

BZA Number: 211208

# CITY OF CAMBRIDGE 

BOARD OF ZONING APPEAL 831 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge MA 02139

617-349-6100
BZA Application Form

## General Information

The undersigned hereby petitions the Board of Zoning Appeal for the following:
Special Permit: $\qquad$ X _

Variance: $\qquad$ Appeal: $\qquad$

PETITIONER: 18-20 Fairmont LLC C/O Adam Glassman / GCD Architects
PETITIONER'S ADDRESS: 2 Worthington Street, Cambridge, MA 02138

## LOCATION OF PROPERTY: 18 Fairmont St, Cambridge, MA

TYPE OF OCCUPANCY: 2 -Fam Residential
ZONING DISTRICT: Residence C Zone
REASON FOR PETITION:
/Additions/ /New Window and Door Openings /
DESCRIPTION OF PETITIONER'S PROPOSAL:
Enlarge Existing Structure in Rear
New Mansard Roof Addition
New Window and Door Openings
Increase FAR

## SECTIONS OF ZONING ORDINANCE CITED:

Article: 5.000 Section: 5.31 (Table Dimensional Requirements).
Article: 8.000 Section: 8.22.2.c \& 8.22.2.d (Non-Conforming Structure).
Article: 10.000
Section: 10.40 (Special Permit).

Original Signature(s):

Adam Glassman
(Petitioner (s) / Owner)
Adam J. Glassman R.A. I GCD ARCHITECTS
(Print Name)
2 Worthington St Cambridge MA 02138
Address:
Tel. No.
617-412-8450
E-Mail Address: ajglassman.ra@gmail.com

## BZA APPLICATION FORM - OWNERSHIP INFORMATION

To be completed by OWNER, signed before a notary and returned to The Secretary of the Board of Zoning Appeals.

I/We $\qquad$ Fraser Allan (18-20 Fairmont St LLC)
(OWNER)
Address: 200 Falcon St East Boston 02128
State that I/We own the property located at $18-20$ Fairmont St Cambridge MA which is the subject of this zoning application.

The record title of this property is in the name of $\qquad$
18-20 Fairmont St LLC
*Pursuant to a deed of duly recorded in the date 2/01/2023, Middlesex South County Registry of Deeds at Book 01598 , Page 195 ; or Middlesex Registry District of Land Court, Certificate No. Book $\qquad$ Page $\qquad$ .

*Written evidence of Agent's standing to represent petitioner may be requested.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts, County of $\qquad$
Middlesex

The above-name Fraser Allan $\qquad$ personally appeared before me, this 8 of $\mathbb{Z}$, 2023 , and made oath that the above statement is true.


My commission expires $\qquad$ (Notary Seal)

- If ownership is not shown in recorded deed, e.g. if by
 deed, or inheritance, please include documentation.
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## BZAApplication Form

## SUPPORTING STATEMENT FOR A SPECIAL PERMIT

Please describe in complete detail how you meet each of the following criteria referring to the property and proposed changes or uses which are requested in your application. Attach sheets with additional information for special permits which have addifional criteria, e.g.; fast food permits, comprehensive permits, etc., which must be met.

Granting the Special Permit requested for 18 Fairmont St, Cambridge, MA (location) would not be a detriment to the public interest because:
A) Requirements of the Ordinance can or will be met for the following reasons:

The proposed work will cause no detriment to the direct abutters or to the neighborhood in general. There will be no loss of privacy, no creation of any substantial shadows on the abutting lots. The scale and character of the house and neighborhood will remain unchanged. There will be no additional dwelling units and no new non-conforming lot conditions. The existing non-conforming lot conditions will not be increased.
B) Traffic generated or patterns of access or egress would not cause congestion hazard, or substantial change in established neighborhood character for the following reasons:

The existing 2 family house will remain a 2 family house. The (2) existing parking spaces will remain. The scale and character of the house will remain mostly unchanged. The new mansard roof and rear addition are consistent with other similar houses on the street. The existing exterior of the house is in bad shape and an eyesore which will be tastefully renovated to be consistent with the original design of the house and the traditional character of the neighborhood. The existing driveways, walkway and yard spaces will receive the cosmetic upgrades they badly need with new pervious pavers and landscaping. In sum, there will be no change to existing traffic patterns, no increase in congestion, no loss of off street parking, no added density, and no change to the established character of the neighborhood.

The continued operation of or the development of adjacent uses as permitted in the Zoning
C) Ordinance would not be adversely affected by the nature of the proposed use for the following reasons:

The proposed renovations and additions will have no impact on the adjacent property uses and are consistent with the current 2-family residential use of the property.
D) Nuisance or hazard would not be created to the detriment of the health, safety, and/or welfare of the occupant of the proposed use or the citizens of the City for the following reasons:

The proposed renovations and additions will create no new air or light pollution, the existing 2family residential use will remain. There will be no loss of privacy.
E) For other reasons, the proposed use would not impair the integrity of the district or adjoining district or otherwise derogate from the intent or purpose of this ordinance for the following reasons:

The proposed project is consistent and in harmony with the uses and character of the neighborhood, and upholds the intents of the zoning ordinance as there will be no creation of any detriment whatsoever.

Date: $\qquad$

## BZA Application Form

## DIMENSIONAL INFORMATION

| Applicant: | 18-20 Fairmont LLC |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | 18 Fairmont St, Cambridge, MA |
| Phone: | $617-412-8450$ |

Present Use/Occupancy: 2-Fam Residential
Zone: Residence C Zone
Requested Use/Occupancy: 2 Family Residential

|  |  | ExistingConditions | Requested Conditions | Ordinance <br> Requirements |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL GROSS FLOOR } \\ & \text { AREA: } \end{aligned}$ |  | 3,706.00 | 4,600.00 | 3,000.00 | (max.) |
| LOTAREA; |  | 5,000 | No Change | 5,000.0 | (min.) |
| RATIO OF GROSS FLOOR AREA TO LOT AREA: ${ }^{2}$ |  | . 74 | . 92 | . 60 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { LOT AREA OF EACH } \\ & \text { DWELLING UNIT } \end{aligned}$ |  | 2,500.00 | NO CHANGE | 1,800.00 |  |
| SIZE OF LOT: | WIDTH | 50 | No Change | 50 |  |
|  | DEPTH | 100 | No Change | NA |  |
| SETBACKS IN FEET; | FRONT | 15 | 15 | 10 |  |
|  | REAR | 26.8 | 26.8 | 20.0 |  |
|  | LEFT SIDE | 10.4 | 10.4 | 17.5 |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RIGHT } \\ & \text { SIDE } \end{aligned}$ | 9.9 | 9.9 | 17.5 |  |
| SIZE OF BUIIDING; | HEIGHT | $32.4{ }^{\prime}$ | No Change | $35.0^{\prime}$ |  |
|  | WIDTH | 57' +/- | No Change | NA |  |
|  | LENGTH | 30 | No Change | NA |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { RATIO OF USABLE } \\ & \text { OPEN SPACE TOLOT } \\ & \hline \text { AREA: } \end{aligned}$ |  | 34\% | 40\% | 36\% |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { NO. OF DWELLING } \\ & \text { UNITS: } \end{aligned}$ |  | 2 | No Change | 2 allowable |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { NO. OF PARKING } \\ & \text { SPACES: } \end{aligned}$ |  | 2 | No Change | 0 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { NO. OF LOADING } \\ & \text { AREAS: } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | 0 | 0 | N/A |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { DISTANCE TO NEAREST } \\ & \text { BLDG. ON SAMELOT } \end{aligned}$ |  | 13 | 0 per covered patio removal | 10 |  |

Describe where applicable, other occupancies on the same lot, the size of adjacent buildings on same lot, and type of construction proposed, e.g; wood frame, concrefe, brick, steel, efc.:

Existing wood frame patio roof to be removed.
Existing house and new additions to be wood frame.

1. SEE CAMBRIDGE ZONING ORDINANCE ARTICLE 5.000, SECTION 5.30 (DISTRICT OF DIMENSIONAL REGULATIONS).
2. TOTAL GROSS FLOOR AREA (INCLUDING BASEMENT $77^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ IN HEIGHT AND ATTIC AREAS GREATER THAN 5') DIVIDED BY LOTAREA.
3. OPEN SPACE SHALL NOT INCLUDE PARKING AREAS, WALKWAYS OR DRIVEWAYS AND SHALL HAVE A MINIMMM DIMENSION OF 15 .

## Pacheco, Maria

| From: | Emily Holman [emily.holman@gmail.com](mailto:emily.holman@gmail.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Monday, March 20, 2023 4:41 PM |
| To: | Pacheco, Maria |
| Subject: | Letter regarding 18-20 Fairmont Street LLC |
| Attachments: | Letter_18-20 Fairmont Street.pdf |

## Hi Maria,

I am electronically conveying the attached letter on behalf of our neighbor John Summers at 25 Fairmont Street, who joins us in expressing concern regarding the special permit application for 18-20 Fairmont Street.

Thank you for your assistance.

Best,
Emily Holman
24 Fairmont Street

March 13, 2023
Dear Members of the Board of Zoning Appeals:
We are the neighbors directly abutting or living near the property at 18-20 Fairmont Street. We would like to express our strong objection to the proposed special permit allowing for an increase in height, volume, and building area and for new windows in the setback. The proposed increase in the size of an already large building will have negative impacts on the abutters and set a terrible precedent for the neighborhood.

The special permit application states that:
A) Requirements of the Ordinance can or will be met for the following reasons:

The proposed work will cause no detriment to the direct abutters or to the neighborhood in general. There will be no loss of privack no creation of anv substantial shadows on the abutting lots. The scale and character of the house and neighborhood will remain unchanged. There will be no additional dwelling units and no new non-conforming lot conditions. The existing non-conforming lot conditions will not be increased.

The statements in bold are patently false.

1. No Shadows and no Loss of Privacy. By increasing the volume by over $20 \%$ and by increasing the massing of the third floor and the height of much of the building, the applicant will definitely cast broader shadows on the abutting lots and reduce privacy on an already tight intersection of homes. The applicant has not shown any data on how his property relates to the adjacent properties. The notion that the $32^{\prime} \times 60^{\prime}+$ wall-like block the applicant proposes to build inside the setback will not cast shadows defies belief. The attached pictures from the neighboring buildings are indicative of actual conditions, indicating the extent to which the increase in height inside the setback and the new windows in the rear of the building within that setback will create privacy issues.
2. Scale and Character of the House and Neighborhood Will Remain Unchanged. The applicant proposes to build a $32^{\prime}$ tall wall within the setback that extends $60^{\prime}+$ feet. He also proposes a .92 FAR excluding the basement, while his neighbors to the west at 22-24 Fairmont Street have a . 6 FAR and his neighbors to the east at 16 Fairmont have a . 64 FAR, according to the Cambridge property database. How then is his proposal in keeping with the "scale and character of the neighborhood"? The proposed density of $18-20$ Fairmont Street is currently at . 72 FAR. The developer already has the ability to add FAR by finishing the basement. His house is already larger than the FAR of the abutting properties and exceeds the FAR of .6 allowed in the district. The developer is not considering the neighborhood at all, as indicated by the fact that he has made no attempt to discuss his plans with any of us.
3. Failure to Meet Letter and Spirit of Article 8. First, the purpose of article 8 is to allow for otherwise non-conforming but smaller structures to modernize (add a bathroom, make use of an attic), not redesign the neighborhood with an FAR pushing
1.0 (again: 16 Fairmont has an effective FAR of .64 and the two condos at $22 / 24$ Fairmont have a combined FAR of .6 - and he wants a $.92!!!$ a $50 \%$ increase over his closest adjacent neighbors). Second, by increasing the volume and average height of the building, the applicant is effectively worsening the nonconformity of the setback by increasing the setback requirement, which is based on a formula based on height plus length. The purpose of that formula in our district is to ensure that setbacks relate to the mass of the vertical plane on that side yard: in other words, the conformity of the vertical plane of the building depends on its massing as a function of height plus length. The applicant is significantly increasing the side yard setback requirement, which clearly increases the nonconformity of the plane along that side yard.

D \& E) These sections of the application state essentially the same thing. All our above objections apply here. That he wants to increase a home already $10-25 \%$ larger than adjacent properties is not "consistent and in harmony" with the character of the neighborhood.

The section under which the applicant is seeking relief states: "In order to grant the special permit the Board of Zoning Appeal is required to find that the alteration or enlargement shall not be substantially more detrimental than the existing nonconforming structure to the neighborhood, and that the alteration or enlargement satisfies the criteria in Section 10.43." The neighbors at 16 and 22-24 Fairmont Street are the most impacted in "the neighborhood." At a minimum, we would argue that the increased volume and height of the proposed building will be detrimental because 1) it will create more shadows; 2) new windows on a plane in a nonconforming setback will impinge on privacy; 3 ) the home is already larger than either abutters and there is no public good in granting relief to profiteers; 4) the massive proposed wall-like structure inside the setbacks will cause an uncharacteristic and, to us, aesthetically objectionable "block-like" building that will be an eyesore for immediate abutters and passersby.

The proposed increase in volume, area, and height, making the building nearly 1.0 FAR and close to 1.2 with the finished basement is not in keeping with the neighborhood and sets a negative prooodont for the neighborhood. Allowing for significant increases in the massing of already nonconforming planes inside setbacks - and then adding windows there - also sets a negative precedent for the neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration.

Signed,


Dear Members of the Board of Zoning Appeals:
We are the neighbors at 24 Fairmont Street directly abutting the property at 18-20 Fairmont Street. We would like to express our strong objection to the proposed special permit allowing for an increase in the height, volume, and area of an already nonconforming building and for new windows on a new plane being built in a nonconforming setback. The proposed increase in the size of an already large building will have a detrimental impact on us as abutters and is not in harmony with the FAR norms of the neighborhood.

The developer's special permit application states that:

## "A) Requirements of the Ordinance can or will be met for the following reasons:

The proposed work will cause no detriment to the direct abutters or to the neighborhood in general. There will be no loss of privacy, no creation of anv substantial shadows on the abutting lots. The scale and character of the house and neighborhood will remain unchanged. There will be no additional dwelling units and no new non-conforming lot conditions. The existing non-conforming lot conditions will not be increased."

The statements in bold are patently false.

1. No Shadows and no Loss of Privacy. By increasing the height of much of the building, including replacing a 35 degree pitched roof in the front part of the building with a full one story addition, and replacing a 30 degree pitched roof in the rear with a full two story addition, and then moving the rear of the building nearly 3 ' closer into the setback, the applicant will definitely cast broader shadows on the abutting lots and windows and reduce privacy on an already tight intersection of homes. The developor has not shown any data on how his property relates to the adjacent properties.

This is not a small addition, but a significant increase in volume and massing (see Exhibit A). The notion that the $32.4^{\prime} \times 55.4^{\prime}+$ wall-like block that the applicant proposes to build along the side yards will create "no" "substantial shadows" is hard to believe. The attached pictures (see Exhibit B) from our first and second floors, showing light at different times of day, point to actual conditions, indicating the extent to which the increase in height and the new windows in the rear of the building will block sunshine and create privacy issues in our kitchen, dining room, and in our two children's bedrooms.
2. Scale and Character of the House and Neighborhood Will Remain Unchanged. The applicant proposes to build a 32.4 ' tall vertical structure within the setback that extends $55.4^{\prime}+$ feet. He also proposes a .92 FAR excluding the basement, while the immediate neighbors around him have the following FARs: the neighbors to the west at 22-24 Fairmont Street have a . 6 FAR, the neighbor at 26-28 Fairmont Street has a .54 FAR, his neighbors to the east at 16 Fairmont have a 64 FAR, and the neighbor at 15 Fairmont has a .67 FAR , according to the Cambridge property database. How then is his proposal in keeping with the "scale and character of the neighborhood"?

The proposed density of $18-20$ Fairmont Street is currently at . 74 FAR. The developer is already availing himself of his ability to add 1440sf of floor area (on top of the .74 FAR) by finishing the basement. His house is already $20 \%$ larger than the FAR of the abutting properties and exceeds the FAR of .6 allowed in the district. The developer has not considered the neighbors or neighborhood in these designs, further indicated by his choosing not to consult with us as abutters before drawing up and submitting the plans.
$D \& E)$. These sections of the application state essentially the same thing. All our above objections apply here. The developer further states that his proposal will not "derogate from the intent or purpose of this ordinance for the following reasons: The proposed project is consistent and in harmony with the uses and character of the neighborhood, and upholds the intents of the zoning ordinance as there will be no creation of any detriment whatsoever."

We again disagree with the statement there will "no creation of any detriment whatsoever." Moreover, increasing a home already 20\% larger than adjacent properties is not "consistent and in harmony" with the character of the neighborhood. The proposal also fails to meet the letter and spirit of the zoning ordinance for four reasons:

First, the purpose of article 8 is to allow for otherwise non-conforming but smaller structures to modernize (add a bathroom, make use of an attic), not redesign the neighborhood with an FAR pushing 1.0 (again: 16 Fairmont has an effective FAR of .64 and the two condos at $22 / 24$ Fairmont have a combined FAR of .6 - and he wants a .92 FAR , a $50 \%$ increase over his closest adjacent neighbors).

Second, the applicant did not correctly calculate the existing versus required side yard setbacks. According to the logic and spirit of the code, he should use average height and the multi-plane formula under 5.24 , as well as the denominator of 7 , to calculate the existing and required setback to show that the existing setback does not conform. (Choosing not to use such elements to create - in order to then increase - a nonconformity is not in keeping with the spirit or intent of the code.) The error of choosing 5 instead of 7 for the denominator in the $\mathrm{H}+\mathrm{L}$ calculation vastly exaggerates the requirements to make the setbacks look nonconforming. These errors make it impossible to ascertain from the application whether the setbacks do or do not in fact conform.

Third, if the existing building is indeed nonconforming along the right side yard, it is patently clear that moving the rear $16^{\prime}$ of the building nearly $3^{\prime}$ further into the side yard and increasing its height from approximately $15^{\prime}$ to the edge of the 30 degree pitched roof to a 32.4 ' wall (including the mansard, which is essentially vertical) would block light, creating a significant detriment, and not be consistent with the intent of the code. The purpose of the $\mathrm{H}+\mathrm{L}$ formula in our district is to ensure that setbacks relate to the mass of the vertical plane on that side yard. In other words, the conformity of the vertical plane of the building depends on its massing as a function of height plus length. By increasing the height of the rear portion of the building, the applicant is significantly increasing the nonconformity of the side yard setback. For this reason, the project is not consistent with the intent of the code, which is to "to provide adequate light and air" (see the Preamble) - not to massively expand an already oversized existing two-family house into a 6100sf two-family house for the purpose of increasing a developer's profit margin.

Fourth - and most essentially - the section under which the applicant is seeking relief states: "In order to grant the special permit the Board of Zoning Appeal is required to find that the alteration or enlargement shall not be substantially more detrimental than the existing nonconforming structure to the neighborhood, and that the alteration or enlargement satisfies the criteria in Section 10.43." We abutters are the most impacted in "the neighborhood." The increased volume and height of the proposed building will be detrimental because 1) it will create more shadows; 2) new windows on a new plane in a nonconforming setback will impinge on privacy (the developer is not just rearranging existing windows, but adding windows on a new floor in a nonconforming setback that look directly into our children's bedrooms); 3) the home is already larger than either abutters and there is no public good in granting relief to profiteers; 4) the massive proposed wall-like structure inside the setbacks will cause an uncharacteristic and, to us, aesthetically objectionable 55 ' long "block-like" building that will be an eyesore for abutters; and 5) the building will violate 19.30 (to which article 10.43(f) requires adherence); we especially note 19.33 , which requires that building construction be "designed and sited to minimize shadow impacts on neighboring lots"; and that "Building scale and wall treatment, including the provision of windows" be "sensitive to existing residential uses on adjacent lots."

## Any one of these reasons is enough for the BZA to reject the petition now.

Finally, we note that the special permit application contains numerous errors. First, the survey indicates that the house faces south, but it in fact faces north. We wonder if this is the basis for the applicant's false claim respecting shadows. Second, the "Reason for Petition" and "Description of Petitioner's Proposal" do not actually say what relief is being requested; does the advertising language of the petition do so?

The proposed increase in volume, area, and height, making the building nearly 1.0 FAR and close to 1.2 with the finished basement, has a serious impact on our exposure to sun and privacy, is not in keeping with the neighborhood, and sets a negative precedent for the neighborhood and district. Allowing for significant increases in the massing of already nonconforming planes inside setbacks - and then adding windows there - also sets a negative precedent for the neighborhood.

We accordingly urge you to reject this special permit petition.


Emily Holman and Hassanaly Ladha 24 Fairmont Street

## Exhibit A <br> Volume Calculation and Detrimental Effect on Sunshine

We note that the developer has not provided a volume change calculation. Our best estimate from the applicant's petition is that that the proposed addition will increase the volume of an already oversized, nonconforming building by $\mathbf{4 4 \%} \%$. It is hard to believe that anything close to such a number will have no detrimental impact, including on light. We estimate a $44 \%$ increase over the existing volume above the basement as follows: we take the total existing volume of 43,496 cubic feet (see Z 10 of the application), subtracting the basement volume of 11,296 (7'10' height $x$ area of 1442 sf - see D2.1 and Z9) to get an existing volume of 32,300 cubic feet. The proposal will remove volume of 6,307 cubic feet (see Z 10 ) and add 9.97' height x 1357 sf area on the new third floor, or 13,529 cubic feet, and approximately $10^{\prime} \times 580$ sf on the second floor, or 5,800 cubic feet, and $123 \mathrm{sf} \times 10^{\prime}$ on the first floor, or 1230 cubic feet, for a total of 20,559 cubic feet less the 6,307 feet removed $=$ 14,252 cubic feet added divided by $32,300=a 44 \%$ increase in volume.

The purpose of this massive increase in volume and massing is to increase what is already a significant developer margin (he purchased the house for $\$ 2.05$ million or $\$ 400$ per square foot for 5000 saleable square feet including the basement - in a neighborhood where luxury housing sells for upwards of $\$ 1000$ or $\$ 1100$ per square foot).

This grab at an additional 1100 sf for the pure motive of profiteering will literally occur at the expense of sunshine available for our children and family.

## Exhibit B <br> Images



Morning light at 9:50am comes in over the 30 degree pitched roof in the rear and fills our kitchen, dining room, and living room with light. Increasing the height from 15 ' at the eave to $32.4^{\prime}$ and moving the entire plane nearly 3 ' closer to us will block this light.


Morning light coming into our dining room on the first floor will be blocked.


Our kitchen is in the northeastern corner of our plan in the first floor. This morning light will be blocked.


This is late morning - even that sun won't get through.


Morning light from southeast in kitchen will be blocked.


This is looking out our dining room window at 9:45 a.m. - you can see that will have lost all this morning sunshine up until this point with a lot more to go -- the sun coming over the back section of 18 Fairmont is not even yet parallel to the existing roof line of the front part of the house, which is much lower than the proposed higher roofline for both front and back sections.


View from dining room where our youngest plays when we're in the kitchen. Bringing plane forward and building it up from $15^{\prime}$ at eave to $32.4^{\prime}$ will block the sun!


Light in kids room 1 will be blocked; privacy will be detrimentally affected.


If you bring that rear part forward and add windows, it will impinge on privacy in kids room 1.


Privacy in kids room 2. They propose bringing that vertical plane closer 3' and going up from $15^{\prime}$ at the eave to 32.4 ' - and then adding lots of windows on third floor directly across. This will block light and impinge on privacy.

## 18 Fairmont Cambridge

David Nolan [dnolan@pnasurveyors.com](mailto:dnolan@pnasurveyors.com)
To: Adam Glassman [ajglassman.ra@gmail.com](mailto:ajglassman.ra@gmail.com), Paige McLaughlin [paigem@spruhaneng.com](mailto:paigem@spruhaneng.com)
Cc: Peter Nolan [pnolan@pnasurveyors.com](mailto:pnolan@pnasurveyors.com), Omar Guzman [omarg@spruhaneng.com](mailto:omarg@spruhaneng.com), Margarita Guerra [margaritag@spruhaneng.com](mailto:margaritag@spruhaneng.com)
Hi Adam.
My apologies for the unintentional error on the North Arrow on the previous PDF.
I have corrected this and attached the new PDF here for your reference.
If you need anything else, please let me know.
Thank you,
David Nolan
Peter Nolan \& Associates, LLC
80 Jewett St, Suite 1, Newton, MA 02458
Cell: 617-838-3341
Email: DNolan@pnasurveryors.com
Website: www.pnasurveyors.com

From: David Nolan [dnolan@pnasurveyors.com](mailto:dnolan@pnasurveyors.com)
Sent: 21 March 2023 13:09
To: Adam Glassman [ajglassman.ra@gmail.com](mailto:ajglassman.ra@gmail.com); Paige McLaughlin [paigem@spruhaneng.com](mailto:paigem@spruhaneng.com)
Cc: Peter Nolan [pnolan@pnasurveyors.com](mailto:pnolan@pnasurveyors.com); Omar Guzman [omarg@spruhaneng.com](mailto:omarg@spruhaneng.com); Margarita Guerra [margaritag@spruhaneng.com](mailto:margaritag@spruhaneng.com)
[Quoted text hidden]
[Quoted text hidden]
18-20 Fairmont St, Cambridge, MA - Proposed Plot Plan Rev. A.pdf
144K

## PROPOSED RENOVATIONS AND ADDITIONS

1. NEW WINDOW OPENINGS \& ENTRY CANOPY ADDITIONS ON LEFT AND RIGHT SIDES PER EXISTING NON-CONFORMING SETBACKS
2. WIDEN EXISTING REAR SECTION WITHIN THE EXISTING NONCONFORMING LEFT AND RIGHT SIDE SETBACKS. 3. INCREASE EXISTING NONCONFORMING FAR FROM . 74 TO . 92 (. 60 MAX ALLOWABLE)
3. NEW MANSARD ROOF ADDITION WITHIN THE EXISTING NONCONFORMING LEFT AND RIGHT SIDE SETBACKS. 5. INCREASE EXISTING NON CONFORMING STRUCTURE BETWEEEN 10\%-25\% OF EXISTING STRUCTURE AS OF 1940.


