

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

Wednesday August 18, 2021

Worcester City Hall - Levi Lincoln Chamber, with remote participation options available via Webex online at <https://cow.webex.com/meet/planningboardwebex> and call-in number 415-655-0001 (Access Code: 1601714991).

Planning Board Members Participating: Albert LaValley, Chair
Edward Moynihan, Vice Chair
Conor McCormack

Planning Board Members Participating Remotely: None

Planning Board Members Absent: Kevin Aguirre, Clerk

Staff present: Michelle Smith, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
Marisa Lau, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
Steve Rolle, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services

Staff Participating Remotely: Jody Kennedy Valade
Nick Lyford
Alexandra Kalkounis

Call to Order – Board Chair LaValley called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm

Requests for Continuances, Extensions, Postponements, and Withdrawals

- Item 1: 47R Fourth Street (PB-2020-072) – Definitive Site Plan & Special Permit to allow a Cluster Group of Single-Family Dwellings**
Request to Postpone the Public Meeting & Hearing to September 29, 2021
Extend the Constructive Grant Deadline to October 21, 2021
- Item 2: The former Kendig Street ROW (between Attleboro Street and Clay Street); part of 11 Attleboro Street; Attleboro Street (from Glade Street +/- 700ft to Coonan Street); Coonan Street (from Attleboro Street west 75ft and east 75ft); Glade Street (from Attleboro Street west 50ft); Kendig Street (from Attleboro Street west 50ft); and Clay Street (at the intersection with the former Kendig Street ROW) (PB-2021-012) 81-G Street Opening & G.R.O. Chapter 12 Section 12 Private Street Improvements, and Definitive Site Plan**
Request to Postpone the Public Meeting to September 8, 2021
Extend the Constructive Grant Deadline to September 30, 2021
- Item 3: 5, 7 & 9 Richards Street (PB-2021-014) – Amendment to Definitive Site Plan**

Request to Postpone the Public Meeting to September 8, 2021
Extend the Constructive Grant Deadline to September 30, 2021

- Item 4: 573 Grafton Street (PB-2021-020) – Definitive Site Plan**
Request to Postpone the Public Meeting to September 8, 2021
Extend the Constructive Grant Deadline to September 30, 2021

On a motion made Mr. Moynihan, seconded by Mr. McCormack, the Board voted 3-0 to grant the postponements.

New Business

- Item 5: 0 & 305 Belmont Street (aka 0 or Lots 1, 8, & 10 Reactory (fka Hospital) Drive) (PB-2021-043)**

a. Public Meeting – Amendment to Definitive Site Plan

Attorney Mark Borenstein presented in-person on behalf of the applicant. He described modifications to the site plan (increased height to four stories; reconfigured entrance, additional parking/reduced loading, changes to drainage and utilities location). He noted there were minor changes to the building footprint. He also described updates to the stormwater management system that have performed well so far in rain events. Lastly, he addressed staff comments and asked for conditions to be slightly revised from the staff memo by combining condition 1b and 1c and revising 1s. Staff supported the revisions.

Mr. Rolle described work by the applicant to incorporate additional changes to the façade and stormwater system based on staff feedback; supported the revisions to staff-recommended conditions as stated by the attorney.

Staff Comment

Nick Lyford, DPW&P, confirmed the Department agrees with Mr. Rolle that the stormwater system has been improved and it did not have any concerns over capacity at that point. There were no additional staff comments.

Public Comment

1. Gloria Caprioli, 30 Prentice Street, stated she had concerns about noise especially from blasting and normal operations, dirt and air quality, and impact of development on water pressure. She described experience with the construction site to date. Chair LaValley noted that the Board was going to take all the public comments first and then give the applicant the opportunity to respond.
2. Roberta Brien, Worcester Business Development Corporation, stated her organization was in support of the plan amendment and hoped past issues would be addressed by the proposed revisions; looked forward to improved communication from the applicant with neighbors. She reiterated the project will result in new jobs and business sector for Worcester.

Mr. Borenstein responded to comments. He stated the applicant will continue their efforts to improve communications with the neighborhood association and Councilor Mero-Carlson; confirmed that site has been stabilized and is ready for development, with previous issues resolved.

Board Discussion

Board Member Moynihan confirmed with staff that rooftop utilities will be adequately screened, Fire had reviewed the revised plan for turning analysis, etc. and the increase in building size would not impact traffic study results; Mr. Rolle and Ms. Smith confirmed. Mr. Moynihan complimented applicant and staff on working towards an aesthetically pleasing design with an increase in EV charging stations. He confirmed waivers and changes to conditions with the applicant.

