

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

**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
MINUTES**

**Wednesday, November 18, 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  
Tom Ryan, Esq., Member  
Andrew Pepoli, Associate Member

Not Present: Member, Jason L. Mammone, P.E.  
Associate 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 pm** on the night of **Wednesday, November 18, 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 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, 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:     Member, Jason Mammone  
                                   Associate Member, George Panagopoulos

The Chairman continued with the first applicant:

**220 Pine Street**

<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Animal Rescue League</b>
<b>Project Address:</b>	<b>184, 220 and 276 Pine Street and 70 Jenney Lane</b>
<b>Zoning District, Map/Lot:</b>	Single Residence A (SRA), Single Residence B (SRB)
<b>Legal Notice:</b>	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.

<b>Section of Zoning Bylaw:</b>	<i>Town of Dedham Sign Code Table 1 and Table 2.</i>
---------------------------------	--

This application had been continued from the October 21, 2020 meeting. At the last meeting the Zoning Board of Appeals members had asked the Applicant to please meet with the neighbors in order to come to an understanding over the signage and construction issues. The Applicant had done so.

Howard Snyder of Harriman and Dr. Edward Schettino from the Animal Rescue League were both on the call. They were able to meet with the neighbors virtually. Dr. Schettino stated that they listened to their concerns and explain what would be presented at this meeting so that they would not be surprised.

Ann Frasca of 22 Aspen Court was on the call. She thanked Dr. Schettino for having the meeting with them, and she was very grateful for his input and for listening to the neighbor's concerns.

Stephanie Carter, of 227 Pine Street was on the call. She echoed Ann Frasca's sentiments and said she was looking forward to hearing the results of those meetings.

Howard Snyder asked for the amended signage to be put up on the screen for everyone to see. They had reduced the number of signs from eight to seven. Several of these would be refurbished and there would be four (4) new signs. Proposed directional signs 1 and 2 would no longer have low voltage up lighting.

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

Tom Ryan - yes  
 Chair, Scott Steeves - yes  
 Andrew Pepoli – yes  
 Sara Rosenthal – yes  
 Greg Jacobsen – yes

The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

*The following application was taken out of order from the Agenda.*

**159 High Street**

<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Pina and Renato Reda</b>
<b>Project Address:</b>	<b>159 High Street</b>
<b>Zoning District, Map/Lot:</b>	General Business (GB) Zoning District, Map/Lot 96-4

<b>Legal Notice:</b>	Request for Special Permits and/or Variances to construct a two-family dwelling; proposed two-family/lot provides 55 ft. of lot frontage where 90 ft. is required and provides a lot width of 55 ft. where 90 ft. is required.
<b>Section of Zoning Bylaw:</b>	<i>Town of Dedham Bylaw Sections 3.3, 4.1, 4.5, 9.2, 9.3, and Table 2.</i>

Peter Zahka, Esquire, attorney for the applicant, and Anthony Reda, applicant, were both of the call. Attorney Zahka gave an overview of the property and the application. The Subject Property is currently occupied by a two-family dwelling. According to the records maintained by the Dedham Board of Assessors the existing building was constructed circa 1910.

According to the deed1 to the Subject Property, the Subject Property consists of Lots 2,3, and portions of Lots 4, 6, and 7 shown on a plan entitled “Plan of Land in East Dedham belonging to Felix Dowd” prepared Surveyed June 1879” prepared by Nathan Smith, recorded on June 10, 1890, with Norfolk Registry of Deeds Book 638, Page 573. (A copy of said deed is attached as Exhibit “A” and a copy of the plan is attached hereto as Exhibit “B”). As further described in said deed, the Subject Property consists of two separate parcels: one parcel consists of approximately 11,365 square feet of land and 55 feet of frontage on High Street and one lot consists of approximately 6,555 square feet of land and 64 feet on High Street. It is noteworthy that the aforesaid two lots have been separately described in deeds since at least 1912 and were actually in separate ownership until 1922. These two lots are depicted on a plan entitled “Plan of Land in Dedham, Mass.,” dated May 6, 1975, and recorded with Norfolk Registry of Deeds Book as Plan No. 401 of 19752. (A copy of said plan is attached hereto as Exhibit “C”). The aforesaid two lots are also shown on a plan entitled “Proposed Dwelling – Prepared for 15 Felix Street/159 High Street, Dedham, MA”, dated September 5, 2020, by Moran Surveying Incorporated. (A copy of said plan is attached hereto as Exhibit “D”). As shown on said plan, the existing two-family dwelling is wholly located on the 6,556 square foot lot and the 11,371

