January 30, 2012

WORCESTER CITY HALL, 455 MAIN STREET, LEVI LINCOLN ROOM

Zoning Board Members Present:
Andrew Freilich, Chair
Lawrence Abramoff, Vice-Chair
William Bilotta
Vadim Michajlow
Kola A. Akindele

Staff Present:
Joel Fontane, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
Luba Zhaurova, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
John Kelly, Department of Inspectional Services

Board Site Views

Call to Order – 5:30 pm
Approval of the Minutes – Approval of the minutes was held.
Requests for Continuances, Extensions of Time, Postponements, Withdrawals

REGULAR MEETING (5:30 PM)
CALL TO ORDER
Chair Freilich called the meeting to order at 5:30 PM.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS
1. 1200 & 1204 Main Street (ZB-2011-060): Crystal Carr of HS&T Group, Inc., representative for Tammy Nguyen, petitioner, stated that the petitioner is seeking to construct an approximately 1,000 SF addition to the building off of Montague Street for commercial use and to provide 10 off-street parking spaces for all uses on site. She stated that revised plans submitted to the Board show that the parking relief requested has been reduced from 11 to 7 off-street parking spaces. To clarify, she stated that 31 off-street parking spaces are provided for all uses at 1200 and 1204 Main Street parcels and 24 are proposed, necessitating a relief of 7 parking spaces.

Mr. Fontane stated that if approved, staff recommends that

- A Variance is approved for relief of 7 off-street parking spaces (as opposed to the originally requested 11 off-street parking spaces per revised plans);
The proposed building addition is constructed in compliance with the elevation drawings submitted on file with the Division of Planning & Regulatory Services (Exhibit D) and the final revised plans;

The area of the proposed addition is not to exceed 1,000 SF;

Six copies of final revised plan are submitted prior to issuance of a Building Permit which:

- Show the location of a shed in the corner of 1200 Main Street property (as seen on staff’s site visit) and label it as uninhabitable structure;
- Correct the plan information by stating that the required side yard setback dimension is 10-ft, and that the exterior side yard setback dimension is 5-ft.

Mr. Abramoff asked how big the addition is and how many floors it has. Ms. Carr was not sure and stated that it would be less than 1,000 SF.

Mr. Kelly asked how many dwelling units are in the 1204 Main Street building and stated that according to the Department of Inspectional Services, there are 5. Ms. Carr confirmed that there are 5 dwelling units at 1204 Main Street.

Mr. Bilotta required that the dumpster be screened and that snow storage area provided is adequate in size.

Mr. Michajlow asked if the petitioner thinks the number of parking spaces provided is sufficient. Ms. Carr stated that she is a client of the petitioner and that she never had a problem finding a parking space on site.

Mr. Bilotta asked if the business at 1200 Main Street is open on weekends. Ms. Carr stated yes but wasn’t sure what the exact hours are.

Mr. Freilich requested that the Department of Inspectional Services verify the exact square footage prior to issuance of a building permit.

Upon a motion by Mr. Abramoff and seconded by Mr. Bilotta, the Board voted 5-0 to close the public hearing.

Upon a motion by Mr. Abramoff and seconded by Mr. Akindele, the Board voted 5-0 to approve a Special Permit for Expansion, Alteration or Change of a Pre-Existing Nonconforming Structure and a Variance for relief of 11 off-street parking spaces from the required 31 off-street parking spaces with the following conditions of approval:

- A Variance is approved for relief of 7 off-street parking spaces (as opposed to the originally requested 11 off-street parking spaces per revised plans);
- The proposed building addition is constructed in compliance with the elevation drawings submitted with the Division of Planning & Regulatory Services and the final revised plans;
- The area of the proposed addition is not to exceed 1,000 SF;
- The dumpster is screened;
- Provided snow storage is adequate for the site;
Six copies of final revised plan with above modifications and the following annotations are submitted to the Division of Planning & Regulatory Services prior to issuance of a Building Permit:

- Show the location of a shed in the corner of 1200 Main Street property (as seen on staff’s site visit) and label it as uninhabitable structure;
- Correct the plan information by stating that the required side yard setback dimension is 10-ft, and that the exterior side yard setback dimension is 5-ft.

