



**Mayor  
Charles C. Kokoros**

**Department of Planning and Community Development**

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

**PLANNING BOARD**

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

**Approved November 9, 2022**

**Braintree Planning Board – Tuesday, October 11, 2022, at 7:02 PM – Cahill Auditorium**

Present:

Ms. Erin Joyce, Chair	Melissa SantucciRozzi, Director (via remote)
Ms. Kim Kroha, Vice Chair	Connor Murphy, Assistant Director
Mr. Darryl Mikami, Clerk	
Mr. William J. Grove, Member	
Mr. Thomas Kent, Member	

Absent:

Ms. Jennifer Connolly, Alternate

Chairwoman Erin Joyce calls the meeting to order at 7:02 PM and then states that all five (5) full members are in attendance (Chairwoman Joyce, Member Kroha, Member Mikami, Member Grove, and Member Kent) and our alternate member (Jennifer Connolly) is not present this evening. As the Public Hearings are not starting until 7:15, we will address Old/New Business Items.

**OLD/NEW BUSINESS – Approval of Meeting Minutes: June 14, 2022 and September 13, 2022  
7:02 PM – Five Planning Board Members are participating.**

Chairwoman Joyce explains that we have two sets of meeting minutes for approval this evening, the meetings of June 14, 2022 and September 13, 2022. The August 9 meeting was one of our longer meetings and will be available for approval at our November meeting.

Member Mikami **MOTIONS** to approve the meeting minutes from the June 14, 2022 and September 13, 2022 meetings; seconded by Member Kroha; voted 5:0:0.

**OLD/NEW BUSINESS - DISCUSSION: Master Plan Update and Next Master Plan Steering Committee Meeting – Thursday, November 14, 2022, at 7:00 PM (Cahill Auditorium in Braintree Town Hall)  
7:04 PM – Five Planning Board Members are participating.**

Chairwoman Joyce hopes everyone has seen the invitation for this weekend’s Open House, which is going to be in Cahill Auditorium. It is from 2:30 PM to 4:30 PM on Saturday. Our consultant will be here hosting a Visioning Workshop with different “hands-on” activities and reviewing the results of the summer engagement process that occurred this summer. We had close to 1800 responses to our survey, which the consultant noted was fantastic and more than they had expected for a community of our size. This weekend is a drop-in event; families are welcome. The other item to note is that the Meeting in a Box is still open. If there is anybody out there looking to host a Meeting in a Box or if you did host, one and you have notes from that, please get that in by October 14, 2022, so that the consultant can incorporate that information into the documents they are working on.

We also are making note that the Existing Conditions Report has been published for public comment. It is a summary of a lot of the census data that the consultant has been gathering to create an updated existing conditions report. It is a long document, but there is an Executive Summary. We are accepting public comment. If there is anything you would like edited or that you would like to make comments on, please send that along to the Planning Department. You can email the Planning Department.

**OLD/NEW BUSINESS – Request for As-Built Approval and Release of Surety**  
**File #18-04 – 300 or 305 Middle Street – Requested by Samiotes Consultants**  
**7:06 PM – Five Planning Board Members are participating.**

Assistant Director Connor Murphy advises that Director SantucciRozzi is working on this matter with Samiotes Consultants, and this matter will be addressed at the November meeting.

**OLD/NEW BUSINESS – Request for As-Built Approval and Release of Surety**  
**File #05-06 – 16-18 Pearl Street – Requested by Bohler Engineering**  
**7:06 PM – Five Planning Board Members are participating.**

Assistant Director Connor Murphy advises that that this was requested by Bohler Engineering. Mr. Murphy has provided a Staff Report at the end of last week. The site itself seems to be built in conformance with their Record Plans. However, Mr. Murphy would like to note that the Existing Condition of pavement that surrounds the building isn't in the greatest state. He would kindly note that some of the old pavement markings are very visible with the new pavement markings just painted over them. While a full rebuild isn't in the works, Mr. Murphy would suggest that the site be seal coated and that the site be crack sealed, as well, in addition to new pavement markings. This site is located within South Braintree Square, and it is a high-visibility site. It would really compliment the Square if that was updated. The Applicant, Bohler Engineering, did reach out to staff this morning. They stated that prior contractor did go out to fix this issue. They "blacked out" the old directional striping with new directional striping. There was an email from Bohler Engineering provided to Board Members. Staff's recommendation on this matter is for the Applicant to seal coat and crack seal the entire site with new striping. If that is completed by the November Meeting, we will recommend As-Built approval and Release of Surety.

