

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

**November 14, 2012**

**WORCESTER CITY HALL – LEVI LINCOLN ROOM**

**Planning Board Members Present:** Andrew Truman, Chair  
Stephen Rolle, Vice Chair  
Satya Mitra, Clerk  
Robert Ochoa-Schutz

**Staff Present:** Joel Fontane, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services (DPRS)  
Abby McCabe, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services (DPRS)  
Marlyn Feliciano, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services (DPRS)  
Kathleen Donovan, Department of Inspectional Services (DIS)  
K. Russell Adams, Department of Public Works & Parks (DPW&P)  
Michael Traynor, Law Department (LD)

**BOARD SITE VISITS**

**REGULAR MEETING (5:30 PM)**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Andrew Truman called the meeting to order at 5:36 P.M.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Mitra, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the minutes for May 23, 2012, July 11, 2012, August 1, 2012, August 22, 2012, and October 3, 2012.

**REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCES, EXTENSIONS OF TIME, POSTPONEMENTS,  
WITHDRAWALS**

**1. 0 Sarah Drive (aka Bittersweet Boulevard) – Definite Site Plan Approval (PB-2012-043)**

Hossein Haghanizadeh, HS&T Group, stated that he requested a postponement because he is still working with DPW&P and other departments with regards to the slope. Upon a motion by Mr. Ochoa-Schutz and seconded by Mr. Mitra, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the postponement to the December 12, 2012 meeting.

**List of Exhibits.**

Exhibit A: Definitive Site Plan Application; received August 8, 2012; prepared by Arboretum Village LLC.

- Exhibit B: Arboretum Bittersweet Boulevard A Definitive Site Plan in Worcester, MA Plan; dated July 24, 2012, prepared by HS&T Group, Inc.
- Exhibit C: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Planning Board; re: 0 Sarah Drive (MBL 29-11A-00090) Arboretum Phase IV (Bittersweet Boulevard) – Definitive Site Plan – Lots 81-92, 112-116, 18 dated September 19, 2012.
- Exhibit D: Letter from Inspectional Services Commissioner, John Kelly to Mr. Gallo dated October 3, 2012.
- Exhibit E: Letter from Arthur Allen of EcoTec, Inc. dated October 11, 2012.

**2. 47 Westminster Street (aka 45 Westminster, 12 Forbes & 17 Perkins streets) – Definitive Site Plan (PB-2012-054)**

Steve Hart from Worcester East Side Community Development Corporation stated that they had been scheduled to go before the Zoning Board on October 29, 2012 and the meeting was cancelled due to the Hurricane Sandy. Mr. Hart state that he wants the approval of the Zoning Board before appearing before the Planning Board therefore he was requesting a postponement to the December 12, 2012 meeting. Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Ochoa-Schutz, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the postponement to the December 12, 2012 meeting.

**List of Exhibits.**

- Exhibit A: Definitive Site Plan Application; received October 10, 2012; prepared by Worcester East Side Community Development Corporation.
- Exhibit B: Definitive Site Plan; dated October 4, 2012; prepared by Quinn Engineering, Inc.
- Exhibit C: Rendering; dated September 25, 2012; prepared by Stephen Hart of Worcester East Side Community Development Corporation.
- Exhibit D: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Planning Board; re: 47 Westminster Street (aka 45 Westminster, 12 Forbes & 17 Perkins Streets) PB-2012-054 – Definitive Site Plan; dated November 14, 2012.
- Exhibit E: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Department of Public Works & Parks to the Planning Board; re: 47 Westminster Street Definitive Site Plan – PB-2012-054; dated November 9, 2012.
- Exhibit G: Request for Postponement from Stephen Hart of Worcester East Side Community Development Corporation to the Planning Board; dated October 31, 2012.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Public Meeting**

**3. 31 Randolph Road (Burncoat Park) – Preliminary Subdivision Plan Approval(PB-2012-045)**

Hossein Haghanizadeh from HS&T Group, was present representing the owner, Burncoat Development, LLC. Mr. Haghanizadeh stated that while it was not required to submit a Preliminary Subdivision Plan he thought it was appropriate to receive input, recommendations, and comments before preparing the

Definitive Subdivision Plan. Mr. Haghanizadeh stated that the Planning Board approved a Definitive Subdivision in 1987. This was later overturned by the courts, but a 66-lot subdivision was approved by the Board with conditions in 1992.

Mr. Haghanizadeh stated that this project was never built due to the slow economy and that the property has changed hands various times over the past two decades. He stated that the pumping station as part of the 1992 approval has been the biggest drawback for this project but technology has advanced and there are more options available now.

Mr. Haghanizadeh stated that he decided to submit this as a new project rather than an amendment to the old subdivision filing. One of the reasons is that over time the methods and laws for delineating wetlands has changed making all the wetlands seem like they have grown. He also stated that they intend to obtain the Conservation Commission's approval prior to submitting a Definitive Subdivision Plan.

Mr. Haghanizadeh stated that the current project proposes 50 lots. It will have two means of entrance and egress; one from Burncoat Street and one from Randolph Road. He stated that this project wouldn't make the traffic more congested than the plan that was approved in the past. The applicant does not plan to ask for any waivers with this project as they believe they can fully comply with the city's subdivision regulations.

Mr. Haghanizadeh stated that they are proposing a closed drainage system which provides piping and three retention basins. The applicant designed a low-pressure system that will require a grinder pump at each home and no pumping station is proposed with this subdivision.

Mr. Haghanizadeh stated that the plan is to install retaining walls along the road in order to reduce the amount of fill needed for the project. In response to a question about the piles of fill on the property, Mr. Haghanizadeh stated that his client does not know where they came from since he recently acquired the property.

City Councilor Phillip Palmieri stated that the community does not support this project. There have been ongoing negotiations to purchase this property and leave it as a park. He stated that the clear cutting of the trees on 20 acres has had a major impact on the wetlands and that there are no developments of this size that have utilized the individual pumping stations, which is cost prohibitive to new property owners. Additionally, Councilor Palmieri stated that the entrance and egress from Randolph Road and from Burncoat Street are a problem due to the amount of traffic that 50 new homes would produce.

Mr. Adams, from DPW&P, stated that the proposal may require two waivers; 1) the 500 ft dead end length since one of the roads exceeds that by 20 ft, 2) the slope of the sidewalks. Both waivers have been granted by the Planning Board in the past for other subdivisions. The proposed sanitary system is a low-pressure force that will be operated by the home owner. In other communities this low-pressure system has serviced 50 homes adequately. The drainage system will need to comply with the Stormwater regulations.

Mr. Adams stated that at the definitive stage a traffic study should be conducted to determine the impact in the area. He doesn't believe that the subdivision needs a traffic light but would use the data in the

traffic study to adjust the timing on surrounding light to allow for egress onto Burncoat Street or Randolph Road.

Mr. Fontane, Director of DPRS, stated that according to the City's Subdivision Regulations, any applicant wishing to create a subdivision may file a Preliminary Subdivision application prior to filing a Definitive Subdivision application to allow the applicant the opportunity to receive feedback from the Board, city departments and the public. The Preliminary application does not grant the applicant any approval to begin work and is essentially used for guidance as to how to proceed with the Definitive Subdivision Plan application.

Mr. Fontane stated that the Board may approve as submitted, approve with modifications as agreed upon by the applicant, or disapprove with conditions. Staff recommends that the plans submitted be modified as indicated in the 6 page plan review memo prepared by staff and provided to the Board. Staff respectfully asks that the applicant apply to the Conservation Commission prior to submitting the Definitive Site Plan application with the Planning Board, and that the applicant demonstrate that the proposed water systems will adequately serve the development. Other modifications to the plans that staff recommend are to: provide more information regarding the proposed storm water basins, provide the details for the retaining walls, drainage profiles, that the wetlands delineation be current, and that all annotations and missing information are provided. The Board should not approve any waivers at this time that should take place after the applicant has asked for it in writing and at the definitive stage.

### **Public Comments**

Ray Fitzgerald, resident at 8 Clearview Avenue, stated that the wetlands area frequently overflows with only a few inches of rain. He stated that he would like to have a park at this location and is concerned with the possible impact to wildlife in the area. He was concerned about the duration of the construction of a large project and how it would disrupt the neighborhood as well as the impacts to traffic. He believed the grinder pumps would not be sufficient and could contaminate soil or get into the wetlands resource area and the water supply.

Bob McDermott, resident at 122 Burncoat Street, stated that it is difficult to back out of his driveway now but the increased traffic of this subdivision will make it worse. He also stated the market is slow and asked how long these houses would be empty and was concerned over the recent clear cutting of the site's trees.

Mr. Haghanizadeh stated that his client had nothing to do with the clear cutting of the trees as they were removed due to the Asian Longhorn Beetle infestation.

Mike Rossi, resident at 39 Clearview Avenue, was also concerned with the recent tree clearing.

Milly Wiyman, resident at 124 Burncoat Street, was concerned that her property will lose value because the area would now be developed and it will change the area. She was also concerned with construction because the streets are small.

Phillip Barbon, resident at 1 Bayberry Road, was concerned about the wetlands and why the previous subdivision was never approved.

Don Ross, resident at 12 Clearview Avenue, did not believe the city needs fifty new homes and was concerned the new houses would not sell. He was also concerned that this would drive away his tenants.

William Doyle, resident at 21 Randolph Road, stated that he has a 23 year old son with cerebral palsy and is concerned with the traffic because of the handicapped buses that come to his property. He is concerned with the mounds of fill on the subject property and with the wetlands, particularly the vernal pool discovered.

James O'Brien, resident at 33 Clearview Avenue, stated that the wetlands have increased in size and supported new studies for this proposal. He was also concerned about traffic and proposal for grinder pumps would also need a generator for backup.

City Councilor Anthony Economou asked that the Board consider that buyers may not want to purchase homes with grinder pumps because it is another perceived hazard. He also pointed out that the wetlands have changed in the past years and the city's schools may not be able to support the increased number of children that may move into this development. He also asked what plans the developer had to replant the neighborhood.

Katherine Evans, Randolph Road resident, asked how abutters will be notified when this project goes before the Conservation Commission. She complimented the Planning Division's staff for the thorough memo they put together and stated that much of the community's concerns were addressed in the memo. She also stated that the Stormwater regulations are stricter now than they were in 2003 and this project must comply with the new regulations. She asked if the land is too wet to be developed and asked the Board to take into account significant storms. She also stated that in 2003 the neighbors held a three day yard sale to raise money to hire a wetlands professional and believes a third party wetlands expert should do the analysis.

Mr. Fontane stated that the Conservation Commission has not received an application for this project yet therefore a hearing has not been scheduled but the Conservation Commission application also requires abutter notification. Additionally, people can call the office and request that they be notified of the hearing.

Mr. Truman stated that jurisdiction of wetlands is not under purview of the Board.

Gary Peters, resident at 4 Clearview Avenue, stated he supports the other comments made. He stated the egress through Burncoat Street is very narrow. He reiterated the traffic concern and his concern that the proposal is too dense with 50 new lots.

Jo Hart, Worcester resident, stated she believed this is an unbuildable lot. Worcester needs more open space and should focus on developing denser areas.

George Evans, Randolph Road resident, asked who the owner was and Mr. Haghanizadeh responded that Burncoat Development LLC of Marlborough, MA is the owner. Mr. Evans did not think the proposal took into consideration the topography and believed there are too many lots. He asked if there is a gravity sewer available and Mr. Adams stated that there is but the applicant would have to get an easement since it would require going through private property for the connection.

Mr. Rolle asked the applicant to describe how the low-pressure system works in the event of a power outage. Mr. Haghanizadeh stated that when the power goes out an alarm sounds to inform the resident

not to use the facilities. Mr. Rolle stated concern with using this system in 50 homes and how they would be affected if there is an extended power outage.

Mr. Rolle also stated that conducting a traffic study would be a condition to a Definitive Site Plan because traffic has changed over time and the last one would no longer be valid. Mr. Haghanizadeh was amenable.

Mr. Rolle asked if the recent wetland study performed included the vernal pool the abutters mentioned and the applicant replied that it was not in their study.

Mr. Ochoa-Schutz asked if there were any plans for the area of the parcel in the BG-3.0 zone. Mr. Fontane further explained that the rear of the subject property falls within the commercial zone but the plans do not show development in that zone but residential use is also permitted use in a the BG-3.0 zone.

Mr. Mitra stated that he is concerned with the issue of drainage, wetlands, traffic, and the project's history. He was also concerned with the individual pumps and would like an independent analysis of the proposed system. He stated that he would have liked the owner present to hear the concerns of the neighbors. Mr. Mitra acknowledged that neighborhoods often change over time and that the Board's job is to guide development within the City's laws and regulations.

In response to the public's comments regarding the wetlands, Mr. Haghanizadeh noted that the Department of Environmental Protection will also have to review this project and it must meet their regulations as well.

Councilor Palmieri spoke to the city's development and the fast pace of growth in this area that has resulted in increased traffic. He stated that he has been working on the purchase of this land for many years but no agreement has been finalized.

Mr. Ochoa-Schutz stated that he is very concerned with the impact on social services such as education and was not supportive of the project as proposed.

Thomas Lamarche, resident at 25 Kenwood Avenue, asked if a hydrology report would be part of the approval process. Mr. Truman stated that it would be a part of the storm water report.

Mr. Rolle asked about frontage on Barber Avenue. Mr. Fontane stated that Barber Avenue does not extend to the edge of the parcel but ends in the parking lot of the old Sam's Club. In order to use it as an access point they would have to own the land and extend the road, then follow a process to add the road to the official map.

Mr. Truman asked what the applicant will present in front of the Conservation Commission. Mr. Haghanizadeh stated that they would go to the Commission with a Notice of Intent for the road and the infrastructure; the lots would come at a later date once all the lot sizes are defined.

Upon a motion by Mr. Mitra and seconded by Mr. Ochoa-Schutz, the Board voted 4-0 to close the public hearing.

The Board asked Mr. Traynor for general guidance. He stated that the Board can approve as submitted, approve with modifications or disapprove but they must site the specific instances where the proposal fails to meet the regulations. Mr. Traynor also stated that the board has 45 days to take a vote. If they do not vote in that time the applicant is free to submit a Definitive Site Plan. If the applicant submits a Definitive Site Plan within the 45 days and the Board has yet to vote on the Preliminary, then the Board has 135 days to act on the Definitive Site Plan. Mr. Traynor stated that the Board cannot make a condition that the applicant provides access through Barber Avenue since that is outside of the applicant's control because they do not own the land. Approving the preliminary plan does not commit the Board to anything and there is no finality to a disapproval at this stage. Generally, Preliminary Subdivision Plans are meant to give input and guidance to the developer. Mr. Traynor also reminded them that the primary objective is the road structure, not the buildability of the lots.

Mr. Mitra stated that he is not comfortable approving the project presented. Mr. Ochoa-Schutz stated that he wanted more information.

Mr. Haghanizadeh stated that the traffic study is not required as part of the Preliminary Subdivision application but he did provide everything that was required.

Mr. Truman asked if two exits points are required and Mr. Adams stated that two are not required but the dead end length would be more than what is allowed.

Mr. Traynor stated that all those concerns can be conditions of approval to the Preliminary Subdivision Plan.

Mr. Adams stated that in the Definitive Subdivision Plan stage the applicant would need another waiver for the 30 ft radius on the Burncoat Street exit.

Upon a motion by Mr. Mitra and seconded by Mr. Ochoa-Schutz to disapprove the Preliminary Site Plan due to traffic concerns and the individual grinder pump design, the Board vote 2-2 (Truman and Rolle voting no). The motion did not carry.

Mr. Traynor stated they can take the vote at another date or let the 45 days elapse. The Board decided to continue to the December 12, 2012 meeting. It was the consensus of the Board that each Board member should do a site visit on their own time prior to the next meeting.

#### **List of Exhibits.**

- Exhibit A: Preliminary Subdivision Application; received August 30, 2012; prepared by Burncoat Development, LLC.
- Exhibit B: Preliminary Subdivision Plan; dated June 12, 2012; prepared by HS&T Group, Inc.
- Exhibit C: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Planning Board; re: Burncoat Park - Preliminary Subdivision; dated November 7, 2012.
- Exhibit D: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Department of Public Works & Parks to the Planning Board; re: 31 Randolph Road (Burncoat Park) Preliminary Subdivision – PB-2012-045; dated November 9, 2012.

Exhibit E: Certificate of Organization of Limited Liability Company for Burncoat Development, LLC from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts dated August 24, 2012.

Mr. Truman called a recess at 8:30 p.m.

Mr. Truman reconvened the meeting at 8:37 p.m.

#### **4. 10-12-14 East Worcester Street – Parking Plan Amendment Approval (PB-2012-053)**

Mike Andrade, Graves Engineering, stated he has been before the Board in early August for the first phase of the project. Phase 2 involves reorganizing the parking lot layout, creating an entrance plaza with landscaped areas and seating areas, narrowing the entrance to the site, modifying the catch basin, and asking for 4 stacked parking.

Mr. Andrade stated he is scheduled for the Zoning Board for relief of 15 parking spaces. He stated he received DPRS staff's memo and was amenable to the notation changes requested.

Mr. Adams stated that the drainage information was included in the previous plan so that did not need to be included in this review.

Ms. Donovan had no questions or commentary.

Ms. McCabe, DPRS, stated that staff recommends approval with a condition that 8 copies of the final revised plans be submitted to DPRS that include all the PB and ZBA conditions and list the relief granted by the ZBA. The only requested revisions for the final revised plans are to label the dimensions of the lot on sheets 2 & 3 and label the percentage of the lot covered by the principal and accessory buildings.

Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Mitra, the Board voted 4-0 to approve with the conditions in the memo.

#### **List of Exhibits.**

- Exhibit A: Parking Plan Amendment Application; received October 9, 2012; prepared by Condron Worcester Realty, LLC.
- Exhibit B: Parking Plan Amendment; dated September 2012; prepared by Graves Engineering, Inc.
- Exhibit C: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Planning Board; re: 10-12-14 East Worcester Street; dated November 7, 2012.
- Exhibit D: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Department of Public Works & Parks to the Planning Board; re: 10-12-14 East Worcester Street; November 9, 2012.
- Exhibit E: Memorandum from Graves Engineering, Inc. Subject: 10-12-14 East Worcester St. dated November 9, 2012.

#### **5. 42 & 46 Providence Street – Definitive Site Plan & Parking Plan Approvals (PB-2012-056)**

Hossein Haghanizadeh, HS&T Group, stated that this plan was before the Board to provide 2 accessory parking lots for an existing church for a total of 41 parking spaces. Mr. Haghanizadeh stated he received DPRS staff's memo and was amenable to all the changes requested and would submit revised copies.



Ms. McCabe stated that staff respectfully recommends approval with a condition that 6 copies of the final revised plans be submitted to DPRS prior to the release of the decision. The revised plans must address all items in staff's memo which includes adding 1 more handicap accessible parking space (2 are required & the plans submitted only show 1, update the parking summary chart, label the lot dimensions, clarify the existing vs. proposed fencing, and provide alternative trees for the 2 Japanese Zelkova and the 2 Skyline Honeylocust by the entrance to #42 Providence because they are large trees that may not survive in the proposed location.

Mr. Truman stated that the applicant should watch the grading so that it doesn't exceed a 2% pitch in any direction.

Upon a motion by Mr. Ochoa-Schutz and seconded by Mr. Mitra, the Board voted 4-0 to approve with conditions in the memo.

### **List of Exhibits.**

- Exhibit A: Parking Plan Application; received October 11, 2012; prepared by The Church of Pentecost, USA, Inc.
- Exhibit B: Parking Plan; dated September 17, 2012; prepared by HS&T Group, Inc.
- Exhibit C: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Planning Board; re: 42 & 46 Providence Street – Parking Plan; dated November 7, 2012.
- Exhibit D: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Department of Public Works & Parks to the Planning Board; re: 42 & 49 Providence Street; dated November 9, 2012.

### **6. 1350 Main Street – Definitive Site Plan Approval (PB-2012-057)**

Attorney Robert Longden, representing Parsons Hill, introduced Mark Beaudre, the site engineer, Mike Moore, the project manager, Jay Mason, the architect, and Ed Murphy, the administrator for the nursing home.

Atty. Longden stated that the applicant is proposing to demolish a substantial section of the building (single-story) and construct two (two-story) wings adjacent to the remaining section of the existing building in the front of the parcel. Additionally, the applicant is proposing to expand the existing retaining walls, and reconfigure the parking area which will increase the total number of parking spaces by 3, and make landscaping changes that include the removal of certain trees due to the new construction and the installation of new trees and shrubbery. The nursing home use will remain and the number of beds will remain the same at 162 beds.

Atty. Longden stated there is a 26% slope on the property and that it is a split lot where the rear is in a RS-7 zone, while the front is in a BL-1.0 zone. Atty. Longden stated that this nursing home employs 107 full time employees and 68 part time employees. Renovations will improve appearance and functionality and upgrade the quality of accommodations for the residents of the nursing home.

Atty. Longden stated that the square footage of the building will increase from ~45,000 SF to ~65,000 but the footprint of the building will still decrease. The fire lane will be widened to 18'. Landscaping will be enhanced even though there are dense woods at the rear of the site but they will add 227 new

trees and shrubs along the perimeter of the building to comply with the Zoning Ordinance and greatly improve the appearance of the site. Atty. Longden stated that total project cost is estimated to be approximately \$8 million and it will generate approximately 260 construction jobs.

Atty. