

**TOWN OF DEDHAM  
COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS**



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](mailto:jrosenberger@dedham-ma.gov)

**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

**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
MINUTES**

**Wednesday, August 19, 2020**

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

Not Present: Tom Ryan, Esq., Member

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

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, 1-844-875-7777. The access code is 93059990691. Again, the toll-free number is 1-844-875-7777. The access code is

93059990691. The meeting was also being recorded and streaming live on Facebook. 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

Acting Member, George Panagopoulos

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

The Chairman continued with the first applicant:

**325 East Street - continued from July 15 meeting**

<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Built Right Construction Group, LLC, 24 Deborah Drive, Walpole, MA</b>
<b>Project Address:</b>	<b>325 East Street</b>
<b>Zoning District, Map/Lot:</b>	Central Business Zoning District (CB). Map/Lot 93-21
<b>Legal Notice:</b>	The applicant requests Variance(s) and Special Permits to demolish existing single-family dwelling and construct new two-family dwelling; proposed two-family will continue pre-existing nonconforming lot frontage, area, lot width, front setback, side yard setback and exceed the maximum lot coverage. The +/-

	3,545 sq. ft. subject property is located at 325 East Street, Dedham, MA.
<b>Section of Zoning Bylaw:</b>	<i>Town of Dedham Zoning Bylaw Sections 3.3, 9.2, 9.3 and Table 2.</i>

Representing the applicant was Erin Joyce with Joyce Consulting Group. Ms. Joyce explained that last time they had been before the board they had heard from residents regarding parking on the street. She explained that each unit that was to be constructed would have their own two car garage on the first level, and as the building was set back from the sidewalk by about four feet, there would not be enough room for another car to park in front of the building. As of right now residents have to park on the street, but if the proposal were approved that would not be the case because of the new street level parking. Therefore, she felt they would not be making parking worse in the neighborhood. Mr. Tony Rosetti, the owner of the property, was also on the call.

The Chairman asked the Administrative Assistant if the neighbors had sent a petition and she replied yes, a letter had been forwarded to the board from neighbors that were still in opposition of the project. The Planning Director shared the letter on screen for the meeting. The letter in opposition was read aloud. The Chairman asked if any members of the Board had questions.

Jason Mammone said that he was concerned that the letter from Joyce Consulting seemed to give very short notice to the neighbors asking them to meet and discuss the project. He felt it was unfair to say the neighbors did not respond to requests to meet if they were not given enough time. Ms. Joyce responded she could appreciate that response. She explained that they first met with the contractors to see if there was anything further, they could do on their end.

Andrew Pepoli asked if any Design Review had looked at the potential of having one curb cut and having a shared parking area? Where the cars will pull in and park at 45-degree angles as opposed to having the two curb cuts. That way you could eliminate to maybe save one on street parking space. Ms. Joyce replied that they had looked at the potential to do something similar. They had looked at having the garages on the outside edges with the entrances next to each other in the middle, basically just flipping that so you would have the two garages next to each other with the driveway, like a double wide driveway. You would have a single curb cut but a wider curb cut in the middle of the site as opposed to the narrower ones. But by the time they looked at where the curb return would be and where the existing entrances are on either side of the property, they felt like it wasn't going to offer any great on street parking space that wouldn't be encroaching on the entrance to the other side of them or the neighbors.

The Chairman asked the owner if he had considered replacing the house with another single-family dwelling. The owner replied he had considered it, but he felt a single-family house could actually add on street parking if they had a large family. The Chairman then asked if any member of the public wished to speak.

