

TOWN OF DEDHAM
COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS



Members

Scott M. Steeves, Chair
Sara Rosenthal, AIA, LEED AP, Vice Chair
J. Gregory Jacobsen
Jason L. Mammone, P.E.
Tom Ryan, Esquire

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

George Panagopoulos
Andrew Pepoli

Dedham Town Hall
450 Washington Street
Dedham, MA 02026-4458
Phone 781-751-9242
Fax 781-751-9225

Jeremy Rosenberger
Town Planner
jrosenberger@dedham-ma.gov

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
MINUTES

Wednesday, October 21, 2020, 7:00 p.m.
Remote meeting by Zoom

Present: Scott M. Steeves, Chair
Sara Rosenthal, AIA, LEED AP, NCARB, Vice Chair
J. Gregory Jacobsen
Jason L. Mammone, P.E.
Tom Ryan, Esq., Member
Andrew Pepoli, Associate Member

Not Present: Acting Member, George Panagopoulos

Staff: Jeremy Rosenberger, Town Planner
Jennifer Doherty, Administrative Assistant
Michelle Tinger, Community Planning and Engagement Specialist

The meeting began at **7:00 p.m.** on the night of **Wednesday, October 21, 2020.**

The Chairman opened the meeting by reading the following statement: Pursuant to Governor Baker's March 12, 2020 Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A, §18, and the Governor's March 15, 2020 Order imposing strict limitations on the number of people that may gather in one place, this meeting of the Town of Dedham's Zoning Board of Appeals is being conducted via remote participation by video meeting. No in-person attendance of members of the public will be permitted, but every

effort will be made to ensure that the public can adequately access the proceedings as provided for in the Order. A reminder that persons who would like to listen to this meeting while in progress may do so by dialing toll-free, 1-646-558-8656. The access code is 919 7002 0615. Again, the toll-free number is free 1-646-558-8656 . The access code is 919 7002 0615 . The meeting was also being recorded. The Chairman then reviewed video procedures and policy.

The Chairman then asked for a roll call of the attendees. In attendance on the conference call were:

Vice Chair, Sara Rosenthal

Member, Jason Mammone

Member, Gregory Jacobsen

Member, Tom Ryan

Associate Member, Andrew Pepoli

Chairman, Scott Steeves

Planning Director, Town of Dedham: Jeremy Rosenberger

Planning Administrative Assistant: Jennifer Doherty

Community Planning and Engagement specialist for the Town of Dedham: Michelle Tinger

Not in attendance: Associate Member, George Panagopoulos

The Chairman continued with the first applicant:

322-326 Washington Street

Applicant:	Petruzziello Properties, LLC
Project Address:	322-326 Washington Street/25 & 27 Harris Street,
Zoning District, Map/Lot:	Central Business Zoning District (CB), Map/Lot 93-119, Map 93-120, Map 93-121, and Map 93-122
Legal Notice:	Requests a Special Permit for a drive teller/ATM as part of a proposed new free-standing bank building.

	The +/- 10,142 sq. ft. property is located at 322 & 326 Washington Street/Dedham, MA
Section of Zoning Bylaw:	<i>The Town of Dedham Bylaw Sections 3.1, 9.2, 9.3, and Table 1.</i>

On the video call for the applicant were Giorgio Petruzziello, and Peter Zahka, Attorney for the applicant. James White, from Needham Bank, Ken Cram, Traffic Engineer, John Getherall from GCG Associates, civil engineer. Attorney Zahka explained the project and indicated that it had gone to the Planning Board and was still before them. He explained the project in detail:

Petruzziello Properties, LLC (the “Applicant”) proposes to construct a new one-story free-standing bank building for Needham Bank with a 2-lane drive-through (one for a teller window and one for an automatic teller machine (“ATM”) at the real estate known and numbered as 322 & 326 Washington Street/25 & 27 Harris Street, Dedham, MA (hereinafter referred to as the “Subject Property”). The Subject Property is shown on Dedham Assessors’ Map 93, Lot 119, Map 93, Lot 120, Map 93, Lot 121, and Map 93, Lot 122. The Subject Property contains approximately 10,142 square feet of land¹ with approximately 110.63 feet of frontage on Washington Street and approximately 126.84 feet of frontage on Harris Street. The Subject Property is currently occupied by C&T Paint and Patriot Motors. According to the Dedham Zoning Map, the Subject Property is located in the Central Business (CB) Zoning District.

