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GENERAL INFORMATION
```

The undersigned hereby petitions the Board of Zoning Appeal for the following:


## REASON FOR PETITION :

Additions

## DESCRIPTION OF PETITIONER'S PROPOSAL

Requesting relief for 171 GSF of added area on the second and third floor, within the
existing building footprint.
Project was submitted to Mid-Cambridge Conservation Commision on 2.10 .20 .

SECTIONS OF ZONING ORDINANCE CITED :
Article 5.000 Section 5.31 (Table of Dimensional Requirements).

Original Signatures) :


$\qquad$

BRA APPLICATION FORM - OWNERSHIP INFORMATION

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

I/We $\qquad$ Michelle M. Wartak
address: in MyRtLE AVE, CAMBRIDGE MA O2138
$\qquad$
State that $I / W e$ own the property located at 23 Nqpitce Ave which is the subject of this zoning application.

The record title of this property is in the name of $\qquad$ WARTAK, MAR tulA. MaTt, Michelle M.
*Pursuant to a deed of duly recorded in the date duly 1,2003, Middlesex South County Registry of Deeds at Book 29770, Page 281 ; or Middlesex Registry District of Land Court, Certificate No. $\qquad$
Book $\qquad$ Page $\qquad$ .

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

Commonwealth of Massachusetts, County of $\qquad$ Middlesex The above-name Master wortak \& michelle warta this $25^{t h}$ of $\overline{\text { Fl }}, 2020$, and made oath ${ }^{2}$ hat the above statement is true.

my commission expires fume 10, 2022 (Notary seal).

- If ownership is not shown in recorded deed, e.g. if by court order, recent deed, or inheritance, please include documentation.


DIMENSIONAL INFORMATION


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

New work will be wood frame construction and cast=in=place foundation. Existing structure is wood frame construction with brick foundation.
Scope includes conversion of half of existing covered front porch footprint into enclosed first floor
living space, addition of same footprint on the second floor, and modification of half of the third
floor roofline to convert eave space into living space.

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'.

## SUPPORTING STATEMENT FOR A VARIANCE

## EACH OF THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS FOR A VARIANCE MUST BE ESTABLISHED AND SET FORTH IN COMPLETE DETAIL BY THE APPLICANT IN ACCORDANCE WITH MGL 40A, SECTION 10:

A) A Literal enforcement of the provisions of this Ordinance would involve a substantial hardship, financial or otherwise, to the petitioner or appellant for the following reasons:

The petitioner is requesting minor relief of the Cambridge Zoning dimensional requirements outlined in Table 5.1, for Zoning District C-l. Specifically, the request is for a CSF that greater than that established by the zoning ordinance by 65 GSF and a resulting CSF to Lot Ratio of 77.

The property has been owned and occupied by the same family since 2003. The Owners are undertaking a renovation that includes increasing the property's square footage in an effort to make the property match the their growing family's needs for long term occupancy.
B) The hardship is owing to the following circumstances relating to the soil conditions, shape or topography of such land or structures and especially affecting such land or structures but not affecting generally the zoning district in which it is located for the following reasons:

Not applicable.
C) DESIRABLE RELIEF MAY BE GRANTED WITHOUT EITHER:

1) Substantial detriment to the public good for the following reasons:

The public sidewalk right-of-way will be maintained and the footprint of the new street facing addition will be no larger than the existing front porch.

The private pedestrian level space adjacent to public pedestrian space will be improved with and enlarged paved entry stair landing and integrated landscaping features.
2) Relief may be granted without nullifying or substantially derogating from the intent or purpose of this Ordinance for the following reasons:

The relief requested is a minor allowance to the building CSF and CSF to LOT ratio, as noted in Item A above and on the Dimensional Form.
The relief will not negatively impact existing sight lines and pedestrian spaces for the surrounding community.

* If You have any questions as to whether you can establish all of the applicable legal requirements, you should consult with your own attorney.


# CITY OF CAMBRIDG. 

## Massachusetts

BOARD OF ZONING APPEAL
831 Mass Avenue, Cambridge, MA.
617) 349-6100

April 15, 2020

Honeycomb Design + Build, LLC
C/O Ann Fullerton
540 Main Street - Suite 7
Winchester, MA 01890
RE: 23 Myrtle Avenue - BZA-017259-2020
Dear Ms. Fullerton,
I am writing to you in regard to your above up-coming Board of Zoning Appeal Hearing.
At this time the City will not be holding any non-essential public meetings due to the COVID-19
Pandemic and the City Manager's closure of all City buildings to non-essential business.: On April 3, 2020, the Governor signed into law Chapter 53 of the Acts of 2020 ("Act"), which extends all land use permitting deadlines until after the State of Emergency is lifted. In light of the extensions provided for in the Act and the closure of City buildings, at this time the Board of Zoning Appeal will be rescheduling all public hearings in accordance with the extensions permitted under the Act. You will receive notice of the new date, once the hearing is rescheduled.

Thank you for your patience and understanding during this unprecedented time.


Administrative Aśsistant


City of Cambridge
Massachusetts
BOARD OF ZONING APPEAL
831 Mass Avenue, Cambridge, MA. (617) 349-6100

BRA
POSTING NOTICE - PICK UP SHEET

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

Name:


Address:


Case No.


Hearing Date:


Thank you,
Baa Members

Cambridge City Hall
Board of Zoning Appeal
831 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge MA 02139

## Ref: BZA-017259-2020

To whomever it may concern,
We are happily writing to express our strong support for our neighbors and friends Martin and Michelle Wartak at 23 Myrtle Ave in their variance petition.

We have known Martin and Michelle for over a decade since moving to Myrtle Ave in 2010 and they have been wonderful neighbors and friends. Specifically as it relates to their current project, they have been very transparent and forthcoming with their ideas and design. We believe the changes they are proposing to their property are fair, appropriate and even necessary for the needs of their growing family unit. And, having reviewed their proposals and drawings, we cannot think of any adverse impact to the street or neighborhood from their project.

If anything, the odd side of Myrtle Ave which is not uniform in its style in any event and has a newer condo development followed by a couple of triple-deckers with another much older structure sandwiched between them, would aesthetically benefit from the addition of a modern-looking residential structure.

In summary, we wholeheartedly support granting the variance requested and if need be we are available to answer any questions.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Keren and Ori Porat
24 Myrtle Ave
Cambridge MA 02138

## Pacheco, Maria

From: Brian Roughan [brianroughan@gmail.com](mailto:brianroughan@gmail.com)
Sent: $\quad$ Sunday, July 19, 2020 10:02 PM
To:
Subject:

Pacheco, Maria
23 Myrtle Ave

Maria,

I am writing this letter in support of the renovation plans for 23 Myrtle Ave. I am a directly adjacent neighbor of Martin and Michelle Wartak and support their efforts to improve the house and expand their footprint. I have seen the plans and have no issues or concerns at all.

Martin and Michelle are wonderful neighbors, longtime Cambridge residents, and are looking for an improved home and more space for their growing family as their second child is due within the next 10 days.

I hope the city will approve all the plans for 23 Myrtle and allow flexibility for families looking to stay in Cambridge and our neighborhood in particular.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you want more information or to speak live about this.

Best regards,
Brian Roughan and Kerry McDonald
19 Myrtle Ave
Cambridge MA 02138
617.645.0536
--
Brianroughan@gmail.com 6176450536


# CITY OF CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS <br> PLANNINGBOARD 

CITY HALL ANNEX, 344 BROADWAY, CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139

July 9, 2020
To: The Board of Zoning Appeal
From: The Planning Board
RE: BZA cases to be heard on July 23, 2020.

The Planning Board have no comments on the cases listed on the BZA agenda.

| From: | Sheraz Choudhary [sherazch@gmail.com](mailto:sherazch@gmail.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Monday, July 20, 2020 4:14 PM |
| To: | Pacheco, Maria |
| Subject: | Zoning Appeal for 23 Myrtle Ave. |

## Hi Maria,

Jessica and I live at 2 Myrtle Ave \#3. Myrtle Ave is a wonderful street with wonderful neighbors. All the kids play outside on the street while all the parents watch. We are a very tightly knit community.

We are writing to you today to fully support the renovation project that Michelle and Martin are undertaking. They shared all the designs and ideas with us and we love them. We think that it will serve to further improve our already wonderful street.

We can't wait to welcome Michelle and Martin's second kid who should be arriving in eight days!

Please let me know if we can support this project in any other way.

Thank you,
Sheraz, Jessica, Zak and Leo
From:

| Sent: | Frank Benesch-Lee [frank@benesch-lee.net](mailto:frank@benesch-lee.net) |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Monday, July 20, 2020 5:00 PM |
| Subject: | Pacheco, Maria |

Dear Maria Pacheco,
My name is Frank Benesch-Lee and I live at 14 Myrtle Ave, Cambridge. I want to support Michelle and Martin Wartak
with their renovation plans at 23 Myrtle Ave.
They have shared their plans and we fully support their project. They are using the space for their growing family, which
includes their two-year-old son, and another child in 9 days.
They are nice neighbors and we want to offer our sincere support.

With best regards,

Frank Benesch-Lee.

City of Cambridge
Massachusetts
BOARD OF ZONING APPEAL
831 Mass Avenue, Cambridge, MA.
(617) 349-6100

BRA
POSTING NOTICE - PICK UP SHEET

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


Address:


Case No. $\qquad$ B2A-07259-7020

Hearing Date: $\quad 7 / 23 / 20$

Thank you, Bra Members

MYRTLE ST GFA / LOT RATIO COMPARISION CHART

| ADDRESS | TOTAL GFA | LOT AREA | RATIO OF GFA TO LOT | MAX. ALLOWABLE GFA |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EVEN SIDE OF STREET |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 MYRTLE AVE | 2160 | 2407 | 0.90 | 1805 TWO FAMILY |  |
| 17 MYRTLE AVE | 0 | 0 | \#DIV/0! | NO INFO. 0 AVAILABLE |  |
| 19 MYRTLE AVE | 1697 | 1954 | 0.87 | 1466 SINGLE FAMILY |  |
| 23 MYRTLE AVE | 1981 | 2783 | 0.71 | 2087 TWO FAMILY |  |
| 25 MYRTLE AVE | 2316 | 2711 | 0.85 | 2033 TWO FAMILY |  |
| 31 MYRTLE AVE | 3648 | 4594 | 0.79 | 3446 THREE FAMILY |  |
| 33-35 MYRTLE AVE | 3666 | 3178 | 1.15 | 2384 THREE FAMILY |  |
| 39-41 MYRTLE AVE | 3682 | 0 | \#DIV/0! | 0 TWO U. CONDO | LAND AREA UNKNOWN |
| ODD SIDE OF STREET |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2-4 MYRTLE AVE | 2519 | 0 | \#DIV/0! | 0 THREE U. CONDO | LAND AREA UNKNOWN |
| 6 MYRTLE AVE | 1440 | 2407 | 0.60 | 1805 SINGLE FAMILY |  |
| 10-12 MYRTLE AVE | 2160 | 2407 | 0.90 | 1805 TWO FAMILY |  |
| 14-16 MYRTLE AVE | 2160 | 2407 | 0.90 | 1805 SINGLE FAMILY |  |
| 18 MYRTLE AVE | 2160 | 2407 | 0.90 | 1805 SINGLE FAMILY |  |
| 22-24 MYRTLE AVE | 2160 | 2407 | 0.90 | 1805 TWO FAMILY |  |
| 28-30 MYRTLE AVE | 2115 | 0 | \#DIV/0! | 0 TWO U. CONDO | LAND AREA UNKNOWN |
| 34 MYRTLE AVE | 2299 | 2407 | 0.96 | 1805 THREE FAMILY |  |
| 36 MYRTLE AVE | 2380 | 1822 | 1.31 | 1367 TWO U. CONDO | LAND AREA UNKNOWN |
| 38-40 MYRTLE AVE | 2346 | 0 | \#DIV/0! | 0 TWO FAMILY |  |
| 45 MYRTLE AVE | 0 | 0 | \#DIV/0! | 0 |  |



The undersigned hereby petitions the Board of Zoning Appeal for the following:

PETITIONERS ADDRESS: 540 Main Street, Suite 7 Winchester, MA 01890
LOCATION OF PROPERTY: 23 Myrtle Ave Cambridge, MA

TYPE OF OCCUPANCY: $\qquad$ ZONING DISTRICT: Residence C-1 Zone

## REASON FOR PETITION :

## Additions

DESCRIPTION OF PETITIONERS PROPOSAL:

```
Requesting relief for }171\mathrm{ GSF of added area on the second and third floor, within the
existing building footprint.
