



**Mayor  
Charles C. Kokoros**

## **Department of Planning and Community Development**

Melissa M. SantucciRozzi, Director  
1 JFK Memorial Drive  
Braintree, Massachusetts 02184  
[msantucci@braintreema.gov](mailto:msantucci@braintreema.gov)  
Phone: 781-794-8234

### **PLANNING BOARD**

Erin V. Joyce, Chair  
Kimberly Kroha, Vice Chair  
Darryl K. Mikami, Clerk  
William J. Grove, Member  
Thomas M. Kent, Member  
Jennifer Connolly, Alternate

**Approved May 9, 2023**

### **Braintree Planning Board – Tuesday, April 11, 2023 – Cahill Auditorium**

Present:

Ms. Erin Joyce, Chair	Melissa SantucciRozzi, Director
Ms. Kim Kroha, Vice Chair	Connor Murphy, Assistant Director
Mr. Darryl Mikami, Clerk	
Mr. William J. Grove, Member	
Mr. Thomas Kent, Member	
Ms. Jennifer Connolly, Alternate	

Chairwoman Erin Joyce calls the meeting to order at 7:03 PM In Cahill Auditorium and then states that we have a full Board present this evening with five (5) full members (Chairwoman Joyce, Member Kroha, Member Mikami, Member Grove, Member Kent) and one (1) alternate member (Jennifer Connolly) in attendance. We will address Old/New Business Items and the Public Hearings will begin at 7:15 PM.

### **OLD/NEW BUSINESS – Master Plan Update:**

#### **7:03 PM – Five Planning Board Members and one (1) Alternate Member are participating.**

Chairperson Joyce advises that the Master Plan Steering Committee, which she is the Planning Board's representative on, has been meeting this week with different stakeholders from around town through technical committees, which are small groups of residents that are meeting with different facilitators from the Master Plan Steering Committee. Last night we held two sessions in Cahill Auditorium and one in Fletcher on Natural Resources and Sustainability. The two that were in Cahill Auditorium last night were Public Facilities and Economic Development. We had some great conversations around those topics. We will be hosting two more Technical Sessions on Thursday evening, one for Transportation and Traffic and one for Housing.

The data that comes out of the Technical Sessions will most likely be presented at the next Master Plan Steering Committee meeting, which is scheduled for May 18, 2023 at Thayer Public Library. We will have Master Plan in person updates at the May 9<sup>th</sup> or June 13<sup>th</sup> Planning Board Meeting. We will be going on a Road Show to all the different committee to talk about what we have been doing and get each committee's feedback on the strategies being discussed as we move into the final phase of our Master Plan, where we look at how we are going to implement the work that we've been doing and get that working throughout all departments. If you want to follow along or look at any of the information to date, you can check out the Master Plan link, which is on the website, and it is also shown at the bottom of the agenda. Chairwoman Joyce advises that the discussions yesterday were fantastic, and she is looking forward to sharing what we have been talking about into the community in the next couple of months.

**OLD/NEW BUSINESS – In Person Meetings (Waiver extended through March 31, 2025):  
7:07 PM – Five Planning Board Members and one (1) Alternate Member are participating.**

Chairwoman Joyce explains that the next item, “In Person Meetings”, pertains to the remote meeting participation. During Covid the state had extended to allow for remote participation through Zoom meetings as an amendment to the open meeting law. That Waiver was extended through March 31, 2025. We are already back in person, but if we were meeting via Zoom, that extension would essentially allow us to continue meeting via Zoom until March 31, 2025. Some other boards and some state boards are still meeting via Zoom, and they most likely will continue until that waiver is ended.