The Applicant proposes to demolish the existing buildings and contact a new one-story free-standing building to be occupied by Needham Bank. The proposed building will have approximately 1,879 gross square feet/1,380 net square feet of floor area on the first/street level, and approximately 1,177 gross square feet/240 net square feet of floor area in the basement/sub-level. The first floor will consist of typical bank related space including lobby, teller’s counter, offices and conference room. The basement/sub-level will consist of a storage room, a break room, and mechanical and electrical rooms. There will also be a 2-lane drive-through for a teller window and automatic teller machine (ATM). The canopy over the drive-through will be approximately 16’ x 34’. The building will be served by a parking lot with 10 parking spaces. Circulation throughout the site will be one-way. There will be two one-way curb-cuts serving Project: (1) an entrance only from Harris Street and (2) an exit only from Washington Street.

As part of the Project Applicant will be installing new sidewalks in front of the Subject Property (on both Washington Street and Harris Street). In addition, Applicant is coordinating with the Town of Dedham Department of Public Works relative to installation of

¹ The 10,142 square feet of land is per Applicant’s survey. According to the records maintained by the Dedham Board of Assessors, the Subject Property is shown as containing approximately 10,125 square feet of land.

new cross walks across Washington Street and Harris Street as well as other improvements to the intersection. Furthermore, Applicant has been in communication with Ever-source relative to the possible removal of telephone poles and placement of utility wires underground.

The Zoning Analysis showed that Table 1 (“Use Regulation Table”) of the Dedham Zoning By-Law provides that a “bank or financial institution” is allowed as of right in the CB Zoning District. Per said Table 1, “drive-through facilities” are allowed in the CB Zoning District upon issuance of a special permit. The Applicant has submitted an application to the ZBA for the aforesaid special permit.

Table 2 (“Table of Dimensional Requirements”) of the Dedham Zoning By-Law sets forth the various dimensional requirements for building lots in the different zoning districts within the Town. Per said Table 2, (except for one-family and two-family dwellings,) there are no lot area, frontage, or front, rear, or side yard setback requirements in the CB Zoning District. In fact, the only dimensional requirements applicable to the CB Zoning District are (a) maximum lot coverage of 80% and (b) maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 240%. The Project is well below both of these maximum requirements. The following table shows the Project’s compliance with the Dedham Zoning By-Law dimensional requirements for the CB Zoning District:

	REQUIRED	PROPOSED
MIN. LOT AREA	N/A	10,142 Sf
MIN. LOT FRONTAGE	N/A	110.63 FEET ²
MIN. FRONT SETBACK	N/A ³	4 FEET
MIN. REAR SETBACK	N/A	54.21 FEET
MIN. SIDE SETBACK	N/A	2.66 FEET
MAX. LOT COVER- AGE⁴	80% [8,111 SF]	23.4% [2,423 SF] ⁵

² For this Memorandum, it is assumed that Washington Street is considered the legal frontage. There is also 126.84 feet of frontage on Harris Street.

³ Footnote 2 to the Table of Dimensional Requirements provides for a front yard setback of “10 ft. for any part of a building within 200 ft. of a residence district boundary abutting on the same street, measured parallel to said street, and 20 ft. from Ames St. north of Charles River, Washington Street north of Wigwam Brook, and Court Street.

⁴ “Lot coverage” applies only to buildings and structures (not paved parking areas). The maximum allowed lot coverage at the Subject Property is approximately 8,111 square feet (i.e. 10,142 x .8 = 8,111.36).

⁵ For purposes of this Memorandum, the lot coverage calculation includes the building footprint (1,879 sf) and the canopy (544 sf). The lot coverage for the Project is calculated to be 24.4% (i.e., (1,879 + 544)/10,142) = 2,423/10,142 = 23.89%).

