

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

November 17, 2010

WORCESTER CITY HALL – LEVI LINCOLN ROOM

Planning Board Members Present: Anne O’Connor, Chair
Scott Cashman, Vice Chair
Stephen Rolle, Clerk
Andrew Truman

Staff Present: Joel Fontane, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
Lara Bold, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
Luba Zhaurova, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
K. Russell Adams, Department of Public Works & Parks
Jennifer Beaton, Law Department

BOARD SITE VISITS

REGULAR MEETING (5:30 PM)

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Anne O’Connor called the meeting to order at 5:40 PM.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Upon a motion by Mr. Truman and seconded by Mr. Cashman, the Board voted 4-0 to approve October 27, 2010 minutes.

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

- 1. 805 West Boylston Street – Definitive Site Plan (PB-2010-062):** Samantha McDonald, representative for Gas Development LLC, the applicant, requested a Leave to Withdraw. Upon a motion by Mr. Cashman and seconded by Mr. Rolle, the Board voted 4-0 to approved the applicant’s request to Leave to Withdraw.

Exhibit A: Amendment to Definitive Site Plan Application; received August 11, 2010.

Exhibit B: Amendment to Definitive Site Plan; dated July 27, 2010, received August 11, 2010; engineer – VHB, Inc.

Exhibit C: Request to Continue Letter, dated October 21, 2010, submitted by Atty. Todd Brodeur, received October 21, 2010.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Public Hearing

2. **Arboretum Phase V (property located at Keach Ave., Marlana Drive, Camellia Court, Forsythia Trail, and Elderberry Circle) – Definitive Subdivision (PB-2010-061):** Hossein Haghanizadeh of HS&T Group, representative for Robert Gallo, the petitioner, stated that the petitioner met with the neighbors to discuss the project. He stated that while the petitioner voluntarily agreed to off-site improvements to the portion of existing Keach Avenue connected to Steele Street (~725') to accommodate additional traffic, which is currently unpaved, he does not feel his client is amenable to installing a sidewalk on one side of the above-mentioned portion of Keach Avenue. He stated that the proposed pavement width at Keach Avenue is currently 20 ft, but that it would have to be widened to 30' to incorporate 10' for the sidewalk and the vegetative strip. He stated that many streets in the area currently do not have sidewalks and that existing sidewalks are not connected to each other very well. He also described a potential issue with the grade of proposed sidewalk where a driveway would be elevated higher than the sidewalk. He suggested that if Board decided to require a sidewalk, its width is reduced from 10 ft to 6 ft.

Mr. Adams stated that he defers to the Board whether or not to require the petitioner to construct a sidewalk on the portion of Keach Avenue to be improved. He stated that he agrees with the assessment of the petitioner's engineer that due to steep grades, there will be a difference between a driveway and the road elevations which might impact the abutters. He read out the DPW&P letter dated November 17, 2010 (Exhibit G) and stated that:

1. The following is a list of waivers required for the submitted project recommended by DPW&P:
 - a. Section IX.C.5.b. The minimum centerline radius for a residential street shall be no less than 275 feet. (Marlana Drive). Plan currently shows 10 ft.
 - b. Section IX.E.1. The maximum centerline grade for a residential street shall be no more than 10%, and on a horizontal curve no more than 7% (Marlana Drive).
 - c. Section IX.E.3. Vertical curves shall adhere to Mass DOT minimums regarding sight distances.
 - d. Section IX.E.4. A leveling area shall be provided, for a distance of 100 feet, at a grade of no more than 3 percent, for intersecting streets.

2. The following is a list of waivers required for the submitted project not recommended by DPW&P:
 - a. Section IX.J.4.G.2. A drainage easement, with a width of 20 feet, shall be provided for drainage structures outside of the proposed right-of-way.
 - b. Section IX.J.4.G.3. An access easement, with a width of 25 feet, shall be provided for vehicle access to drainage structures (here - detention pond) outside of the proposed right-of-way.
 - c. Section X.I.1. Side slopes shall not exceed 3:1 from the back of the sidewalk to the existing grade. (Forsythia Trail 2.5:1)

3. Provide detailed water infrastructure information.

4. Identify stabilization devices for site slopes greater than 3:1.

5. Provide a limit of proposed paving line and existing utility information for the intersection of Keach Avenue and Steele Street.

6. Re-design the proposed sanitary line on Keach Avenue to minimize the slope and velocities of water runoff movement on Keach Avenue.
7. Eliminate the temporary cul-de-sac at the terminus of Sarah Drive and Bittersweet Boulevard and construct an intersection to the satisfaction of DPW&P. Mr. Haghanizadeh was amenable to the proposal. Mr. Adams stated that the same developer owns abutting land and therefore the intersection will not affect anyone else's property.

Chair O'Connor asked if the DPW&P needs to see revised plans prior to making recommendation to the Board. Mr. Adams stated yes. Ms. Bold stated that previously identified annotations/labels were corrected on revised plans. She recommended approval of the project with the following conditions of approval:

- Submit an operation and maintenance plan to address dust and debris created by the construction on site, for the complete duration of the construction period of the project. Such plan should include the following: (a) daily pick up of construction debris, and (b), sweeping the streets on site daily.
- Construction mats shall be lengthened and cleaned as needed to achieve dust reduction.
- Provide a note that the proposed open space areas will be set aside for park or open areas suitable for playground or recreation purposes for the period of 3 years from the date of the final build-out of Marlana Drive, Camellia Court, Elderberry Circle, and Forsythia Trail.

Carolyn Hallin, an abutter, stated that she is concerned how the water runoff would affect her house because there is a 20 ft grade difference in the neighborhood which forces the water to rush down the grade. She also expressed concern with triple-deckers in front of her property (31 Bayberry Drive). She stated that there is no privacy screening, and that the buildings are very large and are located on small lots, which exacerbates the situation. She asked the Board to consider as a condition of approval a screening of trees along property line on the Bayberry Bay side. She stated that the trees would serve as privacy screening and might also capture some of the runoff. Mr. Adams stated that there is a substantial grade on the property, changing from 624 ft to 670 ft. He stated that the newly constructed road will intercept water above the grade, but not the runoff below it, thus mitigating, but not completely solving the existing issue. Mr. Haghanizadeh was amenable to planting a 5 ft landscaped buffer on the property along the Bayberry Bay property line.

