

**Dedham Town Hall**

**26 Bryant Street**

**Dedham, MA 02026-4458**

**Phone 781-751-9242**

**Fax 781-751-9225**

**Administrative Assistant**

**Susan Webster**

[**swebster@dedham-ma.gov**](mailto:swebster@dedham-ma.gov)

**Planning Board**

**Michael A. Podolski, Esq., Chair**

**John R. Bethoney, Vice Chair**

**Robert D. Aldous, Clerk**

**Ralph I. Steeves**

**James E. O’Brien IV**

**Planning Director**

**Richard J. McCarthy Jr.**

[**rmccarthy@dedham-ma.gov**](mailto:rmccarthy@dedham-ma.gov)

**TOWN OF DEDHAM**

**PLANNING BOARD**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**March 9, 2017, 7 p.m., Lower Conference Room**

**Present:** Michael A. Podolski, Esq., Chair

John R. Bethoney, Vice Chair

Robert D. Aldous, Clerk

James E. O’Brien IV

Richard J. McCarthy, Jr., Planning Director

Call to order 6:49 p.m. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited. Plans, documents, studies, etc., referred to are incorporated as part of the public records and are on file in the Planning and Zoning office. Mr. Steeves was not present for this meeting. Mr. O’Brien arrived at 7:10 p.m.

**Review of Minutes**

July 23, 2015: Mr. Aldous moved to approve the minutes as presented, seconded by Mr. Bethoney. The vote to approve was unanimous at 3-0. Mr. Aldous signed the minutes.

September 10, 2015: Page 7, last paragraph concerning zoning amendments: Change the number of parking spaces on subsidiary apartments to one parking space. Mr. Aldous moved to approve the minutes as amended, seconded by Mr. Bethoney. The vote to approve was unanimous at 3-0. Changes will be made and Mr. Aldous will sign the minutes.

September 24, 2015: Mr. Aldous moved to approve the minutes as presented, seconded by Mr. Bethoney. The vote to approve was unanimous at 3-0. Mr. Aldous signed the minutes.

October 8, 2015: Mr. Aldous moved to approve the minutes as presented, seconded by Mr. Bethoney. The vote to approve was unanimous at 3-0. Mr. Aldous signed the minutes.

October 14, 2015 (zoning articles): Mr. Aldous moved to approve the minutes as presented, seconded by Mr. Bethoney. The vote to approve was unanimous at 3-0. Mr. Aldous signed the minutes.

October 22, 2015: Mr. Aldous moved to approve the minutes as presented, seconded by Mr. Bethoney. The vote to approve was unanimous at 3-0. Mr. Aldous signed the minutes.

November 12, 2015: Page 5, third paragraph from bottom: Mr. Aldous asked who would “He will make not a fortune from doing this (fixing the road due to safety conditions).” Change this to read “Mr. Petruzziello said he will not make a fortune from doing this.” Mr. Aldous moved to approve the minutes as amended, seconded by Mr. Bethoney. The vote to approve was unanimous at 3-0. Changes will be made and Mr. Aldous will sign the minutes. Mr. Podolski said he spoke with Shaw McDermott of the Master Plan Implementation Committee, and they want to come before the Board on April 13, 2017, for finalization of the Master Plan Implementation Committee update.

December 10, 2015: Mr. McCarthy was asked if there was any update on Dedham 800, LLC. There has been none. Mr. Aldous moved to approve the minutes as presented, seconded by Mr. Bethoney. The vote to approve was unanimous at 3-0. Mr. Aldous signed the minutes.

Mr. O’Brien arrived at the meeting.

**Approval of Certificates of Action:**

Ursuline Academy, 85 Lowder Street: Mr. Aldous moved to approve the Certificate of Action as presented, seconded by Mr. Bethoney. The vote to approve was unanimous at 4-0. Mr. Aldous signed the Certificate of Action.

Marbridge, LLC, 280 Bridge Street: Mr. Aldous moved to approve the Certificate of Action as presented, seconded by Mr. O’Brien. The vote to approve was unanimous at 4-0. Mr. Aldous signed the Certificate of Action.

