

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

April 15, 2015

WORCESTER CITY HALL – LEVI LINCOLN ROOM

Planning Board Members Present: Andrew Truman, Chair
Robert Ochoa, Clerk
John Vigliotti

Planning Board Members Absent: Satya Mitra, Vice Chair
Andrew Freilich

Staff Present: Stephen Rolle, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
Domenica Tatasciore, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
Michelle Smith, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
Katie Donovan, Department of Inspectional Services
John Gervais, Department of Public Works & Parks
Nicholas Lyford, Department of Public Works & Parks
Alexandra Haralambous, Law Department

BOARD SITE VISITS

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Andrew Truman called the meeting to order at 5:35 P.M.

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

1. Rockrimmon Road, Rockrimmon Way & Joppa Road - 81-G Street Opening (PB-2015-005)

Upon a motion by Mr. Vigliotti and seconded by Mr. Ochoa, the Board voted 3-0 to postpone the item to May 6, 2015 and extend the constructive grant deadline to June 4, 2015.

2. 70 & 72 Swan Ave. and 2 & 4 Farm Street – Definitive Site Plan (PB-2015-007) and Approval Not Required (ANR) Plan (AN-2015-016)

Upon a motion by Mr. Vigliotti and seconded by Mr. Ochoa, the Board voted 3-0 to postpone the item to May 6, 2015 and extend the constructive grant deadline to May 30, 2015.

3. 167 Pleasant Street – Parking Plan (PB-2015-016)

Upon a motion by Mr. Ochoa and seconded by Mr. Vigliotti, the Board voted 3-0 to postpone the item to June 24, 2015 and extend the constructive grant deadline to June 30, 2015.

4. 67 Heywood Street – Definitive Site Plan (PB-2015-017)

Upon a motion by Mr. Ochoa and seconded by Mr. Vigliotti, the Board voted 3-0 to postpone the item to June 24, 2015 and extend the constructive grant deadline to July 30, 2015.

5. 31 & 39 Caroline Street – 81G Street Opening (PB-2015-020) & Definitive Site Plan (PB-2015-019)

Upon a motion by Mr. Vigliotti and seconded by Mr. Ochoa, the Board voted 3-0 to postpone the item to May 6, 2015 and extend the constructive grant deadline to June 30, 2015.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Tatasciore stated that the minutes for March 25, 2015 were not ready for approval at this time.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Public Meetings

6. 0 Sarah Drive, Lots 81-86 (aka Bittersweet Blvd, Arboretum Phase IV) – Definitive Site Plan Approval (PB-2014-009)

Attorney Mark Donahue, representing the applicant, introduced Patrick Burke, engineer from HS&T Group. Mr. Donahue stated that the item has been pending for some time. They submitted revised plans. The amended plans alter what has been referred to as "Slope A" so that the final proposed slope applicable to the Lots will be at a 2.5:1 slope. Further, the amended plans respond to significantly all additional comments provided in the various review memorandums by City Staff.

Mr. Burke reviewed the changes to the slope design with the Board. He stated that the existing slope will be replaced with a 2.5:1 rock-armored slope.

Mr. Donahue stated that they have worked with City staff to work through a number of issues. He has submitted a narrative from the developer providing further explanation of the construction sequencing contemplated by the Applicant to provide the Board with a further understanding of how the work will be performed in order to ensure stability during the rebuilding process. He stated that there will be introducing vegetation into the slope to provide even more stability but it will be mostly rock-armored slope.

Mr. Gervais stated that he was concerned that he did not see drainage associated with the toe of the slope and that has been one of their original comments because they wanted to see the water intercepted and conveyed away from the tow of the slope. Mr. Burke stated that they do not provide a curtain drain but instead believe the rip rap slope will be sufficient to redirect the water to the roadway. It would be difficult to maintain the slope and include additional drainage.

Mr. Gervais stated that the plans were submitted Friday and he has not had time to review in detail everything but he does not agree with not providing additional drainage at the toe of the slope.

