

Planning Board
Worcester, Massachusetts

Wednesday, September 9, 1970
3:00 P. M. - City Hall

Agenda

3:00 P. M. - View

1. Hancock Farms - bond extension
2. Salisbury Farms Section II - release of bond
3. Salisbury Farms Section IV - expired bond
4. Clark St. Housing Development - requested plan change
5. Longview Heights Section II - expired bond
6. Hillsboro Village Section V - expired bond

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

1. call to order
2. minutes of August 12, 1970
3. items of view
4. Bridgeport St. housing - on the table
5. Providence St. housing - on the table
6. North St. housing - on the table
7. Howe St. - priority
8. plans to be ratified
9. date of next meeting
10. any other business
11. recess

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

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

1. Salisbury St. - zone change from RS-10 to RL-7

9:00 P. M. - Regular Meeting - Room 209, City Hall

1. call to order
2. item of public hearing
3. adjournment

✓

The meeting of the Planning Board came to order at 4:00 P. M., Wednesday, September 9, 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, Alexander A. Pridotkas and John J. Reney.

Hancock Farms - bond extension. Mr. Reney reported that there was considerable ledge in the area, and he suggested that the probable financial difficulties were a reason for the bond extension request.

Mr. Segel made a motion to extend the bond for one year.

Mr. McNeil recommended that the bond be extended until July 1, 1970, rather than a full year. He suggested that if the expiration date were September 1, 1971, the Board would have little recourse if the work were not completed.

Mr. Koontz asked what remained to be developed, and if there had been any complaints from the property owners.

Mr. McNeil replied that one house lacked completion and that no complaints had been received. He said that the sewer and water lines were done.

Mr. Segel revised his motion to extend the bond until July 1, 1971. Mr. Koontz seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 4-0 vote.

Salisbury Farms Section II - release of bond. Mr. Donahue reported that the project had been completed and that Mr. Hynes recommended that the bond be released.

Mr. Segel made a motion to release the bond. Mr. Butler seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 4-0 vote.

Salisbury Farms Section IV - expired bond. Mr. Donahue reported that the \$45,600 bond, in the name of the Sisters of Our Lady of Mercy, had expired on July 1, 1970.

Mr. McNeil said that the property in question, being developed by Ciociolo Builders, was the property involved in the easement wording change.

Mr. Donahue said that Mr. Liston had approached Mr. Ciociolo with that question, and that the response had been rather cool.

Mr. McNeil recommended that the question be resolved at the next meeting to give Mr. Liston a chance to speak to Mr. Ciociolo about the bond.

Mr. Anderson asked that Mr. Ciociolo be informed of the action pending.

Clark Street - Housing Development - requested plan change. Mr. Donahue reported that Mr. Lank had requested permission to build a 6 foot sidewalk next to the street berm instead of the 5-1/2 foot grass strip and 4 foot paving strip designated on the plans. Mr. Donahue explained that the reasons for doing this included a steep banking, snow removal, and a request from Mr. Hynes.

Mr. Segel made a motion that Mr. Lank be permitted to install the 6 foot sidewalk, and that the sidewalk requirement of the Subdivision Control Laws be waived.

Mr. Koontz asked about the placement of telephone and light poles on the sidewalk. Mr. Butler asked if fixtures placed on the sidewalks would be obstructions, such as fire hydrants. Mr. Reney replied that the hydrants would be placed back from the sidewalk and that the 6 foot sidewalk was preferable.

Mr. Butler seconded the motion to waive the sidewalk requirement. The motion was carried by a 4-0 vote.

Mr. Koontz suggested that since the question of a 6 foot sidewalk next to the street came up so often that the Board should review the Subdivision Control Laws. He suggested the adoption to two standards for sidewalks,

which the developer could choose from. Mr. Segel agreed that the 6 foot sidewalk had many advantages which should be considered.

Mr. McNeil said that the Subdivision Control Laws were under review and that the suggestion would be considered.

Mr. Butler asked if the Board should consider standards for fire hydrant placement at the same time. Mr. Roney said that this was unnecessary, since the city sets these standards.

Longview Heights Section II - expired bond. Mr. Donahue reported that the bond of \$4,000 was originally signed in 1965 and that it had been extended 4 times.

Mr. Segel asked if the city would be short changed if the extension were allowed.

Mr. Donahue pointed out the area as the one that appeared to be completed.

Mr. McNeil suggested that the request be considered after the Commissioner of Public Works had made a report.

