

**Planning Board**

**Worcester, Massachusetts**

**Thursday, November 19, 1970  
11:30 A. M. - Room 209**

**Agenda**

**11:30 A. M. - Room 209 City Hall**

- 1. call to order**
- 2. Goldthwaite Road - more than one building**
- 3. plans to be ratified**
- 4. date of next meeting**
- 5. any other business**
- 6. adjournment**

*Board*

The meeting of the Worcester Planning ~~Department~~ came to order at 11:30 A.M., on Thursday, November 19, 1970, in Room 209, City Hall.

Members present were Frederic R. Butler, Carl H. Koontz and Carlton B. Payson. Others present were Charles A. Abdella, Gerard F. McNeil, Francis J. Donahue, Alexander A. Pridotkas, and Douglas L. Liston.

Goldthwaite Road - more than one building. Mr. Donahue reported that the state had required an 18" pipe because the drainage area called for an 18" pipe. He said that the 12" pipe in Goldthwaite Road should eventually be replaced by a larger pipe. He said that Commissioner Hynes had required an 18" pipe previous to the application to the State Department of Natural Resources. He said that the pipe in the street would have to be the responsibility of the city.

Mr. Liston pointed out that the city would probably never replace the 12" pipe, but that he envisioned no flooding problem.

Mr. McNeil said that the plan had been tentatively approved with an 18" pipe and a fence on top of the retaining wall.

Attorney Abdella said that the Board could require a fence for safety reasons. Mr. McNeil suggested that the possibility of surcharge from the 12" pipe remained. Mr. Liston explained that the state's drainage calculations were based on a 10 year storm, a 2" rain, and an 80% runoff. He said that the problem was the city's calculations based on a 2 year storm, a 1" rain, and a 50% runoff. He said that most of the city's storm lines were 12" pipes.

Mr. McNeil suggested that approval of the development be accompanied by a report and recommendations to the City Council on this and similar problems.

Mr. Koontz pointed out that the main question involved was the responsibility of the city in this matter. He said that there would be a definite backup problem, that the 18" pipe fall would be the equivalent of three 12" pipes, and that the catch basins in the street would back up.

Mr. Liston pointed out that the problem was city-wide. He said that if the 12" pipe were changed, the 24" pipe in Lincoln Street would not be adequate for an 18" pipe.

Mr. Koontz asked Attorney Abdella what the Board's responsibility in the matter was.

Attorney Abdella replied that the Board should make the city aware of the potential sewage problem. He pointed out that the city's housing problem was just as crucial, and the Board should make these facts known.

Mr. McNeil asked if the Board could require the development to be reduced so that a 12" pipe would be sufficient.

Mr. Liston pointed out that the problem was not caused or aggravated by the development of housing that the problem existed independent of any development in the area.

Mr. Koontz pointed out that the Board should make the issue known to the city, and he agreed that the development would not materially aggravate the present problem. He suggested that a 4-foot fence on any section of the retaining wall over 3 feet in height be required.

Mr. Payson suggested that the Board send a separate letter to the Commissioner of Public Works stating the Board's reluctance to approve an 18" pipe into a 12" main and that the 12" main was inadequate. He suggested that Commissioner Hynes and City Manager McGrath be invited to the next meeting to discuss the problem.

Mr. Liston suggested that drainage calculations be required in the future.

Mr. Koontz made a motion that the definitive plan be approved subject to the requirement of a fence on the retaining wall and revised parking plan.

Mr. Butler seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 3-0 vote.

Date of next meeting. The date of the next meeting was set for December 9, 1970.

Any other business.

Memo from City Manager. Mr. Donahue reported that the Board had received a memo from the City Manager relative to access on Mary Jane Circle. He said that Francis Madigan had complained that uncovered manholes blocked access to his home. Mr. Donahue explained that Mary Jane Circle was on Hancock Hill and that Mr. Moosey was the developer. He said that Austin Keane, Attorney for the developer, said that the hole was due to a broken electric cable. He said that the contract had been drawn up to do the base coat of the road and that it should be completed soon.

Mr. Payson suggested that Mr. Moosey could request use of the bond to do the immediate work.

Mr. McNeil pointed out that the work might not be able to be done this fall.

Mr. Koontz pointed out that the Board had approved the subdivision and extended the bond, and that the Board could do nothing beyond the Subdivision Regulations. Mr. Payson suggested that the Manager be so informed, and that the developer be requested to do something about the problem.

Mr. Donahue said that Amorello had been contracted and was supposedly ready to go. Mr. Payson suggested that the Board suggest to the Manager use of the bond by the city, at the request of the developer, to complete the work.

Mr. Donahue suggested that the Department confer with Mr. Moosey and attempt to arrange a solution.

The meeting adjourned at 12:10 P. M.