Mr. Rolle reminded the board that in addition to constructing the slope the applicant is proposing to construct five semi-detached (duplex) dwellings on 10 lots (for a total of 10 dwelling units) to the south of Bittersweet Boulevard. The dwelling units are proposed on the flat portions of land at the top of this slope. Mr. Rolle reviewed the Planning Board Review Standards comments (in the memo). The Fire Department had a concern about being able to maneuver emergency vehicle in and out of that street. Therefore, Bittersweet Blvd should be constructed to its entire length to allow for through routing of traffic (including emergency vehicles), or to an extent to allow adequate turn around provisions. Construction of Indigo Circle is one option for providing a turn around without completing the full extent of Bittersweet Blvd. Staff has no comment with regard to the pedestrian aspects of the plan. Each proposed lot includes two off-street parking spaces, as required by the Zoning Ordinance. The proposed duplexes are, in staff's opinion, in character with the neighborhood and located outside of applicable setbacks.

Mr. Rolle also stated that the applicant should confirm that the first floor is not-habitable, or will need to seek relief for the height of the proposed duplexes (2+ stories allowed). Also, staff remains concerned about drainage from the slope onto neighboring properties. While the reduced grade of the slope will slow run-off relative to current conditions, the continued use of rock facing would be less permeable than a vegetated slope, and may result in higher velocity runoff. Staff prefers vegetated cover to rock armoring, and recommends the incorporation of drainage collection features in the absence of a fully vegetated surface treatment. Mr. Rolle stated that it wasn't just for aesthetics and that a vegetated slope helps with infiltration so that there is less runoff. Still, the Board should consider whether the proposed rock armor facing is unsightly or otherwise objectionable.

Mr. Rolle stated that no fire hydrants are depicted on the plans so a condition was drafted that the applicant works with the fire department to determine the location of those. Lastly, Mr. Rolle stated that staff recommends hay bales, rather than straw wattles at the top of the slope during construction.

Mr. Rolle stated that if approved, staff respectfully recommends the following suggested Conditions of Approval:

1. That the site is to be operated in substantial accordance with the plan on file with the Division of Planning and Regulatory Services;
2. That six (6) copies of a certified as-built plan be provided to the Division of Planning and Regulatory Services, confirming the final slopes and grading, prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy;
3. That 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 Director of Code Enforcement and consistent with any Conservation Commission or Massachusetts Department of Environment Protection conditions placed on the site;
4. That all work conforms 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;
5. Subject to the Zoning Enforcement Officer's determination that the parcel complies with all the relevant provisions of the Zoning Ordinance;
6. That all portions of Lots 82L/R, 83L/R, 84L/R and 85 L/R be sloped 2.5H:1V or less;

7. That slopes 2.5H:1V or less be vegetated (grasses or other vegetation) with no rock armoring;
8. That fire hydrants be provided at locations to be determined by the Worcester Fire Department;
9. That Bittersweet Blvd be fully constructed to, and inclusive of, Indigo Circle to provide a means of vehicle and fire equipment turn around;
10. That all labeling, annotation corrections, and other comments listed under the "Review of Definitive Site Plan Applications Requirements" section of this memo be addressed;
11. That the applicant submits eight (8) copies of revised plans to the Division of Planning & Regulatory Services (DPRS) prior to the release of the decision reflecting all conditions of approval.

Mr. Donahue stated that they can work out a turnaround in the intersection that will serve the purpose rather than building out a street that doesn't have an immediate use. They have an issue with condition #4 because those aren't clear and he asked if there are particular items that DPW does not believe are reflected on the plans. He prefers those are called out specifically. The fire hydrants are already shown as part of the original approved plan. They can clear that up with the fire department. Mr. Donahue stated that it all comes down to the nature of the surface. They think the neighbors would be less disrupted by keeping a rock armored slope

Mr. Rolle stated that the board should consider conditions that are appropriate for lots 81 and 86. Portions of these lots will have a steeper slope than 2.5:1 because of the need to transition the proposed grading into the existing topography. There is no development proposed for lot 81 and the road is already constructed, which limits the extent of the grading that can be done. A suggested condition for lot 81 is "That that the rock armoring for these areas be repaired/upgraded as necessary to provide a stable surface." Lots 86-R and 86-L include transition areas to Slope B. The Board could consider conditions such as requiring access easements be established for any portions of the slopes on lots 86 L/R steeper than 2.5H:1V to allow for future repair and/or reconstruction, and retained so long as slopes steeper than 2.5H:1V are present; or that lots 86L/R be held by the petitioner (not sold) for a period of five (5) years, to preserve the ability to allow for future repair and/or reconstruction of Slope B.