Project was submitted to Mid-Cambridge Conservation Commision on 2.10.20.
```

SECTIONS OF ZONING ORDINANCE CITED :


Address :
540 Main Street, Suite 7

|  | Winchester MA 01890 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Tel. No.: $\quad 617.420 .3113$ |  |
|  |  |

EMail Address: hiveteamehoneycombdesignbuild.com
Date: 2.20 .20


## City of Cambridge

Massachusetts
BOARD OF ZONING APPEAL
831 Mass Avenue, Cambridge, MA.

## Board of Zoning Appeal Waiver Form

The Board of Zoning Appeal
831 Mass Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02139

RE: Case \# $\qquad$ .

Address:

$\square$ Owner, $\square$ Petitioner, or $\square$ Representative: Ann Fullerton
(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: $\qquad$


Signature
(9:30 p.m.)
Sitting Members: Constantine Alexander, Brendan Sullivan, Janet Green, Jim Monteverde, Slater W. Anderson

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay. On the case that -I'm sorry, the Chair will now call Case Number 017259 -- 23 Myrtle Avenue. Anyone here wishing to be heard on this matter?

ANNE FULLERTON: Yes, Hello, everybody. My name is Anne Fullerton. I'm here representing Martin and Michele Wartak who are the homeowners of 23 Myrtle Ave. And they're actually on this call. So if they could be joined as a participant as well, to be given the ability to speak, that would be great, Sisia.

SISIA DAGLIAN: Can you repeat their names, please?

ANNE FULLERTON: Martin and Michele Wartak, W-a-r-t-a-k. So Martin and Michele have owned their home since 2003. It's a two-family home, and it's owner-occupied for the full-time. And their family is growing. They're looking to make some changes to allow to have an extra
bedroom within their space that's a usable bedroom within their unit.

And the overall square footage add that the proposal has is 171 gross floor area. The request for a variance is solely 65 square feet of gross floor area, which makes them a 0.77 ratio, as opposed to the 0.71 that they are currently.

All other elements are within the exact same footprint; same setbacks. Roofline height, the ridge height does not change. The roof line will change a bit, but the ridge height does not change.

And it is -- we did go through Historic Commission, Conservation Commission for mid Cambridge. It is -- their comments were nonbinding. The Wartaks prefer a more contemporary aesthetic. Of course, the Conservation Commission was really interested in maintaining a more historic nature. So hence the nonbinding commentary.

But again, the whole variance is based on 66 square feet at this point.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: You want to address the requirements for a variance, starting with Archer?

ANNE FULLERTON: I'm sorry, starting with Archer?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Well, you, sorry just for my information, are you an attorney?

ANNE FULLERTON: No, I'm their architect.
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Their architect. Well, to get a variance, you need to -- there's a legal standard you have to satisfy. And there are three parts, if you look at the zoning ordinance.

You must demonstrate -- you must convince us that a literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would involve a substantial hardship, such hardship to the petitioner -- that's one.

That the hardship is owing to circumstances relating to the soil conditions, shape or topography of such land or structures -- that's two.

And third, that the relief may be granted without substantial detriment to the public good, or nullifying or substantially derogating from the intent or purpose of the ordinance. Those are the findings we have to make if you -if we were to grant the variance you're seeking. So you have to --

ANNE FULLERTON: Understood.
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: -- address them and tell
us why we should find that you satisfy those requirements.

ANNE FULLERTON: So there is not -- clearly there is not a soil -- or not clearly, but there is not a soil requirement. The hardship is that without that additional 65 square feet, they actually do not have the ability to turn an office into a bedroom. They -- what they have currently is an approximate $7 \times 12$ office space. That would be a very small bedroom.

So they're looking to make it into a standardsized bedroom that would allow them to be able to grow their family in their house.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: That addresses the literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would involve a substantial hardship, such hardship being that this is a growing family that needs more living space, and that's the reason why you're increasing the square footage of the house.

But I think you were the one who in your application said, "Not applicable" to the second requirement of the variance. It has to be applicable. If it's not applicable, you don't get the relief.

So let's think creatively as to why the hardship,
which is the lack of space, is owing to circumstances relating to the soil conditions -- I understand they don't satisfy that. How about shape of the current structure? Or the topography of the structure?

ANNE FULLERTON: So it is -- the topography of the structure -- the topography of the land is a flat site. But the topography of the structure -- the actual structure is, again, does not allow -- the existing envelope does not allow us to expand enough to have a normal-size bedroom.

And the goal is, again, to stay within the exact same footprint, so we're not creeping out beyond the existing footprint.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Good.

ANNE FULLERTON: But instead to enclose a portion of their first-floor porch, to add a powder room on their first floor, and then to actually add an extension on their second floor over the top of the porch -- the front porch.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you. That's good. And then I can help you on the third one. Relief may be granted without substantial detriment to the public good, or nullifying or substantially derogating from the intent and purpose of the ordinance.

As you have pointed out, the amount of additional space that's being added is quite small. It is supported by what seems to be unanimous neighborhood support, and there seems to be no other reasons not to grant the variance.

So we agree on that. Anything further you want to add to your presentation before we ask other questions, or we open the matter up to public testimony?

ANNE FULLERTON: The only thing that I would add is we did do a study of the GFA ratio in the neighborhood, to make sure that we weren't exceeding the norm. And I believe Sisia added it to the back.

And the two GFAs ratios highlighted in green are only two that currently conform, one of which is 23 Myrtle Street, the property we're talking about.

The rest far exceed. And our 77 percent would still be far below the norm in that neighborhood. And I just wanted to make that point that the neighborhood is already fairly dense.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Good. Thank you.
Questions from members of the Board?
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: No, well maybe a comment. This
is Brendan Sullivan, and Anne, even though you mentioned
that the Historical Commission mid Cambridge's comments were nonbinding, I for one take them very, very seriously, and we welcome their input of any of the historical committees and Planning Boards.

And so, I'm a little bit trouble by their not liking this, I guess to put it mildly. And there are also some letters in the file and some correspondence that is not fitting in the neighborhood. And so, anyhow, that's just one comment that I have.

ANNE FULLERTON: May I address?
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Sure.
ANNE FULLERTON: We agree. I worked with Allison Crosby (phonetic) pretty extensively to sort of walk her through the project from an early phase and took her comments to heart, and actually modified some of the entryway pieces to make it a little bit more gracious and open.

And we actually presented a landscape planting plan as well to the Historic -- or to the Conservation Commission, because we wanted the Commission as well as the neighbors to understand what the public way especially would be like.

Because we know the house is different. The proposal is different than the current house aesthetically. That does not necessarily make it wrong. Certainly, the Conservation Commission was excited about their house initially because it had a lot of original sort of shingle detail that has not been maintained, and needs to be largely repaired.

And again, it's not the homeowner's aesthetic, a and they're long-term homeowners and they're looking to, you know, make the home they're going to stay in for quite a while.

So we did really try to compromise as much as possible, and it became pretty clear during the commission meeting that because of the nature of the current home that hadn't been vinyled over, that they weren't -- they couldn't make the turn easily to support us.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay. Any other members of the Board have any questions or comments you want to make at this point? Hearing none, I assume the answer is no. I'll open the matter up to public testimony, and we'll here from there are many letters of support in the file in writing, but I'll see if anyone wants to speak on this matter, pro or
con.

So any members of the public who to speak, now is the time. You have to click the icon at the bottom of your Zoom screen 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.

Anyone wishes to speak? We'll give it a few more minutes just because it's slow. But apparently no one does wish to speak.

ANNE FULLERTON: The homeowners might.
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I'm sorry?
ANNE FULLERTON: The homeowners might as well. CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: All right.

SISIA DAGLIAN: You need to raise your hand.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Still no indication. So
I'm going to assume nobody wants to address this orally. As
I indicated we are in receipt of many letters from neighbors
in the neighborhood, all of which are in support of the relief being sought.

Well, I'll close public testimony, and I think it's time for a decision.

JIM MONTEVERDE: Can I --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Question, or do you want me to --

JIM MONTEVERDE: Excuse me, Gus.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Go ahead, go ahead, Jim. JIM MONTEVERDE: This is Jim Monteverde. I'm sorry, I -- my screen blacked out there a bit while you were taking --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Sure.

JIM MONTEVERDE: -- Board questions, so may I ask a question or make an observation?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Go ahead.
JIM MONTEVERDE: Thank you, if it's not too late. So I share -- I think I heard Brendan's concern about the other Commission's statements and their concerns. I kind of share those concerns, or I shared those concerns.

And one curious little question $I$ have is if $I$ take the existing elevation, street elevation, and I take your proposed street elevation, in essence the major piece of the massing that changes is what happens on the third floor, which -- if I squint my eyes, in essence it's a dormer that's the entire length of the façade, which this Commission would never allow, or the Zoning Board would
never allow.

So in terms of the -- and I'm just -- I'm pushing aside the issues of the stylistic materiality -- you know, whether the existing structure is reusable and repaintable and any value it has to the community.

I'm strictly looking at the massing that you're proposing. And again, I'm looking at the street-facing elevation for both the existing and the proposed.

Did I basically read that change in massing correctly? That in essence it's -- it amounts to what would be, were you to keep the original, the existing roof line, you would be adding a dormer that's the entire length of the building by whatever the height is?

Is that kind of what --
ANNE FULLERTON: I'm sorry, do you have more to your question?

JIM MONTEVERDE: No.
ANNE FULLERTON: Okay. So I think that we all
know that part of the dormer requirements are like a setback from the main face of the house, as well as a width and length and height relationship to the rest of the house.

So essentially what we're looking at in the
proposal is a full third floor on the right-hand half of the house. It currently has occupied third-floor spaces, but it has significant eaves.

JIM MONTEVERDE: Correct.