FLOOR AREA RATIO⁶	240% [24,340 SF]	16% [1,908 SF] ⁷
-------------------------------------	------------------	-----------------------------

Table 3 (“Dedham Parking Table”) of the Dedham Zoning By-Law provides that “banks” require 1 parking space per 200 square feet of net floor area on the first floor and 1 parking space per 300 square feet of net floor area on floor “above the ground floor”. As stated above, the first floor of the proposed building has a net floor area of 1,380 square feet and the basement has a net floor area of 240 square feet. Therefore, the proposed building requires 9 parking spaces⁸. As shown on the submitted plans, the building is served by 10 parking spaces.

Except as noted herein, the Project satisfies the Parking Lot Design Standards set forth in Section 5.1.7 of the Dedham Zoning By-Law. As required by Section 5.1.7.1 of the Dedham Zoning By-Law, seven (7) of the angle parking spaces are 9’ x 18’ with a 1.5’ overhang, two (2) parking spaces are 9’ x 18’ compact spaces, and the ADA compliant parking space is 8’ x 18 with 1.5-foot overhang⁹. As noted above, all aisles are one-way. In conformance with Section 5.1.7.2 of the Dedham Zoning By-Law, the aisle along the parking spaces at a 70-degree angle is 19 feet wide and the aisle along the parking spaces at a 45-degree angle is 17 feet wide. Section 5.1.7.3 of the Dedham Zoning By-Law provides that driveways for one-way travel shall not be less than 10 feet wide and not more than 15 feet wide. As shown on the plans, the driveway (curb-cut) on Washington Street is 12 feet wide, the driveway (curb-cut) on Harris Street serving the 2-lane drive-through is 18 feet wide and the driveway (curb-cut) on Harris Street serving the parking lot is 16 feet wide. Accordingly, it appears the Harris Street driveways (curb-cuts) will need a waiver.

Arguably, the landscaping requirements set forth in Section 5.2 of the Dedham Zoning By-Law Project are not applicable to this Project (or would not be if the Applicant deleted 1 parking space). Section 5.2.1 of the Dedham Zoning By-Law provides that “the requirements of this subsection shall apply to any proposed outdoor parking lots for 10 or more parking spaces.” While the Project is being served by 10 parking spaces, as detailed above the Project only requires 9 parking spaces. Technically, with 10 parking spaces, the Project would be subject to the landscaping requirements. In lieu of eliminating a parking space, however, Applicant submits that the Project is best served with 10 parking spaces and with the landscaping as described further herein.

⁶ FAR is the ratio of the “net” floor area of the building to the lot area. The maximum allowed FAR at the Subject Property is approximately 24,340 square feet (i.e., 10,142 x 240% = 24,340.8).

⁷ The FAR for this Project is 18.81% (i.e., (1,380 + 240)/10,142) = (1,620/10,142) = 15.97%).

⁸ The parking space requirement for the Project is 9 parking spaces (i.e., (1,380 + 240)/200 = 1,620/200 = 8.1). It is noted, however, that if the parking for the basement was calculated at 1 space/300 nsf, the Project would only require 7.7 (i.e., 8) parking spaces.

⁹ While the ADA compliant space is only 8 feet wide, the same also contains an 8-foot-wide adjacent “striped” space.

There is no frontage landscaping requirement in the CB Zoning District. However, as requested by the Planning Board at the scoping session, Applicant has relocated the building in order to provide a 4-foot to 5-foot landscape area along the Washington Street frontage. As a result of this relocation of the building, Applicant is unable to provide the 5-foot perimeter landscaping required under Section 5.2.2.3 of the Dedham Zoning By-Law. In addition, Applicant is providing interior landscaping of approximately 8.6% instead of the 15% required under Section 5.2.2.2 of the Dedham Zoning By-Law. Applicant notes that the Project is in the Dedham Square area and that it was critical to provide sufficient space on the site for snow storage.

