

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

**May 6, 2015**

**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:** Andrew Freilich

**Staff Present:** Domenica Tatasciore, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services  
Michelle Smith, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services  
Marlyn Feliciano, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services  
Katie Donovan, Inspectional Services  
John Gervais, Department of Public Works & Parks  
Nicholas Lyford, Department of Public Works & Parks  
Alexandra Haralambous, Law Department

**Board Site Views**

**CALL TO ORDER** – 5:45 pm

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

**1. 462 Grafton Street – Special Permit Commercial Corridors Overlay District (PB-2015-023)**

Upon a motion by Mr. Vigliotti and seconded by Mr. Mitra, the Board voted 4-0 to postpone the item to June 3, 2015 and extend the decision deadline to July 15, 2015.

**List of Exhibits:**

Exhibit A: 462 Grafton Street Application; received 2/2/2015, revised 4/27/2015; prepared by Kamel Kamel.

Exhibit B: 462 Grafton Street Plan; dated 4/1/2015; prepared by TASC.

Exhibit C: Worcester Fire Department Comments, undated.

**2. Rockrimmon Road, Rockrimmon Way & Joppa Road - 81-G Street Opening (PB-2015-005)**

Upon a motion by Mr. Vigliotti and seconded by Mr. Ochoa, the Board voted 4-0 to grant the Leave to Withdraw without Prejudice.

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Upon a motion by Mr. Ochoa and seconded by Mr. Vigliotti, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the minutes for March 25, 2015.

## **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### **3. 0 Sarah Drive, Lots 81-86 (aka Bittersweet Blvd, Arboretum Phase IV) – Definitive Site Plan Approval (PB-2014-009)**

Attorney Mark Donahue, on behalf of the applicant, stated that on April 15 they had extensive discussion and the board took extensive public testimony with regards to the plan as last revised. At that time the board gave specific direction to the applicant to make two changes to the plan through a further revision to the plan. Those changes were to change the surficial treatment of the slope from rock armor treatment to a vegetated surface and the second was to install drainage in the slope area itself to reduce any runoff that did hit the slope. The plan before you achieves both of those. The vegetation detail is included as well. You also have a letter from Ecotec that describes the process and methodology for that vegetation so that you have the information in detail as to it. With regard to the request for drainage, the plan shows the installation of a drain structure on the slope.

Patrick Burke, HS&T Group, stated that they will build a two foot wide curtain drain into the slope. It's about two feet deep that will intercept drainage coming off of the slope. It's located near the bottom of the slope. There's a four inch pipe that will connect into the existing one of the drain manhole structures coming down the hill so it doesn't overflow. It just collects into a perforated pipe and goes right into the drainage system.

Mr. Truman asked why the curtain drain wasn't being installed at the bottom of the slope. He would like to see it in the bottom since it would catch all the runoff coming down the hill.

Mr. Burke stated that they kept it a little higher just so they could have access to get into the catchbasin.

Mr. Donahue stated that there are two issues: 1. By doing it the way it is presented, they are able to take all of the flow and discharge off site through the existing drainage and taking it lower will preclude the ability to do it and will create a point source discharge at another point; 2. The second is being able to get to that in this steep slope. This is about the extent of the work that can be done from the wedge that's created on the other side of the wall with equipment in order to safely being able to get there.

Mr. Truman asked if they are getting machines onsite to do all the grading and Mr. Burke responded that they are but they will be reaching down with an extender on an excavator.

Mr. Truman stated that he would like to see the drain a bit further down the slope and doesn't see why they can't get a Bobcat to that location on the slope to do the work

Mr. Donahue stated that there is some limited slope still back here. That slope existed even before the fill was brought in to create Bittersweet. All the flow from the Bittersweet Boulevard is directed away so there's a small area. That's the point that we can get to, that's the point that we submitted to the City some time ago, that has been reviewed by everyone. We haven't heard of any objection to it. It's what works from our viewpoint after having looked at it based upon it and its where the applicant can safely and effectively put it to so that it works and gets the drainage offsite and not create another point source.

Mr. Donahue stated that they believe they have made all the required changes to the plans and are amenable to all but one of the conditions in the memo: proposed condition #14 that states that a drainage collection system will be installed. Since it's already on the plan it suggests that something else has to go in and there is, as far as we know, no intention of putting anything else in at that time. So we will suggest that that be deleted.