Mr. Donahue stated that they will try to tie in as best as they can into the existing ledge on Lot 86 but they are amenable to condition c but prefer that it would be for a period of three years. Lot 81 isn't part of the site plan application and shouldn't have a condition on it because it's not part of the application. They don't have plans for it but it is a buildable lot.

Mr. Rolle stated that there is grading proposed on lot 81 and it is therefore part of the application.

James Bisceglia, 54 Honeysuckle Road, stated that the last meeting on this matter was November 19, 2014 and they continued to January and when the applicant did not produce what was required there were no fines or repercussions and it just kept getting continued. In January, rocks started rolling downhill and the snow made it worse. He stated concerns with the drainage, the fence, and the construction of the proposed rip rap slope. He expressed that he preferred a vegetative slope to allow for better absorption of rain water and believed that a stable 3:1 slope was preferable.

Sarah Walsh, 46 Sophia Drive, stated that this issue has been going on for 7 years and she would like to know when the slope will be fixed.

Atty. Donahue stated that they can start 30 days after approval occurs.

Attorney Ted Hess-Mahan, representing the abutters, stated that the abutters are in favor of a vegetated slope and not a rock-armored slope. He commended staff and the builder for working together to get to this point and stated that they were pleased with the design that has the slope draining to Bittersweet. He urged that a decision be reached soon in order to resolve the issues of the slope right away.

Lori Schlesman, 50 Sophia Drive, stated that she abuts lot 81 and asked for clarification on what they are doing.

Mr. Rolle stated that they are not building on it now, just grading but if they plan to build they have to come before the board again for site plan review.

Timothy Viele, 46 Honeysuckle Road, stated that considering the many iterations of these plans everything should be on the plans and there should be no question as to where anything is located. He also asked for clarification of where the 2.5:1 slope will begin and also why a vegetated slope was not being considered. He also asked if a swale can be installed to redirect the water flow.

Mr. Gervais stated that there is a retaining wall proposed to be built where the City has an easement on Mr. Bisceglia's property but they can resolve that with the applicant before this moves forward.

Mr. Vigliotti asked if DPW will be proposing additional drainage. Mr. Gervais stated that the applicant has to propose it and then they verify that it meets standards and that it is sufficient for the project.

Mr. Truman stated that he preferred a vegetative slope as well and believed if they hydro seeded the area that it will stabilize. He also suggested installing a trench drain be installed at the tow of the slope and tied into the storm drain.

Attorney Donahue asked for a continuation to May 6 in order to revise the plans according to board and staff comments (eliminate rip rap and provide vegetation, provide yoke mesh, install curtain drain).

Upon a motion by Mr. Ochoa and seconded by Mr. Vigliotti, the Board voted 3-0 to continue the item to May 6, 2015.

NEW BUSINESS

Public Hearing

7. Darby Street (from Beverly St. west to ~112 feet) – Street Petition, Abandon and Remove from the Official Map (ST-2015-002)

Mr. Rolle stated that the street in question is not on the Official Map therefore the Board cannot act on it. He recommended that the Board take a vote that no action will be taken.

James Gurnick, 233 Beverly Road, stated that he was the petitioner and he has seen a city map from 1911 showing the street and his deed also shows Darby Street. In 1953 when they made the Official Map, they abandoned the road because it was only 100 feet long and it did not provide interconnection or passage to anywhere.

Ms. Haralambous stated that it was not left off the city map in error; it was a conscious decision not to include it on the Official Map. In order to establish rights on that land, the petitioner would need to go through land court.

Upon a motion by Mr. Vigliotti and seconded by Mr. Ochoa, the Board voted 3-0 that the Board take no action due to the fact that it is not on the Official Map.