Mr. Brock Jackson said he was the owner of a three family across the street from, 328 330 and 332. “I also live there. Also next to me 320 to 324 and 326 is a multifamily house. Both of us, our house was built in the early 1900s. The 320 to 324 and 326 has no driveway whatsoever. So that's an existing three family house that depends on the street for their tenants. My three-family house has a parking spot for one car, so the other units have to park on the street. You can see the photos that I sent in all those spots are taken. And for them to say that there would add no more traffic into that congested area with along with that apartment building that was built there and there's an existing gym that also utilizes the on street parking right in front. They're going to add four more cars even if they got two cars in each garage and take away three on street parking spaces. So, if you really think about it, you know, someone might come home with their one car, but the other car is not going to block the other person. And so, they're going to park on the street if it's available. So, you're going to add two more cars in the street, taken away three spots. So that's five spaces that this new project will be taking up. That is already a hugely congested space on the street. My house has been hit twice in the last 13 years. My neighbor's house has hit once and this property that they're developing was hit not even a month ago by a car coming down the street. So, it's just an area in the street that it's very congested. There's a turn up above that people come from the halfway cafe late at night. I've had my mirror on my vehicle knocked off twice. To add more to this side and some any cutout whatsoever, is just going to create more of a nightmare. And again, in the wintertime, when we can only park on one side of the street. You've already got a lot of things, people from our street going another street over and it just keeps pushing and pushing people over. And people with families like you said, you know if he gets a family in there, which there are a lot of families with that new building, and there are a lot of kids walking down the street in the winter going the street over when sidewalks aren't plowed. Now you got to walk with your child down the street to get home. It's just going to add more congesting and it's a huge safety problem. I understand developers are in the business to make money as much as possible, but at what cost to the existing neighborhood. I mean, are we willing to expand here I just I don't see how adding any curb space is taking away spots, and then adding more cars is going to better the house. When they purchased the single-family home, they knew it didn't have a driveway. They knew what they were purchasing. I think they should really work with what they purchased and not be allowed to have any cutouts on the street taken away from that neighborhood.”

The Chairman then asked if there were any other comments from the public, and there were none. Greg Jacobsen made a motion to deny the application based on the main concern of lack of parking. The motion was seconded by George Panagopoulos. A roll call vote was taken.

Sara Rosenthal – deny application, in favor of motion  
Jason Mammone – deny application, in favor of motion  
Greg Jacobsen – deny application, in favor of motion  
George Panagopoulos - deny application, in favor of motion  
Scott Steeves – deny application, in favor of motion

The motion passed 5-0 unanimously and the application was denied.

**55 Hillsdale Road**

<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Daniel Lombardo</b>
<b>Project Address:</b>	<b>55 Hillsdale Road</b>
<b>Zoning District, Map/Lot:</b>	Single Residence B District (SRB), Map/Lot 169-84
<b>Legal Notice:</b>	Requests a Special Permit for the construction of a second detached garage and Variances as the proposed detached garage will not meet the required front yard setback (16 ft. proposed, 25 ft. required) and not meet the required space between buildings (4 ft. proposed, 10 ft. required). The 22,000 sq. ft. property is located in the Single Residence B Zoning District.
<b>Section of Zoning Bylaw:</b>	<i>Dedham Zoning By-Law Section 3.3, 9.2, 9.2, 9.3, 10, Table 1, Table 2</i>

Representative Peter A. Zahka, II, Esq was on the video call for the applicant, and the applicant himself, Daniel Lombardo was also on the video call. Attorney Zahka explained the proposal in detail, the summary of the proposal being a request for a second detached garage. The applicant had approached his neighbors and had a number of signatures in favor of the proposal.

Chairman Steeves asked if there were any questions from the Board. Mr. Panagopoulos asked “It looks like you have some space to the left of that existing garage and a little bit of space to the right of that existing garage. Did you consider possibly demolishing that garage in place of a single car garage, make a double car garage in that in that location?”

Attorney Zahka explained that the side yard requirement for a detached garage is 10 feet, so we had to come in 10 feet on each side. The existing garage barely meets that. The owner Mr. Lombardo spoke and explained that there was also a water well next to the existing garage and so it would not have been possible to construct a larger garage there.

Mr. Mammone asked if there would be any widening to the existing driveway? Mr. Lombardo explained that he did not feel it was necessary to enlarge the driveway, he felt there was enough room, but they would like to have a second curb access. Mr. Mammone stated it was always preferable to have less egresses to the property to make it safer for pedestrians. Mr. Lombardo stated that previously DPW had looked at the property and said they did not see a problem with a second curb access point to the driveway as there was little pedestrian traffic there, but of course if this was preferable Mr. Lombardo is open to maintaining the driveway as is.

