



*Planning Department*

**CITY of BOSTON**

MEMORANDUM

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

FROM: Joanne Marques  
Planning Department

DATE: June 10, 2026

RE: Planning Department Recommendations

---

Please find attached, for your information, Planning Department recommendations for the June 16, 2026 Board of Appeals Hearing.

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



<b>Case</b>	BOA1822545
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2026-02-20
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-11
<b>Address</b>	5 to 7 Prescott PL Allston 02134
<b>Parcel ID</b>	2201141000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Allston/Brighton Neighborhood 2F-5000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	51
<b>Project Description</b>	The proposed project includes remodeling the existing half bathroom and adding a three-quarter bathroom on the third floor, renovating the front two-level deck/porch, upgrading the side entrance with a new first-floor door, remodeling the second-floor kitchen, and adding a dormer on the left side of the attic.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	FAR Excessive Height Excessive (stories) Side Yard Insufficient Rear Yard Insufficient

**Planning Context:**

The project is located at 5–7 Prescott Place in Allston within a residential area defined by two- and three-family homes on compact lots with limited setbacks. The surrounding neighborhood reflects a range of densities and includes many properties with longstanding dimensional nonconformities.

The proposal consists primarily of interior renovations and modest exterior modifications, including a dormer and porch improvements, rather than a substantial expansion. These changes are consistent with reinvestment patterns in Allston-Brighton, where incremental updates are commonly used to improve existing housing while maintaining neighborhood character.

**Zoning Analysis:**

The proposed project includes interior renovations, a dormer addition at the attic level, and exterior improvements to the porch and entrances, resulting in a modest increase in gross floor area. Zoning relief is required for the following reasons:



Article 51, Section 9, Floor Area Ratio (FAR): The proposed gross floor area is approximately 2,674 square feet on a 2,561 square foot lot, resulting in an FAR of 1.04, which exceeds the allowable FAR of 0.6. A variance is required. The increase is modest and primarily associated with the attic dormer rather than a substantial expansion of the building footprint.

Article 51, Section 9, Building Height (Stories): The proposed building includes three stories, exceeding the allowable 2.5 stories. A variance is required. This condition reflects a typical attic expansion and does not significantly alter the perceived scale of the structure.

Article 51, Section 9, Side Yard and Rear Yard: The property is required to maintain a minimum side yard of 10 feet and a rear yard of 30 feet. The existing structure does not meet these requirements. A variance is required. As the building footprint is not being expanded, the relief sought reflects existing nonconforming conditions rather than new encroachments.

The proposal maintains residential use and introduces modest improvements to the existing structure. The requested relief reflects limitations of the current zoning framework, particularly in relation to existing lot and building conditions, rather than impacts created by the project.

Plans titled "5-7 Prescott Place, Allston, MA," prepared by ARK Design & Build, dated November 12, 2025, were reviewed in support of this recommendation.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1822545, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1844274
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2026-04-29
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-11
<b>Address</b>	68 Addington RD West Roxbury 02132
<b>Parcel ID</b>	2007086000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	West Roxbury Neighborhood 1F-6000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	56
<b>Project Description</b>	Renovate an existing single-unit residence and create an addition over the existing living space.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	Front Yard Insufficient Side Yard Insufficient

**Planning Context:**

68 Addington Road sits in a low-density residential area of West Roxbury. The proposed project adds an addition to the existing living space of the single-unit dwelling on the lot. Multiple structures in the surrounding context have additions to the structure. Furthermore, multiple lots on Addington Road are narrow lengthwise and have a front lot line that slopes upward. The existing structure sits towards Addington Road and leaves about 45 ft towards the rear lot line. The proposed project asks to erect an addition on the second floor of an existing living space. The addition will be on the northeast side and will create a larger bedroom, multiple new closets and a new bathroom for the structure.

**Zoning Analysis:**

The zoning refusal letter states two violations of the Zoning Code: Front Yard Insufficient (Article 56, Section 8) and Side Yard Insufficient (Article 56, Section 8). The proposed new addition worsens the violations for both the front and side yard setbacks. Within this neighborhood, it is required for the front yard setback to be 20 ft and the side yard setback to be 10 ft. The existing front yard setback has a maximum depth of 28.5 ft to the southwest of the building and a minimum depth of 18 ft to the northeast of the building, this is due to the front lot line sitting on a diagonal. Furthermore, the southwest side yard setback sits at 11.1 ft to 11 ft and the northeast side yard setback sits at 9 ft. With the creation of the addition, the front yard setback continues



to worsen its violation (following the diagonal to the northeast) with the setback becoming 14.2 ft. The addition worsens the side yard setback to the northeast with the setback sitting at 9 to 8 ft. These violations are due to the placement of the existing building and the shape of the lot. Nevertheless, while these violations are worsening the front yard or side yard setback, the dwelling is generally in context with surrounding properties and preserves adequate spacing to the neighboring properties. Furthermore, this project provides an example for the Neighborhood Housing initiative which works on updating zoning to better match existing conditions of neighborhoods.

Plans are called ALT1807718 Zoning Refusal Stamped ePlans and were reviewed on 3/4/2026. They were prepared by GSD.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1844274, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1821584
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2026-02-17
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-11
<b>Address</b>	6 Cranmore RD Hyde Park 02136
<b>Parcel ID</b>	1809886002
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Hyde Park Neighborhood 1F-6000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	69
<b>Project Description</b>	The project seeks to mount a solar panel in their rear yard.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Conditional Use
<b>Violations</b>	Accessory Buildings in Side or Rear Yard

**Planning Context:**

The property is a one-unit dwelling on a corner lot in Hyde Park. The lot is surrounded by other homes of similar dimensions. The proponent seeks to build an addition to the lot to accommodate a solar panel. On further observation to the surrounding properties, some of them already contain sheds of similar shapes and size as the proposed project. Particularly in the lots of 1060 Truman Parkway, 1068 Truman Parkway and 51 Badger Road suggesting that this project is similar to the existing context of the area.

**Zoning Analysis:**

The proposed project is in violation of side and rear back depths. However, the proposal isn't unique to the neighborhood as many homes have similar preexisting conditions. In this case, there's adequate space for the proposal as it will be 11.8 feet from the rear yard, and 20.6 feet from the front yard. The plans reviewed are titled, "6 Cranmore Road in Hyde Park" and were prepared by C & G Survey Company and dated 12/3/25.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1821584, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.



Planning Department

**CITY of BOSTON**

Reviewed,

*Kathleen Onuf*

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1772126
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2025-09-04
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-11
<b>Address</b>	31 Mellen ST Dorchester 02124
<b>Parcel ID</b>	1704706000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Dorchester Neighborhood 1F-7000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	65
<b>Project Description</b>	The project seeks to remodel an existing rear yard deck on the first floor and create two new rear yard decks for both floors in a two-unit building.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Conditional Use
<b>Violations</b>	Rear Yard Insufficient

**Planning Context:**

The proposed project sits at 31 Mellen Street, in a primarily residential neighborhood 0.3 miles from Dorchester Avenue's Ashmont station. The proponent seeks to demolish an old deck in the rear yard, with some additional repairs to the building. Following demolition of the existing deck, the proponent will establish a new deck on the first and second floors, further aligning the property's style with neighboring homes. This project's renovation aligns with the Planning Department's Neighborhood Housing initiative where these small scale renovations don't require review and approval.

**Zoning Analysis:**

According to Article 65 of the zoning code, properties must have a minimum of 40 ft in rear yard setback; this site currently sits at 41.5 ft and the proposed changes will place it at 33.6 ft. Given the small decrease in dimensional changes, and that many surrounding properties have yards around 30-40 feet, which is less than that the zoning demands, relief is deemed appropriate. Furthermore when looking at neighboring parcels such as 22 Mellen Street, 30 Mellen Street where the parcels are of similar shape and sizes, the rear yards are less than what's required in Article 65.

The plans reviewed are titled, " New Rear Decks at 31 Mellen Street Dorchester " and were prepared by Thomas McGrath Architects and dated 11/11/24.



**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1772126, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1823198
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2026-02-24
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-11
<b>Address</b>	682 to 684 E Fifth ST South Boston 02127
<b>Parcel ID</b>	0604007000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	South Boston Neighborhood MFR
<b>Zoning Article</b>	68
<b>Project Description</b>	This project proposes to change the official building use from a single-unit dwelling and store to a two-unit dwelling, including minor interior renovations to the existing, non-conforming basement dwelling unit and modifying two points of rear egress to the upper unit.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	Lot Area Insufficient Parking or Loading Insufficient Basement Units Forbidden

**Planning Context:**

682-684 East Fifth Street is located in the South Boston Neighborhood in the Multifamily Residential (MFR) subdistrict. The existing structure was constructed in 1885 as a single-unit dwelling, significantly set back from the public way. In 1924, construction of an addition was approved, extending the basement level to the front property line. As the subject site slopes down towards the street, the extension of the basement became accessible at street level, creating a boot-shaped building. This addition was utilized as a store for many years, until being occupied as a studio dwelling unit, taxed as such as early as 2003.

The subject property shares a party wall and similar development history with 686 East Fifth Street to the east, which also has a basement/first story extension to the front property line. No designated on or off-site parking is associated with the property, as is common in this part of the South Boston neighborhood. Surrounding development includes a mix of one-, two-, and three-unit dwellings on similar sized properties.

The subject proposal includes minor interior renovation to the existing studio dwelling unit, referred to as the basement unit due to its creation by extension of the existing basement.

These renovations will reconfigure the existing bathroom and slightly expand the livable area.



The proposal will also modify two exterior points of egress to the upper level dwelling unit, accessed by stairs in the rear yard.

Overlays associated with the subject property include the Restricted Roof and Restricted Parking overlay districts.

### **Zoning Analysis:**

While the property was originally permitted for one dwelling unit, a second, studio dwelling unit has been utilized on the property for over twenty years. The current owner purchased the property in 2025 and desires to legalize the second unit, changing the official occupancy from one to two dwelling units. The project was cited in violation to Article 68 regarding off street parking, basement units, and insufficient lot area, as discussed below.

**Off-Street Parking:** Per Section 33 of Article 68, "If a Structure existing on the effective date of this Article is altered or extended so as to increase its Gross Floor Area or the number of Dwelling Units, only the additional Gross Floor Area or the additional number of Dwelling Units shall be counted in computing the off-street parking facilities required." The official change of occupancy from one-unit to two-units as well as the expansion of the studio unit trigger the requirement for one additional parking space on site. Given the pre-existing nature of the subject unit, the lack of on-site parking present in the surrounding area, and the site's proximity (within 3 blocks) to four bus line connection points, Staff supports a variance to the required parking.

**Basement Units:** Basement dwelling units are strictly prohibited in the South Boston neighborhood. Article 2 of the Zoning Code defines Basement as "A building story where more than thirty-five percent (35%) of the story's height is below grade" and Grade as the "average elevation of the nearest sidewalk at the line of the street or streets on which the building abuts." Since the studio, "basement unit," as referred to in the plans, is accessed at street level and no portion of the story is lower than 1'2" below grade, the story is not classified as a basement by Code. Furthermore, the Staff does not believe the area to be at risk of future flooding as the property is located outside of the City of Boston's adopted Coastal Flood Resilience Overlay District and the FEMA's 2025 Flood Hazard Area. The unit is therefore in compliance with this regulation and no variance is needed.

**Insufficient Lot Area:** In the subject zoning district, a minimum of 2,000 square feet are required with an additional 1,000 square feet per additional dwelling unit. The subject property is 2,125



square feet, a typical lot size in the area. The lot size is an existing condition and is not being worsened by this case. Furthermore, the lot size is not uncommon in the South Boston neighborhood for one-, two-, and three-unit dwellings. Staff supports a variance to this requirement and notes that this requirement is a case for future zoning reform.

Plans reviewed are titled "Change of Occupancy from a One-Family Dwelling and Store, to a Two-Family Dwelling 682-684 E 5th St South Boston, MA 02127," prepared by Lighthouse Architecture & Design, and dated January 2026.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1823198, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1833990
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2026-03-27
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-11
<b>Address</b>	306 Northern AV Boston 02210
<b>Parcel ID</b>	0602674045, 0602674225
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	South Boston & Harborpark I-2 & South Boston Maritime Economy Reserve
<b>Zoning Article</b>	8
<b>Project Description</b>	This project proposes a seasonal outdoor patio (beer garden) as an accessory use to existing beer hall use.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	Forbidden Use

**Planning Context:**

306 Northern Ave is associated with Mass Bay Brewing Co.'s (d.b.a Harpoon Brewery). The site is located in two zoning districts: the General Industrial subdistrict of the South Boston neighborhood and the South Boston Maritime Economy Reserve within the Harborpark zoning district, in the area commonly referred to as Seaport. The site is presently used as a beer hall with associated parking. The proposed seasonal outdoor patio will take the space of 27 existing, on-site parking spaces that are utilized by Staff. Various off-site parking options exist in the area on surrounding blocks for customer use.

