

**Planning Board**

**Worcester, Massachusetts**

**Wednesday, July 15, 1970**

**2:30 P. M. - View**

**2:30 P. M. - View**

1. Forest Hills II - subdivision
2. North Street - more than one building - preliminary
3. Elnora Drive - subdivision
4. Goldthwaite Road - more than one building - preliminary
5. Taunton Street - more than one building - preliminary

**4:00 P. M. - Regular Meeting - Room 209 - City Hall**

1. call to order
2. minutes of June 3, 1970
3. items of view
4. Upland Gardens - tabled
5. plans to be ratified
6. date of next meeting
7. any other business
8. recess

**5:30 P. M. - Dinner - Putnam and Thurston's Restaurant**

**7:30 P. M. - Public Hearings - Council Chamber - City Hall**

1. Goddard Park - subdivision
2. Cohasset Street - subdivision
3. Forest Hills II - subdivision

**8:30 P. M. - Regular Meeting - Room 209 - City Hall**

1. call to order
2. items of public hearing
- 3 adjournment

✓

The meeting of the Worcester Planning Board came to order at 4:00, Wednesday, July 15, 1970, in Room 209, City Hall.

Members present were: Lloyd Anderson, Frederic R. Butler, Carlton B. Payson, and Philip A. Segel. Others present were: Attorney Frank Karol, John J. Reney, Gerard F. McNeil, Francis J. Donahue, and Alexander A. Pridotkas.

Minutes of June 3, 1970. The minutes of the June 3, 1970 meeting were introduced. Mr. Butler moved that they be approved. Mr. Segel seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 4-0 vote.

Goldthwaite Road - more than one building - preliminary. Mr. Dominic Franchi and Douglas Liston represented the petitioner.

Mr. Liston presented the preliminary plan for 72 units with parking for 81 cars. He said that application had been made through the Hatch Act for the piping of the brook.

Mr. Segel asked if a pool were really to be put in the project.

Mr. Franchi said that the pool construction would begin at the same time as the building construction.

Mr. Segel asked Mr. Reney if the drainage appeared satisfactory. Mr. Reney said that this question had already been discussed with Mr. Liston.

Mr. McNeil asked what arrangements had been made about utility easements.

Mr. Reney explained that the easement would depend on who maintained it.

Mr. McNeil suggested that Board approval be given subject to approval by Mr. Reney. He explained that the revisions of the plan should be submitted by July 23, 1970. He suggested August 12, 1970 as the date for the public hearing.

Mr. Segel asked what zone the property was in. Mr. McNeil replied that the zone was RG-5.

Mr. Payson made a motion to approve the preliminary plan, subject to the approval of Mr. Reney. Mr. Segel seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 4-0 vote.

July 15, 1970  
~~September 9, 1970~~

North Street - more than one building - preliminary. Mr. Liston presented the preliminary plan. He explained that a driveway would be built for the resident behind the property to Sigourney Street and that the existing right of way to North Street would be abandoned. He described the 3 and 4 bedroom town houses. He said that the sewers would tie into the line on Sigourney Street. Mr. McNeil asked what was proposed at the back of the property. Mr. Liston said that this would be developed as a play area. Mr. Segel asked if this area would be for the use of the tenants or the neighborhood residents. Mr. Liston replied that he did not know. Mr. Segel asked how many square feet were involved in the play area. Mr. Liston replied that the total area was 10,000 square feet, and that 600 square feet would be paved.

Mr. McNeil asked Mr. Liston what arrangements had been made with the area residents through the City Council and the Parks Commission. Mr. Liston replied that he did not know. He said that the changes recommended by Mr. Reney had been made.

Mr. Payson made a motion to approve the preliminary plan. Mr. Segel seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 4-0 vote.

Taunton Street - more than one building - preliminary. Mr. Liston said that the plans had been reviewed by Mr. Reney.

Mr. Anderson pointed out that the plan being presented was not the same plan presented to the Board previously by Mr. McNeil. Mr. Liston explained that the plan had just been revised.

Mr. Anderson asked Mr. Liston if the developer had clear title to the property. Mr. Liston replied that the lots on both sides of a discontinued street were owned. He explained the proposal for modular town houses.

