



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

Braintree Planning Board – July 14, 2015 – Johnson Chambers

Present

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

Christine Stickney, Director
Melissa SantucciRozzi, Principal Planner

Chair Harnais called roll call at 7:05 PM; all five members are present.

Zoning Board of Appeal Petitions – July 2015

Chairman Harnais noted to the public present that the Planning Board only makes recommendations to the Zoning Board of Appeals; the Zoning Board of Appeals makes their own decisions.

Petition #15-17 – 58 Francine Road - Mr. Edward Bulger

Edward Bulger, applicant, was present on behalf of the petition and explained his plans to add a second story to the existing ranch-style dwelling. Ms. Stickney summarized her report to the members. No comments from Members Joyce, Mikami and Eng. Member Reynolds commented there is a lot of work being done on the homes in the area.

Member Reynold **Motion** for favorable recommendation; seconded by Member Eng; unanimously voted.

Petition #15-18 – 89 Hancock Street – Mr. Robert Cusack

Bob Cusack, applicant, was present on behalf of the petition and explained that the premises currently are occupied on first floor by a Hair Salon, Barber Shop, and Real Estate office; on the second floor a business office is no longer there. He would like to turn the second floor into four one bedroom residential units; however, multifamily development requires a special permit from the Planning Board and relief from the Zoning Board of Appeals. Ms. SantucciRozzi summarized her report to the members.

Member Joyce asked if the plan just received today depicts the existing conditions and you are only renovating the existing building for residential – is that correct? You probably have more spaces than needed for residential parking? – will you keep all the spaces or is there any potential to add anymore green space to the lot? – Mr. Cusack responded he needed all the spaces, particularly for uses on the first floor.

Member Mikami commented on the reasoning for the conversion and complimented that the creation of housing over the first floor is a creative use. He wanted to confirm with the staff if any issues existed for the conversion. Ms. SantucciRozzi said she had no problem with the conversion; it is actually something we promote in this area. Chair Harnais added that multi-use is something we want. Member Mikami asked, if we support this now and we want to come back to open space issues during the site plan review process, does our recommendation now prejudice that during the public hearing?

Ms. SantucciRozzi states we have been working with the applicant on the existing expanse of pavement at the rear of the property, which is deteriorating. Since it is in the Residence B zoning district he could keep half the parking/open space in the area, and it would render him with 2 additional spaces above required parking. Member Mikami encouraged him to think about that and commented about Mayor Sullivan's efforts for beautification in the Town.

Member Eng questioned the parking, citing the 25 spaces and two handicap spaces shown and asked how many of the spaces do you need for the business on first floor. Mr. Cusack pointed out the required retail spaces and the spaces needed for the residents. Member Eng questioned further what if they have guests where would they all park? Mr. Cusack responded that he believes it would work fine given the use of spaces at different times of the day and hopefully they won't need any spaces since we are located on a bus line and close proximity to the train line. He feels it would co-exist fine during the day and night – it should be a good fit. Member Eng commented in the worst case would people park on Hancock and Frederick Road? Mr. Cusack commented parking is allowed on Hancock Street. Member Eng questioned staff on whether the minimum handicap parking required 2 spaces? She was unsure but will verify.

Member Reynolds commented that this is a good use of the site given the downtown proximity. He supports the Village Overlay District, and this a good change for that area promoting walking and use of public transportation and it fulfills the goals of the Village Overlay and he support the request.

Member Eng **Motion** for favorable action, seconded by Member Reynolds – unanimously voted.

Petition #15-16 -- Plymouth Road – Mr. William Cook

Mr. William Cook, applicant, explained he is seeking permission to develop a lot he purchased over 39 years ago and needs to obtain a variance for the lot because of size and because the road doesn't exist beyond his property and he needs to create the frontage; however, the information sent from staff states no hardship and he doesn't understand? Chairman Harnais explains what constitutes a hardship under the law - soil, shape of lot or topography – if you can't show a hardship then you are not entitled to a variance – you can't just get a variance just because you want to subdivide the lot. Mr. Cook asks if he has a lot that has no frontage on an accepted way would he have to build the roadway beyond his lot is that correct? Chairman Harnais responds yes to satisfy frontage to subdivide. Discussion pursued that he is not subdividing but he had actually purchased an undersized lot that pre-existed. Mr. Cook explained that somehow Plymouth Road was extended and using a plan, showed the Planning Board members the lot but it is not constructed – the lot behind it is owned by the Town. Ms. SantucciRozzi commented that he can't meet the subdivision rules and regulations. To construct the roadway he would need a number of waivers; his plan is only showing a driveway. The Conservation Commission agent has not gone out, but the area looks fairly wet and is subject to the Watershed District. She explained the requirements of the watershed overlay for construction of a lot one acre minimum and 20% lot coverage on the lot. The applicant is showing 30% lot coverage. Chairman Harnais questions the buildable lot size when purchased – Ms. SantucciRozzi said the lot was purchased in 1976; with the 1968 ordinance at that time, it didn't meet the requirements and it was held in common ownership. Mr. Cook comments that there are other lots that are small in area, and Ms. SantucciRozzi states the other lots were all built upon prior to Watershed enacted in 1982.

Member Eng states, if Mr. Cook wants to continue with this proposal, he would have to go the Town for approval to extend Plymouth Road. Ms. SantucciRozzi said the only mechanism to construct the road is a definitive plan process and noted back in the day there was an alternative process called 703D. It was

under zoning to improve a way, but it is no longer in the ordinance. Mr. Cook commented if that means extending the road, he can understand that it would create the frontage. Mr. Cook comments that he was trying to understand the Watershed Protection District and the mention of storm water improvements. Ms. SantucciRozzi notes Watershed has nothing to do with wetlands and that the Watershed requirements state more than 20% lot coverage would have to include stormwater improvements. Member Eng asks the applicant if he understands this and he responds no – Member Eng asks are you willing to make some improvements that may help. Mr. Cook stated the surveyor designed the foot print that he thought would work, so perhaps we can reduce the footprint to meet requirements. Chairman Harnais suggests this should be brought back for review with staff. There are a lot of moving parts. Member Reynolds cites that there are four variances that the applicant is looking for, and this is an example of many deficiencies. With the lack of frontage, I understand the solution you wanted to use, but we can't give you anything of value. We have never approved a lot with no frontage. Mr. Cook states we didn't understand that we had to extend the roadway to access the lot. Member Mikami notes that you may find that this could be costly. Mr. Cook asks if they find it is cost prohibitive, what are the options to an owner who is paying taxes? What do we do? The Town owns the property next to it, and Chairman Harnais advised him to talk with the Town Administration because the Planning Board does not get involved in the purchase/sale of property. Chairman Harnais suggests that the applicant withdraw without prejudice until you can figure out what you want to do. Mr. Cook agrees and says he will be in touch with staff.