The area is characterized by former industrial buildings and surface parking lots being transformed to residential, commercial, and office spaces. A bus stop is located at the corner of the site closest to the proposed patio serving MBTA bus Route 4 and the Silver Line 2 bus and a protected bike lane runs alongside the subject property. Adjacent to the proposed outdoor patio is an outdoor recreation/beer garden use known as Pickleball Social Club.

The site is within the Coastal Flood Resilience Overlay District (CFROD) and a 2025 FEMA Flood Hazard Area. As it is within a Waterfront Designated Port Area, it is subject to Chapter 91 regulations. The area is also within the South Boston Restricted Parking District and an MHC Historic Inventory Area.

**Zoning Analysis:**



Accessory, outdoor patio use is a forbidden use in both the General Industrial (I-2) zoning subdistrict and the Maritime Economy Reserve subdistrict. This site's location is particular as it straddles the lines between zoning districts. Only a small portion of the site (approximately one eighth) lies within the Maritime Economy Reserve subdistrict, and the beer hall itself (primary use) lies entirely within the General Industrial subdistrict.

Staff recommends approval of this temporary use due to the use's general allowance in the area and the site specific location at an existing beer hall that supports ongoing successful industrial operations.

Plans reviewed are titled "Harpoon Patio 2026," prepared by Johnson Osband Architecture and Design and dated February 2026.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1833990, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1821600
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2026-02-17
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-11
<b>Address</b>	60 Elm ST Charlestown 02129
<b>Parcel ID</b>	0200241000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Charlestown Neighborhood 3F-2000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	62
<b>Project Description</b>	The proposed project is seeking to renovate the existing unfinished basement to add living space, storage, and a bathroom.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	FAR Excessive

**Planning Context:**

60 Elm Street is located in a residential part of Charlestown on a block characterized by row houses and semi-detached two unit buildings. The building is similar in character and scale to abutting buildings and the greater neighborhood. The building sits one block off of Bunker Hill Street, a major thoroughfare and commercial corridor for the neighborhood. The proposed project intends to renovate the existing unfinished basement to add living space, a bathroom, kitchenette, and storage.

**Zoning Analysis:**

This project violates the maximum floor area ratio (FAR) for this subdistrict.

60 Elm Street is a single unit building that sits in a 3F-2000 subdistrict. The maximum allowed FAR is 2.0. The current FAR is 2.5. With the renovation of the basement, it is reasonable to expect an increase in FAR. The proposed renovation increases the FAR to approximately 2.6. The interior renovation will have no impact on the neighborhood character or scale of the building. Relief is recommended.

Plans reviewed are titled “60 Elm Street” and were reviewed on 02/04/26.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1821600, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.



Planning Department

**CITY of BOSTON**

Reviewed,

*Kathleen Onufra*

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1716446
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2025-05-01
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-16
<b>Address</b>	178 to 180 Weld ST West Roxbury 02132
<b>Parcel ID</b>	2004301000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	West Roxbury Neighborhood 1F-6000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	56
<b>Project Description</b>	This project will demolish an existing detached garage and build a new attached garage on a relocated area of the yard.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	Height Excessive (ft) Front Yard Insufficient Rear Yard Insufficient Side Yard Insufficient

**Planning Context:**

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

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

**Zoning Analysis:**

This proposal has triggered four zoning violations: height excessive (ft), front, rear, and side yard insufficient. The maximum height (ft) allowed for an accessory building in this zoning subdistrict is 15 feet. Plans show that the existing garage is 27.8 feet but the proposed garage is 16.9 feet. This height violation is an existing nonconformity and goes down in height more than ten feet from the previous. Relief is recommended.

The minimum front yard required is 20 feet. The existing front yard setback is 23.2 feet but the proposed garage will put it at 16.2 feet. Front yard violations are consistently observed in this area, including at both abutting properties. Relief is recommended.



The minimum required side yard setback is 10 feet. Although the refusal letter cites a rear yard violation, this corner triangular lot does not have a proper rear yard; therefore, the rear yard violation is incorrectly cited. However, the side yard setback violation remains, with a setback of 2.4 feet. The existing detached garage leaves no side yard setback, thus this is an existing nonconformity. Relief is recommended.

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

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1716446, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1840878
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2026-04-20
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-16
<b>Address</b>	28 to 32 Averton ST Roslindale 02131
<b>Parcel ID</b>	2000464000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Roslindale Neighborhood 2F-5000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	56
<b>Project Description</b>	This project proposes building three new townhomes that each have three bedrooms on a currently vacant lot.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	Lot Area Insufficient FAR Excessive Height Excessive (stories) Usable Open Space Insufficient Rear Yard Insufficient Main Entrance Use: Forbidden

**Planning Context:**

This property is located in an area of Roslindale that transitions from mixed uses to primarily residential dwellings. This address is also located within a 15 minute walk of Fallon Field Playground, Adams Park, and the Roslindale Village MBTA station.

The residential unit mix of this area is diverse, but features predominantly two-unit and three-unit homes with moderate to higher lot coverage, relatively compact side and front yards with more generous rear yards. Homes tend to be 2.5-3 stories in height.

Considering this project's proximity to a Squares+Streets district, the proposal to build three new homes on this vacant lot fits within the surrounding neighborhood context. It also introduces new housing within proximity to transit resources by way of the Roslindale Village and Bellevue MBTA Commuter Rail stops and bus routes along Metropolitan Ave and Washington Street, located within a 3 minute walking distance

Currently, 28-32 Averton St represents two different lots but plans do not show intentions to combine lots.

**Zoning Analysis:**



This project has received seven zoning citations: FAR and height (stories) excessive, lot area insufficient, rear yard and usable open space insufficient, location of main entrance, as well as forbidden use.

The FAR maximum for this subdistrict is 0.5 and the proposed FAR for this project is 0.9. There are several examples of homes that exceed the maximum FAR requirement in the immediate vicinity, such as at the abutting addresses 34 Averton St (0.66) and 26 Averton St (0.68). Because the home's FAR would not be out of conformity with surrounding properties, relief is recommended.

The project's height (3 stories) exceeds the allowed height of 2.5 stories. However, 3-story dwellings are an established typology in the neighborhood through the presence of triple deckers. Furthermore, the homes are 30.5 feet, considerably below the height (feet) maximum of 35 feet. Relief is recommended.

A minimum lot area of 8,000 square feet is required for "other uses" that are not "1 Family Detached or Semi-Attached or 2 Family Detached". Furthermore, three units on a lot is forbidden in this zoning subdistrict, therefore triggering use: forbidden. Although the lot comes below the 8,000 square foot minimum, there is a three-unit dwelling on a lot of the same size at 34 Averton St. The project represents a modest, contextually consistent increase in housing supply without introducing novel impacts to the surrounding area, and therefore relief should be recommended.

A rear yard minimum setback of 40 feet is required whereas the project leaves 14 feet of rear yard setback. Furthermore, 5,250 square feet of open space is required for three units, whereas the project leaves 2,294 square feet. While the project does not comply with these requirements, it fully meets the required front and side yard setbacks, maintaining appropriate separation from the street and adjacent properties. The dimensional deficiencies are concentrated in the rear yard rather than distributed throughout the site, allowing the project to preserve the neighborhood's established development pattern while providing a modest increase in housing supply. Relief is therefore recommended.

Location of main entrance is cited as a violation for two of the three units. Article 67 Section 9.3 states that "within the Residential Subdistricts, the main entrance of a Dwelling shall face the Front Lot Line." Two unit main entrances were cited for not facing the front lot line, which presents as an issue to the fire department. The Planning Department recommends Design



Review to work with the proponent on enhancing the walkway, lighting, and adding signage that clearly indicates where the main entrance to the three units is located. Relief is recommended once appropriate entryway visibility is met.

Plans reviewed are titled "Proposed Plot Plan 28-32 Averton Street Boston (Roslindale), Massachusetts", are prepared by Colgate Development LLC, and dated December 19, 2025.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1840878, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH PROVISIO/S: that plans be submitted to the Planning Department for design review to work with the proponent on enhancing the walkway, lighting, and adding signage that clearly indicates where the main entrance to units two and three are located.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1804456
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2025-12-07
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-16
<b>Address</b>	66 to 66A Cedrus AV Roslindale 02131
<b>Parcel ID</b>	1805182000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Roslindale Neighborhood 2F-5000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	67
<b>Project Description</b>	New construction of a two-unit townhome.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	Usable Open Space Insufficient Side Yard Insufficient Off-Street Parking Insufficient Accessory Bldg. in Rear Yards Lot Area Insufficient Lot Width Insufficient FAR Excessive Height Excessive (stories) Front Yard Insufficient Rear Yard Insufficient Lot Frontage Insufficient

**Planning Context:**

The project at 66-66A Cedrus Ave proposes two units and a one-story detached garage in what is currently a vacant lot. Each unit will have three bedrooms and be 3.5 stories in height.

This site is situated in a transitional residential area where lower-density housing exists alongside more compact residential development, resulting in a diverse mix of one-, two-, and three-unit buildings. Lots in this area exhibit varying coverage and setbacks, but generally exhibit higher lot coverage patterns.

Homes and lots along this street display a range of sizes and characteristics relative to the proposed project, from single-unit detached dwellings to triple deckers and small multifamily buildings. Building heights range from one to three stories, and yard setbacks vary from compact to moderate.

**Zoning Analysis:**



This proposal has triggered eleven zoning citations: FAR excessive; height (stories) excessive; lot area, frontage, and width insufficient; front, side, and rear yards insufficient; open space insufficient, off-street parking and loading, and accessory buildings in rear yards.

The maximum FAR for this lot is 0.5 and calculations from plans show that the proposed FAR will be approximately 1.01. FAR violations appear consistently in the neighboring lots, such as at 68 Cedrus next door (0.76), 297 Kittredge St two lots over (0.84), and 50-52 Cedrus two lots down (0.83). Relief is recommended.

The maximum building height in this subdistrict is 2.5 stories and 35 feet. This project will be 3.5 stories and 35 feet. The proposed building is over 3 stories but remains at the allowable height allowance. In practice, this means the building stays within the overall scale that zoning is intended to regulate, even if it technically exceeds the story limit. The sloped roofs align with the character of many surrounding properties. Relief is recommended.

A minimum lot area of 5,000 square feet and lot width and frontage of 500 feet are required. The lot is 4,840 square feet with a lot width and frontage of 44 feet. These are existing nonconformities as this project will not alter any of these lot dimensions. Furthermore, these violations are consistently present in a 1-2 block radius of the project site, with very few lots meeting the lot area and lot frontage requirements. Future zoning reform for this area should look to re-calibrate the lot area and width requirements to better align with the area's existing context. Relief is recommended.

Front, side, and rear yards are cited as violations, and in this subdistrict the front yard minimum is 20 feet, side yard is 10 feet, and rear yard is 40 feet. Plans show that the front yard is 13 feet, side yard is 6 feet on one side and 12 feet on the other, and the rear yard is 35 feet. Although the proposal does not fully meet the required dimension, yard violations are prevalent among homes in the immediate vicinity because yard setback requirements are not scaled to the size of the lots in this area. Several more similar patterns of nonconformity are established on this street. Relief is recommended.

A total of 3,500 square feet of open space is required for two dwelling units, or 1,750 square feet per unit. While the plans do not quantify the amount of open space provided, the site retains unbuilt areas in the rear yard and along portions of the lot perimeter. Despite this violation, the property is within a ten-minute walk of Bellevue Hill Park, Beechland Circle Playground, and Metropolitan Woods. Given this context, relief is recommended.



Two parking spots per dwelling unit is required in this subdistrict, for a total of 4 spots. It is unclear whether this project proposes any off-street parking spots. Plans show an existing 1-story detached garage, but it is unclear if this garage can accommodate vehicles. Considering this lot is within 0.2 miles of four MBTA bus lines and a 1 mile walk to both the Bellevue and Roslindale Village MBTA Commuter Rail Stations, relief is recommended.

Article 67-33 (7) states "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 accessory building in question violates the setback requirements. However, as this is an existing nonconformity and accessory buildings that come close to the lot lines are commonly observed in this area, relief is recommended.

