

**Planning Board**

Michael A. Podolski, Esq., Chair  
John R. Bethoney, Vice Chair  
Robert D. Aldous, Clerk  
Ralph I. Steeves  
James E. O'Brien IV

**Planning Director**

Richard J. McCarthy Jr.  
[rmccarthy@dedham-ma.gov](mailto:rmccarthy@dedham-ma.gov)



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

**Administrative Assistant**

Susan Webster  
[swebster@dedham-ma.gov](mailto:swebster@dedham-ma.gov)

**TOWN OF DEDHAM  
PLANNING BOARD**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**June 9, 2016, 7 p.m., Lower Conference Room**



**Present:** Michael A. Podolski, Esq., Chair  
John R. Bethoney, Vice Chair  
Robert D. Aldous, Clerk  
Ralph I. Steeves  
James E. O'Brien IV  
Richard J. McCarthy, Jr., Planning Director

**Applicant:**

**Project Address:**

**Case #:**

**Zoning District:**

**Representative(s):**

**TILL, Inc.**

**83 Washington Street, Dedham, MA**

**SITE-04-16-2088 – SCOPING SESSION**

Single Residence B

- Dafna Krouk-Gordon, President, TILL, Inc., 20 Eastbrook Road, Suite 201, Dedham, MA
- Cindy Anderson, Director of Vocational Services, TILL, Inc.
- Brian Donahue, AIA, 21 McGrath Highway, Quincy, MA 02169

Time: 7:05 to 8:00 p.m. Mr. Podolski noted that this is the first architectural scoping review by the Planning Board since Town Meeting approved the Board to conduct this review.

Ms. Krouk-Gordon gave the background of TILL, Inc., a recognized 501(c)3 non-profit organization offering residential, clinical, family support services, and day and vocational programs for individuals with disabilities. The proposal is for construction of a building with a commercial kitchen for training cooks at the former Oasis site; this replaces a commercial kitchen on River Street in Hyde Park. The group has contracts with charter schools and currently prepares over 596,000 breakfasts and lunches for children throughout Greater Boston and South Shore. The employees come in at 6 a.m. and the food goes out between 10:00 and 11:00 a.m. The existing liquor license from the Oasis will be sold, and the buildings will be demolished. She passed around existing and proposed pictures, and said they are very concerned about the aesthetics of any of their sites because (1) people spend a lot of time there and (2) they want to project a certain image. Even though TILL is a non-profit, it owns commercial space and apartment buildings. Ms. Krouk-Gordon said the whole idea of a non-profit is that any "profit" or

anything that is done financially goes right back into the agency, which is how they are able to keep developing new services. They have 1,011 employees, and have support services for autism and vocational training, bringing it to about 1,800 support people.

Mr. Donahue explained the site and the proposed 7,200 square foot, two-story building, which will have a 40' x 90' footprint. The renderings given to the Board are the latest ones, and the ones that DRAB liked the best. The kitchen will be on the first floor. Much of the material will be no to low maintenance, i.e., wood veneer siding attached to plywood with a resin finish. There will be a small café for employees only. The taller side of the building will be galvanized corrugated gray metal and Hardie plank, which are also low maintenance. There is a slight pitch to the roof. The side facing the residential neighborhood will have plastic siding. Lighting will be simple, possibly uplighting, as the building is not used at night. Each entry will be lit. The largest delivery truck will be a box truck. There is parking all around the building.

Mr. Podolski asked if Ms. Krouk-Gordon thought the architecture would fit into the Single Residence B residential nature of this part of Washington Street, as this would be a modern building in a colonial town and it will stand out. Ms. Krouk-Gordon thought that it would be good to stand out as a commercial building, and would start a trend. She said that landscaping will make a difference. Mr. McCarthy said the location is in a Single Residence B zone, not a commercial zone. This project would be grandfathered. He said there are two thoughts: will it really change the area to trend that way, or will it be something that stands out but fits in. He showed photos of the houses across the street.