EXISTING STREET VIEW

## 18-20 Fairmont Street Cambridge, MA

SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO NEIGHBORHOOD COMMENTS SUBMITTED TO THE FILE ON MARCH 202023 NOTES:

1. NEW CONSTRUCTION OUTSIDE OF THE EXISTING BUIDLING ENVELOPE FALLS UNDER RES-C DIMENSIONAL REQUIREMENTS
2. MULTIPLANE SET BACK ANALYSIS $=$ NON-CONFORMING


PROPOSED STREET VIEW

|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br> 2 WORTHINGTON STREET CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138 617-412-8450 <br> www.glassmanchungdesign.com | 2/24/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street <br> Cambridge, MA | Title Sheet |  | $\mathrm{CO} 1$ |








8. The elevatons shown are based on city of cambrioge datum
a. zonng oistric: Resionce c

| ZONING LEGEND |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ZONING DISTRICT: RESIDENCE $C$ |  |  |  |
|  | REQUIRED | EXISTING | PROPOSED |
| MAX. F.A.R. | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.95 |
| MIN. AREA | 5,000 S.F. | 5,000 S.F. | 5.000 |
| AODITOOAA AEA FOORECH | - | 1,800 s.r. | - |
| MN. LOT WOTH | 50' | $50^{\circ}$ | $50^{\prime}$ |
| MIN. YaRd front |  |  |  |
| SIDE (LEFT) | 17.5 ${ }^{\text { }}$ | $10.4{ }^{4}$ | $10.4{ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| SIIE (RIGHT) | 17.5 | $9.9{ }^{\prime}$ | 9.9 |
| REAR | $20^{\prime}$ | $26.8^{\prime}$ | $26.8{ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| MAX. BLDG. НеІІНt | $35^{\prime}$ | $32.4{ }^{\prime}$ | 32.4' |
| DPEN | 36\% | 34\% | 4\% |




EXISTING PROFILE NOT TO SCALE


PROPOSED PROFIL NOT TO SCALE

## graphic scale



COPYRCGTT (C) 2023 by PEERE NOLAN \& ASSOCIATES LC
2awnewax

| Dimension Regulation - ZONE RESIDENCE C |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EXISTING | PROPOSED | REQUIRED | CONFORMING |
| MAX FAR | 0.74 | 0.92 | 0.60 | EXISTING NON CONFORMING |
| MIN. LOT SIZE | 5,000 sq. ft. | 5,000 sq. ft. | 5,000 sq. ft. | YES |
| MIN. LOT AREA PER DWELLING UNIT | 2,500 sq. ft. | 2,500 sq. ft. | 1,800 sq. ft. | YES |
| MIN. LOT WIDTH | $50 '$ | $50^{\prime}$ | 50' | YES |
| MIN. FRONT SETBACK | 30' - CENTER L. 15' - STREET L. | 30' - CENTER L. 15' - STREET L. | (H+L)/4 MIN.10' | YES |
| MIN. LEFT SIDE SETBACK | 10.4' | 10.4' | (*) EXTG. $=16.80^{\prime}$ <br> (**) PROPOSED = 17.6' | EXISTING NON CONFORMING |
| MIN. RIGHT SIDE SETBACK | 9.9' | $9.9{ }^{\prime}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (*) EXTG. }=16.80^{\prime} \\ & (* *) \text { PROPOSED }=17.6^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | EXISTING NON CONFORMING |
| MIN. REAR SETBACK | $26.8^{\prime}$ | 26.8' | $20^{\prime}$ | YES |
| MAXIMUM HEIGHT | 32.4' | 32.4' | 35' | YES |
| RATIO OF PRIVATE OPEN SPACE TO LOT AREA | 34\% | 40\% | 36\% | YES |

(*) CALCULATION FOR EXTG. SIDE SETBACKS
EXTG. AVERAGE HEIGHT $=(H 1 x L 1)+(H 2 x L 2) /(L 1+L 2)=\left(32.4^{\prime} \times 32.30^{\prime}\right)+\left(23.29^{\prime} \times 23.11^{\prime}\right) /\left(32.30^{\prime}+23.11^{\prime}\right)=28.60^{\prime}$
( $\left.^{*}\right)$ REQUIRED EXTG. SETBACK $=(\mathrm{H}+\mathrm{L}) / 5=\left(28.60^{\prime}+55.4^{\prime}\right) / 5=16.80^{\prime}$
(**) $^{*}$ REQUIRED PROPOSED SETBACK $=(\mathrm{H}+\mathrm{L}) / 5=\left(32.4^{\prime}+55.4^{\prime} / 5\right)=17 . \mathbf{6}^{\prime}$

|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br> 2 WORTHINGTON STREET CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138 617-412-8450 $\qquad$ | 2/24/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street <br> Cambridge, MA | Zoning Analysis Zone C |  | $Z .1 .1$ |



|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS 2WORTHMGTON STREET CAMBRIOGE MA O23B $617.412-8450$ | 2/24/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street Cambridge, MA | Zoning - Setback plan- Zone C | 1/8" = 1'-0" | Z.1.2 |


| Dimension Regulation-ZONE RESIDENCE C-1 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | .EXISTING | .PROPOSED (***) | .REQUIRED | EXISTING CONFORMITY |
| MIN. LOT SIZE | 5,000 sq. ft. | N/A | 5,000 sq. ft. | YES |
| MAX FAR | 0.74 | N/A | 0.75 | YES |
| MIN. LOT WIDTH | $50^{\prime}$ | N/A | 50' | YES |
| MIN. FRONT SETBACK | 30' CENTER L. 15' STREET L. | N/A | $(\mathrm{H}+\mathrm{L}) / 4 \mathrm{MIN} .10^{\prime}$ | YES |
| MIN. LEFT SIDE SETBACK | 10.4' | N/A | (*) EXTG. $=12{ }^{\prime}$ | EXISTING NON CONFORMING |
| MIN. RIGHT SIDE SETBACK | 9.9' | N/A | (*) EXTG. $=12{ }^{\prime}$ | EXISTING NON CONFORMING |
| MIN. REAR SETBACK | 26.8' | N/A | $20^{\prime}$ | YES |
| MAXIMUM HEIGHT | 32.4' | N/A | 35' | YES |
| RATIO OF PRIVATE OPEN SPACE TO LOT AREA | 34\% | N/A | 30\% | YES |
| MIN. LOT AREA PER DWELLING UNIT | 2,500 sq. ft. | N/A | 1,500 sq. ft. | YES |

## ${ }^{*}$ * CALCULATION FOR EXTG. SIDE SETBACKS

EXTG. AVERAGE HEIGHT $=(H 1 \times L 1)+(H 2 x L 2) /(L 1+L 2)=\left(32.4^{\prime} \times 32.30^{\prime}\right)+\left(23.29^{\prime} \times 23.11^{\prime}\right) /\left(32.30^{\prime}+23.11^{\prime}\right)=28.60^{\prime}$
(*) $^{*}$ REQUIRED EXTG. SETBACK $=(\mathrm{H}+\mathrm{L}) / 7=\left(28.60^{\prime}+55.4^{\prime}\right) / 7=12^{\prime}$
(***) C1 DIMENSION REQUIREMENTS DO NOT APPLY FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION


|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE |  | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br> 2 WORTHINGTON STREET CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138 617-412-8450 <br> w.glassmanchungdesign.com | 03/21/23 | 18-20 Fairmont Street <br> Cambridge, MA | Zoning - Setback plan - Zone C1 | 1/8" = $1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $7.2 .2$ |



EXTG. LEFT SIDE ELEVATION MULTIPLANE CALCULATION

| EXTG. LEFT SIDE ELEVATION MULTIPLANE CALCULATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INDIVIDUAL PLANES CALCULATION |  |  |  |  |  | VOLUME CALCULATION |  |  |
| PLANE | H | L | CALC. SETBACK ( $\mathrm{H}+\mathrm{L} / 7$ ) | EXTG. SETBACK | INDIVIDUAL PLANE CONFORMITY (MIN. 7'-6") | SETBACK for VOLUME calc. | AREA OF PLANE | VOLUME CALC. OF EACH PLANE |
| C | 32.4 | 32.3 | 9.24 | 10.39 | YES | 10.39 | 1046.52 | 10873.34 |
| D | 23.29 | 23.11 | 6.63 | 14.7 | YES | 14.7 | 538.2319 | 7,912 |
| TOT. |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,585 | 18,785 |



| EXTG. RIGHT SIDE ELEVATION MULTIPLANE CALCULATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INDIVIDUAL PLANES CALCULATION |  |  |  |  |  | VOLUME CALCULATION |  |  |
| PLANE | H | L | CALC. SETBACK ( $\mathrm{H}+\mathrm{L} / 7$ ) | EXTG. SETBACK | INDIVIDUAL PLANE CONFORMITY (MIN. 7'-6") | SETBACK for VOLUME calc. | AREA OF PLANE | VOLUME CALC. OF EACH PLANE |
| A | 32.4 | 32.3 | 9.24 | 9.89 | YES | 9.89 | 1046.52 | 10350.08 |
| B | 23.29 | 23.11 | 6.63 | 14.3 | YES | 14.3 | 538.2319 | 7,697 |
| TOT. |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,585 | 18,047 |

FOR BOTH RIGHT AND LEFT CALCULATION, THE INDIVIDUAL PLANE CALCULATION IS CONFORMING FOR EACH PLANE (A,B,C AND D).

HOWEVER, THE SINGLE PLANE CALCULATION IS NOT CONFORMING, THEREFORE THE EXGT. SETBACKS CALCULATED USING THE MULTIPLANE CALCULATION ARE NON CONFORMING (ART. 5.24.4.3)

| SINGLE PLANE CALCULATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PLANE | H | L | CALC. <br> SETBACK <br> $(H+L / 7)$ |  |  | AREA OF <br> PLANE | VOLUME CALC. OF <br> SINGLE PLANE |  |
| SINGLE | 32.4 | 55.41 | 12.54 |  |  |  | 1,585 |  |


| 18,047 IS LESS THAN 19,880 | NON CONFORMING ART. 5.24.4.3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |


|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br> 2 WORTHINGTON STREET CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138 617-412-8450 $\qquad$ | 03/21/23 | 18-20 Fairmont Street <br> Cambridge, MA | Zoning - <br> MULTIPLANE CALC <br> - Zone C1 |  | $Z .2 .4$ |






(1) 3rd Floor
$1 / 8^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$
(D) Mansard Roof

29'-0"

Prop. 3 rd
$18^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime}$

(2) Section PROP. GFA
$1 / 8$ " = 1'-0"

| PROPOSED GFA - FAR CALCULATION |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Name |  |  |  |
|  | GFA | Lot Area | FAR <br> (GFA/LOT) |
| 1st Floor 1616 SF 5000 SF 0.323197 <br> Proposed 3rd Floor 1357 SF 5000 SF 0.271492 <br> 2nd Floor 1578 SF 5000 SF 0.315668 <br> Canopy 15 SF 5000 SF 0.002987 <br> Canopy 33 SF 5000 SF 0.006581 <br> Canopy Rear 26 SF 5000 SF 0.005246 |  |  |  |$>.$| 0.925173 |
| :--- |

## ARCHITECT

GCD ARCHITECTS
2 WORTHINGTON STREET
CAMBRIDGE,
$617-412-8450$
$617-412-8450$
www.lassmanchungdesign.com

## 18-20 Fairmont Street

Cambridge, MA

| TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Zoning - PROP. GFA <br> \& FAR Analysis | $1 / 8^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-\mathbf{0 \prime \prime}$ | Z.7 |






|  | BASEMENT | 1ST FLOOR | 2NDFLOOR | 3RD FLOOR | TOT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| EXTG. (S.F.) | 1,303 | 1,392 | 1,357 | 895 | 4,947 |
| DEMO (S.F.) | 0 | 0 | 452 | 0 | 452 |

Percentage of DEMO = 9.14\% < 25\% CONFORMING

|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br>  ${ }^{617,412-2.850} 0$ | 2/24/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street Cambridge, MA | GFA DEMO CALCS | 3/32" = 1'-0" | Z. 11 |




(2) Extg. 3rd Floor


ARCHITECT
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ARCHITECT
GCD ARCHITECTS
2 WORTHINGTON STREET
${ }_{\substack{\text { CAMBRIDGE, MA } \\ 617-412-8450}}$
DR.2

(1) Front/Left side view PROPOSED
2) Front/Right side view PROPOSED

|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT |  | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS 2 WORTHINGTON STREET CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138 617-412-8450 | 2/24/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street <br> Cambridge, MA | Proposed 3D Views |  | A0.1 |



[^0]|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br>  b17.42-2.850 | 2/24/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street <br> Cambridge, MA | Proposed 3D Views |  | A0.2 |




(1) Front Elevation
$1 / 8^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$
(2) Right Side Elevation
2) $\frac{\text { Right Side Ele }}{1 / 8^{\prime \prime}}=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$

|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br> 2 WORTHINGTON STREET CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138 617-412-8450 $\qquad$ | 2/24/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street <br> Cambridge, MA | Proposed Elevations | $\text { 1/8" = } 1 \text { '-0" }$ | $\mathrm{A} 2.1$ |


(1) Rear Elevation
$1 / 8^{\prime \prime}=1$ '- $0^{\prime \prime}$
(2) Left Elevation

(1) Section 1
$3 / 16^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$

(1) Front/Left side view- EXTG

(2) Front/Left side view- PROPOSED

|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS 2 WORTHINGTON STREET 617-412-8450 | 2/24/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street Cambridge, MA | 3D views COMPARISON |  | A4. 1 |


(1) Front Right View - EXTG

(2) Front Right View - PROPOSED
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS 2WORRHMGTON SIRET CAMBRIOGE, MA OO23B ${ }^{617-412-8450}$ | 2/24/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street Cambridge, MA | 3D Views COMPARISON |  | A4.2 |


(1) Rear Right View - EXTG


[^1]
(1) $\frac{1-\text { SUMMER SOLSTICE } 10 \text { AM EXTG }}{3 / 64^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}}$
(2) $\frac{1 \text { - SUMMER SOLSTICE } 10 \text { AM PROP. }}{3 / 64^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0 "}$ $3 / 64^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0$ "
$\qquad$


(2) $\frac{3 \text { - SUMMER SOLSTICE } 3 \text { PM PROP }}{3 / 64^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}}$

| TITLE <br> SUMMER SOLSTICE <br> JUNE 21tH 3 PM | AS NOTED | SRAWING |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  |  | S-3 |

1) $\frac{4-\text { FALL EQUINOX } 10 \text { AM EXTG }}{3 / 64^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0 "}$

(2) $\frac{4-\text { FALL EQUINOX } 10 \text { AM PROP }}{3 / 64^{\prime \prime}}=1^{\prime}-0 " 10$

|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br>  <br>  | 3/22/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street, Cambridge Proposed Side and Roof Additions | FALL EQUINOX <br> SEPT. 22nd 10 AM | AS NOTED | S-4 |




(2) $\frac{5-\text { FALL EQUINOX } 1 \text { PM PROP }}{3 / 64^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0 "}$
(1) $\frac{5-\text { FALL EQUINOX } 1 \text { PM EXTG }}{3 / 64^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}}$

|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br>  617.412 .8450 O. | 3/22/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street, Cambridge <br> Proposed Side and Roof Additions | FALL EQUINOX SEPT. 22nd 1PM | AS NOTED | $\mathrm{S}-7$ |


$3 / 64^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$

$3 / 64$ " $=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$

|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br>  whuggassmanchunggessign. .oon | 3/22/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street, Cambridge <br> Proposed Side and Roof Additions | WINTER SOLSTICE DEC. 21st 10 AM | AS NOTED | S-9 |




(2) $\frac{10-\text { SPRING EQUINOX } 10 \text { AM PROP }}{3 / 64^{\prime \prime}}=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$

|  | ARCHITECT |
| :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br> 2 WORTHINGTON STREE CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138 617-412-8450 <br> www.glassmanchungdesign.com |


(2) $\frac{10-\text { SPRING EQUINOX } 11 \text { AM PROP }}{3 / 64^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}}$

|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br> 2WORTHMGTON STRET <br> CAMBRROGE: MA O23 <br> 617-412.8450 | 03/22/23 | 18-20 Fairmont Street, Cambridge <br> Proposed Side and Roof Additions | SPRING EQUINOX MARCH 21st 11 AM | AS NOTED | S-13 |





## SPECIAL PERMIT REQUIRED:

1. NEW WINDOW OPENINGS \& ENTRY CANOPY ADDITIONS ON LEFT AND RIGHT SIDES PER EXISTING NON-CONFORMING SETBACK.
2. WIDEN EXISTING REAR SECTION WITHIN THE EXISTING NONCONFORMING LEFT SIDE SETBACK
3. INCREASE EXISTING NONCONFORMING FAR FROM . 74 TO 82 (. 60 MAX ALLOWABLE)
4. RECONSTRUCT FRONT GABLE ROOF AND ADD DORMER ADDITIONS WITHIN THE EXISTING NONCONFORMING LEFT AND RIGHT SIDE SETBACKS.
5. INCREASE EXISTING NON CONFORMING STRUCTURE BETWEEEN 10\%-25\% OF EXISTING STRUCTURE AS OF 1940.


EXISTING STREET VIEW

## PROPOSED RENOVATIONS AND ADDITIONS

18-20 Fairmont Street Cambridge, MA


PROPOSED STREET VIEW

|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br> 2 WORTHINGTON STREET CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138 617-412-8450 <br> www.glassmanchungdesign.com | 04/19/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street <br> Cambridge, MA | Title Sheet |  | $\mathrm{CO} 1$ |


| Dimension Regulation - ZONE RESIDENCE C |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EXISTING | PROPOSED | REQUIRED | CONFORMING |
| MAX FAR | 0.74 | 0.82 | 0.60 | EXISTING NON CONFORMING |
| MIN. LOT SIZE | 5,000 sq. ft. | 5,000 sq. ft. | 5,000 sq. ft. | YES |
| MIN. LOT AREA PER DWELLING UNIT | 2,500 sq. ft. | 2,500 sq. ft. | 1,800 sq. ft. | YES |
| MIN. LOT WIDTH | 50' | $50^{\prime}$ | 50' | YES |
| MIN. FRONT SETBACK | 30' - CENTER L. 15' - STREET L. | 30' - CENTER L. 15' - STREET L. | $(\mathrm{H}+\mathrm{L}) / 4 \mathrm{MIN} .10{ }^{\text {a }}$ | YES |
| MIN. LEFT SIDE SETBACK | 10.4' | $5{ }^{\prime}$ | (*) EXTG. $=16.80^{\prime}$ <br> (**) PROPOSED $=16.86^{\prime}$ | EXISTING NON CONFORMING |
| MIN. RIGHT SIDE SETBACK | 9.9' | 9.9' | (*) EXTG. $=16.80^{\prime}$ <br> (**) PROPOSED $=16.86^{\prime}$ | EXISTING NON CONFORMING |
| MIN. REAR SETBACK | 26.8' | 26.8' | $20^{\prime}$ | YES |
| MAXIMUM HEIGHT | $32.4{ }^{\prime}$ | 34.06' | 35' | YES |
| RATIO OF PRIVATE OPEN SPACE TO LOT AREA | 34\% | 52\% | 36\% | YES |

## (*) CALCULATION FOR EXTG. SIDE SETBACKS

EXTG. AVERAGE HEIGHT $=(H 1 \times L 1)+(H 2 x L 2) /(L 1+L 2)=\left(32.4^{\prime} \times 32.30^{\prime}\right)+\left(23.29^{\prime} \times 23.11^{\prime}\right) /\left(32.30^{\prime}+23.11^{\prime}\right)=28.60^{\prime}$
(*) REQUIRED EXTG. SETBACK $=(\mathrm{H}+\mathrm{L}) / 5=\left(28.60^{\prime}+55.4^{\prime}\right) / 5=16.8 \mathbf{0}^{\prime}$

## *) CALCULATION FOR PROPOSED SIDE SETBACKS

PROP. AVERAGE HEIGHT $=(H 1 x L 1)+(H 2 x L 2) /(L 1+L 2)=\left(34.06^{\prime} \times 32.30^{\prime}\right)+\left(21.76^{\prime} \times 23.11^{\prime}\right) /\left(32.30^{\prime}+23.11^{\prime}\right)=28.9^{\prime}$
(**) REQUIRED PROPOSED SETBACK = $(H+L) / 5=\left(28.9^{\prime}+55.4^{\prime} / 5\right)=16.86 '$





(1) 3rd Floor $\frac{1 / 8^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}}{}$

(2) Section GFA $1 / 8 "=1$ '-0"

(3) Covered Patio $1 / 8^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$


| 1st Floor | 1491 SF | 5000 SF | 0.298293 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 2nd Floor | 1458 SF | 5000 SF | 0.291503 |  |
| Attic | 522 SF | 5000 SF | 0.104305 |  |
| Canopy | 26 SF | 5000 SF | 0.005241 |  |
| Canopy | 26 SF | 5000 SF | 0.005241 |  |
| Covered Patio | 174 SF | 5000 SF | 0.034887 |  |
| 0.73947 |  |  |  |  |



(1) 3rd Floor $1 / 8^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0$

(2) Section PROP. GFA
$1 / 8^{\prime \prime}=1$ '-0"


| 1st Floor | 1718 SF | 5000 SF | 0.343501 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2nd Floor | 1679 SF | 5000 SF | 0.335809 |
| Canopy | 16 SF | 5000 SF | 0.00319 |
| Canopy | 32 SF | 5000 SF | 0.006328 |
| Canopy Rear | 26 SF | 5000 SF | 0.005249 |
| Proposed 3rd Floor | 688 SF | 5000 SF | 0.137503 |
| 4158 SF |  |  | 0.83158 |


|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br> 2 WORTHINGTON STREET CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138 617-412-8450 <br> www.glassmanchungdesign.com | 4/23/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street <br> Cambridge, MA | Zoning - PROP. GFA \& FAR Analysis | 1/8" = 1'-0" | $7.7$ |




TOT. FLOOR AREA ( 1,303 S.F.)FLOOR AREA TO BE DEMOLISHED (0 S.F.)
(1) GFA DEMO Basement
TOT. FLOOR AREA (1,392 S.F.)FLOOR AREA TO BE DEMOLISHED (O S.F.)
(2) GFA DEMO 1st Floor
TOT. FLOOR AREA ( 1,357 S.F.)FLOOR AREA TO BE DEMOLISHED (452 S.F.)
(3) GFA DEMO 2nd Floor
TOT. FLOOR AREA. (895 S.F.)FLOOR AREA TO BE DEMOLISHED (0 S.F.)
(4) GFA DEMO 3rd Floor $3 / 32^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$

|  | BASEMENT | 1ST FLOOR | 2NDFLOOR | 3RD FLOOR | TOT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| EXTG. (S.F.) | 1,303 | 1,392 | 1,357 | 895 | 4,947 |
| DEMO (S.F.) | 0 | 0 | 452 | 0 | 452 |

Percentage of DEMO $=\quad 9.14 \%<25 \% \quad$ CONFORMING

|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br> 2 WORTHINGTON STREET <br> CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138 617-412-8450 <br> www.glassmanchungdesign.com | 4/23/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street <br> Cambridge, MA | GFA DEMO CALCS | $3 / 32$ " = $1^{\prime \prime}$ | $Z .11$ |


(1) Front/Left side view EXTG
(2) Front/Right side view EXTG




ARCHITECT


(1) Front/Left side view PROPOSED
(2) Front/Right side view PROPOSED


(1) Rear/ Right side view PROPOSED

(2) Rear Left View PROPOSED
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(1) Front Elevation
(2) Right Side Elevation
$1 / 8^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$


|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br> 2 WORTHINGTON STREET CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138 617-412-8450 <br> ww.glassmanchungdesign.com | 4/23/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street <br> Cambridge, MA | Proposed Elevations | 1/8" = 1'-0" | A2.2 |





| DATE | PROJECT |
| :--- | :--- |
| $4 / 23 / 2023$ | 18-20 Fairmont Street |
|  | Cambridge, MA |


(1) Rear Right View - EXTG
(2) Rear Right View - PROP.

|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138 617-412-8450 | 4/23/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street <br> Cambridge, MA | 3D Views COMPARISON |  | A4.3 |



1) Section Rear Portion EXTG $3 / 16^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0$ "

(2) $\frac{\text { Section Rear Portion PROPOSED }}{3 / 16^{\prime \prime}=1^{1} 0^{\prime \prime}}$ $3 / 16^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0 "$

## 4/23/2023

ROJECT
18-20 Fairmont Street
Cambridge, MA



Adam Glassman [ajglassman.ra@gmail.com](mailto:ajglassman.ra@gmail.com)

## 18-20 Fairmont St

Adam Glassman [ajglassman.ra@gmail.com](mailto:ajglassman.ra@gmail.com)
Wed, Mar 22, 2023 at 5:20 PM
To: emily.holman@gmail.com, sandra.y.ferguson@gmail.com, anayanez@mit.edu, cpgrippo@gmail.com, jserna@gmail.com Cc: "Pacheco, Maria" [mpacheco@cambridgema.gov](mailto:mpacheco@cambridgema.gov), Fraser Allan [allanf002@gmail.com](mailto:allanf002@gmail.com)

Dear Residents of both Fairmont St and beyond, (listed below)
Thank you for sharing your concerns about this project.

Emily Holman and Hassanaly Ladha - 24 Fairmont Street (direct abutter)
lan and Sandra Ferguson - 22 Fairmont Street (direct abutter)

John Summers - 25 Fairmont St, No Email address provided (across the street neighbour)

Juan Carlos Serna - 29 Fairmont Ave (approx 3 blocks away)

Christian Grippo-31 Lopez Street (approx 6 blocks away)

Ana Yanez Rodriguez - 6 Washington Ave, Avon Hill

We have digested and considered your opposition to this project, and would like to address some of your concerns.

1) Typically for these projects involving 1 and 2 family homes seeking zoning relief we reach out directly to all direct abutters, which we did with the owners of 16,22 and 24 Fairmont Street. Last week we were able to speak with lan Ferguson (22 Fairmont St) and left a voicemail with Hassanaly Ladha (24 Fairmont Street). At that time lan expressed no opposition to or concern about the project, and Hassanaly never called us back. We also spoke with the direct abutter at 16 Fairmont St, Luba Feigenberg, who remains neutral with regard to this project. We also have no opposition from our direct rear abutters. This is just to say that a) we made a good faith effort to communicate with all of our closest neighbors and b) those who we were able to contact did not at that time oppose this project. However, two days ago, on Monday we received 6 letters of opposition, 3 of which are from residents of Fairmont Street, the remaining 3 from areas not directly impacted by this project.

To the residents of Fairmont St who oppose this project, we hope to be able to clarify a few points and work with you as best we can to alleviate your concerns.

1) Privacy- to the owners of 22 and 24 , all the proposed windows on the right side on the expanded rear bump out are in stair and hallway spaces, and 1 of them is in the dining room. We would be happy to make all of those windows transom style where the window sills will be above head height which should alleviate your concerns about privacy.
2) Roof Height and Loss of Light- the existing roof height is 32.4 ', and our proposed roof height is to remain unchanged. The survey site plan was incorrect in calling out a taller roof and we have corrected that. We would like to go a step further and reduce the proposed building height to 31.4', a full foot below the existing roof height.
3) Shadows - per the expressed concerns about shadows by the owners of 22 and 24, please see the attached shadow study which is digitally created and an accurate representation of the shadows cast when the sun is at its highest and
lowest points throughout the year. You will see that there are new shadows cast only briefly between approx 10 and 11:00 on the Fall Equinox and between approx. 10 and 11:30 on the Spring Equinox. These shadows are very brief and limited to those 2 times of the year. Now that we have offered to reduce the proposed building height to 12" below the existing building height, these shadows will be decreased even beyond what is shown in the attached shadow study.
4) The shadow study was produced with the correct north arrow which you correctly noted was incorrect on the site plan. This error was not intentional and it has been fixed. The correct north arrow is shown on the shadow study plans and the updated site plan.
5) Dimensional Requirements: All new work constructed outside the existing building envelope in a Res-C zone must follow the Res-C dimensional requirements which we have done. Per your comments regarding the use of the multiplane method for calculating setbacks, we did use that method and we failed to comply, as shown in the attached zoning plans showing setback calculations for both Res C, Res C1 and the multiplane method. In all cases our structure is existing non-conforming. Our proposed enlargement of the rear bump out does not extend any further to the rear and only 2.5 on either side, but still those walls remain $1^{\prime}-10$ " set back behind the planes of the existing left and right side walls of the main body of the house.
6) FAR: Seeking relief to go from a .74 to a . 94 FAR does seem to us to be reasonable. The existing 2 family structure has a total of only 4 bedrooms ( 2 bedrooms per unit) which is not in any way conducive to family living. Our proposed plans call for 8 total bedrooms, with 4 per unit, which is conducive to family living without being extravagant. All the bedrooms are located on the 2nd and 3rd floors, for although we can as by right use the basement for habitable space, bedrooms in basements are not desirable below grade for multiple reasons. Our plans do not call for any exterior below grade window or stairwells so we are limiting the basement to family room type space only.
7) Scale and Character: Fairmont Street is characterized by an eclectic and diverse array of architectural styles and sizes. Our block of the street contains 2-1/2 story, 3 story and 4-1/2 story structures, including a full 3-story mansard roof structure 3 houses down at 10-12 Fairmont Street. 22 Fairmont Ave and 24 Fairmont St, our most direct abutters, each contain 4 bedrooms within 2 detached structures on a lot of comparable size to 18-20 Fairmont Ave. Surely our proposed increase in size is reasonably within the scale and character of the neighborhood both terms of density, scale and style.

We hope that our clarifications are helpful, and that our offers to raise the sills and reduce the sizes of the windows on the right side of the rear bump out, and lower the proposed roof height of the entire house, will help alleviate your concerns.

Please feel free to reach out to me directly with any additional comments or questions.
Sincerely,
Adam

Adam J Glassman, Architect for 18-20 Fairmont Street.
T: 617-412-8450

## 2 attachments

2023_0321 18-20 Fairmont BZA Plans.pdf
5743K
2023_0322 18 Fairmont Shadow Study.pdf
6253K

## 18-20 Fairmont St

Adam Glassman [ajglassman.ra@gmail.com](mailto:ajglassman.ra@gmail.com)
Wed, Mar 22, 2023 at 5:49 PM
To: emily.holman@gmail.com, sandra.y.ferguson@gmail.com, anayanez@mit.edu, cpgrippo@gmail.com, jserna@gmail.com Cc: "Pacheco, Maria" [mpacheco@cambridgema.gov](mailto:mpacheco@cambridgema.gov), Fraser Allan [allanf002@gmail.com](mailto:allanf002@gmail.com)

All,
I need to make 1 last clarification about our existing bedroom count.
The existing 2-family structure at 18-20 Fairmont has a total of (4) functional bedrooms on the 2nd floor. We do have what are labeled on the existing plans as (4) additional 'bedrooms' in the attic level, however they are hindered by low sloping ceiling heights which slope from $7^{\prime}-1$ " to $0^{\prime}-0$ " over the span of $9^{\prime}-00^{\prime \prime}$. These are not functional nor are they building code compliant. What were acceptable bedrooms in 1873 , when this house was built, are no longer acceptable.

So for all practical purposes, this property contains (4) existing legitimate bedrooms.
Thank you,
Adam

Adam J. Glassman, R.A.
Cambridge, MA
C: 617.412.8450
www.glassmanchungdesign.com

## Pacheco, Maria

| From: | Adam Glassman [ajglassman.ra@gmail.com](mailto:ajglassman.ra@gmail.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Wednesday, March 22, 2023 5:50 PM |
| To: | emily.holman@gmail.com; sandra.y.ferguson@gmail.com; anayanez@mit.edu; |
|  | cpgrippo@gmail.com; jserna@gmail.com |
| Cc: | Pacheco, Maria; Fraser Allan |
| Subject: | Re: $18-20$ Fairmont St |

All,
I need to make 1 last clarification about our existing bedroom count.

