



**Mayor
Charles C. Kokoros**

Department of Planning and Community Development

Melissa M. SantucciRozzi, Director
1 JFK Memorial Drive
Braintree, Massachusetts 02184
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 October 11, 2022

Braintree Planning Board – Tuesday, September 13, 2022, at 7:01 PM – Cahill Auditorium

Present:

Ms. Erin Joyce, Chair	Melissa SantucciRozzi, Director
Ms. Kim Kroha, Vice Chair	Connor Murphy, Zoning Planner
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 7:00 PM and then states that we have a full Board present this evening. Five (5) full members (Chairwoman Joyce, Member Kroha, Member Mikami, Member Grove, and Member Kent) and one (1) alternate member (Jennifer Connolly) are present this evening. Member Connolly will be participating in all matters but voting on only the ones where we don't have a full quorum of full board members. As the Public Hearings are not starting until 7:15, we will address Old/New Business Items.

OLD/NEW BUSINESS - DISCUSSION:

We are addressing Member Grove's previous comments related to term limits of members and the legality of voting, which the Director has been in touch with the Town Solicitor's office about. Director SantucciRozzi confirms there was a comment made at the last meeting by Member Grove. Member Grove has had extensive discussions about this topic with Crystal Huff, our Assistant Town Solicitor, and Nicole Taub, our Town Solicitor and Chief of Staff. The Director updated Counselor Huff about the last meeting. Crystal Huff is currently on maternity leave, and she has asked us to not place this on the agenda, as she will take this under advisement, and this matter will be taken up at a later date. Chairwoman Joyce confirms with the Director that this is something that may potentially be placed on a future agenda, as it is under review by Town Counsel.

OLD/NEW BUSINESS - DISCUSSION: Master Plan Update and Next Master Plan Steering Committee Meeting – Thursday, September 22, 2022, at 7:00 PM (Cahill Auditorium in Braintree Town Hall

7:03 PM – Five Planning Board Members are participating.

Chairwoman Joyce notes that she was at the Farmer's Market on Saturday. There was a booth that Town Councilors had set up, which had Master Plan information. There were a lot of people in attendance; there were about 50 people that stopped to participate in the activity that we had at the event. Chairwoman Joyce notes that our survey that we were advertising for several months throughout the summer closed last Friday, September 9th. We had a pretty good response on that. The Director will provide more information regarding those two events.

Director SantucciRozzi confirms that we finished the survey last week. Although she doesn't have a final number of participants yet, the number from last week was 1500 completed surveys, which is a number we should be proud of.

The Meeting in a Box is still open; the Director was also at the Farmer's Market, and she handed out a couple of kits. About 8 Meeting in a Box kits have been turned in already. There are about 20 that are queued up to happen. The Meeting in a Box is open until October 14. If anyone is interested in a kit, please reach out to the Director via email, phone or in the office.

The next meeting of the Master Plan Steering Committee Meeting is on Thursday, September 22, 2022, and the next Community Forum is October 15. The team is still ironing out the format and the location. We will have updates on that in the near future. We encourage people to reach out with questions or visit our website. There is plenty of information there. The Director thanks Member Kroha who shared posts through the Chamber of Commerce, which helped bring in numbers for the survey. The Director expresses that any opportunity to make a personal connection with dialogue works better.

We will be moving into the public review of the Existing Conditions Report. The team is very excited. We continue to try to engage and get input. The Director confirms that they connected with about 50 people on Saturday at the Farmer's Market.

Chairwoman Joyce asks if Board Members have any questions about the Master Plan.

Member Kroha recognizes that the survey is closed, but what would be other best ways to participate. Director SantucciRozzi states there may be additional surveys in the future, but even a general comment that is emailed to the Director would be useful. She states that the Meeting in a Box, although it seemed intimidating at first, but when you look at it and break it down is very low key and very user-friendly. There is no right or wrong way to do it. The Director notes that there were significantly less males taking the survey than females; the Director mentions that it is football season and suggests doing a Meeting in a Box before a football game.

Member Mikami looked at all the materials, which there is a lot of, and he would be interested in a halfway point summary of key issues or challenges. The Director advises that the Existing Conditions Report is really the meat that we have right now. That is the current deliverable. The Director would suggest reading the minutes or watching the video, which are on the website as well.

Chairwoman Joyce states the Existing Conditions Report will be provided to the public shortly and will have a good summary of what has been done so far. There is an Executive Summary in the Existing Conditions Report that is a good way to summarize what has been done so far.