Chairman Steeves asked if there were any more questions from the Board, and there were none. He asked if there were any questions from the public, and there were none. A motion was made by Sara Rosenthal in favor of the proposal. The motion was seconded by George Panagopoulos. A roll call vote was taken:

- Jason Mammone – yes
- Greg Jacobsen – yes
- Sara Rosenthal - yes
- George Panagopoulos – yes
- Scott Steeves – yes

The motion passed 5-0 unanimously.

**55 Elm Street**

<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Dedham Savings Bank</b>
<b>Project Address:</b>	<b>55 Elm Street</b>
<b>Zoning District, Map/Lot:</b>	Research Development & Office (RDO) Zoning District Map 148-29
<b>Legal Notice:</b>	Requests waivers from the provisions of the Dedham Sign Code to install a monument sign that will have a 10 ft. setback (25 ft. required) and two (2) internally illuminated wall signs (40 sq. ft. and 74 sq. ft.) where wall signs above the roof line and/or 25 ft. above grade not permitted. The 109,771 sq. ft. property is located at 55 Elm Street, Dedham, MA
<b>Section of Zoning Bylaw:</b>	<i>Town of Dedham Sign Code Section 237-19(E), 237-26 and Table 2.</i>

Representing the applicant was Chad from Graphic Impact Signs. He explained the proposal for the new signs. George Panagopoulos asked if in keeping with the precedent set by other businesses in the area, if the lights could be kept on a timer to turn off after closing so as not to disturb any of the residential neighbors around there. It was agreed that the lights could go off one hour after closing and could go on one hour before opening.

The Chairman asked if anyone else from the Board had a question and there were none. He then asked if there were any questions from the public and there were none.

A motion was made by George Panagopoulos to approve the proposal and grant waivers with the contingency that the lights be on timers and turned on one hour before opening of the businesses, and turned off one hour after closing of the business. The motion was seconded by Greg Jacobsen, and a roll call vote was taken.

- Jason Mammone – yes

Greg Jacobsen – yes  
 Sara Rosenthal - yes  
 George Panagopoulos – yes  
 Scott Steeves – yes

The motion passed 5-0 unanimously.

**2 Washington Street**

<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Duncan Senisse, Gulf Station</b>
<b>Project Address:</b>	<b>2 Washington Street</b>
<b>Zoning District, Map/Lot:</b>	Local Business (LB) Zoning District, Map/Lot 59-10
<b>Legal Notice:</b>	Requests waivers and/or modification of existing ZBA Decision (#VAR-02-14-1801) dating from March 28, 2014 to reface existing a canopy fascia with an internally LED illuminated wordmark and logo (14.8 sq. ft. and 9.6 sq. ft.); replace existing internally illuminated wall sign with new internally illuminated wall sign (15 sq. ft.); and reface existing illuminated ground sign (79.2 sq. ft.); internal illumination is not allowed and exceeds allowable hours of illumination. The 17,539 sq. ft. property is located at 2 Washington Street, Dedham, MA.
<b>Section of Zoning Bylaw:</b>	<i>Town of Dedham Sign Code Section 237-18, 237-19 and Table 2.</i>

Gary Potts of Project CSI explained the rebranding of the Gulf Station with the new logos. The Chairman asked if there were any questions from the Board. Drew Pepoli asked if this was a one for one swap out. Mr. Potts clarified that the new lit sign would be facing Washington Street. Mr. Panagopoulos raised the issue of greenspace and increased landscaping for the site. Mr. Potts explained that landscaping was outside of his scope of work for his client, but he would be happy to pass along the comments. There were no further comments from the Board.

The Chairman asked if there was any member of the public who wished to speak, and there were not. A motion was made by Sara Rosenthal to approve the proposal, and the motion was seconded by Greg Jacobsen. A roll call vote was taken:

Jason Mammone – yes  
 Greg Jacobsen – yes  
 Sara Rosenthal - yes  
 George Panagopoulos – yes  
 Scott Steeves – yes

The motion passed 5-0 unanimously.