The existing 2 -family structure at 18-20 Fairmont has a total of (4) functional bedrooms on the 2 nd floor.
We do have what are labeled on the existing plans as (4) additional 'bedrooms' in the attic level, however they are hindered by low sloping ceiling heights which slope from $7^{\prime}-1$ to to $0^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ over the span of $9^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$. These are not functional nor are they building code compliant. What were acceptable bedrooms in 1873, when this house was built, are no longer acceptable.

So for all practical purposes, this property contains (4) existing legitimate bedrooms.
Thank you,

Adam

Adam J. Glassman, R.A.
Cambridge, MA
C: 617.412.8450
www.glassmanchungdesign.com

On Wed, Mar 22, 2023 at 5:20 PM Adam Glassman [ajglassman.ra@gmail.com](mailto:ajglassman.ra@gmail.com) wrote:
Dear Residents of both Fairmont St and beyond, (listed below)
Thank you for sharing your concerns about this project.

Emily Holman and Hassanaly Ladha-24 Fairmont Street (direct abutter)
lan and Sandra Ferguson - 22 Fairmont Street (direct abutter)

John Summers - 25 Fairmont St, No Email address provided (across the street neighbour)

We have digested and considered your opposition to this project, and would like to address some of your concerns.

1) Typically for these projects involving 1 and 2 family homes seeking zoning relief we reach out directly to all direct abutters, which we did with the owners of 16, 22 and 24 Fairmont Street. Last week we were able to speak with lan Ferguson (22 Fairmont St) and left a voicemail with Hassanaly Ladha ( 24 Fairmont Street). At that time lan expressed no opposition to or concern about the project, and Hassanaly never called us back. We also spoke with the direct abutter at 16 Fairmont St, Luba Feigenberg, who remains neutral with regard to this project. We also have no opposition from our direct rear abutters. This is just to say that a) we made a good faith effort to communicate with all of our closest neighbors and b) those who we were able to contact did not at that time oppose this project. However, two days ago, on Monday we received 6 letters of opposition, 3 of which are from residents of Fairmont Street, the remaining 3 from areas not directly impacted by this project.

To the residents of Fairmont St who oppose this project, we hope to be able to clarify a few points and work with you as best we can to alleviate your concerns.

1) Privacy- to the owners of 22 and 24, all the proposed windows on the right side on the expanded rear bump out are in stair and hallway spaces, and 1 of them is in the dining room. We would be happy to make all of those windows transom style where the window sills will be above head height which should alleviate your concerns about privacy.
2) Roof Height and Loss of Light- the existing roof height is $32.4^{\prime}$, and our proposed roof height is to remain unchanged. The survey site plan was incorrect in calling out a taller roof and we have corrected that. We would like to go a step further and reduce the proposed building height to $31.4^{\prime}$, a full foot below the existing roof height.
3) Shadows - per the expressed concerns about shadows by the owners of 22 and 24 , please see the attached shadow study which is digitally created and an accurate representation of the shadows cast when the sun is at its highest and lowest points throughout the year. You will see that there are new shadows cast only briefly between approx 10 and 11:00 on the Fall Equinox and between approx. 10 and 11:30 on the Spring Equinox. These shadows are very brief and limited to those 2 times of the year. Now that we have offered to reduce the proposed building height to $12^{\prime \prime}$ below the existing building height, these shadows will be decreased even beyond what is shown in the attached shadow study.
4) The shadow study was produced with the correct north arrow which you correctly noted was incorrect on the site plan. This error was not intentional and it has been fixed. The correct north arrow is shown on the shadow study plans and the updated site plan.
5) Dimensional Requirements: All new work constructed outside the existing building envelope in a Res-C zone must follow the Res-C dimensional requirements which we have done. Per your comments regarding the use of the multiplane method for calculating setbacks, we did use that method and we failed to comply, as shown in the attached zoning plans showing setback calculations for both Res C, Res C1 and the multiplane method. In all cases our structure is existing nonconforming. Our proposed enlargement of the rear bump out does not extend any further to the rear and only $2.5^{\prime}$ on either side, but still those walls remain $1^{\prime}-10^{\prime \prime}$ set back behind the planes of the existing left and right side walls of the main body of the house.
6) FAR: Seeking relief to go from a .74 to a .94 FAR does seem to us to be reasonable. The existing 2 family structure has a total of only 4 bedrooms ( 2 bedrooms per unit) which is not in any way conducive to family living. Our proposed plans call for

8 total bedrooms, with 4 per unit, which is conducive to family living without being extravagant. All the bedrooms are located on the 2 nd and 3rd floors, for although we can as by right use the basement for habitable space, bedrooms in basements are not desirable below grade for multiple reasons. Our plans do not call for any exterior below grade window or stairwells so we are limiting the basement to family room type space only.
7) Scale and Character: Fairmont Street is characterized by an eclectic and diverse array of architectural styles and sizes. Our block of the street contains 2-1/2 story, 3 story and 4-1/2 story structures, including a full 3 -story mansard roof structure 3 houses down at 10-12 Fairmont Street. 22 Fairmont Ave and 24 Fairmont St, our most direct abutters, each contain 4 bedrooms within 2 detached structures on a lot of comparable size to 18-20 Fairmont Ave. Surely our proposed increase in size is reasonably within the scale and character of the neighborhood both terms of density, scale and style.

We hope that our clarifications are helpful, and that our offers to raise the sills and reduce the sizes of the windows on the right side of the rear bump out, and lower the proposed roof height of the entire house, will help alleviate your concerns.

Please feel free to reach out to me directly with any additional comments or questions.

Sincerely,

Adam

Adam J Glassman, Architect for 18-20 Fairmont Street.
T: 617-412-8450

## Pacheco, Maria

| From: | Adam Glassman [ajglassman.ra@gmail.com](mailto:ajglassman.ra@gmail.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Wednesday, March 22, 2023 5:20 PM |
| To: | emily.holman@gmail.com; sandra.y.ferguson@gmail.com; anayanez@mit.edu; |
|  | cpgrippo@gmail.com; jserna@gmail.com |
| Cc: | Pacheco, Maria; Fraser Allan |
| Subject: | 18-20 Fairmont St |
| Attachments: | 2023_0321 18-20 Fairmont BZA Plans.pdf; 2023_0322 18 Fairmont Shadow Study.pdf |
|  |  |
| Dear Residents of both Fairmont St and beyond, (listed below) |  |
|  |  |
| Thank you for sharing your concerns about this project. |  |

Emily Holman and Hassanaly Ladha-24 Fairmont Street (direct abutter)

Ian and Sandra Ferguson - 22 Fairmont Street (direct abutter)

John Summers - 25 Fairmont St, No Email address provided (across the street neighbour)

Juan Carlos Serna-29 Fairmont Ave (approx 3 blocks away)

Christian Grippo-31 Lopez Street (approx 6 blocks away)

Ana Yanez Rodriguez - 6 Washington Ave, Avon Hill

We have digested and considered your opposition to this project, and would like to address some of your concerns.

1) Typically for these projects involving 1 and 2 family homes seeking zoning relief we reach out directly to all direct abutters, which we did with the owners of 16,22 and 24 Fairmont Street. Last week we were able to speak with lan Ferguson (22 Fairmont St) and left a voicemail with Hassanaly Ladha ( 24 Fairmont Street). At that time lan expressed no opposition to or concern about the project, and Hassanaly never called us back. We also spoke with the direct abutter at 16 Fairmont St, Luba Feigenberg, who remains neutral with regard to this project. We also have no opposition from our direct rear abutters. This is just to say that a) we made a good faith effort to communicate with all of our closest neighbors and b) those who we were able to contact did not at that time oppose this project. However, two days ago, on Monday we received 6 letters of opposition, 3 of which are from residents of Fairmont Street, the remaining 3 from areas not directly impacted by this project.

To the residents of Fairmont St who oppose this project, we hope to be able to clarify a few points and work with you as best we can to alleviate your concerns.

1) Privacy- to the owners of 22 and 24 , all the proposed windows on the right side on the expanded rear bump out are in stair and hallway spaces, and 1 of them is in the dining room. We would be happy to make all of those windows transom style where the window sills will be above head height which should alleviate your concerns about privacy.
2) Roof Height and Loss of Light- the existing roof height is 32.4 ', and our proposed roof height is to remain unchanged. The survey site plan was incorrect in calling out a taller roof and we have corrected that. We would like to go a step further and reduce the proposed building height to $31.4^{\prime}$, a full foot below the existing roof height.
3) Shadows - per the expressed concerns about shadows by the owners of 22 and 24 , please see the attached shadow study which is digitally created and an accurate representation of the shadows cast when the sun is at its highest and lowest points throughout the year. You will see that there are new shadows cast only briefly between approx 10 and 11:00 on the Fall Equinox and between approx. 10 and 11:30 on the Spring Equinox. These shadows are very brief and limited to those 2 times of the year. Now that we have offered to reduce the proposed building height to $12^{\prime \prime}$ below the existing building height, these shadows will be decreased even beyond what is shown in the attached shadow study.
4) The shadow study was produced with the correct north arrow which you correctly noted was incorrect on the site plan. This error was not intentional and it has been fixed. The correct north arrow is shown on the shadow study plans and the updated site plan.
5) Dimensional Requirements: All new work constructed outside the existing building envelope in a Res-C zone must follow the Res-C dimensional requirements which we have done. Per your comments regarding the use of the multiplane method for calculating setbacks, we did use that method and we failed to comply, as shown in the attached zoning plans showing setback calculations for both Res C , Res C 1 and the multiplane method. In all cases our structure is existing non-conforming. Our proposed enlargement of the rear bump out does not extend any further to the rear and only $2.5^{\prime}$ on either side, but still those walls remain $1^{\prime}-10^{\prime \prime}$ set back behind the planes of the existing left and right side walls of the main body of the house.
6) FAR: Seeking relief to go from a .74 to a .94 FAR does seem to us to be reasonable. The existing 2 family structure has a total of only 4 bedrooms ( 2 bedrooms per unit) which is not in any way conducive to family living. Our proposed plans call for 8 total bedrooms, with 4 per unit, which is conducive to family living without being extravagant. All the bedrooms are located on the 2nd and 3rd floors, for although we can as by right use the basement for habitable space, bedrooms in basements are not desirable below grade for multiple reasons. Our plans do not call for any exterior below grade window or stairwells so we are limiting the basement to family room type space only.
7) Scale and Character: Fairmont Street is characterized by an eclectic and diverse array of architectural styles and sizes. Our block of the street contains $2-1 / 2$ story, 3 story and $4-1 / 2$ story structures, including a full 3 -story mansard roof structure 3 houses down at 10-12 Fairmont Street. 22 Fairmont Ave and 24 Fairmont St, our most direct abutters, each contain 4 bedrooms within 2 detached structures on a lot of comparable size to 18-20 Fairmont Ave. Surely our proposed increase in size is reasonably within the scale and character of the neighborhood both terms of density, scale and style.

We hope that our clarifications are helpful, and that our offers to raise the sills and reduce the sizes of the windows on the right side of the rear bump out, and lower the proposed roof height of the entire house, will help alleviate your concerns.

Please feel free to reach out to me directly with any additional comments or questions.
Sincerely,
Adam
Adam J Glassman, Architect for 18-20 Fairmont Street.
T: 617-412-8450

## Pacheco, Maria

| From: | Juan_Carlos_Serna [jserna@gmail.com](mailto:jserna@gmail.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Thursday, March 23, 2023 2:03 PM |
| To: | Adam Glassman |
| Cc: | Fraser Allan; Pacheco, Maria; anayanez@mit.edu; cpgrippo@gmail.com; |
|  | emily.holman@gmail.com; sandra.y.ferguson@gmail.com |
| Subject: | Re: $18-20$ Fairmont St |

Adam,

I appreciate your response to our concerns, but it has raised additional questions regarding the accuracy of the information provided. The response refers to changes to plans that are not on file and includes selectively chosen data from a shadow study that was not submitted as part of the application process.

With regards to the proposed significant increase in the Floor Area Ratio (FAR), we understand the reasons for seeking this relief. However, we must opine that such a large increase in FAR should not be granted through a special permit, as it may set a precedent that could significantly impact the neighborhood. If a substantial increase in FAR is desired, it should be brought about through an amended zoning code, rather than a one-time special permit.

I also object to the suggestion that our concerns are less valid because we are not direct abutters. Many of us are opposed to the construction of McMansion-scale houses in our neighborhood.

I hope you can find a design and scale that is in keeping within character of our neighborhood but unfortunately the proposed project is not.

Sincerely,

Juan Carlos

On Wed, Mar 22, 2023 at 5:50 PM Adam Glassman [ajglassman.ra@gmail.com](mailto:ajglassman.ra@gmail.com) wrote:
All,

I need to make 1 last clarification about our existing bedroom count.

The existing 2-family structure at 18-20 Fairmont has a total of (4) functional bedrooms on the 2 nd floor.
We do have what are labeled on the existing plans as (4) additional 'bedrooms' in the attic level, however they are hindered by low sloping ceiling heights which slope from $7^{\prime}-1^{\prime \prime}$ to $0^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ over the span of $9^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$. These are not functional nor are they building code compliant. What were acceptable bedrooms in 1873 , when this house was built, are no longer acceptable.

So for all practical purposes, this property contains (4) existing legitimate bedrooms.

Thank you,

Adam

[^2]On Wed, Mar 22, 2023 at 5:20 PM Adam Glassman [ajglassman.ra@gmail.com](mailto:ajglassman.ra@gmail.com) wrote:
Dear Residents of both Fairmont St and beyond, (listed below)
Thank you for sharing your concerns about this project.

Emily Holman and Hassanaly Ladha - 24 Fairmont Street (direct abutter)

Ian and Sandra Ferguson - 22 Fairmont Street (direct abutter)

John Summers - 25 Fairmont St, No Email address provided (across the street neighbour)

Juan Carlos Serna - 29 Fairmont Ave (approx 3 blocks away)

Christian Grippo - 31 Lopez Street (approx 6 blocks away)

Ana Yanez Rodriguez - 6 Washington Ave, Avon Hill

We have digested and considered your opposition to this project, and would like to address some of your concerns.

1) Typically for these projects involving 1 and 2 family homes seeking zoning relief we reach out directly to all direct abutters, which we did with the owners of 16,22 and 24 Fairmont Street. Last week we were able to speak with lan Ferguson (22 Fairmont St) and left a voicemail with Hassanaly Ladha ( 24 Fairmont Street). At that time lan expressed no opposition to or concern about the project, and Hassanaly never called us back. We also spoke with the direct abutter at 16 Fairmont St, Luba Feigenberg, who remains neutral with regard to this project. We also have no opposition from our direct rear abutters. This is just to say that a) we made a good faith effort to communicate with all of our closest neighbors and b) those who we were able to contact did not at that time oppose this project. However, two days ago, on Monday we received 6 letters of opposition, 3 of which are from residents of Fairmont Street, the remaining 3 from areas not directly impacted by this project.

To the residents of Fairmont St who oppose this project, we hope to be able to clarify a few points and work with you as best we can to alleviate your concerns.

1) Privacy- to the owners of 22 and 24 , all the proposed windows on the right side on the expanded rear bump out are in stair and hallway spaces, and 1 of them is in the dining room. We would be happy to make all of those windows transom style where the window sills will be above head height which should alleviate your concerns about privacy.
2) Roof Height and Loss of Light- the existing roof height is 32.4 ', and our proposed roof height is to remain unchanged. The survey site plan was incorrect in calling out a taller roof and we have corrected that. We would like to go a step further and reduce the proposed building height to $31.4^{\prime}$, a full foot below the existing roof height.
3) Shadows - per the expressed concerns about shadows by the owners of 22 and 24 , please see the attached shadow study which is digitally created and an accurate representation of the shadows cast when the sun is at its highest and lowest points throughout the year. You will see that there are new shadows cast only briefly between approx 10 and 11:00 on the Fall Equinox and between approx. 10 and 11:30 on the Spring Equinox. These shadows are very brief and limited to those 2 times of the year. Now that we have offered to reduce the proposed building height to 12 " below the existing building height, these shadows will be decreased even beyond what is shown in the attached shadow study.
4) The shadow study was produced with the correct north arrow which you correctly noted was incorrect on the site plan. This error was not intentional and it has been fixed. The correct north arrow is shown on the shadow study plans and the updated site plan.
5) Dimensional Requirements: All new work constructed outside the existing building envelope in a Res-C zone must follow the Res-C dimensional requirements which we have done. Per your comments regarding the use of the multiplane method for calculating setbacks, we did use that method and we failed to comply, as shown in the attached zoning plans showing setback calculations for both Res C, Res C1 and the multiplane method. In all cases our structure is existing nonconforming. Our proposed enlargement of the rear bump out does not extend any further to the rear and only 2.5 ' on either side, but still those walls remain 1'-10" set back behind the planes of the existing left and right side walls of the main body of the house.
6) FAR: Seeking relief to go from a .74 to a .94 FAR does seem to us to be reasonable. The existing 2 family structure has a total of only 4 bedrooms ( 2 bedrooms per unit) which is not in any way conducive to family living. Our proposed plans call for 8 total bedrooms, with 4 per unit, which is conducive to family living without being extravagant. All the bedrooms are located on the 2nd and 3rd floors, for although we can as by right use the basement for habitable space, bedrooms in basements are not desirable below grade for multiple reasons. Our plans do not call for any exterior below grade window or stairwells so we are limiting the basement to family room type space only.
7) Scale and Character: Fairmont Street is characterized by an eclectic and diverse array of architectural styles and sizes. Our block of the street contains 2-1/2 story, 3 story and $4-1 / 2$ story structures, including a full 3 -story mansard roof structure 3 houses down at 10-12 Fairmont Street. 22 Fairmont Ave and 24 Fairmont St, our most direct abutters, each contain 4 bedrooms within 2 detached structures on a lot of comparable size to 18-20 Fairmont Ave. Surely our proposed increase in size is reasonably within the scale and character of the neighborhood both terms of density, scale and style.

We hope that our clarifications are helpful, and that our offers to raise the sills and reduce the sizes of the windows on the right side of the rear bump out, and lower the proposed roof height of the entire house, will help alleviate your concerns.

Please feel free to reach out to me directly with any additional comments or questions.
Sincerely,
Adam

Adam J Glassman, Architect for 18-20 Fairmont Street.
T: 617-412-8450

## Pacheco, Maria

| From: | Christian Grippo [cpgrippo@gmail.com](mailto:cpgrippo@gmail.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Thursday, March 23, 2023 2:25 PM |
| To: | Adam Glassman |
| Cc: | emily.holman@gmail.com; sandra.y.ferguson@gmail.com; anayanez@mit.edu; |
|  | jserna@gmail.com; Pacheco, Maria; Fraser Allan |
| Subject: | Re: $18-20$ Fairmont St |

## Dear Adam,

The developer proposes an FAR of 0.94 when the directly adjacent properties on Fairmont Street, including the most directly affected abutters, are at . 6 FAR. You are seeking $50 \%$ more than what is allowed in our district. Your client already has a .74 FAR and already wants to go to 5000sf with a finished basement on a 5000sf lot. But he wants more: he wants to increase that to 6100sf.

He is actually increasing the volume of an already oversized .74 house in the $C$ district by $44 \%$.
This will set a serious negative precedent for our neighborhood.
We also object because you present this petition as if it were a small request, using incorrect numbers - when in fact it is a massive house that you are proposing to build.

Best,
Christian
Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 22, 2023, at 5:50 PM, Adam Glassman [ajglassman.ra@gmail.com](mailto:ajglassman.ra@gmail.com) wrote:

All,
I need to make 1 last clarification about our existing bedroom count.
The existing 2-family structure at 18-20 Fairmont has a total of (4) functional bedrooms on the 2 nd floor. We do have what are labeled on the existing plans as (4) additional 'bedrooms' in the attic level, however they are hindered by low sloping ceiling heights which slope from $7^{\prime}-1^{\prime \prime}$ to $0^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ over the span of $9^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$. These are not functional nor are they building code compliant. What were acceptable bedrooms in 1873, when this house was built, are no longer acceptable.

So for all practical purposes, this property contains (4) existing legitimate bedrooms.

Thank you,
Adam

On Wed, Mar 22, 2023 at 5:20 PM Adam Glassman [aiglassman.ra@gmail.com](mailto:aiglassman.ra@gmail.com) wrote: Dear Residents of both Fairmont St and beyond, (listed below)

Thank you for sharing your concerns about this project.

Emily Holman and Hassanaly Ladha - 24 Fairmont Street (direct abutter)

Ian and Sandra Ferguson - 22 Fairmont Street (direct abutter)

John Summers - 25 Fairmont St, No Email address provided (across the street neighbour)

Juan Carlos Serna - 29 Fairmont Ave (approx 3 blocks away)

Christian Grippo - 31 Lopez Street (approx 6 blocks away)

Ana Yanez Rodriguez - 6 Washington Ave, Avon Hill

We have digested and considered your opposition to this project, and would like to address some of your concerns.

1) Typically for these projects involving 1 and 2 family homes seeking zoning relief we reach out directly to all direct abutters, which we did with the owners of 16, 22 and 24 Fairmont Street. Last week we were able to speak with lan Ferguson (22 Fairmont St) and left a voicemail with Hassanaly Ladha ( 24 Fairmont Street). At that time lan expressed no opposition to or concern about the project, and Hassanaly never called us back. We also spoke with the direct abutter at 16 Fairmont St, Luba Feigenberg, who remains neutral with regard to this project. We also have no opposition from our direct rear abutters. This is just to say that a) we made a good faith effort to communicate with all of our closest neighbors and b) those who we were able to contact did not at that time oppose this project. However, two days ago, on Monday we received 6 letters of opposition, 3 of which are from residents of Fairmont Street, the remaining 3 from areas not directly impacted by this project.

To the residents of Fairmont St who oppose this project, we hope to be able to clarify a few points and work with you as best we can to alleviate your concerns.

1) Privacy- to the owners of 22 and 24 , all the proposed windows on the right side on the expanded rear bump out are in stair and hallway spaces, and 1 of them is in the dining room. We would be happy to make all of those windows transom style where the window sills will be above head height which should alleviate your concerns about privacy.
2) Roof Height and Loss of Light- the existing roof height is 32.4 ', and our proposed roof height is to remain unchanged. The survey site plan was incorrect in calling out a taller roof and we have corrected that. We would like to go a step further and reduce the proposed building height to $31.4^{\prime}$, a full foot below the existing roof height.
3) Shadows - per the expressed concerns about shadows by the owners of 22 and 24 , please see the attached shadow study which is digitally created and an accurate representation of the shadows cast when the sun is at its highest and lowest points throughout the year. You will see that there are new shadows cast only briefly between approx 10 and 11:00 on the Fall Equinox and between approx. 10 and 11:30 on the Spring Equinox. These shadows are very brief and limited to those 2 times of the year. Now that we have offered to reduce the proposed building height to $12^{"}$ below the existing building height, these shadows will be decreased even beyond what is shown in the attached shadow study.
4) The shadow study was produced with the correct north arrow which you correctly noted was incorrect on the site plan. This error was not intentional and it has been fixed. The correct north arrow is shown on the shadow study plans and the updated site plan.
5) Dimensional Requirements: All new work constructed outside the existing building envelope in a Res-C zone must follow the Res-C dimensional requirements which we have done. Per your comments regarding the use of the multiplane method for calculating setbacks, we did use that method and we failed to comply, as shown in the attached zoning plans showing setback calculations for both Res C, Res C1 and the multiplane method. In all cases our structure is existing non-conforming. Our proposed enlargement of the rear bump out does not extend any further to the rear and only 2.5 ' on either side, but still those walls remain $1^{\prime}-10$ " set back behind the planes of the existing left and right side walls of the main body of the house.
6) FAR: Seeking relief to go from a .74 to a .94 FAR does seem to us to be reasonable. The existing 2 family structure has a total of only 4 bedrooms ( 2 bedrooms per unit) which is not in any way conducive to family living. Our proposed plans call for 8 total bedrooms, with 4 per unit, which is conducive to family living without being extravagant. All the bedrooms are located on the 2nd and 3rd floors, for although we can as by right use the basement for habitable space, bedrooms in basements are not desirable below grade for multiple reasons. Our plans do not call for any exterior below grade window or stairwells so we are limiting the basement to family room type space only.
7) Scale and Character: Fairmont Street is characterized by an eclectic and diverse array of architectural styles and sizes. Our block of the street contains $2-1 / 2$ story, 3 story and $4-1 / 2$ story structures, including a full $3-$ story mansard roof structure 3 houses down at 10-12 Fairmont Street. 22 Fairmont Ave and 24 Fairmont St, our most direct abutters, each contain 4 bedrooms within 2 detached structures on a lot of comparable size to 18-20 Fairmont Ave. Surely our proposed increase in size is reasonably within the scale and character of the neighborhood both terms of density, scale and style.

We hope that our clarifications are helpful, and that our offers to raise the sills and reduce the sizes of the windows on the right side of the rear bump out, and lower the proposed roof height of the entire house, will help alleviate your concerns.

Please feel free to reach out to me directly with any additional comments or questions.
Sincerely,

## Adam

Adam J Glassman, Architect for 18-20 Fairmont Street.
T: 617-412-8450

## Pacheco, Maria

| From: | Ana Yanez Rodriguez [anayanez@mit.edu](mailto:anayanez@mit.edu) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Thursday, March 23, 2023 3:05 PM |
| To: | Christian Grippo |
| Cc: | Adam Glassman; emily.holman@gmail.com; sandra.y.ferguson@gmail.com; jserna@gmail.com; |
|  | Pacheco, Maria; Fraser Allan |
| Subject: | Re: 18-20 Fairmont St |

## Dear Adam,

You are proposing to increase your house to a 6100 square foot two-family house -- a size unusual for Cambridgeport or any $C$ district in Cambridge. You are seeking a 0.94 FAR when the properties next door on Fairmont St., including the most affected abutters, are at . 6 FAR. Why do you think your client deserves $50 \%$ more than his neighbors or what is allowed in the zone? Where in the law is it written that he is entitled to 8 bedrooms?

You pointed out that I live in Avon Hill, Cambridge--correct. But I also lived in and own property in Cambridgeport for nearly twenty years. By contrast, the developer does not live in Cambridge and has no interest here except to make money. He already has a . 74 FAR - more than his neighbors - and wants more. He wants to increase the volume of an already oversized .74 house in the $C$ district by more than $40 \%$.

This will set a serious negative precedent for our neighborhood and for the city I know and love and actually live in.

Best,

Ana

On Thu, Mar 23, 2023 at 2:25 PM Christian Grippo [cpgrippo@gmail.com](mailto:cpgrippo@gmail.com) wrote:
Dear Adam,

The developer proposes an FAR of 0.94 when the directly adjacent properties on Fairmont Street, including the most directly affected abutters, are at .6 FAR. You are seeking $50 \%$ more than what is allowed in our district. Your client already has a .74 FAR and already wants to go to 5000sf with a finished basement on a 5000sf lot. But he wants more: he wants to increase that to 6100sf.

He is actually increasing the volume of an already oversized .74 house in the C district by $44 \%$.

This will set a serious negative precedent for our neighborhood.

We also object because you present this petition as if it were a small request, using incorrect numbers - when in fact it is a massive house that you are proposing to build.

Best,

## Christian

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 22, 2023, at 5:50 PM, Adam Glassman [ajglassman.ra@gmail.com](mailto:ajglassman.ra@gmail.com) wrote:

All,
I need to make 1 last clarification about our existing bedroom count.
The existing 2 -family structure at 18-20 Fairmont has a total of (4) functional bedrooms on the 2 nd floor. We do have what are labeled on the existing plans as (4) additional 'bedrooms' in the attic level, however they are hindered by low sloping ceiling heights which slope from $7^{\prime}-1$ " to $0^{\prime}-0{ }^{\prime \prime}$ over the span of $99^{\prime}-0{ }^{\prime \prime}$. These are not functional nor are they building code compliant. What were acceptable bedrooms in 1873, when this house was built, are no longer acceptable.

So for all practical purposes, this property contains (4) existing legitimate bedrooms.

Thank you,
Adam

Adam J. Glassman, R.A.
Cambridge, MA
C: 617.412.8450
www.glassmanchungdesign.com

On Wed, Mar 22, 2023 at 5:20 PM Adam Glassman [ajglassman.ra@gmail.com](mailto:ajglassman.ra@gmail.com) wrote:
Dear Residents of both Fairmont St and beyond, (listed below)
Thank you for sharing your concerns about this project.

Emily Holman and Hassanaly Ladha - 24 Fairmont Street (direct abutter)

Ian and Sandra Ferguson - 22 Fairmont Street (direct abutter)

John Summers - 25 Fairmont St, No Email address provided (across the street neighbour)

Juan Carlos Serna - 29 Fairmont Ave (approx 3 blocks away)

Christian Grippo - 31 Lopez Street (approx 6 blocks away)

We have digested and considered your opposition to this project, and would like to address some of your concerns.

1) Typically for these projects involving 1 and 2 family homes seeking zoning relief we reach out directly to all direct abutters, which we did with the owners of 16,22 and 24 Fairmont Street. Last week we were able to speak with lan Ferguson ( 22 Fairmont St) and left a voicemail with Hassanaly Ladha ( 24 Fairmont Street). At that time lan expressed no opposition to or concern about the project, and Hassanaly never called us back. We also spoke with the direct abutter at 16 Fairmont St, Luba Feigenberg, who remains neutral with regard to this project. We also have no opposition from our direct rear abutters. This is just to say that a) we made a good faith effort to communicate with all of our closest neighbors and b) those who we were able to contact did not at that time oppose this project. However, two days ago, on Monday we received 6 letters of opposition, 3 of which are from residents of Fairmont Street, the remaining 3 from areas not directly impacted by this project.

To the residents of Fairmont St who oppose this project, we hope to be able to clarify a few points and work with you as best we can to alleviate your concerns.

1) Privacy- to the owners of 22 and 24, all the proposed windows on the right side on the expanded rear bump out are in stair and hallway spaces, and 1 of them is in the dining room. We would be happy to make all of those windows transom style where the window sills will be above head height which should alleviate your concerns about privacy.
2) Roof Height and Loss of Light- the existing roof height is 32.4 ', and our proposed roof height is to remain unchanged. The survey site plan was incorrect in calling out a taller roof and we have corrected that. We would like to go a step further and reduce the proposed building height to $31.4^{\prime}$, a full foot below the existing roof height.
3) Shadows - per the expressed concerns about shadows by the owners of 22 and 24 , please see the attached shadow study which is digitally created and an accurate representation of the shadows cast when the sun is at its highest and lowest points throughout the year. You will see that there are new shadows cast only briefly between approx 10 and 11:00 on the Fall Equinox and between approx. 10 and 11:30 on the Spring Equinox. These shadows are very brief and limited to those 2 times of the year. Now that we have offered to reduce the proposed building height to $12^{\prime \prime}$ below the existing building height, these shadows will be decreased even beyond what is shown in the attached shadow study.
4) The shadow study was produced with the correct north arrow which you correctly noted was incorrect on the site plan. This error was not intentional and it has been fixed. The correct north arrow is shown on the shadow study plans and the updated site plan.
5) Dimensional Requirements: All new work constructed outside the existing building envelope in a Res-C zone must follow the Res-C dimensional requirements which we have done. Per your comments regarding the use of the multiplane method for calculating setbacks, we did use that method and we failed to comply, as shown in the attached zoning plans showing setback calculations for both Res C, Res C 1 and the multiplane method. In all cases our structure is existing non-conforming. Our proposed enlargement of the rear bump out does not extend any further to the rear and only 2.5 ' on either side, but still those walls remain $1^{\prime}-10$ " set back behind the planes of the existing left and right side walls of the main body of the house.
6) FAR: Seeking relief to go from a .74 to a .94 FAR does seem to us to be reasonable. The existing 2 family structure has a total of only 4 bedrooms ( 2 bedrooms per unit) which is not in any way conducive to
family living. Our proposed plans call for 8 total bedrooms, with 4 per unit, which is conducive to family living without being extravagant. All the bedrooms are located on the 2nd and 3rd floors, for although we can as by right use the basement for habitable space, bedrooms in basements are not desirable below grade for multiple reasons. Our plans do not call for any exterior below grade window or stairwells so we are limiting the basement to family room type space only.
7) Scale and Character: Fairmont Street is characterized by an eclectic and diverse array of architectural styles and sizes. Our block of the street contains 2-1/2 story, 3 story and 4-1/2 story structures, including a full 3 -story mansard roof structure 3 houses down at 10-12 Fairmont Street. 22 Fairmont Ave and 24 Fairmont St, our most direct abutters, each contain 4 bedrooms within 2 detached structures on a lot of comparable size to 18-20 Fairmont Ave. Surely our proposed increase in size is reasonably within the scale and character of the neighborhood both terms of density, scale and style.

We hope that our clarifications are helpful, and that our offers to raise the sills and reduce the sizes of the windows on the right side of the rear bump out, and lower the proposed roof height of the entire house, will help alleviate your concerns.

Please feel free to reach out to me directly with any additional comments or questions.
Sincerely,
Adam

Adam J Glassman, Architect for 18-20 Fairmont Street.
T: 617-412-8450

Ana Yáñez-Rodríguez
Lecturer in Spanish, MIT-Global Languages
77 Massachusetts Ave., 14N-208, Cambridge, MA 02139
anayanez@mit.edu

From:
Sent:
To:
Cc:
Subject:

Emily Holman [emily.holman@gmail.com](mailto:emily.holman@gmail.com)
Thursday, March 23, 2023 4:53 PM
Adam Glassman; Pacheco, Maria
sandra.y.ferguson@gmail.com; ianworld@gmail.com; Fraser Allan; jserna@gmail.com; Ana Yanez Rodriguez; Christian Grippo
Re: 18-20 Fairmont St

Dear Adam,
Thank you for your email.
We were all taken aback by the petition and email yesterday evening. First, your client bought the property in January, but did not reach out to us until 6-7 days ago, in mid-March - well after your plans had been drawn up and submitted. That is not community outreach. Second, we were surprised by the errors and untruths in your petition. Emily's husband was in Africa when your client called a few days ago; the rest of us didn't know what to say to your client given the false claims in your application, the fact that there had been no outreach before you drew up and submitted your plans; our impression was therefore that you were rushing to get this through without consultation and on the basis of wrong facts and misrepresentations.

Your email indeed acknowledges numerous such errors and untruths in the petition, including your claim that there would no impact "whatsoever" on light and privacy. Here are direct quotes from the petition:
"There will be no creation of any detriment whatsoever." "There will be no loss of privacy, no creation of any substantial shadows on the abutting lots."

In your email from yesterday, you acknowledge these misrepresentations in the petition: you adnit that the proposed building does in fact create a privacy issue; that the plan was mistaken about the north/south direction and orientation; that there are errors with respect to height and setback calculations; and that the project does create shadows during the morning that do impact abutting properties. In other words, your email agrees with these objections in the letters of opposition. We appreciate the offer to change windows to transoms - but we would need to see and consider elevations. You shared a light study last night - but we have numerous questions about the rest of the morning and other times of year, and we deserve an opportunity to get a professional opinion, especially given the errors on the north/south orientation of your plan and setback calculations and the false statements in the petition about no impact "whatsoever" on light and privacy.

That your email acknowledges that these statements are false could be the beginning of a real and constructive dialogue between us - but you are giving us less than 24 hours to respond. We have small kids, one of us has been with a sick child and a husband overseas (he returns this evening). We understand that your out-of-town developer client wants to move quickly; but our families are dealing with the very real impact of your project on our property and our daily lives, and these misrepresentations and errors do not build confidence.

We are glad you agree that the setback calculations showing a 17' required setback in your original application was mistaken due to your failure to use an average height and multi-plane calculation and denominator of 7 . Your new math needs vetting too. We need more than a mere 24 hours to review your new submission (including the multiplane calculation).

The fact that your email does not accurately represent the facts and nature of your outreach to your neighbors at 22 Fairmont Street and 24 Fairmont Street is deeply upsetting and does not build trust with us as neighbors.

We scrambled to get professional advice to understand the city's rules, and had not completed our investigation when your client (at the last minute) called. As a professional architect, you are correct that we are the neighbors that
are, in your words, the "most directly affected" by your project -- the "neighborhood" that is detrimentally affected by the building proposal, in the language of the code. Yet as a professional architect, you also reached out at the last minute. It is not reasonable for us to receive less than 24 hours' to consider your latest light study, windows proposals, setback calculations, etc. In his voicemail late last week, your client misrepresented the project as merely "squaring off the building," rather than increasing the volume of an already oversized building by over $40 \%$. Why did the permit application not disclose that increase in volume?

If you truly want to engage with us in dialogue in an honest and constructive way - which we would of course be open to - then you will put an end to the misrepresentations and last-minute calls and emails that pretend the lack of communication is somehow our fault - and instead ask to sit down with us to discuss the project with correct facts and figures.

As far as your email, we have numerous objections and issues with its claims:

1. Height and Light. Your claims about height do not honestly represent the facts. With respect to the roofline, you state "the existing roof height is 32.4 ', and our proposed roof height is to remain unchanged." You continue, "The survey site plan was incorrect in calling out a taller roof and we have corrected that."

First, we are shaken by yet another mistake in the survey site plan. Second, you are clearly increasing average height and thus increasing the nonconformity of the side yard setbacks, under the $\mathrm{H}+\mathrm{L}$ formulas.

Your statement that the height will "remain unchanged" is yet another technical obfuscation: you are increasing the height of the front part of the building from 24' at the eaves and the rear part of the building from 15' at the eaves to (now) over 31' (based on your email), as well as transforming the gently sloping 35 and 30 degree pitched rooflines into vertical planes, effectively adding one story at the front and two stories at the back.

Your persistence in misrepresenting the change in the massing of the building at the vertical planes and its impact again does not strike us as a good faith attempt to accurately represent your project.

Any reasonable person would agree that the addition of one and two stories will significantly impact light.
2. FAR. You are seeking "relief to go from a .74 to a . 94 FAR" and assert that it "does seem to us to be reasonable." Your plan calls for " 8 total bedrooms, with 4 per unit, which is conducive to family living without being extravagant." These are new arguments, again, submitted 24 hours before the hearing.

First, we note that the current house has 9 bedrooms, according to the MLS listing sheet. Many bedrooms in Cambridge are small, including in new construction (there are many kids' bedrooms with $9^{\prime} 6^{\prime \prime}$ or $9^{\prime}$ or even 8 ' dimensions).

Second, have you tried to get 8 bedrooms in the 5000sf you currently have? Can you not achieve 8 bedrooms through other means, including dormers, that meet code?

Third, you are not entitled under any statute or law to 4 bedrooms. Many families in Cambridge, including ours, have 3 bedrooms. The average family in America has 1.9 children, which would suggest that 3 bedrooms is adequate in the majority of cases; and there are many alternative families with no children or one child, empty nesters, etc. What makes you think that your client, who is not addressing actual family needs but rather seeking profit, deserves to build a 4 family house with more than $50 \%$ of the 0.6 FAR allowed by code? There are many families that need more affordable 3 bedroom houses too.

Fourth, you state that bedrooms in the basement are not desirable; and yet there are examples all over Cambridgeport, including at 22 Fairmont Street, of such bedrooms. Have you studied the possibility of window wells? These are common in new construction in Cambridgeport.

It does not stand to reason that you can increase the FAR of your building - and increase volume by $44 \%$ - without causing detriment to our access to sunshine. The increase in height, FAR, and volume, incidentally, is the reason that others in Cambridgeport are concerned and objecting to your project: if the BZA agrees that a near 1.0 FAR will
become normative for all nonconforming buildings next to buildings at 0.6 FAR, then that will utterly change the character of Cambridgeport. You cannot increase the FAR of your building to $50 \%$ more than your neighbors without significantly impacting the "light and air" that our zoning code seeks to protect.
3. Consistency and harmony with the neighborhood. Your project is not in keeping with the neighborhood. A FAR approaching 1.0 is utterly atypical of the street or Cambridgeport. Our corner of this beloved neighborhood, full as it is of light and air, will be detrimentally affected by the uncharacteristically large building you propose on our street. The houses directly adjacent and opposite to your developer-client's building have an FAR around 0.6: the neighbors to the west at 22 and 24 Fairmont Street have a . 6 FAR, the neighbor at 26-28 Fairmont Street has a .54 FAR, his neighbors to the east at 16 Fairmont have a . 64 FAR, and the neighbor at 15 Fairmont has a .67 FAR, according to the Cambridge property database. Many of the houses with higher FARs have smaller lots but remain smaller houses on a square footage basis. Your client will already have approximately 5,000 square feet finishing the basement, and the house already has a . 74 FAR; your client does not need to achieve a 0.94 FAR to the detriment of his neighbors.

You point to the "eclectic" mix of houses on our street. It is true that there is a range of houses. But the character of the street depends precisely on that mix; if additional nonconforming houses enlarge towards 1.0 FAR, then that eclectic mix will no longer exist.
4. Setbacks. Thank you for using the correct method and updating your calculations. Our initial reaction is that your multiplane setback calculation - which you sent last night - is still wrong. You need to use the single plane facing area in the single plane calculation, but instead you multiply the maximum height times the entire length, despite the fact that much of the building is not at maximum height along the side yard. By using the maximum height, you inflate the surface area of the vertical plane, creating an exaggerated sense of nonconformity.

Under 5.24.4, you need to take the sum of the facing area of each plane, calculated as the height of that plane times the length of that plane, to calculate the single plane facing area. By definition and as a matter of fact, the "single plane facing arean is in fact much lower than you say. The calculation that determines conformity of the left side yard in particular is so close as to require interrogation of the inputs.

## 5. Purpose of Code.

We also submit that the purpose of the zoning code is not to massively add FAR to nonconforming houses, but rather to modernize old, nonconforming houses by finishing attics, adding a bathroom, or the like. Your client not only gets the letter of the law wrong in terms of obfuscating detriment to neighbors and failing to keep with the character of the neighborhood, but also utterly twists its spirit and intent. His only goal is to add 1100 square feet on top of the 1440 square feet he will gain by finishing the basement to make money. There is no public interest in profiteering. There is a public interest in not detrimentally affecting the character of our neighborhood and street or creating a light-blocking 55 ' long $\times 31$ ' high eyesore for your abutters.

In conclusion, we again evoke the preamble of the code, which states that its purpose is to "provide adequate light and air," and section 19.33 (to which Section 10.43 requires adherence), which states that buildings shall be "designed and sited to minimize shadow impacts on neighboring lots" - and moreover that "building scale and wall treatment" be "sensitive to existing residential uses on adjacent lots." We doubt that the BZA will agree that taking one house and allowing it to push FAR to almost 1.0 while adjacent houses are at 0.6 is "sensitive" to "existing residential uses." For this reason we have urged the BZA to reject this special permit petition.

If you and your client are prepared to engage in an honest and constructive way; present facts squarely; and give us more than 24 hours to properly study the torrent of information sent yesterday (including on setbacks, light study, privacy), you will find us to be reasonable people.

Respectfully,
Emily Holman and Hassanaly Ladha (abutters)
Residents of 24 Fairmont Street

On Thu, Mar 23, 2023 at 3:05 PM Ana Yanez Rodriguez [anayanez@mit.edu](mailto:anayanez@mit.edu) wrote:
Dear Adam,
You are proposing to increase your house to a 6100 square foot two-family house -- a size unusual for Cambridgeport or any C district in Cambridge. You are seeking a 0.94 FAR when the properties next door on Fairmont St., including the most affected abutters, are at . 6 FAR. Why do you think your client deserves $50 \%$ more than his neighbors or what is allowed in the zone? Where in the law is it written that he is entitled to 8 bedrooms?

You pointed out that I live in Avon Hill, Cambridge--correct. But I also lived in and own property in Cambridgeport for nearly twenty years. By contrast, the developer does not live in Cambridge and has no interest here except to make money. He already has a .74 FAR - more than his neighbors - and wants more. He wants to increase the volume of an already oversized .74 house in the C district by more than $40 \%$.

This will set a serious negative precedent for our neighborhood and for the city I know and love and actually live in.
Best,
Ana

On Thu, Mar 23, 2023 at 2:25 PM Christian Grippo [cpgrippo@gmail.com](mailto:cpgrippo@gmail.com) wrote:
Dear Adam,

The developer proposes an FAR of 0.94 when the directly adjacent properties on Fairmont Street, including the most directly affected abutters, are at . 6 FAR. You are seeking $50 \%$ more than what is allowed in our district. Your client already has a .74 FAR and already wants to go to 5000 sf with a finished basement on a 5000 sf lot. But he wants more: he wants to increase that to 6100sf.

He is actually increasing the volume of an already oversized .74 house in the $C$ district by $44 \%$.
This will set a serious negative precedent for our neighborhood.
We also object because you present this petition as if it were a small request, using incorrect numbers - when in fact it is a massive house that you are proposing to build.

Best,
Christian
Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 22, 2023, at 5:50 PM, Adam Glassman [ajglassman.ra@gmail.com](mailto:ajglassman.ra@gmail.com) wrote:

All,

I need to make 1 last clarification about our existing bedroom count.
The existing 2-family structure at 18-20 Fairmont has a total of (4) functional bedrooms on the 2nd floor. We do have what are labeled on the existing plans as (4) additional 'bedrooms' in the attic level, however they are hindered by low sloping ceiling heights which slope from $7^{\prime}-1$ " to $0^{\prime}-0$ " over the span of $9^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$. These are not functional nor are they building code compliant. What were acceptable bedrooms in 1873 , when this house was built, are no longer acceptable.

So for all practical purposes, this property contains (4) existing legitimate bedrooms.
Thank you,
Adam

```
Adam J. Glassman, R.A.
Cambridge, MA
C: 617.412.8450
www.glassmanchungdesign.com
```

On Wed, Mar 22, 2023 at 5:20 PM Adam Glassman [ajglassman.ra@gmail.com](mailto:ajglassman.ra@gmail.com) wrote:
Dear Residents of both Fairmont St and beyond, (listed below)
Thank you for sharing your concerns about this project.

Emily Holman and Hassanaly Ladha-24 Fairmont Street (direct abutter)

Ian and Sandra Ferguson - 22 Fairmont Street (direct abutter)

John Summers - 25 Fairmont St, No Email address provided (across the street neighbour)

Juan Carlos Serna-29 Fairmont Ave (approx 3 blocks away)

Christian Grippo-31 Lopez Street (approx 6 blocks away)

Ana Yanez Rodriguez - 6 Washington Ave, Avon Hill

We have digested and considered your opposition to this project, and would like to address some of your concerns.

1) Typically for these projects involving 1 and 2 family homes seeking zoning relief we reach out directly to all direct abutters, which we did with the owners of 16,22 and 24 Fairmont Street. Last week we were able to speak with lan Ferguson ( 22 Fairmont St) and left a voicemail with Hassanaly Ladha ( 24 Fairmont Street). At that time lan expressed no opposition to or concern about the project, and Hassanaly never called us back. We also spoke with the direct abutter at 16 Fairmont St, Luba Feigenberg, who remains neutral with regard to this project. We also have no opposition from our direct rear abutters. This is just to say that a) we made a good faith effort to communicate with all of our closest neighbors and b) those who we were able to contact did not at that time oppose this project. However, two days ago, on Monday we received 6 letters of opposition, 3 of which are from residents of Fairmont Street, the remaining 3 from areas not directly impacted by this project.

To the residents of Fairmont St who oppose this project, we hope to be able to clarify a few points and work with you as best we can to alleviate your concerns.

1) Privacy- to the owners of 22 and 24 , all the proposed windows on the right side on the expanded rear bump out are in stair and hallway spaces, and 1 of them is in the dining room. We would be happy to make all of those windows transom style where the window sills will be above head height which should alleviate your concerns about privacy.
2) Roof Height and Loss of Light- the existing roof height is 32.4', and our proposed roof height is to remain unchanged. The survey site plan was incorrect in calling out a taller roof and we have corrected that. We would like to go a step further and reduce the proposed building height to $31.4^{\prime}$, a full foot below the existing roof height.
3) Shadows - per the expressed concerns about shadows by the owners of 22 and 24 , please see the attached shadow study which is digitally created and an accurate representation of the shadows cast when the sun is at its highest and lowest points throughout the year. You will see that there are new shadows cast only briefly between approx 10 and 11:00 on the Fall Equinox and between approx. 10 and 11:30 on the Spring Equinox. These shadows are very brief and limited to those 2 times of the year. Now that we have offered to reduce the proposed building height to 12 " below the existing building height, these shadows will be decreased even beyond what is shown in the attached shadow study.
4) The shadow study was produced with the correct north arrow which you correctly noted was incorrect on the site plan. This error was not intentional and it has been fixed. The correct north arrow is shown on the shadow study plans and the updated site plan.
5) Dimensional Requirements: All new work constructed outside the existing building envelope in a Res-C zone must follow the Res-C dimensional requirements which we have done. Per your comments regarding the use of the multiplane method for calculating setbacks, we did use that method and we failed to comply, as shown in the attached zoning plans showing setback calculations for both Res C, Res C 1 and the multiplane method. In all cases our structure is existing non-conforming. Our proposed enlargement of the rear bump out does not extend any further to the rear and only 2.5 ' on either side, but still those walls remain $1^{\prime}-10$ " set back behind the planes of the existing left and right side walls of the main body of the house.
6) FAR: Seeking relief to go from a .74 to a .94 FAR does seem to us to be reasonable. The existing 2 family structure has a total of only 4 bedrooms ( 2 bedrooms per unit) which is not in any way conducive to family living. Our proposed plans call for 8 total bedrooms, with 4 per unit, which is conducive to family living without being extravagant. All the bedrooms are located on the 2nd and 3rd floors, for although we can as by right use the basement for habitable space, bedrooms in basements are not desirable below grade for multiple reasons. Our plans do not call for any exterior below grade window or stairwells so we are limiting the basement to family room type space only.
7) Scale and Character: Fairmont Street is characterized by an eclectic and diverse array of architectural styles and sizes. Our block of the street contains 2-1/2 story, 3 story and 4-1/2 story structures, including a full 3 -story mansard roof structure 3 houses down at 10-12 Fairmont Street. 22 Fairmont Ave and 24 Fairmont St, our most direct abutters, each contain 4 bedrooms within 2 detached structures on a lot of comparable size to 18-20 Fairmont Ave. Surely our proposed increase in size is reasonably within the scale and character of the neighborhood both terms of density, scale and style.

We hope that our clarifications are helpful, and that our offers to raise the sills and reduce the sizes of the windows on the right side of the rear bump out, and lower the proposed roof height of the entire house, will help alleviate your concerns.

Please feel free to reach out to me directly with any additional comments or questions.
Sincerely,
Adam
Adam J Glassman, Architect for 18-20 Fairmont Street.
T: 617-412-8450

## SPECIAL PERMIT REQUIRED:

1. NEW WINDOW OPENINGS \& ENTRY CANOPY ADDITIONS ON LEFT AND RIGHT SIDES PER EXISTING NON-CONFORMING SETBACKS

WIDEN EXIStING REAR SECTION WITHIN THE EXISTING NONCONFORMING LEFT AND RIGHT SIDE SETBACKS.
3. INCREASE EXISTING NONCONFORMING FAR FROM . 70 TO . 92 (. 60 MAX ALLOWABLE)
4. NEW MANSARD ROOF ADDITION WITHIN THE EXISTING NONCONFORMING LEFT AND RIGHT SIDE SETBACKS.
5. INCREASE EXISTING NON CONFORMING STRUCTURE BETWEEEN 10\%-25\% OF EXISTING STRUCTURE AS OF 1940.

EXISTING STREET VIEW


## PROPOSED RENOVATIONS AND ADDITIONS

18-20 Fairmont Street Cambridge, MA


PROPOSED STREET VIEW
PROJECT
18-20 Fairmont Street
Cambridge, MA


LOCUS MAP


STREET VIEW 18-20 FAIRMONT STREET

|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br>  <br>  | 02/09/23 | 18-20 Fairmont Street Cambridge, MA | PHOTOS / CONTEXT |  | $0.1$ |



SATELLITE VIEW


STREET VIEW 18-20 FAIRMONT STREET

|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138 www.glassmanchungdesign com | 02/09/23 | 18-20 Fairmont Street Cambridge, MA | PHOTOS / CONTEXT | $3 / 32$ " = 1'-0" | 0.2 |


| Dimension Regulation - ZONE RESIDENCE C |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EXISTING | PROPOSED | REQUIRED | CONFORMING |
| MAX FAR | 0.74 | 0.92 | 0.60 | EXISTING NON CONFORMING |
| MIN. LOT SIZE | 5,000 sq. ft. | 5,000 sq. ft. | 5,000 sq. ft. | YES |
| MIN. LOT AREA PER DWELLING UNIT | 1,800 sq. ft. | - | - | - |
| MIN. LOT WIDTH | $50^{\prime}$ | $50^{\prime}$ | 50' | YES |
| MIN. FRONT SETBACK | 30' - CENTER L. 15' - STREET L. | 30' - CENTER L. 15' - STREET L. | $(\mathrm{H}+\mathrm{L}) / 4 \mathrm{MIN} .10{ }^{\text {' }}$ | YES |
| MIN. LEFT SIDE SETBACK | 10.4' | 10.4' | $\begin{aligned} & (\mathrm{H}+\mathrm{L}) / 5 \mathrm{MIN} .7^{\prime}-66^{\prime \prime} \text { SUM OF 20' } \\ & \left(32.4^{\prime}+55.4^{\prime} / 5\right)=17.56^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | EXISTING NON CONFORMING |
| MIN. RIGHT SIDE SETBACK | 9.9' | 9.9' | $\begin{aligned} & (\mathrm{H}+\mathrm{L}) / 5 \mathrm{MIN} .7^{\prime}-6 " \text { SUM OF 20' } \\ & \left(32.4^{\prime}+55.4^{\prime} / 5\right)=17.56^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | EXISTING NON CONFORMING |
| MIN. REAR SETBACK | 26.8' | 26.8' | $20^{\prime}$ | YES |
| MAXIMUM HEIGHT | 32.4' | 32.4 | 35' | YES |
| RATIO OF PRIVATE OPEN SPACE TO LOT AREA | 34\% | 40\% | 36\% | YES |

NOTE: REFER TO PLOT PLAN BY NOLAN AND ASSOCIATES FOR ALL SETBACK MEASUREMENTS, BUILDING HEIGHT AND OPEN SPACE

|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | drawing |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br>  617.4228450 | 2/24/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street Cambridge, MA | Zoning Analysis |  | $\text { Z. } 1$ |





(2) Section GFA

(3) Covered Patio

EXISTING GFA -FAR CALCULATION

| Name | Gross Floor <br> Area | Lot Area | FAR <br> (GFA/LOT) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| 1st Floor | 1493 SF | 5000 SF | 0.298563 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2nd Floor | 1459 SF | 5000 SF | 0.291772 |
| Attic | 526 SF | 5000 SF | 0.105286 |
| Canopy | 26 SF | 5000 SF | 0.005241 |
| Canopy | 26 SF | 5000 SF | 0.005241 |
| Covered Patio | 174 SF | 5000 SF | 0.034887 |
| 3705 SF |  |  |  |



(1) $\frac{\text { Basement }}{1 / 8 "=1 '-0 "}$

(2) $\frac{1 \text { st Floor }}{1 / 8^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0 "}$



- Mansard Roof

29'-0



TOT. FLOOR AREA (1,303 S.F.)FLOOR AREA TO BE DEMOLISHED (0 S.F.)
(1) GFA DEMO Basement


FLOOR AREA TO BE DEMOLISHED (0 S.F.)
(2) GFA DEMO 1st Floor $3 / 32$ " = 1'-0"


TOT. FLOOR AREA ( 1,357 S.F.)FLOOR AREA TO BE DEMOLISHED (452 S.F.)
(3) GFA DEMO 2nd Floor
$3 / 32$ " = 1'-0'
TOT. FLOOR AREA (895 S.F.)FLOOR AREA TO BE DEMOLISHED (0 S.F.)
(4) GFA DEMO 3rd Floor $3 / 32^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0$ "

|  | BASEMENT | 1ST FLOOR | 2NDFLOOR | 3RD FLOOR | TOT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| EXTG. (S.F.) | 1,303 | 1,392 | 1,357 | 895 | 4,947 |
| DEMO (S.F.) | 0 | 0 | 452 | 0 | 452 |

## Percentage of DEMO =

9.14\% < 25\%

CONFORMING

DATE

(1) Front/Left side view EXTG
(2) Front/Right side view EXTG

|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br>  <br>  | 2/24/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street Cambridge, MA | Existing 3D Views |  | 0.1 |



2) Extg. 3rd Floor

1/8" = 1'-0"

(3) Extg. Roof


## GCD ARCHITECTS <br> 2 WORTHINGTON STREET <br> CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138 $617-412-8450$

$\left.\begin{array}{l}617-412-8450 \\ \text { www.glassmanchungdesign.com }\end{array}\right]$

| TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Extg. Demo | $1 / \mathbf{" ' ~}^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-\mathbf{0 "}$ | D2.1 |



| TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Extg. Demo | $1 / 8^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | D2.2 |
| Elevations |  |  |


(1) Front/Left side view PROPOSED
(2) Front/Right side view PROPOSED

(1) Rear/ Right side view PROPOSED

(2) Rear Left View PROPOSED



(1) Front Elevation
(2) Right Side Elevation
$1 / 8 "=1$ '-0


|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br> 2 WORTHINGTON STREET CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138 617-412-8450 www.glassm $\qquad$ | 2/24/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street <br> Cambridge, MA | Proposed Elevations | 1/8" = 1'-0" | $\mathrm{A} 2.2$ |




[^3](2) Front/Left side view- PROPOSED

(1) Front Right View - EXTG

(2) Front Right View - PROPOSED



5. FRST floor ellevatons are taken at threshol.

8. THE Elevatons shown are based on city of cambiloe datu
9. ZONNG DISTRCT: RESIDENEE $c$.

| ZONING LEGEND |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ZONING DISTRICT: RESIDENCE C |  |  |  |
|  | REQUIRED | EXISTING | PROPOSED |
| max. F.a.r. | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.95 |
| MIN. AREA | 5,000 S.F. | 5,000 s.F. | 5,000 s.F. |
|  | - | 1,800 S.F. | - |
| MIN. LOT WOTH | $50^{\circ}$ | $50^{\circ}$ | $50^{\circ}$ |
| MIN. YARD Front |  |  |  |
| SIIE (LLEFT) | 17.5' | $10.4{ }^{\prime}$ | $10.4{ }^{\prime}$ |
| SIDE (RIGHT) | 17.5' | 9.9 | 9.9 |
| rear | 20' | $26.8^{\prime}$ | $26.8^{\prime}$ |
| MaX. BLOG. HEIGHT | $35^{\circ}$ | $32.4{ }^{\circ}$ | $34^{\circ}$ |
| IN. 0 | 36\% | 34\% | 40\% |


|  | LeGEND |
| :---: | :---: |
| - |  |
| $\bigcirc$ | Sule por |
|  | nes sum |
|  |  |
|  | sem |
| $\bigcirc$ | \%emememe |
| ${ }^{\text {® }}$ | men mear |
| $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | ${ }^{\text {masem mame }}$ |
|  |  |
|  | momer |
| $\bigcirc$ | nuemu memat |
| - |  |
|  | Uatraut |
| - | mame |
|  | 边 |
|  |  |
|  | Seme mume |
|  |  |
|  | mote |
|  | Eme ule |
|  | 边 |
|  | aseme |
| mos | ormen mes |
|  | comen urime |




EXISTING PROFILE NOT TO SCALE


PROPOSED PROFILE
NOT TO SCALE

GRaphic scale
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| From: | Adam Glassman [ajglassman.ra@gmail.com](mailto:ajglassman.ra@gmail.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, March 24, 2023 8:53 AM |
| To: | Emily Holman |
| Cc: | Fraser Allan; Pacheco, Maria; ianworld@gmail.com; sandra.y.ferguson@gmail.com |
| Subject: | Re: 18-20 Fairmont St |

Dear Emily, Hassanaly, Ian and Sandra,
We would like to regroup and start fresh with you properly, if you are still open to working with us. We do want to be good neighbors, and we regret we didn't initiate a real dialogue with you much earlier.

