

**Planning Board**

**Worcester, Massachusetts**

**Wednesday, August 19, 1970**

**3:00 P. M. - View**

**Agenda**

**3:00 P. M. - View**

1. Hooper Street - housing development
2. North Street - more than one building on a lot
3. Providence Street - more than one building on a lot
4. Bridgeport Street - more than one building on a lot

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

1. call to order
2. Forest Hills Section II - subdivision
3. Lynnwood Lane - bond review
4. Lincoln Street zone change - on the table
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**

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

1. North Street - more than one building on a lot
2. Providence Street - more than one building on a lot
3. Bridgeport Street - more than one building on a lot

**9:00 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 P. M. on Wednesday, August 19, 1970, in Room 209, City Hall.

Members present were: Lloyd Anderson, Frederic R. Butler, Carl H. Koontz, Carlton B. Payson and Philip A. Segel. Others present were: Charles Abdella, Francis J. Donahue, Gerard F. McNeil and Alexander A. Pridotkas.

Lincoln Street - zone change. Attorney Bernstein, Mr. Cassavant, and Mr. Harrington were in attendance.

Mr. Payson explained that the petition had been tabled because of the lack of time and not because of the merits of the petition itself.

Mr. Anderson asked Mr. McNeil to summarize the report on this subject prepared by the Planning Department.

Mr. McNeil outlined the five alternatives to the developers original proposal.

1. 91 acres RL-7, 10 acres BL-1.0 in addition to the existing BL-1.0 zone.
2. 76 acres RL-7, 26 acres BL-1.0.
3. 76 acres RL-7, 26 acres RG-5, with existing BL-1.0 strip maintained.
4. 91 acres RL-7, 10 acres BL-1.0, with existing BL-1.0 zone eliminated.
5. 102 acres RG-5, with existing BL-1.0 zone maintained.

Mr. Segel asked Attorney Bernstein if the Planned Unit Development project involved any real estate subsidies. Attorney Bernstein replied that it did not.

Mr. Segel asked if the Planned Unit Development construction involved any cost to the city such as costs for sewers or streets. Attorney Bernstein replied that to his knowledge, no such cost was involved.

Mr. Payson thanked Mr. McNeil for his very useful presentation, and he asked how the Board would like to conduct its discussion.

Mr. Anderson asked if Mr. Johnson had been contacted regarding the traffic pattern changes, in reference to possible cost to the city. Mr. McNeil replied that a traffic light would have to be installed on Lincoln Street at the entrance to the Planned Unit Development and the Ramada Inn.

Mr. Koontz asked Mr. McNeil to indicate the existing entrances to Lincoln Plaza in relation to the new Planned Unit Development entrance. Mr. McNeil did so, and he suggested that the city's investment would be in the neighborhood of \$15,000.

Mr. Segel asked Attorney Bernstein to give the estimated investment in the area and possible tax returns to the city. Attorney Bernstein replied that the present land assessment was \$25,000. He said that the investment would be in the neighborhood of 50 million dollars.

Mr. Koontz pointed out that the Board agreed with the plan for development of the area, but he indicated that the Board wanted the most restricted zone that would still allow the development to take place. He said that of course the petitioners wanted the least restrictive zone for the development. This, he said, was the element of question.

Mr. Payson said that the Planning Board's first responsibility was for the protection of the city as a whole and for the proper development of land. He pointed out that the Board needed to maintain zoning control for this purpose. He suggested that the necessary zoning control for the Planned Unit Development would be RL-7 zone.

Mr. Koontz observed that the first proposal would almost force strip development of Lincoln Street. He suggested that while the second proposal was less restrictive, that it might be preferable for proper development.

Mr. McNeil agreed that strip development along Lincoln Street was not in the best interests of the city. He suggested that alternatives #1 and #4 might be too restrictive for proper development. He said that commercial development should either be concentrated outside of the Planned Unit Development itself with strict limits within, or should be permitted within the Planned Unit Development with strict limits without.

Mr. Payson asked if Mr. McNeil were proposing alternate #2, since there was no provision for commercial development in alternate #4.

Mr. McNeil pointed out that 72,000 square feet of commercial space would be allowed within the proposed Planned Unit Development, and that 500,000 square feet of commercial space would be possible within the proposed 750 foot BL-1.0 zone.

Mr. Koontz asked if Mr. McNeil had any idea of the effect of business uses within the Planned Unit Development on Lincoln Plaza.

