

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

December 30, 2020

Pursuant to Governor Baker’s March 12, 2020 Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A, §18, and the Governor’s March 23, 2020 Order, as amended, imposing strict limitation on the number of people that may gather in one place, this meeting was conducted through remote participation. The meeting was livestreamed from the City of Worcester website and via the local cable access channel and is available for streaming online. Public participation was facilitated through a call-in number, 415-655-0001 (Access Code: 1601714991), which was publicized on the posted meeting agenda and during the video broadcast.

Planning Board Members Participating: Albert LaValley, Chair
Paul DePalo, Vice-Chair
Eleanor Gilmore, Clerk
Toni Molinari
Edward Moynihan

Planning Board Members Not Participating: None

Staff present: Stephen Rolle, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
Michelle Smith, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
Jody Kennedy Valade, Inspectional Services Division
Alexandra Kalkounis, Legal Department

Call to Order – Mr. LaValley called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm.

Approval of Minutes- – 10/7/2020 & 10/28/2020

Upon a motion by Ms. Gilmore and seconded by Mr. DePalo, the Board voted to 5-0 to approve the minutes as reviewed.

Requests for Continuances, Extensions, Postponements, and Withdrawals

Postponements

Item 2: 11 & 22 (aka 24) Canterbury Street– Definitive Site Plan (PB-2020-058)

Request to Postpone the Public Meeting to January 20, 2021
Extend the Constructive Grant Deadline to February 11, 2021

Item 4: 1451 Grafton Street– Special Permit (AUM) (PB-2020-066)

Request to Postpone the Public Meeting & Hearing to January 20, 2021
Extend the Constructive Grant Deadline to February 11, 2021

Item 5: 11 Sever Street – Special Permit (PB-2020-070)

Request to Postpone the Public Meeting & Hearing to January 20, 2021
Extend the Constructive Grant Deadline to February 11, 2021

Item 10: To keep chickens/poultry in RS-7 – Zoning Ordinance Amendment (ZA-2020-007)

Request to Postpone the Public Meeting to January 20, 2021

Extend the Constructive Grant Deadline to February 11, 2021

- Item 13a: 857 Main Street & 19 Ripley Street – ANR (AN-2020-054)**
Request to Postpone the Public Meeting to January 20, 2021
Extend the Constructive Grant Deadline to February 11, 2021

Withdrawals

- Item 6: Arctic/Hygeia/Franklin Street – Extension of Time (Site Plan) (PB-2020-078)**
Request to Leave to Withdraw Without Prejudice

- Item 9: 49 Arlington Street – Extension of Time (Site Plan) (PB-2020-081)**
Request to Leave to Withdraw Without Prejudice

On a motion by Ms. Gilmore and seconded by Mr. DePalo, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the request for leave to withdraw without prejudice, and the requests for postponements with fee refunds for Items 6 and 9 after subtracting the cost of legal advertisements for the above named applications.

Old Business

- 1. 7, 11, & 12 Neponset Street (PB-2020-075)**
a. Public Meeting – Definitive Site Plan

Brad Griggs, Senior Manager at Amazon, summarized recent meetings with community members and City officials on various issues (i.e. facility operations, staffing/recruitment, traffic impact, community engagement, project timeline) since this project was last before the Board.

Steven Medouse, Attorney, added that recent meetings were useful to discuss issues outside the scope of the review process but their project team is ready to return to the site plan review standards applicable to this project.

Mr. Rolle of the DPRS gave a recap of the project; stated stormwater management will be improved on site with development and gave details; gave overview of traffic routing and circulation, with breakdown of cars, vans, and trucks.

Mr. Rolle explained the purpose of site plan review process and stated that the proposed use is allowed by-right; reviewed the DPRS comments and traffic review memo, referencing the sixteen criteria used for site plan review.

Mr. Rolle mentioned some of the conditions of approval, which involve incorporation of bicycle parking, revisions to details on plans, erosion and sediment control during construction, and stormwater report; he stated that there are additional conditions of approval relative to the traffic memo.

Mr. LaValley stated that he is glad to see the high levels of public interest in this project; stated that there is already been a number of meetings on this project, and reminded public that the tenant itself is not under consideration at this meeting, and stated that he will try to keep the topic of the comments to the site plan review criteria.