Board Member McCormack asked the applicant to comment on noise. Mr. Borenstein stated Wuxi is biotech, not a traditional manufacturing use, and their technology is quite advanced. He confirmed there should not be any noticeable sound emanating from the property once the site is operational.

Board Chair LaValley stated he had previously supported the site plan approval. He also viewed the proposed changes to the stormwater system as positive. He noted concerns about the building size and massing and that he was sympathetic to issues related to past construction work, as a neighborhood resident also; he hoped they had been addressed. He asked about the proposed landscaping to curb heat island effect for parking area; staff described. He asked the applicant to consider additional trees near the main entrance and how to increase pedestrian access, noting existing patterns of use in this area as well as potential benefits for employee. Thomas Yue, applicant, and Mr. Rolle commented on feasibility for additional landscaping in that area. Mr. Yue responded to previous comments on noise reduction. He stated the rooftop utilities will be located away from the front of the building which is near the street.

On a motion by Mr. Moynihan; seconded by Mr. McCormack, the Board voted 3-0 (Aguirre absent) to approve the Definitive Site Plan Amendment subject to staff-recommended conditions of approval and grant waivers, deleting #1c and with the following revisions:

1b. Verify architectural columns and bollards are represented to-scale and that placement provides adequate walkway widths for compliance with ADA/Access Board requirements or revise walkways as necessary to meet minimum ADA/Access Board requirements, including clear width.

1s. Provide a photometric plan demonstrating the adequacy of proposed lighting (minimum 1 fc at all potential points of vehicular and pedestrian conflict) and including specifications and details for each proposed light fixture and eliminating any spots of glare (>10fc) or spillover at the property line or along public ways.

Item 6: 28-36 Moreland Green Drive (PB-2021-047)

a. Public Meeting – Definitive Site Plan

Zac Couture, HS&T Group, presented remotely on behalf of the applicant. The applicant also remotely participated in the meeting. The site plan proposed two single-family dwellings, each on their own lot. Mr. Couture described revisions to the site plan made in response to staff comments about required setbacks and maximum impervious surface area. The stormwater system was slightly relocated to a better location; areas with steep slopes/ledge will not be disturbed. He stated that any ledge on the site was shale and therefore no blasting would be required. Three street trees would be planted on each lot.

He described proposed erosion controls and the limit of clearing shown on the plan, he emphasized vegetated area along steep slopes would remain, and requested waivers in the staff memo.

Ms. Smith stated that plan revisions were received early today but staff had not updated their recommended conditions in the memo to the Board in order to thoroughly review the revisions. She summarized public comments received. One comment related to the original subdivision approval in the 1980s that prohibited further subdivision of the lots; she clarified that the proposed plan would not subdivide these lots and described the history of the development and previous Board approvals. Another concern related to a declaration of restrictive covenant that defined these lots as a common area for the subdivision. Staff review has shown that the covenant was a private agreement, could not be enforced by the City, and was not relevant to the current site plan application before the Planning Board. The applicant's lawyer's response to public comments was available on the Planning Board website.

Staff Comment

Nick Lyford, DPW, stated the drainage connection to the City system shall be DR18 material. There were no additional City comments.

Public Comment

1. Susan Moreleck - Abutter on Moreland Green Drive. She was concerned the project would require blasting and disrupt the neighborhood or cause damage to private property in the area. Mr. Rolle confirmed the engineer had stated the project will not require blasting and described the permitting process for projects with blasting. He also encouraged residents to look up more resources on the topic from the state and noted they can contact his office for these.
2. Edward Santiago – 33 Moreland Green. His property is located across from the project; stated that the neighborhood density is such that no additional houses should be built; discussed privacy, egress to/from development, drainage.
3. Christina MacDonald – 1 Glenbrook Lane. She agreed with prior statements opposing this development. Stated concerns about dirt and dust and the bus stop across from the development for safety reasons. Mr. Rolle indicated DPW&P would be the best resource to contact on how to install new stop signs or cross walks and gave information. Mr. Lyford stated he would check that proper signage is installed here and will follow up. Chair LaValley suggested she contact her councilperson for help addressing this issue.
4. Richard Wolf – Abutter. He summarized concerns stated by staff earlier about the private restrictive covenant and asked for additional information about tax history for subject parcels when these lots went from common land to buildable lots. He stated these are legal matters that may not be the purview of this board.
5. Brian MacDonald – 1 Glenbrook Lane. He stated the plan was misleading and he opposed building on these lots. He believed the ledge on site is mostly granite, not shale; had concerns about potential damage by construction equipment to repaved Moreland Green Drive; commented on stop sign situation; and described environmental concerns and reiterated the need for erosion controls to protect this conservation area.
6. James Walsh – Abutter for 29 years. He stated his views on the lots/current applications and that these were not buildable lots. Mr. Rolle commented that the assigned tax value is not relevant to whether a lot is buildable under the City's Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Walsh asked

whether there was a mistake in the assigned tax value for the properties. Chair LaValley replied that the Board is not able to comment on that matter, and described how the lots meet the zoning requirements for the proposed development.

