

**MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE
PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF WORCESTER**

OCTOBER 5, 2011

WORCESTER CITY HALL – LEVI LINCOLN ROOM

Planning Board Members Present: Anne O’Connor, Chair
Andrew Truman, Vice Chair
Stephen Rolle, Clerk
Satya Mitra

Staff Present: Joel Fontane, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
Deborah Steele, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
Kathleen Donovan, Department of Inspectional Services
K. Russell Adams, Department of Public Works & Parks
Michael Traynor, Law Department

BOARD SITE VISITS

REGULAR MEETING (5:30 PM)

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Anne O’Connor called the meeting to order at 5:36 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Upon a motion by Andrew Truman and seconded by Stephen Rolle, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the minutes of August 17, 2011 & September 14, 2011.

**REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCES, EXTENSIONS OF TIME, POSTPONEMENTS,
WITHDRAWALS**

NEW BUSINESS

1. 0 Foster Street (Union Station) – Definitive Site Plan (PB-2011-043):

Stephen O’ Neil, Administrator of the Worcester Regional Transit Authority appeared on behalf of the application. Accompanying him were David Zielinski, Architect from

Wendel Duschcherer, Christopher Loesch, Landscape Architect from Wendel Duschcherer and Barbara Boylan, project manager.

The Worcester Regional Transit Authority proposes to construct a bus transfer facility at the southeast corner of Foster and Front Streets, adjacent to the existing Union Station intermodal center to include: An eight (8) bay bus platform, Bus circulation lanes, 6,500 SF office space for WRTA administrative uses and bus patron uses, 250 SF bicycle pavilion, associated landscaping, lawns, plaza, and fountain area.

Mr. O'Neil stated the proposal is for a three story 14,000 square foot building on an acre of land on west side of Foster Street bonded by Franklin Street, Foster Street and Front Street. The goal is to move the current bus hub that is in front of City Hall to Union Station. The justification for doing that according to Mr. O'Neil is due to the other modes of transportation at Union Station including the commuter rail, Peter Pan, Greyhound and for that reason and others WRTA thinks it will be much easier on customers to move the hub to the new location.

Mr. O'Neil stated they are in the process of hiring a construction management firm and they should have a firm on board in a few weeks and they anticipate construction in Spring of 2012.

Christopher Loesch, from Wendel Duschcherer showed a site plan rendering of the proposed hub at Union Station. He explained that the site is currently a surface parking lot with one bus shelter and it is currently zoned BG-6, business general. The design can be broken down into three main components: bus transfer platform, bus transfer facility building, half acre of open space at north end. The dashed outline shown on the plan represents a canopy that will protect passengers. There will be eight (8) bus slips and WRTA anticipates a maximum traffic count of 26 buses per hour. Within the platform space there is a raised median and that is where the passengers will line up for arrival and departures. The project also includes benches, trash receptacles and a LED signage which will indicate departures and arrivals. At the far southwest end of the platform is a snow storage area and maintenance staff will be able to push snow so that it can be melted before draining into storm sewer system. The transfer platform is bound by a retaining wall which will complement the adjacent Providence and Worcester Railroad.

Mr. Loesch discussed the turning movements for the busses. He explained that there are two main points on the site for egress and ingress. The first is off Foster Street and the second is off of Front Street. Northbound bus traffic can make a right hand turn into the facility and proceed clockwise around the platform before parking at an appropriate slip. Southbound bus traffic can make a left hand turn onto Front Street and then make immediate right before proceeding up the bus ramp to their appropriate slip. Northbound traffic can make a right hand turn onto Foster Street or they can make a right hand turn onto Front Street. Directly adjacent to the transfer platform is the taxi lane. The taxi lane motions will be left turn onto Harding St. which is a one way street and then immediate left into taxi lane where they can queue up for passengers.

Mr. Loesch stated that the red crossed line on the plans shows the accessible routes. Mr. Loesch stated that the most important accessible route is the PBS loading zone and that is where para transit passengers can be loaded and unloaded and the route takes you through the building to the transfer platform which is over 57 feet.

Mr. Loesch stated that one an important handicap accessible route is from Union Station Terminal. A person can proceed through the terminal tunnel across the Peter Pan crosswalk and up a series of ramps to a crossing and reach the proposed administration building or the platform.

Mr. Loesch stated another accessible route is proposed along Front Street. Patrons can cross the crosswalk as shown on the plan and proceed through the open space area to the transfer facility building and platform.

Mr. Loesch stated that there will be a snow melt system around the building which will maintain clear areas and there will be no accumulation of snow or ice.