PUBLIC HEARING – SITE PLAN REVIEW (File #22-08)
575 Quincy Avenue – Quirk Car Dealerships, Applicant
7:15 – Five Planning Board Members are participating.

Appearing on behalf of the Applicant:
Attorney Frank Marinelli
Cameron Campbell, Project Engineer, DeCelle-Burke-Sala
Walter White, Consultant-Quirk
Eric Dias, Peer Review Consultant-Strong Point Engineering Solutions

Chairwoman Joyce requests that Assistant Director Connor Murphy read the Public Notice into record.

Attorney Frank Marinelli, representing the Applicant-Quirk Car Dealerships, introduces the team. Attorney Marinelli explains that tonight they propose a 26,480 square foot new dealership known as Quirk Genesis of Braintree. Genesis is a luxury product, and currently Genesis is operating at 411 Quincy Avenue. Earlier this summer the Applicant got a Class 1 license to renovate the SuperShine Car Wash at 411 Quincy Avenue, and that is where Quirk Genesis is temporarily located at; that is about a 4000 square foot building. This is a 26,480 square foot, state-of-the-art dealership building that will be the permanent home of Quirk Genesis. It is situated on a 3 ½ acre site, which is part of a 39-acre parcel on the Braintree side of the former shipyard. This is a portion (about 1/10 of the portion) of the 39-acre site. As the Board knows, Mr. Quirk has operated in the Town of Braintree for over 40 years. He has grown the company since 1979 to 15 dealerships, employing over 1200 people at dealerships in Quincy, Braintree, Marshfield, Dorchester and Manchester, NH. He is consistently named as one of the nation's best Chevrolet and Ford dealers. Genesis is a luxury product that we will be bringing to the southwest corner of the 39-acre parcel.

Attorney Marinelli goes through the plans; he highlights the renderings which show the elevation from Quincy Avenue. It is the sales side of the building. The plan shows the context of the layout, with the 3.5 acres of the 39 acres. About 13 acres is wet open space and part of the open basin and about 26 acres that is up. This site is part of Decision #13-08. In 2013, as part of the Class 1 storage that occurs on the former shipyard site, there are about 1300 spaces and a security gatehouse, which was approved under File #13-08; the security gatehouse will be moved in an easterly direction. The dealership will consist of 26,480 square feet and is comprised of the sales area, which faces Quincy Avenue, and then you will have the ability to drive into a service building from Hill Avenue. The service area will be comprised of 15 service bays. Sales is approximately 11,189 square feet; service is 15,200 square feet. Sales requires 1 parking space per 250; service requires 1 parking space per 500. There are 199 parking spaces, where there are only 76 parking spaces required. Every element of zoning dimensional and density requirements is met. Attorney Marinelli highlights the landscaping plan. It is very generously landscaped. When they create the greenbelt, they are removing pavement and creating 25% open space. There is a Traffic Report that has been filed which shows there is 1 new car every 2-3 minutes, and it has no impact on level of service. Stormwater is improved with new catch basins and runoff treatment. That will tie into existing drainage, which then has an outfall to the wet basin. There are stormwater improvements, open space improvements, and a luxury product with several million dollars investment in the Commercial Highway Business Zone. Attorney Marinelli knows that there has been a Peer Review. The Applicant feels that everything has been addressed, and they are happy to answer any questions that the Board may have.

Chairwoman Joyce asks staff to provide an overview of the Staff Report, and then we will give the Peer Consultant a chance to provide an overview of the work they did. Assistant Director Connor Murphy presents details from the Staff Report and explains that the site is access by Hill Avenue. This is a substantial improvement to the area along that corridor of Quincy Avenue. Staff has a couple general comments regarding the submitted application. Most of it has to do with landscaping and the entrance on Hill Avenue. The plan submitted depicts that the landscaping will end right at the curb cut. Staff has a concern that we are going to be putting in a brand-new site at this location; are we going to be improving the entrance on Hill Avenue, which is a private way? What is going on with the landscaping past the site into the roadway? Mr. Murphy explains you don't want to put a Class A site on a Class C street. The other question staff has is related to a schedule route for customers when test-driving these vehicles. Where are they going? How are they getting out of the site? How are they coming back? Aside from that, Mr. Murphy explains that this was sent out for departmental review. DPW did comment regarding stormwater, as well as the civil aspects regarding the sewer and water. Those have been addressed by the applicant. Mr. Murphy is waiting for follow-up comments from the Town Engineer.

