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## BZA Number: 122612

## General Information

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

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

PETITIONER: 58 Granville LLC C/O Adam Munnelly
PETITIONER'S ADDRESS: 572 Freeport Street, Boston, MA 02122
LOCATION OF PROPERTY: 58 Granville Rd, Cambridge, MA
TYPE OF OCCUPANCY: Two Family Residence
ZONING DISTRICT: Residence B Zone

## REASON FOR PETITION:

/Additions/ /Dormer/ /New exterior egress stairway in sideyard setback. Areaway guardrail in rear yard setback. /

## DESCRIPTION OF PETITIONER'S PROPOSAL:

The petitioner proposes alterations to an existing non-conforming Two Family Residence requiring a Special Permit per MGL Chapter 40a, Section 6 and recently adopted Ordinance 2021-1. The alterations include: 1) New dormers on the 3rd Floor increasing non-conforming GFA 2) addition of an egress stair and deck in the side yard setback. 3) relocation and addition of openings on a non-conforming facade facing the right side yard and 4) 3' high areaway guardrail in the rear yard setback.

## SECTIONS OF ZONING ORDINANCE CITED:

Article: 5.000 Section: 5.31 (Table of Dimensional Requirements).
Article: 8.000 Section: 8.22. 2.D (Non-Conforming Structure).
Article: 8.000 Section: 8.22.2.C (Non-Conforming Structure).
Article: 10.000 Section: 10.40 (Special Permit).


## Address:

## Tel. No.

617-406-8605

Date:


## BZA APPLICATION FORM - OWNERSHIP INFORMATION

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

I/we 58 Gran vile LLC
(OWNER)
Address: 32 Shady Hill Rd weston, MA 02493
State that I/we own the property located at 58 Granville Rd Cambridge, MA which is the subject of this zoning application.

The record title of this property is in the name of 58 Granville LLC
*Pursuant to a deed of duly recorded in the date $12 / 14 / 2020$, Middlesex South County Registry of Deeds at Book 76416 _ Page 80 ; or Middlesex Registry District of Land Court, Certificate No.

Book $\qquad$ Page $\qquad$ .


Commonwealth of Massachusetts, County of MibNLLTD
The above-name ADAM MUNNECY personally appeared before me, this $\boldsymbol{J}^{(r}$ of APMR, 2021, and made oath that the above statement is true. My commission expires $\qquad$ $02 / 27 / 2026$ (4otary Seal).

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

37316064

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { r.19:4 } \\
& \leftrightarrow \rightarrow \because \because
\end{aligned}
$$

## DIMENSIONAL INFORMATION

| Applicant: | 58 Granville LLC |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | 572 Freeport Street |
| Phone: | $617-406-8605$ |


| Present Use/Occupancy: | Two Family Residence |
| ---: | :--- |
| Zone: | Residence B Zone |
| Requested Use/Occupancy: | Two Family Residence |


| Existing Conditions | Requested Conditions | Ordinance Requirements |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3760 | 3839 | 2739 | (max.) |
| 5281 | 5281 | 5000 | (min.) |
| .. 69 | . 73 | 5 (FIRST 5000 SF) .35 (REMAINING SF) |  |
| 2640.5 | 2640.5 | 2500 |  |
| 58.3' | 58.3' | $50^{\prime}$ |  |
| 99.98' | 99.98' | n/a |  |
| $6.0{ }^{\prime}$ | 6.0 ' | 15' |  |
| $31.0^{\prime}$ | $31.0{ }^{\prime}$ | 26.6' |  |
| 15.6' | 15.6' | $7.5^{\prime}$ (SUM OF 20') |  |
| $5.0{ }^{\prime}$ | $2.0{ }^{\prime}$ | $7.5^{\circ}$ (SUM OF ${ }^{\text {2 }}$ ') |  |
| 33.3' | 33.8' | 35' |  |
| $59.0{ }^{\prime}$ | $59.0{ }^{\prime}$ | n/a |  |
| 45.7\% | 40.0\% | 40.0\% |  |
| 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| n/a | n/a | n/a |  |
| 16.6 | 16.6' | $10^{\prime}$ |  |

2640.5

Ordinance
Requirements
TOTAL GROSS
LOT AREA:
RATIO OF GROSS
FLOOR AREA TO
LOT AREA: ${ }^{2}$
LOT AREA OF
EACH DWELLING
SIZE OF LOT:
SETBACKS IN FEET:

|  | . .69 |
| :--- | :---: |
|  |  |
|  | 2640.5 |
| WIDTH | $58.3^{\prime}$ |
| DEPTH | $99.98^{\prime}$ |
| FRONT | $6.0^{\prime}$ |
| REAR | $31.0^{\prime}$ |
| LEFT | $15.6^{\prime}$ |
| SIDE |  |
| RIGHT | $5.0^{\prime}$ |

## SIZE OF BUILDING: HEIGHT <br> WIDTH

RATIO OF USABLE OPEN SPACE TO LOT AREA:
NO. OF DWELLING
UNITS:
NO. OF PARKING
SPACES:
NO. OF LOADING
AREAS:
DISTANCE TO
NEAREST BLDG.
ON SAME LOT

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

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

## SUPPORTING STATEMENT FOR A SPECIAL PERMIT

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

Granting the Special Permit requested for 58 Granville Rd, 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:

MGL Chapter 40a, Section 6 provides unique protections for existing non conforming one and two family structures provided the proposed alteration is not substantially more detrimental than the existing nonconforming use to the neighborhood. The proposed alterations and extensions at 58 Granville increase the non-conforming nature of the residence in modest ways, the changes are not substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood.
B) Traffic generated or patterns of access or egress would not cause congestion hazard, or substantial change in established neighborhood character for the following reasons:

The proposed development will not alter patterns of access or egress given that the driveway and curb cut will remain in their current location. No increase in congestion hazard will be created because the number of dwelling units in the proposed project will not be increased.