Mr. Loesch stated some of the other amenities on site will include a bicycle lane and a pedestrian path that dead ends into the site. Upon crossing Franklin St. there is combined facility with a bicycle shelter which has room for 15-20 bicycle slips and an air pump. This area will serve the bicycle travelers.

Mr. Loesch stated another important feature of the project is the large open space to the north of the site. At the north end of the space at the intersection of Front and Foster Streets is a welcoming function area for pedestrians and facility users. WRTA sought to create an important focal feature which will include a sculpture related to transportation and most likely, bicycles. Proceeding south throughout the space is an open lawn area which will be a green space for passengers and facility users and staff can enjoy themselves. Directly adjacent to the building is another large open space and at the center is fountain which will be unique. There is an area dedicated to benches, trash receptacles and other site amenities for the staff and passengers.

Mr. Loesch stated with regard to landscaping - along Foster Street the WRTA seeks to install large shade trees which will create a visual barrier between the road and the facility building. The original plan had included a species of trees that was susceptible to Asian Longhorn Beetle but after further research they will choose a different species and consult with city staff.

Mr. Loesch stated that at the rear of the open space there is also a proposed line of ornamental trees that will provide seasonal interest and screening from the bus ramp and there is also a series of evergreens that provide a screening element from platform and the staircase adjacent to the Peter Pan bus lot.

Mr. Loesch stated that one other feature is that at the southwest corner of site there is a generator with a transformer and the generator will provide backup power to the facility building and the crosswalks will not be typical. They will feature strobe lighting system which will notify motorists that pedestrians are in the sidewalk which is above and beyond what you typically see but is an additional feature that will reduce the conflict between pedestrians and motorists.

Mr. Adams stated that DPW had three comments: For drain connections into the Right-of-Way use an RCP pipe. Second was to connect the 10" sanitary service to a manhole and third was to provide City of Worcester standard details on a detail sheet attached to the back of the plans.

Katie Donovan from Inspectional Services stated she had no comments.

Mr. Fontane stated they are excited to see the project come to fruition. He mentioned that currently the City of Worcester and Worcester Redevelopment Authority (WRA) own the land where the hub will be built. After reviewing the plan DPRS had a few questions relative to the operations on site in addition to a few suggested site plan annotations that are fairly straightforward. He also recommended, where possible, that existing street trees be maintained and the applicant confer with the Department of Public Works City Forester regarding street trees and their replacement if planned.

Mr. Loesch stated they had reviewed DPRS comments.

Ms. O'Connor asked what was planned for the existing trees.

Mr. Loesch stated that given the location of some current street trees and areas planned for construction, some trees will be removed. One idea they are exploring is the feasibility of protecting and relocating trees instead of completely removing them.

Mr. Fontane reiterated that the applicant should discuss street tree questions with the City Forester. He stated that DPRS notes showed that none of the trees were indicated to be protected and wanted to clarify whether all of the trees will be removed or will some be retained and if so that would need to be shown on the revised plan.

The other questions DPRS had were regarding seating capacity, trash receptacles, pedestrian connectivity during construction and the bicycle pavilion and perhaps the inclusion of a air pump as suggested by staff.

The Law Department had no comments.

Ms. O'Connor stated that there was a comment about snow storage but that had been addressed. She stated that final revised plans should be provided to address the labeling issues identified by staff including noting which trees will be retained and/or removed.

Mark Binnal stated he would like to know about the proposed lighting plan for inside and outside the building and the handicapped parking space availability.

Mr. Loesch stated that the outside lighting will be typical Worcester pole light fixtures with tear-drop fixtures. Along the staircases and pedestrian accessible route there will be wall lighting to include box lights that are recessed into the wall. There is also going to be lighted bollards that will line some of the pathways to the building.

David Zielinski stated that in terms of lighting inside the building it going to be conventional office lighting T5 throughout. Zoned for eight spaces so there will be ample lighting inside and outside of the building

Mr. Binnal asked if it would be dark in the building or outside.

Mr. Zienlinski stated that the building and site will be well lit and there will be mostly natural lighting.

Mr. Binnal asked if there will be handicapped parking spaces.

Mr. Zienlisnki stated on the site there is a curb cut along Foster Street for Para transit along with people dropping off and anyone that needs assistance. On the actual site other than busses there is no parking. The adjacent parking facility will be where those needs will be met.

Mr. Binnal asked where people will park if coming to a meeting.

Ms. O'Connor asked for clarification of question.

Mr. Binnal asked how many parking spaces will be provided.

Ms. O'Connor stated that from what she is being told there is no parking handicapped or otherwise on the site.

Mr. Binnal asked if someone comes to an advisory meeting where will they park.