Mr. Koontz asked the status of such an insurance bond. Attorney Abdella replied that it was still up to the Planning Board to decide on an extension. If the extension is not granted, he explained that action must be taken by the Law Department.

Mr. Anderson asked if any time limit were involved. Attorney Abdella replied that the bond can still be claimed.

Mr. McNeil said that a report should be made on the question before any decision is reached.

Mr. Segel made a motion to table the petition and refer it to the Commissioner of Public Works for a report. Mr. Butler seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 4-0 vote.

Hillsboro Village Section V - expired bond. Mr. Donahue reported that the \$11,400 bond had expired on October 1, 1969.

Mr. Segel asked what the department recommended.

Mr. McNeil asked Mr. Donahue if an extension had been requested. Mr. Donahue replied that none had.

Mr. McNeil recommended that the Board request a report from Mr. Papale and the Commissioner of Public Works.

Mr. Segel made a motion that the Board request such a report before a decision is reached. Mr. Butler seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 4-0 vote.

Hudson Street - request for re-appeal to the Board of Appeals. Attorney Albert E. Maykel represented the petitioner.

Attorney Abdella explained that leave to withdraw was granted by the Board of Appeals in August, 1970 when the petition was presented to them prematurely.

Mr. Segel asked if Attorney Maykel was requesting permission to return to the Appeals Board. Attorney Maykel replied that he was.

Mr. Donahue presented the plan of the lot in question.

Attorney Maykel explained that the variance was granted 2 years ago by the Board of Appeals, but that the decision had been overturned by the Superior Court on an appeal by an abutter. He said that this abutter had since moved.

Mr. Anderson asked if the leave to withdraw would have any impact on the petition. Attorney Abdella replied that there would be no impact, that the application had simply been prematurely filed.

Mr. McNeil explained that Attorney Maykel wanted leave to appear before the Board of Appeals before October 23, 1970, the two year limit. He explained to

Attorney Maykel that it was necessary that he provide new evidence applicable to the variance law to the Board.

Mr. Anderson agreed that the Board needed this information for a decision to be made.

Attorney Maykel explained the additional hardship. He said that the Board of Assessors had taxed the lot in question at the same rate as the adjoining business property on Park Avenue. He explained that the land was vacant and not used for business purposes, that it had been idle for the last 5 years. He said that the property was put up for sale after the variance was refused, but that no one wanted it. He said that the additional taxes on unusable land constituted a financial hardship to the petitioner.

Mr. Butler asked if the increase in taxes applied only to the lot in question. Attorney Maykel replied that the original valuation was 22 cents per square foot, and that this valuation was raised to 1.00 per square foot, from \$2,200 to \$10,000, an increase of \$7,800.

Mr. McNeil asked if any other property on the street were taxed at this rate. Attorney Maykel replied no.

Mr. Koontz said that the hardship appeared valid, and he moved that the petitioner be granted leave to return to the Board of Appeals. Mr. Anderson seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 4-0 vote.

Attorney Maykel asked if it was necessary to wait until October 23 to return to the Board of Appeals. Mr. McNeil replied that the decision was effective immediately.

Bridgeport Street - Housing. Mr. McNeil explained that it was necessary for the Board to take final action on the petition. He said that the Board of Appeals had granted leave to withdraw upon request of the petitioner.

Attorney Abdella explained that since the Special Permit was not granted, there was nothing the Board could do except grant the petitioner leave to withdraw.

Mr. Koontz made a motion to grant the petitioner leave to withdraw. Mr. Butler seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 4-0 vote.

Providence Street - Housing. Mr. McNeil explained that the petition had been tabled pending an investigation by Mr. Reney.

Mr. Reney said that he had sent Mr. Sharistanian and Mr. Liston to see the property, and that he had viewed the property at a later date. He reported that there was no brook in evidence on the property.

Mr. McNeil asked if the engineering plan was adequate. Mr. Reney replied that it was.

Mr. McNeil said that the objections concerned traffic and density. He said that the objections on this basis were not valid.

Mr. Koontz made a motion that the petition be granted. Mr. Segel seconded the motion.

Mr. Anderson asked if there were any problem about traffic being tied into Baltic Street. Mr. Reney replied that the grade was sufficiently steep to prevent this. The motion was carried by a 5-0 vote.

