

James F. McGrail, Chairman
J. Gregory Jacobsen, Vice Chairman
Scott M. Steeves
E. Patrick Maguire, MLA, RLA, CLARB, LEED AP®
Jason L. Mammone, P.E.

Associate Members
Jessica L. Porter
Jared F. Nokes, J.D.



Dedham Town Hall
26 Bryant Street
Dedham, Ma 02026-4458
Phone 781-751-9242
Fax 781-751-9225

Susan Webster
Administrative Assistant
swebster@dedham-ma.gov

TOWN OF DEDHAM ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MINUTES

Wednesday, April 19, 2017, 7:00 p.m., Lower Conference Room

Present and Voting: James F. McGrail, Esq., Chairman
J. Gregory Jacobsen, Vice Chairman
Scott M. Steeves
Jason L. Mammone, P.E.
Jessica L. Porter



Staff: Susan Webster, Administrative Assistant

Mr. McGrail called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. The plans, documents, studies, etc. referred to are incorporated as part of the public record and are on file in the Planning and Zoning office. In addition, the legal notice for each hearing was read into the record. Member E. Patrick Maguire, MLA, RLA, CLARB, LEED AP, ® was unable to attend this meeting. Accordingly, Chairman McGrail appointed Associate Member Jessica L. Porter to sit in his stead.

Mr. McGrail, on behalf of the Zoning Board of Appeals, recognized Richard Cimeno, a former member of the Board and the Housing Inspector for the Town of Dedham. He was also the father of Town of Dedham Building Commissioner, Kenneth Cimeno. Mr. Cimeno passed away April 12, 2017, and his funeral service was this morning. Mr. McGrail asked that a brief moment of silence be held in his memory.

Applicant:	Edward and Ellen Donovan, 41 Antwerp Street, Milton, MA
Property Address:	127 Milton Street, Dedham, MA
Case #:	VAR-02-17-2203
Property Owner:	Edward and Ellen Donovan, 41 Antwerp Street, Milton, MA
Zoning District and Map/Lot	General Business/General Residence, Map 113, Lot 47
Application Date:	February 28, 2017
Present and Voting:	James F. McGrail, Esq., J. Gregory Jacobsen, Scott M. Steeves, Jason L. Mammone, P.E., Jessica L. Porter
Representative:	Edward and Ellen Donovan, owners
Legal Notice:	To be allowed a Special Permit to set a garage 10 feet into the General Residence zoning district.
Section of Zoning Bylaw:	<i>Town of Dedham Zoning Bylaw Section 2.1.4.3 Location of Boundaries</i>

Mr. and Mrs. Donovan would like to construct a new three-car garage. The current garage will be torn down. There will be six parking spaces. The new garage will be ten feet into the General Residence zone and will be used for storage for his electrical company. The property also contains a house that is used solely as a business; there are no residents. His plan is to keep the bucket truck in the garage, and to store his work material inside. The landscaping is good. Mr. Mammone pointed out that the plans submitted to the Board do not show the zoning line or the distance to the General Residence district. Mr. McGrail said the Board can vote with the condition that Mr. Donovan provides a plan with this. No one in the audience spoke in favor or against the petition.

Mr. Mammone moved to allow a Special Permit to set a garage 10 feet into the General Residence zoning district with the condition that Mr. Donovan provide a plan depicting the 10 foot distance from the zoning line to the end of the building within the General Residence district when he applies for a building permit. Ms. Porter seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous at 5-0.

Applicant:	Josephine (Jody) Angevin
Property Address:	67 Chestnut Street, Dedham, MA
Case #:	VAR-03-17-2206
Property Owner:	Josephine Angevin
Zoning District and Map/Lot	Single Residence B, Map 106, Lot 10
Application Date:	March 17, 2017
Present and Voting:	James F. McGrail, Esq., J. Gregory Jacobsen, Scott M. Steeves, Jason L. Mammone, P.E., Jessica L. Porter
Representative:	Christopher Cabot
Legal Notice:	To be allowed a Special Permit for an 8.2 foot side yard setback instead of the required 10 feet to construct a one-story addition consisting of a bedroom, bathroom, and laundry room.
Section of Zoning Bylaw:	<i>Town of Dedham Zoning Bylaw Section 4.1, Table of Dimensional Requirements</i>

Mr. Cabot explained that the Applicant wishes to take down a two-story addition and construct a one-story addition that will be used as a bedroom, bathroom, and laundry room. The house is already very close to the property line. The addition will come out in the same direction, but will be a little longer than the existing addition. There will be no change in setback. The Applicant presented a petition in support of the addition signed by Monica Caine, 57 Chestnut Street, and Alexandra Jump, 72 Chestnut Street. No one in the audience spoke in favor or against the petition.