7. Edward Santiago – 33 Moreland Green. He restated his concerns are how active construction will impact him and his neighbors and its long-term effects on neighboring properties.
8. Maureen Jarvis – 2 Glenbrook Lane. She had the same concerns as neighbors about safety/ egress/construction impact/ ledge and blasting. She related her history with the applicant's company and recalled statements made by them about not developing the lots in question.
9. Colin Novick – Greater Worcester Land Trust. He described prior decisions by the Planning Board and the City about this subdivision, and described how he sees the approval process as inconsistent. He questioned whether this Board or the City can decide whether the lots are buildable and suggested different paths forward for the City review process.
10. Steve Gallo – Applicant/developer. He stated he did not recall any blasting in this subdivision development when he was involved and described the rock hammering process to be used on both lots. He responded to several comments made regarding radon, emergency egress, land acquisition by his company from the original owner, and specific parcels that were mentioned.
11. Paul Matthews – 9 Greenview Lane. He stated he understands the deed covenants have been determined to be outside the board's purview; he asked for original covenant holders to be notified before this application should be allowed to proceed. Mr. Gallo asked for the covenant holders to produce documentation with that notification requirement.

Chair LaValley asked if City staff wanted to respond. Mr. Rolle restated the City's position that the only restrictions enforced by the City related to subdivision of these lots, not development of the lots. Staff has reviewed private covenants that the City is not a party to and it has been determined the City has no responsibility to enforce them. Ms. Kalkounis, Law Department, confirmed the covenant holders would have to pursue the matters raised in the courts.

Board Discussion

Board Member McCormack stated that based on the information provided the Board would have to rely on the City's position that the lots are buildable. He asked whether pedestrian walks will be provided; applicant's representative confirmed.

Board Member Moynihan stated that legal concerns about buildability were not the purview of the Board's site plan review. He asked DPW&P if stormwater runoff would be adequately contained during and after construction. Mr. Lyford responded that he couldn't speak to the construction phase, but there were no issues anticipated post-construction and noted the relatively small increase in impervious area and recharge for roof runoff. Mr. Rolle also responded that several conditions related to erosion control to better secure the site, including a condition to redirect overflow from the infiltration unit away from steep slopes on Lot F. He directed residents with drainage concerns to contact Inspectional Services. Ms. Smith discussed further approvals needed for the project related to drainage and runoff from the Conservation Commission.

Chair LaValley thanked residents for coming out and voicing concerns at the public meeting, despite the frustration of not having the Board be able to take action based on those issues.

On a motion by Mr. Moynihan, seconded by Mr. McCormack, the Board voted 3-0 (Aguirre absent) to approve the Definitive Site Plan subject to staff-recommended conditions of approval and grant waivers.

Item 7: 50 & 62 Richland Street & 22 Dorchester Street (PB-2021-051)

a. Public Meeting – Parking Plan

Attorney Joshua Lee Smith presented in-person on behalf of the applicant, Learning First Foundation and public charter school which has purchased the site (formerly St. Mary's school) to expand further and relocate their current operations. He described the existing parking conditions and stated the proposed changes would reorganize and improve circulation in both parking areas – one across from the school, and one located behind the building. These changes, which include a proposed crosswalk and sidewalk improvements, would provide safe circulation for staff, students and visitors. Changes would also include upgraded playground facilities and new landscaping installed. Additionally, the applicant planned to renovate the building interior although that process is separate from the parking plan approval. Several project team members presented on different aspects of the project: Kathy Bartels from LLB Architects described building renovations, Traffic Engineer from VHB described traffic operations related to pick up and drop off (Mr. Smith highlighted additional off-site parking for the school), and Rosie Fayard, VP from Learning First described the importance of this project to overall operations of the foundation/school.

