



# Department of Planning and Community Development

Melissa M. SantucciRozzi, Principal Planner  
1 JFK Memorial Drive – Braintree, Massachusetts 02184  
Phone: 781-794-8234 Fax: 781-794-8089

Joseph C. Sullivan  
Mayor

**APPROVED**

## PLANNING BOARD

Robert Harnais, Chair  
Joseph Reynolds, Vice Chair  
James Eng, Clerk  
Darryl Mikami, Member  
Erin V. Joyce, Member

Braintree Planning Board  
June 9, 2015 – Cahill Auditorium

### Present:

Mr. Robert Harnais, Chair (arrived at 7:25PM)  
Mr. Joseph Reynolds, Vice Chair  
Mr. James Eng, Clerk  
Mr. Darryl Mikami  
Ms. Erin V. Joyce

Christine Stickney, Director  
Melissa SantucciRozzi, Principal Planner

Vice Chair, Joseph Reynolds called roll call at 7:05PM  
Chairman Robert Harnais joined the meeting at 7:25PM

### Zoning Board of Appeal Petitions – June, 2015

#### ZBA Petition Recommendation – 42 Newport Avenue – Present: Donald Wakeling (#15-13)

Mr. Wakeling explained he wants to convert the existing cape to colonial (2.5 story) with a dormer along the back. However there is a front yard deficiency that he needs a finding from the ZBA to expand a non-conforming structure. Mr. Wakeling had brought with him a set of architectural plans.

Member Joyce asked about the area in the attic and Mr. Wakeling said it would be a playroom for his children. Member Mikami asked about the existing trees and Mr. Wakeling said he would need to trim and/or remove the one closest to the house. Member Eng asked if the deck meets the rear setback and Ms. SantucciRozzi said yes it does – 63 feet.

Member Eng **MOTION** for favorable recommendation, seconded by Member Mikami – Vote 4:0:0

#### ZBA Petition Recommendation – 291 & 297 Washington Street (#15-12)

##### Present: Atty. Carl Johnson, Paul Gratta and Gerry Hart

Ms. SantucciRozzi reminds the Planning Board that a grading permit was recently approved by them for this property. At issue with this request is that building and legal department feel the applicants need to reconfirm a variance issued in 1994 for lot width at the front of the property and she explained the lots will be accessed by a common driveway off Washington Street.

Atty. Carl Johnson representing the applicant provided background relative to the development of the lot, Conservation Commission approval and the recording of the ANR plan in 1995. He feels the Building Department is taking a conservative approach due to case law and the recent Myrtle Street issue upon advice of the Town Solicitor. He cited the topographical issues and how the lot width was measured in 1994 and what had taken place on the lot since the change in ownership. He feels the current petition is a confirmation and cure for the applicants to any potential future zoning issues and will be recorded on their titles.

Member Joyce asked if the April dated plan is the approved grading plan and Atty. Johnson responded yes. Member Mikami questioned the time period between the 1994 and today as to the development progress. Atty. Johnson explained what happened with the previous owner and the time frame to when Mr. Hart took ownership. Member Mikami commented it appears to be a technical issue but everything else in order. Member Eng questioned if the Conservation Commission was satisfied with the building placement on lot 3 and Ms. SantucciRozzi commented that the corner of the house is at the 100' buffer zone and that Ms. Phelan has been very involved with the development of the lot.

Member Eng **MOTION** for favorable recommendation, seconded by Member Mikami – Vote 4:0:0

**ZBA Petition Recommendation –614 & 616 Washington Street (#15-14)**

**Present: Atty. Carl Johnson and Peter Carloni**

Ms. SantucciRozzi explained the petitioner was before the PB in 2004 for a ZBA recommendation to repair the rear stair case at the rear of the structure and there are building permits prior to 1986 for interior renovations that made it apparent to her it was a three family structure. The variance decision for the stair stated it brought the property into compliance with the building code. The applicant is here to re-confirm the relief and other relief under 705 for multi-family, 806 for parking and reasons related to access on the third per the building code - maybe the permits were not clear but when you piece the permits together it made a third unit witnessed it in 2004.