Mr. Murphy advises that the Record Plans did not call for any repaving or restriping. There was new striping added because of the dumpster area.

Member Mikami asks if we have the ability to tell them this needs to be done before the surety will be released or is it just part of the aesthetics. Mr. Murphy states it is mainly part of the aesthetics. It is difficult to say from a drainage stand-point because the whole site flows onto Pearl Street. It is more for an aesthetic look, given the fact that the whole building and landscaping saw an overhaul as part of this approval. It is something that Mr. Murphy would recommend the Applicant do. Mr. Murphy would have to look deeper into what the Planning Board can regulate, but it is something he would encourage.

Member Kroha would need to look at the original decision a little closer in light of their request to release the surety. Member Kroha didn't focus on whether we could require this, and she would prefer to continue it and go by the site to look at it based on the email this morning.

Member Kent comments that it seems that it would make perfect sense to do what is requested. You don't remodel your house and not cut your lawn. You try to make the whole property as attractive as possible. He doesn't think we are talking about a large dollar amount. If we have the authority to insist, we should insist. If we don't, it is a strong recommendation that they should heed.

Member Grove has no comments or questions.

Chairwoman Joyce states it sounds like we would like to review the file in a little more detail, and she asks staff if we could continue this to the next meeting. Staff agrees that we can continue this to November.

Member Mikami **MOTIONS** to continue this matter until the next Planning Board Meeting on Wednesday, November 9, 2022; seconded by Member Kent; voted 5:0:0.

**OLD/NEW BUSINESS – Request for Release of Surety**  
**File #18-16 – 201 Commerce Drive – Requested by Marr Companies**  
**7:12 PM – Five Planning Board Members are participating.**

Assistant Director Connor Murphy advises the Applicant has requested the Planning Board release \$58,000 in surety that was posted by the Applicant for incomplete Site Improvements. The Applicant is underway in finishing the second phase of their development. They were seeking a Certificate of Occupancy at the beginning of the summer, and most of the landscaping had not been completed onsite. They posted cash surety with this department in the full estimation of the landscape services. They were issued a temporary Certificate of Occupancy from the Building Department. The Applicant is working to get an As-Built Plan to us. We are holding \$10,000 in As-Built Surety. At this moment, they have completed the landscaping and are seeking a request to release said \$58,000 surety.

Member Mikami has no questions or comments.

Member Kroha has no questions or comments.

Member Kent has no questions or comments.

Member Grove has no questions or comments.

Chairwoman Joyce notes that we have a staff recommendation for favorable action on a Surety Release.

Member Kent **MOTIONS** to approve Release of the \$58,000 Surety for PB File #18-16, 201 Commerce Drive; seconded by Member Kroha; voted 5:0:0.

Chairwoman Joyce notes that it is 7:13 PM, and at 7:15 we will be taking the hearings out of order. At 7:15 PM, we will open with Town Council Order #22-012. In the meantime, the Chairwoman asks if there are any questions related to the Master Plan. Member Kroha asks what the format will be for the weekend Open House. The Chairwoman advises that they have been working on a draft Vision Statement – it is a broad, brushstroke of what we envision Braintree to be in 2033. We will talk a little about the draft Vision Statement, which the Master Plan Steering Committee started work on last Monday. There will be stations for visioning in different areas of town. The last Community Forum was focused on Existing Conditions, and this will be very specific to the Vision aspect of the Master Plan.

**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**  
**7:15 PM – Five Planning Board Members are participating.**

Chairwoman Joyce advises that our Planner, Melissa SantucciRozzi, is calling in. Chairwoman Joyce advises that Mayor Kokoros is here with us this evening, and he is the official applicant on this matter. The Chairwoman states that we are happy to have Mayor Kokoros here to talk about this; it has been on our agenda for some time now. She understands that the last time we talked about this we talked about maybe looking at some of the numbers and making some modifications. Chairwoman Joyce asks Mayor Kokoros to provide an overview and update, as he has been doing a lot of work on this matter. Then the Chairwoman will open this up to the Board and the public for comment.