Mr. Steeves moved to allow a Special Permit for an 8.2 foot side yard setback instead of the required 10 feet to construct a one-story addition consisting of a bedroom, bathroom, and laundry room, seconded by Mr. Jacobsen. The vote was unanimous at 5-0.

Applicant:	John E. Aplin, Trustee, Aplin Realty Trust
Property Address:	331 Whiting Avenue, Dedham, MA
Case #:	VAR-03-17-2205

Property Owner:	John E. Aplin, Trustee, Aplin Realty Trust, 331 Whiting Avenue, Dedham, MA
Zoning District and Map/Lot	General Residence, Map 128, Lot 105
Application Date:	May 17, 2017
Present and Voting:	James F. McGrail, Esq., J. Gregory Jacobsen, Scott M. Steeves, Jason L. Mammone, P.E., Jessica L. Porter
Representative:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peter A. Zahka II, Esq., 12 School Street, Dedham, MA • John Aplin, Trustee • Scott Henderson, P.E., Henderson Consulting Services, 144 Washington Street, #1, Quincy, MA 02169
Legal Notice:	To be allowed such Special Permits and variance as required to change, alter, extend, and/or reconstruct nonconforming uses and structures on a nonconforming lot (with frontage and lot width of approximately 57.68 feet), including the demolition of four (4) nonconforming commercial buildings used for a landscaping business and contractor's yard and construction of a new commercial building which will have a side yard setback of five (5) feet, and associated parking and outdoor storage, to be continued to be used for a landscaping business and contractor's yard, the erection of retaining walls in excess of four (4) feet in height, and the continued use of a nonconforming, two-family dwelling on the same lot with a side yard setback of five (5) feet.
Section of Zoning Bylaw:	<i>Town of Dedham Zoning Bylaw Sections 3.1.3 Use Regulation Table, 3.3 Nonconforming Uses and Structures, 4.1 Dimensional Requirements, 6.5.2 Retaining Walls, 9.2 Board of Appeal, 9.3 Special Permits, Table 1 Principal Use Regulations, and Table 2 Table of Dimensional Requirements</i>

Mr. Zahka reviewed the existing site, which contains 22, 291 square feet of land and 57.5 feet of frontage as shown on the submitted GIS map. It is located between on a section of Whiting Avenue between Walnut and River Streets. The property is in the General Residence zoning district, although it may have been in the LM zone at one time. The property is pre-existing nonconforming in use and dimensionally. Currently on the site is a two-family dwelling and four commercial buildings, some of which were built in the 1900's. The Applicant uses the property as a contractor's yard for his landscaping business, as it has been used in the past. Nothing will comply because the property is in the General Residence zoning district. The Zoning Bylaw's requirements for General Residence is lot frontage and lot width of 90 feet, minimum side yard of 10 feet, and minimum rear yard of 20 feet. Frontage and lot width of the property is approximately 57.68 feet, and one of the commercial buildings is only 5 feet from the property line. Rear setback is 2.7 feet, and the two-family dwelling is only 5 feet.

The proposal is to demolish all the commercial buildings and construct a newer building with 5,850 square feet. Floor area will be about 5,500 net square feet. The Applicant wants to continue using the building as his landscaping business and contractor's yard. As part of the site work, retaining walls will be over four feet, requiring a Special Permit. Because it is pre-existing

nonconforming, the Zoning Board of Appeals has the authority to grant Special Permits to change, alter, extend, renovate, etc., pre-existing nonconforming uses, as well as the dimensional issues. The proposed building would be 5 feet off the side property line; the reason is that, given the nature of the business, there needs to be a turning radius that allows trucks and equipment to enter the site for storage.

Basically, Mr. Aplin is cleaning up the current conditions by putting his equipment in a single building. The project also triggers site plan review with the Planning Board, and Zoning Board of Appeals approval is necessary to proceed with that. No relief will be asked tonight for parking. The Applicant will also need to go to the Conservation Commission for storm water management. As outlined in his memo, Mr. Zahka believed they meet the standards for issuance of the Special Permit. It is continuation of an existing use in a much better area. Mr. Aplin informed his neighbors of the project and presented a signed petition and letters in favor.