Mr. Segel asked how Mr. Reney and Mr. McNeil felt about the "private driveway" as an access. Mr. McNeil said that he would prefer the access road width to be at least 30 feet.

Mr. McNeil asked if only one sidewalk was to be constructed. Mr. Liston explained that ample sidewalks had been provided throughout the development.

Mr. Reney asked if space were provided for fire trucks to turn around.

Mr. Liston replied that there was ample room.

Mr. Reney explained that the street could not be accepted as a private street.

Mr. Segel asked if HUD were aware of this fact. Mr. Liston replied that it was.

Mr. McNeil pointed out that two sidewalks were required under the Subdivision Control Laws. Mr. Reney said that if one sidewalk requirement were waived that a 4 foot strip would be needed for snow removal.

Mr. Payson asked if lack of space were the reason for the narrow paving strip.

Mr. Liston said no, that there was enough room for a wider street.

Mr. Payson made a motion to accept the preliminary plan provided that it conform to Subdivision Control Laws.

Mr. Liston requested that one sidewalk be waived due to the difficult grade.

Mr. McNeil suggested that the sidewalk be put in from the first building to Taunton Street. Mr. Liston agreed.

Mr. Payson moved to accept the preliminary plan with the addition of a sidewalk southerly to Taunton Street and with the widening of the street pavement.

Mr. Segel seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 4-0 vote.

Providence Street - more than one building on a lot. Mr. Liston explained the changes in the proposal. He said that the number of units had been increased from 12 to 14 units, and that the access had been changed from Baltic Street to Providence Street. He explained that the revised plan would be presented at the public hearing.

Mr. McNeil asked if any buildings were to be placed on Baltic Street.

Mr. Liston replied that the Worcester Housing Authority would not allow building on Baltic Street.

Mr. Segel asked what tax arrangements had been made. Mr. Liston explained that this was a turnkey operation and that the payments to the city would be worked out by the Worcester Housing Authority.

Mr. Segel asked what formula was used to determine these payments. No one knew.

Elnora Drive - subdivision. The Board discussed the complaints received by the City Manager about sidewalk construction.

Attorney Karol said that this was essentially a civil matter, not a matter subject to a Planning Board decision.

Mr. Segel made a motion to inform the City Manager that the question was a civil matter and refer it to the Law Department. Mr. Butler seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 4-0 vote.

Upland Gardens. Mr. McNeil recommended that the plans be approved.

Mr. Segel made a motion to approve the plans subject to the approval of the City Engineer. Mr. Payson seconded the motion.

Mr. Butler asked if the objectors wouldn't go to the City Council with their complaints. Mr. Payson explained that they had no legal grounds to do so. The motion was carried by a 4-0 vote.

Date of next meeting. The date of the next meeting was set for Wednesday, August 12, 1970.

The Board recessed for dinner at 5:30 P. M., at Putnam and Thurston's Restaurant.

At 7:30 P. M. the Board met in the Council Chamber for the scheduled public hearings.

Goddard Park - subdivision. The Worcester Business Development Corporation explained that the basic question involved 469 feet of street.

Mr. Payson asked what had been done about Shrewsbury's request to move further from the municipal well area. Mr. Donahue read a letter from the Health Department of Worcester approving the subdivision. He also pointed out that preliminary approval had already been given by the Planning Board. Mr. Payson asked if this met with the department's approval. Mr. Donahue replied that it did. He asked if a name for the subdivision could be given so that the plan could be recorded.

Mr. Payson asked if the plan met with the approval of the city.

Mr. Reney replied that the plan had been discussed and approved.

Mr. Payson asked if there were any opponents to the plan. There was no response. He then declared the hearing to be closed.

Unity Village - Cohasset Street - subdivision. Mr. Raymond Moran of Thompson-Liston Associates, and Thomas Finnegan of the Worcester Housing Development Corporation spoke as proponents.

Mr. Moran presented the plans for development.

Mr. Finnegan explained that the 12 semi-detached buildings would be eligible for federal funding under Section 235.

Mr. Payson asked if there were any possible way to obtain an easement to go through to Trahan Avenue. Mr. Finnegan replied no.

Mr. Donahue said that the petition had been approved by the Health Department and that preliminary approval had been given by the Planning Board.

