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

November 18, 2015
WORCESTER CITY HALL – LEVI LINCOLN ROOM

Planning Board Members Present: Satya Mitra, Vice Chair
                                    Robert Ochoa, Clerk
                                    Andrew Freilich

Planning Board Members Absent:     Andrew Truman, Chair
                                     John Vigliotti

Staff Present:                    Steven Rolle, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
                                    Domenica Tatasciore, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
                                    Michael Antonellis, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
                                    Katie Donovan, Inspectional Services
                                    Nicholas Lyford, Department of Public Works & Parks
                                    Alexandra Kalkounis, Law Department

BOARD SITE VISITS

CALL TO ORDER
Satya Mitra, Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:34 p.m.

REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCES, EXTENSIONS OF TIME, POSTPONEMENTS, WITHDRAWALS

1. Sarah Drive - Arboretum Phase I – Amendment to Definitive Subdivision (PB-2015-055)

   Ms. Tatasciore stated that the Planning Board received request to postpone Sarah Drive – Arboretum
   Phase I – Amendment to Definitive Subdivision (PB-2015-055) to December 9, 2015 and extend
   constructive approval date to January 31, 2016.

   Upon a motion by Mr. Freilich and seconded by Mr. Vigliotti, the board voted 3-0 to approve the
   postponement request, postponing the hearing December 9, 2015 and extending the constructive
   approval date to January 31, 2016.

List of Exhibits

   Exhibit A: Definitive Subdivision Plan - Amendment Application; received October 15, 2015 prepared
               by Robert Gallo, Arboretum Village, LLC (President).

   Exhibit B: Sarah Drive – An Amendment to Arboretum Phase I Plan; dated October 15, 2015; prepared
               by H.S. & T. Group, Inc.
2. **Lot 7 (aka 0) Salisbury Street - Definitive Site Plan (PB-2015-051)**

   Ms. Tatasciore stated that the Planning Board received request to postpone Lot 7 (aka 0) Salisbury Street - Definitive Site Plan (PB-2015-051) to December 9, 2015 and extend constructive approval date to January 31, 2016.

   Upon a motion by Mr. Freilich and seconded by Mr. Vigliotti, the board voted 3-0 to approve the postponement request, postponing the hearing December 9, 2015 and extending the constructive approval date to January 31, 2016.

   **List of Exhibits**

   Exhibit A: Definitive Site Plan Application; received October 15, 2015; prepared by H.S. & T. Group

   Exhibit B: Definitive Site Plan; dated October 15, 2015; prepared by H. S. & T. Group.

   Exhibit C: Rendering; Undated; prepared by Shane Structures.

   Exhibit D: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Fire Department to the Planning Board; Undated.

3. **1219 Main Street and 4 & 6 Young Street - Parking Plan (PB-2015-054)**

   Ms. Tatasciore stated that the Planning Board is in receipt of request to postpone 1219 Main Street and 4 & 6 Young Street - Parking Plan (PB-2015-054) to December 9, 2015.

   Upon a motion by Mr. Freilich and seconded by Mr. Vigliotti, the board voted 3-0 to approve the postponement request, postponing the hearing December 9, 2015.

   **List of Exhibits**

   Exhibit A: Parking Plan Approval Application; received October 15, 2015; prepared by Q-Look Bridal.

   Exhibit B: Parking Plan; dated August 13, 2015; prepared by Bertin Engineering.


**NEW BUSINESS**

4. **1023 Main Street - Amendment to the City of Worcester Zoning Map (ZM-2015-002)**

   The petitioner seeks to amend the City of Worcester Zoning Map by extending the BG-2.0 (Business, General) zoning district to include the entire property located at 1023 Main Street. Presently, the property is split zoned - located in both the RG-5 (Residence, General) zoning district and the BG-2.0 (Business, General) zoning district.
Attorney Todd Brodeur, who represented the petitioners, stated that membership has declined over the years and the Post would like to sell the property and as a result, they have been holding meetings at a different location. This issue has come up since the Post has been through 2 or 3 buyers, according to Attorney Brodeur.

Attorney Brodeur stated that the interested parties have proposed a variety of “low intensity” different uses. Attorney Brodeur stated that a zone change would not be detrimental to the neighborhood and would be congruent to uses already established in the neighborhood. Attorney Brodeur went through uses that are allowed by-right in the BG-2.0 zone including, daycare, nursing home, bank, funeral home, general office, demonstrating the low-impact nature. Attorney Broder stated that the highest and best use of the lot is for it to be considered a part of the BG-2.0 zone.

