

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Michael Sheehan, Chair
Mary Kate Daly, Clerk
Shannon Greenwell
Al Porro
Rachel Churchill



DIRECTOR OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Sarah Dixon

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Holly Jones

Zoning Board of Appeals
December 5, 2023
Hybrid Meeting Minutes

PRESENT

Michael Sheehan, Chair
Mary Kate Daly, Clerk
Shannon Greenwell
Al Porro
Rachel Churchill
Paul Eysie
Ryan Gorman

Sarah Dixon, Town Planner
Holly Jones, Assistant Town Planner

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 P.M.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case 23-02, 973 University Avenue (Continued from 9/12/2023)

Rachel Churchill was not sitting on this case

Dan Bailey, 100 Summer Street, Boston, and Luke Fabri, 14 Hubon Street, Salem, presented on behalf of the applicant, UAVE Inc. They had recently met with members of the Community Development Office. At the last meeting, there were issues with the plans on record for the project, which were from 2020, and the plans had changed significantly since. They were seeking a new plan approval, as well as an extension for the project. Mr. Fabri went over the previously submitted plans and work that had been done on site in the past, particularly noting a third party review that took place in January, in which they had resolved most of the issues the reviewer pointed out. The new plans that the applicants were seeking approval for were dated September 9, 2023, and were revised on November 17. The new plans included additional plantings around the perimeter of the site, a permanent gravel turnaround atop their maintained service road, extending riprap down the eastern slope of the property, and exposing bedrock. The applicants had also completed repairs on the M.S. Walker property, which was a theme of prior meetings.

Matt Moyer, a representative of Tetra Tech (the third party reviewers), 100 Nickerson Road, Marlborough, stated that Tetra Tech was pleased with the additional vegetation included in the new plans. Rather than sand and gravel which the applicant planned, Mr. Moyer suggested loam and seed, or another type of stabilization measure to eliminate erosion, for the finish material on the buildable area. He recommended motions from the Board to assure perimeter landscaping and stabilization of the buildable area. He also maintained the recommendation for the Board to condition temporary use for material processing on the property, which was allowable under the bylaws. Mr. Moyer also suggested enhancing an existing condition, requiring the applicant to provide ground surface elevations on the site as a part of their Annual Status Report to the Board.

Mr. Porro was curious in Tetra Tech's opinion, had the applicants satisfied the reclamation plan identifying the finished conditions. Mr. Moyer explained that Tetra Tech still had concerns over the plans to finish with sand and gravel due to wind and water erosion.

Ms. Greenwell confirmed with Mr. Fabri that there was still a 4-5 year timeline for project completion. She also wondered when the Board was due to receive an Annual Status Report detailing elevations from the applicants. Mr. Fabri explained that they had not had a recent survey done on the property, while Mr. Bailey added that the applicants had submitted their report for 2023. Mr. Sheehan noted that it was up for discretion when the updated information would need to be provided to the Board.

Mr. Porro questioned where the 4-5 timeline came from, as he believed the Board was voting to set a date for finished work in a year or two. Mr. Sheehan explained that the work being done on the site was not allowed by use. Ms. Dixon and the Building Commissioner had been working on this project for quite some time, and the Building Commissioner had recommended that the Board could authorize a

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Michael Sheehan, Chair
Mary Kate Daly, Clerk
Shannon Greenwell
Al Porro
Rachel Churchill



DIRECTOR OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Sarah Dixon

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Holly Jones

temporary use that could not take more than three years. Ms. Jones clarified that rock crushing was the use that was not allowed and taking place on the site. She explained that the Board could vote to extend the permit for earth removal which was what was originally applied for and approved. The Board could also vote to allow for a temporary use permit for the rock crushing if the work was pre-existing non-conforming, which would be allowed for no more than three years. She added that if the temporary use permit for rock crushing were approved, only natural materials could be used. The Board and staff discussed the applicants bringing in off site materials to crush.