square foot lot is vacant. As shown on the aforesaid plans and the Dedham GIS Map, the Subject Property occupied by two-family dwelling abuts 175 High Street, 15 Felix Street, and 123 High Street. (A copy of the Town of Dedham GIS Map is attached as Exhibit “E”). According to the records maintained by the Dedham Board of Assessors, 175 High Street is occupied by a two-family dwelling constructed circa 1935, 15 Felix Street is occupied by a single-family dwelling constructed in 1976, and 123 High Street is occupied by the old Avery School constructed circa 1921.

As noted above, the Subject Property is depicted on the Dedham Zoning Map as being located in the GB Zoning District. It is noteworthy that prior to 2015 the Subject Property was located in the General Residence Zoning District. The Subject Property (and many of the abutting properties) were re-zoned to the GB Zoning District upon adoption of Article 25 of the May 2015 Dedham Spring Annual Town Meeting.

Table 1 (Principal Use Table) of the Dedham Zoning By-Law sets forth the uses allowed as of right and by special permit in the various zoning districts. Per said Table 1, single family and two-family dwelling are allowed as of right in the GB Zoning District<sup>4</sup>. In addition, offices, banks, retail businesses, and trade shops are allowed as of right<sup>5</sup>. Said Table 1 further provides that mixed-use buildings, restaurants, gas stations, and auto body and paint shops are allowed in the GB Zoning District by special permit<sup>6</sup>.

Table 2 of the Town of Dedham Zoning By-Law (Table of Dimensional Regulations) sets forth the dimensional requirements applicable to lots and buildings in the various zoning districts. Per said Table 2, there are no dimensional requirements in the GB Zoning District with the exception of maximum lot coverage and maximum floor area ratio. However, Footnote 9 to said Table 2 provides that “the GR dimensional regulations apply to one- and two-family dwellings located in the CB and GB Districts . . . provided that the Board of Appeals may grant exceptions from such requirements by Special Permits, for lots established by plan or deed recorded before 1/1/95, if compliance would entail practical difficulties and the exception would have no adverse effect on nearby properties.” .

Based upon the above, the existing two-family dwelling is allowed as a matter of right.

However, in light of Footnote 9 to said Table 2, the existing two-family dwelling is non-conforming in a number of respects including front yard setback (18.1 feet vs. 20 feet required) and side yard setback (4.8 feet vs. 10 feet required). In addition, as described further below, it appears that the 11,371 square foot vacant lot constitutes and is protected as a separate building lot under Section 4.5.1 of the Dedham Zoning By-Law.

Applicant proposes to maintain the existing two-family residential dwelling on the 6,556 square foot lot and construct a new two-family dwelling on the 11,377 square foot lot. Applicant will not be establishing any new lots. Instead, Applicant will be utilizing the two (2) lots described in deeds since 1912.

The Applicant had submitted seven letters of support from abutters for this proposal.

Letters of support were from:

- Jean Ford Webb and Dan Hart of the Motherbrook Arts Association
- 220 High Street
- 218 High Street
- 202 High Street
- 234 High Street
- 210 High Street

- 128 and 138 High Street

One letter of opposition had been sent to the Board from Sharon and John Correlias, of 154 High Street.