Deborah Chad of 36 Steele Street stated that her property has a 200 ft frontage on the existing portion of Keach Avenue. She stated that Keach Avenue is steep and expressed concern with "many people cutting through to Steele Street and going fast" to get to Route 146. She stated support for a sidewalk on Keach Avenue and stated that in winter, it will create a safer environment for children when walking home. She stated that she would lose portion of the driveway anyway as her garage is very close to the street already. She asked if the road has to be 30ft wide, or if this dimension can be changed. She stated that other streets with no sidewalks, such as Whipple or Steele Streets, are flat and people do not accelerate so fast on them as on Keach Avenue. She wanted to promote what she called a "community feel" and stated that it would be "odd to stop the sidewalk/walking path" mid-way through the street. Ms. Chad also advocated for a stop sign at the end of Keach Avenue and for installing a speed limit sign of 20 miles per hour or less on Keach Street as there is currently no set speed limit. Chair O'Connor stated that the Planning Board has jurisdiction over sidewalks, but that City Council has jurisdiction over setting speed limits and stop signs.

Steven Chad of 27 Keach Avenue stated support for the improvement on Keach Avenue because it would reduce the number of connections to the utility lines and because the developer agreed to connect

up all houses to the sewer line. He stated that he was not “happy” about the fact that the road will be used as access to the subdivision. He stated that drainage and erosion is a big problem on Keach Avenue and that he wants to make sure that the proposed catch basins would capture water runoff. Chair O’Connor stated that DPW&P asked for revised plans to address those concerns.

Mr. Haghanizadeh asked the Board’s opinion regarding Keach Avenue sidewalk proposal. Mr. Adams stated that he was not sure how it might affect the retaining wall. He stated that the DPW&P does not want the responsibility of owning and maintaining a retaining wall, and that, therefore, it cannot be located in the public right of way. Mr. Rolle asked how long is the unpaved portion of Keach Avenue. Mr. Haghanizadeh stated 471 ft. Mr. Rolle asked whether it is possible to provide a sidewalk on both sides of the street. Mr. Haghanizadeh responded that the same dimensional and grade issues would then be on the other side. Mr. Rolle stated that he believed it was the right thing to do to continue the sidewalk given the testimony on the grade of the street and safety concerns.

Ms. Bold stated that in terms of sidewalk connectivity, the walk from the neighborhood (Keach Ave terminus) to Quinsigamond Elementary School is about 0.7 miles. She stated that Stockholm and Whipple Streets have sidewalks on at least one side of the street, but that there are no sidewalks on Upland Street, which is the alternative means of accessing the school. She stated that it is conceivable that due to short distance to school, some people will be walking, and not driving, to it from the new subdivision.

Mr. Adams stated that if retaining walls are necessary for installation of the sidewalks, it would mean that they would need to be on someone else’s property, as DPW&P does not want it to be the City’s responsibility, and if that person would not want the sidewalk, the developer might not be able to comply with condition of approval as it will be not be up to the developer to decide. Mr. Rolle asked if the DPW&P would be amenable to reducing the pavement width of the street to 26 ft. Mr. Adams said yes. Mr. Cashman stated that he would be in favor of extending sidewalks on Keach Avenue if it is feasible given that there probably are families with small children in the neighborhood. Mr. Haghanizadeh proposed to eliminate a grass plot between the road and the sidewalk. Mr. Adams stated that DPW&P would only be amenable to reducing the road width to 26 ft for the installation of the sidewalk if a grass plot is provided which could be used for snow storage in the winter. Mr. Haghanizadeh stated that he will consider it.

Upon a motion by Mr. Cashman and seconded by Mr. Rolle, the Board voted 4-0 to continue the hearing to January 5th, 2011 and to extend the Constructive Grant deadline to January 28th, 2011.

Public Meeting

- 3. 98 Wigwam Hill Drive – Definitive Site Plan (PB-2010-058):** Kevin Quinn of Quinn Engineering, representative for Medway Lumber & Home Supply Inc., stated that the applicant is seeking to construct a single-family semi-detached dwelling on a property with 15% slope or more. Mr. Quinn stated that he will install hay bales to prevent erosion on the slope. Mr. Adams stated that the applicant needs to connect the surface connection to the 12” surface main, not the manhole. Ms. Bold stated that she defers to the Law Department as to whether or not the parcel is developable. Ms. Beaton stated that the issue “has been resolved” and that she is “comfortable going forward”.

Miguel Salerno, an abutter, stated that he has lived at his current address since 1998 and that he was always under the impression that the lot is not buildable. He expressed opposition to the project and stated that he thinks the site is too steep to build on and does not meet the Code. Chair O’Connor asked Mr. Adams if the site is too steep to build on. Mr. Adams responded that the reason for the 15% or more

slope trigger for Definitive Site Plan review is to make sure that the abutting properties are not negatively affected by water runoff from the development. He stated that it does not mean that steep sites cannot be developed. Mr. Quinn stated that the reason people said that the lot was unbuildable was because it was probably financially unfeasible in the past, but that with higher housing prices and improvements in engineering methods, the higher costs of improvements on this steep site are now justified. He stated that an extensive retaining wall is proposed and that a lot of material will have to be removed from the lot in order to flatten it for the development.

Mr. Truman asked if the proposed wall is structural. Mr. Quinn stated yes. Mr. Truman stated that the wall seems to be tall and close to the lot line, and asked how the owner is planning to stay away from Wigwam Hill Drive. Mr. Quinn stated that some of the ledge will be removed, and that the proposed “versalock” detail of the wall is shown on the plan. Mr. Truman stated that most likely a “geogrid” will be needed and stated that he believes more thought needs to be put into design of the wall. Mr. Cashman stated that if the wall cannot be build as shown on the plans, an Amendment to Definitive Site Plan will be required. He asked Mr. Adams if the wall is buildable as shown. Mr. Adams responded that there are different ways to build walls and that it is hard to say which technology a contractor will utilize and that he is not comfortable saying whether or not the wall’s construction is feasible. He stated that typically when a wall is built so close to the lot line, a “geogrid” technology is used. Mr. Adams added that if the type of the wall needs to be changed, it can usually be dealt through the Department of Inspectional Services. Mr. Quinn stated that there is a possibility of a contractor to get a temporary easement from the abutter to get access for construction. He stated that his job is to do a plan, not construction, and that he and his client will come back for an amendment if necessary.

Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Cashman, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan with the following conditions of approval:

- Six copies of the revised plan must be submitted to the Planning and Regulatory Services Division prior to release of the decision with the following changes:
 - Connect the surface connection to the 12” surface main, not the manhole.
 - Label width of driveway.
 - Label construction materials of driveway and right of way driveway access to structure.
 - Label height of retaining wall.
 - Label materials and height of fence on retaining wall.