ANNE FULLERTON: And so, what the proposal is, is to essentially make half of the third floor a full third floor height. I wouldn't call it a dormer, because we didn't propose a setback.

JIM MONTEVERDE: Yep.
ANNE FULLERTON: -- intentionally, we didn't propose a setback. We thought that it was inappropriate for the overall massing of the house.

And the house immediately to the right of it actually has the rear half of it has a roofline similar to what we're proposing. So we felt like it was in keeping with the aesthetics of for the built condition surrounding the house.

JIM MONTEVERDE: Yeah. I'm looking at the photo of the adjacent building. I'm not quite following the logic totally. But I understand your point. Yeah. You're not considering it a dormer. In essence, you're raising the roof on that section to get a full third-floor level
occupancy on that, as you said, right side of the building. ANNE FULLERTON: Right.

JIM MONTEVERDE: So I have my concerns. Just -again, you're following the threads that go through the various commissions, and couple letters that I read in the file, and then my own sense that it's that lifting of the roof on that particular end.

I mean, I see the lifted roof adjacent to you to the right, but --

ANNE FULLERTON: It's substantial.

JIM MONTEVERDE: -- I think that -- yeah, I think what you're proposing is just much more substantial, and I can't say that I would be in support. Anyway, thank you. That's my comment.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you, Jim. Any other comments or should I make a motion and we can vote on this matter?

MICHELE WARTAK: Hi, this is Michele Wartak. If we could just make a comment, would that be okay?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Go ahead.
MICHELE WARTAK: Oh, sure. So I'm Michele Wartak and this is my husband, Martin Wartak. And we've lived here
for 17 years, and we continue -- want to continue to do so. I'm actually right now you can't tell from this little Zoom window, but I'm 39 weeks pregnant, and we have a baby arriving next week, which is very exciting.

When we were thinking that we would do this, you know, hearing back in April it was a little bit of a different scenario.

But what we would like to say is just that we've been in support of this neighborhood. We are not thinking about moving, even though we're adding to our family. And the neighborhood as, you know, for children his just been amazing.

And we already have a 2-year-old son, and we were -- we're older parents, if you will, but, you know, the support of the neighborhood and the neighborhood overall is just warm and welcoming.

So we just wanted to explain that and say, you know, that we're hoping that, you know, this bedroom would be obviously, you know, have an occupant pretty quickly, so we're hoping that, you know, this could be, you know, at least supported, if you will. Thank you.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you. Any other
comments from members of the Board?

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: I may have missed it Gus. Did we have a sense of what the neighbor on the tall side of the house thought about the three-story side?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: What's that neighbor's name and address, and I'll go through the letters in our file. I can ask the petitioner to give that answer.

MICHELE WARTAK: Yeah. I can tell you their address, I believe, is 21.

MARTIN WARTAK: It should be Debra Bell. And I think she might be at 23 or 25 . Oh, we're 23 -- sorry, we're 23.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: You're 23.
MARTIN WARTAK: So she's not there.

MICHELE WARTAK: She's 25.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Well, we have letters in the file from the person that lives at 14 Myrtle Avenue, 2 Myrtle Avenue \#3, 19 Myrtle Avenue.

MARTIN WARTAK: We have a file, Gus. Yeah, I'm seeing a file from Deborah Bell, a letter, in opposition.
"I have lived at 27 Myrtle Ave. I'm writing to urge you to prevent the proposed renovation to the house
next door to mine."

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I'M looking through the
letters.

JANET GREEN: Is she in the green house or the other one? Which house is she in?

ANNE FULLERTON: She's in the green house. CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Oh, we have --

JANET GREEN: The light green?
ANNE FULLERTON: The one with the higher roof.
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: We do have a letter from
27 Myrtle Avenue. And he -- she I should say -- opposes relief being sought.

JANET GREEN: So she's the neighbor. But it looks
like if she's in the greenhouse, it looks like a lot was done there already.

ANNE FULLERTON: Right.
JANET GREEN: Is that correct, or is it? So it's been adjusted and changed?

ANNE FULLERTON: Significantly. She has a full third story on the back half of her house, yeah.

JANET GREEN: It's an interesting street in many ways, but because it obviously had many of the houses look
the same on that street, and were built around the same time. And then gradually over a period of time, this little bit's been added or that's been changed. And so there's change in a fairly significant number of the houses.

Do you have, like would you say that half the houses in the neighborhood have had additions or changes to the original architecture, or would you -- would that be a -- you know, would you just be adding to a small group, who -- you see what I mean, you see my question?

ANNE FULLERTON: I think about a third. Martin and Michele, would you agree with that? That a third have significant aesthetic changes to the architecture?

MICHELE WARTAK: Yes.
ANNE FULLERTON: Especially across the street? JANET GREEN: Mm-hm.

ANNE FULLERTON: Yeah. Across the street, people have added dormers, much less sort of like the mint green house. And so, I would say probably about a third.

JANET GREEN: Mm-hm. It's a very attractive house that you have, you know, from the outside. And the original architecture on the street had many houses like that, I think, before all of the changes happened.

But I guess I'm not sure that you should be responsible for maintaining a neighborhood that's in change, you know?

So I guess I would be in favor of your project. I'm only one person on the Board, and it's a big -- what you're asking is kind of a big deal. So I'm not sure how that would go, but I'm in favor of it, given that things -the change in the entire neighborhood, not just looking at your own house.

MICHELE WARTAK: Thank you.
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: This is the Chair. I
share a dislike of the architecture that's being proposed for this house. And there are letters I didn't read one from a cofounding partner of HMFH Architects, a noted Cambridge architectural firm, who strongly opposes the design, what you're doing in the house.

But I understand your need for the house, need for the addition you're proposing. I wish you got a better design than what you're submitting to us. But with a great deal of reluctance, I guess I would vote for it.

JANET GREEN: Mm-hm. And I know it's a big, it's a big thought to, like, think about the design a little bit
differently after hearing the comments.
And as I said, I'm in support of you having the project, but $I$ wondered if you -- in listening to all of the comments that you're hearing, if you wanted to think about a design of it again, or if you want to go forward with this, as I say, I'm supportive of your project. So -- but I hear the comments.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: This is Brendan Sullivan. I sympathize and agree with your need for additional space. I just don't like the envelope, the look of it. I think it is very inappropriate. And I would agree with the comments from the Cambridge Conservation District Commission.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Well, I just want to point out if we got to a vote, which we will shortly, and the vote is you don't get four votes -- you need four votes to get the approval -- so it's not a simple majority, and that's state law, it's a super majority.

And if we -- if you don't get the vote, you're going to -- you can't build, you can't come back for two years, unless you come back with a substantially different design, which may be the case if you get turned down, I don't know. But it's your call, petitioners, if you want to
put us to a vote now? You've heard comments from members of the Board.

JANET GREEN: And how, I think Gus -- what the Chair is saying that, you know, there's a possibility you could say, "Well, maybe we would like to think it over a little bit more before we go to a vote now." And then you would come back with whatever changes you do or don't make.

Or you could ask for us to vote tonight. But I think you're hearing some real questions.

MICHELE WARTAK: So just for clarification, when you say, "voting" it's voting for just the 65 square feet?

JANET GREEN: No.
MICHELE WARTAK: Or you're also -- you're talking about the design of the whole structure?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I think it's both. I mean, it's the footage, the square footage, definitely. You can't divorce that from the design that's been submitted to us. So, not much of an answer, but basically that.

I don't think -- I'm speaking for myself as the Chair, but only for myself -- I don't think there's much objection to the amount of space you're proposing to add. I think the crux of the matter is the design that's being
presented to us.
MICHELE WARTAK: Okay, so just to clarify what you're saying, you -- if this is voted down, then that means that we cannot do this design either?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I'm sorry, I --
SLATER ANDERSON: You could do this design if it was in conformance with zoning. So for example, if you didn't need a variance. So that's where there is a little bit of a -- you know, it would be a shame to be voted down. I mean, you could come back with a plan to conform that didn't need a variance, and you could do this design, yes.

MICHELE WARTAK: But we couldn't come back for two years, because if you vote this down now, we can't come back for two years. Is that what -- it's?

MARTIN WARTAK: For that.

MICHELE WARTAK: If we can -- for a variance, but if we conform because we do have some of the square footage left in our FAR, we can still continue with potentially a variation of this design?

SLATER ANDERSON: Correct.
MICHELE WARTAK: Okay.
JANET GREEN: It sounds like there are questions
somewhat about the design, but it's also sort of the location of the footage, you know? But nobody is saying that you're trying to make it way too big.

MICHELE WARTAK: Yeah, yes, no, I understand. Thank you.

MARTIN WARTAK: We actually would have loved to have opened it up entirely, but that seemed a little bit gratuitous to --

MICHELE WARTAK: Yeah.

MARTIN WARTAK: -- to do so much. We kind of tried to balance it with -- I think we're leaving it at two children, we can't really have any more of them, but we kind of didn't want to present something that we were trying to be greedy with the space or anything like that. We've kind of tried to do it reasonably with kind of -- within the walls and not imposing too much on the neighbors or on the neighborhood and kind of trying to fit in.

For what it's worth, as Michelle said, we're not going anywhere. We're not trying to do this to then flip it or something like that. We've been here 17 years. I grew up in Cambridge. My parents over on Fenno Street. And so we're planning in staying here. We love the neighborhood.

We love the city.
And we love the house that we're in, it just -- it desperately needs to be updated. And we thought we would try to build the house that we loved. And most of our neighbors I think have been very supportive and love the house. The important thing is just being able to keep our family and our kids in this neighborhood. And that's kind of what we've tried to do.

And it's gotten a little bit with COVID and just kind of all of the scheduling getting pushed out, it's kind of been getting harder and harder to kind of keep pushing this out and keep modifying the plans. Because we're going to have to move out for six months or a year or something like that with the kids to somewhere else and then come back.

And so, we'd love to try to do that while the kids are kind of a little bit younger. We think it's going to be kind of a little bit easier to do.

So I'm inclined to -- hopefully it's not rolling the dice, but to roll the dice with you all and with the committee to hopefully that you all would -- well, if not overlook the design entirely, but just realize that what
we're trying to do is we're trying to accommodate hopefully everyone and the neighborhood and the city and ourselves with a small addition. Yeah, it'll be modern.

That's been one of the neat things growing up in Cambridge is seeing the changes and how the city kind of has evolved and everything like that. And you do see a lot of these modern houses and places, and they're kind of neat. And then you see some other renovations.

But I think that's been some of the great diversity in the city of seeing it not just in the people, but in the architecture of what's been going on. So we -well anyway, either way we thank everyone very much for listening to it, for the feedback about the design and we hope you could support it.

SLATER ANDERSON: Before you roll the dice, if that was the phrase, if -- I think from the -- if I kind of count in my little Hollywood Squares thing that's on my computer here, the Board members who've kind of spoken and voiced some concern, I have, I think Brendan has -- that's two. The numbers say you don't pass tonight.

MARTIN WARTAK: Oh, I see. Oh, there are five and we need four?

JIM MONTEVERDE: Four. So yeah, I just want to help you with the rolling the dice routine.

MARTIN WARTAK: Okay, no, I appreciate it.
JIM MONTEVERDE: But it's more like driving off a cliff.

MARTIN WARTAK: Okay, no, that's fine. That's actually very helpful, then. So it sounds like from what I'm hearing then, that it's not going to pass.