**OLD/NEW BUSINESS – Update: TCO 22-073 – 135-608 Floodplain:  
7:08 PM – Five Planning Board Members and one (1) Alternate Member are participating.**

Director SantucciRozzi advises that a couple of months ago we presented to the Planning Board an updated floodplain bylaw in accordance with FEMA’s model bylaw. The staff was working with a representative from the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR). Staff prepared drafts and vetted those drafts through them. They were acceptable. After the Planning Board recommendation, the Director brought that bylaw to the Ordinance and Rules Subcommittee, received a favorable recommendation, and then presented that to the full Council, which also unanimously voted to adopt that. Post adoption, we were asked to send the signed ordinance to DCR so that we could demonstrate that it has, in fact, been heard and passed locally. Unfortunately, the staff was very upset because the person at DCR that reviewed it and had said it was acceptable said that they had problems with it. Staff went back to the drawing board and made more changes, and they have sent it back out for comment. This time, she has looped in directly with FEMA, and she advises that she has to make another amendment, but she will not be filing anything with the Council until we get acceptance from FEMA. The Director expressed her disappointment and stressed the cost of advertising this, because to advertise three times for the Planning Board and the Council is a bit of a burden. We will pursue this above the person that previously okayed our first version because we don’t have the time and capacity to do things over and over again.

**OLD/NEW BUSINESS – Zoning Amendments: Definitions, Use Table and Parking Requirements  
Brewery, Production Studio and Function Facility:  
7:10 PM – Five Planning Board Members and one (1) Alternate Member are participating.**

Director SantucciRozzi advises that we are looking at some different uses in the ordinance. There has been some interest from various Breweries. As folks know, we permitted a brewery under our light manufacturing ordinance, and while they are manufacturing things there, it’s really not a one-for-one fit. We are looking to produce some language that not only deals with production but also the tap room and other accessory features that come along with the production of malt beverages. Regarding the production studio, there seems to be interest in Massachusetts for production of all types of media. Regarding Function Facility, that is something that has been lacking in Braintree for a long time, and we don’t have a stand-alone facility like this, although we have clubs and lodges that fall under a different definition. Staff will be doing some research on this, and they will be looking at some language that is straightforward with definitions and parking requirements. The Director would like the Planning Board to be the sponsor, and she would like to have some definitions at next month’s meeting.

Member Connolly asks a question about the definitions, and she mentions that about a year ago we had a lot of MedSpa type groups that were coming in to apply, and there wasn’t a great fit there. She recalls there was

nurse injection for Botox and things like that. Member Connolly asks if that is a definition that would be looked at? Director SantucciRozzi advises that they were put under Retail and Services. We have a lot of them that fall under that category. The Director doesn't see it as a concern because that is the category for that situation. A particular applicant thought it was a concern, but we just had another one going in on Quincy Avenue. You can get a lot of things done at a spa. If that is something the Board wanted us to look at, we could. It is difficult because those facilities also have uses that do not fall within medical spa. We have a lot already, and they fall under Retail and Services. To create a new category, it creates inconsistencies.

Member Mikami recalls when we permitted Widowmaker Brewery, one of the consequences were food trucks. Would food trucks be a consideration? The Director thinks that the definition might include an option for onsite food – to provide food either in-house or accessory. We can be a little ahead of the game, such as dedicated spaces for food trucks so it's parked out of aisles and doesn't displace parking spaces.

**PUBLIC HEARING: 79 Pleasant View Avenue (PB File #23-03)**  
**Grading Permit – John Mento – Mento Homes, Applicant**  
**7:16 PM – Five Planning Board Members and one (1) Alternate Member are participating.**

**Appearing on behalf of the Applicant:**  
**Shawn Hardy, Civil Engineer for Hardy + Man**  
**John Mento, Applicant**

Assistant Director Connor Murphy reads the legal notice into record.

