



Joseph C. Sullivan
Mayor

Department of Planning and Community Development

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

PLANNING BOARD

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

APPROVED

Present:

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

Melissa SantucciRozzi, Principal Planner
Jeremy Rosenberger, Zoning Administrator

Chair, Robert Harnais, called roll call at 7: 10 PM

Zoning Board of Appeal Petitions – September 2015

Jeremy Rosenberger, Zoning Administrator for the Town, explained that the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting for September was rescheduled to September 28, 2015. We have six cases that we will be hearing on September 28th, which is a Monday, three that are continued if you look at the Agenda. The first three petitions tonight are old business and are provided as an update. The last three petitions are new business.

ZBA Petition Recommendation – 639 Washington Street (#14-33)

Present: No One Present

Jeremy Rosenberger presents that this petition has gone before the Planning Board twice; the first time was a “no vote” by the Planning Board, and it was revised to its current status of seven units, which the Planning Board recommended denial on. There have been no changes to the plans since the unfavorable recommendation by the Planning Board. Mr. Rosenberger has reached out to both the attorney, Mr. Phelan, and the representative, Mrs. Tan, via telephone and emails and he has received no response thus far. Their extension goes until this next hearing.

No Motion made.

ZBA Petition Recommendation –60-80 Campanelli Drive (#15-10) – Thayer Academy

Present: No One Present

Jeremy Rosenberger reminds the Planning Board that the applicant is asking for additional extension to Zoning Board of Appeals in October, and I believe they will be coming before the Planning Board shortly to present revised plans.

No Motion made

Braintree Planning Board
September 8, 2015
Cahill Auditorium
ZBA Petition Recommendation –79 Wyman Road (#15-21)
Present: No One Present

Jeremy Rosenberger explained that this petition was before the Planning Board last meeting, but there was some confusion on the part of the applicant related to meeting times between Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting and Planning Board Meeting. They did not show up to Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting, so we gave them an extension for their hearing until the next ZBA Meeting. They will be appearing before the Zoning Board on September 28.

No Motion made

That will lead us to new petitions:

ZBA Petition Recommendation – 147 Old Country Way (#15-24)
Present: No one Present

Jeremy Rosenberger explains that this is a proposal to create a one-story, 14X17.5 three-season enclosed sunroom in the rear yard on an existing concrete slab. The staff recommendation was approval. This requires findings; there are no variances required. Member Eng had question on the size of the enclosed sunporch to confirm what was in documentation; Mr. Rosenberger responded that the size is 14'X17.5'; they are going to use the entire concrete slab; he is waiting for revised plans.

There were no further questions or comments by remaining members.

Member Eng **MOTION** for favorable recommendation, seconded by Member Joyce – Vote 5:0:0

ZBA Petition Recommendation – 42 Howie Road (#15-25)
Present: No one Present

Jeremy Rosenberger explains that this petitioner is looking to expand to the second floor and create more living space on first floor. It is an existing one-story ranch on a concrete slab. The staff recommendation is approval. Although it is a rather large addition, if you go in the neighborhood, it is becoming a common place where old post WWII homes are being modified to meet today's needs. The home is right off Common Street, and there have been a number of rehabs that are similar shape. Right across the street, there is a significantly large home that is very similar to what they are hoping to get to.

There were no questions or comments from board members.

Member Reynolds **MOTION** for favorable recommendation, seconded by Member Joyce –
Vote 5:0:0

Braintree Planning Board

September 8, 2015

Cahill Auditorium

ZBA Petition Recommendation – 33 Wildwood Road (#15-26)

Present: No one Present

Jeremy Rosenberger explains that this proposal is looking to raise an existing single family home and construct a new single family home of roughly about 2200 square feet with an attached two-car garage. Staff recommends approval with conditions.

Member Joyce asks, when you say “approval with conditions”, what will the conditions relate to? Mr. Rosenberger responds that, according to the plans, it appears they are going to be doing some grading and some fill. The existing garage is below grade, and there are retaining walls. It is a bit of a sloping property. There wasn’t a plan about how much fill is going to be required. To make up for that, as the proposed new garage will be at grade, there is going to be some new soil that will have to be put in. I believe there is going to be some digging for the new home. Mr. Rosenberger is awaiting new plans on that. Member Joyce expressed that it was a little hard to read the plan that was provided; you really cannot see the existing conditions.

Member Reynolds commented that it was stated that a lot of grading needs to be done on the property. Do you know, at this particular time, how much grading will be done – is it measurable to the point where it may require a special permit? Mr. Rosenberger responded that’s what we need to find out because he believes the threshold is 150 square yards, which is still a lot of soil, but he is waiting to hear from the proponent, and that would require a special permit.

Member Reynolds **MOTION** for favorable recommendation based on staff recommendations with conditions, seconded by Member Eng– Vote 5:0:0 with conditions

Chair entertained a Motion to recess. Member Reynolds **MOTION** was made to recess until Public Hearing, seconded by Member Eng—Vote 5:0:0

Chair Harnais reconvened the meeting at 7:44PM

PUBLIC HEARINGS

7:45 PM Continued Public Hearing; All five Planning Board members participated.

**Definitive Subdivision Plan – 459 West Street LLC, 459 West Street (Del’s Way)
(PB File #15-01)**

Present for the applicant:

Richard Whittington, Agent, Whitman Homes, representing 459 West Street LLC
Eric Diaz, Engineer, Tunison Diaz, Inc.
Peter Williams, Peer Review, GZA – GeoEnvironmental, Inc.
Carl Johnson, Attorney

Richard Whittington , representing 459 West Street LLC, states that tonight they appear before Planning Board on a continued Public Hearing related to an eight lot subdivision off of West Street. You can find a brand new set of plans. There has been a change to a new engineering company—Tunison Diaz. I will be introducing Eric Diaz, who will do the presentation of the plans. Attorney Carl Johnson will be assisting with application relative to zoning issues we foresee. At this time, Eric Diaz, the engineer on this project, is introduced and presents as a registered Professional Engineer with Tunison Diaz Inc. He states he knows there is a lot of history on this project and a lot of stuff to go through. This is a brand new submittal, from soup to nuts, from what you have seen with this project in the past, aside from the basic layout of the site. He would like to touch briefly on their history with the project and walk through some of the broad stroke design improvements that have been made to the plan; he wants to make everyone aware that they have also submitted an updated waiver request. They have received comments back from the Peer Review that they want to walk through very quickly, as well.