JIM MONTEVERDE: Yeah, I'm just listening to the conversation and I think --

MARTIN WARTAK: Okay, yeah.
JIM MONTEVERDE: -- that's the way I counted it. So you don't want to do a Thelma and Louise unless you really want to do it.

MARTIN WARTAK: Right. I haven't seen that movie, but I think I know what you're saying.

SLATER ANDERSON: So my concern I would just weigh in is one of the things we look at with this is, you know, was there an earnest effort to resolve concerns of the neighbor. And I'm seeing a letter from an immediate abutter, if I understand, where Deborah Bell lives that -you know, expressing concern about it on the side that is
the highest height of the house.

I also, I don't see an elevation for that side of the house. It would be the right side of the house.

ANNE FULLERTON: It is in the package.
SLATER ANDERSON: Is it? Okay.
ANNE FULLERTON: Yeah.
JIM MONTEVERDE: Yeah, I don't find it either.
I'm doing it not on the -- I'm doing it online and I don't find it.

SLATER ANDERSON: The one online didn't seem to happen.

ANNE FULLERTON: Yeah, I --
JIM MONTEVERDE: I think --
MARTIN WARTAK: Yeah.

ANNE FULLERTON: It was in the package that we submitted to Conservation. It's possible that it did not get submitted to you as well because we submitted at the same time.

I just thought from what $I$ know as a more granular commentary about the design, we have heard the Commission's comments in that Michele Martin and I have had significant conversations about whether or not the scale of materiality
affects the perception of the relationship of this house to the rest of the neighborhood.

And initially we had been looking at possibly a metal panel, which is what is on your submission. And we are now looking at something more in line with, like, a 10 inch flat plan instead of the metal panel, where it would have a more residential scale of materiality. Doesn't change the envelope or the fenestration necessarily, but it does change the scale and texture.

So you have -- that is the driveway side, so not the neighbor who has -- that you noted.

JIM MONTEVERDE: It's the right elevation that $I$ don't find in the online or in what's on the screen for all of us. But --

ANNE FULLERTON: I don't know how much this helps you for me to do this.

JIM MONTEVERDE: No, that's -- I can imagine what it is. I mean, I can read it on the plan, I can see the height of it in the front elevation, street-facing elevation. Personally, it doesn't help me.

ANNE FULLERTON: Well, I think part of her concern that she has expressed to Martin and Michele -- and I don't
know if this is outlined in her letter -- was privacy. And the only window change on that elevation is the addition of a window in the bathroom, which would be above eye level for privacy.

SLATER ANDERSON: Yeah. I mean we haven't seen, you know, a shadow study. I mean, that house -- so that tall side is on the south side of the neighbor who's concerned. So, like, the shadows, you know, you're building a substantial wall there that's going -- will block light.

I just -- it doesn't mean you need to have unanimous support from your neighborhood, but I'm not feeling that there was a dialogue between your clients. And I have less of an issue with the architectural design. I agree with your client's comments that, you know, Cambridge is eclectic in ways, and that.

But I have an issue with the massing of that side and not having, you know, evidence you've made an effort with that neighbor to, you know, work on a solution.

And it's over 65 feet -- you know, square feet, you know? And it's just a high risk venture for you guys to proceed. So that's my perspective.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: This is Gus Alexander, the

Chairman. We've got to bring this to a conclusion. We've got some more cases to hear tonight. I think you're hearing petitioners from the Board. That's a lot of problems with -- not fatal, maybe -- but a lot of problems with the design of this structure.

And I think it's time -- I think it would behoove you to go back to your neighbors, and also reflect on the comments you've heard tonight. And you can get a copy of the transcript so you can see exactly what was said, and think about this.

You might want to come back with the very same structure you have right now a couple of months from now when we would hear you again. But you may not. And you want to roll the dice, it's your call. But I think it might behoove you not to roll the dice tonight, but to take some time to think about what you heard, and talk to your neighbors, and then decide what to do.

MARTIN WARTAK: Could I ask what the objections were of -- that you all had -- it was just the aesthetic of it or the large third floor?

Because regarding Deborah, we've been talking to her for at least a year about this, and we've been entirely
transparent with her about the plan. There are some neighbors -- not to say more about her personally -- that are just kind of a little bit intractable, and you can look kind of on other neighborhood issues, where Deborah has had the same stance on these things. So we're not overly surprised about this.

But we've tried to be as transparent as possible with her and every neighbor about it. We didn't treat her any differently, about exactly what we're doing and getting feedback and everything like that.

But I'm just curious about what the Committee would want us to do differently.

SLATER ANDERSON: That's helpful to hear, Martin. It wasn't clear to me that there was a dialogue.

MARTIN WARTAK: I just -- a lot, a lot, lot, lot of dialogue. I like Deborah -- we all do very much personally. Our son Tate sees her in the back yard, he says, "Debwa" it's very cute. But we've really tried to kind of -- I'm a little puzzled about kind of her letter.

By the way, after we talked to her, the first we heard of her opposition was the letter that she sent to the Historic Commission. That was kind of like -- there were a
little bit of rumblings, "Oh, I'll think about it, I'll think about it," and then poof it happened.

So I think you can kind of meet people where they are. But anyway, we tried very much to actively engage her. But I'm curious what we could do if we resubmitted that would be more agreeable to you all?

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Well, this is Brendan Sullivan. I don't mean to be cute, but we would know it when see it. MARTIN WARTAK: Okay.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: It's hard to --
MARTIN WARTAK: No, and that's fair.
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: -- you know, it's hard to say, "Do this, do that" or something like that. It's just that to me the façade of the building is radical. It is inappropriate with the neighborhood.

You know, and, you know, yes, I do go to Myrtle. I live up at the other end of the city. You know, I go down Myrtle Street every once in a while, up Broadway -- all that other type of stuff.

And, you know, I do sometimes revisit some of the cases that we sat on just to see the end result of what we approved or whatever.

And I critique it. I critique, you know, why I voted for something and oh, maybe I should not have on second thoughts, you know, so on and so forth. Or you go by and you say, "Yeah, that's a nice-looking plan." And, you know, you're glad you were able to add to the streetscape, and also, to enhance people's lives.

But then some of the -- most of the time what I do is I put myself in the position of the person next door to you. What effect will this have on either side -- across the street, who will be looking at this all the time.

And some things have gone on in my own neighborhood that I look at. And again, my tastes should not be your taste. We'll have -- that's -- my father used to have an expression saying that's why Howard Johnson's has 28 flavors, because we all don't like vanilla, chocolate and strawberry.

So there is variety that is part of the Cambridge fabric. To me, I think this is a radical design which tears at the fabric of that lovely street, put it very simply. And I just -- I, again sympathize with your need for more room, I have no problem with that. I think the amount of space is de minimis compared to, you know, the house and
what your needs are. But it's just -- it's a radical design, and I just go back to the mid Cambridge that I think it's inappropriate. So --

MARTIN WARTAK: My one -- and so, thank you for clarifying that. My one question is it sounds like the raising of the roof is partly the objection. But I don't know that we have any other place to gain more space.

SLATER ANDERSON: You may be better with a gable and a dormer effect, rather than a full third floor on one side. I think that that's kind of where the design fails.

JIM MONTEVERDE: This is Jim Monteverde. I'm just flipping between the -- I have this online. I'm looking at the drawings. I'm flipping between the existing third floor or the proposed third floor and just seeing, you know, what's the game, what's the rationale?

And, you know, you pick up on mechanical space. You have a bathroom there, you revise the bathroom; you pick up on office, there is a closet, you pick up a bigger closet. It just -- it doesn't give me enough rationale to say that the existing, you know, roof profile should be obliterated.

You know, I can get beyond the façade treatment,
but I think what you've got as an existing piece of fabric -- and I think that's what I'm reading from the Conservation Commission and a couple of the other letters is it's a classic.

It -- you know, people would hate to see it go, be obliterated. Which means the argument of, "Well I'm doing this within the same shell, I'm just giving it a new suit of clothes" is raising some objections.

And I think the bigger move that you're making massing wise, which you just talked about, Martin, of raising that roof on $I$ guess is the right-hand side of the house, is the one that's causing me concern.

I'm not sure from what $I$ see in your new thirdfloor plan, there wouldn't be a way to -- or I'd be curious if there was a way to achieve this new space that you get by a dormer or some other method within the existing, you know, roof profile.

Maybe you can, maybe you can't, I don't know. But it would be that analysis that would basically say, "Ah, yeah, you know, by the way there is a method or there isn't." That's the part I can't follow at the moment, and I can't get there.

ANNE FULLERTON: Yeah. I think --
JIM MONTEVERDE: Because frankly, if the house were to burn down and this is the lot and you came back with this, it would be a whole different story. So part of it is just letting that existing fabric go.

ANNE FULLERTON: That's exactly the same commentary we ended the Conservation Commission with, was, you know, had this house not sort of held its place in time for so long, it would be a different story.

JIM MONTEVERDE: Yeah.
ANNE FULLERTON: But just to go back to your Chairman about the validity of the additional space on the third floor, a large amount of the reason that we need to raise the walls to accommodate the additional space for mechanical, and especially the office, is they're losing their office space on the second floor to the new bedroom for their second child.

JIM MONTEVERDE: Yeah.
ANNE FULLERTON: And Martin does work from home. JIM MONTEVERDE: Yeah.

ANNE FULLERTON: And even in normal times. And so, that office space is essential to their family needs.

And so, -- and the mechanical space really is essential to us serving the house appropriately for mechanical.

JIM MONTEVERDE: I hear you, but at the moment I'm not swayed.

JANET GREEN: I hear --
ANNE FULLERTON: Yeah.

JANET GREEN: -- I don't think anybody's
disagreeing with what you just said. But I'm not sure people feel that you've got it organized.

SLATER ANDERSON: I mean, there's a basement that seems to be, even in the new plans, seems to be underutilized. What's happening in the basement?

ANNE FULLERTON: It's a short basement and it's in a flood zone. And it would be incredibly expensive for them to actually use that as occupiable space, because it does flood.

SLATER ANDERSON: No, but I'm thinking mechanical. I mean, you've got the mechanicals on the table.

ANNE FULLERTON: Oh, so the issue with the mechanical is their second floor, their second unit is really only on the second floor. And it's sort of bound between the eve space on the third floor and their living
space on the first floor. It doesn't have good heating and cooling service.

And to really effectively cool it and heat it without pushing ducts through their living space, we would do a ducted mini split from that space behind their master bedroom on the third floor.

SLATER ANDERSON: Okay. Gus?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: It's decision time. Do we want to go -- does the petitioner want to go forward with a vote? And --

ANNE FULLERTON: No, we won't.
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Sorry?
ANNE FULLERTON: We will not go forward with a vote.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay. So we'll continue this case. Give you time to talk to your neighbors, think about what you've heard tonight. I'd urge you to get a copy of the transcript when it's available in the weeks to come, so you'll have everything. You know, you might forget things you would have said, or you want to really reflect on what is said, to get it in the transcript.

ANNE FULLERTON: Okay.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Continue the case until -what date's the earliest date?

SISIA DAGLIAN: Probably October 8, when everyone's here, right?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: If we have room?