Attorney Johnson representing Peter Carloni explained the history of the structure that it was laid out in the 1890's – 1920' before the first zoning ordinance and dedicated for a multi-family within the RC zone and the lot is 6,040 SF. In 1948 the zoning ordinance change and the lot size required additional area and again in 1978 the town adopted Section 705 and required additional zoning requirement and spatial requirements that none of the structures prior to that could make. In 1986 Mary Achorn owned the property through inheritance and decided to add a third floor studio unit with building. She had authorization from the Town whether correct or not, with a building permit. He believes the then Building Inspector Marinelli did require that an outside third floor staircase as the second the mean of egress. He noted it is taxed as 3 units and the current Building Inspector in October cited the property owner that he was not in conformance even after the building permits had been issued to the prior owner. He continued under MGL Chapter 40A section 7 if you have a building permit after 6 years and the Building Inspector cannot take enforcement action. This is complicated matter, he is asking the ZBA to find that what was constructed as the third unit is protected because of the issuance of the building permits and a variance to legalize the unit and provide a RPLS plan to show the existing location. Therefore he is asking for a finding, a variance etc. and is precluded from

enforcement action and to legalize this unit since it was built with permits. Mr. Carloni provided pictures of the property.

Member Joyce asked where is the existing parking is (at the back of the building) and given it is a corner lot on Sampson Place are vehicles allowed to park on Sampson Street – Mr. Carloni responded that they are not allowed to park on the street. She asked is the area between the structure and street the grass area party of your property. And is the house next to you a two or three family property? Mr. Carloni responded a two family that was just renovated is to the rear and across the street are apartments. Member Mikami comment that this topic reminds me of many things growing up in this town that were just done so here we are. If Mr. Carloni was going to sell the property do you feel the buyer would be protected if the variance is granted? Atty. Johnson commented there are two parts – one is zoning and the second building code and we have different interpretations than the building department, but we feel we are protected by statute and a decision would clearly show it is protected. There was no certificate of occupancy which was common in the past. The situation will be cleaner if we can come to agreement on the zoning then we will deal with the building code. Member Mikami agreed that seemed sensible to do. Member Eng had no questions.

Member Eng **MOTION** for favorable recommendation, seconded by Member Mikami – Vote 4:0:0

**ZBA Petition Recommendation – 250 Granite Street – No one present (#15-11)**

Ms. SantucciRozzi explained the petition is for a replacement restaurant for the Legal Seafood former location and David Lin would like a small sign to direct patrons to the restaurant approximately 25 SF. However the South Shore Plaza has so many signs and the aggregate is over 150 SF requires relief. Member Eng commented it is very reasonable let's move it ahead.

Member Eng **MOTION** for favorable recommendation, seconded by Member Mikami – Vote 4:0:0

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**Special Permit/Site Plan review – Total Outdoor LLC, 290 Wood Rd  
Billboard Overlay Zoning District (PB File #15-08)**

**Present for the applicant:**

Attorney Lynnea Taylor

Tom McCarver, Total Outdoor Senior Vice President of Real Estate and Development

Drew Hoffman, Total Outdoor Executive Vice President

**8:10 PM All five PB members participated**

Chairman Harnais read the legal advertisement into the record

Attorney Lynnea Taylor on behalf of the applicant made a presentation about the Total Outdoor as a business entity and the recent zoning enacted by the Town Council that created the Billboard Overlay District and requires billboards by Special Permit. Total Outdoor presently has 10 other digital billboards in the state citing Peabody and Malden and other locations along the Southeast expressway. The F1 site was of interest over two years ago to the company because of its ideal location and the elevation relative to the highway. The proposed billboard is to be located at 290 Wood Road which presently has F1 and Fit Factory Gym located on the site. The billboard is proposed to be 75' in height with two faces (672 SF each side). The billboard will support 8 advertisers at 10 seconds and a single advertisement can be seen 45 times in an hour. Atty. Taylor noted only Total Outdoor has access to the advertisement minimizing the capability of hacking. The company will be providing the Town of Braintree with five (5) hours of public service announcements (PSA) each month on each face board. The State also has PSA time (15hrs) on each of the boards and any Amber Alerts or other public announcements are above the PSA hours stated.

Tom McCarver, Senior Vice President of Real Estate and Development spoke to the issue of a fall zone raised in the staff report noting that unlike a cell tower these are rated for hurricane winds under the International Build Code. As to the illumination these are not like other standard billboards that have either downward or upward lights our goal is to make the image look as crisp and clear as possible. Unlike an on premise sign that is set back from the highway these billboards do have the need for projection to reach the view from the highway.

Attorney Taylor responded in detail to each of the questions and points of concern raised by staff along with the addressing how the project meets the Outdoor Advertising Board rules and regulations in detail. Then Chairman Harnais asked for public comment.

