



Charles C. Kokoros
Mayor

Department of Planning and Community Development

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

PLANNING BOARD

Erin V. Joyce, Chair
Darryl Mikami, Clerk
James N. Downey, Member
William J. Grove, Member
Thomas Kent, Alternate Member

Approved 11/09/2021

Braintree Planning Board – Tuesday, August 10, 2021, at 6:00 PM – via ZOOM

Present:

Ms. Erin Joyce, Chair
Mr. Darryl Mikami, Clerk
Mr. Darryl Mikami, Clerk
Mr. James Downey, Member
Mr. William J. Grove, Member
Mr. Thomas Kent, Alternate Member

Melissa SantucciRozzi, Director
Kenneth Kirkland, Assistant Director
Connor Murphy, Zoning Planner

Chairwoman Erin Joyce opens the meeting at 6:00 PM, provides an overview, explains the process to address issues on ZOOM, highlights the Agenda, and explains how to comment during the meeting via Chat, by email, by raising your hand or via telephone. The phone numbers will be put in the Chat. Chairwoman Joyce then takes attendance via a roll call. Five (5) members and one alternate member (Member Kroha: HERE; Member Mikami: HERE; Member Downey: HERE; Member Grove: HERE; Member Kent: HERE; Chairwoman Joyce: HERE) are in attendance. Chair Joyce is jumping down to New Business before our first Public Hearing is scheduled to begin at 6:15PM.

NEW BUSINESS: WELCOME/INTRODUCTION OF KENNETH R. KIRKLAND, MPA, MRC, AICP – ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

6:04 PM

Chairwoman Joyce welcomes our new staff member, Kenneth Kirkland, as our new Assistant Director of Planning and Community Development. Chairwoman Joyce asks the Director to make the introduction. Director SantucciRozzi explains that Mr. Kirkland comes to us from Norwell, MA where he was the Planning Director working for our former Chief of Staff, Peter Moran. The Director states Mr. Kirkland has quite the resume and reviews Mr. Kirkland's previous positions and educational credentials. Director SantucciRozzi is ecstatic to have an Assistant Director to help the department and serve our boards. Mr. Kirkland explains his previous work experience and states he is excited to have this opportunity. Chairwoman Joyce expresses that she is looking forward to Mr. Kirkland's additional support and expertise.

NEW BUSINESS: UPDATE ON THE MASTER PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE:

6:05 PM

Chairwoman Joyce, as a member of the Master Plan Committee, provides an update and states they are working through the next steps. She states reminds the Board that back in June they issued an RFP looking for a consultant to assist in the process, but, unfortunately, we didn't receive any responses back. They are actively looking for feedback as to why we didn't get responses. This impacts the progression of the Master Plan. Director SantucciRozzi states she will be reaching out to quite a few of the firms that had taken out the solicitation to get insight and feedback as to why they didn't put in a proposal. She will be sharing those with the Master Plan Steering Committee as well as the Planning Board.

NEW BUSINESS: REQUEST FOR AS-BUILT APPROVAL – 16 WEST STREET
FILE #18-19 – REQUESTED BY: HANK DUONG, APPLICANT

6:07 PM – Five Planning Board Members and one Alternate Member are participating.

Connor Murphy explains that we have request for As-Built Approval for 16 West Street. Mr. Murphy reminds us that the Planning Board that they approved a Special Permit/Site Plan Review for a two-family conversion for this address. Mr. Murphy explains that a lot of the work was done internal to the structure. The applicant did expand the driveway, as reflected on the As-Built Plan. As discussed at the June Planning Board meeting, there was an issue with tenants of the structure parking on the front lawn. The Applicant has remedied this issue by installing a planted bed along that strip of the driveway to the front yard. While it is minor, the intent is that goes from the walkway to the sidewalk to prevent anybody from driving over it and parking on the front lawn. Other than that, the site appears to be built to conformance with the plans, including landscaping along the left-hand portion of the property All conditions of the Special Permit have been satisfied. There are several conditions to be survived. Those are conditions 1, 5, 12, 14, 21 and 29.

Mr. Murphy notes the Planning Board is not holding any surety for this project. Mr. Murphy recommends granting the As-Built Approval with surviving conditions.

There are no comments or questions from Planning Board Members.

Member Mikami **MOTIONS** for positive endorsement for As-Built approval for File 18-19, 16 West Street, with surviving conditions, as outlined by staff; Member Kroha seconds; VOTED 6:0:0 (6 Votes – Member Kroha: YES; Member Mikami: YES; Member Downey: YES; Member Grove: YES; Member Kent: YES; Chair Joyce: YES).

NEW BUSINESS: REQUEST FOR AS-BUILT APPROVAL AND RELEASE OF SURETY –
1535 WASHINGTON STREET FILE #17-13 – REQUESTED BY: EDGE SPORTS GROUP (APPLICANT)

6:11 PM – Five Planning Board Members are participating. Alternate Member Kent does not participate.

Appearing for the Applicant:

Brian DeVellis, Applicant-unable to attend meeting
Phil Cordeiro, Allen and Major

Director SantucciRozzi explains that she did forward an email to the Board a short time ago from Mr. DeVellis, who cannot be with us this evening. This is for the Edge Sports Group facility at 1535 Washington Street. This was permitted back in June 2018, and subsequent to that we did a Minor Modification back in December 11, 2018 related to the entrance drive and some modifications to the parking layout. The materials forwarded to the Board include a written narrative, which outlines things completed to date. The As-Built Plan was the last sheet of that narrative. The outstanding items at that time were reworking some of the lighting and making some minor modifications. There are some items related to the landscaping plan that didn't work that well out in the field. Staff did make some suggestions. We are holding quite a bit of surety. We have a \$3,000 cash As-Built surety. There was a \$200,000 surety that was posted; most of it was released back in August 2019. We did retain \$10,000 for these items. We also had two paper bonds that Thayer had posted. One was for the tennis courts, and one was for the new entrance. The staff is supporting the request for As-Built Approval and to release the surety. The surviving Conditions have been outlined in the Staff Report as follows: 1, 11, 12, 14, 26, 27, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41a, 41b, 41c, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 49, 50, 51, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68 and 69.

There are no comments or questions from Planning Board Members.

Member Downey **MOTIONS** for positive endorsement for As-Built approval for File 17-13, 1535 Washington Street, with surviving conditions, as outlined by staff and to release the surety; Member Mikami seconds; VOTED 5:0:1 (5 Votes – Member Kroha: YES; Member Mikami: YES; Member Downey: YES; Member Grove: YES; Chair Joyce: YES). Alternate Member Kent abstains from this vote.

PUBLIC HEARING

42 Hayward Street – PB File #21-12 - Grading Permit

Applicant: John D. Lu

6:15 PM – Five Planning Board Members and one Alternate Member are participating. Alternate Member Kent is not voting.

Appearing for the Applicant:

John Lu, Applicant

Chi Man, Engineer

Director SantucciRozzi reads the Legal Notice into record.

Chi Man from Hardy/Man Design Group is here representing the Owner, John Lu. Mr. Man shares the Grading Plan on the screen, which is a more updated plan than the one submitted. They met with Conservation Commission, and the Commission has requested that the Applicant do some modification. Mr. Man advises that the owner purchased the property last November, and without knowing the regulations in Braintree he tried to widen the driveway. Unfortunately, the wrong landscaper did the job. The Applicant found out from the Town that he needed a permit, and the fill did go into the buffer zone of the wetlands. They met with Conservation Commission already, and they recommended removal of some of the fill. What they are planning to present is to rework the slope and widen the back area. He proposes putting some fill in the back area and widening the deck in the rear and also put in a permeable paver patio. In the front, because it is a gravel driveway, the engineer recommends a permeable paver instead of the gravel washing down into the slope and the wetlands. Mr. Man highlights the paver system being proposed. The current gravel/crushed stone is difficult to maintain. The paver system will allow the owner to stabilize the driveway.