**725 Providence Highway**

<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Red Dog Barn Holdings, LLC</b>
<b>Project Address:</b>	<b>725 Providence Highway</b>
<b>Zoning District, Map/Lot:</b>	Highway Business District (HB), Map/Lot 122-1
<b>Legal Notice:</b>	Requests a Special Permit to operate a dog day care facility with grooming services and overnight stays. The 784,082 sq. ft. property is located at 725 Providence Highway, Dedham, MA
<b>Section of Zoning Bylaw:</b>	<i>Dedham Zoning By-Law Section 3.1, 9.2, 9.3 and Table 1</i>

Representative Kevin F. Hampe, Esq gave a summary of the proposal. The site was located in the Dedham Plaza location on the back side, Washington Street side by Domino's Pizza. The petitioner proposes to operate a dog daycare center with grooming and overnight stays seven days a week and doing business as "Dogtopia". The hours of operation intend to be 7am to 7pm Monday through Friday, and 7am to 2pm on Saturday and Sunday. It's anticipated the facility will have five employees per shift, with a maximum of 20 to 25 employees employed by the site. With the application, the client filed plans that show the interior space of the site and how it's broken down. They have such things as a gym Romper Room, toy room, kennel areas for the dogs as well as offices and lobby area for the workers. The petitioner is very experienced in the area of developing these sites in all different types of locations. The petitioner has done over 140 locations nationally over the past 17 years. Noise abatement is obviously a concern that the board would have, and also cleanliness is a common issue with these sites and the petitioner has been very successful in dealing with these issues at all other locations. The leased space will be acoustically soundproof to reduce any noises from traveling beyond the area. There is no outdoor exercise area. And as I indicated, the applicant has a comprehensive program for cleaning and waste removal for both inside and outside the site, which is vital to the operation of the business. He then turned over the presentation to Kathy Halter, who is vice president of new store development for the Red Barn Holding LLC. Ms. Halter gave a very detailed presentation to the Board regarding the operation.

The Chairman asked if there were any questions from the Board. Greg Jacobsen asked how many dogs they would be able to keep there overnight. The applicant answered that the capacity was for 107 but he did not except more than 50% capacity at any one time. Mr. Jacobson then asked if there was overnight staff and they answered there was not.

Mr. Panagopoulos asked about curbside pickup and regulations from the State on kennels. Attorney Hampe replied they would be complying with any State regulations. For curbside pickup, the hours of operation were not traditional shopping hours, so they did not anticipate any parking issue, however they were open to suggestions. Attorney



Hampe also stated that if the Building Commissioner wished for them to go through a minor site plan review then they would do so. There were no other questions from Board members.

The Chairman asked if there were any questions from the public and there were not.

Greg Jacobsen made a motion to approve the Special Permit as presented, it was seconded by George Panagopoulos and a roll call vote was taken.

- Sara Rosenthal - yes
- Jason Mammone – yes
- Greg Jacobsen – yes
- George Panagopoulos – yes
- Scott Steeves – yes

The motion passed 5-0 unanimously.

**99 Oakdale Ave.**

<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Silva Development, LLC</b>
<b>Project Address:</b>	99 Oakdale Ave
<b>Zoning District, Map/Lot:</b>	Limited Business Zoning District (LB), Map/Lot 127-134
<b>Legal Notice:</b>	Requests a Special Permit to demolish a pre-existing non-conforming two-family dwelling and construct a new two-family dwelling. The 8,915 sq. ft. property is located at 99 Oakdale Ave., Dedham, MA.
<b>Section of Zoning Bylaw:</b>	<i>Dedham Zoning By-Law Section 3.1, 3.3, 3.3.5, 9.2, 9.3, Table 1 and Table 2.</i>

Attorney Keith Hampe was representing the applicant. He was in attendance on the video call. Scott Miller, President of New Bridge Construction was also on the call for the project. The property was a badly damaged building from a previous fire, and they were seeking to reconstruct it. Attorney Hampe explained the proposal as previously being a two-family dwelling and they were seeking the same.

The Chairman asked if anyone on the Board had questions, and there were none, however the Chairman had a question. Chairman Steeves asked if the existing garage in the back was going to be taken down. The answer was yes. The Chairman then stated that he understood the previous property was a pre-existing non-conforming dwelling and he wished to know if the applicant were taking any measures to make it more conforming.