Public Comment

Malt Schlitzman expressed concern that Amazon underreports number of tractor trailers that come and go from facilities, asked what recourse the city will have if this is the case.

Mr. LaValley stated that calculations are educated guesses, asked the applicant to comment.

Mr. Schlitzman stated that he would like to know about holiday spikes as well.

Mr. Griggs described how the traffic projection of 18 tractor trailer trucks per day was arrived at; stated that plus or minus for daily figure is in the single digits; stated that they anticipate increase to low to high 30's for daily number of tractor trailers during holiday peaks.

Mr. Schlitzman pointed out inconsistency in Mr. Grigg's response.

Mr. LaValley stated that there will not be a back-and-forth between commenter and Mr. Griggs.

Mr. Griggs further described how operations may change during the 5-or-6-week holiday peak.

Mr. Schlitzman asked Mr. Griggs to comment on holiday peak congestion at Amazon facilities in nearby towns and whether they have fit their projections.

Mr. Griggs stated that he would refer to Planning Board's in those towns.

Claire Bayler, Independent Socialist Group, stated that Worcester Planning Board is a political body and would like this to be a discussion of what is good for Worcester; stated that Amazon does not abide by conditions of permits; asked Board to use their power to put affordable housing at Greendale Mall instead of Amazon.

Mr. LaValley reminded Ms. Bayler of the scope of the Planning Board's power.

Alex Guardiola, Director of Government Affairs and Public Policy for the Worcester Chamber of Commerce, stated that the use is allowed by-right, that the proposal only requires site plan review from this Board, that no tax breaks are being requested and the project will generate revenue, and that the use will reduce traffic from when Greendale Mall was at its peak.

Samuel Skinner, Independent Socialist Group, stated that community members deserve to have time with the applicant as mayor and city manager did.

Mr. LaValley asked that Mr. Skinner yield time to those with actual comments on the site plan.

Mr. Skinner asked the Board to use the power it has and yielded his time.

Emery Addams, Independent Socialist Group, expressed anger at lack of community engagement and that community meeting was inadequate, expressed concern for labor rights and COVID in Worcester.

Tim V, Worcester resident, expressed concern about traffic growth concurrent with Amazon growth and recourse if it's more than expected; expressed concern about difference between car traffic and tractor trailer traffic and stated that he would like Amazon representative to respond.

Eric Stratton expressed concern about air pollution, traffic impact to residents by trucks using shortcuts through residential streets, and environmental impacts; expressed skepticism about independent nature of the traffic review.

Mr. LaValley stated that the traffic study was done up to professional standards and reviewed by City staff with diligence.

Jay Verchin, Independent Socialist Group, expressed concern about the Amazon facility in Milford, stated his opposition to Amazon and that Amazon cannot be held accountable; expressed criticism of development process and lack of opportunity for community input in the process.

Andrea Batae, resident of Worcester, expressed that she understands use is by-right but is concerned about the size, frequency, and unquantified projected growth of tractor trailer traffic; stated that the Board needs to provide comfort to the residents of the City in this neighborhood about 18-wheelers using and overburdening the residential streets; would like to see remedy by covenant or restriction on the number of trips to be made and states that City attorneys know how to do it.

Casey Duggan, resident Worcester, commented on definitive site plan criteria #4, encouraged green, blue roof or roof-top solar and smart/green design elements practices to be incorporated; would like to see electric vehicle infrastructure for workers and requested commitment for worker use; requested elimination of birch species from a planting list as they are host to Asian Longhorn Beetle, not native plants and would like to see native plantings; encouraged applicant to work with city to address barriers to pedestrian access and provide traffic calming measures; expressed opposition to Amazon and critique to community input process.

Ben Desjarlais, resident of Worcester, expressed that there has been inadequate opportunity for community input; that tenant is relevant to site plan review given that tenant has not followed conditions of approval at other facilities.

Kathryn Santiago, Whitman Road in Worcester, expressed concern that community has not been consulted on this decision; that Amazon is a poor employer and would like to see better jobs come to the City.