Public Meetings

8. 50 Winneconnett Road – 81G Street Opening for Mohican Road (PB-2015-018) & Definitive Site Plan (PB-2015-004)

Carol Redden, HS&T Group, stated that she was representing the petitioner, Nick Grande, and that they were before the Board for an 81G for Mohican Road in order to provide access to the property located at 50 Winneconnett Road. There was an 81G approved for Mohican Road on October 18, 2006 but the work was never completed and the scope has since changed, therefore they had to refile for the new 81G. The proposal is to provide enough frontage for a four unit multi-family low rise building.

Ms. Redden stated that they are seeking to improve Mohican Road from Winneconnett Road northwesterly towards Dominion Road for a length of ~158 feet. She stated that a few changes have occurred since the plans were reviewed by DPW. The first is that the end of the road will now be flared out to provide additional access for emergency vehicles and for turnaround. The paving and curbing will be to City standards. Drainage is proposed for this project; a swale will be installed to collect runoff from the hill, also a catch basin that will connect to a new manhole in Mohican and will drain into the street drainage in Winneconnett. Silt fence and haybales will be provided around the site during construction.

Mr. Gervais stated that DPW's comment was regarding the flare on the road and the extent of the paving and the applicant addressed the comments with the revised plans.

Upon a motion by Mr. Vigliotti and seconded by Mr. Ochoa, the Board voted 3-0 to approve the 81G for Mohican Road with the conditions in the memo.

Ms. Redden stated that the applicant seeks to construct a 4-unit multi-family low-rise dwelling. Each unit will contain two bedrooms, a one-car under garage and one parking space in the driveway, for a total of 8 parking spaces. There will be a number of retaining walls on site. A dumpster is proposed onsite and snow storage will be to the side of the driveway. Additional snow will be trucked offsite. There is no additional lighting proposed onsite other than the lighting on the entrance of the building. There will be no signs on this site. Landscaping will conform to the city ordinance. They will connect to the City's municipal water and sewer system. Roof runoff will be collected by a drywell and will go into an infiltration system along with the runoff from the driveway.

Ms. Redden stated that 60% of the site will be impervious. There will be ~6,400 SF of open space.

Mr. Gervais stated that the City does not pick up dumpsters for trash. Mr. Grande stated that the City picks up trash for buildings with less than 6 units so the dumpster will probably be removed.

Ms. Tatasciore stated that the petitioner received a Special Permit from the Zoning Board on October 20, 2014 for the approval of a multi-family low-rise use. She stated that most of the

comments are annotative changes. She did state that staff was suggesting curbing be provided around the proposed grass islands. Ms. Redden stated that was added to the revised plans.

Ms. Tatasciore asked for clarification on the conflict between the plan and the rendering as the former depicts a walkway with steps and the latter does not portray steps. Ms. Redden stated that the renderings will be modified to show the changes on the plans. Ms. Tatasciore asked if additional fencing is proposed on-site. Ms. Redden stated that retaining wall will have fencing on top but the fencing around the dumpster will be removed since the dumpster will also be removed.

Ms. Tatasciore stated that applicant needs the following waivers:

1. Showing trees in excess of 9 inches in diameter on the plan.
2. Showing abutters within 300 feet of the site.

Mr. Vigliotti asked what type of fencing will be installed on top of the retaining walls. Mr. Grande stated that chain-link fencing. Mr. Truman asked if they could install black-vinyl coated or some other type. Mr. Grande stated that he was open to other types of fencing.

Upon a motion by Mr. Ochoa and seconded by Mr. Vigliotti, the Board voted 3-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan with the conditions of approval in the memo, and that the fencing be stockade or similar material.

Upon a motion by Mr. Ochoa and seconded by Mr. Vigliotti, the Board voted 3-0 to approve the waivers requested.