Eric Diaz mentions that they were asked to participate in project by Rich Whittington. There is no secret that there has been some design hurdles to overcome; they dissected the previous design all the way around and made some pretty notable improvements, especially with regard to drainage. That was all submitted back to Planning Board on August 25th, and it is what you have in front of you now. As part of our redesign process we went through everything on this. What we essentially found is that the drainage system might have been a little bit undersized and did not take advantage of this site's characteristics the way it could. To that end, we decided to make a few changes. The first of which is, under existing conditions, the site is split into two primary watersheds that contribute to storm water runoff to West Street. The previous design tried to collect those and push them all to one design point. We wanted to get away from that; so we thought it better to split those into a more appropriate fashion. So what we proposed was one subsurface infiltration basin on the left-hand side of the street that would account for all of the storm water recharge that we are required to have for the project. On the right-hand side of the street we have a surface infiltration basin. It is controlled through an outlet control structure that discharges to the closed drainage system in West Street.

Notable change right off the bat, was that, in order to make room for that facility on site, we had to take all of the lot lines and push them north a little bit. This leads to a little bit of a longer road than we originally proposed. We have a revised waiver requested for that, which we will touch base on.

A couple of other things that are unique to this design: along the east side of property, the existing topography suggests that there is a bit of a natural swale there. I believe in some prior meeting there was concern expressed by abutters about storm water runoff. So we proposed to really increase and define that swale that's there to intercept and direct the storm water runoff away from those properties and push it to where it should go. There is also a similar swale toward West Street on the western side of the property. The prior design seems to negate that,

so we revised that and brought that swale back into play to really help control things more naturally along that side. Another primary difference that you are going to see on this plan, aside from there being two different storm water management facilities, is that the piping to the surface infiltration basin rather than running through the proposed roadway runs behind the house and along the lots. The reason for that is that, as you know, the subdivision regulations require that the first 100 feet of a proposed roadway be no more than a 1% slope. We had two options going to the roadway: (1) one was to put that basin in a hole, which didn't seem to work as well as we would like it to; (2) the other was to request further waivers from the subdivision regulations with regard to roadway geometry, and we didn't feel that was necessary. In bringing that trunk line around, we were able to: raise that basin, make the lot more manageable, improve the curb appeal and all of those things. On the south eastern corner of the site there is an existing 10 inch culvert that connects directly to the drainage system of West Street; we have utilized that. For greater than the 100 year storm event, we have built in an overflow that will overflow through a rip-rap spillway in a direct flow toward that culvert. We are trying to take advantage of what we have there today. It has been a very positive improvement to the design. We have hit all the marks that we need to with regard to storm water recharge, with regard to water quality, which are very important things to know considering this site is within the Watershed Resource Protection Division.

This brings me to touch briefly on some of the waivers, one of which I've mentioned; a previous design required a waiver to bring the allowable roadway length from 400' to roughly 408'; with the drainage improvements we've made, we found it necessary to actually increase the allowable length of the roadway a little bit more. The waiver we request brings that allowable length to 482.7'. Outside of that, we have some waivers that were the same as what was requested in the past. One is a reduced pavement width, a reduced diameter on the paved area of the cul-de-sac, which I believe have both been reviewed by public safety and there were no objections to those. Both will serve to increase the amount of impervious area we need for the site, to help us in our storm water mitigation and water quality control. Along those lines we request waiver to have sidewalks on only one side of street, which does come all the way around the cul-de-sac. There is also a waiver that requests us to be able to not position the drainage on home lots but within easements on individual lots in which the rights would be given to the town.

We did have some Peer Review comments. Peter Williams and his crew at GZA were good enough to turn around the Peer Review Letter pretty quickly. We got some comments at the end of last week. All were very manageable things; we actually provided a response to those comments to Melissa's office today. First let me acknowledge that we understand you got the response today, and you probably didn't have a change to go through it before the meeting. I would be glad to go through anything you would like to. Primarily, there were eight comments, and we are willing to comply with all of them. So, I am glad to walk through those. One other thing that we should acknowledge, and I think the board is aware, this project does require a variance from ZBA based on lot size. That variance was secured some time ago, and allows the creation of six undersized lots within the watershed protection district. That variance has been

**Braintree Planning Board
September 8, 2015
Cahill Auditorium**

extended once and will run out on September 25, 2015. Rather than us trying to rush to reposition for a new variance, we felt it pertinent to come before the board now to discuss this project with you with our revised layout. This layout has 8 undersized lots, rather than the six that were previously allowed. With support from the board, we would really like to run with this configuration in our petition to ZBA. It simply better supports the site in this design, but we wanted to open that up to you. I will be glad to answer any questions I can.

Chair Harnais opens the discussion up to the public; for anyone that wishes to speak, please come forward. No one comes forward; therefore, discussion is now opened up to the board.

Member Joyce recommends that our Peer Review contact provide a short summary of what they think about the revised plans. Peter Williams from GZA Environmental speaks on the Peer Review. He has reviewed revised plans submitted; he concurs that they have made some improvements to better suit development to the site and have addressed many of the prior comments. As Eric mentioned, there were eight comments in my review of September 2nd. A couple of them are procedural and just notations on the waiver requirements. The ones I feel are important and I believe that they should be able to address are the berm width around the detention basin. It is very narrow in their current design and should be widened as a factor of safety. Number 6 relates to a location of an existing sewer easement on the east side of the project. We are running a pipeline in close proximity to that. We should confirm if that sewer line is in the easement and if there could be any impacts to that sewer line or the proposed drain line. My last comment is that, although there are standard procedures and rules and regulations for spacing of catch basins, I have often found that contributing water sheds often can increase the flow to catch basins. It is important to actually calculate what is anticipated to flow to each catch basin and also formulate a calculation to confirm that there won't be significant bypassing to West Street. From the prior design, they had added some double catch basins; I still would not feel comfortable until I saw the capacity calculations. The biggest issue outstanding right now is number 7; they really haven't fully defined the seasonal high ground waters in the areas of these basins. Being in a watershed protection district, I think we have to be careful that we provide that buffer of the existing subsoil between the basin and the ground water.

Eric Diaz asks if he may just respond to a few of those items. With regard to Peter's comments, we are willing to comply with all of them. We have no issue with increasing the size of the berm around the infiltration basin. I have spoken with the applicant, and he agrees to confirm the location of that sewer line within the easement prior to construction, as Peter suggested. The catch basin capacity calculations will be provided; I should be able to send those over by the end of the week. In response to Peter's comments and what we were planning on doing anyway, we have set up some confirmatory test pits in the location of Subsurface and the surface basins for early next week.

Member Joyce is starting with a comment carried over from last meeting; the topography for the existing conditions, is that still coming from Town Of Braintree GIS? Mr. Diaz responds that

it is coming from Town of Braintree GIS. However, what he was able to do was to send his survey crew out to the site to take a good blanketing of shots to confirm. What they found was that topography was reasonably within tolerance within 3-6 inches in all locations. The other thing that we did in this submission is we added spot grades to the areas where there may have been more distance between contours. We added 1 foot contours to the flatter areas of the site, as well.

