

Planning Board  
Worcester, Massachusetts

Wednesday, January 27, 1971  
3:00 P. M., City Hall

Agenda

3:00 P. M. - Room 209, City Hall

1. call to order
2. Henry Terrace - remove from official map - request leave to withdraw
3. off-street parking requirements - review of
4. plans to be ratified
5. date of next meeting
6. any other business
7. invitation to meet with WRA and City Council at noon, February 2, 1971  
at Coach & Six Restaurant
8. recess

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

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

1. Lincoln Country Club zone change corrections
2. petition to amend zoning ordinance re: mobile homes
3. Emile Street - alter layout

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

1. call to order
2. items of public hearing
3. adjournment.

The meeting of the Worcester Planning Board came to order at 3:30 P. M., on Wednesday, January 27, 1971, in Room 209, City Hall.

Members present were Carl H. Koontz, Frederic R. Butler, Lloyd Anderson, and Carlton B. Payson.

Others present were Francis J. Donahue, Gerard F. McNeil, Alexander A. Pridotkas, William J. Mulford, and Charles A. Abdella.

Henry Terrace - remove from official map - request leave to withdraw.

Mr. Donahue read the letter from Mr. Isarel requesting leave to withdraw.

Mr. Koontz made a motion to send the request to the Council. Mr. Butler seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 4-0 vote.

Plans to be ratified. Mr. Koontz made a motion that the following plans signed by the secretary be ratified:

#1440 - plan of land at Millbury Street and McKeon Road,  
owned by Mobil Oil Corporation, signed 1/12/71

#1441 - Withdrawn

#1442 - plan of land at Mill and Main Streets, owned by  
Beach Realty Trust, signed 1/12/71

#1443 - plan of land on Lincoln Street, owned by James J.  
and Florence Forhan, signed 1/14/71

#1444 - plan of land on Elliott Street, owned by Aaron G.  
and Phyllis A. Najarian, signed 1/20/71

#1445 - plan of land on Queen Street, owned by Worcester  
Housing Development Corp., signed 1/21/71

#1446 - plan of land at Mill Street and Gates Lane, owned  
by Edith E. Lebel, signed 1/25/71

#1447 - plan of land at Hathaway and Gardner Streets, owned  
by Gardner Development Corp., signed 1/27/71

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

Date of next meeting. The date of the next meeting was set for Wednesday, February 17, 1971.

Bus Grant. Mr. McNeil reported that according to the 1970 amendment of the Urban Mass Transit Act of 1964, the city must hold a public hearing on the city's application for a federal grant to assist Mass transportation in Worcester. He said that the City Manager had designated the Planning Board as holder of the hearing and that notice of the hearing must be published in both local and minority newspapers. He said that the required hearing would be held on February 17, 1971. He said that subsequent to that hearing, a transcript of the hearing and the Board's recommendations must be sent to the federal government.

Other business: Moreland Street. Mr. Raymond Moran and Mr. Raymond Sansoucy asked for recommendations on a development including a 9-hole golf course. Mr. Moran said that they wanted to build apartments with 200 apartments in 8 buildings. He said that he now has four single family homes and two others were due. He said he was planning to apply for a zone change. That the present zone was an RS-7.

Mr. McNeil said that he would need a special permit for a private golf course. Mr. Payson suggested that they ask for a zone change to RL-7 and apply for a special permit for a Planned Unit Development.

Mr. McNeil suggested that he include townhouses with apartments. He asked if he proposed commercial.

Mr. Sansoucy said no. That it was not part of his present plan.

Mr. McNeil suggested that Mr. Sansoucy use a parking ratio of 1.5 - 1.0.

He also suggested a clubhouse.

Mr. Sansoucy said it was in his plan to have a clubhouse for the use of the residents and owners of the single family homes.

Mr. McNeil said that the department needed to study the circumferential highway right of way.

Mr. Sansoucy thanked the Board for its recommendations.

Off-Street parking review. Mr. Payson asked if the provisions were all as requested. Mr. Payson suggested that Mr. McNeil go over them.

Mr. McNeil read the revised draft submitted by John Brown & Associates and asked for the Board's comments.

Mr. Koontz asked what was meant by "New students and faculty."

Mr. McNeil said that these were additional students and faculty over and above the existing enrollment. Mr. McNeil suggested there be clarification as to what new students and faculty were.

Mr. Anderson said that the section dealing with funeral establishments should be amended. He suggested a ratio of 1 parking space for each 3 persons of design capacity.

Mr. Anderson said that school requirements on children under 16 years of age was unrealistic.

Mr. Koontz said that W.P.I. would need more parking spaces depending upon the interpretation of the definition of new students. He said that the wording sounded foggy.

Mr. Anderson suggested that it be reconsidered.

Mr. McNeil said that the definition of a student needed re-wording.

Mr. Donahue said that each school should certify the number of students and each year provide parking spaces according to the prescribed ratio for the number of students in excess of the prior year's certification.

