



Minutes for Meeting

Zoning Board of Appeals, via Zoom

April 4, 2022 at 7:00 PM

Members present: Alan D. Rose, Jr., Stephen J. Larocque, Sujit Sitole

97 Pigeon Hill Road: a hearing request by Megan and Dominic Jones, requesting a special permit for a shed and porch and a variance for a swim-spa.

The following members were present:

- Alan D. Rose, Jr., Acting Chair and Acting Secretary
- Stephen J. Larocque
- Sujit Sitole

Documents in the record include:

- Isometric Drawings, Floor Plans, RGFA comparison, and photographs submitted with hearing application
- Administrative Approval from the Conservation Commission, 97 Pigeon Hill Road, dated 10/22/21
- Framing Plans, 97 Pigeon Hill Road, Screened Porch, prepared by Testa Engineering Associates, S0, dated 6/28/21
- Framing Plans, 97 Pigeon Hill Road, Screened Porch, prepared by Testa Engineering Associates, S1, dated 6/28/21
- Plot Plan, 97 Pigeon Hill Road, prepared by The Jillson Company, Inc., dated 1/18/22
- Stormwater Management Permit, 97 Pigeon Hill Road, dated 10/20/21
- Letter of support from T. Eastman dated 3/12/22
- Letter of support from A. Thomsen dated 12/21/21

- ZBA decision dated 7/29/94

The subject site, 97 Pigeon Hill Road, (the “Premises”) is located in Single Family Residence District A, where 60,000 ft² of area is required. This lot is undersized at 45,828 ft². In addition, the existing home is located 54 feet from Pigeon Hill Road, in a district that requires a 60-foot minimum setback. The lot and home are pre-existing non-conforming.

Appearing before the Board was Megan and Dominic Jones (the “Petitioner”). The Petitioner explained to the Board that they have worked on their property to reduce the amount of lawn and have planted many trees since owning the property. The Petitioner explained that they would like to build three things on the property: a shed, a screened-in porch, and a swim/spa.

They are proposing a 10 foot x 14 foot shed that conforms with the setbacks, at a site that used to be a dog kennel. The proposed screened-in porch would be located in the rear of their home, and also conforms with the setbacks.

The proposed swim/spa would be located partially in the setback, 42.8 feet from the rear lot line, in a district that requires 45 feet. The Petitioners stated that they chose this area because there are no trees there, and that only a small corner of the swim/spa encroaches into the setbacks. They also stated that their lot has a hill in the back of their home that constrains the location of the swim/spa, and a low retaining wall carving out a small backyard area. The Petitioner explained to the Board that moving the swim/spa closer to the home would not be feasible as there would not be enough room to pass between the home and the swim/spa.

Ann Thomsen, 103 Conant Road, the abutter most affected by the potential encroachment, appeared before the Board to support the proposed project, and stated there is a lot of dense vegetation between their properties and that she supports the proposal.

Terry Eastman, 59 Conant Road (aka 50 Pigeon Hill Road), appeared before the Board to give her strong support for the proposal.

Following due and open deliberations, the Board, by unanimous decision, voted to grant a special permit to allow the Petitioner to build a the proposed shed and screened-in porch as shown in the hearing application submittal. In granting the special permit, the Board found that the shed and screened-in porch would not be substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood than the existing conditions.

In addition, following due and open deliberations, the Board, by unanimous decision, voted to grant a variance for the proposed swim/spa as shown on the drawings and documents provided

with the hearing application. The Board determined that the Petitioner is constrained by the topography and narrow shape of the lot, with limited space behind the home and a hill and retaining wall preventing any other reasonable location for the swim/spa. The Board also noted that the encroachment into the setback was minimal at 2.2 feet, and not visible from the street or any neighboring properties.