Mr. McGrail summarized the petition:

1. Special Permit for construction of a new commercial building with a side yard setback of 5.'
2. Special Permit for erection of retaining walls in excess of 4' in height.
3. Variance for the continued use of a nonconforming use of a nonconforming two-family dwelling on the same lot with a side yard setback of 5.'
4. Special Permit to reconstruct a nonconforming use and structure on a nonconforming lot with frontage and lot width of approximately 57.68 feet.
5. Variance for demolition of four nonconforming commercial buildings used for a landscaping business and contractor's yard.
6. Special Permit for continued use of the property for a landscaping business and contractor's yard.

Mr. Mammone asked if there is any issue with the next door neighbor regarding the retaining walls, and Mr. Zahka said they were in favor. Mr. Aplin said he has had a long-standing agreement with that neighbor that they can park on his property in exchange for him be allowed access to the back of his building. He has a permit for that. The new building will be set behind the house, which will provide better sight line.

Edward Mahoney, 337 Whiting Avenue: He asked if the new retaining wall would go on top of the existing one. Mr. Aplin said they would remove the existing wall and replace it with a new one. The existing walls are 4 feet high in some sections, and there is a 30 foot section where the wall is 6-8 feet high. He said the new wall would be no higher than it currently is. Mr. Mahoney asked if anyone can use the mulch in the yard, and Mr. Aplin said it was for his customers only, and it is trucked off site for his business.

Mary Mahoney, 337 Whiting Avenue: She asked if he would eventually decide to rent out space to another company. Mr. Aplin said it was solely for his business. He also said he would not be adding any trucks. He has 15 trucks in total, of which 12 will be on site. The remaining 3 will be on another site. He said his goal is to put most of the vehicles inside and put the landscape trailers in back. The worst case scenario would be that there would be four or five trucks showing. Mrs. Mahoney asked how many square feet are allowed per truck. Mr. Zahka said there is no law for this. He again said that Mr. Aplin's first priority was to operate his business in a better manner and shield the vehicles from the weather.

Mr. Mahoney commented that there is a lot of traffic on Whiting Avenue, particularly since another landscaping company on the street has enlarged. Mr. McGrail said he did a site visit, and the proposal is not for anything other than what he already does. He said that razing the old buildings would be an aesthetic improvement and a substantial upgrade to the area. He asked Mr. Aplin if he planned to expand his operation, and he said he cannot do that because there is no more room. Mr. Zahka said that it will be the same operation, but conducted in a more orderly fashion. They want to delineate the area for outdoor storage; right now it can be anywhere on site. In addition, parking on the site is random; the Planning Board will deal with this. As for vehicles, this will allow trucks and trailers to be parked inside. In the winter, workers take trucks home for plowing, and they are in and out during the winter working on the equipment.

Mr. Mahoney then asked if he how he would bring the trucks in, and Mr. Aplin said they would be backed in. The hours of operation will be from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. with no work on Sundays; this is typical of the business now, and will not change. Mr. Mahoney said that a couple of times he has had to tell the workers that they cannot be there on Sunday, and he does not want to have issues like that. Mr. Aplin said this was probably over 20 years ago. Mr. McGrail said there is no particular law regarding hours of operation for this property, but the Zoning Board of Appeals has put conditions on this in the past. Mr. Mahoney said she has never seen that many trucks parked there. She asked if there would be more traffic with the new building.

Mr. McGrail asked about deliveries to the site. Mr. Aplin said that there are rare deliveries during the day. The vehicles load up in the morning, and return at the end of the day. From traffic generation, there is not a lot of activity. The mulch is out in the open right now; with the proposed changes, it will be behind the building, and no one will see it. The building will be about 20 feet high; currently, the existing buildings are of various heights, one of which is about 30 feet high. Mr. Zahka noted that their submission included a floor plan and a rendering of the building.

Christos Nikou, 346 Whiting Avenue: He asked about safety, and whether there will be an oil separator on the ground. Mr. McGrail said that Mr. Aplin has been operating the business for 27 years, and he is not proposing to anything different, only upgrade and clean up the property. Mr. Nikou said he parks four or five trucks on the property, and he will be putting 15 on site with the new proposal. Mr. McGrail corrected him, saying there will be 12 on site, of which 7 to 8 will be inside, and 4 to 5 outside. Currently, he can only park 2 inside. Mr. Nikou said he hears trucks at 9 or 10 p.m. but this was two years ago. Mrs. Mahoney said she has awakened to the noise of a very large truck at 6:15 a.m., beeping back and forth, and this required a call to the police. She was told that businesses' hours of operation are 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Mr. Zahka said that the employees can show up at 6 a.m. or 5 a.m.; there are no hours of operation for a business, other than a retail business, in the Town. There is a noise requirement, which is a separate issue for working on a site and how early work can start. The current situation is unregulated.