Mr. Tony DiBona of Braintree asked how many of Total Outdoor billboards are in Peabody and if they are currently involved in litigation? Tom McCarver wasn't prepared to address those type of questions and said he would have to get back to the Board.

Robert Kearns – 200 Pilgrim Rd commented that he felt in general against the highway is a good location but asked what does the view from the Blue Hill Cemetery look like with the billboard on Wood Road he commented on it making sense for that commercial area but that the cemetery is a peaceful area that often has memorial services. Attorney Taylor that they can have a view from the cemetery done with the billboard superimposed.

Planning Board members were asked for their questions.

Member E. Joyce asked that the site plan show the edge of the billboard and asked if the size is typical of other billboards in MA. She also asked about Braintree Ordinance if it only addressed LED billboards. She asked how long has Total Outdoor been in the business? Tom McCarver responded that they will revise the plans and the ordinance is for digital LED and that Total Outdoor is fairly new to the Boston area but that he was with another competitor formerly. Ms. Joyce follow-up with if there were any billboards south of the city and Drew Hoffman, Executive Vice President commented they have two sites off the southeastern expressway under agreement. Member Joyce commented on "view shed" and asked how do you decide how high the billboard should be? Tom McCarver responded we want to be above the tree line to avoid having to take down trees – Member Joyce commented on the lower height of the Forbes Road billboards and asked if they could decrease the height by 10' feet – and Mr. McCarver responded they could look at it if above the tree line and give different angles of the board's location. Ms. Joyce questioned how the PSA time and the client times works with the scheduling of the signage – Tom McCarver pointed out that the local PSA time is above the regional or amber alerts times.

Member D. Mikami questioned if the correspondence from the Town Tax Collector had been addressed relative to delinquent taxes and Attorney Taylor assured the Board they had been paid – she was asked to submit something formally showing the taxes are paid. Citing language in the lease agreement with the property owner he questioned language that the tenant will be paid up to 50% of any revenues for additional infrastructure on the billboard and if this meant the wireless from cell carriers? Attorney Taylor commented this was standard lease language regarding wireless cell carriers and the applicant had no desire to do this and Mr. Mikami asked if they would have any objection to a condition prohibiting it and she commented no. Mr. Mikami asked staff to speak with the Assessors & Tax Collector regarding a new assessment. Member Mikami asked about public safety on the highway with a 75' high billboard and if drivers would be distracted and if any trees would have to be removed to accommodate the view. Mr. McCarver said that they could be flexible with the billboard height as long as well above the tree line. Member Mikami asked if the Town's PSA are at 3 AM on a Sunday or

would they have premium time also what do you not advertise? Mr. McCarver explained that the PSA are rotated in with the other client's normal schedules. Mr. Mikami asked about potential clients – political? Mr. McCarver answered that Total Outdoors does not advertise tobacco or gentlemen's clubs on their billboards – political advertisements are difficult due to some first amendment protections. The Amber Alerts are not charged to the local PSA time they are a public service beyond those dedicated hours and we use an emergency system with a pre-established template for those alert through the Dept. of Public Safety. Member Mikami asked about the economic model and who deals with the public's complaints about any of the advertisements? Mr. McCarver mentioned that there are 45 views per hour and there all different types of sales models from hours to monthly depending on the client's needs. Mr. McCarver explained all complaints come through Total Outdoor and it is a matter of taste – we have always addressed issues asap. Member Mikami asked if you submit annual reports to other towns about complaints – Mr. McCarver was agreeable to work with the Town.

Member Mikami questioned how deep is the foundation – Tom McCarver responded 32' in depth – Member Mikami asks if there will be any blasting or will they drill and have the explored the locations already – Tom McCarver responded no blasting and they have subsurface conditions. Member Mikami asks further have you ever had any of your billboards ever failed? Tom McCarver we have had no failures I am aware of at this point in time.

Member Eng noted that most of his questions have been answered but wanted to know if a billboard were to fail and it fell towards the highway what lane would fall into on Rte. 128? Mr. McCarver said unlike a cell tower these billboards do not have a fall zone per say because of their structure design – but in linear feet he would get an answer. Member Eng notes the structural report submitted with the application and we should still know what it is? Member Eng asked if the applicants have a catastrophic insurance coverage if there was a failure and Mr. McCarver responded 2 million and Attorney Taylor read from the lease agreement.