List of Exhibits.

Exhibit A: Special Permit & Variance Application; received 11/7/2011; prepared by HS&T Group, LLC.
Exhibit B: Special Permit & Variance Plan; dated 8/24/2010; revised and received 01/04/2012; prepared by HS&T Group, Inc.
Exhibit C: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Zoning Board of Appeals; re: 1200 Main Street; dated 12/9/11, revised 1/06/12.
Exhibit D: Elevation drawings of the proposed addition at 1200 Main Street; prepared by J.R. Associates Design Services; dated 12/28/2011.

2. **37 Fruit Street & 59 William Street (ZB-2011-063)**: Carl Hultgren of Quinn Engineering, presented the petition. Also present were Attorney Craig O’Neil and Christopher Bruce, petitioner. Mr. Hultgren showed revised plans that incorporated staff’s comments such as improving unpaved driveway area off of Fruit Street and removing the proposed off-street parking space from the exterior side yard setback in the RL-7 portion of the site, in part in an effort to preserve 2 American Beech and 1 European Beech trees.

Mr. Fontane stated that it appears the plans presented to the Board reflect staff’s recommendations, such as relief of 6 off-street parking spaces, reduction of dwelling units to 3, and restoring front yard off of Williams Street.

Mr. Kelly stated that the property has been issued two Enforcement Orders from the Housing Division and two from the Building Code division for the two buildings on site. Chair Freilich asked if code violations will be rectified, and Mr. Kelly stated yes.

Mr. Bilotta asked if the Historical Commission will need to review the project. Mr. Fontane stated that while the structure is listed on the National Register of Historic Properties, he does not believe any exterior changes are proposed that would trigger Historical Commission review.

Chair Freilich asked how the site became non-complaint. Attorney O’Neil stated that uses changed gradually overtime with no required permitting done. Mr. Kelly stated that the City’s Property Review Team has discovered noncompliance during its walk-throughs.

Mr. Freilich asked if the applicant “will improve the exterior of the property to make it fit the decorum of the neighborhood”. Attorney O’Neil stated yes.

Claude Dorman of 38 Sever Street, an abutter, listed his concerns with the current operations on site. He stated that he was generally in favor of the petition but had concerns about
“immobile junk cars” on site and asked that the Board sets a condition of approval that storage of junk cars is prohibited, that no commercial vehicles are parked overnight, and that the site is not used for trash and containers storage.

Mr. Bruce stated that the vehicles on site referred to by Mr. Dorman are insured and registered, but have not been inspected for some time. Mr. Fontane stated that vehicle storage is not allowed by-right in a business zone and is not allowed at all in residential districts. Mr. Kelly stated that no more than three quarters of a ton of trash are allowed in a business zone, and that he was told by the applicant than no trash storage will be on site. Mr. Bruce stated that he was amenable to remove anything perceived as trash from the site. He stated that the trash trailer on site is not being used as such anymore. Mr. Fontane stated that Zoning Ordinance allows no more than 1 unregistered vehicle per lot for no more than 7 days.

Mr. Fontane stated that it appears the plans shown to the Board incorporate staff’s comments and asked that 2 copies are submitted to DPRS for the record.

Upon a motion by Mr. Abramoff and seconded by Mr. Akindele, the Board voted 5-0 to close the Public Hearing.