Exhibit A: Definitive Site Plan Application and plan, received August 9, 2010.

Exhibit B: Letter from the Law Department to Joel J. Fontane, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services; re: ANR Plan – 98 Wigwam Hill Drive, Worcester, Massachusetts; dated September 9, 2010.

Exhibit C: Letter from Quinn Engineering requesting a continuance to October 27, 2010; dated September 13, 2010

Exhibit D: Letter re: Request for Continuance [Postponement] to November 17, 2010 for 98 Wigwam Hill Drive. From Jonathan Finkelstein, Attorney At Law.

Exhibit E: Memorandum from Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Planning Board, dated September 10, 2010, updated October 22, 2010 and November 12, 2010.

- 4. Pocasset Street – 81-G Street Opening (PB-2010-066):** Items #4 and #5 were taken contemporaneously. Kevin J. Quinn of Quinn Engineering, representative of the applicant, stated that the applicant seeks to extend the paved portion of Pocasset Street, a private street, in an RL-7 zoning district an additional 129' from the terminus of the paved area with a right of way width of 40' and a paved portion of the right-of-way of 24'. He stated that Pocasset Street currently does not have any sidewalks nor does Pineview Rd nor does the 81-G street opening propose to add sidewalks. Mr. Quinn stated that the item was continued to resolve an issue with a retaining wall and that the wall has been eliminated. He thanked staff for working with him. Mr. Adams stated that DPW&P requests that the proposed swale is removed and replaced with a Cape Cod style berm. Mr. Bold stated that staff recommends approval of the project provided that DPW&P determines that the submitted plan meets engineering standards for the proposed street opening. Ms. Beaton reminded the Board that the proposed work should be accepted by the City.

Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Truman, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the 81-G Street Opening petition with the following conditions of approval:

- Six copies of the revised plan must be submitted to the Planning and Regulatory Services Division prior to release of the decision with the following changes:
 - Provide City of Worcester standard berm for the proposed street extension.

Exhibit A: 81-G Street Opening Application prepared by AET Realty Trust, dated September 15, 2010. Received September 21, 2010.

Exhibit B: Revised 81-G Street Opening Plan, prepared by Quinn Engineering, Inc, dated November 8, 2010. Received: November 10, 2010.

Exhibit C: Memorandum from Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Planning Board, dated September 10, 2010, updated October 22, 2010 and November 12, 2010.

Exhibit D: Memorandum, Department of Public Works & Parks, Chris Gagne to Anne O'Connor, Planning Board, dated October 20, 2010, revised October 26, 2010.

- 5. Pocasset Street, Lot 2 (MBL: 38-033-31-04) – Definitive Site Plan (PB-2010-067):** Items #5 and #4 were taken contemporaneously. The applicant submitted a related 81-G petition concurrently with a Definitive Site Plan to construct a single-family, semi-detached dwelling at property known as 0 Pocasset Street (MBL 38-033-31-04).

Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Truman, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan with the following conditions of approval:

- Six copies of the revised plan must be submitted to the Planning and Regulatory Services Division prior to release of the decision with the following changes:
 - Connect the proposed sanitary service to the sanitary main, not to the manhole.
 - No building permit be issued until the improvements required by the 81-G approval are completed.

- Exhibit A: Definitive Site Plan Application prepared by AET Realty Trust, dated September 15, 2010. Received September 21, 2010.
- Exhibit B: Revised Definitive Plan prepared by Quinn Engineering, Inc, dated November 8, 2010. Received: November 10, 2010.
- Exhibit C: Memorandum from Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Planning Board, dated October 20, 2010, updated November 11, 2010.
- Exhibit D: Memorandum, Department of Public Works & Parks, Chris Gagne to Anne O'Connor, Planning Board, dated October 20, 2010, revised October 26, 2010.

6. Mower Street / Benjamin Road – Definitive Site Plan (PB-2010-068): Patrick Healey, representative for Raymond Sansoucy, applicant, stated that the applicant is seeking to construct a single-family detached dwelling on a property with 15% slope or more. He stated that since last meeting, an extensive title research was conducted that demonstrated that Mr. Sansoucy owns the fee to the land and therefore can build on it. He stated that he will add the Conservation Commission's order of conditions to the final revised plans to provide three granite bollards along the wetlands. Ms. Bold asked the petitioner to provide a summary of zoning classification and requirements on final revised plans. Ms. Beaton stated that she met with Attorney O'Neil regarding the fee ownership issue and is satisfied with the evidence presented to her. Upon a motion by Mr. Truman and seconded by Mr. Rolle, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan with the condition that six copies of the revised plan must be submitted to the Planning and Regulatory Services Division prior to release of the decision providing summary of zoning classification and requirements.

- Exhibit A: Definitive Site Plan Application prepared by Thompson-Liston Associates, Inc., dated September 20, 2010; received September 21, 2010.
- Exhibit B: Definitive Site Plan prepared by Thompson-Liston Associates, Inc., dated September 14, 2010; received September 21, 2010.
- Exhibit C: Memorandum from Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Planning Board, dated October 21, 2010, updated October 28, 2010.
- Exhibit D: Memorandum from Department of Public Works & Parks to the Planning Board, dated October 20, 2010.
- Exhibit E: A packet submitted by Patrick Healey in response to the request to provide proof of fee ownership of the petitioned Mower Street / Benjamin Road land; received October 27, 2010.
- Exhibit F: Documentation from Attorney Donald J. O'Neil from O'Neil & Bloom, LLP establishing Mr. Sansoucy's title to the fee in the Benjamin Road layout at its intersection with Mower Street; dated November 17, 2010; received November 17, 2010.

7. 266 Chandler Street – Parking Plan (PB-2010-070): Attorney John Shea of Lian, Zarrow, Eynon & Shea, representative for Webster Five Cents Savings Bank, applicant, stated that the applicant is seeking to develop the eastern portion of the vacant lot for the construction of a 2,930 square foot bank with sixteen (16) parking spaces, two (2) drive-through lanes and one escape lane. He stated that on October 27th, he requested a continuance to allow time to submit a traffic impact study to the Board and to provide time for DPW&P to review it. He stated that currently the building on site is used for storage,

but that historically there was a gun manufacturing facility on site. He stated that his client has another drive-through bank branch less than half a mile away and is planning to relocate to the 266 Chandler Street location. Mr. Shea stated that on November 8, 2010, the Zoning Board of Appeals granted relief for the project allowing for 2 drive-through and one escape lane on site. Mr. Shea stated that a proposed connection via Abbott Street is also provided for customers who want to access the nearby Walgreens without driving on Chandler Street. Mr. Shea showed a rendering of the proposed building to the Board. Ms. Bold stated that the plan meets minimum Parking Plan requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and recommended approval of the Parking Plan. Upon a motion by Mr. Cashman and seconded by Mr. Rolle, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the Parking Plan.