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

The driveway curb cut will remain as it exists allowing traffic patterns to remain the same. The proposed parking spaces will be in the same location as the existing parking spaces maintaining existing relationships to adjacent uses. The proposed additions and fenestration changes are modest and occur in areas that have limited impact on adjacent uses. The changes proposed at 58 Granville will not adversely affect the continued operation of adjacent uses.
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:

Areas dedicated to Open Space will largely remain intact to the benefit of the neighborhood residents. Traffic patterns and driveway ingress and egress will remain consistent for the adjacent residents. There will be no hazard or nuisance created by the requested relief.
E) For other reasons, the proposed use would not impair the integrity of the district or adjoining district or otherwise derogate from the intent or purpose of this ordinance for the following reasons:

The proposed alteration and additions to the existing structure are consistent with other uses in the neighborhood and the larger district. The proposed use is consistent with the existing use and the other uses in the neighborhood. The proposed minor additions and site planning changes will not impair the integrity of the district or derogate from the intent of the ordinance.
*If you have any questions as to whether you can establish all of the applicable legal requirements, you should consult with an attorney.


## City of Cambridge <br> 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: Adam NiunndolG Date: $\frac{7 / 13 / 2021}{\text { (Print) }}$
Address: 58 Granville Rd. $\qquad$ .

Case No. $\quad$ ZZA-122612

Hearing Date: $\qquad$

## Thank you, <br> Baa Members







(6) $\frac{\text { EXISTING AREA PLAN - 3RD FLOOR }}{11^{1}=10^{-}-0^{A}}$ $\qquad$


(7) $\frac{\text { EXISTING AREA PLAN - 2ND FLOOR }}{1 n^{\prime}=10^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}}$ $\qquad$

 $\qquad$

$1^{\prime \prime}=10^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$
-


(1) $\frac{\text { IST FILOOR.SP }}{18=T}$


(5) $\frac{\text { EXISTING AREA PLAN - BASEMENT }}{11^{1}=10^{-}-0^{n}}$


(1) $\frac{\text { PROPOSED OPEN SPACE }}{1 / 8^{\circ}=11^{-1}}$ Dependent 1

(2) $\frac{\text { EXISTING OPEN SPACE-Dependent } 1}{118^{n}=1}$









(1) $\frac{\text { ALTERNATE LEFT SIDE ELEVATION }}{1 / 4^{\circ}=11^{\circ}-0^{\circ}}$

## ALTERNATE - REDUCED DORMER WIDTH




(1) $\frac{\text { PROPOSED LEFT SIDE ELEVATION }}{1 / 4^{\circ}=11^{-1}-0^{\prime \prime}}$

PERMITTED AS-OF-RIGHT DORMER CONFIGURATION
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## OFFICE OE THE CITY CLERK ABRIDGE. MASACHUSEITS

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: $\qquad$ Granville Rd.

Owner, $\square$ Petitioner, or $\not \subset$ Representative:

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

Date:

(8:31 p.m.)
Sitting Members: Constantine Alexander, Brendan Sullivan, Andrea A. Hickey, Wendy Leiserson, and Matina Williams

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The Chair will now call the last case on our agenda, Case Number \#122612 -- 58 Granville Road. Anyone here wishing to be heard on this matter?

LAUREN MARETT: Yes. Hi. Hello, can you hear us? Great.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The floor is yours.
LAUREN MARETT: Okay, great.
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The screen is yours, I should say.

LAUREN MARETT: Thank you. Good evening, Chairman and members of the Board. Thank you for taking the time to hear our request this evening. My name is Lauren Marett, and this is my partner, Adam Munnelly. We are the property owners, and we just wanted to take a very brief moment to introduce ourselves.

Adam's from Ireland and moved to the States about

20 years ago. He works as a General Contractor now, and he has two wonderful kids.

I'm from the Boston area, and I now own fitness studios, one of which is located in Harvard Square. Both my parents as well as my brother and sister-in-law have lived in Cambridge, so I've spent lots of time in Cambridge over the years. It's always had a special place in my heart.

So when it came time for us to start looking for a place to put down roots, Cambridge was an obvious choice for us.

So as I mentioned, Adam has two kids, and we're hoping to add to our family. So we're very much hoping that we'll be able to maximize the space we have within the house, and make it our home for many years to come. Thank you.

ADAM MUNNELLY: Thank you.
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Thank you. Let me ask you one question, and you may have heard us refer to the dormer guidelines that our city has that are guidelines.

ADAM MUNNELLY: Yes.
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: They are prepared by or promulgated by the Community Development. And they're not a
requirement, but our Board pays close attention to it.
Are you in a position to comment on the extent that you will be complying with the dormer guidelines, with regard to the dormer -- excuse me, the dormer relief you're seeking?

STEPHEN HISERODT: Mr. Chair, this is Steve Hiserodt, the architect.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I'm sorry. I didn't hear who you are.

STEPHEN HISERODT: Steve Hiserodt, the architect. CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay, thank you. STEPHEN HISERODT: I can speak to all of that -all of those issues. I guess I'd like to just start by going over the requests, the first request being an increase in non-conforming GFA.

We are in a $B$ zone currently, which allows 0.5 GFA. The neighborhood itself is primarily two and threefamily structures that are nonconforming for the vast majority, ranging in FARs from 0.6 to 1.0. Most are over the allowable FAR.