Mr. Smith went over staff comments in the memo and stated the project team was in agreement with these. Ms. Smith noted that comments seem to have been addressed through subsequent revisions and the applicant should request the waivers identified. Also, an updated determination with respect to Dover Amendment applicability for the project as revised should be part of the final submission.

Staff Comment

Ms. Valade noted that the project has been reviewed and determined exempt per the Dover Amendment.

Mr. Lyford stated that Traffic and Parking committee approval is needed for a crosswalk.

There were no public comments.

Board Discussion

Board Member McCormack stated he was happy to see the building is being renovated. He noted the narrow width of the drive aisle behind the school from Endicott St. Ms. Smith noted that since the access is existing and changes are not proposed, Fire found it acceptable. He asked the applicant to consider increasing the 3' landscape buffer on the western side of 22 Dorchester Street to 4'.

Board Member Moynihan lamented the lack of EV parking. He asked if Gates Street traffic will be distributed evenly on surrounding streets and where new basketball court will be located. Traffic engineer confirmed surrounding streets can accommodate new traffic, thanks in part to changes to regulations on either side of Richland St. Mr. Smith stated the existing basketball court will be removed from the parking lot, and one hoop will be installed in the playground.

Chair LaValley stated the project is a great reuse for this building and was happy to support it.

On a motion by Mr. Moynihan, seconded by Mr. McCormack, the Board voted 3-0 (Aguirre absent) to approve the Parking Plan subject to staff-recommended conditions of approval and grant waivers.

Item 8: 500 Salisbury Street (PB-2021-054)

a. Public Meeting – Parking Plan

Carl Hultgren presented remotely on behalf of the applicant. He stated Assumption University has proposed to expand an existing driveway and construct 27 parking spaces near Authier Hall. Runoff from the parking area would flow into an infiltration basin for treatment. The project will utilize lighting fixtures from elsewhere on campus. He noted the residence hall does not have ADA-accessible units and no such parking is proposed; no EV spaces are proposed either in the new lot per the campus master plan. He asked for waivers and checked that large boulders for vehicular barriers from the stormwater swale would comply with condition 1d in the staff memo. Ms. Smith confirmed the boulders would be sufficient in this regard and asked if applicant was amenable to conditions in the staff memo.

There were no additional staff comments.

Public Comment

Meg Giarusso – Abutter. She stated that the university had removed vegetation in recent years that used to provide shielding from campus lighting. She was concerned with the impact on residences near the Nelson Place gate. Mr. Hultgren confirmed this general area as the project location and described where he thought additional trees could be added to help shield residences. Ms. Smith noted that conditions for retrofitting light temperature appropriately were recommended, and requested evergreen trees should be conditioned to provide glare protection, in addition to those trees required to help offset heat island effect from new impervious area. Ms. Giarusso asked how tall the light poles would be; Mr. Hultgren described these as standard height consistent with other poles in use. She asked about the distance of the proposed lot from the gate; Mr. Hultgren described. She further described her concerns about vehicular traffic relative to the dorm use and expansion of parking closer to the campus limits. Ms. Smith added that a row of arborvitae would be more effective than evergreens to shield lighting in that case; Chair LaValley proposed a new condition to which Mr. Hultgren was amenable.

Board Discussion

Board Member McCormack appreciated the applicant working through glare issues with neighbors.

Board Member Moynihan asked for details about EV charging stations and ADA accessible parking on campus. Mr. Hultgren noted that there were plans for charging stations in a garage and select spaces elsewhere on campus. He did not know how many spaces approximately were proposed. He thought the university would be amenable to lay conduit during the construction process for the parking area. He also confirmed there was sufficient ADA parking elsewhere on campus.

Chair LaValley agreed with prior comments on the importance on adding EV infrastructure during construction; noted it would be easy to install in this particular location.

On a motion by Mr. Moynihan, seconded by Mr. McCormack, the Board voted 3-0 (Aguirre absent) to approve the Parking Plan subject to staff-recommended conditions of approval with an addition:

Add three evergreen trees of minimum 3.5" caliper along southeast corner of the parking area and additional vegetation as deemed necessary to screen lights from the abutting residences

and grant waivers.

Item 9: 172 (aka Lot 8) Gates Lane (fka a portion of 45 Montague Street) (PB-2021-055)

a. Public Meeting – Definitive Site Plan

Ron Thunberg presented remotely on behalf of the applicant. The plan proposed a single family house on property with 15% or more grades in the corner of the site. The applicant incorporated staff feedback about erosion controls for construction. Stormwater infiltration is proposed with a connection to the City drainage system. He asked for waivers in the staff memo.