Upon a motion by Mr. Abramoff and seconded by Mr. Michajlow, the Board voted 5-0 to accept the petitioner’s findings of fact as amended by staff and approve the:

1) Special Permit for expansion or change of a pre-existing nonconforming use/structure
2) Variance for relief of six (6) off-street parking spaces

with the following conditions of approval:

**Number of Units:**

- Reduce the number of dwelling units by one (1) at 59 William Street for a total of three (3) residential dwelling units on site (two units at 59 William St. and one unit at 37 Fruit St);

**Parking Area**

- A total of seven (7) off-street parking spaces will be provided on-site;
- Improve the unpaved driveway area from Fruit Street that is not shown on the existing conditions plan by installing crushed stone or gravel in the area of the two parking spaces;
- Restore the area of the proposed hammerhead which has been used for off-street parking to grass to improve the aesthetics of the site;
- Remove the proposed off-street parking space from the exterior side yard setback in the RL-7 portion of the site and restore to green space;

**Landscaping**

- On the 37 Fruit Street side of the lot, install landscape screening where the parking abuts public streets and residential uses (including the nursing home), consisting of tree and shrubs, on two sides of the proposed Fruit St. parking and hammerhead turnaround;
- On the 59 William Street side install additional shrubs along the newly proposed parking space;

**Other**
• That the buildings comply with the Building Code within 90 days;
• That all vehicles that are uninsured, uninspected, unregistered, and/or not actively used on site, cannot be stored on site and shall be removed expeditiously;
• That no storage of trash containers is allowed on site;
• That this Special Permit expires within 1 year;
• That the dumpster is screened;
• That the buildings have larger property numbers to allow for better visibility from the street;
• That a 6-month property maintenance program is instituted that will maintain parking lot and landscaping (such as removal of broken limbs and fresh gravel replenishment);
• That two copies of final revised plans showing these conditions of approval are submitted to the Division of Planning & Regulatory Services prior to issuance of a Building Permit;
• Approval of the requested relief is conditioned upon the final Definitive Site Plan approved by the Planning Board with updates to all notes/annotations related to final uses approved on site and final parking relief;

List of Exhibits.
Exhibit A: Special Permit/Variance Application – 37 Fruit Street; 59 William St; received November 11, 2011 prepared by Christopher Bruce, owner; revised January 5, 2012.
Exhibit B: 37 Fruit Street; 59 William Street Plan; dated November 7, 2011; revised January 4, 2012; prepared by Quinn Engineering
Exhibit C: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Zoning Board of Appeals; re: 37 Fruit Street, 59 William Street dated January 5, 2012, updated January 26, 2012
Exhibit D:  
1.) Two Enforcement Orders from Amanda Wilson, Director of Housing/Health Inspections- Inspectional Services to Christopher Bruce, owner for 37 Fruit Street dated December 12, 2011.  
2.) Two Enforcement Orders from Amanda Wilson, Director of Housing/Health Inspections- Inspectional Services to Christopher Bruce, owner for 59 William Street dated December 12, 2011  
3.) Two Enforcement Orders from John Kelly, Building Commissioner to Christopher Bruce, owner, 37 Fruit Street and 59 William Street dated December 16, 2011.
3. **0 (aka 13) Woodcliffe Avenue (ZB-2011-065):** Attorney Jonathan Finkelstein, representative for Matthew D. O’Mara, stated that the petitioner is seeking to subdivide the parcel into Lots X, Y and Z and to construct a single-family residential dwelling on each of the three lots. The petitioner is seeking relief of 4.9-ft from the 65-ft frontage dimensional requirement relief from frontage requirement for Lot X. Also present for the hearing was Robert O’Neil, project engineer. Attorney Finkelstein submitted Exhibit E and stated that he added a column with area of proposed and existing parcels to demonstrate that while frontage is lacking for one parcel, generally speaking, lot areas of the three parcels are comparable to those of the abutting properties. With respect to staff’s memo with respect to by-right alternatives (Exhibit C) that stated: “If the applicant obtained clear title rights to the land shown on the submitted plan as formerly Woodcliffe Ave., the lot would have sufficient frontage without the need to seek relief”, Mr. Finkelstein stated that obtaining clear title rights is a “tedious and expensive process”.

Mr. Fontane stated that another by-right alternative could be constructing 2 single-family detached dwellings, as opposed to proposed three.