The FAR that we're adding is 0.035. It is about 160 square feet, a relatively small amount of floor area
added. It's all being added on the third floor, with the addition of the dormer.

If we could go to --
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Can you speak to the dormer guidelines, sir?

STEPHEN HISERODT: The dormer on the right-hand side, the shed dormer, which can be seen on -- let's see, sheet A2.3 or A23 -- meets the dormer guidelines in most respects. It sits back one foot six inches from the main wall that it is above.

It is proper distance away from the eve lines, and it sits a little bit tight to the ridge, but that could be adjusted by lowering the slope of the roof. And it is 13 feet wide.

If we go to the other side, A22?
The existing dormer, which is in the middle, does not meet with respect to ridgeline or its distance off the front of the main face of the façade. But it meets --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: How about the size? The dormer guidelines size? Are you more than 15 feet?

STEPHEN HISERODT: The existing dormer is this, the central dormer that is above the bay. And it is a sole
dormer. We've added the dormer to the left of that, which is identical size. And we've added a shed dormer in between them to connect them.

But it sits back quite a bit off the face, just to be -- say, secondary to the primary pair.

The dormer on the left does not meet with respect to its relationship to the exterior wall, or the edge of the roofline.

And they both do not meet the setback away from the primary façade. But that was an issue of trying to keep them an equal pair.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: How big is the existing dormer on the side?

STEPHEN HISERODT: 10 feet.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I'm sorry?
STEPHEN HISERODT: 10 feet.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: 10 feet?
STEPHEN HISERODT: Yeah.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: So you're going to have 20
feet of dormer on this side?
STEPHEN HISERODT: On this side of the roof. Yes. CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Is there any way you can
reduce the size of that dormer, so the combined dormer front is 15 feet or less?

STEPHEN HISERODT: I mean yes. There's always -there's always a way that we could do that. We couldn't do it in -- I mean, they would lose their symmetry. They wouldn't be the identical dormers. We can't reduce the size of the original dormer, because it won't support a bedroom in that case.

Honestly, I think it will appear more complete and honest if it stays similar to the way it is.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: This is Brendan Sullivan. Let me just -- the existing dormer, as we're looking at it now on the left is --

STEPHEN HISERODT: The existing dormer is on the right in the center.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: -- okay, the one on the -- the existing dormer is what, on the left or the right?

STEPHEN HISERODT: On the right-hand side. It is above the bay below.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Okay. And that's 10-foot-11, is that correct?

STEPHEN HISERODT: Yes. That's correct.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Okay. And then you're adding a
9-foot-10 section in between?

STEPHEN HISERODT: It is roughly that. The -yeah.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: And then the one on the left is also going to be --

STEPHEN HISERODT: Yes.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: -- 10 feet?
STEPHEN HISERODT: And we can easily lose that connection in the middle.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: So you're basically going to wind up with 30 feet of dormer.

STEPHEN HISERODT: Yes. It is roughly 30 feet of dormer.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: All right. The dormer guidelines call for no more than 15 feet on any one side. And that also includes an existing dormer.

STEPHEN HISERODT: Um--.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: So you're basically double what the dormer guidelines really call for.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: We have -- this Board in the past on occasion has allowed dormers that are bigger
than the 15 feet, and individually are combined. But you're going much farther beyond what our dormer guidelines provide. I --

STEPHEN HISERODT: How about if we lose the connection in the middle?

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I'm sorry?
STEPHEN HISERODT: We could lose the connecting piece in the middle without impacting the plan at all.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Yeah. I mean, the dormer on -this is Brendan Sullivan -- the dormer on the left, as we look, actually services the staircase.

STEPHEN HISERODT: Yeah.
BRENDAN SULLIVANN: So that really is non-
movable. That's very functional, and the dormer -- the connecting piece, what does that give you on the inside?

STEPHEN HISERODT: It really just adds light to that corridor area between --

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Is it a washer and dryer in there?

STEPHEN HISERODT: Yeah.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: The walk-in?
STEPHEN HISERODT: Yeah.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: So it's -- you got a laundry room there, and --

STEPHEN HISERODT: That doesn't need to be there.
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: I mean, it adds some height, obviously, to that room too.

STEPHEN HISERODT: Yes. But there's enough height for a laundry in there. So that could be sacrificed. In which case we'd have essentially two 10- or 11-foot dormers.

But $I$ think they're both fairly vital to successful use of that upper story, and the effort to provide ample bedroom space for the kids was the primary goal.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Can we -- while we're there can we pull up the floor plans showing the third floor, which is sheet A13 on your submittal?
[Pause]
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Okay.
STEPHEN HISERODT: So the roof slope is a nine and 12. But the roof joists sit right on the floor. So there's a vast area of space that is lower than five feet and lower than useful space.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: And what you're trying to
achieve is an extra bedroom, is that --
STEPHEN HISERODT: Yes.
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: -- is that correct? So up
there now there is a study area, you've got that dormer over the stairway. There is a closet, obviously the existing -the bath -- the two baths will be created with the dormer on the other side of the house?

STEPHEN HISERODT: Yes.
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: And by expanding and putting in that dormer to the right, then you can basically gain another bedroom?

STEPHEN HISERODT: Yes, yes.
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: So you're basically only going to have two bedrooms and sort of a study area?

STEPHEN HISERODT: Yeah.
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: But right now you only have -STEPHEN HISERODT: Right now, there is a bedroom and a half.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Yeah. I don't know. The plan works.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Well, does it work from a zoning point of view?

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: No. Well, nothing works from the zoning point of view. I mean, the only thing is that you would have to sacrifice that study and create a bedroom there. But then that leaves you void of any open gathering space, I guess, other than the second floor.

STEPHEN HISERODT: Yeah. That space was desirable for, you know, children to hang out.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Yeah. That's their gathering area.

STEPHEN HISERODT: Yeah.
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Can sell some stuff.
STEPHEN HISERODT: [Laughter] There's a possibility that I could reduce the size of the dormer on the left-hand side where the stair is, and only shift it over as tight as possible until I have head clearance issues, which I think I could probably take four feet out of it. But it would lose the balance.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: I don't know. I -- I mean, it works from a logical standpoint of view from the -- do you only occupy the second-floor unit, is that correct?

ADAM MUNNELLY: Yes.
LAUREN RHETT: Yes.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Yeah. So it's a condo? You
have --

ADAM MUNNELLY: Yes.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: -- people on the first floor, and then you're on the second and third floor, is that correct?

ADAM MUNNELLY: Yes.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Yeah. Yeah. It's, I mean the plan works. But it goes against everything that we do, or espouse. I'd be interested in how other members of the Board feel.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Well, is there a possibility we just continue this case and let the architect work on this, come up with another solution, or you think there's no solution other than what is being proposed to us?

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Yeah, I don't know. Andrea, your thoughts?

ANDREA HICKEY: Yeah. So I'm looking at this, and Brendan, if they were to lose that connection between the two dormers, do you feel better about it then?

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Well it's -- you know, it does work. I mean, to be honest with you I think that you have
the two dormers up there, it -- this connecting link actually basically ties it together a little bit. So there is a form to that.

And as opposed to having two little dormers -they're not little, but -- two dormers that are just plunked on the roof, which sort of almost look from an architectural standpoint a missing link. And that -- so that does, there is that form of sort of a connecting link.

The function of that form is I think very beneficial on the inside, because then you can get a functioning laundry room, washer/dryer and, you know, maybe above it a little bit of storage area to put stuff that you put in laundry rooms. And also, you get some natural light into that room.

So from a functioning standpoint, the plan that's before us I think works.

ANDREA HICKEY: Yeah. I get that.
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Now, suppose --
ANDREA HICKEY: But I just -- the way I'm seeing this, it makes one big, giant dormer.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Well, that's unfortunately -that's what it is, correct.

ANDREA HICKEY: That's the result. And if it is in fact one big, giant dormer, it is so far outside of our Dormer Guidelines that it makes it tough for me to consider in a positive way.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Right. Because every -- you know, every night that we sit here and people, you know, again rightfully so come down before us and want to really stretch that 15 feet to, you know, 16 feet to 18 feet to 20, 21 -- and again, for all the right reasons.

And, you know, we always say, "No, we have these guidelines, and we really want to pull back and conform to those guidelines." And we do that I think consistently, and we try to do it very well.

And yet this flies in the face of all of the guidelines and all our efforts to comply with the guidelines. So --

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Aren't we in a position that we have a pact that we can't approve these plans, this -- we can't grant the relief being sought tonight because of the dormer issue that they have to go back to the drawing boards and see if they come up with another solution that either if it doesn't comply with the dormer guidelines, it's
much closer to what they require?
And that's it. It's unfortunate, but I don't -- I have a problem, like Andrea and I think Brendan's wrestling with as well: We do have dormer guidelines.

ANDREA HICKEY: Mm-hm.
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Like we have other requirements. And this is not a requirement, but something that we treat as a requirement. And, you know, we have to follow them, as much as we might be sympathetic to what the petitioners want to do.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Yeah. [Brendan Sullivan again.] And again, once we start chipping away at that, and in this case blowing up that whole dormer guidelines, I don't think it's fair to all the other people who have come down before us that we have pulled back within that envelope, and also future people coming down who we will -again, try to corral into those dormer guidelines.

So I think it's --
STEPHEN HISERODT: Can I ask we --
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: -- it's probably a redo at this point.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I'm going to make a motion
that we continue this case. We'll give the petitioner and their architect time to reflect on what they've heard and what the Dormer Guidelines require, and come up with a different plan -- a plan much closer to compliance, if not complying, with the Dormer Guidelines.

As others have said, we do -- we're not rigid with required compliance with the Dormer Guidelines, but we like to see most compliance -- mostly compliant, and a good reason why they can't all the way comply.

So unless other members of the Board object, I'm going to make a motion to continue this case. Any objections to that?
[Pause]
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Apparently not. I assume no. All right. Then the Chair moves that we continue this case as a case heard until -- that heard means we have to have the same five people who were on the call tonight be available for that continued case.

How much time, petitioners and your architect, do you think you need to go back and reflect on this and come back with hopefully new plans, or modified plans?

STEPHEN HISERODT: No time at all.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I'm sorry.
STEPHEN HISERODT: I could be ready tomorrow if you could.

BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Any time, if I can work the
second date.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Do you do it in September?
STEPHEN HISERODT: Is there any chance we could do
it in the August hearing?
SISIA DAGLIAN: No, we're not doing continued cases that day. August we're not, we don't have room.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: I'm not available.

SISIA DAGLIAN: Yeah. September 2, right? Is your hearing.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Are you ready, can you be ready by September 2 ?

STEPHEN HISERODT: Yes, definitely.
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Okay. All right. Let me make a motion. The Chair moves that we continue this case as a case heard until 6:00 p.m. on September 2, subject to the following conditions:

One, that the petitioner sign a waiver of time for decision. Because by law, otherwise relief would be
automatically granted, which would mean we would automatically deny relief tonight. It's a very simple standard form that we've used -- the City uses forever.