Mr. McNeil replied that the development of this BL-1.0 zone would be of a much lower key and that the kind of business included would be quite different from the Lincoln Plaza business uses.

Mr. Payson indicated that the Board would have less difficulty in making its decision if more information on the 15 acres in question had been given. He said that the business zone could always be changed at a later date. He said that a business use in that area would be fine if the developer would provide more information.

Mr. Anderson agreed, and he said that the Board actually hadn't heard that much about the Planned Unit Development in the proposal. He said that the only clear commitment was the Ramada Inn and that there was no definite commitment for a Planned Unit Development. He said he was hesitant to go ahead.

Mr. Koontz agreed. He said that if the zone were changed to BL-1.0, the Board would be recommending to the Council that anything permitted as part of a BL-1.0 zone would be the proper land use for the area. He said that the Board should consider this when voting.

Mr. Butler expressed his concern for the precedent set if the zone change were granted. He said that if the Board accepted the developers proposal for a zone change in this case, the Board would have to accept similar changes in the future.

He said that he favored alternative #4.

Mr. Koontz suggested that alternative #4 would insure that the developers proceed one step at a time.

Mr. Segel pointed out that this method would not work out financially.

Mr. Butler said that financing was not the issue at hand, that the question of precedent was vital.

Mr. Payson asked why lenders would be so disturbed by restrictive zoning.

Attorney Bernstein replied that he did not have an answer. He said that banks were less concerned about development than they were about the sale price of a piece of land at auction. He said that restrictive zoning would kill the entire project.

Mr. Butler said that the city was very anxious to see this kind of development.

Attorney Bernstein replied that alternative #4 was totally unacceptable and would kill the project.

Mr. Payson pointed out that the developers could petition the Board of Appeals for the changes they want even if the Council denies the zone change.

Attorney Bernstein replied that if that happened, the project would no longer make financial sense. He said that the bankers put these kind of projects together. He explained that since 150 feet along Lincoln Street was already zoned BL-1.0, and since the access road would take up about 1.5 acres of business land, what the Board seemed so concerned about amounted to only 6 or 8 acres of additional business land along Lincoln Street.

Mr. Koontz asked Attorney Bernstein how the developers would feel about alternative #2. Attorney Bernstein replied that alternative #2 was acceptable.

Mr. Segel said that since there was no opposition to the proposal at the hearing and since Attorney Bernstein could ~~except~~ alternative #2, he moved that the

*Accept*

Board approve alternative #2. Mr. Koontz seconded the motion.

Mr. Anderson said that he was still concerned about the development itself. He said that the Board needs control of the land development with this kind of loose proposal.

Mr. Koontz asked Mr. McNeil what the most ambitious development would be under an RL-7 zone. Mr. McNeil replied that a Planned Unit Development represented the most dense development.

Mr. Anderson replied that the Board had not seen plans for a Planned Unit Development.

Attorney Bernstein asked the Board to understand the cost of the kind of plans it was requesting. He said that these plans would cost close to \$100,000. He said that it was unfair for someone to ask the developers to spend this kind of money on a chance.

Mr. Payson said that if the developers did not build a Planned Unit Development, they would have to appear to the Board under the subdivision control laws.

Mr. Koontz pointed out that if a Planned Unit Development constituted proper land use, then RL-7 constituted proper land use.

Mr. Segel asked what percentage of the land would go for actual buildings.

Attorney Bernstein replied that he did not know, but that the density would be 17 units per acre.

Mr. Anderson asked Mr. McNeil how he felt about alternative #2. Mr. McNeil replied that this was an acceptable compromise and that it would give the Planning Board adequate control.

Mr. Payson asked what leasing arrangements would be made for the Ramada Inn.

Mr. Harrington, a partner with Mr. Mingolla, said that the Consolidated Motor Inns would be leasing the land from the option holder. He indicated a preference for alternative #2.

Attorney Bernstein said that the developers had already turned down opportunities to finance the project because they felt that the land use presented by the buyers was not compatible with the business use, the Planned Unit Development, and the Motor Inn. He said that the developer had already turned down the chance to make a fast dollar. He said that the developer wants the three parcels involved developed as a whole project.

Mr. Anderson asked Mr. Harrington if he were only concerned with ten acres.

Mr. Harrington replied yes.

Mr. Koontz asked if the property 200 feet to the north of the Lincoln Country Club could be rezoned RL-7 to insure a continuous zone.

Mr. McNeil replied that the Planning Board could initiate a petition to this effect, but that it would require a new public hearing.

Mr. Payson called for a vote on Mr. Segel's motion to recommend alternative #2.