Mr. Mitra opened hearing to the public. No one from the public is present to speak on this matter.

Mr. Rolle stated that the commission is voting on whether or not to recommend approving the zone change to the City Council. Mr. Rolle stated that RG-5 is the highest intensity residential use zone and BG-2.0 is the lowest intensity business use zone. Mr. Rolle stated that the rear portion of the lot is zoned RG-5 and can only be used as such. The rear of the lot includes the parking lot and that any use proposed in the portion of the lot which is zoned BG-2.0 would be subject to the use of the parking lot which is zoned RG-5. Mr. Rolle stated that the proposed zone change is not much different from uses and extensions of the BG-2.0 zone into neighborhoods in the area.

Mr. Freilich asked Mr. Rolle to explain the effect of this change. Does this land lock the property and does it become unusable if it is not granted the change? Mr. Rolle stated that not granting the zone change would continue to limit the property, especially since the parking lot is zoned differently from the building portion of the lot.

Mr. Freilich asked if the property was originally purchased for residential use. Mr. Rolle stated that the property was originally residential use and then purchased by the Post sometime in the 1960’s or 1970’s.

Mr. Freilich asked about the status of the ambulance company across the street, specifically in regards to the sirens and how that affects nearby uses. Attorney Broder stated that he is unaware, at this time, how the ambulance company operates their company in regards to best management practices as such.

Mr. Freilich asked if the Post is intent on selling the property regardless of receiving the zone change. Attorney Brodeur stated that the intent is to sell; however not receiving the zone change will make it more difficult to sell.

Bill Sylvester, Finance Officer, stated that the Post no longer has a liquor license.

Mr. Mitra stated asked what the basis of analysis was to determine that this change would have no adverse effects. Mr. Rolle stated that staff recommends the board recommend approval and that the space discussed is a small area with a boundary between the two zones and that the uses associated with the two zones are of a low impact nature.

Upon a motion by Mr. Freilich, and seconded by Mr. Vigliotti, the Planning board voted 3-0 to approve a recommendation to the City Council to amend the City of Worcester Zoning map to include 1023 Main Street in the BG-2.0 zone.
Upon a motion by Mr. Freilich, and seconded by Mr. Vigliotti, the board voted 3-0 to close the public meeting.

5. 0 Sarah Drive (aka Bittersweet Blvd.) – Lots 108 to 112 - Definitive Site Plan (PB-2015-052)

The applicant proposes to construct 5 single family semi-detached (duplex) structures with 2 off-street parking spaces, along with related grading and site work, located 23-41 (aka lots 112 L&R though 108 L&R) Bittersweet Boulevard (fka 0 Sarah Drive) (part of Arboretum Subdivision, Phase IV). The property has a slope of 15% or greater and is located within a RL-7 (Residence, Limited) zoning district.

Patrick Burke, engineer from HS & T Group, representing petitioner stated that they are accepting of most of the comments from the staff memo. Mr. Burke stated that they have extended the pavement to include the entire frontage of lot 108.

Mr. Burke asked for a waiver on staff’s proposed condition number 3 of page 2 of 5 which states: “That the improvement of Bittersweet Boulevard Right-of-Way shall be completed to the first layer of pavement binder coarse, as acceptable to the DPW&P, for all required frontage, prior to the issuance of any building permits for the proposed dwellings.”

Mr. Burke stated that they thought it would be better to grade around yards directing to road drains. The roof runoff will be tied into foundation drains which will lead to the stormwater drain in Bittersweet Boulevard. Slope in the backyard is 2.5 to 1 and stabilized with loam and seeding. There will be a stop sign at the end of Bittersweet Boulevard and lighting will conform to city standards. Erosion control will be placed on the perimeter of lots and at the base of the slope and near the roadway. Regarding Fire Department comments, the applicant will coordinate with fire department to determine need for additional hydrants.

Mr. Mitra opened meeting to the public.

Timothy Viele present from public to comment. Mr. Viele stated that there is about 8 feet of stone abutting residences and he would like to see this cleaned up.

Mr. Rolle stated that the area in question is outside of the area showed in this Definitive Site Plan.

Mr. Viele stated that he has concerns over stormwater mitigation and does not think the infrastructure, catch basins, can handle the amount of development.

Mr. Burke stated that the amount of catch basins will be increased and the stormwater drains have been designed to handle the proposed amount of development.