Shawn Hardy, Professional Engineer with Hardy + Man Group located in Weymouth and the Engineer for the Applicant, Mento Homes, explains that the existing residence at 79 Pleasant View was destroyed by fire and is in a state of extreme disrepair. It was before the Board for a much larger residence about a year ago. The lot slopes pretty steeply from elevation 116 at the street down to an approximate elevation of 98 in the back. There is a series of retaining walls and steps to get down through all the elevation change. There are currently no stormwater controls on the site, and there is also no driveway. The cars park on the widened sidewalk. They are proposing to demolish the residence, regrade the lot to provide a proposed off-street parking area, use the existing curb cut, add some fill to the front yard, and make it a usable driveway. In addition, they acknowledge they trigger a minor Stormwater Permit. They are proposing a series of five cultic subsurface chambers (three in the rear to take the roof flows and two out front to capture a trench drain at the driveway. Those are sized to hold the 100-year Noah Atlas 14 storm that is required through the Stormwater Department. Overall, this represents 4,750 square foot area of disturbance, and it will involve the import of approximately 260 cubic yards of fill. That fill will come from Mento Landscaping, 1157 Washington Street, and if there is not enough there, they will truck from G. Lopes in Taunton and bring it to the Mento yard to process it, sort it, and deliver it to the site.

Chairwoman Joyce provides a reminder to the public that this is a public hearing, so if anyone from the audience would like to ask any questions or make comment, please feel free to come up.

Carol and Jim Hoey, 69 Pleasant View Avenue, live next door, and there is a public way between the properties, which they take care of. They are quite thankful they are buying the house and tearing it down. It has been an eyesore for 2 ½ years. They advise that they take care of the dirt road. They have a landscaper that mows and does a spring cleanup and a fall cleanup. That is one of the conditions that Mrs. Hoey would like to keep once they are complete. She would like it to be returned the way it was. Mrs. Hoey refers to French

drains, and she advises that the people down back get flooded, and with them raising it up she doesn't want the water coming over to her property or to other neighbors that are here. That is all they ask. Chairwoman Joyce asks, as a follow-up to the Hoey's comment, could the applicant speak to construction staging areas and about the plan for the paper street next to the property.

Mr. Hardy states they are proposing to bring the fill in up through where the proposed driveway is and construct it from that way; they are not proposing to access that paper street in anyway. Regarding water and drainage, there are no stormwater controls at all currently. They are proposing to take the roof leaders from the proposed house and capture them in the three cultic chambers in back and the driveway in a trench drain piped to the two cultic chambers proposed out front. They are sized for 100-year storm and to hopefully help reduce what makes it overland. That is a sloped area. They are trying to make the back yard behind the house level and usable. Chairwoman Joyce states it sounds like they will not be using the paper street during construction.

Member Mikami asks what the paper road is used for today, parking? Mr. Hardy states it is a grassy area. Mrs. Hoey confirms that it is all grass, and in the winter, it is used for sledding. It is a nice area. There are four neighbors around the area. Member Mikami feels it is a non-issue. Mr. Hardy states, as it is Mento Landscaping, in the event they need to access the paper street, they will see that it gets loomed and seeded and brought back to the same condition. Member Mikami asks if any of the work has started, and Mr. Hardy advises that it has not. Member Mikami asks Mr. Hardy if the work will have a positive impact. Mr. Hardy advises that the chambers represent 558 cubic feet of stormwater storage. He thinks it will be a help for some of the neighbors downstream. In addition, flattening some of the slope in the front yard and getting rid of some of those retaining walls and flattening the slope in the back yard all helps, as well. Member Mikami is assuming they will build a nice house, but it will not overwhelm the lot. Mr. Hardy advises that it is a small residence. Member Mikami states it will be nice to get this fixed.

Member Kroha had a question related to the drainage. She sees a retaining wall that is going to remain in the back part of the property. It looks like the slope will run to the corner of that wall. Is the sloping going to go into that drainage device back there. Mr. Hardy states the yard in the back or the grass area will continue to go, but the drainage improvement is that they are flattening it out a little bit. The only flows that will go into those four chambers are from the roof. The grading was just to bend it and give the cover on the chambers.