List of Exhibits:

- Exhibit A: 50 Winneconnett Road – Definitive Site Plan Application; received January 29, 2015; prepared by Nicholas Grande.
- Exhibit B: 50 Winneconnett Road – Definitive Site Plan; dated January 21, 2015 and revised on March 12, 2015; prepared by H.S. & T. Group, Inc.
- Exhibit C: Landscaping Plan; dated November 21, 2014; prepared by J.R. Associates.
- Exhibit D: Renderings; received January 29, 2015.
- Exhibit E: Hydrology & Stormwater Management Report; dated January 29, 2015 and revised on March 12, 2015; prepared by H.S. & T. Group, Inc.
- Exhibit F: Belgrade Terrace Building Sites Plan; dated 1913; approved by the Worcester District Forestry on January 20, 1914.
- Exhibit G: Zoning Board of Appeals Special Permit Decision – October 20, 2014

9. 421 Grove Street – Definitive Site Plan (PB-2015-006)

Robert Murphy, Murphy Associates and Environmental Consultants, representing Lake 20, LLC, stated that they had to come before the board because the site has more than 15% slope and they plan to level the site and install a retaining wall in the rear that will allow greater utilization of the lot. There is an existing gas station onsite that was built in 1914 so they obtained Historical Commission approval for a complete demolition of the building. They have also appeared

before the Conservation Commission due to the catch basins in close proximity of the site and they obtained an Order of Conditions.

Mr. Murphy stated that they plan to build a new brick building, to be used as an AT&T Wireless store. They also plan to have an ATM, which won't be accessible from the AT&T store. They provided more than the required parking, plus one handicapped space. Mr. Murphy stated that they are amenable to all the conditions of approval suggested by staff.

Mr. Gervais stated that they had several comments but the applicant provided the stormwater calculations and existing conditions plans that were requested. Their only question is regarding the catch basin near the edge of the driveway near the infiltration system because that was not part of the set of plans they reviewed.

Mr. Murphy stated that they planned to place the catch basin closer to the road but they were approached by National Grid, who requested that they be allowed to put an underground manhole in order to provide a drop down transformer system to provide electricity to the area. This required that they move their infiltration system. He discussed different options available to them with Mr. Gervais and they came up with a solution to tie into the onsite catch basin.

Ms. Smith stated that the photometric plan show lighting levels along Grove Street appear to be extremely low and lighting areas along the lot line with the residence to the west of the subject property appear to generate substantial overspill. Mr. Murphy was asked to comment on the adequacy of the proposed lighting and address the overspill – particularly where the property abuts residences. Mr. Murphy stated that they had two light poles proposed on either side of the property but now they will install lighting on the building to provide light around the building with little to no spillover. They will also shield the lights. They will revise the photometric plan to show that.

Ms. Smith stated that the applicant is showing a 6 ft. green-vinyl-coated chain-link style fence atop the proposed retaining wall. Staff would prefer an alternate fencing type given the proximity to the residential area to the west. Would the applicant consider an alternate style of fencing? Mr. Murphy stated that the retaining wall will be 14-15 ft. high. There is a slope towards the back of the property that slopes toward the retaining wall, which is why they raised the wall a few extra feet and will be adding fencing to ensure that no one could fall over. He then explained how the retaining wall will be installed.

Upon a motion by Mr. Vigliotti and seconded by Mr. Ochoa, the Board voted 3-0 to grant the waiver request to label all abutters within 300 feet.

Upon a motion by Mr. Vigliotti and seconded by Mr. Ochoa, the Board voted 3-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan with the conditions in the staff memo and that the drainage pipe be removed as indicated along with the catch basin per DPW's recommendation, that the photometric plan comply with the City Ordinance, and that the fence atop the training wall be stockade or vinyl.

List of Exhibits:

Exhibit A: 421 & 427 Grove Street Application; received 2/12/2015; prepared by Steve Venincasa.

Exhibit B: 421 & 427 Grove Street Plan; dated 10/14/2014, revised 1/21/2015; prepared by Robert G. Murphy Associates, Inc.