Applicant has submitted a Traffic Report prepared by Bayside Engineering. Said Traffic Report indicates that the Project is anticipated to generate a total of 288 vehicle trips (144 vehicles entering and 144 vehicles exiting) on a typical weekday with a total of 27 vehicle trips (16 vehicles entering and 11 vehicles exiting) during the weekday morning peak hour and a total of 58 vehicles (29 vehicles entering and 29 vehicles exiting) during the evening peak hour. In addition, the report indicates a maximum of 4 vehicle queue in the drive-through lane.

Inasmuch as the Project does not involve the creation of more than 5,000 square feet of gross floor area, or a change of use to more than 5,000 square feet of gross floor area which requires the addition of more parking spaces, the Project requires Minor Site Plan Review and approval by the Dedham Planning Board under Section 9.5 of the Dedham Zoning By-Law. The only significant difference between Major and Minor Site Plan Review is that Major Site Plan Review requires the submittal of a traffic report. As noted above, although not required for Minor Site Plan Review Applicant has submitted a traffic report.

As described above, Applicant respectfully requests the following waivers:

1. **Request:** A waiver from Section 5.1.7.1 of the Dedham Zoning By-Law to allow the ADA compliant space to have a width of 8 feet instead of the required 9 feet. **Rationale:** The aforesaid parking space is ADA compliant but is 1 foot short of the required width of parking spaces under the Dedham Zoning By-Law. However, as required for ADA parking space, there is an adjacent “striped” space with a width of 8 feet. Therefore, the overall parking “area” for the ADA parking space is 16 feet.
2. **Request:** A waiver from Section 5.1.7.3 of the Dedham Zoning By-Law to allow driveways for one-way traffic to have widths of 16 feet and 18 feet instead of the maximum 15 feet. **Rationale:** The Dedham Zoning By-Law provides that one-way driveways may have a width of not less than 10 feet and not more than 15 feet. The Project provides one-way driveways with a width of 16 feet and 18 feet. The 18-foot driveway is for a 2-lane drive-through and will allow for extra room for users of the same. The 16-foot sidewalk will allow for easy entering the parking lot.

3. **Request:** A waiver from Section 5.2.2.3 of the Dedham Zoning By-Law to allow the parking lot to have 10 parking spaces and perimeter landscaping to be less than 5 feet as shown on the plans.
Rationale: Per the Planning Board's request/suggestion, the building has been re-located to provide 4-5 feet of frontage landscaping. Such frontage landscaping is not required in a CB Zoning District. This re-location of the building, however, impacts the ability to provide the required perimeter landscaping. Furthermore, Applicant could eliminate 1 parking space and avoid be subject to the requirements of Section 5.2.2.3.
4. **Request:** A waiver of Section 5.2.2.2 of the Dedham Zoning By-Law to allow the interior landscaping to be 8.6 % instead of the required 15%.
Rationale: As noted above, the building has been re-located to allow frontage landscaping which has reduced areas within the parking area for landscaping. In addition, given the location of the Subject Property within the Dedham Square, Applicant felt it was extremely important to maintain sufficient area for snow storage. Furthermore, Applicant could eliminate 1 parking space and avoid be subject to the requirements of Section 5.2.2.2.
5. **Request:** A waiver of Section 9.5.4.13 of the Dedham Zoning Board to eliminate the requirement of a polar diagram.
Rationale: No lights are proposed in the parking lot and the Subject Property is located at a well-lit intersection.

Jason Mammone asked if the traffic engineer could discuss some of the trip generation data for traffic at the site. Ken Cram assumed 15 vehicles would use the drive thru during the peak periods. Unfortunately, the data would not be exactly the same as the drive thru that was being used since it was a shared drive thru teller and ATM, whereas these would be separated. The worst-case scenario would be four cars total in one lane, or two and two, according to their calculations.

Jason Mammone also asked about signage in case of back up in the drive thru. He wished for there to be signage indicating to people to park in the parking lot in case of a four car back up. He wanted to make sure there was no traffic backing up onto Harris Street. The applicant agreed there would be.

Sara Rosenthal had a question about the curb cuts. Were they flush with the street, for pedestrians wishing to cross would there be adequate indication of the changes from a sidewalk to a street? The applicant indicated yes there would be.