- Exhibit A: 266 Chandler Street - Parking Plan Application. Prepared by J. Radovanik, Webster Savings Bank, dated September 21, 2010. Received September 23, 2010.
- Exhibit B: Parking Plan. Prepared by Jeffrey Howland, JH Engineering Group; B&R Survey, and Landscape Architect Earth Design. Dated: September 23, 2010, revised: November 9, 2010.
- Exhibit C: Memorandum: Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Planning Board, October 21, 2010, revised October 27, 2010 and November 10, 2010.
- Exhibit D: Memorandum: Department of Public Works & Parks, Chris Gagne to the Planning Board; re: 266 Chandler Street, Definitive Site Plan– PB-2010- 070; dated October 20, 2010, revised October 27, 2010.
- Exhibit E: Stormwater Report. Prepared by JH Engineering Group. Received October 21, 2010.
- Exhibit F: Memorandum: Jeffrey Howland, JH Engineering Group to Anne O'Connor, Planning Board, dated November 10, 2010. Received: November 10, 2010.
- Exhibit G: MDM Transportation Consultants. Traffic Impact Assessment to Jeffrey Howland of JH Engineering Group for 266 Chandler Street; dated October 28, 2010, received November 1, 2010.

NEW BUSINESS

Public Hearing

8. Rankin Street – Definitive Subdivision (PB-2010-072): Hossein Haghanizadeh, of HS&T Group, representative for Luigi DiGioia, petitioner, stated that the petitioner is seeking to subdivide the lot into two parcels for the purpose of constructing two (2) single-family semi-detached dwellings (duplexes). Mr. Haghanizadeh stated that the petitioner is proposing to extend Rankin Street, now a dead-end road, to provide a cul-de-sac at the end of it, and to provide all utilities on the road. He stated that he is amenable to the DPW&P comment with respect to identification of stabilization devices for site slopes greater than 3:1. He asked to continue the item to January 5, 2011 meeting.

Mr. Adams listed the waivers that would be necessary for the project and recommended by the DPW&P:

- Section IX.C.6. Intersection roundings shall not have a radius of less than 30 feet.
- Section IX.C.7. The distance between the curb line and property line shall be the same as that of the connecting street.
- Section IX.C.8.b. Cul-de-sac bulbs shall have a diameter of not less than 100 feet.
- Section X.D.6. Cul-de-sac pavement width shall be 80 feet. The proposed width is 60 ft. Mr. Adams stated that the cul-de-sac is not going to handle much traffic.

- Section X.I.1. Side slopes shall not exceed 3:1 from the back of the sidewalk to the existing grade.
- Section IX.F.1. Stormwater flows shall be mitigated for the 25 year storm event.
- Section X.E.1. Adequate drainage shall be provided for all low points to intercept runoff along streets. (Provide calculations for the adequacy of the single catchbasin proposed on Rankin Street)
- Waiver of dead end length of 500 ft because this creates a turnaround (cul-de-sac) and improves access for emergency vehicles.

Mr. Adams asked the applicant to identify stabilization devices where slopes are greater than 3:1 (plan detail) and to provide descriptions of meets and bounds description of 20 ft easement for drainage. He stated that DPW&P would not be amenable to accepting the street with a cul-tec system under the right-of-way.

Mr. Adams stated that the drain the petitioner is seeking to tie into is on Mr. Charles Flannigan's property, who had previously voiced concerns to DPW&P about drainage and surface-water runoff at the end of the street. Mr. Adams stated that Mr. Flannigan indicated to him that he was pleased with the revised proposal.

Ms. Bold stated that staff recommends approval of the petition conditioned upon the following:

- Six copies of the revised plan and a mylar that address annotation comments below and that address DPW&P's comment regarding storm water mitigation.
- Suitable space to record the action of the Board and the endorsement of the Board's approval, and any revision date in the title block.
- A statement that the applicant will provide, at no cost to the City, all facilities shown on the plan including but not limited to roadways, curbs, bounds, drainage systems, sanitary sewer systems, utilities, street lights and earthworks, except as otherwise noted located on the plan that will be filed.
- Properly executed easements to the City of Worcester in all ways shown on the Definitive Plan for all purposes for which ways are commonly used in the City and properly executed easements to the City of Worcester in and over all lands not included within the ways which are shown on the plan to be devoted to drainage or other common use. Wherever a drainage easement is shown, there shall also be an easement to discharge and dispose of said drainage whether within or without the subdivision. A sum of money sufficient to pay recording fees shall accompany the easements. Said easements to be duly recorded with the approved plan.

Mr. Adams stated that DPW&P would like see revised plans showing proposed drainage infrastructure and easement information prior to making recommendation to the Board.

Upon a request by the applicant, and upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Truman, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the petitioner's request to continue the hearing to January 5, 2011 and to extend the Constructive Grant deadline to January 28, 2011.

Public Meeting

Chair O'Connor recused herself. Mr. Cashman assumed the chair.

- 9. 50 Prescott Street – Amendment to Definitive Site Plan (PB-2010-073):** Andrew Crystal, Vice President of O'Connell Development, representative for Gateway Park LLC and Washburn Park Inc.,

petitioners, stated that the petitioner is seeking to amend the most recently approved plan for this area of Gateway Park by increasing a previously approved four-story 91,000 square foot structure for office and laboratory uses to a 92,000 SF four-story structure. He stated that the reason for the proposed expansion is to add a small single-story addition to the north-eastern corner of the building for loading/receiving area. Mr. Fontane recommended approval of the petition. Upon a motion by Mr. Truman and seconded by Mr. Rolle, the Board voted 3-0 to approve the Amendment to Definitive Site Plan with a condition that all tree species shall be Asian long horn beetle resistant.