Plans reviewed are titled "Proposed Conditions Plans located at 68-70 Cedrus Ave Roslindale, MA", prepared by Boston Survey, Inc and dated October 14, 2025.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1804456, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1749423
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2025-07-17
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-16
<b>Address</b>	26 Burt ST Dorchester 02124
<b>Parcel ID</b>	1704564000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Dorchester Neighborhood 1F-7000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	65
<b>Project Description</b>	Combine two neighboring lots into one larger lot and build an 8-unit multifamily building.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	FAR Excessive Height Excessive (stories) Rear Yard Insufficient Side Yard Insufficient Front Yard Insufficient Parking or Loading Insufficient Parking design and maneuverability Lot Area Insufficient Forbidden Use: Multifamily

**Planning Context:**

The proposed project would construct a new 8-unit multifamily building on two currently separate lots that will be combined into one lot. This area of Dorchester is defined by its residential character. Residential buildings ranging from single-family to large 5+ unit buildings are common in this area. The predominant design form of these buildings is the traditional triple-decker, and this building attempts to match the scale provided by triple-deckers with a more modern design.

The proposed project is located in an area of Dorchester that is well-connected to transit. The project is less than a tenth of a mile from the Ashmont MBTA stop, and under half a mile from the active bus routes along Dorchester Ave and Washington St.

**Zoning Analysis:**

This project is proposing a forbidden use: multifamily residential. The area is zoned for one family, while the proposed project would have a total of eight units. However, multifamily residential is common in this area, with many larger multifamily buildings nearby. Nearby is both



Peabody Square and Washington Street, two large nexuses for both business and residents. 4-8 unit multifamily is the most common multifamily use for the area and the proposed project is of a similar scale and density to nearby existing projects. The building manages to fit a unit above the maximum without creating a building that stands out from neighborhood character. The appropriate sizing of the building, with the added neighborhood multifamily context, points to the appropriate fit of multifamily residential.

In a similar vein, the project has also been cited for insufficient lot area. The zoning code requires a lot of 7000 square feet, while the proposed project is located on a lot that is around 6,918 Square feet. This again highlights a disconnect between the zoning code and built reality. The proposed lot is of a similar size to typical lots for the neighborhood. If this regulation were to be strictly followed, none of the existing neighborhood would be allowed under this regulation. This project is of a similar scale to nearby buildings, on a lot that is similar in scale to nearby lots, highlighting its appropriate fit in the area.

The next violation is in regards to the front yard setback. The zoning requires a setback of 15 feet, while the proposed project would have a setback ranging from 15 feet on the northern edge of the property, to a 5 foot setback on the southern end. This is due to the slanted nature of the front yard line, making it difficult for any project to adhere to this requirement. In addition, this area of Burt Street is defined by a modal street wall. The proposed project is meeting this modal street wall and helps contribute to the character of the neighborhood. This violation should not be considered as the modal street wall takes precedence over the front yard setback.

The next violation is regarding the side yard setback. The proposed project has a side setback of five feet four inches, while the zoning requires a side setback of twelve feet. This is again not reflective of the built reality of the neighborhood. Small side yards are common in this area, especially with the neighboring rows of triple deckers to the north and the east which have almost no side yards. Almost none of the nearby buildings meet this requirement, and it reflects a disconnect between the code and built reality. If the project were to adhere to these provisions, it would create a project in discontinuity with its neighbors.

The next violation regards off street parking. The zoning requires a parking ratio of 1.25 spaces per unit, or 8 spaces where the proposed project is providing 7. While it technically does not meet the requirements for parking under the zoning code, little to no on parcel parking is common in this area of Dorchester. Street parking is the predominant form of parking, and this project is located within proximity of public transportation options. While this is a violation, BT

BOA1749423

2026-06-16

2 Planning Department



parking guidelines have highlighted this as an area that contextually makes sense for a required parking ratio of as little as 0 spaces per unit. This project is providing 7 spaces well above that 0 space ratio, and so a variance is recommended.

The next violation is in regards to off-street parking and maneuverability. This is triggered by the single lane driveway proposed for the project. While this style of rear 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 rear yard has a required depth of 40 feet, where the proposed project is leaving a setback of 31 feet. As with the side yard setbacks, this again highlights the disconnect between zoning code and built reality. The proposed project is being built to a similar scale as its neighbors, on a similar lot size to its neighbors. If this requirement were to be strictly followed, the character of the neighborhood would change drastically. The proposed setbacks are in line with neighboring properties and fits well within established neighborhood design.

The next violation is due to the excessive height of the proposed structure. The neighborhood is zoned for two and a half stories, while the project proposes a full three stories. This is not reflective of the larger built environment. Where two and a half stories is predominant, full three-story buildings are also present within the area. A full third floor through the use of dormers to match neighborhood character is common. Even though it is half a story above the maximum height in stories, the project is only proposing a building height of 33 —below the maximum of 35 feet—again highlighting the appropriate dimensions of the project. This requirement is not at all reflective of the larger development patterns in the area and highlights the need for potential zoning reform.

The proposed project would have an FAR of 0.54. The zoning code requires a maximum FAR of 0.4. This again reflects a disconnect between the zoning code and the built reality of the area. Triple-deckers are extremely common, and while many have rear yards, the height of the building creates a situation where FARs are commonly between 0.75 and 1.25 for the area. The proposed project is in line with its neighborhood design characteristics and is an appropriate fit for the development pattern in the area.

This project is subject to the City's Inclusionary Zoning, which requires that market-rate housing developments with seven or more units support the creation of income restricted housing. While



it is unclear from the plans how many of the proposed eight units will be dedicated as income-restricted, the applicant will need to execute an agreement with the Mayor's Office of Housing to comply with the zoning.

Plans reviewed were titled "26 Burt Street" created by HiARCHi Design Collaborative and dated 12/23/24.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1749423, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH PROVISIO/S: that plans be submitted to the Planning Department for design review and that a housing agreement be issued with the Mayor's Office of Housing.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1806734
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2025-12-16
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-16
<b>Address</b>	501 Talbot AV Dorchester 02124
<b>Parcel ID</b>	1704934000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Dorchester Neighborhood 3F-6000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	65
<b>Project Description</b>	Expand living space into an existing attic and raise the roof by one foot to create a habitable addition to an existing unit.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	Height Excessive (ft) Height Excessive (stories) Side Yard Insufficient FAR Excessive

**Planning Context:**

The proposed project would legalize an existing attic extension of a previously constructed building. There are minimal dimensional changes and no change in use. This project aligns well with both the neighborhood character and city planning goals. By expanding the already existing unit, it can allow a family to continue to live in place without having to leave the community and neighborhood.

The project is on Talbot Ave, which is a main thoroughfare for the area and acts as a conduit for retail and denser development. The project's appropriate fit suggests a potential need for zoning reform to bring the code into line with the area's built reality.

**Zoning Analysis:**

The proposed project is also triggering a violation for excessive height in both feet and total stories. The proposed project would be three and a half stories and 41.63 feet. The zoning has a maximum height of 2.5 stories and 35 feet. However, the existing building is already at this scale. The overall stories will not change. The existing building is already three and a half stories and 40.63 feet. The proposed project would increase the overall height of the roof one foot in order to meet habitability standards for the proposed new rooms. There will be almost no



noticeable difference in the on street perspective with the new project. The existing building and surrounding context point to the appropriate fit of the project and is deserving of a variance.

As the proposed project is creating new habitable space in an already existing attic, the FAR of the project will increase and trigger a violation. The zoning requires a maximum FAR of 0.4. The existing building is 0.87 and the new proposed building would be at an FAR of 1.

The next violation is in regards to FAR. The zoning requires a maximum FAR of 0.4. The existing building is 0.87 and the new proposed building would be at an FAR of 1. The FAR is the only dimension that changes for the project, as making the attic occupiable will count towards the FAR, unlike an unfinished storage area. However, there is no use change and the only external dimensional changes that are being made is the raising of the roof by one foot.. This points to the appropriate fit of this addition within the neighborhood context.

The next violation is in regards to the side yard setback. There are no changes being made to these dimensions with the proposed renovation. This is a prior existing non-conformity that is not being expanded on in any material way. As the building is already constructed to the footprint proposed in this ZBA case, these violations should be given a variance as they clearly fit within the existing character of the neighborhood.

Plans reviewed are titled "501 Talbot Ave" created by Soza Architecture and design, and dated 8/20/25.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1806734, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1828945
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2026-03-17
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-16
<b>Address</b>	19 Greenock ST Dorchester 02124
<b>Parcel ID</b>	1404387000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Greater Mattapan Neighborhood 3F-5000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	60
<b>Project Description</b>	Construct a three-story, four-unit building on an existing vacant lot
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	Rear Yard Insufficient Front Yard Insufficient Side Yard Insufficient FAR Excessive Usable Open Space Insufficient Lot Area Insufficient Additional Lot Area Insufficient Parking or Loading Insufficient Location of Main Entrance Forbidden Use Basement Units Forbidden

**Planning Context:**

The proposed project is a three-story, four-unit building. The site is located across Blue Hill Avenue from Harambe Park. This neighborhood is mostly residential and is served by commercial uses along Blue Hill Ave. Blue Hill Ave, Harvard Street, and Morton Street are within a half-mile of the site and provide bus transit connectivity. Most of the three-to-four-unit buildings on this street have a maximum of one parking space. Lots that have space for parking typically have two dwelling units or less.

A mix of two-, three-, and four-unit buildings are present on Greenock Street, with triple-deckers being the most common building type. The adjacent properties at 23 and 15 Greenock Street are traditional triple-decker style buildings. The Neighborhood Housing Zoning Initiative encourages contextually-sensitive infill development and small-scale additions to existing properties. While the proposed project has a below-grade dwelling unit, 19 Greenock Street is not located in the Coastal Flood Resiliency Overlay District (CFROD) or an area at risk of



flooding. Therefore, it is in line with most buildings in the area and it is in line with City planning goals related to housing and climate resiliency.

The proposed unit count (4) triggers requirements for accessibility and fire safety according to state building code. An approved design will need to have a fully accessible first floor dwelling unit, main entrance, and any common areas due to the total unit count as per ADA regulations. While a triple-decker is contextual in this area, the proposed project needs to comply with accessibility regulations, fire safety regulations, and design guidelines.

### **Zoning Analysis:**

The proposed project violates use, parking, and dimensional standards of Article 60 of the zoning code.

The proposed project violates standards for required minimum lot area and additional lot area. The required lot area for the four proposed units is 10,000 square feet (sf). The 2,421sf lot area of the proposed site is common for this area and is not being changed by the project. This violation is recommended for relief because the lot area is an existing condition that is suitable for development and cannot be changed. Likewise, the additional lot area violation is recommended for relief.

The maximum allowed floor area ratio (FAR) is 0.8. The proposed FAR is 1.67. This violation is recommended for relief as the proposed FAR is consistent with the surrounding context. The minimum required usable open space per dwelling unit is 400 sf. The proposed open space is 350 sf per dwelling unit. This violation is recommended for relief as the proposed open space is consistent with the surrounding context.

The proposed project violates dimensional standards for front, side, and rear yards. The required front yard minimum is 15 feet and the proposed front yard is 3'-6". The required minimum rear yard is 30 feet and the proposed rear yard is 7'-1". These violations are recommended for relief because upholding all required setback standards on a lot of this size exclusively allows a very small building envelope that is not in alignment with the existing buildings on the street.

The required minimum side yard is 10 feet and the proposed side yard is shown as 4'-5" in the drawings. However, the side yard would not include the in-ground entrance well and is therefore less than a foot wide. This is not an adequate side yard condition for ensuring light and air in between buildings. It also does not fit the context of side yards on this block. To ensure



compliance with fire code, the main entrance should be an accessible front-facing, common entrance to all units. This would also create a condition where the side entrance well can be removed and the side yard can be expanded to at least four feet. The side yard should be increased to at least four feet on both sides of the building.

The proposed project violates standards for the required location of the main entrance. The main entrance for the basement-level unit faces the side lot line instead of facing the front lot line as required. Also, the location of the ground floor unit's entrance is in the rear. To comply with accessibility and fire safety standards, all units should have a shared common entrance that is accessible. The Proponent should construct an at-grade, front-facing entrance to accommodate these requirements.

According to Article 60 Off-Street Parking Requirements, the minimum allowed parking ratio is 0.75. The proposed project provides zero parking spaces. Most three- to four-unit buildings on Greenock Street do not have off-street parking, making the proposed parking ratio contextual. This violation is recommended for relief due to alignment with existing context and in order to further city planning goals by adding contextual infill.