Member Kent drove by yesterday, and he was concerned about the paper street and how that was going to fair, but he thinks the Applicant has covered his question.

Member Grove has no comments or questions.

Member Connolly asks what the paper street was created to provide access to or from? It is a continuation of Argyle Street from across the street, but it was never constructed.

Chairwoman Joyce had a couple of follow-up questions to the drainage situation at the front. She noticed there was an existing catch basin with a small section of curb at the front of the house. She is wondering will the driveway be constructed such that the gutter line will be maintained. She is concerned if the catch basin were to be clogged, that neighborhood will get a ton of water flowing down the driveway. What is the plan to help alleviate that? Mr. Hardy advises the intent would be to maintain the gutter line. There is a sidewalk that runs down there.

Chairwoman Joyce confirms the metric for collecting the driveway runoff is a trench drain at the end of the driveway. Mr. Hardy confirms and adds with some separation that is not paved EJ asks about the stairway near the trench drain. Mr. Hardy advises with some separation that is intended to not be paved if they need that area for snow storage to not clog the trench drain. The Chairwoman discusses the stairs and confirms that the whole front yard is around elevation 115.5, and she confirms that the stairs step down to a side flat area. Chairwoman Joyce confirms that existing walls will be able to be maintained. The Chairwoman has no further comments or questions.

Chairwoman Joyce confirms that there are no speakers from the public, and she asks the staff to provide their input.

Assistant Director, Connor Murphy, states the staff report speaks to the application that was submitted. The Applicant triggered the grading permit by filling more than two feet in height in addition to importing over 250 cubic yards of fill. The Staff Report provides Draft Findings and Conditions. The Draft Conditions are tailored to Article 12 specifically and cites the applicant's improvements. Mr. Murphy would like to note that there is a conditional Landscaping Plan as part of the draft conditions. The Applicant did not submit one. There is existing vegetation on site that staff is hoping will remain. There is a condition proposed that if those trees were to come down, they are to be planted at a three to one ratio. In addition, prior to the applicant starting the activity, they must provide staff with a Landscaping Plan for the proposed site. Staff would like to make a comment that there is a condition that speaks to maintaining Pleasant View Avenue as a part of the grading activity; staff would like to include Argyle Road as well so if they were to disturb that it would have to be maintained.

Chairwoman Joyce confirms that there is no further public comment, and she asks for a motion.

Member Kent **MOTIONS** to close the public hearing; seconded by Member Grove; voted 5:0:0.

Member Mikami **MOTIONS** to enter correspondence into record through April 10, 2023; seconded by Member Grove; voted 5:0:0.

Chairwoman Joyce confirms that Applicant has reviewed and accepted draft conditions. Mr. Hardy states they have no objections.

Member Kroha **MOTIONS** to approve the Grading Permit for PB File #23-03, 79 Pleasant View Avenue with conditions as modified to include any damage to the paper way shall be loam and seeded and put back in its current condition; seconded by Member Grove; voted 5:0:0.

**CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING: Town Council Order (#23-004) – Residences on Granite (RG PUD) Section 135-612 – Zoning Map and Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment Creation of a PUD District Portion of 250 Granite Street 2089/22, 135 Lakeside Drive 2039/17, 131 Lakeside Drive 2039/6 and Assessors' Parcel 2039-0 56 – Street Layouts of Bonnieview Rd., Silver Rd. & Portions of Lakeside Dr. Braintree Property Associates, Limited Partnership; SSP 131 Lakeside, LLC; SSP 135 Lakeside, LLC, Applicant**  
**7:35 PM – Five Planning Board Members and one (1) Alternate Member are participating.**

Chairwoman Joyce confirms with Director SantucciRozzi that we have a continuance on this matter. The Director advises that Attorney Marinelli on behalf of ZOM submitted a letter dated April 10, 2023. For the

Board's information, there was a narrative submitted in accordance with our submission deadlines and then subsequent to that the modifications and changes that were outlined in the letter were submitted last Thursday, (April 6, 2023), and the Director made it clear to Attorney Marinelli and ZOM that it would not be possible for a complete review of those materials in advance of the meeting. Hence, the Applicant has asked that this hearing be continued without testimony to the May 9, 2023 meeting of the Planning Board. Chairwoman Joyce states will need a **MOTION**.