Member Joyce states that it looks like in most areas there are two foot contours, but when you get up to the north part of the site it looks like you go to 1 foot contours. Between 160 and 165 it looks like there are 3 contours. Member Joyce asks, did you add some contours here? Mr. Diaz responds yes, they added some 1 foot contours. Member Joyce asks, so the spot grades that are shown on the existing conditions plan have been field verified by your survey crew? Mr. Diaz responds yes. Member Joyce continues, with regards to the existing drainage system in West Street, I don't see any information on rims and inverts and such. Do we have that information? Mr. Diaz states that they based that on information provided by others, but they can certainly confirm that information is correct prior to moving forward. Member Joyce asks, how will you know where to connect it; the culvert ties into a drain manhole that runs west, and then you are tying your infiltration into that, but do we have inverts on that manhole? Mr. Diaz responds that inverts on the manhole were provided by other; with regard to the culvert, however, that is something that they specifically surveyed in the field to confirm because it was a critical part of our design so this was field verified by us.

Member Joyce continues, but we have not field verified the invert of the drainage system on West Street at the manholes? Mr. Diaz replies, not by this office, but it is certainly something we can investigate. Member Joyce responds that she would like to see that happen, please; she also states that she noticed on lot coverages, some of them are pretty close to 20% for being in the watershed protection district; presumably, people are going to put up patios; is there any way to indicate on the plans that those lots are calling out 20% coverage? Mr. Diaz responds that they have no problem adding notations to the plan that indicates a 20% maximum coverage. Obviously, those lots would be subject to individual building permits. One additional note, however, for the houses you see proposed there the footprints are a bit generous for what will come. We did that on purpose to account for almost the worst case scenario to give some room for things like patios and walkways.

Member Joyce asks: I am just curious, why is one of the infiltration areas cultec and the other an open basin? What is the reason behind that design? Mr. Diaz responds that ultimately they would like both to be an open basin for ease of construction, a little bit easier to maintain, a little more cost effective. The reason one ended up being the cultec system is because of the DEP water recharge requirement. We wanted to make sure that we nailed that one. In some previous iterations of the design, I don't know if it made its way to the board, it was looked at to put a roof drainage system on each individual lot, whether it be a rain barrel or a cistern. That was kind of frowned upon because of the maintenance requirements of getting on the lots to take care of those things. So the infiltration basin/cultec system at the bottom of the road, as

designed, is essentially equivalent to what it would take to do an individual system on each rooftop and tie them together. It is really a function of meeting the DEP storm water management standards.

Member Joyce's next question is a technical question on the drainage design. In the report the soils are referred to as C/D soils or sandy loams for the test pit. You call them "C's", which I would agree. My comment is with regard to the infiltration rate that you use, you are using 1.02, which is for a high B. I am wondering what your reasoning for that was. That is based on test pits that were done, as opposed to the NRCS mapping data, which suggest something closer to a B, which is why we went with that and another reason why we intend to do confirmatory test pits. One of the comments that came out of the previous design is that design utilized an infiltration rate of 2.41, which we felt was a bit too aggressive so we cut that in more than half for this design.

Member Joyce states that her follow-up question is, would it be reasonable to assume you should use a B soil when you are calculating your curve numbers? She further states that if you are using a C soil you are generating a little more run-off. Using a B rate would be a little more consistent. Mr. Diaz did not have an issue with that. Member Joyce asks then for individual roof house runoffs, it is just going to be roofs to splash pads and run over surface or are they going to be piped into anything? Mr. Diaz responds that the intent is to put a splash pad and let it roll over land to where it is going. Member Joyce asks a logistics question on construction related to the sediment and erosion control plan; is the plan to build a road and then build out the individual house lots? Mr. Diaz responds that is typically the plan. With this site the roadway construction and grading is going to require a pretty significant area of disturbance. So it would seem that the plan would be to come through and remove trees, construct the roadway, and then as we are able to obtain lot releases and foundation permits, we would expand that process into the lots.

Member Joyce comments that with the nature of the limits of clearing and regrading, there are some significant cuts at the end of the cul-de-sac, she wonders if it might be helpful to show typical sediment and erosion control plan for a house lot construction because presumably this is going to be changing as you go. It may be beneficial. I see that you know that infiltration areas won't be used for sediment runoff during construction. Could you indicate where they can direct that? I think it would be helpful to reiterate that those areas need to be protected so that the infiltration rates in the soil are not compromised. Mr. Diaz agrees.

Member Joyce states maybe one thought would be to add check downs in that swale that is running along the side during construction just to help with sediment loss. You said you were doing test pits at the infiltration basin to confirm ground water – so that's good. There was one discrepancy just to note there is some indication that leaving the underground infiltration chambers some areas the outlet pipe is labeled 10" and some areas it is labeled 12", just as clarification. Mr. Diaz clarifies that for the record it is 12". Member Joyce has not further questions or comments.

Member Mikami references, talking about the drainage on West Street, for those of us who are not experts on drainage, could you explain, today the water is running offsite and there is no special mechanism to capture it, are saying that will not change or are you talking about creating some sort of captured area that feeds into the municipal drain system?

Mr. Diaz responds, a bit of a combination of both of those things; in the existing conditions watershed model there are two primary watersheds; we haven't necessarily created a berm or anything that would absolutely stop flow from coming onto West Street. What we have done is provided a closed drainage system with the proposed roadway that we have directed everything to, so that everything is collected within the closed drainage system and would be directed either toward the infiltration basin at subsurface or the surface basin. From there, the release of that water to the closed drainage system on West Street is controlled. With regard to the peak flow, in every storm event, in the 2, 10, 25 and 100 year storm event, we have actually reduced the amount of water coming from the site. We have certainly mitigated the storm water flows. Overall we have captured the water, we have controlled its release and we do not anticipate any negative impact on the closed drainage system in West Street.

Member Mikami responds that if he is thinking about it, what he wants to make sure is "do no harm"; if you put a lot of water into West Street, and it floods, we have a big problem. Member Mikami states his simple thought is what is going there now in terms of an undisturbed basis? When you change the setting, meaning you add coverage, houses, and so on, instead of ground cover, which absorbs it, how much of that is going to change and to what extent are you mitigating that with your system and controlling it, as you say, with some new either natural or artificial means on West Street. Again, do no harm, first of all, and secondly, take very conservative approach; if you could do some analysis on this. I am going to count on Member Joyce to hold you accountable, but I'm just a regular citizen and I don't want you to cause any problems on West Street. Mr. Diaz states that he agrees completely. To that end, page 3 of the drainage narrative gives a breakdown comparison of the pre-development flow rates and the post-development flow rates. It does show a reduction. By the merits of that alone, we reduced the amount of water going there now. Member Mikami asks how much was the water reduced by? Mr. Diaz responds that it is different for each storm event, but for the 2 year storm event it was reduced by just shy of 1 cubic foot per second, for the 10 year storm even it was reduced by just shy of 1 cubic foot per second, for the 25 year storm event it was reduced by 1.4 and for the 100 year storm event it was reduced by 2.25. So roughly, each case was reduced by around 20-25% of what is going there today. Member Mikami states that it sounds reasonable but he is going to count on the experts. He further states that his intent is that we have water rushing down West Street or any street in this town, that's a big problem and we have to avoid that.