Mr. O'Neil stated that the plan is that for any advisory meeting that people will park at Union Station Parking Garage and there will be sufficient parking in the garage to provide for the needs for the advisory board and there is sufficient access from garage into the proposed facility.

Mr. Binnal asked if bathrooms will be automatic.

Mr. Zielinski stated that there are ten toilets thought the building and all will meet ADA requirements and there will be automatic sensors for doors and sinks.

Mr. Binnal asked if doors will open automatically for main entrance and bathrooms with a pad button or push button.

Mr. Zielinski stated that the push buttons will be offered to entrance into the building and bathrooms will be ADA compliant but they will not require operators.

Mr. Binnal asked whether there will be railings on the landings and asked if they will be a little before the step and after the step.

Mr. Zielisnki stated that there are two stairwells at both ends of building and there will be handrails on both sides.

Mr. Binnal asked if there will be railings and asked if they will be a little before the step and after the step.

Mr. Zielisnki stated they will meet the ADA requirements and will have full tread extension beyond the step. He stated there is no need to extend landings so the railings will be adequate around the perimeter.

Mr. Binnal asked if they will be before the step then.

Mr. Zielisnki stated they will extend one tread beyond the step which is about 11 or 12 inches.

Mr. Binnal asked if there will tag tack on the steps and the outside stairs.

Mr. Zielisnki stated yes both at the stairs and to the transit.

Mr. Binnal asked about the elevator for the vision impaired.

Ms. O'Connor asked if there was an elevator planned.

Mr. Zielisnki stated there is an elevator at the one end of the building that accesses the three floors but he could not answer question but imagined they could meet requirement.

Mr. O'Neil stated that Mr. Binnal has an open invitation to sit with WRTA and the architect as they proceed through the project and they will work with him on answering questions as they go forward.

Phil Stone stated he has worked in downtown for 25 years and this is the first time he has heard of this project to move the WRTA hub away from City Hall to Union Station. He stated he is worried about the economic role this will play in downtown.

Mr. Stone suggested that as an alternative that a shuttle from Union Station to City Hall be implemented.

Mr. Stone stated that the real need at Union Station, in his opinion, is additional parking for people picking up and dropping off.

Susan Lozaratti stated that the poor, elderly, children are the ones taking the busses and they should not have to walk ten minutes to get to the bus and she agrees with Mr. Stone that a shuttle service should be implemented.

John Provost stated he feels that project is impressive and that a lot of planning has been done but there has been no public input from the riders of the WRTA and what they think about it and their usage of the transportation should be. Mr. Provost doesn't feel the project comes together to be workable. He feels it admirable to integrate the rail and bus and looks logical but when you look at local day to day users using the buses there is no figures on the number of bus riders using the rails but he believes the number is very small. He feels if the transfer point is taken away from downtown it will hurt downtown the area.

Mr. Provost stated that no bus system is perfect but this system has worked for years and 20 years ago there were three times as many buses and if there is congestion downtown it is because there are fewer buses and people have to wait longer to transfer.

Mr. Provost feels that this proposal will create more hurdles for people utilizing the bus system and will add five to ten minutes to bus trip.

Ms. O'Connor asked if how the WRTA decided the reason why this proposed site would be more advantageous.

Mr. O'Neil stated they have worked very closely with the Department of Transportation for Massachusetts as well as the Federal Transit Authority-Region One Office in Boston. They also worked closely with City of Worcester Economic Development staff to the point that the consultants and architects were held back until the development consultant worked with WRTA to explore ways to how this project can interact once all the other projects in City Square are done. They recognized that Front Street is not going to be Front Street as it is now. It will eventually be opened through to City Hall and that will eliminate major barrier by adding direct link to Union Station. The other features looked at were linking up with the bike path that will eventually will go down to Rhode Island and interoperability. The state has encouraged WRTA to work with state officials at MBTA and WRTA in the very near future will have new fare boxes once the Charlie card and commuter rail is extended and the Charlie card will be put in the rail from Boston to Worcester. WRTA customers will be able to get on the WRTA bus with tap card on the WRTA fare box that will also be used on the Charlie card system-MBTA system. Mr. O'Neil stated that no busses will be taken away from City Hall. They are moving the transfer to Union Station. There will still be busses going by in front of City Hall and Front Street and Franklin Street as well.

Mr. O'Neil stated if you look at this objectively this will be a much better thing for WRTA customers. Right now customers have to go to 319 Main Street to get passes but in near future when the project is complete there will be ticket vending machines outside on the platforms that people can obtain tickets from. There will be a ticket machine and customer service inside the building.

Mr. O'Neil stated once the project is done it will be better for WRTA customers.

Kim McCoy stated that he has ridden other transit busses in other areas and compared to Pittsburgh where busses come in front a lot of different directions. Other cities have holistic integration but feels this is misguided.

Ms. O'Connor reminded people that the Board has only has authority to approve the plan based on the ordinance of the city and whether the site plan meets the requirements of ordinance.

Jo Hart stated she has been trying to get a public hearing before the WRTA to discuss this project but it has not happened. She does not feel the plan has been designed well and no study has been done on the proposal.

Ms. Hart stated that she feels that Wyman Gordon site would be better location for this hub. Ms. Hart passed out a letter to the Board members relative to alternative site. (Exhibit D)

Mr. Mitra asked the Law Department where residents could bring their concerns relative WRTA proposal.

Mr. Traynor stated that the purpose of the meeting before the Planning Board is to review the site plan based on standards set forth in the Zoning Ordinance and stated that this project is an allowed use so questions of operations and use not related to the site plan review standards are outside of the Board's authority. He suggested that if residents have comments on the policy decisions of the WRTA and board of advisors they should direct their comments to those entities in the appropriate forum. He reiterated that the Planning Board's review is limited to the physical site plan.

Mr. Truman asked whether there would be any parking at the facility and where would people park.

Mr. Loesch stated that per zoning the area does not require parking.

Katie Donovan stated there are no parking requirements in the BG-6 zone.

Mr. Fontane stated that the Union Station garage is available for parking and reiterated there is no particular number of required spaces required.

Mr. Truman stated that would need to be changed on the plan.

Mr. Rolle asked how people would access the site for bus service and commented that busses exiting on Front Street be right turn only and that would make sense as difficult turn currently and would be difficult for busses. He asked where signage would be placed.

Mr. Loesch stated they could add a sign for right hand turn out.

Mr. Rolle asked what the path to get back to downtown to City Hall would be.

Mr. O'Neil stated similar options that are there now and that the intent is when Front Street opens up traffic flow will change and make it much better with opening of Front Street but basically the same pattern will be followed.

Mr. Truman asked if every bus in city will go through facility.

Mr. O'Neil stated they will.

Ms. O'Connor asked where the bike path would be located.

Mr. Loesch stated that the bike path would be located parallel to Foster Street.

Mr. Mitra asked for clarification for the uses and purpose of the proposed building.

Mr. Loesch stated the three floors are split between program: WRTA functions on the third floor, Paratransit Brokerage Services Inc. (PBSI) is on second and the first floor will be divided between public space, PBSI, retail areas and a waiting lounge for ridership.

Mr. Rolle asked if there is space on the first floor for public if they have longer time between transfers.

Mr. Loesch stated that would be correct.

Mr. Rolle asked the applicant to speak to the architectural elements of the building.

Mr. O'Neil stated that that this building is located in the City's innovative district and the WRTA worked closely with Development Office to come up with architectural design that fits that district but doesn't exclude beauty, icons, and the stature of Union Station. They have been also able to capture some of the elements of Union Station in the facility but this will be an introduction to this district.

Mr. O'Neil stated on the first floor there will be a coffee and a warm waiting area where people can go in case of inclement weather.

Mr. Loesch stated this building is located in a innovative corridor with the center space of the program on the first, second and third floor. The building will have channel glass and bring natural daylight in. He stated that the design tries to connect usability and activity between the building and street. The two tend towers are homage to Union Stations and are brick structures with stair towers and elevators with the idea of reflecting architecturally the brick in Union Station and using that material to bring the two together architecturally.

Mr. Rolle stated that second rendering presented shows better representation.

Ms. Hart stated she believes WRTA customer service could be at Midtown Mall or City Hall and would be more accessible than Union Station.

Upon a motion by Mr. Truman and second by Mr. Mitra the Board voted 4-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan with the following conditions:

- 1.) That six (6) copies of the final revised Definitive Site Plan with all plan sheets are submitted to the Division of Planning & Regulatory Services prior to the release of the decision with the following information:**
 - **Label ownership information on the cover sheet.**
 - **Adjust text on Sheet L401 to show all facilities inside the building footprint.**
 - **Label the location of the proposed Blackstone Bike Path right of way (and terminus) with a note that it is to be designed by others.**
 - **Correct parking table to state that no off-street parking is required in the BG-6 zoning district.**
 - **Revise the landscaping table to show, at a minimum, 3 ½ inch caliper for proposed trees on site.**
 - **Clarify whether trees will be protected or removed that are not marked and update the legend to remove the tree protection symbol if none are to be protected.**