North Street - Housing. Mr. Segel asked about the newspaper article on the transfer of land on North Street. Mr. McNeil explained that a hearing before the Council was scheduled for September 18 concerning the transfer of city owned land for the project.

Mr. Segel made a motion that the petition be granted.

Mr. Payson asked why the petition had been previously tabled. Mr. McNeil replied that the proposal included 15 units, that the residents of the area wanted no more than 9 units on the city owned land, that they wanted a play area on the property for area residents. He said that he had spoken to Mr. Rosen of Sterling Homex about the proposals, and that he had agreed to both of them, if they were stipulated by the Planning Board.

Mr. Segel asked if the Board were concerned with the 9 units or the 15 units. Mr. McNeil said that the vote was for 15 units, that 6 units were to be constructed on private land. He said that the Board could stipulate that a recreational area for the neighborhood be provided.

Mr. Koontz asked how the Board could legislate such a land use on private land.

Mr. McNeil replied that such a recreational use could be suggested. He said that the Board could recommend that the Council incorporate a deed restriction when the land was sold.

Attorney Abdella asked if the Board approval required that a plan be signed.

Mr. McNeil replied that it did. Attorney Abdella suggested that the recommendation be incorporated in the plan.

Mr. McNeil asked if the Board wanted to hold off until after the Council had made its decision and until the plan had been revised.

Mr. Payson asked if it weren't the city's job to provide recreational areas. He suggested that the Board could not require such areas to be built.

Mr. Koontz said that since there was no way to enforce such a requirement, that it would be a bad idea to recommend it.

Mr. McNeil reported that the land in question was owned by the city and that the Board could incorporate a restriction in the deed. Attorney Abdella agreed that such a restriction would be effective.

Mr. Segel amended his motion to approve the plan with a deed restriction applicable to the northwest corner that it be reserved and developed for playground purposes.

Attorney Abdella suggested that the Board have the Council request the Law Department to draw up such a deed.

Mr. Koontz seconded Mr. Segel's motion. The motion was carried by a 5-0 vote. Howe Street - priority. Mr. Donahue reported that no sewers were needed, but that the street was only 33 feet wide and would rate a #5 priority. He said that special circumstances may necessitate a #2 priority.

Mr. Segel made a motion that the petition be given a #2 priority, since it was in an urban renewal area.

Mr. Reney said that if the street were constructed, surface drainage would have to be put in.

Mr. Koontz suggested that since the street was of minor importance, that a #5 priority would be proper.

Mr. Payson made a motion that the street be given a #5 priority. Mr. Koontz seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 5-0 vote.

Plans to be ratified. Mr. Payson moved that the following plans signed by the Secretary be ratified:

#1395 - plan of land at Main and Pleasant Streets, owned by the Worcester County National Bank and Peoples Savings Bank, signed 8/19/70

#1396 - plan of land on Madison Street, Section "AA", owned by Wyman Gordon Company, signed 8/20/70

#1397 - plan of land on Madison Street Section "BB" and "CC", owned by Wyman Gordon Company, signed 8/20/70

- #1398 - plan of land on Greendale Avenue, owned by Ralza F. and Martha M. Horton, signed 8/20/70
- #1399 - plan of ^{land} on Barton Place, owned by the Peoples Savings Bank, signed 8/28/70
- #1400 - plan of land on Grafton Street, owned by McDonald Corp., 888 Washington St., Dedham, Mass., signed 8/31/70
- #1401 - plan of land on Main Street, owned by the Peoples Savings Bank, signed 9/1/70

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

Minutes of August 12, 1970. Mr. Segel made a motion that the minutes of August 12, 1970 be approved subject to approval of Mr. Butler. Mr. Koontz seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 5-0 vote.

Date of next meeting. The date of the next meeting was set for September 30.

Preliminary outline for the Mobile Home Study. Mr. McNeil presented the preliminary outline for the Mobile Home Study prepared by the Department. He explained the study questions raised in the report and he asked that the Board look over the outline for comment at a later date.

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

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

Salisbury Street - zone change from RS-10 to RL-7. Mr. McNeil explained the difference in permitted uses between RS-10 and RL-7 zones. He read the Planned Unit Development provisions in the RL-7 zone.

Mr. Payson explained the process of petition for a zone change.

Mr. Joseph Allen, of 390 Main Street, representing Chapin Riley, and Attorney Edward Maher, representing John Berwick, spoke as proponents for the petitioner.