Mr. Murphy explains that this was sent out to a Peer Review Consultant, Eric Dias. He performed an analysis and generated a report to the Applicant. The Applicant responded to their report, and as of today, we received an updated report from the Peer Review Consultant.

Eric Dias, Registered Professional Engineer, and Peer Review Consultant from Strong Point Engineering Solutions was hired to do a peer review of the stormwater design, so the scope of services is limited to that. Mr. Dias advises that it is a bit of a unique project in that in the Existing Conditions you have a sea of pavement that is discharging untreated stormwater to a wet area. There is a ton of opportunity for the Applicant to make some improvements, which the Peer Reviewer feels they have. They have increased the amount of green space on the site, which will allow the site to recharge more water. They have done a lot with water quality treatment. One of the things the Peer Review asked for in the first review was that they increase the amount of water quality treatment that they were providing to meet the bylaw requirements of 80%, and they did that. Mr. Dias advises that the initial review had 16 comments, a couple of which were bylaw related; Mr. Dias is satisfied with all 16 comments. Mr. Dias explains that highlighted in the report are two things that the Planning Board should be aware of. Mr. Dias notes that the Applicant is looking for one waiver; the waiver has to do with a section of the bylaw that requires that any overflow from the stormwater drainage system be directed to the control structure. Where they aren't proposing a control structure, and Mr. Dias doesn't think it would be appropriate to do so in this case, that is a waiver that the Peer Reviewer would support. The other thing they were asking for is one condition of approval. The Peer Reviewer had a comment that they are connecting to an existing pipe with their stormwater system that they were unable to identify the slope on. The Peer Reviewer's understanding is that was because the downgrading in structure is buried. The Applicant asked that the Board allow them to mobilize equipment to the site and then confirm that slope and elevation. Mr. Dias thinks that is reasonable should the Board choose to grant them that condition. Other than that, the Peer Reviewer is satisfied with the review.

Chairwoman Joyce mentions that this is a public hearing, and she opens discussion to the public. There are currently no comments or questions from the public, so the Chairwoman opens discussion to the Board for their comments and questions.

Member Mikami states the Assistant Director hit on two questions that Member Mikami was interested in: what will happen to Hill Avenue? what will happen with test-drives? Member Mikami asks the Peer Consultant where the water was going today. Mr. Dias explains that today everything is going to the ocean. It is basically being discharged to the ocean. There is a network of discharge structures there that ultimately just daylight with very little treatment. Ultimately, things will still go to the same place, but because they have created green space, the theory would be that they are sending less of it and what is going there from this portion of the site will now be treated. Member Mikami states if water goes directly to the ocean, is that a bad thing? Mr. Dias advises that when you discharge stormwater from a site like this to the ocean proper, it doesn't make a large impact, but the state regulations and EPA regulations encourage cleanup of that water. Mr. Dias thinks they are certainly on the right track with their design in cleaning that water before it is discharged to the ocean. Member Mikami asks if they are going to be able to process 100%? 90%? 80%? Mr. Dias believes their closed drainage system is designed to be able to handle a 25-year storm event. It is designed to handle the first inch of water quality from all impervious surfaces on the site, which is what is required under the bylaw – both state and local. Anything over a 25-year storm event might presumably overwhelm the system. Anything above a 25-year event would continue along its natural flow course now, which is to the ocean. At that point, it would have been "pre-cleaned".

Member Kroha's only question was related to the Staff Report and the Application reference a modification to PB File #13-08; Member Kroha was curious to see if that involved anything more than the Gate House and if there was anything more to consider. Assistant Director Connor Murphy states the File #13-08 decision spoke exclusively to the Gate House.

Member Grove acknowledges that the building appears to be mainly glass, and he asks if any assessment has been done on any reflective light from the sun that may cause a problem with driving on Quincy Avenue. Attorney Marinelli doesn't have an answer, but he will get an answer from the architect. Attorney Marinelli advises that the building will present itself very nicely to that intersection. The pad will be elevated and then tapered. Attorney Marinelli wanted to point out to the Board that Mr. Quirk has properties, new buildings, or renovated buildings: Quirk Kia (280 Quincy Avenue); Quirk Subaru (372 Quincy Avenue); Quirk Chevrolet/ Quirk Pre-Owned/GMC Buick (444 Quincy Avenue); Quirk Hyundai (435 Quincy Avenue); Quirk Jeep. Attorney Marinelli has photographs of how these properties are maintained along that corridor, and he submits that these properties are among the most attractive in that corridor, and he introduces these for the record.

Member Connolly has no questions at this time, but she acknowledges that the stormwater peer review was very helpful to the process.

