

Planning Board
Worcester, Massachusetts
3:00 P. M., City Hall
Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Agenda

3:00 P. M. - View

1. Plantation Street at Franklin Street - zone change
2. Miscoe Estates Sect II - subdivision approval

4:00 P. M. - Regular Meeting - Room 209, City Hall

1. call to order
2. minutes of November 19, 1970, December 9, 1970, January 6, 1971, January 27, 1971, February 17, 1971, and February 24, 1971.
3. Heard Street bridge - petition to widen
4. Emile Street - alter layout - on the table
5. Stratton Road - make public
6. Hancock Farms - bond reduction
7. Emerson Street - priority
8. Mohawk Avenue - "
9. Lochwan Avenue - "
10. Sewer priority system - revision
11. Discussion re: off-street parking zoning amendments
12. Plans to be ratified
13. Date of next meeting
14. Any other business
15. recess

5:30 P. M. - Dinner at Putnam and Thurston's Restaurant.

7:30 P. M. - Public Hearings - Council Chamber, City Hall

1. Grafton Street at Pine Hill Road - petition to change zone
2. Miscoe Estates Sect II - subdivision approval
3. Plantation Street - petition to change zone

8:30 P. M. - Regular Meeting - Room 209, City Hall

1. Call to order
2. Items of public hearing
3. Adjournment

✓

The Planning Board met on Wednesday, March 10, 1971, in Room 209, City Hall.

Members present were: Carlton B. Payson, Lloyd Anderson, Frederic R. Butler, and Philip A. Segel. Professor Carl H. Koontz arrived later. Others present were: Gerard F. McNeil, Francis J. Donahue, John J. Reney, and Alexander A. Pridotkas. Attorney Charles A. Abdella arrived later.

The Board viewed the following:

1. Plantation Street at Franklin Street - zone change
2. Miscoe Estates Sect II - subdivision approval

Mr. Payson called the meeting to order at 4:00 P. M.

Minutes of November 19, 1970, December 9, 1970, January 6, 1971, January 27, 1971, February 17, 1971 and February 24, 1971.

Mr. Butler moved that the minutes be approved. Mr. Segel seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 4-0 vote.

Heard Street bridge - petition to widen. Mr. Reney reported that the Heard Street bridge was being taken care of under the Chapter 90 program. He said that the bridge was to be designed this year and would be under construction in 1972.

Emile Street - alter layout - on the table. Mr. McNeil read the letter dated February 4, 1971, from Charles A. Abdella. Mr. McNeil suggested to hold this item until Mr. Abdella's arrival so that the Board could discuss Emile Street with Mr. Abdella.

Stratton Road - make public. Mr. Donahue explained that the bond had been released and suggested that it be recommended to the Council that Stratton Road be made public. Mr. Anderson so moved. Mr. Butler seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 4-0 vote.

Hancock Farms - bond reduction. Mr. Donahue reported that the bond was presently \$48,600. and that Mr. Hynes recommended the bond be reduced to \$28,600.

Mr. Segel moved that the bond be reduced to \$28,600. Mr. Butler seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 4-0 vote.

Emerson Street - priority. Mr. Donahue reported that Section A of Emerson Street and Section C of Minots Street did not have sewers and suggested these Sections be given a no. 5 priority. He said that Section B was the only Section that had sewers and suggested they be given a No. 2 priority.

Mr. McNeil asked if all the lots which front on Emerson Street were part of the frontage on Benedict Street and therefore are hitched up to a sewer. Mr. Donahue replied that they were not.

Mr. Anderson moved to give the entire length of Emerson Street a No. 5 priority. Mr. Butler seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 4-0 vote.

Mohawk Avenue - priority. Mr. Donahue explained that there had been previous petitions filed on Mohawk Avenue and reviewed them. He said that the petition in 1969 was filed by a different person and that Mohawk Avenue was given a No. 5 priority. He said that the Board then recommended to the Public Works Committee that Mohawk Avenue be handled as a No. 2 priority because Mohawk Avenue was only 30 feet wide and could not be made any wider. He also said that the petition filed in 1969 was still before the Public Works Committee and that the Public Works Committee had never held a public hearing on the petition.

Mr. Anderson moved to refer the petition to the Public Works Committee and state that the Board had already given their recommendations and it had never been acted upon. Mr. Butler seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 4-0 vote.

Lochwan Avenue - priority. Mr. Donahue reported that the section from Ballard Street to Gibbs Street had sewers and recommended this section be given a No. 2 priority, and suggested that the rest of Lochwan Avenue be given a No. 5 priority. Mr. Anderson so moved. Mr. Butler seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 4-0 vote.