Member Grove **MOTIONS** to continue this hearing to May 9, 2023 at 7:15 PM; seconded by Member Kent; voted 5:0:0

**PUBLIC HEARING: 8-10 and 40 Arnold Street (PB File #20-02)**

**Major Modification to Special Permit and Site Plan Review Decision and Use Special Permit  
TLC Supply Inc., Applicant**

**7:36 PM – Five Planning Board Members and one (1) Alternate Member are participating.**

**Erin Joyce is recusing herself. Member Kroha will be acting as Chair and Member Connolly will be voting on this application.**

**Appearing on behalf of the Applicant:**

**Attorney Frank Marinelli**

**Shawn Hardy, Hardy + Man Engineering**

**Don Ross, TLC Supply Inc.**

**Rolanda Ross-Lee, TLC Supply Inc. – General Manager**

Director SantucciRozzi provides an update and explains that she has been working with Attorney Marinelli and Mr. Ross and family, and Shawn Hardy on revising the plans and addressing the comments in the Staff Report. That has all been done to date; there is one minor revision to one of the conditions that she discussed with Attorney Marinelli earlier today, which is in the email in board member packets. The Director explains that the original decision was for Riverside Business Park. Mr. Lang is also here this evening. The Director has split this into two decisions. There are a lot of responsibilities, especially regarding environmental remediation, that is the responsibility of Mr. Lang. Those are all clearly outlined in the document provided. In Staff Report II, she outlines how the items in the original Staff Report have been addressed, but that also includes the draft findings for the new Special Permit for factory outlet use and the conditions. The Director explains that the conditions that were in the 20-02 original decision that have now been allocated to Mr. Lang's portion, you can see that they are noted "removed". It is very easy to track what was originally permitted and now how that development will be split into two ownership entities and essentially who is responsible for what. The Director states the plans look great, and she expresses that dealing with Mr. Ross and his organization was a very nice experience; she hopes that more businesses like Mr. Ross will come to Braintree. Mr. Ross is diligent, he cares, he is there at the table responding to issues and making sure that all of the information that has been requested has been provided. The Director wanted to note that so that the Board is aware, and Mr. Ross is aware. The Director is very excited to have him come to Braintree, and she states all his revised materials were very pleasurable to review.

Attorney Frank Marinelli makes the presentation for the Applicant and starts by introducing the Applicant Team. Attorney Marinelli explains that over the past 22 years, TLC has built quite a business for contractors, wholesalers, and homeowners dealing in any kind of masonry or hardscape product. Attorney Marinelli states the Board has been provided background information on the company and he reviews that information.

The Applicant wants to thank the Planning Director for all the work on this because this site, as the Board knows, has been a complex permitting site. The entire site is about 16 acres. Attorney Marinelli represents TLC Supply. George Lang, Principal of Adams Street Enterprises, is here; they are represented by Attorney Jerry Fong; Jerry has another commitment tonight and cannot be here, but the Director is working with Attorney Fong on the second part of this decision. The TLC Supply decision will concern the 3.24 acres that you see here, and it is really the southwest corner of the 16 acres. That site was previously permitted by the Planning Board and the Conservation Commission for a 49,000 square foot building. The Applicant's development program with TLC is significantly less. They have an approximate 4900 square foot sales showroom and office and a 10,800 square foot warehouse for product and fleet, etc. There are 21 parking spaces. There are palletized areas where consumers can come in and see the product. It is characterized as a factory outlet store because there is some retail, but less than 25%. There are about 16,000 square feet of building. The showroom is within the 25% that allows you to have the retail sales as accessory to the commercial use. The zoning is Commercial; it is 3.24 acres.