Member Mikami continues, when I look at the design, you said you pushed it back; how much have you pushed it back? Mr. Diaz responds that the previously road length was 408', as proposed; they are now proposing to bring it to 483', as proposed. So roughly, 75 feet we have pushed back road. The houses have been pushed back roughly 50 feet. We have shifted

everything as a whole toward the north part of the site in order to make room for the drainage to support the design.

Member Mikami responds that the natural first question that comes up, when you push it back to what extent are we providing protection to the people on Fallon, Eleanor, the abutters behind there, which would be effected by runoff. Mr. Diaz responds, as far as the abutters to the North on Eleanor, all the drainage in existing conditions and proposed conditions, everything drains away from Eleanor. So nothing is going toward them now. We have provided a bit of a buffer to those on Burton, and additionally about half of that side of the roadway is coming to our proposed roadway, same thing on the other side. We have also taken an advantage of an existing swale at the Southwest portion of the site; we are creating a more defined swale along the entirety of the property along the eastern side to capture storm water, redirect its flow away from those properties and control its discharge to the flow drainage system on West Street.

Member Mikami states, he assumes the dotted line on the plan on the setbacks pertains to the 30 foot rear yard setback. Mr. Diaz confirms on the lotting plan and responds yes, those pertain to required setback to each individual lot whether it's the side, front or rear. Member Mikami asks does it make sense to have a "no disturb" policy relative to that setback area?

Attorney Carl Johnson, representing 459 West Street LLC, explains some history. Originally, he had, on behalf of the Delpico family and 459 West Street LLC, gone before the ZBA and sought relief for the configuration of lots to provide for 2 conforming 1 acre lots and 6 lots that were less than that; this new plan changes that. That was at recommendation of board that we should start from scratch at the last hearing; that is just what the applicant has done and retained a new engineer to try to make this work and do it as quickly as possible. If you look at the lotting plan, the observations from staff and my observations early on were that two larger lots, the acre lots, were in the back; what you needed to do in order to treat the storm water in the current DEP storm water regulations and make it work were move those larger lots to the front, where you could have an area for recharge or to catch the water. What I think has happened here is the lot lines have shifted back. If you note there is a waiver that the applicant has submitted for the width of asphalt on the roadway. The layout may still be 50 feet, but there is a reduction in there from 28 feet of asphalt to 24. If you take that area that is reduced in the roadway and maybe one sidewalk on the side and you take additional 82 plus or minus feet, it's pretty close to the same amount of asphalt coverage, and that's why it is being requested. It is a very difficult bylaw; I don't want to go into the merits of that bylaw—the watershed protection district; this is an attempt to do it. One of the reasons I am here tonight is that I am going to have to file with the ZBA to seek a new variance on the lotting plan with the dimensions of these new lots. I was going to inform you that on September 25th the current variance expires. As the attorney, I need to file a new variance because of operation of law, as they had a six month extension which will expire on the 25th. I would like to file for a variance that seeks relief for all eight lots. We can justify that in the same way that we justified it for the six undersized lots.

What I think is important here is they have attempted to put in a swale that protects the neighborhood on one side and to solve some of the problems people are having on Fallon Circle with the water coming back; you will note on the plan that there is a larger area around the houses; whatever that area you talked about as a “no disturb”, we had represented initially to neighbors whatever comes about, we are going to put an area that would remain as is. I had suggested an area of 20’ would be reasonable. Mr. Diaz has also pointed out that the foundation or the footprint of these houses is approximately 2800 square feet; these houses are not going to be twice that large for the second floor. This is a very aggressive plan which takes up more area than necessarily is shown because you don’t have a finite decision, particularly the way the bylaw is structured, what is going to be pervious and impervious. But these lots will all have to meet the 20%, or they cannot get a building permit. This will be revised, if you wish, as the applicant does not know how large these homes are going to be. So, I would ask if the board is satisfied. Staff has indicated that this plan makes a lot more sense than before; I know there are technical issues that still have to be dealt with. That is beyond my expertise. I think the board has asked questions that should be addressed by the next hearing. I would like the board to give me some sense, if I file for a new variance by September 25th, the deadline for next month’s Zoning Board of Appeals hearing, if you are satisfied that we can go with eight undersized lots, substantially in this configuration, which will fix the plan. It’s a bit of the cart before the horse, but I need to get in the que for that variance, and I am not sure when the board is going to develop a comfort level with the layout of the lots. We want the subdivision to work; it has been in the works for a long time. The applicant’s representative has done a great job on putting plans together that are readable, plans that are well-engineered and certainly in this short period of time there are things that have to be verified and developed. I think your calculation requests are proper. We can show what the mitigation factor is by these storm water management techniques. I would ask that you support the lotting plan of lots of this size, all eight of them.

Member Mikami states the point simply being that the potential exists to have a “no disturb” area, whatever size or dimension. I would say that my reason for that, along with West Street drainage, is to make sure we have enough protection for everyone, the abutters as well as the people that are going to buy the homes; maybe we shouldn’t have 8 lots; maybe there should be six or seven—a different number to accommodate some of these drainage issues; that is something that you are going to have to figure out. Related to making sure you have enough protection, Mr. Diaz, if you look at these eight lots as they are currently configured, which ones would have the highest risk for drainage problems in the future? Mr. Diaz states that honestly he cannot see that any of them have a risk of developing a drainage problem in the future provided that they are maintained the way that they are recommended to do so. In the drainage report, we have provided a full operations and maintenance plan. There will be a homeowners association involved in the project and operations and maintenance will be something that is within their purview. As far as protection, to bring it back to your first comment, as far as providing a buffer to adjacent lots, the applicant has agreed and does not take issue with providing a 20’ buffer along those areas to the west and to the north of the site.

**Braintree Planning Board
September 8, 2015
Cahill Auditorium**

Obviously, along the east of the site is where we are putting that swale now, so we won't be developing beyond there anyway. That swale is intended to protect residents along the eastern portion of the site. Elsewhere, we don't take exception to providing a 20' vegetated, non-disturbed buffer to what is there now today. Member Mikami confirms that the engineer's proposal is 20'; the staff or other members, however, may have a different number in mind. Member Mikami states, going back to the question I just asked, which houses might have highest risk for flooding, when we looked at the previous plan, there were challenges with the potential for flooding to me, how much room for error do you think you have built into this? We had a terrific storm this past year, we have a lot of things going on with the climate. Do you feel like you have 5% variance? You mentioned 20% on the West Street portion, but if you are a homeowner and you look at this and you know that there are challenges to this site, how much protection are you building in for these people? Mr. Diaz states that he would not attempt to quantify a "room for error" because he is very confident in their design and that it meets and exceeds what it is required to do, will perform as it is required to and will provide the protection we are required and even beyond to the eventual homeowners. As far as what is built in, Ms. Joyce mentioned curve numbers and soil types, that will related to our drainage design, and if I may to paraphrase what she is talking about, we have used a curve number that provides a runoff rate that is probably more aggressive than what is there now. We have provided an overflow from our drainage facilities; we have provided an emergency overflow from our drainage facilities. We have provided a foot of freeboard within our drainage facilities, which means that it will pond to a certain amount, and it still has a foot to go before it can overtop and activate the emergency overflow. The houses that we have proposed are certainly greater in size than what will ultimately be there. That is to provide some buffer for additional impervious area than what will be built. So, I wouldn't attempt to quantify the percentage and say that there is 50% room for a greater storm event than we have anticipated, but I am confident in saying that we have met the requirements that we need to and gone beyond those to provide a safe and efficient design for the eventual homeowner.