Mayor Kokoros appreciates all the hard work that the Planning Board does and long hours that they put in. It means a lot for the community.

Mayor Kokoros states, upon review of the initial document, there was a lot of conversation. On the first page, we need to Modify Section 135-705 to remove references to Commercial Districts. On page two, under Applicability, they did include congregate living facilities as part of all residential developments. Upon further review, they looked closer at the affordability requirements based on number of residential units. For the range of 6-10 units, the requirement remains the same at 1 unit. For 11-50 units, they are proposing 10% affordable units; for 51-75, they are proposing 12.5% affordable units; anything 76 units and above would have a requirement of 15% affordable units. This is far different than the original proposal, which may have been more difficult for some of the smaller projects. We tried to come up with number that would be more reasonable while still making sure we maintain our affordability once we reach it but also give folks the ability to build smaller developments without a huge impact. Mayor Kokoros notes that 15% on the smaller projects may have been detrimental and probably would have kept some of them from even happening.

The last revision on the last page was in reference to Commercial Districts. With regards to removing housing from Commercial Districts, they looked at the Commercial Districts we have out there, and most of the Commercial Districts do not represent a place that you would want to have housing. They are more industrial areas than commercial. They were originally industrial and became commercial. There is one parcel, and the remedy would be to move to highway business, and that particular property owner is willing to do that. This is a product that began with the 15% requirement, and now we have been able to work through to come up with more reasonable numbers. This will serve two purposes. One purpose will help us maintain our 10% once we get there, and the other purpose will allow for some of the smaller developments that we see coming about throughout our town.

Mayor Kokoros would appreciate the Planning Board's consideration, and he would ask for the Planning Board's support to move this forward to the Town Council.

Chairwoman Joyce opens discussion to the public if they have comments or questions. Seeing no comments from the public, she opens discussion with Planning Board members.

Member Mikami asks the staff, now that we have this and it has been reviewed and we are being asked to put this forward, what will happen when an applicant comes before us. Connor Murphy explains that any newly

proposed developments will have to follow these guidelines. Mayor Kokoros explains once this is created into an ordinance, there is no flexibility. If someone was close on margins, the only remedy would be for the Applicant to go to ZBA for relief. Member Mikami states there was some discussion that we were going to talk to some developers, did that happen? Mayor Kokoros states he did speak with developers of smaller developments, and that is why we reduced it to 10% for the smaller developments. Mayor Kokoros didn't speak with developers in the 51-75 range.

Member Kroha's question would be related to the MBTA zoning. The Action Plan is due January 31, 2023, if communities want to put together a bylaw. Her two thoughts are that the percentages seem much more palatable to an investor looking to invest in the Town. The Town has done a good job of getting the affordable housing up to the 10%. When the action plan to get things through MBTA zoning, part of the Action Plan talks about what steps there are to incorporate multi-family housing within a half mile. The Armstrong Dam site is currently commercially zoned, and that is within a half mile. It seems like it would make a great location for housing to go to. Member Kroha is concerned that having this go through now, and taking away that commercial property, would really hamper what efforts the Town might be making with the MBTA zoning. Secondly, having this finalized and on the books might make it harder to come up with a well-rounded plan that could fulfill some of the visions and thoughts that come out of the Master Plan. Having this on the books might make it difficult to cater to something that looks a broader basis. In summary, Member Kroha wonders whether the MBTA zoning was part of the consideration when putting this together.

Mayor Kokoros states, with regards to that piece of property, that was the piece he was referring to earlier and it will move towards highway business, which will remedy that issue prior to us finalizing any MBTA zoning. Mayor Kokoros states it is a moving target. We will have a new governor elected. The original legislation called for 15 units per acre. They recently made a modification that took out communities that had bus routes. Mayor Kokoros doesn't know what their expectations will be. The Town is trying to meet all the deadlines. That piece of property is very valuable in this context. It is something that the mayor will support when they move forward with an application. We will have to see if there are any other changes made. There has been pushback from Mass Municipal Association and some other groups. As Mayor, he thinks that initially there was no talk of affordability in the original plan. He is not sure they would be allowed to utilize this ordinance as part of the affordability of those units. Mayor Kokoros states certainly he would support the rezone, but regarding what the future of the zoning is, it may change as they move forward. It came in millions of dollars more than it was costed out last year. That location will probably be zoned something else prior to this making its way through.