Member J. Reynolds noted that there would be a peer review to look at a lot of the issues with the structural and illuminating aspects of the project. He questioned the security of the billboard access via the 18' ladder and do you have any barrier protection to the ladder. Member Reynolds referred to prior comments about hacking and the central location that total outdoor has and if this is also using WIFI is needed to transmit the billboard advertisement or ground wiring. Mr. McCarver commented that he isn't aware of any issues with security we feel it is sufficient and it would all depend on what WIFI was available. Member Reynolds questioned Ms. Stickney about how the measurement for setbacks is determined.

Chairman Harnais noted his concern that the applicants also have a second application as well on this side of the roadway and is it also 75' in height and does it have the topographical advantage of being as high up as this one? Chairman Harnais asked if the cellular attachments

referred to in the lease if it can be removed from the lease. He agreed he would like to know if they are in litigation in Peabody and requested that information be provided.

Christine Stickney questioned the applicants on the distance between their billboard and the existing ones on Forbes Road – because she feels the Forbes Road meets the definition of an electronic sign under the Outdoor Advertising Board (OAB) that requires 1000 feet away from each other and asked about the distance? Attorney Taylor said they are not electronic signs and that this location is 870' feet away from those signs. Discussion turned to the movement on the signs – Tom McCarver said that determination has been made and he would get something from OAB because it is a tri-vision. Atty. Taylor said they would look into the matter with the OAB and get an answer for the Planning Board. Ms. Stickney commented that the application will be reviewed by a peer consultant and each of the applicant's need to submit peer funding

**Member Reynolds MOTION to continue the public hearing to July 14, 2015 at 8:45PM,** seconded by Member Eng – unanimously voted. The applicant signed a mutual agreement to continue the public hearing.

**Special Permit/Site Plan review – Lamar Central Outdoor, 340 Wood Rd  
Billboard Overlay Zoning District (PB File #15-09)**

**9:25 PM - 4 Members participated** (Ms. Joyce did not participate due to a professional relationship with the property owners and she left the hearing room).

**Present for the applicant:**

Attorney Jeffery Drago

Michael F. Murphy – Lamar Providence Vice President/General Manager

Chairman Harnais read the legal advertisement into the record

Member Joyce announced a professional conflict with the property owner so she recused herself and left the room.

Attorney Drago presented the application stating he represented Lamar Advertising and that they are seeking a Special Permit for the erection of a 75' high – double face (672SF each) at the southwest corner of the lot at 340 Wood Road which is presently a medical office building with parking. He described the lot size proximity to the highway and commercial zoning as well as its location in the Billboard Overlay District. He noted that they have met with Mayor Sullivan to discuss the host agreement and Christine Stickney added that agreement presented to the Mayor is supposed to be included with the submission. Atty. Drago provided a copy of the

development agreement and read the annual amounts proposed. Mr. Murphy was asked by Atty. Drago to speak about Lamar and its operations. Mr. Murphy provided handouts about Lamar to each of the members citing it is a national advertising company not only billboards but other advertising on buildings, busses and subways etc. and has been established since 1902, a publically traded company on NASDAQ. We have a network operation center based in Baton Rouge, LA and Lamar has 41 billboards in Massachusetts with 14 digital locations. He explained that they provide space to 6 advertisers per board at a 10 second time/60 messages in any hour and the amber alert is a seventh position that is added in an emergency and Lamar works with the FBI citing the current situation with the prisoner escapees in upper New York – they are showing their faces on over 20 billboards over New England. Their central operation is out of Baton Rouge, LA and every digital is seen on television for any problems or interruptions we have a 24 hour technician on board for all digital signs are the hub through computers and monitors for all these billboards nationwide. We are offering 12 hours of PSA to the City of Braintree.

The Chairman asked if anyone from the public wanted to speak:

James MacInerney and Rod Roberts from Haemonetics at 360 Wood Road questioned if the proposed Billboard location could be on the other side of the lot as to not hide the Haemonetics sign that exists on their site for the last 30 years. They noted their sign is 45' in height however from a distance would the sign be blocked particularly with vehicles traveling northbound on Rte. 128. They would like the applicants to consider relocating the sign to the north side of the lot and would serve both parties with some separation. Haemonetics had recently made a long term commitment to stay in Braintree.

Atty. Drago commented they would look in to it. Christine Stickney noted to the Planning Board that the property lease, development agreement and a plan with the existing engineered drainage system with elevations needed to be submitted if the applicants intended to move forward with locating the billboard in the drainage basin.