Mr. Bilotta was concerned with the proposed dwellings encroaching on the Mass Audubon and Conservation Commission land in the rear. Mr. Fontane stated that another large undeveloped parcel in the rear of the 0 Woodcliffe Avenue belongs to Judith and Steven Wensel and appears to have access from Sandra Drive and could be developed in the future. Mr. Finkelstein stated that he was amenable to dedicating a defined vegetative buffer along the Mass Audubon and Conservation Commission land in the rear.

Mr. O’Neil stated that Woodcliffe Avenue is paved and that access to the lots is already defined and that there would be no disturbance of the existing pavement as a result of construction. He stated that the houses would have a footprint of about 3,500 SF.

Mr. Abramoff stated that he was in favor of the petition because he thought the relief requested was de minimus. Mr. Michajlow stated that he believed the petitioner met Variance requirements.

Upon a motion by Mr. Abramoff and seconded by Mr. Bilotta, the Board voted 5-0 to close the Public Hearing.

Upon a motion by Mr. Abramoff and seconded by Mr. Akindele, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the requested Variance for relief of 4.9-ft from the 65-ft frontage requirement for Parcel X with the following conditions of approval:

1) The structure on Parcel X be constructed and the lots X, Y, and Z be delineated in accordance with the final approved Definitive (Frontage) Subdivision Plan by Planning Board;

2) The vegetative buffer in the rear of the parcels is maintained per final revised plans;
3) Three copies of final revised plan are submitted to the Division of Planning & Regulatory Services prior to issuance of a building permit with the following changes:
   
a. Label address of property on plan: *Proposed Parcels X, Y, Z – 0 Woodcliffe Avenue* in addition to the MBL numbers already provided;
   
b. Revise note to plan indicating that the applicant is seeking 4.9-ft of relief from the frontage requirements.

List of Exhibits.

Exhibit A: Variance Application – 0 (aka13) Woodcliffe Avenue; received December 7, 2011 prepared by Atty. Jonathan Finkelstein on behalf of owner, Matthew O’Mara.


Exhibit C: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Zoning Board of Appeals; re: 0 Woodcliffe Avenue Variance request (aka 13 Woodcliffe Ave.) dated January 3, 2012


The Board took a 10-min recess.

**NEW BUSINESS**

4. **15 Southwood Road (ZB-2011-066):** Toni Meltzer, petitioner, stated that he is seeking relief of 12.2-ft from the 25-ft front yard setback dimensional requirement in order to construct an ~646 SF addition on the north side of the house.

   Mr. Fontane stated that as a by-right alternative, it appears possible to relocate the proposed addition to the western side of the home, though he couldn’t say if it was feasible from interior renovation perspective. He stated that if approved, he recommended that the applicant provides revised plans indicating that the applicant is seeking 12.2’ of relief from front setback requirements and that installation of landscape screening and tree protection measures during construction of the addition.

   Mr. Abramoff asked if the petitioner considered constructing the addition in another location. Mr. Meltzer stated that he believed the proposed addition was in an appropriate location, not too close to the neighbors and adjacent to playing fields of the Worcester Academy. In response to staff’s memo (Exhibit C), he stated that no trees will be removed as a result of expansion, except for possibly a tree branch.
In response to a letter of opposition (Exhibit D), Chair Freilich asked if the petitioner has constructed another addition previously. Mr. Meltzer stated that it happened over 10 years ago.

Chair Freilich and Mr. Abramoff stated they were in favor of the petition.

Upon a motion by Mr. Abramoff and seconded by Mr. Michajlow, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the requested Variance for relief of 12.2-ft from the 25-ft front yard setback dimensional requirement with the following conditions of approval:

1) Revise plan indicating that the applicant is seeking 12.2’ of relief from front setback requirements;

2) Installation of landscape screening and employ tree protection measures during construction.

List of Exhibits.

Exhibit A: Variance Application – 15 Southwood Road; received 12/07/2011; prepared by Glenn & Toni Meltzer.