Attorney Maher presented the reasoning behind the petition to change the zone, and he described the proposed Planned Unit Development. He said that the proposal represented a progressive, well thought out, professional opinion. He suggested that much opposition to such plans in the past was due to fear and lack of knowledge of the actual proposal. He proposed to allay such fears. He explained that there were few areas in the city available for development as viable Planned Unit Developments. He said that Mr. Prager, of Larkin and Glassman Associates, would present the details of the plan. He explained, again, the process through which the petition would be considered. He said that the plan would not be forced on anyone, and that the number of hearings involved should assure that everyone have a voice in the final outcome. He said that the project included 324 units, that the investment would approach \$7 million dollars and that the yearly tax income to the city would be in the neighborhood of \$250 to 275 thousand dollars per year. He presented an aerial photograph of the area. He described the present changes going on in the neighborhood of the site, the expansion of Assumption College, the Home for the Sisters of Mercy, the Jewish Community Center, Temple Sinai, the Jewish Home for the Aged.

He said that 490 parking places would be provided for the Planned Unit Development, and that a traffic study conducted recently indicated that Salisbury Street would not be overloaded by the additional cars. According to this study, 4,091 cars used Salisbury Street during one day in 1969. On the same day in 1970, 3,539 cars used Salisbury Street. He pointed out that under the existing zone, 79 single homes would be permitted, and that about 100 children could be expected to live there. He said that because of the kind of units in a Planned Unit Development, only 25 children could be

expected in the proposed Planned Unit Development. He explained that his experience as owner of the Executive House supported this low estimate, since only 2 children had lived there in 7 years.

He presented the details of the plan. He explained the utility arrangement in Barry Road, the 1,100 foot frontage on Salisbury Street, the proposed access road 350 feet from Barry Road along Salisbury Street¹, the 110 foot setback from the Barry Road properties, and the 300 foot setback from Salisbury Street. He described the 30 town houses, 5 sets of L shaped luxury apartments with 54 units in each, and the ultra luxury apartment building with 24 units. He said that the parking ratio would be 1.5:1, and that the parking areas would be from 2 to 8 feet below grade level. He pointed out the swimming pool. He explained that all efforts would be made to retain the existing trees, and that the 110 foot strip along the Barry Road properties would be restricted as woodland.

Attorney Mahler
also
He presented the planting plan and described the relationship between the planting and the buildings and walkways. He said that the rents would be \$285 per month for a one bedroom apartment, \$325 per month for a two bedroom apartment, from \$350-\$375 per month for the luxury apartments, and close to \$400 per month for the town houses. He described the tenant as a well-off couple, and he said that there was a definite demand for this kind of housing in the city.

Attorney Mahler presented a series of perspectives of the project itself. He said that the only commercial uses within the development would be commercial washers, dryers, and coke machines.

He suggested that to instill confidence, the developer was willing to describe the proposal in terms of a deed restriction. He read a letter presented to the Board by John Burwick. This letter described the deed restriction agreement as follows:

1. 100 foot minimum setback on Salisbury Street
2. 110 foot minimum setback along the rear property line of Barry Road
3. 50 foot entrance to Barry Road would not be used for anything but utilities
4. commercial uses would be restricted to commercial washer-dryers and vending machines, and snack bar for swimming pool
5. land could not be used for more than 324 units or 490 parking spaces
6. building height restriction of 2 stories for the 30 town houses and 3 stories for the 6 low rise apartment buildings
7. these restrictions shall be effective for 30 years if the zone change and Planned Unit Development are approved
8. if the Planned Unit Development is not approved, petition to rezone to RS-10 will be submitted, and all deed restrictions will be withdrawn.

Attorney Maher then introduced Jack Prager of Larkin and Glassman, Architects. Mr. Prager described the plan and the design approach to the project taken by his firm. He described the wooded areas, the stone retaining walls, the walkways, and the relationship between the trees, the town houses, and the apartments. He explained that the project was conceived of as a village, and that the general development would not violate the characteristic of the existing neighborhood. He outlined the background of his firm and listed similar developments planned and built in Massachusetts, 240 units in Amherst, completed one year ahead of schedule, 304 units in Milford, 1,094 units in Westboro, 800 units in Hopkinton, 800 units in Framingham, and luxury

apartment houses elsewhere. He reported that in all cases, the property values have increased, and the neighbors and tenants have been satisfied.

He explained that of the 24.2 acres of the proposed Planned Unit Development, about 20 acres would actually be developed. He said that the floor area ratio was about .452 to 1, that the density was about 13.4 units per acre, and that the actual parking ratio was 1.51 to 1.