Mr. Bethoney said he applauded what the business does, but the applicant is departing significantly from the regulations in Section 9.5.7 of the Zoning Bylaw; he suggested that she read that. He asked if Ms. Krouk-Gordon had spoken with any of the neighbors about the proposal and the appearance; she had not, but was planning to. He said that she has an obligation to do that. The Planning Board's job is to minimize unreasonable departure from the character, materials, and scale of buildings in the immediate vicinity as viewed from public ways; he did not think this design is doing that. Ms. Krouk-Gordon strongly disagreed, saying that the building will maximize the location and upgrade the neighborhood. Mr. Bethoney understood this, but explained that there are regulations from which the Board cannot deviate. He said that it would be possible that the neighbors will like the design, so she should show it to them. Ms. Krouk-Gordon asked if the regulations state that the Board must take when the neighbors want, and they do not. She said that DRAB loved it but the Board does not, and asked what they would choose if the neighbors liked it. She asked why she would bother asking the neighbors. Mr. Bethoney explained that he is trying to give the applicant another direction. There is a long history with the neighbors, citing the Mall, the Oasis, Motherbrook, and apartment buildings. This is their neighborhood, and based on his experience with them, the building will likely be considered unfavorably. He said he would prefer a more traditional building, but she could propose whatever she liked.

Mr. Donahue asked how the Board defined traditional. Mr. Bethoney cited 420 Washington Street as an example. Mr. Donahue said this is a contemporary building, and that architecture is subjective. He asked that the Board keep an open mind, saying that DRAB was happy with it, but this is a 180° change. Mr. Podolski explained the advisory role of DRAB and that the Planning Board is the final say. He said he is considering meeting with DRAB privately to review the proposal to see why their opinions are so different. Mr. O'Brien kind of liked the renderings, saying that this may be a new, more industrial look. If she talks with the neighbors and if they

like the design, it would be great. Ms. Krouk-Gordon asked the Board to think a bit differently, saying they have tried to fit in with other towns. She explained why the design changed, citing the fact that they make 596,000 meals and need a more functional, open kitchen.

Mr. Aldous said that it is more the gray metal siding on the building that bothers him the most, and said it makes the building look ugly. He asked that they change it to a normal type of siding, i.e., brick or wood. He said he would not like it if he was a neighbor. Mr. Bethoney asked Mr. McCarthy under what level of review this proposal falls. Mr. McCarthy said it is under peer review and is a minor site plan because it is an educational use. Mr. Bethoney said his issue with the building is its overall shape, design, and façade material, and it has gone too far. This project qualifies for architectural peer review on design. Ms. Krouk-Gordon questioned this, and how far this has to go. Mr. Podolski said the Board ultimately decides, but obtains peer review from an architect. She asked if it was a traditional or modern architect and who pays for the review.

Mr. Steeves attempted to clarify what is being said for Ms. Krouk-Gordon. He said the Board does not like contemporary. He asked how many meals go out of the site, and she said nearly 500,000 a year from this site. The meals, breakfast and lunch, go to charter schools, which pay for the meals. This is vocational training for the employees. Mr. Podolski cited 910 Washington Street, which was built two to three years ago. This building is as close as the Board will ever get to a contemporary building, and they love it. Mr. Steeves noted that this neighborhood is commercial.

Mr. Podolski advised Ms. Krouk-Gordon to speak with Mr. McCarthy and then come back with another site plan. Mr. Bethoney explained the required architectural review and that the Zoning Bylaw regulations already put her at a disadvantage. Ms. Krouk-Gordon said she will work on this. She also asked if there would be a possibility for a waiver. Mr. Podolski said that a new design would not require much review. The Board is trying to determine how the new rules on architectural review, which were voted on at Town Meeting, would apply. She asked if hiring a peer review architect is a requirement of the rules.