Sean of Worcester expressed opposition to Amazon and skepticism about traffic figures and conflicts of interest between Board, city government, and Amazon; expressed concern about trucks on residential streets and the noise pollution.

David Slatkin of Columbus Park neighborhood of Worcester, expressed concern about safety of highway ramps and traffic impacts; expressed skepticism about traffic study and oversight of distribution center, would like to see the City of Worcester conduct an independent traffic study; requested more information about traffic circulation during holiday peak; noted that owners, Finnard Properties, had stated that they had other intentions for the property one year ago; requested community benefits agreement with Finnard Properties and Amazon; would like to see electrical vehicle charging, solar panels, and trip limitation included in such an agreement.

Elyse Waksman, Worcester resident of District 2, shared concerns and requested independent traffic study; asked for clarification on community benefits and its legality.

Mr. LaValley stated that a community benefits agreement would be negotiated by City Council, as in the case with the CSX terminal.

At request of Mr. LaValley, Mr. Rolle reviewed the details of the traffic study and the methodology of traffic studies; stated that this traffic study did cover interchange; described traffic generation and states that applicant gave their own numbers for projected traffic generation based on experience from other facilities; discussed how IRT trip generation manual has recently added distribution warehouse use, and that the manual projects less than Amazon's projections; stated that this reassured staff that the traffic figures are not an underestimate; Mr. Rolle gave more details on trip generation at site compared to prior use and discussed projections for traffic in surrounding areas.

Vinod Kalikiri, VHB, licensed traffic/transportation engineer; gave further clarification on the veracity of the traffic study.

Benjamin Mart, resident of Worcester, expressed opposition to Amazon and would like to know the governmental body or person to whom the public should be voicing their opposition; states that he would like to know what recourse the Planning Board has for tenant not following conditions of approval; would like more clarification on sustainability measures and feels they are inadequate; expressed concern about air pollution, noise pollution, public transportation access and pedestrian safety.

Mr. LaValley responded that there is no body regulating the tenants, and that the City only regulates the use.

Andrea Batae commented that the traffic data relied on does not account for future growth that Amazon expects post-pandemic.

David Shea expressed concern about property values, about traffic safety of vans shifting lanes, about emissions of idling vans and diesel tractor trailers during loading and unloading; stated he would like to know how Amazon is going to handle refueling and expressed concern about traffic generated by fuel refueling; expressed concern about ripple effects of traffic on surrounding streets; would like to see an independent traffic study; expressed concern about environmental impacts on Indian Lake and air pollution impacts on human health.

Tim V, Worcester resident of West Boylston Street, expressed skepticism over traffic figures put forward by traffic engineer; would like to see independent traffic study; shared concern over vans shifting lanes; expressed that this feels like a rushed process.

Kim McCoy expressed concern about traffic safety, particularly on West Boylston Street.

Laura Matthew, Worcester resident of District 6, echoed traffic concerns and skepticism of traffic studies and that public has not been given enough information about environmental impacts; would like to see the City be more sustainable; expressed concern over tenant sticking to approved site plan and enforcement mechanisms.

Erica from Worcester, shared concerns already expressed; expressed lack of trust in tenant; would like a traffic study, a safety study, and an environmental impact study.

Benjamin Mart asks if there has been environmental impact study conducted.

Mr. LaValley stated that there has not been.

Mr. Rolle explained that during the site plan review process the Board asks questions pertaining to environmental impact, and that project is not large enough to trigger an environmental impact study at the state level.

Eric Stratton asked if the Board can request that applicant voluntarily submit an environmental impact study as an act of good faith, given that public is concerned about air and noise pollution.

Mr. LaValley stated that the Board cannot condition that.

Mr. Rolle reiterated that the Board can only consider things relative to site design given that it is a by-right use.

Mr. Stratton recommended that site plan have indoor bicycle parking.

Board Discussion

Mr. Moynihan expressed concern that there is no stop sign for traffic coming off West Boylston Drive into Reliant Medical Group and concern about another location lacking stop sign; wanted to confirm that developer will be doing something about traffic remediation in those areas.

Mr. Rolle confirmed that concern has been addressed in suggested conditions of approval.