The remaining 12.88 acres is the subject of a separate permit, which Director SantucciRozzi described, that will be going to Adams Street Enterprises to Mr. Lang's company. That carries forward a lot of the obligations of #20-02, which was the original permit. The original permit has remediation obligations, mitigation obligations, and traffic monitoring obligations. The Applicant's traffic report is on file for the TLC Supply part of the project for the 3.24 acres, and they are reducing a 49,000 square foot approval to just over 16,000 square feet. That results in significantly less vehicle trips, and that is pointed out in the VAI Traffic Report. Attorney Marinelli advises that the Monatiquot River and other issues are on the 12.88-acre site and not TLC's site. TLC Supply is currently located on Vernon Street in Quincy. They have been there for many years, and they are anxious to move to Braintree. This is a transformation of the site to a nice business use. The Applicant looks forward to continuing to work with the town and open for business. Mr. Ross and the team have reviewed the conditions. As the Director advised, Attorney Marinelli confirms that there have been a few amendments, but the Applicant is pleased with the Decision as written and with the suggestions that were made. Note: Attorney Marinelli advises that they are tying into the previously approved drainage because that was peer reviewed before Conservation; so, rather than reinventing the wheel and do their own stormwater on their own site, TLC Supply has done an agreement with Mr. Lang and Attorney Fong where they will connect to that drainage system, which has already been peer reviewed.

Vice Chair Kroha provides a reminder that this is a continued public hearing, and she asks if there is anyone here from the public that has any questions or comments. There is no one. She then opens the discussion to Planning Board members.

Member Mikami asks the Director, now that we are splitting these into two different decisions, has there been any substantial project made on the original project? The Director advises that Mr. Lang has received approval from EPA regarding the remediation plan. That was a very long effort, and he has started some demo work on the batch plant. Her understanding is that will be the catalyst to getting things going. Member Mikami asks if any of the drainage work has started yet and how will the drainage work proceed? Mr. Fong is working with the Director on the timing of that, and they have submitted a sequencing plan of the activities that will occur. Attorney Marinelli advises that drainage has not commenced yet because demolition is currently taking place on the TLC Supply site, which is where the cement plant was. They do have a purchase and sale agreement, which has significant provisions the obligations in terms of demolition, grading, remediation, frontage, the ANR Plan to create the 3.24-acre lot, etc. Attorney Marinelli advises that the quick answer is the drainage work has not started yet. Member Mikami asks if he is correct to assume operations won't start until drainage is completed. Attorney Marinelli confirms this.

Member Mikami acknowledges that this is a larger site that TLC Supply has in Quincy, and he asks, when it's in full operation, do we have enough protection in place for noise and dust, etc. for the residents in the area? How will that work? Mr. Ross, TLC Supply Inc., advises that his current site does not have a good flow to make everything work. They want better control of the flow, and that is why the new site has been designed in this manner, and he highlights the design. Mr. Mikami asks about noise and dust. Mr. Ross advises that currently they are in a residential area, and there are houses within 15 feet of the yard. They have been there for 23 years and have never received a single complaint. Mr. Ross discusses the noise level and explains that the forklifts have special backup alarms. If there is no noise around them, you hardly hear them. Member Mikami asks Attorney Marinelli if the whole yard is going to be paved or will it be dirt? Attorney Marinelli points out the zoning legend and says there is a bit more Open Space than required, at 26.1% of open space where 25% is required. There are no variances on any of the dimensional requirements. Shawn Hardy highlights the areas that will be totally paved, the areas that will have landscaping, and the wetland area that will be constructed as a meadow with grasses as remediation for flood storage. The area is framed in with landscaping to provide screening and shading. Mr. Hardy advises that there was a concern from the Conservation Commission related to suspended solids or dirt that can migrate and get into the drainage system. They have a sweeper onsite that will provide monitoring daily.