Sewer priority system - revision. Mr. Donahue explained that Mr. McNeil sent a recommendation to Mr. Hynes in January of 1970 to change the methods of determining sewer priorities. Mr. Donahue explained the recommendation to the Board and said that instead of sewer priority based on the total construction cost divided by the number of buildings, that the equation be changed to the cost of sewer construction divided by the number of dwelling units to be served. He said that Mr. Hynes suggested a criteria be established for streets where large frontages of individual properties increase the cost per dwelling unit with a corresponding lower priority. Mr. Donahue said that the Planning Department looked into this and could not figure out any way of doing this. He recommended the new method of determining priorities for sewers.

Mr. Payson suggested that Mr. Hynes be asked for suggestions on changing the method of rating sewer priorities. It was agreed that this would be done.

Discussion Re: off-street parking zoning amendments. Mr. McNeil read the changes recommended by the Board at the last meeting. Discussion followed. The Planning Board suggested that the Planning Director submit the proposed changes to the City Council, on behalf of the Board.

Plans to be ratified. Mr. Anderson moved that the following plans be ratified:

- #1448 - plan of land on West Boylston Street, owned by Abran G. Bigelow Estate, signed 2/1/71.
- #1449 - plan of land on Lovell Street, owned by Earl V. & Mary T. Atchue, signed 2/11/71.
- #1450 - plan of land at Mill Street and Gates Lane, owned by Edith E. Lebel, signed 2/17/71.
- #1451 - plan of land at Marion Avenue and Providence Street, owned by The St. Vincent Hospital, signed 2/19/71.
- #1452 - plan of land on Moreland Street, owned by Joseph A. Reney, et ali, signed 2/19/71.
- #1453 - plan of land on Trenton Street, owned by Stephen S. & Adeline Bulejcik, signed 2/19/71.
- #1454 - plan of land on Flagg Street, owned by George & Anna K. Starros, signed 2/23/71.
- #1455 - plan of land on Cambridge Street, owned by Nicholas & Mary L. Pellegrini, signed 3/10/71
- #1456 - plan of land on Southbridge, Madison & New Salem Streets, owned by City of Worcester, signed 3/10/71.

Mr. Segel seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 4-0 vote.

Date of next meeting. The date of the next Planning Board meeting was set for March 31, 1971.

Any other business - Mr. McNeil reported that the City Council, on February 16, ordered that the Planning Board was hereby requested to report on the status of the cannons on the Common. Mr. McNeil reported to the Board that on September 8, 1970, there was an order from the City Council that the Civil War cannons be restored to the Civil War monument on the Common. Mr. McNeil read his reply to the City Manager. He said that drilling would be needed. He said it was anticipated that the cannons be placed in the front of City Hall.

Mr. Payson suggested that the Board report to the City Manager that the Planning Board agreed with the correspondence from Mr. McNeil. Mr. Anderson made a motion that because of the raising of Front Street which necessitated the covering up of the base foundation of the Civil War monument on the Common that the cannons can not be placed on the monument on the new grade because of the requirement of drilling the monument for attachments which would require more concrete work at the base and that placement of the cannons, at this point, would destroy the aesthetics of the monument itself.

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

The Board recessed at 5:30 P. M. for dinner at Putnam and Thurston's Restaurant.

The Board met for its public hearings at 7:30 P. M. in the Council Chamber, City Hall.

Plantation Street - petition to change zone. Mr. Payson read the notice of hearing. He then asked for those in favor of the petition. Mr. Richard A. Bonofiglio of 9 Benedict Road stated that he was representing his family who owned property on Emerson Street and Cameron Street and said that he was in favor of the petition.

Mr. Ralph J. Aktarian of 2 Emerson Street asked when the zone was changed. He said that he was not notified.

Mr. McNeil said that in 1963 the entire city was changed and that neighborhood meetings were held and that the meetings were well advertised.

Mr. Bonofiglio said that he could not see why there was a change from residential to business. He said that he did attend the meeting held in 1963 but misunderstood the change in the zone. He said that there was no intention of using the area for business.

Mr. Stephen A. Grasseschi of 694 Franklin Street said that he wanted to avoid any expansion of business in this area.

Mr. Bonofiglio said that the majority of the residents in this area were in favor of the petition.

Mr. George W. LaConte of 276 Plantation Street said that the people should investigate to see what zone their property is in. He said that 50% of the residents were in favor of leaving the zone as is.

Mr. LaConte said that he did not believe that the petition to change the zone was to help the city. He said that the people were apt to let the houses run down. He also said that there was not enough land for business.

Mr. Anderson asked Mr. LaConte if he would rather have the zone residential than have a spa with kids hanging around.

Mr. LaConte said that if there were a business there that there would probably be more police in the area.

Mr. Vincent F. Maiorano of 620 Franklin Street said that he was representing the owner of the Fish & Chip Store in the area and that he was in favor of leaving the zone as is. He said that the owner was willing to compromise.

Mr. Payson asked if there were any others opposed to the petition. There was no response. Mr. Payson declared the hearing to be closed. Grafton Street at Pine Hill Road - petition to change zone. Mr. Payson read the notice of hearing. Mr. Payson asked for those in favor of the petition.