Ms. Smith asked about roof runoff; Mr. Thunberg confirmed 100% of the roof runoff will drain to the stormwater unit.

Staff Comments

Mr. Lyford requested the size, material, and tie-in with City system of utility connections be shown. There were no other comments from City staff and no public comments.

There was no Board discussion on the application.

On a motion by Mr. Moynihan, seconded by Mr. McCormack, the Board voted 3-0 (Aguirre absent) to approve the Definitive Site Plan subject to staff-recommended conditions of approval and grant waivers.

Item 10: 65 Cedar Street (PB-2021-056)

a. Public Meeting – Definitive Site Plan

Attorney Brian Falk presented in-person on behalf of the applicant. He was joined by other project team members Steve Quist and Kevin Dandrade. The Definitive Site Plan proposed to convert the existing dwelling (currently vacant; former dormitory "Maple Hall") into a lodging house for seasonal use by Worcester Railers. He described prior approvals received for the project. He noted the project team had reviewed the staff memo and was amenable for conditions.

Mr. Rolle added that the Zoning Ordinance specifies lodging houses are subject to site plan review, and this was the final approval needed for the project. He pointed out a landscaped buffer for a parking area that is actually located on the adjacent property through an easement, which was approved by ZBA. Also, the expanded parking area behind the dwelling included a drywell to mitigate increased impervious area on the site.

There were no City staff comments and no public comments.

Board Discussion

Board Member Moynihan asked the applicant if the lodging house license had been granted and for more details about the Fire alarm system. Mr. Falk confirmed the license approval and provided details

about the alarm and sprinkler system; the latest floor plans were submitted to the City. he also asked for the waivers.

Chair LaValley noted that the building had been a Becker dormitory for a long time and that the proposed use was very similar. He was glad to see reinvestment in the property by a local institution.

On a motion by Mr. Moynihan, seconded by Mr. McCormack, the Board voted 3-0 (Aguirre absent) to approve the Definitive Site Plan subject to staff-recommended conditions of approval and grant waivers.

Item 14e: 65 Cedar St ANR (AN-2021-053)

Mr. Rolle recommended the Board take Item 14e out of order; it was an ANR plan for the same property to fix an encroachment through a land transfer. He stated the plan was endorseable.

On a motion by Mr. Moynihan, seconded by Mr. McCormack, the Board voted 3-0 (Aguirre absent) to endorse the ANR plan.

Item 11: Lot B (fka part of 25) Apthorp Street (PB-2021-057)

a. Public Meeting – Definitive Site Plan

Patrick Healy presented in person on behalf of the applicant. He described the location of the project and that it had been before the Conservation Commission already. The plan proposed a single family dwelling on a lot with 15% or more grades at the northwest property line. He described the plan; wetlands and intermittent stream on the property; drainage connection; parking spaces; proposed infiltration for roof runoff. He discussed changes made to erosion controls with the Commission and tree plantings based on staff feedback for this plan. A proposed underground propane tank was removed from the plan (tanks will be inside the house). He confirmed staff conditions would be followed and asked for waivers.

Ms. Smith stated the property is located in the Water Resources Protection Overlay District, which related to the concern expressed regarding the storage tank underground. She asked if applicant was amenable to all conditions including for some sort of edging to be installed along driveway and tree replacement if needed. She also stated the project will need to establish an easement for a shared driveway prior to receiving a building permit. Mr. Healy confirmed they were amenable to all conditions.

There were no additional City staff comments and no public comments.

There was no Board discussion on the application.

On a motion by Mr. Moynihan, seconded by Mr. McCormack, the Board voted 3-0 (Aguirre absent) to approve the Definitive Site Plan subject to staff-recommended conditions of approval and grant waivers.

Item 12: Lot 2 (fka part of 45) Garrison Avenue (PB-2021-059)

a. Public Meeting – Definitive Site Plan

Ron Thunberg presented remotely on behalf of the applicant. The plan proposed a single family dwelling with two-car garage (tandem spaces) on a vacant lot. He stated the intent was to infiltrate 100% of the roof runoff but they had not determined if this was possible. He described the proposed drainage connection to City system.

Ms. Smith stated her question about the overflow connection had been answered. She asked if grades next to house will be clarified on the plan; he confirmed they would be on the revised plan.

Staff Comments

Ms. Valade asked what the regularity factor would be; Mr. Thunberg replied.

Mr. Lyford requested the size, material, and tie-in with City system of utility connections be shown. There were no other comments from City staff and no public comments.

There was no Board discussion on the application.

On a motion by Mr. Moynihan, seconded by Mr. McCormack, the Board voted 3-0 (Aguirre absent) to approve the Definitive Site Plan subject to staff-recommended conditions of approval.

Item 13: 300 Southbridge Street (ZA-2021-004)

a. Public Hearing – Zoning Map Amendment

Attorney Todd Brodeur presented in person on behalf of the applicant. He stated the application was to extend the Adaptive Reuse Overlay District (AROD) to this parcel zoned MG-2. He described the applicant, Dalfior Development, and its existing projects in the area; the proposed use for residential with some ground-floor commercial space and other site improvements (existing diner to remain on site); history of the manufacturing building built ca. 1866 and plans for rehabilitation process funded by historic tax credits.

Mr. Rolle provided additional background on the property and the purpose of the AROD, which was to facilitate the redevelopment of abandoned or underutilized buildings that had fallen into disrepair for different purposes. He described the additional uses and flexible design options that would be available if the AROD was extended on the property. He also noted the AROD had been added in recent years to several other properties in the area.

There were no additional City staff comments.

Public Comment

Paul Giorgio – Abutter on Gold Street. He supported the proposed reuse of the property and noted building deterioration.

Amanda – She described the current use of property as a collaborative place for community members. She opposed the rezoning since the proposed use would not serve community members particularly youth. She clarified her town of residence is Leicester. She clarified that she was not a City resident but was part of this community.

Nelly Medina – Central MA organizer for MA Jobs for Justice; Coordinator for Worcester Community United and other organizations. She described community-based programming for youth that had been housed in the building and talked about the demolition of historic buildings, gentrification, displacement, and serving community members in the city. She stated that the property should be restored and preserved as a community space.

Board Discussion

Board Member McCormack stated he was sympathetic to members of the Bridge and community members, but support the adaptive re-use on this property.

Board Member Moynihan summarized his views, and stated both preserving historic buildings and maintaining the momentum of downtown redevelopment is important; however he will vote no since he can't support the rezoning based on the proposed project as is.

Chair LaValley agreed with callers that the loss of the community use is a detriment. He stated that the Planning Board should not try to stop development to prevent a developer from going forward with a proposed use; that method seems backwards looking. He asked staff to clarify what the procedural implications would be of the vote.

Mr. Rolle stated that the motion would be recorded as a 2:1 vote to favorably recommend the rezoning and the range of discussion would be reflected in the report to Council, including why there was a dissenting vote and the reasons for that.

Board Member McCormack added that he seconded the Chair's comments but believed that rezoning was the best way forward for preservation of the property.

On a motion by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. Moynihan, the Board voted 3-0 (Aguirre absent) to close the public hearing.

On a motion by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. Moynihan, the Board voted 2-1 (Moynihan against; Aguirre absent) to favorably recommend the zoning map amendment to Council.

Other Business

Item 14: Approval Not Required (ANRs)

- a. 0 & 7 Ellie Way (Public) (AN-2021-050)
- b. 21 & 23 Creston Street (Public & Private) (AN-2021-049)
- c. 56 Northboro Street (Private) & Pollock Street (Private) (AN-2021-051)
- d. 198 Dana Avenue (Public) (AN-2021-052)

On a motion by Mr. Moynihan, seconded by Mr. McCormack, the Board voted 3-0 (Aguirre absent) to endorse the ANRs.

Item 15: Street Petitions

- a. Petition to Convert to Public – Allston Avenue (ST-2021-0023)

On a motion by Mr. Moynihan, seconded by Mr. McCormack, the Board voted 3-0 (Aguirre absent) to favorably recommend conversion of Allston Avenue to a Public Way from its southern terminus north +/- 325' to the end of the private section at a priority 1 level as recommended by DPW&P.

Item 16: Subdivisions

- a. Kiara Drive
 - i. Request for extension of performance agreement work completion date

ii. Request for partial, conditional release for Lot 8L&R (as reconfigured) from the restrictive covenant 3-0

Ms. Smith explained the request. Lots 8L&R were reconfigured via ANR plan.

On a motion by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. Moynihan, the Board voted 3-0 (Aguirre absent) to grant the extension of the performance agreement work completion date for the Kiara Drive subdivision to December 1, 2022 and release Lot 8L&R as a partial, conditional release from the restrictive covenant.

Item 17: Minutes – 7/28/2021

On a motion by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. Moynihan, the Board voted 3-0 (Aguirre absent) to approve the minutes.

Adjournment

The Board unanimously voted to adjourn at 9:30 p.m.