Andrew Pepoli asked what other measures were being taken to ensure no impact to walkability for pedestrians along Washington Street? Attorney Zahka felt they were greatly improving walkability with the addition of the sidewalk and other measures the Planning Board were taking to ensure pedestrian safety.

Mr. Pepoli also asked if there would be any lights to give a visual cue as to a car coming for pedestrians? Attorney Zahka explained that as of right now there is not, but that could change with further Planning Board review.

Chairman Steeves asked if there was any member of the public who wished to speak? There were none.

A motion was made by Greg Jacobsen to grant a Special Permit, and the motion was seconded by Sara Rosenthal. A roll call vote was taken:

Sara Rosenthal – yes

Jason Mammone – yes

Greg Jacobsen – yes

Tom Ryan – yes

Scott Steeves – yes

The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

At the request of the attorney the Chairman asked for a motion to close the public hearing.

A motion was made by Greg Jacobsen to close the public hearing, and the motion was seconded by Sara Rosenthal. A roll call vote was taken:

Sara Rosenthal – yes

Jason Mammone – yes

Greg Jacobsen – yes

Tom Ryan – yes

Scott Steeves – yes

The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

300 Legacy Place – Whole Foods Market

Applicant:	Whole Foods Market
Project Address:	300 Legacy Place
Zoning District, Map/Lot:	Research Development & Office Zoning District (RDO), Map/Lot 162-1
Legal Notice:	Requests a Special Permit to house a temporary trailer behind Whole Foods Market on property owned by WS Development.
Section of Zoning Bylaw:	<i>Town of Dedham Zoning Bylaw Sections 3.2.1, 9.2 and 9.3.</i>

Dave Phillipone, the general manager of Whole Foods Market in Dedham, was on the video call. As in previous years the applicant was requesting a Special Permit to have refrigerated trailers to house turkeys and catering orders. They would be arriving two weeks before the Thanksgiving and would be removed shortly after.

There were no members of the public who wished to speak on this application.

A motion was made by Greg Jacobsen to approve a Special Permit, the motion was seconded by Sara Rosenthal. A roll call vote was taken.

Sara Rosenthal – yes

Jason Mammone – yes

Greg Jacobsen – yes

Tom Ryan – yes

Scott Steeves – yes

The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

70 Hastings Road

Applicant:	Joseph Federico
Project Address:	70 Hastings Road
Zoning District, Map/Lot:	Single Residence B Zoning District (SRB), Map 182 Lot 91
Legal Notice:	Requests a Variance to exceed the minimum side yard requirement of 10 ft. (8.7 ft. proposed) to accommodate fireplace.
Section of Zoning Bylaw:	<i>Town of Dedham Zoning Bylaw Sections 9.2, 9.3 and Table 2.</i>

Joe Federico was on the video call for the application. The applicant explained that when he had been before the Board last time, there was a discrepancy between the site plan and the architectural plan. The error had been on the site plan as it did not show the 2 foot by 6-foot bump-out for the fireplace. The Building Permit had been issued and the foundation put down and then they found out it encroached into the side yard allowable.

Jason Mammone had a question as to the actual footage proposed. The plans stated it was 8.5 feet, and the legal notice stated 8.7 feet. Jeremy Rosenberger, Planning Director for the Town of Dedham, stated that was a clerical error and it was still within the Board’s purview to grant relief if they wished.

There were no members of the public who wished to speak.

A motion was made by Sara Rosenthal to approve the application, the motion was seconded by Jason Mammone. A roll call vote was taken.