Mr. Viele readdressed his concerns about the ability of the infrastructure to handle the amount of water.

Mr. Burke restated that he feels the stormwater can be handled with what has been proposed.

Mr. Lyford stated that the DPW has some issues it would like the applicant to address;

1. Remove odd numbered houses from erosion and drainage plan.
2. Provide City of Worcester standard detail for road cross section (i.e. 4’ of cover on utilities, and correct thicknesses for binder and top course super pave mix).

Regarding the applicant’s request to waive staff’s proposed condition of approval, Mr. Lyford stated that the DPW would like to see the binder in place before issuing house numbers (or building permits).

Mr. Rolle stated that the applicant has addressed most of the concerns on the staff memo. Mr. Rolle then stated what the suggested conditions of approval are;

1. That eight (8) copies of final revised plans shall be submitted to the Division of Planning & Regulatory Services prior to the release of the decision with the addition of the missing information listed below:

   General

   a. Provide the Map-Block-Lot (MBL) number for each lot upon which work is proposed as part of this sequence of construction on the “Cover” Plan Sheet;

   b. Clearly differentiate between the limit of proposed work (including but not limited to grading, paving, etc.) associated with the construction of the 5 structures and work that is proposed in future phases of construction;

   Zoning & Dimensional Requirements

   c. Provide the minimum required legal frontage (minimum 35’ improved to City Standards) for the dwelling unit proposed at 41 (aka lot 108R) Bittersweet Boulevard;

   d. Include abutting zoning boundaries in the locus plan;

   e. Revise the labeling for rear-yard setbacks to be from the outermost point of the proposed structures (e.g. deck) and update the zoning classification table (Plan Sheet 8) to reflect the correct, corresponding dimensions;

   Grading

   f. Denote the installation locations for the proposed silt fence on the plans;

   g. Label the proposed finished grading of the proposed slopes, as V:H, on the plan;

   h. Provide a detail for the proposed yard drains;

   Landscaping & Lighting

   i. Provide a detail, and specifications for, the proposed street lighting;

   j. Notate the location of sidewalks on the plan.

2. Revise the plan to show that Bittersweet Boulevard’s proposed edge of pavement shall be extended and will be constructed to the City’s Subdivision Roadway standards in full width and length for the entire legal frontage of Lot 108R.
3. That the improvement of Bittersweet Boulevard Right-of-Way shall be completed to the first layer of pavement binder coarse, as acceptable to the DPW&P, for all required frontage, prior to the issuance of any building permits for the proposed dwellings.

4. Provided that the project is constructed in substantial accordance with the final revised plans on file with the City of Worcester and in accordance with all applicable governmental codes.

Mr. Vigliotti asked if what the applicant has provided for lighting and drainage is acceptable. Mr. Rolle stated that this is acceptable. Mr. Rolle stated that staff was concerned about how draining will be captured off the back slope, for example through swales and raingardens.

Mr. Burke stated that raingardens are not desirable due to how onerous that would be for the future homeowners for maintenance. Mr. Burke also stated that small swales could be placed on the back of the property in order to spread out usage amongst the catch basins.

Mr. Rolle asked where the first point of interception of the stormwater from the slope is located. Mr. Burke stated that this is located in the street from the drainage basin.

Mr. Freilich asked for clarification regarding the binder requirement. Mr. Lyford stated that house numbering is clerical and the binder is standard requirement.

Mr. Freilich asked if there is crossover between departments regarding the oversight of the installation of the binder. Ms. Donovan stated that this is common requirement.

Mr. Freilich asked Mr. Burke why the request for the waiver is needed. Mr. Burke stated that the plants close early and the applicant would like to pour foundations first for construction sequencing.

Mr. Freilich asked if the city is satisfied with the proposed drainage. Mr. Lyford stated that the city is satisfied.

Mr. Freilich asked if there is a way the Board can recommend a condition with regards to Mr. Viele’s concerns. Mr. Rolle stated that staff would advise against conditioning the application with Mr. Viele’s noted concerns given that they are outside the purview of the application and the matter before the board.

Mr. Mitra asked if the board can make a recommendation that both the applicant and Mr. Viele discuss amongst themselves Mr. Viele’s concerns.

Ms. Kalkounis stated that the board should not make any recommendation as to what the applicant and Mr. Viele should do regarding the application or any other matter because this is not what is before the board.