Petition #15-15 - 1431 Washington Street - Patrick Stone

Patrick Stone, applicant, was present and explained the proposed alterations to the one-half story house to include a secondary story to the existing home. Ms. Stickney reviewed the property commenting on the zoning being Residence B and located in both the Watershed Overlay and Floodplain districts. The lot is an irregular shape lot and the front portion of the lot where the house is located was subject to a taking in the past by the State for Route 37. The original site plan did not locate the floodplain or the base flood elevation, but the surveyor has provided it now. It runs directly beneath the deck, which is not habitable space. The construction of the second story may require some work around the rear of the house or possible work with the foundation. She commented he will need to come before the Planning Board for a determination if he is subject to a Special Permit for development in the floodplain. The Applicant is adding a one-car garage over a portion of the structure that has been raised. He will meet the side set-backs for that. Ms. Stickney further provided information on set-backs.

Member Eng comments on the front of the property and the taking by the State by eminent domain for the building of a state road and if it would be considered a hardship. Ms. Stickney commented that some would say yes or no based on the shape of the lot; half of the lot is registered and the other half is unregistered land. However, the real hardship is more with the soils and the floodplain in the rear. The house sits very close to the roadway. Members discussed the setback at the front yard, and Ms. Stickney noted the Building Department provided an old ZBA decision but it appeared to not be recorded on the title of the property.

Member Eng questioned if the appeal in 1950 was approved by the ZBA, and Ms. Stickney said it appears to have been but it was never recorded. June 30, 1950 is not an active document. Mr. Stone said it was not registered. Ms. Stickney noted it is so old you can't even tell what was requested, and it doesn't even tell you what the relief is for. Member Eng asked if he can address all the other issues raised by staff.

Mr. Stone commented that he is not even touching the back, and Ms. Stickney said a plan showing the floodplain, contours and the base elevation is needed for the existing conditions to assure no future change. Mr. Stone said he is going straight over the foundation. Ms. Stickney asked how he would access the rear yard with equipment. Using the plan, he showed it would be along the side. Member Eng asked Mr. Stone if he understood why we are concerned about the floodplain and the drop in elevation and how it gets wetter. Mr. Stone responded yes. Ms. Stickney reminded the members that tonight we are here for a recommendation to the ZBA and that in the future we would be discussing the floodplain once the plans are submitted. She cautioned that any change to the grade within the floodplain area could result in a filing. She recommended a favorable action.

Chairman Harnais talks about the variance from 1950 and subdividing property. Ms. Stickney noted the deed and reference to the registered/unregistered portion of a larger estate lot.

Member Mikami supports staff request for additional plans because as of late we have had a lot grading being performed without authorization. For your safety, for everybody, you should think about including it for future.

Member Reynolds commented that there were a lot of moving parts. He has no problem with the application for the compliance with the dimensional and density regulations, but for the secondary issue of the construction that has to go on around the home, a due diligence perspective with a surveyed plan showing the grading is needed. He would be in favor of granting the variance with an understanding or condition that they will have to come back before the Planning Board to review the grading, and the Planning Board could give you a finding for the best course of action as to a floodplain jurisdiction. Chairman Harnais warned Mr. Stone against any grading occurring. Mr. Stone confirmed that they are not touching the grading.

Member Reynolds **MOTION** for a favorable recommendation on the application for variances with the condition the applicant comes back before the Planning Board for finding and determination relative to the grading requirements; seconded by Member Eng; unanimously voted.

Petition #15-19 – 205 Elm Street/Riverwalk Development LLC – Tom Cavanaugh – Cochato Club

Chairman Robert Harnais left the meeting room – Member Reynold steps in as chair.

Present: Attorney Thomas Cavanaugh & George Clements of Riverwalk LLC

Atty. Cavanaugh stated they are seeking favorable recommendation from the Planning Board for relief from the ZBA. Unrolling a site plan, Attorney Cavanaugh reminded the Planning Board that this is the former Elks building, and the existing structure is located in the front setback currently at 10.5' where it is required at 50'. We are proposing to cut the canopy off the front of the building, which will then be a 23.7' setback. In addition, you can see on the plan we seek relief on the east and west side for the building for proposed dormers that also fall within the 50' setback. Next we are proposing four units to the east of the building that is proposed town houses that we would like to put in that also face the road. We are seeking variance on the front setback for the new building to keep it in line with the existing building. We are seeking continuity between the two buildings, both facing the street where esthetically it looks good.

We are dealing with a serious soil and topography hardship where the grade drops about 10 feet from the street; you have a drastic hill. The soil conditions in the rear of the lot are not buildable, and we have discussed with Conservation Commission to hire a botanist to work with us to mitigate an invasive vegetative species on the hillside. The back Riverview building requires no variances, as it meets all setbacks by right. Also on the lodge we are also seeking a variance as to the building height explaining there is a basement, two livable levels as it stands now and a third uninhabitable level (almost like an attic); we are trying to make the first three levels livable space and the basement will be where the parking will be, so we are seeking a finding. We think the hardships are present on this land, and based on those hardships, we are entitled to a variance as it relates rear and front setbacks.

Ms. SantucciRozzi provided comments related to herself and Kelly Phelan working with Mr. Cavanaugh and Mr. Clements looking at plans on the layout of the buildings. They have worked very diligently to come up with this layout. Initially the applicants had other layouts that had been considered but had even more variances needed and didn't work; however, the applicants were encouraged to preserve the main building. The existing building currently has deficiencies with the front yard setback and exceeds the height. The present height of the building exceeds the limitation now, and the addition of dormers gives the building a more residential feel and creates some livable space on the third floor. The hardships speak for themselves; the topography and the location of the existing structure is really what is dictating how this is going to be laid out. Staff is in support of the project.

Attorney Cavanaugh introduced George Clements to the Planning Board here tonight as well.

Member Joyce clarified so we are really just looking at a recommendation for the front setback. Ms. SantucciRozzi noted she had written the report for variances and findings; this is not an existing or town residential structure afforded protection, and in her discussion with Atty. Cavanaugh the variances are front yard setback and height of existing structure, and it will eventually be a multi-residential unit, so a finding is also need for the alterations to a nonconforming structure.

Member Joyce agreed that it makes sense to have similar frontage across the site and maintain what is there; she no issue with the setback variance or the uses. She questioned the spacing of the development towards the river; regarding the units setback off the from the 12' drive lane, are they setback that distance because of the river or are they are setback to provide parking? Mr. Clements explained that, working with the environmental engineer, we want to set these units back close to the river front. They wanted to set it back and provide a 12' buffer as greenspace, which will help with water infiltration from the roof. With the one way entrance and exit, we needed a 16' foot roadway throughout the site. We also want to accommodate the 2 car garages under the front buildings and the attached two car garages on the rear buildings. The mindset was providing capability of parking behind your garage; this accommodates some additional visitor parking, almost like a private driveway. Ms. Joyce questions as the drive enters the site when it turns it doesn't line up, what is the intention to have them come down to have the 24' plus 16' with the pavement behind and the five individual spaces? Mr. Clements said the concept is permitting the same use as the town houses; the road gets a bit narrower, but when you come down and you extend the road so that vehicles backing out and not into an entering vehicle, there is space and you have the capability of again pulling a car into the garage and parking behind the garage space if needed for additional parking. Member Joyce added given the nature of the site being close to the river, you should consider any opportunity to make these pavement areas take up less space; you should have enough space at the 24' width to get in and out of the perpendicular spaces. Member Joyce asked if is there any proposal for walking trails on the property for residents of the development to see the river? Mr. Clements responded - we value the river front as a tremendous feature and we have been

working with an environmental consultant; we have significant challenges and costs associated with the project. Overtime, there has been some ragweed, which is very invasive, and some Norwegian maples planted. So we are developing a plan, and we are hopeful by the time we get to site plan review we will have more to offer. Attorney Cavanaugh commented the plan is to utilize the area well landscaped. Member Joyce commented she understood you will be back before us in time, but she wanted to share these thoughts in the beginning as considerations to be thinking about now.