Member Kent asks who the patrons are – is this business-to-business or individual customers. Mr. Ross states it is a variety of homeowners, contractors, municipal contractors, and home-building contractors. Mr. Ross advises that is why they want to build a nice showroom.

Member Grove asks about abutter notifications and whether this was done for the Major Modification. Director SantucciRozzi replies this was advertised in the newspaper, abutter notice was done, and they will also be notified of the decision.

Member Connolly asks if all goes well, when do you think you might outgrow this site? Mr. Ross advises that they outgrew their current site about 15 years ago; they still can manage, but they have to be a little smarter in how they do things.

Vice Chair Kroha asks if this modification needs to go through Conservation Commission and what is the status with that. Attorney Marinelli advises that they will be before the Conservation Commission in May. The revised plan they filed conforms to this plan. This project was previously peer reviewed. Vice Chair Kroha asks about the ANR for this property. The requirement of the seller is to create a suitable roadway. The seller has the rest of that frontage. It has all been measured appropriately. Shawn Hardy was there the other day, as he was trying to respond to a DPW comment about the location of a manhole. They do show some proposed grading. That was part of what the original filing was going to include. Constructing it is not a problem, as they have more than the required frontage. Vice Chair Kroha asks about the access coming around through the site and if there will be cross-access easements to run through the property? Attorney Marinelli advises that they will have easements serving this property for access for utilities and for drainage. Attorney Marinelli advises that the Draft Conditions require that. One of Mr. Lang's requirements is that they have to submit a plan for the remaining 12.88 acres and make sure that the remaining parcel and development program complies.

Vice Chair Kroha asks if there is anyone from the public that has any comments or questions. There are none.

There are no further comments from staff.



Member Mikami **MOTIONS** to close the public hearing; seconded by Member Grove; voted 5:0:0.

Member Grove **MOTIONS** to accept correspondence into record through April 10, 2023; seconded by Member Kent; voted 5:0:0.

Director SantucciRozzi requests that any future motions, if they are going to be in the positive, include the revisions to Condition 1 from Attorney Marinelli that further clarifies responsibilities for the different parties according to the email from Attorney Marinelli dated April 11, 2023, at 5:17 PM.

Member Kent **MOTIONS** to approve the Major Modification to the Special Permit and Site Plan Review for TLC Supply, Inc. with draft conditions dated April 6, 2023, and an email from Attorney Marinelli dated April 11, 2023; seconded by Member Grove; voted 5:0:0. **Note: Alternate Member Jennifer Connolly is voting on this, as Erin Joyce recused herself from this hearing.**

**CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING: 125 Union Street –Site Plan Review and Special Permit (PB File #23-01)**  
**JBM Braintree LLC/Torrington Properties, Applicant**  
**8:02 PM – Five Planning Board Members and one (1) Alternate Member are participating.**

Chairwoman Joyce advises that the Applicant has asked that this hearing be continued without testimony to the May 9, 2023, meeting of the Planning Board at 7:15 PM, and we will need a **MOTION**.

Member Grove **MOTIONS** to continue this hearing to May 9, 2023, at 7:15 PM; seconded by Member Tom Kent; voted 5:0:0.

**OLD/NEW BUSINESS – Approval of Meeting Minutes:**  
**8:03 PM – Five Planning Board Members and one (1) Alternate Member are participating.**

Chairwoman Joyce advises that the January 10, 2023, Meeting Minutes are on the agenda for approval. There are no comments or revisions for those minutes, so, we just need a motion.

Member Grove **MOTIONS** to approve the minutes from the January 10, 2023, Planning Board Meeting; seconded by Member Tom Kent; voted 5:0:0.

Member Grove **MOTIONS to adjourn** the meeting; seconded by Member Kent; voted 5:0:0.

The meeting adjourned at 8:04.

Respectfully submitted,  
Louise Quinlan  
Planning/Community Development