- Exhibit C: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Department of Public Works & Parks to the Planning Board; re: 421 & 427 Grove Street; dated 3/18/2015.
- Exhibit D: Historical Commission Decision; dated 9/11/2014.
- Exhibit E: Worcester Fire Department Comments; undated.
- Exhibit F: Rendering of proposed structure at 421 & 427 Grove Street; prepared by HPA Design Inc; undated; received 4/7/2015.
- Exhibit G: 421 & 427 Grove Street Photometric Plan; prepared by LSI Industries; dated 4/1/2015; received 4/7/2015.
- Exhibit H: 421 & 427 Grove Street Request to Postpone; dated 3/24/2015; received 4/7/2015.

10. 20 & 24 Rockdale Street – Parking Plan (PB-2015-009)

Michael Loin, Bertin Engineering, representing Rockdale Brooks, LLC, stated that his client seeks to construct a ~13,000 SF parking area with 16 accessory off-street parking spaces, to be used in association with a 19,000 SF educational use at 20 Rockdale Street, along with associated grading, paving, drainage, and site work on the southern side of property located at 24 Rockdale Street and the northern side of property located at 20 Rockdale Street. The school will be for troubled youth; it will be a rehabilitation program. The students will come by van and no school buses will be at the site.

Mr. Loin stated that the project has received an Order of Conditions from the Conservation Commission. He stated that the site was 100% impervious but per the Conservation Commission's request, they have pulled the pavement back in order to install a five foot landscaping buffer on the north side. They are looking to add a portico overhang over the main entrance. Construction is ongoing on the inside of the building. They are providing more than the required parking spaces. They addressed the recommended conditions from staff and the Fire Department.

Mr. Loin addressed the questions to the applicant in the memo. He stated that there will only be up to 30 students in this school so they have a designated delivery area but it will not have large trucks making deliveries. The overhang, along the west side of the existing building nearest Rockdale Street, already exists and is to remain. The existing lighting will remain on the manufacturing side. The photometric plan shows the proposed parking lighting.

Mr. Gervais stated that all of DPW's comments have been addressed in the last set of revised plans.

Ms. Smith stated that the applicant addressed all of staff's questions. She recommended that the Board approve the plan with conditions and staff can verify compliance on the revised plans.

Mr. Loin requested a waiver from labeling abutters within 300 feet.

Mr. Truman asked if DPW wanted the driveways flush with the curb cut. Mr. Gervais stated that they did prefer that they are flush but as long as it meets ADA standards they are amenable.

Upon a motion by Mr. Ochoa and seconded by Mr. Vigliotti, the Board voted 3-0 to approve the waiver requested.

Upon a motion by Mr. Ochoa and seconded by Mr. Vigliotti, the Board voted 3-0 to approve the Parking Plan with the conditions in the staff memo and that they coordinate with DPW on the curb cuts.

List of Exhibits:

- Exhibit A: 20-24 Rockdale Street Application; received 2/18/2015; prepared by Rockdale Brooks, LLC.
- Exhibit B: 20-24 Rockdale Street Plan; dated 2/10/2015, last revised 4/2/2015; prepared by Bertin Engineering.
- Exhibit C: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Department of Public Works & Parks to the Planning Board; re: 20-24 Rockdale Street Parking Plan; dated 3/19/2015.
- Exhibit D: Worcester Fire Department Comments undated.
- Exhibit E: Request for Postponement from Bertin Engineering; dated 3/23/2015.
- Exhibit F: 20 – 24 Rockdale Street Approval Not Required Plan, endorsed 3/25/2015.
- Exhibit G: Emails from Michael Loin, Bertin Engineering, to staff; dated 4/9/2015.

- 11. Goldthwaite Road (Burncoat Gardens – Phase II) – Extension of Time - Definitive Site Plan (PB-2015-012)**
- 12. Goldthwaite Road (Burncoat Gardens – Phase III) – Extension of Time - Definitive Site Plan (PB-2015-013)**

Items 11 & 12 were taken up contemporaneously.

Ms. Tatasciore stated that the applicant was not present but these are administrative applications that can be taken up by the board without a representative present. She stated that the approvals expired February 24, 2015. They did file on that date and they are asking for a one year extension to April 15, 2016.

Upon a motion by Mr. Vigliotti and seconded by Mr. Ochoa, the Board voted 3-0 to approve the extensions of time for Goldthwaite Road (Burncoat Gardens – Phase II & III) to April 15, 2016.