The Chairman asked if the Board had any questions for the Applicant. Mr. Greg Jacobsen asked how many parking spots would be set aside for this project. Attorney Zahka answered there would be four. He then asked how many were allotted for the existing structure. The answer was there were six (6) spots total for the properties. There were four people and two cars at present.

Attorney Zahka stated that there was an additional garage structure on the property that could be leveled and used for additional parking if necessary.

Mr. Jacobsen continued by asking if the hill behind the structure would create any issue for construction. The house had been proposed at a location where it would not cause interference and the hill would not be a problem.

Mr. Tom Ryan asked who owned the lot behind the proposed structure. The back lot was all part of the proposed and was one lot. There was no possibility of another house being proposed in this area. Mr. Ryan asked if additional parking could be proposed here later. Attorney Zahka replied that it would be quite difficult given the scope and width of the area in question. He reiterated that parking could be made in the present garage area which was to be leveled anyway. The Chairman asked if the Applicant was ok with that being made a condition of the decision. Mr. Ryan was concerned with neighbors trying to use these areas for their overflow parking, as had been done previously at the old Avery School. Attorney Zahka explained that they would looking to put in eight spaces for these two properties, however they did not want to be tied into where they were located.

Mr. Jacobsen asked for the dimensions of the garage that was to be demolished. It was 348 square feet.

Drew Pepoli asked if one parcel was to be sold would there be an easement agreement in place to allow the other parcel to park there still. Attorney Zahka explained it would depend on how the spaces are laid out, yes they may need to have an easement, but they would not know until the spaces could be designed.

There was no one from the public wishing to speak on this property.

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

Tom Ryan – yes

Greg Jacobsen – yes

Scott Steeves – yes  
 Andrew Pepoli – yes  
 Sara Rosenthal – yes

The motion was approved unanimously, 5-0.

The Chairman then closed the public hearing by a unanimous vote of 5-0. He went back and also closed out the public hearing by a unanimous vote of 5-0.

**123 and 97 Westfield Street and 50 Haven Street**

<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Westfield Crossings, LLC</b>
<b>Project Address:</b>	<b>123 and 97 Westfield Street and 50 Haven Street</b>
<b>Zoning District, Map/Lot:</b>	Single Residence A (SRA) Zoning District, Map/Lot 88/13, 88/14 and 71-1
<b>Legal Notice:</b>	Request for a Special Permit and/or Variance to allow an existing shared driveway serving three (3) lots to serve four (4) lots; driveway for more than two (2) lots not allowed.
<b>Section of Zoning Bylaw:</b>	<i>Town of Dedham Bylaw Sections 3.3, 9.2, 9.3, and 10.</i>

Attorney Peter Zahka, Dr. Louis J. Sawan, principal for the Applicant, and Matt Smith from Norwood Engineering were all in attendance on the video call. Attorney Zahka presented the application by stating section 10 of the Town of Dedham Zoning By-Law states that: “No more than two lots meeting street frontage requirements may share an access driveway.” Currently, however, the three (3) lots comprising 123 Westfield Street (Map 88, Lot 13), 97 Westfield Street (Map 88, Lot 14), and 50 Haven Street (Map 71, Lot 1) are all served by a common or shared driveway off of Westfield Street. Applicant will be demolishing the existing house on 123 Westfield Street, and dividing the property into two buildable lots. After such division, Applicant desires that the two new building lots, 97 Westfield Street and 50 Haven Street all be served by the common driveway. Simply stated, Applicant is requesting such special permits and/or variances required to allow a shared driveway serving currently serving three (3) lots to serve four (4) lots.

The portion of Westfield Street fronting 123 Westfield Street is heavily wooded and very scenic and Applicant desires to maintain the same. In addition, while Applicant could access the two new lots directly from Westfield Street, the same would necessitate crossing a wetlands buffer area. After extensive discussions (over a period of more than a year)

with the Dedham Conservation Commission, Applicant has agreed to proceed in a manner which would avoid crossing the wetlands buffer area.