Multifamily dwellings and basement-level dwelling units are forbidden in this residential subdistrict. This site is governed by the Greater Mattapan Neighborhood Articles which prohibit basement-level units (Section 60, Table A). Basement units with express risk of being impacted by sea level rise and flooding events are mapped in the CFROD. The project site is not located in this district, therefore, garden-level units are both feasible and sensible infill options for this area if lot conditions allow. Sections of the basement-level unit or dimensioned elevations including below-grade area would confirm the ceiling height is suitable for the unit. The proposed unit count is contextual with the appropriate design and massing. Therefore, the forbidden multifamily use and forbidden basement unit violations are recommended for relief, provided a minimum ceiling height of 7'-6" is ensured in the basement.

Plans reviewed are titled "19 Greenock St. New 4 Family", prepared by Flow Design Architects, and dated 1/15/26.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1828945, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH PROVISIO/S: that plans be submitted to the Planning Department for design review to ensure adequate side yard conditions and an accessible, shared, common entrance to all units.



Planning Department

**CITY of BOSTON**

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1825902
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2026-03-06
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-16
<b>Address</b>	24 Alaska ST Roxbury 02119
<b>Parcel ID</b>	1200416000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Roxbury Neighborhood 3F-4000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	50
<b>Project Description</b>	Convert an existing one-unit building, through interior renovations, to a two-unit building.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	FAR Excessive Off Street Parking Insufficient Usable Open Space Insufficient Lot Area Insufficient Side Yard Insufficient Use Regulations

**Planning Context:**

The surrounding area is characterized by low- to moderate-density residential uses, including one-, two-, and three-family dwellings on compact urban lots. The neighborhood contains a consistent residential fabric with traditional residential building forms and a well-established streetscape pattern typical of the surrounding Roxbury area. Consistent with this established urban fabric, the proposed conversion creates an internal ADU as outlined in the City of Boston Accessory Dwelling Unit Guidebook.

**Zoning Analysis:**

The proposal requires zoning relief for excessive floor area ratio (FAR), insufficient lot area, insufficient usable open space, insufficient side yard setback, and off-street parking requirements.

The first citation concerns additional lot area per dwelling unit.

The subject lot contains approximately 2,377 square feet. Under Article 50, Table F, the 3F-4000 subdistrict requires 2,000 square feet for the first dwelling unit and an additional 2,000 square feet for each additional dwelling unit. The proposal to convert the existing single-family



dwelling into a two-family dwelling introduces an additional dwelling unit on a lot that does not contain sufficient area to satisfy the additional lot area requirement. As such, zoning relief is required. Relief is appropriate as the proposal maintains the existing building footprint and residential character of the property.

The second citation involves floor area ratio (FAR).

Article 50, Table F permits a maximum FAR of 0.8 in the 3F-4000 subdistrict. The existing structure is already nonconforming, with an existing FAR of approximately 1.08. As shown on the submitted plans, the proposal includes the conversion of previously unfinished basement space as part of the conversion to a two-family dwelling, increasing the total gross living area from approximately 2,579 square feet to 3,426 square feet and resulting in a proposed FAR of approximately 1.44. As such, the proposal further extends the existing nonconforming condition and requires zoning relief. Relief is appropriate because no expansion to the existing building footprint or building height is proposed.

The third citation relates to side yard setback.

Article 50, Table F requires a minimum side yard setback of 10 feet. The refusal letter cites insufficient side yard setback as a citation. However, the proposal does not expand the existing building footprint, alter the exterior building envelope, or otherwise increase the degree of nonconformity associated with the existing side yard condition. Pursuant to Section 13-3 of the Boston Zoning Code, a nonconforming building may be altered provided that any dimensional nonconformity is not worsened. As the proposal consists primarily of an interior conversion and does not worsen the existing side yard condition, it does not appear that additional side yard relief is required.

The fourth citation concerns usable open space.

Under Article 50, Table F, the code mandates a minimum of 650 square feet of usable open space per dwelling unit, requiring 1,300 square feet total for a two-family layout. While the total lot area is 2,377 square feet, the physical footprint of the existing building leaves the remaining outdoor yard space below the required 1,300 square foot threshold. Because the land boundaries are fixed, zoning relief is required to waive this dimensional requirement. Relief is appropriate because the project is strictly interior and will not reduce the existing yard space.



The fifth citation concerns off-street parking.

Under Article 50, Table H, one off-street parking space is required per dwelling unit; therefore, the proposed two-family dwelling requires two spaces. No off-street parking is provided on the site. Given the existing developed condition of the property and absence of a driveway or parking area, providing compliant parking would require substantial site alteration and reduction of available open space. Accordingly, zoning relief is appropriate.

Additionally, because the proposal does not include any exterior alterations, additions, or changes to the building's massing or roof form, Design Review under Article 28 is not required.

This analysis is based on plans prepared by JCBT Architect LLC "24 Alaska Street, Boston, MA 02119" dated May 3rd, 2026.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1825902, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1827322
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2026-03-11
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-16
<b>Address</b>	35 Notre Dame ST Roxbury 02119
<b>Parcel ID</b>	1100940000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Roxbury Neighborhood MFR
<b>Zoning Article</b>	50
<b>Project Description</b>	The proposed project is the erection of a six-unit, three-story building.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	FAR Excessive Rear Yard Insufficient Side Yard Insufficient Front Yard Insufficient Lot Frontage Insufficient Lot Width Insufficient Additional Lot Area Insufficient Lot Area Insufficient Parking or Loading Insufficient

**Planning Context:**

The Proposed Project would be the ground up construction of a new six-unit three-story building on a lot presently undeveloped and used as a garden. The surrounding context is made up of a mixture of uses and scales of built structures. In the immediate vicinity there is the medical institution of the Dimock Center, a local firehouse, smaller single-unit or two-unit homes, and larger multi-family buildings that occupy most of their lots. The proposed project would be closer in mass to the nearby multi-family homes. Due to the proposed project being the erection of a new building design review will be required as described in Section 50-38 of the zoning code.

**Zoning Analysis:**

The overall lot size of the site is 2,938 SF when the required would be 4,000 SF for the first three units and an additional 3,000 SF for the last three units. The width of the lot is 35'-0" when the required lot width and frontage is 40'-0". The proposed project also is proposing no off-street parking while the requirement is six spaces. These violations are due to the sizing of the site or come from challenges the site's size presents. The aforementioned violations can be



recommended for relief in accordance with Section 7-3's description of special circumstances in relation to the narrowness or shape of the lot.

The proposed project has an excessive FAR of 1.82 due to the maximum being 1.0. The side yard depth is insufficient at 5'-0" with the minimum being 10'-0'. The front yard depth is insufficient of 5'-0" when the minimum is 20'-0. All of these violations are commonplace in the neighborhood, including the immediately adjacent homes. These violations can be recommended for relief and should also be considered for zoning reform.

Lastly the project presently has an insufficient rear yard depth of 10'-0". The required depth would be 20'-0" however Section 50-44 provides relief for lots shallower than 100'-0 which reduces the required depth by 0-6" for every 1'-0" a lot is shorter than 100'-0". The site has an overall lot depth of 85'-3", therefore the required depth is 12'-5". The proponent should consider adjusting the proposal to meet this rear yard depth.

"35 Notre Dame" Drawn by Sol and Associates Inc. Dated January 15th, 2026

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1827322, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH PROVISIO/S: that plans be submitted to the Planning Department for design review with attention to the rear yard depth and facade design.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1817132
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2026-01-28
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-16
<b>Address</b>	18 Delle AV Mission Hill 02120
<b>Parcel ID</b>	1000585000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Mission Hill Neighborhood 3F-2000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	59
<b>Project Description</b>	The project will build a new three-unit residential structure on a lot with an existing three-unit residential structure.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	FAR Excessive Usable Open Space Insufficient Two or More Dwelling Same Lot

**Planning Context:**

The subject property is located on Delle Avenue in Mission Hill, a primarily residential street next to Fenway High School and one block from Tremont Street. Delle Avenue has a mix of building types with examples of detached, two-and three-unit residential structures, row homes, and larger residential structures with four units or more. Generally, these structures are triple-deckers, 2.5 to 3 stories tall and cover most of the lot. The properties on the South side of Delle Avenue have small, planted rear yards with narrow walkways between structures. The property is less than one-quarter mile from the MBTA Roxbury Crossing Station making it a fitting place for transit-oriented development.

The project proposes a new, three-unit residential structure on a lot with an existing three-unit residential structure. The existing structure appears to have been completed in May 2025. The structure will have a flat roof, rear decks, and three new parking spaces in a lot in the rear of the parcel. The parking will be accessed using a driveway between the two structures.

The design of the proposed driveway and rear parking area that fills the rear yard are inconsistent with the context of the surrounding neighborhood. While there is one other example of a property with parking in the rear of the lot on the south side of Delle Avenue, the parking area does not take up the entire rear yard. Other properties have planted yards or outdoor living areas in the rear of the lot that increase livability for residents.



Parks Design Review under Ordinance 7.4-11 is required because the proposed structure is less than 100 feet from the Gibbons Playground.

**Zoning Analysis:**

The project is cited for three violations including: excessive floor area ratio (FAR), two or more dwellings on the same lot, and insufficient usable open space per dwelling unit.

The maximum FAR is 1.0 whereas the proposed FAR is 1.22. The proposed FAR is consistent with existing residential structures on the south side of Delle Avenue.

Section 59-38.12 of the Zoning Code provides specific dimensional requirements for when two or more dwellings are proposed on the same lot. It provides conditions under which the Board of Appeal may grant a variance to projects proposing two or more dwellings on the same lot.

The only violation applicable to the requirements in Section 59-38.12 is the requirement for usable open space. Section 59-38.12 states that the dimensional requirements “shall apply as if such Dwelling were on a separate Lot.” The proposed structure is required to provide 400 square feet of open space per dwelling unit, plus “twenty-five percent (25%) of the lot area in excess of the required minimum lot area specified in the [Article 59] Table E for the lot.” If we split the total lot area of 6,699 square feet to comply with Section 59-38.12, approximately 487 square feet of usable open space per residential unit is required.

The proponent has provided a calculation of the total usable open space on the lot of 287 square feet per unit. Their calculation cites the four proposed decks and two patios between the two structures. Having reviewed the site plan, it is unclear where the proposed patio for 18 Delle Avenue is located given that the area underneath the proposed decks is a window well. For 18 Delle Avenue, approximately 248.6 square feet of usable open space is proposed per unit.

The Planning Department does not support the request for variance with respect to usable open space. The project should reduce the size of the proposed parking area to provide additional usable open space to comply with the requirement. The properties on the south side of Delle Avenue do not have off-street parking and provide usable open space instead of parking in the rear of the property. The project’s proximity to MBTA Roxbury Crossing Station means that the requirement for one parking space per dwelling unit presents a case for zoning reform.

Plans reviewed “18 Delle Ave” prepared by Design Resource Team, LLC dated 11/10/2025.



**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1817132, The Planning Department recommends DENIAL WITHOUT PREJUDICE. The proponent should reduce the size of the rear parking area to increase the usable open space in the rear of the property.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1834035
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2026-03-27
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-16
<b>Address</b>	25 Upton ST Roxbury 02118
<b>Parcel ID</b>	0306962000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	South End Neighborhood MFR
<b>Zoning Article</b>	64
<b>Project Description</b>	This project proposes a complete interior remodel of the existing building located at 25 Upton Street to convert the space from two dwelling units to three dwelling units, adding cantilever rear balconies, a new roof deck hatch and condensers, and facade repairs.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance, Conditional Use
<b>Violations</b>	Rear Yard Insufficient Roof Structure Restrictions Rear Yard Encroachment

**Planning Context:**

The existing two-unit rowhouse is within the South End Landmark District, less than half a mile from the Back Bay MBTA Orange Line Station. The surrounding area includes a consistent building typology of three- to six-unit rowhouse buildings of similar size and scale, the majority of which include rear balconies and roof decks.

The proposed renovation includes a complete interior remodel, converting the existing two units to three units. Work will include construction of a roof deck including a new hatch and two rooftop condensers; rear balconies on the street level, parlor level, and third levels; a rear garden level patio; in-kind facade repairs; and rear window and door reconfiguring. No addition of gross floor area (GFA) is proposed outside of the existing building walls. The work resembles an internal Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU), renovating the layout and use of existing space to create an additional dwelling unit and helping to achieve city-wide housing goals of housing flexibility and the production of more housing units.