- 13. 28 Bullard Avenue – Definitive Site Plan (PB-2015-014)**

Jeff Howland of JH Engineering, representing the owner/applicant, stated that this also includes a 15 ft. strip that is known as 0 Bullard Ave, that the applicant recently purchased. The applicant proposes to construct three single-family detached dwellings, on three lots, with a total of 6 off-street parking spaces, along with associated drainage, grading, paving, site work, and landscaping on property located at 0 & 28 Bullard Avenue.

Mr. Howland addressed the questions to the applicant in the memo. He stated that they will try to save any trees they can. They are proposing two story single family detached dwellings with garages underneath. He requested a waiver from labeling abutters within 300 feet.

Ms. Smith stated that the applicant's engineer should also request a waiver from labeling trees with 9" or more in diameter on the plan. Mr. Howland stated that he will show the trees on the plans and does not need that waiver.

Upon a motion by Mr. Ochoa and seconded by Mr. Vigliotti, the Board voted 3-0 to grant he waiver requested.

Upon a motion by Mr. Vigliotti and seconded by Mr. Ochoa, the Board voted 3-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan with all the conditions in the memo.

14. 0 Eustis Street – Definitive Site Plan (PB-2015-015)

Jeff Howland, JH engineering, representing the owner/applicant, stated that the applicant proposes to construct a ~1,800 SF (footprint) single-family semi-detached dwelling (duplex) along with four off-street parking spaces with minor grading. Drainage will connect to Eustis and drywells will be installed for each of the units. There are a few retaining walls proposed onsite. He requested a waiver from labeling abutters within 300 feet.

Ms. Tatasciore stated that no rendering was supplied and asked that one be submitted. Staff recommends approval with the conditions in the memo.

Upon a motion by Mr. Ochoa and seconded by Mr. Vigliotti, the Board voted 3-0 to grant the waiver requested.

Upon a motion by Mr. Ochoa and seconded by Mr. Vigliotti, the Board voted 3-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan with the conditions in the memo.

List of Exhibits

Exhibit A: Definitive Site Plan Application; prepared by owner/applicant Enilton Lisboa; received March 6, 2015.

Exhibit B: Definitive Site Plan; prepared by JH Engineering Group LLC; dated February 17, 2015; received January 23, 2015

Exhibit C: Memo from DPW; dated April 9, 2015.

Exhibit D: ANR Plan; endorsed June 25, 2015.

Exhibit E: Letter of Opposition from abutter S. & E. Gardell; received April 8, 2015.

15. 366 Shrewsbury Street – Parking Plan (PB-2015-021)

David Mackwell, Kelly Engineering Group, representing Reliant Medical, stated that the parking will serve the needs of the proposed 14,000 SF medical building. The property is located within the BG-2.0 (Business, General) zoning district, the Commercial Corridors Overlay District Shrewsbury Street Subarea (CCOD-S). They had to redesign the site to move the building closer to Shrewsbury Street and added landscaping. Mr. Mackwell introduced Anna Ng of Reliant Medical Group and engineers from Cutler Associates. He stated that they are amenable to all the conditions but he had a question regarding the loading space.

Mr. Mackwell stated that the abutter at 10 Imperial Place was concerned about screening and wants to see a fence maintained. She was also concerned because there is a portion of the sidewalk on Imperial Place that is overgrown and has reverted to grass and people in the area use

it to walk their dogs and do not clean after their pets. Therefore, she requested that the applicant work with DPW to restore that sidewalk so that people are not able to hide their dog waste so easily.

Ms. Donovan stated that if the loading space does not have an elevated door but just a regular door, arbor vitae will meet the requirement of the ordinance to enclose the loading area if it's within 100 feet of a residential area.

Mr. Gervais stated that they have no comments on the plans but asked for clarification on the sidewalk the neighbor is referring to. He stated that he would prefer the plan not be conditioned dependent on a city sidewalk. They would need to look into the matter further to determine why the sidewalk no longer exists.