Mr. Eysie clarified with Mr. Sheehan that the Building Department would enforce the crushing of only natural materials during routine inspections or if they were to receive a phone call. Mr. Fabri added that he also made routine checks to the site which were reported to the EPA. The applicant also had a material processing location in Dedham, so it would not be necessary for brick, asphalt or concrete to be crushed on this site.

Mr. Sheehan read the conditions of extending the Special Permit that were recommended by the staff. The recommended conditions were as follows:

- I. *All existing conditions of approval of the 2021 Special Permit shall remain in effect*
- II. *Buildable area cover shall be loamed and seeded rather than finished with sand and gravel*
- III. *The applicant must provide a surety bond within 90 days of the decision as certified by the Town Clerk, pending an estimate provided by the ZBA's peer reviewer, in an amount sufficient to assure completion of the permit of landscape and final stabilization measures that eliminate wind or water erosion resulting from the exposure of bare earth*
- IV. *No man made materials such as asphalt, brick, or concrete shall be stockpiled, crushed, dumped, or otherwise processed on the site*
- V. *Condition IV of the 2021 Special Permit shall be amended that the required Annual Status Report must include a status plan identifying ground surface elevations at the end of the prior year*
- VI. *In accordance with the terms of the Conservation Commission Order of Conditions, the modified closure plan must be approved by the Conservation Commission. If the plan is not approved by the Conservation Commission, the applicant shall return to the ZBA with a plan acceptable to the Commission*

Mr Sheehan acknowledged the material processing on site that was made aware to the Board by the applicant. A temporary Special Permit under §3.5 was recommended, subject to the following conditions:

- I. *Materials must be limited to natural materials only. No brick, asphalt, or concrete.*
- II. *Temporary use is authorized from one year of the date of decision. The applicant may seek to renew the temporary use annually for a total of not more than three (3) years*

Mr. Bailey was concerned about the condition for a surety bond, as it would be an expensive cost to the applicant. He also asked if it were possible to change Condition V to submit ground surface elevations from every year to every other year. Mr. Fabri asked for the opportunity to not have to loam and seed over four acres of land, as they were planning to immediately apply for a building permit for the property. He stated that if the property were to sit for an extended period of time, loaming and seeding would be necessary. Mr. Moyer explained that there was a requirement in the bylaws that the finished surface prevent wind and water erosion. He added that one of the conditions of the earth removal permit was that exposed earth be stabilized. He was concerned that the sand and gravel finishing material would be subject to wind or water erosion. Ms. Jones added that there was a condition from the Conservation Commission that all side slopes and bottom elevations be loamed and seeded, either at final grade or if the site has been inactive for over six months.

MOTION I to close the public hearing made by Mary Kate Daly. Seconded by Shannon Greenwell.

Roll Call Vote:

Paul Eysie: **Yes**
Al Porro: **Yes**
Shannon Greenwell: **Yes**
Mary Kate Daly: **Yes**
Michael Sheehan: **Yes**

Result: 5-0-0 (Motion Passed)

MOTION II to approve the updated plan from Griffin Engineering dated November 17, 2023, that states the post-excavation, reclamation, and grading plans for 973 University Ave., made by Paul Eysie. Seconded by Shannon Greenwell.

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Michael Sheehan, Chair
Mary Kate Daly, Clerk
Shannon Greenwell
Al Porro
Rachel Churchill



DIRECTOR OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Sarah Dixon

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Holly Jones

Roll Call Vote:

Paul Eysie: Yes
Al Porro: Yes
Shannon Greenwell: Yes
Mary Kate Daly: Yes
Michael Sheehan: Yes

Result: 5-0-0 (Motion Passed)

MOTION III to extend the earth removal Special Permit, with the six aforementioned conditions as recommended in a letter from the staff dated December 1, 2023, to December 31, 2027, made by Shannon Greenwell. Seconded by Mary Kate Daly.