Mr. Moynihan encouraged members of the public to volunteer for vacancies on Boards and Commissions, there are twenty vacancies.

Mr. Moynihan further discussed his concerns with the traffic and how they have been alleviated in the time since the last meeting; clarified that this is a by-right use and the limitations of the Planning Board's purview; reminded Amazon that there is a lot of public angst toward them; encourages public to get politically involved in Worcester.

Mr. DePalo expressed gratitude towards staff for working through holidays; would like to hear from Mr. Rolle on condition of approval number 7.

Mr. Rolle explained that conditioned improvements on two locations involve signage and striping changes.

Mr. DePalo asked for clarification on commitment to using MassHire.

Jessica Schumer, Amazon representative, explained that hiring is currently all virtual, but when warehouse opens they have committed to hosting local hiring sessions.

Mr. DePalo encourages public to get involved in re-zoning processes and echoed Mr. Moyihan in encouraging public to get involved with Boards.

Ms. Molinari asked for clarification on when 18-30 tractor trailer truck figure came from.

Ms. Schumer clarified that those are projections for when the warehouse opens.

Ms. Molinari asked to clarify what maximum capacity of warehouse would be relative to trucks.

Ms. Schumer said high 30s for daily tractor trailer traffic.

Ms. Molinari asks about other Amazon site.

Ms. Schumer said they do not anticipate sites interacting.

Ms. Gilmore asked for clarification on which waivers are being requested.

Mr. Medouse clarified.

Ms. Gilmore asked applicant why there is not EV infrastructure for passenger vehicles.

VHB Engineer explained that the applicant is committing to EV charging stations for 80-100% of van spaces, but that there is not available space for EV infrastructure for employee spaces.

Ms. Gilmore explained that Board likes to encourage as much EV readiness as possible.

Ms. Gilmore echoed comments of colleagues in regard to limitations of zoning framework, and agreed that this is an inherently political process and that the Board is upholding rules and power structures; explained that the Board must evaluate using sixteen criteria regardless of how they feel about tenant; expressed hope that energy from this meeting translates into people getting to know the ordinance and zoning framework so that they can be changed; echoed Mr. Moynihan in saying that the public may not agree with tenant, but that does not mean their concerns are invalid even if they are outside the purview of this meeting; stated that the applicant would do well to work with community beyond the few meetings that have been held, as members of public are not going anywhere; stated the concerns of the public should not only be taken into consideration but also put into action.

Mr. LaValley expressed gratitude to DPRS staff for working through holidays on this project; expressed that changing zoning is a political process and encouraged member of the public to get involved; asked for clarification on where vehicles will be refueled.

Ms. Schumer explained that they do not do refueling on site, they use third parties -- vans goes to gas stations—and they will work with community on where vans should refuel.

Mr. La Valley stated that area is pedestrian and bicycle unfriendly, asked applicant how someone would access building on foot or by bike.

Mr. Kalikiri explained that roadway network is largely within MassDOT jurisdiction, which would include sidewalks and crosswalks on interchange area, which is what pedestrians would use; once they reach Neponset Street, there is a new sidewalk system being implemented on site.

Ms. Geisner, VHB Engineer, further elaborated on where crosswalks, sidewalks, and curb ramps are and will be.

Mr. Kaliki stated that they will be meeting MassDOT requirements for multi-mobility.

Mr. LaValley asked for clarification on how busy one of the parking lots will be, and traffic calming measures that will be taken.

Ms. Geisner explained that there will be speed bumps and signage, and that all crosswalks will have speedbumps and signage.

Mr. LaValley asked about noise pollution and mitigation efforts being taken.

Ms. Geisner explained that there is not a lot of large green space available for noise-dampening features, but they have significantly increased the number of trees and vegetation on site.

Mr. LaValley asked for clarification on non-ALB-resistant tree proposed.

Ms. Geisner stated that that will be resolved.

Mr. LaValley asked applicant to address sustainability measures.

Ms. Geisner explained that by developing the site at all, that is a sustainability effort because of all the impervious surface existing; explained that proximity to highway counts towards sustainability; went over other measures including increasing shade trees; replacing catch basins; adding hydrodynamic separators; recharging roof runoff; adding infrastructure for EV charging stations; replacing existing lighting.