ECEC, 1100 High Street: Mr. Podolski asked what the date was for this decision, as he had made changes that were given to Mrs. Webster to process. Mr. McCarthy said it should be the second draft of the decision dated February 22, 2017. Copies were given to the Board. Dave Roberts of the School Building and Rehabilitation Committee was present for the meeting and said that this is being submitted by the Town Manager to Town Meeting via Article 13 at the request of the SBRC. The article states that it is “to fund the engineering, design, and permitting for the off-site mitigation listed in a letter from Knight, Bagge, and Anderson (KBA), 6 13th Street, Charlestown, dated February 2, 2017.” This will be attached as Exhibit B. The Board asked Mrs. Webster to review the Certificate of Action for spelling and grammar.

Page 4, #3 and #6: Mr. Aldous asked if the phone number could be included. Mr. Podolski said that Mr. McCarthy will have the phone number, and it will be in the file and given to the Planning Board members. Mr. O’Brien asked if blasting should be mentioned in the removal of the foundation. Mr. McCarthy said no. Mr. Podolski suggested putting it in at #6 “During construction of the Project, which includes all blasting operations…” He asked if the Board did a Certificate of Action for pre-construction, but they did not. Mr. Bethoney asked for correction of the grammar on page 3, #14. Mr. O’Brien asked if spraying down dust was included in the construction documents. Mr. Bradford of KBA said it is.

Mr. O’Brien moved to approve the on-site Certificate of Action for major site plan as amended, seconded by Mr. Bethoney. The vote to approve was unanimous at 4-0. This approval does not include off-site. Corrections will be made and Mr. Aldous will sign the Certificate of Action.

David Raftery, 333 East Street: **Prior to the beginning of the discussion, Mr. Bethoney made the statement that he is recusing himself from this review or vote. He explained that the agency at which he works has had a professional relationship with Mr. Raftery in the past. He left the hearing room.** Mr. Podolski had reviewed the proposed Certificate of Action. The vote has been changed to 3-0, as Mr. Steeves was not present for the meeting at which the proposal was made and Mr. Bethoney had recused himself. Mr. Aldous asked if the changes had been made on the as-built plans, but an as-built plan has not yet been received. Mr. Podolski said this is a good question because it has probably already been built. Mr. Aldous moved to approve the Certificate of Action as amended with the stipulation that Mr. McCarthy will make sure the fence location is noted on the as-built when it is submitted. Mr. O’Brien seconded the motion. The vote to approve was unanimous at 3-0. Changes will be made and Mr. Aldous will sign the decision.

Mr. Bethoney returned to the hearing room.

Donovan Electric, 127 Milton Street: Mr. Donovan must go to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a Special Permit to set his garage 10 feet into the General Residence zoning district. The decision will be changed to reflect “tax accounts,” not taxes. Mr. Aldous moved to approve the Certificate of Action as amended subject to approval of a Special Permit from the Zoning Board of Appeals. If it is not granted, the Applicant will need to return to the Planning Board. Mr. O’Brien seconded the motion. The vote to approve was unanimous at 4-0. Changes will be made and Mr. Aldous will sign the decision.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicant:** | **Empire Telecom USA d/b/a AT & T[[1]](#footnote-1)** |
| **Project Address:** | **8 Industrial Drive, Dedham, MA** |
| **Case #:** | **SITE-12-16-2178** |
| **Zoning District:** | Limited Manufacturing A |
| **Representative(s):** | David Cooper, Empire Telecom, 10130 Donleigh Drive, Columbia, MD 21046 |
| **Town Consultant:** | Steven Findlen, McMahon Associates |

The Applicant wants to remove three radioheads and three amplifiers, and replace them with different ones. Mr. Findlen reviewed the application, and noted three concerns: 1) signage for emergencies, 2) the new equipment is painted to match the smokestack, and 3) there is adequate grounding. He said that all issues have been resolved. These will be added to the plans.