Roll Call Vote:

Mary Kate Daly: Yes
Shannon Greenwell: Yes
Al Porro: No
Paul Eysie: Yes
Michael Sheehan: Yes

Result: 4-1-0 (Motion Passed)

MOTION IV to approve a temporary Special Permit under §3.5 until December 31, 2024, to allow rock crushing and processing use under the conditions that it be limited to natural materials only (no brick, asphalt, or concrete), and that the temporary use will be authorized for one year, with the applicant's ability to renew annually, made by Shannon Greenwell. Seconded by Mary Kate Daly.

Roll Call Vote:

Mary Kate Daly: Yes
Shannon Greenwell: Yes
Al Porro: Yes
Paul Eysie: Yes
Michael Sheehan: Yes

Result: 5-0-0 (Motion Passed)

Case 23-42, 156 Gay Street- Special Permit

Kathleen and James Smith, 156 Gay Street, presented. The home was pre-existing non-conforming. Ms. Smith explained that they were seeking to add a single story addition to the existing home to accommodate a living space for her elderly parents. They were also looking to level elevation for the addition so there were less stairs for her mother to climb.

Mr. Porro wondered what the square footage of the addition would be. Mr. Smith stated that the addition would be around 938 square feet, making it a 70% habitable floor area increase. Mr. Porro believed the addition would be a positive addition to the neighborhood.

Ms. Churchill noted that the plans provided were preliminary drafts, and wondered if the final plans closely reflected the draft. Ms. Smith stated that the final plans would reflect the draft, and confirmed that the site plan provided was the final plan.

Ms. Greenwell and Ms. Daly also stated they believed the addition would reflect positively on the neighborhood.

MOTION I to close the public hearing made by Mary Kate Daly. Seconded by Shannon Greenwell.

Roll Call Vote:

Shannon Greenwell: Yes
Rachel Churchill: Yes

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Michael Sheehan, Chair
Mary Kate Daly, Clerk
Shannon Greenwell
Al Porro
Rachel Churchill



DIRECTOR OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Sarah Dixon

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Holly Jones

Al Porro: Yes
Mary Kate Daly: Yes
Michael Sheehan: Yes

Result: 5-0-0 (Motion Passed)

MOTION II to approve the Special Permit under §5.4, as presented in the application, made by Shannon Greenwell. Seconded by Mary Kate Daly.

Roll Call Vote:
Al Porro: Yes
Rachel Churchill: Yes
Shannon Greenwell: Yes
Mary Kate Daly: Yes
Michael Sheehan: Yes

Result: 5-0-0 (Motion Passed)

Case 23-45, 70 Union Street- Special Permit

Son Dang, 37 Standish Drive, presented. He had purchased the home at 70-72 Union Street given the possibility of a family member moving over from Vietnam. He was looking to add a second story addition to the pre-existing non-conforming duplex-style home. This would create additional bedrooms on the second level.

Mr. Porro mentioned that when he drove by the property, he noticed multiple trees set for removal. Mr. Dang explained that some of the trees were extremely close to the home, and he had found that previous occupants had connected the electrical terminal from the home to a tree. He contacted the Town for assistance and they fixed the connection by installing a pole.

Ms. Greenwell clarified that Mr. Dang was planning to extend the driveway as well as the decks. He was not planning to extend the existing garage, and was looking to use the space for storage.

Ms. Churchill questioned the elevation renderings for the height of the roof. Based on the provided plans, she wondered if the applicant was within maximum building height for the roof, as the elevations were provided from sea-level and not the average of the ground. Ms. Dixon noted that the plans were reviewed by the Building Commissioner and he only recommended relief under §5.4, and did not require relief for the roof height.

Mr. Sheehan noted that the habitable floor area increase would be 50%.

MOTION I to close the public hearing made by Mary Kate Daly. Seconded by Shannon Greenwell.

Roll Call Vote:
Al Porro: Yes
Rachel Churchill: Yes
Shannon Greenwell: Yes
Mary Kate Daly: Yes
Michael Sheehan: Yes

Result: 5-0-0 (Motion Passed)

MOTION II to approve the Special Permit, as presented with the 50% increase, made by Mary Kate Daly. Seconded by Shannon Greenwell.