That form must be signed no later than 5:00 p.m. on a week from Monday. If you don't do that, we are going to dismiss the case.

So you have to go to the Building Department and you get a copy of the form and have them e-mail it to you. That's the first condition.

The second condition is that a new posting sign, or a modified posting sign be erected and maintained for the 14 days prior to September 2, just as you've done with regard to the case tonight.

And third, to the extent that there are -presumably there will be -- new plans, specs, modifications, what have you, they must be in our files, the Building Department files, no later than 5:00 p.m. on the Monday before September 2.

If they are not, we will not hear the case on September 2, or we'll deny relief, which I think you can tell we don't want to do, but we need to give you a better -- another shot at complying with our -- the legal
requirements of our city.

So on the basis of all of these, that's the motion
I am making.

Brendan, how do you vote?
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Brendan Sullivan yes to the continuance.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Andrea?

ANDREA HICKEY: Andrea Hickey yes to the continuance.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Wendy?
WENDY LEISERSON: Wendy Leiserson yes to the continuance.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Matina?

MATINA WILLIAMS: Matina Williams yes to the continuance.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: The Chair votes yes to the continuance.
[All vote YES]
So the case is continued until 6:00 p.m. -SISIA DAGLIAN: [Whispered] September 2.

CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: On September 2. Thank
you. The case -- that's it for the end of the cases
tonight.
ADAM MUNNELLY: Thank you.
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: Hopefully you will have a better result on September 2.

LAUREN RHETT: Thank you.
ADAM MUNNELLY: Thank you very much.
CONSTANTINE ALEXANDER: And that's it. Goodnight.
BRENDAN SULLIVAN: Okay. Goodnight, ladies.
WENDY LEISERSON: Goodnight.
ANDREA HICKEY: Thank you, everyone. Stay well.
MATINA WILLIAMS: You as well.
[08:53 p.m. End of Proceedings]
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| From: | Lauren Marett [lauren.marett@gmail.com](mailto:lauren.marett@gmail.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Thursday, July 29, 2021 12:53 PM |
| To: | Pacheco, Maria |
| Subject: | Fwd: 58 Granville Perspective Views - 072621.pdf |

Hello Maria,
My name is Lauren Marett and I have my hearing with the BZA for my home at 58 Granville Road coming up this evening. I just wanted to forward along this letter of support from one of my neighbors. I will have one more coming through shortly.

Many thanks,
Lauren
---------- Forwarded message $\qquad$
From: JULIE SILBERMAN [julsilb@comcast.net](mailto:julsilb@comcast.net)
Date: Mon, Jul 26, 2021 at 6:00 PM
Subject: Re: 58 Granville Perspective Views - 072621.pdf
To: Lauren [lauren.marett@gmail.com](mailto:lauren.marett@gmail.com)

Lovely to hear from you and the plans look fine.
We are actually in Wellfleet, not Provincetown and come back to Cambridge occasionally. We'll likely be back much more often in the late fall. We'll look for you when we're home.
Good luck with your plans.
Julie and Dianne
On 07/26/2021 4:04 PM Lauren < lauren.marett@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello Julie,

My name is Lauren Marett, Adam Munnelly and I recently purchased 58 Granville and will be your new neighbors! I'm so sorry we haven't gotten a chance to meet yet but hope we get to cross paths soon. Our neighbors let us know that you spend most of your time in Provincetown, which is one of our most favorite places on earth. My aunts have had a place there for many years and we absolutely love going to visit them.

Anyway, I saw the email you sent to the BZA regarding the Apple tree, so I just wanted to send you a quick note to let you know that we plan to keep the tree and fully understand how important it is to the neighborhood. I've seen several notes come through about the tree and I really want the neighborhood to know that we are in support of this tree! I also wanted to share our plans with and see if you'd be willing to take a look at the proposed exterior design, and if you approve, add your approval to your note to the BZA? I'm happy to talk through any questions or concerns you may have. We greatly appreciate your consideration and look forward to meeting you in person soon!

All the best,
Lauren

Sent from my iPhone

Lauren Marett
617.633.1096

## Pacheco, Maria

| From: | Lauren Marett [lauren.marett@gmail.com](mailto:lauren.marett@gmail.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Thursday, July 29, 2021 2:36 PM |
| To: | Pacheco, Maria |
| Subject: | Fwd: Plans |

Hi Maria,

Here is the other letter I'd mentioned for the hearing this evening for 58 Granville.

Thank you again,
Lauren
---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: bahadir yildirim [bahayild@yahoo.com](mailto:bahayild@yahoo.com)
Date: Thu, May 6, 2021 at 2:38 PM
Subject: Plans
To: [lauren.marett@gmail.com](mailto:lauren.marett@gmail.com), [adammunnelly@gmail.com](mailto:adammunnelly@gmail.com)
Cc: Aysin Yildirim [ayoltar@yahoo.com](mailto:ayoltar@yahoo.com)

Hi Lauren and Adam,
Thanks for the note and image.
It appears fine with us.
May all go well,
Baha and Aysin

Lauren Marett
617.633.1096

From: Janet Randall, 62 and 64 Granville Road (owner of both condominiums)
To: Members of the Board of Zoning Appeal
Re.: Petition by Adam Munnelly, Case \#BZA-122612
Date: 8.15.21

Dear members of the BZA,
I wrote to you on 7.25 .21 before the 7.29 hearing about two issues concerning 58 Granville Road, Case \#BZA-122612. The first was about the lack of a tree survey and tree protection area, specifically for the significant historic apple tree that straddles the line between our houses. This is still a problem; just yesterday a backhoe was delivered, in the driveway beside the apple tree, which is as yet unprotected.