In terms of the oil separator, Mr. Aplin will need to go to the Conservation Commission for storm water management, and they will deal with that. The Building Commissioner will also require whatever the Building Code requires for this type of use. The Conservation Commission, in addition to looking at the outside, will also be looking inside the building because of the nature of the use, as will the Building Department when it issues the building permit for the structure. Mr. McGrail said this is only one step in the process for Mr. Aplin. He will need review by the Planning Board, Conservation Commission, and Building Department.

Ms. Porter said that the Zoning Board of Appeals can give relief for walls over four feet in height, but there is no limit. She asked if the Board could put in a condition that the wall cannot exceed the current height. Mr. Aplin agreed to that. Mr. Henderson said that, based on existing topography and the existing walls in site, the tallest wall is about 5.5 feet tall. The wall will be engineered, and will be more resilient and sustainable. Mrs. Mahoney asked about landscaping, noting that trees were cut down in the past but not replaced. Mr. Aplin said they would plan arborvitae along the back to block the back of the building. Mr. Zahka will be submitting a full landscaping plan to the Planning Board, and they will also need to go to the Design Review Advisory Board for this. Mr. McGrail noted that this is not within the purview of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. McGrail noted a petition signed by eight neighbors in support of the project:

Thomas Wood	1 Business Street
Tim Sullivan	5 Business Street
Jane Weiss	335 Whiting Avenue
Andrew Weiss	335 Whiting Avenue
Arnold Mancini	38 Oakdale Avenue
Linda Goldman	331 Whiting Avenue
Thomas Cargill	9 Business Street
Mark MacLean	51 Fairview Street

There were no further questions from the Board or the audience.

Mr. McGrail moved the following:

- To allow a Special Permit to reconstruct a nonconforming use and structure on a nonconforming lot with frontage and lot width of approximately 57.68 feet, seconded by Mr. Jacobsen, voted unanimously.
- To allow a variance for demolition of four nonconforming commercial buildings used for a landscaping business and contractor's yard, seconded by Mr. Steeves, voted unanimously.
- To allow a Special Permit for construction of a new commercial building with a side yard setback of 5', seconded by Mr. Jacobsen, voted unanimously.
- To allow a Special Permit for the continued use of the property for a landscaping business and contractor's yard, seconded by Mr. Steeves, voted unanimously.
- To allow a Special Permit for erection of retaining walls that will be in excess of 4' in height but no higher than 6', seconded by Mr. Jacobsen, voted unanimously.
- To allow a Special Permit for the continued use of a nonconforming two-family dwelling on the same lot with a side yard setback of 5', seconded by Mr. Mammone, voted unanimously.

Applicant:

Marybeth Reddish, 11 Drayton Road, Dedham, MA

Property Address:

25 Eled Way, Dedham, MA

Case #:

VAR-03-17-2207

Property Owner:

Reddish Properties, LLC, c/o Elsa H. Reddish, 28582 La Caille Drive, Naples, FL 34119

Zoning District and Map/Lot

LMA, Map 129, Lot 144

Application Date:

March 20, 2017

Present and Voting:	James F. McGrail, Esq., J. Gregory Jacobsen, Scott M. Steeves, Jason L. Mammone, P.E., Jessica L. Porter
Representative:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kevin F. Hampe, Esq., 411 Washington Street, Dedham, MA • Marybeth Reddish, 11 Drayton Road, Dedham, MA • Matthew Bombaci, P.E., Bohler Engineering, 352 Turnpike Road, Southborough, MA 01772
Legal Notice:	To be allowed a waiver from the Town of Dedham Sign Code for a side yard setback of 2 feet, a front yard setback of 1.5 feet for placement of a pylon sign, and 70 square feet of signage (15 square feet for the pylon sign and 55 square feet for a wall sign) with no frontage in the LMA zoning district and the Flood Plain Overlay District.
Section of Sign Code:	<i>Town of Dedham Sign Code Section 237-19 Computation of Sign Area and Height, Section 237, Table 2 Dimensions and Location</i>

Mr. Hampe described the site, which is located off River Street near Four Corners. There is an approximately 225 foot right of way to the proposed location for Xchange Leasing, LLC, a subsidiary of Uber. This will be a location where Uber will store cars for leasing purposes for drivers who do not want to use their own cars. Leasing will be for two, four, six months, or more. There will be an office for Xchange Leasing, LLC, in 4,000 square feet, and storage of cars in the parking area, which is located behind Curtis Newton Lumber and away from the residential area. The Applicant will be going before the Planning Board for site plan review on 4/28/17.

The Applicant is seeking waivers from the Town of Dedham Sign Code for a free-standing sign located on River Street in an area that is owned by the property owners of Pizzadoro's. Mr. Hampe presented a signed letter from the 23-27 River Street Condominium Association that gives permission to the Applicant to locate the proposed sign on the property. They have gone before the Design Review Advisory Board and made the suggested changes, including a slightly larger pole for the 3' x 5' free-standing sign and color. There would also be a wall sign on the building that measures 3' x 10'; it had originally been 55 square feet, but DRAB suggested a smaller sign with the same colors as the free-standing sign. The building is in the back, and no one can see it from the street, so DRAB thought a smaller sign was more appropriate.

Ms. Porter asked what is allowed by right on the building. Mr. Bombaci said it is generally calculated based on frontage in the LMA district. There is also frontage on Paradise Lane, which is a residential district, but their frontage will be in the LMA zoning district. Ms. Porter also asked how the proposed sign compares in height and overall size to the other signs on the street. Mr. Bombaci said their sign is probably the same size as the Maaco sign. Ms. Porter's concern is to try to improve the signage in the area to bring more consistency. Adding something taller than the existing signs is not great in terms of the visual affect, but also for wayfinding. It is easier for drivers if there are uniform signs. Mr. McGrail asked if the Applicant would agree not to make the sign any higher, and she agreed.

Mr. Mammone said that it looks like the numbers 1.5' and 2.0' are reversed on the plans. Mr. Bombaci said the side yard is shown as 1.5' and the front yard 2'. Mr. Hampe said that they asked for a 2' side yard setback, but it shows as 1.5' on the plans. They also asked for 1.5' on the front

yard setback, but it shows as 2.' They will be able to work with that. Mr. Mammone said that approval will be conditioned on submission of a plan stamped by a professional land surveyor. Ms. Porter asked if there would be illumination, and there will be none. No one in the audience spoke in favor or against the petition.

Ms. Porter moved to approve a waiver from the Town of Dedham Sign Code for a side yard setback of 2 feet and a front yard setback of 1.5 feet for placement of a pylon sign as requested by the Applicant, with the conditions that the Applicant submit a stamped plan signed by a professional land surveyor, that there be no illumination of the sign, and that the sign not be higher than any of the other signs in the general area. The request for 55 square feet of signage was withdrawn and replaced by 30 square feet of signage. Mr. Steeves seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous at 5-0.

Applicant:	Dedham Wings, LLC
Property Address:	850 Providence Highway, Dedham, MA
Case #:	VAR-01-17-2182
Property Owner:	850 Providence Highway Associates, c/o McNeil Associates, 75 McNeil Way, Suite 301, Dedham, MA
Zoning District and Map/Lot	Highway Business, Map 149, Lot 1
Application Date:	January 18, 2017
Present and Voting:	James F. McGrail, Esq., J. Gregory Jacobsen, Scott M. Steeves, Jason L. Mammone, P.E., Jessica L. Porter
Representative:	None
Legal Notice:	To be allowed a waiver from the Town of Dedham Sign Code for a sign that will be higher than the existing roof line.
Section of Sign Code:	<i>Town of Dedham Sign Code Section 237-19E</i>

Mr. McGrail called for the hearing on Dedham Wings, LLC, 850 Providence Highway, Dedham, MA, but no one was present for the meeting. He said that the Board would hear any comments from the members or the audience. Those present in the audience included Allison Staton, 30 Woodleigh Road, Georgiana Woods, 4 College Place, Mary Jane Parnell, 20 Church Street, and Jean Zeiler, 59 Woodleigh Road.

Ms. Staton wondered what it meant if the Applicant is not at this meeting. Mr. McGrail said that the Board typically would continue it to the next meeting, which would be May 17, 2017. He explained that the Applicant was at the first meeting, then sent a letter for the next continuation requesting another continuation because their representative was stuck in traffic in New York during a snowstorm. That hearing was continued to tonight. Ms. Webster said she had notified the representative of this meeting. There has been no information on why he was not present tonight. Ms. Staton said she was present to officially oppose the waiver. Mr. McGrail was aware of the controversy of this entity, and said the Board has received a number of e-mails, phone calls, and encounters while walking down the street. He said everyone knows where the Town of Dedham stands in this regard.