Arnold Conti, of the Worcester County Institution for Savings, spoke in favor of the proposed Planned Unit Development. He explained that the bank was interested in financing the project because of its imagination and sensitivity of approach.

Mr. Payson asked the opponents to present their views.

Attorney Walter J. Griffin, of 340 Main Street, spoke in opposition to the proposal, on behalf of his clients; Jerome Cohen, Donald Keller, Gloria C. Iandoli, Arthur Stern, Ruth Stern, Lionel Glazer, Cynthia and Albert Stratton, and Catherine Kelley.

Attorney Griffin pointed out that the petition before the Board was concerned only with a zone change, that the question and proposal for a Planned Unit Development was not material. He urged that the Board and the public disregard Attorney Maher's position as Chairman of the Worcester Redevelopment Authority, and he pointed out that the project did not have any special approval by the Worcester Redevelopment Authority.

He said that the existing RS-10 zone was of the highest character and represented the most valuable residential land in the city. He said that when the abutters purchased their homes in the area, they had relied on the Council and the zoning ordinance to protect this investment. He said that the proposal did not really represent a Planned Unit Development, and that the Board of Appeals was not required to submit the Planned Unit Development plan to

the Planning Board. He pointed out that there was no assurance that the plan would come back to the Planning Board.

He described the list of commercial uses permitted as part of a Planned Unit Development. He suggested that the area could become a veritable Revere Beach in the shadow of Westwood Hills. He asked what would happen if during the course of development, the project ran into financial difficulty and the developer chose to complete the project with two family houses. He said that the Board was being asked to approve a plan for multiple housing on a grand scale, that nothing would prevent any other kind of permitted multiple housing development in the area if the zone were changed. He said that this kind of housing belongs in some other zone in the city.

He pointed out that when the zoning amendment was presented to the Council, it was recommended for RL-7 and RG-5 zones only, not for RS zones. He said that by changing the zone, the Board and the Council would be defeating the whole purpose of the zoning law, and they would be breaking faith with the people. He said that land was available in RL-7 zones for this purpose and it should be used.

He said that Mr. Burwick came before the City Council and requested a zone change at the corner of Park Avenue and Highland Street. He said that Mr. Burwick had proposed to put a motel there, but that he had actually constructed a super market and a liquor store.

He summarized the objections as follows:

1. There was plenty of RL land left in the city.
2. The advisability of the zone was questionable.
3. The number of school children would approach 350 children, not 25.

4. The street system would be a problem, traffic would be funnelled onto Barry Road.
5. The city had a greater need for low cost housing, not super luxury housing.
6. The city would be breaking faith with the people.
7. The Planning Board should not give its stamp of approval to such a plan.
8. The RL-7 zone is of a lower grade than the RS-7 zone, and the two should not be mixed.

He requested that the petition be denied.

Mr. Israel Weisman, of Spring Valley Drive, spoke in opposition to the petition.

He said that in spite of the presentation, once the zone change was made, the area would no longer be the finest residential land in the city.

Attorney Meyer Cohen pointed out that the probable number of cars in the development would be closer to 600 instead of 490. He asked what would happen to the already overburdened Salisbury Street. He said that the proposed street within the development was a fire hazard. He added that Attorney Maher and Mr. Conti's interest in the project was strictly financial. He asked the Board not to approve the zone change because it would be detrimental to everyone who owns nice homes in the area.

David Tannerbaum of 62 ^NLinwood Lane, a realtor, disagreed with two aspects of the plan. He said that by using a circular driveway, the developers would be providing one basic access route, Salisbury Street. He said that tremendous congestion could be expected on the street at the peak travel hours. He pointed out that if the zone were changed, the apartments would probably be staged. He asked what would happen if the development fell through at some

point in this staging. He said that from a real estate point of view, property values would not necessarily increase. He asked what kind of increase could be expected in an area of \$30,000 to \$90,000 homes. He asked if Worcester shouldn't preserve its suburban areas within the city. He said that the alternative to this was a move to suburbia outside of the city. He suggested that a zone change in this area would endanger other RS-10 areas in the city. He asked what would happen in 30 years, when the deed restriction is lifted. He asked that the zone change be denied.