Jon Gervais, DPW&P, stated that the only additional comment would be with regards to the proposed hammerhead turnaround or whatever the turnaround that was going to be put in per the fire department's suggestion. He believes the fire department recommended that be paved and we would second that recommendation that any pavement going up to the turnaround be at least in binder.

Ms. Smith stated that she wanted to draw the board's attention to some new conditions that were being proposed by staff, such as #8: That a fire hydrant be installed in front of Lot 82 and that the applicant work with the Worcester Fire Department to discuss future hydrant placement. There are a number of annotative changes as well and she reviewed those with the board. Additionally staff would recommend that condition #13 on page 3 be revised to clarify that this is in reference to lots 81 left and right as well as lots 86 left and right. It references the rock armoring transition area so that the only areas this would be needed in are on those lots.

James Bisceglia, 54 Honeysuckle Rd, through ASL interpreter Cynthia Ramos, asked for clarification as to the location of the curtain drain and stated that he agreed with what was proposed that the curtain drainage system should be on the second pipe and third pipe so that there's no overflow onto his property. He does not want the curtain drain further down.

Mr. Burke showed Mr. Bisceglia where the curtain drain will be located here and explained how it would collect the stormwater runoff on the easterly and westerly side of the slope.

Mr. Bisceglia stated that that's going to be way too much water and it will flood his driveway. He stated that his home is the one with the easement and if you are going to put three pipes worth of rain drainage in to the easement his property is going to be flooded.

Mr. Burke stated that they are not proposing surface drainage, once the stormwater gets into the manhole it is subsurface the rest of the way.

Mr. Bisceglia asked where they planned to start grading and if there was going to be a flat grassed area provided.

Mr. Burke stated they they plan to start grading about five feet off the fence and everything will be loamed and seeded.

Mr. Bisceglia stated that his concern about the drainage since it has cause damage to his property in the past and also expressed his opinion about where they start grading.

Mr. Burke stated that they are starting where they are in order to blend the slope into the existing grading so they don't have to bend the grades. It's better to have a smoother surface instead of creating a swale with the slope so by starting back a little bit further we are able to keep the grades flatter along the surface and more continuous instead of doing a swale. So they got a little closer to the fence and started the slope without a flat area and installed the curtain drain.

Mr. Bisceglia asked if they were removing the fence and how often inspections will occur during construction and Mr. Burke responded that the fence will remain. Mr. Truman stated that they will address inspections during deliberation.

Mr. Bisceglia asked what the City's regulation was for the maximum height of a manhole cover and the size of the pipes they are installing.

Mr. Burke stated that they will be 6" pipes.

Timothy Viele, 46 Honeysuckle Road, asked several questions. Do the plans state a 2.5:1 slope? Where do they intend to start grading and will they grade into a slope?

Mr. Truman stated that the 2.5:1 slope is noted on the details of the plans. Mr. Burke stated that they are starting to grade five feet from the fence.

Mr. Viele asked how far from the property line was the fence.

Andrew Truman stated that the fence, based on the plan, is on the property line or maybe a foot or so.

Mr. Viele stated that is not correct because the fence is not on the property line in some cases it is more than 20 feet off and if that's the case and they are grading five feet from where the fence is then they are already halfway up the slope. He also commented that using an extender on an excavator will only get them halfway down the slope and they need to get a machine down the slope to ensure the grading is done correctly.

Mr. Truman stated that regardless of where the fence is located the grading on the plans state that it will start five to ten feet from the property line. The grading is relative to the property lines on the plans so that's what we're going to go with.

Mr. Viele asked that be clarified on the conditions and asked how high the manhole covers are supposed to stick out of the ground because there is at least one that is sticking out five feet. He would like to see that lowered.

Mr. Gervais stated that they don't have a regulation on the height of a manhole that's not in a public way.

Mr. Burke stated that the revised plans show that they have to adjust the manhole covers. Mr. Truman stated that they will condition the height.

Mr. Viele asked if the fence on lot 81 can be removed and Mr. Burke stated that they will keep it. He also asked where the slope ended and how far it was in relation to the last house. Mr. Burke showed him. He stated that there needs to be fencing on Slope B because it is a cliff and someone could get hurt.