Member Kent comments that the cost of borrowing is going through the roof and that could put further pressure on what happens as a result with this. It will be a lot harder to make these things work financially Mayor Kokoros states today was an historic day as they were awarded the bid on the treatment plan. It came in millions of dollars more than it was costed out last year. However, on the same note, the cost of rent is extremely high, as well.

Member Grove doesn't see the 75 units being taken advantage of as much as the other three categories. His personal preference would be to see the 11-50 and 50-75 units a little higher. Member Grove asks how the height is determined. Mr. Murphy details the calculations used to get an average grade, where the surveyor will take a spot grade out 10 feet out from each face of the building, and those grades are averaged. Mr. Murphy states each zone has different height requirements, but the way to calculate it is the same. Member Grove asks what the height is in a Cluster Zone. Under the Density and Dimensional Requirements, Cluster 1, 2, and 3, maximum building height is 35 feet. Mr. Murphy states the number of units depends on the size of the land they are using.

Member Grove asks what the highest building height is we can go in any one zone. Mr. Murphy explains the highest in any one zone would be within the General Business, Highway Business, and Commercial Districts. There is a maximum building height of 45 feet and 50 feet for non-habitable space.

Chairwoman Joyce wanted to spend some more time reviewing this, but she had a busy afternoon. The Chairwoman notes that what other members commented on in having an affordable housing element prioritized by the Town is very important. There is an element of finance that could potentially hinder this. The Chairwoman thinks we must be pro-active as a Town, and it is best to not put barriers in our own way. She is happy to see the numbers getting better, and she mentions tax credits for developers occurring at higher density. The Chairwoman notes that the density that can be built in Braintree currently are low, and at this time we are not looking at revisions to other sections of our bylaw that might make this more effective. The Chairwoman acknowledges that Mayor Kokoros, his office, and the Planning Director have spent a lot of time talking to people about this, and the Chairwoman states she would like more time to look at this. She also knows Member Connolly is incredibly involved in affordable housing, so the Chairwoman would love to have Member Connolly's perspective on this. Therefore, the Chairwoman would like to take a little more time to review this and have it on next month's Planning Board Agenda.

Mayor Kokoros understands that Planning Board Members have just received this recently, and he would anticipate that Members would want to take some time to look it over. He just wanted to present it formally. It has been a while since the original document was provided. Mayor Kokoros thanks the Board.

Member Mikami asks, since Chairwoman Joyce is a member of the Master Plan Steering Committee, how this looks to the Chairwoman with what you have heard from the Master Plan. Chairwoman Joyce states everybody talks about wanting affordable options, especially people in our community that are retiring, or looking to retire and want to downsize. There is an immense need for affordable housing. The Chairwoman understands we are building to meet a need, but are we capturing the need of the community that exists? People are talking about this. Member Mikami mentions a lot of people talk about the need for senior housing, which also means affordable housing. We haven't really done a lot in that area. Chairwoman Joyce comments that the reality of market is certainly something we should consider.

Member Kent **MOTIONS** to continue this matter until the next Planning Board Meeting on Wednesday, November 9, 2022, at 7:15 PM; seconded by Member Grove; voted 5:0:0.

**CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING – SITE PLAN REVIEW (File #22-08)**  
**575 Quincy Avenue – Quirk Car Dealerships, Applicant**  
**7:41 – Five Planning Board Members are participating.**

**Appearing on behalf of the Applicant:**  
**Attorney Frank Marinelli**  
**Jim Burke, Project Engineer, DeCelle-Burke-Sala**

Chairwoman Joyce asks Attorney Frank Marinelli to update of what has transpired since the last meeting.

Attorney Frank Marinelli, representing the Applicant-Quirk Car Dealerships, reviews the Site Plan and explains that the proposal is for a 26,480 square foot new dealership known as Quirk Genesis of Braintree. Genesis is a

luxury product and will be constructed on a 3 ½ acre site portion of the 39-acre parcel on the Braintree side of the former shipyard. It is the southwest corner of the shipyard property. Attorney Marinelli notes that they have shown the elevations where all the showroom is oriented towards Quincy Avenue. The current elevation is about 12 to 14. There is close to 5700 cubic yards of fill to create a pad, and the building will sit nicely in that corner. There is a Landscaping Plan with over 50 trees and over 50 shrubs; the Landscape Plan shows about 200 plantings.

