

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

January 22, 2014

WORCESTER CITY HALL – LEVI LINCOLN ROOM

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

Planning Board Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Steve Rolle, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
Luba Zhaurova, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
Michelle Smith, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
Katie Donovan, Department of Inspectional Services
Jonathan Gervais, Department of Public Works & Parks
Alexandra Haralambous, Law Department
Michael Traynor, Law Department

BOARD SITE VISITS

REGULAR MEETING

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Andrew Truman called the meeting to order at 5:30 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Upon a motion by John Vigliotti and seconded by Robert Ochoa the Board voted 4-0 to approve the minutes from the August 7, 2013, September 4, 2013, November 20, 2013, December 11, 2013, and December 17, 2013

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

1. **Bittersweet Boulevard – Definitive Site Plan Approval (PB-2013-048)**
2. **Approval Not Required (ANR) Plans**
 - a. **Sophia Drive (public street) (AN-2013-058)**

Luba Zhaurova, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services, stated that staff received a written request for postponement for Bittersweet Boulevard Site Plan and for the ANR for Sophia Drive to the February 12, 2013 meeting as the applicant was unable to have an attorney represent him at the meeting.

Upon a motion by Mr. Ochoa and seconded by Mr. Vigliotti the Board voted 4-0 to approve the request for postponement.

List of Exhibits:

- Exhibit A: Bittersweet Boulevard Application; received November 27, 2013; prepared by HS&T Group, Inc.
- Exhibit B: Bittersweet Boulevard Plan; dated November 27, 2013; prepared by HS&T Group, Inc.
- Exhibit C: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Planning Board; re: Bittersweet Boulevard – January 22, 2014; dated January 22, 2014.
- Exhibit D: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Department of Public Works & Parks to the Planning Board; re: Bittersweet Boulevard Definitive Site Plan Approval; January 16, 2014.
- Exhibit E: Comments from the City of Worcester Fire Department; re: Bittersweet Boulevard Definitive Site Plan Approval; January 17, 2014.
- Exhibit F: Enforcement Order for Arboretum Subdivision (Phase IV) Bittersweet Boulevard off Sophia Drive issued by Conservation Commission 7/26/2013.
- Exhibit G: Request for Postponement form, dated and received 1/22/2014.

NEW BUSINESS

PUBLIC HEARING

3. **Goldthwaite Road (aka Burncoat Gardens) Phase 1 - Amendment to Special Permit (PB-2013-041)**
4. **Goldthwaite Road (aka Burncoat Gardens) Phase 5 - Special Permit (PB-2013-043)**
5. **Goldthwaite Road (aka Burncoat Gardens) Phase 5 - More than One Building on a Lot (PB-2013-045)**
6. **Goldthwaite Road (aka Burncoat Gardens) Phase 1 - Amendment to Definitive Site Plan (PB-2013-042) (a public meeting)**
7. **Goldthwaite Road (aka Burncoat Gardens) Phase 5 - Definitive Site Plan Approval (PB-2013-044) (a public meeting)**

Items 3-7 were taken up contemporaneously.

Charles Scott of CFS Engineering, on behalf of Goldthwaite Holdings, stated that the applicant is seeking an amendment to a previous Phase I approval and approvals for an additional phase, Phase V of the development.

Mr. Scott stated that the property has access via Goldthwaite Road and Hillsbury Road. He stated the property is over 18 acres of undeveloped woodland and is zoned RS-7 and a small portion of the site is in RG-5 and falls within a watershed protection zoning overlay district. He stated that three bordering vegetative wetlands fall under the jurisdiction of Conservation Commission and two isolated wetlands fall under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Scott stated that the neighboring properties are predominantly single-family homes.

He stated that Phase I included 33 approved units, from 2008, and that the permits were extended until 2016 and outlined the other previous approvals from the phased work. He stated that the proposed amendment to Phase I will eliminate one of the previously approved units which falls within one of the isolated vegetative wetlands. He stated that the proposal is for a private gated community, designed to

eliminate through traffic. He stated that as part of the gated concept, they will provide fencing around the perimeter of the property.

He stated that Phase V seeks to add an additional 38 homes to the development and that the addition of two new streets would allow the applicant to cluster homes and have less impact on the surrounding undeveloped land.

Mr. Scott specified that the development will provide 78% of the land area for the open space, exceeding the required minimum of 40 %. He stated that 13% of the open space is wetlands and that there will also be an active outdoor recreation area and that the applicant is looking into additional recreational space in other parts of the development.

Mr. Scott stated that all the homes would be single family detached dwellings with a one car garage, consistent with other homes in the area and noted that each unit complies with the required zoning setbacks for RS-7.

He stated that the stormwater management system has been designed to meet all applicable local and stated standards.

He stated that a homeowners association will be established and charged with maintenance of the property's roads and for maintaining the open space.

Ms. Smith commented that for Phase I the major change consisted of the elimination of one unit and the associated parking spaces bringing the total down to 32 units with 64 associated off-street parking spaces. She stated that the road construction would remain the same as was previously approved in Phase I. She stated that for Phase V the applicant is seeking approvals for 38 single family detached dwellings in a cluster zoning layout. She stated that the applicant proposes to extend Goldthwaite Road ~1,000 feet to connect with Hillside drive and extend Hillsboro Road ~700 ft. to become Hillsboro Drive. She stated that additionally the applicant proposes two new cul-de-sacs, Alexander Avenue and Louella Lane.

Chair Truman asked if staff would still be recommending continuation.

Ms. Smith confirmed. She stated that the applicant complied with the maximum number of dwellings and open space requirements, but added that the applicant is missing some findings of fact and that staff had not received revised plans per staff's review letter. Ms. Smith stated that the applicant had not provided documentation of how the applicant would preserve the open space in perpetuity and that a portion of Goldthwaite Road would need to be discontinued in order for the applicant to build lots 44, 45, 46.

Mr. Truman asked if the applicant would be amenable to continuation. Mr. Scott affirmed.

Mr. Ochoa asked if the applicant could explain the fencing and gated community components and if the homeowners association would take care of snow removal and other maintenance.

Mr. Scott stated that fencing is proposed around the entire site and explained that the fencing styles would vary with a shadowbox style fence when the property is adjacent to other single-family homes in the area. He stated that the association would be responsible for all maintenance.