Mr. Koontz said that the new requirements were just numbers.

Mr. Anderson asked Mr. McNeil to give an example of what these numbers meant.

Mr. McNeil showed how the proposed parking requirements would affect business presently under construction. He said that the entire Worcester center would need 3,821 spaces on the basis of the proposed parking requirements. He said

that the center was scheduled to have 4,300 parking spaces. Mr. McNeil suggested that a minimum distance of 30 feet from any intersection be specified for access to parking areas. He noted that the minimum fence height should be changed to 5 feet. He suggested that the wording be revised for subdividing open parking areas. He said that the Department would review the Board's recommendations and report at the next meeting.

Mobile Homes - zone change. Mr. McNeil read the appropriate section of the building code and pointed out that the building code does not discriminate against conventional building methods.

Mr. Butler asked if all mobile homes manufactured complied with the building code. Mr. McNeil said that he didn't know.

Mr. McNeil said that the proposal would open up a segment of the market for single family homes costing \$14,000 - \$18,000.

Mr. Koontz asked how mobile homes could be kept out of an RS-10 zone.

Mr. Butler said that the proposal should be more restrictive and suggested that mobile homes not be allowed in RS-7 zones under any circumstances.

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

At 7:30 P. M., the Board met in the Council Chamber for its scheduled public hearing.

Public Hearing - Lincoln Country Club - zone change corrections. Mr. Payson read the notice of hearing. He read the corrections that were to be made.

Mr. Payson asked who was in favor of this petition.

Mr. Stephen Burwick of 3 Dick Drive, said that he was in favor of the petition.

Mr. Payson asked if there were any opposition. There was no response.

Mr. Payson declared the hearing to be closed.

Public Hearing - zoning amendment - mobile homes. Mr. Payson read the notice of hearing and asked Mr. McNeil to read the proposed amendment. Mr. Payson asked if there were any in favor of this petition.

Mr. Thomas Finnigan, Director of the Worcester Housing Development Corporation, and the representative of the Worcester Chamber of Commerce, said that both organizations were in favor of the proposal.

Mr. Carl Gordon, Chairman of the Board of Appeals, asked if Mr. Finnigan's support wasn't premature. He asked for clarification of the petition.

Mr. McNeil explained the proposed amendment. He gave the definition of a mobile home and read the appropriate section of the building code.

Mr Payson distributed literature about mobile homes.

Mr. Griffin asked why W. H. D. C. was in favor of the petition.

Mr. Finnigan said W. H. D. C. supported the petition because it complied with all building codes, it conformed to the zoning ordinance, it would not degrade neighborhoods and that it would provide affordable and rapidly constructed housing.

Mr. William J. Johnson of 104 Darrow Street, asked if it would lower the value on other people's homes.

Mr. Finnigan said no. The value will be comparable.

Mr. Gordon said that some of his employees had mobile homes. He said that no one would recognize them.

Mr. Warren Senecal of 24 Bergin Lane, pointed out that the mobile homes described by Mr. McNeil were double wide models. He asked if a standard 12 by 68 foot model which would have the required minimum living space would qualify.

Mr. McNeil replied that most 12 by 68 foot mobile homes use a tubular construction which the building code did not permit.

Mr. David W. Shearer of 37 Saxon Road, asked Mr. McNeil to distinguish between mobile and modular units.

Mr. McNeil explained that the difference was in the method of fabrication and the method of transportation to the site.

Mr. Shearer asked why there was a discrepancy between the minimum space requirements of single family conventionally built homes and mobile homes.

Mr. McNeil replied that the discrepancy was based on the problem of public acceptance of the mobile home.

Mr. William L. Bowler of 27 Shaffner Street, asked if a 12 by 50 foot mobile home with an addition would be acceptable if the total living area were 768 square feet.

Mr. McNeil said that he could just give his opinion and that it would depend on the building plan.

Mr. Michael E. Kabachenski of 342 Greenwood Street, asked why the Board would object to mobile homes if the people in the area wouldn't object.

Mr. McNeil said that the purpose of zoning was to protect the people.

He said that the homes in an R6-10 area were very expensive homes and to maintain these homes, the mobile homes were excluded in this area.

He said tha the Board felt it would not be economical to have mobile homes in an RS-10 area because the land is expensive. He said that in

some RS-7 areas, mobile homes were accepted under special conditions depending upon the area in question and in the price of the unit that

was to be built. He said that mobile homes would be excluded from

business and manufacturing areas because business land was too valuable to the city to be used for residential purposes.

Mr. Kabachenski explained that he was having a problem getting a zone change in the Greenwood Street area.

Mr. Payson said that Mr. McNeil would be happy to talk to him about his problem at another time.

Mr. Oliver C. Sullivan of 48 Gates Lane, said that he was worried about allowing mobile homes in the City. He asked if trailer or mobile home parks were allowed in the city.

Mr. Payson said that trailer parks were not allowed in the city.