Members were asked next if they had questions or comments:

Member D. Mikami noted that the Lamar application did not provide any financial development agreement that they now have and the lease with the property owner. Atty. Drago noted they filed a "Memorandum and Notice of Lease Agreement" but the property owner Mr. Howard Hersh of Jumbo Capital Management is here tonight to answer questions. Member Mikami asked if the development agreement fee is typical of others Lamar has in communities where their billboards are located and if they would also consider a lower height billboard. Mr. Murphy noted that the total fee is 1.5 million over 25 years and that it would be adjusted given there is a 30 year lease and that the height is typical of these types of structures. Christine Stickney noted to the Planning Board that the property lease, development agreement and a

plan with the existing engineered drainage system with elevations needed to be submitted if the applicants intended to move forward with locating the billboard in the drainage basin. Ms. Stickney asked Mr. Murphy to identify the proposed development agreement 25 year at 1.5 million agreements. Member Mikami commented similar to other members have commented on the height of the sign and asked the applicant's to figure out how high the sign should be and taking into the various factors but come back to us with an estimate of what you feel the sign should be particularly the height.

Member Eng noted he had other questions relative to the structure but he would wait for the Peer Review to be done.

Member J. Reynolds agreed with member Eng but did note the staff report points out the proposed location is within a drainage retention area that supports the other uses on the lot and asked if the applicants did any additional study along the highway for a possible different location? Mr. Murphy said that they will look at the other side of the lot as a potential location and if not them would look at modifying the drainage system. Atty. Drago commented that they need to go back and look further into the site and the drainage system. Member Reynolds added have you considered another location along the frontage of the lot than what is proposed.

Chairman Harnais noted that the applicant is aware of the Peer Review and the need to get to staff funding for this as soon as possible to meet a future hearing.

Christine Stickney noted that this site has never received As-Built approval from the Board for the building addition put on in 1985 and the drainage improvements that were part of that approval – to be modified will require the an amendment to the Special Permit as well as this Special Permit. Christine questioned the applicants to explain to the Board how they address the content on the billboards. Mr. Murphy noted that each client has access to their own user and password for their advertisement and can make creative changes from their own desktops but that Lamar has a filter system for in appropriate content and that they receive training from Lamar and are only able to access their own media field. In addition they also do not advertise gentlemen's clubs. The clients have signed off on an agreement as to their creative changes what is allowed or not and they are all pre-approved.

Christine Stickney had recommended it be continued to August. Members discussed continuing the public hearing to August but Attorney Drago asked if Lamar could come in on July 14 also like Total Outdoor – The Chairman noted they have a lot of engineering work that needs to be done and it would probably be better to come in later however Atty. Drago asked when would they need to have the engineering in and Christine responded at the very latest June 18<sup>th</sup> in order for it to be reviewed and she couldn't even confirm if the Peer could turn it around that quick for 7/14. Discussion pursued as members schedules and availability for summer meetings.

The Chairman finally allowed the application to be placed on the July 14, 2015 scheduled but if materials were not in by June 18<sup>th</sup> it would not be discussed.

Member Reynolds **MOTION** to continue the public hearing to **July 14, 2014 at 9:15PM**, seconded by Member Eng – voted 4:0 (Member Joyce was not participating) The applicant signed a mutual agreement to continue the public hearing.

**Special Permit/Site Plan review – Total Outdoor LLC, 236-240 Wood Rd  
Billboard Overlay Zoning District (PB File #15-10)**

**10:10 PM All five PB members participated**

**Present for the applicant:**

Attorney Lynnea Taylor

Tom McCarver, Total Outdoor Senior Vice President of Real Estate and Development

Drew Hoffman, Total Outdoor Executive Vice President

Chairman Harnais read the legal advertisement into the record

Attorney Lynnea Taylor representing Total Outdoor noted that this second location at 236-240 Wood Road they would like the Planning Board to approve for a Billboard – same dimensions 75' in height and double sign faces (672 SF each). She noted the staff report and the concern expressed for its location in relation to the lot's operations. The adjacent building provides for customer pick-up on that side and there are no large trucks they use the opposite side of the building and would not have to maneuver around the column of the billboard – the applicant can either paint the column or add bollards to call attention to the customer drivers to use caution. Attorney Taylor noted that the sign faces are shown on this plan. She also commented on staff's questions regarding the loading docks at the lumber liquidator building. The large deliveries that come in for lumber liquidator come in to the other side of the building not in the location of the billboard sign.