We had an idea that the best way for us to effectively address your (very legitimate) concerns would be to do the following:

1) remove the rear gable roof altogether, creating a full 2 story rear bump out, substantially increasing your exposure to direct sun, daylight and views to the sky. Existing shadows cast toward your homes would be effectively reduced.
2) We would want to widen the rear section per the plans Approx $2.5^{\prime}$ on either side and possibly a bit to the rear to help make up for the lost square footage on the existing half story.
3) we will add a condition to the proposal that no rear roof decks are permitted.
4) on the front portion of the house we would proceed with the mansard roof design which I believe is not as much a source of concern for you or the board as is the formerly proposed increased rear massing.
5) we will consult with you on the major aesthetic decisions you will see when the project is complete, such as house color, landscaping and fencing.
6) we will provide a landscape plan for you to review as part of our updated application to the board.

If all this sounds agreeable we can send you updated visuals to review along with an updated shadow study.
And if you are open this, l'd like to meet you in person and review the revised design with you on-site. This might be much better than limiting our dialogue to purely emails.

We sincerely believe that the new plans will not only provide no detriment to you, but will actually improve the quality of life in your properties.

We look forward to hearing from you.
Sincerely,
Adam

Adam Glassman, R.A.
T: 617-412-8450

Adam J. Glassman, R.A.
Cambridge, MA
C: 617.412.8450
www.glassmanchungdesign.com

## Pacheco, Maria

| From: | Adam Glassman [ajglassman.ra@gmail.com](mailto:ajglassman.ra@gmail.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, March 24, 2023 8:53 AM |
| To: | Emily Holman |
| Cc: | Fraser Allan; Pacheco, Maria; ianworld@gmail.com; sandra.y.ferguson@gmail.com |
| Subject: | Re: 18 -20 Fairmont St |

Dear Emily, Hassanaly, Ian and Sandra,
We would like to regroup and start fresh with you properly, if you are still open to working with us. We do want to be good neighbors, and we regret we didn't initiate a real dialogue with you much earlier.

We had an idea that the best way for us to effectively address your (very legitimate) concerns would be to do the following:

1) remove the rear gable roof altogether, creating a full 2 story rear bump out, substantially increasing your exposure to direct sun, daylight and views to the sky. Existing shadows cast toward your homes would be effectively reduced.
2) We would want to widen the rear section per the plans Approx $2.5^{\prime}$ on either side and possibly a bit to the rear to help make up for the lost square footage on the existing half story.
3) we will add a condition to the proposal that no rear roof decks are permitted.
4) on the front portion of the house we would proceed with the mansard roof design which I believe is not as much a source of concern for you or the board as is the formerly proposed increased rear massing.
5) we will consult with you on the major aesthetic decisions you will see when the project is complete, such as house color, landscaping and fencing.
6) we will provide a landscape plan for you to review as part of our updated application to the board.

If all this sounds agreeable we can send you updated visuals to review along with an updated shadow study.
And if you are open this, l'd like to meet you in person and review the revised design with you on-site. This might be much better than limiting our dialogue to purely emails.

We sincerely believe that the new plans will not only provide no detriment to you, but will actually improve the quality of life in your properties.

We look forward to hearing from you.
Sincerely,
Adam
Adam Glassman, R.A.
T: 617-412-8450

## Pacheco, Maria

| From: | Catherine Zusy [cathzusy@gmail.com](mailto:cathzusy@gmail.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Thursday, March 23, 2023 6:34 PM |
| To: | Pacheco, Maria |
| Subject: | Comments re 3.23 Meeting re Board of Zoning Appeal |

3.23.2023

To: Board of Zoning Appeal
From: Cathie Zusy, 202 Hamilton St., Cambridge, MA 02139
Re: CASE NO. BZA-211208 18 FAIRMONT STREET Residence C Zone FRASER ALLAN - 18-20 FAIRMONT LLC - C/O ADAM GLASSMAN, R.A Special Permit

Why allow the developer at 18 Fairmont St. more FAR (increasing it from a district base of 60 to .92) when it will only benefit him, the developer? If this was affordable housing, it might be appropriate. But it is not.

We believe that granting this special permit would be a bad precedent for Cambridgeport, an already very dense neighborhood!

Thank you.

## Pacheco, Maria

| From: | Jimena Bermejo [jimenabermejo@gmail.com](mailto:jimenabermejo@gmail.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Thursday, March 23, 2023 7:02 PM |
| To: | Pacheco, Maria |
| Subject: | CASE NO. BZA-211208 18 FAIRMONT STREET Residence C Zone FRASER ALLAN - 18-20 |
|  | FAIRMONT LLC - C/O ADAM GLASSMAN, R.A Special Permit |

## To: Board of Zoning Appeal

From: Jimena Bermejo,13 Pleasant Place \#2 Cambridge, MA 02139
Re: CASE NO. BZA-211208 18 FAIRMONT STREET Residence C Zone FRASER ALLAN - 18-20 FAIRMONT LLC - C/O ADAM GLASSMAN, R.A Special Permit

Please do not allow this developer to continue the gentrification of the neighborhood. We need AFFORDABLE housing. No more of this PLEASE. People are getting displaced. No One except for rich people can live here now. You have the power to stop this.

Thank you
--
Jimena
www.jimenabermejo.com


Luba

## APRIL 13, 2023

 ABUTTER SUPPORT CORRESPONDACE WITH LUBA FEIGENBERG 16 FAIRMONT STREET

Hi Luba, hope all is well. Here are the revised elevations, the left is existing and the right is proposed.

You'll see that we reduced the size of the rear section from three stories, to two. We also reduced the FAR from . 92 to .82 , and are keenina the_qable_roof
and are keeping the gable roof style in the front section. Let me know if you have any questions/ comments.

## Thank you!

Fraser


Here's the previous proposal for reference

Todav 7:48 AM

8:46


Luba


(forn Rot ver. ExTC
(2) Fiminami vor. PRoposes

Here's the previous proposal for reference

Today 7:48 AM
Hi Luba- did you have a chance to take a look at this?

Thanks for sending Fraser. Great to see, and will definitely be better for us - less sky blocked from our windows.

To:
Cambridge Board of Zoning Appeals
831 Mass Ave
Cambridge MA 02139

Dear Cambridge BZA,
I am writing to express my strong support for the relief sought for the proposed project at 18-20 Fairmont Street.

I have reviewed the plans and as I understand it, the sought after relief would be for the following:

1) Modest Increase in non-conforming FAR
2) New left side, low profile additions within the left side setback.
3) New gable roof and dormers within both side setbacks.
4) Modification of the existing 1-1/2 story rear bump-out and its conversion into a 2-story bump-out with a low-profile flat roof.

These proposed modifications are modest and reasonable and pose no substantial detriments and no greater detriments to the neighborhood than the existing non-conforming house which is an eye-sore and in need of substantial reconstruction and modernization. The proposed work will be consistent in scale and character to the existing house and to the neighborhood, and (2) new units designed for families and modern living will be created.

I understand that the developers have worked closely with the abutters to substantially reduce the scale of the proposed work and I strongly encourage the BZA to grant the requested relief.

Sincerely,

## William Senue

## Signature

William Senne

Printed Name

## 100 Pacific St, Cambridge

## Address

05/01/23

## Date

## Signature Certificate

Reference number: DUHDF-FDTMJ-XUAHH-N6WFW

| Signer | Timestamp |
| :--- | :--- |
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## Cambridge Board of Zoning Appeals

831 Mass Ave.
Cambridge MA 02139

To the Cambridge Board of Zoning Appeals,
I am long term resident of Cambridgeport, and I fully support the plans to modestly enlarge and greatly improve the existing house at 18-20 Fairmont Street.

The raised gable roof and new dormers are very tasteful and in keeping with the character and scale of the existing streetscape and are consistent with the Cambridge Dormer Guidelines.

The new left side additions are low profile, attractive and modest, the additional FAR is not excessive and is consistent with helping to make the existing house more comfortable for family living.

The updated existing rear bump out is clearly no longer a functional appendage to the existing structure. The second floor needs to be raised to align with the second floor of the main building and the roof heights are lower than what the building code and modern living require. The developers have proposed the lowest profile, most modest, and most logical change conceivable to make the existing rear bump out suitable and functional for modern use. The right side of the building footprint does not change, the high point of the existing half story gable drops lower, and the low eave is raised only $3^{\prime}-9^{\prime \prime}$ which is by all measures a very modest and reasonable increase, just the minimum increase in height required to achieve legal head height within the existing footprint of the second floor.

The proposed revised plans are a dramatic reduction in scale from the first submission to the BZA, far more appropriate for the context of the neighborhood, I encourage the BZA to approve these extremely modest and very reasonable upgrades as proposed.

Sincerely,
Carmen Maianu
141 Allston St
Cambridge
857-321-1773

To:
Cambridge BZA (Board of Zoning Appeals)
831 Mass Ave.
Cambridge MA 02139

Dear Cambridge BZA,

I reside at 28 Speridakis Terrace in Cambridgeport, I have seen the plans and renderings of the proposed work to be considered by the Cambridge Zoning Board at 18-20 Fairmont Street.

This proposed design seems to me to be very appropriate for the neighborhood. The scale, the overall design and the various improvements make sense for the functionality of the building to accommodate family living. Over all the proposed work seems to improve the quality of the existing housing and the aesthetics of the neighborhood, and at the same time the issues requiring zoning relief are quite reasonable and modest. The FAR increase, the new dormers, the left side additions and the squaring off the rear bump-out are all modest increases beyond the existing non-conforming conditions, and I can see no substantially increased existing nor any new substantial detriments posed by the proposed work.

This is a good project for the community, and I support it.

Sincerely,

## Daneli Urena

28 Speridakis Terrace
954-649-9719
5/5/2023


831 Mass Avenue, Cambridge, MA. (617) 349-6100

## Board of Zoning Appeal l Waiver Form

The Board of Zoning Appeal
831 Mas Avenue
Cambridge, MAA 02139
RE: Case \# $\qquad$ _.

Address:
 St

## I.

$\square$ Owner, $\square$ Petitioner, or $\square$ Representative:

(Print Name)
hereby waives the required time limits for holding a public hearing as required by Section 9 or Section 15 of the Zoning Act of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 40A. The $\square$ Owner, $\square$ Petitioner, or $\square$ Representative further hereby waives the Petitioner's and/or Owner's right to a Decision by the Board of Zoning Appeal on the above referenced case within the time period as required by Section 9 or Section 15 of the Zoning Act of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 40A, and/or Section 6409 of the federal Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012, codified as 47 U.S.C. §1455(a), or any other relevant state or federal regulation or law.

Date:

(8:27 p.m.)
Sitting Members: Brendan Sullivan, Jim Monteverde, Andrea A. Hickey, Slater W. Anderson, and Matina Williams

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: The Board will hear Case No. 211208 -- 18 Fairmont Street. Mr. Glassman?

ADAM GLASSMAN: Good evening, Mr. Chair, and members of the Board. I'm Adam Glassman, GCD Architects located at 2 Worthington Street in Cambridge. I'm here representing the petitioner, Fraser Allan, owner of 18-20 Fairmont Ave. -- or Fairmont Street.

Olivia, can you pull up the -- the drawings?

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Adam, before we actually get into the merits of the case, and we may -- it's entirely up -- give you an option, but there is substantial correspondence and some questioning of the project. There was one that actually came in today at 4:53.

And I was just wondering if you want to continue with the case tonight, or if you want to take a continuance as a case not heard. If it's a case heard, then we'll have to reassemble the same five members and to have discussions
with abutting property owners.

ADAM GLASSMAN: Yep. We would prefer to present tonight, let the Board hear the merits of this petition, the petitioner and if a continuance is required, we'll certainly consider that.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Okay. All right.
ADAM GLASSMAN: Olivia, can you pull up the files?
So 18-20 Fairmont Street, and it's an existing two-family structure. It's outdated, it's in need of substantial improvements and renovations inside and out.

The goal of our project is to enlarge this structure, maintaining it as a two-family creating higherquality, more livable spaces, especially on the third floor, which has extremely, an extremely steep roof pitch. The rooms currently in the attic space aren't really functional or -- as bedrooms or much of anything else.

You know, goals include, you know, a respectful integration into the neighborhood with an architectural style that's present on the street, and to achieve this goal of higher-quality housing.

We're here seeking relief to expand the footprint in the rear modestly to either side, requiring a special
permit and construct a Mansard roof in the front and in the back bump out, also within left and right-side setbacks requiring a special permit. And we'd be increasing our FAR from a 0.74 to a 0.92 , requiring a special permit for existing nonconforming conditions.

Next slide, please?
A street view of the house showing some contextual
views. On the left, you can see the -- on the locus plan No. 18 is identified. You can see that compared to other structures on our block and behind us, we're a relatively small footprint.

And enlarging it as we propose does not make it substantially larger than many of our abutting and nearby buildings.

Next slide, please?
Again, on the left an aerial view. The -- the roof right in the middle with that bit of brown siding you can see, that is our property. Just above it, the red houses are our direct abutter on the right. You can see behind us we have some pretty massive three- and four-story triple-decker style structures.

Across the street from us and to the right we have
a four-and-a-half story brick apartment building.
Directly to the left of us two homes down is a mansard structure, similar design to what we're proposing. And of course we've got smaller and medium-sized gable structures in the neighborhood.

My point is that our proposed increase in size will not be out of character with the scale of this neighborhood and the increase in FAR is not inconsistent with this neighborhood. It may not be consistent with every house. But we're certainly within the broad range of scales and sizes that exist around us.

Next slide, please?
Our zoning tables for Residence C: Residence C complies to any new construction in this neighborhood, in this zone that is outside the existing footprint. And we're looking to create an integrated new third floor, an expanded third floor, expanded rear bump outs. So all of this puts us in the Residence $C$ dimensional requirements.

Going from a nonconforming 0.74 to a nonconforming
0.92. In terms of GFA, we would be going from a 3700-square-foot structure to a 4600-square-foot structure. This doesn't include the basements, as the basements are not
included in the FAR and GFA calculations.

The existing per unit size is 1850 square feet.
The proposed unit size is 2300 square feet. Again, not extravagant, not inconsistent with many of the dwellings on our block in our neighborhood.

Next slide, please?
Oh, actually, no -- not next slide. Let me -more here to review. Our left and right-side setbacks are both existing nonconforming, no matter how we calculate it, and we calculate it with the single, single-wall calculation, which is the height plus the length divided by -- divided by five.

Whether we use this method or the multiplane method, we're still nonconforming. If we could have made our setbacks conforming, then we would be here seeking far less relief. But we're nonconforming with our setbacks.

Our rear setback is conforming and will remain conforming.

Our building height in this legend is $32.4^{\prime}$ and our proposed building height is 32.4'. So it remains conforming.

Our ratio of open space is 34 percent existing.

We're proposing 40 percent. And the required is 36 percent, so we're bringing that into conformance.

Next slide, please?

Our setback plans showing that the setbacks run directly through the house. I know some of our neighbors wanted us to calculate our setbacks differently. We've used -- we tried some other methods. We've tried the multiplane method; we tried even other zones. Our setbacks are nonconforming, and that's really can't be disrupted.

So what you see towards the rear of the building in grade is the existing bump out in white and gray to the left. To the right we're proposing to widen the rear bump out by approximately 2.5 feet on either side. We've also got a rear deck, a left-side entry and a right-side exterior entry also on site, also within the setbacks.

We would be dividing the structure between front and back units. Right now it's -- it's configured with a left and a right unit, which makes it extremely narrow and creating front and rear townhouse-style units much more desirable, comfortable livable spaces.

Next slide, please?
Our open space plans showing the removal of
various patios, concrete-covered patio deck, replacing shabby, left- and right-side yards with more attractive patio entries for both units, squaring off the existing parking spaces to make them a little more attractive and functional and maintaining the front green space, maintaining and improving it.

Next slide, please?
Our FAR plans for the existing house: 1493 square feet on the first floor, 1459 on the second.

Next slide?
More FAR documentation. I think we can come back to this if anyone has questions, but we have an existing 0. 74 at this time.

Next slide?
Again, proposed FAR widening the back on the first and second floor, but still maintaining the rear façades, or the rear side façades would still be recessed back behind the main house, left and right façades.

Next slide, please?
Additional FAR calc information. You can see on the lower right we're at 0.92 proposed.

Next slide?

Unit sizes are not really pertinent to zoning. We can move on to the next slide.

This documents the percentage of the house that we are demolishing in order to construct the new Mansard roofs. This was for the Historic Commission. We're under 25 percent. No demo delay was required.

Next slide, please?
Additional demo counts from the Historic

Commission.

Next slide, please?

Essentially areas of work and substantial demolition within the building. The structure requires a complete gut of the interior, basically rebuilding it from the inside out. Our undersize framing cracking brought undersized beams and posts, lack of headers, nonconforming stairs.

Next slide, please?

3D views of the existing house. We will be maintaining the front bays, most of the window pattern in front, and will be reconstructing covered entries on the side, consistent with the style of the existing.

You can see towards the back the smaller rear bump
out. That's where the primary expansion of the house is, in addition to the Mansard over the main volume.

Next slide, please?

Additional demo plans.
Next slide?

Additional demo plans. Both main roofs to come out, construct new mansards.

Next slide?

Our demo elevations. We can -- yeah, we can -- we can pass through this, I think. We can keep going. More demo elevations. Here we have the proposed structure of mansard.

I know we've had some negative feedback on the design. You know, we really worked hard to make this an attractive traditional style building. We'd be restoring the original clapboard wood siding, the original -restoring original-style corner boards, refurbishing the bays, maintaining the rear setbacks between the main volume and the rear volume.

You know, our argument is that this is proportionally correct. It's consistent with similar style homes in the neighborhood, where we have mansards.

Next slide, please?
Rear views: Both the front unit and the back unit would have attractive covered entries. The rear unit has the benefit of a nice rear deck with another canopy. Again, traditional detailing, proper volumes.

Next slide, please?
Our proposed plans exclude any use of the basement for additional bedrooms. We exclude any future accessory dwelling units. There are no window wells, no exterior stairwells. The basement can only be used as livable space, but not additional density.

On the first-floor, open kitchen living plans for both units are pretty standard for new and substantial renovations of the structures. These days, on the second floor we've got several bedrooms, standard, associated spaces -- closets, laundry.

You keep scrolling on the third floor again: Two bedrooms per unit. You can see towards the back on the right side we have new windows over the stair for headroom, and we do the same thing on the front unit towards the left in the mansard. Most of the new windows actually at this level are four -- are facing the neighbors for stair and
support spaces.

Next slide, please?
Our elevations -- exterior elevations, again
showing the design of the mansard, the windows, the canopies. The existing height to remain the same, no change.

Next slide, please?
I think you get more elevations. The style is consistent around the house. You know, we're careful to center windows, align windows to give this the proper architectural appearance.

Next slide, please?

Our building section just showing the ceiling heights at each level.

Next slide, please?

We can come back to this if there are any questions. Our comparison views, our 3D comparison views: On the left is the existing structure on -- from the front and the left, and on the right is our proposed view.

Again, the roof heights are consistent. The front volume does not become any wider. The rear volume is modestly wider. Most of this line -- is that it? Okay.

Another comparison: Before and after, existing and proposed. While, you know, clearly the style of the house changes at a certain point, it's definitely consistent with homes throughout Cambridge, throughout our neighborhood, even on our block.

Next slide, please?
The last comparison, 3D view. The third-floor windows in the foreground in the back, those are supporting stair head height. The other windows on the first and second floor of the rear bump out are also for support spaces, hallway space, airspace. One of the windows is a dining room.

And I mention this as a transition to address some of the concerns that came in from our abutters.

Is there another slide? Oh, just our site plan. Okay. Believe that's the last slide.

So, you know, now I want to address some of the comments that came in. I know we're going to hear from our neighbors tonight. We had essentially one very intense letter of opposition that was signed and circulated and signed by various abutters to our right -- people from beyond the neighborhood, which is their right. I completely
understand.

A few things $I$ should mention from the start is that, you know, there were some minor human errors in our original application. They were not substantial.

We -- for example, we always call the building height and the architectural set as to remain at $32.4^{\prime}$ Our surveyor hadn't updated his proposed information in a timely manner and was calling out a taller roof line.

But of course we'd be held to the dimensions shown in our architectural plans and elevations. There were some thoughts on maybe we did this intentionally for some reason. Of course we did not.

The north arrow on the site plan had been shown incorrectly. That was brought to our attention on Monday this week. That has been corrected and resubmitted but can't be shown here because it came in on Monday.

There were concerns from our direct abutters on the right regarding light, shadow, and privacy. And we understand those concerns. We respect them.

We've made some offers to address them in e-mail correspondence. There's been no response to those offers. We offered then and offer now to reduce the proposed
building height by a foot, which would make it one foot lower than the existing ridgeline.

We offered to make our rear right-side windows all transoms so the sills would be above head height, and they're hoping that would alleviate the concerns about privacy. I know we stated in our application that there would be no shadows cast. You know, perhaps that language was too strong. I think what I should have said was no in our opinion, meaningful or detrimental shadows cast.

You know, part of what makes this project difficult at this point, as you'll see when the public comment comes, is that we didn't reach out to neighbors as quickly as we should have.

Both Fraser and I have been to this Board. We've done many projects in Cambridge. We're usually spot on with who's doing what with regard to abutter outreach. That I'm I thought he was doing the outreach, he thought $I$ was doing the outreach. March 15 came, and we realized we hadn't done the outreach, so Fraser quickly called our neighbors to our right and our neighbors to the left at 16.

Our neighbor at 16 who Fraser spoke with -- I forget her name; I apologize for that -- She had no interest
in either opposing or supporting this project.
To our neighbors on the right, I know Ian spoke with -- I'm sorry, Fraser spoke with Ian Ferguson on the fifteenth. I am told Ian said that he knew this was happening. He had received the notice from the city. He had not looked at the plans yet, but he had no issues at that time no questions or concerns. Then again, that was last week on the fifteenth.

At some point, Fraser did e-mail him plans, I think it was the next day, to make sure he had them. Maybe he asked for them, I'm not surgery.

Our neighbors behind No. 22 at No. 24, we -Fraser left a message on the fifteenth. He didn't hear back; he left his number. My information has always been out there as a contact for this project; no one reached out to us. And we realize the onus is on us to be proactive about it. We were a little late to the game, but we did reach out.

We got very little response until the Monday of this week the flood of negative comments in it. And we have addressed all those comments as quickly as we could; material we can't present tonight, because it came in, you
know, the comments came in on Monday. We weren't able to get the shadow studies produced until a Tuesday fixing the north arrow in the site plan, a few other wrinkles.

I wish I could show you the shadow studies tonight. They're -- the shadows cast are very brief for a very limited amount of time during the equinox. You know, we're talking about a 1.5 -hour window at one equinox and a two-hour window at another. It's very brief.

So we've offered to reduce the height by a foot and to address that concern as well as modify the windows on the right side. No one has taken us up on that offer or asked us for something in particular.

We know there's a lot of negative feedback. And I think I'd like the Board to evaluate the project on its merits. And I'll be happy to answer and respond to as many of the comments that come up as I can.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Well, let me chime in. I think that the building obviously needs a transformation. I think the plan that is before us is a nice plan, a nice transformation, repurposing of the structure, except for the back addition, which is what I hesitate, and I've been to that site as actually even this afternoon around noontime.

I walked it again just to get a better sense of, you know, the effect it has.

And I refer to the letter from Emily Holman raising a number of issues. The pictures that are shown and the effect that that back addition will have on the adjoining property $I$ think is valid, and I think it's substantial.

And there is an awful lot of correspondence -some of it has come in lately, and I'm not sure if the Board has reviewed all of it -- I don't know how it could have, because I know I didn't.

And I guess my thought in trying to make some sense of the -- you know, what you've submitted, the dimensional form that was submitted on February 17 with the application is not accurate, is that a question?

ADAM GLASSMAN: No, it is accurate. There are no -- there are no errors in the form that I'm aware of at all.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: On the one that you sent it with the application? Okay.

ADAM GLASSMAN: Yes.
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: All right.
ADAM GLASSMAN: Unless it says we're proposing to
raise the building height, I'm not sure. But the building height remains the same.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Okay. Except that you are putting an addition on the back, which is raising that?

ADAM GLASSMAN: Correct, correct.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Yeah, but.
ADAM GLASSMAN: We raise the roof.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Right, but.
ADAM GLASSMAN: We raise the roof in the back.
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: But the high point is not changing?

ADAM GLASSMAN: Exactly.
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: And again, I think that there is substantial opposition here, and so, then you say, well, you know, what is the opposition all about? and what have you, and there's a tremendous amount of correspondence that -- again, is trying to decipher, go through it all.

But -- and again, I will recite what I've said many times in the past: You may have heard it, the Board has heard it ad infinitum, but the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court has stated repeatedly that the power to vary the application of the zoning ordinance must be sparingly
exercised, and only in rare instances and under exceptional circumstances peculiar in their nature, and with due regard to the main purpose of the zoning ordinance is to preserve the property rights of others.

And $I$ would offer that the abutting properties are asking that their property rights be upheld. So that's my comment.

Jim Monteverde, any thoughts, questions?

JIM MONTEVERDE: I agree with the comments from the Chair. And likewise, I have not seen the latest correspondence that came in.

BRENDAN SULIIVAN: Okay. Andrea Hickey, any thoughts, comments?

ANDREA HICKEY: No. I agree with your comments, Mr. Chair. I have nothing really to add.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Okay. Matina Williams?

MATINA WILLIAMS: Yes. Again, I agree with your comments.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Slater Anderson?

SLATER ANDERSON: Yeah, I've -- would concur. I agree with your comments. I think, you know, that it's the appropriateness for the location of the project. And, you
know, we could go back to the Pleasant Street project we had earlier.

You know, that was a six-unit, 40-foot building, but it was appropriate to the location. This is a residence in a tight, densely-settled street looking to increase an already nonconforming structure by, you know, 20-30 percent in size.

And, you know, the light impacts I think are legitimate -- the privacy impacts are legitimate. And I just -- I don't think it's the appropriate project for the location.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Okay. Let me open it to public comment. Any member of the public who wishes to speak should now click the button that says, "Participants," and then click the button that says, "Raise hand."

If you are calling in by phone, you can raise your hand by pressing *9 and unmute or mute by pressing *6, and you'll have up to three minutes in which to speak. And I would ask that you limit your comments to be concise and within the three minutes.

STEPHEN NATOLA: Sandra Ferguson?
SANDRA FERGUSON: Yeah, good evening, Mr. Chair,
the Board and also the entire Board. Thank you so much for spending time on this project tonight and for all the work that you do for our community.