Mr. Man advises that, on the erosion control side, they will have a construction entrance with stabilized stone, and erosion control will be placed all the way around the work area to prevent any sedimentation and erosion into the wetland resource area. For any slope steeper than 3:1, they are proposing to put in an erosion control blanket. The slope will also be planted with plant materials, and Mr. Man highlights the selection. Mr. Man advises that the Conservation Commission asked the Applicant to remove any fill that was placed within the 25-foot buffer. The latest plan shows the establishment of the 25-foot buffer, with material removed; it also shows a more-gentle slope back into the driveway area. They are proposing rip-rap stabilization. They did receive a couple of correspondence from the Engineering Department. Basically, the Applicant understands they have to get a minor Stormwater Permit, and they want to make sure the Applicant protects the existing utilities.

Mr. Man discusses the way they calculate the amount of fill. They received an As-Built Plan from the Conservation Commission, and they overlaid that with the existing survey. They came up with the number of cubic yards placed on site.

Chairwoman Joyce asks for a review from staff.

Director SantucciRozzi has prepared a Staff Report and states for the scope of the project, unfortunately some of the work was done without benefit of a Grading Permit, but the concept and ideas makes sense. What is being proposed is a good way for driving and will stabilize the ground and prevent erosion. The details which Mr. Man had shown are essentially a snowflake. The open holes are grass. This grass crate area will not be parked on. This driveway is located much closer to the actual dwelling. Director SantucciRozzi has requested a basic Operations & Maintenance Plan. When the Conservation Agent visited the site, the outlet was buried. She wants to make sure what Mr. Man is designing will be maintained and working in good order, as it is designed to function. To the north of the area is a cross-hatched area which includes a deck expansion and some minor grading for an impervious patio. Director SantucciRozzi explains that this is a large lot. The lot is almost 70,000 square feet. When you look at the part being worked on vs. the open areas, the lot coverage is just under 22%. There is still quite a bit of Open Space. Director SantucciRozzi's main concerns were to make the Conservation Commission happy because you are very close to the wetland. Provide the couple responses requested in the Staff Report. If the Applicant can wrap this up with Conservation in early September, the Planning Board can take another look at this at the September Planning Board Meeting and hopefully work towards an approval.

Director SantucciRozzi states she did receive some comments via email, which were shared with the Board. She responded to those residents stating the items would be discussed tonight. Chairwoman Joyce sees a hand raised.

Ed Albrecht, 73 Connell Street, advises that Hayward Brook runs alongside his property. They do have a problem with water in the basement during heavy storms. If they didn't have a sump pump, they would get quite a bit of water. His main concern is the stormwater runoff from this project into Hayward Brook. Down at the back of the property is marshland, which gets pretty heavy with water. His basement is just above the water table, and it gets quite a bit of water if sump pumps don't work. Chairwoman Joyce asks the applicant to address the comment.

Chi Man states the driveway proposal doesn't change the drainage characteristics or the runoff. It will let the rainwater go into open joints and infiltrate slowly into the ground. This project doesn't increase stormwater runoff.

Mrs. Albrecht, 73 Connell Street, asks about absorption rate of 8 inches and mentions, when there is a large snowstorm, they have water problems. Mr. Man explains that the Town has a storm drain pipe that drains into the brook. The brook receives a lot of street runoff. Mr. Man explains that the driveway will not change the drainage characteristics. Mr. Man explains why the new system will be a positive improvement. Mrs. Albrecht asks what the 12-inch pipe will do. Mr. Man states the 12-inch pipe doesn't direct the water from this site into the brook. The 12-inch pipe will be under the driveway and is to drain out the depressed area from the neighboring land and let the water go into the wetlands. There are two pipes. One is under the driveway. The other will be next to the driveway, which will totally absorb street runoff.

Mrs. Albrecht asks about proposed planting with plants that absorb water located at the outer edge of the driveway. Mr. Man explains which ones are being used and explains that they are erosion absorbing materials. Mr. Man understands that the owner will be planting some shade trees. Mrs. Albrecht mentions that the trees being planted fed the deer population, and, although she likes deer, the deer also ate everything else.

Valerie Johnson, 65 Connell Street, asks where did the fill come from? Mr. Man explains that the fill came from the landscaping company, and it is regular gravel fill. Ms. Johnson asks if the fill is good for drainage. Mr. Man states the fill is good for drainage. The most important concern is to make sure the slope is stabilized and there is no erosion.

Dan Dancheck, 72 Connell Street, asks, if there is a problem with the runoff, how will this be resolved. Mr. Man personally does not see any additional issues with his design; he feels there will be an improvement with the runoff. Some of the houses were built in the flood-zone, and Mr. Man is not sure how to improve that once a house is built in the flood-zone. Mr. Man explains that not only are they appearing before the Conservation Commission and the Planning Board, their application was required to get a minor Stormwater Permit.

Member Kroha has no comments; she was a member of the Conservation Commission before and realizes they are taking a close look at this and making sure it is done right.

Member Mikami confirms procedurally we are not going to proceed with a vote until Conservation is all done. Director SantucciRozzi states that is correct. Chi Man will be submitting the revised plan to Conservation. Kelly Phelan, Conservation Planner, had left the Director some notes that the Commission had directed the Applicant to remove materials from the 25. Member Mikami asks if this property had ever been subject to Conservation Commission review. Mr. Man explains that when the project was built it was subject to an Order of Conditions. Member Mikami clarifies and asks if there were any other projects for this property that had to go through Conservation Commission. Mr. Man does not know of any but states the original house was built with the approval of Conservation Commission. Member Mikami asks if there will be any surety for this project. The Director explains we will have our standard As-Built Surety. She doesn't want to speak for the Conservation Commission, but they will probably require a bond to ensure that the vegetation takes; they may hold the bond for a couple of growing seasons. Typically, the Conservation Planner goes out and does multiple inspections. Given this case and the paver driveway, erosion may not happen. Member Mikami provides a comment about this being the second project in recent months involving illegal work by a contractor. Member Mikami states it is very troublesome, and he wishes there were some penalties, as he is pretty confident that these companies know better and they are taking advantage of the situation.

Member Downey asks what happens if there is runoff or it doesn't go according to plan. What is the recourse? Mr. Man states they can do an additional drywell to take the roof runoff, but he feels very confident that they are improving drainage. Director SantucciRozzi explains that she had looked at Connell Street through GIS, and unfortunately these homes are very low. If you look at floodplain elevation and the elevation of these basements, they are low. Director SantucciRozzi doesn't think that those homes, unless they are raised up, are ever going to improve water problems. Looking at this, the Applicant is going with a low impact design. If the Applicant is willing to do other forms of infiltration, that wouldn't hurt the situation. However, the neighbors are very low and these are the natural patterns of drainage for this area. She suggests taking the Applicant up on the offer to do drywells on the higher portion of the property.

Mr. Man states the amount of runoff is the amount of rainfall, and it goes to the same spot. Mr. Man explains that he is trying to slow down the rate of runoff going into the wetlands. Even though they put all of the runoff into the drywell, it is going to find its way into the ground water and go to the low spot. They can offer a couple more drywells, but Mr. Man doesn't think it is going to help much.

Member Grove wonders where the rest of the lot coverage is expanding. Mr. Man explains that the added coverage in the deck and the patio area, which he considers pervious. Chairwoman Joyce asks if the building coverage is going up; it is from the deck standpoint. Director SantucciRozzi explains that the crate driveway is included in the coverage. Member Grove confirms that the turf/stone pavers are all permeable, and states that needs to be reflected on the plan. Both the Director and Mr. Chi confirm that it is.

Member Kent asks how effective the paver system is. What about in March or when it freezes and thaws repeatedly? Will that be more effective than a paved driveway? Mr. Man states the key for this paver system to work is the base – crushed stone. If you don't have that, it is not as successful. Mr. Man explains the paver over time will need some maintenance.

Margaret Florentine, 61 Connell Street, will adding the pavers to the proposed patio area help mitigate runoff into the properties on Connell Street and the wetlands? Mr. Man explains because of the open joint pavement, the rainwater is going to slip into the joints, and he describes how this will work.