Mr. Viele stated that he is not satisfied with what the applicant and the board have stated.

Mr. Mitra stated that the board has heard Mr. Viele’s concerns, but that the board cannot make recommendations or conditions with regard to those specific concerns because they are not within the scope of the application.
Mr. Rolle suggests the applicant request the following waivers;

1. The application requirement to label abutters and abutters thereto within 300 ft. on the plan or provide such notation on revised plans.

2. The plan requirement that a plot plan be provided that includes the entire site owned by the property owner.

Mr. Burke stated that the applicant would like to request these waivers.

Mr. Rolle stated that the board should consider including additional condition stating that the fire hydrant locations be placed in a location acceptable to the Worcester Fire Department.

Upon a motion by Mr. Freilich, seconded by Mr. Vigliotti, with recommendations noted in the staff memo, including proposed condition number 3 on page 2 of 5 of the staff memo, all DPW comments and an additional condition that hydrants be located in a location suitable to the Worcester Fire Department and to include request for waivers 1 and 2, the board voted 3-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan.

Upon a motion by Mr. Freilich, the request to waive proposed condition #3 of staff’s review memo was denied by the board by a 3-0 vote.

**List of Exhibits:**

Exhibit A: Definitive Site Plan Application; received October 15, 2015; prepared by H. S. & T. Group

Exhibit B: Definitive Site Plan; dated September 24, 2015; prepared H.S. & T. Group.

Exhibit C: Rendering; dated September 24, 2015; prepared by H.S. & T. Group.

Exhibit D: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Fire Department to the Planning Board; re: Definitive Site Plan Application; undated.

Exhibit E: Memorandum from DPW; dated November 12, 2015.

6. **6 Norfolk Court – Definitive Site Plan (PB-2015-049)**

   The petitioners seek to construct a single family attached building consisting of 3 dwelling units (townhouses) whereby each unit will have a 2-car garage on vacant land with associated grading and site work located in RL-7 zone (Residence, Limited). Each 1,600 SF dwelling unit will consist of 4 bedrooms.

   Carl Hultgren, the applicant’s engineer stated that they have already received a Special Permit for the use from the Zoning Board of Appeals. Mr. Hultgren described the plan before the board showing where the slopes are located relative to the building.

   Mr. Hultgren stated that erosion controls will be used.

   Mr. Mitra opens the meeting to the public. There are no comments.
Mr. Antonellis stated that all comments were addressed and stated the suggested conditions of approval:

1. Provided that the project is constructed in substantial accordance with the final revised plans on file with the City of Worcester and in accordance with all applicable governmental codes.

2. That each side of the driveways remains as green space and not be paved.

3. That the applicant coordinate with DPW’s Engineering Division to obtain a Norfolk Street municipal address and house number instead of Norfolk Court.

Mr. Antonellis suggested striking condition number 4 since the applicant has already provided renderings.

Mr. Hultgren asked if it is permissible for residents to place walkways on what has been referred to as green space in the suggested conditions. Staff agreed this is acceptable.

Upon a motion by Mr. Freilich, seconded by Mr. Vigliotti, the board voted 3-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan with recommendations made by staff with the elimination of number 4.

List of Exhibits
Exhibit A: Definitive Site Plan Application; received October 9, 2015; prepared Tallage Adams, LLC.
Exhibit B: Definitive Site Plan; dated August 14, 2015; prepared by Quinn Engineering, Inc.
Exhibit C: ZBA Special Permit – Findings of Fact and Decision; dated October 5, 2015

7. 1 College Street (College of the Holy Cross) - Definitive Site Plan (PB-2015-053)

The Trustees of the College of the Holy Cross have applied for a Definitive Site Plan Approval at 1 College Street, under the requirements of the City of Worcester Zoning Ordinance. The applicant proposes the following:

- The renovation of ~46,500 GSF of the existing Hart Center.
- The addition of ~139,838 GSF of new recreational space to be used as a field house and will also contain a turf field, weight room, locker rooms and offices.
- A new driveway loop to connect McCarthy Lane to the proposed upper parking lot.
- A net decrease of 8 parking spaces.

Attorney Joshua Lee Smith, Steven Engler & Robert Titus of Sasaki Associates and Scott Merrill of Holy Cross represented the petitioner.