SISIA DAGLIAN: Yep. Yeah, we only have one other case. I mean --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay. So we would continue this case until October 8. And then we would -excuse me -- meet again. Is that acceptable to you?

ANNE FULLERTON: Yes.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: October 8?

ANNE FULLERTON: Very much.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay. The Chair moves that we continue this case as a case heard until 7:00 p.m. on October 8, subject -- at 7:00 p.m., not this late hour we have right now, subject to the following conditions:

The first is that you sign a waiver of time for decision. By law, if we don't decide a case quickly, relief is granted. And so, when we continue cases, we're going to trip that.

So the waiver just simply says that we have more
time to make a decision, which works in your favor as well as the city's. And that's -- it's a simple, standard document.

So you have to sign a waiver of time for decision. The condition on that is that you must do this within one week from tonight, and it will go to Inspectional Services Department -- it's a simple one-page form -- and sign it. You don't do that; the case will be dismissed. That's the first condition.

The second condition is that the posting sign that you have maintained for the 14 days, you'll need a new one for the new date, October 8, and that sign will have to be maintained for the 14 days before the hearing on that date.

And lastly, to the extent you want to come back with new plans or modified plans -- new plans, specifications, other specific statistical data or tangible data, that must in our files no later than -- our files being ISD, the Special Services Department -- no later than 5:00 p.m. on the Monday before October 8 .

And that's to allow us and citizens of the city to go down there or go online and to review what you're now proposing. So -- and those are the conditions. All those
in favor of continuing the case on this basis -- Brendan? BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Brendan Sullivan, in favor of continuing.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Janet?

JANET GREEN: I'm in favor of continuing. CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Jim?

JIM MONTEVERDE: Jim Monteverde, in favor of continuing.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Slater?
SLATER ANDERSON: Slater Anderson, in favor of continuing.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And I am in favor of continuing as well.
[All vote YES]
So the case will be continued until October 8, and we will see what happens then. Thank you very much. COLLECTIVE: Thank you, goodbye.

Pacheco, Maria

| From: | ann@honeycombdesignbuild.com |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Monday, September 28, 2020 9:16 AM |
| To: | Pacheco, Maria |
| Cc: | 'Michelle Wartak'; 'Martin Wartak' |
| Subject: | 23 Myrtle Ave, Cambridge - BZA continuance |

Good morning Maria,

We would like to request an extension of the subject property BZA review continuance until an early November 2020 date.
The project is currently scheduled to appear in front of the Board again on October $8^{\text {th }}, 2020$.

Please confirm if you need any additional information from our team to change the schedule. Thank you.

ANN FULLERTON Partner, AIA LEED-AP
617.420.3113
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(7:27 p.m.)
Constantine Alexander, Brendan Sullivan,
Janet Green, Andrea A. Hickey, Jim Monteverde
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The Chair will now call
Case Number 017259 -- 23 Myrtle Avenue. Anyone here wishing
to be heard on this matter? No one wishes to be heard; we are in receipt of a letter, if $I$ can find it, from the architect or designer.
"We would like to request an extension of the subject property -- BZA Review Continuance -- until an early November 2020 date. The project -- "

Okay, the rest is tonight. We already have booked up, I think, the nineteenth of November with three cases.

SISIA DAGLIAN: Well, we're -- no, we only have two now.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: We only have two?
SISIA DAGLIAN: Yeah, with 32 Highland, we only have two.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay, then we can -- does November 19 work?

SISIA DAGLIAN: Yep.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay. The Chair moves that we continue this case -- I don't think we've ever heard this case, have we? I don't recall ever sitting on this case.

SISIA DAGLIAN: Same.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: So it's not a case heard. Okay, the Chair moves that we continue this case until 7:00 p.m. on November 19, subject to the following conditions:

That the petitioner sign a waiver of notice for time of decision -- and that's already been done in connection with the current continued case --

Two, that a new posting sign be posted and maintained reflecting the new date, November 19, and the new time, 7:00 p.m. And that any new, revised plans, spec $\$$, dimensional forms, must be in our files no later than $\$: 00$ p.m. on the Monday before November 19.

All those in favor of continuing the case on this basis?

JANET GREEN: Gus, this is Janet Green. I have a question.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Yes.
JANET GREEN: I'm not sure if I'm on this case to
be continued, or if these are the --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Ah --

JANET GREEN: I just want to be sure.

SISIA DAGLIAN: Well, if it's not heard?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Your name is on here as
being --

JANET GREEN: Okay.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: -- for tonight. And if
it's been a case heard --

JANET GREEN: Okay.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: -- if it's not been a case heard, you don't have to sit on the continued case. Ard I'm not clear to me yet whether this is a case heard or not.

JANET GREEN: I can do it, but $I$ just wanted to make sure whether $I$ should be doing it.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Well, there's no,
'should." If you can do it --

JANET GREEN: Well no, I can do it.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: -- and you want to d $i t$, that's fine.

JANET GREEN: Sure.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Is that it?


JANET GREEN: Yep.
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Is that the case?
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: All those in favor on the
basis --
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Brendan Sullivan, yes to the continuance.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Jim? (sic)
ANDREA HICKEY: Andrea Hickey, yes to the continuance.

JANET GREEN: Janet Green, yes to the continyance.
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Jim?
JIM MONTEVERDE: Jim Monteverde, yes to the
continuance.
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And the Chair votes yes as
well.
[All vote YES]
This case is continued as well until Novembel 19.
We'll just take a brief break. Mr. Sullivan s
checking the file for something. We're just taking a prief recess while Brendan's reviewing the transcript from the prior case. [BREAK]

| From: | Deborah Belle [debbelle@gmail.com](mailto:debbelle@gmail.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Sunday, November 15, 2020 2:50 PM |
| To: | Pacheco, Maria; Michelle Wartak; Martin Wartak |
| Subject: | Wartak renovation plans |

Dear Ms. Pacheco and members of the Cambridge Zoning Board:
Michelle and Martin Wartak have been in touch with me as they have revised their renovation plans. I am very happy with their new design and write to you today to endorse their plans enthusiastically. The new design retains enough of the shape and feel of the original house to be pleasing to me. The design also does not encroach on my own space or result in the loss of my view of the sky from my garden.

I am grateful to the Board for taking my viewpoint into consideration, and I am especially grateful to Michelle and Martin for doing so during this planning process.

All the best,
Deborah
27 Myrtle Avenue
--
Deborah Belle
Professor Emerita
Department of Psychological \& Brain Sciences
Boston University

## Updated BZA Submission Documents

The attached documents represent the updated proposed project, original heard at the Cambridge BZA hearing on July 23rd, 2020.

- Updated BZA Application, including revised dimensional table and project description.
- Signed neighborhood petition supporting the homeowner's proposal.
- GFA Comparison Table for Myrtle Ave.
- 23 Myrtle Ave survey with the proposed footprint overlaid.
- Updated proposed plans and elevations, with existing conditions attached.
- Updated 3d model views.
- Shadow study for the proposed project.

Dear Board Members,
Michelle and Martin Wartak, the long time owners of 23 Myrtle Ave, heard your commentary regarding appropriateness of the previous proposal clearly, and as a result have worked very diligently to develop an updated proposal that we believe addresses those concerns, but still allows them to create a home that will fit their long term needs and represents their personal style.

The updated proposal maintains the existing roofline, and creates much of their needed additional square footage in the rear of the property, within the allowable rear yard setbacks, and maintaining the existing side yard setback.

We have also worked hard to find a representative palette of materials that would meet the client's aesthetic, and also define the 'classic modern' style appreciated in successful newer Cambridge residential constructions. We are using the material properties of 20 Madison St, Cambridge as our aesthetic benchmark.

It is our hope that the Board of Appeals is supportive of this updated proposal and we are able to move forward with creating this family's dream home.

Sincerely,
Michelle and Martin Wartak, and The Honeycomb Team


# CITY OF CAMBRIDGE <br> MASSACHUSETTS <br> BOARD OF ZONING APPEAL <br> 831 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE <br> CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139 <br> 617 349-6100 

BZA APPLICATION FORM Plan No: BZA-017259-2020
GENERAL INFORMATION

The undersigned hereby petitions the Board of Zoning Appeal for the following:

| Special Permit : |  | Variance : | $\checkmark$ | Appeal : |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PETITIONER : | Honeycomb | Build, LL | C/ |  |

PETITIONER'S ADDRESS: 540 Main Street, Suite 7 Winchester, MA 01890

LOCATION OF PROPERTY: 23 Myrtle Ave Cambridge, MA
TYPE OF OCCUPANCY $\qquad$ ZONING DISTRICT: Residence C-1 Zone

REASON FOR PETITION: Addition to front and rear of the existing property.

DESCRIPTION OF PETITIONER'S PROPOSAL :
Requesting relief for 552 GSF of added area on the first, second and third floors. The proposed front footprint is with in the existing building footprint. The proposed rear footprint is an enlargement of the existing addition footprint, within allowable rear setbacks. Project was submitted to Mid-Cambridge Conservation Commission on 2.10 .20 , and initially appeared before the BZA on 07.23.20.
SECTIONS OF ZONING ORDINANCE CITED :
$\qquad$ Section 5.31 (Table of Dimensional Requirements).

Original Signature(s) :

(Petitioner(s) / Owner)
Ann Fullerton
(Print Name)

Address :
540 Main Street, Suite 7

Tel. No. :
617.420 .3113

E-Mail Address : $\qquad$


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

Modification of half of existing covered front porch footprint into enclosed first floor living space, addition of the same footprint on the second floor.
Enlargement of rear addition footprint to create code conforming stair to rental unit and new living space on three floors. Cast-in-place foundation and wood frame construction for all areas of new construction.

[^0]
## SUPPORTING STATEMENT FOR A VARIANCE

## EACH OF THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS FOR A VARIANCE MUST BE ESTABLISHED AND SET FORTH IN

 COMPLETE DETAIL BY THE APPLICANT IN ACCORDANCE WITH MGL 40A, SECTION 10:A)
A Literal enforcement of the provisions of this ordinance would
involve
a substantial hardship, financial or otherwise, to the petitioner or
appellant for the following reasons:

The petitioner is requesting minor relief of the Cambridge Zoning dimensional requirements outlined in Table 5.1, for Zoning District C-1. Specifically, the request is for a GSF that greater than that established by the zoning ordinance by $\mathbf{5 5 2} \mathbf{G S F}$ and a r esulting GSF to Lot Ratio of $\mathbf{1 . 3 6}$, which is below the average ratio on the street.
The property has been owned and occupied by the same family since 2003. The Owners are undertaking a renovation that includes increasing the property's square footage in an effort to make the property match the their growing family's needs for long term occupancy.
B) The hardship is owing to the following circumstances relating to the
soil conditions, shape or topography of such land or structures and especially affecting such land or structures but not affecting generally the zoning district in which it is located for the following reasons:
The long term owners (18 years!) need a larger space for their growing family's needs. The modest proposed project creates a new larger code conforming stair for the existing one bedroom rental unit, and creates the necessary owner's unit spaces, without modifying the existing roofline shown in the previous BZA submission.
No soil / topography issues.
C) DESIRABLE RELIEF MAY BE GRANTED WITHOUT EITHER:

1) Substantial detriment to the public good for the following reasons:

The public sidewalk right-of-way will be maintained and the footprint of the new street facing addition will be no larger than the existing front porch.