Ms. Zhaurova quoted from the Zoning Ordinance, Article VIII, Section 3: *"The entire site shall be designed to and shall remain in one ownership and shall be developed and maintained as a unit, excepting for units, private yards and other similarly designated spaces for private use and/or ownership. The Planning Board shall determine that the design and ownership scheme assures unified control and maintenance of all land not so individually owned."*

Mr. Mitra asked for clarification about the number of units and timeline and if the applicant was amenable to conditions proposed by staff. Ms. Smith responded that the applicant is in compliance with the maximum allowed number of units for the site. Mr. Scott stated that they plan to begin in the spring, if approved, and are hoping to complete the project, as shown on the plan, within two years. He stated they were amenable to staff conditions.

Mr. Ochoa asked for clarification about traffic flow and access to the site. Mr. Scott stated that they plan to use key cards to operate the gates. He explained that guests could dial to a home and the homeowner could remotely open the gate.

Chair Truman requested that the requirement for conveyance of the open space is complied with prior to the next meeting. Ms. Scott stated that the conditions would cap the number of units allowed to be built so that no additional units could be constructed, thus maintaining the open space in perpetuity.

Ms. Zhaurova quoted from the Zoning Ordinance, Article VIII, Section 3: “...open land shall either be conveyed to the City and accepted by it for park or open space use or be conveyed to a non-profit organization the principal purpose of which is the conservation of open space or to be conveyed to a corporation or trust owned or to be owned by the owners of lots or residential units within the development. If such a corporation or trust is utilized, ownership thereof shall pass with conveyances of the lots or residential units. In any case where such land is not conveyed to the City, a restriction enforceable by the City shall be recorded providing that such land shall be kept in an open or natural state and not be built for residential use or developed for accessory uses such as parking or roadway.”

Chair Truman confirmed that discontinuation could be a condition of approval.

Mr. Scott stated that the applicant planned to discontinue a portion of the Goldthwaite Road prior to the construction of the homes.

Upon a motion by Mr. Ochoa and seconded by Mr. Mitra the Board voted 4-0 to continue the item to the February 12, 2014 meeting to allow the applicant time to address staff's comments and submit revised plans.

List of Exhibits.

Exhibit A: Burncoat Gardens Phase 1 Application; received 11/8/2013; prepared by CFS Engineering.

Exhibit B: Burncoat Gardens Phase 5 Application; received 11/8/2013; prepared by CFS Engineering.

Exhibit C: Burncoat Gardens Phase 5 Plan; dated 10/23/2013; prepared by CFS Engineering.

Exhibit D: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Planning Board; re: Goldthwaite Road (aka Burncoat Gardens); dated January 14, 2014.

Exhibit E: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Department of Public Works & Parks to the Planning Board; re: Goldthwaite Road (Burncoat Gardens); dated January 16, 2014

Exhibit F: Request for Continuation/Postponement/Leave to Withdraw from Chuck Scott, CFS Engineering to the Planning Board; dated 12/06/2013 and 12/31/2013.

Exhibit G: Notes from Fire Department; re: Burncoat Gardens.

8. Arboretum Subdivision (Phase IV) – Information & Discussion Regarding Compliance with Approved Plans

Mr. Rolle stated that there are long-standing issues with the Phase IV approval for the Arboretum specifically with regards to the construction of the slope and the stability and materials used to construct and stabilize the slope. Mr. Rolle gave an overview of the project's history and noted that the issues identified were never resolved. He stated that no revised plans have been received and that to the best of his knowledge no improvements have been made to the site.

Mr. Rolle stated that staff is recommending the Board find the applicant in non-compliance with the approved Subdivision for Phase IV, send a letter to the owner to notify him of such a determination, and request revised plans within 30 days to address the issues identified in the memorandum (Exhibit A).

Chair Truman asked for legal clarification as to what would happen after 30 days were the owner not to take any action.

Mr. Traynor stated that 30 days would be sufficient time for a good-faith effort to comply and address the issues identified. He noted that if there is no response from the owner, then the Board may act upon their own motion, pursuant to Chapter 41, Section 81W of the Subdivision Law, to require a change in a plan to maintain its approved status or the Board can take steps to rescind the subdivision approval. He stated that staff can report back on other enforcement actions as well, including a court order to force the owner to remove what's there and re-build the wall. He stated that the issue at hand is that a portion of the slope was constructed as part of Phase III and the owner may not be able to construct the slope as it was approved because Phase III lots are now privately owned. He noted that this fact may complicate the court order to request Arboretum Village LLC to build to plan because it may not be possible. He emphasized that the letter would begin a dialogue on this issue.

Ms. Lori Schlesman, 50 Sophia Drive, asked to clarify that the letter would deny Mr. Gallo of Arboretum Village LLC the right to construct any further until he fixes the slope.

Sarah Walsh, 46 Sophia Drive, asked for clarification about the timeline and expressed concerns about safety of the constructed slope behind her home.

Mr. Rolle stated that the letter from the Board is asking for revisions by February 20, 2014 to allow the applicant time to prepare revised plans. He explained that the Board would then hear the amended Subdivision on March 26, 2014 and make a determination about whether or not the plans are acceptable to remedy the situation. He reiterated that the challenge is that the slope extends beyond the Phase IV subdivision into Phase III (now owned by other parties) and therefore it doesn't seem possible for Arboretum Village LLC to re-construct the slope in accordance with the approved plans, thus necessitating re-design of the slope.

Chair Truman stated that Ms. Walsh would receive an abutter notification if staff receives and advertises for Subdivision Amendment as suggested.

Mr. Traynor suggested the Board vote to accept staff recommendations and to send the letter.

Upon a motion by Mr. Ochoa and seconded by Mr. Mitra the Board voted 4-0 to find that the owner, Arboretum Village, LLC, has not constructed the subdivision in accordance with the approved definitive plan and is in violation of the Planning Board's October 6, 2009 approval. The Board requested that DPRS staff send a demand notice to the owner demanding action be initiated within 30 days to remedy the non-conformance of the slopes and slope stabilization methods. The submission of an amendment to the approved Arboretum Definitive Subdivision Plan, Phase IV showing current conditions and all proposed changes to address non-conformities submitted no later than February 20, 2014 to the Division of Planning & Regulatory Services for a hearing at the March 26, 2014 planning board meeting would

constitute such action. The amendment must detail a design that can be safely constructed to meet all applicable standards and is so certified by a structural engineer. Further, the revised design must include measures to reduce storm water drainage onto abutting properties.