Member Kent asks about asbestos (in terms of the shipyard) and whether that has been looked at. He wonders what happens when we start digging. Attorney Marinelli advises that when the shipyard was purchased in 2003, there was capping. There were environmental reports and existing obligations of other companies. To Attorney Marinelli's knowledge, all of that has been handled and capped for years on the property. Mr. Marinelli explains that millions of dollars have been spent by the Quirk companies on the former blueprint building, and he would imagine that any abatement necessary was done properly because that is now a beautiful office building on the Quincy side, which is occupied by a mini-submarine company. Member Kent states if somebody missed something and they needed to clean up something, would that be part of the plan? Attorney Marinelli states there is nothing they know of that would require any kind of treatment. The 21E reports were part of records available to the Town when the Quirk Companies purchased the shipyard.

Cameron Campbell, DeCelle-Burke-Sala, states, prior to doing any digging for the foundation, they are going to do test borings for the foundation to see what is below, and they will be able to tell what is underneath the soil before it gets fully dug up. If there is anything under there that is not good, they will figure it out beforehand and it will be cleaned up the right way.

Chairwoman Joyce doesn't have any additional commentary. The Chairwoman thanks the Peer Review Consultant for the presentation and helping us understand stormwater simply.

Chairwoman Joyce states that there are no comments from the public, and the recommendation from staff is to continue this meeting under October 11 at 7:15. The Applicant asks for Draft Conditions at that time. Chairwoman Joyce notes the request for Draft Conditions at the next meeting, and she looks for a motion to continue this hearing.

Member Kent **MOTIONS** to continue this hearing to the October 11, 2022 Planning Board Meeting at 7:15 PM; seconded by Member Grove; voted 5:0:0.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING – GRADING PERMIT (File #22-07)

131A Pond Street – Mark and Theresa Farina, Applicants

7:41 PM – Five Planning Board Members are participating.

**Appearing on behalf of the Applicant:
Chi Man, Hardy + Man Design Group
Theresa Farina, Applicant**

Chairwoman Joyce requests that the Applicant begin their presentation.

Chi Man, Civil Engineer working on this project, will provide a quick rundown. The lot is a rear lot with no frontage, and it is served by a right-of-way from 131 Pond Street. It is a pre-existing, nonconforming lot with an existing building. The right-of-way serves two separate lots in the rear. The rear lot abuts Sunset Lake. They are proposing to clean up the backyard; there is a 2-to-1 slope from the upper patio area down to the beach at Sunset Lake level. It causes a lot of erosion. They are proposing to remove the existing timber wall and replace them with modular, concrete block retaining wall. The existing timber is all rotted, and the existing wood stairs that go down to the beach is all rotted. They are replacing the slope with something more durable – a modular block retaining wall to match the existing block wall onsite. They will be creating a terrace two-steps down. It will be easier to maintain and control the erosion on the site. The project was granted an Order of Conditions from the Conservation Commission – resulting from last week’s hearing. A minor revision has been made to the plan since the original submission; Mr. Man acknowledges that he read the FEMA map wrong and based on staff comment this correction was made. Also, with staff comments from Conservation, landscaping was added. Mr. Man states he has reviewed the Draft Conditions, and his client has no issue with the Draft Conditions. Mr. Man explains that the only item they are asking if it can be waived is the \$1,000 As-Built, as they are posting a \$2,000 As-Built to the Conservation Commission. Chairperson Joyce states that can be discussed this evening, and she asks staff to provide an overview of what has transpired between the last meeting and this meeting; then, discussion will be opened to the Board and public.

Assistant Director Connor Murphy advises that since the last meeting the Applicant submitted a revised plan shortly before the last Conservation Commission hearing. The Applicant satisfied the comments made in the first Staff Report based on the revised grading plan. Staff worked on Draft Conditions for the Grading Permit. Those are attached to the Staff Report. Staff has no further comments at this time.

Chairperson Joyce reminds that this is a Public Hearing, and if there is anybody from the public that would like to come up and speak regarding this application, please feel free to do so. Seeing no one from the public, discussion is open to Board Members.

Member Mikami has no comments; the proposal is straightforward and consistent with what other neighbors and abutters to the Lake are doing. Member Mikami states the Assistant Director has organized everything well.

Member Kroha notes that the conditions have a completion date of April 2023, and she asks if that is enough time. Ms. Farina, the Applicant, hopes that this project will be done by October 31, so she thinks it will be completed before the end of this year; Mr. Man states it is weather permitting; the applicant has had three contractors touring the site yesterday and providing quotes. Pending the permits, the homeowner is ready to start right away.