Yeah, my name is Sandra Ferguson. I'm one of the abutters. My husband Ian Ferguson is also on the call. We live at 22 Fremont Street. And I just want to start off with that I really loved what you said, Mr. Chair. You know, this building really does need some love.

And so, we were genuinely excited to see that, you know, it would go into a process of being renovated, which I think it really needs.

And so, we were really hoping that, you know, we would have great neighbors there and an additional another family. You know, there's a lot of children on this street, so we all, you know, get to know each other and are looking forward to new neighbors.

I guess the couple comments that $I$ would like to make today is first off, I wish that Adam, you would have agreed to push this hearing tonight. I feel like this was very hasty, and it didn't actually really give the Board a lot of, you know, opportunity to read everything.

We're also, between jobs and children, trying to
make sure, you know, that we respond and kind of communicate. I agree with you, it would have been great to see the shadow study today.

And I -- one of the things that I feel upset about in this process is just that the original permit application really stated that there was no loss of privacy, no creation of any substantial shadows, and that the scale and character of the house will remain UNC, as if this were a really small ask. And I just don't think that's true.

And, you know, we bought our house, and you talk about our property rights; you know, we bought our house because we love the light. And what often is not shown there is actually a deck on a house that abuts directly to that other building.

And it's great to show shadow studies that have like a snapshot, but I found it and ran a Smart City company that was local to Cambridge as the CEO, and I've done a lot of solar studies, because we made solar products for smart cities.

And it's really about the hours of sunlight that you get. And that will be really reduced with the proposed project. So I think that is really a substantial piece to
what we oppose to.

There's also the loss of privacy that, in
particular our neighbors will be facing. Suddenly three
windows going up. I mean, there's basically two stories being added across from their children's bedrooms. And I think Emily will also take her three minutes. So thank you for letting us speak.

So -- and yes, the proposed transom windows to address privacy concerns, but we haven't really seen an elevation. Like, this is all, obviously, going very quickly again. Like, I wish we would have just pushed this to the next meeting so that we would have also more of a chance to review plans.

And yeah, we need a little bit more time also to review things. But $I$ can already say looking at the light study, there will be a substantial change to us.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: All right. All right. Thank you. Nobody else calling in.

Emily?
STEPHEN NATOLA: Emily Holman?
[Pause]
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Emily Holman?

HASSANALY LADHA: Hello. Can you hear me?

Or is that Emily?
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Yes.

HASSANALY LADHA: Oh, okay.
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: If you would introduce yourself

HASSANALY LADHA: I don't know why --
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: -- for the record.

HASSANALY LADHA: [Laughter] this is actually Emily
Holman's husband. I'm not sure my computer is not cooperating. So I've been in Africa. I just landed at Logan, and I'm between the gate and passport control.

THE REPORTER: Could you state your name for the record, please?

HASSANALY LADHA: So I did get a message at the end of last week, I think it was Friday, from Fraser. And it was sort of this comment that -- or sometime last week, you know, oh "We're just squaring off the house doing a few things." It didn't sound like anything I needed to jump on.

But when we did, it was, you know, we dug into it, we found that they're increasing the volume by a staggering amount for a house that's already 20 percent bigger than all
the houses are -- you know, than the houses certainly to -on Fairmont Street to the left and the right.

I think the Board had already mentioned a lot of the criticism -- a lot of these criticisms, and I don't want to sort of reiterate any, you know, things that have already -- already been said.

But I would -- I would just like to add that a lot of these, a lot of the claims that applicant is making, or the architect is making about the original forms are really -- are really not true.

There's a lot of obfuscation, and there's a lot of -- you know, the setback calculations, you know, even the multiplane formula that he used, which we got yesterday, we find it erroneous because he's not using -- he's using a maximum height across the entire single plane, which is not what the study should do.

He mentions these, that we've not responded to his offers, but they came in last night. You know, so -- you know, there's a lot -- I mean, it's very hard for us to sort of view all this as anything in the realm of -- of good faith. We've sort of, you know, the bottom line is that the impact on, on light in the area is significant.

On privacy, there are -- you know, this light study that was sent yesterday is, again, you know, it doesn't show -- it doesn't show 9:00, 12: 00 and 3:00. It shows 11:00. What happens before 11:00 am.

I mean, there's just -- you know, I the applicant seems to be -- you know, in all our experience in Cambridge, and we've lived here 20 some years, it seems to -- you know, not respectful at all of, you know, of neighbors that have some familiarity with the code.

There's no -- there's no way that a 6100 squarefoot two-family house is typical. And certainly not the houses around us -- are $20-24,26,28,16,15$. Immediate houses on Fremont Street are all around a 0.6 FAR, not 20 -BRENDAN SULLIVAN: All right. Okay. Great. Thank you. Thank you for calling in.

HASSANALY LADHA: Yeah.
STEPHEN NATOLA: Ian Ferguson?
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Three minutes, Ian.
IAN FERGUSON: Hello? Okay. Hello, everyone. Hello, hello, BZA Board. And thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak here. My wife and neighbor have just given a good take on this. Just to emphasize sort of the
key points, it's definitely -- definitely on the light, and sort of the impacts the structure will have on our morning light, which is definitely something I value every single day.

I also just want to -- yeah, so I just basically want to reemphasize that, and then I also just want to, you know, emphasize that this is going to be sort of like a block-like building, almost like a wall running our -- the full length, which right now has a bit of character to it and is a little bit more interesting than what we -- than what I believe will be in these current plans, and just sort of create a precedent for these sort of large block houses on our block.

Yeah. And so, I don't think I need to go and emphasize all these things much further, but I just wanted to -- you know, just sort of bring these up again, because I think they're really harmful.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Okay. Thank you.
STEPHEN NATOLA: Christian Grippo?
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: All right. Three minutes.
CHRISTIAN GRIPPO: Thank you. Can you hear me?
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Yes.

STEPHEN NATOLA: Yes.

CHRISTIAN GRAPPO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Board. I'm a longtime Cambridgeport resident. And yeah, I object to this project. According to the applicant's dimensions, he's complying with C-1 GFA, and I believe he cannot increase the GFA without a variant.

Also wanted to say that he proposes an FAR of 0.94 and when most of the properties are around 0.6 . So he's seeking more than 50 percent than what is allowed in our district. And he already has 0.74 FAR.

And so, he wants to go from a 5000-square-foot with a finished basement on a 5000-sqaure-feet lot. And so, he wants even more than that, making a 6100-square-feet twofamily.

And this is not typical from Cambridgeport. And I think it really creates a detriment to the abutters. And he's already increasing our volume that on a 0.74 house in a C district by the more than 44 percent.

So the numbers are huge. So $I$ think this sets a serious negative precedent in the Cambridgeport, and I -- it would mean that anybody with a nonconforming house could be up to, you know, house of 50 percent bigger than what the
code requires in the neighborhood. And I don't think that's the intent of the code.

And again, I think this was also mentioned before: They presented the petition as if it was a small request, but this is a huge, yeah, request. And with a huge impact. So I urge the Board to reject this petition and avoid setting this trouble precedent for Cambridge.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Thank you very much, Christian.
CHRISTIAN GRAPPO: Have a good night.
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Thank you.
STEPHEN NATOLA: Another Emily Holman.
EMILY HOLMAN: Hi. Sorry. I've been having trouble getting the button to push. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman and members of the Board for, you know, taking into consideration the concerns that we expressed in our correspondence.

And I mean, we're super open to talking about these things, it's just this has all come so fast. And there really just hasn't been a chance. And the way that -anyway, these offers have come so late. Like, it just hasn't been kind of open in the same way that Adam's kind of -- maybe I feel -- it hasn't felt that way to me in the way
he's characterizing it.
So anyway, but, you know, I think the main point is that this characterization again of like a minor, "Oh, it's just a couple of hours of light in the morning" if that's even it, I mean in the pictures -- and I've been kind of monitoring and everything -- you know, over these last days trying to sort of get my brain around it.

It's like all the morning light until, you know, 10:00 or 11:00, which is like the whole morning. And it's like washing the dishes light. It's, you know, my 3-yearold playing on the carpet light. It's -- it's not a joke. And it's like what makes our house a home. And it's just -it'll completely change the whole character of the house when we lose that.

And it's also that it's having -- I have two teens as well. Like, getting the 3 -year-old up in the morning, getting the 7 -- the, you know, 15-year-old for high school. Like, you need that more light, not just at, like, 10:00 you need it at -- anyway, all the earlier hours too. So I mean Sandra kind of mentioned that. But --

And I mean I think a lot of this stuff has already been expressed in the correspondence. But, you know, there
is all this -- also this potential issue with possibly needing a variance for the kinds of requests he's making because I think with the 0.74 FAR, he is compliant in the $C$ 1 district.

And, you know, that would mean that he would need to -- any increase in floor area or units or whatever it needs to be within the limits of the existing structure. I'm pretty sure that's how the [indiscernible] goes. So --

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: All right.
EMILY HOLMAN: -- something else to just be aware of. But thank you so much for --

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: All right.
EMILY HOLMAN: -- considering our comments.
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Thank you, Emily. Okay. That is the end of people calling in. There is quite a substantial amount of correspondence back and forth from the petitioner and abutting property owners and other concerned citizens.

Is it the sense of the Board that this matter should be continued? Jim Monteverde? Andrea? Matina? Slater? Anybody agree with that assessment?

JIM MONTEVERDE: I do. I agree.

MATINA WILLIAMS: I agree as well.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Yeah.

SLATER ANDERSON: Well, I -- okay, I mean the applicant requested to have this heard tonight. So I'm ready to go for a vote on this thing.

MATINA WILLIAMS: Okay. I concede.
ANDREA HICKEY: I agree with Slater. The applicant knew there was opposition and chose to proceed. So I think we should go to a vote.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Okay. Unless the petitioner asks for a continuance, which is a courtesy that the Board does extend. So Adam, I turn it back to you. Either --

ADAM GLASSMAN: I'm definitely -- I would definitely request a continuance. We have started brainstorming on how to redesign the rear roof to bring this down, you know, when I heard where this was going.

So we respectfully request a continuance. We'll see if we can try to come up with something more appealing to us neighbors. I'm sorry they felt that this was rushed. I mean, everyone was able to $\log$ in tonight, was able to -you know, they received a notice, it's not like the plans have been hidden. You know, we -- we shared them on our own
a little late, but they've always been available.

And our offers to produce the [connection interference] and the roof height they came late because all of the opposition came in on one day, just happened to come in on the day that would make it impossible for us to get our responses, our shadow studies into the --

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Okay.
ADAM GLASSMAN: -- into the file for the
presentation.
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Okay.

ADAM GLASSMAN: That being what it is, we would like to continue.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: All right. Which goes back to my original statement, whether or not you really wanted to go forward.

ADAM GLASSMAN: Well, I wanted the Board to hear the merits of it. I -- you know, I think --

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Other than to get a sense of the Board, which it appears that there's a high hurdle here to cross on this particular project. So --

ADAM GLASSMAN: Yep.
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Members of the Board, can we
extend the courtesy, then, to continue this matter one more time?

JIM MONTEVERDE: I would say yes.
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Okay. There are two dates:
Either May 11 or May 25. That's available. It's a case heard, so I would ask members of the Board: Jim, Andrea, Matina, Slater, are you available on May? Let me ask you this: If you are not available on either May 11 or May 25? ANDREA HICKEY: I am not available on May 25.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Okay.

ADAM GLASSMAN: May 11 suits us, Mr. Chair?
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Is everybody -- Jim, Andrea, Matina, Slater available on May 11?

JIM MONTEVERDE: Yes, I am.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Okay. So let me make a motion, then, to continue this matter to May 11, 2023 at 6:00 p.m. on the condition that the petitioner change the posting sign to reflect the new date of May 11, 2023 and the time at 6:00 p.m.

That the petitioner sign a waiver to the statutory requirement for a hearing and a decision to be rendered thereof into the statutory requirement. Such waiver shall
be signed and returned to the Staff no later than 5:00 p.m. one week from tonight, next Thursday.

Any new submittals not currently in the file be submitted by 5:00 p.m. on the Monday prior to the May 11 hearing.

That any -- again, dimensional form, supporting statements and drawings...

Any other conditions, members of the Board? No. So on the motion, then, to continue this matter to May 11, 2023 at 6:00 p.m., Jim Monteverde?

JIM MONTEVERDE: In fact.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Andrea Hickey?
ANDREA HICKEY: Yes, in favor.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Matina Williams?

MATINA WILLIAMS: In favor.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Slater Anderson?

SLATER ANDERSON: In favor.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Brendan Sullivan in favor.
[All vote YES]
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Five affirmative votes. This matter is continued to May 11.

ADAM GLASSMAN: Thank you.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: All right. I think we have one more case.
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## Pacheco, Maria

| From: | Adam Glassman [ajglassman.ra@gmail.com](mailto:ajglassman.ra@gmail.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, March $31,20238: 56 \mathrm{AM}$ |
| To: | Sandra Ferguson |
| Cc: | Emily Holman; Fraser Allan; Pacheco, Maria; ianworld@gmail.com |
| Subject: | Re: $18-20$ Fairmont St |

Dear Emily, Hassanaly, Ian and Sandra,

Last week we sent you the below list of proposed changes to our original design to address your concerns regarding massing, natural light and shadows.

We understand you all have busy lives, but we do need time to prepare our plans accordingly and resubmit them to the BZA file.

However, we have still not heard back from you other than the initial response that you would regroup and review our proposed revisions and other accommodations and let us know early this week.

I also offered to meet you in person to review the plans on site, that offer still stands.

Please let us know as soon as possible if you approve or have questions about what we have have proposed.

With the proposed 2 story bump out with a flat roof in the rear you will enjoy even more natural light and views to the sky than you do currently.

We believe the changes to the designs would not only improve the quality of life issues you are concerned about, but will make the project a better one as well.

Thank you, and we look forward to hearing from you.

Adam

On Fri, Mar 24, 2023 at 9:07 AM Sandra Ferguson [sandra.y.ferguson@gmail.com](mailto:sandra.y.ferguson@gmail.com) wrote:
Adam,

We will all debrief this weekend and digest your suggestions.

You can expect a response early next week.

My best,
Sandra

On Fri, Mar 24, 2023 at 8:53 AM Adam Glassman [ajglassman.ra@gmail.com](mailto:ajglassman.ra@gmail.com) wrote:
Dear Emily, Hassanaly, Ian and Sandra,

We would like to regroup and start fresh with you properly, if you are still open to working with us. We do want to be good neighbors, and we regret we didn't initiate a real dialogue with you much earlier.

We had an idea that the best way for us to effectively address your (very legitimate) concerns would be to do the following:

1) remove the rear gable roof altogether, creating a full 2 story rear bump out, substantially increasing your exposure to direct sun, daylight and views to the sky. Existing shadows cast toward your homes would be effectively reduced.
2) We would want to widen the rear section per the plans Approx $2.5^{\prime}$ on either side and possibly a bit to the rear to help make up for the lost square footage on the existing half story.
3) we will add a condition to the proposal that no rear roof decks are permitted.
4) on the front portion of the house we would proceed with the mansard roof design which I believe is not as much a source of concern for you or the board as is the formerly proposed increased rear massing.
5) we will consult with you on the major aesthetic decisions you will see when the project is complete, such as house color, landscaping and fencing.
6) we will provide a landscape plan for you to review as part of our updated application to the board.

If all this sounds agreeable we can send you updated visuals to review along with an updated shadow study.
And if you are open this, l'd like to meet you in person and review the revised design with you on-site. This might be much better than limiting our dialogue to purely emails.

We sincerely believe that the new plans will not only provide no detriment to you, but will actually improve the quality of life in your properties.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,
Adam
Adam Glassman, R.A.

T: 617-412-8450

| From: | Sandra Ferguson [sandra.y.ferguson@gmail.com](mailto:sandra.y.ferguson@gmail.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Monday, April 3, 2023 9:21 AM |
| To: | Adam Glassman |
| Cc: | Emily Holman; Fraser Allan; Pacheco, Maria; ianworld@gmail.com |
| Subject: | Re: 18-20 Fairmont St |

Dear Adam,
Thanks for this message. lan and I as well as Emily and Ally have all been away at various times during the week and have not had a chance to meet and fully consider and discuss your proposal. We are busy professionals and parents and are doing the best we can.

Unfortunately, your proposal remains a money grab at our expense. You already have an excess of saleable FAR (at .74) that was purchased at an attractive price. There is no reason for the BZA to give you more saleable square footage in a manner that obstructs views of the sky and sunlight for our families. Detriment to us so your client makes money isn't the purpose of the zoning code.

Dishearteningly, your proposal is again full of false claims and equivocations.

1. In your email, you tell us that under your proposals "you will enjoy even more natural light and views to the sky than you do currently." You pretend that the mansard in the front, which converts a 35 degree roof - one that slopes gently over a 15 foot run - into a vertical plane somehow would have no effect on views of the sky and exposure to sunlight? That does not stand to reason.
2. You further propose to "remove the rear gable roof altogether, creating a full 2 story rear bump out, substantially increasing your exposure to direct sun, daylight and views to the sky. Existing shadows cast toward your homes would be effectively reduced." The current eave in the rear is at approximately $15^{\prime}$. We were initially supportive of this specific proposal and are indeed absolutely fine with you removing the gable.

But please clarify what you mean by the word "full." If this word is hiding your purpose to increase the height at the eaves, it stands to reason that increasing the height of the vertical plane will countervail the effect of the removal of the gently sloping pitched roof (especially as you then propose to move the wall closer to us) and in fact significantly block light and views to the sky. We would be delighted if you were to prove us wrong here and say that you are not intending to increase the eave height and that your claims about light, sky views, etc. are, this time, actually true. (It would also help counter the opinion formed with respect to your initial filings and communication that you are not dealing with us or the BZA in a plain and straightforward way.)
3. Your proposals to bring the rear portion closer to us and to increase the length of the building are not acceptable to us. Reducing the setback in the rear and increasing the massing will further block light and cast shadows. And creating a 55' long wall, even with varied heights, is aesthetically worse than what we have now, which is a building with varied setbacks and thus dimensionality.

No rational person would agree that increasing the FAR, massing, and length of your building, increasing the vertical plane in the front of the building (essentially adding a full story), and reducing the setbacks as you propose would achieve what you say it will, which is that we "will enjoy even more natural light and views to the sky than [we] do currently." Perhaps you are being honest about your intentions to maintain the eave in the rear and thus genuinely increase incoming light and views in the rear; if so, that would indeed be a plus; but the other proposals all have a detrimental effect.

We have already spent an enormous amount of time dealing with your initial filing and its many misrepresentations; and it is disheartening that you continue to make patently false claims about your proposals, taking time from our busy lives and family responsibilities. If you can make an honest proposal that actually (and verifiably) achieves your stated goal - that we will all "enjoy even more natural light and views to the sky" than we do now - then we would be delighted to entertain such a proposal, review plans, etc.

And in all events, we would also be happy to meet with you to show you how the sunlight and sky exposures work here in the morning and why they are such important elements of our peaceful enjoyment of the interior and exterior of our properties.

Thank you,
Sandra, Ian, Emily, and Ally
On Fri, Mar 31, 2023 at 8:56 AM Adam Glassman [ajglassman.ra@gmail.com](mailto:ajglassman.ra@gmail.com) wrote:
Dear Emily, Hassanaly, Ian and Sandra,
Last week we sent you the below list of proposed changes to our original design to address your concerns regarding massing, natural light and shadows.

We understand you all have busy lives, but we do need time to prepare our plans accordingly and resubmit them to the BZA file.

However, we have still not heard back from you other than the initial response that you would regroup and review our proposed revisions and other accommodations and let us know early this week.

I also offered to meet you in person to review the plans on site, that offer still stands.
Please let us know as soon as possible if you approve or have questions about what we have have proposed.
With the proposed 2 story bump out with a flat roof in the rear you will enjoy even more natural light and views to the sky than you do currently.

We believe the changes to the designs would not only improve the quality of life issues you are concerned about, but will make the project a better one as well.

Thank you, and we look forward to hearing from you.
Adam

On Fri, Mar 24, 2023 at 9:07 AM Sandra Ferguson [sandra.y.ferguson@gmail.com](mailto:sandra.y.ferguson@gmail.com) wrote:

## Adam,

We will all debrief this weekend and digest your suggestions.
You can expect a response early next week.
My best,
Sandra

On Fri, Mar 24, 2023 at 8:53 AM Adam Glassman [ajglassman.ra@gmail.com](mailto:ajglassman.ra@gmail.com) wrote:

Dear Emily, Hassanaly, lan and Sandra,
We would like to regroup and start fresh with you properly, if you are still open to working with us. We do want to be good neighbors, and we regret we didn't initiate a real dialogue with you much earlier.

We had an idea that the best way for us to effectively address your (very legitimate) concerns would be to do the following:

1) remove the rear gable roof altogether, creating a full 2 story rear bump out, substantially increasing your exposure to direct sun, daylight and views to the sky. Existing shadows cast toward your homes would be effectively reduced.
2) We would want to widen the rear section per the plans Approx $2.5^{\prime}$ on either side and possibly a bit to the rear to help make up for the lost square footage on the existing half story.
3) we will add a condition to the proposal that no rear roof decks are permitted.
4) on the front portion of the house we would proceed with the mansard roof design which I believe is not as much a source of concern for you or the board as is the formerly proposed increased rear massing.
5) we will consult with you on the major aesthetic decisions you will see when the project is complete, such as house color, landscaping and fencing.
6) we will provide a landscape plan for you to review as part of our updated application to the board.

If all this sounds agreeable we can send you updated visuals to review along with an updated shadow study.
And if you are open this, l'd like to meet you in person and review the revised design with you on-site. This might be much better than limiting our dialogue to purely emails.

We sincerely believe that the new plans will not only provide no detriment to you, but will actually improve the quality of life in your properties.

We look forward to hearing from you.
Sincerely,
Adam

Adam Glassman, R.A.
T: 617-412-8450

Cambridge, MA
C: 617.412.8450
www.glassmanchungdesign.com

Adam J. Glassman, R.A.
Cambridge, MA
C: 617.412.8450
www.glassmanchungdesign.com

## Pacheco, Maria

## From:

Sent:
To:

## Cc:

 Subject:Adam Glassman [ajglassman.ra@gmail.com](mailto:ajglassman.ra@gmail.com)
Monday, April 3, 2023 10:21 AM
Sandra Ferguson
Emily Holman; Fraser Allan; Pacheco, Maria; ianworld@gmail.com
18-20 Fairmont St

Dear Neighbors,

Thank you for your response to our proposed revisions and other offers toward making this a better and more acceptable project.

It is unfortunate you feel we are intentionally trying to in some way misrepresent the intents and effects of this project, when in fact, we sincerely want to effectively address your concerns in good faith. As first step, the day after the initial BZA hearing, we sent you a list of ideas and other offers for you to consider as steps forward to a more acceptable project. We believe they are good ideas and would like to meet with you on-site to discuss them.

Additionally, we welcome any feedback or insights you have and are willing to collaborate with you to achieve a mutually agreeable project.

Finally, we appreciate that you all have busy lives, but please let us know as soon as you can what days and times work for you to meet and discuss the issues of massing, light and sun, as well as other concerns you may have.

Thank you,

Adam

On Mon, Apr 3, 2023 at 9:20 AM Sandra Ferguson [sandra.y.ferguson@gmail.com](mailto:sandra.y.ferguson@gmail.com) wrote:
Dear Adam,

Thanks for this message. Ian and I as well as Emily and Ally have all been away at various times during the week and have not had a chance to meet and fully consider and discuss your proposal. We are busy professionals and parents and are doing the best we can.

Unfortunately, your proposal remains a money grab at our expense. You already have an excess of saleable FAR (at .74) that was purchased at an attractive price. There is no reason for the BZA to give you more saleable square footage in a manner that obstructs views of the sky and sunlight for our families. Detriment to us so your client makes money isn't the purpose of the zoning code.

Dishearteningly, your proposal is again full of false claims and equivocations.

1. In your email, you tell us that under your proposals "you will enjoy even more natural light and views to the sky than you do currently." You pretend that the mansard in the front, which converts a 35 degree roof - one that slopes gently over a 15 foot run - into a vertical plane somehow would have no effect on views of the sky and exposure to sunlight? That does not stand to reason.
2. You further propose to "remove the rear gable roof altogether, creating a full 2 story rear bump out, substantially increasing your exposure to direct sun, daylight and views to the sky. Existing shadows cast toward your homes would be
effectively reduced." The current eave in the rear is at approximately 15 '. We were initially supportive of this specific proposal and are indeed absolutely fine with you removing the gable.

But please clarify what you mean by the word "full." If this word is hiding your purpose to increase the height at the eaves, it stands to reason that increasing the height of the vertical plane will countervail the effect of the removal of the gently sloping pitched roof (especially as you then propose to move the wall closer to us) and in fact significantly block light and views to the sky. We would be delighted if you were to prove us wrong here and say that you are not intending to increase the eave height and that your claims about light, sky views, etc. are, this time, actually true. (It would also help counter the opinion formed with respect to your initial filings and communication that you are not dealing with us or the BZA in a plain and straightforward way.)
3. Your proposals to bring the rear portion closer to us and to increase the length of the building are not acceptable to us. Reducing the setback in the rear and increasing the massing will further block light and cast shadows. And creating a 55' long wall, even with varied heights, is aesthetically worse than what we have now, which is a building with varied setbacks and thus dimensionality.

No rational person would agree that increasing the FAR, massing, and length of your building, increasing the vertical plane in the front of the building (essentially adding a full story), and reducing the setbacks as you propose would achieve what you say it will, which is that we "will enjoy even more natural light and views to the sky than [we] do currently." Perhaps you are being honest about your intentions to maintain the eave in the rear and thus genuinely increase incoming light and views in the rear; if so, that would indeed be a plus; but the other proposals all have a detrimental effect.

We have already spent an enormous amount of time dealing with your initial filing and its many misrepresentations; and it is disheartening that you continue to make patently false claims about your proposals, taking time from our busy lives and family responsibilities. If you can make an honest proposal that actually (and verifiably) achieves your stated goal - that we will all "enjoy even more natural light and views to the sky" than we do now - then we would be delighted to entertain such a proposal, review plans, etc.

And in all events, we would also be happy to meet with you to show you how the sunlight and sky exposures work here in the morning and why they are such important elements of our peaceful enjoyment of the interior and exterior of our properties.

Thank you,
Sandra, Ian, Emily, and Ally
On Fri, Mar 31, 2023 at 8:56 AM Adam Glassman [ajglassman.ra@gmail.com](mailto:ajglassman.ra@gmail.com) wrote:
Dear Emily, Hassanaly, Ian and Sandra,
Last week we sent you the below list of proposed changes to our original design to address your concerns regarding massing, natural light and shadows.

We understand you all have busy lives, but we do need time to prepare our plans accordingly and resubmit them to the BZA file.

However, we have still not heard back from you other than the initial response that you would regroup and review our proposed revisions and other accommodations and let us know early this week.

I also offered to meet you in person to review the plans on site, that offer still stands.
Please let us know as soon as possible if you approve or have questions about what we have have proposed.
With the proposed 2 story bump out with a flat roof in the rear you will enjoy even more natural light and views to the sky than you do currently.

We believe the changes to the designs would not only improve the quality of life issues you are concerned about, but will make the project a better one as well.

Thank you, and we look forward to hearing from you.
Adam

On Fri, Mar 24, 2023 at 9:07 AM Sandra Ferguson [sandra.y.ferguson@gmail.com](mailto:sandra.y.ferguson@gmail.com) wrote:
Adam,
We will all debrief this weekend and digest your suggestions.

You can expect a response early next week.
My best,
Sandra

On Fri, Mar 24, 2023 at 8:53 AM Adam Glassman [ajglassman.ra@gmail.com](mailto:ajglassman.ra@gmail.com) wrote:
Dear Emily, Hassanaly, Ian and Sandra,
We would like to regroup and start fresh with you properly, if you are still open to working with us. We do want to be good neighbors, and we regret we didn't initiate a real dialogue with you much earlier.

We had an idea that the best way for us to effectively address your (very legitimate) concerns would be to do the following:

1) remove the rear gable roof altogether, creating a full 2 story rear bump out, substantially increasing your exposure to direct sun, daylight and views to the sky. Existing shadows cast toward your homes would be effectively reduced.
2) We would want to widen the rear section per the plans Approx $2.5^{\prime}$ on either side and possibly a bit to the rear to help make up for the lost square footage on the existing half story.
3) we will add a condition to the proposal that no rear roof decks are permitted.
4) on the front portion of the house we would proceed with the mansard roof design which I believe is not as much a source of concern for you or the board as is the formerly proposed increased rear massing.
5) we will consult with you on the major aesthetic decisions you will see when the project is complete, such as house color, landscaping and fencing.
6) we will provide a landscape plan for you to review as part of our updated application to the board.

If all this sounds agreeable we can send you updated visuals to review along with an updated shadow study.
And if you are open this, l'd like to meet you in person and review the revised design with you on-site. This might be much better than limiting our dialogue to purely emails.