Carmen DelloIacono, Town of Dedham electrical inspector, reviewed the application, and was present on his own time. He said that Mr. Aldous looks at grounding through experience in the trade. Times have changed on the actual wiring, and it used to be called “aught,” which he also prefers. The industry has changed to 2 aught standards; both are acceptable. On this application, he tried to contact Mr. Cooper and the contact engineer, without success. His issue is grounding, noting that with Mr. Aldous’ due diligence in looking at the plans, the wire may in fact be undersized. An electrical permit will need to be filed, and he will be looking for a whole new grounding system. The plans call for 5 OHMs or less, which is not enough. He said he will be present for testing. Mr. Podolski commended Mr. Aldous, who has made it his duty to review each wireless application very carefully, and has had good reason to do so. Mr. Bethoney asked whether applicants should be reminded about the necessity of obtaining electrical permits. Mr. Dello-Iacono said they should know, but if the Board wants to remind them, they are free to do so. He offered to answer any questions the Board may have. He said applicants may pull permits, but they never call for inspections.

Mr. O’Brien moved to approve the site plan modification, seconded by Mr. Bethoney. The vote to approve was unanimous at 4-0.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicant:** | **Town of Dedham Parks and Recreation** |
| **Project Address:** | **Gonzalez Field, Dedham, MA** |
| **Case #:** | **SITE-02-17-2195** |
| **Zoning District:** | Local Business/Highway Business |
| **Representative(s):** | Mark Novak, Principal, Activitas  Stephen Crisafulli, Activitas  John Maida, Parks and Recreation Commission  Bob Stanley, Town of Dedham Parks and Recreation Director |
| **Town Consultant:** | Steven Findlen, McMahon Associates |

Plans and correspondence were distributed. The site consists of three parcels in the Local Business and Highway Business zoning districts. There is an access easement by Staples at 456 Providence Highway. A drainage easement runs from Wigwam Brook through a culvert system under the existing field. There is currently a wooden stairway used for access, two handicapped spaces accessed through the Staples parking lot, and a lower parking lot on East Street.

The proposal is to renovate the natural grass field with synthetic turf and athletic sports field lighting. There will be a four-pole system with an illumination level on the surface of 30. There would be a series of walkways around the entire facility, some larger than others, accessing both parking lots in a handicapped accessible manner. The walkway coming from the parking lot and around to the upper parking lot would be ten feet wide. The majority of the other walkways are either eight or four feet wide. Peer review requested an increase in the width of the walkways to five feet for operational and maintenance reasons. They have done that. The existing parking lot will be available throughout construction. There is no thru traffic for any construction materials or staging; all staging will happen on the field. The existing stairway from the lower parking lot will be moved and rebuilt in a different location where there will be a flagpole, up lights, pavers, and a couple of benches. There will be 30’ high sports netting at both ends of the field. At the sidelines, there will be one larger field east to west, and two six-on-six going north to south. The smaller fields will have 10’ high netting.

They propose 28 new parking spaces in the upper parking lot, three of which will be handicapped spaces including one van space. Emergency access has been discussed with Fire Chief William Spillane. The Chief originally stated that he would probably access the field in the same manner as he has in the past, but he changed his mind so that they would come into the Staples parking lot and back into one of the areas associated with handicapped parking. This has been changed on the plans. They met with DRAB and incorporated their comments on planting on the slopes and putting trees at the seating areas. There will be two sets of bleachers, which are not part of the contract at this time, and trees will provide shade. There will be seating for 84 spectators if bleachers are installed. All the materials from the site will remain on site and will be re-used as landscape berms all the way around. There will be pedestrian light poles from the upper parking lot walkway to the lower parking level.

Materials: Artificial grass, bike racks, benches, black trash receptacles, and lighting, mimicking the same type of furnishings in Dedham Square. The netting system was shown to the Board. There will be granite cobble pavers around the flagpole and a concrete anchor around the field attached to the synthetic turf. The lighting system will be the most advanced system on the market. They had proposed lights like those in the Square, but DRAB wanted something more contemporary. There is no spill of illumination. A heat map was shown.