Member Joyce agreed that some type of precaution should be considered and she asked about the existing utility connection and the existing pole if overhead or underground. Member Joyce asked that they provide the Board with the average height of your billboards.

Member Mikami asked again that the height and the two sites which is preferable and what could the height be at this location.

Member Eng asked how these billboards are grounded from lightning strikes and acting as conduit if struck to other structures or individuals around them. Mr. McCarver explained the measures taken and agreed with Member Eng that the Peer Review will address as well.

Member Reynolds and Harnais had no questions at this point. Mr. McCarver commented these are two different property owners – Chair Harnais expressed his concern that three (3) maybe too much for that area.

Christine asked the applicant's if the hydrogen grading permit still going forward? Attorney Taylor said yes - Then the two site plans should be the same for each application. The Billboard bylaw allows for distance between two billboards – it would be 1073 LF to the proposed billboard to F1. She also asked for the measurements to those billboards on Forbes Road to this location.

Members discussed again the scheduling conflicts with summer meetings. Member Reynolds **MOTION** to reschedule the **August 11, 2105 meeting to August 18, 2015**, seconded by Member Eng – unanimous

Member Joyce questioned how will this whole process work as to a final vote for a Special Permit?

Christine Stickney commented this unlike the standard special permit – information needs to be complete and all issues addressed before Board action – there is no other Special Permit in the bylaw that establishes setbacks like this one for Billboards – the Planning Board will need to decide how many should be located and which application provides the desired location. Chairman Harnais said he intends to have them all on the same night when it comes times to vote.

Member Reynolds **MOTION** to continue the public hearing to **August 18, 2015** at 7:45PM, seconded by Member Eng – unanimously voted

**Administrative Hearing – Planning Board Fees – Applicant: Planning Board  
MGL Chapter 40 Section 22F, MGL Chapter 40A Section 9 & 11 and MGL Chapter 41 Section 81Q**

Christine Stickney requested the public hearing be continued to the fall given the work load of the office at this time.

Member Reynolds **MOTION** to continue the public hearing to **10/13/15 at 9pm**, seconded by Member Mikami – Unanimously voted

**Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment – Town Council Order #15-019 – Applicant: Mayor Joseph Sullivan**  
**Section 135-710 Notes**

**10:30PM All five PB members participated**

Chairman Harnais read the legal advertisement into the record

Melissa SantucciRozzi, Principal Planner on behalf of Mayor Sullivan presented the proposed amendment which she describes as a modest increase of 5% to the building coverage requirement for sites in a Highway Business zoning district with structures parking. The site would still need to have to comply with the 25% Open Space Coverage and 75% Lot Coverage but building Coverage could increase 5%. She cited the benefits of the amendment including improved parking management/circulation, efficient use of land, allows for bicycle parking and electric vehicle charging stations, design integration and sustainability, customer, resident and employee convenience, environmental and financial/fiscal benefits.

Chairman Harnais asked if anyone from the public wished to speak

Attorney Carl Johnson commented that in Braintree building area includes structures which in some other communities are not counted as building coverage because under the MA Building code the structure definition is different from the building definition. The proposed amendment maintains the 25% open space and 75% lot coverage. Braintree uses a footprint theory unlike other communities a floor area ratio (FAR) most if not all don't counting parking structures. Particularly in the northeast in parking structures are desired because of weather. Overall it is a good text amendment and wishes to be recorded in support.

Chairman Harnais asked members if they had questions

Members Joyce, Mikami and Eng had no questions.

Member Reynold express his support of the amendment and agreed with the convenience of structure parking and the environmental benefit.

Member Eng **MOTION** to close the public hearing, seconded by Member Joyce – unanimously voted

Member Reynolds **MOTION** to recommend to Town Council a favorable recommendation for the proposed amendment, seconded by Member Mikami – unanimously voted.

**OTHER**

**Braintree Planning Board**

**June 9, 2015**

**Cahill Auditorium**

**Page | 13**

Christine Stickney informed members that she is beginning the interviewing process for the Zoning Administrator starting next week.

Member Reynolds **MOTION** to accept the minutes of April 14, 2015, seconded by Member Mikami – unanimously voted.

Member Reynolds **MOTION to adjourn** the meeting, seconded by Member Eng – unanimously voted. The Meeting adjourned at 10:45 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Christine Stickney, Director  
Planning/Community Development