Member Mikami states in terms of the footprint, we don't know what is going to happen here; we have to take the 2800 square feet as the rule as opposed to the exception, and he just wants to endorse what Member Joyce was saying is given the challenges of this site, particularly for drainage, we have to be careful and provide as much protection as we can for the buyers, the neighbors, runoff to West Street. We need to make sure we have beyond a safe variance so that we have absolutely no problems. It has happened before; we don't want to see it happen, particularly when we are doing this upfront and we know that we have these challenges.

Member Eng asks, when you were designing these drainage systems, what was the square footage of these homes that you were predicting? Mr. Diaz responds, I think it we carried a template home footprint of roughly 2800 square feet. Member Eng asks, so you are not going to need a variance to enlarge the square footage of those homes in the future. Mr. Diaz states that they are not going to proceed with a variance to enlarge, in fact, he believes Attorney Johnson mentioned in this zone, because it is in a water resource protection overlay zone, we are required to cap the amount of impervious surface on the lot at 20%, which includes the

home, driveways, walkways, patios. As Member Joyce pointed out, some of these lots are very close to that now. So we are not allowed to make them substantially bigger than they are now because it will exceed that impervious, which will required us to go back to the ZBA for a variance, which is a process that I would not try to go for.

Member Eng states, the reason I am asking this is we don't want to get a call in the future that they are having issues with a larger square footage. He wants to make that a very succinct point in what the square footage will be in the future. Mr. Diaz understands and agrees. Mr. Eng states as far as quality control while this is being built, you are going to be the engineer of record on this property, correct? Mr. Diaz states, yes. Mr. Eng continues, there was a question by Mr. Williams about what you should be working off of for your survey for horizontal control; Mr. Eng confirms, you are going to have precise survey; he states that he is asking this question because this grading system that you are proposing and the swale you are proposing has to be built very accurately. Mr. Diaz confirm, yes it does. Mr. Eng states, again you have faith in making sure this is done. Mr. Diaz confirms, absolutely they do. Mr. Eng continues, because there are other things that he sees where the quality control must be exact. The handicap community here tonight is going to make sure sidewalks have the proper slope for a wheelchair to travel on. Mr. Diaz confirms, absolutely, to that end things like accessible ramps will be ADA compliant; they will be required to be monitored, checked, approved by the DPW prior to the roadway being accepted. There is definitely a quality control process built into the construction of the subdivision that goes even beyond what our team would do internally. By the time it gets to review by town officials, DPW, things like that, those items are going to have to be accounted for. So, it would behoove us, as the applicant and engineer of record, to do it right the first time. Member Eng concludes, that those are excellent answers.

Member Reynolds, the question I have is the infiltration basin on the east side. Staff had pointed out or questioned, in the Subdivision Rules, Section 10 for Drainage, they talk about a 50' buffer zone of existing vegetation shall be retained between all the basin components and the adjacent uses, structures or parcel property lines. Member Reynolds asks, what do you have for a distance between the property and Bonafigglio property. Mr. Diaz responds, as proposed that basin is approximately 40' from the property line to the east side of it; now that said, in that location, there is not much in the way of natural vegetation there to maintain, Additionally, in that location, that is where we proposed to put the swale through, which has been requested and discussed with abutters. The need for that swale is going to negate any vegetation that is there today. Member Reynolds confirms, the swale goes all the way down to the street or it stops and you have the culvert? Mr. Diaz confirm, the contouring that you see stops a little shy, but that swale will continue to be manicured to direct flow directly to that culvert. Member Reynolds questions, are you saying that there isn't already in place the vegetation. Mr. Diaz confirms that there is not much in the way of vegetation in that location as far as significant treed vegetation; there is a bit of scrub in that location, but I don't believe there is anything substantial there, please correct me if I am mistaken. Member Reynolds responds, if you don't mind, I am going to ask the staff to get a little further information from their perspective.

Principal Planner, Melissa SantucciRozzi responds, Member Reynolds is correct, we have a requirement of the basin and any of its components, and the spillway is considered a component of the basin, the swale would also be considered a form; my recommendation would be to try to move that over, if at all possible. You are going to be in a waiver scenario with the understanding that if you are trying to tie into an existing overflow that's located in the layout. Some of the board members recall that we have initially talked about some of these "no disturb" buffers we've done recently in a different subdivision that we have approved. We were looking at implementing those here, as well. The neighbors actually wanted the swale. My recommendation would be the swale is not going to make any sense unless it is in that location. To whatever extent you can confirm your seasonal high ground water, which you are going to be doing anyways, if the basin could get a little deeper but maybe not as wide, and then maybe try to redesign the spillway, maybe accomplish the same goal. If you look at Sheet C4, you are well into the tree line; while it may not be any substantial, worth saving vegetation, I think that the abutters on that particular side have expressed that drainage outweighs buffering. We could also look towards plantings on their side of the property. We have done this for Elmlawn and perhaps other subdivisions. Looking at the plan, it made sense for the plantings to go in on the abutter's side instead of trying to integrate those with grading and drainage and other situations that were part of the subdivision design. That would be a waiver for readjustment or reshaping or readjusting; the board, in the past, has looked to those basins impacting the people in the subdivision first vs. the people outside of the subdivision. Mr. Diaz agrees, all very good suggestions and they would be glad to take another look at that to see what we can do to minimize it to the maximum extent possible. If we are unable to get out of that realm completely, a waiver request may be appropriate in that location. Mr. Reynolds stated that he just wanted make sure if that was going down the road in a required waiver, you have the information leading in. Mr. Diaz agreed. They will re-evaluate and prior to the next hearing they will make sure they will get that duck-in-a-row. Member Reynolds commented that there are some mitigating steps that could potentially be factored in here to make it a more acceptable choice, as far as how it applies to the subdivision laws. Mr. Williams comments, on that matter of mitigation, we have to be careful because we do have a sewer easement and an existing sewer line going through that area. So we don't want to put a lot of large trees or vegetation in that area that could prevent maintenance and possibly impact the line. Member Reynolds agrees that is a good point.

Member Reynolds states, overall with this revised plan, I like it. The swales along the east side that run pretty much the length of the property, I think that is going to be a benefit. I think some of the other board members and Ms. Santucci talked about abutters along that side of the property that were interested in keeping the vegetation. Member Reynolds feels that they are achieving a balance. Member Reynolds has no further questions.

Chair Harnais states that, although Mr. Johnson is looking for a clear indication, he does not believe he is going to get a clear indication. He feels that is something Mr. Johnson will have to present and the board will take it up then. He does not believe the board is ready to provide a clear indication as to what they are going to decide about the lots as you proposed. I know you

Braintree Planning Board

September 8, 2015

Cahill Auditorium

are in a time crunch; my suggestion would be to go forward and put the application in. I am not giving any indication where the board is on this.

The Chair requests a motion to continue this until November Meeting, Member Reynolds **MOTION** to continue the public hearing to **November 10, 2015 at 7:30PM**, seconded by Member Joyce – unanimously voted **VOTE: 5:0:0**. The applicant signed a mutual agreement to continue the public hearing.

8:45PM Site Plan Review; four Planning Board members participated; Bob Harnais recused – K. Spillane LLC, Harry White LLC and Bookshe LLC, Daniel Quirk, Manager – 429-445 Quincy Avenue (PB File #15-07)

While applicants are setting up, Chair Harnais recuses himself from this hearing. Vice Chair Joseph Reynolds reviews new correspondence received from July 2, 2015 through September 4, 2015. Vice Chair Reynolds will take a motion from the board to accept the correspondence. Member Eng **MOTION** to accept the correspondence seconded by Member Mikami; Vote 4:0:0

Present for the applicant:

Frank Marinelli, Attorney for Quirk Auto Dealerships

Jim Burke, Project Engineer, DeCelle Burke

Attorney Marinelli reminds that when they were before the Planning Board in July they presented a history of the site. It is about 13.3 acres; it is an assemblage of land purchased by the Quirk entities from 2002 when the major portion of the former General Dynamics offsite parking for the shipyard was purchased all the way up to 2013 when the Quirk entities purchased the Flibotte's Junkyard and cleaned that whole area up; the building is sited at eastern point edge of the site. It's a new car dealership, approximately 53,000 square feet footprint and another mezzanine of about 5000 square feet as set forth in the staff report. We presented the grading permit that was applied for in 2013; that was then modified in 2015 to provide for the paving that is now underway. Jim can update you on the status of some of the construction being done pursuant to the 2015 modification paving, installation of the storm water system, which is a big improvement; there was really no storm water runoff control on the site. You can see from drainage plan, that's the infrastructure that is now being installed. That will also serve the dealership. We will have some modifications that are contained in the staff report when we construct the dealership, some cuts and fills. Basically, that's the history that brings us to tonight's hearing and the progress that has been made on all of the issues that were talked about, which were not major at the July Hearing. The use is a "use by right", automotive sales and service. There have been Class I Licenses in that parcel since 2003; we have reviewed the draft conditions and are happy to answer any questions, but we feel that the proposed conditions are appropriate and acceptable to the applicant.

Member Reynolds states that before he entertains any questions or comments from the public or the planning board members themselves, he just wants to give the staff an opportunity to provide their perspective on where we stand on any outstanding issues. Principal Planner, Melissa SantucciRozzi states that she has reviewed the revised plan, quite a bit of revised materials came in, some updated engineering reports as well as plans, revised landscape plans, updated traffic memo. I did draft the conditions and feel as though everything has been addressed in there. There are minor plan revisions that we are looking for and also some items to address in response to Bob Campbell's (Engineer for the Town) memo. If the Board is so inclined to act this evening, I will work with Mr. Burke, the engineer of record, we will get those plans finalized and they will be entered into the decision as the record drawing. One item did come up, if Mr. Burke wants to weigh in, the item of these tree box filters. The board has seen these before. We used them on the Dunkin Donuts University site. The town engineer has made recommendations that they be removed out of the layout, but they don't function unless they are in the layout with the inlets, capturing the water, and they were a direct recommendation in the MEPA Certificate issued in response to the particular MEPA filings for this project. They wanted some low impact drainage, and Mr. Burke has achieved that with tree box filters. I have talked to Attorney Marinelli, and he has agreed to draft an easement that they will maintain those. We can record it right along with decision that those will be maintained by Quirk entities in perpetuity. The maintenance, replacement of trees and constructions costs associated with the insulation and long-term maintenance will be provided for privately. Staff has no other comments.

Vice Chair Reynolds asks if there are any comments from the public, if anyone would like to come forward with any questions. There are no questions from the public.

Member Joyce wishes to confirm, essentially the drainage system is picking up in catch basins, treating it with a storm sceptor and then sending it to these recharge areas. So the recharge volume is accounted for in the sand and stone below them. What about the area behind the building and down towards Clean Harbors? Is that just running off towards Clean Harbors? Mr. Burke responds that it sheds in two directions toward catch basins. 62.5 is this location here; we shed down past the doorways; it's a little steep here-- it is a bit of a run, but it makes it; the grade is there.

Member Joyce asks, for the catch basins along the retaining wall, do those rims just need to be revised because it looks like they are six feet lower than what your grade is? Mr. Burke responds that he is looking at a rim of 44.3. Member Joyce is thinking that's probably a typo. Mr. Burke agrees and states it looks more like it might be 48.3. Member Joyce states that on all CB4-2, 4-3, 4-1, make note to make sure that those are all accurate. CB3-5 just jumps out at me. It's in the cross walk; there is a catch basin in middle of the walkway. Mr. Burke states, that's a good pickup; the sidewalk is actually new, part of the revisions. Member Joyce states, having that sidewalk is very good because we have a nice access to the main entrance; Member Joyce states that, as long as those technicalities are worked out with staff and the plans are updated

Braintree Planning Board

September 8, 2015

Cahill Auditorium

accordingly to meet the conditions, I don't have any additional concerns aside from what we have addressed at past meetings and the reflection in revised drawings.

Member Mikami notes that we had spoken about this last time; car carriers are proposed to access only through the Fore River Shipyard Site off of Hill Ave. We are not going to use Patten, which is very good. The main entrance off Quincy Avenue is used for everybody else; that's excellent. There was a discussion last time that this would be potentially a Jeep dealership. Is that still the case? Attorney Marinelli responds that they would be presenting to staff what the elevations would be, once the particular brand is designated. Member Mikami recalls that there was a discussion last time about signage, given that the building was further back; so your primary signage would be closer to Quincy Avenue. Member Mikami continues, the parking areas primarily for internal personnel, will there be a sign there for that? Attorney Marinelli responds, I think there are 153 parking spaces required and another 100 for employees; so we have about 250 that are customer or employee related and then the inventory storage is well over 600 additional spaces. Member Mikami asks, isn't there an area primarily for employee parking down below? Mr. Burke responds, a lot of times we will prepare a parking layout plan for Mr. Quirk, he'll hand it to his employees and say, "you're parking here"; that's generally how it is done.