Sara Rosenthal – yes

Jason Mammone – yes

Greg Jacobsen – yes

Tom Ryan – yes

Scott Steeves – yes

The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

220 Pine Street - Animal Rescue League

Applicant:	Animal Rescue League
Project Address:	220 Pine Street
Zoning District, Map/Lot:	Single Residence A (SRA) and Single Residence B (SRB), Map/Lot 38-39, 22-8, 22-8, 23-3 and 22-8A
Legal Notice:	Requests waivers from the provisions of the Dedham Sign Code to install five (5) identification/ground signs and two (2) directional/monument signs where proposed signs exceed allowable signage square footage, number of freestanding/identification signs allowed and monument signs not allowed.
Section of Zoning Bylaw:	<i>Town of Dedham Sign Code Table 1 and Table 2.</i>

Howard Snyder of Harriman was on the video call and representing the applicant. For the new administrative building they were constructing there were a number of signs that needed to be erected on the property. Three of the signs were existing. He gave a presentation reviewing each sign for the Board. The existing signs would not increase in size, they were only requesting relief for the number of signs.

Ms. Anne Frasca of 22 Aspen Court wished to speak. She stated that she was opposed to the granting of this variance. She said that she and her neighbors were told during the Planning Board meeting that the one existing sign would be the only replacement, that there would be no lighting on the signs. She would like the chance for the neighbors to weigh in on the signs for the project. She noted that neighbors she had spoken with were not happy with the project construction to date. She also stated she and her neighbors were told that the large tree that was on the property was not to be removed and then it was removed.

Mr. Snyder indicated that this was not a variance request but rather a request for a waiver for the number of signs. He can not speak to the construction activity as he is not in charge of this. He did know that after the Planning Board meetings the applicant had met with the Conservation Commission, and the tree removal had to do with their instruction. The driveway was not a roadway, there was an understanding that the applicant would come at a later date with the sign application and that was how they are presently in front of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Chairman Steeves advised that the applicant sit down with the neighbors again.

The lighting for the signs was explained as they were proposing low wattage from outside onto the signs, not internal illumination.

Mr. Snyder was happy to work with the neighbors.

Mr. Mammone wished to ask the Planning Director Jeremy Rosenberger if there was any validity to what Ms. Frasca was stating, was there anything the Planning Board had directed that was not being adhered to? Mr. Rosenberger said that in relation to signs there had not been discussion as signs were not regulated by the Planning Board but rather by the Design Review Board and the Zoning Board. Most of these signs would not be seen from the street, they were more for wayfinding on the property. He also had been notified about the construction issues and he had been in touch with the applicant and those issues were being addressed.

Mr. Snyder stated that it was his understanding that the sign information had been shared prior to the meeting, and he asked Ms. Frasca if she had received it. She replied that yes she had, however she felt the communication was not sufficient from the applicant. She again voiced concerns about the tree that was taken down. She further explained that she and the neighbors would like to have a better look and understanding of what was being proposed.

Gina Imbaro of 235 Pine Street expressed that she felt this was a trust issue with the applicant. She wished for the process to be more transparent.

Board Member Tom Ryan asked if the present sign that was at the property was illuminated? The applicant would look into that and have an answer for him at the next meeting.

A motion was made by Sara Rosenthal to continue the hearing until the November 18, 2021 meeting at 7:00 pm. Jason Mammone seconded the motion.

- Sara Rosenthal – yes
- Jason Mammone – yes
- Greg Jacobsen – yes
- Tom Ryan – yes
- Scott Steeves – yes

The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

21 Youngs Road

Applicant:	Kevin J. Kelleher
Project Address:	21 Youngs Road
Zoning District, Map/Lot:	Single Residence Zoning District (SRB) Map 142, Lot 137,
Legal Notice:	Requests a Variance and/or a Special Permit to construct a one-story rear addition (66 sq. ft.) that would intensify but maintain the pre-existing nonconforming right-side yard setback of 4.9 ft. (10 ft. required).
Section of Zoning Bylaw:	<i>Town of Dedham Bylaw Sections 3.3, 3.4, and Table 2</i>

Attorney Kevin Hampe was on the Zoom call for the applicant. They have an undersized lot that the house is presently on, both the house and lot are currently non-conforming per Zoning bylaws. They would like to increase their dining room slightly which would even out the house. They had also asked for a variance to be on the safe side, even though it was their understanding that the Special Permit would cover a variance as well.

Drew Pepoli asked about the plans which showed a porch/deck. Attorney Hampe explained this was an existing open-air deck and they were not asking for relief on that.

The Chairman asked if there were any members of the public who wished to speak, and there were none.