Roll Call Vote:
Al Porro: Yes

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Michael Sheehan, Chair
Mary Kate Daly, Clerk
Shannon Greenwell
Al Porro
Rachel Churchill



DIRECTOR OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Sarah Dixon

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Holly Jones

Rachel Churchill: Yes
Shannon Greenwell: Yes
Mary Kate Daly: Yes
Michael Sheehan: Yes

Result: 5-0-0 (Motion Passed)

Case 23-29, 940-958 Bos-Prov Hwy, Urgent Care (Continued from 10/10/2023)

Mr. Sheehan stated that the Board had received sufficient advice from the Planning Board on Footnote 12.

Brian Almeida, 1350 Main Street, Walpole, presented on behalf of the applicant. He noted the previously approved plan for an urgent care at 115 Norwood Park South, which was a similar request. Mr. Almeida believed that the urgent care in this case was a retail oriented use, and appropriate to be located within 100 feet of Route One.

Ms. Greenwell was curious what the Board would be voting on. Ms. Dixon explained that the Board had the authority to grant whatever relief they found appropriate as advertised in the legal notice. The Building Commissioner had previously recommended that a Special Permit may be appropriate, and the Board was within legal right to grant a Special Permit on this. Ms. Churchill clarified that the Special Permit would be provided with respect to the use of an existing structure. Ms. Dixon and Mr. Porro discussed the discourse with the Planning Board in regards to Footnote 12.

David Hern, 30 Walpole Street, was attending the meeting on behalf of the tenants that would occupy the building if the Special Permit was approved. He echoed that an urgent care facility was a retail oriented use, and appropriate to be within 100 feet of Route One.

Mr. Sheehan acknowledged a letter from the Building Commissioner, who supported the granting of a Special Permit.

MOTION I to close the public hearing made by Mary Kate Daly. Seconded by Shannon Greenwell.

Roll Call Vote:
Mary Kate Daly: Yes
Shannon Greenwell: Yes
Rachel Churchill: Yes
Al Porro: Yes
Michael Sheehan: Yes

Result: 5-0-0 (Motion Passed)

MOTION II to approve a Special Permit under §5.2.2 made by Shannon Greenwell. Seconded by Mary Kate Daly.

Roll Call Vote:
Mary Kate Daly: Yes
Shannon Greenwell: Yes
Rachel Churchill: Yes
Al Porro: No
Michael Sheehan: Yes

Result: 4-1-0 (Motion Passed)

Case 23-43, 61 Endicott Street- Euphoria Health & Fitness- Special Permit

The previous application was withdrawn without prejudice on October 24, 2023

Marina Bekker, 95 West Street, Walpole, presented. Euphoria Health and Fitness hosted small, boutique style boxing and fitness classes, as well as personal training sessions. There were no more than 20 people in attendance at a time.

Mr. Sheehan noted that there was a site plan now on file, as well as the plan for the space in Building 26, Unit 55 at the Winsmith Mill. The space was around 2,375 square feet.

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Michael Sheehan, Chair
Mary Kate Daly, Clerk
Shannon Greenwell
Al Porro
Rachel Churchill



DIRECTOR OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Sarah Dixon

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Holly Jones

David Hern, 30 Walpole Street, was in attendance representing the Winsmith Mill (not the individual tenants). Mr. Porro asked Mr. Hern to speak to the status of the Master Plan for the property, particularly the parking and traffic flow. Mr. Hern stated that they had submitted to the Planning Department, as well as the applicants in attendance, a copy of the plan that showed available parking throughout the site, as well as circulation throughout the site. There were presently 415 parking spaces available on the site. The plan submitted also showed areas that were available to create additional parking. Mr. Hern noted that the property would most likely need to apply for a Major Project Special Permit, similar to what the Space Center had.

Mr. Porro was concerned about adding more tenants given the parking situation, as he had seen issues first hand. He explained that on a Saturday at 3 PM, there were roughly six parking spots available. Mr. Hern stated that in this particular tenant's case, she would be open mostly during weekdays, as opposed to the retail locations on site, and would not create additional traffic on weekends. He added that the site had the capacity to accommodate over 500 parking spaces.