Member Mikami states this would be a significant upgrade for Quincy Avenue, albeit a more intensive usage but a welcome improvement; clearly, the beautification landscaping plan is very important, as we've talked about. Member Mikami states that everything else looks fine to him.

Member Eng asks Mr. Marinelli, have you looked at staff report #2 with the draft conditions? There are a lot of comments that are on this report. Are you okay with these? I counted over 30 comments. Attorney Marinelli responds that those have been addressed. If you look at page 4, it says that a full response to the items raised in the staff report has been addressed in writing. Those were taken care of. Mrs. SantucciRozzi adds that there was one statement at the top of the Staff Report that these comments had been addressed either in writing or will be on the plans and through the revisions that we are going to work through. Attorney Marinelli adds, that other than the technical things that have been raised with Melissa and Jim, for all of these categories we have submitted supplemental materials. Member Eng just wanted to make sure we cover this, and he didn't want to get into the discussion later that these items were not being done.

Vice Chair Reynolds does not have any other questions above and beyond what has been asked already. Previous questions asked by board members have covered what we thought may have been gaps. The conversations have been ongoing; we have solutions; we have answers. It is just a matter between the staff catching up with documenting it in the final copy. You're satisfied from an applicant's standpoint; I am satisfied from the town's position.

Member Eng states that, if all those comments are taken care of, the next step is to move ahead with the final conditions to be drafted. Attorney Marinelli responds that they have 72

Braintree Planning Board

September 8, 2015

Cahill Auditorium

conditions which include repaving Patten Avenue, which Jim tells me has started. As you say, it is an improvement over the pretty baron area that existed out there with a junk yard. Now, at least, we have a building, commercial real estate taxes, a "use by right", greenspace, landscaping, organized circulation, and we have some improvements to public way.

Vice Chair Reynolds states that he agrees with those comments; that combined with the questions that have been asked and the staff's due diligence, he would feel comfortable with moving forward. These are draft conditions, but I am feel comfortable that from both the staff's perspective and the applicant's perspective there is an agreement that they have finalized the last questions. Attorney Marinelli confirms that is correct; for tonight we were to have draft conditions. That was the will of the board at the end of the meeting in July.

Vice Chair Reynolds asks if the board is comfortable with closing the public hearing; **Member Eng MOTION to close the Public Hearing seconded by Member Mikami. Vote: 4:0:0**

Member Eng MOTION to move forward with final order of conditions on this project and have them issued. Vice Chair Reynolds asks, are you recommending an approval with the condition that the staff could finalize the editing. Attorney Marinelli interjects, Mrs. SantucciRozzi might support us on this; he thinks the conditions are fine; it's just the revisions to the plan that need work. Mrs. SantucciRozzi confirms, the only thing that would be changed in there would be the dates on the record plans. Member Eng continues, just for the record, he just wants to make sure staff gets answers to these questions and comments that were made. If the staff is satisfied with the answers, then they don't have to be included in the order conditions but be made part of the record. Vice Chair Reynolds thinks that is prudent just to have it stated for the record; we have done this before with other projects in the past, and it is something we are comfortable with; further Vice Chair Reynolds asks if staff has any further comments. Mrs. SantucciRozzi states the response has been included for the record when you reviewed the updated correspondence.

Vice Chair Reynolds states that we have the MOTION by Member Eng to approve these conditions and the staff will continue to complete revisions/edits that we have discussed this evening and agreed upon. At this point, does anyone on the board have an additional comment?

Member Joyce states that she has a question/comment; as far as staff comments on what are revisions, are there any outstanding ones on the utility design, drainage system, that sort of thing? Mrs. SantucciRozzi responds that the plan revisions are shown at the bottom of page 8, so in red it says: "New Comment". The town engineer has submitted comments that will require minor plan revisions that will be required to be addressed by the applicant and incorporated into the record plans. Bob Campbell's memo was attached to draft conditions, which is dated September 2nd, right underneath Plan Revisions. Some are taken from Bob's memo; we had some of the same comments. Other ones were taken from a written response that I would like perfected on the site plan. Those are numbers one through seven. Member

Braintree Planning Board

September 8, 2015

Cahill Auditorium

Joyce wanted to make sure, from the storm water management because they did test pits, there is adequate separation to ledge or ground water since there are going to be recharge areas. Can we add that as something to check or coordinate if it hasn't already been done? Mrs. SantucciRozzi responds that is in the written if you want to recap that; we are nowhere near ground water.

Mr. Burke states, there is ledge on site, and we have done some significant blasting in the past. There is one system that is already in; the soils were surprisingly better than what my test pit showed. We got in some really good gravel. The second one is finding the same stuff; it's where the fill was placed. We are actually going below that.

Member Joyce asks, are all the areas recharge areas are just certain ones? Mr. Burke responds, they are all meant to be recharge areas; the design doesn't really take into account given the amount of ledge that we've had. They are really designed as underground detention basins, but with open bottom. We have the benefit of how much the soils will allow to recharge. Based on the first one I saw in the ground, you are not going to see a lot of runoff coming out of that 24" pipe. Member Joyce states, she doesn't have an issue with the design or the calculations. I was just curious as I didn't quite follow where the recharge volumes were being accounted for. I was just curious if it was at all four systems equally and that they were going to work. Mr. Burke confirms, exactly, they are going to work. There is a lot of volume in there and a lot of surface area for recharge. Member Joyce states that she does not mean to be redundant; she is just making sure everything is technically designed the same. The reason she was asking is because the one that is out in front of the building looks like the ledge was 66" deep, so that would be about 5 feet; the ground is 50'; that puts your ledge at 45'; the system is at 44'; so that would put it in the ledge and you wouldn't be able to do recharge. Mr. Burke confirms there are plans to do regrading. The design doesn't take in any recharge requirements given the ledge soils. Member Joyce states, as long as staff is coordinating with you and the revisions on the structure and elevation are fine and accounted for in the draft conditions, I'm fine.

Mrs. SantucciRozzi confirms, when we do as-built approval, if there is additional information needed to confirm installation, and we have built into the conditions Mr. Burke's response removing unsuitable material and bringing in material. They have blasted and will probably do some additional hammering if they need to. Attorney Marinelli confirmed that there were conditions for blasting, 34 through 36. Member Joyce adds one quick thing, there are little w's scattered across the site, are those ground water monitoring wells? Mr. Burke confirms, yes they are. Member Joyce asks if they will stay. Mr. Burke responds, no.

Vice Chair Reynolds asks if there are any additional questions or comments.

Member Eng MOTION to approve with revisions being completed by staff on the conditions; seconded by Member Mikami -- Vote 4:0:0

Braintree Planning Board

September 8, 2015

Cahill Auditorium

**9:11 PM Major Mod. to Special Permit/Site Plan Review – all five PB Members participate
Super Petroleum Inc. – 297 Quincy Avenue (PB File #03-04)**

Chair Harnais returns to the hearing and reads the legal notice into the record.