We sincerely believe that the new plans will not only provide no detriment to you, but will actually improve the quality of life in your properties.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

## Adam

Adam Glassman, R.A.

T: 617-412-8450

Adam J. Glassman, R.A.
Cambridge, MA
C: 617.412.8450
www.glassmanchungdesign.com

Adam J. Glassman, R.A.
Cambridge, MA
C: 617.412.8450
www.glassmanchungdesign.com

Adam J. Glassman, R.A.
Cambridge, MA
C: 617.412.8450
www.glassmanchungdesign.com

## Pacheco, Maria

From:
Sent:
To:
Cc:
Subject:
Attachments:

Adam Glassman [ajglassman.ra@gmail.com](mailto:ajglassman.ra@gmail.com)
Thursday, April 13, 2023 11:32 AM
emily.holman@gmail.com; sandra.y.ferguson@gmail.com; lan Ferguson
Pacheco, Maria; Fraser Allan
Re: 18-20 Fairmont St
2023_0413 18 Fairmont St BZA Plans REVISED DRAFT.pdf

## Dear Abutters at 22 and 24 Fairmont St.

Thank you again for meeting with us at your homes on April 6.
It was very helpful for us to better understand how you experience the light and views from your homes and how our work can impact your quality of life.

Our takeaways from the meeting are as follows:

1) The previously proposed mansards would block some of the light, sky views and sense of openness you currently enjoy.
2) Extending the existing rear addition any further to the right or to the rear would also negatively impact your sense of openness and exposure to air as your homes are already very close to the right-side lot line.
3) You prefer we add our desired additional space to the left side if possible.
4) You prefer we maintain the existing scale of the structure as much as possible.
5) The previously proposed increase in FAR felt excessive.
6) You have concerns about decreased privacy from the new windows on the right side of the rear addition.

Attached you will see substantially revised plans that we believe address each of these concerns.

1) Instead of the previously proposed main mansard we now propose raising the existing front gable roof ridge just 20" and adding $15^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ dormers on either side, designed per the Cambridge Dormer Guidelines. This will allow us to utilize our attic in a way consistent with modern living without changing the massing or character of the existing house. The existing roof eave will remain as is. This to us seems a modest and reasonable change to the existing structure without posing any substantial detriment.
2) As you may know, the existing rear addition is essentially unusable in its current state. The 2nd floor level is several steps below the 2 nd floor level of the main house, and the 2 nd floor ceiling heights of this half story are very low. Any plans to modernize this structure would necessitate raising the 2 nd floor of the rear addition to align with the second floor of the main house. In place of the previously proposed third story mansard, we instead propose to transform the existing 1.5 story bump out to a 2-story bump out with a flat roof to be 1'-6" lower than the existing gable roof ridge. We do need to raise the eave approx. $4^{\prime}-9$ " but the existing right-side wall will remain in its current location. You can reference all the roof profile changes on pages A2.1, A2.2 and A3.1. This to us seems a modest and reasonable change to the existing structure without posing any substantial detriment.
3) We have created additional living space on the left side of the house which will have no impact on you. The existing front, right side and rear portions of the building footprint will be maintained.
4) The proposed changes to the front and rear roof lines are very modest and will preserve the scale and overall massing of the existing structure.
5) We have reduced the proposed increase in FAR from . 94 to .82. The existing FAR is .74 and this seems to us a modest and reasonable increase that poses no substantial detriment to you.
6) To preserve your sense of privacy the (4) proposed windows on the right side of the rear addition are all transoms with high sill heights, and as the plans show those (4) transom windows serve the new right side stair and are not adjacent to any bedrooms or primary living spaces. These (4) transom windows are all smaller than the existing (4) full size double hung windows they will replace. The existing door will also be removed. The amount of window openings on the right side of the rear addition has in fact decreased from the existing conditions by approx. 50\%.

Additionally, to further protect your privacy we offer to condition BZA approval on no new rear roof decks over the proposed flat roof addition.

Once you let us know your thoughts on the revised design we would be pleased to forward you the shadow studies.

Lastly, while we are still tweaking the interior basement layouts, the proposed exterior design would not change from what is presented here except for the likely addition of a new window well on the left side to serve an additional bedroom on the left side. We just want to give you adequate time to review all the substantial changes while we nail down the front portion of the basement for the final plans.

Thank you for your patience while we reworked the plans, and we hope you will find acceptable the reduced scope of this project.

We look forward to your feedback.

Sincerely,

Adam

1. NEW WINDOW OPENINGS \& ENTRY CANOPY ADDITIONS ON LEFT AND RIGHT SIDES PER EXISTING NON-CONFORMING SETBACKS
2. EXTEND EXISTING LEFT SIDE REAR SECTION AND ADD LEFT SIDE ADDITIONS WITHIN THE EXISTING NONCONFORMING LEFT AND RIGHT SIDE SETBACKS.
3. INCREASE EXISTING NONCONFORMING FAR FROM . 74 TO . 82 (. 60 MAX ALLOWABLE)
4. NEW DORMER ADDITIONS AND TALLER ROOF RIDGE WITHIN THE EXISTING NONCONFORMING LEFT AND RIGHT SIDE SETBACKS
5. NEW FLAT ROOF ADDITION IN REAR WITHIN THE EXISTING NONCONFORMING LEFT AND RIGHT SIDE SETBACKS.
6. INCREASE EXISTING NON CONFORMING STRUCTURE BETWEEEN 10\%-25\% OF EXISTING STRUCTURE AS OF 1940.

EXISTING STREET VIEW


## PROPOSED RENOVATIONS AND ADDITIONS

18-20 Fairmont Street
Cambridge, MA


PROPOSED STREET VIEW

|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br>  <br>  | 04/11/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street Cambridge, MA | Title Sheet |  | C01 |


| Dimension Regulation - ZONE RESIDENCE C |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EXISTING | PROPOSED | REQUIRED | CONFORMING |
| MAX FAR | 0.74 | 0.82 | 0.60 | EXISTING NON CONFORMING |
| MIN. LOT SIZE | 5,000 sq. ft. | 5,000 sq. ft. | 5,000 sq. ft. | YES |
| MIN. LOT AREA PER DWELLING UNIT | 2,500 sq. ft. | 2,500 sq. ft. | 1,800 sq. ft. | YES |
| MIN. LOT WIDTH | $50^{\prime}$ | $50^{\prime}$ | $50^{\prime}$ | YES |
| MIN. FRONT SETBACK | 30' - CENTERL. 15' - STREET L. | 30' - CENTERL. 15' - STREET L. | $(\mathrm{H}+\mathrm{L}) / 4 \mathrm{MIN} .10^{\prime}$ | YES |
| MIN. LEFT SIDE SETBACK | 10.4' | 5' | (*) EXTG. $=16.80^{\prime}$ <br> (**) PROPOSED $=16.86$ ' | EXISTING NON CONFORMING |
| MIN. RIGHT SIDE SETBACK | $9.9{ }^{\prime}$ | 9.9' | (*) EXTG. $=16.80^{\prime}$ <br> (**) PROPOSED $=16.86^{\prime}$ | EXISTING NON CONFORMING |
| MIN. REAR SETBACK | 26.8' | 26.8' | $20^{\prime}$ | YES |
| MAXIMUM HEIGHT | 32.4' | $34.06{ }^{\prime}$ | $35^{\prime}$ | YES |
| RATIO OF PRIVATE OPEN SPACE TO LOT AREA | 34\% | 52\% | 36\% | YES |

## ${ }^{*}$ ) CALCULATION FOR EXTG. SIDE SETBACKS

EXTG. AVERAGE HEIGHT $=(H 1 \times L 1)+(H 2 x L 2) /(L 1+L 2)=\left(32.4^{\prime} \times 32.30^{\prime}\right)+\left(23.29^{\prime} \times 23.11^{\prime}\right) /\left(32.30^{\prime}+23.11^{\prime}\right)=28.60^{\prime}$
( $\left.^{*}\right)$ REQUIRED EXTG. SETBACK $=(\mathrm{H}+\mathrm{L}) / 5=\left(28.60^{\prime}+55.4^{\prime}\right) / 5=16.80^{\prime}$
(*) CALCULATION FOR PROPOSED SIDE SETBACKS
PROP. AVERAGE HEIGHT $=($ H1xL1 $)+(H 2 x L 2) /(L 1+L 2)=\left(34.06^{\prime} \times 32.30^{\prime}\right)+\left(21.76^{\prime} \times 23.11^{\prime}\right) /\left(32.30^{\prime}+23.11^{\prime}\right)=28.9^{\prime}$
(**) REQUIRED PROPOSED SETBACK $=(\mathrm{H}+\mathrm{L}) / 5=\left(28.9^{\prime}+55.4^{\prime} / 5\right)=16.86^{\prime}$

















|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br> 2 WORTHINGTON STREET CAMBRDGE, MA 02139 $617-42-8450$ | 04/11/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street <br> Cambridge, MA | Extg. Demo Elevations | $1 / 8^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | $\text { D2. } 1$ |




(1) Rear/ Right side view PROPOSED

(2) Rear Left View PROPOSED

| SCALE | DRAWING <br>  |
| ---: | ---: |





|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br>  <br>  | 04/11/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street <br> Cambridge, MA | Proposed Plans | $1 / 8^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | A1.3 |






(1) Front/Left side view- EXTG

(2) Front/Left side view- PROPOSED



| DATE | PROJECT |
| :--- | :--- |
| $04 / 11 / 2023$ | $\mathbf{1 8 - 2 0}$ Fairmont Street |
|  | Cambridge, MA |


| TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 3D views <br> COMPARISON |  | A4.1 |







(1) $\frac{1 \text { - SUMMER SOLSTICE } 8 \text { AM EXTG }}{1^{\prime \prime}=20^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}}$
(2) $\frac{1 \text { - SUMMER SOLSTICE } 8 \text { AM PROP. }}{1^{\prime \prime}=20^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}}$

|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br> 2 WORTHINGTON STREET CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138 617-412-8450 $\qquad$ | 4/20/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street, Cambridge <br> Proposed Side and Roof Additions | SUMMER SOLSTICE JUNE 21th 8 AM | AS NOTED | $S-1$ |


(1) 1- SUMMER SOLSTICE 8-30 AM EXTG
$1 "=20^{\prime}-0 "$
(2) 1-SUMMER SOLSTICE 8-30 AM PROP
1 " $=20^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$

|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS CAMERTIMEGEMANO2138 $\qquad$ | 04/20/23 | 18-20 Fairmont Street, Cambridge <br> Proposed Side and Roof Additions | SUMMER SOLSTICE JUNE 21th 8-30 AM | AS NOTED | $\mathrm{S}-1.1$ |



(2) $\frac{2-\text { SUMMER SOLSTICE } 9 \text { AM PROP. }}{1 "=20^{\prime}-0 "}$

|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br>  <br>  | 4/20/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street, Cambridge Proposed Side and Roof Additions | SUMMER SOLSTICE <br> JUNE 21th 9 AM | AS NOTED | S-2 |


(1) $\frac{3-\text { SUMMER SOLSTICE } 10 \text { AM EXTG }}{1 "=20^{\prime}-0 "}$
(2) $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3- SUMMER SOLSTICE } 10 \text { AM PROP } \\ & 1 \text { " }=20^{\prime}-0 "\end{aligned}$
























|  | ARCHITECT |
| :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br> 2 WORTHINGTON STREET CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138 617-412-8450 <br> www.glassmanchungdesign.com |









## Pacheco, Maria

| From: | Adam Glassman [ajglassman.ra@gmail.com](mailto:ajglassman.ra@gmail.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Monday, April 24, 2023 8:34 AM |
| To: | Sandra Ferguson; Ally Ladha |
| Cc: | Fraser Allan; Ian Ferguson; Pacheco, Maria; emily.holman@gmail.com |
| Subject: | Re: 18-20 Fairmont St |
| Attachments: | 2023_0424 18 Fairmont Final Iteration.pdf; 2023_0424 18 Fairmont Shadow Study.pdf |

From:
Sent:
To:
Cc:

Attachments:

Adam Glassman [ajglassman.ra@gmail.com](mailto:ajglassman.ra@gmail.com)<br>Monday, April 24, 2023 8:34 AM<br>Sandra Ferguson; Ally Ladha<br>Fraser Allan; Ian Ferguson; Pacheco, Maria; emily.holman@gmail.com<br>2023_0424 18 Fairmont Final Iteration.pdf; 2023_0424 18 Fairmont Shadow Study.pdf

Dear Neighbors at \#22 and \#24 Fairmont Street,

First of all, thank you all very much for taking the time to carefully review our plans, several times, and giving us your feedback on multiple iterations since the first BZA hearing, including your comments on the plans which you communicated to me by phone on April 19. We know you have very busy lives and we appreciate your attention to this matter.

Our take-aways from that call are as follows:

1) The proposed left side additions are acceptable to you.
2) For the front Unit \#22 the proposed gable roof and dormers are a welcome change from the mansard roof and likely acceptable once you have had a chance to review our shadow studies. The shadow studies are attached here for your review with the times of year and day times you requested. Also see the link to the time lapse shadow movement you requested.
3) For Unit \#24 the rear addition, reduced from the originally proposed 3 story mansard roof to a flat roof 2 story element is still giving you concerns per possible loss of light.

Since April 19 we have studied how to best accommodate your request to either maintain the current $1 / 2$ story roof slope or step the 2 nd story wall back 6 ' or $7^{\prime}$. Unfortunately, those options do not work. Maintaining the existing roof slope would leave us with even lower and non code compliant ceiling heights, the spaces under the sloping roof would become unusable. Shifting the 2nd story wall 6' to 7 ' to the left would overly compromise the rear unit's functionality and the ability to have 3 modest bedrooms and the basic associated support spaces. The rational use of Fraser's existing footprint would include raising the 2 nd floor to match the 2 nd floor of the main structure and utilizing the second floor with fully legal ceilings heights. We also looked at maintaining the existing roof slope and adding dormers, however that would result in a taller building profile which we know you would not favor.

However, to address your concern as best we can, we have lowered a $6^{\prime}-0$ " wide portion of the flat roof, spanning the length of the right side, an additional $1^{\prime}-0$ " which would leave us with only a $7^{\prime}-0$ " ceiling, the lowest possible ceiling height permitted by the building code. The existing roof eave on the right side would be raised by no more than $3^{\prime}-9^{\prime \prime}$, a very modest amount especially given that we are $14^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime}$ from the right side lot line and $20^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ from your house which remains nearly $10^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$ taller than our proposed rear roof height on the right side.

Please also see the attached shadow studies with our observations noted.
In sum, in our view, the increased existing shadows as shown on the days of the most extreme seasonal sun angles are quite minimal and very brief as the proposed new dormers and new rear roof height are modest in scale.

Per your request, the drop box link to the time lapse studies is below:
https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/xpmse6sjdgfjvzkjlu0vw/h?dl=0\&rlkey=k9xm57ugy5fm71fixopk3zz6w

We hope after the various revisions Fraser has made to this project in response to your concerns you feel you can support the revised plans, we have done our best to address all your concerns and to make this a much better and much lower impact and lower profile project for everyone.

Thank you for all your input to date, we believe the reduction in scale and size from the original proposal makes this a more appropriate project for the neighborhood. Fraser wants to be a good neighbor and believes he has reduced those elements of his application which impact you directly as much as he can to make this project functional and desirable for modern living.

Sincerely,

Adam

Adam J. Glassman, R.A.
Cambridge, MA
C: 617.412.8450
www.glassmanchungdesign.com

On Mon, Apr 17, 2023 at 8:15 AM Sandra Ferguson [sandra.y.ferguson@gmail.com](mailto:sandra.y.ferguson@gmail.com) wrote:
Hi Adam,

Thanks for following up. Received and planning on discussing this evening.

My best,
Sandra

On Mon, Apr 17, 2023 at 7:01 AM Adam Glassman [ajglassman.ra@gmail.com](mailto:ajglassman.ra@gmail.com) wrote:
Hi everyone,

I know it has only been 4 days, but could you let us know that you are in receipt of the email and plans I sent to you last week on April 13 and if you plan to review them and offer your comments?

Thank you,

Adam

On Thu, Apr 13, 2023 at 11:31 AM Adam Glassman [ajglassman.ra@gmail.com](mailto:ajglassman.ra@gmail.com) wrote:

Dear Abutters at 22 and 24 Fairmont St.

Thank you again for meeting with us at your homes on April 6.

It was very helpful for us to better understand how you experience the light and views from your homes and how our work can impact your quality of life.

Our takeaways from the meeting are as follows:

1) The previously proposed mansards would block some of the light, sky views and sense of openness you currently enjoy.
2) Extending the existing rear addition any further to the right or to the rear would also negatively impact your sense of openness and exposure to air as your homes are already very close to the right-side lot line.
3) You prefer we add our desired additional space to the left side if possible.
4) You prefer we maintain the existing scale of the structure as much as possible.
5) The previously proposed increase in FAR felt excessive.
6) You have concerns about decreased privacy from the new windows on the right side of the rear addition.

Attached you will see substantially revised plans that we believe address each of these concerns.

1) Instead of the previously proposed main mansard we now propose raising the existing front gable roof ridge just 20" and adding $15^{\prime}-0$ " dormers on either side, designed per the Cambridge Dormer Guidelines. This will allow us to utilize our attic in a way consistent with modern living without changing the massing or character of the existing house. The existing roof eave will remain as is. This to us seems a modest and reasonable change to the existing structure without posing any substantial detriment.
2) As you may know, the existing rear addition is essentially unusable in its current state. The 2 nd floor level is several steps below the 2 nd floor level of the main house, and the 2nd floor ceiling heights of this half story are very low. Any plans to modernize this structure would necessitate raising the 2 nd floor of the rear addition to align with the second floor of the main house. In place of the previously proposed third story mansard, we instead propose to transform the existing 1.5 story bump out to a 2 -story bump out with a flat roof to be $1^{\prime}-6$ " lower than the existing gable roof ridge. We do need to raise the eave approx. $4^{\prime}-9{ }^{\prime \prime}$ but the existing right-side wall will remain in its current location. You can reference all the roof profile changes on pages A2.1, A2.2 and A3.1. This to us seems a modest and reasonable change to the existing structure without posing any substantial detriment.
3) We have created additional living space on the left side of the house which will have no impact on you. The existing front, right side and rear portions of the building footprint will be maintained.
4) The proposed changes to the front and rear roof lines are very modest and will preserve the scale and overall massing of the existing structure.
5) We have reduced the proposed increase in FAR from .94 to .82 . The existing FAR is .74 and this seems to us a modest and reasonable increase that poses no substantial detriment to you.
6) To preserve your sense of privacy the (4) proposed windows on the right side of the rear addition are all transoms with high sill heights, and as the plans show those (4) transom windows serve the new right side stair and are not adjacent to any bedrooms or primary living spaces. These (4) transom windows are all smaller than the existing (4) full size double hung windows they will replace. The existing door will also be removed. The amount of window openings on the right side of the rear addition has in fact decreased from the existing conditions by approx. $50 \%$.

Additionally, to further protect your privacy we offer to condition BZA approval on no new rear roof decks over the proposed flat roof addition.

Once you let us know your thoughts on the revised design we would be pleased to forward you the shadow studies.
Lastly, while we are still tweaking the interior basement layouts, the proposed exterior design would not change from what is presented here except for the likely addition of a new window well on the left side to serve an additional bedroom on the left side. We just want to give you adequate time to review all the substantial changes while we nail down the front portion of the basement for the final plans.

Thank you for your patience while we reworked the plans, and we hope you will find acceptable the reduced scope of this project.

We look forward to your feedback.
Sincerely,

## Adam

Adam J. Glassman, R.A.
Cambridge, MA
C: 617.412.8450
www.glassmanchungdesign.com

Adam J. Glassman, R.A.
Cambridge, MA
C: 617.412.8450
www.glassmanchungdesign.com

## SPECIAL PERMIT REQUIRED:

NEW WINDOW OPENINGS \& ENTRY CANOPY ADDITIONS ON LEFT AND RIGHT SIDES PER EXISTING NON-CONFORMING SETBACK.
2. WIDEN EXISTING REAR SECTION WITHIN THE EXISTING NONCONFORMING LEFT SIDE SETBACK.
3. INCREASE EXISTING NONCONFORMING FAR FROM . 74 TO . 82 (. 60 MAX ALLOWABLE)
4. RECONSTRUCT FRONT GABLE ROOF AND ADD DORMER ADDITIONS WITHIN THE EXISTING NONCONFORMING LEFT AND RIGHT SIDE SETBACKS.
5. INCREASE EXISTING NON CONFORMING STRUCTURE BETWEEEN 10\%-25\% OF EXISTING STRUCTURE AS OF 1940.

EXISTING STREET VIEW
. NCREASE EXISTING NON CONFORMING STRUCTURE BETWEEEN 10\%-25\% OF EXISTING STRUCTURE AS OF 1940.


PROPOSED RENOVATIONS AND ADDITIONS
18-20 Fairmont Street Cambridge, MA


PROPOSED STREET VIEW

|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br> 2 WORTHINGTON STREET CAMBRDCE, MA Q2238 www.glassmancturgodesion.com | 04/19/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street <br> Cambridge, MA | Title Sheet |  | $\mathrm{CO}^{\circ}$ |


| Dimension Regulation - ZONE RESIDENCE C |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EXISTING | PROPOSED | REQUIRED | CONFORMING |
| MAX FAR | 0.74 | 0.82 | 0.60 | EXISTING NON CONFORMING |
| MIN. LOT SIZE | 5,000 sq. ft. | 5,000 sq. ft. | 5,000 sq. ft. | YES |
| MIN. LOT AREA PER DWELLING UNIT | 2,500 sq. ft. | 2,500 sq. ft. | 1,800 sq. ft. | YES |
| MIN. LOT WIDTH | $50^{\prime}$ | $50^{\prime}$ | 50' | YES |
| MIN. FRONT SETBACK | 30' - CENTER L. 15' - STREET L. | 30' - CENTER L. 15' - STREET L. | $(\mathrm{H}+\mathrm{L}) / 4 \mathrm{MIN} .10^{\prime}$ | YES |
| MIN. LEFT SIDE SETBACK | 10.4' | 5' | $\begin{aligned} & \left({ }^{*}\right) \text { EXTG. }=16.80^{\prime} \\ & \left({ }^{* *}\right) \text { PROPOSED }=16.86^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | EXISTING NON CONFORMING |
| MIN. RIGHT SIDE SETBACK | 9.9' | 9.9' | $\begin{aligned} & \left({ }^{*}\right) \text { EXTG. }=16.80^{\prime} \\ & \left({ }^{* *}\right) \text { PROPOSED }=16.86^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | EXISTING NON CONFORMING |
| MIN. REAR SETBACK | 26.8' | 26.8' | $20^{\prime}$ | YES |
| MAXIMUM HEIGHT | 32.4' | $34.06{ }^{\prime}$ | 35' | YES |
| RATIO OF PRIVATE OPEN SPACE TO LOT AREA | 34\% | 52\% | 36\% | YES |

(*) CALCULATION FOR EXTG. SIDE SETBACKS
EXTG. AVERAGE HEIGHT $=(\mathrm{H} 1 \times L 1)+(\mathrm{H} 2 \times L 2) /(\mathrm{L} 1+\mathrm{L} 2)=\left(32.4^{\prime} \times 32.30^{\prime}\right)+\left(23.29^{\prime} \times 23.11^{\prime}\right) /\left(32.30^{\prime}+23.11^{\prime}\right)=28.60^{\prime}$
(*) REQUIRED EXTG. SETBACK $=(\mathrm{H}+\mathrm{L}) / 5=\left(28.60^{\prime}+55.4^{\prime}\right) / 5=16 . \mathbf{0}^{\prime}$
(*) CALCULATION FOR PROPOSED SIDE SETBACKS
PROP. AVERAGE HEIGHT $=(H 1 \times L 1)+(H 2 x L 2) /(L 1+L 2)=\left(34.06^{\prime} \times 32.30^{\prime}\right)+\left(21.76^{\prime} \times 23.11^{\prime}\right) /\left(32.30^{\prime}+23.11^{\prime}\right)=28.9^{\prime}$
(**) REQUIRED PROPOSED SETBACK $=(\mathrm{H}+\mathrm{L}) / 5=\left(28.9^{\prime}+55.4^{\prime} / 5\right)=16.86^{\prime}$

|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br> 2 WORTHNGTON STREET cavBroce, ma criba 61742 | 4/23/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street <br> Cambridge, MA | Zoning Analysis Zone C |  | Z.1.1 |



|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br> 2 WORTHINGTON STREET CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138 $617-412-8450$ <br> Www.glassmanchungdesign.com | 4/23/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street Cambridge, MA | Zoning - Setback plan- Zone C | $1 / 8^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | Z.1.2 |















(2) $\frac{\text { Extg. Right }}{1 / 8^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}}$

| TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Extg. Demo | $1 / 8^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | D2.1 |
| Elevations |  |  |








|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br>  514122450 | 4/23/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street Cambridge, MA | Proposed Plans | $1 / 8^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | A1.3 |
















(1) $\frac{3 \text { - SUMMER SOLSTICE }}{10}=20^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}-30$ AM EXTG
(2) $\frac{3 \text { - SUMMER SOLSTICE } 10-30 \text { AM PROP NO CHANGE }}{1{ }^{\prime \prime}=20^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}}$ -

|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | drawing |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS 2 WORTHINGTON STREET CAMBRIDGE, MA O2138 17-412-8450 | 04/20/23 | 18-20 Fairmont Street, Cambridge <br> Proposed Side and Roof Additions | SUMMER SOLSTICE JUNE 21th 10-30 AM | AS NOTED | S-3.1 |


|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br>  <br>  | 04/20/23 | 18-20 Fairmont Street, Cambridge <br> Proposed Side and Roof Additions | SUMMER SOLSTICE JUNE 21th 10-30 AM | AS NOTED | S-3.1 |
















(1) $\frac{17-\text { WINTER SOLSTICE NOON EXTG }}{1^{\prime \prime}=20^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}}$
(2) $\frac{17-\text { WINTER SOLSTICE NOON PROP. }}{1^{\prime \prime}=20^{\prime}-0 "}$

|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | Wing |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECIS | GCD ARCHITECTS CAMBRIDINGION STREET MA Q2138 617-412-8450 | 4/20/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street, Cambridge <br> Proposed Side and Roof Additions | WINTER SOLSTICE DEC. 21st NOON | AS Noted | S-17 |



|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br>  <br>  | 04/20/23 | 18-20 Fairmont Street, Cambridge <br> Proposed Side and Roof Additions | WINTER SOLSTICE DEC. 21st 12-30 PM | AS NOTED | S-17.1 |





(1) $\frac{21-\text { SPRING EQUINOX } 8 \text { AM EXTG }}{1^{\prime \prime}=20^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}}$
(2) $\frac{21-\text { SPRING EQUINOX } 8 \text { AM PROP. NO CHANGE }}{11^{\prime \prime}=20^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}}$

|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br>  <br> Hildizemsenchuvadesincoon | 4/20/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street, Cambridge Proposed Side and Roof Additions | SPRING EQUINOX MARCH 21st 8 AM | AS NOTED | S-21 |




(1) $\frac{23-\text { SPRING EQUINOX } 10-30 \text { AM EXTG }}{1^{\prime \prime}=20^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}}$
2. 23-SPRING EQUINOX 10-30 AM PROP
(2) $1^{\prime \prime}=20^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$

|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br>  617412 24850 | 04/20/23 | 18-20 Fairmont Street, Cambridge <br> Proposed Side and Roof Additions | SPRING EQUINOX MARCH 21st $10-30$ AM | AS NOTED | S-23.1 |








(1) $\frac{1 \text { - SUMMER SOLSTICE 8-30 AM EXTG }}{1 "=20^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}}$
(2) $\frac{1 \text { - SUMMER SOLSTICE 8-30 AM PROP }}{1^{\prime \prime}=20^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}}$

|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br> 2 WORTHINGTON STREET CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138 617-412-8450 <br> ww.glassmanchungdesign.com | 04/20/23 | 18-20 Fairmont Street, Cambridge <br> Proposed Side and Roof Additions | SUMMER SOLSTICE JUNE 21th 8-30 AM | AS NOTED | $S-1.1$ |







(1) $\frac{6 \text { - SUMMER SOLSTICE } 1 \text { PM EXTG }}{1 "=20^{\prime}-0 "}$
$1^{\prime \prime}=20^{\prime}-0 "$





(1) 9- FALL EQUINOX 11 AM EXTG
(2) $\frac{9-\text { FALL EQUINOX } 11 \text { AM PROP }}{1 "=20^{\prime}-0 "}$

1. $1^{\prime \prime}=20^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$

|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br> 2 WORTHINGTON STREET <br> CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138 617-412-8450 <br> www.glassmanchungdesign.com | 4/20/2023 | 18-20 Fairmont Street, Cambridge <br> Proposed Side and Roof Additions | FALL EQUINOX SEPT. 22nd 11 AM | AS NOTED | S-9 |











|  | ARCHITECT | DATE | PROJECT | TITLE | SCALE | DRAWING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GCD ARCHITECTS | GCD ARCHITECTS <br> 2 WORTHINGTON STREET CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138 617-412-8450 <br> www.glassmanchungdesign.com | 04/20/23 | 18-20 Fairmont Street, Cambridge <br> Proposed Side and Roof Additions | WINTER SOLSTICE DEC. 21st 12-30 PM | AS NOTED | $S-17.1$ |














## CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

BOARD OF ZONING APPEAL
831 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge MA 02139
CITY OF CAMBPIDCE
MSPECTIOMAL SERVICES
617-349-6100

2033 MAY-8 A 10: 46

## BZA Application Form

BZA Number: 211208

## General Information

The undersigned hereby petitions the Board of Zoning Appeal for the following:
Special Permit: $\qquad$ Variance: $\qquad$ Appeal: $\qquad$

PETITIONER: 18-20 Fairmont LLC C/O Adam Glassman / GCD Architects
PETITIONER'S ADDRESS: 2 Worthington Street , Cambridge, MA 02138
LOCATION OF PROPERTY: 18 Fairmont St, Cambridge, MA
TYPE OF OCCUPANCY: 2-Fam Residential
ZONING DISTRICT: Residence C Zone

## REASON FOR PETITION:

/Additions/ /New Window and Door Openings /

## DESCRIPTION OF PETITIONER'S PROPOSAL:

Reconstruct Gable Roof in Front with Dormer Additions
New Flat Roof Addition in Rear
Increase FAR
New Left Side Additions
New Window and Door Openings

## SECTIONS OF ZONING ORDINANCE CITED:

Article: 5.000 Section: 5.31 (Table Dimensional Requirements).
Article: 8.000 Section: 8.22.2.c \& 8.22.2.d (Non-Conforming Structure).
Article: 10.000 Section: 10.40 (Special Permit).