Mr. Truman stated that portion wasn't part of the application but if there's an issue with it they should contact Inspectional Services but they will be coming in for that soon.

Ms. Smith stated that at the next Conservation Commission meeting, on June 18, they'll be an update provided by the applicant with regards to slope B, as the commission requested that at their last meeting.

Mr. Viele insisted that the curtain drain proposed should be lower down the slope. He also asked for clarification on the five foot buffer being proposed to do the work.

Mr. Burke stated that five feet was chosen just in case there are minor discrepancies in the topography. They will be tying into the existing grade.

Mr. Bisceglia asked if they will be digging up the easement on his property to put the pipe in and why they don't add drainage on the other end of the slope.

Mr. Burke stated that they will be working only on their property and not on Mr. Bisceglia's side of the easement. They are sticking with the original subdivision design. Mr. Bisceglia's requires another discharge out to tie into the road. The existing pipes may not have the capacity, we would have to assess it and possibly reconstruct everything.

Ms. Smith stated that starting on page 4 of the memo there are the standards for review for the site plan listed out, they are listed as numbers 1 through 11. Item #7 with regards to the fencing seems to be a concern to some abutters so she asked that the board consider the chain-link fence, the need to retain it, the type, the height, and the location of the fence. She also stated that there's a stabilization detail, which is a variable 5-10 foot buffer area, the board can clarify an update to that detail.

Mr. Truman asked for clarification on the size of the pipe for the trench drain. He would prefer it be 6". And he mentioned that the trench drain should be lower down the hill.

Ms. Smith stated that if that ends up being the board's recommendation, staff would request that instead of removing condition #14 that they should include "location as shown on the plan or lower down the slope, to the extent practicable."

Mr. Donahue stated that he was amenable as long as it was drafted as an option. They will try to relocate it lower.

Mr. Truman stated that he would like the property line staked out as part of the conditions, also a certified as-built by a registered land surveyor when it's done showing all the topographic grades, and a certification from the excavator and installer saying it was built per the approved plans.

Mr. Mitra asked how often during this process is Inspectional Services going to check that everything is going per the approved plans.

Ms. Donovan stated that there will be potentially a team between the Department of Public works and the Building Inspectors that would make more periodic inspections than normal. I can't give a number because it's not a normal situation.

Upon a motion by Mr. Vigliotti and seconded by Mr. Ochoa, the Board voted 3-0 (Mr. Mitra couldn't vote because he missed a meeting and didn't review the information prior to the meeting) to approve the definite site plan for 0 Sarah Drive (Arboretum Phase IV) (aka Bittersweet Boulevard Lots 81-86) subject to conditions 1 - 14 in staff's memo updated May 6, 2015 and to include the recommendations of the Chair regarding certifications of a land surveyor and the contractor on the as-built plans. Also, that the drainage shown on the plan be lowered on the hill if possible and also the requirements and recommendations that set forth on pages 5 through 8 regarding definite site plan application requirements as recommended by staff be complied with. Also, that the manhole covers in regards to slope on the drainage be restricted to one foot or below sticking out of the ground and that grading be done from the property line pursuant to the plans.

Mr. Donahue if we could make the manhole height no more than two feet.

Mr. Vigliotti amended his motion to between 12" and maximum of two feet.

Ms. Smith reminded the Board to vote on the waiver.

Upon a motion by Mr. Vigliotti and seconded by Mr. Ochoa, the Board voted 3-0 to approve the waivers requested.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **4. Street Petition Convert to Public – Honeysuckle Road (ST-2015-004)**

Mr. Donahue stated that the road has been completed in accordance with the plans. DPW's recommendation is that it be a Priority #1.

Mr. Gervais stated that the applicant is correct.

Upon a motion by Mr. Vigliotti and seconded by Mr. Ochoa, the Board voted 4-0 to recommend a Priority Level 1 to the City Council.

### **5. Forest Hill Drive – Special Permit Cluster Subdivision (PB-2015-025)**

Patrick Burke, HS&T Group, stated that the proposal is to construct 8 single-family detached dwellings, on individual lots, in a cluster subdivision. The site is predominantly wooded now. The proposed cul-de-sac is located further than 500 feet from the nearest throughway (Moreland Street), which is the maximum length specified by the Subdivision Rules and Regulations. They are requesting a waiver from that requirement. They are proposing to tie into the existing sewer and into the town's water. By right, they would be allowed to do 14 units but they are only proposing eight to reduce the impact to the site.