This parcel is located in both the Coastal Flooding Resilience (CFROD) and the Groundwater Conservation (GCOD) overlay districts, as well as Restricted Parking and Restricted Roof districts. While the project adds a unit and renovates existing basement to livable floor area, the work proposed falls below the minimum thresholds that triggers CFROD applicability and is not



subject to Resilience review. However, the project will be subject to review by the South End Landmark District Commission (SELDC) and Groundwater Conservation Overlay District (GCOD).

**Zoning Analysis:**

The project was cited for violation to Article 64, Section 9 of the Boston Zoning Code for insufficient rear yard depth. Additionally, conditional approval is required based on Article 64, Sections 9.4 and 34 for rear yard encroachment and roof structure restriction, as discussed below.

**Rear Yard Depth:** The required rear yard depth for row houses in the South end neighborhood is 20 feet. While today the site has 23'6" of rear yard, most is paved for three existing parking spaces. The proposed six-foot deep balconies will reduce the rear yard depth, but expand the overall open space on the lot by providing private, outdoor space for each unit, a common design feature on this block and for this part of the neighborhood. Existing parking will be maintained. Therefore, Staff supports a variance to the required rear yard.

**Rear Yard Encroachment:** Per the Zoning Code, "the addition of a porch or balcony, other than a roof deck, above the first story" on a row house in the South End neighborhood into the rear yard requires conditional approval. The project proposes three rear balconies which will each extend six feet into the rear yard. Within the subject block and the block to the rear of the subject property (sharing a rear alley), Juliet style to eight-foot deep balconies dominate the rear facades. The proposed balconies will provide increased open space, blend seamlessly into the facade, and are not expected to cause any negative impacts to light, air, or drainage of adjacent units. Staff is in support of approval of this conditional use.

**Roof Structure Restrictions:** "No roofed structure designed or used for human occupancy...headhouse, or mechanical equipment... shall be erected or enlarged on the roof of an existing residential building" without approval of a conditional use, considering "whether such roof structure has the potential of damaging the uniformity of height or architectural character of the immediate vicinity." Furthermore, roof deck balustrades shall be "set back horizontally at least five (5) feet from all roof edges." Given that the proposed headhouse or condensers will not violate height restrictions and roof decks are commonly found on surrounding buildings, the roof deck should be approved.

Plans reviewed are titled "25 Upton Street Three Unit Residential Development," prepared by Pitman and Wardley Associates and dated February 2026.

BOA1834035

2026-06-16

2 Planning Department



Planning Department

**CITY of BOSTON**

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1834035, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kathleen Onufra".

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1817120
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2026-01-28
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-16
<b>Address</b>	78 Bunker Hill ST Charlestown 02129
<b>Parcel ID</b>	0202907000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Charlestown Neighborhood RH-1500
<b>Zoning Article</b>	62
<b>Project Description</b>	Change of use from one unit to two units. New three-story addition on rear right-side of house, second-floor balcony on left side, third-floor roof deck with spiral staircase, and livable area in existing basement to support change of use.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance, Conditional Use
<b>Violations</b>	Height Excessive (ft) Height Excessive (stories) FAR Excessive Rear Yard Insufficient Additional Lot Area Insufficient Roof Structure Restrictions Use: Forbidden (two-family dwelling)

**Planning Context:**

Bunker Hill Street serves as one of Charlestown’s primary corridors, supporting a diverse mix of residential and commercial properties. The property at 78 Bunker Hill Street is located along a predominantly residential stretch of the street, surrounded by three-family and multi-family subdistricts. Distinctly located within a small Row House (RH) Residential Subdistrict, the property features the area’s characteristic urban form of long, narrow lots where the building footprint occupies a majority of the parcel’s depth and is connected through party walls on either side to adjacent row houses. While there are several single-family row houses in this subdistrict, there are also a considerable number of row houses supporting three-family dwellings, more aligned with the surrounding multi-family residential fabric. No matter the unit count, these row houses maintain a relatively uniform character, scale, and lot size along Bunker Hill Street. 78 Bunker Hill Street differs from the standard row house form seen by its immediate neighbors, standing two stories with a pitched roof featuring a small, centrally located front and rear dormer. In contrast, the adjacent row houses generally stand a full three stories tall with flat roofs that commonly support various rooftop utilities or decks.



The lot sits directly across from the Boston Housing Authority's Bunker Hill Public Housing Development, which is currently undergoing a major mixed-income redevelopment to introduce new civic, retail, and public open spaces. The incoming neighborhood amenities help further contextualize small-scale density improvements at the individual parcel level, such as the residential conversion proposed at 78 Bunker Hill Street, by providing the public amenities needed to support minor growth in a historically constrained residential area.

The site is subject to both the Charlestown Neighborhood Design Overlay District (NDOD) and the Roof Structure Restriction Overlay District. While the NDOD ensures that any alterations remain compatible with Charlestown's historic scale and character, the roof structure overlay requires a Conditional Use Permit under Article 62-25 for the creation or expansion of any rooftop structures. Given that Bunker Hill Street is a prominent public corridor, compliance with these requirements is essential to ensure additions do not negatively impact the pedestrian experience along this public way. Finally, while the boundary of the Coastal Flood Resilience Overlay District (CFROD) encompasses several nearby parcels, 78 Bunker Hill Street itself sits entirely outside of the overlay district boundary.

### **Zoning Analysis:**

The proposed project is cited for six dimensional violations, requires a Conditional Use Permit pursuant to Article 62-25, and requires relief for a forbidden use.

The provided Refusal Letter incorrectly identifies "Additional Lot Area Insufficient" as a dimensional violation. In accordance with Article 62, Table C, a residential land use of up to two units only requires a 1,500 sq ft lot area. While the property's existing 1,080 sq ft lot area represents a pre-existing nonconformity with the baseline subdistrict requirement, the size is contextually aligned with the 1,500 sq ft baseline for two units rather than the 2,250 sq ft requirement mandated for uses exceeding two units. Additionally, the Refusal Letter incorrectly cites a violation for "Building Height Excessive (Stories)", proposed rooftop additions increase the overall building height to a non-compliant 35'-6", exceeding the subdistrict's 35' maximum height allowance. However, the building maintains compliance with the subdistrict's three-story height limit.

Under Article 62, Table A, the proposed conversion of 78 Bunker Hill Street from a single-family to a two-family residence constitutes a forbidden use within the Row House (RH) Residential Subdistrict. However, the surrounding residential context heavily supports this transition.

Numerous existing row houses within this exact subdistrict already operate as three-family dwellings while preserving their architectural form, and the lot is further bordered by three-family



and multi-family residential subdistricts. Because the design maintains the key elements of the existing row house character and accommodates the minor increase in density within the basement and a rear addition on a highly similar footprint to the existing structure, the Planning Department supports relief for this violation.

Usable open space and excessive FAR violations are directly related to the lot's undersized existing condition. The proposed additions significantly improve the usable open space condition, increasing the provided amount from 120 sq ft to 285 sq ft. While falling just short of the 300 sq ft minimum requirement, this represents a major upgrade to the existing condition. This proposal also adds approximately 1,000 sq ft for GFA to this property, creating a new GFA of 2,826 sq ft and a new FAR of 2.61. The RH-1500 Subdistrict limits FAR to 2.0, which restricts the potential GFA for this property due to the undersized lot. Despite the excessive FAR, the building's overall massing remains highly contextual with adjacent and surrounding row houses, and the introduction of livable space in the basement does not conflict with the CFROD's guidance, making relief appropriate.

The proposed rear addition significantly improves the existing rear yard condition on this lot. Currently, the rear porch's staircase exceeds the legal lot line and encroaches into an adjacent City-owned parcel. The new rear configuration features a spiral staircase that provides a 5.5' rear setback, resolving the property line encroachment. While this configuration is still noncompliant with the subdistrict's 15' requirement, the substantial improvement of the overall condition warrants relief.

Proposed rooftop additions would bring the overall height of the building from a compliant two stories and 28'-0 1/2" to a non-compliant three stories and 35'-6". While this creates a new non-conformity, the building maintains a highly contextual height relative to the surrounding three-story town houses. The inclusion of the roof deck and an accompanying entrance hatch adds 1'-9 1/2" of additional height to the building; without these structures, the building's height would be a fully compliant 34'-8 1/2". As these elements only create a minor violation and still maintain an aligned height with the adjacent row houses, relief is appropriate.

The proposed design for the roof deck complies with the design guidance of the Restricted Roof Structure District, maintaining adequate setbacks to provide screening from view along Bunker Hill Street. This roof deck is properly located, properly screened, and will not cause a nuisance or disturbance. The proposed front dormer introduces a non-contextual design element that is highly visible from the public way along Bunker Hill Street. Furthermore, the overall scope of work significantly increases the building's height and adds well over 300 sq ft of GFA. By



exceeding two of the established thresholds under the Charlestown NDOD, the project triggers formal Planning Department Design Review in accordance with Article 28-5

The plans reviewed are titled "Proposed Renovations 78 Bunker Hill Street Charlestown, MA", prepared by Timothy Sheehan Architect, and dated June 30, 2025. The proponent submitted an updated set of plans dated March 19, 2026, which addresses violations related to building height through the removal of the proposed rooftop deck and roof hatch for access. These revised plans are not officially stamped by ISD; because of this, review is based strictly on the officially stamped plan set submitted on October 19, 2025.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1817120, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH PROVISIO/S: that plans be submitted to the Planning Department for design review with specific focus on the size, scale, and contextual nature of the proposed front dormer.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1833678
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2026-03-26
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-16
<b>Address</b>	65 to 71 Main ST Charlestown 02129
<b>Parcel ID</b>	0203653000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Charlestown Neighborhood Neighborhood Shopping (NS)
<b>Zoning Article</b>	62
<b>Project Description</b>	Add one new ground-floor unit to the rear of existing retail space within the existing building footprint.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Conditional Use
<b>Violations</b>	Use: Conditional on Ground-Floor (Residential Unit)

**Planning Context:**

Main Street serves as a primary corridor defined by active ground-floor uses, including restaurants and boutiques, alongside occasional residential units. While this subdistrict has a strong retail focus, 65-71 Main Street sits in a much more transitional zone surrounded by residential subdistricts, abutting a three-family subdistrict and located a block away from several row home subdistricts.

Ground-floor residential uses were made conditional in NS Subdistricts as a result of the zoning updates responding to the recommendations of PLAN: Charlestown (2023). This specific recommendation aims to reduce intense real estate market pressure to convert commercial spaces into housing, which has caused a steady loss of neighborhood retail in recent years. By changing the use to conditional rather than forbidding ground-floor residential uses, these conversions can still happen for proposed projects in highly contextual areas or situated away from the primary commercial streetscape. By positioning the new residential unit at the rear of the building where it directly abuts a residential subdistrict, all existing retail space along Main Street is preserved. This allows the project to maintain an active streetscape along Main Street while increasing the stock of available housing in Charlestown.

Finally, the lot also falls within the Neighborhood Design Overlay District (NDOD) but the scope of the proposed project doesn't meet any of the thresholds to trigger Planning Department Design Review.



**Zoning Analysis:**

The project requires a Conditional Use Permit under Article 62, Table B, which classifies ground-floor residential units as a conditional use within the Neighborhood Shopping Subdistrict. Per Article 6-3, the Zoning Board of Appeal may grant this permit if the proposed use is appropriately located and will not adversely affect the neighborhood or create a nuisance. Although the property is situated in a commercial subdistrict, the proposed unit is located at the rear of the building, directly abutting a 3F-2000 residential subdistrict. This placement is highly contextual, as the site is directly adjacent to and across from existing condominium buildings within the same block, both within the NS Subdistrict.

Furthermore, the proposal includes the preservation of ground-floor retail space fronting Main Street within the existing footprint of the building, supporting the active streetscape objectives of the subdistrict and the broader goals of PLAN: Charlestown. By balancing the addition of a well-placed residential unit with the preservation of commercial frontage along Main Street, the project meets the necessary criteria for approval. As such, the Planning Department supports the issuance of this Conditional Use Permit.

