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**TOWN OF DEDHAM**

**PLANNING BOARD**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Thursday, April 6, 2017, 7 p.m., Lower Conference Room**

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

John R. Bethoney, Vice Chair

Robert D. Aldous, Clerk

Ralph I. Steeves

James E. O’Brien IV

Richard J. McCarthy, Jr., Planning Director

Call to order 7:00 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.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicant:** | **Supreme Development** |
| **Project Address:** | **Schoolmaster Lane, Lot 8, Dedham, MA** |
| **Zoning District:** | Single Residence A |
| **Representative(s):** | Peter A. Zahka II, Esq., 12 School Street, Dedham, MA |

**Prior to the beginning of this meeting, Mr. Podolski made the statement that Mr. Bethoney is recusing himself. He explained that the agency at which he works has had a professional relationship with Mr. Petruzziello, who owns Supreme Development. He was not present in the hearing room and did not participate in any part of this meeting, consideration of the proposal, or signing of the covenant release.**

Mr. Zahka is seeking a covenant release for Lot 8, Schoolmaster Lane. One lot is still being held. The house on Lot 8 is about to be sold. The Applicant will probably be back at the end of the month for another lot release and to give covenants on the other side of the street. The covenant is conditional upon the entire street down to Country Club Road being paved, so it does not make sense to have construction going on after the street is done. The Board had no questions. Mr. Aldous moved to approve the covenant release as presented, seconded by Mr. Steeves. The vote to approve was unanimous at 4-0. The covenant release was signed.

Mr. Bethoney rejoined the Board at 7:04 p.m.

**RECONSIDERATION OF ARTICLE 24**

*To see if the Town will vote to amend the Zoning Bylaw by inserting a new definition in Article 10 for Lodging House, and amending Section 3.1.3 Use Regulations Table, and inserting a new use “Lodging House” as #8 under A. Residential Uses.*

After approving the amendment of Article 24, the Board received an e-mail from Building Commissioner Kenneth Cimeno requesting that the Board reconsider the vote. The original article proposed creation of a bare definition of board/rooming houses. Mr. Cimeno was present to clarify the definition of a boarding house so it can close the gap on some of the bed and breakfast operations that are cropping up. Under Accessory Use in the Zoning Bylaw it allows up to three people, unrelated, as well as family, living in one house. With four or more people, it becomes a boarding, rooming, or lodging house under the law and requires a license from the Board of Selectmen. The Building Department would be able to define it so that these can be regulated in a fashion where they would not be allowed in the residential zoning districts. This is the intent of the bylaw, and he asked the Board to support this to help further define what the limitations of these bed and breakfast operations are. It would put a limit on of not more than three (3) persons unrelated in a dwelling unit. Right now, a boarding, rooming, or lodging house is not specifically defined in the Zoning Bylaw, just generally defined. It is not clear at times when the Building Department is taking someone to court. They need clarity for future enforcement actions.

The Zoning Bylaw definition is in Section 3.1, Accessory Use Table, Residential, I.5: “The regular renting of rooms or the furnishing of table board in a dwelling by the owner-occupant thereof to not more than three (3) persons.” This has been a longstanding bylaw. Mr. Cimeno explained enforcement; when a complaint is received, they investigate it and taken appropriate legal action in court. Mr. Mr. Podolski said that the presentation by Fred Johnson, Assistant Building Inspector, seemed to indicate that he had no way to figure out if there were three or more unrelated people living in a single family dwelling. Mr. Cimeno said that, from a practical standpoint, they have had situations in which they had what they consider illegal boarding houses. In these instances, the Building Department goes before a clerk magistrate or a judge, who assesses the situation. If there are four or more persons in the building, there must be reduction to three and the complaint may be dismissed, or there can be a fine.

Mr. Podolski asked the three person Zoning Bylaw is not being amended instead of creating a new one. Mr. Cimeno said that under Chapter 48, Section 3, the definition of family would include three people who are not related. Mr. Podolski asked why they could not make the boarding room statute the same. Mr. Cimeno said the boarding room/lodging house statute is a State law. Mr. Podolski asked why they could not make the bed and breakfast three or more. Mr. Cimeno said it would then be a boarding house or lodging house that would have to be licensed by the Board of Selectmen and then it would be up to the Town to permit it. Mr. Podolski asked why this would not be acceptable. Mr. Cimeno said it is the will of the Town as to whether it wants to have that. Mr. Podolski said this should wait until the language in the amendment is as strong as possible to protect the Town against bed and breakfast establishments advertising themselves hotels. For instance, the Town of Canton has a bylaw that requires off street parking; the Town of Dedham does not have that. Mr. Cimeno said these establishments would have to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals and the Planning Board, and it would have to be approved like any other use. Mr. Podolski said that the neighbors need to understand that there is regulation in place for up to three people, and this is not being changed. This zoning amendment adds a new category for four or more people.

Mr. Cimeno said there are cases in which bed and breakfast establishments have up to three people. He asked if the Board wanted to further limit this or whether they can limit it. He has looked at other state statutes regarding taxation for these, and these can be for up to five rooms, taxed as a single family dwelling. The State has an exemption on the architectural access. Mr. O’Brien asked about serving food, saying this could be a health risk. Mr. Cimeno said this is why they are trying to regulate it for more than three persons. Under the current Zoning Bylaw, there could be a rooming house for up to three persons, and they could be serving food to those individuals. He has not talked to the Board of Health in this regard. As far as he knows, they do not regulate anything along the food lines. Mr. O’Brien said that, besides the tax issues and that benefit to the Town, there is a health risk and disturbance to the neighborhood. He is a proponent for the Town changing the law and putting more restrictions on the street. Mr. Cimeno has spoken with Town Counsel several times, who said that defining it as a boarding/lodging house requires compliance with definitive regulations. Noncompliance could compel someone to stop illegal activity. Up to now, it has been open-ended. The Building Department could go to court, but they may not always be successful. They are trying to create tighter regulations. They have been receiving multiple complaints from the residents, and he wants to find a way to regulate this.

Mr. Bethoney supported Mr. Cimeno’s recommendation and proposal. Mr. Aldous said he was neutral. Mr. Steeves asked where bed and breakfast establishments were located in Town. Mr. Cimeno said they are in different areas of the Town, i.e., Riverdale, near Legacy Place, Precinct One off High Street, off Court Street, and on Court Street. He has not seen any in Greenlodge or the Manor. The most visible one is at 39 Court Street, which advertises as a bed and breakfast. Mr. Steeves said that people come for the historical aspect of Dedham. He asked if these properties were once rooming houses years ago, but Mr. Cimeno did not know since there are no records before 1941. He assumed that it was a single family dwelling. Mr. Steeves said that there are several single family dwellings on Court Street that have a fair amount of history. He said he would think that someone visiting Dedham would want to stay in a historical house. Mr. O’Brien clarified the dwellings. Church Street had a blacksmith shop and a Chinese laundromat. There were a lot of boarding houses, and the area was commercialized. His problem is that 39 Court Street advertises on the Internet as a hotel called French Welcome. Mr. Steeves agreed that they should not advertise as this.

Marie-Louise Kehoe, 858 High Street: She has been working with the neighbors for a few months, and said this is a very serious issue in the neighborhood and an imposition on the residents. *She was very difficult to hear because she was so far from the microphone and spoke softly.* She said that one resident had someone from France knocking on his door, thinking it was the French Welcome. She said this cannot continue. She understood what the Board was trying to do, and said the Town needs to remove this illegal use. If the Town desires, they could be allowed, through the Planning Board, to be located in a properly zoned district. It is, at this time, an infringement on the neighbors due to the traffic and music. She welcomed anything the Board could do to prevent this. She said that the Board of Health is looking into it as a possible violation of their rules and regulations. She said that French Welcome advertises nationally and internationally.

Mr. Podolski said that no district will be allowed to have a lodging/boarding house of four or more unrelated people. This article is the first definition of this type of housing. By putting it at four or more, it is hoped that it addresses the very issue that the neighborhood wants, that it is basically operating a business out of a single family dwelling. This is what the Board is trying to prevent. However, he was not sure how the Building Department would enforce it since there are difficulties enforcing three persons. Proving it is the problem.