Mr. Gervais stated that they have a two page comment letter, which includes a list of waivers required for the submitted project recommended by DPW&P and a list of waivers required for the submitted project not recommended by DPW&P. The following is a list of waivers required for the submitted project not recommended by DPW&P:

- Section IX.C.8.a. Dead end streets shall not be longer than five hundred (500) feet.
- Section IX.G. Detention Pond Design- Insufficient information has been provided to properly review this section.
- Section IX.G. Detention pond with a depth in excess of three (3) feet shall be provided with a six (6) foot chain link fence.
- Section IX.H.4. Scour Protection- Insufficient information has been provided to properly review this section.
- Section IX.J.4.G.1. Easements for utilities across lots shall be provided where necessary and shall be at least 20 feet wide.
- Section X.D.1. Street construction shall conform to the City of Worcester standard street cross section.
- Section X.D.5. The pavement width of a residential street shall be thirty (30) feet.

Mr. Gervais also stated that there were no stormwater calculations or report submitted for them to review. There was no fence shown on the plan for the detention pond. There was insufficient information provided to determine if the sewage connections were adequate. There were no easements shown on the plans for the utilities and the detention pond that cross on the lots. The proposed street construction does not conform to the City of Worcester's standards. The pavement width of the residential street is required to be 30 feet and only 20 feet is proposed.

Ms. Tatasciore stated that staff had questions regarding where the applicant measured the 500 ft. for the cul-de-sac. The applicant has indicated that the open space will be used for recreational

purposes by the residents but has not identified if it will be for passive or active recreation. They also do not provide the required 25% and staff questions the usability of it since the detention basin renders a portion of it unusable. The open space parcel is currently inaccessible to most of the residents since it is located at the rear of Lots 5 & 6. An easement or reconfiguring the open space so that it can be accessed by the proposed roadway will need to be explored.

Richard Wolfe, 8 Moreland Green Drive, stated that he was the president of the Moreland Green Homeowner's Association; the group maintains the open lots along Moreland Green drive. He stated that he was concerned about how incomplete the plans were and has a petition signed but 40+ neighbors opposing this project.

Attorney Joel Green, representing Valentine Gapontsev and his wife, abutters at 31 Hickory Drive, stated that the Gapontsevs oppose this because this doesn't meet any of the criteria to be allowed a special permit. Mr. Green stated that this petition does not fit into the neighborhood. The benefits do not outweigh the negatives. He argued the special permits finding of fact by stating that the natural environment would be impacted since there will be ~80 trees clear cut. He stated that the fiscal impacts have not been properly addressed as the applicant didn't mention impact to schools, police and fire needs, and snow plowing and other municipal services.

Raymond Deshaies, 3 Hickory Drive, stated that over 40 years ago a similar project was denied at this location. One of the reasons was because there was a safety factor because there was only going to be a sidewalk on one side. He also asked for clarification as to how far this would be from his property.

Mr. Burke stated that it was setback approximately 10 ft. Ms. Donovan clarified that under a normal subdivision it would be 20 ft. but this is reduced under cluster subdivision ordinance.

Councilor Bergman, 11 Kensington Heights, stated that there are many outstanding questions and there are numerous abutters present that oppose this project. He requested that they continue the item and have a neighborhood meeting in the interim.

Brenda Eze, 19 Hickory Drive, stated that she preferred a retention area as opposed to a detention area because she did not want mosquitoes breeding disease there.

Mr. Truman stated that a retention basin holds the water and make the mosquito issue worse than a detention basin.

Mr. Vigliotti stated that he is not prepared to vote on this item and agreed that there should be a neighborhood meeting to address the neighborhood's questions and concerns regarding this project. Before the applicant comes back they need to address the recreational area and the length of the roadway. He suggested they might look into fewer lots and keeping some more of the area wooded.

Mr. Mitra stated that he agreed with Mr. Vigliotti. The plans need to be revised to address the concerns mentioned.

Mr. Ochoa also stated that there are too many unanswered questions and agreed with the comments the other board members made.