Ms. Churchill clarified with the applicant that her site was strictly contained to Unit 55, as presented on the plan provided. Ms. Churchill also clarified that the maximum class size was 20 people. Ms. Bekker explained that she had classes on weekday mornings and evenings, with personal training sessions in between. On Saturday, there was one morning class at 9:15 AM. Her class times would not overlap with retail shop hours.

Ms. Greenwell stated that she believed that the parking plan provided did not accommodate the amount of commercial recreation spaces on the site, however that was more of an issue for the potential Major Project Special Permit.

Mr. Sheehan wondered if the Board could condition that the property owner at 61 Endicott Street submit a plan for a Major Project Special Permit to the Planning Board as a part of the motions for the tenants. Ms. Dixon explained that would be permissible. While she understood the need for the Major Project Special Permit, Ms. Churchill was concerned about placing this condition on the tenants, as they could not control whether or not their landlord would comply, and it was potentially putting their individual businesses and community outreach at risk. Mr. Sheehan stated that the language of the condition could be worked through prior to making a motion. Mr. Hern offered the possibility of setting a certain date to stop granting permits if a Major Project Special Permit was not submitted, and noted that they had provided the documentation the Board asked for during the last meeting, minus the lighting plan. Mr. Hern also understood the concerns of the Board, and offered to return to his client with the information that the Board would stop granting Special Permits to tenants after a certain date.

Ms. Dixon commented that the sidewalk work on Endicott Street was thought to begin in 2024, as funds had been secured for the work by the Town. The sidewalks were a previous concern of abutters.

MOTION I to close the public hearing made by Shannon Greenwell. Seconded by Mary Kate Daly.

Roll Call Vote:
Mary Kate Daly: Yes
Shannon Greenwell: Yes
Rachel Churchill: Yes
Al Porro: Yes
Michael Sheehan: Yes

Result: 5-0-0 (Motion Passed)

MOTION II to waive the fee made by Mary Kate Daly. Seconded by Shannon Greenwell.

Roll Call Vote:
Mary Kate Daly: Yes
Shannon Greenwell: Yes
Rachel Churchill: Yes
Al Porro: Yes
Michael Sheehan: Yes

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Michael Sheehan, Chair
Mary Kate Daly, Clerk
Shannon Greenwell
Al Porro
Rachel Churchill



DIRECTOR OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Sarah Dixon

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Holly Jones

Result: 5-0-0 (Motion Passed)

The Board discussed the possibility of conditioning the motion, however did not want to see the tenants lose their use. Ms. Greenwell commented that she appreciated the idea of setting a date for no longer allowing Special Permits for tenants if the landlord did not submit a Major Project Special Permit to the Planning Board. Staff would work to provide the landlord with the requested course of action.

MOTION III to approve the Special Permit with respect to Building 26, Unit 55, at 61 Endicott Street, made by Rachel Churchill. Seconded by Mary Kate Daly.

Roll Call Vote:

Mary Kate Daly: Yes
Shannon Greenwell: Yes
Rachel Churchill: Yes
Al Porro: No
Michael Sheehan: Yes

Result: 4-1-0 (Motion Passed)

Case 23-44, 61 Endicott Street- Avni Events- Special Permit

The previous application was withdrawn without prejudice on October 24, 2023

Shalini Baldeo, 28 Macy Ave, Brockton, presented. She spoke to previous concerns over occupancy for her space. Although she would not have an official occupancy number until a permit was granted, she explained that in her business plan that she provided, she indicated that she wanted to target smaller sized events. During the holiday season, she would target larger events of up to 100 people. She explained that as far as traffic concerns, she was planning to work with other tenants on site to not have large events overlapping.

Ms. Greenwell clarified that the space in question was in Building 24. Ms. Churchill was curious if this space occupied the entire fourth floor of the building. Ms. Baldeo's space was strictly in Unit 412 and occupied 3,000 square feet. Her space included one large room and two bathrooms.