As noted above, three (3) lots (123 Westfield Street, 97 Westfield Street and 50 Haven Street) currently share an access driveway. It appears that this condition is pre-existing nonconforming Sections 3.3. 2 and 3.3.3 of the Dedham Zoning By-Law authorize and empower the ZBA to grant special permits to extend, alter, or enlarge non-conforming uses and non-conforming structures provided the same is not substantially more detrimental than the existing nonconformity. In acting upon requests for Special Permits, the ZBA is guided by Section 9.3.2 of the Dedham Zoning By-Law which provides that:

Special permits shall be granted by the Special Permit Granting Authority, unless otherwise specified herein, only upon its written determination that the adverse effects of the proposed use will not outweigh its beneficial impacts to the town or

the neighborhood, in view of the particular characteristics of the site, and of the proposal in relation to that site. In addition to any specific factors that may be set forth in this By-Law, the determination shall include consideration of each of the following:

1. Social, economic, or community needs which are served by the proposal;
2. Traffic flow and safety, including parking and loading;
3. Adequacy of utilities and other public services;
4. Neighborhood character and social structures;
5. Impacts on the natural environment;
6. Potential fiscal impact, including impact on town services, tax base, and employment.

In addition, Section 9.2.2 of the Dedham Zoning By-Law provides that the ZBA has the power “to hear and decide appeals or petitions for variances from the terms of this By-Law, with respect to particular land or structures as set forth on G.L. c. 40A, § 10.” Section 10 of Chapter 40A of the General Laws of Massachusetts states that a variance may be granted if:

Owning to circumstances relating to soil conditions, shape or topography of such land or structures and especially affecting such land or structures but not



affecting generally the zoning district in which it is located, a literal enforcement of the provision of the ordinance or by-law would involve substantial hardship, financial or otherwise, to the petitioner or appellant and that desirable relief may be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without nullifying or substantially derogating from the intent or purpose of such ordinance or by-law.

Applicant respectfully submits that the requirements and criteria for the issuance of the requested special permits and variances are satisfied. Applicant submits that allowing four (4) lots to share a common driveway will have less impact on the alternative. Allowing the same will maintain an existing and scenic portion of Westfield Street and will avoid having to construct a driveway through a wetland buffer area. Allowing four (4) lots to share a driveway will be consistent with the neighborhood character and minimize impacts on the natural environment. By eliminating the need for an additional curb-cut on Westfield Street would also further better traffic flow in the area. Applicant also submits that due to the topography and soil conditions of the land (i.e., the presence of wetlands and wetlands buffers) Applicant would suffer a severe financial hardship if required to construct a driveway through the wetlands buffer. Furthermore, the requested relief can be granted without substantially derogating from the intent or purpose of the Zoning By-Law.

There were no questions from the Board, nor from any member of the public.

Mr. Gregory Jacobson made a motion to approve the proposal as presented. A second to the motion was made by Sara Rosenthal and a roll call vote was taken.

Tom Ryan – yes  
Sara Rosenthal - yes  
Andrew Pepoli – yes  
Greg Jacobsen – yes  
Scott Steeves – yes

The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

The Chairman then closed the public hearing by a unanimous vote of 5-0.

### **875 Providence Highway**

<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Serrato Signs LLC</b>
<b>Project Address:</b>	<b>875 Providence Highway</b>
<b>Zoning District, Map/Lot:</b>	Research & Development (RDO) Zoning District, Map/Lot 149-35
<b>Legal Notice:</b>	Request for a waiver for a 12 sq. ft. illuminated monument sign; proposed sign would be located within required front setback area.
<b>Section of Zoning Bylaw:</b>	<i>Dedham Sign Code Table 2.</i>

Anthony Serrato of Serrato Signs was on the video call to represent the Applicant. Mr. Serrato explained the proposal. He stated that this was for the Starbucks Drive-thru at the property. Cars that were attempting to turn into the correct driveway area were not able to see the current monument sign before it was too late, and they were past the entrance to it. This sign was to assist drivers to see the sign in time and make a safe turn into the driveway.