Present for the applicant:

Frank Marinelli, Attorney for Applicant

Mike Bugazia, Applicant

Dave Mackwell of Kelly Engineering Group

Attorney Marinelli provides background information, in 1996, approximately 19 years ago Mike Bugazia started Super Petroleum; he is really a small business success story; he came to the United States 34 years ago; he has built the company to 32 current locations. When he bought this site at 297 Quincy Avenue, it was a pretty dilapidated old gas station. It had a rental property next to it; he sacrificed the rent from the rental property; took that down. He developed a real state-of-the-art filling station. It has been well maintained and well operated since it was constructed in 2004. He has created a brand; he has developed that brand. In 2004, after the Board allowed him to do that redevelopment, he came back in 2010 and we proposed a 480 + 252 square foot addition to the building. Those additions were not built; the larger one was to make more office space for his growing business. He has now moved to 25 Braintree Office Hill Park. There is no longer any need for the office space; at the time of approval in 2004, there was 400 square feet of retail, convenience store items. When we came back in 2010, it was increased to 657 square feet. We now wish to only do 1 addition of 252 square feet. That is the only thing being proposed tonight in the way of a change to the building. It is the highlighted yellow area here. This building that exists is shown in grey. The yellow area in that corner would be added (252 square feet). So, it brings the total available retail area to 1597 square feet. On the site plan, under the zoning bylaw, we have shown the required parking, 8 parking spaces meeting the bylaw. We have landscaping. The request tonight, as the staff points out in their report, the 252 square feet is really protected under the permit extension act, but we are asking to use the whole building for retail. We have the parking for it; that kind of retail is an allowed by-right in general business district. It is a convenience and a necessity for the operator to go along with the filling station. He's done a nice job with the circulation on and off of Potter Drive with the cooperation of Braintree Electric Light Department since it was first built in 2004. All department recommendations that have come in for tonight's modification are favorable. We respectfully request your favorable consideration. I think staff has issued a report on page 6 which shows limited number of prior conditions that would require modification. The most important one, for Mike's business, is to be able to sell the typical convenience store items. Previously, whether it was allowed by law or not, there was a Condition 24 in the original approval that tried to itemize everything, chips, peanuts, hostess or similar products, etc. You could miss something; then is he not allowed to sell? Is it going to affect his financing? Is it going to affect the future permits applicable to this property? What he is asking for is what is typical and customary of a convenience store accompanying a filling station. We are happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Chair Harnais opens the meeting up to the public for questions or comments. There were no questions or comments from the public. So discussion was opened up to the Board.

Member Joyce asks, is there currently a convenience store at the site? Attorney Marinelli responds, yes; Member Joyce, asks so he is just making it bigger? Attorney Marinelli states, exactly; right now the convenience store is approximately in this area, and there is unused office space in this area being used for storage. Member Joyce asks, so is it all going to be convenience? Attorney Marinelli responds, yes it is all going to be convenience, except for the mechanical area; the mechanical area is about 189 square feet. The retail space is 1597 square feet. Member Joyce concludes, that makes sense to me.

Member Mikami begins, so existing office space now is used for storage? How long ago did it stop being an office? Attorney Marinelli asks Mr. Bugazia when he moved to Braintree Office Hill Park, and responds about three years ago. Member Mikami asks if that office space will be renovated at all. He has a construction company that just did one on the North Shore that he is probably going to use down here. They will outfit it so that it's more of a retail space. Mr. Bugazia adds, basically they are going to convert storage to convenient store. There is not much structure change. They are going to make the addition, and deal with the existing structure to make it a user-friendly store. Member Mikami asks, is the 252 square feet going to be new construction? Mr. Bugazia responds, yes. Member Mikami continues, then essentially are you going to renovate the old office space and reconfigure it so it will flow? Mr. Bugazia responds, basically, we are going to make it a perfect rectangle. Member Mikami continues, in terms of the parking, it's on the side and some in the back. Are your current customers utilizing parking now if they stop and buy something at the convenience store or are they staying in the gas spots and just running in quickly and then running out? Mr. Bugazia states they are mostly staying in the gas spots. Member Mikami has no further questions.

Member Eng has no questions. Member Reynolds has no questions and feels it is pretty straight forward from the staff's point of view in what they have presented to us and then what the applicant had to fill in subsequent to that.

Chair Harnais just wants to add a note. He actually goes there and did not know there was parking behind the building; you might want to advertise that a little bit more. Other than that, it is needed. Chair Harnais has one quick question, is there a plan to put KENO there? My concern is that because there is a store right down the street and people sit there for hours and I don't want people tying up parking spaces. Mr. Bugazia responds, no. Chair Harnais has nothing further; he thinks it's a great idea. The people there have been great to deal with. Principal Planner, Melissa SantucciRozzi, would like to add a couple of things; I have reviewed and provided my recommendations in the staff report. I just have three things that I would like permission to work with applicant on. That is landscaping, construction phasing, and signage for customer parking. With landscaping, they have given us the revised layout and labeled that some things are going to be moving. I would like Mr. Bugazia to implement some screening in

Braintree Planning Board

September 8, 2015

Cahill Auditorium

the back because that was part of the original approval. I am not sure what his plan is for construction phasing, like if he is going to keep the place open and how that is going to work. We want to make sure there is still adequate parking and those types of things. Finally, I made a note about adding some signage for customer parking if that is okay with the Board.

Chair entertains a motion to enter correspondence starting July 23, 2015 to the present.

Member Reynolds MOTION to enter correspondence; seconded by Member Eng. VOTE: 5:0:0

Chair entertains a motion to close the Public Hearing. **Member Eng MOTION to close Public Hearing; seconded by Member Reynolds. VOTE: 5:0:0**

Member Reynolds MOTION to approve the modification as spelled out in the correspondence that have been received and to incorporate the modified conditions Number 3, 46, 75, 81, as written by the staff and staff's recommendation; seconded by Member Joyce. VOTE: 5:0:0

9:24 PM - Special Permit/Site Plan Review – 4 PB Members participated; Member Joyce recused

Lamar Central Outdoor, 340 Wood Rd. - Billboard Overlay Zoning District (PB File #15-09)

Principal Planner, Melissa SantucciRozzi announces that the applicant, Lamar Central Outdoor, has requested a continuance to the October Meeting. The staff is proposing 8:15 PM if that is acceptable with the Board.

Member Mikami MOTION to continue the public hearing for Lamar Central Outdoor to October 13, 2015 at 8:15 PM, seconded by Member Reynolds; VOTE: 4:0:0.

The applicant signed a mutual agreement to continue the public hearing.

The Chair entertains a motion to convene the meeting. **Member Reynolds MOTION to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Member Mikami – unanimously voted.**

The Meeting adjourned at 9:28 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Louise Quinlan

Planning/Community Development