- Annotate the location of proposed digital/LED signs in the bus platform area.
 - Add the appropriate notation to the plan showing the retention, relocation or removal of the existing Lincoln Sq. I-290 sign.
 - Label location of air pump compressor for bicycles on Sheet L505.
 - Label the location of proposed freestanding identification signs, if any.
 - For drain connections into the Right-of-Way use an RCP pipe.
 - Connect the 10” sanitary service to a manhole.
 - Provide City of Worcester standard details.
- 2.) The applicant shall confer with the City Forester regarding the proposed removal and replacement of street trees in the public sidewalk.
- 3.) Submit a memorandum to the Division of Planning & Regulatory Services addressing the following questions in staff’s memo to the Planning Board dated September 30, 2011:
- What is the operations/maintenance plan for the proposed fountain?
 - Will a trash receptacle be provided next to the proposed fountain?
 - Clarify the relocation/removal plan for the *Green is Good* trash compactor.
 - Clarify pedestrian access along the sidewalk during construction.
 - Provide a comparison of current and proposed seating capacity for bus patrons.
 - Submit the Massachusetts Historical Commission’s concurrence with FTA’s categorical exclusion regarding the Section 106 approval process.

Standard Conditions of Approval

- All work must conform to the standards contained in the City of Worcester, Department of Public Works & Parks, Engineering Division, Construction Management Section, STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS & DETAILS, most recent edition.
- The appropriate soil erosion and sediment control measures, including hay bales and silt fences, shall be installed and maintained throughout construction by the applicant to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Inspectional Services.
- All work shall be done in accordance with the final approved Definitive Site Plan on file with the Division of Planning and Regulatory Services.

List of Exhibits.

- Exhibit A: 0 Foster Street- WRTA Bus Transfer Facility – Definitive Site Plan Application; received September 1, 2011; prepared by Worcester Redevelopment Authority.
- Exhibit B: Definitive Site Plan – 0 Foster Street; dated September 1, 2011 prepared by Wendel Companies.
- Exhibit C: Supplemental Information Package, dated September 1, 2011; received September 1, 2011; prepared by Wendel Duchscherer Architects and Engineers including:
1. Report of MEPA, NEPA, Worcester Conservation Commission
 2. Stormwater and Utility Impact Narrative

3. Traffic Review Study prepared by VHB, dated 7/11/2011
4. Report on the Soil Pre-Characterization.

Exhibit D: Letter to the Planning Board, submitted October 5, 2011, from Jo Hart.

2. 37 Lee Street – Parking Plan (PB-2011-044)

Attorney Stephen Madaus on behalf of Worcester Polytechnic Institute (WPI) the applicant. Accompanying him were Matt Merva of Landworks Collaborative and Alfredo DiMauro, Vice President of Facilities for WPI.

Attorney Madaus stated that the proposal seeks to redevelop pre-existing paved parking areas by installing landscaping along Institute Road, installing new curbing and a controlled driveway with turn-around access, and installing loading dock along existing building to enable loading/unloading of deliveries and service/trade vans in rear of property and no longer utilizing Lee Street, a public way with residential properties.

Mr. Madaus stated they are seeking parking plan approval for proposed improvements to a existing non conforming parking lot which is accessory to a pre-existing non conforming building which is the former Lee Street School which is located at 37 Lee Street and located in RS-7 zoning district.

Mr. Madaus stated in a meeting with Inspectional Services that it falls under the definition of campus despite distance from other WPI properties.

WPI acquired the property from the City of Worcester in July of 2008 and pays taxes on the property. There are no student activities on site. The site is for the plant facility department of WPI.

Mr. Madaus stated that the applicant met with neighbors and they are committed to making improvements and enhancements to site to provide landscaping that does not currently exist and WPI also removed some fencing that was at the corner.

Mr. Madaus showed on a plan the area that is currently paved and where they propose to repave the existing paved area and provide new striping, better controlled travel lands and access. The applicant also proposes installing a small loading dock that will enable WPI to have on-site deliveries that currently occurs on Lee Street which obstructs the public way. WPI thinks it would be beneficial to have this loading behind the building.

Mr. Madaus stated that the existing paved area will be replaced with landscaping. He also showed the Board where the landscaping is on the plan. The existing site has 22 spaces and it will go to 24 with the improvements.

Mr. Madaus stated they had received comments from DPRS and Department of Public Works and they have made many of the changes.