Plans reviewed are titled "3 Monument Avenue Charlestown, MA" prepared by LaFreniere Architects and undated.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1833678, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1817787
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2026-02-02
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-16
<b>Address</b>	450 William F McClellan HW East Boston 02128
<b>Parcel ID</b>	0101662000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	WE Waterfront Economic
<b>Zoning Article</b>	53
<b>Project Description</b>	The proposal seeks to update the authorized use of the lot to allow vehicles service activities as an ancillary operational component of the existing rental fleet business.  No exterior alterations, structural expansion, changes to site layout, or other physical site modifications are proposed.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Conditional Use, Variance
<b>Violations</b>	Extension of Non Conforming Use

**Planning Context:**

The Hertz fleet lot is set back from William F. McClellan Highway and located behind existing commercial and airport-support business operations. It does not directly front the highway. The proposed activity would occur within an interior fleet area, rather than along the primary roadway frontage. The surrounding area is predominantly commercial and characterized by transportation, logistics, cargo handling, fleet, and airport-support operations.

**Zoning Analysis:**

The proposal received one citation for a vehicular service use, specifically auto body or cosmetic repair of vehicles.

The property is located within the Waterfront Economy (WE) subdistrict. Under Article 53, Section 53-10 and Table C of the East Boston Neighborhood District zoning, the “Vehicular Services” use is classified as a forbidden use. The requested use would be limited to internal



fleet servicing of Hertz vehicles within existing membrane tent structures on the interior fleet lot to an existing business.

The proposal would not establish a separate customer-facing auto repair business, expand the site, or alter the existing land use pattern. In this context, the use functions as an ancillary operational activity to the existing rental fleet operation and is consistent with the surrounding commercial, transportation, logistics, and airport-support setting.

The plans reviewed are titled "450 William F. McClellan Highway," prepared by Balance Architects and issued for review on November 19, 2025.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1817787, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1824666
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2026-03-03
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-16
<b>Address</b>	61 Brookline AV Boston 02215
<b>Parcel ID</b>	2100065000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Fenway Neighborhood CC
<b>Zoning Article</b>	66
<b>Project Description</b>	Project intends to add live entertainment after 10:30pm to the restaurant space.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Conditional Use
<b>Violations</b>	Conditional Use

**Planning Context:**

61 Brookline Ave sits in one of the main commercial corridors of the Fenway Neighborhood. It is across the street from the Fenway Stadium and Lansdowne Street which is home to similar restaurants, bars, and live music venues. The project abuts a parking lot and a restaurant on either side. The current building includes residential units, a retail bank, a car repair shop, and a small restaurant that includes take out. The project proposes a change of use to add live entertainment after 10:30pm to the small restaurant, which is a conditional use in this subdistrict.

**Zoning Analysis:**

The proposed change of use is contextually appropriate given the building's location along a commercial corridor. Additionally, there are similar land uses across the street from this building. The change in use requires no construction or displacement, and thus no disruption to the surrounding area. A conditional use permit is recommended.

Plans submitted were titled "Loco- Fenway" and were reviewed on 02/27/26.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1824666, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.



Planning Department

**CITY of BOSTON**

Reviewed,

*Kathleen Onuf*

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1810052
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2026-01-07
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-16
<b>Address</b>	2 Hopkins PL Mattapan 02126
<b>Parcel ID</b>	1800348000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Greater Mattapan Neighborhood R1
<b>Zoning Article</b>	60
<b>Project Description</b>	Construct a new three-unit, three-story building on a vacant lot.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	Rear Yard Insufficient Off Street Parking Regulations Building Lot Coverage Excessive Forbidden Use

**Planning Context:**

The proposed project would be developing a three-unit three story multifamily building in a presently unoccupied lot. The lot at 5,704 SF which is about the typical lot sizing in the neighboring context and is located at the dead end of Hopkins place. The proposed building will occupy about 1,475 SF in the southern portion of the lot. Adjacent to the street access in the northern portion of the lot will be a paved parking area with four parking spaces. The site is within the catchment area of PLAN: Mattapan, passed May 2023 and the site was rezoned in April 2024. PLAN: Mattapan highlights the need for additional housing stock in the neighborhood; however, it also emphasizes the importance of respecting the neighborhood’s historically low-density, low rise nature. This project is filed with 1 Hopkins Place and due to the unit count exceeding seven units across both projects, Article 79 Inclusionary Zoning would be applicable to both.

**Zoning Analysis:**

The proposed project use of three units is forbidden as the R1 zoning only allows up to two units. The additional third unit is welcomed as it would trigger state building code requirements for development of an accessible unit and sprinkler system for fire safety. The proposed project also has a violation for the location of the parking being in the front yard of the site. The



proponents should consider a new location for the parking which minimizes its location on the front yard.

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

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

**Recommendation:**

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

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1810051
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2026-01-07
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-16
<b>Address</b>	1 Hopkins PL Mattapan 02126
<b>Parcel ID</b>	1800349020
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Greater Mattapan Neighborhood R1
<b>Zoning Article</b>	60
<b>Project Description</b>	The proposed project is the new construction of a six-unit, three-story residential building.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	Off Street Parking Regulations Forbidden Use

**Planning Context:**

The proposed project would be developing a six-unit three story multifamily building in a presently unoccupied lot. The lot at 9,084 SF which is about double the typical lot in the neighboring context and is located at the dead end of Hopkins Place surrounded on three sides by the rear yards of numerous homes. The proposed building will occupy about 4,500 SF in the eastern portion of the lot. Adjacent to the street access in the western portion of the lot will be a paved parking area with eight parking spaces. The site is within the catchment area of PLAN: Mattapan, passed May 2023 and the site was rezoned in April 2024. PLAN: Mattapan highlights the need for additional housing stock in the neighborhood; however, it also emphasizes the importance of respecting the neighborhood’s historically low-density, low rise nature. This project is filed with 2 Hopkins Place and due to the unit count exceeding seven units, Article 79 Inclusionary Zoning would be applicable to both.

**Zoning Analysis:**

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



proponent should be open to lowering the parking count to an amount that allows more opportunity for reconfiguration but still provides the minimum amount of spaces.

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

**Recommendation:**

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

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1849154
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2026-05-13
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-16
<b>Address</b>	1526 to 1530 Dorchester AV Dorchester 02122
<b>Parcel ID</b>	1600667000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Dorchester Neighborhood MFR/LS
<b>Zoning Article</b>	65
<b>Project Description</b>	Interior commercial conversion of a retail space into art, accessory food service and live entertainment.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Conditional Use
<b>Violations</b>	Off Street Parking Regulations Use Regulation

**Planning Context:**

The project proposes a change of use from Retails, Lodgers, Offices, Education Center and Ice Cream Parlor to Retails, Lodgers, Offices, Education Center, Ice Cream Parlor, and Retail with accessory food service (prepackaged food and coffee), accessory Art Gallery, and accessory Live Entertainment. The scope of work includes performing interior renovations to accommodate the arts/community center space from a retail sneaker store. There will also be demolition of wall sections, existing doors, and bathrooms with new handwashing stations and sinks for food/activity use, new women's and men's bathrooms. As part of the Fields Corner Main Streets District, this side of Dorchester Avenue is a commercial corridor where the project sits 0.2 miles from Fields Corner MBTA station, abuts a large plaza that contains a McDonalds, Target, Dollar General, and a Price Rite. Moreover, with the Doherty-Gibson playground right across the street, several properties with mixed use businesses, markets, restaurants, the area is an active pedestrian use.

**Zoning Analysis:**

The project triggers two violations for Article 65 in the Dorchester Neighborhood Zoning and Multifamily Residential/Local Services District/Subdistrict. With regards to the first violation, off-street parking regulation, the Neighborhood Article requires 2 parking spots per 1,000 sq ft. The proposed project sitting at 19,000 sq ft, would need to accommodate roughly 38 off-street



parking spaces. However, being within walking distance of Fields Corner MBTA station, with several pedestrian centered retails, restaurants, markets and businesses, omitting the parking spaces is in character with the surrounding area when considering this scale of parking would require the demolition of the existing building. Also, the change of use requires the same number of parking spaces, rendering this an existing nonconformity and signals a need for zoning reform.

With regards to the second violation of use regulation, the proposed changes are appropriate for the location when observing Google historical images of the ways the neighborhood has changed over the years. For example, 1558 Dorchester Avenue that's in the same subdistrict as the proposed project, once occupied a business, and is now an art gallery. Other changes within the active block are common, where 1506 Dorchester Avenue currently services a restaurant and previously was a chiropractic clinic. At 1512 Dorchester Avenue, a former retail shop is now a cosmetic beauty salon. Therefore, the changes are appropriate for the location, and will be a benefit for the corridor.

The plans reviewed are titled, "Commercial Tenant Fit-Out" and were prepared by Design Construction & Consulting Services and dated 5/6/26.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1849154, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1819749
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2026-02-09
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-16
<b>Address</b>	439 Walnut AV Jamaica Plain 02119
<b>Parcel ID</b>	1101515000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Jamaica Plain Neighborhood 2F-4000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	55
<b>Project Description</b>	The project will add two units to an existing two-unit residential structure for a total of four units. One unit is proposed in the basement, the second within an addition proposed for the third floor of the structure.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	Height Excessive (stories) Rear Yard Insufficient Side Yard Insufficient Usable Open Space Insufficient Lot Area Insufficient Parking or Loading Insufficient FAR Excessive Use: Forbidden

**Planning Context:**

The proposed project is located on Walnut Avenue in Jamaica Plain between Egleston Square and Franklin Park. The project’s proximity to Franklin Park means it has a high level of access to open space. The area is primarily residential with a mix of smaller, one-to-three-unit residential structures and larger multi-unit buildings. The property is one and a half blocks from Columbus Avenue, which has a high level of bus service served by the MBTA Number 22, 29, and 44 buses. It is also three quarters of a mile from the MBTA Stony Brook Station.

There are a variety of residential building types in the area surrounding the property. On neighboring parcels along Walnut Ave., there are a few smaller residential structures spaced closely together with very small yards. Directly next to the property and to the south on Walnut Ave., there are larger, multi-unit, three story residential buildings that are built to the street.

The project proposes to increase the number of residential units within the structure from two to four. It will achieve this by adding a unit in the basement and by expanding the existing upper half story to create a full third floor.



Parks Design Review under Ordinance 7.4-11 is required because the property is less than 100 feet from Franklin Park.

**Zoning Analysis:**

The project is cited for eight violations related to the proposed use and dimensional requirements in the subdistrict. The existing use is a two-unit residential structure; the project will create two more units for a total of four and will install an emergency sprinkler system. Multi-unit dwellings are not allowed in the subdistrict, however, there are examples of other four-unit structures in the area. Along with the transportation and open space resources in the area, this is a fitting place for the proposed use.

The project is also cited for excessive height in stories, insufficient side yard, and insufficient rear yard. The existing height is 2.5 stories, and the proposed structure is 3 stories, above the maximum height of 2.5 stories. There are several examples of structures that are 3 stories in the surrounding area which means the height will not be out of context for the neighborhood. The proposed side yards are 4.2 and 2.5 feet and are existing non-conformities that are not changing in the project. The minimum side yard requirement in the subdistrict is 10 feet. The proposed rear yard is 13 feet and is also an existing non-conformity. The required rear yard is 20 feet. Although the side and rear yards are existing non-conformities, the proposed height will extend non-conformity vertically. The exceptional narrowness of the lot contributes to the side yard violation. The project strikes the balance of increasing the height to add units while also maintaining sufficient light and air between the structure and neighboring properties.

The project is also cited for insufficient usable open space per dwelling unit, parking, lot area, and excessive floor area ratio (FAR). The requirement for usable open space is 800 square feet “per lot.” The project reports 1,402 square feet of usable open space on the lot. The proposal includes rear decks for the three upper story units. It is unclear from the plans if a violation exists for usable open space, however, the project’s proximity to Franklin Park and the exceptional narrowness of the lot mean that a variance is appropriate. The project is also cited for insufficient parking with 1.25 parking spaces required per residential unit. There is no existing parking, and no parking is proposed due to how narrow the existing side yards are. The required lot size is 4,000 square feet whereas the subject lot is 2,500 square feet. The existing FAR is 1.41 and will increase to 1.84, above the maximum FAR of 0.6. This is an example of how a small lot size: in this case, a very narrow lot increases the FAR even though the bulk of



the structure fits within the existing context of the neighborhood. The proposed project allows the owner to update their property and increase the number of residential units while ensuring it will not be injurious to the surrounding neighborhood.

The property is located within the Jamaica Plain Neighborhood Design Overlay District (NDOD). Design review in an NDOD prioritizes preservation of the existing building to the extent possible, however, it appears that the roof has been previously modified. The project should complete design review with respect to the proposed dormers.