Attorney Marinelli reminds that the dealership service and sales is a use “by right”. All the density and dimensional requirements of the Highway Business Zone are complied with. The building coverage can be 25%; the building footprint is only 17%. They will be taking up some of the existing pavement because currently the shipyard is permitted for storage of vehicles, and they provide 25% of open space. Attorney Marinelli states at our last meeting Member Grove asked for information related to the glass. They did provide the letter from two architects with the specification of the showroom glass. The intent is to use “no-glare” glass. The Applicant also provided a Lighting Plan, which shows no spillage. Currently, there is a guard shack in this area, which is part of a 2013 permitting. That guard shack, which is the intake for the Quirk storage area, will be moved several hundred feet in an easterly direction.

Attorney Marinelli notes that there are 56 Draft Conditions, and the Applicant has reviewed all of them. They are all acceptable. They are items that have been discussed by the Project Engineer, Jim Burke, with staff. Jim Burke is here if there are any questions on stormwater. The stormwater has been Peer Reviewed. There are stormwater improvements. The Traffic Memo has been accepted because there is not any quantity of new trips that would trigger a traffic study. Attorney Marinelli explains that they were requested to install a complete perimeter black vinyl fence, and that will happen and is now on the revised plan. The site will be completely isolated and enclosed by a black vinyl fence. The deliveries of cars will be through the normal storage lot. Any inventory will be driven over into the site. This is also noted in the conditions. Attorney Marinelli notes that interior landscaping was required to be 5% under the bylaw. The Applicant has 10.2%. There are 199 parking spaces, where 76 are required under the bylaw. There are 33 spaces for employees, 42 spaces for service, 57 spaces for sales and 67 spaces for inventory.

Attorney Marinelli explains that they were asked to increase snow storage. That was increased from about 9700 square feet to over 18000 square feet. Attorney Marinelli explains they were asked to describe the Test Drive Route, which will be out of the driveway on Hill Avenue, take a right, take a right on Quincy Avenue, take a right on East Howard Street, take a left on DesMoines Road, take a left on Southern Artery and a left back onto Quincy Avenue.

Attorney Marinelli advises that the site has sloped granite curb around the parking lot and vertical granite curb around the building. They also provided a fire circulation plan. They have reviewed the Draft Conditions, and they are acceptable. They provided a roof screening plan for the mechanicals on the roof, as requested.

Member Mikami asks about sign plans for Quincy Avenue. Attorney Marinelli states they don't have any sign plans currently. It will be designed appropriately for the site. They will apply to Zoning Board if they need any relief. Member Mikami was curious about where signage might go, as there isn't a lot of area near Quincy Avenue. Jim Burke, Project Engineer, states typically signage may be placed in a parking space upfront, so there would be one less parking space. They strive for it to comply with zoning, and that dictates the location of the sign.

Member Kroha has no questions. She appreciates the responsiveness to the questions asked at the last hearing.

Member Kent asks if Genesis has electric vehicles in their fleet. Have charging stations been contemplated? Attorney Marinelli cannot comment for the manufacturer. Pricing seems to be \$47-57K, which is a competitive price for a luxury vehicle. Member Kent assumes that the property would be able to install charging stations. Attorney Marinelli doesn't think that would be an issue.

Member Grove has no further comments or questions.

Chairwoman Joyce has no comments or questions. She appreciates the thorough response this evening, and she would like to ask staff if there is anything to highlight.

Assistant Director Murphy would like to make one comment. There is one minor edit to Condition 30. It should read 219 parking spaces where it reads 119. Otherwise, staff recommends that the public hearing be closed, correspondence entered into record and the Site Plan Review approved. Chairwoman Joyce reminds that this is a public hearing and open for public comment; not seeing anyone from the public, she moves forward with closing the public hearing.

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

Member Grove **MOTIONS** to accept correspondence through October 6, 2022, into record; seconded by Member Kent; voted 5:0:0.

Member Kroha **MOTIONS** to approve the Site Plan Review for Planning Board File #22-08, 575 Quincy Avenue, with the revision to Condition 30 noted; seconded by Member Grove; voted 5:0:0.

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

The meeting adjourned at 7:56 PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Louise Quinlan  
Planning/Community Development