Chairwoman Joyce asks about the permeability of the turf stone and turf grass. Mr. Man states, typically, they recommend putting in sand and gravel mix so grass can grow better. Chairwoman Joyce confirms that Mr. Man would anticipate them planning grass. Chairwoman Joyce asks about the hatched area near the house and if that is an existing brick driveway. Mr. Man clarifies it is brick pavers. Chairwoman Joyce confirms that the addition is the deck and asks what would be the surface below the deck. Mr. Man states it would be crushed stone. Mr. Man will add that note to the plan. Chairwoman Joyce confirms that the patio is a porous paver patio. Chairwoman Joyce asks what are the soils like. Mr. Man states they haven't done any soil testing because they were not planning on doing drywells, but he looked at soil survey on the upper side and it looks like sand and loam material. Chairwoman Joyce asks what the grade is on the driveway? Are you essentially replacing at the gravel driveway with the new paver? Mr. Man states they are not changing the grade. It will remain at existing grade. Chairwoman Joyce asks for double checking that this driveway works with that system. Chairwoman Joyce states an effort for the drywell to collect roof runoff would be helpful.

Mrs. Albrecht looked at the botanist, Kenneth Thompson, and their comments about the soil. Mrs. Albrecht reads what the botanist states in that the soils are rich sandy loam, deep and somewhat poorly drained. The Director states those materials were submitted to the Conservation Commission and were not in the Planning Board Member packets. Chairwoman Joyce states that is helpful. Mr. Man states those are typical comments, and Mr. Thompson went out to do borings and come up with wetland lines.

Chairwoman Joyce states there are no other comments from the public, and she recognizes that we still have work to do on this application and would be looking to continue this hearing

Director SantucciRozzi clarifies, before we get into continuances, do we want to continue our meetings via ZOOM or in person. Director SantucciRozzi explains what other Boards, Commissions and the Council has been doing, and she states that whatever the Board is comfortable with. Staff doesn't have a preference. Chairwoman Joyce is going to poll the Planning Board, where "YES" means in person; Kim Kroha: prefers ZOOM so NO; Darryl Mikami: NO; James Downey: NO; William Grove: NO; Tom Kent: NO; Chairwoman Joyce feels similar to Member Kroha so NO. The September Meeting will be schedule for ZOOM. The Director advises that the hearing will be for 6:15 PM on September 14, 2021.

Member Mikami **MOTIONS** to continue this hearing to the Planning Board meeting of September 14, 2021 at 6:15 PM; Member Downey seconds; VOTED 6:0:0 (6 Votes – Member Kroha: YES; Member Mikami: YES; Member Downey: YES; Member Grove: YES; Member Kent: YES; Chair Joyce: YES).

PUBLIC HEARING

250 Granite Street– PB File #21-14 - Special Permit and Site Plan Review

Applicant: Braintree Fitness LLC (Orangetheory)

7:11 PM – Five Planning Board Members and one Alternate Member are participating. Alternate Member Kent is not voting.

**Appearing for the Applicant:
Carl Johnson, Attorney
Michael Mehr, Orangetheory**

Director SantucciRozzi reads the Legal Notice into record. Chairwoman Joyce asks for the Applicant to introduce themselves, the team and the project.

Attorney Carl Johnson represents Braintree Fitness LLC in this Special Permit/Site Plan Review application for a commercial recreation use to operate the proposed Orangetheory Fitness facility at the South Shore Plaza. Attorney Johnson advises that the proposed Orangetheory will be located in a vacant 3500 square foot store unit, which is located between Macy's and Buffalo Wild Wings and adjacent to the Sears parking lot. The facility is accessed by a new exterior facility and façade, and it is not directly accessed from the interior of the Mall. Joining Attorney Johnson is Michael Mehr, head of real estate and development for Honors Holding LLC. Mr. Mehr owns, operates and manages 122 Orangetheory Fitness facilities and is joining us from Atlanta, Georgia. Attorney Johnson advises that Mr. Mehr will describe the Orangetheory methods of fitness training focus and answer any questions the Board may have concerning the operation and use of the facility.

Michael Mehr is really excited about this project in Braintree. Mr. Mehr advises that Orangetheory is the number one boutique fitness provider in the fitness industry currently. Orangetheory is a one-hour total body workout. They focus on endurance, strength and power. It is a coach-led workout. They hold classes from 5:00 AM to 12:00 PM and then from 4:00 PM to 8:00 PM, Monday through Friday; they do half-days on Saturday and Sunday from 7:30 AM to 12:30 PM. They are seven days a week; they are a high-end brand with a premium look. They focus on heart-rate based interval training or HIIT training to give members a phenomenal result in a 30, 60 or 90-day period. Orangetheory, as a brand, has over 1400 locations in the United States and about another 250 locations internationally. For Orangetheory, as a brand, there are 34 locations in Massachusetts, and Honors Holding has 12 locations currently in Massachusetts. Honors Holding has been operating in Massachusetts since December 2019.

Attorney Johnson states that submitted with this application were detailed plans, architectural and other details that go along with the construction of the interior. It does show the exterior façade that accesses directly from the parking lot. There was a brief sign depiction that was submitted by another vendor; they will meet and exceed code requirements. Attorney Johnson wants to point out that this is a special permit for commercial recreational use. Focusing on the use, this will provide some diversity and non-retail offerings, which is essential for continued operations at South Shore Plaza. It is well-positioned to be accessed only from the exterior. This also requires Site Plan Review.

Also submitted with this is the Overall Site Plan (or OS1 Plan), which was developed when the Board issued Special Permit 08-03. What that plan does is monitors all the parking area, gross leasable area and all other dimensional open space requirements that the mall exceeds in all respects. This will not have any additional gross leasable area. It will not generate any additional parking and will have no impact on the travel ways or the operation of the mall nor conflict with any provisions or findings of the Special Permit that was issued.

On behalf of Simon, Simon strongly supports this additional, high-quality well-established fitness-use, which is much desired. They believe it will enhance and diversify the offerings at South Shore Plaza and will greatly benefit the public with the addition of non-retail uses.

Chairwoman Joyce reminds the public that they can add their comments, and she asks staff for a summary.

Director SantucciRozzi states this is very straight forward. She sat down with Attorney Johnson and the contractor. They will have an exterior entrance. She confirms the location and states there is a chance to dress things up in that area. The staff has no concerns. The Director has prepared the draft conditions, and they are very similar to the recreational development from a few months ago. They are tied back to the OS1 plan, which relates to parking, landscaping, etc. The Director is looking forward to a diversification of use at South Shore Plaza.

Member Kroha explains Orangetheory is a great plan. She asks about what are the hours, how many people are typically there.

Michael Mehr advises that hours will be 5AM – noon then 4PM to 8PM Monday – Friday; there is one class per hour with a 15-minute break in between. The maximum capacity is 24-36 people per class. Weekend hours are 7:30 AM to 12:30 PM. Member Kroha asks about parking. Mr. Mehr states it is general parking for everybody with no dedicated parking for this business. There is ample parking. Chairwoman Joyce asks if any of the tenants at the mall have dedicated parking. Director SantucciRozzi discusses former parking issues and the Employee Parking Plan, and mentions there are a few dedicated areas for Target, Cheesecake Factory and Charging Stations; however, it is generally first come first serve. There has been an ongoing monitoring of parking at the plaza. The General Manager is a phone call away, and they are very responsive.

Member Mikami would also like to say that he is happy to see some diversification at the plaza. Member Mikami asks if there is an emergency exit or is the new front door the only entrance/exit. Mr. Mehr states there is an emergency exit behind the weight room into the common hallway then out of the building. Member Mikami asks if there will be locker rooms and showers. Mr. Mehr advises that there are not locker rooms, but there will be two showers. There are lockers and cubbies. Most members come to exercise and shower when they get home.

Member Downey has no comments or questions.

Member Grove asks about potential health issues of attendees in the midst of exercising. Mr. Mehr states, in the event of an emergency, all studios have AED; the entire staff is CPR and AED certified. In the event of emergency, they stop class and evacuate all members. The attendee needing assistance can be brought to the lobby area for care.

Member Kent asks what the demographic is at these facilities. Mr. Mehr states they cater to college age up to 75-80 years old. Wheelhouse is early 30's to early 60's. It is typically 75% female to 25% male.

Chairwoman Joyce agrees with diversity of uses at South Shore Plaza, and she has heard great things about Orangetheory. Director SantucciRozzi states there have been no comments from the public; the abutter's list was extensive. Chairwoman Joyce confirms that draft conditions have been shared with the Applicant. Chairwoman Joyce asks if the Applicant has any comments or questions on the conditions. Attorney Johnson has no comments.

Member Kroha **MOTIONS** to accept correspondence into record through August 8; seconded by Member Grove; 5:0:0 (5 Votes – Member Kroha: YES; Member Mikami: YES; Member Downey: YES; Member Grove: YES; Chair Joyce: YES). Member Kent is not voting.

Member Mikami **MOTIONS** to close the public hearing; seconded by Member Grove; 5:0:0 (5 Votes – Member Kroha: YES; Member Mikami: YES; Member Downey: YES; Member Grove: YES; Chair Joyce: YES).

Member Kroha **MOTIONS** for approval of the Special Permit and Site Plan Review for file #21-14, Orangetheory, 250 Granite Street, subject to conditions; seconded by Member Downey; 5:0:0 (5 Votes – Member Kroha: YES; Member Mikami: YES; Member Downey: YES; Member Grove: YES; Chair Joyce: YES).

PUBLIC HEARING

250 Granite Street– Major Modification to PB File #17-14 - Special Permit and Site Plan Review

Applicant: Jennifer Alves (Eyebrow Glam)

7:30 PM – Five Planning Board Members and one Alternate Member are participating. Alternate Member Kent is not voting.

**Appearing for the Applicant:
Jennifer Alves**

Director SantucciRozzi reads the Legal Notice into record. Chairwoman Joyce asks for the Applicant to introduce themselves, the team and the project.

Jennifer Alves states she is looking for a modification to relocate to a larger and more prime location to provide additional capacity for clientele as well as more visibility.

Chairwoman Joyce reminds the public that they can comment or ask questions via the methods described earlier; seeing none, she asks for an overview by staff. Director SantucciRozzi would like to commend Jennifer about embarking upon a new business venture and now she is looking to expand. The Director is happy for the applicant's success. The Director has reviewed the renderings and sketches of what the new facility will look like. Essentially, what the Director did was take the previous Special Permit that the Board had issued and changed the store location so that we can transfer that over and Ms. Alves can continue her business here in Braintree.

Member Kroha has no comments or questions.

Member Mikami wants to congratulate the Applicant on her success. Member Mikami's only question is with the body art, does it fall under any additional regulations from the Health Department. Ms. Alves states the only

thing that the Board of Health requires is that the establishment meets all requirements and all practitioners are licensed and certified. Member Mikami confirms that the state regulates and licenses Ms. Alves' workers.

Members Downey, Grove and Kent have no comments or questions.

Chairwoman Joyce does not have further questions or comments, but is thrilled to see the Applicant succeeding and upgrading her space. She confirms that the Applicant is all set with conditions.

Member Grove **MOTIONS** to enter correspondence into record through August 7; seconded by Member Kroha 5:0:0 (5 Votes – Member Kroha: YES; Member Mikami: YES; Member Downey: YES; Member Grove: YES; Chair Joyce: YES). Alternate Member Kent is not voting.

Member Downey **MOTIONS** to close the public hearing; seconded by Member Grove; 5:0:0 (5 Votes – Member Kroha: YES; Member Mikami: YES; Member Downey: YES; Member Grove: YES; Chair Joyce: YES). Alternate Member Kent is not voting.

Member Kroha **MOTIONS** for approval of the Major Modification to Special Permit and Site Plan Review for file #17-14, Eyebrow Glam, subject to conditions; seconded by Member Grove; 5:0:0 (5 Votes – Member Kroha: YES; Member Mikami: YES; Member Downey: YES; Member Grove: YES; Chair Joyce: YES). Alternate Member Kent is not voting.

PUBLIC HEARING

4 and 44 Allen Street – PB File #21-15 - Special Permit and Site Plan Review

Applicant: Winn Development Company

7:44 PM – Five Planning Board Members and one Alternate Member are participating. Alternate Member Kent is not voting.

Appearing for the Applicant:

Frank Marinelli, Attorney

David Gamble, Gamble Associates-Project Architect

Jesse Johnson, Weston Sampson – Civil Engineer

Jeff Dirk, Vanasse – Traffic Engineer

Tim Mustacato, Winn Development, Director of Acquisitions

Adam Stein, Winn Development Senior VP

Rich Relich, Arch Communities-Co-Developer

Jennifer Ng, Landscape Architect

James Carrico, Gamble Associates

Director SantucciRozzi reads the Legal Notice into record. Chairwoman Joyce asks for the Applicant to introduce themselves, the team and provide an overview of the project.

Attorney Frank Marinelli is appearing on behalf of Winn Development and Arch Communities (co-developers) that he will refer to as simply "Winn". Winn was designated earlier this year as part of the Town's RFP process, as redeveloper of the former Braintree Electric (BELD) site on Allen Street. Under the Winn Proposal, the site will be transformed from a vacant form BELD industrial use into beautifully designed and landscaped residences know as Switch House Lofts. Switch House Lofts is a tremendous opportunity for Braintree and provides much needed housing and transformation of a blighted site.

Winn is investing \$1.5Million in site acquisition and over \$25Million in construction. The redeveloped site will have a public Riverwalk amenity that will extend from Allen Street over 600 linear feet to the riverfront and to a river overlook deck. With the transformation, open space will double to approximately 44%. There will be hundreds of new plantings. For the first time, after decades of municipal ownership, the vacant site will now product significant real estate tax revenue, construction jobs and other substantial economic benefits for the Landing area and for the Town. Attorney Marinelli would like to introduce the Winn Redevelopment Team. Attorney Marinelli explains that Winn is based in Boston, and they have acquired and developed over \$2.5Billion in holdings in ten states. Winn has completed over three dozen historically-significant, adaptive re-use projects turning historic structures, similar to the BELD Switch House being renovated here, into vibrant, living communities. Winn's residential management company is the fifth largest in the nation with 105,000 housing units under management, and they are the largest in Massachusetts with over 17,500 units under management. Braintree will have one of the nation's premier residential developers transforming this blighted site. Attorney Marinelli highlights the order of the presentation.

Attorney Marinelli explains the former BELD Allen Street site is over 1.6 acres. BELD operations began in 1892. The power plant was removed in 1993. The Allen Street site has been vacant since 1996 when they relocated to the Potter Street location; the Allen Street site has been vacant for 25 years. In 2011 the Allen Street site was appropriately designated part of the Braintree/Weymouth Landing Zoning District. The Applicant seeks Special Permit approval under Section 615 and 608 of the Braintree Zoning Ordinances to construct the Switch House Loft Residences. The Winn proposal of 56 residences meets the purposes of Landing Zoning District, Section 615. Specifically: 1.) to provide a range of housing options for people of different income levels and stages of life; 2.) to propose compact horizontal and vertical residential development; 3.) to upgrade existing properties; and 4.) to promote an active and publicly accessible waterfront. Switch House Lofts accomplishes all of these purposes of the Landing Zoning District with 44% open space and public amenity. A second floor will be added to the Switch House. On the water side of the Switch House, the grade drops significantly lower than Allen Street. At that lower level there will be resident's storage, meeting rooms and other amenities. In addition to renovating the Switch House, Winn plans to renovate the Screen House. In addition to the 16 residences in the Switch House, a new building west of the Switch House will be constructed parallel to Allen Street with 40 total residences. The new building has an easterly section and westerly section with an enclosed glass bridge connecting the two. The new building is four stories, which is allowed under Section 615. The new building has 17 residences in the easterly portion and 23 residences in the westerly portion. The significant grade drop allows 39 parking spaces covered under the building and another 21 surface-parking for a total of 60 parking spaces, and that is 15 more parking spaces than the 45 required. There will also be secure bicycle parking and an electric charging station. The Unit mix for the 56 residences is 23 one-bedroom, 28 two-bedroom and 5 three-bedroom. A purpose of the Landing Zoning District is to provide a range of housing options for people at different stages of live and income levels. Winn builds housing for all, and 25% or more of the 56 units will be provided as affordable units. Switch House Lofts complies with all dimensional, density and parking requirements of the Landing Zoning District. It provides 44% open space, with a portion comprising of the publicly accessible river walkway. The historic BELD Switch House is preserved, renovated and re-used for residential purpose. All criteria are met for the Landing District Special Permit. The site is also located in the floodplain, and there is a Special Permit approval required under Section 608 of the Zoning Ordinances. The project engineer has filed the justification for issuance of that Floodplain Special Permit. The Applicant also understands that the stormwater and drainage will be Peer Reviewed by Merrill Engineering. Attorney Marinelli explains that the rate of stormwater runoff from the site is reduced post construction vs. pre-construction.