Mr. Truman stated that he is concerned with the density, the open space, and suggested walking to the neighbors.

Mr. Burke stated that he would like to continue to June 24, 2015.

## List of Exhibits

- Exhibit A: Special Permit Application; received April 2, 2015; prepared by Melissa O'Connor.
- Exhibit B: Forest Hill Drive – Cluster Subdivision Special Permit Plan; dated April 2, 2015; prepared by HS&T Group, Inc.
- Exhibit C: Overview of Existing Onsite Easements; received April 28, 2015; prepared by HS&T Group, Inc.
- Exhibit D: Cluster Zoning Calculations; received April 28, 2015; prepared by HS&T Group, Inc.
- Exhibit E: Lot Layout Plan; received April 28, 2015; prepared by HS&T Group, Inc.
- Exhibit F: Letters of Opposition from Tracy Raphaelson, received April 29, 2015 & Rebecca Raphaelson, received April 29, 2015.
- Exhibit G: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Department of Public Works & Parks to the Planning Board; re: Forest Hill Cluster Subdivision; 5/1/2015.
- Exhibit H: Petition of Opposition prepared by Richard Wolfe; received May 6, 2015.

### 6. 78 Upland Street – More Than One Building On A Lot (PB-2015-024)

Robert O'Neil, applicant, stated that the proposal is to construct a 12-unit three-story multi-family low-rise building at the northerly portion of the property and a 4-unit two-story multi-family low-rise building at the southerly portion of the property (for a total of 16, 2-bedroom, units). They will provide a 35 space surface parking area with associated site-work, grading, and paving. Mr. O'Neil explained the stormwater management onsite.

Mr. Gervais stated that most of the drainage calculations comments were addressed by the applicant and the last notes provided to him were minor so he is confident that the requirements will be met. The calculations have been revised but he has not been able to review them.

Ms. Tatasciore stated that on February 23, 2015, the Zoning Board of Appeals approved the special permits needed for this project. Because of this the only comments staff has are annotations that they are asking the applicant to provide. She explained that Condition 1(k) in the memo was because the Zoning Board requested that condition.

Mr. O'Neil requested the waiver from showing parcels and ownership information for abutters within 300 feet of the subject property.

Upon a motion by Mr. Ochoa and seconded by Mr. Vigliotti, the Board voted 4-0 to close the public hearing.

Upon a motion by Mr. Vigliotti and seconded by Mr. Ochoa, the Board voted 4-0 to grant the waiver requested.

Upon a motion by Mr. Mitra and seconded by Mr. Ochoa, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the definitive site plan and More than one building on a lot application with the condition of approval in the memo and that the drainage calculations be done to DPW's satisfaction.

### **List of Exhibits**

- Exhibit A: Definitive Site Plan Application; received April 2, 2015; prepared by Attorney Donald O'Neil.
- Exhibit B: More Than One Building On A Lot Application; received April 16, 2015; prepared by Mary & Robert O'Neil.
- Exhibit C: Proposed Plan; prepared by Robert D. O'Neil, PLS; dated December 29, 2014, revised through to April 15, 2015.
- Exhibit D: Stormwater Management & Hydraulic Calculations Report; prepared by Malley Engineering, Co. Inc.; dated April 15, 2015.

## **7. 78 Upland Street – Definitive Site Plan (PB-2015-024)**

Taken up contemporaneously with item #6.

### **List of Exhibits**

- Exhibit A: Definitive Site Plan Application; received April 2, 2015; prepared by Attorney Donald O'Neil.
- Exhibit B: More Than One Building On A Lot Application; received April 16, 2015; prepared by Mary & Robert O'Neil.
- Exhibit C: Proposed Plan; prepared by Robert D. O'Neil, PLS; dated December 29, 2014, revised through to April 15, 2015.
- Exhibit D: Stormwater Management & Hydraulic Calculations Report; prepared by Malley Engineering, Co. Inc.; dated April 15, 2015.

## **8. 31 & 39 Caroline Street – More Than One Building On A Lot (PB-2015-019A)**

Carl Hultgren, Quinn Engineering, stated that they are proposing to construct 3, three-story, multi-family low-rise dwellings. While the three structures are attached, there is no interconnectivity proposed; therefore, the structures are considered separate buildings requiring a More Than One Building On A Lot approval from this Board. In 2006 the board approved a similar design but the permit has expired and since they needed to reconfigure the site since they bought additional land they need new approvals.