Original Signature(s):

Address:
Tel. No.
E-Mail Address:
(Petitioner (s) / Owner)
Adam Glassman, R.A.
(Print Name)
Adam Glassman

2 Worthington St Cambridge MA 02138
617-412-8450
ajglassman.ra@gmail.com
vate: $\qquad$ 5/5/2023

## RED TEXT = REVISION

18-20 Fairmont LLC
18 Fairmont St, Cambridge, MA
617-412-8450

Applicant: Location: Phone:

## BZA Application Form

## DIMENSIONAL INFORMATION

Present Use/Occupancy: 2-Fam Residential
Zone: Residence C Zone
Requested Use/Occupancy: 2 Family Residential

|  |  | Existing Conditions | Requested Conditions | Ordinance <br> Requirements |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL GROSS FLOOR } \\ & \text { AREA: } \end{aligned}$ |  | 3,706.00 | 4,600.00 | 3,000.00 | (max.) |
| LOT AREA: |  | 5,000 | No Change | 5,000.0 | (min.) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { RATIO OF GROSS } \\ & \text { FLOOR AREA TO LOT } \\ & \text { AREA: }{ }^{2} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | . 74 | . 92.82 | . 60 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { LOT AREA OF EACH } \\ & \text { DWELLING UNIT } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | 2,500.00 | NO CHANGE | 1,800.00 |  |
| SIZE OF LOT: | WIDTH | 50 | No Change | 50 |  |
|  | DEPTH | 100 | No Change | NA |  |
| SETBACKS IN FEET: | FRONT | 15 | 15 | 10 |  |
|  | REAR | 26.8 | 26.8 | 20.0 |  |
|  | LEFT SIDE | 10.4 | $10.4{ }^{5.0}{ }^{\prime}$ | 17.5 |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RIGHT } \\ & \text { SIDE } \end{aligned}$ | 9.9 | 9.9 | 17.5 |  |
| SIZE OF BUILDING: | HEIGHT | 32.4' | No Change 34.06 ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | $35.0^{\prime}$ |  |
|  | WIDTH | $30^{\prime}$ | No Change 35.5 | NA |  |
|  | LENGTH | 57 ' +/- | No Change | NA |  |
| RATIO OF USABLE OPEN SPACE TO LOT AREA: |  | 34\% | 40\% | 36\% |  |
| NO. OF DWELLING UNITS: |  | 2 | No Change | 2 allowable |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { NO. OF PARKING } \\ & \hline \text { SPACES: } \end{aligned}$ |  | 2 | No Change | 0 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { NO. OF LOADING } \\ & \hline \text { AREAS: } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | 0 | 0 | N/A |  |
| DISTANCE TO NEAREST BLDG. ON SAME LOT |  | 13 | 0 per covered patio removal | 10 |  |

Describe where applicable, other occupancies on the same lot, the size of adjacent buildings on same lot, and type of construction proposed, e.g; wood frame, concrete, brick, steel, etc.:

Existing wood frame patio roof to be removed.
Existing house and new additions to be wood frame.

1. SEE CAMBRIDGE ZONING ORDINANCE ARTICLE 5.000, SECTION 5.30 (DISTRICT OF DIMENSIONAL REGULATIONS).
2. TOTAL GROSS FLOOR AREA (INCLUDING BASEMENT 7'-0" IN HEIGHT AND ATTIC AREAS GREATER THAN 5') DIVIDED BY LOT AREA.
3. OPEN SPACE SHALL NOT INCLUDE PARKING AREAS, WALKWAYS OR DRIVEWAYS AND SHALL HAVE A MINIMUM DIMENSION OF $15^{15}$.

## REVISED AND ADDITONAL STATEMENTS

## BZA Application Form

## SUPPORTING STATEMENT FOR A SPECIAL PERMIT


#### Abstract

Please describe in complete detail how you meet each of the following criteria referring to the property and proposed changes or uses which are requested in your application. Attach sheets with additional information for special permits which have additional criteria, e.g.; fast food permits, comprehensive permits, etc., which must be met.

Granting the Special Permit requested for 18 Fairmont St, Cambridge, MA (location) would not be a detriment to the public interest because:


A) Requirements of the Ordinance can or will be met for the following reasons:

The proposed work will cause no substantial new or increased existing detriments to the direct abutters or to the neighborhood in general. There will be no loss of privacy, no creation of any substantial new shadows on the abutting lots. The scale and character of the house and neighborhood will remain unchanged. There will be no additional dwelling units and no new non-conforming lot conditions. The existing non-conforming lot conditions will remain as is, with the exception of the reduced existing non-conforming left side setback which has the support of the left side abutter.
B)

Traffic generated or patterns of access or egress would not cause congestion hazard, or substantial change in established neighborhood character for the following reasons:
The existing 2 family house will remain a 2 family house. The (2) existing parking spaces will remain. The scale and character of the house will remain unchanged. The modestly raised front gable roof and $15^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ dormers, left side 2-story additions and new rear flat roof addition are consistent with the streetscape, the additions are all very modest and low profile. The increase in FAR is minor. The existing exterior of the house is in bad shape and an eyesore which will be tastefully renovated to be consistent with the original design of the house and the traditional character of the neighborhood. The existing driveways, walkway and yard spaces will receive the cosmetic upgrades they badly need with new pervious pavers and landscaping. In sum, there will be no change to existing traffic patterns, no increase in congestion, no loss of off street parking, no added density, and no change to the established character of the neighborhood.
C) The continued operation of or the development of adjacent uses as permitted in the Zoning Ordinance would not be adversely affected by the nature of the proposed use for the following reasons: The proposed renovations and additions will have no impact on the adjacent property uses and are consistent with the current 2-family residential use of the property.
D) Nuisance or hazard would not be created to the detriment of the health, safety, and/or welfare of the occupant of the proposed use or the citizens of the City for the following reasons:
The proposed renovations and additions will create no new air or light pollution, the existing 2family residential use will remain. There will be no loss of privacy. The existing housing will be substantially improved and become more amenable to modern family living.
E) For other reasons, the proposed use would not impair the integrity of the district or adjoining district or otherwise derogate from the intent or purpose of this ordinance for the following reasons: The proposed project is consistent and in harmony with the uses and character of the neighborhood, and upholds the intents of the zoning ordinance as there will be no creation of any substantial new detriments beyond those already existing per the existing-non-conforming lot and structure.
*If you have any questions as to whether you can establish all of the applicable legal requirements, you should consult with an attorney.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS:
IN RESPONSE TO THE RIGHT SIDE ABUTTER CONCERNS EXPRESSED AT THE FIRST BZA HEARING, AT THE FOLLOWING ABUTTER MEETING, AND IN THE VARIOUS COMMUNICATIONS, THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS TO THE DESIGN HAVE BEEN MADE IN GOOD FAITH TO ADDRESS THE CONCERNS OF THE RIGHT SIDE ABUTTERS:

1. THE ORIGINALLY PROPOSED INCREASE IN NON-CONFORMING FAR IS REDUCED FROM .92 TO .82.
2. THE ORIGINALLY PROPOSED NEW 3RD STORY MANSARD ROOF IN THE FRONT OF THE BUILDING IS REPLACED WITH A RECONSTRCUTED GABLE ROOF WITH 15'-0" DORMERS DESIGNED PER THE CAMBRIDGE DORMER GUIDELINES.
3. THE ORIGINALLY PROPOSED NEW 3RD STORY MANSARD ROOF IN THE REAR PORTION OF THE BUILDING IS REPLACED WITH 2-STORY FLAT ROOF TO MAKE THE EXISTING 1-1/2 STORY BUMP-OUT FUNCTIONAL AND CODE COMPLIANT. AS A CONDITION FOR APPROVAL NO ROOF DECK IS PROPOSED ON THE NEW FLAT ROOF ADDITION.
4. THESE REVISIONS TO AND REDUCTIONS OF THE ORIGINALLY PROPOSED NEW MANSARD ROOF PROFILES, AND THE ELIMINATION OF THE PROPOSED REAR NEW 3RD STORY, MAINTAINS THE ESSENTIAL OPENESS OF THE SKY FOR BOTH ABUTTING LOTS. THE INCREASE IN THE EXISTING SHADOWS EVEN AT THE MOST EXTREME SEASONAL SUN ANGLES ARE BRIEF, AND THEY ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE EXISTING SHADOWS ALREADY CAST, AND IN NO WAY CONSITUTE A SUBSTANTILLY WORSE DETRIMENT THAN THE EXISTING SHADOWS AS PER THE PROVIDED SHADOW STUDY.
5. THE HEIGHT OF THE REAR PORTION OF THE BUILDING REMAINS SUBSTANTIALLY LOWER THAN THE ABUTTING STRUCTURES. IN FACT, THE OVERALL HEIGHT OF THE REAR PORTION OF THE BUILDING IS REDUCED, NOT INCREASED. THE LOW EAVES ON THE RIGHT SIDE ARE RAISED ONLY 3'-9" TO ACHIEVE THE MINIMUM CODE COMPLIANT HEAD AND FUNCTIONAL USE OF THE EXISTING SPACES.
6. THE ORIGINALLY INCREASED WITH OF THE EXISTING REAR PORTION OF THE HOUSE IS ONLY BEING WIDENED ON THE LEFT SIDE. THE RIGHT SIDE EXTERIOR WALLS AND THE ASSOCIATED EXISTING RIGHT SIDE SETBACKS WILL REMAIN UNCHANGED.


EXISTING REAR BUMPOUT INTERIOR / EXTERIOR VIEWS


VIEW FROM 18-20 FAIRMONT ST


VIEW FROM 22 FAIRMONT ST 2ND FLOOR DECK


VIEWS FROM 22 FAIRMONT STREET 2ND FLOOR DECK


VIEW FROM 22 FAIRMONT ST 2ND FLOOR


YARD VIEW FROM 22 FAIRMONT ST

EXISTING REAR BUMPOUT EXTERIOR VIEWS


VIEW FROM 18-20 FAIRMONT ST 1ST FLOOR


VIEW OF 22 \& 24 FAIRMONT STREET FROM YARD OF 18-20 FAIRMONT ST

EXISTING REAR BUMPOUT EXTERIOR VIEWS


VIEW FROM YARD AT 24 FAIRMONT ST


101-106
WHEELER, ROBERT T. \& NIVES DAL BO-WHEELE
78 NORTH MAIN AVE
ORONO, ME 04473
101-103
PORTER, DALE A. \& JAMIE S. JONKER
27 PRINCE ST. UNIT\#1L
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139

101-103
ZHU, MIN \& XIAO MING CHENG 5 THOMAS ST.
BELMONT, MA 02478

101-106
SILVA, BERNAD N.,
TR. OF F \& D TRUST
51 PRINCE ST. \#3
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139

## City of Cambridge <br> Massachusetts

BOARD OF ZONING APPEAL

831 Mass Avenue, Cambridge, MA. (617) 349-6100

## BRA <br> POSTING NOTICE - PICK UP SHEET

The undersigned picked up the notice board for the Board of Zoning Appeals Hearing.


Case No. $\qquad$
Hearing Date: $\quad 3 / 23 / 23$
Thank you,
Baa Members

## Pacheco, Maria

| From: | Christian Grippo [cpgrippo@gmail.com](mailto:cpgrippo@gmail.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Sunday, March 19, 2023 6:02 PM |
| To: | Pacheco, Maria |
| Subject: | Re: 18 Fairmont Street |
| Attachments: | Christian and Melissa_18 Fairmont_Neighbor and Abutter Letter to BZA.pdf |

Hello,

We would like to submit a letter containing written comments for the Board of Zoning Appeal meeting scheduled for this Thursday $3 / 23$, expressing our objection for the project at 18 Fairmont Street.

Our names and addresses are as follows:
Christian Grippo
Melissa Grippo
31 Lopez St, Cambridge, MA 02139

Attached is the signed letter.

I appreciate your help in this matter.

Thank you,
--
Christian Grippo
MSCS/MSME

March 19, 2023
Dear Members of the Board of Zoning Appeals:
We are longtime Cambridgeport residents that would like to express our strong objection to the application for a special permit at 18 Fairmont Street allowing for an increase in height, volume, and building area, including new construction further into the setback on three fullheight floors and for new windows in the setback on all three floors. The proposed increase in the size of an already large building will have immediate negative impacts on the abutters. But more gravely, it will set a concerning precedent for the neighborhood's current FAR and setback norms.

The special permit application states that: "Requirements of the Ordinance can or will be met for the following reasons: The proposed work will cause no detriment to the direct abutters or to the neighborhood in general. There will be no loss of privacy no creation of any substantial shadows on the abutting lots. The scale and character of the house and neighborhood will remain unchanged. There will be no additional dwelling units and no new non-conforming lot conditions. The existing non-conforming lot conditions will not be increased."

The claims in bold are not true. By increasing the volume by over 20\%, increasing the massing of the third floor, moving the rear of the building nearly 3 ' closer into the setback, and increasing the height of much of the building, the applicant will definitely cast broader shadows on the abutting lots and reduce privacy on an already tight intersection of homes. The developer has not shown any data on how his property relates to the adjacent properties.

The developer also proposes a .92 FAR excluding the basement, while his neighbors to the west at 22-24 Fairmont Street have a . 6 FAR and his neighbors to the east at 16 Fairmont have a .64 FAR, according to the Cambridge property database. How then is this proposal in keeping with the "scale and character of the neighborhood"?

The proposed increase in volume, area, and height, making the building nearly 1.0 FAR and close to 1.2 with the finished basement is not in keeping with the neighborhood and sets a concerning precedent for the district. Allowing for significant increases in the massing of already nonconforming planes inside setbacks - and then adding windows there - sets yet an additional negative precedent for the neighborhood.

Allowing a developer to obtain a special permit for a massive increase in FAR without showing impact to neighbors also sets a negative precedent.

Signed,


Christian Grippo
31 Lopez Street, Cambridge MA


Melissa Grippo
31 Lopez Street, Cambridge MA

| From: | Juan_Carlos_Serna [jserna@gmail.com](mailto:jserna@gmail.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Sunday, March 19, 2023 4:07 PM |
| To: | Pacheco, Maria |
| Subject: | Re 18 Fairmont St |

March 19, 2023
Dear Members of the Board of Zoning Appeals:
We are longtime Cambridgeport residents that would like to express our strong objection to the application for a special permit at 18 Fairmont Street allowing for an increase in average height, volume, and building area, including new construction further into the setback on three full-height floors and for newwindows in the setback on all three floors. The proposed increase in the size of an already large building will have immediate negative impacts on the abutters. But more gravely, it will set a concerning precedent for the neighborhood's current FAR and setback norms.

The special permit application states that: "Requirements of the Ordinance can or will be met for the following reasons:The proposed work will cause no detriment to the direct abutters or to the neighborhood in general. There will be no loss of privacy no creation of any substantial shadows on the abutting lots. The scale and character of the house and neighborhood will remain unchanged. There will be noadditional dwelling units and no new non-conforming lot conditions. The existing non-conforming lot conditions will not be increased."

The claims in bold are not true. By increasing the volume by over $20 \%$, increasing the massing of the third floor, moving the rear of the building nearly $3^{\prime}$ closer into the setback, and increasing the height of much of the building, the applicant will definitely cast broader shadows on the abutting lots and reduce privacy on an already tight intersection of homes. The developer has not shown any data on
how his property relates to the adjacent properties.
The developer also proposes a . 92 FAR excluding the basement, while his neighbors to the west at 22-24 Fairmont Street have a . 6 FAR and his neighbors to the east at 16 Fairmont have a 64 FAR, according to the Cambridge property database. How then is this proposal in keeping with the "scale and character of the neighborhood"?
The proposed increase in volume, area, and average height, making the building nearly 1.0 FAR and close to 1.2 with the finished basement is not in keeping with the neighborhood and sets a concerning precedent for the district. Allowing for significant increases in the massing of already nonconforming planes inside setbacks - and then adding windows there - sets yet an additional negative precedent for the neighborhood.
We urge you to deny this special permit application.

## Best,

Juan Carlos Serna
29 Fairmont Ave

March 20, 2023
Dear Members of the Board of Zoning Appeals:
As a longtime Cambridgeport / Cambridge resident and property owner, I would like to express my strong objection to the application for a special permit at 18 Fairmont Street allowing for an increase in height, volume, and building area, including new construction further into the setback on three full-height floors and for new windows in the setback on all three floors. The proposed increase in the size of an already large building will have immediate negative impacts on the abutters. But more gravely, it will set a concerning precedent for the neighborhood's current FAR and setback norms.

The special permit application states that: "Requirements of the Ordinance can or will be met for the following reasons: The proposed work will cause no detriment to the direct abutters or to the neighborhood in general. There will be no loss of privacy, no creation of any substantial shadows on the abutting lots. The scale and character of the house and neighborhood will remain unchanged. There will be no additional dwelling units and no new non-conforming lot conditions. The existing non-conforming lot conditions will not be increased."

The claims in bold are not true. By increasing the volume by over 20\%, increasing the massing of the third floor, moving the rear of the building nearly 3 ' closer into the setback, and increasing the height of much of the building, the applicant will definitely cast broader shadows on the abutting lots and reduce privacy on an already tight intersection of homes. The developer has not shown any data on how his property relates to the adjacent properties.

The developer also proposes a .92 FAR excluding the basement, while his neighbors to the west at 22-24 Fairmont Street have a . 6 FAR and his neighbors to the east at 16 Fairmont have a .64 FAR , according to the Cambridge property database. How then is this proposal in keeping with the "scale and character of the neighborhood"?

The proposed increase in volume, area, and height, making the building nearly 1.0 FAR and close to 1.2 with the finished basement is not in keeping with the neighborhood and sets a concerning precedent for the district. Allowing for significant increases in the massing of already nonconforming planes inside setbacks - and then adding windows there - sets yet an additional negative precedent for the neighborhood.

I urge you to deny this special permit application.
Signed,


Ana Yanez-Rodriguez
6 Washington Ave Apt 19
Cambridge MA. 02140

March 20, 2023
Dear Members of the Board of Zoning Appeals:
We are the neighbors at 22 Fairmont Street directly abutting the property at 18-20 Fairmont Street. We would like to express our strong objection to the proposed special permit allowing for an increase in the height, volume, and area of an already nonconforming building and for new windows on a new plane being built in a nonconforming setback. The proposed increase in the size of an already large building will have a detrimental impact on us as abutters and is not in harmony with the FAR norms of the neighborhood.

The developer's special permit application states that:
"A) Requirements of the Ordinance can or will be met for the following reasons:
The proposed work will cause no detriment to the direct abutters or to the neighborhood in general. There will be no loss of privacy no creation of any substantial shadows on the abutting lots. The scale and character of the house and neighborhood will remain unchanged. There will be no additional dwelling units and no new non-conforming lot conditions. The existing non-conforming lot conditions will not be increased."

The statements in bold are patently false.

1. No Shadows and no Loss of Privacy. By increasing the height of much of the building, including replacing a 35 degree pitched roof in the front part of the building with a full one story addition, and replacing a 30 degree pitched roof in the rear with a full two story addition, and then moving the rear of the building nearly 3 ' closer into the setback, the applicant will definitely cast broader shadows on the abutting lots and windows and reduce privacy on an already tight intersection of homes. The developer has not shown any data on how his property relates to the adjacent properties.

This is not a small addition, but a significant increase in volume and massing (see Exhibit A). The notion that the $32.4^{\prime} \times 55.4$ ' + wall-like block that the applicant proposes to build along the side yards will create "no" "substantial shadows" is hard to believe. The attached pictures (see Exhibit B), point to actual conditions, indicating the extent to which the change will block sunshine. We bought this house because of its light since this helps with Seasonal Affective Disorder and Major Depressive Disorder which one of us is diagnosed with.
2. Scale and Character of the House and Neighborhood Will Remain Unchanged. The applicant proposes to build a 32.4 ' tall vertical structure within the setback that extends 55.4 '+ feet. He also proposes a $\mathbf{. 9 2}$ FAR excluding the basement, while the immediate neighbors around him have the following FARs: the neighbors to the west at 22-24 Fairmont Street have a . 6 FAR, the neighbor at 26-28 Fairmont Street has a
.54 FAR, his neighbors to the east at 16 Fairmont have a .64 FAR , and the neighbor at 15 Fairmont has a 67 FAR, according to the Cambridge property database. How then is his proposal in keeping with the "scale and character of the neighborhood"? The proposed density of $18-20$ Fairmont Street is currently at $\mathbf{7 4}$ FAR. The developer is already availing himself of his ability to add 1440sf of floor area (on top of the .74 FAR) by finishing the basement. His house is already $20 \%$ larger than the FAR of the abutting properties and exceeds the FAR of 6 allowed in the district. The developer has not considered the neighbors or neighborhood in these designs, further indicated by his choosing not to consult with us as abutters before drawing up and submitting the plans.
$D \& E)$. These sections of the application state essentially the same thing. All our above objections apply here. The developer further states that his proposal will not "derogate from the intent or purpose of this ordinance for the following reasons: The proposed project is consistent and in harmony with the uses and character of the neighborhood, and upholds the intents of the zoning ordinance as there will be no creation of any detriment whatsoever."

We again disagree with the statement there will "no creation of any detriment whatsoever." Moreover, increasing a home already 20\% larger than adjacent properties is not "consistent and in harmony" with the character of the neighborhood. The proposal also fails to meet the letter and spirit of the zoning ordinance for four reasons:

First, the purpose of article 8 is to allow for otherwise non-conforming but smaller structures to modernize (add a bathroom, make use of an attic), not redesign the neighborhood with an FAR pushing 1.0 (again: 16 Fairmont has an effective FAR of .64 and the two condos at 22/24 Fairmont have a combined FAR of .6 - and he wants a .92 FAR, a $50 \%$ increase over his closest adjacent neighbors).

Second, the applicant did not correctly calculate the existing versus required side yard setbacks. According to the logic and spirit of the code, he should use average height and the multi-plane formula under 5.24, as well as the denominator of 7 , to calculate the existing and required setback to show that the existing setback does not conform. (Choosing not to use such elements to create - in order to then increase - a nonconformity is not in keeping with the spirit or intent of the code.) The error of choosing 5 instead of 7 for the denominator in the $\mathrm{H}+\mathrm{L}$ calculation vastly exaggerates the requirements to make the setbacks look nonconforming. These errors make it impossible to ascertain from the application whether the setbacks do or do not in fact conform.

Third, if the existing building is indeed nonconforming along the right side yard, it is patently clear that moving the rear 16 ' of the building nearly $3^{\prime}$ further into the side yard and increasing its height from approximately $15^{\prime}$ to the edge of the 30 degree pitched roof to a 32.4 ' wall (including the mansard, which is essentially vertical) would block light, creating a significant detriment, and not be consistent with the intent of the code. The purpose of the $\mathrm{H}+\mathrm{L}$ formula in our district is to ensure that setbacks relate to the mass of the vertical plane on that side yard. In other words, the conformity of the vertical plane of the building depends on its massing as a function of height plus length. By increasing the height of the rear portion
of the building, the applicant is significantly increasing the nonconformity of the side yard setback. For this reason, the project is not consistent with the intent of the code, which is to "to provide adequate light and air" (see the Preamble) - not to massively expand an already oversized existing two-family house into a 6100sf two-family house for the purpose of increasing a developer's profit margin.

Fourth - and most essentially - the section under which the applicant is seeking relief states: "In order to grant the special permit the Board of Zoning Appeal is required to find that the alteration or enlargement shall not be substantially more detrimental than the existing nonconforming structure to the neighborhood, and that the alteration or enlargement satisfies the criteria in Section 10.43." We abutters are the most impacted in "the neighborhood." The increased volume and height of the proposed building will be detrimental because 1) it will create more shadows; 2) new windows on a new plane in a nonconforming setback will impinge on privacy (the developer is not just rearranging existing windows, but adding windows on a new floor in a nonconforming setback that look directly into our children's bedrooms); 3) the home is already larger than either abutters and there is no public good in granting relief to profiteers; 4) the massive proposed wall-like structure inside the setbacks will cause an uncharacteristic and, to us, aesthetically objectionable 55 ' long "block-like" building that will be an eyesore for immediate abutters and passersby; and 5) the building will violate 19.30 (to which article 10.43(f) requires adherence); we especially note 19.33 , which requires that building construction be "designed and sited to minimize shadow impacts on neighboring lots"; and that "Building scale and wall treatment, including the provision of windows" be "sensitive to existing residential uses on adjacent lots."

Any one of these reasons is enough for the BZA to reject the petition now.
Finally, we note that the special permit application contains numerous errors. First, the survey indicates that the house faces south, but it in fact faces north. We wonder if this is the basis for the applicant's false claim respecting shadows. Second, the "Reason for Petition" and "Description of Petitioner's Proposal" do not actually say what relief is being requested; does the advertising language of the petition do so?

The proposed increase in volume, area, and height, making the building nearly 1.0 FAR and close to 1.2 with the finished basement, has a serious impact on our exposure to sun and privacy, is not in keeping with the neighborhood, and sets a negative precedent for the neighborhood and district. Allowing for significant increases in the massing of already nonconforming planes inside setbacks - and then adding windows there - also sets a negative precedent for the neighborhood.

We accordingly urge you to reject this special permit petition,
Sandra Ferguson and Ian Ferguson
22 Fairmont Street, 02139 Cambridge



## Exhibit A <br> Volume Calculation and Detrimental Effect on Sunshine

We note that the developer has not provided a volume change calculation. Our best estimate from the applicant's petition is that that the proposed addition will increase the volume of an already oversized, nonconforming building by $\mathbf{4 4 \%}$. It is hard to believe that anything close to such a number will have no detrimental impact, including on light. We estimate a $44 \%$ increase over the existing volume above the basement as follows: we take the total existing volume of 43,496 cubic feet (see Z10 of the application), subtracting the basement volume of 11,296 ( 7 ' 10 ' height $x$ area of 1442 sf - see D2.1 and Z9) to get an existing volume of 32,300 cubic feet. The proposal will remove volume of 6,307 cubic feet (see Z 10 ) and add 9.97 ' height x 1357 sf area on the new third floor, or 13,529 cubic feet, and approximately $10^{\prime} \times 580$ sf on the second floor, or 5,800 cubic feet, and $123 \mathrm{sf} \times 10$ ' on the first floor, or 1230 cubic feet, for a total of 20,559 cubic feet less the 6,307 feet removed $=$ 14,252 cubic feet added divided by $32,300=a 44 \%$ increase in volume.

The purpose of this massive increase in volume and massing is to increase what is already a significant developer margin (he purchased the house for $\$ 2.05$ million or $\$ 400$ per square foot for 5000 sellable square feet including the basement - in a neighborhood where luxury housing sells for upwards of $\$ 1000$ or $\$ 1100$ per square foot).

This grab at an additional 1100 sf for the pure motive of profiteering will literally occur at the expense of sunshine available for our child and growing family.

Exhibit B
Images

View from child's room which receives a lot of sunlight until the afternoon.


View from parents art studio which receives a lot of sunlight until the afternoon.



[^0]:    (1) Rear/ Right side view PROPOSED

[^1]:    (2) Rear Right View - PROP.

[^2]:    Adam J. Glassman, R.A.
    Cambridge, MA
    C: 617.412.8450
    www.glassmanchungdesign.com

[^3]:    (1) Front/Left side view- EXTG