Mr. Madaus stated, to clarify, that application submitted stated there be 25 spaces but on redevelopment of the parking lot it will be 24 based on comments from DPRS and Public Works. Mr. Adams stated he had six comments relative to the plan which were as follows:

1. Revise the plan to reflect an Engineer's scale.
2. Provide a width of at least 15' for the one-way parking aisle.
3. Use a 2' radius at the driveway entrances.
4. Provide information about the site drainage.
5. Any proposed alterations to the sidewalk are not to diminish what is existing, for example, the width of the proposed sidewalk cannot be less than the current width.
6. Any On-Street parking alterations must be made through the City Council. No On-Street pavement markings will be made (with respect to parking), and existing parking signs will not be removed as a result of this Parking Plan proposal.

Ms. O'Connor asked if the applicant would have any problems addressing the comments.

Mr. Madaus stated that Mr. Merva would address the comments but they do anticipate filing a petition with City Council and seeking a road opening permit necessary to any proposed alterations in the right of ways and also to lift the current no parking ban in front of the building.

Mr. Merva stated he had brought a plan that evening that showed one inch equals twenty feet engineer scale. Mr. Merva stated that DPRS had requested maintaining a LOSD (level of service) for the parking lot by providing a 13'6" access aisle with 60 degree angled parking spaces. He suggested that the level of service be provided by using a 45 degree angled parking with an 11' access aisle with.

Mr. Merva stated that the cross hatched area on the plans is just a stamped texture in the pavement which also is drivable surface so they are including in the aisle width. It has been revised to a three foot textured area with an eight foot, ten inch non-textured area for a total of eleven feet ten inches which would allow for a traveled way. They have incorporated the recommended two foot turning radius on the revised plan. With regard to site drainage there is one catch basin on site in the southeastern corner of the parking lot which they will maintain. All of the drainage flow goes to the catch basin. They are just repaving what is existing so there are no changes to the drainage configuration. The existing sidewalk is not delineated from the rest of the paved width. It is all asphalt from the building to the curb. Along the sidewalk they are suggesting some type of landscape buffer and having a seven foot walk able width which is consistent with the neighborhood and utilizing three feet for a planted area that is within the right of way and another two feet that is on the WPI Lee Street property for a larger total plant bed that could allow for a street tree to be planted in that area.

Mr. Adams stated that using any portion of the right away for the planting bed would require action outside of Planning Board approval. If the applicant proposes a planter of some type of other permanent structure in the right of way there needs to be permission granted and a maintenance document executed to cover that. Mr. Adams stated he could not say whether DPW would approve and that the applicant would need to send a letter to the Director of Engineering as to whether they would approve.

Ms. O'Connor asked if they would be able to approve a plan if it shows something in the right of way.

Mr. Traynor stated the Board could approve the plan but that it needs the approval of DPW and if the approval is not granted they would need to come back and amend the plan.

Mr. Adams asked whether that proposal could be removed on a revised plan and if the applicant wants to pursue that they could at a later time to discuss the options.

Mr. Traynor asked whether it is needed to meet landscape requirements and if not the plantings on the right of way technically is off-site issue. If it is located on city right of way it could taken off the plan and if applicant wants to do it and receives permission from DPW, then it doesn't need to be reflected on the site plan. Mr. Traynor felt that would be best solution.

Ms. O'Connor asked Mr. Adams since he hadn't seen the revised plan that the Board would consider approval subject to the items on the DPW letter.

Mr. Adams stated that would be correct with the addition to remove the improvements in the right of way.

Ms. Donovan stated the Board had a letter from Commissioner Kelly regarding the aisle width, the five foot buffer and the loading space. The letter which is a review of the applicability of the Zoning Ordinances as it relates to the Dover Amendment found that the proposed layout while not meeting Zoning Ordinance requirements was reasonable.

Mr. Fontane stated in light of the exemption this parking plan is approvable and DPRS recommends approval and DPRS did have some comments regarding the plan and the applicant needs to provide revised plans to DPRS. DPRS also recommended that a different fence type be used.

Mr. Madaus stated they have discussed the fence comment and they didn't know if the suggestion for wrought iron fence for the corner was where there previously a chained link fence was. That fence has now been removed and there will be no fencing. Along the back of the parking lot they have proposed a chain link fence which they think works well as drivers have tend to hit the fence if wrought iron.

Mr. Fontane stated the comments refers to the fence that it existing in the rear of the building.

Mr. Fontane stated he will withdraw the comment from staff's memo regarding the fence.

Mr. Fontane asked a follow up questions relative to the resolution of the traffic circulation as the way out parking is laid out is up to applicant, given the exemption of Dover, but from planning perspective it wouldn't work. Therefore, DPRS is recommending a level of service to angle of forty five degree so they are achieving a level of service of D.

Mr. DiMauro stated they would expect they would use the existing driveway out.