Attorney Herman J. Dumas of 339 Main Street said that he was representing Mr. Thomas the petitioner. He said that Mr. Thomas was asking that all the land owned by Gateway Realty be transferred to a business use. He said that the change of the land would result in a great increase in tax income. He said that the land was now fallow. Mr. Payson said that this petition had come before the Board before and asked Mr. Dumas if there was anything different.

Mr. Dumas said that there was no difference but there was a change in the surrounding area. He said there was an increase in business. He said that there was one objector.

Mr. Thomas of 3 Sunrise Avenue said that he was in favor of the petition. He said that he only had a 200 foot depth.

Mr. Segel asked how much land Mr. Thomas owned. Mr. Thomas replied that he owned all the land there, about 10 acres.

Mr. McNeil asked what the acreage was that Mr. Thomas wanted changed. Mr. Thomas replied that he wanted 10 acres changed and that he owned the 10 acres.

Mr. Payson asked if there were any opposed to the petition. There was no response. Mr. Payson declared the hearing to be closed.

Miscoe Estates Sect II - subdivision approval. Mr. Payson read the notice of hearing. Mr. Payson read a letter from the Health Department stating that they could not make the necessary examination

because the area was covered by snow. The letter also stated that the Health Department was denying approval of the subdivision because of weather conditions. Mr. Payson explained that without the Health Department's approval it would be impossible for the Planning Board to make a decision. The Health Department suggested that application be made early in April 1971, for the necessary approval.

Mr. Louis A. Fantasia of 370 Massasoit Road said that he was paying men and did not want to wait until April.

Mr. Payson asked Mr. Abdella if the Board could approve the subdivision subject to the approval of the Health Department.

Mr. Payson explained to Mr. McNeil that unless this was cleared with the Health Department that there was nothing the Board could do.

Mr. McNeil suggested that the Board give leave to withdraw and have the subdivision resubmitted on April 1st. He said that the Board would then be able to take the subdivision up at a meeting three weeks from that date and by that time, Mr. Fantasia could get the approval.

Mr. Fantasia said that he could clear the subdivision area so that it could be examined.

Mr. Anderson asked if the hearing could be closed and the item tabled so that Mr. Fantasia could have an opportunity to go before the Board of Public Health and straighten it out.

Attorney Abdella said that this could be done on special request by the petitioner.

Mr. McNeil said that Mr. Fantasia should, in writing, request an extension and give up his right of appeal of the Board's decision.

He said that this would allow the Board of Health to make the necessary examination at the earliest possible time.

Mr. Payson declared the hearing to be closed.

Regular Meeting - Grafton Street at Pine Hill Road. Mr. Payson asked Mr. Donahue if this petition came before the Council.

Mr. Donahue replied that the petition had been before the Council but it was so late after the Planning Board's hearing which was in August 1967 (the petition went before the Council in December of 1970) that the Council referred the petition back to the Planning Board for another public hearing.

Mr. Payson read the decision that the Planning Board had made three years ago. He said that the Board recommended the zone change be denied.

Mr. Anderson asked for Mr. McNeil's opinion on this area.

Mr. McNeil replied that there had been no changes in the area and said that denial should be made on the same reasons that the denial was made before.

Mr. Anderson made a motion that the zone change be denied for the following reasons:

1. The petitioned change would be detrimental to the residential uses abutting the rear of the petitioner's land.
2. The petitioner's land is already zoned for limited business use to a depth of 200 feet from Grafton Street and this appears to be sufficient to support the type of neighborhood business uses allowed in that zone.

3. There is a very large shopping center just north of this area which is sufficient to support the needs of the entire southeast quadrant of the city. Therefore, another large area of business zone does not appear warranted.
4. The existing depth of the BL-1.0 zone is sufficient to support the small neighborhood type of business permitted in that zone and an increase in the zone to the size petitioned for, approximately 10 acres, would create a business area which would be regional in scope and therefore tend to be more of a Business General zone in use rather than the Business Limited uses intended.

Mr. Butler seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 4-0 vote. Mr. Segel opposed.

Miscoe Estates Sect II - subdivision approval. Mr. Anderson moved that the petition be tabled until the petitioner requested an extension of time. Mr. Butler seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 5-0 vote.

Plantation Street - petition to change zone. Mr. Segel moved to recommend denial of the petition for the following reasons:

1. This is one of many small neighborhood business zones scattered throughout the city. These small areas were created when the city was rezoned in 1963 and were only intended to serve the neighborhood in which they were located. It is the Board's opinion that the same need exists today as existed in 1963.

2. A rezoning would make a business use which exists today a non-conforming use and in fact all the residential uses in the area except one would become non-conforming also as they are all multi-family structures.

Mr. Koontz seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 5-0 vote.

Emile Street - Attorney Abdella said that the Planning Board did have the authority to alter or modify any non-public way on the official map only through subdivision control requirements.

Mr. Anderson moved to deny the petition. Mr. Butler seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 5-0 vote.

The meeting adjourned at 9:15 P. M.