The existing drainage and sewage infrastructures are old, and Switch House Lofts proposes to install new drainage infrastructure, new sewer service and all that complies with current design standards. Regarding stormwater, the impervious coverage will be reduced from 79% to 58%. All pavement runoff will be captured and directed to new catch basins and separated by two levels of treatment prior to discharge. Currently, runoff is uncontrolled and untreated. In summary, highlights and benefits of the Winn proposal: First, it is residential development intended by the Landing Zoning District transforming a former industrial site vacated for 25 years to 56 aesthetic residences with public accessible Riverwalk in complete compliance with residential zoning. There are many reports that attest to the need for housing units like this. This is a housing alternative to single-family homes, which are beyond the capability of many hard-working people. Frankly, many young people and empty-nesters prefer apartment homes. Secondly, Switch House Lofts involves a \$1.5Million acquisition payment to the Town, a \$25Million investment by Winn, substantial permit fees, and significant tax revenue to be generated at a site which produced no tax revenue and no economic benefits over the past 25 years. As Mayor Kokoros states in announcing the Winn RFP designation, the property has been vacant since 1996. The estimated construction costs are expected to generate over 150 jobs and over \$12Million of economic activity. Switch House Lofts is an exciting redevelopment opportunity for Braintree of a currently blighted site.

David Gamble, Gamble Associates-Architect for the project, will explain the thoughtful design and elevations of Switch House Lofts. Mr. Gamble advises that this project is not happening in a vacuum. He explains that over 12 years ago they were involved in a series of conversations with the Town, the East Braintree Civic Association and BELD to think about the appropriate planning principles to use if this site was to be redeveloped. There were six goals: 1.) showcase the river; 2.) salvage existing buildings; 3.) maintain views for Allen Street neighbors; 4.) calm surrounding traffic; 5.) create a quiet, peaceful and beautiful setting; 6.) be an asset for the community. Mr. Gamble describes each of the goals. Mr. Gamble expresses that it seems like nothing has happened over the last 12 years, but in addition to the community outreach in 2010 and the rezoning in 2011, some tanks were removed from onsite that were submerged below ground, a National Parks Service Grant was written to extend the Monatiquot Riverwalk, in 2014 there was a predevelopment study that identified that the Switch House could be reused structurally and that housing was the most market viable use for the site, in 2015 there was an RFP that led to this RFP and the development proposal. It is a complex site, which is why Winn and Arch Communities is the best developer for the site because it is what they do. Mr. Gamble describes plans for preserving some areas and removing others, and he explains that there are assets here that one can build upon. Existing Conditions Photos are highlighted, showing the expansiveness of the 1.6-acre site. Mr. Gamble explains how they will use the grade change on the site to put parking below the building. Mr. Gamble discusses the 15-foot sewer easement right-of-way, which requires pushing construction up against Allen Street. Mr. Gamble highlights ways to transform the project along Allen Street such as repairing the brick, adding windows, cleaning the façade, adding lighting and street trees and adding a sidewalk on the right side. This is a shift in thinking about Allen Street, not as a priority for cars, but as a priority for people. The development team is trying to honor Thomas Watson by rehabilitating the site and to think about making connections to the river front that weren't there for a century.

Mr. Gamble continues by discussing the architectural design. He highlights the view from Allen Street, the plaza, the lobbies into each building and the first-floor parking areas. He explains that the bulk of the parking resides under the new building, and he explains where you would find your way up to the residential portion of the buildings from the parking area. Mr. Gamble explains that they are leaving development potential on the table as he highlights the maximum allowable roof height. He continues with providing information about the construction of the Switch House building vs. the new building, which is actually split into two buildings connected by a glass bridge. He continues by describing the view of the buildings from the south side (or the river side).

Mr. Gamble highlights a model they have used to talk about the site and the relationship of the landscape to the architecture. The project is really trying to fit in the environment vs. on top of it, work with the topography and the hydrology in ways that can transform it.

Jesse Johnson, Weston and Sampson-Civil, Environmental and Permitting Consultants for the project, will discuss the Site Engineering aspects of the project. He confirms some of the guidelines and restrictions they have been sensitive to adhere to as they laid out the site. He explains that the entire site is within the floodplain. He provides elevations and explains that the existing basement floor of the Switch House and retaining wall around Allen Street is around 9.4 feet. The measured floodplain elevation for the 100-year storm, listed by FEMA, is calculated at 12 feet. So, the entire site is within floodplain. He also reminds that the sewer easement bisects the property. There are two existing curb cuts; they propose to close the one on the left and maintain the one on the east and improve it by improving the angle and the slope. In order to do this, they had to look at going into the adjacent lot, which was not part of the original proposal. Using this property will improve access and improve the project. They enter the site with a conventional 24-foot wide, two-way traffic entrance. They provide parking at the surface and also provide an entrance to a basement-level parking under the two new buildings. They have 21 surface parking spaces and 39 interior parking spaces. They were careful to design this to meet criteria of local Fire Department. They are also sensitive to how close they pushed the pavement towards the sensitive resource areas. Currently it goes up to the existing seawall. They have pulled that back significantly to try to improve the site by reducing stormwater and provide green-space between the pavement and the river. They have considered need for snow storage. Grading needs to be considered. There is a retaining wall along the front that provides 12-14 feet. It is about 12% grade at the entrance/egress. They are going to improve that and make it roughly 8.5-9%. They will level it off as quickly as they can. They are careful not to change the drainage patterns, but to work with them. They want to limit the amount of fill on the site. They are sensitive to the fact that they are in a floodplain. They wanted to maintain the existing ground levels of the Switch House and put the new buildings at the same ground level. They now have a naturally draining site to low areas within the paved area. They didn't want to have water cascading into the river, as it does now. They wanted to direct it back into the site and treat it before it runs into the river. By reducing the impervious coverage by 22%, they have been able to reduce rate of runoff and the volume of runoff into the site by 15%. They have not yet gone before the Conservation Commission, but the team feels they have a very good application to show them. One of the considerations is that they not cause scour or cause issues with the Building Codes. The first residential floor has to be at least one foot above that 12 feet. They have it at 21 feet, showing a 7-foot delta. It was mentioned that there is open air to the parking garage that would allow water to come in and out. The previous development and buildings were all closed off and didn't have that available capacity or volume. This is a tidal river and subject to elevations and storm surges related to the ocean. It is not a typical river, so compensatory storage is something that comes into play, but you have to be sensitive to scour and making sure you are not going to impact abutters. They are minimizing fill and just bringing in enough to improve their driveway.

Jen Ng, Landscape Architect, is hoping to talk about pedestrian connection and some of the landscape experience. She explains that 44% of the site is for the public amenity. There are two character-zones to the landscape: the public Riverwalk and the shared amenities. The public Riverwalk is a 15-foot wide Riverwalk that follows existing seawall. It is supported by spaces that offer flexible programming and passive recreation. To the north of the Riverwalk is the open lawn, which is relatively flat. This would be an area with trees and shade. Additionally, there is a Riverwalk overlook where the river naturally expands and widens. This would be a great place for sitting and viewing. The Riverwalk is connected to Allen Street and the Quincy Avenue Bridge through an accessible path. It moves through the adjacent property, and it is the link between this property's

Riverwalk and the existing Riverwalk and trails to the east. The Applicant intentionally wanted this path to feel like a walk through the woods and not like another sidewalk experience. They created a buffer between the realigned driveway and the path, and they tried to consider some slope stabilization. With regard to the shared amenities, there are three zones to the shared amenities. The outdoor terrace, which is an extension of the ground-floor amenity, allows the ground-floor residents to have a good inside/outside experience. The plaza, which ensures the abutters across the street have views and connection to the river, is the common ground between the Switch House and the new building and is a gathering place and offers a direct stair connection to the Riverwalk. It also offers a small porch, which starts to mitigate the grade change and elevation difference between the Switch House front door and the new building front door. Then there are the terraces on either side of the glass bridge. On Allen Street, there is a planted terrace to tuck in the transformer that will serve the development, and on the Riverwalk side there is a raised deck or perch overlooking the Riverwalk. Ms. Ng highlights the Planting Plan and explains there are three zones to the plantings. There is the lawn, which is roughly 3000 square feet. The second zone is the slope stabilization planting, which is on the far west side and the far east side and is about 9500 square feet. The third zone in the middle, which is about creating a frame for the public space and outdoor activity, is low plantings that are all native, ground covers, perennials and some grasses. Ms. Ng walks us through renderings, which show the relationship of the public space to Allen Street and that it is quite a bit lower. They also show the relationship of the different types of landscape materials.