List of Exhibits.

Exhibit A: Memorandum to Planning Board from Stephen S. Rolle; re: Arboretum Subdivision (Phase IV) – Information & Discussion Regarding Compliance with Approved Plans; dated January 22, 2014.

9. Commercial Corridors Overlay District - Amendments to the City of Worcester Zoning Ordinance & Map (ZM-2013-005 & ZO-2013-003)

Mr. Rolle stated that the purpose of the proposal is to create a Commercial Corridors Overlay District. He stated that the proposal was drafted by the administration and has been referred to the Board by City Council for a hearing and recommendations. He stated that staff recommended two amendments to the proposal. He explained the first is to establish a higher maximum parking rate for food-service uses (Article 9, 7 b) and the second is to delete the sentence regarding the language about a level of service, as this is not a practical measure for parking lots (Article 9, 7 c).

Mr. Rolle stated that an overlay is coupled with the underlying Zoning districts and that the overlays supersede the land use regulations required in the underlying zoning.

Mr. Rolle stated that the proposed corridors are the major arteries of the city along with downtown and include predominantly business districts: BL-1, BG-6, BG-4, BG-3, BG-2 with some RL-7 and MG-2 areas. He noted that the overlays would replace the existing parking, arts and other overlay districts and help create a uniform set of regulations throughout the City. He stated that the areas impacted would include: downtown, Gateway Park, Chandler Street, Highland Street, Pleasant Street, Park Avenue, Shrewsbury Street, and Grafton Street.

Mr. Rolle stated that the district would encourage infill and compact development avoiding excessive parking to help create dense, walkable areas preserving the historic and cultural assets of the City.

Mr. Rolle emphasized the amendment applies to four areas 1) dimensional requirements, 2) urban design guidelines, 3) allowed uses, and 4) parking requirements.

Mr. Rolle stated that the amendment would decrease the minimum frontage requirement for non-residential uses to none and decrease the frontage for multi-family residential uses to 40 feet while eliminating the minimum lot size. He stated that the floor area ratio requirements would be eliminated for mixed use buildings and the height limit for buildings would be scaled to 1.5 times the width of the fronting roadway.

Mr. Rolle stated that landscaped parking buffers would be reduced to 3 feet, with the provision that trees be planted in minimum of 5 ft. by 5 ft. areas. He added that setbacks would change to a maximum of 5 ft. from the street for non-residential uses and 10 ft. for residential uses. He explained that building entrances would be required to face the street to help improve pedestrian access.

Mr. Rolle stated that allowed uses would be modified to eliminate uses related to auto service, sales, storage, and fueling, drive-through uses, single and two family residential uses, and non-accessory surface parking lots. He added that small lots with fewer than 16 spaces could deviate from the required dimensions with the approval of the Building Commissioner. He stated that minimum parking requirements would be eliminated and a maximum parking requirement would be instituted.

Mr. Rolle emphasized that the current Zoning Ordinance reflected a very suburban mindset and subsequently parking requirements are too high, limiting re-use of buildings in the downtown and commercial areas. He gave an overview of similar cities and their associated parking requirements, showing that Worcester often requires twice as much parking compared to other similar sized New England towns.

Mr. Rolle stated that maximum parking requirements help avoid over dedication of land to parking and noted that a Special Permit would allow a businesses' or property owners to exceed the maximum number of parking spaces if warranted. He stated that nationally parking maximums are well-established and parking minimum elimination is becoming frequent. He noted that some parking minimum eliminations already exist in parts of the City today.

Mr. Rolle reminded the Board of the process for a zoning ordinance or map amendment noting that the Board will make a recommendation to City Council who will then refer the item to the Economic Development Committee for another hearing and then the amendment will return to City Council for a final vote.

Phil Stone, Member of the Board of Directors of Worcester Common Ground stated that successful businesses on Highland Street, Chandler Street, and Pleasant Street all provide parking for customers. He stated that his organization was in the process of developing a Commercial Development Plan for Chandler Street and that capturing the high volume of traffic that spans the street daily is essential and requires parking.

Mr. Stone stated that he agreed with the direction of the proposal but expressed concerns about business owners determining the parking they need. He stated that the City needs to discuss municipal parking garages in the area and work to provide other infrastructure that would make pedestrian access and vehicular street crossings easier, safer, and more attractive. He stated that implementation of such infrastructure is beyond the means of an individual business owner to provide.

Mr. Stone expressed concerns about the Pleasant - Piedmont Street neighborhoods being underserved by banks and credit unions and emphasized the need to encourage such institutions to the area, not create a disincentive for them to locate there by removing the provision for drive-through banks.

Mr. Rolle responded that the concerns related to parking garages, while important and recognized by the City, were outside of the scope of this Amendment. He stated that the proposal recognizes that requiring businesses to provide large amounts of parking is not efficient for dense areas.

William Breault of the Main South Lions Club expressed concerns about eliminating the requirements for parking in the Main South area and about gathering adequate public input for the amendment.

Jo Hart, Worcester resident, stated that she was in support of the proposal but that the City needed additional public input. She stated that there are too many parking lots and drive-through banks and expressed interest in seeing denser, mixed use, developments. She expressed concerns about pedestrian access, poor infrastructure regulating traffic, and inadequate public transportation. She stated that the City needed to make the proposal adaptable for pedestrians, vehicles, and business. She stated that there is limited cohesive long-term planning and development in the City.

Gary Vecchio, president of the Shrewsbury Street Neighborhood Association, stated that the Association is only in opposition of the elimination of parking minimums and the imposition of parking maximums as the proposal pertains to Shrewsbury Street. He stated that the proposal will make parking even more sparse, thus more difficult, and that it would disenfranchise the elderly and disabled. He expressed concerns with the lack of public transportation.

Mr. Vecchio stated that the Shrewsbury Street area is “parking challenged” and to allow developers to build without requiring any parking will disadvantage existing businesses whose customers utilize street parking. He stated that customers are discouraged from patronizing businesses where there is no parking. He stated the proposal would challenge the residents who already have parking issues. He stated that the provision of on street parking has made Shrewsbury Street successful.

Mr. Vecchio stated that patrons and merchants on the street want more parking and need valet parking. He stated that areas with a proliferation of valet parking are already “parking challenged” areas. He stated that maximum parking requirements will be a disincentive for the creation of additional parking and make it more difficult for businesses to locate in the City if they have to seek relief to create additional parking. He stated the Ordinance should encourage development and protect existing businesses and residents’ quality of life. He stated this purpose would not be served by this proposal on Shrewsbury Street and requested the Board remove Shrewsbury Street from the parking requirements associated with the amendment.

