



Town of Brookline

Massachusetts

10/25/19

PLANNING BOARD

Town Hall, 3rd Floor
333 Washington Street
Brookline, MA 02445-6899
(617) 730-2130 Fax (617) 730-2442

Steve Heikin, Chair
Robert Cook, Clerk
James Carr
Linda K. Hamlin
Blair Hines
Mathew Oudens
Mark J. Zarrillo

To: Zoning Board of Appeals
From: Planning Board
Date: October 24, 2019
Subject: Construct additions and a new garage for a single family home
Location: 60 Cramond Road

Atlas Sheet:	128	Case #:	2019-0062
Block:	439	Zoning:	S-40
Lot:	01-02	Lot Area:	87,286 SF

Board of Appeals Hearing: November 7, 2019 at 7:00 pm or later

PRESERVATION AND BACKGROUND

The applicant applied for partial demolition in March 2019. Despite having a classical architectural style, the house was built in 1992. Preservation Staff determined that the house is not significant and so approved the application for partial demolition.

SITE AND NEIGHBORHOOD

The property is located in a neighborhood south of Route 9 near Pine Manor College and the Country Club. The neighborhood consists predominantly of large single-family dwellings on large lots. The neighborhood features a variety of architectural styles.

APPLICANT'S PROPOSAL

The owner, Ken Frieze, is proposing to construct 3,548 SF of additions to an existing single-family house. These additions are primarily at the rear of the existing structure or inside the existing footprint. In the lower level the proposal includes a new media room and a new 2-car garage (in addition to the existing 3-car garage on the first floor). On the first floor they are modifying the front entryway and adding a double-height "great room" at the rear of the house. They are also slightly expanding the livable space in the attic.

In addition to changes to the main structure, the proposal includes a new 12.5' curb cut and driveway to provide access to the second, lower-level garage. The proposal also includes a pool/spa area, more terrace space, and a shed for pool equipment.

FINDINGS

ZONING: S-40	Required/ Allowed	Existing	Proposed	Relief
Use		Single family	Single family	None
Lot Size	40,000sf	87,286sf	87,286sf	None
Floor Area Ratio	0.15 / 100% 13,093sf	0.16 / 106% 13,889sf	0.19 / 127% 16,614sf	Special Permit¹, §8.02²
Lot Width	150'	206'	206'	None
Height	35'	34'	34'	None
Setbacks: F/S/R	30/20/50	33.8 39.9 unknown	33.8 38.8 125.7	None
Parking Spaces	Min. 2 Max. 4	3	5	Special Permit, §4.07, Use 55³

¹ **M.G.L. c.40A, §6 finding (aka Deadrick)** - Because the building is nonconforming, any alteration or substantial reconstruction that increases the nonconforming nature of the structure can only be approved provided that the Zoning Board of Appeals make a finding that the altered structure is not substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood than the existing structure.

² **Section 8.02: Alteration or Extension** - A Special Permit is required to alter and/or extend this non-conforming structure.

³ **Section 4.07: Table of Use Requirements** - Use 55 requires a special permit in order to provide more parking spaces than allowed under Use 54 which allows for no more than four spaces for a single-family dwelling on a 10,000 SF lot or larger. The proposal is for five spaces, and thus requires a Special Permit.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

The Planning Department is generally supportive of this proposal and views it as a reasonable request. While Staff would prefer to not see applicants requesting zoning relief to provide more parking spaces than the By-law allows because it encourages dependence on cars, the request is reasonable and allowed by zoning. The lot is situated in an area that does not encourage alternative modes of transportation, and preventing the one extra requested parking space from being built will not change that fact. The second curb cut could likely be removed to prevent the project from further discouraging walking in the neighborhood, but it would have a very minor impact, if any. Additionally, in the five letters of support we've received (including from two direct abutters) none have expressed any concerns about the project.

Overall, the proposal is large but is not expected to have any significant impact on abutters. The only major change clearly visible from the street is the addition of a 12.5' curb cut, as everything else is either at the rear of the existing house, shielded by landscaping, or a fairly minor addition. Therefore, Staff believes that this project is not substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood and satisfies the criteria laid out in §9.05.

PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Board found that the submitted plans were not as detailed as they would have liked and therefore expressed skepticism about the existing FAR calculations. They also questioned the need for a second driveway, but ultimately that Planning Board was supportive of the proposal. They did believe that that existing FAR calculations should be provided in more detail by the applicant and confirmed by the Building Department to ensure that the property is truly a pre-existing nonconforming property as it relates to FAR.

The Planning Board recommends approval of the site plan by Hancock Associates, dated May 16, 2019 and architectural plans by Mark P. Finlay Architects, dated March 22, 2019, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to the Public Hearing with the Zoning Board of Appeals, the applicant shall submit detailed and dimensioned floor plans showing what space is or is not contributing to the calculation of existing Floor Area. The applicant shall also submit to an inspection by the Building Inspector or his/her designee.**
- 2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall electronically submit final floor plans and elevations, stamped and signed by a registered architect or engineer and a final site plan, stamped and signed by a registered engineer or land surveyor, to the Assistant Director of Regulatory Planning for review and approval.**
- 3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall 1) electronically submit the site plan, floor plans, and elevations displaying the approval stamp of the Assistant Director of Regulatory Planning; and 2) evidence that the Board of Appeals decision has been obtained from the Town Clerk's office by the applicant or their representative and recorded at the Registry of Deeds.**