Jeffrey Dirk, Managing Partner at Vanasse & Associates, prepared a Transportation Assessment and has a few slides to summarize the findings. Their assessment was submitted to the Town last month; however, they have been working with the Town of Braintree and Town of Weymouth to conduct a transportation assessment. They want to make sure the project fits into existing conditions and future conditions. From a transportation perspective, the Applicant wants to make sure the project fits into the transportation needs that are envisioned for this area. Mr. Dirk discusses how traffic counts are adjusted during the pandemic. It is a backward-looking adjustment where they rely on historic counts to predict the way things would have been had the pandemic not happened. For this project of 56 units, it is a relatively low traffic generator. They are predicting that the project will add 20 to 30 vehicle trips during the peak hours. It is one additional vehicle every 2 to 3 minutes. Vehicle queuing at any intersection didn't increase by any more than one vehicle, which said there was sufficient capacity to accommodate the project. The Town has undertaken studies and developed plans to improve the Allen Street corridor. The Applicant looked at connectivity to the existing sidewalk infrastructure in accommodating pedestrians and bicycles and safety improvements. They looked at sight lines in exiting the project to make sure they were sufficient for vehicles approaching the actual speed driven along the Allen Street corridor. They found that the driveway, as positioned, is appropriate and meets all requirements for a safe intersection. Mr. Dirk explains that there is sufficient capacity to accommodate this project. Mr. Dirk highlights the sidewalk connections between Shaw Street and Quincy Avenue (Route 53), and he explains that Quincy Avenue provides public transportation, which he highlights the location of. The public transportation forms an amenity for this project. Having the sidewalk and MBTA bus service and commuter rail within a reasonable walking distance is a benefit to this location. Mr. Dirk highlights the expected addition in traffic due to this development. It is not a significant generator of new traffic to the area. It is a very small net increase as you get away from the Allen Street corridor. As a result of their assessment, Mr. Dirk has a series of recommendations, which have been incorporated into the Site Plan by Mr. Johnson. Mr. Dirk highlights these recommendations. The next series of recommendations are in accordance with Standard Practice. Lastly, they have very good sightlines in the driveway, so they don't want anything placed within the site triangle areas that would inhibit the sightlines. They did identify that the Allen Street/Shaw Street intersection is in-need-of improvements. Those improvements are primarily focused on safety related improvements.

The Town's plan for the reconstruction of Allen Street would address safety at that intersection (making it one-way and providing proper traffic control). However, recognizing that at this point there is not a funding source for the Allen Street improvements, the Applicant provided a series of recommendations for improvements that should be undertaken and that the Applicant has agreed to undertake as part of this project, subject to receipt of all necessary rights, permits and approvals. Those would entail providing "All Way" STOP control of that intersection. The majority of crashes occurring at that location are angle-type crashes related to someone either crossing or turning from Allen Street being struck by a vehicle that is traveling along Shaw Street. In order to eliminate that conflict, "All Way" STOP control would be an appropriate measure. The Applicant has committed to evaluating that, and if it is deemed warranted and is desired by the Town, the Applicant would undertake the necessary installation of signs to place that intersection under "All Way" STOP control. Lastly, related to the amenities and the sidewalk infrastructure and the opportunity to connect to the MBTA bus and commuter service, a transportation coordinator will be designated to coordinate the elements of the Transportation Demand Management Program. Work-at-home workspaces will be provided to support telecommuting by residents. A centralized maildrop will be provided to eliminate the need to drive to the Post Office. Bicycle parking will be provided in both a secured, interior location and exterior for visitors.

Attorney Marinelli thanks the Board and members of the public for their attention and patience during this presentation. The team is ready and willing to answer any questions from the Board or the public.

Chairwoman Joyce thanks the team and states this was a great and very thorough presentation. She is monitoring the areas for public comments and questions, and she asks for an update from Director SantucciRozzi.

Director SantucciRozzi states they did have a series of different meetings with Attorney Marinelli and the team. There were site visits in the field and a rather large pre-filing meeting with the various departments. She has not prepared a staff report for this evening. The presentation is very detailed. We have secured the services of Deb Keller to do a Peer Review of the Drainage System. The Applicant has not yet filed with the Conservation Commission. The Director's understanding is that application is in the works and is being put together by Jesse Johnson and his team. There is quite a lot of permitting and funding going on. The Director's plan is to sit down and work through some of the issues of the Peer Review and DPW. There are quite a few moving parts. We want to make sure all of the issues from various departments are considered. Director SantucciRozzi thinks this is an excellent opportunity for the Town of Braintree. The Director expresses that the team put together is really the "A Team". Staff will be working with the Applicant, and she suggests that the hearing be continued this evening. She expresses that we would like to keep this project moving; the Applicant has other permitting that they need to secure. Tonight, she wants to thank the developer for providing housing that represents Braintree and is going to serve the residents of Braintree and the abutting communities. Not only does this project provide for varying incomes and demographics, but the location itself is affordable. She has made her concerns known early on in the process, and she can see that a lot of them have been put into the design, which tells her that the Applicant is listening. She is looking forward to reporting minimal concerns and putting together a decision for a development that we can be proud of. She is also looking forward to addressing any issues raised by the Board and the public.

Bill Bottiggi, General Manager of Braintree Electric (BELD), wants to speak out in favor of this major improvement to the old BELD complex. BELD occupied it for 125 years, leaving in 1996. It has taken 25 years and a lot of imagination by Gamble Associates and Winn Development to move this project forward. This redevelopment will be a major improvement for East Braintree.

Robert, 86 Quincy Avenue, is an abutter to an abutter and states the view he has looking out from his deck will be hampered or blocked from this development. What can he do to ensure this doesn't happen to a view he has been enjoying for the last 46 years. The Director states a lot of design and placement of the buildings and breaks takes into consideration the views from various properties; she states staff will work with the team to ensure this isn't overlooked. Attorney Marinelli points out that the abutter is diagonal from the two-story building. Tim Mustacato, Winn Development, explains it is only a one-story addition to the SwitchHouse. The abutter is handicapped and will not be able to use the Riverwalk. He prefers sitting out on his deck with views of the water and not the rooftop of the building. He has another concern, which is disturbance of the rat population during construction. Attorney Marinelli states there absolutely is pest control required. Robert addresses Illustration 39 by Mr. Dirk and discussing the Commuter Rail; Robert clarifies that the commuter platform is southeast. David Gamble states they will provide some perspectives and drawings. Chairwoman Joyce suggests that Robert contact the Planning Director to ensure that further clarification and additional information is provided.

Member Kroha appreciates the thorough presentation. She appreciates the Applicant consideration of the views of existing residents. She also appreciates the walkability of the site to get to commuter rail and businesses. Member Kroha wanted to know if anyone looked at the possibility of adding another sidewalk on the far side of the property. Member Kroha was curious if they are rental or condo units. Are the boat slips connected with the project or are they separate? Attorney Marinelli clarifies that they are rental units, and the boat slips are the extension of Braintree Yacht Club. Jesse Johnson states the sidewalk cannot be extended on the left side because of the grading.

Member Mikami appreciates the presentation tonight and mentions it is a lot to absorb. Member Mikami asks why are we taking up the Special Permit before this is before Conservation Commission. Director SantucciRozzi states this application was ready before the NOI was completed. The Peer Review has been commissioned for both Boards. The Planning Board case load is typically a lot heavier. Attorney Marinelli explains that historically most proceed to Planning Board first or simultaneously. Every decision is subject to the conditions and orders and approvals of every other Board or Commission. The DHCD marker has to be done by October. Tim Mustacato clarifies that the DHCD deadline is toward the end of October. Member Mikami asks about funding from the State, and asks if the funding is currently available. What is the proportion of state funding vs. private. Tim Mustacato states they don't currently have the funding and explains they are for tax credits from the state, bond financing from MassHousing and other subsidies at the state level – all of which they would apply for concurrently and receive in their normal funding rounds that happen at the end of this year and awards are made this time next year. They have projects going into DHCD's funding round every year, and are very familiar with mixed-income funding rounds. Mr. Mustacato references their development in Quincy, the Watson. Member Mikami confirms that the Applicant has the money and is going to take advantage of tax credits from the state, and MassHousing has some bonds.