There were no members of the Board, nor any members from the public wishing to speak.

It was noted that this Applicant had recently gone before the Design Review Advisory Board for this sign and was given a favorable recommendation.

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

Greg Jacobsen – yes  
Sara Rosenthal – yes  
Tom Ryan - yes  
Andrew Pepoli – yes  
Scott Steeves – yes

The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

The Chairman then closed the public hearing by a unanimous vote of 5-0.

**49 Wentworth Street**

<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Kylie Calzone</b>
<b>Project Address:</b>	<b>49 Wentworth Street</b>

<b>Zoning District, Map/Lot:</b>	Single Residence B (SRB) Zoning District, Map/Lot 139-80
<b>Legal Notice:</b>	Request for a Variance to replace an existing side deck with a +/- 72 sq. ft. mudroom where the proposed addition would not meet the minimum side yard requirement of 10 ft. (5 ft. proposed).
<b>Section of Zoning Bylaw:</b>	<i>Town of Dedham Section 4.1, 9.2, 9.3, and Table 2.</i>

Kylie Calzone was on the video call for the application. She explained that they had a side deck on the house and was not in the best condition and needed to be replaced. Since they had to do the deck over again they would like to add a mudroom to this side and extend the house slightly for the addition. The addition would also have stairs that led down to their driveway.

There were no questions from the Board and no members of the public that wished to speak.

A motion was made by Sara Rosenthal to approve the proposal as presented. The motion was seconded by Andrew Pepoli, and a roll call vote was taken.

Greg Jacobsen – yes  
Sara Rosenthal – yes  
Tom Ryan - yes  
Andrew Pepoli – yes  
Scott Steeves – yes

The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

The Chairman then closed the public hearing by a unanimous vote of 5-0.

**46 Hazelnut Place**

<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Dan DeHart</b>
<b>Project Address:</b>	<b>46 Hazelnut Place</b>
<b>Zoning District, Map/Lot:</b>	General Residence (GR) Zoning District. Map 112, Lot 42
<b>Legal Notice:</b>	Requests a Special Permit to construct one-story addition (+/- 384 sq. ft.) that would be intensify, but not increase pre-existing nonconforming front yard setback

<b>Section of Zoning Bylaw:</b>	<i>Town of Dedham Bylaw Section 3.3, 4.1, 9.2, 9.3 and Table 2.</i>
---------------------------------	---

Dan DeHart was in attendance on the video call for the proposal. Mr. DeHart was looking to build a one-story addition. The room that he was looking to replace was in disrepair and in the process of replacing the room they would like to add a bathroom and closet.

There were no questions from the Board.

Shawn and Jamie Kelley of 38 Hazelnut Place spoke in support of the application.

A motion was made by Sara Rosenthal to approve the proposal as presented. The motion was seconded by Andrew Pepoli, and a roll call vote was taken.

Greg Jacobsen – yes  
 Sara Rosenthal – yes  
 Tom Ryan - yes  
 Andrew Pepoli – yes  
 Scott Steeves – yes

The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

The Chairman then closed the public hearing by a unanimous vote of 5-0.

**98 Quincy Avenue**

<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Raising Stars LLC, c/o Inga Yaghubyan</b>
<b>Project Address:</b>	<b>98 Quincy Avenue</b>
<b>Zoning District, Map/Lot:</b>	General Residence (GR) Zoning District. Map/Lot 142-179,
<b>Legal Notice:</b>	Request for a Special Permit for a Family Day Care (large).
<b>Section of Zoning Bylaw:</b>	<i>Town of Dedham Bylaw Sections 3.1, 9.2, 9.3, and Table 1.</i>

The Chairman stated that it had been brought to his attention that there were some issues pertaining to this application and the Applicant was working with the Building Department to resolve them. As such the Applicant was requesting a continuance until the matters could be resolved.

