



TOWN OF WINTHROP BOARD OF APPEALS
1 Metcalf Square, Winthrop, MA 02152
[o] (617) 846-1852 x 1013

MEETING MINUTES: 6/26/25

PROPERTIES DISCUSSED:

- **115 Read Street:**

Attorney David Stasio from JMG Realty LLC presented a plot plan showing a discrepancy of 1,500 square feet, potentially affecting the variance application. The Board suggested updating the Building Department Denial Letter and amending the application. It was also discussed that a title search is needed to find the property boundaries. A motion was made and seconded to continue the project to August 21, 2025. All voted in favor.

- **67 Woodside Avenue:**

Attorney Delehanty presented updated plans for this property.

The zoning requirements and proposed heightened stories of the building were discussed at the last meeting, along with trash placement, feasibility parking and the suggestion of restricting parking stickers for residents of the new development. This property abuts a two-family house to the left of it and there is an existing driveway. This is not a shared driveway. So, there's little property that is on that side.

The front and side alleyway creates an awkward shape that stretches all the way to the back. The area in the back was certainly an area of contention regarding the easement. The project is going to be the exact footprint of the building now. So, there are no pilings that are intruding out into the back that would obstruct any easement rights.

As for the heating and cooling units, the preferred place is to put them on the roof. The controlled construction will help with rodent control Rodent plan during construction, trash removal and screening of all bins.

The dimensional regulations are as follows: five thousand square feet are allowed, and this project is approximately four thousand three hundred and seventy-one square feet. The minimum frontage is thirty feet, and this project is at sixty-two and a half, for the front setback. The project proposes zero on the side setbacks, with ten feet on one side, zero on the other. Because it is located a CBD, it is allowed to have zero. There are two feet seven, two inches, existing on the right side and on the left side it is much wider because of the driveway. The rear setback is allowed to be fifteen feet, but the project proposes ten (this is subject to Site Plan Review). The rear set back can be reduced to ten feet if it is not abutting a residential A. The rear does not. This variance will be requested.

The height is thirty-five feet, two and a half stories, abutting residential A or forty-eight which is within compliance with the height restriction. The parking requirement is almost four (3.8) spaces, and the project proposes three. The shared parking ordinance brings this down to 3.8 with the exemption allows us to count on street municipal lot space within one thousand feet for any commercial space under three

thousand feet. This commercial space is under three thousand feet. By applying that exemption all the parking is on the premises. That exemption would be requested.

This is a preexisting, non-conforming lot with an irregular shape. The irregular shape creates a challenge in meeting the standard zoning requirements, which necessitate variance. Denying the requested relief would result in this mixed-use property remaining underutilized or potentially underdeveloped. The proposed construction aligns with the goals of the Center Business District zoning, which was adopted by the town, allowing mixed use development such as this project. The granting of the variance aligns with the intent of the zoning ordinance. The request of relief utilizes the building footprint to create transient, oriented housing, and office space.

Public Comment:

- An abutter (Paul Cevizzi) expressed concerns about parking and obstruction and infringement of the easement that is shared between his property and the property at hand. He also expressed concerns about drainage and a large shadow that will be cast on the area.
- A second abutter (Dr. Brooks) expressed concerns about the disruption to businesses in the area during construction, the overall parking in that area, the limited access to Winthrop Center, and making it difficult for senior patients to get to his office.
- A third abutter (Suzanne Swope) expressed concerns about parking, congestion in the area, and the lack of trees.
- A fourth abutter (Anna Baker) expressed concerns about parking and oversaturation in the area, and that this project may set a precedent that goes against the rules and ordinances to limit building in the area.

Attorney Delehanty explained that the easement will be available by foot or by vehicle. There are cars parked on the property that belongs to other properties. The traffic problem is an ongoing issue, and an additional three cars on that street are not going to make a lot of difference. It was raised that one of the abutter's business stalls traffic daily. The controlled construction plan will be overseen by an architect or an engineer.

The Board asked if the easement is on the updated plans. Attorney Delehanty explained that because the easement is not clearly defined on the plans because the deeds of the properties involved were subdivided. The Board discussed that if there are cars parked on Woodside Avenue to the left of the driveway, it will be difficult to turn left out of the driveway. Discussion also raised concerns about emergency vehicles being able to access the neighboring properties and the property at hand. Attorney Delehanty agreed to get confirmation from the Fire Chief.

The Board discussed that the Center Business District has been rezoned and as such, this project is allowable and that parking is not requested because the project meets the requirements.

The Board requested the updated plans that were discussed at the meeting and/ or perhaps another set of new plans to include the easement measurements, a rendering of what the back side of the building will look like with the parking and trash, the height and overhang, and the Site Plan Review with the Fire Chief. There needs to be clarification about whether when there are three cars parked, does it impede easement access. Once the plans are resubmitted, the Board will ask the Town's Counsel to review them to ensure that the easement is not being impeded.

A motion was made and seconded to continue this project to the July 17, 2025, meeting. All voted in favor.

MEETING MINUTES REVIEWED:

Meeting Minutes from May 15th and May 29th, 2025, were not reviewed and will be continued to July.