Exhibit B: Variance Plan; dated 05/18/2011; prepared by HS&T Group, Inc.

Exhibit C: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Zoning Board of Appeals; re: 15 Southwood Road - Variance; dated 01/20/12.

Exhibit D: A Letter of Opposition from Anonymous on Southwood Rd; received 01/18/2012.

5. **442 Southwest Cutoff (ZB-2011-067):** Mark Cook, representative for Sprint Nextel Corp, petitioner, stated that the petitioner is seeking to replace the 6 of the existing 9 antennas, remove and replace the existing 2 equipment cabinets with 4 equipment cabinets, and to add 12 remote radio head units. He stated that the proposed equipment will be better quality and that the proposed antennas will be 2-ft longer the existing ones. All installation work will contain to the existing concrete pad. He stated that there are 2 free-standing poles with wireless facilities on them on the site. Chair Freilich commented on the cell phone equipment and technology aging over time.

Mr. Akindele asked if a structural analysis would be required for the building permit for these new antennas as they will be wider and taller. Mr. Kelly stated that this will be reviewed by his staff during the Building Permit review. Mr. Cook stated that he will include a structural analysis report with the Building Permit application.

Mr. Bilotta asked that the proposed installation is color-coordinated with the rest of the tower which is charcoal-grey in color. He also requested that a maintenance program is put in place to maintain the look of landscaping and fencing.

Mr. Fontane stated that staff was in favor of the petitioner’s requested application requirement waivers, including the noise study, given the location of the towers in a manufacturing zoning district and about 450-ft away from the closest residential building.
Mr. Cook stated that he submitted a radio-frequency study of the Sprint Facility. Mr. Fontane stated that staff is in favor of an application requirement waiver for a pre-installation RF study of all PWSF facilities.

Upon a motion by Mr. Abramoff and seconded by Mr. Akindele, the Board voted 5-0 to close the Public Hearing.

Upon a motion by Mr. Abramoff and seconded by Mr. Akindele, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the requested Amendment to Special Permit: To allow a Personal Wireless Service Facility in ML-0.5 zoning district and a Special Permit: Extension, Alteration or Change of a Privileged Pre-Existing Nonconforming Structure (Article XVI, Section 4) with the following conditions of approval:

That the structure is constructed in substantial accordance with the site plan and the photo simulation package submitted by the applicant on December 22, 2011 and in compliance with all governmental codes and the City of Worcester Zoning Ordinance;

That landscaping, fencing and equipment at the bottom of the tower is maintained on a regular basis;

**Cost of decommissioning:** That an affidavit, signed by a qualified professional, be submitted that provides an accurate and complete estimate of the costs of decommissioning and removal of the proposed PWSF, and that said affidavit be submitted to the Division of Building and Zoning and the Division of Planning & Regulatory Services prior to the issuance of a building permit;

**Paint color matching:** That an affidavit, signed by the applicant, be submitted that states that the applicant agrees to match the paint of the proposed equipment as closely as practicable to the existing materials within the area of the installation, and that said affidavit be submitted to the Division of Building and Zoning and the Division of Planning & Regulatory Services prior to the issuance of a building permit;

**Surety Bond:** That prior to the issuance of a building permit, a surety bond, equal to the cost of decommissioning and removal of the proposed PWSF, be obtained. Said bond shall be for a term of at least two years, and be adjusted for inflation every two years. The provisions of said bond shall be to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning & Regulatory Services;

**Post-installation measurement of sound and RFP:** That post-installation measurements of the total noise and total Radio Frequency Radiation emitted by all PWSF on the building/site are taken by a certified noise and RF engineer; that results of these measurements demonstrate compliance with the Noise and Radio Frequency Radiation standards of the Zoning Ordinance and Federal Communication Commission Guidelines; and that these results are submitted to the Division of Planning & Regulatory Services and Department of Inspectonal Services prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Use & Occupancy;

**Signs** are posted on the fence surrounding all three towers with Personal Wireless Service Facilities in compliance with the Federal Communication Commission rules and regulations regarding warning of exposure to radio-frequency radiation.
The Board requested that the petitioner communicates to the owner that landscaping, fencing and equipment at the bottom of the tower for all PWSF facilities are to be maintained on a regular basis.