Member Grove no comments or questions.

Member Connolly no comments or questions.

Member Kent no comments or questions.

Chairwoman Joyce has no comments or question. Regarding the request from the Applicant for potential waiver of the As-Built Surety, the Chairwoman feels that the request seems reasonable. Chairwoman Joyce is not familiar with the difference between the Planning Board's As-Built bond vs. the Conservation Commission's As-Built Bond. Mr. Murphy explains that it is two different Boards; however, they will require the same As-Built Plan, which is under the jurisdiction of the Planning Department. The Assistant Director states if the Board is inclined to waive it, that would be fine. It is standard practice to ask for the bond to be posted to ensure the close-out of all projects. Chairwoman Joyce asks if any board members have any comments on waiving the bond, given there is a \$2,000 surety from the Conservation Commission. Mr. Man provides a copy of the Order of Conditions. Chairwoman Joyce reviews the Order of Conditions from the Conservation Commission. Chairwoman Joyce states that the requirements are not the exact same requirements; the Conservation As-Built does allow for a Landscape Architect to complete the As-Built. The Chairwoman thinks the As-Built Plan should be completed by a Land Surveyor, given the proximity of the new wall to the property line. Director SantucciRozzi states the requirements of the As-Built would be the same; it is just a determination if the Board wants to have the \$1,000 surety paid. Member Kroha's thought is, because there is already a monetary encouragement on the Conservation side to complete the job, she would be in favor of waiving the \$1,000. Chairwoman Joyce states if it possible to the Conservation Commission Condition in the Planning Board Conditions, but not require the surety, that would be a suggestion.

Chairwoman Joyce confirms that whoever makes the motion can incorporate the revision.

Chairwoman Joyce confirms there is no one from the public with comments or questions; she states we have draft conditions that have been reviewed and discussed. Therefore, it sounds like we would be ready to make a motion on this application.

Member Kent **MOTION** to close the Public Hearing; seconded by Member Grove; voted 5:0:0.

Member Kent **MOTION** to enter correspondence through September 8, 2022 into record: seconded by Member Grove; voted 5:0:0.

Member Kroha **MOTIONS** to approve Grading Permit for File #22-07, 131A Pond Street, with waiver of the \$1,000 monetary surety bond in Condition 15; seconded by Member Grove; 5:0:0.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING – GRADING PERMIT (File #22-06)
1070 Liberty Street – Joseph Hannon of Atlantic Coast Engineering, Applicants
7:54 PM – Five Planning Board Members are participating.

Appearing on behalf of the Applicant:
Joseph Hannon, Atlantic Coast Engineering

Chairwoman Joyce requests that the applicant provide an overview of the project.

Jed Hannon, Atlantic Coast Engineering, previously appeared before the Planning Board in August for an “after the fact” Grading Permit. He notes that the homeowners wanted to put in a retaining wall and weren’t privy to the bylaw regulations with respect to cuts and fills. At the last hearing the guidance and conclusions from staff was to come up with a revegetation plan, which they did. They used Brad Holmes, a professional Wetlands Scientist from ECR, and he prepared the revegetation plan along with input from the homeowner. Mr. Hannon advises that Assistant Director Connor Murphy met with the homeowner to review the revegetation plan. It is very thorough and detailed. Mr. Hannon did review staff comments from the last Staff Report. There was an issue with the elevation datum that they adjusted on the revised plan. There was a concern with the clearness of the erosion detail, which Mr. Hannon had reprinted. Overall, there were some minor items that they addressed.

Chairwoman Joyce thanks the Applicant and asks staff for an overview.

Assistant Director Connor Murphy states staff reviewed the revised grading plan and the submitted revegetation plan in addition to meeting with the homeowner onsite. Mr. Murphy has worked with this homeowner in years past; they are a new family moving to Braintree and revitalizing this corner lot. Looking at the Building Permits, they have provided a significant re-investment into this property. This goes along with their plan; they are not too familiar with changes in grade and the need for a grading permit. Mr. Murphy did discuss the vegetation with the homeowners, and he specified that there was a lot of vegetation removed. The homeowners expressed that there were a lot of dead trees and overgrown vegetation that was affecting the structure on the lot. The only comment staff has on the revegetation plan is related to the proposed arborvitae along the front portion of the parcel. Typically, those are to be spaced out between six inches and one foot, and they are supposed to be staggered to properly screen. These are spaced out a little more, so as they grow and mature, they will look like stand-alone trees, which isn’t the best aesthetic look. Staff had respectfully suggested that the Applicant continue the white birch, which is proposed at the corner of the driveway and install two more white birch trees in the front yard, rather than the arborvitae. Aside from that, staff has prepared Draft Conditions for this meeting for the Board to consider. Chairwoman Joyce asks if the applicant had a chance to review staff suggestions with the homeowner. Mr. Hannon did talk with the homeowner and Brad Holmes, and they prefer to keep the layout as it is. They feel that the landscape will fill out over the years. They will make best efforts to shield for privacy.