Mr. Findlen, Senior Project Manager at McMahon Associates, is the peer review consultant retained by the Planning Board to do a modified minor site plan review; the Applicant pays for this. He does not work for the Applicant or the Town. He said he just received a letter tonight, and has not had the chance to review it. His review included site access, safety, and parking and included:

* Emergency access: This has been addressed by Chief Spillane, and a letter is needed.
* Site access: Signage is needed to alert since there is a new intersection conflict point that tends to be a blind spot. There is a 45° drop, possibly 40 feet, behind Staples that comes up quickly, and it could cause an accident. In addition, RCN and other commercial uses are behind the building and there are big box trucks and vans coming through there.
* Site signage: Designation of handicapped spaces is needed, as are wayfaring traffic signs and pavement markings to help tell cars where to go.
* Location of bleachers: This needs clarification for purposes of parking.
* Dimensions of parking spaces: Must be in compliance with the Zoning Bylaw.
* Lower lot use: This parking lot is also used for businesses. He expressed concern about what will happen with the lot on Saturdays.
* Walkways: These should be at least five feet wide.
* Types of materials proposed: MUTCD compliant.
* Compliance with town bylaw in terms of scales, i.e., 1”=40.’

Mr. Podolski asked about the handicapped accessibility from the lower lot, and asked if a ramp would be built. The Applicant said there will be a gradual grade up. Mr. Findlen will review that. Mr. Podolski thought the proposal was phenomenal. He reminded the Applicant that lighting must not spill onto adjacent properties. Mr. Bethoney asked if people could walk all around the entire field. Mr. Novak said they could, and that it would be about one-quarter mile of asphalt. Mr. O’Brien asked about winter maintenance, i.e., after snowstorms, saying that people will use it for a walking path when the field is not in use. Mr. Maida said they will put in a request with the Capital Expenditures Committee for money to maintain it. The goal is to let teams play if the winter is mild. Mr. Podolski asked if snow and ice would be removed so the site can be used for walking. Mr. Maida said this is not in their plan yet.

Mr. Bethoney liked the proposal and the upgrades it will bring. He supported having as much parking as reasonably possible. He asked if the intensity of the use would be increasing; the use would be stretched out with the lighting system. Instead of three or four teams at the same time, it could be less, but they could play longer. They can alleviate all that themselves. Mr. Bethoney asked about parking. Mr. Maida said the proposal will improve this. He said the Applicant should work within what the site has to offer and do the best they can.

Mr. Aldous asked if the parking is shared with Staples. Mr. Maida said this will all be new; it has not been built yet. Mr. Aldous was skeptical about the number of parking spaces, and found hard to believe there would be 28 spaces. Mr. O’Brien assured him that there is plenty of room. Mr. Aldous wants to see a lighting plan, stamped by a lighting engineer that gives lumens. He was concerned about spillage onto the highway. Mr. Novak said that the image he showed was from the photometric plan. Mr. Aldous wanted to see it before he voted.

Mr. Bethoney asked Mr. Findlen if he was reviewing the landscaping; Mr. Findlen said they are doing a modified site plan review only. Mr. Novak said the plant material is native with deciduous trees, small shrubs, and various grass covers. There is a Spectra gas line, so there will no trees there. The rest of the site is basically grass, with some of the grass being maintained. There will be unmaintained perennial rye grass in the back of the berms. Parking spaces will be restriped, and there will be interior landscaping in the upper parking lot. The lower parking lot will not be landscaped. This is owned by the Board of Selectmen, and they voted to keep it the way it is.

Mr. Novak said they will accept all of the recommendations with the exception of:

1. Instead of the plan being 40 scale, they requested a waiver for 30 scale. This allows them to get more detail on the plans. This will be put on the plan.
2. They will work with Mr. Findlen on site circulation in the upper parking lot.
3. Parking will require more detailed analysis. They are working with the Conservation Commission, and will do the best they can. They hope to get 28 spaces. Mr. Podolski said they should make sure that the parking area is property signed. They will work with Mr. Findlen on this. Mr. Findlen said he is pretty confident that all this can be resolved by the next meeting.