Mr. Rolle asked Ms. Smith whether comments from sewer department need to be recommended as conditions of approval.

Ms. Smith confirmed that they received comments from water distribution department, and those need to be added into conditions of approval.

Legal Department had no comment.

Zoning had no comment.

DPW had no comment.

Mr. Moynihan asked for clarification that there are no emergency access issues.

Ms. Smith described one condition of approval in that regard.

Mr. Moynihan expressed appreciation for staff efforts.

On a motion by Ms. Gilmore, seconded by Mr. DePalo, the Board voted 4-1 (Ms. Molinari voted no) to approve the Definitive Site Plan, subject to staff recommended conditions of approval, incorporating DPW comments, and granted waivers.

New Business

- 3. 0 (aka 50-60) Richards Street (PB-2020-063)**
 - a. Public Hearing – More than one Building on a Lot
 - b. Public Meeting – Definitive Site Plan

Mr. LaValley opened the hearing.

Ms. Smith gave an overview of the project; explained that topography and number of units trigger site plan review; gave details of parking and how site will look from the streets; explained that staff asked applicant to incorporate window treatments; explained that staff has asked for photometric plan and additional tree plantings; asked applicant to comment on use of exterior space.

Nick Fasendola, applicant's representative, states that they have no issue with Ms. Smith's recommendations; they can accommodate secondary access, additional plantings, will provide photometric plan to ensure no spillover; described use of exterior space including proposed patio space and said that there are no exterior balconies or decks proposed; described stormwater treatment efforts.

Law Department had no comment.

Zoning had no comment.

Ms. Smith stated that DPW comments have been addressed, and water division comments have been incorporated in memo, and that fire department comments have been addressed.

Mr. DePalo had no comment.

Ms. Molinari had no comment.

Ms. Gilmore expressed her support for window treatments on the Richard Street-facing side; also in favor of incorporating some kind of terrace or balcony to three-unit building; asked applicant to confirm waiver for soil types is being requested.

Mr. Fasendola stated that he can either make changes to plan or request the waiver.

Mr. Moynihan stated he is also in favor of window treatments; asked for clarification on existing and proposed location of curb cuts.

Ms. Smith clarified.

Mr. Moynihan asked for clarification on number of exterior parking spaces and whether a traffic study has been done, expressed concern about traffic safety in adjacent streets.

Ms. Smith confirmed parking and states that no traffic study was required.

Mr. Fasendola offered explanation of location of driveway.

Mr. Moynihan asked for clarification that there is adequate access for emergency vehicles.

Ms. Smith stated that Fire had no comment in that regard.

Mr. Moynihan asked for clarification on whether there will be EV charging spaces.

Mr. Fasendola explained that they will be providing infrastructure for one charging space outdoors but have no plans for EV charging in interior spaces.

Mr. Moynihan encouraged them to provide infrastructure.

Mr. Rolle addressed driveway location.

Mr. LaValley asked for clarification on zoning and MTOBOAL application.

Mr. Rolle and Ms. Smith provided clarification.

Mr. Fasendola said applicant can look at adding more recreational open space area but said it is difficult site for amenities.

Mr. LaValley stated that the site might be better served by a less dense development.

Ms. Smith described purpose of More Than One Building on a Lot application.

Mr. DePalo asked for clarification on resolution to façade issue.

Ms. Smith explained where windows are required.

On a motion by Ms. Gilmore, seconded by Mr. DePalo, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan, subject to staff-recommended conditions of approval, and granted waivers, and approved the application for More Than One Building on a Lot, subject to staff-recommended conditions of approval.

7. 64 (aka 56, 58, 62, & 68) West Bolyston Street (PB-2020-079)

a. Public Hearing – Amendment to Special Permit to allow an Adult Use Marijuana Establishment – Storefront Retailor

Ms. Smith gave an overview of the application; the retailer is already operational having come before the Board for special permit and parking plan; they are changing their corporate name from Trichome to Bud’s Goods and Provisions; need to rectify that with the special permit; noted that there are slight changes to the conditions of approval, including modifying the hours of operation.