The motion was carried by a 4-~~0~~<sup>1</sup> vote. Mr. Butler opposed.

Lynnwood Lane - bond review. Attorney R. Norman Peters represented the plaintiff.

Mr. Payson asked if Ciociolo Builders had been notified. Mr. Donahue replied that they had been notified and that they had not communicated with the department since. He said that the bond had been extended until October 15.

Mr. Koontz asked what remained to be done.

Mr. Donahue explained that the base coat had been put down and that it had been ruined by the heavy equipment used for construction. He said that Mr. Franchi would not accept it.

Mr. Koontz asked for a recommendation from the Engineer.

Mr. Anderson asked what the Planning Board should do, if the bond should be rescinded. Mr. McNeil suggested that the Board let Mr. Ciociolo know that the bond would not be extended again.

Attorney Peters explained that Mr. Ciociolo had many excuses about the work not being completed and that the neighbors were angry about the whole thing.

Mr. Anderson said that if the Board waits until October to act, that it would be too late.

Mr. Payson suggested that the Board give definite notification to Mr. Ciociolo that if the work is not completed, the bond will be forfeited.

Mr. Segel made a motion that this be done.

Mr. Koontz seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 5-0 vote.

Forest Hills, Section II - subdivision. Mr. McNeil explained that Mr. Liston would be present at the evening meeting and that the Board might consider it then.

Date of next meeting. The date of the next meeting was set for Wednesday, September 9.

At 5:30 P. M. the Board recessed to Putnam and Thurston's Restaurant for dinner.

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

North Street - more than one building on a lot. Attorney Donald Conte represented the petitioner.

Attorney Conte presented renderings and plans of the proposed housing, and he explained the 9 units on North Street were to be built on land presently owned by the city, and that 6 units on Sidney Street were to be built on land presently owned privately. He explained that the general housing units would be handled by the Worcester Housing Authority, and that the school survey had indicated that the present facilities were adequate to handle the extra number of children.

Mr. Robert McHugh, of North Street, pointed out that something had to be done about the existing school facility. He asked about the neighborhood park proposed for the city owned land.



Mr. Payson explained to Mr. McHugh that questions could be brought up after the presentation.

Mr. McNeil asked Mr. Conte about the number and size of the proposed units.

Mr. Conte replied that there would be 9-4 bedroom units and 6-3 bedroom units, for a total of 15 units.

Mr. McNeil asked Mr. Conte about the provisions for recreational areas.

Mr. McHugh pointed out that there were no local parks in the area.

Mr. Conte introduced Richard Rosen, of <sup>i</sup>Starling-Homex, <sup>Corporation</sup> and asked him to explain the recreation arrangements.

Mr. Rosen explained that a paved play area would be constructed within the housing area, that a grassy play area would be built above and behind the housing area.

Mr. McNeil asked how many children were anticipated in the area. Mr. Conte explained that there was no way of knowing, since the houses would fall under Worcester Housing Authority jurisdiction as soon as they were completed.

Mr. McHugh asked how many children would be allowed to sleep in one room.

Mr. Payson explained that this is governed by state law, and that the houses would be under the jurisdiction of the Worcester Housing Authority. He said that this issue was not of concern to the Planning Board. He pointed out that recreational facilities were not required of private developers. He said that the Board was only concerned with the design, the street layout and construction, and the building layout.

Mr. Payson asked if anyone else were opposed to the plan. There was no response. He then declared the hearing to be closed.

Bridgeport Street - more than one building on a lot. Attorney Conte spoke for the petitioner. He explained the proposed development of 2-1/2 acres for 25 town house units. He said that there would be 17-4 bedroom units and 8-3 bedroom units.

Mr. Payson asked the opponents to give their views.

Attorney Robert X. Tivnan spoke for some of the opponents.

Attorney Tivnan said that the residents wanted to know more about the project.

He pointed out that the residents had no recourse to the City Council, and he asked if the project met the city's requirements for that zone.

Mr. McNeil explained that in the RL-7 zone, town houses were allowed by special permit. He explained that to obtain the special permit, the developer did not have to show hardship, only that the proposed use would not be detrimental to the neighborhood and that the proposal would not violate the zoning regulations. He said that the proposal does conform to the zoning ordinance.

Attorney Tivnan pointed out that the zoning ordinance specifies that certain area requirements be met. He asked if the proposal met these requirements.

Mr. McNeil said that the lot contained 110,000 square feet, and that the zoning ordinance only requires 75,000 square feet for the 25 town houses. He said that the proposal was well within the prescribed limits.