The second issue was about the proposed dormers, which is my focus here.
At the hearing, you found the proposed dormers too large and asked for a redesign. My concern was not about the size of the dormers but the aesthetics. These shallow-pitched shed dormers have no relation to the roof angles and conflict with the character of the house. It's understandable why a shed design was submitted, of course; it solves the challenge of maximizing floor area while staying inside the height requirement. But the result, unfortunately, sacrifices the house's architectural consistency and its harmony with the neighboring houses.

I faced the same challenge a number of years ago when I submitted my own $3^{\text {rd }}$ floor renovation plan to the BZA. It also proposed shed dormers, for the same reason. But the BZA rejected it, not for size, but for aesthetics: the dormer angles, they said, looked completely out of place. They asked for a redesign with parallel rooflines and -- because that would require raising the roof over the limit -- they offered me a height variance! When I was surprised, they said, "It just has to match the house. Now it will!" Well, it not only matched, it also increased the interior space and provided much more headroom than the shed design.

Below are photos of the models that I brought to the BZA. When you look at them, you'll see why they preferred the raised roof (on the left). Additional views (elevations and aerials) are in this link.


In talking with Adam and Lauren, I learned that their architect didn't even consider a raised-roof version, because he didn't think you would issue a height variance. But I hope you will consider that option for 58 Granville Road. If so, the additions will blend beautifully with the rest of the house, and this house (a "twin" house to mine, built the same year by the same owner) will preserve its 1927 architectural character, consistent with itself and the neighboring houses.

Thank you for considering my request.





MICAELL A COLEMAN
PROEESSIONAL LAND SUVVETOR Notes: 1) Lot owned by: 58 granvule, luc 2) LOT IS ZONED: B
3) PROPERTV DEED Book 76416 PAGE 80
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(6) $\frac{\text { EXIISTING AREA PLAN }-3 R D \text { FLOOR }}{1 / 8^{\prime \prime}=1-0^{\prime}}$ $\qquad$ (7) $\frac{\text { EXISTING AREA PLAN - } 2 \text { ND FLOOR }}{1 / 8^{\prime \prime}=11^{-0}}$ $\qquad$

(2) $\frac{2 N D}{1 / 8^{\prime \prime}=100 R-S R}$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

(8) $\frac{\text { EXISTING AREA PLAN - 1ST FLOOR }}{1 / 8^{\prime \prime}=11^{-0} 0^{\prime \prime}}$

(1) $\frac{1 \text { ST FLOOR-SP }}{1 / 8^{\prime \prime}=1-10^{\prime}}$


BUILDING AREA - EXISIING

(5) $\frac{\text { EXIISTING AREA PLAN - BASEMENT }}{1 / 8^{\prime \prime}=1-0^{\prime \prime}}$




(1) $\frac{\text { PROPOSED OPEN SPACE - Dependent } 1}{1 / 8^{\prime \prime}=11^{-0}-0^{\prime \prime}}$
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(1) $\frac{3 R D F L O O R-S P}{1 / 4^{\prime}=1-1^{n}}$
(2) $\frac{2 N D F L O O R-S P}{1 / 4^{\prime \prime}}=1^{1}-0^{\prime \prime}$


(2) $\frac{1 \text { ST FLOOR }}{1 / 4^{\prime \prime}=11^{\prime} .0^{\prime \prime}}$

(1) $\frac{\text { OST FLOOR }}{1 / 44^{\prime}=1.0-S P}$


(1) $\frac{\text { ROOF PLAN }}{1 / 4^{4}=1-0^{n}}$

(2) $\frac{\text { REAR ELEVATION }-S P}{1 / 4=1}=1-0^{\prime \prime}$

(1) $\frac{\text { FRONT ELEVATION - SP }}{1 / 44^{\prime \prime}}=1-0^{1-0 "}$

(1) $\frac{\text { LEFT }}{1 / 4^{\circ}}=11^{-1}-0^{\prime \prime}-$ ELEVATION $-S P$

(1) $\frac{\text { RIGHT SIDE ELEVATION }-S P}{1 / 4^{4}=}=1-0^{\prime \prime}$
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## DIMENSIONAL INFORMATION

| Applicant: | 58 Granville LLC |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | 572 Freeport Street |
| Phone: | $617-406-8605$ |


|  |  | Existing <br> Conditions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TOTAL GROSS |  |  |
|  |  | 3670 |
| LOT AREA: |  | 5281 |
| RATIO OF GROSS |  |  |
| FLOOR AREA TO |  | .. 69 |
| LOT ARE:A: ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
| LOT AREA OF |  |  |
| EACH DWELLING |  | 2640.5 |
| UNIT |  |  |
| SIZE OF LOT: | WIDTH | 58.3 ' |
|  | DEPTH | $99.98{ }^{\prime}$ |
| SETBACKS IN FEET: | FRONT | $6.0{ }^{\prime}$ |
|  | REAR | $31.0^{\prime}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LEFT } \\ & \text { SIDE } \end{aligned}$ | 15.6 ' |
|  | RIGHT SIDE | $5.0{ }^{\prime}$ |
| SIZE OF BUILDING: | HEIGHT | $33.3{ }^{\prime}$ |
|  | WIDTH | $59.0^{\prime}$ |
| RATIO OF USABLE |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { OPEN SPACE TO } \\ & \text { LOT AREA: } \end{aligned}$ |  | 45.7\% |
|  |  |  |
| NO. OF DWELLING |  | 2 |
| UNITS: |  | 2 |
| NO. OF PARKING |  | 2 |
| SPACES: |  | 2 |
| NO. OF LOADING |  | n/a |
| DISTANCE TO |  |  |
| NEAREST BLDG. |  | $16.6{ }^{\prime}$ |
| ON SAMELOT |  |  |

Ordinance
Requirements
$\frac{\text { Requested }}{\text { Conditions }}$

3839 $\quad$| $\frac{\text { Ordinance }}{\text { Requirements }}$ |
| :---: |
| 5281 |$\quad 2739 \quad$ (max.)