Attorney Smith stated that the Hart Center serves as the main athletic complex for the college. The expansion would double the space of the building at 39,000 SF. McCarthy Lane will serve as access to parking space. The project is located within the IN-S zone and will comply with the zoning ordinance. Attorney Smith clarified that there will now be a net loss of 19 parking spaces, while the college
maintains a net surplus of required spaces - 279 spaces over the minimum are currently provided. There will be 10 additional, accessible parking spaces included with the new proposal.

Attorney Smith stated that there will be no detrimental effects relative to the project. The abutters will not be affected. The existing building is currently 100 feet from closest abutter. The expanded portion will be 200 feet from the closest abutter. There will be no light spillover and all lighting to be in compliance with Worcester ordinance. Attorney Smith stated that there will be no increased traffic as a result of the project.

Attorney Smith stated that the college held an informational session meeting and invited 303 neighbors (abutters) surrounding the main campus to ask any questions about the project. Attorney Smith stated that there are no major issues that were brought up at the meeting.

Mr. Engler stated that erosion control has been addressed. The diversion swale has been moved to encompass the stockpile area. Additional catch basin protection has been added in the parking area in roadway to the east.

Mr. Mitra opened the meeting to the public. There were no comments.

My. Lyford stated that DPW would like all catch basin connections to be made with 8” DR-18.

Ms. Tatasciore stated that recommendations on page 2 of 5 of the staff memo have been mostly addressed and that a full sized copy of photometric plan has been submitted and reviewed.

Mr. Freilich asked how much the project will cost. Mr. Merrill responded that it will cost $71.5 million.

Mr. Freilich stated that he thinks Holy Cross is a fantastic institution and that most of the projects going forward in many of the universities are “keeping up with the Jones’” and the cost of tuition may be affected by such projects. Mr. Freilich stated that he thinks City Council and other community members address what is too much and how can we provide for reasonably priced education.

Mr. Mitra stated that these comments exceed the purview of the application before the board.

Mr. Mitra asked what will the expansion include. Attorney Smith stated that the main area of the expansion space will be a turf field and also include an auxiliary basketball court.

Mr. Mitra and Mr. Vigliotti asked to see the renderings. Mr. Engler explained the renderings that have been provided.

Mr. Freilich asked about availability of parking and conflict of athletic seasons. Mr. Merrill stated that the seasons will not conflict and Mr. Engler stated that parking will be available at the same area of the college as it’s currently provided.

Upon a motion by Mr. Freilich, seconded by Mr. Vigliotti, the board voted 3-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan including recommendations from staff memo on page 2 of 5 and DPW comments that the catch basin connections must be made with 8” DR-18.

List of Exhibits

Exhibit A: Definitive Site Plan Application; received October 15, 2015 and prepared by Robert E. Longden, Esquire, Owner’s Authorized Representative

Exhibit B: Hart Center Renovation and Expansion Site Plan; dated July 10, 2015 and revised through to October 13, 2015; prepared by Sasaki Associates, Inc. of 64 Pleasant Street, Watertown, MA.
Exhibit C: Photometric Plan; dated July 10, 2015; prepared by Sasaki Associates, Inc. of 64 Pleasant Street, Watertown, MA.

Exhibit D: Stormwater Management Report; dated October 13, 2015; prepared by Sasaki Associates, Inc. of 64 Pleasant Street, Watertown, MA.

Exhibit E: MACRIS list for College of the Holy Cross.

Exhibit F: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Fire Department to the Planning Board; received October 27, 2015.

OTHER BUSINESS

8. Election of Officers

Motion by Mr. Freilich to postpone to next meeting.

9. Approval Not Required (ANR) Plans

   a. 300 Salisbury Street (public) (AN-2015-032)

      Upon a motion by Mr. Freilich and seconded by Mr. Vigliotti the board voted 3-0 to endorse the plan.

   b. 23-25 Kenberma Road (private) & 160 Houghton St. (public) (AN-2015-033)

      Mr. Lyford stated that the private portion of Kenberma Road has been brought to city standards.

      Upon a motion by Mr. Freilich and seconded by Mr. Vigliotti the board voted 3-0 to endorse the plan.

10. Approval of Minutes – October 21, 2015

      Upon a motion by Mr. Freilich and seconded by Mr. Vigliotti the board voted 3-0 to accept the minutes as presented.

11. Communication

   a. CMRPC’s Regional Approach to Municipal Challenges Meeting

12. Signing of Decisions from prior meetings

ADJOURNMENT

Upon a motion by Mr. Freilich and seconded by Mr. Vigliotti, the board voted 3-0 to adjourn at 7:06 pm.