They are also requesting an 81G Street Opening Permit to conduct proposed grading, paving, and drainage within the Caroline Street Right-of-Way in order to extend the existing end of pavement easterly to meet Ingleside Avenue. The site slopes downwards from west to east and therefore the buildings are staggered to account for the change in topography. Mr. Hultgren reviewed the drainage with the Board. He also stated that the eastern parking area has one way traffic from Caroline Street to Cohasset Street because as part of the original approval the Traffic Department didn't want anyone using the parking lot to cut through from Cohasset to Caroline.

Mr. Hultgren stated that the buildings are handicapped accessible and they also provided handicapped parking spaces. He reviewed landscaping, signage, snow storage, stormwater, etc.

with the Board. The Conservation Commission issued a Negative Request for Determination of Applicability for two isolated vegetated wetlands on the subject property.

Ms. Smith stated that the applicant did provide the detail for the wall-mounted lighting proposed. One of the shrub species proposed is an invasive species so staff recommends that the applicant replace that with an alternate species. She asked the engineer to comment on the facade.

Mr. Hultgren stated that in order to make the building more architecturally interesting they are proposing a fake gable on the Caroline Street façade and landscaping to break up the building mass. They proposed black vinyl chain-link fencing around the detention pond.

Robert Wilcox stated that he owns 51 Caroline Street, which is 4' x 94, and he wanted to know how this would affect his property. He also asked for clarification on the wetland on site.

Mr. Hultgren stated that it will not affect his property since all the work proposed is within the right of way. He stated that there is an isolated vegetated wetland onsite and it is non-jurisdictional so they are able to fill it in.

Mr. Truman asked if the applicant can add a DO NOT EXIT sign on the one way parking lot. Mr. Hultgren stated he was amenable to that and there will be painted directional arrows on the pavement as well.

Upon a motion by Mr. Vigliotti and seconded by Mr. Mitra, the Board voted 4-0 to close the public hearing.

Upon a motion by Mr. Vigliotti and seconded by Mr. , the Board voted 4-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan, 81G, and More than One building on a Lot with the conditions in staff's memo and the additional Do Not Enter signs pursuant to the parking lot that is one way and that the invasive shrub species be replaced with non-invasive species.

### **List of Exhibits:**

- Exhibit A: 31 & 39 Caroline Street Definitive Site Plan & 81-G Application; received March 12, 2015; prepared by Botany Bay Construction Co, LLC.
- Exhibit B: 31 & 39 Caroline Street Definitive Site Plan, More than One Building on a Lot Plan & 81-G Plan; dated 3/11/2015; revised 4/28/2015; prepared by Quinn Engineering.
- Exhibit C: Rendering; dated 1/6/2015; revised 4/20/2015; prepared by A J Drafting & Designs.
- Exhibit D: Caroline Street Photometric Plan; prepared by Reflex Lighting; dated 4/6/2015; revised 4/17/2015; received April 28, 2015.
- Exhibit E: Letter from abutter Walter Wyse to the Planning Board; re: 31 & 39 Caroline Street; undated, received 4/6/2015.
- Exhibit F: Worcester Fire Department Comments, undated; revised.
- Exhibit G: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Department of Public Works & Parks to the Planning Board; re: 31 & 39 Caroline Street DSPA & 81-G; 4/9/2015; revised forthcoming.
- Exhibit H: Caroline Street Traffic Impact and Access Study; Prepared by MS Transportation Systems, Inc.; dated August 2006; received 3/12/2015.

- Exhibit I: 31 & 39 Caroline Street Stormwater Report; Prepared by Quinn Engineering; dated 3/11/2015; revised 4/27/2015;
- Exhibit J: Response Letter from Carl Hultgren, P.E., Quinn Engineering; dated April 28, 2015.
- Exhibit K: Letter from abutter Paul Charest to the Planning Board; re: 31 & 39 Caroline Street; dated 4/20/2015, received 4/20/2015.

**9. 31 & 39 Caroline Street – 81G Street Opening (PB-2015-020) & Definitive Site Plan (PB-2015-019)**

Taken up contemporaneously with item #8.