David Hern, 30 Walpole Street, commented that he did not believe this use should be categorized as commercial recreation. He believed event spaces should be treated as areas of public assembly. He noted that places of public assembly called for one parking space per 3 occupants, as opposed to commercial recreation which had a higher parking ratio. Ms. Dixon stated that after the Special Permit was granted and the applicant could obtain a Certificate of Occupancy, the space could be categorized differently under the building code.

MOTION I to close the public hearing made by Shannon Greenwell. Seconded by Mary Kate Daly.

Roll Call Vote:

Mary Kate Daly: Yes
Shannon Greenwell: Yes
Rachel Churchill: Yes
Al Porro: Yes
Michael Sheehan: Yes

Result: 5-0-0 (Motion Passed)

MOTION II to waive the fee made by Mary Kate Daly. Seconded by Shannon Greenwell.

Roll Call Vote:

Mary Kate Daly: Yes
Shannon Greenwell: Yes
Rachel Churchill: Yes
Al Porro: Yes

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Michael Sheehan, Chair
Mary Kate Daly, Clerk
Shannon Greenwell
Al Porro
Rachel Churchill



DIRECTOR OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Sarah Dixon

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Holly Jones

Michael Sheehan: **Yes**

Result: 5-0-0 (Motion Passed)

MOTION III to approve the Special Permit made by Mary Kate Daly. Seconded by Shannon Greenwell.

Roll Call Vote:

Mary Kate Daly: **Yes**
Shannon Greenwell: **Yes**
Rachel Churchill: **Yes**
Al Porro: **No**
Michael Sheehan: **Yes**

Result: 4-1-0 (Motion Passed)

Case 23-25, 61 Endicott Street, Hometown Arcade- Special Permit (Continued from 7/25/23)

Dennis Quilty, 28 State Street, Boston, presented on behalf of the applicant. He was aware of the concerns around the location. The business had been in operation for almost seven months, and they had been issued a temporary Common Victualler License by the Town, as well as an Entertainment License. The space had become a popular location in town, and had hosted events for the Recreation Department in the past.

Ms. Daly was curious how operations had been, and where customers were parking when visiting the space. Mr. Quilty explained that there were numerous areas on the site that patrons could utilize. They had not had issues with unavailability of parking. He added that customers seemed to enjoy the space, and it has become a popular spot to congregate. Afterschool programs and Recreation Departments were also taking advantage of the space on early-release days and vacation weeks.

Ms. Greenwell wondered if the business owner had noticed any trends of when the space was more popular. Matt Snow, 61 Endicott Street Building 26A, explained that they were busiest on Saturday and Sunday. He stated that they saw on average over 100 customers per day. Ms. Greenwell also asked whether or not events with alcohol brought in larger crowds. Mr. Snow stated that most events with alcohol have been private with set numbers of guests, for example, a Norwood High School reunion was held there.

Mr. Sheehan questioned the occupancy number of the space, as there were submissions stating numbers from 100-250 people. Mr. Snow stated that he did not realize there was a discrepancy in occupancy numbers, and added that he had not had a private event with 250, and they were usually in the range of 100-150 people attending events. It was also noted that the space did not contain fire sprinklers, which were required in events of over 100 people.

Ms. Churchill questioned memos submitted to the Board that contained information relating to the applicant meeting all Town permit requirements, which was not consistent with what was on record at time of the meeting. She asked for further clarification on what was being requested by the applicant. Mr. Quilty stated that in June, the Building Commissioner stated to the applicant that as long as he was actively pursuing all proper permitting from the Town, he would be allowed to remain open and operating while awaiting the Special Permit. He explained that he believed the applicant was under the impression that he was compliant while in the process of seeking a Special Permit. Ms. Churchill further clarified that the Board was voting on a Special Permit for commercial recreation. She also wondered how many gaming machines were in the space, which Mr. Snow confirmed they had a maximum of 65 machines. Rather than increase the space, they rotated out different machines. Ms. Churchill was also curious about the ability to limit the number of machines on site, however that was under purview of the Board of Selectmen.