Mr. Donald Keller, of 2 Dick Drive, said that the major concern of the residents was the question of single family zoning. He said that the residents wanted to protect their investment and the kind of environment found in RS-10 acres. He said that the zoning must have been set up for a reason and that this reason should be respected. He asked why a development of single family homes could not be built on the property. He requested that the petition be denied.

Attorney Jacob Young questioned the proposal for a buffer zone along Barry Road. He reported that it was his understanding when he purchased his house that the property behind the house would never be used for anything but single family homes. He said that he would never have purchased a home there with the possibility of a Planned Unit Development in the area. He asked that the Board keep faith with the residents who have poured thousands of dollars into their homes.

Dr. Arthur Stern, of 11 Barry Road, asked what arrangements were to be made for sewers. He said that sewers were installed in Barry Road some years ago, and that the pipe was 4" wide. He said that he had heard no mention of sewer construction on Salisbury Street, where there were no sewers.

He said that using the Barry Road facilities would constitute a health hazard, and he asked if the city were prepared to absorb the cost of utility construction in Salisbury Street. He said if the city were prepared to pay for the necessary sidewalks as well.

Mr. Payson asked for other opponents. There was no response. He asked those in favor of the project to raise their hands. There were several. He then declared the hearing to be closed.

The Board reconvened to Room 209 for their regular meeting.

Item of public hearing.

Salisbury Street - zone change from RS-10 to RL-7. Mr. Payson asked Mr. Robert Johnson for a report on the Salisbury Street traffic study.

Mr. Johnson said that the counts mentioned by Attorney Maher were taken in ^{the months} April, one on a Tuesday, ⁽¹⁹⁶⁹⁾ and one on a Wednesday, ⁽¹⁹⁷⁰⁾. He said that in 1969 the count was 4,100 for a 24 hour period. He said that the probable volumes generated by a project of this size could be calculated, that each unit would generate 3.2 trips per day, and that the increase in traffic would be about 1,036 cars per day. He said that the extra 1,000 cars would by no means cripple Salisbury Street.

Mr. McNeil asked if Salisbury Street could handle 10,000 cars per day without being overloaded. Mr. Johnson said it could not, that the street could possibly handle 6 to 8 thousand cars per day.

Mr. Payson pointed out that the proposed circumferential highway was scheduled to go through the area, that it would be a four lane divided highway with a 100 foot right of way, that it was supposed to have handled 10,000 cars in 1968 if it were built by then.

Mr. Butler pointed out that this plan would not permit the construction of such a highway.

Mr. Payson asked Mr. McNeil to present the plan showing the route of this highway. He asked that Mr. Reney first comment on the sewer arrangement of the area.

Mr. Reney said that sanitary sewers are seldom built less than 8 inches in diameter. Mr. Payson asked if an 8 inch sewer could handle the extra load from the development. Mr. Reney replied that it would.

Mr. Anderson asked about the sewers on Salisbury Street. Mr. Reney said that it might be possible to extend the main in Salisbury Street with the use of a pumping station.

Mr. Payson asked Mr. Reney to make a report on the sewer arrangements in the whole area for the next meeting.

Mr. Anderson asked Mr. Johnson about the congestion at the corner of Forest and Salisbury Streets, and the corner of Salisbury Street and Park Avenue.

Mr. Johnson replied that the traffic would disperse, but that the majority would be heading to the center of the city.

Mr. McNeil asked Mr. Johnson to give the number of trips generated by a single family home. Mr. Johnson replied that the single family house would have 2.2 cars per unit, as opposed to 1.5 for apartments. He said that this would naturally mean more trips generated.

Mr. McNeil described the path of the proposed circumferential highway, and he said that it would cross the area in question near the intersection of Barry Road and Salisbury Street. He said that building takings were involved at Tatnuck Square, but that this did not present too much of a problem elsewhere.

Mr. Koontz asked if the highway could be moved out. Mr. McNeil replied that moving the highway out would decrease its ability to serve the area.

Mr. Payson asked how much of the highway was presently completed, or partially completed.

Mr. McNeil replied that East Mountain Street was being reconstructed to Clark Street, Plantation Street had been widened, North Lake Avenue from the Expressway to Belmont Street was scheduled for improvement.

Mr. Johnson said that the construction of the Medical School would probably precipitate such improvement.

Mr. McNeil said that a cut-through was proposed from Sunderland Road to Route 20, that the Millbury Street Connector to Hope Avenue was proposed, that Hope Avenue was recommended to be extended to Heard Street, that the Gates Lane area connector to Mill Street was proposed to be done under Chapter 90 and federal highway programs, that Mill Street was completed to Airport Road, and that the last connection through the Barry Road area to the Route 52 area was in question.