Michelle Kayserman, 3 Allen Lane, asked if they had considered any pollinator-friendly plants. She also said that the lower parking lot has a lot of illegal parking in the summer, and asked if the Board had considered any type of restriction for the higher lot for overnight parking, especially with the anticipated new apartments. Mr. Podolski said the Planning Board can control the upper parking lot, but not the lower one; this is governed by the Board of Selectmen. The upper lot will have three handicapped spaces. Mr. O’Brien suggested that the upper lot be just for the elderly and the handicapped instead of everyone. He said there is a “feeding frenzy” for parking spaces. The Board can control the upper lot with signage and possibly by ticketing; this will be investigated. Mr. Bethoney commented about the grasses, saying that after a year or so, they go flat, die, and disappear. He also said he would prefer a traditional lighting design. Mr. Novak said that if the grasses are mowed shorter, they will look like grass.

This meeting was continued to March 23, 2017, after the Public Meeting on the zoning articles. Mr. Bethoney asked them to think about restricting parking on the upper level when the field is not in use.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicant:** | **National Development** |
| **Project Address:** | **100 Meadow Road, Dedham, MA** |
| **Case #:** | **SITE-02-17-2196** |
| **Zoning District:** | LMB |
| **Representative(s):** | David Mackwell, Kelly Engineering Group, 0 Campanelli, #2, Braintree, MA 02184 |
| **Town Consultant:** | Steven Findlen, McMahon Associates |

The Applicant requested an insignificant modification of the previously approved site plan. Access to the site is from the Boston side. A new tenant, Cross Fit Gym, will occupy a previously vacant, 8,800 square foot space. Parking had been approved for the entire land in Dedham, but the modifications incorporate striping five previously unstriped spaces. The original site plan had parking there, but the Applicant did not want to tie it up because they thought a warehouse might occupy the space and they could put in loading docks. They will still put in loading docks, but they will be used for ventilation for the gym. There will be a handicapped parking space next to the handicapped ramp going into the building, and they will add a couple of parking spaces. There are no other physical changes to the site with the exception of an egress door on the other side of the space to meeting the Building Code.

The previous calculation for a warehouse space required nine spaces. The increased demand with the gym will require four more parking spaces, which requires major site plan review because they have to change the building because of the doors. They requested that the Planning Board accept the new site plan as the new plan of record. They have received the peer review from McMahon Associates, and responded today.

Mr. Findlen, Senior Project Manager at McMahon Associates, is the peer review consultant retained by the Planning Board to do a modified minor site plan review; the Applicant pays for this. He does not work for the Applicant or the Town. He received the Applicant’s letter today. He said there are eight issues with the site; Mr. Mackwell’s comments are in red.

1. Site access safety and turning radii. They provided templates showing that access is satisfactory. The Fire Chief is also satisfied.
2. Handicapped access/ADA compliance. There is a question about the building itself once inside; this will be addressed in the construction documents. The plan is 100% compliant on the interior space. The stairs on the egress door are not required to be a ramp. Primary handicapped access will be up the ramp that was built for The Ride.
3. Parking demand: The plan is compliant with the required 13-14 spaces. The Applicant has been asked to look at ITE to see what would actually be required for this type of use. He agreed that it is sometimes worth looking at another source when it comes to total parking and what is recommended. They may do that when the landlord gets a tenant for the remaining warehouse spaces. Cross Fit Gym does not need more than 14 parking spaces, and there is ample excess parking. Gentle Giant occupies 60,000 square feet, and only uses 15 spaces. It is anticipated that the gym will be open for twelve hours a day, and they do not need a lot of parking. Mr. Findlen confirmed this.
4. Pavement markings and signage: They have been asked to do any improvements that could help the site, i.e., STOP bar, STOP sign.
5. Bituminous concrete. The abbreviation on the plan was not consistent, and has been changed on all the sheets.
6. Loading. They are not proposing any loading activity.
7. Dumpsters. These have been identified on the plan.
8. Snow Storage. These have been identified on the plan.