Mr. Steeves said that the Board does not want a contemporary building. Ms. Krouk-Gordon said she heard him before. She continued to interrupt and said she did not believe he was speaking for the Board, but he was certainly the most colorful. She again asked if a peer review architect is required because she was not sure what one more architect would give the Board other than an opinion. She also asked if she would select the architect. Mr. Podolski said the Board would choose the architect. She then asked why they are bothering, because she was pretty sure she knew what they would say. Mr. Podolski again said that the rules require it. Mr. O'Brien said that architecture is a subjective matter. Some members of the Board have a fixed mind on what they want to see. The possible fear is that there would be an architect picked that is like-minded. Ms. Krouk-Gordon said they pay for it, and asked why it was needed if she is willing to come in with another alternative that the Board would like.

Mr. Bethoney said that the peer review architect looks at all the details that the Board may not be aware of. There are nuances that they will examine. He again said that the regulations already put her at a disadvantage. Ms. Krouk-Gordon again asked if there was a waiver possibility that, if the Board likes it, it would need another architect. She said there are no other towns that she could name that ask for an architect to review a building. Mr. Bethoney asked Mr. McCarthy if there were any other towns that did this. Mr. McCarthy said there are towns that do it. Mr. Podolski said that he would tend to think that if she returned with a different design that the Board would like more, they probably would not need much from another architect. He said they

would discuss this with Mr. McCarthy and figure out what they are supposed to do since this is so new and there is no list of architects that they could hire yet. Ms. Krouk-Gordon said they will work on pleasing four out of five people on the Board. Mr. Podolski said she might please everyone, but she said it would be highly unlikely.

Mr. Bethoney made a further suggestion, noting that this is what scoping sessions are designed for. He said that the regulations regarding site plan review and design review are clearly defined in the Zoning Bylaw. There will be a peer reviewer who will look at all aspects of the site from parking to lighting to landscaping to design. She interrupted, saying they have already paid for that. Mr. Bethoney explained how the dialogue should go: he talks and he finishes, then she can talk. He asked that she not interrupt the Board when someone is speaking. He cited the many developments the Board has handled, i.e., Hebrew Senior Life and Legacy Place, and said the Board is very capable of going through a reasonable review. He said there are regulations that they are obligated to follow.

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Applicant:</b>         | <b>Chick-fil-A</b>  |
| <b>Project Address:</b>   | <b>100 Providence Highway, Dedham, MA</b>   |
| <b>Case #:</b>            | <b>SITE-02-16-2067 – <u>SCOPING SESSION</u></b>   |
| <b>Zoning District:</b>   | Highway Business  |
| <b>Representative(s):</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Peter A. Zahka II, Esq., 12 School Street, Dedham, MA</li><li>• Anthony Donato, P.E., LEED AP BD+C, Project Engineer, Bohler Engineering, 352 Turnpike Road, Southborough, MA 01772</li></ul> |

Time: 8:02 to 8:11 p.m. Mr. Zahka has submitted a Certificate of Action for Board consideration. Mr. Podolski reviewed it and only incorporated a reference to the two Zoning Board of Appeals. He also caught an inconsistency in that in one area it was called major site plan review, and in another it was called minor site plan review. He otherwise thought it was well done. Mr. Steeves moved to approve the Certificate of Action as presented, seconded by Mr. Aldous, and voted unanimously 5-0. The Certificate of Action was signed.

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Applicant:</b>         | <b>EG/GP3 480 Sprague Street, LLC, c/o Griffith Properties</b>                                  |
| <b>Project Address:</b>   | <b>480 Sprague Street, Dedham, MA</b>   |
| <b>Case #:</b>            | <b>SITE-05-14-1844</b>  |
| <b>Zoning District:</b>   | Limited Manufacturing A   |
| <b>Representative(s):</b> | Donna Pennino, Principal, Griffith Properties, 260 Franklin Street, 5th Floor, Boston, MA 02110 |

Time: 8:16 to 8:28 p.m. Griffith Properties was called in by the Planning Board due to problems with trucks and parking. Macy's complained that it was unable to get its trucks out. The Planning Board had approved expansion of the parking lot in June 2015 after Griffiths had purchased the property. Phase 1 has been completed; this was shown on the map, as were Phase 2 and Phase 3. Phase 2 will be in combination with Manor Fields. They were not planning to do Phase 3, but Amazon is overparking the area, creating a problem. They began temporarily leasing spaces off site beginning the night before, although Ms. Pennino does not know where this is. Mr. O'Brien said that all the Amazon trucks go to Endicott rotary to fill up.