Richard Culross of 31 Lee Street stated he had concerns relative to the loading dock and the noise as there is no fence at the rear of the property but WPI has satisfied them by eliminating any early a.m. loading and adding bushes to that area which helps eliminates some of the sounds.

Mr. Maduas stated that it is shown on the revised plan.

Mr. Culross reiterated again that the neighbors are satisfied and WPI is a good neighbor but he had follow up question relative to the proposal for on-street no parking on Lee Street and understood the item is not before Planning Board but requested to know where neighbors could bring comments to.

Mr. Adams stated that would be an action of the City Council and the City Council would have to forward such a request to Traffic & Parking subcommittee meeting and interested parties would be notified that a meeting was taking place.

Mr. Culross stated the neighbors feel that Lee Street has lot of apartments and cars in that area and he could see where WPI could use to their advantage during the day and be able to park vehicles coming to the facility department but at night when everyone comes home there is very little parking on Lee Street.

Ms. O'Connor asked if WPI is pursuing a non on-street parking restriction.

Mr. Madaus stated that is being pursued and stated that Fred DiMauro sent letter to all the neighbors and notified them of the project and invited them to call. Mr. Madaus stated they will be petitioning the City Council.

Mr. DiMauro stated that the parking issue in the street is related to when the building was a school and there was no parking along the street for pick up and drop off and when WPI purchased the building the City never restored the parking so WPI will pursue it.

Jerry Creen of 35 Lee Street stated that WPI is a great neighbor. They have cleaned up the property and have security on site. His concerns were with regards to the new loading dock and noise as his house is twenty feet away from the proposed loading dock. Right now there is a four foot chain link fence and ramp going down the side to his property and he has spoken to WPI and they informed him they would work with him on plantings or a higher fence. He is just concerned about demised property value.

Ms. O'Connor stated there was a new revised plan that he could look at.

WPI stated that they would meet with Mr. Creen after meeting and review the plan.

Mr. Adams asked if the applicant would describe briefly the proposed changes on the revised plan.

Mr. Merva stated that a row of arbor vitae will be planted along the ramp and the WPI facility building.

Mr. Rolle stated his only concern on a site visit was the angle of the parking and believes the applicant has been addressed.

Mr. Truman asked for some clarification and asked if there was handicapped accessible parking on site and another one on Lee Street.

Mr. Merva stated that would be correct but that would have to be approval through City Council but the site meets requirements.

Mr. Truman stated it is not ADA compliant which requires an eight foot parking space with an eight foot access aisle width so the applicant may want to look at revising that.

Mr. Merva stated that the hatched area next to the parking area is just textured pavement so they are basically counting that as the loading area for that handicap space.

Mr. Truman reiterated it has to be eight feet.

Mr. Merva stated that it would be revised by sliding the spaces down.

Mr. Truman asked for clarification on the granite circle shown in the right of way on the corner where the tree pit is and wanted to know if that is an issue per DPW.

Mr. Merva stated it is curbed planter and will be put on the property.

Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Mitra the Board approved 4-0 the Parking Plan subject to comments #1, #2, #3, #5, #6 of DPW memo of October 3, 2011 as well as the comments of the DPRS memo of October 3, 2011 except with regard to fencing.

Ms. O'Connor asked a follow up question relative to whether the landscaping in the right of way should be removed.

Mr. Adams stated that plan should be revised to just show items on the site plan itself.

Mr. Rolle made a further condition that the items on site plan show only improvements on the property itself.

Mr. Adams stated item #6 on his memo doesn't need to be condition of approval.

Mr. Rolle amended his motion to remove #6.

Mr. Madaus asked for clarification of item #5 of DPW memo if Planning Board wants to amend that condition unless properly approved through Public Works through permit.

Mr. Adams stated condition should be to shrink it outside of the right away.

Mr. Madaus asked if that would be contrary to the condition.

Mr. Traynor stated the Board suggested that the condition be: that plantings be entirely on the site unless otherwise approved to encroach on the sidewalk by Department of Public Works.

The Parking Plan was approved with the following conditions:

Six copies of a revised plan shall be submitted to the Division of Planning and Regulatory Services with the following modifications:

- Provide an engineer's scale.
 - Provide a width of at least 15' for the one-way parking aisle.
 - Use a 2' radius at the driveway entrances.
 - Revise the table of zoning requirements by labeling required setbacks for "Other Uses" from the Zoning Ordinance Table 4.2.
 - Reduce the number of parking spaces to 2 in the area along Institute Road to provide for a Level of Service "D".
 - Depict the required striping for the access aisle and accessible route adjacent to the proposed handicapped space.
 - On the Landscaping Plan, clarify if the tree to the south of the proposed walkway is to remain or to be planted and indicate the species.
 - Label more clearly off-site v. on-site proposed trees.
 - Revise the parking table to show 24, not 25, parking spaces (as a result of provision of the access aisle for the handicapped space, above).
 - Label the following:
 - Streets as public or private.
 - Minimum yard dimensions.
 - The names of owners of properties up to abutters of abutters within 300 feet of the applicant's property lines.
 - Distances from adjacent buildings.
 - The percentage of the lot covered by the principal and accessory buildings, proposed and existing.
 - The elevations and contours of the existing and finished site.
 - Capacity and drainage.
 - Location, size and arrangement of any lighting and/or signs: Any existing or proposed signs, if any.
 - Area available for snow storage or include a note stating that snow will be taken off-site. (Snow storage cannot be located within the required landscape buffer).
 - Methods and location of erosion and sedimentation control devices for controlling erosion and sedimentation during the construction process as well as after.
- 2.) Submit three (3) copies of drainage information to the Division of Planning & Regulatory Services.

- 3.) Any proposed alterations to the sidewalk are not to diminish what is existing, for example, the width of the proposed sidewalk cannot be less than the current width.
- 4.) Plantings shall be located entirely on the site unless otherwise approved to encroach on the sidewalk by Department of Public Works.

List of Exhibits.

- Exhibit A: Parking Plan Application; received 9/1/2011; prepared by Worcester Polytechnic Institute.
- Exhibit B: Parking Plan for Lee Street Facility; dated 8/31/2011; prepared by Landworks Collaborative.
- Exhibit C: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Department of Inspectional Services to Stephen F. Madaus, representative for WPI; re: WPI; 37 Lee Street: Improvements to Parking Lot; dated 9/14/2011.
- Exhibit D: Letter of Support from KSC Associates, LLC to the Planning Board; re: 37 Lee Street; dated 9/22/2011; received 9/23/2011.
- Exhibit E: Letter from Alfredo DiMauro of WPI to the neighbors of 37 Lee Street; re: 37 Lee Street; dated 9/23/2011; received 9/23/2011.
- Exhibit F: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Planning Board; re: 37 Lee Street – Parking Plan; dated October 3, 2011.
- Exhibit G: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Department of Public Works & Parks to the Planning Board; re: 37 Lee Street; dated September 29, 2011; revised October 3, 2011.

OTHER BUSINESS

3. ANR Plans

- **AN-2011-036**, Massasoit Road: Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Mitra, the board voted 4-0 to endorse AN-2011-36
- **AN-2011-037**, Mount Avenue & Boxford Street: Upon a motion by Mr. Mitra and seconded by Mr. Rolle the board voted 3-0-1 to endorse AN-2011-037- (Ms.O'Connor recused herself from this item.)

Jeff Howland appeared on behalf of the ANR application. He stated that house #36 has not been sold and the original ANR plan which was done in 2010 was based on a different house style and different lot configuration and when site plan was done in 2011 the site plan was based on the house plan but when the foundation plan was done the zero lot line was not done. Mr. Howland showed the configuration on the plan in red. The original plan was approved in April 2011. The green on the plan presented by Mr. Howland was what was originally approved. Mr. Howland stated that #38 is deeded and they will sell a small portion back to #36 and also sell or deed back to Murkland which will become part of main parcel and Murkland will deed portion to the house

#38 and then also to meet areas requirements in the deed for Lot 2R2 will be exactly as shown on deed. If site gets developed as duplex they will come back before Board.

Mr. Adams stated they did not go view the site because DPW thought it was just a change of interior lot line not seeing Parcel F still has 182.35 feet of frontage on the private street, Boxford Street. As the lot has so much frontage Mr. Adams felt the site should be viewed as it would be considered a buildable lot.

Mr. Howland stated that Parcel F has site plan which was granted.

Mr. Adams stated asked if that is case to does it site need to be viewed.

Mr. Traynor stated no. The change is interior and has already been viewed and approved as adequate way.

Mr. Howland stated they just reconfigured a plot plan.

- **AN-2011-038**, Plantation Street & Robin Road: Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Mitra the board voted 4-0 to endorse AN-2011-038
- **AN-2011-039**, Massasoit Road: Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Mitra, the board voted 4-0 to endorse AN-2011-039.
- **AN-2011-040**, Atchison Street & Plantation Street: Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Mitra, the board voted 4-0 to endorse AN-2011-040
- **AN-2011-041**, Rodi Circle: Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Mitra, the board voted 4-0 to endorse AN-2011-041.

ADJOURNMENT: Upon a motion by Stephen Rolle and seconded by Satya Mitra , the Board voted 4-0 to adjourn the meeting at 7:15 p.m.