Mr. Cimeno said there have not been many problems with boarding houses lately. There have been problems with a couple of properties (Whiting Avenue and another one in East Dedham, which was a long ongoing problem), but it is not prevalent, and he wants to keep it that way. Bed and breakfast establishments have been a new phenomenon recently. They are trying to strike a balance between what is currently allowed and cutting off lodging/boarding houses, which are well defined under State law. He is trying to get clarification from legal counsel on what exactly a hotel is from a licensing standpoint in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Hotels, motels, and inns need to be licensed by the Board of Selectmen pursuant to State law, and he is trying to get clarification on that. There is no specific definition as to what a hotel is under the definition of the requirement for an inn holder’s license. It does not give the quantity of rooms or quantity of persons, so he is trying to get clarification from Town Counsel as to what the threshold is. The more tools he has to go to court, the better chance there is to restrain or stop these places; without the tools, he will lose cases. He noted that historical buildings have been converted, i.e., Norfolk Inn. The future may change the bylaw for provisions like these. However, he first needs a good, clear definition.

Tanya Holton, 30 Court Street: *She was very difficult to hear because she was so far from the microphone and spoke softly.* She thanked the Board for the attempt to strengthen the law. She noted that 39 Court Street was a single family dwelling, and has been for a very long time. Mr. Podolski acknowledged that she was the impetus for this amendment. She said understood Mr. Cimeno’s suggestion that the Town will be operating under the existing bylaw of three unrelated, and there will be an additional provision to the bylaw, lodging with four or more unrelated people not permitted in any zoning district. She said she understood, felt comfortable, and that it addressed her concerns. *She spoke further, but* *she was very difficult to hear because she was so far from the microphone and spoke very softly.*

Mr. Podolski said that if this amendment does not work well, it will be re-defined further. There will also probably be the need to further define what makes up a hotel. Mr. Cimeno said that if the State definition says more than five rooms or five or more, he will not have, from a licensing standpoint, the tool to use to fight these. It can be inserted once the State definition is determined. He said that he does not want a judge to say it is not permitted by Dedham’s bylaw, but the State law defines it differently and is contrary to Dedham’s. He said that Town bylaws should stand on their own, but judges look at all the information and come up with a decision. Therefore, he needs as many tools as possible to try to define correctly.

Mr. Podolski stated for the record that the advice of Town Counsel is that the Planning Board can continue to revise and review this warrant article up to the point of Town Meeting even though it has closed the Public Hearing, thereby putting it in the exact format they want for Town Meeting. Mr. Cimeno feels that he can enforce the bylaw at four or more; the Board will do what he wants. He also said that off-street parking needs to be addressed sooner rather than later. Single family dwellings are exempt from the parking bylaw, but not if they are lodging houses. Several years ago, he had asked for a change to require parking for multifamily properties because he felt that there was lack of enforcement in having people who owned these provide off-street parking. There needs to be an enforceable bylaw, and he wants as much clarification in this as possible for legal issues.

Howard Ostroff, 24 Court Street: He said that if anyone wanted to see the conditions and issues with 39 Court Street, they could go to Hotels.com, Trip Advisor, AirBNB, etc., and look at the reviews for French Welcome. He is a Town Meeting member, and asked for clarification on what Article 24 is right now. He asked if it will be amended and whether it would be a prohibition. Mr. Podolski said that, right now, there is no lodging house definition in the Zoning Bylaw. They are adding one at this Town Meeting. The use table shows that it is not allowed in any district. He believes that this amendment will give Mr. Cimeno much more legal authority. Mr. Ostroff said that the other issue is that hotels have no issues with food. Mr. Podolski said they are regulated by the Board of Health. A lodging house would need to discuss this with the Board of Health.

Darcy Lane, 45 Court Street: She lives next door to French Welcome. *She spoke but* *was very difficult to hear because she was so far from the microphone and spoke fast and very softly.* She has received people at her doorbell at night looking for French Welcome. In the General Law, it clearly defines lodging house as “a house where lodgings are let to four or more persons not within second degree of kindred to the person conducting it.” *She spoke further, but* *she was very difficult to hear because she was so far from the microphone and spoke very fast and softly.* Her concern is that she does not understand why there is a State law, and something additional has to be put in the Town of Dedham Zoning Bylaw if it has already been identified in the State law. Mr. Cimeno said it is strictly from a licensing standpoint. There may be a violation there right now as to the operation of the building as a lodging house under Massachusetts General Law. When he tries to take things to court, he takes them from a zoning standpoint, and he also informs Town Counsel to take it in violation of every applicable bylaw that is proper. He is trying to get as much enforcement power as possible.