Greg Jacobsen made a motion to accept the proposal are presented. The motion was seconded by Sara Rosenthal. A roll call vote was taken.

- Sara Rosenthal – yes
- Jason Mammone – yes
- Greg Jacobsen – yes
- Tom Ryan – yes
- Scott Steeves – yes

The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

197 Milton Street – Jodaan LLC

Applicant:	Jodaan LLC
Project Address:	197 Milton Street
Zoning District, Map/Lot:	Limited Manufacturing A (LMA) Map/Lot 129-2
Legal Notice:	Requests a Special Permit to demolish and reconstruct the pre-existing nonconforming use (gas station w/ retail sales) and a Variance to maintain the pre-existing nonconforming rear yard setback (14.8 ft. provided, 25 ft. required).
Section of Zoning Bylaw:	<i>Town of Dedham Zoning Bylaw Sections 3.3, 9.2, 9.3, Table 1 and Table 2.</i>

Attorney Peter Zahka was on the Zoom call for the applicant. The applicant Yogi was also on the Zoom call. Attorney Zahka explained that the applicant had been before the Board previously, June 2018. They were planning on having 125 feet on retail space for non-automotive sales. While appearing before the Planning Board for approval of the new building, and due to Covid, the variance had lapsed over time. There were also

some changes implemented by the Planning Board to improve safety and the overall project. They were therefore back in front of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Jason Mammone asked about the curb cuts on the Milton Street side of the property. Attorney Zahka explained that the Milton Street one would be brought all the way down to the next opening at River Street. Then there would be an exit only on River Street and a landscaped island and a sidewalk. Mr. Mammone then asked if the openings were wide enough for the fuel trucks, and Attorney Zahka said yes they were. Mr. Mammone then asked if the applicant had completed the Planning Board process. Attorney Zahka stated yes, they were fully finished with the Planning Board process and had been granted a Certificate of Action. Mr. Mammone asked if the opening could possibly be closed a little bit for the safety of pedestrians. It was explained that the drawing showed the fire truck radius. They were willing to look at the opening and size of the curb cut as a condition if the Zoning Board agreed.

The Chairman asked if there were any members of the public who wished to speak and there were none.

A motion was made by Jason Mammone to accept the proposal with the condition that a second look would be given to the Milton Street entrance to determine if the width could be reduced and still allow fuel vehicles and fire vehicles entrance to the site. The motion was seconded by Greg Jacobsen. A roll call vote was taken.

- Sara Rosenthal – yes
- Jason Mammone – yes
- Greg Jacobsen – yes
- Tom Ryan – yes
- Scott Steeves – yes

The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

125 Stergis Way

Applicant:	UTEC Constructors LLC
Project Address:	125 Stergis Way
Zoning District, Map/Lot:	Highway Business Zoning District (HB), Map/Lot 170/7A
Legal Notice:	Requests a Special Permit to change occupancy from a warehouse use to a trade use (no exterior or interior work proposed).
Section of Zoning Bylaw:	<i>Town of Dedham Bylaw Sections 3.1, 9.2, 9.3, and Table 1.</i>

Attorney Kevin Hampe was representing the applicant. The building was originally used by Verizon to warehouse their trucks. The client was hoping to lease the property to store their equipment, which is high wire lines. They anticipated only having two people on site at the property, 7:00 am – 4:00 pm Monday through Friday. There would be very little impact to the area from the business and no impact to the neighboring businesses.

There were no questions from the Board, and no questions from the public.

A motion was made by Sara Rosenthal to accept the proposal as presented. The motion was seconded by Greg Jacobsen and a roll call vote was taken.

Sara Rosenthal – yes
Jason Mammone – yes
Greg Jacobsen – yes
Tom Ryan – yes
Scott Steeves – yes

The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

A motion was made to adjourn by Greg Jacobsen, and the motion was seconded by Jason Mammone. A roll call vote was taken.

Sara Rosenthal – yes
Jason Mammone – yes
Greg Jacobsen – yes
Tom Ryan – yes
Scott Steeves – yes

The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:58 pm.