Member Mikami confirms with staff there will be a site plan review. He has concerns given it is a prominent spot in Town; there is going to be a lot of eyeballs on it. He asks if these are existing curb cuts on the property. Mr. Clements explains there are four existing curb cuts, and we are eliminating one entry under the portico. For the two on the perimeter, one is existing, and one is new cut. Member Mikami states - when I look at the height, you are not taking the existing roof down at all. The floor then, whether it is 3rd or 4th floor, what is the ceiling height. Mr. Clements states the first floor is 9' ceilings; on the second level, formerly a dance hall, there were 20' ceilings. They are going to capture that 20' height and cut a mezzanine between the two. That will create a vaulted living room with a lofted space on the third level. There is no change to roof line, other than adding dormers. Member Mikami states they will discuss traffic later.

Member Eng commented that when you come back to our Board you need to be prepared to discuss the traffic and tell us it works because you have one way in and out from the site. Member Eng asked if the traffic lights are at the entrance and staff responded no. He continued so you have enter into traffic – have you done any traffic counts to date to show that this one way in and out will work? Mr. Clements responded we are working with traffic engineer; we have information as to traffic counts and site lines, but didn't present that information tonight but will at Site Plan Review. Member Eng comments that it is a nice layout because you have units at the back; however, he agrees with Member Joyce that your greenery needs some help and you need to work on landscaping. Mr. Clements comment that they are dealing with some invasive weeds; for twenty years, nothing has been done back there. It has been neglected; however, we have a new landscaping plan. Member Eng added it appears you have a list of things to address before you come back to make the Town happy. Overall it looks good.

Member Reynolds – only comment is that he agrees with staff as to the uniformity of the setback at the front of the property with the proposed new structures, and you have a preexisting condition with main building. I have no issue with the variance – you are working with what you have – topography is challenging – a text book definition of a hardship issue from a topography position.

Member Eng **MOTION** to move forward with a favorable recommendation; seconded by Member Joyce; unanimously voted (4).

McGourty Companies – 29/39 Hayward Street

Ms. SantucciRozzi asks if anyone is here from the McGourty Company for the Zoning Application. There is no response from the audience – Chairman Harnais comments on what we have done in the past – Ms. SantucciRozzi states “No show No Action” – Ms. SantucciRozzi commented she had contacted their office today and urged someone to be present. Member Eng **MOTION** to move for no action; seconded by Member Reynolds; unanimously vote.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

7:40 PM Public Hearing - 745 Washington Street – Thayer Academy - Grading Permit (File #15-12)

Present on behalf of applicants:

Bill Stephenson – Business Agent, Thayer Academy

Nate Cheal – Engineer, Rizzo Associates

Ms. SantucciRozzi updated the Planning Board of the progress on the application since the last public hearing. Since that time revised plans were submitted; they addressed comments in the staff report. The Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan was submitted, verification of the drainage system was submitted and last Friday I met with Mr. Stephenson and we discussed alternative access of the trucks to have a couple of methods proposed; the staff is in support of one method. Staff was not sure which drawing to access the site from the Central Ave curb cut; it will require temporarily moving an island and curbing within the site. However, staff is of the opinion that it is the best route to get in; it stays away from neighbors of Central Ave and keeps the trucks off Central and Tremont Ave. It's a fair number of vehicles. There is a period when school starts, and they won't be able to use that. They seek permission to unload sod from Tremont Street; it is a different kind of truck - not the intensity. If we do get to a discussion of conditions this evening, I have a couple of notes on a few minor revisions/additions I would like to discuss. Thanks you.

Nate Cheal, Engineer, Rizzo Associates, explains what has been submitted. Revised plans include all of staff's recommendations, which show new fencing, additional sediment controls, and stormwater calculations. The stormwater calculations show the project fields existing drainage to be collected. This also benefits Thayer and the surrounding neighbors where we are gathering all drainage and rerouting it through our drainage system, which actually peaks much later than the parking lots so there is no negative impact from the drainage. The big discussion is the access during construction. In addition to access off Tremont Street, we have come up with two alternatives off of Central Ave; first alternative would be to utilize the curb cut off Central Ave; we come up and swing through existing parking area right next to operation center; it is an extremely tight 11' width. The drawback is it is right at the back yards of the Central Ave neighbors - from our perspective this is the worst condition for the neighbors. The second option, would be to come off same existing curb cut at Central Ave, utilize an existing emergency fire access that comes through this side of the campus, but this would require removal of some flush curbing through an existing island and removal of two small trees. We can bring trucks bringing common fill to come between the Operations Center and south of the Library. In the memo we presented estimates from the contractor of what he needs. He is anticipating about 20 loads a day over 5-6 weeks. That is primarily fill and sand, and then down the road we have the sod, which would come in twice a day on a flatbed for delivery off of Tremont Street.

Member Joyce expressed her approval on the alternative options for access - you mentioned there is fire access route through the campus – She asked the engineer if he had any concerns with the existing drainage and the heavy weight of a truck loaded with stone damaging any of the structures or making it through that area. Nate Cheal assured her the trucks would be fine. Member Joyce states -- so you do think a truck can fit through the lower corner, and Nate Cheal said the simulation shows it can. Member Joyce recognizes those abutters are being affected by the construction operation anyways, and by the truck traffic either option is better than Tremont Street. This would be essentially used for the first six weeks of import and Mr. Cheal concurred. Member Joyce asks -- Why Hobart Ave and not Central Ave? Neal answered it is quicker and closer to the gates we have on campus, and if we come down Central,

we impact neighbors on both sides of the street and along Hobart Ave Thayer is completely on this side of the street, so there is less impact to the neighborhood. Member Joyce commented that Central Ave seems to be a busier road with that type of traffic than Hobart. In addition, she commented with regards to drainage I am all set on the information presented; it is substantial and good.

Member Mikami notes the access is a big issue, so I appreciate that, and I know you are starting at 7AM, and you do have construction fencing to protect the camp. I would also encourage that you not have trucks lined up at 7AM and idling in the neighborhood waiting to be unloaded. Nate Cheal states the Contractor has been made aware of this in documents. Member Mikami's other comment is about the event parking and a discussion with the Thayer administration; there will be a condition added. Nate Cheal commented that the event on the 23rd was a Braintree event – Ms. SantucciRozzi added that when we did the Performing Art Center and the house came down and there were two sections identified for additional temporary parking of events – the current Board was not here for that approval. Nate Cheal, using the plans, shows that they currently have parking over the soccer field and field hockey field during large events—such as graduation or homecoming. Member Mikami comments we are neighbors – we can't have the parking occur in the Town Hall lot. If you have the space, you should use your facilities first – I intend to ask for a condition as such. For every event, you should use your parking areas first. That should be a normal course of business.