**List of Exhibits:**

- Exhibit A: 31 & 39 Caroline Street Definitive Site Plan & 81-G Application; received March 12, 2015; prepared by Botany Bay Construction Co, LLC.
- Exhibit B: 31 & 39 Caroline Street Definitive Site Plan, More than One Building on a Lot Plan & 81-G Plan; dated 3/11/2015; revised 4/28/2015; prepared by Quinn Engineering.
- Exhibit C: Rendering; dated 1/6/2015; revised 4/20/2015; prepared by A J Drafting & Designs.
- Exhibit D: Caroline Street Photometric Plan; prepared by Reflex Lighting; dated 4/6/2015; revised 4/17/2015; received April 28, 2015.
- Exhibit E: Letter from abutter Walter Wyse to the Planning Board; re: 31 & 39 Caroline Street; undated, received 4/6/2015.
- Exhibit F: Worcester Fire Department Comments, undated; revised.
- Exhibit G: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Department of Public Works & Parks to the Planning Board; re: 31 & 39 Caroline Street DSPA & 81-G; 4/9/2015; revised forthcoming.
- Exhibit H: Caroline Street Traffic Impact and Access Study; Prepared by MS Transportation Systems, Inc.; dated August 2006; received 3/12/2015.
- Exhibit I: 31 & 39 Caroline Street Stormwater Report; Prepared by Quinn Engineering; dated 3/11/2015; revised 4/27/2015;
- Exhibit J: Response Letter from Carl Hultgren, P.E., Quinn Engineering; dated April 28, 2015.
- Exhibit K: Letter from abutter Paul Charest to the Planning Board; re: 31 & 39 Caroline Street; dated 4/20/2015, received 4/20/2015.

**10. 70 & 72 Swan Ave. and 2 & 4 Farm Street – Definitive Site Plan (PB-2015-007)**

Mr. Vigliotti recused himself.

David Sadowski, representing Gold Star Builders, stated that the petitioner seeks to construct four, 1,152 SF footprint, single-family detached dwellings on four existing lots. The trigger was the slope of the sites. On November 17, 2004, the Planning Board voted to approve a Definitive Site Plan for the construction of four 2-family dwellings. The lot configuration has changed somewhat and there is an ANR before the Board tonight as well. Mr. Sadowski stated that they have made the changes requested by staff already.

Mr. Sadowski stated that all four roofs will be tied into a collection system to recharge the aquifer so there will be no roof runoff. The project will go before the Conservation Commission because they are within 100 ft. of a Catchbasin. Mr. Sadowski requested the following waivers:

1. A waiver of the requirement to show abutters and abutters within 300 ft. on the plan, as per Article II, Section 7.C.1. of the Planning Board’s Rules & Regulations for Site Plan Approvals.
2. Labeling trees that are 9” in diameter or larger.

They will keep as many trees as possible. One of the abutters asked that they keep a specific tree and they are amenable to that. Mr. Sadowski stated that the houses are setback 52’ because of a sewer easement.

Ms. Tatasciore stated that staff did receive a revised set of plans but staff did not have time to review them hence staff recommends that the conditions of approval be included in the decision if the Board approves it so that staff has a chance to properly review the plans.

Upon a motion by Mr. Ochoa and seconded by Mr. Mitra, the Board voted 3-0 to approve the waivers requested.

Upon a motion by Mr. Ochoa and seconded by Mr. Mitra, the Board voted 3-0 to approve the petition with the conditions in the staff memo.

**List of Exhibits:**

- Exhibit A: Definitive Site Plan Application; received February 18, 2015; prepared by Owner/Applicant Tony Nguyen of Gold Star Builders.
- Exhibit B: Site Plan, dated February 17, 2015; prepared by Sadowski Engineering, Inc.
- Exhibit C: November 17, 2004 Definitive Site Plan Decision
- Exhibit D: 1923 plan – “The Hermitage Tract – Section No.2”.
- Exhibit E: Letter from DPW, dated March 19, 2015
- Exhibit F: Memo from Fire Chief Robert Courtney
- Exhibit G: E-mail to staff & Rendering
- Exhibit H: Letter of Opposition from abutter Jacquelyn Ball Stein; received April 10, 2015
- Exhibit I: Letter of Postponement; received April 15, 2015

John Vigliotti returned to the meeting.