Attorney Tivnan asked if the zoning ordinance didn't require 7,000 square feet for the first unit plus 3,000 square feet for each additional unit.

Mr. McNeil replied that these requirements do not apply to town houses.

Mr. Payson asked Mr. McNeil to explain the various housing categories described in the zoning ordinance. Mr. McNeil did so.

Attorney Tivnan said that he had been talking to the Council and to the City Manager, and he said that they would like to have this information about the yard requirements. He said that he would also like to know how much area would be devoted to streets.

Mr. Payson explained that the proposed requirements had been verified by both the Planning Department and the Law Department, and he said that these questions related to the merits of the zoning ordinance itself and not to the proposal at hand. He asked Attorney Tivnan to confine his remarks to the proposal at hand. Attorney Tivnan said that the density proposed was much higher than that allowable in an RL-7 zone.

Mr. Payson explained that the proposal met the zoning requirements, and that the units were one family homes.

Attorney Tivnan said that he had done some research on the proposal, and that 105,000 acres were needed for the 25 units. He asked how much land was devoted to streets.

Mr. McNeil explained that the street would not be a public street and therefore would not be considered as such, that the street and driveways were included in the total computation.

Attorney Tivnan asked if the snow plowing would be done by the development owners instead of the city. Mr. McNeil replied that it would.

Attorney Tivnan said that he believed that information was being withheld from the people. He asked what the units would cost.

Mr. Payson explained that the cost was immaterial since the units would be rental units. He pointed out that the hearing was concerned with a proposal for more than one building on a lot. He said that the Board was only concerned with the proper use of the land.

Attorney Tivnan repeated his question about the cost of the units.

Mr. Segel pointed out that similar units built by the same manufacturer on Hooper Street cost \$22,000 to \$23,000 per unit.

Attorney Tivnan pointed out the problems of traffic and nuisances. He said that the proposal presented a question of policy, that by approving the proposal, the Board would be tampering with an RL-7 zone. He said that Councillor Cotton supported him in this view. He said that technically, the Board of Appeals could grant a Special Permit for the construction of these units in the Bridgeport Street area and throughout the city, and that the result would be a city of ticky-tacky homes everywhere. He said that no one would want to build single family homes anymore. He said that projects like this would disturb the neighborhoods of the citizens. He asked about the traffic and street problems. He said that there was a real problem on Taunton Street in the winter. He said that the existing road would be cut off by a cul-de-sac, creating further problems. He said that the residents were strongly opposed to the proposal on this basis, and he used as evidence a petition signed by 214 residents and circulated by Mr. Adelle Richmond.

Mr. Payson said that the petition had not reached the Planning Board.

Mrs. Richmond asked to be heard as an opponent.

Mr. Payson asked her to confine her remarks to the questions of the zoning ordinance. He explained that the Board must consider the proposal on the basis of the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Richmond pointed out that the site was not suitable for this kind of development, and that it would create problems of traffic, congestion, and parking. She said that these problems would be compounded by winter weather. She asked the Board to leave the zoning as it was.

Mr. Payson explained that the hearing had nothing to do with a zone change, that it was concerned with a special permit provided for in the zoning ordinance.

Mrs. Richmond asked about the problem of Bridgeport Street in the winter.

She said that there was little sanding and no plowing done.

Mr. Payson explained that this problem did not concern the Planning Board.

Mrs. Richmond asked where the residents would park, since the project tenants would use all existing parking places.

Mr. Payson explained that the project would have its own off-street parking.

Mrs. Richmond asked how the tenants would get to the project.

Mr. McNeil explained that Dillon Street would be improved and would improve the access.

Mrs. Richmond said that Dillon Street had nothing to do with the question.

She asked about snow removal.

Mr. Payson said that the developers would take care of snow removal.

Mrs. Richmond pointed out the problem of children near the Jamesbury construction site. She said that there were just as many children on Bridgeport Street.

Mr. Payson explained that the Board had to consider the case in terms of the zoning ordinance, and he asked Mrs. Richmond to confine her remarks to it.

Mr. Peter Campanale, of 41 Dillon Street, asked the Board if it could consider the suitability of the site.

Mr. Payson explained that the Board was governed by the law, and that law was the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Campanale asked about the suitability of the site, and the projects threat to the safety of the residents. He said that the area was congested as it was.

He said that the project would lower property values, and that this fact

wasn't being considered by the Board. He said that everyone on the Board

lived in nice homes and couldn't appreciate the problem being faced by the

Bridgeport Street residents.

Mr. Payson said that no one questioned the need for new apartments in Worcester, until the apartments were proposed in their own back yard. He stressed the fact that the Board had to act according to the rules governing it.

Attorney Tivnan quoted the zoning ordinance, page 13, about the conditions under which the Board of Appeals can hear a case.

Mr. Payson explained that this was not the Board of Appeals, and he explained the rules governing the Planning Board.

Attorney Tivnan reread the conditions governing Board of Appeals decisions, and he said that these conditions applied within a development.

Mr. Paul Lavoie, of 76 Granite Street, asked if the Planning Board had anything to do with the school problem.

Mr. Payson replied that it did not, that this was taken care of by the School Department.

Mr. Lavoie pointed to the congestion created by the project, and he asked about the snow problem.

Mr. Payson said that the snow would be taken care of on the property of the developers.

Mr. Lavoie said that lower income families would rent the 4 bedroom apartments and that this would degrade property values.

Mr. Payson explained that the Planning Board was not concerned with the tenants of the project. He asked that the residents confine their remarks to questions of layout and zoning.

Mr. Edward Kalinowski, of 14 Wabash Avenue, pointed out that a special permit could be granted as long as the proposed use did not affect the surrounding area.

He said that the kind of people that would rent the apartments would detract from the surrounding property values.

Mr. Frank Leone, of 39 Dillon Street, pointed out that Dillon Street was a private way.

Mr. Payson explained that the city will not be involved with plowing the developed area so that it would not cost the city anything.

Mr. Ruohonen, of 20 Taunton Street, said that he bought his home on the assumption that RL-7 was a single family zone. He said that he had put all his savings into his home, and that he would now be forced to leave. He said that the neighborhood would be overrun with children.

Mr. Edward Kaminski, of 43 Dillon Street, asked if the Planning Board were in favor of the housing. He said that the residents had no recourse, that the Board represented the residents, but it wouldn't allow the residents to say what they wanted to say.

Mr. Payson explained that the residents could go to the Board of Appeals and that the Board of Appeals had the final say in the matter.

Mr. Kaminski asked if the Board would recommend that the Board of Appeals approve the plan.

Mr. Payson explained that the Board of Appeals would make its own decision. He said that within 21 days of the Appeals Board decision, the citizens could take the case to the Superior Court of Massachusetts. He said that the citizens do have recourse.

Mrs. Joan Conroy, of 21 Taunton Street, asked if the Board were interested in the construction of the units.

Mr. Payson said that this was not the job of the Planning Board, that this was covered by the Building Code and the Buildings Department.

Mrs. Mary O'Leary, of 28 Bridgeport Street, said that she disapproved of the whole proposal. She pointed out that the neighborhood was composed of single buildings on single lots, and that the Board was not concerned with the effect of such a proposal on the neighborhood. She asked the Board to look at Great Brook Valley, and she asked what the buildings would look like in 10 years.

Mr. Payson explained that the proposed units were well built.

Mr. Lavoie said that the homes in the area were maintained for 52 weeks a year, and he asked if the Worcester Housing Authority were prepared to do the same.

Mr. Payson repeated that the Board could only concern itself with zoning.

Mr. Edward Allen, of 36 Dillon Street, suggested that the units be built on the Island or on Providence Street, where the housing is needed. He said there was no housing shortage on Bridgeport Street.

Mr. James Buffone, of 46 Dillon Street, explained that the units would literally be built in his front yard. He said he had a 3 year old ranch house. He asked why the Board wanted to ruin his land. He asked why single family homes weren't proposed for the area. He said that he paid almost \$1,000 a year in taxes, and that the residents wanted single family homes there. He said that the neighborhood would disintegrate, that the residents would have to move out of town. He asked the Planning Board, as representatives of the people, to consider what was proper for the area.

*Mrs.* Patricia Foley, of 44 Dillon Street, asked why the area was considered proper for this kind of development.

Mr. Payson explained that the land was available and that it was purchased for this purpose.

Mrs. Foley said that the Board should try to plan neighborhoods for people of similar income.



Mr. Allen Johnson, of 74 Granite Street, asked where the decision would be published. Mr. Payson replied that it would be published in the Worcester Telegram.

Mr. Johnson said that the law only allowed 1 or 2 family dwellings on a lot. He asked how the Board could recommend such a violation.

Mr. Payson asked Mr. McNeil to read the permitted uses in an RL-7 zone.