Mr. Stephenson commented that Thayer does communicate with the Mayor's office at Town Hall as to the events and potential conflicts, and he cites that it works vice versa, for example the case of the farmer's market. Member Mikami states I plan to put that condition in this grading decision. You have a lot of space, and parking is precious to all of us. We need to take advantage of the resources we both have.

Member Eng questions why the plan's datum is NGVD 29 and has not had a NAVD 88 conversion. Mr. Cheal responded we would have to go through the entire campus at a cost of \$15,000 to \$20,000 to do that. Member Eng and Mr. Cheal discuss bringing it up to the most up-to-date datum – the cost and the extensiveness of the survey. Member Eng asked staff if the Town Engineering Department is going with the new datums now. Staff advised that all the Town topo is in NGVD 29. There is no floodplain here, but the new flood maps are in NAVD 88. We encourage NGVD 29 for the new datum. Staff did ask for it all to be converted. Member Eng encourages the Applicant to look at this again, and when you are back before us next definitively say exactly how much it would cost. Member Eng's other question is could you remind us where all this drainage is heading towards because you have a lot of calculations. Nate Cheal explains all drainage from this part of the campus drain to a 12" pipe under Union Street. Back in 2008 we installed a pipe using directional drilling to tie into the bottom of the hill. This all goes down to the Monatiquot River. Member Eng asks is there a hood to catch any contaminants before they get to the river? Mr. Cheal explains that all the catch basins onsite have those protections. Member Eng refers to 10 year and 25 year storm events – can this system handle a 100 year storm event? Mr. Cheal states the systems in the parking lots are designed to handle a 100 year storm. Member Eng confirmed this is all backed up by the Applicant's calculations.

Member Reynolds thanked Thayer Academy for listening to the Planning Board's concerns for the construction traffic. Member Joyce and Mr. Cheal discuss a 60" tree trunk that is in need of removal, it is pretty distressed and displaying rot. It is to be removed. Member Joyce asks what is the ratio for tree removal. Staff clarified that they are removing five trees and Staff is requiring a replanting of 15 trees. We will evaluate tree location once the construction is over. There are mixed feelings from abutters. Member Reynolds states the third issue from the last meeting was around the 2008 drainage plan. The

question was about the operation and maintenance plan; the applicant had provided a response and a lot of additional information. However, there was no answer to the question about the maintenance records. Was there a log? Mr. Cheal clarified there is not a log – building and grounds staff on-site don't log reports; they do routinely inspect their catch basins. Mr. Cheal suggests that perhaps they could prepare a table that the school could use for the more routine things. Member Reynolds referred to Grading Permit for South Athletic Field on Washington Street. Five years ago, we asked for some additional documentation, and it still has not been provided on the permit. From a due diligence perspective, we want to make sure this is done. Member Reynolds reminds Applicant that there were building permits for the fence and retaining wall. There was mention that Thayer was coordinating with Water and Sewer about setting up running water for bathrooms. We don't have anything in our records; would you be able to provide anything as a courtesy to us to make this a complete picture? Mr. Cheal understands.

Chair Harnais opens discussion to the public for questions or comments.

Tom Chillemi, 81 Central Avenue, offered positive comments about staff and Thayer working together to address the problem of flooding.

Paula Lyons Lafavre - 25-27 Central Ave – I appreciate the recommendation of Ms. SantucciRozzi to move further away from the residents; she mentions that in 2010 her house was struck by lightning and has been rebuilt; since then, Thayer has worked with neighbors to provide screening from what is stored at Operations Center. That will need to be temporarily removed to do the drainage project. She does not want to lose the ground they have gained in plantings behind the wall or that fence where that is a tight opening. We don't want to lose the trees that Thayer Academy has provided as a barrier. She is also concerned about the soft grass underneath there, which is the flooding area from my house, which is the first house down to the end. Those issues go back far longer than 15 years; they go back 20, 30 or 40 years – long before a grading permit was required. Anything that alleviates the water is great. She asks that the 15 trees that are replanted not be small. When they redid landscaping they put some significant trees; she is hoping they will put significant trees back in.

Paul Agnew – 37 Central Ave – He would like to echo Paula's comments. He appreciates the Planning Board asking the questions at the last meeting and staff supplying answers. It sounds like it makes sense, and you are satisfied with the calculations that the outflow can handle all that water coming from the field. Mr. Agnew has a question – what if it doesn't work for a 100 year storm event – what are your contingency plans? By the way, the trees are really important to at least two of the abutters – the size and placement of the trees is important. Member Eng states you can only design it to a reasonable design; you cannot design it so that it encompasses every drop of rain water than comes down. Member Eng references the 2010 storm and states nobody is designing anything that can encompass that. Chair Harnais states the 100 year storm is a lot of water – it is the highest standard, but everything has a limit. Mr. Agnew asked for clarification on the two options on entry from Central Avenue, which Mr. Cheal provides. Staff and Mr. Cheal agree that Option 1 is not an option.

Member Eng **MOTION** to accept the correspondence list from April 28, 2015 through July 14, 2018; seconded by Member Joyce; unanimously voted.

Ms. SantucciRozzi asks for clarification on construction schedule – Week 1 is mobilizing and Weeks 2-7 are the importing weeks. Are those weeks that you would use Central Avenue? Mr. Cheal states "yes". Ms. SantucciRozzi clarified Weeks 8-9-10 are sod delivery, which would be done using Tremont.

Staff provides an explanation on the revisions which include: removing condition 18, 35 referencing truck schedule, condition #32 with revised Operations and Management Plan – log sheet comment to be included, condition #42 – further reference the removal of the island and reestablished, condition 46 clarification of the location of fencing that will be replaced; lastly we talked about using a hydraulic hammer for the rock removal, so we will stipulate that and no blasting. Member Mikami asked that a condition be added for Thayer to use all additional areas for overflow parking. Member Joyce asks if Thayer has a parking map that they can provide to their students, parents and families to see where parking options are on campus. Mr. Stephenson clarifies that there is existing parking but not for special events or overflow events. Thayer has to organize for people to be directed to go in a certain area. That would be a special communication. Member Joyce is envisioning a parking plan that Thayer could provide showing an effort for people to park in designated locations on campus, with the understanding that on Farmer’s Market days Thayer parking is available. Staff remembers that Attorney Marinelli showed two areas that were going to be used for overflow events. This may be related to the Art Center or a ZBA application. Staff asked if something was put down to protect the fields. Mr. Stephenson states they staff for an event to make sure people are sent in the correct direction. Member Mikami states that he is not asking you to ruin your fields – he is just asking for your facilities to be used.