Mr. Sheehan wondered if the applicant planned to seek a liquor license from the Board of Selectmen, as there was space for a bar on site. Mr. Snow stated that they were looking to add a bar, and it was included in their site plan. He also stated that they did serve food, and held a conditional license from the Health Department.

Jennifer Kanser, 71 Jefferson Drive, believed that Hometown Arcade was a great entertainment space in Norwood. She has spent countless hours there with her son. She explained that there has not been much for kids in Norwood to do in town in the past, and she believed it had become a great gathering space for them. She added that she has never had trouble finding parking on site.

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Michael Sheehan, Chair
Mary Kate Daly, Clerk
Shannon Greenwell
Al Porro
Rachel Churchill



DIRECTOR OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Sarah Dixon

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Holly Jones

George Bratt, 70 Endicott Street, explained that Hometown Arcade has been an amazing spot for him. He and his wife enjoyed spending time there and meeting members of the community.

Spiro Loukos, 494 Walpole Street, noted that the applicant has been great to work with, as his business 1A Pizza provided pizzas for their parties.

MOTION I to close the public hearing made by Shannon Greenwell. Seconded by Mary Kate Daly.

Roll Call Vote:

Mary Kate Daly: Yes
Shannon Greenwell: Yes
Rachel Churchill: Yes
Al Porro: Yes
Michael Sheehan: Yes

Result: 5-0-0 (Motion Passed)

Ms. Greenwell and Ms. Churchill commented that they believed the location was a great addition to the Town. Ms. Churchill was supportive overall, but was hesitant over setting the precedent that it was okay to seek permitting retroactively.

MOTION II to approve the Special Permit to operate an arcade under the commercial recreation use, with the condition that a sign be placed indicating all patrons use Endicott Street when existing, made by Shannon Greenwell. Seconded by Mary Kate Daly.

Roll Call Vote:

Mary Kate Daly: Yes
Shannon Greenwell: Yes
Rachel Churchill: Yes
Al Porro: No
Michael Sheehan: Yes

Result: 4-1-0 (Motion Passed)

OTHER BUSINESS

MOTION I to approve the minutes of the December 3, 2022 meeting, as amended, made by Mary Kate Daly. Seconded by Shannon Greenwell.

Roll Call Vote:

Mary Kate Daly: Yes
Shannon Greenwell: Yes
Rachel Churchill: Yes
Al Porro: Yes
Ryan Gorman: Yes
Michael Sheehan: Yes

Result: 6-0-0 (Motion Passed)

MOTION II to approve the minutes of the October 10, 2023 meeting, as amended, made by Mary Kate Daly. Seconded by Shannon Greenwell.

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Michael Sheehan, Chair
Mary Kate Daly, Clerk
Shannon Greenwell
Al Porro
Rachel Churchill



DIRECTOR OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Sarah Dixon

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Holly Jones

Roll Call Vote:

Mary Kate Daly: Yes
Shannon Greenwell: Yes
Rachel Churchill: Yes
Al Porro: Yes
Ryan Gorman: Yes
Michael Sheehan: Yes

Result: 6-0-0 (Motion Passed)

MOTION III to approve the minutes of the October 24, 2023 meeting, as presented, made by Mary Kate Daly. Seconded by Al Porro.

Roll Call Vote:

Mary Kate Daly: Yes
Shannon Greenwell: Abstained
Rachel Churchill: Yes
Al Porro: Yes
Ryan Gorman: Yes
Michael Sheehan: Yes

Result: 5-0-1 (Motion Passed)

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION to adjourn the meeting made by Mary Kate Daly. Seconded by Shannon Greenwell.

Roll Call Vote:

Mary Kate Daly: Yes
Shannon Greenwell: Yes
Rachel Churchill: Yes
Al Porro: Yes
Ryan Gorman: Yes
Michael Sheehan: Yes

Result: 6-0-0 (Motion Passed)

The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 P.M.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Emily Manning