Mr. Mackwell was asked to get a description of the general Cross Fit regimen. Mr. O’Brien said there should be a note from Gentle Giant and other tenants regarding shared parking, and that this should be part of the agreement. There is one vacant space for Tenant #5. Mr. Aldous was not concerned about parking since there are plenty of spaces. He asked about the tanks and whether they are used. Mr. Mackwell did not know, but thought they may be water tanks, although they could be empty; he will find out. He also said that when Tenant #5 is found, they will return to the Planning Board for further modification of the site. Mr. Findlen said that, based on this evening’s discussion, the Applicant is all set. He will write a letter to document this.

Mr. Bethoney moved to approve the request for insignificant modification subject to an acceptable Certificate of Action. Mr. Aldous seconded the motion. The vote to approve was unanimous at 4-0.

**Discussion: Associate Member of Planning Board**

Michelle Kayserman, 3 Allen Lane, expressed her interest in being appointed as an associate member of the Planning Board. She said she is interested in improving the town. She is a civil engineer specializing in site development, and is on the East Dedham Guidelines committee. Mr. O’Brien is familiar with her and said she is quite knowledgeable. Mr. Podolski said that this would probably be put on the next agenda for discussion, and a notice will be posted as part of the process. He told Ms. Kayserman that she would need to be available for Public Hearings. Mr. Aldous said he was very much in favor of appointing her.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicant:** | **Amazon** |
| **Project Address:** | **500 Sprague Street, Dedham, MA** |
| **Zoning District:** | LMA |
| **Representative(s):** | * Michael Giaimo, Esq., Robinson & Cole, One Boston Place, 26th Floor, Boston, MA 02108 * Marc A. deBourbon, Program Manager, Amazon Real Estate, Seattle, Washington * John Mannix, Principal and Director of Acquisitions, Griffith Properties, 260 Franklin Street, Boston, MA 02110 * Donna Pennino, Principal, Portfolio Manager, Griffith Properties, 260 Franklin Street, Boston, MA 02110 |
| **Town Consultant:** | Steven Findlen, McMahon Associates |

Mr. Giaimo has spoken with Mr. McCarthy several times about the concept of having indoor parking for Amazon’s delivery vans. It would be a loading operation, and not really parking. They can fit 50 vans inside the building for loading, which lets them move all the vans off the travel area in the back. It also makes the process more efficient and reduces the number of trips back and forth to the site since there would be already loaded vans. He did not believe this required any site plan approval, but wanted to discuss this. He showed the layout for the indoor parking. The vans would enter through a back ramp, be loaded overnight, and then they would pull out in the morning.

Process: Amazon gets two to three shipments in the evening that are unloaded and sorted. Loading people come in for the overnight shift at 10:30 p.m., and park in a designated area. Vans are then loaded in the building. In the early morning, the first 14 to 20 vans pull down the ramp and are staged in double rows in an open area in front of the building. Another load of vans then pull into the building and are loaded. The purpose of the indoor loading is for efficiency, safety, and a more orderly process. When the loaders leave, the first group of van drivers arrive and set off to deliver. This is a flow control process. Once the vans have completed deliveries, they pull into the entrance, queue up, come to the ramp, and fill in the spaces vacated by the last group of vans, and the cycle starts again. At the end of the day when the routes are completed, the off-site vans park and the drivers go home. Other vans pull into the building and the loading process starts again at 10:30 p.m. There is no interference with the other tenants. The vans do not idle all night.

Mr. Podolski met with Mr. McCarthy, Fred Johnson of the Building Department, Lt. Jared Blaney from the Fire Department, and John Titus, the Fire Department’s consultant on fire safety. The Fire Department, Mr. Titus, and the Building Department are content with the proposal to have no more than 50 vans in the building. Any dangers are adequately addressed by the fire suppression unit in the building. There is no issue with ventilation, although this will be reviewed. This process is already being done now, but in the daytime. The Applicant said it would probably be fewer than 50 vans most of the time; if it was started today, they would probably start with fewer depending on levels of activity.