Paula Lyons Lafave asks an additional question regarding the fencing that is being replaced and the trees that are coming down. She just wants to make sure that nothing will happen to the existing stone walls, which is special to a lot of residents on the street. It is a true antique wall. She wants to make sure nothing happens to dismantle the wall. As far as parking goes, she has the best birds-eye-view than any of these gentlemen. She can guarantee that when Thayer has an event, they post security guards at end of the drive-way on the Thayer side. They keep people from parking over in the Town Hall lot. They do put signage out directing people where to park. At the end of school year events, there are people giving direction on where to go. She can guarantee that Thayer is very diligent when they have events. Chair Harnais communication is very important on the parking situation, which should be formulated into a condition. Member Eng asked the Engineer to address the datum conversion with Thayer, and if it costs less than \$5,000 ask them to consider doing it. Member Joyce offers her perspective on datum.

Member Reynolds **MOTION** to close the Public Hearing; seconded by Member Mikami; unanimously voted.

Member Mikami **MOTION** to approve the Grading Permit with the conditions as amended; seconded by Member Eng; unanimously voted.

Request for Extension of Time to Exercise Special Permit Decision
2 Commercial Street, Landing Pub – Harry Sarris, Applicant (PB File #12-02)

Present for the discussion was the applicant, Harry Sarris, owner of the Landing Pub. Ms. Stickney provided the Board with an update on history of the project since the Planning Board’s administrative site approval in 2012 of a ninety five seat restaurant with some retail. She explained that he was provided with an extension a year ago, and he is here again this year requesting an additional extension. There was a fire this past March, and the building had to be demolished per order of the Building Department for public safety reasons. The site currently has no structure on it and he is here now to ask for an extension. In your packet is additional information that Mr. Sarris brought in today.

Member Joyce deferred from any comments.

Member Mikami states obviously we are sorry about what happened to you. He asks can you tell us why you need another extension – what have you accomplished or what progress was made. I haven't really seen anything happening Mr. Sarris reported that we have made a lot progress, we have our financing in place, we got contracts from all the builders, we chose our builder, we were ready to start July 1st which was the first date we could start because of the Planning Board and Conservation Commission decision. Then on March 24th, as you guys know, is when fire occurred; we didn't anticipated a fire. It was tragic lost for us. After that, we did continue to move forward; we did submit our decision with the Registry of Deeds. We did go in front of the Licensing Board today for the approval of outdoor seating, which was a hold up as well. The Mayor approved it. We have cleaned up the site, and we are moving forward as much as we can to keep this project underway. The only thing that is holding us up right now is the insurance company they are still working on this file claim. They have not closed their claim; we cannot move forward until they finish off what they need to do. Once they finish their claim and close their file, the very next day we are ready to go.

Member Mikami followed up – So since the last time you were here and when we talked about the project in the beginning, even post the fire, has anything changed to the design? Mr. Sarris states “no”. Obviously, for those people that drive by they can see the brook – so one of the issues that came up is that would be a heavy cost for you to fix that whole area. Now it is exposed and it is kind of interesting to those of us living near there. It has always been there, and you know there are some people want to daylight it further down and now you have this opportunity. I understand the Mayor had essentially tried to work with you and made an offer for a portion of that property to allow the daylighting and some other benefits to you in terms of handicap access – clearly a much lower risk. Despite the fire and everything, so why not consider that more fully and try to think about how that might work? Mr. Sarris responded that they had consider this, and we went back and forth with the mayor and we had three meetings with the Mayor, went to the architect to ask what it would cost us for revisions. We met with the Bank to see their take on it as far as financing; so we did do our research. The Town's offer was not a significant amount to off-set our cost of what we already have put into this project. The numbers did not work out to off-set to allow the project to move forward.

Member Mikami commented he appreciates that; however, you are going to have some unknown risks and costs moving forward. For example, the walls of the culvert – we don't know the stability of the river – we would want other things examined for safety. Member Mikami states you mentioned before that you had financing, what does that mean? Mr. Sarris states that they worked with the bank and have approvals. Member Mikami asks do you have an actual commitment letter because I am looking at materials here, which says you have nothing. Mr. Sarris asked to get a pre-approval letter, but it is against banking policy. Member Mikami states that clearly for any project financing is critical. If you don't have a commitment letter no financing. That is another risk. If you don't have a commitment letter, you don't have financing. Member Mikami asks -- what is the time table to move forward? When is it going to be resolved? Mr. Sarris advises that he hired a public adjuster to move this faster; the adjuster does not currently have an answer from the insurance company. Member Mikami confirms that basically your plan is going to stay the same. Staff provides information on the process for getting the project started and updating the Planning Board. Member Mikami asks, given the fire, will the Planning Board need to review stability of structure. Staff advises that we will need to go back to structural engineer to make sure no damage to the culvert walls and we can still attest it will support the structure. Mr. Sarris advises that they have actually brought the engineer down to take a look at everything and make sure the plan will work. They assured Mr. Sarris that the plan will work; they are going to sure up the walls to make sure the stability of the walls in intact. Member Mikami advises that the

Planning Board will want confirmation of that. Member Mikami summarizes his position that Planning Board supported the Applicant on this, there was a question on why there were so many delays, and we are still asking that question. Member Mikami is very concerned about the Applicant's financing. He is also concerned about any other unforeseen risk, particularly related to the water and anything else that would add to your cost of the project and then increase your financial burden. There is a lot of stuff going on down there, and obviously your corner is important. That is why weighing the opportunities and the risks is key.

Member Eng confirms that the applicant is asking for a one year extension and states that would depend on how the insurance company treats the Applicant – the longer they take; the longer it may extend the project. Member Eng asks if the Applicant is comfortable with a one year extension. The Applicant states his Public Adjuster assured him it would not take longer than one year. Member Eng confirmed the dates for extension.

Member Reynolds has no questions and supports the extension based on the history. It is a landmark for our community, and Member Reynolds would like to give the Applicant another year to make this thing come together.

Chair Harnais states the Planning Board is taking a chance; he requests that we do some periodic updates – every 60 days come in and let us know where you are. Chair Harnais wants to make sure everything is working in the Landing – don't let a year go by.

Member Eng **MOTION** to approve the one-year extension from 8/18/15 to 8/18/16; seconded by Member Reynolds; unanimously voted.

Mr. Harnais stressed to Mr. Sarris that this has to get going and not wait for the year.

7:50 PM Public Hearing – 459 West Street (Del's Way) – Definitive Subdivision Plan (File #15-01)

Present on behalf of the Applicant:
Robert Hannigan – Engineer
Builder Whitman Homes

Robert Hannigan explains they made revisions to the plan; the main concern was drainage. He discussed the fact that Peer Review did not like their original concept so they made changes to Lot 1; however, discussions are still going on with the Peer Review. Mr. Hannigan described the drainage patterns that exist and what is proposed – we have reduced the subcatchment G – we have created a drainage swale along the easterly side of the property – he explains the drainage pattern to the West Street drainage system. As requested, we have addressed the proposed road profile – we have shown the looped water system with connections to each of the lots. He further discusses the grading and sidewalk proposals. They have eliminated the sidewalk on the west side of Del's Way from the proposal. The erosion control plan remains the same. There is one outlet with stone tracking area for trucks.