- Exhibit A: 42-50 Prescott Street Definitive Site Plan Application; received October 14, 2010; prepared by applicant: Jeffrey Solomon, 50 Prescott Street, LLC; owner is Gateway Park LLC and Washburn Park LLC.
- Exhibit B: Revised Amendment to Definitive Site Plan; received November 9 2010, dated November 8, 2010; prepared by Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.
- Exhibit C: Stormwater Management Memorandum, Gateway Park Building 1, prepared by Craig Lizotte, P.E. from Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. dated October 14, 2010; received October 14, 2010.
- Exhibit D: Memorandum from Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Planning Board, dated November 10, 2010.
- Exhibit E: Memorandum from Department of Public Works & Parks to the Planning Board, dated November 9, 2010.

Chair O'Connor resumed the chair. Mr. Cashman recused himself.

10. 25 Winthrop, 0 Providence, 42 South Street and 19 Marion Avenue (Worcester Academy) – Definitive Site Plan (PB-2010-074): Attorney Robert Longden of Bowditch & Dewey, representative for Worcester Academy, stated that the applicant is seeking to construct a 108,580 SF synthetic turf athletic field and associated lighting, pedestrian crosswalks, and landscaping, as well as to reduce the number of parking spaces, for a Worcester Academy educational use. Mr. Longden stated that this is the location of the former St. Vincent Hospital and that the new athletic field will be used in conjunction with the school use. He directed the Board to the letter issued by John Kelly from the Department of Inspectional Services (Exhibit E) who made a determination that no relief from the light pole height requirement is necessary (by Zoning Ordinance, maximum 40' is allowed, 70' and 80'-high light poles are proposed) as the proposed use, an athletic field, is protected by the Dover Amendment regarding educational use because the proposed height of the light poles is necessary to provide adequate lighting for nighttime field activities.

Mr. Longden stated that the field will be used for field hockey, soccer, lacrosse and baseball. He stated that the site will be accessed from Marion Avenue and Winthrop Street. Mr. Longden referred to the "Overview of Field Lighting and Usage" letter (Exhibit H) submitted to the Board that stated there will be no light spillover to the abutting property buildings in excess of 1 foot candle of light per square foot due to the height and design of the light towers. He stated that evening practices will be held from mid-October through mid-November and from mid-March through late April. He stated that field lighting will be required for late afternoon practices and games and that practice will occur Monday through Friday, and games will be played on Wednesday and Saturday afternoons. Mr. Longden stated that practices and games will typically be completed by 6:45 pm on most nights. The Academy may schedule occasional Friday or Saturday night games or tournaments, which will typically end no later

than 8:30 pm. He stated that while the field will be used primarily for Worcester Academy students, it will also be available to neighbors as the goal of the project to make the field an amenity to the neighborhood.

Mr. Longden stated that the bathrooms and light controls would be located in the building off-site, currently used as a warehouse. Mr. Longden stated that the lights can also be operated remotely. He stated that competition lighting level would be 70 foot-candles, reduced to 1 foot-candle approximately 56 feet from the property line, and that the Illuminating Engineering Society recommends a minimum of 50 foot-candles for high school athletic games. He added that a lighting level of 30 foot-candles will be used for practices of all sports, except for lacrosse practices for which 70 foot-candles would be used. He stated that security light fixtures will be mounted halfway up each of the 7 light poles. The security light will guide pedestrians to walk on the field and footpaths, and will not result in a light spillover in excess of 1 foot-candle onto neighboring properties. He stated that he is amenable to the conditions of approval recommended by DPRS staff in their memo (Exhibit C).

Mr. Longden handed out 3 letters of support (Exhibit I) for the project.

Mr. Fontane recommended the project to the Planning Board. He stated that there appeared to be a significant outreach to the community and that the project would be an amenity to the neighborhood.

Linda LaMontagne, of 22 Marion Avenue, an abutter, stated her opposition to the project. She stated that her home is currently located near the parking lot and is not screened. She stated her concern that students will cross South Street and will be disruptive, will litter and will create excessive noise. She was also concerned about the lighting levels. She stated that the proposed 6-ft tall shrubs along her property line would be insufficient to screen the proposed use. Mark Novack of Stantec Company, project manager, stated the applicant is proposing an alley of about 10 deciduous trees (hornbeams) on each side (1.5-2.5 inch caliper) and that the proposed parking would be further away from Ms. LaMontagne's property than where it is currently, which is an improvement to the current layout. Ms. LaMontagne stated that the proposed trees would not cover the entire length of her property abutting the proposed use. Mr. Rolle asked if it was possible to plant more trees. Mr. Novack said yes. Mr. Rolle stated that he believed the proposed project was an improvement to the site. Mr. Novack stated that the existing lights on the property will be removed as part of the demolition. Ms. LaMontagne stated her concern that the field will not be fenced off. She stated that she did not get the first flyer from the applicant regarding the community hearing and that she will have no use for the athletic field. Mr. Novack stated that the parking area next to Ms. LaMontagne would be decreased and be mainly used by personnel. Mr. Truman asked if the three light poles at the parking entrance are reflected in the photometrics. Mr. Novack stated no and stated that those are standard height shoe-box cut-off types of lights. Mr. Truman asked if it was possible to move the proposed walkway further away from Ms. LaMontagne's property. Mr. Novack stated that it would create an awkward circulation pattern of pedestrians crossing Marion Avenue and South Street and would force relocation of the driveway entrance and moving of the parking area closer to Ms. LaMontagne's property. Ms. LaMontagne stated that her house is somewhat elevated and that the wall along the warehouse is deteriorating. She was also concerned that balls might reach her house. Mr. Novack pointed out that the 20 ft high protective athletic netting wrapping around the field is designed to prevent balls from escaping the field.

Jo Hart, resident, stated that deciduous trees are not buffer trees as they are bare half the year, and suggested to use non-deciduous trees instead.

Mullin Sawyer of Oak Hill Community Development Corporation stated his support for the project. He stated that Worcester Academy conducted two community meetings. He stated that his organization conducted a study that showed residents wanted recreational facilities, which the project would provide,

and that the project would be a great cornerstone lot promoting more development in the neighborhood. He stated that his organization is proud of the proposed design, which is open and welcoming to the community.

Mr. Rolle expressed sympathy for Ms. LaMontagne's concerns and asked to increase screening along her property line. He stated that overall he thought the project was an improvement and that bringing people to the area will increase security. The Board and Mr. Novack discussed the change in the proposed landscaping and the caliper and height of the proposed trees.

Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Truman, the Board voted 3-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan with the following conditions of approval:

- Proposed deciduous trees shall be minimum three (3) inch caliper along the north-eastern property line of 0 Providence Street, abutting the western property line of 22 Marion Avenue (MBL 05-039-0034A).
- Evergreen trees, minimum 6-8 (six-eight) feet in height, shall be planted in addition to the deciduous trees, along the north-eastern property line of 0 Providence Street, abutting the western and southern property lines of 22 Marion Avenue parcel (MBL 05-039-0034A).
- Six copies of the final revised plan must be submitted to the Planning and Regulatory Services Division prior to release of the decision with the above-mentioned conditions of approval and the following additional annotation changes:
 - Label the plan "Definitive Site Plan" and provide addresses and Map-Block-Lot numbers for all four (4) properties.
 - Label all existing parking spaces, including the ones in the southern portion of the 25 Winthrop Street parcel that are proposed to be reused.
 - Label square footage, height, floor area ratio and uses of the existing building that will remain.
 - Label total square footage of impervious and pervious surfaces.
 - Label a parking table for the proposed off-street parking spaces with the breakdown of the number of regular, compact and handicap spaces.
 - More clearly delineate the boundaries of the four (4) parcels.
 - Include the western corner of the 25 Winthrop Street parcel on the plans.

Exhibit A: Definitive Site Plan Application; received October 14, 2010; prepared by Attorney Robert Longden of Bowditch & Dewey, LLP.

Exhibit B: Definitive Site Plan; dated October 13, 2010; prepared by Kelly Engineering Group, Inc.

Exhibit C: Memorandum from Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Planning Board, dated November 5, 2010.

Exhibit D: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Department of Public Works & Parks to the Planning Board; re: 25 Winthrop Street/ "0" Providence Street Definitive Site Plan – PB-2010-074; dated November 9, 2010.

Exhibit E: Letter from John Kelly, Department of Inspectional Services to Attn. Robert Longden of Bowditch & Dewey; re: Worcester Academy Athletic Fields; dated September 14, 2010.

Exhibit F: E-mail from Attn. Robert Longden of Bowditch & Dewey to Joel Fontane of Division of Planning & Regulatory Services; re: Worcester Academy - New Athletic Field: Lighting Spillover Issue; dated October 28, 2010.

Exhibit G: Worcester Academy - South Campus Athletic Field Development Plan. Stantec. July 2010.

Exhibit H: Worcester Academy South Campus Athletic Field: Overview of Field Lighting and Usage; received November 10, 2010.

Exhibit I: Letters of Support from:

Lorraine M. Laurie of 64 Dorchester Street (dated November 15, 2010)

Oak Hill Community Development Corporation (dated November 16, 2010)

Colleen M. Pino, Radius HealthCare Center (dated November 16, 2010)

11. 451 Lincoln Street – Parking Plan (PB-2010-075): Attorney Robert Longden of Bowditch & Dewey, representative for Commerce Bank and Trust, applicant, stated that the applicant is proposing to construct 12 off-street parking spaces and two eight foot wide drive through lanes for a 2,050 SF drive-through bank. Mr. Longden stated that the site is currently impervious and that the Zoning Board of Appeals granted the requested relief from drive-through requirements on October 18, 2010. He stated that the parking on site will be reduced from 26 to 12 spaces and that a new 6-ft stockade fence will be installed as a buffer. The hours of operation would be Monday-Friday, 7am-7pm, and Saturday – 7am-1pm. He stated that the previous use on site was a restaurant and there were no drainage facilities, but that the proposal would reduce the amount of imperviousness on site. Mr. Longden stated that all snow will be removed from the site and that the final plans will reflect that. Mr. Fontane recommended approval of the project. Mr. Rolle asked how the applicant is planning to address traffic on site. Mr. Longden stated that the queuing will extend over the length of the proposed drive-through, but if vehicles back into the right-of-way, the Building Commissioner will have the authority to determine whether or not the queue length exceeds on-site capacity or that the drive-through use causes a disruption to traffic flow and safety. He stated that the Building Commissioner may request that a police detail shall be hired during peak hours of operation or drive through service shall be closed. Mr. Longden stated that the bank is confident the traffic flow will function well, because its branch at 404 Main Street, of similar length and configuration, does not encounter problems with queuing, and that there are tools to manage the traffic flow, such as two tellers per service window, lighted signs showing whether a lane is open or closed, and more.

Mr. Truman suggested striping to connect the location of the handicapped parking space to the building for safer crossing. Michael Scott, engineer for the project, stated that handicapped clients will be guided to the sidewalk which connects the parking area to the handicap accessible entrance of the building. Mr. Truman suggested adding signage to the site that would direct people using handicap accessible parking spaces to use the sidewalk.

Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Truman, the Board voted 3-0 to approve the Parking Plan with the following conditions:

- Provide 6 copies of the drainage plan approved by the Conservation Commission.
- That an instructional sign be installed in the proximity of the proposed handicap accessible parking space directing customers who require handicap access to the building to the sidewalk connecting parking area to the building entrance.
- Six copies of final revised plan must be submitted to the Planning and Regulatory Services Division prior to release of the decision with the above-mentioned condition of approval and the following annotation changes:

- Label plan as “Parking Plan” on Title Page.
- Provide a column entitled “Exterior Side Yard” setback in the Zoning summary Table on Sheet 2 – Layout and Materials Plan, as this lot is located on a corner lot.
- Provide an off-street parking table that includes the number of proposed teller stations for the site, the number of proposed compact parking spaces, and the number of handicap accessible parking spaces.
- Label distances from adjacent buildings on the plan.
- The proposed pylon sign located on Lincoln must be set back 5 feet from the lot line per Article IV, Sec 6 (D) (2)).
- Provide proposed signage package for on-site signs.
- Provide lighting detail for proposed lighting.
- Provide a note stating that snow will be removed from the site.
- Label Zoning Board of Appeals’ October 18, 2010 approval and the conditions of that approval.

Exhibit A: Parking Plan Application; received October 14, 2010; prepared by Commerce Bank and Trust.

Exhibit B: Parking Plan; dated 9/13/10, revised 10/4/10; prepared by Waterman Design Associates, Inc.

Exhibit C: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to Anne O’Connor; re: 451 Lincoln Street - Parking Plan; dated November 8, 2010.

Exhibit D: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Department of Public Works & Parks to Anne O’Connor; re: 451 Lincoln Street - Parking Plan 2010-075; dated November 9, 2010.

Mr. Cashman resumed the Board.