Plans reviewed "439 Walnut Avenue Boston, MA 02119" prepared by "Paul Lessard" dated 05/05/2026.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1819749, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH PROVISIO/S: that plans be submitted to the Planning Department for design review with attention to the design of the dormers.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1842341
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2026-04-23
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-16
<b>Address</b>	612 to 612A Shawmut AV Roxbury 02118
<b>Parcel ID</b>	0901509000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Roxbury Neighborhood MFR
<b>Zoning Article</b>	50
<b>Project Description</b>	Construct a new four-story building with one retail unit and seven residential units on an existing vacant lot.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance, Conditional Use
<b>Violations</b>	GCOD Applicability Lot Area Insufficient Lot Width Insufficient Lot Frontage Insufficient Usable Open Space Insufficient Additional Lot Area Insufficient FAR Excessive Rear Yard Insufficient Side Yard Insufficient Front Yard Insufficient Parking or Loading Insufficient Conditional Use

**Planning Context:**

The proposed project is a four-story, mixed use building with retail space on the ground floor and residential units above which are characteristic of previous Squares + Streets study areas. A similar condition applies along Washington St, as developed during PLAN: JP/ROX in Egleston Square. Larger parcels with residential zoning are well-suited for multifamily housing development, especially when those units improve the vitality of their neighboring commercial centers and can reduce car dependency. The site is 0.6 miles or a 15-minute walk from Ruggles Station. Bus service is available on nearby corridors, Melnea Cass Boulevard and Washington Street.

The adjacent building at 610 Shawmut Avenue is similar in scale to what is proposed at 612 Shawmut Ave, and the Proponent is proposing an increase in the scale of the existing building at 610 Shawmut Ave to be consistent with the new building. This section of Shawmut Ave from 608 to 618 are narrow, mixed use buildings connected by party walls with no side or front yards.



Some buildings on this block have large rear yards, while others have one- to two-story additions that extend into the rear. The vacant lot at 612 Shawmut is currently an inactive driveway which creates a break in the existing fabric. Therefore, infill of an active, pedestrian-oriented use is appropriate here.

**Zoning Analysis:**

The proposed project violates Article 50 dimensional standards for minimum lot area, additional lot area, lot width, lot frontage width, usable open space per unit, and maximum FAR. The total required lot area for this project is 5,000 square feet minimum and the proposed lot area is 2,673 sf. The required lot width is 40 feet minimum and the proposed lot width is 25.76'. These violations are recommended for relief because they are existing conditions that cannot be changed. The required usable open space per unit is 200 sf, totaling 1,400 square feet minimum, and the total proposed usable open space is 440 sf. This violation is recommended for relief because the proposed open space is in alignment with the surrounding context.

The maximum allowed FAR is 1.0 and the proposed FAR is 2.83. While the maximum allowed FAR is not representative of what is found on the block, the proposed FAR also exceeds what exists in the surrounding context. The proposed building falls out of alignment with the existing context due to its bulk. The FAR should decrease by either decreasing the building's depth or reducing height in the rear so that this building can remain consistent with the other buildings on the street.

The proposed project also violates dimensional standards for front, side, and rear yards. The minimum required front yard is 20 feet and the proposed front yard is 0 feet. The minimum required side yard is 10 feet and the proposed side yard is 0 feet. The minimum required rear yard is 20 feet and the proposed rear yard is 18.8'. The front and side yards are in alignment with the other buildings on the block, but there are no other structures that are the proposed height and encroach into the rear yard at this scale. The front yard and side yard violations are recommended for relief. However, the rear yard should increase to align with the four-story building at 616 Shawmut Avenue.

According to Article 50-43.4, the proposed parking ratio violates minimum parking requirements. The minimum required parking is a combination of the requirements for residential uses and the single commercial unit, totalling eight spaces minimum. The proposed project provides zero off street parking spaces. Active driveways leading to rear parking do not match the context of this



block and are not possible to build on sites that contain structures connected by party walls. Therefore, this violation is recommended for relief.

Article 32 establishes the Groundwater Conservation Overlay District. Because this project is located in the Groundwater Conservation Overlay District (GCOD), this project is also subject to review by the BWSC. Additionally, the project site is located in a Boulevard Planning District. Boulevard Planning Districts are established in the code in Section 50-37 "As gateways to the residential areas [which] establish a design image and are focal points for the surrounding neighborhoods." Boulevards are connection points to neighborhoods. These corridors are for travel into the neighborhood and neighborhood-oriented uses.

Lastly, retail is a conditional use in MFR subdistricts. According to Article 6-3, the standards for recommending approval of a conditional use are broadly that the proposed use at the proposed location will not adversely affect the neighborhood, create any hazards, or fail to comply with the provisions of applicable zoning overlays. The proposed project location is appropriate for the retail use as long as the facade and building massing fit the neighborhood context. The conditional use is recommended for approval with design review due to its appropriate location and to increase alignment with the standards of the Boulevard Planning District.

Plans reviewed are titled "612 Shawmut Avenue", prepared by 686 Architects, and dated 12/4/25.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1842341, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH PROVISIO/S: the plans shall be reviewed and approved by the Boston Water & Sewer Commission due to its location within the Groundwater Conservation Overlay District (GCOD), that plans be submitted to the Planning Department for design review to increase alignment with the standards of the Boulevard Planning District and increase the rear yard.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1842339
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2026-04-23
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-16
<b>Address</b>	610 to 610A Shawmut AV Roxbury 02118
<b>Parcel ID</b>	0901510000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Roxbury Neighborhood MFR
<b>Zoning Article</b>	50
<b>Project Description</b>	Construct a new four-story, mixed use addition in the rear yard of an existing building.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance, Conditional use
<b>Violations</b>	Additional Lot Area Insufficient Lot Width Insufficient Rear Yard Insufficient Side Yard Insufficient FAR Excessive Usable Open Space Insufficient GCOD Applicability Parking or Loading Insufficient

**Planning Context:**

The proposed project is a four-story, rear addition to an existing mixed use building with retail space on the ground floor and residential units above. This is a mixed use area that is accessible to transit. The site is 0.6 miles or a 15-minute walk from Ruggles Station. Bus service is available on nearby corridors, Melnea Cass Boulevard and Washington Street. Larger parcels with residential zoning are well-suited for multifamily housing development, especially when those units improve the vitality of their neighboring commercial centers and can reduce car dependency.

In addition to the project at 610 Shawmut Ave, the Proponent is proposing a new construction project at the adjacent lot (612 Shawmut Avenue) which would make these two buildings similar in scale. This section of Shawmut Ave from 608 to 618 is narrow, mixed use buildings connected by party walls with no parking, side yards or front yards. Some buildings on this block have large rear yards, while others have one- to two-story additions that extend into the rear.

**Zoning Analysis:**

The proposed project violates Article 50 dimensional standards for minimum additional lot area, lot width, usable open space per unit, and maximum FAR. The minimum required additional lot



area for this project is 1,000 sf and the proposed additional lot area is 0 square feet. The minimum required lot width is 40 feet and the lot of the project site is 22.82' wide. These violations are recommended for relief because they are existing conditions that cannot be changed. The required usable open space per unit is 200 sf, totaling 1,400 square feet, and the total proposed usable open space is 574 sf. This violation is recommended for relief because the proposed open space is in alignment with the surrounding context.

The maximum allowed FAR is 1.0 and the proposed FAR is 3.25. While the maximum allowed FAR is not representative of what is found on the block, the proposed FAR also exceeds what exists in the surrounding context. The proposed addition adds bulk to the existing building that would cause it to fall out of alignment with the existing context. Rear structures on this lot are two stories or less. The FAR should decrease by either decreasing the addition's depth or reducing the height so that this building's massing can remain consistent with the other buildings on the street.

The proposed project also violates dimensional standards for side and rear yards. The minimum required side yard is 10 feet and the proposed side yard is 0 feet. The minimum required rear yard is 20 feet and the proposed rear yard is 17.4'. The front and side yards are in alignment with the other buildings on the block, but there are no other structures that are the proposed height and encroach into the rear yard at this scale. The side yard violation is recommended for relief. However, the rear yard should increase to align with the bulk of the four-story buildings at 618 and 614 Shawmut Avenue.

According to Section 50-43.4, the proposed parking ratio violates minimum parking requirements. The minimum required parking is a combination of the requirements for residential uses and the single commercial unit, totaling 5 spaces. The Proponent proposes 0 parking spaces. This violation is recommended for relief because of alignment with the surrounding context and city planning goals.

Article 32 establishes the Groundwater Conservation Overlay District (GCOD). Because this project is located in the GCOD, it is also subject to review by the BWSC. Additionally, the project site is located in a Boulevard Planning District. Boulevard Planning Districts are established in the code in Section 50-37 "As gateways to the residential areas [which] establish a design image and are focal points for the surrounding neighborhoods." Boulevards are connection points to neighborhoods. These corridors are for travel into the neighborhood and neighborhood-oriented uses. Therefore, the proposed project is recommended for design review

BOA1842339

2026-06-16

2 Planning Department



with special attention to the proposed FAR to create consistency with the building massing on the block.

Plans reviewed are titled "610 Shawmut Avenue", prepared by 686 Architects, and dated 5/12/2025.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1842339, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH PROVISIO/S: that plans be submitted to the Planning Department for design review to ensure alignment with the Boulevard Planning District and to decrease bulk of the rear addition.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1776822
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2025-09-18
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-16
<b>Address</b>	29 Plain ST Dorchester 02122
<b>Parcel ID</b>	1603932000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Dorchester Neighborhood 1F-5000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	65
<b>Project Description</b>	Construct a new five-unit building on a lot occupied by a single family home.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	FAR Excessive Height Excessive (stories) Lot Frontage Insufficient Conformity with Existing Building Alignment Front Yard Insufficient Use: Forbidden

**Planning Context:**

The proposed project would construct five new residential units in one multifamily building. Dense residential development is very necessary in this area. The proponent has responded to community feedback in order to properly shape this proposed development. The property is located in the Neponset section of Dorchester, a primarily residential area with a mix of single- and multi-family homes.

The project is within walking distance of major streets including Neponset Ave and Gallivan Boulevard, which provide access to neighborhood amenities and services. The home is also situated near bus routes along Neponset Ave, offering convenient access to public transportation.

While the residential use is above the allowable number of units for the area, the unique size of the parcel provides context for this project. The parcel is almost three times as wide and twice as deep as the standard parcel for the area. Since the parcel is almost six times as large as neighboring parcels, a five-unit composition fits within the context of the neighborhood.

**Zoning Analysis:**



The proposed project would have a total of five units and be classified as a multi-family building. The area is zoned for a maximum of one unit on the parcel. However, this does not match the built reality of the neighborhood. Two- and three-family buildings are very common, with some multifamily scattered throughout the neighborhood area. The limit of one unit reflects the disconnect between zoning and the built reality of the neighborhood and points to the need for potential zoning reform. In addition, the proposed project parcel is almost six times the size of the typical parcel for the area. This increased area also points to the appropriate fit of five units for this project.

This plan has also triggered a “Conformity with Existing Building Alignment” violation. Along Plain St, there is a uniform nature to the building alignment. While from the plans it appears that the new building is meeting this requirement, the calculations have not been provided. If the proponent provides the calculation and it meets the existing building alignment, then this violation should be disregarded.

The proposed project is also triggering a front yard setback violation. However, this is not in line with the above-stated modal setback. The front yard has been decreased in order to match the existing context, as the modal setback takes precedence over the front yard requirement. As stated above, if the provided calculation for the modal setback is provided and in line with the neighbors, this violation should also be disregarded.

The next violation is due to the excessive height of the proposed structure. The neighborhood is zoned for two and a half stories, while the project proposes a full three stories. This is not reflective of the larger built environment. Where two and a half stories is predominant, full three-story buildings are also present within the area. A full third floor through the use of dormers to match neighborhood character is common. Even though it is half a story above the maximum height in stories, the project is only proposing a building height of 31 feet 11 inches—below the maximum of 35 feet—again highlighting the appropriate dimensions of the project. This requirement is not at all reflective of the larger development patterns in the area and highlights the need for potential zoning reform.

The proposed project is also triggering a violation for its FAR (Floor Area Ratio). The zoning district has a maximum FAR of 0.5, while the proposed project would have an FAR of 0.78. This is a disconnect between the zoning code and the built reality of the neighborhood. Many nearby multi-story buildings have near 50% lot coverage, creating an FAR above the zoning maximums. The proposed project is in line with the scale of nearby development, creating five



new units on a parcel around six times the size of neighboring projects. By consolidating these units onto one parcel, this allows for better consolidation of the driveway and open space.