Mr. McNeil did so.

Mr. Alex Driscoll, of 42 Dillon Street, asked what income the city would get from the property.

Mr. Payson said that this was not pertinent to the case. He said that the city would get an income from the property.

Mr. Driscoll asked that the statement concerning income balancing be ignored.

He said that none of the residents wished to discriminate against anyone.

Attorney Tivnan raised the question of spot zoning, and he said that it was debatable whether this constituted spot zoning. He said that recourse through the courts was difficult, and that decisions were seldom overruled.

He said that the Board would be setting a policy for the future. He pointed out that people wanted protection when they bought a house. He said that the proposed units were pre-fabs, constructed of pressed wood and other cheap materials.

Mr. Segel pointed out that the units were well constructed, and that buildings themselves do not downgrade an area, people do.

Attorney Tivnan raised the question of snob zoning within the city. He said that the result of such a policy would be a city composed of the very rich and the very poor.

Mr. Payson asked if anyone else wanted to be heard. There was no response. He then declared the hearing to be closed.

Providence Street - more than one building on a lot. Attorney Donald Conte and Douglas Liston spoke for the petitioner. Mr. Conte explained that the building system to be used would be the same as proposed for Bridgeport Street. He added that all units were erected by local Worcester labor and by union workers. He said that there were 14 units proposed for the site, 8-4 bedroom units and 6-3 bedroom units, with off-street parking provided.

Mr. Reney pointed out that Upsala Street School presently had 380 students and that its maximum capacity was 400 students.

Mr.<sup>s</sup> Shirley Rovezzi explained that the schools were still inadequate for present needs. She said that the Providence Street School had 100-150 extra students.

Mr. McNeil pointed out that the people who would live in the proposed houses already lived in the area. He said that school districts were constantly changed to accommodate any school population changes.

Mrs. Rovezzi asked why the site was considered suitable for this kind of development.

Mr. Payson replied that it was readily developable.

Mrs. Rovezzi asked what the Board could concern itself with.

Mr. McNeil read the appropriate section of the subdivision control laws, and he said that the main question was the traffic capacity of Providence Street.

Mr. Richard Karollis said that there was a great deal of traffic on Providence Street already. He brought up the question of the brook running through the property.

Mrs. Valerie Chojnicki, 21 Baltic Road, asked about the water drainage into Baltic Road.

Mr. Liston explained the topographical data and the results of the test borings. He said that cinders were found from 3 to 14 feet down, and that below the cinders lay glacial till. He explained the new grading and drainage plan, and he said that nothing would flow on the surface of the land. He said that the surveyors had found no brook on the property.

Mr. Reney said that he would view the site to check on the existence of a brook.

Mrs. Chojnicki asked about access on a private road. Attorney Conte replied that Baltic Road would not be used for access.

Mrs. Chojnicki asked if a fence could be placed along Baltic Road to prevent access. Attorney Conte said that any fencing would have to be done by the Worcester Housing Authority.

Mr. Payson explained that no decision would be made until the Board knew whether a brook ran through the property or not.

Mr. Payson asked if anyone had any other questions. There was no response. He then declared the hearing to be closed.

The Board reconvened to Room 209 for their regular scheduled meeting.

Items of public hearing.

Forest Hills Section II - subdivision. Mr. Douglas Liston presented the subdivision plan.

Mr. McNeil said that it appeared acceptable. He asked why the water and sewer easements weren't contiguous. Mr. Reney said that it appeared to be a question of grade. Mr. Liston explained that the sewer had to be placed below the water line.

Mr. Anderson made a motion to approve the definitive plan. Mr. Koontz seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 5-0 vote.

Providence Street - more than one building on a lot. Mr. Anderson made a motion to table the petition until a report on the brook had been made.

Mr. Segel seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 5-0 vote.

North Street - more than one building on a lot. Mr. McNeil recommended that the petition be tabled due to the conflict between the Council and the Manager on the recreation facilities and the number of units. He suggested that the matter be referred to the Manager for clarification.

Mr. Koontz made a motion to table the petition until the questions were clarified. Mr. Segel seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 5-0 vote.

Howe Street - priority. Mr. Reney explained that there were no sewers on Howe Street, and he questioned whether sewers were needed. He suggested that the question be brought up at the next meeting.

Mr. Segel moved that the question be tabled.

Mr. Butler seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 5-0 vote.

Providence Street - more than one building on a lot. Mr. Anderson made a motion to table the petition. Mr. Koontz seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 5-0 vote.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 P. M.