*Mrs. Kehoe spoke, but could not be understood because she spoke softly and at a distance from the microphone.* The question was, if the bylaw passed and is approved by the Attorney General, the Building Commissioner can go to court the next day. Mr. Podolski agreed, saying it is a zoning violation, but the owner of French Welcome has a licensing violation. He said this may result in a two-prong attack: go to the Board of Selectmen for the violation of State law licensing. They could go to the Board of Selectmen and tell them they are in violation of State law licensing. *Ms. Darcy* *spoke further, but could not be understood.* She has brought this to the attention of the Board of Health, and they are working on it. Mr. Cimeno has also asked Town Counsel to put together what this type of entity is and what it is not. If it is before this whole process ends with the zoning change, Town Counsel said he would have to go to court without the zoning issue. If Town Counsel said to wait, he will do so.

Darcy Lane, 45 Court Street: She asked if a husband and wife shared a room; they are technically unrelated. She asked if this would be the case if they were not related to the owner. Mr. Cimeno said there is a definition of family in the Zoning Bylaw that clearly states what a family is. If a person owns the house by himself, or if he leases the house, under the current Zoning Bylaw, he is allowed, by himself, to have three unmarried people living with him. That would be four people in total. If he lived by himself and is the owner of record, lessee, or renter of the house, there would be four people living collectively in the house without a violation of the Zoning Bylaw. This is common. In the case of a husband, wife, and children, this would be a family, and three persons unrelated could live with them as a family. There are other definitions of family and other types of families, i.e., foster children living with a married couple. He reviewed other types of situations and other types of families as well. It is to be noted that the bylaw is not retroactive.

Marie-Louise Kehoe, 858 High Street: She asked whether, with publicity and the neighbors’ testimony, if this would be enough to take them to court, and if the bylaw passes and is accepted by the Attorney General, whether Mr. Cimeno would take them to court the next day. She said that the Board of Health is working on this.

Mr. O’Brien said the owners of 39 Court Street say very clearly what they are, which is a hotel. They get ratings and bookings. Mr. Podolski said Mr. Cimeno needs more before he goes to court. He read Article 24 for the record. He asked Mr. Podolski if he had had the article reviewed by Town Counsel. Mr. McCarthy said they had. Ms. Lane said the definition should be consistent with that of the state stature. Mr. Podolski asked about referring to the state stature, which is in Chapter 62 of the Massachusetts General Law. Mr. Podolski suggested that the following be added: “…unrelated as defined in State law.” Mr. McCarthy said they worked closely with Town Counsel on the language. He said that fine tuning is not always the best way, and he is hesitant to make another amendment.

Mr. Podolski will talk with Town Counsel about the proposed language “as defined in State law.” As he said previously, the Board can continue to revise the article right up to Town Meeting. He suggested that the language be circulated to the neighborhood. This will be put on the April 13, 2017, agenda. They will check in with Mr. McCarthy regarding Town Counsel’s opinion.

**Consideration of Adding an Associate Planning Board Member**

Mr. Podolski said that, under the current Zoning Bylaw, the Board is allowed to add a person to the Planning Board as an associate member for Special Permits only. Michelle Kayserman, who is interested in the position, was present for this discussion. Mr. Podolski asked the Board if it wanted to add an associate Planning Board member at this time. If the Board decides that it does not want an associate member at this time, they will not go forward with opening the position.

Mr. Aldous noted that an associate member could only talk officially if a member is missing. That would mean that the associate member would have to attend every meeting for a Special Permit but could not speak. He said this is why the last associate member left. Mr. Aldous wants to be sure that applicants know that, or the Board should change how it handles it. Mr. Podolski said the original intent was for the associate member to be present for large scale meetings and large scale projects when a member could not be present or was ill at a time when the Board needed a supermajority vote of four. This was the purpose for the associate member. In his opinion, that situation is not present at this time, so he did not think it was needed at this time. Mr. McCarthy said that in the absence of a member, the Board would have a fifth member. He said the Board could have a supermajority as opposed to a unanimous vote to approve a Special Permit. Mr. O’Brien said the language may need to be changed. He could see a situation in which the associate member may have specific skills or education that could help, i.e., Master Plan experience, noting that one of the candidates has been working on a Master Plan. Mr. Steeves disagreed, saying that Mr. O’Brien serves on the Master Plan. Mr. Podolski said this is exactly what the bylaw does not allow. The Board cannot appoint an associate member to sit on the Master Plan; it can only be for Special Permits. Mr. McCarthy said that the associate member by statute is just to be able to fill in on Special Permits. Mr. Podolski suggested amending the bylaw if the Board so chose to do so. Mr. Bethoney said it is statutorily not allowed. Mr. McCarthy said the scope of what an associate member could do is by statute. Mr. Steeves said he has missed meetings, and has never heard that this is a problem. He said that every member has missed a meeting from time to time. He said the Board works fine without an associate member, and he does not see why it is necessary.