Mr. Butler asked what width should be reserved for the highway. Mr. McNeil replied that the DeLew-Cather report recommended 100 feet and that the Planning Board had recommended 150 feet.

Mr. Butler asked if the 110 foot buffer strip would be sufficient for the highway. Mr. McNeil pointed out that a 50 foot wooded area on a ridge behind the Barry Road properties already served as a buffer zone.

Mr. Segel asked the depth of the Barry Road lots. Mr. McNeil replied that they were 125 feet deep.

Mr. Payson pointed out that the Board still needed answers to a number of questions. He said that the strongest argument as far as he was concerned was the question of the size of the development in relation to the existing single family area. He said that there was a good argument against having this kind of development in this area.

Mr. McNeil said that the Board had accepted the minimum of 20 acres for a Planned Unit Development in order that it would produce its own environment.

Mr. Payson said that no petition had been submitted for the construction of a Planned Unit Development, and that the Board should concern itself with the change in zone.

Mr. Koontz said that Mr. Maher had spoken of the need for housing. He said that the residents question concerned the desirability of meeting this need in an RS-10 zone, that if this were the proper use for the area, why it hadn't been zoned RL-7 in the first place. He said that if the zone were changed, what value would an RS-10 area have. He said that the residents look to the Board for protection, and that the question raised was valid.

Mr. Payson agreed that it was a good argument, but that this kind of thing had been successfully done in Brookline. He said that there were good arguments on both sides.

Mr. Anderson asked for a large scale zoning plan of the area. Mr. McNeil presented the plan.

Mr. Anderson asked if a zone change would amount to spot zoning, since there was no RL zone near the property.

Attorney Abdella said that the Law Department would check on it, but that it was presumed that if the land were used for a Planned Unit Development, it would not be spot zoning.

Mr. Koontz said that the problem was that there was no Planned Unit Development zone, so that no proposal for a zone change could be a proposal for a Planned Unit Development.

Mr. Anderson asked Attorney Abdella to check on the question. Attorney Abdella asked the Board to form the question in writing. Mr. McNeil agreed to direct such a letter to the Law Department.

Mr. Koontz pointed out that the first Planned Unit Development proposal was for a separate zone that could be put anywhere. He said that the Council had made the decision that a Planned Unit Development would not go in a RS zone, and that the argument was very strong.

Mr. McNeil said that the developers had not pointed out the number of bedrooms to be in each unit. He said that 90% of the units would have 2 bedrooms, that the rest would have 1 bedroom and a few three bedrooms.

Mr. Koontz asked how easy it was to break the agreements mentioned.

Mr. Anderson said that the agreement could be broken, but that it would be very difficult to break a deed restriction since such a restriction runs with the land and not with the ownership.

Mr. Donahue read the pertinent sections of the letter of agreement.

Mr. Butler asked if the developer were aware of the plans for the Circumferential Highway. Mr. McNeil replied that they were.

Mr. Koontz asked what the City Council's action would be relative to the road. Mr. McNeil said that the Planning Board could require an easement for street purposes under the provisions for more than one building on a lot.

He said that after requiring such an easement, the Board could revise the city map to incorporate the easement.

Mr. Segel pointed out that good planning must be flexible and that the Board could not be adamant about existing zones. He pointed to the great need for new apartments within the city. He said that he didn't know of any examples of devaluation due to apartment construction. He used the example of luxury apartments in Boston, the Charles Bank Apartments, as a successful development right on a major street, as this Planned Unit Development would be right along the Circumferential Highway. He stressed that there was no question about the need for apartments.

Mr. Koontz asked about the advisability of putting all luxury apartments in one area, and all poor houses in another area.

Mr. Payson suggested that the land might be too expensive for the development of single family homes. Mr. McNeil said that wetlands were present in the area and might prove to be an obstacle to single family development. Attorney Abdella said that the Law Department was checking the applicability of the Hatch Act.

Mr. Payson suggested that the question be taken up again at the next meeting. Attorney Abdella pointed out that there was a question in the Law Department about the time limit on filing a recommendation, that the limit was 20 days. Mr. Payson suggested setting up a special meeting. This meeting was set for noon, Monday, September 21.

Mr. Segel made a motion to recess the meeting until noon on September 21.

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