in Hampden Street and a 10-inch sanitary sewer in Howard Street.

The Commission has the following comments regarding the PNF:



General

1. Prior to the initial phase of the site plan development, Bahlmann should meet with the Commission's Design and Engineering Customer Services to review water main, sewer and storm drainage system availability and potential upgrades that could impact the development.
2. All new or relocated water mains, sewers and storm drains must be designed and constructed at Bahlmann's expense. They must be designed and constructed in conformance with the Commission's design standards, Water Distribution System and Sewer Use regulations, and Requirements for Site Plans. The site plan should include the locations of new, relocated and existing water mains, sewers and drains which serve the site, proposed service connections, water meter locations, as well as back flow prevention devices in the facilities that will require inspection. A General Service Application must also be submitted to the Commission with the site plan.
3. The design of the project should comply with the City of Boston's Complete Streets Initiative, which requires incorporation of "green infrastructure" into street designs. Green infrastructure includes greenscapes, such as trees, shrubs, grasses and other landscape plantings, as well as rain gardens and vegetative swales, infiltration basins, and paving materials and permeable surfaces. The proponent must develop a maintenance plan for the proposed green infrastructure. For more information on the Complete Streets Initiative see the City's website at <http://bostoncompletestreets.org/>
4. For any proposed masonry repair and cleaning Bahlmann will be required to obtain from the Boston Air Pollution Control Commission a permit for Abrasive Blasting or Chemical Cleaning. In accordance with this permit Bahlmann will be required to provide a detailed description as to how chemical mist and run-off will be contained and either treated before discharge to the sewer or drainage system or collected and disposed of lawfully off site. A copy of the description and any related site plans must be provided to the Commission's Engineering Customer Service Department for review before masonry repair and cleaning commences. Bahlmann is advised that the Commission may impose additional conditions and requirements before permitting the discharge of the treated wash water to enter the sewer or drainage system.
5. Bahlmann should be aware that the US Environmental Protection Agency issued the Remediation General Permit (RGP) for Groundwater Remediation, Contaminated Construction Dewatering, and Miscellaneous Surface Water Discharges. If groundwater contaminated with petroleum products, for example, is encountered, Bahlmann will be required to apply for a RGP to cover these discharges.



6. Bahlmann is advised that the Commission will not allow buildings to be constructed over any of its water lines. Also, any plans to build over Commission sewer facilities are subject to review and approval by the Commission. The project must be designed so that access, including vehicular access, to the Commission's water and sewer lines for the purpose of operation and maintenance is not inhibited.
7. It is Bahlmann's responsibility to evaluate the capacity of the water, sewer and storm drain systems serving the project site to determine if the systems are adequate to meet future project demands. With the site plan, Bahlmann must include a detailed capacity analysis for the water, sewer and storm drain systems serving the project site, as well as an analysis of the impacts the proposed project will have on the Commission's water, sewer and storm drainage systems.

Water

1. Bahlmann must provide separate estimates of peak and continuous maximum water demand for residential, commercial, industrial, irrigation of landscaped areas, and air-conditioning make-up water for the project with the site plan. Estimates should be based on full-site build-out of the proposed project. Bahlmann should also provide the methodology used to estimate water demand for the proposed project.
2. Bahlmann should explore opportunities for implementing water conservation measures in addition to those required by the State Plumbing Code. In particular, Bahlmann should consider outdoor landscaping which requires minimal use of water to maintain. If Bahlmann plans to install in-ground sprinkler systems, the Commission recommends that timers, soil moisture indicators and rainfall sensors be installed. The use of sensor-operated faucets and toilets in common areas of buildings should be considered.
3. Bahlmann is required to obtain a Hydrant Permit for use of any hydrant during the construction phase of this project. The water used from the hydrant must be metered. Bahlmann should contact the Commission's Meter Department for information on and to obtain a Hydrant Permit.
4. Bahlmann will be required to install approved backflow prevention devices on the water services for fire protection, vehicle wash, mechanical and any irrigation systems. Bahlmann is advised to consult with the Commission's Manager of Engineering Code Enforcement, with regards to backflow prevention.



5. The Commission is utilizing a Fixed Radio Meter Reading System to obtain water meter readings. For new water meters, the Commission will provide a Meter Transmitter Unit (MTU) and connect the device to the meter. For information regarding the installation of MTUs, Bahlmann should contact the Commission's Meter Department.

Sewage / Drainage

1. In conjunction with the Site Plan and the General Service Application Bahlmann will be required to submit a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. The plan must:
 - Identify specific best management measures for controlling erosion and preventing the discharge of sediment, contaminated stormwater or construction debris to the Commission's drainage system when construction is underway.
 - Include a site map which shows, at a minimum, existing drainage patterns and areas used for storage or treatment of contaminated soils, groundwater or stormwater, and the location of major control structures or treatment structures to be utilized during the construction.
 - Specifically identify how the project will comply with the Department of Environmental Protection's Performance Standards for Stormwater Management both during construction and after construction is complete.
2. The Commission encourages Bahlmann to explore additional opportunities for protecting stormwater quality on site by minimizing sanding and the use of deicing chemicals, pesticides, and fertilizers.
3. The discharge of dewatering drainage to a sanitary sewer is prohibited by the Commission. Bahlmann is advised that the discharge of any dewatering drainage to the storm drainage system requires a Drainage Discharge Permit from the Commission. If the dewatering drainage is contaminated with petroleum products, Bahlmann will be required to obtain a Remediation General Permit from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for the discharge.
4. Bahlmann must fully investigate methods for retaining stormwater on-site before the Commission will consider a request to discharge stormwater to the Commission's system. The site plan should indicate how storm drainage from roof drains will be handled and the feasibility of retaining their stormwater discharge on-site. All projects at or above 100,000 square feet of floor area are to retain, on site, a volume of runoff equal to 1.25 inches of rainfall times the impervious area. Under no circumstances will stormwater be allowed to discharge to a sanitary sewer.



5. The Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) established Stormwater Management Standards. The standards address water quality, water quantity and recharge. In addition to Commission standards, Bahlmann will be required to meet MassDEP Stormwater Management Standards.
6. Sanitary sewage must be kept separate from stormwater and separate sanitary sewer and storm drain service connections must be provided. The Commission requires that existing stormwater and sanitary sewer service connections, which are to be re-used by the proposed project, be dye tested to confirm they are connected to the appropriate system.
7. The Commission requests that Bahlmann install a permanent casting stating "Don't Dump: Drains to Boston Harbor" next to any catch basin created or modified as part of this project. Bahlmann should contact the Commission's Operations Division for information regarding the purchase of the castings.
8. If a cafeteria or food service facility is built as part of this project, grease traps will be required in accordance with the Commission's Sewer Use Regulations. Bahlmann is advised to consult with the Commission's Operations Department with regards to grease traps.
9. The Commission requires installation of particle separators on all new parking lots greater than 7,500 square feet in size. If it is determined that it is not possible to infiltrate all of the runoff from the new parking lot, the Commission will require the installation of a particle separator or a standard Type 5 catch basin with an outlet tee for the parking lot. Specifications for particle separators are provided in the Commission's requirements for Site Plans.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project.

Yours truly,

John P. Sullivan, P.E.
Chief Engineer

JPS/afh

cc: Casper Bahlmann, Bahlmann Capital Group LLC
C. Rizzi, MWRA
S. McFee, BWSC