Vincent Pedone of 18 East Park Terrace stated that residents and businesses, including the Shrewsbury Street Merchants Association, are in agreement that the parking component of this proposal will not work for Shrewsbury Street and will have detrimental effects on the area. He stated that just because staff has found parking to be a problem downtown doesn’t mean that there is a “parking problem” in the different corridors or that the City needs a “uniform code” to fix parking. He stated that any issues bringing development into the downtown area are likely not due to parking restrictions.

City Councilor Michael Gaffney stated that he has spoken to many Green Street Business owners and that they are happy with the streetscape improvements but frustrated that the area lost on-street parking spaces. He expressed concerns that while one may think businesses would not develop a site without providing parking that it is possible it will happen if there are no requirements. He stated that he liked many parts of the proposal and expressed the importance of this proposal for areas such as those near the Union Station garage and downtown. He stated that the parking proposal does not work for Shrewsbury Street and Highland Street and likely other corridors. He stated that lack of access to parking presents a challenge to customers when patronizing businesses. He stated that the parking minimums are problematic given there are not enough parking garages and public lots throughout the City. He stated the City needs a “conductive plan”. He stated that the proposal did not need to be so large that it covers large portion of the City and should be tried in a microcosm first.

Don Morse, of 1 Envelope Terrace stated he was in agreement with everything that was said regarding Shrewsbury Street. He stated that Shrewsbury Street is unique as there is a small buffer between the commercial corridor and residential homes. He stated that there is limited pedestrian traffic and minimal parking on the street. He stated that lack of parking was a huge issue.

Jo Hart, Worcester resident, stated that the mindset in Worcester is to use the automobile. She stated that the City needs adequate public transportation and infrastructure to allow travel without a vehicle. She stated that the City needs a transportation planner and that Worcester needs light rail systems. She stated “Worcester has the Pensacola syndrome where parking lots have been built to encourage people to come to the City but people don’t come to a City to look at parking lots”.

Stewart Loosemore, Worcester Regional Chamber of Commerce, stated that the WRCC supported the plan but that the individual corridors are unique and requested the Board consider the residents and businesses concerns, and adjust the proposal accordingly. He submitted a letter into evidence.

Mr. Ochoa confirmed with staff that his home was outside of the proposed area

Mr. Mitra stated that much of the proposal seems approvable and would complement the changes already taking place in the City. He stated that there is a concern about the parking requirements and

removal of the minimum parking requirements would impact many business owners and there should be more input from these stakeholders.

Mr. Rolle stated that he agreed the only controversial parts of the proposal are the parking requirements. He stated that staff could spend more time analyzing mentioned parking issues and provide options for revising and/or refining recommendations as well as research practices elsewhere, if the Board decides to continue the hearing.

Mr. Ochoa stated that he feels there are many underutilized parking lots - including those on Shrewsbury Street - and that these lots are not aesthetically pleasing. He stated that the Board imposes ADA compliance for new parking lots but that many parking lots do not provide easy access for this population. He stated that he believes valet parking is for convenience and is not indicative of a need for parking.

Mr. Ochoa stated that the Board often grants parking relief to applicants because the parking requirements are set too high. He stated that he feels that the elimination of the minimum parking requirement would attract more businesses as the existing requirements are challenging for small businesses. He stated that he also understands the proposal may be ambitious. He suggested the proposal should first concentrate in the downtown area and allow for additional conversations in the outlying areas. He requested evidence and trends regarding parking challenges in the proposed corridors.

Mr. Vigliotti asked if staff considered focusing only on downtown as concerns were about the corridors and asked why staff decided to extend down these corridors. Mr. Rolle responded that the corridors are the areas where staff is seeing many of the issues described, specifically a lot of land being dedicated to individual parking lots. He stated that there were important urban design aspects that are appropriate for the corridors but that nuances on the parking requirements could be re-considered. He stated he would like to analyze alternative parking requirements.

Mr. Ochoa stated he felt the Board should have another hearing. Chair Truman agreed.

Ms. Zhaurova clarified that staff believes businesses will provide the parking that the market dictates or go out of business. She stated that this is an opportunity to open a discussion about the parking situation in the City and that the proposal covers only ~5% of the City land. She stated that the Ordinance provides uniform parking requirements across the City but that the corridors and downtown are distinctly different areas from the rest of the City.

Ms. Zhaurova stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals has granted many special permits and variances for parking relief and that this practice indicates that many businesses do provide parking, but often much less than what would have been required by-right.

Chair Truman stated that he agreed that the proposal is perfect for downtown but that it is not a one size fits all for the corridors.

Upon a motion by Mr. Ochoa and seconded by Mr. Vigliotti the Board voted 4-0 to continue the item to the March 5, 2014 meeting to allow staff time to research and provide additional information regarding new parking minimum requirements for different uses and geographies.

List of Exhibits:

Exhibit A: City of Worcester – Proposed Commercial Corridors Overlay District Map

Exhibit B: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE WORCESTER ZONING ORDINANCE ADOPTED APRIL 2, 1991, RELATIVE TO CREATING COMMERCIAL CORRIDORS OVERLAY DISTRICTS, CREATIVE ENTREPRENEUR LOFTS, AND THE ELIMINATION OF THE PARKING OVERLAY DISTRICTS, THE ARTS OVERLAY DISTRICT AND THE MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY DISTRICTS

Exhibit C: City of Worcester Commercial Corridors Overlay District: A Summary of the Proposal

Exhibit D: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Planning Board; re: Commercial Corridors Overlay District – Zoning Amendment; dated January 22, 2014.

Exhibit E: Letter re: Commercial Corridor Overlay District by Worcester Regional Chamber of Commerce dated and received January 22, 2014.

10. 184 Highland Street – Definitive Site Plan Approval (PB-2013-012)

Dave Batbouta, DE Realty, stated that a ~3,900 SF building exists at the property and that the proposal is for a lodging house with 8 rooms. Mr. Batbouta stated that there would be only interior renovations done to the building. He stated that motion sensing lights had been installed on the building to provide lighting for security cameras. He provided the Board with revised floor plans.

Ms. Zhaurova stated that the applicant received an approval from the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) to allow a lodging house use and for a Special Permit for an Extension, Alteration or Change of a Privileged Pre-existing Non-conforming Structure. She stated that as a condition of approval the ZBA reduced the number of beds from proposed 10 to now 8. She stated that staff recommends approval of this Site Plan with the condition that 8 copies of revised plans be submitted to the Division of Planning and Regulatory Services (DPRS) with the revisions.

Mr. Doershler of 5 Einhorn Road stated he was concerned with the wide driveway opening at Einhorn Road. He requested the Board approve a narrowed driveway to control access to the property from Einhorn Road and thus provide a longer landscape buffer with more limited parking. Mr. Doershler expressed concerns related to an increase in traffic, given the other existing lodging house on Einhorn Road. He expressed concerns related to ownership and management of the property, long-term, noting the property is for sale. He requested the Board require down shading or angling of the blue lights which are directed into the neighbors' yards and not good at motion sensing. He requested the remaining mature trees on the west of the property be protected and be kept.

Mr. Batbouta responded that the curb cuts is already existing and that they could re position the existing lights to shine down but that the color was the closest to white they could provide.

Chair Truman asked if there were requirements in the Ordinance regarding lighting overspill.

Katie Donovan, Inspectional Services, responded that she was not aware of any such requirements.

Ms. Zhaurova stated that the plans in front of the Board do not reflect what was approved by the ZBA - 5 parking spaces and no backing-out onto Einhorn Road by altering the curb cut on Einhorn Road. Mr. Batbouta stated that they could accommodate those conditions. Chair Truman stated that the Board would want the remaining pavement removed so as to avoid land being designated as additional parking spaces. Mr. Batbouta stated he was amenable to the condition.

Upon a motion by Mr. Vigliotti and seconded by Mr. Ochoa the Board voted 4-0 to approve the petition with the conditions that eight (8) copies of final revised Definitive Site Plan are submitted to the Division of Planning & Regulatory Services prior to the release of the decision with the following items included:

1. Label streets as public or private and provide widths for each
2. Provide note indicating Special Permits granted by the Zoning Board on December 2, 2013 with its conditions of approval.
3. Label square feet, total floor area, floor area ratio and height in stories & feet of buildings on site
4. Provide note on number of bedrooms
5. Update parking requirement based on reduced number of allowed beds
6. Provide the number of off-street parking available
7. Provide methods and locations of erosion and sedimentation control devices for controlling erosion and sedimentation during the construction process as well as after.
8. Remove additional pavement in the front of the building along Einhorn Road to reflect Parking as approved by the Zoning Board of Appeals - providing only paving for the required 3 spaces.
9. Configure curb cut so that it does not allow for backing out onto the street.
10. Adjust existing lighting to not reflect onto neighboring properties, to shine down rather than out.

List of Exhibits:

- Exhibit A: Definitive Site Plan Application; prepared by D. E. Realty LLC; received 3/4/13, revised 7/17/2013 and 10/4/2013.
- Exhibit B: Definitive Site Plan; prepared by Land Planning, Inc.; dated 3/1/13, revised 6/17/2013, 7/2/2013 and 9/17/2013.
- Exhibit C: Floor Plans; dated 1/4/2013; prepared by R. C. Searles, Associates.
- Exhibit D: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Planning Board; re: 184 Highland Street (PB-2013-012) – Definitive Site Plan; dated May 31, 2013; revised 6/21/13, 7/12/13, 9/13/13, 10/25/13, 12/4/13 & 1/15/14.
- Exhibit E: Stormwater Report for Proposed Dormitories for 184 Highland Street and 2 Einhorn Road; dated June 27, 2013, prepared by Land Planning, Inc.

11. 5, 7, 25, 38 & 45 Arctic Street; 1, 4 & 13 Hygeia Street; and 290 Franklin Street – Definitive Site Plan Approval (PB-2013-040)

12. 5, 7, 25, 38 & 45 Arctic Street; 1, 4 & 13 Hygeia Street; and 290 Franklin Street – Chapter 12, Section 12 (PB-2013-047)

Ding On Kwan, Arctic Street, LLC, stated that the proposal includes a three level parking garage with the first floor 5 ft. below grade. He stated that the proposal is for ~350 units residential units with ~750 parking spaces. He showed the Board a short slideshow.

Mr. Kwan stated that the location is within walking distance to the train station, provides adequate parking for residents, additional public parking, and will have minimal impacts on transportation.

Jeff Howland, JH Engineering Group, stated that the site consists of a number of buildings which were previously part of a mill site. He stated that the proposal is to demolish all the structures on the block, including all the infrastructure in Plastics Street and a portion of Arctic Street, with the exception of abutting existing pizza shop and machine shop. He stated that the proposal includes new drainage for both streets and the removal of three old catch basins which are not currently functioning. He stated that the proposal will tie in to the City's water lines and combined sewer lines. He stated the requested mechanical drawings will be provided once the architect begins the design of the structure.

Mr. Howland stated that the entrance at Plastic Street to the parking garage will be at the second floor level and that the roads will be 26 ft. wide. He noted this would be wider nearest Franklin Street to accommodate an additional egress lane. He noted the parking space discrepancy will be revised and stated the Floor Area Ratio, including the common areas and stairwells, will be 2.99:1. He stated that the square footage provided is for the (~95,000SF) parking garage and the residential units will have less area (~65,000SF).

Robert Micho, MDM Transportation Consultants of Marlborough, project's consultant, stated he prepared a traffic and access impact study for the following locations: Grafton Street, Washington Square, Franklin Street, Arctic Street, Foster Street, and Posner Square. He stated that they manually counted and recorded traffic flow to estimate and project conditions 5 years ahead with background growth assumptions. He noted that the site will generate 130 directional trips during peak travel with an estimated 2,020 trips daily during the week. He stated that the calculations account for only 10% use of public transit and stated that they anticipate these rates to be higher.

Mr. Micho stated that at present Franklin Street carries ~1,000 vehicles per hour and Washington Square carries ~4,000 vehicles per hour. He stated that the impact from the project would be minimal providing an increase of ~20 cars per hour at these intersections and less than one additional car per minute for the Franklin Street Area heading east and west. He noted that the capacity analysis conducted shows adequate capacity and would only provide a slight delay at the Arctic Street intersection with Franklin Street for users making a left hand turn and likewise a delay at Plastics Street and Franklin Street.

Chair Truman asked for clarification about the change in capacity and delay for the Plastics and Franklin Streets intersection. Mr. Micho stated that taking a left onto Franklin Street from Plastics Street will result in a 2 vehicle queue at the intersection with minor delays. He noted that because of the additional lane for egress at this intersection, it will not impact those motorists making a right hand turn nor will it make use of Franklin Street delayed.

Mr. Micho stated that the auto-turn analysis to shows ample maneuvering area at the existing businesses to accommodate the vehicles that currently use the site and for tractor-trailer use. He stated additional parking to serve the area would be provided by the proposal as well. He stated that the proposal will create a fully compliant sidewalk which will wrap the building and connect with the existing walkways for pedestrians. He noted that site would be compliant with the required 2 spaces per unit and that there would be at least 700 spaces provided, 50 of which will be on the surface lot. He stated that the site is designed to favor use of Plastic Street and not require use Arctic Street. He noted Arctic Street would be used as emergency exits only.

Alice Web of Kirk Design Landscape Architecture, project's architect, stated that the proposal provides shrubs, groundcover, and trees to disguise the parking garage from the streets and screen the surface lot. She noted that more landscaping is provided than is required by the Ordinance.

Ms. Zhaurova stated that staff would require clarification on the number of parking spaces and showing hydrants. She stated that for the Definitive Site Plan Approval staff recommended approval with the conditions that 8 copies of revised plans would be submitted to DPRS and showing missing annotations.

She stated that the Chapter 12 Section 12 approval applied to alteration of any streets, private or public, and that staff recommended approval without conditions. She asked if the applicant had considered retail space on the first floor given there is excess parking provided and given the number of people that would be living in the building.

Gianni Romeo, 274 Franklin Street, stated he is in favor of the project.

Councilor Philip Palmieri, District 2 Worcester, stated he is in favor of the project.

David Karen, of Town to Town Movers on Hygeia Street, stated that he is in favor of the project.

Mr. Ochoa asked for clarification on the stormwater management.

Mr. Howland stated the mechanicals for the inside of the garage have not yet been designed but that there would be adequate pitch to provide drainage. He noted the site is entirely impervious at present with almost no drainage and that the proposal would decrease runoff by ~10%. He noted the building would have interior roof drains that will tie into the drainage system, providing 6-8 catch basins in Arctic and Plastic Streets and the surface parking lot.

Mr. Mitra expressed his support for the project and stated he hopes the project is completed and not left undone. He inquired about the financing. Mr. Kwan stated that he has a commitment from the bank for the financing and that he put up 30% of his own money with every intention to complete the project.

Jo Hart, Worcester resident, asked how the exhaust in the parking areas would be managed. She stated that the applicant should consider ventilation. She stated she felt the windows should be sound proof and vibration resistant given the proximity to the trains near CSX.

Mr. Kwan stated that the parking garage is open-air and above ground and isn't required to have ventilation systems. He stated that there are many similar residential structures in Quincy which are adjacent to the highway.

Mr. Howland stated that his office is located at 274 Franklin Street, second floor, and while he overlooks the rail yard, he does not hear the trains at all.

Chair Truman stated that the concern would be in relation to CSX as the company operates all night. He stated that the Board has had complaints from neighbors about the noise. He stated that the CSX rail yard was not operating at full capacity yet. He stated that it is encouraging to see this type of project being built. He asked for clarification about the sidewalk as to why it did not wrap around the building entirely.

Mr. Howland stated that the sidewalk does not go all the way around because they are trying to maintain the existing parking arrangement at 33 Arctic Street and therefore the sidewalk is interrupted to accommodate that site as is.

Upon a motion by Mr. Ochoa and seconded by Mr. Mitra, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan petition with the following conditions:

That eight (8) copies of final revised Definitive Site Plan are submitted to the Division of Planning & Regulatory Services prior to the release of the decision with the following items included:

11. Provide existing contours on a separate plan for legibility purposes;
12. Provide corrected parking summary on Sheet C-4 to correspond with quantity specified with the plans, application or traffic study;
13. Provide a breakdown of the number of regular, compact and handicap and spaces in the parking summary;

14. Provide proposed building exterior materials and elevations;
15. Provide location, size and arrangement of all signs and lighting;
16. Provide fire hydrant locations;

Chair Truman called a 5 minutes recess.

Upon a motion by Mr. Mitra and seconded by Mr. Ochoa, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the Chapter 12 Section 12 petition.

List of Exhibits: Definitive Site Plan Approval (PB-2013-040)

- Exhibit A: Definitive Site Plan Application; received October 17, 2013; prepared by DOK Realty LLC.
- Exhibit B: Proposed Definitive Site Plan, Plastics-Arctic Apartments; prepared by JH Engineering Group and Dimensions 2 & 3; dated 10/17/2013, revised 11/19/2013 and 12/3/2013.
- Exhibit C: Landscape Plan for Plastics-Arctic Apartments; prepared by JH Engineering Group; undated; received November 14, 2013.
- Exhibit D: Traffic Impact and Access Study for Arctic Street & Plastics Street; prepared by MDM Transportation Consultants, Inc.; dated October 2013; received November 14, 2013.
- Exhibit E: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Planning Board; re: 5, 7, 25, 38 & 45 Arctic Street; 1, 4 & 13 Hygeia Street; and 290 Franklin Street; dated November 19, 2013, revised December 6, 2013 and January 15, 2014
- Exhibit F: Project Reviews from District Chief John P. Powers, Fire Department; undated.
- Exhibit G: Letter from Fusaro, Altomare & Ermilio RE: Definitive Site Plan Approval for 5, 7, 25, 38 & 45 Arctic Street, 1,4 & 13 Hygeia Street and 290 Franklin Street (the “Project”), 33 Arctic Street (the “Property”); dated November 15, 2013.
- Exhibit H: Postponement Request for 5/7, 25, 38 & 45 Arctic Street, 1,4 & 13 Hygeia Street and 290 Franklin Street (PB-2013-040).
- Exhibit I: Letter from Fusaro, Altomare & Ermilio RE: Definitive Site Plan Approval for 5, 7, 25, 38 & 45 Arctic Street, 1,4 & 13 Hygeia Street and 290 Franklin Street (the “Project”), 33 Arctic Street (the “Property”)-postponement; dated and received November 20, 2013.
- Exhibit J: Letter from Jon P. Carlson, FlexOgraphic Printing Plate Co., Inc. to the Worcester Planning Board; re: Hygeia Street; dated November 18, 2013.
- Exhibit K: Letter from Norman J. Picard, New England Sign Group. to the Worcester Planning Board; re: Hygeia Street; dated November 18, 2013.
- Exhibit L: Letter from Kristel A. Frick, New Hope Soap, LLC to the Worcester Planning Board; re: Arctic Street; dated November 27, 2013.
- Exhibit M: Letter from Patrick J. Moynihan, the McCormack Firm, LLC to the Worcester Planning Board RE: Definitive Site Plan Approval, 5, 7 25, 38 & 45 Arctic Street, 1, 4, & 13 Hygeia Street and 290 Franklin Street (the “Project) with enclosure-Proposed Apartment Complex – Arctic and Plastic Street, Response to Graphics Group (33 Arctic Street) Comments (11/27/13); dated December 3, 2013.