12. 25 Tobias Boland Way – Amendment to Definitive Site Plan (PB-2010-076): John Kucich of Bohler Engineering, project engineer and representative for Madison Worcester Holdings, LLC, applicant, stated that the applicant is seeking to make the following changes to Phases B and C of the Definitive Site Plan (but no revisions to the Phase A of the site):

- 1) Revise building footprint for Retail A and eliminate Restaurant B.
- 2) Relocate electric transformer for Retail A.
- 3) Provide a Worcester Crossing Development sign between the Sam’s Club building and fuel station.
- 4) Revise the landscaping in the southern portion of the development to match the installed landscaping around the Walmart and along Tobias Boland Way.
- 5) Remove sixteen (16) trees behind the buildings along the proposed bike path in accordance with MassHighway requirements to remove potential obstacles along the bike path.
- 6) Modify planter configuration at southwest corner of Sam’s building to improve the truck access in the area.
- 7) Revise one catch basin located southwest of Retail A by 4 feet to relocate out of bike path.

- 8) Revise area east of Sam's building to include a small retaining wall – less than 2 ft high and 20 ft long.
- 9) Move a light pole that was formerly on the east side of Restaurant A (Olive Garden) across the driveway to a point nearer the northeast corner of the building.
- 10) Add pavement striping at the Sam's Club tire mounting area.

Ms. Bold stated that staff recommends that with respect to landscaping, the proposed sixteen (16) trees to be removed along the bike path be replaced in the southernmost portion of the site adjacent to the Sam's Club loading areas. With respect to bicycle parking, she stated that staff strongly recommends provision of bicycle parking (post and ring bike rack is preferred) in close proximity to Retail A and that the site plan reflect the side doors on the south elevation shown on the submitted rendering (Exhibit C) of the proposed retail tenant.

Ms. Bold distributed a letter from Howard Simon (Exhibit G) and stated that she responded to Mr. Simon stating that the adjacent, but off-site, bike path, which was his concern, is within purview of MassHighway, not the Planning Board nor the applicant.

Upon a motion by Mr. Cashman and seconded by Mr. Truman, the Board voted 4-0 to approve Amendment to Definitive Site Plan with the following conditions of approval:

- The original conditions of approval and amended conditions of approval from the previously approved Amendment to Definitive Site Plan, dated February 18, 2009 (see Attachment A) apply to this further amendment except for necessary updates to previously referenced plans and elevations to reflect current plans and renderings.
- The structure be constructed in substantial accordance with the final revised submitted architectural elevations and prior to the issuance of final certificate of occupancy permits for the site (including Retail A), the applicant shall submit six (6) copies of a revised plan incorporating all amendments (Phase A-C) into one plan set, including:
 - Bicycle Parking / Pedestrian / Bicyclist Connectivity: Bicycle parking, similar to the one at the Olive Garden restaurant, shall be provided and shall be located in close proximity to Retail A. A Label shall be provided on sheet C-2.
 - Label the side doors on the south elevation shown on the submitted rendering (Exhibit C) of the proposed retail tenant.
 - Landscaping: Some or all of the proposed sixteen (16) trees to be removed along the bike path shall be replaced elsewhere on Phase B portion of the plan.

Exhibit A: Definitive Site Plan application, prepared by Bohler Engineering, dated October 21, 2010. Received October 21, 2010.

Exhibit B: Definitive Site Plan Amendment – 25 Tobias Boland Way. Prepared by Matthew Smith, Bohler Engineering, dated October 19, 2010. Received October 21, 2010.

Exhibit C: Memorandum from Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Planning Board, dated November 10, 2010.

Exhibit D: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Department of Public Works & Parks to the Planning Board; dated November 9, 2010.

Exhibit E: Worcester Crossing Pylon Sign rendering, prepared by Poyant Signs, dated October 21, 2010. Received October 21, 2010.

- Exhibit F: Worcester Crossing Retail A – Architectural Rendering. Prepared by Smook Architecture and Urban Design Inc., dated August 11, 2010. Received October 21, 2010.
- Exhibit G: Letter from Howard Simon to the Planning Board; re: Public Meeting / 25 Tobias Boland; dated November 14, 2010; received November 17, 2010.

OTHER BUSINESS

13. Proposed Amendment to the Subdivision Regulations of the City of Worcester and Amendment to Special Permit Regulations of the City of Worcester Planning Board related to consultant review fees: Mr. Fontane stated that the attached amendments to the Planning Board's Rules and Regulations (Exhibits B & C) would enable the Board to retain outside consultants to assist in reviewing any application for a special permit where the Board determines that the assistance of a consultant is warranted to analyze and evaluate a project to ensure compliance with all relevant laws, ordinances and regulations (see legal opinion – Exhibit D). Through this amendment the Board may require applicants to pay a "review fee" consisting of reasonable costs incurred by the Board for the employment of such services. The ability to hire outside consultants is particularly important for technical matters beyond the in house capabilities of the City such as those pertaining to personal wireless communications, for example. Mr. Fontane stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals has considered the same amendment. He gave an example of a review of Special Permits for wind energy facilities and considerations in the Water Protection Overlay District that may require assistance from an outside consultant. Mr. Fontane recommended that the Board vote to take up this matter formally by voting to advertise the proposed amendment for a public hearing at the Board's meeting on January 5, 2011.

Mr. Rolle asked if there would be limits to what might be reasonably requested of an applicant. Mr. Fontane stated that staff would need to go through a procurement process. Mr. Cashman asked if the Request for Proposals would delay the permitting process. Mr. Fontane stated that it depends on the type of information sought because often staff would consult state bid lists for pre-approved projects. In other cases, the process might be somewhat delayed, but the Board would still have to work within the constructive grant deadlines imposed by the state law. He stated that it typically takes three weeks minimum for solicitation of RFP, and that it is relatively easy to review applicants if the scope of work is narrow.

Upon a motion by Mr. Truman and seconded by Mr. Rolle, the Board voted 4-0 to advertise the proposed amendment for a public hearing at the Board's regularly scheduled meeting on January 5, 2011.

- Exhibit A: Memorandum from Division of Planning & Regulatory Service to the Planning Board; re: Amendment to the Board's Rules and Regulations and Subdivision Regulations - Consultant Review Fees; dated November 12, 2010.
- Exhibit B: Proposed Amendment to PB Rules and Regulations – Article II, Section 6.
- Exhibit C: Proposed Amendment to the Subdivision Regulations – Section 6, Part A.
- Exhibit D: Memorandum from the law Department to the Division of Planning & Regulatory Service; re: Consultant Review Fees: Proposed Amendments to the Rules & Regulations of the Zoning Board of Appeals and the Planning Board; dated March 6, 2010.