Ms. Tatasciore stated that the issue of the sidewalk is outside of the board's purview. She stated that the applicant seeks to construct an 82 space surface parking lot along with associated drainage, grading, paving, site work, and landscaping at property located at 366 Shrewsbury Street. A photometric plan was submitted on April 10th and it complies with the City's requirements. She asked the engineer to clarify which curb cuts are to remain and which ones are to be removed.

Mr. Mackwell stated that there are two existing curb cuts that will be used to service the site. The first is on Shrewsbury Street and one on Granby Road. They will be opening another curb cut at the northwesterly side and then closing off the remaining three curb cuts.

Ms. Tatasciore asked if the existing chain-link fence will remain. Mr. Mackwell stated that they plan to replace the fencing along the residential properties with black-vinyl coated chain-link. Ms. Tatasciore asked the engineer to consider stockade or vinyl on the residential side and the engineer was amenable to it. Ms. Tatasciore stated that the applicant needs to show the snow storage area but reminded him that it cannot be placed in the landscape buffers.

Ms. Tatasciore asked if outdoor amenities, such as benches and picnic tables, will be provided and asked him to review the placement of the retaining walls. Mr. Mackwell stated that the final plan will include that but they are still finalizing the design and showed where the retaining walls would go.

Ms. Tatasciore asked Mr. Mackwell to comment on the noise from the transformer that is located close to the residential area. Mr. Mackwell stated that they can provide information on it when applying for the permit to ensure that complies with noise levels allowed and they will also provide a sound barrier. He also stated that they will try to move the dumpster further away from the residential area.

Ms. Tatasciore stated that she recommends approval with the conditions in the memo. She did recommend striking the one that states that "The loading space, located within 100 feet of a Residence district, shall have enclosed material handling activities"; and the one that states that "Provide a photometric plan which is compliant with the requirements of the Ordinance". She also asked the board to amend the condition regarding chain-link fencing be amended to state that stockade fence be provided along the residential neighbors.

Mr. Ochoa asked about the hours of operations and whether that will affect the lighting of the parking lot. Mr. Mackwell stated that Reliant Medical will not be sharing their parking lot with any other business or entity.

Upon a motion by Mr. Ochoa and seconded by Mr. Vigliotti, the Board voted 3-0 to approve the parking plan with the conditions in the memo and eliminating the conditions 1(h) and 1(i), as mentioned by Ms. Tatasciore, also that stockade fencing be installed along the property lines shared with residential areas, also that the applicant find an area for the dumpster that least affect the residential neighbors if possible.

List of Exhibits

- Exhibit A: Parking Plan Application; received March 12, 2015; prepared by Anna Ng of Reliant Medical Group.
- Exhibit B: Site Development Plans for 366 Shrewsbury Street; dated March 10, 2015; prepared by Kelly Engineering Group, Inc.
- Exhibit C: Stormwater Management Report; dated March 10, 2015; prepared by Kelly Engineering Group, Inc.
- Exhibit D: Exterior Elevations & Floor Plan; dated March 10, 2015; prepared by MPA Architects.

OTHER BUSINESS

16. Approval Not Required (ANR) Plans:

- a. 35 Nelson Place (public) (AN-2015-011)

Ms. Tatasciore stated that this plan is in two sheets and it relates to the Nelson Place School and there are numerous owners involved. There is a significant amount of land swapping and easements. The rear portions of the lots on Hapgood Road (A-D) can be conveyed from the property owners to the City of Worcester. There is also a temporary 15 foot wide easement for construction. Parcel E is also being conveyed to the City. Parcel F is being conveyed from the City to the property owner at 51 Nelson place and then there's another portion from the same owner to the City. There are several other temporary construction easements.

Upon a motion by Mr. Vigliotti and seconded by Mr. Ochoa, the Board voted 3-0 to endorse the ANR.

17. Review and adoption of draft Special Permit Application for Commercial Corridor Overlay District – Item forthcoming, draft was not ready.

18. Signing of Decisions from prior meetings – decisions were signed and the Registry of Deeds authorization form.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon a motion by Mr. Ochoa and seconded by Mr. Vigliotti, the Board voted 3-0 to adjourn at 8:36 p.m.