Mr. Aldous was interested in ventilation because there will be three to four hours of vans driving in and out of the building. He wanted to hear an expert say that the ventilation is sufficient. Mr. Giaimo said he was confident that someone would say it is okay. The building has been approved with the same operation, just not having vans inside overnight. He thought it was probably evaluated initially, but it can be done again. Mr. O’Brien said he never knew this was taking place since Day 1. Mr. deBourbon said he could provide documentation. There are carbon monoxide monitors and oil/water separators. He said that all buildings are monitored. Mr. Podolski noted that Mr. Titus mentioned that there is a warning system in place for emergencies. Mr. O’Brien was concerned about the circulation going in and out of the building. Mr. Giaimo said this was discussed last summer when operations were discussed. Mr. O’Brien said it was not.

Mr. Bethoney asked how this affected site utilization and the plan that the Board approved outside the building. He asked how 50 cars pulling in and out would affect this, noting that the Planning Board is the one that has purview of this. Mr. Johnson made some suggestions regarding walking, egress/ingress around the vans; the Applicant will comply with them. He was fairly satisfied with the proposal for no more than 50 vans, but wanted the Planning Board to approve this prior to issuing a Certificate of Occupancy. Mr. Bethoney specifically asked how the staging in the front affected the site utilization. Mr. Giaimo said it alleviates the temporary parking in the back on the unpaved area. Other than that, nothing has really changed. Some of the complaints and conflicts people have made about the system have been resolved. Mr. Bethoney said Mr. Johnson told him that there have been no citizen complaints since the last time the Applicant was before the Board. Mr. Bethoney’s concern is safety and whether the operation affects site utilization that the Board had previously approved. Mr. Giaimo said it would not affect it.

Mr. McCarthy said there had been discussion about increasing the number of vans inside the building from the allowed 13. The Applicant wants to use the unpaved tractor trailer spaces for van parking. They have off-site employee parking and parking for vans in Boston. They would use the unpaved spaces, but some of those spaces are designated for tractor trailer parking. They are seeking guidance from the Board as to what it wants so they can change the operation of the site as it relates to the site itself. Mr. Podolski said it is part of the Board’s review of the exterior site. He asked Mr. Mannix if conflicts with the other tenants in the building (Restoration Hardware and Macy’s) have been resolved. There had been a lot of issues with either Amazon employees or vans parking in spots that were not designated for Amazon. He asked for the status on this. Mr. Mannix said these conflicts no longer happen. Amazon has someone who monitors where the cars park during the day, and they have assigned parking (Restoration Hardware and Macy’s do not have assigned parking). The property itself is managed by Transwestern and they monitor the parking. There have been no complaints from the tenants. At one point, a truck broke down. Mr. Podolski was of the understanding that there were a lot of tenant complaints, and asked if it has been resolved. Mr. Mannix said it has. Mr. Aldous said there have been a lot of complaints about the truck drivers, after they left the Amazon building, wanting to rearrange their load for the way they are going to drive. He understood that, but asked if it has been resolved. He cited the Dedham TV building as having issues with this, as well as many residents who had trucks stop in front of their houses to rearrange the loads. Mr. Mannix said these have been resolved. Mr. deBourbon said there were a number of complaints, between tractor-trailers and between the vans rearranging their loads in residential neighborhoods. He recalled a memo that said there were eight complaints. Each item was given an action plan to address the complaints, including the trailers. Each complaint was addressed internally as part of an “eight-point plan” to overall fix their operation. The result is the lack of complaints. Mr. Giaimo said they now have different van vendors, and complaints have stopped.