- Exhibit N: Email from Jonathan Gervais, Department of Public Works & Parks to Jeff Howland, JH Engineering Group; re: Arctic/Plastic Site; dated November 15, 2013.
- Exhibit O: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Department of Public Works & Parks to the Planning Board; re: 5, 7, 25, 38 & 45 Arctic Street, 1, 4, & 23 Hygeia Street Site Plan Application – PB-2013-040; dated December 6, 2013.

List of Exhibits: Chapter 12, Section 12 (PB-2013-047)

- Exhibit A: Street Opening Application; prepared by DOK Realty, LLC; undated; received November 22, 2013.
- Exhibit B: Proposed Definitive Site Plan for Plastics-Arctic Apartment; dated October 17, 2013; revised November 19, 2013; prepared by JH Engineering Group, LLC.
- Exhibit C: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Planning Board; re: Plastic Street & Arctic Street Opening; dated December 4, 2013, revised January 15, 2014.
- Exhibit D: Email and Arctic Street plan (Franklin Street – Southerly) from William Nietmitz, Department of Public Works & Parks to Nancy Tran, Senior Planner; RE: Arctic and Plastics Street - Street Alteration; dated December 4, 2013.

13. 2 & 6 Carver Street – Site Plan Approval (PB-2013-046)

Maureen Finlay of Summit Engineering, Oxford, MA, project's engineer, stated that the applicant had received approval from the ZBA for relief from the required frontage and to allow increased height of the structure. She stated that the proposed structure has 12 dwelling units and 24 associated off-street parking spaces. She stated that the surface parking lot would use underground storage and treat runoff prior to release into the City's line and that the garage would have a catch basin abutting the driveway so runoff would be routed to an oil separator and then into the City Sewer line. She stated that the landscape buffer is compliant and the provision of open space at ~1,700 SF is over the required 10%.

Mr. Gervais stated that since the time the comments were issued the applicant has submitted revised plans which address the DPW&P comments.

Ms. Smith stated that the revised plans also addressed many of staff comments but that there were additional annotations which were not addressed and that staff would request 10 copies or revised plans showing the requested changes.

Upon a motion by Mr. Ochoa and seconded by Mr. Mitra, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan with the condition that ten (10) copies of final revised Definitive Site Plans are submitted to the Division of Planning & Regulatory Services prior to the release of the decision with the following items included:

1. Show and label existing trees (in excess of nine inches in diameter);
2. Provide the location, size, use, attributes and arrangement, including height in feet, floor area ratio, total floor area, total square feet of ground area coverage, number and size of dwelling units by number of bedrooms, and exterior materials of the proposed building;
3. Provide construction materials and dimensions of all vehicular and pedestrian circulation elements, including driveways, entrances, curbs, curb cuts, parking spaces, access aisles, sidewalks, walkways and pathways;

4. Label proposed circulation for parking and garage access;
5. Provide minimum one accessible parking space (compliant with the ADA requirements);
6. Provide information on whether &/or how the existing vegetation on site will be retained;
7. Delineate and label the total area of all usable open space or common property and the extent to which it is to be improved;

List of Exhibits:

- Exhibit A: 2 & 6 Carver Street Application; received 11/08/2013; prepared by William J. Dowell.
- Exhibit B: 2 & 6 Carver Street Plan; dated 10/29/2013, revised 11/20/2013; prepared by Summit Engineering & Survey, Inc.
- Exhibit C: 2 & 6 Carver Street Rendering; dated 11/08/2013; prepared by John Ciccariello & Associates, Inc.
- Exhibit D: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Planning Board; re: 2 & 6 Carver Street; dated December 6, 2013, revised January 15, 2014.
- Exhibit E: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Department of Public Works & Parks to the Planning Board; re: 2 & 6 Carver Street; Site Plan Application – PB-2013-046; dated December 6, 2013.
- Exhibit F: Request to Postpone; re: 2&6 Carver Street; dated 12/10/2013.

14. 169, 170, 181, 187 Greenwood St & 1 Lundberg St – Amendment to Parking Plan Approval (PB-2013-049)

Fidel Colona, Cornerstone Engineering, project’s engineer, stated the parking plan was previously approved in August 2013 for a rail freight storage yard for ~240 stalls for containers waiting to be put on trailers. He stated that the amendment seeks to revise the location of the perimeter fence and wall to encompass the entire property (~40 ft. down Greenwood Street), to repave the sidewalk on Greenwood Street, and leave 2 ft. x 4 ft. concrete blocks on site as a retaining wall.

Chair Truman confirmed revised plans had been received since the previous approval.

Upon a motion by Mr. Mitra and seconded by Mr. Vigliotti, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the Parking Plan Amendment.

List of Exhibits:

- Exhibit A: Parking Plan Amendment Application; prepared by Greenwood LLC; received December 18, 2013.
- Exhibit B: Parking Plan Approval; prepared by Connorstone Engineering, Inc.; dated December 21, 2012; last revised December 3, 2013.
- Exhibit C: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Planning Board; re: 169, 170, 181, 187 Greenwood Street and 1 Lundberg Street – Parking Plan Amendment; dated January 15, 2014.

15. 151 West Boylston Drive – Amendment to Definitive Site Plan (PB-2013-051)

Todd Rodman of Seder and Chandler, project's attorney, stated the proposed amendment is to complete the build-out of parking given the addition of a final tenant. He stated that this amendment will restore the approval from the site plan approved in 2005, short of 5 parking spaces. He stated the 54,000 SF structure is used as commercial office spaces and that the Department of Children and Family Services would take the remaining vacant space. He noted the required parking is ~150 spaces and they will provide ~290 with the amendment.

David Macwell, Kelley Engineering Group, stated that he was able to accommodate and address staff comments without any issues. He stated the site was affected by the Asian Long Horned beetle and that they are working to have trees replanted.

Ms. Zhaurova stated that staff recommends approval with revised plans addressing the landscaping issue and other missing annotations.

Chair Truman asked if the large existing tree on the property would be maintained. Mr. Macwell stated that they would ensure it is protected.

Mr. Ochoa asked about snow storage. Mr. Macwell stated this would be designated in the revised plans and that they will truck snow offsite if needed.

Upon a motion by Mr. Mitra and seconded by Mr. Vigliotti the Board voted 4-0 to approve the Amendment to Definitive Site Plan with the condition that six (6) copies of final revised Definitive Site Plan are submitted to the Division of Planning & Regulatory Services prior to the release of the decision with the following items included:

1. Show location and provide dimensions of the four loading spaces provided
2. Notate Neponset Street as public and indicate road width
3. Provide breakdown of number of regular, compact and handicap spaces
4. Label compact parking spaces
5. Provide the location, size and arrangement of all signs and lighting.
6. Provide a landscaping plan showing existing and proposed landscaping (include type, location, quantity). Landscaping should be provided along sidewalk edges and side lot lines where parking abuts a street, public park or residential property and with a minimum of one tree per ten interior parking spaces.
 - a. Provide a minimum of 12 trees along the northeasterly property line where the new parking spaces are proposed
 - b. Provide three (3) trees adjacent to N/F Finnegan (residential)
 - c. Provide five (5) trees next to the 13 proposed spaces along West Boylston Drive
 - d. Provide four (4) trees next to the 19 proposed spaces along West Boylston Drive
 - e. Provide landscaping plan showing existing and proposed landscaping (include type, location, quantity)
7. Provide a wood stockade fence or similar between the property and N/F Finnegan
8. Label enclosed dumpster pad

List of Exhibits:

Exhibit A: Amendment to Definitive Site Plan Application; received December 19, 2013; prepared by West Boylston Drive LLC.

- Exhibit B: Modification to Definitive Site Plan; dated December 17, 2013; prepared by Kelly Engineering Group, Inc.
- Exhibit C: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Planning Board; re: 151 West Boylston Drive – Amendment to Definitive Site Plan; dated January 15, 2014.
- Exhibit D: Project Review Sheet from District Chief John Powers, Worcester Fire Department;; re: 151 West Boylston Drive – DPSA-Amend; undated.

OTHER BUSINESS:

16. Barrett Avenue – Street Petition Convert to Public (ST-2013-031)

Jonathan Gervais, DPW, stated that DPW&P recommends that the Board recommend that City Council adopt a priority level 1 for the conversion of Barrett Avenue. Upon a motion by Mr. Vigliotti and seconded by Mr. Mitra the Board voted 4-0 to recommend City Council adopt a Priority 1 designation for Barrett Avenue.

17. Westinghouse Parkway – Street Petition Convert to Public (ST-2013-032)

Mr. Gervais stated that DPW&P recommends that the Board recommend that City Council Leave to Withdraw for Westinghouse Parkway as conversion of the street has previously been petitioned and adopted by Council. Upon a motion by Mr. Vigliotti and seconded by Mr. Mitra the Board voted 4-0 to recommend City Council leave to withdraw for Westinghouse Parkway.

18. Willow Street – Street Petition Convert to Public (ST-2013-032)

Mr. Gervais stated that DPW recommends that the Board recommend that City Council adopt a priority level 1 designation for the conversion of Willow Street. Upon a motion by Mr. Vigliotti and seconded by Mr. Mitra the Board voted 4-0 to recommend City Council adopt priority 1 designation for Willow Street.

19. Approval Not Required (ANR) Plans

a. 31 & 39 Caroline Street (private street) (AN-2014-002)

Ms. Smith stated that this property is located in the RG-5 zone, on a private way, and that the purpose is to subdivide the property into 7 lots. Chair Truman noted that lots 2 and 3 did not have adequate frontage. Ms. Smith stated that the applicant could build a single-family attached dwelling if 20 ft of frontage is provided per dwelling unit.

Upon a motion by Mr. Mitra and seconded by Mr. Ochoa, the board voted 4-0 to endorse.

Ms. Zhaurova stated that staff found an issue with the plan and recommend rescinding the approval and denying the petition based on inadequate frontage. She stated that while the single family detached dwellings require only 20 ft. of frontage per dwelling unit, the definition of a single family attached dwelling requires a minimum of three dwelling units. She stated that because the applicant has only proposed two lots, the frontage provided would not be compliant with that required by the Ordinance.

Upon a motion by Mr. Ochoa and seconded by Mr. Mitra, the board voted 4-0 to rescind endorsement of the ANR and deny the proposal. The plans were not endorsed.

b. 0 & 40 Quinsigamond Avenue (public street) (AN-2014-001)

Ms. Smith stated that this property is located in the MG-2.0 zone. She stated that Worcester Regional Transport Authority would be locating to the site along with a fueling station. She stated that no frontage is specified in the Ordinance for this zoning district and that the applicant provides adequate frontage with ~400 ft. and ~800 ft. for the respective parcels. She stated that the proposal is to re-configure the existing lots to form two new lots.

Upon a motion by Mr. Ochoa and seconded by Mr. Mitra, the board voted 4-0 to endorse the ANR plan for 0 & 40 Quinsigamond Avenue.

20. Elections of Officers

Upon a motion by Mr. Ochoa and seconded by Mr. Vigliotti the Board elected Mr. Mitra as Vice Chair.

Upon a motion by Mr. Mitra and seconded by Mr. Vigliotti the Board elected Mr. Ochoa as Clerk.

Upon a motion by Mr. Mitra and seconded by Mr. Ochoa the Board elected Mr. Truman as Chair.

21. Delegation of CMRPC Delegate

Mr. Ochoa stated he would be interested in accepting the delegate role.

Upon a motion by Mr. Mitra and seconded by Mr. Vigliotti the Board appointed Mr. Ochoa as the CMRPC delegate.

ADJOURNMENT:

Upon a motion by Mr. Ochoa and seconded by Mr. Mitra, the Board voted 3-0 to adjourn the meeting at 9:03 p.m.