Member Mikami states the last time we met, we wanted to give the homeowners an opportunity to review all the comments. That lot is pretty visible. Given the fact that the homeowners did remove quite a few trees without a permit, Member Mikami thinks the staff’s comments are spot-on, and the homeowner needs to rethink this considering all they have done illegally. Member Mikami would go with the Assistant Director’s suggestion rather than the homeowners.

Member Kroha states she doesn’t have an overly strong feeling and would go with the homeowner’s plan.

Member Grove has no comments or questions.

Member Connolly follows-up with Member Mikami’s comments, and she feels that the arborvitae should be placed in the manner suggested by staff.

Member Kent has no comments or questions.

Chairwoman Joyce has a question regarding the stone wall at the corner of Liberty and Forest Streets. The Chairwoman sees it in Google Streetview. She asks if that wall is still there. Mr. Murphy believes it is no longer there. The Chairwoman asks if we know if that stone wall has historic significance? Mr. Hannon states, unfortunately, they were pulled in after the fact, and he wasn't aware of the stone wall being in place. Chairwoman Joyce notes the stone wall on the other side of the driveway that goes up Forest Street; she is presuming that is on the survey and still there. The Chairwoman notes that is too bad, and she was going to say the tree planting should be careful to preserve that stone wall as, often times, those are some of the few monumentations we have in Braintree. Those stone walls are historically significant, and she thinks the town should be very cognizant of preserving survey monumentation and historical documentation that is irreplaceable. Chairwoman Joyce is very disappointed but understands prior to the current engineering consultant's participation. Those are Chairwoman Joyce's only comments regarding plantings. Chairwoman Joyce has nothing to add regarding the arborvitae or birch trees; although, she will support staff in their recommendation, as they are the experts.

Chairwoman Joyce acknowledges that there are no comments from the public, and she thinks we could have a motion to close the public hearing.

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

Member Mikami **MOTIONS** to enter correspondence through September 12, 2022 into record: seconded by Member Grove; voted 5:0:0.

Member Mikami asks for a point of clarification; if there is an issue between different types of plantings, how does that issue get resolved in the end? Assistant Director Murphy explains that, as of now the Applicant has a submitted plan which highlights the arborvitae. If the Board is inclined, they could propose a motion to have the revegetated plan revised to include the white birch trees in the front without the arborvitae. The Chairwoman states if someone would like to make a motion on this, perhaps you can include the preferred language and we can see if it gets seconded and voted through.

Member Mikami would like to ask the staff what they would prefer. Assistant Director Connor Murphy states, given it is a corner site, he would strongly encourage the white birch within the front yard rather than the arborvitae in a row along Liberty Street. The Assistant Director's recommendation would be for the two white birch trees in the front.

Member Mikami **MOTIONS** to approve the Grading Plan for PB #22-06, 1070 Liberty Street, with amended conditions related to the revegetation plan according to staff's requirements; seconded by Member Grove; voted 5:0:0. For clarification, Mr. Hannon for clarification confirms that the plan is approved as is subject to receipt of the revised vegetation plan. Chairwoman Joyce explains that the Planning Board approved the Landscaping Plan, taking into account the revision requested by staff.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING: Town Council Order #22-012 – Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment – New Section 135-616 Inclusionary Housing & Amendments to Sections 135-102, 135-601, 135-711, 135-614 and 135-705 – Mayor Charles C. Kokoros, Applicant
8:09 PM – Five Planning Board Members are participating.

Chairwoman Joyce advises that this item has also been requested to be continued without testimony to the October 11, 2022, Planning Board Meeting at 7:15 PM.

Braintree Planning Board
September 13, 2022
Cahill Auditorium

Member Mikami **MOTIONS** to continue this hearing to the Planning Board Meeting on Tuesday, October 11, 2022, at 7:15 PM; seconded by Member Grove; voted 5:0:0.

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

The meeting adjourned at 8:10 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Louise Quinlan
Planning/Community Development