Peter Williams for GZA GeoEnvironmental, retained by the Planning Board as the Peer Review Consultant, begins his presentation. Mr. Williams received the revised plans at the end of June; he completed his review and submitted a comment letter on July 6th. They have addressed a number of items, and we are pleased to see a central drain system being provided. Overall there remain a number of significant issues. He is very concerned with the location of an infiltration drainage system, which is

very close to a house on one of the lots. He discusses this further. He is very concerned with how the drainage is being handled, and he feels there is some sort of error with the infiltration, as it is not working out. We need to explore and work out these issues. Overall, Peter Williams is not confident with the drainage design or the location of the infiltration system. There are a number of information requests that have not been submitted.

Melissa SantucciRozzi, Principal Planner, states we have established a really nice pattern on the recent subdivision, and we got to the point where the Peer Review, the Planning Board and the Town was comfortable with the design. Then when I started to look at the waivers, I have yet to do any of that because we are not at that stage quite yet. There has been a list of waivers submitted. I have not reviewed it; I am waiting until the Plan meets the Peer Review Consultant's and the Town Engineer's requirements because things are going to constantly change. The Planner did have a couple of comments – one is related to lot coverage. She had spoken to Whitman Homes at the beginning and reminded them that these lots are watershed lots and are capped at 20% coverage (driveways, decks, patios, houses). The original plan did show over 20%, and she wants to reiterate again that these lots need to be 20% or below. This information should be provided for each of these lots. The other thing, at the first meeting we talked about instituting “no disturb” buffers around the subdivision. Some abutters were looking for not clearing all the way to the property line. The revised plan shows grading in that area. Grading will not be permitted if, in fact, the Board does institute some type of buffers. Going forward, those two considerations should be looked at. In addition, there are some requirements for locations of drainage basins and infiltration basins in the Subdivision Rules and Regulations. To all extent practical, those should be adhered to.

Bob Campbell – 38 Fallon Circle, who is representing the Hayes Family who lives at 71 Fallon Circle, refers to leaving a buffer zone. It is at 162; she is at 150. If you leave that there, she is not getting any relief; she had asked Whitman Homes to take it out. She is below them. We asked for the swale, but putting the swale in along G and H, you would lose vegetation. Mr. Hannigan states it was a trade-off – you have the swale or you have the buffer.

Judy Colletta – Commission on Disabilities – She doesn't know if it is too early to ask for the sidewalks, but we want to make sure that is addressed. Who would be responsible for the sidewalks and curb cuts? Would it be the Town or the builder? Chair Harnais clarifies that we are not at that point yet, but it will certainly come up.

Chair Harnais clarifies, because there is such a separation between the engineer/applicant and the Peer Review Consultant do we want them to work together more or ask questions?

Member Joyce has a couple of questions. On the existing conditions survey mapping, you note that the boundary survey was from a record drawing and the topo was the from the Town's GIS. Was there actually an instrument survey with topography done prior to this project or is this plan a compilation of information? Mr. Hannigan advises that the plotting plan was based upon the boundary survey that was done and recorded at the Registry of Deeds by field resources for the ZBA. Doing an additional boundary survey seemed to be reinventing the wheel. The topography that was presented to ZBA was Town topography; that was all part of the package. Member Joyce asks -- How did the topography get put onto that plan if not done by instrument survey? Mr. Hannigan advises -- It was part of the package for ZBA from field resources. Member Joyce asks how did they put the topo on the plan – was it scaled on? Member Joyce clarified, you can look at the Town's data on Assessor's Maps, but what ties that information? Mr. Hannigan can't specifically answer that, but he imagines it was overlaid. There are

significant structures that they could relate that to. Member Joyce asks -- as a Professional Engineer, how confident are you that the topography is accurate to 6 inches on this site? Mr. Hannigan advises he field checked the CL of Del's Way and it matched the topography. Member Joyce asked what Mr. Hannigan did when he field checked it. Mr. Hannigan clarified that using a Total Station it was plus or minus less than ½ foot. Member Joyce's concern is, when you tie into the West Street structures, you don't have exact elevations. She is concerned we may not be accurately seeing the intricacies of the topo slopes, which ties into the waivers requested. We need to have that discussion – will you get more specific information on the topo? Mr. Hannigan states that he will get additional “spot shots” just to confirm the proposed connection into Del's Way matches up.

Member Joyce continues, touching on the limits of disturbance, looking at the grading plan, she feels the grading limits that are outlined on the erosion control plan, would be the grading limits for the road. She confirms that the builder is going to build the road and then go in and build the house lots. Mr. Hannigan confirms that they would do the swale at the same time they do the road. Member Joyce thinks they should see an erosion control plan that depicts the phasing of construction; she discusses the contours being tied in closer. She imagines it would be beneficial for the abutters to have as much privacy as possible. Mr. Hannigan states the rational was to maximize the driveway and building foundation – individual grading permits for each lot. Member Joyce confirms that it would be good to understand the grading plan is more for roadway construction than the lots with some note regarding a typical house layout. Member Joyce asks what is the cut of the roadway at the cul-de-sac – how deep are you cutting the grade? Mr. Hannigan states from memory it is about 4 to 4.5 feet. Mr. Hannigan states there are two reasons to cut the road in this manner: (1) the builder prefers to have the house perched; (2) you would be increasing that slope from 5% to 7%. Member Joyce asks if there is lighting proposed. Mr. Hannigan highlights on the plan where lighting is located. Member Joyce asks -- is there any concern for site distances at the entrance? Mr. Hannigan says it is excellent. Member Joyce's biggest concern is to see the existing conditions plan stamped by a professional land surveyor with the elevations surveyed on the plan, as well as addressing the concerns of the Peer Review Consultant. Mr. Hannigan states that at an earlier meeting Member Joyce requested additional information on Eleanor Drive – it is a high point – the road drains toward Fallon and down towards Burton. Member Joyce refers to the swale being built on the east side and coming down between those properties. She is concerned about what happens where this swale is right next to 435 West Street; it looks like the natural contours are bringing it onto 435 West Street on the Existing Conditions Plan. Member Joyce suggests that builder verify that swale is not going not on to the 435 West Street. Mr. Hannigan said he did go out during a rain storm and watched the drainage – there is a stone wall along the lot line– it did not appear that there was any disturbance in the vegetation. Member Joyce states this should be added to the Existing Conditions Plan. Member Joyce looks forward to seeing the responses to the Peer Review comments.

Member Mikami asks can you point out which lots are the most challenging from a drainage standpoint. Mr. Hannigan states you have to look at each individual lot. Member Mikami asks Peter Williams is asked if we took a blank slate to redo this piece of property, given what you have seen so far, – would you have laid it out like this? Peter Williams said he would have had a separate lot for drainage – this is going to be the primary issue with this subdivision. Member Mikami states we will look forward to your comments, Mr. Williams.