Adam Stein clarifies that the type of housing is also in line with the policy of the state agencies, is part of the objectives that the state wishes to pursue and complies directly with the state's initiatives. Mr. Stein explains that we have to be ready to make a successful application, which means environmental, due diligence feasibility, zoning, conservation.

Member Downey asks if the boat slips will be accessed from the development. David Gamble explains that the Yacht Club wants to keep their slips separate from the development. Member Downey asks about access to the Riverwalk from Quincy Avenue. Jennifer Ng highlights the access on the rendering through the path connection.

Member Grove asks if there is any physical separation between the Riverwalk and the site so they are not intermingling? Jennifer Ng confirms he is talking about blocking shared amenities to the general public. Ms. Ng discusses the terraces on the west side have gates so that the general public will not have access. The plaza has access for the general public. There is a keyed entrance to the terraces and parking. Mr. Stein thinks that Member Grove raises a good question in defining what is public and what is private. Member Grove states it looks like the existing building is outside the property line. Attorney Marinelli states there is about a foot intrusion outside the property line by the Switch House. This has been discussed with Melissa and Town Solicitor staff. There will be a permanent and perpetual easement to be worked out in the legal documents. Member Grove asks if Allen Street will be subject to existing state law related to bicycle lanes and will Quincy Avenue be subject to bicycle lanes. There is discussion about the impact of a bicycle lane on Quincy Avenue. Mr. Dirk doesn't feel that his traffic reporting would fail because the amount of traffic produced by this project is a low traffic generator. Director SantucciRozzi asks if there is a plan to do something on Quincy Avenue and she clarifies that the reconstruction doesn't impact anything on Quincy Avenue.

Member Kent refers to ESG's (Environmental Social Governance) and asks about the energy plans for this project (solar, gas, electric). David Gamble states it is a no-brainer to try to include solar energy here. BELD has a program. This project can be a signature for ways to address energy consumption and offer energy production. Mr. Gamble explains they cannot do geothermal because the level of the soil conditions won't allow it. They can do solar. Wind is not great in this area. They are trying to use as highly efficient mechanical systems as possible.

Chairwoman Joyce asks what the project was going to do from a building construction view in the ways of sustainable building. Mr. Gamble states they are not there yet, but there is an individual that is responsible for this at Winn. Mr. Mustacato states that they certainly have significant experience with sustainable energy and energy efficient design. They have more work to do on their end. Chairwoman Joyce asks if any state funding ties into the sustainability of building construction. Mr. Stein states DHCD and MassHousing have energy criteria. The Applicant will typically exceed whatever the state agency requires. Chairwoman Joyce asks about the breakdown of housing (unit mix). There will be 23 one-bedroom, 28 two-bedroom and five three-bedroom units. Chairwoman Joyce asks if they anticipated many school aged children. Mr. Mustacato explains that over 50% of the development will be two-bedroom+. It is targeted toward workforce families. Chairwoman Joyce asks about open patio space, and whether there are restrictions on what can be placed on patio. Mr. Stein states a lot with regard to aesthetics can be done through the lease agreement and lease operations. Mr. Stein agrees that they don't want a bunch of satellite dishes and grills on the patios. That is the benefit of a centrally managed apartment community. Chairwoman Joyce asks about the location of utilities on the roof or will they be internal to the building. Mr. Gamble states they have not done a mechanical layout determination. Mr. Gamble states they are concerned with how the rooftops look to neighbors. Chairwoman Joyce agrees that we should pay more attention to what is up on the roof. Chairwoman Joyce is looking forward to seeing this move along and really appreciates the presentation.

Director SantucciRozzi states, if any of the other board members have any concerns that come up, they should email her. It is a big project with a lot of details to take in.

Member Downey **MOTIONS** to continue this hearing to the Planning Board meeting of September 14, 2021 at 6:15 PM; Member Mikami seconds; VOTED 5:0:0 (5 Votes – Member Kroha: YES; Member Mikami: YES; Member Downey: YES; Member Grove: YES; Chair Joyce: YES).

Chairwoman Joyce asks that we take a break until 9:35 PM.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

232 Peach Street, South Middle School, Grading Permit PB File #21-05

Applicant: Town of Braintree

9:35 PM – Four Planning Board Members and one Alternate Member are participating, as Member Kroha cannot participate.

Appearing for the Applicant:

Will Spears

Nereyda Rodriguez, Architect

Brian Pace

Mike Carroll, Hill International

Mary Mahoney, Hill International

Kris Bradner, Traverse-Landscape Architect

Michelle Kayserman, Samiotes

Stephen Garvin, Samiotes

Eric Dias, Strong Point Engineering-Peer Review

Michelle Kayserman introduces the team and highlights the renderings of the proposed school, existing school, landscaping and changes since their initial submission. She explains that additional plantings were added for better screening for the abutters in key locations, such as neighbors on Richard Road, the neighbor on Peach Street and neighbors on Kenmore Road. She highlights that the school buses will be coming in and out of Kenmore, similar to how they come in now. She highlights the area of parent drop-off. She also highlights the proposed school building and the construction entrance. She clarifies that the crosswalk has been moved further away from the construction entrance to address some of the concerns heard at the last hearing.

In Phase 1A, April 2022, the site contractors would install all the site utilities that connect into Kenmore as part of that first phase upfront, put some base coat for paving in the parking lot and move the fencing to allow for additional parking area for the existing school while the new school is being built. When they get to Phase 2, they would pave the entire area with a topcoat. In Phase 2, after teachers and students are using the new school, the modular classrooms would come down, the second parking lot would be built with the raingardens and stormwater for that area to be tied in and the re-aligned Peach Street entrance would be constructed.

Ms. Kayserman highlights the project schedule with construction beginning in October 2021. She further highlights the utility plan, the grading plan and a heat map of the cut/fill areas of the site. Ms. Kayserman explains that they are leaving the cut-through area from Celia Road entrance alone. They have shifted the grading so that it is at 3:0.

Director SantucciRozzi asks Ms. Kayserman to go over the crosswalk on Peach Street, as there have been some revisions to that. It was one of the areas of main concern at the last hearing.

Ms. Kayserman shows the existing vs. proposed. They have closed down parallel parking, which allows buses and cars to maneuver. They are building a temporary sidewalk, parallel to existing sidewalk which is elevated and near existing driveway, which shifts the curb cut further up the road on Peach Street. Students are no longer crossing directly or right next to the construction entrance. Then, they would come back at a diagonal towards where the sidewalk is.

Chairwoman Joyce expresses that we have concluded the Peer Review and asks the Director if there are any other outstanding items. Director SantucciRozzi advises that there were a few things worked through with the team, the Peer Review, Councilor Boericke (who has been very helpful in neighborhood meetings), Chairwoman Joyce and staff. Samiotes and Strongpoint had about four rounds of comments. The Director advises that everything has been vetted. Staff has prepared the Grading Permit and has no additional concerns. Staff is comfortable with revised drawings, and she expresses that the Applicant has taken into consideration the Board's and staff's comments.

Member Mikami is happy to see that the team has had some flexibility and has made changes to the crosswalk. It will be a difficult period, but all the professionals involved have done a good job, including the residents and town officials. Member Mikami comments "let's get going on South".

Members Downey and Grove have no comments or questions.

Member Kent second Member Mikami's comments to get this going.

Chairwoman Joyce has no further comments or questions, and she is happy that this is figured out and completed. She confirms with the applicant that there were no issues with the Draft Conditions. This was confirmed by Mary Mahoney.