$2.0^{\prime}$
33.8'
$59.0^{\prime}$
40.0\%

2
2
n/a
$16.6^{\prime}$
$7.5^{\prime}$ (SUM OF 20')
$35^{\prime}$
n/a
40.0\%

2
2
n/a
$10^{\prime}$

| Present Use/Occupancy: | Two Family Residence |
| ---: | :--- |
| Zone: | Residence B Zone |
| Requested Use/Occupancy: | Two Family Residence |

Present Use/Occupancy: Two Family Residence

Requested Use/Occupancy: Two Family Residence

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

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) $\frac{\text { PROPOSED OPEN SPACE - Dependent } 11}{1 / 8^{\circ}=1^{1}-0^{\prime \prime}}$





(1) $\operatorname{OSTTFLORR-SP}$


(1) $\frac{\text { 3RDFLOOR-SP }}{1 / 4=1-1-0^{-}}$

(2) $\frac{2 N D F \operatorname{LLOOR}-\text { sp }}{1 / 4=1 .-0^{-1}}$


$\qquad$








From: Janet Randall, 62 and 64 Granville Road (owner of both condominiums)
To: Members of the Board of Zoning Appeal
Re.: Petition by Adam Munnelly, Case \#BZA-122612
Date: 7.25.21

I am pleased to be invited to speak to the BZA on Adam Munnelly's petition for a Special Permit. I have owned and lived in 64 Granville since 1991, and I, myself, came before you in 1997 for a variance to convert my unfinished attic into living space. My plan involved 2 shed dormers, but the BZA rejected it, because shed dormers are not in keeping with the architectural flavor of the house, and instead proposed that my dormer parallel the other roof lines. "But that violates the height restriction," I said, to which they replied, "Well, we'll give you a variance for THAT!" And though more expensive, in the end it was much more spacious and aesthetically "right", consistent with the other lines of the house and those around it. I tell this story because I appreciate this committee for having that larger view in mind - the building in relation to itself as well as to the buildings around it.

I would like to support Adam's petition, since I welcome him and Lauren as new neighbors and would like him to see his vision realized. But I have a few concerns that I need to lay out first.

## 1. A Significant Tree

Right on the property line between our houses stands a 10" diameter "significant" apple tree, now in full fruit. The tree is the offshoot daughter of an 82-year old, 40 ' high tree (one of the 10 tallest apple trees of its time), which got sick and had to come down. It was planted by the prior owner's dad in 1927 between our houses (both of which he built). The daughter tree is growing out of the base, and after 12 years is now bearing the same heirloom Baldwins. When Adam and I met, he said that he was planning to remove it, but after I explained that the tree falls under the definition of a "significant" tree, and described how important this heirloom tree is to me and to Cambridge, we agreed to protect it. I put our understanding in writing (attached below) with a brief history of the tree and on 7.24, sent it to him to sign. I don't have it back yet.

## 2. Protecting the Tree During and After Construction: The Tree Ordinance

### 2.1 The Tree Save Area

To protect significant trees during construction, the Cambridge Tree Ordinance requires a "Tree Save Area". To understand what this means, I phoned Andrew Putnam, Superintendent of Urban Forestry \& Landscapes and he sent me this description (7.14, email): "The Tree Save Area as defined by the ordinance is:

The area surrounding a tree which must remain as undisturbed as possible so as to prevent damage to the tree. Disturbance within the Tree Save Area may only be for limited and exceptional reasons."

### 2.2 A Tree Study

In addition, for all projects seeking a special permit, the Ordinance requires "a Tree Study, certified complete by the Gty Arborist," showing all significant trees (formerly 8" diameter, now

6"). Adam didn't include a Tree Study in the plans he sent me, and when I met with Commissioner Ranjit Singanayagam on Friday, 7.16, there was none on file. Before the construction moves forward, I would like the BZA to ask Adam to supply the required tree study and set up Tree Save Areas to protect the significant trees.

### 2.3 Parking and its Effect on Tree Roots

Something else that will put the tree at risk is parked cars. Adam told me that he plans to have cars park in front of the garages, not inside. This would put the cars right on top of the tree roots, which will ultimately kill the tree. I discussed the situation with Adam and my landscape architect, Manny Stefanakis, and Adam agreed to invite Manny to our last meeting. They discussed some options (all of which offer the advantage of increasing the usable backyard space) and Adam agreed to work with Manny to develop a design. I am very, very grateful to Adam for his commitment to do this.

Before the construction moves forward, I would like the BZA to ask Adam to submit a parking plan that will avoid the apple tree roots.
2.4 My requests related to the Tree

To summarize, if the BZA approves Adam's petition, before construction resumes, I would like them to ensure that,
a. the plans include a Tree Study;
b. each significant tree be protected during construction with a Tree Save Area;
c. the apple tree roots be protected from cars parking on them after the construction is complete;
d. our understanding about the tree (as detailed in our agreement) be signed, notarized and passed to future owners as a deed restriction.