Ms. Zeiler asked why the Summer Shack sign was still on the building. She said it seemed like it should be gone by now. The Town of Dedham Sign Code states the following:

Section 237-24 Removal of sign when business is discontinued.

A sign permit shall lapse and become void when there has been a discontinuance of the activities, business, goods or services described on the sign. The owner shall remove a sign within 30 days of discontinuance of the activities, business, goods or services described on the sign. A Freestanding Pre-existing Non-conforming Sign structure shall be removed after three-hundred and sixty five days have elapsed where all signage on said structure has been or is required to be removed for discontinuance of the activities, business, goods or services.

Mr. McGrail said the sign should be blank right now. The Building Department has jurisdiction over this, and should tell them that it should be either covered or taken down. The space itself is owned by the landlord, so Hooters can go in and take that space on the pylon. With regard to Hooters' petition for signage, this is only for the signs on the building itself. The issue is the sign that will be higher than the roofline. The roofline is very low there. They propose replacing the Summer Shack signs with Hooters signs in the same locations. Ms. Staton asked if there is any requirement that Hooters should use the Applicant's name on the sign. The applicant is Dedham Wings, and maybe this should be used instead of Hooters. Mr. McGrail did not think so.

Mr. McGrail said the Dedham Sign Code really needs to be revamped. The Board will to end the meeting tonight by making a formal request to the Planning Department and the Building Department to undertake a formal review of the Dedham Sign Code. Ms. Staton asked if Town Meeting would have a say on this, and Mr. McGrail said it would vote on the changes that are requested. He said it would have no impact on the Hooters' application. Ms. Webster said that Richard McCarthy, the planning director, is in the process of reviewing the Sign Code. Mr. McGrail said he wanted to be sure that the Zoning Board of Appeals is on record as supporting this, and making sure Mr. McCarthy understood their stance.

Summer Shack did not come before the ZBA, and no one raised any objection to their sign. Hooters is asking to do the same thing. The ZBA does not deny applicants and then get sued, expending money from tax resources on an inevitable verdict. He said it does not make sense to do that. He also said there is nothing the Board can do about Hooters coming to town. He said they will make them come back and listen to the Board. The best the Board can do this evening is to continue it until the next meeting in May. Ms. Staton said, as a tax paying resident of the Town, she firmly believed that it would be money well spent for the Town to fight (*unintelligible*). She said that sometimes making a statement and losing a fight is better than not even trying. At an earlier presentation, she heard the representative say they were losing money by paying rent on space that they could not use yet; she said the Town should let them continue to lose money.

Ms. Porter said that the Board encouraged the representative to leave and think about ways that they could improve the signage, i.e., lighting, making the pedestal sign smaller, change the form of illumination or size of the sign they are requesting for the building, or remove the owl. This was the reason for the initial continuation, and this is the reason for this continuation. Mr. McGrail said that is why they want to meet with them again. He said he did not think they would be able to deny the sign, but he hoped that the Board would have an impact on the end product.

Ms. Staton thanked the Board for allowing them to speak. He also noted that Margaret Adams, 255 East Street, sent another e-mail expressing her opposition. Mr. McGrail said the hearing will

be continued to May 17, 2017, at approximately 7:30 p.m. Mr. Steeves moved to continue the hearing to that date, seconded by Ms. Porter, and voted unanimously at 5-0.

Ms. Porter made a motion for the Zoning Board of Appeals to endorse a review of the Town of Dedham Sign Code to be conducted by the Planning Department and the Building Department, seconded by Mr. Steeves, and voted unanimously at 5-0. Mr. Jacobsen asked if, during the review of the Sign Code, the Planning Department or the Building Department come up with something that is decent, whether the Zoning Board of Appeals could sell it to have the approval be done in the Building Department instead of the Zoning Board of Appeals. Mr. McGrail said it was possible, but he does not necessarily like the idea of taking it away in its entirety from the ZBA. He thought it was good to have people talk to the Board so it can shape it better. Mr. Jacobsen also asked if May 17, 2017, would be the last time Hooters can show up. Mr. McGrail said that if they do not show up at that time, the petition will be denied. The Board agreed.

Review of Minutes: Mr. Jacobsen moved to approve the minutes of March 25, 2017, seconded by Mr. Steeves, and voted unanimously at 5-0.

Mr. Steeves moved to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Jacobsen, and voted unanimously at 5-0. The meeting ended at 8:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Susan Webster
Administrative Assistant