279 Meadowbrook Road: a hearing on a request by John and Kelly O'Rourke requesting a special permit for an addition.

The following members were present:

- Alan D. Rose, Jr., Acting Chair
- Stephen J. Larocque
- Sujit Sitole, Acting Secretary

Documents in the record include:

- 279 Meadowbrook Road, Basement Floor Plan, A1, prepared by Lincoln Architects LLC, dated 1/28/22
- 279 Meadowbrook Road, First Floor Plan, A2, prepared by Lincoln Architects LLC, dated 1/28/22
- 279 Meadowbrook Road, Second Floor Plan, A3, prepared by Lincoln Architects LLC, dated 1/28/22
- 279 Meadowbrook Road, Exterior Elevations, A5, prepared by Lincoln Architects LLC, dated 1/28/22
- 279 Meadowbrook Road, Exterior Elevations, A6, prepared by Lincoln Architects LLC, dated 1/28/22
- 279 Meadowbrook Road, Exterior Perspective Views, A7, prepared by Lincoln Architects LLC, dated 1/28/22
- 279 Meadowbrook Road, Wall/Roof Demo Calculation – 1st Floor, D1, prepared by Lincoln Architects LLC, dated 1/28/22
- 279 Meadowbrook Road, Wall/Roof Demo Calculation – 2nd Floor, D2, prepared by Lincoln Architects LLC, dated 1/28/22
- 279 Meadowbrook Road, Wall/Roof Demo Calculation – Roof, D3, prepared by Lincoln Architects LLC, dated 1/28/22
- 279 Meadowbrook Road, RGFA Calculations – 1st Floor, RGFA-1, prepared by Lincoln Architects LLC, dated 1/28/22

- 279 Meadowbrook Road, RGFA Calculations – 1st Floor, RGFA-2, prepared by Lincoln Architects LLC, dated 1/28/22
- 279 Meadowbrook Road, RGFA Calculations – 2nd Floor, RGFA-3, prepared by Lincoln Architects LLC, dated 1/28/22
- 279 Meadowbrook Road, Existing Site and Context Photos, L1, prepared by Lincoln Architects LLC, dated 1/28/22
- 279 Meadowbrook Road, Existing Site Photos, L2, prepared by Lincoln Architects LLC, dated 1/28/22
- Existing Conditions Plan of Land, 279 Meadowbrook Road, prepared by DGT Associates Surveying & Engineering, dated 1/19/22
- Certified Plot Plan, 279 Meadowbrook Road, prepared by DGT Associates Surveying & Engineering, dated 1/21/22
- Letter from the Historical Commission approving proposed addition, dated 12/20/21
- Letter of support from J. Bradner dated 1/27/22
- Letter of support from The Weston Golf Club dated 11/11/21

The subject site, 279 Meadowbrook Road, (the “Premises”) is located in Single Family Residence District B, where 40,000 ft² of area is required. This lot has 49,869 ft². District B requires 150 ft of street frontage for a lot created before 1997, and this lot has no street frontage. It accesses Meadowbrook Road by a right of way. The lot is pre-existing non-conforming.

Appearing before the Board were Kelly and John O’Rourke (the “Petitioners”). Alan Rose, Board Member, disclosed that he is a member of The Weston Golf Club, which abuts this property, but that this would not affect his impartiality in this case. The Petitioners agreed to allow Alan to continue to hear the case. The Petitioner explained to the Board that this is a historic home, built in 1847, and they would like to build an addition in the back of the house. The Historical Commission approved the proposed changes.

The Petitioners are making changes to the rear of the of the home only. They are proposing to change the roof in the rear of the house, and add 1,575 ft² of living area. Currently, the RGFA/lot area ratio is about 10.3%. With the proposed addition, the RGFA/lot area ratio would be 13.5%.

Michele Ryan, 4 Hidden Road, appeared before the Board, to ask if any changes are being done to the roof line towards Hidden Road and if any trees would be cut down. The Petitioners stated that there is only one tree on the west side of the property, towards Bryden Road that needs to be taken down.

Sujit Sitole, Board Member inquired whether the drawings submitted were consistent with the Revised North Elevation as indicated in the December 20, 2021 Historical Commission letter, and the Applicant confirmed they were.

Following due and open deliberations, the Board, by unanimous decision, voted to grant a special permit to allow the Petitioners to build the addition, as shown in the drawings submitted for this hearing. In granting the special permit, the Board found that the proposed addition would not be substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood than the existing conditions.