Member Kent **MOTIONS** to enter correspondence into record through August 7, 2021; Member Grove seconds; VOTED 5:0:0 (5 Votes – Member Mikami: YES; Member Downey: YES; Member Grove: YES; Member Kent: YES; Chair Joyce: YES). **Alternate Member Kent is voting on this hearing, as Member Kroha cannot participate.**

Member Mikami **MOTION** to close the public hearing; seconded by Member Kent; 5:0:0 (5 Votes – Member Mikami: YES; Member Downey: YES; Member Grove: YES; Member Kent: YES; Chair Joyce: YES). **Alternate Member Kent is voting on this hearing, as Member Kroha cannot participate.**

Member Mikami **MOTIONS** for approval of the Grading Permit for file #21-05, 232 Peach Street, South Middle School, subject to conditions; seconded by Member Grove; 5:0:0 (5 Votes – Member Mikami: YES; Member Downey: YES; Member Grove: YES; Member Kent: YES; Chair Joyce: YES). **Alternate Member Kent is voting on this hearing, as Member Kroha cannot participate.**

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

300 Quincy Avenue – PB File 21-10 - Special Permit and Site Plan Review

Applicant: Steven Mei

9:54 PM – Five Planning Board Members

Director SantucciRozzi advises that the Applicant has not finished his revised materials, and he has requested that this hearing be continued without testimony to our next Planning Board Meeting on September 14, 2021.

Member Downey **MOTIONS** to continue this hearing to September 14, 2021 at 6:15 PM; seconded by Member Mikami; 5:0:0 (5 Votes – Member Kroha: YES; Member Mikami: YES; Member Downey: YES; Member Grove: YES; Chair Joyce: YES).

Chairwoman Joyce reminds that we did discuss In Person Meetings earlier this evening, and September will continue to be via Zoom and we will continue to “play it by ear”.

Connor Murphy, Zoning Planner, advises that there are no Zoning Board of Appeal recommendations for this meeting.

NEW BUSINESS: REQUEST FOR MINOR MODIFICATION – 540 GRANITE STREET – FILE #87-38
REQUESTED BY: CORE STATES GROUP FOR CHASE BANK

9:56 PM - Five Planning Board Members and one Alternate Member are participating. Alternate Member Kent is not voting.

Attending for Applicant:
Kai Burk, Core States
Alan Roscoe, Core States
Matthew McCool, Chase

Mr. Kai Burk, Engineer for the project, introduces the team and explains they are proposing to use the existing Citizens Bank at 540 Granite Street, with some minor modifications for a Chase Bank. The building would stay intact. There are some minor architectural updates to it. They would add a ten-foot landscape strip on the eastern side against the Goddard School, which is Residential District, and they would add additional landscaping on the western side along Granite Street. Mr. Burk highlights the Building Site Plan. It is pretty simple with no real substantial changes. The Minor Modification is the removal of the Condition requiring the Applicant to provide a dumpster. With bank use, the waste is very minimal. They just contract with cleaning service to haul off any waste.

Chairwoman Joyce asks for comments from staff. Connor Murphy, Planner, has been working with applicant since June; Mr. Murphy explains that the applicant is looking to come in and revamp this property. It is located in Braintree’s Five Corners and is probably one of the older sites in that corridor. They were granted a special permit by the Planning Board in 1988, and it was also granted relief by the Zoning Board of Appeals in 1987. In addition to that, the owner at the time went back to the Planning Board and was granted an Amended Special Permit/Site Plan Review for the second through lane, which is reflected today. The Special Permits were granted under the 1988 Zoning Bylaw and control the site presently. The Applicant was granted a Special Permit for the existing buffer between the site and the Residence B property, known as the Goddard School today. The applicant is actually improving that buffer from seven feet to ten feet, which was the requirement within the 1988 bylaw. The Applicant will be proposing all new landscaping encompassing the site, as depicted on Sheet LP-1. Mr. Murphy also advises that the Applicant is proposing to re-orient parking onsite; this is somewhat encouraged, as the Applicant is going to be increasing their Open Space onsite from 8.76% to 15.2%. There is a 10% minimum allowed in a General Business zone.

Staff would like to make note that if you were to use today’s zoning map it would highlight this property as Highway Business. Staff has done research on this matter and found back in 1975 the Town underwent to rezone in that corridor along Granite Street; they allowed for rezoning up and to Ross Way, which is reflected on the plans as Highway Business. This property remained General Business. Staff at the time made a clerical error on the map, which is noted within the Special Permit findings.

In regards to amending Condition 10 of the original Special Permit from 1988, the original Condition 10 reads: “The proposed dumpster is to be located at the end of the ten (10) space parking area, enclosed by a wooden

fence for wind control and aesthetics.” Staff is recommending we alter this condition to read: “The Applicant is responsible for disposing of trash and recycling off site on an as needed basis. The Applicant shall furnish proof to the Department of Planning and Community Development that a service will be provided to do so.” In addition, staff is recommending approval. There are a few proposed conditions; these conditions are in relation to the site work, such as erosion control and things of that nature, striping, landscaping, and an As-Built plan to close out the project. Staff has provided the Board architectural plans. As you can see, the building will be getting a facelift. The Applicant is proposing new signage at this location, which is something staff will review prior to them being issued a permit.

Member Kroha states it looks like there will be two drive-thru aisles, where currently there is one. Has the circulation of the site been looked at? Mr. Connor advises that the circulation will remain to be what it is today; the second drive-thru will not be used by the Applicant. Currently there is nothing stopping anyone from cutting through from West Street to Granite Street.

Member Mikami is happy to see a refresh on this site, particularly the landscaping. He is hoping it will be an improvement from what it is today.

Members Downey, Grove and Kent have no questions.

Chairwoman Joyce noted that the Stop signs were off the property, and she suggests that they be pushed back on. She wonders if the signage is needed. Mr. Murphy doesn't think they are needed. The Applicant would prefer to keep them on the site, but he is flexible either way. Chairwoman Joyce asks about the two spaces on the side; Mr. Burk states they are designated employee spaces.

Mr. Burk has seen the conditions and has no issue with them.

Member Kroha **MOTIONS** to grant the Minor Modification for 540 Granite Street, PB File #87-38, with conditions; seconded by Member Grove; 5:0:0 (5 Votes – Member Kroha: YES; Member Mikami: YES; Member Downey: YES; Member Grove: YES; Chair Joyce: YES).

NEW BUSINESS: REQUEST FOR LOT RELEASE – 1 HILL AVENUE (DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION)
FILE #19-15 – REQUESTED BY: CLEAN HARBORS OF BRAINTREE

10:08 PM – Five Planning Board Members and one Alternate Member are participating. Alternate Member Kent is not voting.

Appearing for the Applicant:
Rick Grady, Grady Consulting

Director SantucciRozzi advises that Rick Grady is here tonight on this matter. She describes the process so far in that Clean Harbors has gone through Preliminary Subdivision, Definitive Subdivision as well as two Site Plan Reviews with the Planning Board in 2019. She explains that Clean Harbors is gearing up to start the building construction on Lot 9. There was quite a bit of paperwork that needs to be done; therefore, Mr. Grady was called upon. They have posted a Surety Bond for the full surety of the subdivision, that Town Council has approved. The Director has advised Mr. Grady that Lot 10 was not being given up, as some improvement on the roadway needs to occur first. The Director was comfortable releasing Lot 9. The Director describes the process for lot release, which includes a Lot Release Form endorsed by the Planning Board. Clean Harbors

Braintree Planning Board
August 10, 2021
Via Zoom

will have some onsite erosion controls. Mr. Grady has provided some of those materials, but there are typical work conditions that staff needs to work through with the Applicant.

Members Kroha, Mikami, Downey, Grove and Kent have no comments or questions.

Chairwoman Joyce has no further comments or questions, and she explains this seems pretty straightforward to keep this project moving forward.

Member Grove **MOTION** to release Lot 9 from the Covenant and recognizing that surety is being placed on the subdivision; seconded by Member Downey; 5:0:0 (5 Votes - Member Kroha: YES; Member Mikami: YES; Member Downey: YES; Member Grove: YES; Chair Joyce: YES).

Member Downey **MOTION to adjourn** the meeting; seconded by Member Grove; voted by roll 6:0:0 (6 Votes – Member Kroha: YES; Member Mikami: YES; Member Downey: YES; Member Grove: YES; Member Kent: YES; Chair Joyce: YES). The meeting adjourned at 10:12 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Louise Quinlan, Planning/Community Development