The private pedestrian level space adjacent to public pedestrian space will be improved with and enlarged paved entry stair landing and integrated landscaping features.

All existing trees on the lot will be maintained.
2) Relief may be granted without nullifying or substantially derogating from the intent or purpose of this Ordinance for the following reasons:

The relief requested is a minor allowance to the building GSF and GSF to Lot Ratio, as noted in Item A above and on the Dimensional Form.
The relief will not negatively impact existing sight lines and pedestrian spaces for the surrounding community.
Please note the attached GFA comparision document for Myrtle Ave, which highlights that the proposed project will be below most of the existing properties Lot Ratio.

* If You have any questions as to whether you can establish all of the applicable legal requirements, you should consult with your own attorney.


## 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 23 Myrtle Ave 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:
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:
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:
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:
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:

To the City of Cambridge Board of Zoning Appeals,
We the undersigned have reviewed the drawings, prepared by Honeycomb Design Build, for the proposed additions and renovations for the Wartak Residence (Michelle and Martin) at 23 Myrtle Avenue, Cambridge, Massachusetts. We support the plans for the proposed additions and their application for a Zoning Variance.



```
            SITE PLAN 1 INCH = 10 FEET
                23 MYRTLE AVENUE
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETIS
```

$1 \mathrm{INCH}=10$ FEET JANUARY 17, 2020
SNELLING \& HAMEL ASSOCIATES, INC.
PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYORS \& ENGINEERS
10 LEWIS STREET P.O. BOX 102
LINCOLN, MASSACHUSETTS 01773
(781) 259-0071
OWNERS OF RECORD:
MARTIN A. WARTAK
MICHELLE M. MATZ
BK. 39770 PG. 281
$N / F$
MARIO J. TORROELLA
BK. 25659 PG. 259
$N / F$
BRIAN ROUGHAN
*
KERRY MCDONAL


NOTES:

- ZONING DISTRICT: C-1
- the trees depicted hereon are IDENTIFIED AS DECIDUOUS " $D$ ".
- ROOF RIDGE $=135.7$
- MEAN GRADE $=100.8$ $(101.0+101.2+100.6+100.5+100.5) / 5$
- BUILDING HEIGHT $=34.9$

PLAN REFERENCES:

- PLAN 2 IN PLAN BOOK 72
- PLAN NUMBER 1030 OF 1994
- LAND COURT PLAN 21549A
- PLAN NUMBER 550 OF 1944
- PLAN NUMBER 797 OF 1948

N/F RAY L. SHERWN BK. 59175 PG. 300

N/
THE 2011 CALVINE COOK FAMILY TRUST BK 57323 PG. 36

## WARTAK RESIDENCE ：CAMBRIDGE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS SET

## 21－23 MYRTLE AVE，CAMBRIDGE，MA <br> ＊SECOND SUBMISSION

| SHEET INDEX |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SHEET \＃． | SHEET DESCRIPTION | PG \＃． |
| A－001 | Cover Sheet，Sheet Index，Abbrevation Key | 1 |
| EC－100 | Existing Conditions－Basement Floor Plan | 2 |
| EC－101 | Existing Conditions－First Floor Plan | 3 |
| EC－102 | Ensting Conditions－Second Floor Plan | 4 |
| EC－103 | Ensting Conditions－Third Floor Plan | 5 |
| EC－104 | Existing Conditions－Roof Plan | 6 |
| EC－200 | Existing Street Facing Elevation | 7 |
| EC－201 | Exsting Left Facing Elievation | 8 |
| EC－202 | Ensting Right Facing Elevation | 9 |
| EC－203 | Exstung Rear Facing Elevation | 10 |
| A－100 | Proposed－Basement Floor Plan | 11 |
| A－101 | Proposed－First floor Plan | 12 |
| A－102 | Proposed－Second floor Plan | 13 |
| A－103 | Proposed－Third Floor Plan | 14 |
| A－104 | Proposed－Roof Plan | 15 |
| A－200 | Proposed Street Facing Elevation | 16 |
| A－201 | Proposed Left Facing Elevation | 17 |
| A－202 | Proposed Right Facang Elevation | 18 |
| A－203 | Proposed Rear Facing Elevation | 19 |

ZONING ANALYSIS information per cambridge cit zoning regulations ZONING DISTRICT：C－I
PROPERTY USE：MULTI－FAMILY RESIDENTIAL

|  | EXISTING | LiMIT | PROPOSED | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MAX．RATIO OF GSF TO LOT AREA | 1.16 | 0．75 MAX． | 1.36 |  |
| LOT SIZE | 2，783 5F | 5，000 SF MiN． | NO CHANGE | EXISTING NON－CONFORMING |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| UVING AREA 5 F | 1，916 5F | － | 2，393 5F |  |
| LOT MDTH | 411 | 50 MIN ． | NO CHANGE | EXISTING NON－CONFORMING |
| FRONT SETBACK | $9{ }^{\prime \prime} 2^{\prime \prime}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \mathrm{FT} \text { MN } \\ & \text { TO STRET } \end{aligned}$ | NO CHANGE | EXISTING NON－CONFORMING |
| SIDE SETBACK | 2.5 | $7.5{ }^{5}$ नT MIN． | No CHANGE | EXISTING NON－CONFORMING |
| REAR SETBACK |  | 20 न MIN ． | 20 | TO DECK |
| MAXIMUM HEIGHT | $35^{\prime}$ | $35 '$ | no Change |  |
| RATIO OF USEABLE OPEN SPACE TO LOT AREA | 34\％ | $30 \% \mathrm{MNN}$ ． | 31\％ |  |


| ABBREVIATIONS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ABBR． | DESCRITION | ABBR． | DESCRIPTION | ABBR． | DESCRIPION |
| Adj． | Adjustable | Hdr． | Header | PPL． | Pohypropylene |
| Alum． | Aluminum | Hdwe． | Hardware | Pumt． | Pavement |
| Approx． | Approximate | Honz． | Honzortal | Remf． | Reinforced |
| Avg． | Average | Ht． | Hieght | Reqd． | Requred |
| Bring． | Bearng | Htg． | Heating | Rs | Ruser |
| CH | Celling Height | HVAC | Heating，ventilation \＆arr conditionng | 5 | Swich |
| CMU | Concrete masonry unit | Hw | Hot watwer | 53 | Three－way Swich |
| Conc． | Concrete | in． | Inch | S．F． | Square Foot |
| Cont． | Contrinuos | 1 lt ． | Interor | T．4G． | Tongue and Groove |
| Cu．ft． | Cublc Foot | Inst． | Instalataion | v | Volt |
| DW | Dish Washer | Insul． | Insulation | w | Wre |
| Ea． | Each | LED | Light emitting diode | \％ | Percentage |
| Ext． | Exterior | Lt．Ga． | Lghtt gavge | （3） | At |
| Fr． | Floor | Max． | Maximum | 4 | And |
| Fdn． | Foundation | MDF | Medum－density fiberboard | － | Inch |
| ft． | Foot | Min． | Minimum | ＇ | Foot |
| Ftg． | Footing | o．c． | On center | ¢ | Centerline |
| Fum． | Furmiure | OSB | Oriented strand board | ＊ | Number |
| Ga． | Gauge | Pc． | Pieces |  |  |
| GWB | Gypsum wail board | Pl． | Plate |  |  |
| HH | Header Height | Ply． | Plywood |  |  |


| SYMBOLS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| （3） | Smoke Detector | Q | Single receptacle outlet | $\dagger$ | Celing light |
| C0 | $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ Detector | $\oplus$ | Four－Plex receptacle outlet | © | Recessed celling light |
| （ ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | Therrmostat | （1） | Double receptacle outlet | 廿 | Scone light／Wall light |
| （A） | Alarm | ＋ | Double lamp flood light | 中 | Pendant Light |
| （C） | Cable Sernce | $\triangle$ | Exhast Fan | $\Delta$ | Telephone Jack |
| （12） | Dryer Vent | 区 | AC Register | $\Delta$ | Computer Datal LAN outiet |
|  |  | R－\＃ | Radiator－（size if known） | $\frac{\gamma}{\Delta \lambda}$ | Track light |
|  |  |  |  | PC | Pull Chan Control |
|  |  |  |  | JB | Junction Box |




| Prolect Adotroes |
| :---: |
| Wartak Residence 23 Myrtle Ave. Cambridge, MA 02138 |
| Document Tems \& Conditions <br> a. HONETCOMB Dosign + Build, LC grartis you, when you purchesese or are bolilievere a thil wet of plans, a ilmtad nornexdulusve <br>  Work nne 1 Ime, at one location. The llcerne <br>  <br>  cocose anvor other dessing neocos. This <br>  transterred, zmainnod, edd or beanco. |
|  |
|  an 'as is' beaie. At thit trimo of their Crivinal minimum uiveling coodes and regulations tor <br>  <br>  LC stook plana should be revemod by a cortiniod geaneral conturstor to vorify <br>  <br>  comsummoe ail rresponibility tor any <br>  UC Ilabib tor any probems resiturg trom <br>  HONEYCOMB Dealgn + Bulld, UC. |
| Draming Name |
| EXISTING CONDITIONS BASEMENT FLOOR PLAN |
| Dato |
| November 16, 2020 |
| ${ }^{\text {scala }}$ / $1 / 4^{\prime}=1^{1-0^{\prime \prime}}$ |
| Draming Number |








EC-104

















VIEW OF EXISTING STREET FACING ELEVATION
WARTAK RESIDENCE
23 MYRTLE AVE, CAMBRIDGE MA
EXISTING CONDITIONS PHOTOS
HONEYCOMB
DESIGN + BUILD


CONTEXT VIEW: WITH NEIGHBORING HOUSES
WARTAK RESIDENCE
23 MYRTLE AVE, CAMBRIDGE MA
EXISTING CONDITIONS PHOTOS
HONEYCOMB
DESIGN + BUILD


CONTEXT VIEW A : WITH EXISTING STREET TREES

HONEYCOMB
DESIGN+BUILD DREAM, DEVELOP, CREATE



CONTEXT VIEW B: WITH EXISTING STREET TREES

HONEYCOMB
DESIGN + BUILD


CONTEXT VIEW A: EXISTING STREET TREES HIDDEN

## Shadow Study

The attached documents represent the shadow impact analysis of the proposed project, as requested at our BZA hearing on July 23rd, 2020.

It is important to recognize that the shadow analysis solely addresses the built forms, and does not address the substantial existing tree coverage, which is intended to remain intact.
A Google Maps view of the proposed project parcel is included in this package, to describe the condition and add frame of reference.

## Google Maps 23 Myrtle Ave



Imagery ©2020 MassGIS, Commonwealth of Massachusetts EOEA, Maxar Technologies, Sanborn, Map data ©2020 50 ft








```
            SITE PLAN 1 INCH = 10 FEET
                23 MYRTLE AVENUE
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETIS
```

$1 \mathrm{INCH}=10$ FEET JANUARY 17, 2020
SNELLING \& HAMEL ASSOCIATES, INC.
PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYORS \& ENGINEERS
10 LEWIS STREET P.O. BOX 102
N/F
MARIO J. TORROELLA
LINCOLN, MASSACHUSEITS 01773
(781) 259-0071
OWNERS OF RECORD:
MARTIN A. WARTAK
MICHELLE M. MATZ
BK. 39770 PG. 281

N/F RAY L. SHERWM BK 59175 PG. 300

OWNERS OF RECORD: MARTIN A. WARTAK
\&
MICHELLE M. MATZ
BK. 39770 PG. 281

N/F
THE 2011 CALUNE COOK FAMIVY TRUST
N/F
bRAN ROUG
KERRY MCDONLLD
KERRY MCODNGLD
BK. 63306
PG. 156

NOTES:

- ZONING DISTRICT: C-1
- THE TREES DEPICTED HEREON ARE IDENTIFIED AS DECIDUOUS " $D$ ".
- ROOF RIDGE $=135.7$
- MEAN GRADE $=100.8$ $(101.0+101.2+100.6+100.5+100.5) / 5$
- BUILDING HEIGHT $=34.9$

PLAN REFERENCES:

- PLAN 2 IN PLAN BOOK 72
- PLAN NUMBER 1030 OF 1994
- LAND COURT PLAN 21549A
- PLAN NUMBER 550 OF 1944
- PLAN NUMBER 797 OF 1948


LOT 28 2,783土 S.F.
deborat E. beLIE
BK. 15205 PG. 116
(30' WIDE)


GRANITE CURB

1 hereby state that the location of the features shown HEREON IS THE RESULT OF A FIELD SURVEY PERFORMED AS OF january 6, 2020, with the use of a topcon total station.

## WARTAK RESIDENCE : CAMBRIDGE CONSERVATION COMMISSION SET

## 21-23 MYRTLE AVE, CAMBRIDGE, MA

| SHEET |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| SHEET \#. | SHEET DESCRIPTION | PG \#. |
| A-001 | Cover Sheet, Sheet Index, Abbrevation Key | 1 |
| EC-100 | Existing Conditions - Basement Floor Plan | 2 |
| EC-101 | Existing Conditions - First Floor Plan | 3 |
| EC-102 | Existing Conditions - Second Floor Plan | 4 |
| EC-103 | Existing Conditions - Third Floor Plan | 5 |
| EC-104 | Existing Conditions - Roof Plan | 6 |
| EC-200 | Existing Street Facing Elevation | 7 |
| EC-201 | Existing Left Facing Elevation | 8 |
| EC-202 | Existing Right Facing Elevation | 9 |
| EC-203 | Existing Rear Facing Elevation | 10 |
| A-100 | Proposed - Basement Floor Plan | 11 |
| A-101 | Proposed - First Floor Plan | 12 |
| A-102 | Proposed - Second Floor Plan | 13 |
| A-103 | Proposed - Thrd Floor Plan | 14 |
| A-104 | Proposed - Rooo Plan | 15 |
| A-200 | Proposed Street Facing Elevation | 16 |
| A-201 | Proposed Left Facing Elevation | 17 |
| A-202 | Proposed Right Facing Elevation | 18 |
| A-203 | Proposed Rear Facing Elevation | 19 |

ZONING ANALYSIS information per cambridge city zoning regulations ZONING DISTRICT: C-I

|  | Existing | LIMIT | PROPOSED | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MAX. RATIO OF FL. AREA TO LOT AREA | 0.71 | 0.75 MAX . | 0.77 |  |
| LOT SIZE | 2,783 SF | 5,000 SF MIN. | no CHANGE | EXISTING NON-CONFORMING |
| GSF | 1,981 SF | - | 2,152 SF | ADDITION OF 171 GSF, INCIUDES ENTRY PORCH |
| LOT WIDTH | $41^{\prime}$ | $50^{\prime} \mathrm{MIN}$. | No CHANGE | EXISTING NON-CONFORMING |
| FRONT SETBACK | $9{ }^{\text {-2" }}$ | 10 F F MIN. | NO CHANGE | EXISTING NON-CONFORMING |
| SIDE SETBACK | $2.5{ }^{\prime}$ | 7.51 FT MIN. | No CHANGE | EXISTING NON-CONFORMING |
| REAR SETBACK | $23^{\prime}$ | $20^{\prime} \mathrm{FT}$ MIN. | $20^{\prime}$ | TO DECK |
| MAXIMUM HEIGHT | $35^{\prime}$ | 35' | No Change |  |
| RATIO OF PRIVATE OPEN SPACE TO IOT AREA | 34\% | $30 \% \mathrm{MIN}$. | NO CHANGE |  |


| ABBREVIATIONS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ABBR. | DESCRIPTION | ABBR. | DESCRIPTION | ABBR. | DESCRIPTION |
| Adj. | Adjustable | Hdr. | Header | PPL | Polypropylene |
| Alum. | Alumnum | Hdwe. | Hardware | Pvmt. | Pavement |
| Approx. | Approximate | Horrz. | Horzontal | Renf. | Renforced |
| Avg. | Average | Ht. | Hieght | Req'd. | Requred |
| Brng. | Bearng | Htg. | Heating | Rsr | Riser |
| CH | Celling Height | HVAC | Heating, ventilation $\ddagger$ ar conditioning | 5 | Switch |
| CMU | Concrete masonry unit | HW | Hot watwer | $S_{3}$ | Three-way Switch |
| Conc. | Concrete | In. | Inch | S.F. | Square Foot |
| Cont. | Contrnuous | Int. | Interior | T.fG. | Tongue and Groove |
| Cu.ft. | Cubic Foot | Inst. | Installation | $\checkmark$ | Volt |
| DW | Dish Washer | Insul. | Insulation | w | Wre |
| Ea. | Each | LED | Light emitting diode | \% | Percentage |
| Ext. | Exterior | Lt.Ga. | Light gauge | @ | At |
| Fir. | Floor | Max. | Maximum | $\ddagger$ | And |
| Fdn. | Foundation | MDF | Medium-density fiberboard | " | Inch |
| Ft. | Foot | Min. | Minimum | , | Foot |
| Ftg. | Footing | о.c. | On center | $\varepsilon$ | Centerine |
| Furn. | Furniture | OSB | Oriented strand board | \# | Number |
| Ga. | Gauge | Pc. | Pieces |  |  |
| GWB | Gypsum wall board | Pl. | Plate |  |  |
| HH | Header Height | Ply. | Plywood |  |  |


| SYMBOLS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (5) | Smoke Detector | Q | Single receptacle outlet | $\phi$ | Celing light |
| (c) | $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ Detector | $\oplus$ | Four-Plex receptacle outlet | $\bigcirc$ | Recessed celling light |
| ( ${ }^{\text {( }}$ | Thermostat | \$ | Double receptacle outlet | - | Scone light/ Wall light |
| (A) | Alarm | * | Double lamp flood light | $\phi$ | Pendant Light |
| (C) | Cable Service | $\triangle$ | Exhaust Fan | $\triangle$ | Telephone Jack |
| (10) | Dryer Vent | 区 | AC Register | $\triangle$ | Computer Data/ LAN outlet |
|  |  | R-\# | Radiator - (size if known) | $\frac{{ }_{\Delta}{ }^{\gamma}}{}$ | Track light |
|  |  |  |  | PC | Pull Chan Control |
|  |  |  |  | JB | Junction Box |
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DESIGN+BUILD PROPOSED PROJECT : MODEL VIEWS



CONTEXT VIEW A : EXISTING STREET TREES HIDDEN

WARTAK RESIDENCE
23 MYRTLE AVE, CAMBRIDGE MA
HONEYCOMB
DESIGN + BUILD
Dream develop:create

Wartak Residence
23 Myrtle Ave
Cambridge Mass


Climbing Hydrangea $\stackrel{\text { or }}{\text { Clems }}$ lematis paniculata

The driveway-This space is to remain simple providing interest while also remaining pract cle. Planting additions will include a vine for the side of the house and some groudcover for the exisitng evergreen edge by the fence. The bed for the vines will need to be $6^{\prime \prime}-1$ deep minimum

The side leading to the backpatio- this area is to provide an area for the trash and recylcing to be stored outside of view. Some of the exsiting large plant material could be kept, they should be look over for health and safety before making final decisions. Additional plant material to be planted further down the side, including larger fast growing flowering shrubs such as Hydrangea paniculata and Virburnum triloum. A larger tree such as a River Birch will fill the corner, these trees grown fast and provide
good coverage through all seasons. These will provide interest while also providing privacy. Lower plants are to be planted along the edges, these will include some areas of simple groundcover such as Liriope, Gallium or Vince and other areas will be developed into textured shade gardens with the use of plants such as Hellebore, Hakonachloa and Hosta. The pathway leading from the driveway should be at least 3' wide

Overall Proprety Plan Produced by Sophie Bignet Pemberton Gardening Services


- The front is to remain simple ising shrubs, grasses and groundcover to provide low maintenance and effective sidewalk appeal
- Hardscape to be done in brick but could be another material. This plan proposes continuing the material into the parking and again down the pathway to the tenant entrance
- The design for the back is primarily for play and privacy. The Patio would begin at the gate to the driveway and by the AC unit at the end of the porch.
- A lawn will go in byt the patio to provide play space for the children. This would be complimented with a cobblestone border to provide a tidy edge between planting beds and the lawn.
- The planting for the back will keep many of the existing plants adding primarily some shrubs for addtional interest and privacy while also ensuring the establishment of groundcover in all beds. The groudcover will provide more green to the space and help the soil retain both nutrients and water.

Ms. Maria Pacheco
Administrator
Cambridge Zoning Board
City of Cambridge
831 Massachusetts Avenue, 2nd FI.
Cambridge, MA 02139
March 9, 2020

Dear Ms. Maria Pacheco and the Zoning Board:
I am writing in reference to the renovation of 23 Myrtle Ave. in Cambridge, 02138 whîas $\stackrel{\sim}{2} \mathrm{~m}$ abutter, I want to present my strong disapproval of its design.

Being a co-founding partner of HMFH Architects and partner in charge of design, now retired, and a Fellow of the AIA, I find the above project not in accordance with many of the standards set by the Cambridge Zoning Board and the Cambridge Historical Commission.

At present, the house is a most pleasant building classical of its period; Early 20th century if not as far back as the turn of the 19th century. In its present condition, rather of a certain negligence, it still is the "anchor" of that neighborhood. It fits in with the urban fabric and it brings attention to itself thanks to its quiet sobriety, proportions and detailing.

My wife and I have lived in the neighborhood since 1973 when we bought 17 Myrtle Ave. which at the time came with an empty piece of land. We kept both 17 Myrtle and the piece of land when we moved to 19 Myrtle. Greatly appreciating the neighborhood, I designed our present home, 30 Magnolia, which abbots 23 Myrtle in the back, on that empty piece of land.This was in 1989, and in 1996 our house was honored by the Boston Society of Architecture with its Domestic Excellence in Design Award. Prior to this, in 1975, the 133 Brattle St. house, known as the Falxa house, received the same award.

I say all of the above to indicate that I know of what I speak of when I discuss architecture. In addition, these two homes were designed in two Cambridge historical districts. Therefore, I am sure that 23 Myrtle Ave. can receive a good design which respects its exterior appearance, fits into a historical environment and still is able to house modern day facilities. I might also add that with good thinking, one can expand to the back and therefore respecting its existing front appearance.

Thanking you for your patience in reading this letter, I offer my best regards.