Member Eng – going to the datum issue again – he refers to waiver NAD83 for horizontal and NAV88 for vertical control. He suggests engineer check that out. Member Eng refers Lot 1 to having the recharge, if not there where would you put it? Mr. Hannigan states it seems to be a logical place for it and explains

why. Richard Whittington, Builder, if we need additional distance between the house and the infiltration system, could we reduce the footprint? Mr. Hannigan states he could look at that.

Member Reynolds states he has no additional questions and agrees to wait for the responses to the Peer Review comments.

Richard Whittington, President of Whitman Homes and the registered agent for the Owner/Applicant, states it seems we are at a point to look at technical merits and hopefully we have addressed the public concerns. What we are hoping to do, because of the pending deadline with the variance, is close the public hearing and work on these technical merits to get this thing going. Chair Harnais is very uncomfortable doing that because there are so many different issues – members expressed agreement. Chair Harnais states it is not something Planning Board has done; we only close public hearing when everything is done.

Member Reynolds refers to best practices for subdivisions and comments with the White's Hill subdivision what he felt worked with the waivers was being able to see how the plan was laid out – I would be prepared if the questions were answered to the staff's and Peer Review and the Applicant's Engineer's agreement – I would have a level of comfort to discuss the waivers. Melissa SantucciRozzi, Principal Planner, comments that there were 2 months between the last hearing and this hearing, while we have a filing deadline, the Applicant filed right on that day; they waited until the last possible date. That gave Peter Williams two weeks to do his review, which he expedited. If you are looking for more back and forth between now and the next meeting, don't wait that full time to file. File in advance of the deadline so that staff and Peer Review have an opportunity to review. Delpico wants to know the dates when filings are due; Member Mikami states the dates are on Public Record. Chair Harnais states the Planning Board has a hearing and if they don't have time to digest and know what is in the plans because they get them the day before that doesn't work. There is a tremendous demand on Planning Department now, and Planning Department is understaffed. If you are going to deliver something a week ahead of meeting, that is your decision, but we cannot tell you that it will be analyzed.

Chair Harnais wants to make it clear that the Applicant was before the Planning Board previously and it was delayed 2 months or more because the Applicant didn't want to do a Peer Review and had conflicts. You can see this in the video. The applicant states – if you want the ANR you will get that. The Engineer adds comments about working with Peer Review. Chair Harnais is confident that the Engineer and Peer Review can work it out, but he thinks there are other issues that are hindering you from being able to work it out.

Staff provides suggestion for date of continued public hearing and states she welcomes things coming in early.

Member Reynolds **MOTION** to continue the Public Hearing to September 8th at 7:45pm; seconded by Member Mikami; unanimously voted.

Bregoli Lane - Definitive Subdivision (File #02-03) – Request for Lot Release

Ronald Bregoli, Applicant

Carl Johnson, Attorney for the Applicant

Attorney Carl Johnson states that staff has submitted a recommendation, based upon the fact that there is a bond in place. The request is for 3 lots to be released (Lots 4, 5 and 6 at Bregoli Lane). The Town Engineer has verified that the amount of bond is sufficient. Staff agrees that Attorney Johnson pretty much summarized it; the Planning Department is in favor of this; they have verified the bond; there was an issue of trailers, which Mr. Bregoli is going to remove this month. There is a Braintree builder purchasing two of the lots, and Mr. Bregoli is going to build on the last one. There are no questions from board members.

Member Reynolds **MOTION** to approve the Request for Lot Release; seconded by Member Eng; unanimously voted.

Chair Harnais steps out of meeting.

9:45 PM Public Hearing – 429-445 Quincy Avenue – Site Plan Review (File #15-07)

Applicant: K. Spillane LLC, Harry White LLC and Bookshe llc, Daniel Quirk, Manager

Mark Kopchelle- Landscape Architect

Jim Burke – Project Engineer, Decelle & Burke

Frank Marinelli - Attorney

Member Eng **MOTION** to accept the correspondence list through July 13, 2015; seconded by Member Mikami; unanimously voted 4:0:0.

Melissa SantucciRozzi, Principal Planner, reports on the updates since the last meeting; there has been a Traffic Report submitted in final format – site line information on curb cuts need more information – Ms. SantucciRozzi discusses grading -- lighting will be adjusted onsite -- the drainage system consists of your typical catch basin system and she explains how it is routed. She discussed with Attorney Marinelli providing a narrative on how the site will work – pedestrian access, where the employees will park and customers will park – the entire area is laid out 9 x 18 parking spaces. The landscaping plan has been perfected; however, we need the species and the quantities. Staff has asked them to pay particular attention to the frontage on Quincy Avenue and dressing up the curb cut with different species – it is a wonderful opportunity to improve the properties. There are some questions in the Staff Report, none are major issues or concerns. It is just – fine tune the drawings.

Attorney Marinelli begins his overview – he fully supports the explanation of the project by the Principal Planner, which is an excellent summary of the proposal. The proposal is to construct an approximate 53,000 square foot new car dealership; there will also be a 5000 square foot mezzanine. The entire development is about 58,000 square feet on 13.3 acres. Attorney Marinelli, using boards and pictures, showed the existing site conditions, grading permit improvements. Mr. Quirk has been based in Braintree for almost 40 years – since 1977 he has grown the Quirk car companies to 11 dealerships and he employs over 1000 people. Mr. Quirk and his companies have been a good corporate citizen for Braintree; he has been involved in many community and charitable undertakings through the years. When Mr. Quirk purchased the Quincy Shipyard, which is approximately 112 acres—about 40 acres in Braintree, that was 2003. At that time, he also purchased the land across Hill Avenue on the southerly

side, 13 acres – comprised of 23 smaller lots – consolidated into 3 larger lots. In 2007, he acquired some lots along Quincy Avenue. As of January 2015, showing a plan everything in green is the Quirk property. There was an ANR plan which consolidated all of the acres into the 3 lots owned by the applicant – two storage lots and then the dealership lot, which is over 5 acres. That is the current status of the property. It is a nice, clean plan. As you remember, in 2012 Quirk took over the Filbottes Junk Yard – now we have this commercial highway business. This is a use-by-right, highway business zone property. Clean Harbors is to the east, Quincy shipyard is to the north, Citgo to the south, and Quirk Chevy to the West. Everything they have done has been an improvement. He further discusses the drainage and how landscaping will help.

Using the landscaping plan, they met with staff on July 7th. It was suggested they use more landscaping appeal to the Quincy Avenue side. Attorney Marinelli feels it will be a very generous landscaping plan compared to what is there now. The open space is at about 33%, which is 8% more than required in Highway Business zone. Architectural plan that shows a generic plan with the facility – that is similar to Quirk Nissan in Quincy – the floor plan shows the 20 service bays, the parts department, and the showroom. We have about 840 parking spaces on site. Attorney Marinelli discusses parking options. We have a class I license storage license – it is a use by right – they are seeking approval of the dealership. Attorney Marinelli mentions that there was a meeting with Dan Delasky, Traffic Engineer, who could not be here. Attorney Marinelli reads from the traffic report conclusion – Patten Ave is a public way – car carriers come in through the main gate via Quincy Avenue or Hill Avenue through the guard shack gate. The guard shack gate lines up with Columbia. The processing of the new cars would be done in the shipyard property – Attorney Marinelli tells you how it will be operated – the main entrance is parallel with the former Quintree Mall – Quirk dealership. Attorney Marinelli states that is the narrative on the way the dealership would function – he feels they have addressed all the points of the staff report.