The proposed project has a lot frontage of 89 feet. The zoning code requires a lot frontage of 50 feet in this zoning district. The frontage requirement was calculated as 50 feet per unit, whereas it is supposed to be 50 feet overall. This violation is incorrect and should be disregarded.

Plans consulted were titled "29 Plain St" created by Context Architects and dated 7/30/25 and revised 4/29/26.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1776822, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL WITH PROVISIO: that plans be submitted to the Planning Department for design review with attention to simplifying the roof form.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1794725
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2025-10-31
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-16
<b>Address</b>	34 Spring Garden ST Dorchester 02125
<b>Parcel ID</b>	1303175000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Dorchester Neighborhood 2F-5000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	65
<b>Project Description</b>	Renovate and expand an existing single-family dwelling to three units, including vertical and rear additions, and two off-street parking spaces.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	FAR Excessive Height Excessive (stories) Front Yard Insufficient Rear Yard Insufficient Off Street Parking Regulations Lot Area Insufficient Lot Width Insufficient Lot Frontage Insufficient Forbidden use

**Planning Context:**

The surrounding area consists primarily of one- and two-family dwellings, with some multifamily buildings. Properties are generally closely spaced with limited off-street parking, reflecting an established residential pattern. The proposal converts an existing single-family dwelling into three units through interior changes and life safety upgrades, without altering the overall building scale.

**Zoning Analysis:**

The first violation concerns the use. The Boston Zoning Code allows one- and two-family residential uses in the 2F-5000 subdistrict. The proposal introduces a three-family residential dwelling, which is not a permitted use, resulting in a use violation. While not permitted, three-family dwellings exist in the neighborhood, including on Sydney Street to the rear of the site, indicating a presence of similar housing types. As part of the proposed renovation, the building



will be upgraded with a new fire alarm and sprinkler system, improving overall life-safety conditions for future residents.

The second violation relates to floor area ratio (FAR). The zoning code permits a maximum FAR of 0.5, while the proposal increases the FAR to 1.0, exceeding the allowable limit. While this represents an increase in density, similar building scales and massing are present in the surrounding area, particularly among nearby multi-family structures; therefore, the request for FAR relief may be considered appropriate.

The third violation concerns building height in stories. The code permits a maximum of 2.5 stories, while the proposal introduces a full third story, as shown in the elevations, resulting in a violation. Similarly scaled three-story residential buildings are present on Sydney Street to the rear of the site; therefore, the proposed height is consistent with the neighborhood character, and the request for height relief is appropriate.

The fourth violation concerns the front yard setback. A minimum front yard of 15 feet is required pursuant to Article 9, Section 9-1 of the Boston Zoning Code, while the proposal provides approximately 10 feet 8 inches, resulting in an insufficient front yard. The proposal does not alter the existing front yard setback or increase the degree of nonconformity. Therefore, the request for front yard relief is appropriate. The fifth violation relates to the rear yard setback. The zoning code requires a minimum rear yard of 20 feet, while the proposal provides approximately 4 feet 2 inches due to the rear addition, resulting in a significant reduction as shown on the submitted existing and proposed site and elevation plans. The plans indicate that the reduction is driven by the rear expansion of the building footprint, which substantially extends the massing toward the rear property line out of line with surrounding properties. The proposal results in a largely paved site with limited opportunities for meaningful landscaping, reduces open space quality, and is out of character with the surrounding properties.

The final violation concerns off-street parking. The proposal provides two off-street parking spaces for three units, which is insufficient under Article 65, Section 41. Given the site's location within a Restricted Parking District and access to alternative transportation options, reducing off-street parking demand is consistent with Boston Transportation Department (BTD) guidelines supporting reduced parking in areas with on-street parking controls and multimodal access; therefore, the request for parking is appropriate.



This analysis is based on plans prepared by 686 Architects, Inc. titled "34 SPRING GARDEN STREET, BOSTON, MA 02125 REV" dated April 13th, 2026.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1794725, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL W/ PROVISIO that plans be submitted to the Planning Department for design review with attention to screening of the parking area from the view of neighboring properties.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1814618
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2026-01-27
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-16
<b>Address</b>	163 to 165 Hillside ST Mission Hill 02120
<b>Parcel ID</b>	1000954000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	Mission Hill Neighborhood 2F-3000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	59
<b>Project Description</b>	The proposed project will renovate the existing 2.5-story, 2-unit residential building into a 3-story, 3-unit residential building.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	Height Excessive (ft) Height Excessive (stories) Usable Open Space Insufficient Parking or Loading Insufficient Use: Forbidden

**Planning Context:**

The Zoning Board of Appeal deferred this case from the 06/02/2026 hearing. New plans have been submitted, but the Planning Department’s recommendation has not changed. The proposed project is located on Hillside Street in Mission Hill which is a primarily residential area in the neighborhood. The property currently has a 2-unit, 2.5 story residential structure with a small front yard and a rear yard. The rear yard includes an alley that runs parallel to Hillside Street. Residential structures in the area are generally 2.5 to 3.5 stories tall with very small yards and limited off-street parking. The property is located less than one quarter mile from the MBTA Green Line Mission Park stop.

The project will add one dormer to the structure to expand one of the units while increasing the height to three stories. It will also finish the basement and garage on the lower level to create a new residential unit. The property has significant grade sloping south to north which allows the lower-level garage to access the alley to the north.

**Zoning Analysis:**

The project is cited for three violations due to the increase in unit count from two to three residential units. They include forbidden use, insufficient open space per unit, and insufficient



off-street parking. Three-unit residential structures are a forbidden use in the subdistrict. While there are not many examples of three-unit structures in the subdistrict, there are many examples of residential structures with four or more units in the area directly surrounding the property. The project's proximity to the MBTA Green Line make it an appropriate place for an additional dwelling unit. The project is required to provide 600 square feet of usable open space per unit and is providing 396 square feet per unit, below the requirement. It is also required to provide three parking spaces and will only provide two. The small lot sizes in this part of Mission Hill make it very challenging for a two- or three-unit residential structure to meet these requirements.

The project is also cited for two additional dimensional violations: maximum building height (floors) and maximum building height (feet). The proposed height is 3 stories or 35 feet while the maximum for the district of 2.5 stories or 35 feet. Structures in the surrounding area are generally 2.5 to 3.5 stories which means that the proposed height is not inconsistent with the surrounding neighborhood. Plans reviewed "163 Hillside Street" prepared by "Context a Collaborative Design Workshop" dated 05/04/2026.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1814618, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA183351
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2026-03-26
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-16
<b>Address</b>	176 L ST South Boston 02127
<b>Parcel ID</b>	0702582000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	South Boston Neighborhood MFR
<b>Zoning Article</b>	68
<b>Project Description</b>	This project proposes to add a 4th story addition to increase the living space of the existing third-floor unit.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance Conditional Use
<b>Violations</b>	Parking or Loading Insufficient Height Excessive FAR Excessive Rear Yard Insufficient Roof Structure Restrictions

**Planning Context:**

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

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

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

**Zoning Analysis:**

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



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

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

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

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

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



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

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

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1833514, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1575425
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2024-02-28
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-16
<b>Address</b>	62 L ST South Boston 02127
<b>Parcel ID</b>	0603571000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	South Boston Neighborhood MFR
<b>Zoning Article</b>	68
<b>Project Description</b>	Replace the existing exterior stair system and construct a new roof deck atop the main roof of the existing structure. The new roof deck will be accessed via a spiral staircase and will include guardrails in accordance with applicable building codes. No expansion of the building footprint or enclosed habitable space is proposed.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance, Conditional Use
<b>Violations</b>	Roof Structure Restrictions Side Yard Insufficient Rear Yard Insufficient

**Planning Context:**

This case was originally scheduled for the August 12, 2025 ZBA hearing and was deferred; the Planning Department’s recommendation remains unchanged.

The subject property is located in the South Boston Neighborhood District, within a multifamily residential (MFR) context characterized by medium-density residential uses, including triple-deckers and rowhouses. The surrounding neighborhood exhibits a range of rooftop improvements, including multiple examples of roof decks accessed via spiral staircases. These precedents indicate a pattern of evolving rooftop usage that is consistent with the proposal, which seeks to provide functional outdoor space without altering the overall building envelope. The proposed deck is in keeping with other approved structures in the area and does not introduce new massing inconsistent with the neighborhood character.

**Zoning Analysis:**

The proposed replacement of existing exterior stairs and construction of a new roof deck requires zoning relief for the following reasons:



Article 68, Section 29, Roof Structure Restrictions: Access to the roof deck is proposed via a spiral stair and platform assembly, rather than a roof hatch. Under zoning, access to roof decks must be provided by a hatch or a bulkhead no more than 30 inches tall. The proposed stair configuration exceeds this allowance and introduces new vertical structures on the roof, necessitating conditional use relief.

Article 68, Section 8, Side Yard Insufficient: The MFR subdistrict requires a minimum side yard setback of 3 feet. According to the site plan, the proposed metal stair and platform will be constructed within the footprint of the existing house and do not project further into the side yard than the current structure. The northern side yard measures only 2.7 feet at its narrowest point, resulting in a deficiency. This shortfall is due to the lot's existing constrained width rather than any new encroachment. Therefore, dimensional relief is required for insufficient side yard on the southern lot line.

Article 68, Section 8, Rear Yard Insufficient: The required rear yard setback is 20 feet. Based on the site plan, the proposed spiral staircase is located approximately 4 feet from the rear property line, resulting in a 16-foot shortfall and a violation of the rear yard dimensional standard. The new spiral staircase will replace an existing deck and stairs; while it maintains a similar location, it will extend approximately 10 inches further into the rear yard than the current condition.

The plans, entitled 62 L Street – Roof Deck Renovation Project and prepared by Tucker Architecture on November 12, 2022, propose the construction of a new roof deck with access via a spiral stair and exterior platform, replacing an existing stair and deck system. Given the scope of the project and its alignment with other roof deck approvals in the neighborhood, this project presents a reasonable case for zoning relief. It also illustrates the need for dimensional standards that better reflect the built conditions and lifestyle expectations in South Boston's dense multifamily districts.

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1575425, The Planning Department recommends APPROVAL.



Planning Department

**CITY of BOSTON**

Reviewed,

*Kathleen Onuf*

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1811706
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2026-01-13
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-16
<b>Address</b>	360 Princeton ST East Boston 02128
<b>Parcel ID</b>	0100269000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	East Boston Neighborhood EBR-3
<b>Zoning Article</b>	53
<b>Project Description</b>	Build three (3) roof decks for each floor of the building.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance
<b>Violations</b>	Rear Yard Insufficient

**Planning Context:**

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

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

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

The refusal letter states one (1) violation of the Zoning Code of The proposed project triggered Article 53, Table F of the Code, which requires the minimum rear yard to be 1/3 lot depth. In the case of 360 Princeton Street the minimum rear yard would need to be 18 ft, with the building currently sitting at 20 ft. However, the proposed project violates this requirement with the addition of the rear decks as the rear yard would become approximately 8 ft. While the creation of the rear deck violates the minimum rear yard requirement, the deck does create private, usable open space for all units of the building and accounts for the construction of stairs to the



rear of the building. Due to this violation, the Planning Department recommends the plans undergo Design Review, with a specific focus on shrinking the depth of the rear decks.

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

**Recommendation:**

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

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning



<b>Case</b>	BOA1482368
<b>ZBA Submitted Date</b>	2023-06-06
<b>ZBA Hearing Date</b>	2026-06-16
<b>Address</b>	87 Morris ST East Boston 02128
<b>Parcel ID</b>	0106841000
<b>Zoning District &amp; Subdistrict</b>	East Boston Neighborhood 3F-2000
<b>Zoning Article</b>	53
<b>Project Description</b>	Change of use from a 2-family to a 3-family by remodeling the basement into a new unit.
<b>Relief Type</b>	Variance, Conditional Use
<b>Violations</b>	FAR Excessive Usable Open Space Insufficient Parking or Loading Insufficient GCOD Applicability IPOD 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 4/28/26, 1/27/26, 4/23/25, 6/24/25, 7/30/25, 9/25/25, and again on 11/25/25 . No new project plans have been submitted. The contents of this recommendation remain the same.

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

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



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

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

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

### **Zoning Analysis:**

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



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

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

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

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

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

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



Planning Department

**CITY of BOSTON**

**Recommendation:**

In reference to BOA1482368, The Planning Department recommends DENIAL.

Reviewed,

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

Deputy Director of Zoning