Mario Torroella, FAIA
30 Magnolia Ave.
Cambridge, MA 02138
mj.torroella@gmail.com
?.
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CITY OF CAMBRIDGE
Cambridge, MA 02138
March 6, 2020

Ms. Maria Pacheco
Cambridge Zoning Board
City of Cambridge
831 Mass. Ave.
Cambridge, MA 02139

2020 MAR -9 P 3: 14

Re: 23 Myrtle Avenue proposed renovations
Dear Ms. Pacheco:


I am writing to urge you to prevent the proposed renovations to the house next door to wine 23 Myrtle Avenue.

I have lived at 27 Myrtle Avenue since 1983, and I love our short street, or "avenue." Wluchofits charm, I think, lies in the architectural similarities that bind the houses together, withusfficient points of difference to be interesting. I have always thought that the house next door to mine, 3 Myrtle Avenue, was particularly lovely and almost a visual anchor on the street. I moved if, when the house was owned by landscape architect Michael Van Valkenburgh and his wife, Carol. At that time the house was beautifully maintained and there was a beautiful garden.

Today the house is much deteriorated because routine maintenance has been postponed for years, but the house is still beautiful. I had looked forward to its being restored to its former beauty and was saddened to see the proposal that we have. In the architect's drawings the house is unrecognizable to me. Any connection to the past is severed. The materials, the size and shape of the house, let alone the architectural details of the existing house are all changed, and not for the better.

The house also expands to remove part of the sky from view and it creates a more crowded street-front. When I sit in my own backyard, I can see part of the sky over 23 Myrtle Avenue, including some branches of one of the beautiful maple trees Michael Van Valkenburgh planted in front of the house. If the house is allowed to expand, I will lose that beautiful sight and my special piece of the sky. I also worry that expansion of the house in front will damage the roots of Michael's maple trees.

I hope the Cambridge Zoning Board will rule decisively against this renovation.
Sincerely,
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141-19
WARTAK, MARTIN A. \& MICHELLE M. MATZ 23 MYRTLE AVE.
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138

141-76
BUSSEY, JOHN L. \& SOPHIA ROVITTI
16 MAGNOLIA AVE, \#3
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138

141-26
SHERWIN, RAY L.
20-22 MAGNOLIA AVE
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138

## 141-76

HUANG, HENNA 14 1/2 MAGNOLIA AVE
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138

## 141-76

LEBENSON, CHERYL. P.
14 MAGNOLIA AVE \#1
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138

141-76
WANG, YIOU
14-16 1/2 MAGNOLIA AVE. UNIT\#14.5/3
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138

141-56
RUSSEM, LEE \& MICHAEL RUSSEM
JULIE ANN BAINE
28-30 MYRTLE AVE., \#28
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138

## 141-76

HUAI, YALU
14-16 1/2 MAGNOLIA AVE \#16/53
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138

## 141-56

O'CONNELL, KAREN
30 MYRTLE AVE
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139

141-54
FLOWER, JEREMY \& ELISA FLOWER 18 MYRTLE AVE
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138

## $\bigcirc$

141-102
TORROELLA, MARIO J. \& ISABELLE B. TORROELLA 30 MAGNOLIA AVE.
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138

141-55
PORAT, ORI \& KAREN RABI 24 MYRTLE AVENUE.
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138

## 141-101 <br> ROUGHAN, BRIAN \& KERRY MCDONALD 19 MYRTLE AVE <br> CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139

141-76
BOXER, SUZANNE
14 MAGNOLIA AVE. APT\#2
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138

## 141-76

NOLEN, CARLA J. \& STEVEN J. NOLAN 16.5 MAGNOLIA AVE., UNIT \#2

CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138

```
141-23
CHAN, LEICIA
32-34 MAGNOLIA AVENUE, UNIT \#2 CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138
```

```
141-18
BELLE, DEBORAH E.,
TRS THE BELLE FAMILY REV TR
25 MYRTLE AVE
CAMBRIDGE,MA 02138
```


## 141-76

ROUGHAN, BRIAN KERRY MCDONALD
14-16 1/2 MAGNOLIA AVE \#14/3 CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138

141-25
COOK, CALVIN
TRS. THE 2011 CALVIN COOK FAMILY TRUST
C/O CALVIN ARSENAULT
4 FRANCES PL.
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02140

141-76
MATLACK, LAURA G.
16 MAGNOLIA AVE.,UNIT \#1
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138
HONEYCOMB DESIGN + BUILD, LLC C/O ANN FULLERTON 540 MAIN STREET - SUITE 7 WINCHESTER, MA 01890

141-21
ROSELLI, RHONDA AND BRUCE HASSUK 17 MYRTLE AVE
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138-3218

141-76
EL-DIAN MANAGEMENT LLC
AUTUMN CIRCLE
HINGHAM, MA 02043

141-83
ELD, SAM T. \& DIANE ABU-EID 31 MYRTLE AVE
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138-3218

141-23
MIN, PATRICIA J. LIFE ESTATE 32-34 MAGNOLIA AVE UNIT \#1 CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138

## 141-76

DRAKE, EMILY H. ROBERT J. HADERER
16 1/2 MAGNOLIA AVE \#1
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138

## 141-76

SANDIER, BENJAMIN \& EMILY GRIFFIN
16 MAGNOLIA AVE., \#2
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139

Cambridge Historical Commission
831 Massachusetts Avenue, $2^{\text {nd }}$ Floor, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
Telephone: 6173494683 TTY: 6173496112
E-mail: histcomm@cambridgema.gov URL: http://www.cambridgema.gov/Historic
Bruce A. Irving, Chair; Susannah Barton Tobin, Vice Chair; Charles M. Sullivan, Executive Director Joseph V. Ferrara, Chandra Harrington, Elizabeth Lyster, Caroline Shannon, Jo M. Solet, Members Gavin W. Kleespies, Paula A. Paris, Kyle Sheffield, Alternates

## Jurisdiction Advice

To the Owner of Property at

## 23 Myrtle Avenue

The above-referenced property is subject to the jurisdiction of the Cambridge Historical Commission (CHC) by reason of the status referenced below:

```
    Old Cambridge Historic District
- Fort Washington Historic District
            (M.G.L. Ch. 40C, City Code \(\S 2.78 .050\) )
    Avon Hill Neighborhood Conservation District
- Half Crown - Marsh Neighborhood Conservation District
    Harvard Square Conservation District
_X_Mid Cambridge Neighborhood Conservation District
    The application for a Certificate of Nonapplicability was denied by the Mid Cambridge
    NCD Commission. However, their jurisdiction in this case was non-binding. Please see
    Denial of Certificate for more information.
    Designated Landmark
    Property is being studied for designation:
            (City Code, Ch. 2.78., Article III, and various City Council Orders)
    Preservation Restriction or Easement (as recorded)
__ Structure is fifty years or more old and is therefore subject to CHC review of any application
    for a demolition permit, if one is required by ISD. (City Code, Ch. 2.78, Article II). See the
    back of this page for definition of demolition.
    No jurisdiction: not a designated historic property and the structure is less than fifty years
    old.
    _ No local jurisdiction, but the property is listed on the National Register of Historic Places;
    CHC staff is available for consultation, upon request.
                    Staff comments:
```

The Board of Zoning Appeal advises applicants to complete Historical Commission or Neighborhood Conservation District Commission reviews before appearing before the Board.

If a line indicating possible jurisdiction is checked, the owner needs to consult with the staff of the Historical Commission to determine whether a hearing will be required.

CHC staff initials $\qquad$ SLB

Received by Emailed to ISD

$$
\text { Date April 10, } 2020
$$

Relationship to project BZA 017259-2020

cc: Applicant<br>Inspectional Services Commissioner

## Demolition Delay Ordinance and Application Information

The Demolition Delay Ordinance (Chapter 2.78, Article II of the Cambridge Municipal Code) was adopted by the City Council in 1979 to afford public review of demolition permit applications for potentially significant buildings. When the Historical Commission determines that a building is significant and should be preserved, demolition will be delayed for up to six months so that solutions can be sought to preserve the building indefinitely. The Ordinance covers all buildings over 50 years old, city-wide. The Historical Commission archives provide dates of construction for all properties in the City.

Demolition is defined in the ordinance as "the act of pulling down, destroying, removing or razing a building or commencing the work of total or substantial destruction with the intent of completing the same." The Inspectional Services Commissioner has provided further guidelines to outline what actions require a demolition permit. In addition to complete demolition of a building, the following actions may require a demolition permit,

- removal of a roof,
- removal of one side of a building,
- gutting of a building's interior to the point where exterior features (windows, etc.) are impacted, and
- removal of more than $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$ of a structure.

Please contact the building inspector or a staff member of the Historical Commission if you have questions about whether a demolition permit is required for a particular project.

Demolition permit applications can be obtained from the Inspectional Services Department. The completed application should be submitted to the Historical Commission, where the staff will review the application. If the Executive Director of the Historical Commission makes an initial determination that the building is significant, a public hearing will be scheduled with Historical Commission. If the staff makes an initial determination that the building is not significant, the application is released for further review by the Building Commissioner.

More information about the demolition permit application procedures is available on the Historical Commission's web site or by calling or dropping by the Historical Commission office.


Mid Cambridge Neighborhood Conservation District Commission<br>831 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139<br>Telephone: 6173494683 Fax: 6173493116 TTY: 6173496112<br>E-mail: histncds@cambridgema.gov<br>URL: http://www.cambridgema.gov/Historic/midcambridgehome.html<br>Tony Hsiao, Chair<br>Lestra Litchfield, Vice Chair, Monika Pauli, Members<br>Charles Redmon, Margaret McMahon, Alternates

March 2, 2020

Martin Wartak and Michelle Matz<br>23 Myrtle Avenue<br>Cambridge, MA 02138

## Re: Case MC-5888: 23 Myrtle Avenue

Mr. Wartak and Ms. Matz,
The Mid Cambridge Neighborhood Conservation District Commission, which had a non-binding review of the above case at a public hearing on March 2, 2020, voted to deny your application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove the front porch and partially enclose the space and build out on the second floor, alter the roof and window configuration, install new window openings, replace the roof with a metal standing seam roof, replace original wood shingle and clapboard siding with metal panels, hardwood siding, and aluminum framed windows, and the demolition of 1 or more chimneys. The proposal to remove all existing exterior features and build-out of the front façade was found to be inappropriate to the preservation of the original character of the structure as well as the setting and character of the surrounding neighborhood. The Commission recommended maintaining the front façade and focusing the renovation at the rear of the house in order to preserve the historic character of the structure as viewed from the public right of way.

Because the review in this case is non-binding, you may proceed with the work as initially proposed if you so choose. Please call me at 617 349-4686 if you have any questions or would like to schedule a time to meet.

Sincerely,

Allison A. Crosbie<br>Preservation Administrator

cc: City Clerk, please file this decision<br>Ranjit Singanayagam, Inspectional Services

Attest: A true and correct copy of decision filed with the office of the City Clerk and the Mid Cambridge Neighborhood Conservation District Commission on March 2. 2020

By _Tony Ftsiaolaac , Vice Chair

Twenty days have elapsed since the filing of this decision. No appeal has been filed $\qquad$ . Appeal has been filed . Date


[^0]:    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'.
[^1]:    Deborah Belle

