



OFFICE OF THE
LITTLETON BOARD OF APPEALS
LITTLETON, MASSACHUSETTS 01460

received
10/2/08

Petitioner: WATERFORD DEVELOPMENT CORP.
Case No: 752A
Date Filed: August 7, 2008

The Littleton Board of Appeals conducted a public hearing on September 17, 2008, at 7:50 P.M. at the Shattuck Street Municipal Building, Shattuck Street, Littleton, for a variance/special permit from Section 173-27, of the Zoning Bylaw to allow a height variance for a new hotel building being constructed on Monarch Drive, Littleton, Massachusetts. Notice of the hearing was given by publication in the Littleton Independent, a newspaper published in Acton and circulated in Littleton, on September 4 and September 11, 2008, and by mail to all abutters and parties in interest. Present and voting: Sherrill R. Gould, Chairman, John Cantino, Julia Adam, Jeff Yates, Members and Cheryl Hollinger, Alternate. Present but not voting were alternates, Marc Saucier and Rod Stewart.

The Petitioner, Waterford Development Corp., represented by Robert Shapiro, Becky Mahoney and Matt Shapiro, received approval from the Planning Board to build a hotel on land on Monarch Drive, Littleton, Ma., in conjunction with S & S hotels, Marriott Hilton. The hotel will be called Homewood Suites, Hilton. The property is an industrial parcel of land situated in proximity to the Route 2, Taylor Street exit, located along a *cul de sac* known as Monarch Drive. The height allowed in the zone is 40 feet and four stories. The proposed building would be four stories, but since a pitched roof is planned, the height will be 46 feet. The petitioner seeks a height variance to allow for a pitched roof.

The Petitioner described the uniqueness of the site, in that it lies significantly below the grade of any of the surrounding properties, very distant from any traveled way, and not visible from any residential properties. The surrounding buildings are essentially at the same height because of the low grade in which this building will be constructed. The Petitioner also stated that a flat roof is not desirable in New England weather conditions and a pitched roof is safer to avoid accumulation of snow and ice load. Finally, the construction of a four story building instead of a three story building would be more energy efficient. A three story building would be economically not viable.

No abutters appeared in opposition. The building inspector had no opposition.

FINDINGS: The Board found that the Applicant satisfied the requirements of uniqueness of the site, owing to location, shape and topography, and that there would be a hardship to the applicant if prevented from constructing a pitched roof. It was further agreed that due to the elevations, the variance would present no substantial derogation from the intent and purpose of the bylaw and no detriment to the neighborhood.

DECISION: The Board voted unanimously to GRANT a Variance from the requirements of Section 173-27 to allow the Petitioner a height variance to construct a building with four stories

and a pitched roof not to exceed 46 feet in height substantially as shown in the materials submitted with the application and the plans approved by the Planning Board.

Appeals, if any, shall be made pursuant to G.L. 40A, Section 17 and shall be filed within twenty days after the date of filing of this Notice in the office of the Town Clerk.

Signed: Julia A. Adam Date: 10/2/08
Julia A. Adam, Clerk

Book 47402, Page 98
Book 9418, Page 379

I hereby signify that twenty days have elapsed since the filing of the above decision by the Board of Appeals and that no appeal concerning said decision has been filed or that any appeal that has been filed has been dismissed or denied.

True Copy Attest: _____ Date: _____
Town Clerk, Littleton, Massachusetts