## 3. The Dormers

My other concern with this Special Permit request is an aesthetic one. As I laid out in my opening, our "twin" houses, built together, have 1927-style rooflines and the original dormers all follow the same roof angle. In order to maximize the $3^{\text {rd }}$ floor interior space and stay within the current height, Adam's plan shows shed dormers. However, these, just like my originally-proposed shed dormers, are out of character with the rest of the house and neighboring houses. Not only that, viewed from the front, these asymmetrical dormers go off at two different angles, and don't even match each other.

I would strongly support Adam's request to add dormers, as long as they follow the other roof lines. Therefore,

I would like to ask the BZA to grant Adam a variance for a higher roofline, so that the new dormers can be aligned with the existing roof lines of 58 Granville and the houses around it. Not only would this follow Article 10.32 of the Zoning Ordinance that asks the Board to consider "the character and use of nearby buildings and land, "it would add more living space to his current plan. (Note: Before proposing this, I wondered if a raised roof would shade my solar panels, also mentioned in Article 10.32. But if the two roofs are the same height, it would not.)

## 4. Other issues

I have considered the other non-conforming elements on the Special Permit request: \#2) addition or an egress stair and deck in the side yard setback, \#3) relocation and addition of openings on a nonconforming façade facing the right side yard, and \#4) 3' high area way guardrail in the read yard setback. All of these changes would affect other neighbors more than me, so l leave it to them to register their opinions.

## 5. Summary

I agree to support Adam's petition, provided that:

- Adam formalize our attached agreement, and
- guarantee the safety and longevity of our shared apple tree as summarized in (1) and (2) above. In addition,
- I'm requesting that the BZA and Adam work together to revise his dormer plan, as laid out in (3) above.


Agreement between

| Janet Randall | $62 \& 64$ Granville Road | Cambridge MA 02138 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Adam Munnelly | 58 Granville Road | Cambridge MA 02138 |

## Background

The Baldwin apple tree that spreads over both sides of our property line is an important tree. It's the daughter of a massive apple tree, more than 40' high, one of the tallest apple trees on record in Massachusetts. That giant mother tree was planted in 1927 on the border between our two houses, both built by Elian Battit, the father of George Battit, from whom Adam bought 58 Granville. The tree produced a huge crop of apples every year, too many for us to use, so each harvest time, Janet lined up a donated bucket truck, a pile of fruit crates, and a team of friends. The extra apples went to Food For Free, a local organization that provides food to students, seniors, and those at risk for hunger and provides year-round fresh fruits and vegetables to food programs. Janet also took a few boxes of apples to Drumlin Farm during Farm Family Days for demos on their hand-powered wooden cider press. Children loaded the press and turned the crank, and got to sample "their own" cider. Baldwins are an Heirloom variety; they make wonderful pies and cakes, apple crisps, and sauce and apple chutney became the annual Randall holiday gift. Unfortunately, in November 2009, at age 82, the tree succumbed to a disease and was taken down. But it left a legacy: a daughter tree is now growing out of the root system to take its place (see attached photos). Now a "significant tree," over 10 " in diameter, it's bearing fruit for the first time. With apples on both sides of our border, we will continue to share the tree's generous bounty.

Against this background, Adam Munnelly, new owner of 58 Granville Road, and Janet Randall, owner of 62 \& 64 Granville Road, agree to jointly preserve and care for this tree and share liability for it. Specifically, we agree that:

1. No one connected to or working on either property, at 58 Granville or 62 \& 64 Granville, will damage the tree or take it down;
2. We will work together to maintain the tree to keep it healthy. Since the tree would be damaged by cars parked on the roots, and since Adam doesn't plan to use his garages for parking, he will arrange to put parking elsewhere on the property.
3. During the current construction at 58 Granville, Adam will create a Tree Save Area, as required by Cambridge's Tree Protection Ordinance. This involves constructing a temporary fence around the area under the canopy. Whenever Janet has construction on her property, she will do the same.
4. The shared tree is only one element on our shared property line. In our same spirit of cooperation, we agree to discuss and mutually approve of any changes along that line, including plantings and fencing, and will share in maintaining them.
5. When either of us sells one or both of our units, this agreement will be transferred to the new owner(s) as a deed restriction.
6. This agreement will stand until we both agree to change it.


The 40 ' tall apple tree, age 82.


Goodbye, tree.


Hartney Greymont, our tree experts



Taking down the large tree, leaving the offshoot.

The "offshoot" daughter tree, now 12 years old, about to produce a crop of apples.

## Pacheco, Maria

| From: | JULIE SILBERMAN [julsilb@comcast.net](mailto:julsilb@comcast.net) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Sunday, July $25,20213: 15 \mathrm{PM}$ |
| To: | Pacheco, Maria |
| Subject: | tree preservation |

To: BZA Cambridge
From: Julie Silberman and Dianne Perlmutter 59 Granville Road
Cambridge, MA 02138
As neighbors of Janet Randall and Adam Munnelly on Granville Road, we support efforts to preserve the historic apple tree between their properties.

## Pacheco, Maria

| From: | Victoria Solomon [visolomon@gmail.com](mailto:visolomon@gmail.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Saturday, July 24, 2021 6:54 PM |
| To: | Pacheco, Maria |
| Subject: | Renovations at 58 Granville Rd |

Dear Marie Pacheco,
We are writing this letter in support of the plans of Adam Munnelly for 58 Granville Rd. They seem just fine to us, and will add to the neighborhood. As I understand the plans they are retaining the house as a two family property. There will not be a third residence.

We want to add our support to keep the big apple tree in the back between 58 and 64 Granville Rd.
Thank you.

Victoria and Frank Solomon
71 Vassal Lane