The Board approved the requested application requirement waivers, as amended by staff.

List of Exhibits.

Exhibit A: Special Permit Application; received 12/22/11; prepared by Sprint Nextel Corp. with the following attachments:
   a. Waiver Request Letter from Mark Cook for Sprint Nextel Corp to the Zoning Board of Appeals; dated December 22, 2011.
   b. Equipment Information
   c. RF Engineering Affidavit from Ryan Monde de Ramos of Alcatel-Lucent; dated December 22, 2011.
   e. Photographs with superimposed proposed antennas; prepared by Network Building & Consulting, LLC

Exhibit B: Special Permit Plan; dated 12/21/11; prepared by Salient Architects, LLC and Alcatel Lucent.

Exhibit C: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Zoning Board of Appeals; re: 442 Southwest Cutoff (ZB-2011-067); dated 01/25/2012.

Exhibit D: Supplementary information submitted January 13, 2012:
   i. Sprint Nextel Corp. FCC license
   ii. Existing and proposed indoor reliable coverage for BSO3XC144; prepared by Alcatel Lucent; received 1/13/2012.
   iii. Revised Special Permit plans dated 1/05/12

6. **50 Eastham Street (ZB-2011-068):** Attorney Garry Bracket, representative for Jacqueline J. Duval, petitioner, stated that the petitioner is seeking to subdivide the property into two lots with a single-family detached dwelling on each lot and is, consequently, seeking relief of 15-ft from the 65-ft frontage dimensional requirement for one of the two lots. He stated that an Approval Not Required Plan was approved for this lot in 1991 but that a second building was not constructed in accordance with this plan in 1992. He stated that Ms. Duval was trying to sell a lot to Mr. Mancini at which point lack of compliance was determined. He stated that no enforcement orders are on file with the City for this property and that the owner seeks to legitimize the uses.

Mr. Fontane stated that no physical changes to the lot or density are proposed and that the subdivision of the lots would merely allow for a change in ownership to two separate entities. He stated that construction of a by-right subdivision with a cul-de-sac has the potential to impact the neighborhood by increasing impervious surface; the proposed alternative allows
for the subdivision of lots without increased roadwork and thus increased cost. Mr. Abramoff stated that the cul-de-sac might also allow for higher density than 2 single-family detached dwellings. Mr. Brackett stated there are no plans in place to develop the site more. Mr. Bilotta was concerned with proximity of the property to North High School.

Upon a motion by Mr. Abramoff and seconded by Mr. Akindele, the Board voted 5-0 to close the public hearing. Upon a motion by Mr. Abramoff and seconded by Mr. Akindele, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the requested relief of 15-ft from the 65-ft frontage dimensional requirement for one of the two lots with a condition that the approval is tied to the final approved Frontage Subdivision Plan by the Planning Board and to approve the proposed findings of fact as amended by staff.

List of Exhibits.


Exhibit B: Variance Plot Plan, 50 Eastham Street; dated October 10, 2011 revised [date]; prepared B&R Survey.

Exhibit C: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Zoning Board of Appeals re: 50 Eastham Street dated January 26, 2012.

OTHER BUSINESS

7. Letter from Division of Banks regarding a proposed check casher at 342 Shrewsbury Street: Mr. Fontane stated that the letter submitted to the Board is for its information only and doesn’t require action.

8. Conflict of Interest Training Mandate: Mr. Fontane requested that Board members submit to staff an acknowledgement of receipt of summary of the Conflict of Interest Law for Municipal Employees and a proof of passing an Online Ethics Training Course.


ADJOURNMENT

Chair Freilich adjourned the meeting at 7:50 pm.