With regard to idling in the building, Mr. deBourbon said he would be happy to supply letters in support of this. The overnight vans are brought into the building, and are turned off. Vans leave the site at 6:00 a.m. There are signs stating “NO IDLING.” Mr. Podolski said an indoor operations plan needs to be devised. They may have one, but he wants it to be official. Mr. Titus said that sufficient ventilation has been installed when the building was being fitted. There is a CO2 detector with two levels of alarm. Mr. Johnson will investigate whether this is safe for 50 vehicles and give his report to the Board. Mr. Podolski was happy with the Fire Department, Mr. Titus, and the Building Department being fairly comfortable with the situation. He asked for the specifications on the ventilation system. The Fire Department said there is no problem with the water suppression and it is more than adequate. The operation has already been approved by the Building Department.

Mr. Podolski asked getting the outside resolved, i.e., striping, etc. He wondered if their thought was that once they get the vans inside, they would not need to do anything. Mr. Giaimo thought they could get there, but, if not, he will explain who. He said there are a couple of constraints, i.e., they have a particular leased area so anything they did would be within that leased area. They have no place to put the vans except on the site, and it was originally chaotic. They obtained off-site van parking in Boston, which solved a lot of problems. They have still not put the vans on the unpaved area. They understood it was temporary, but they could not do anything about it until there was a solution. This is the solution and the best outcome they can come up with to keep the operation at this location.

Mr. Podolski asked Mr. McCarthy what, from a Town Planner perspective, should be put together to review. He wondered if Mr. Findlen needed to review any of this. Mr. McCarthy said they could put things together in a package, and then they could make an assessment. Mr. Giaimo asked if the Board was comfortable telling Mr. Johnson that it is comfortable with the indoor parking subject to the ventilation and the CO2. They would like to get that process moving so they can get approval from Mr. Johnson. The Board agreed that they were fine. Mr. Findlen asked if there would be any condition for the Applicant to return to the Board in six months for review. Mr. McCarthy said there would not be such a condition. There will be a revised decision, which he will write. Mr. Podolski asked the Board if they want to take Mr. Johnson’s recommendation to allow them to start using overnight parking within the building for no more than 50 vans. The Board as a whole said yes. Mr. Johnson will be apprised of the Board’s decision.

Mr. Bethoney asked if Amazon has participated in any civic engagement. Mr. Giaimo said they have donated school materials. Mr. O’Brien noted that this donation was not solicited.

**Old/New Business**

**Star Market, Dedham Plaza:** They would like permission to install bollards after a recent incident in which a car drove through the front door. The Board voted unanimously to allow them.

**Dunkin Donuts, Sawmill Drive:** **Prior to the beginning of the discussion, Mr. Bethoney made the statement that he is recusing himself from this review or vote. He explained that the agency at which he works has had a professional relationship with the property owner in the past. He left the hearing room.** The Certificate of Action is ready for this. Mr. McCarthy said that one thing that was not in the original certificate was delivery off-hours, and it needs to be added. When deliveries were during the open hours, 18-wheeler trucks would block off the exit. This will correct these issues. The Board of Health is reviewing the trash issue and doing inspections. Mr. O’Brien said they took their barrels away for an unknown reason. Mr. McCarthy spoke with them about that and that they need to have trash barrels due to the nature of the business. Mr. O’Brien also noted that the Dunkin Donuts along Route 1 has trash that has blown over the retaining wall from the drive-thru. Mr. McCarthy will keep in contact with the Board of Health and their efforts. Mr. Spiegel, owner of the Dunkin Donuts on Route 1, will be notified to clean the property. Mr. Podolski said the Certificate of Action will be amended to add off-deliveries by semi-trucks only, and continuous monitoring of trash on site.

**Public Hearing for Zoning Articles:** This will be on March 23, 2017. Mr. Podolski said that everyone needs to attend because the Board will be missing one member. Town Counsel will attend about the marijuana moratorium article.

Mr. Aldous moved to adjourn, seconded by Mr. O’Brien. The vote to adjourn was unanimous at 4-0.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert D. Aldous, Clerk

/snw

1. In the minutes of February 23, 2017, it was incorrectly stated that this application was for Verizon. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)