A motion was made by Greg Jacobsen to continue the hearing until the next meeting of December 16, 2020. Sara Rosenthal seconded the continuance motion and a roll call vote was taken.

- Greg Jacobsen – yes
- Sara Rosenthal – yes
- Tom Ryan - yes
- Andrew Pepoli – yes
- Scott Steeves – yes

The motion passed unanimously, 5-0. The hearing would be continued to December 16, 2020 at 7:00 pm.

**297 Pine Street**

<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Michael and Christine Hernon</b>
<b>Project Address:</b>	<b>297 Pine Street</b>
<b>Zoning District, Map/Lot:</b>	Single Residence B (SRB) Zoning District, Map/Lot 23-22
<b>Legal Notice:</b>	Request for Variances to construct a single-family dwelling on a lot that does not meet the required lot frontage of 95 ft. (73.57 ft. provided) and minimum front yard lot width of 95 ft. (71.67 ft. provided).
<b>Section of Zoning Bylaw:</b>	<i>Town of Dedham Bylaw Sections 4.1, 9.2, 9.3, and Table 2.</i>

Attorney Kevin Hampe was on the video call for the Applicant. Michael and Christine Hernon, the owners, were also on the Zoom video call. Attorney Hampe explained that the property had been before the Board in the past and granted relief for the frontage and front yard setback twice. In 1965 a variance was granted to the previous owner and a plan was supposed to be filed at the Registry of Deeds at that time. It was not. The present owner, Mr. Hernon was granted relief from the Zoning Board in 2014 for the frontage and front yard setback. However, at that time he was unable to carry out the work intended due to the town moratorium issued regarding sewer lines and repaving of Pine Street. Since he was unable to act on the variance at that time, it had lapsed. They were now re-requesting a variance for frontage and the front yard setback.

Gregory Jacobsen asked if the owners were planning on living in the new house if it were constructed. The owners answered that they hoped to give the house to their daughter. The owners currently lived in Mansfield.

Deborah Arunda, of 19 Eaton Road Street had previously written a letter in opposition to the application. Opposition reasons were:

- Blocking out sunlight to abutters
- House too big and too high for the non-conforming lot
- Increased density
- Decrease in property value
- Reduction in privacy
- Reduction in view

Signed,

Deborah Arunda, 18 Eaton Road  
Edward Arunda, 18 Eaton Road  
Jennifer Anderson, 26 Pine Street  
Denise Beckhold, 291 Pine Street

Andrew Pepoli asked about the “merger doctrine” that was mentioned in the letter. He asked if this was the parcel that had been merged or it was another parcel of land. Attorney Kevin Hampe replied it was a different parcel of land.

There were no other questions from the Board and no further members of the public wishing to speak.

A motion was made by Greg Jacobsen to approve the proposal as presented. The motion was seconded by Tom Ryan, and a roll call vote was taken.

Greg Jacobsen – yes  
Sara Rosenthal – yes  
Tom Ryan - yes  
Andrew Pepoli – yes  
Scott Steeves – yes

The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

The Chairman then closed the public hearing by a unanimous vote of 5-0.

## **Minutes**

Greg Jacobsen made a motion to approve the minutes of August 19, 2020. Sara Rosenthal seconded the motion and a roll call vote was taken.

Greg Jacobsen – yes  
Sara Rosenthal – yes  
Tom Ryan - yes  
Andrew Pepoli – yes  
Scott Steeves – yes

The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

## **Old Business/New Business**

Michelle Tinger, Assistant Planning Director, wished to inform the Board that on December 16, 2020 meeting that the Sign Code Consultants would be on the meeting to give an update and recommendations on the Sign Code.

A motion was made by Gregory Jacobsen to adjourn the meeting at 9:00 pm. The motion was seconded by Sara Rosenthal, and a roll call vote was taken.

Greg Jacobsen – yes  
Sara Rosenthal – yes  
Tom Ryan - yes  
Andrew Pepoli – yes  
Scott Steeves – yes

The motion passed unanimously, 5-0.