Joshua Lee Smith, Attorney, presented on behalf of applicant. He gave more detail on the amendment to the special permit, reiterating that this is a name change only; there was no change in corporate structure or other significant changes, but Law Department requires an amendment.

Law Department had no comment.

Zoning had no comment.

DPW and had no comment, as business is already operational.

Public had no comment.

Board Discussion

Ms. Gilmore had no comment.

Mr. Moynihan had no comment.

Mr. DePalo had no comment.

Ms. Molinari had no comment.

Mr. LaValley had no comment.

On a motion by Ms. Gilmore, seconded by Mr. DePalo, the Board voted 5-0 to close the hearing.

On a motion by Ms. Gilmore, seconded by Mr. DePalo, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the Amendment to Special Permit, subject to staff-recommended conditions of approval, and accept the findings of fact.

8. 0 (aka 329) Granite Street (PB-2020-080)

a. Public Meeting – Definitive Site Plan

Ms. Smith confirmed that a representative for the applicant is on the line.

Ms. Smith gave an overview of the site and application—single-family dwelling on a slope greater than 15%.

Applicant representative Jason Deboise, engineer, added that the revised plan was sent this morning with additional rendering and erosion controls reflected on plan.

Law Department had no comment.

Zoning had no comment.

DPW had no comment.

Public had no comment.

Board Discussion

Ms. Molinari had no comment.

Ms. Gilmore had no comment.

Mr. Moynihan had no comment.

Mr. DePalo had no comment.

Mr. LaValley had no comment.

On a motion by Ms. Gilmore, seconded by Mr. DePalo, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan, subject to staff-recommended conditions of approval, and grant waivers.

11. 1 & 7 Brattle Street (ZA-2020-012)

a. Public Hearing – Zoning Map Amendment

Mr. LaValley asked for clarification that with Zoning Map Amendments, the Board's role is to make a recommendation to City Council.

Mr. Rolle confirmed and described the process.

Mr. Rolle gave an overview of the proposed zoning amendment, a proposal to rezone two parcels of land from a residential (RS-7) to a business (BL-1) zone; described the history of zoning on the parcel and uses in the area.

Donald O'Neil, Attorney, on behalf of petitioner, explained motivations of application and intentions of petitioners for changing the zoning designation; petitioners seek to demolish an existing building; zoning change would give more flexibility to construct a new building and create additional parking space; wish to make zoning actually reflect current use.

Mr. O'Neill further stated that he believes opposition to zoning change is a result of people not understanding that the proposed change came from business owners themselves, and that it would be a benefit to the neighborhood; Mr. O'Neill described neighborhood outreach efforts conducted by petitioner.

Law Department had no comment.

Zoning had no comment.

DPW had no comment.

Public Comment

Kim McCoy, Esterbrook Road, asked if there would be historical review, if there was a site plan, and whether a four way intersection at the site were possible; stated that people would like to see what building would like that.

Mr. LaValley confirms that there is a site plan, and that applicant is willing to share with neighborhood residents, and that site plan will come before Board if zoning change is approved.

William Gemme, 15 Brattle Street, explained that he is a direct abutter, stated that he has spoken to thirty neighborhood members who are opposed to zoning change; thinks that existing building fits in well with the neighborhood structure, would like to see changes to building done within existing zoning.

Bill Blankenship, 182 Holden Street, kitty corner to property as an abutter, stated his opposition to zoning change and his concern over what new ownership would do with a larger building on the site.

Board Discussion

Mr. Moynihan stated that he feels this zoning change is “out-of-place”, shared concern that there is no knowing what future owners would do with this zoning, would not make this recommendation.

Mr. DePalo had no comment.

Ms. Molinari had no comment.

Ms. Gilmore stated that she does not believe in single-family zoning but she is sympathetic to concerns that residents have--BL-1 district does have a variety of allowed uses and scales; stated that this zoning change could be interpreted as “spot zoning”; stated that she is unsure how she will vote at this point.

Mr. LaValley stated that he would not feel comfortable voting in favor at this time, but does recognize good-faith intentions of the petitioner; feels that this is close to spot zoning; would support if there was not so much resident opposition; petitioner could overcome opposition by communicating with community on what they intend to build.