Mr. Payson explained the approval process to those attending the hearing.

He then asked Mr. Finnegan how wide the proposed street was to be.

Mr. Finnegan replied 50 feet.

Mr. Butler asked if sidewalks were to be installed on both sides of this street.

Mr. Moran replied that they would and that it was hoped that the street would be accepted as a city street.

Mr. Finnegan explained that off-street parking would be provided.

Mr. Payson asked if anyone were in opposition to the proposal.

Francis J. Sukis, William R. Padovano and Mrs. William R. Padovano went on record as opposed to the development.

Mr. Sukis asked how far back the houses were to be set. Mr. Finnegan replied 20 feet.

Mr. Padovano asked to see plans of the proposed units. Mr. Finnegan presented the plans and description of the units.

Mr. Sukis said that he was opposed to the development because it would depreciate the values of the surrounding homes. He explained that the owner, Mr. Fox, had refused sale of the land to him at an earlier date.

Mr. Padovano said he was also interested in purchasing the land and was refused.

Mr. Anderson explained the concept of the proposed units. Mr. Segel asked Mr. Finnegan about the cost of the units. Mr. Finnegan said that each unit would cost about 20 to 23 thousand dollars and each building would thus represent 40-46 thousand dollars of value.

Mr. Payson asked if there were any more opponents. There was no response. He then declared the hearing to be closed.

Forest Hills - Subdivision. Mr. Raymond Sansoucy and Mr. Raymond Moran spoke as proponents.

Mr. Moran explained the plan and he pointed out that Mr. Sansoucy was interested in obtaining approval for the sewer easements before the actual subdivision lots were shown so that these sewers could be put in immediately. He explained the extension of Hickory Street to Paradox Drive and Forest Hills Road.

Mr. Payson asked Mr. Donahue if this kind of plan were unusual for a subdivision plan. Mr. Donahue explained that the plan recorded at the Court House for Hickory Drive shows lots. He said that the cul-de-sac shown on this plan did not correspond to the actual cul-de-sac. He said that the definition of a subdivision involves lot lines and frontages to be shown. He said that this information did not appear on the plan presented.

Mr. Moran asked if the proposed sewers could be approved by Mr. Roney outside of the subdivision control laws. Mr. Payson replied no, that the Planning Board had full jurisdiction over the sewers in this case.

Mr. Donahue suggested that Mr. Sansoucy indicate lot lines on the plan to conform to the subdivision definition.

Mr. Payson suggested that the petition be tabled until a report could be made by the Law Department. Mr. Donahue said that the Board had until the end of August to hold the hearing. Mr. Payson suggested August 12, 1970 as the date for the hearing. Mr. Sansoucy agreed.



Attorney Karol asked if Mr. Sansoucy had sold off lots from the parcel shown. Mr. Sansoucy replied that he had. Attorney Karol asked if the failure to show these lots didn't misrepresent Mr. Sansoucy's ownership. He asked Mr. Sansoucy to indicate the boundaries of his property.

Mr. Moran explained that all the streets indicated were drawn up at the same time. He offered to draw in the house lots which had been sold.

Mr. Payson asked Mr. Moran and Mr. Sansoucy to reappear on August 12th.

Attorney Karol asked Mr. Moran to leave the original plan and the new plans with him for Law Department review.

Mr. Payson then declared the hearing to be continued until August 12.

The Board reconvened to Room 209 for their scheduled meeting.

Items of public hearing.

Goddard Park - Subdivision. Mr. Payson pointed out that the only item of concern to the Board was the road.

Mr. Reney suggested that the Board approve the plan subject to the decision of the Town of Shrewsbury.

Mr. Anderson made a motion to approve the subdivision plan subject to the approval of the Shrewsbury authorities and subject to the approval by the City Engineer. Mr. Butler seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 4-0 vote.

Cohasset Street - Subdivision. Mr. Segel made a motion to approve the plan.

Mr. Anderson seconded the motion.

Mr. Reney suggested that an access should be made to Trahan Avenue, but he said this was not an engineering requirement. The motion was carried by a 4-0 vote.

Forest Hills - Subdivision. Mr. Anderson made a motion to table the item.

Mr. Butler seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 4-0 vote.

The meeting adjourned at 8:40 P.M.