Mr. Podolski said that the statute said an associate member could be used only for a Special Permit project, so the Board does not need one. Mr. O’Brien said that any associate member would need to be educated by the Board. Mr. Aldous thought there should be an associate member, but the bylaw needed to be changed to make it worthwhile for that person to be an associate. Mr. Podolski asked Mr. McCarthy to research the statute on this. If it says that the Board can only use an associate member for Special Permit projects, it is not necessary unless the Board knows that one of its members will either be gone from the Board or he will be out for an extended period of time before the hearings start. Mr. McCarthy said this is his understanding. He said he really did not need to research it; he knows from his own practice and education that it is just for Special Permits, nothing else. Other actions the Board takes just need a majority vote; Special Permits need a supermajority vote. Mr. Bethoney appreciated anyone’s interest in wanting to be an associate member. The reason there was an associate member for Hebrew Senior Life was really at the request of the Applicant, who was spending hundreds of thousands of dollars to go through the permitting process. They were concerned that something might happen to one of the members, in which case the application would have to start all over. The Board appointed an associate member specifically for that Special Permit project. However, this associate could not do anything because no one on the Board was absent. The Planning Board is not a young board, and this has been discussed in the past.

Mr. Podolski polled the Board individually. He, Mr. Bethoney, Mr. O’Brien, Mr. Aldous, and Mr. Steeves all agreed not to add an associate member at this time.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicant:** | **Boston Bread d/b/a Panera Bread** |
| **Project Address:** | **725 Providence Highway, Dedham, MA** |
| **Zoning District:** | Highway Business |
| **Representative(s):** | * Kevin F. Hampe, Esq., 411 Washington Street, Dedham, MA * David Webster, Director of Development, Federal Realty Investment Trust, 450 Artisan Way, Suite 320, Somerville, MA  02145 * Jason Berg, Director of Construction, Panera Bread * David J. LaPointe, RLA, LEED AP, Beals and Thomas, Reservoir Corporate Center, 144 Turnpike Road, Southborough, MA 01772 |
| **Town Consultant:** | Philip Viveiros, P.E., PTOE, McMahon Associates |

Mr. Hampe and his team returned for site plan review. They have taken the Board’s advice and made new plans and a new design that is more aesthetically pleasing. They saw the Design Review Advisory Board last evening, who made recommendations regarding signage, an additional window, and coloring on the awnings.

Mr. Berg presented a sample of full brick (originally this was to be half-brick, but the Board did not like that), which measured 2¼” x 3 5/8” x 7 5/8.” This will be on most of the building except for a wall feature that juts out. This will be tile measuring 6” x 48” long. They will have canopies to add more depth to the building.

Mr. Berg met with Building Commissioner Kenneth Cimeno, the Board of Health, Department of Public Works, and Engineering, and one of the concerns was the distance from the service door to the trash corral. This will now be located closer to the inside of the plaza. DRAB raised concerns about the raised concrete beds matching the EIFS on the building, and they will do that. DRAB also proposed another window facing Route 1, and the Applicant will return to DRAB with this change. DRAB had also been concerned about the awning design, wanting a solid color. Mr. Berg will return to them for this as well.

There has not been any official discussion about signage. The Sign Code for the Dedham Plaza does not allow anything for an out lot because there have been none to date. Mr. Berg understood that this will require a waiver. This will be fleshed out. DRAB suggested reducing the quantity of the drive-thru signs and bringing them closer or incorporating them with the Panera Bread sign itself. Mr. Berg will return with that. He was told that the sign cannot exceed the roof height (not the parapet height). If the sign was put below the roof height, the sign would become linear, and the font would become extremely small. Raising it has a positive effect on the building as well, regardless of the sign. DRAB recommended that they seek a waiver from the Sign Code from the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Landscaping plans were not available, although renderings were shown. Mr. McCarthy noted that some of the landscaping on the renderings will not actually be there. Mr. Bethoney asked if the landscaping will look like the renderings, and it will not. Mr. Hampe said that there is not enough room for what is shown. The distance between the side of the drive-thru aisle and Route 1 will be approximately 270 (?) feet. Mr. Webster said there will be new landscaping throughout the property. Mr. McCarthy said that by changing the rear door, the sidewalk will not be needed along the rear of the drive-thru. This will allow for more landscaping. Mr. Podolski asked if they would need a waiver for landscaping, and they said they would not.

Mr. LaPointe presented a board that showed examples of the plant material proposed throughout the Plaza, not just Panera. There will be a variety of trees in some locations, a lot of ornamental grasses, and evergreen shrubs, i.e., broadleaf evergreens or deciduous evergreens. They propose some trees along Route 1. Mr. Podolski said this would shield the look of people coming through the drive-thru. This will be discussed. Mr. LaPointe said they have a landscape plan, but did not bring it to the meeting. There will be no rain gardens. The existing vegetation will be spruced up.

Mr. Bethoney asked what the major differences will be between what is existing and what is on the plan, notwithstanding the Panera site. Mr. LaPointe said that the islands, for the most part, are all remaining the same. They are creating islands and adding a walkway for pedestrian access from the lower parking lot to the Plaza building, but the other islands will remain. The vegetation will be removed and replaced with a new planting scheme. There will be some lawn or ground cover adjacent to the walkways. The area along Route 1 from the entrance down will remain the same in terms of islands. No curbs will be changed there.

Mr. Bethoney said that the proposal does not look like the rendering that they brought in. Mr. Webster said this was rendered by an architect in Missouri to show the Board the building. *Mr. Webster’s other comment could not be heard.* Mr. Bethoney asked why they could not do the design on the entire site that is shown on the rendering. Mr. Webster said it looks like a much more difficult landscape plan to maintain. The materials they will use will be hardier. Mr. Bethoney gave an example of excellent landscaping at 280 Bridge Street, which had been vacant since 1987. The previous plantings, which had been there for years, looked like what is at the Plaza. They changed the entire landscaping design, added irrigation, etc. It changed the whole dynamic of the site and brought more tenants. Without an existing landscape plan, the Board cannot determine what is already there and what will be added or changed. Mr. Podolski suggested a drone photograph of the property so they can see what it looks like now.

Mr. Aldous said that the area where cars come out onto Route 1 near Panera has what look like large bushes. In the area near the street, they need to have what is known as Aldous bushes. These are shorter bushes that allow a good sight line. Mr. Podolski liked the rendering of the landscaping. Mr. Steeves asked when the rest of the site will be completed. Mr. Webster said it would be about two years. Mr. Podolski said that this will be discussed later. He said the façade looks 100% better when you drive by. He said the rest of the lot should be up to snuff as quickly as possible.

Mr. Hampe said that the first peer review showed 22 issues on the site plan. The last two issues have been addressed; McMahon is reviewing their response. The meeting yesterday brought up more comments, i.e., the distance from the back door to the dumpsters. These were resolved. They now do not need a sidewalk in the back, so they will add landscaping. They have also reviewed the traffic peer review, and there are no issues. They will present this at the next meeting. Mr. Viveiros said they distributed the traffic report today, and will give the Board a copy of this. This will go out tomorrow, and it will be reviewed at the next meeting on April 13, 2017. They are requesting a waiver for additional parking for Panera. They gave him a stamped lighting plan, which was fine. Information on the auto turn came in today. There may be some changes to the internal walkways per Engineering. He is waiting to review this. The next meeting will be for traffic, not site related. Mr. Bethoney asked that they use as many bushes and traditional landscaping as possible, and the fewest amount of grass.

**Minor Modification, 19 Court Street:** The applicant wants to add a gate to the existing fence. Mr. Aldous moved to consider this a minor modification, seconded by Mr. Bethoney. The vote was unanimous at 5-0. The Board will vote on this at the next meeting.

**Town of Dedham Presentation by MAPC:** This will happen at the May 11, 2017, meeting.

**Reappointment of John Haven to Design Review Advisory Board:** Mr. Steeves moved to reappoint Mr. Haven, seconded by Mr. Bethoney. The vote to reappoint was unanimous, 5-0.

Mr. Bethoney moved to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Steeves. The vote was unanimous at 5-0. The meeting ended at 8:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert D. Aldous, Clerk

/snw