Mr. Gordon said that the mobile homes were a very good thing.

Mr. Senecal asked if the mobile homes would be taxed as a conventional home or would they depreciate as a trailer.

Mr. McNeil said that the mobile home would be taxed as a single family home.

Mr. Donahue read a letter from the City Manager's Executive Housing Committee which stated the Committee was in favor of amending the zoning ordinance so as to permit mobile homes in the city.

Mr. Payson asked who was in opposition of the proposal.

Mrs. Donovan of 5 Blain Avenue, said that it would depreciate the property. She said that she represented the people from Ward 7 and that they were opposed to mobile homes. Mrs. Donovan asked if the city or the mobile home owners would be assessed for sewer facilities.

Mr. McNeil replied that the assessment would be no different as that for single family homes.

Mr. Joseph F. Mastroberti of 56 Aphrop Street, representative of the Summit Improvement Association, questioned the definition of a mobile home. He asked if the appearance shouldn't be controlled.

Mr. McNeil explained that the Board's definition of a mobile home was not meant to be a means of controlling mobile home design. He explained that regulations of mobile homes was another part of the proposed amendment.



Mr. Mastroberti said that he would like the definition to be more restrictive. He also said that it was discrimination. He asked that the Board let the market restrict and that as a Board, it should not discriminate development.

Mr. Payson explained that the Board was not being discriminatory.

Mr. Johnson said that he would like more information from Mr. Finnigan as to his decision to favor the proposal.

Mr. Finnigan said that the proposed amendment would be another tool to help solve the housing shortage in the City of Worcester.

Mr. Charles Collins of 25 Gates Lane, said that he did not think the cost mentioned, was reasonable for housing.

Mr. Payson said that the mobile home was a less expensive home.

Mr. Sullivan asked why the zoning ordinance should be changed if mobile homes are presently allowed by special permit in all areas of the city.

Mr. Payson said that the Board was making the ordinance more restrictive. He then asked if there were any others in opposition. There was no response. Mr. Payson declared the hearing to be closed.

Public Hearing - Emile Street. Mr. Payson read the notice of hearing.

Attorney Joseph Lian represented Mr. & Mrs. Anthony Assard. Attorney Dominic A. Caronna represented Mrs. Rose Gallo.

Attorney Lian explained that the reason for the change was to insure the Assards of clear title to their house now and in the future. He gave the Board a copy of a agreement among all abutters on Emile Street releasing the existing right of way to Mr. Assard in exchange for right of way over an adjoining portion of Mr. Assard's land.

Mr. Anderson asked Attorney Abdella who owned the fee in the right of way. Attorney Caronna said that according to Massachusetts Law, the abutting property owners would own fee to the center of the street.

Attorney Abdella asked if it was the intention of the abutters to convey the fee or the easement.

Attorney Abdella suggested that the question be clarified.

Attorney Lian said that the question could be resolved and that the revised agreement would be recorded.

Mr. Payson asked if there were any opposition. There was no response.

Mr. Payson declared the hearing to be closed.

The Planning Board reconvened Wednesday, January 27, 1971, at 9:00 p. m., in Room 209, City Hall.

Mr. Payson called the meeting to order.

Lincoln Country Club - zone change corrections. Mr. Payson made a motion to recommend the change to the City Council. Mr. Anderson seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 4-0 vote.

Mobile Homes. Mr. Butler suggested that the mobile homes be limited to a designated area rather than allowed in the three zones proposed.

Mr. Payson said limiting them to a specific area would be discriminatory.

Mr. Butler made a motion that mobile homes not be permitted in RS-7 zones.

Mr. Koontz asked for clarification. He said that the Board was trying to both broaden the areas of mobile homes and then restrict the areas.

Mr. McNeil said that there could be mobile homes of any size in any residential or business zone by a special permit from the Board of Appeals, at present.

Mr. Koontz asked why the method of transportation had anything to do with the Public Health, Safety and Welfare. He asked why the Board singled out mobile homes. He suggested that mobile homes be considered as single family homes as long as they met the requirements of the Public Health, Safety and Welfare.

Mr. Anderson replied that mobile homes were a specific housing type and thus, must be identified.

Mr. Koontz asked why it mattered how a building was built or transported.

Mr. Anderson said that the method of transport was important because of inspection for codes.

Mr. Butler asked if excluding the mobile home from RS-10 zones was discriminatory.

Mr. McNeil read the appropriate section of the zoning enabling act.

Mr. Koontz asked where the section of the zoning enabling act mentioned the class of building. Mr. Koontz asked how the Board controls pre-engineered construction now.

Mr. McNeil read the code for prefabricated construction.

Mr. Anderson made a motion to recommend the proposal as is. Mr. Koontz seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 3-0 vote. Mr. Butler abstained.

Emile Street. Attorney Abdella suggested that the question of fee should be clarified before the Board made its decision.

Mr. Anderson moved that the item be tabled until the next meeting.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 P. M.