Chrystal Evans – member of Commission on Disability – she is curious about the street along Quincy Avenue and whether there are actual sidewalks and curb cuts – especially regarding the entry way. Jim Burke, Project Engineer, states they will have ramps that are straight and in line. They will be able to maintain the sidewalk elevation, and they will come up level and grade into the lot.

Member Joyce asks if there is access from Quincy Avenue as a pedestrian into the lot of the dealership – Mr. Burke states Patten Ave has no sidewalks – no curbing – there is no pedestrian access proposed to the dealership. There is handicap accessibility into the building itself – if you are moving around the site, you would be escorted by a sales agent. Member Joyce asks if there could be an island – on the left side of the driveway with a sidewalk. Mr. Burke states it is a matter of the alignment, but it may be possible. Member Joyce asks what has changed since the original grading plan. Staff explains that the original application (File #13-02) was the grading but did not authorize paving. There were swales at the bottom of the slope. The Major Modification asked permission to pave all of this to use it for storage, which was approved but it was never built out. There is a slight revision of the drainage based on the installation of the building – this project is subject to a MEPA filing. According to Attorney Marinelli and Mr. Burke, they received an approval certificate – project modification with the dealership. Jim Burke explained the drainage system goes in first, then paving. He further explains the drainage catchment areas and the system in response to Member Joyce's request. There is no drainage on Hill Avenue; he explains the storm water system in the general area. Member Joyce states the existing conditions plan shows a chunk of ledge. Mr. Burke confirms there is a ledge that would be removed – a rock crusher will be used on the site; he estimates about 8000 yards of structural stone to be used on site. There is a 1500 net cut with the site. Mr. Burke states they are not proposing grading Patton Avenue at all. Mr. Burke shows the existing waterline on Quincy Avenue that will be tied into the new

waterline to the site. Member Joyce asks how tall is the retaining wall – Mr. Burke advises it ranges from 4-6 feet on the retaining wall. There will be a guard rail.

Member Mikami mentions, when we did the last grading permit, we talked about car carriers. Have any car carriers gone up Hill Avenue; Attorney Marinelli advises to go to the shipyard location they use Hill Avenue – the guard shack is built and staffed. Member Mikami makes a quick comment on traffic; it is primary auto sales, even though you will have service; does the number include service? Mr. Burke states it was a discussion with the traffic engineer; the traffic engineer asked if we had a similar situation since the ITE are not good relative to this type of use for sales and services. They do for Quirk Nissan, Volkswagen and Jeep. The Traffic Engineer did a linear regression calculation that established traffic counts. Member Mikami asks has the lighting been turned on yet, has it been tested? Mr. Burke states yes, it is on – there are no further complaints – the original lighting plan was a little bright– it has been adjusted – it is the same lighting intensities as the grading plan. Member Mikami asks to talk a little bit about the sign strategy – potential location, what is going on the buildings and how many signs? Mr. Burke states there will be one pedestal sign similar to the sign across the street. Attorney Marinelli discusses variances in other communities; the manufacturer controls the signage, and if we need relief we will follow the necessary steps and may be back before the Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals. Member Mikami and Attorney Marinelli discuss the sign on the building. Member Mikami mentions that regarding landscaping, we are trying to make Quincy Avenue look better. Is the landscape strategy the same for both facilities? It looks like a lot of your effort is towards the building and not the street.

Mark Kopchelle – MKA Landscape Architects –states there are three goals of the landscape design. One is to reduce the overwhelming size of the site; the second is to provide screening for massive amounts of parking; the third is to enhance the site visually. He then highlights landscaping strategy on the plan. Mr. Kopchelle doesn't think they have to make the parking a display for the dealership. Member Mikami asks will Quincy Avenue look better. Mr. Kopchelle confirms it will look better.

Member Eng states this is an excellent project – it will provide the site with a huge and fabulous facelift. It looks like there will be an improvement to the corridor. Member Eng asks if they have ever had a mezzanine in dealerships before. Attorney Marinelli confirmed that they have had a mezzanine where Mr. Quirk's office is. It is often a place where there is a conference room for dealership personnel. It is a feature of any state-of-the-art dealership now. Member Eng mentions the questions prepared by staff and asks if there were any issues in responding. Attorney Marinelli knows that Jim Burke will answer the engineering matters before the next meeting. Mr. Marinelli feels there are no deal-breakers; however, he wants to call attention to his concern with limiting the truck restrictions, as a condition. He would like to work with the staff, also in connection with the proposed paving of Patten Ave, which they said they would pave in good faith. However, they don't want to pave a road and not be able to use it. They are not going to use a road that doesn't have appropriate grade for car carriers.

Member Reynolds has no further questions. He agrees with the comment that this will be a great addition and improvement to Quincy Avenue and the whole corridor.

Attorney Marinelli asks if there could be draft conditions for the next hearing. Member Reynolds has no problem with that.

There is a minor discussion and clarification between Member Joyce, Mr. Burke and staff regarding the site lines, stop sign on the site, curb cuts and easement.

Member Eng **MOTION** to continue public hearing to September 8th at 8:30 PM with draft conditions; seconded by Member Mikami; unanimously voted 4:0:0.

Chair Harnais returns to the meeting.

10:40 PM Public Hearing - Billboard Special Permit/Site Plan Review – 290 Wood Road – Total Outdoor (PB File #15-08)

Chair Harnais states that he has received a letter requesting that the Public Hearing for 290 Wood Road be continued – 290 Wood Road was on the Agenda for tonight and 236-240 Wood Road is on the Agenda for the August Meeting. Staff clarifies that we can only continue the Public Hearing for the application scheduled for tonight's meeting. We need to wait until the August Meeting to continue the application scheduled for that meeting. Chair Harnais requests that he receive a letter from the Applicant related to continuing the Public Hearing for 236-240 Wood Road, which is currently scheduled for the August Meeting.

Chair Harnais clarifies that the decision will be made after the Planning Board hears from all parties, and all parties will be present for the decision.

Member Reynolds **MOTION** to continue the public hearing to August 18, 2016 at 7:50 PM; seconded by Member Mikami; unanimously voted 5:0:0.

10:50 PM Billboard Special Permit/Site Plan Review – 340 Wood Road – Lamar Central Outdoor LLC (PB File #15-09)

Member Reynolds **MOTION** to continue the public hearing to September 8, 2015 at 9:00 PM; seconded by Member Mikami; unanimously voted 5:0:0.

Staff discusses a second hearing for the month of September on September 29th. Planning Board Members are in agreement.

Member Reynolds **MOTION** to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Member Mikami; unanimously voted.

The meeting adjourned at 10:55 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine Stickney