Attorney Hampe pointed out that the project was in a limited business zone. According to table two, foot notes number six in limited business districts, no side or rear yard setback shall be required for buildings on lots established by plan or deed before January 1,1970. According to the Town of Dedham assessor's records, the existing house was built some time in 1880. Given that the current house is longer from Oakdale Ave to the back of the lot, the new property appears to fit within the existing footprint of the damaged property. The new building would also be set back a little bit further from Oakdale Ave.

The Chairman asked if there were any members of the public who wished to speak on the project. Bill Punch of 113 Oakdale Ave asked if there was a residential generator proposed for the site at all? The answer was no, not that they were aware of. Mr. Punch then asked if the property would be rentals or owner occupied. Mr. Miller answered they would be owner occupied. Mr. Punch then asked if there were any plans for trees or bushes on the site because the site line was a problem. They were not planning on any landscaping that would negatively impact the site line. Mr. Punch’s final question was asking if a fence was planned for the property. Mr. Miller said that the existing chain link fence would be left during construction only for safety reasons, but there was no other fence planned for the property. There were no further questions.

George Panagopoulos made a motion to approve the proposal as presented. The motion was seconded by Sara Rosenthal. A roll call vote was taken.

- Sara Rosenthal - yes
- Jason Mammone – yes
- Greg Jacobsen – yes
- George Panagopoulos – yes
- Scott Steeves – yes

The motion passed 5-0 unanimously.

**43 Hillsdale**

<b>Applicant:</b>	Patricia Ferreria
<b>Project Address:</b>	43 Hillsdale Road
<b>Zoning District, Map/Lot:</b>	General Residence Zoning District (GR), Map/Lot 169-85
<b>Legal Notice:</b>	Requests a Special Permit for a retaining wall over 4 ft. tall (9 ft. proposed). The 15,500 sq. ft. property is located at 43 Hillsdale Road
<b>Section of Zoning Bylaw:</b>	<i>Dedham Zoning By-Law Section 6.5.2., 9.2 and 9.3</i>

**49 Hillsdale**

<b>Applicant:</b>	Patricia Ferreria
<b>Project Address:</b>	49 Hillsdale Road
<b>Zoning District, Map/Lot:</b>	Single Residence B (SRB) and General Residence Zoning District (GR), Map/Lot 169-85
<b>Legal Notice:</b>	Requests a Special Permit for a retaining wall over 4 ft. tall (9 ft. in height proposed). The 27,500 sq. ft. property is located at 49 Hillsdale Road,
<b>Section of Zoning Bylaw:</b>	<i>Dedham Zoning By-Law Section 6.5.2., 9.2 and 9.3</i>

The Board heard both applications at the same time as they were related.

Carlos Ferreria of MF Engineering was on the video call for the applicant. He explained that during the approval process for both properties the Building Commissioner had pointed out that they had a retaining wall that was more than four (4) feet and therefore required Zoning Board of Appeals approval.

The Chairman asked if there were any questions from the Board and there were none. He asked if there were any questions from the public and there were none.

Although the two properties had been heard together as one, they needed to be voted on separately.

A motion was made by Sara Rosenthal to approve the proposal at 43 Hillsdale Road, and was seconded by Greg Rosenthal. A roll call vote was taken.

Sara Rosenthal - yes  
Jason Mammone – yes  
Greg Jacobsen – yes  
George Panagopoulos – yes  
Scott Steeves – yes

The motion passed for 43 Hillsdale, 5-0 unanimously.

A motion was made by Greg Jacobsen to approve the proposal at 49 Hillsdale Road. The motion was seconded by Sara Rosenthal. A roll call vote was taken.

Sara Rosenthal - yes  
Jason Mammone – yes  
Greg Jacobsen – yes  
George Panagopoulos – yes

Scott Steeves – yes

The motion passed for 49 Hillsdale, 5-0 unanimously.