It was hoped that Amazon will expand the parking lot, but the DPW uses the back left hand corner to access Manor Fields for storage of material. Ms. Pennino said that if they construct a new lot,

they would like to shorten the spaces so they would not be trailer spaces. They would leave an opening for DPW to access their site. They will resubmit the proper plans. They will begin Phase 3 before Phase 2, which is in the front on the left. They would like to keep Amazon as a tenant, but it needs parking. Mr. Podolski appreciated that they are doing something about this, and was in favor of swapping Phase 2 with Phase 3. He was pleased that there was such an active use of the building, which had been empty for so long. They will provide an adequate parking plan that preserves the right of the Town to get into its pit.

Mr. Bethoney asked how many spaces are provided in Amazon's lease. Ms. Pennino said 55. Because they are 100 over, they have 155 spaces. He suspected that this is understated, and the use of the property is in significant noncompliance. He is happy to see the revised plan. Ms. Pennino said they will control the situation. Mr. Podolski said he does not want to drive Amazon out of the property, but agreed that the amount of parking they are using is overstated. Until the site is upgraded, they will have to remain off site.

Mr. Bethoney asked Ms. Pennino whether they had fulfilled their promise to complete the work on Mr. Cimeno's property, i.e., bollards, etc. She said they had, but will double check to be sure. Mr. Bethoney said that when they resubmit and if the work is not done, Mr. Cimeno will come before the Board with a complaint. He suggested that they do everything they committed to before they return to the Board with a revised site plan.

**Certificate of Action: 450 Washington Street:** Mr. McCarthy will submit this at the next meeting.

**Certification of Action: Noble & Greenough School:** Mr. Podolski reviewed this and was fine with it.

**Summer Schedule:** After discussion, the Board decided to meet on 7/21/16 and 8/11/16. If something comes in that requires action within 21 days, they will meet for that.

**Discussion re: Architectural Review:** Mr. Zahka noted that the Town of Westwood did an extensive architectural review of Mr. Petruzzello's project in Islington. When asked what they wanted, they said a "villagey" look, and gave them photos of examples. The architectural peer reviewer went, in his opinion, way too far, almost to the point of doing building permit review. The peer reviewer did not get into the look of the building. Mr. O'Brien pointed out the potential conflicts, i.e., having an architect who did contemporary work and hiring a peer reviewer who is does more traditional work. Mr. Zahka said he would send Mr. McCarthy the peer review report to see the types of things the peer architect does.

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Project Address:</b>   | <b>Liana Estates</b>  |
| <b>Zoning District:</b>   | Single Residence B  |
| <b>Representative(s):</b> | Peter A. Zahka II, Esq., 12 School Street, Dedham, MA<br>Giorgio Petruzzello, owner |

Prior to the beginning of this meeting, Mr. Bethoney made the statement that he is recusing himself from this meeting. He explained that the agency at which he works has a professional relationship with Mr. Petruzzello. He left the building at 8:38 p.m. and did not participate in any part of this meeting or consideration of the proposal. All utilities are in and the crushed stone base is down. Mr. McCarthy will hold these in escrow. The binding coat goes in on Monday, June 26, 2016, and Mr. McCarthy will confirm this. Once he does, he will release Lots 1 and 2, and Mr.

Zahka will record them. Mr. Steeves moved to approve the covenant release for Lots 1 and 2, seconded by Mr. Aldous, and voted unanimously 4-0. The Board signed the covenant release.

Mr. Steeves moved to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Aldous, and voted unanimously 4-0. The meeting ended at 8:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert D. Aldous, Clerk

/snw