**11. 0 (aka 0S) Boxford Street – Definitive Site Plan (PB-2015-022)**

Jeff Howland, JH Engineering, representing Aitch Properties, stated that this lot has received Definitive Site Plan Approval in 2010. He explained the water and sewer connections. He stated that they are amenable to the conditions of approval and he addressed the questions in the memo. They are willing to provide one 3” caliper shade tree on each lot. All the vegetation in the rear will be retained. He stated that the dashed line running from east to west of the proposed lot 1 is for the sewer easement.

Ms. Smith stated that if approved staff recommends the conditions of approval in the memo.

Upon a motion by Mr. Mitra and seconded by Mr. Ochoa, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the waiver from the application requirement of labeling abutters and abutters thereto within 300 ft. or provide such information on revised plans.

Upon a motion by Mr. Mitra and seconded by Mr. Ochoa, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the definitive site plan with the conditions in the memo and that the applicant label the easement on the plan.

**List of Exhibits:**

- Exhibit A: 0 (aka 0S) Boxford Street Definitive Site Plan Application; received 3/18/2015; prepared by Aitch Properties, LLC.
- Exhibit B: 0 (aka 0S) Boxford Street Definitive Site Plan; dated 2/16/2015; prepared by JH Engineering.
- Exhibit C: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Department of Public Works & Parks to the Planning Board; re: 0 Boxford Street; dated 5/1/2015.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

**12. Street Petition Convert to Public – Rydberg Terrace (ST-2015-003)**

Mr. Gervais stated that DPW recommends a Priority Level 4 for Rydberg Terrace.

Upon a motion by Mr. Mitra and seconded by Mr. Ochoa, the Board voted 4-0 to recommend a Priority Level 4 for Rydberg Terrace.

**13. Sewer Extension Petition – Esper Avenue (ST- 2015-005)**

**14. Sewer Extension Petition – Midgley Avenue (ST-2015-006)**

Mr. Gervais asked that Esper Avenue and Midgley Avenue be taken up contemporaneously. He stated that DPW recommends a Priority Level 1 for both streets.

Upon a motion by Mr. Mitra and seconded by Mr. Ochoa, the Board voted 4-0 to recommend a Priority Level 1 for Esper Avenue and Midgley Avenue.

**15. Sewer Extension Petition – Aetna Street (ST-2015-007)**

Mr. Gervais stated that Aetna Street is not properly before the Board since it has not been properly referred to the Planning Board yet. Therefore, no action can be taken.

**16. Approval Not Required (ANR) Plans:**

**a. 70 & 72 Swan Ave. and 2 & 4 Farm Street (private) (AN-2015-016)**

Ms. Tatasciore stated that this plan seeks to reconfigure the four lots and correcting a discrepancy from the previous plan.

Upon a motion by Mr. Vigliotti and seconded by Mr. Mitra, the Board voted 4-0 to endorse the ANR.

**b. 419 Burncoat Street & Arbutus Road (public) (AN-2015-017)**

Ms. Tatasciore stated that they are moving the side lot line to comply with setbacks because of a new deck.

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

**c. 0 Boxford Street (private) (AN-2015-018)**

Ms. Tatasciore stated that the purpose is to provide a zero lot line to divide the lot into two and show a proposed sere easement.

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

**d. 275 Harrington Way (public) & Raphael Street (private) (AN-2015-019)**

Ms. Tatasciore stated that they want to subdivide the lot to create another lot for future development.

Upon a motion by Mr. Vigliotti and seconded by Mr. Ochoa, the Board voted 4-0 to endorse the ANR.

**17. Review and adoption of draft Special Permit Application for Commercial Corridor Overlay District**

Ms. Tatasciore stated that this draft is still being finalized and will be before the Board at the next meeting.

**18. Communication**

**a. Method 1 & 3 Risk Characterization and Permanent Solution Statement & Activity and Use Limitation Notice from Environmental & Energy Solutions, Inc., received April 13, 2015**

No comment.

**19. Signing of Decisions from prior meetings**

The decisions from the previous meeting were signed.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Upon a motion by Mr. Vigliotti and seconded by Mr. Ochoa, the Board voted 4-0 to adjourn at 7:57 p.m.