Mr. O’Neill addressed concerns of opposition; stated that petitioner has tried to do outreach with community and there will be more opportunity for communication, and that in regards to spot zoning, they are only trying to rezone a parcel that has already operated commercially for a long time.

Mr. LaValley asked planning staff to clarify options for voting that the Board has, and whether there is an option that gives petitioner time to address concerns.

Mr. Rolle stated that Board can articulate a more nuanced recommendation.

Ms. Gilmore stated that she would support pushing this to City Council Economic Development Subcommittee and conditioning more outreach.

Mr. DePalo stated that he would support it going to the City Council as the process gives more time for community input.

Mr. Moynihan expressed concern that there are other issues to consider, for example traffic patterns and safety of surrounding park; inclination is still to vote no.

Mr. Rolle stated that Board can entertain a yes/no vote that would also reflect the statements that Board members gave conditioning their support.

Mr. LaValley stated that Board could vote on one opinion voicing conditioned support.

Ms. Gilmore suggested recommending this zoning change, conditioning that applicant conduct more outreach to abutters.

Ms. Kalkounis of the Law Department clarified that the Board can articulate reasons for recommendation, but recommendation would not be conditioned—it would not require the applicant to do anything.

Mr. LaValley suggests that the Board say that “they understand that this applicant is requesting this rezoning to further the goal of modifying (*unintelligible in playback of meeting*), we believe these concerns need to be addressed by Economic Development Subcommittee of the City Council.”

Ms. Kalkounis confirms that this would be acceptable.

Mr. Moynihan clarified that the Board will not have any control over what kind of business takes place there in the future once zoning change is made.

Mr. LaValley stated that he is not concerned with business changing hands in the near-future, given that the business owners are currently investing in it.

Mr. Moynihan agreed, stated he still has reservations about zoning change.

Ms. Gilmore asked to clarify that she is making a motion to both favorably recommend this zoning change and include the comments they discussed.

On a motion by Ms. Gilmore, seconded by Mr. DePalo, the Board voted 5-0 to close the public hearing.

On a motion by Ms. Gilmore, seconded by Mr. DePalo, the Board voted 4-1 (Mr. Moynihan against) to favorably recommend the zoning map amendment petition with “an understanding that although the applicant is requesting this rezoning to further their business goals, there are a number of concerns that have been raised by residents, and we believe that these concerns need to be addressed in the collaborative manner at Economic Development Standing Committee Meeting.”

Other Business

12. Street Petitions

a. Petition to Convert to Public – Forsberg Street & Steele Street (ST-2020-015)

Ms. Smith stated that DPW is in favor with caveats.

On a motion by Ms. Gilmore, seconded by Mr. DePalo, the Board voted 5-0 to favorably recommend the conversion, with a priority-one designation per DPW comment.

b. Petition to Rename – Chester Terrace after Jason Menard (ST-2020-017)

Mr. Rolle explained reasons for renaming and that Planning Board is not required to weigh in, but staff thought they should give Board the opportunity.

Ms. Smith reads language of the decision.

Mr. Moynihan expressed support.

Mr. DePalo expressed support, glad to see that street is in neighborhood where Mr. Menard grew up.

On a motion by Ms. Gilmore, seconded by Mr. DePalo, the Board voted 5-0 to express its support for the street renaming.

13. Approval Not Required (ANR) Plan(s)

b. 15 Holden Street (Public) (AN-2020-073)

On a motion by Ms. Gilmore and seconded by Mr. DePalo, the Board voted 5-0 to endorse the plan.

14. Approval of Minutes

On a motion by Ms. Gilmore and seconded by Mr. DePalo, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the minutes from 10/7/2020 and 10/28/2020

15. Communication(s)

16. Discussion of Board Policies and Procedures

17. Review & Signing of Decisions (from prior meetings)

Mr. LaValley stated that he had the opportunity to review the language of 757 Salisbury Street decision and that the Board can be comfortable signing it.

On a motion by Ms. Gilmore and seconded by Mr. DePalo, the Board voted 5-0 to sign the decision.

Adjournment

On a motion by Ms. Gilmore and seconded by Mr. DePalo, the Board voted 5-0 to adjourn the meeting at 10:11 PM.