**211 High Street**

<b>Applicant:</b>	Dental Group
<b>Project Address:</b>	211 High Street
<b>Zoning District, Map/Lot:</b>	Limited Manufacturing District (LMA), Map/Lot 95-74
<b>Legal Notice:</b>	Requests a waiver from the provision of the Dedham Sign Code to install an 11.25 sq. ft. illuminated wall sign; wall signs above the roof line and/or 25 ft. above grade are not permitted. The 7,466 sq. ft. property is located at 211 High Street,
<b>Section of Zoning Bylaw:</b>	<i>Town of Dedham Sign Code Section 237-15</i>

Heather Hopkins Dudko from Sign Effects was representing the applicant. The Logo that the applicant wished to install would be above the roof line. The applicant had already gone to the Design Review Board and were seen favorably. Except for the roof line, the rest of the sign was within code.

The Chairman asked if there were any questions from the Board and there were none. He asked if there were any questions from the public and there were none.

Sara Rosenthal made a motion to grant a waiver from the provision of the Sign Code to the applicant. The motion was seconded by Greg Jacobsen. A roll call vote was taken.

Sara Rosenthal - yes  
Jason Mammone – yes  
Greg Jacobsen – yes  
George Panagopoulos – yes  
Scott Steeves – yes

The motion passed for 211 High Street, 5-0 unanimously.

**22 Bridge Street**

<b>Applicant:</b>	Elie on Bridge
<b>Project Address:</b>	22 Bridge Street
<b>Zoning District, Map/Lot:</b>	General Business Zoning District, Map/Lot 14-51
<b>Legal Notice:</b>	Request Special Permits and Variances necessary to construct an +/- 528 sq. ft. addition to a pre-existing nonconforming use (service station) to be used as a bay for automobile inspections. The subject property is located at 22 Bridge Street
<b>Section of Zoning Bylaw:</b>	<i>Town of Dedham Zoning Bylaw Sections 3.1, 3.3, 9.2, 9.3, and Table 1.</i>

The attorney Peter A. Zahka was on the video call for the applicant. Elie Laskas and John Melowski were also on the video. He explained that the applicant had been before the Zoning Board of Appeals before in 2018 for this same matter and the application was denied three to two. The applicant appealed the decision to the Norfolk County Superior Court and the parties submitted a joint motion for the remand order which said the applicant should proceed first to the Dedham Conservation Commission. If the matter was denied, that essentially would have ended the matter. And if the Conservation Commission granted the approval that was necessary, the matter would be remanded back to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a rehearing, so they were now before the Board for that reason.

The applicant was a gas station seeking a special permit to add a 528 square foot addition to an existing preexisting nonconforming gasoline station. The use of the additional bay would be exclusively for automobile inspections. As indicated the property is at 22 Bridge Street. It is in the general business zoning district and is 10,900 square feet of land and 136 feet of frontage on Bridge Street.

The property is within close proximity to the Charles River and therefore had to go through the approval process with the Dedham Conservation Commission. The applicant had done this and received approval on July 15, 2020. As a condition of the Conservation Commission, the applicant had installed an enclosure like a storage room, along the back of the property to enclose existing tanks. The requirements as set forth by the Conservation Commission had been met.

Gregory Jacobsen asked if it was correct that Attorney Zahka had indicated that the additional bay would be used for inspections only? Attorney Zahka replied that was correct. There were no further questions from the Board.

The Chairman asked if there were any members of the public who wished to speak on this application. There were none.

A motion was made by Gregory Jacobsen to approve the proposal as presented, with the condition that the additional bay be used for automobile State inspections only. The motion was seconded by Sara Rosenthal. A roll call vote was taken.

Sara Rosenthal - yes  
Jason Mammone – yes  
Greg Jacobsen – yes  
George Panagopoulos – yes  
Scott Steeves – yes

The motion passed 5-0 unanimously.

The Chairman introduced Tom Ryan as the newest member of the Zoning Board of Appeals. Mr. Ryan had been observing the meeting during the night.

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting by Sara Rosenthal and seconded by Jason Mammone. A roll call vote was taken.

Sara Rosenthal - yes  
Jason Mammone – yes  
Greg Jacobsen – yes  
George Panagopoulos – yes  
Scott Steeves – yes

The motion passed 5-0 unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 pm.