14. Wildwood Circle Subdivision – Bond Reduction Request: Mr. Adams stated that construction has been completed for the entire subdivision. He recommended the full release of the remaining performance bond, in the amount of \$40,000 on the Rodi Circle – Sta. 0 + 00 to Sta. 2 + 00 to include lots 1 through 5. Upon a recommendation by DPW&P and upon motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Cashman, the Board voted 4-0 to accept the recommendation of the Department of Public Work and Parks (DPW&P) to release \$40,000 bond from the existing \$40,000 bond for a remaining recommended performance bond in the amount of \$0 based on the following - Rodi Circle – Sta. 0 + 00 to Sta. 2 + 00 to include Lots 1 through 5, because the work has been completed to DPW&P's satisfaction.

Exhibit A: Letter from Law Offices of Stephen P. Bik & Associates to the Planning Board; re: Bond Reduction Request – Rodi Circle, Worcester, MA; dated November 9, 2010.

15. Arboretum Subdivision – Bond Reduction Request for Phase III:

Mr. Adams stated that DPW&P recommends a performance bond in the amount of \$20,500 for **Pearlbush Path** – Sta. 0 + 00 to Sta. 3 + 81.07. Upon a recommendation by DPW&P and upon motion by Mr. Cashman and seconded by Mr. Truman, the Board voted 4-0 to accept the recommendation of the Department of Public Work and Parks (DPW&P) to release \$ 47,000 bond from the existing \$ 67,500 bond for a remaining recommended performance bond in the amount of \$ 20,500 based on the following: Pearlbush Path – Sta. 0 + 00 to Sta. 3 + 81.07 to include Lots 32 L&R through 40 L&R, because the work has been partially completed to DPW&P's satisfaction.

Mr. Adams stated that DPW&P recommends a performance bond in the amount of \$450,000 for **Honeysuckle Road** – Sta. 0 + 00 to Sta. 11+53.04. Upon a recommendation by DPW&P and upon motion by Mr. Truman and seconded by Mr. Cashman, the Board voted 4-0 to accept the recommendation of the Department of Public Work and Parks (DPW&P) to release \$ 160,000 bond from the existing \$ 610,000 bond for a remaining recommended performance bond in the amount of \$ 450,000 based on the following: Honeysuckle Road – Sta. 0 + 00 to Sta. 11 + 53.04 to include Lots 61 L&R through 80 L&R, because the work has been partially completed to DPW&P's satisfaction.

Mr. Adams stated that DPW&P recommends a performance bond in the amount of \$36,500 for **Lilac Lane** - Sta. 0 + 00 to Sta. 5+00. Upon a recommendation by DPW&P and upon motion by Mr. Truman and seconded by Mr. Rolle, the Board voted 4-0 to accept the recommendation of the Department of Public Work and Parks (DPW&P) to release \$ 47,500 bond from the existing \$ 84,000 bond for a remaining recommended performance bond in the amount of \$ 36,500 based on the following: Lilac Lane – Sta. 0 + 00 to Sta. 5 + 00 to include Lots 41 L&R through 52 L&R, because the work has been partially completed to DPW&P's satisfaction.

Exhibit A: Letter from Steven Gallo of Fox Hill Builders, Inc. to the Division of Planning & Regulatory Services; re: Bond, Arboretum Subdivision Phases I, II, III; dated October 27, 2010.

16. Winnipeg Street – Sewer Installation Petition: Mr. Adams stated that the DPW&P recommends a Priority Level Recommendation #1 for the Sewer Petition along Winnipeg Street – 200 ft east of Millbury Street. Upon a motion by Mr. Truman and seconded by Mr. Cashman, the Board voted 4-0 to recommend to the City Council a Priority #1 for the Sewer Petition along Winnipeg Street – 200 ft east of Millbury Street based on the recommendation of Department of Public Works and Parks.

17. Wendover Road – Sewer Installation Petition: Mr. Adams stated that the DPW&P recommends a Priority Level Recommendation #2 for the Sewer Petition along Wendover Road – Holden Town Line to End of location. Upon a motion by Mr. Truman and seconded by Mr. Cashman, the Board voted 4-0

to recommend to the City Council a Priority #2 for the Sewer Petition along Wendover Road – Holden Town Line to End of location based on the recommendation of Department of Public Works and Parks.

18. Wendover Road – Private Street Conversion: Mr. Adams stated that the DPW&P recommends a Priority Level Recommendation #2 for the Private Street Conversion along Wendover Road – Holden Town Line to End of location. Upon a motion by Mr. Truman and seconded by Mr. Rolle, the Board voted 4-0 to recommend to the City Council a Priority #2 for the Sewer Petition along Wendover Road – Holden Town Line to End of location based on the recommendation of Department of Public Works and Parks.

19. ANR Plans:

- **AN-2010-058, 666 Lincoln Street:** Upon a motion by Mr. Cashman and seconded by Mr. Truman, the Board voted 4-0 to endorse ANR Plan AN-2010-058.
- **AN-2010-059, Paine Street:** Upon a motion by Mr. Cashman and seconded by Mr. Truman, the Board voted 4-0 to endorse ANR Plan AN-2010-059.
- **AN-2010-060, Plantation Street:** Upon a motion by Mr. Cashman and seconded by Mr. Truman, the Board voted 4-0 to endorse ANR Plan AN-2010-060.
- **AN-2010-061, 0 Atlanta Street:** Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Truman, the Board voted 3-0 (Mr. Cashman recused himself) to endorse ANR Plan AN-2010-061.
- **AN-2010-062, 57 Atlanta Street:** Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Truman, the Board voted 3-0 (Mr. Cashman recused himself) to endorse ANR Plan AN-2010-062.
- **AN-2010-063, 177 & 205 Grafton Street:** Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Truman, the Board voted 3-0 (Mr. Cashman recused himself) to endorse ANR Plan AN-2010-063.
- **AN-2010-064, 15-17 Putnam Lane & 285 Plantation Street:** Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Truman, the Board voted 3-0 (Mr. Cashman recused himself) to endorse ANR Plan AN-2010-064.
- **AN-2010-065, Mower Street:** Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Truman, the Board voted 4-0 to endorse ANR Plan AN-2010-065.

ADJOURNMENT: Upon a motion by Mr. Cashman and seconded by Mr. Truman, the Board voted 4-0 to adjourn the meeting at 8:54 pm.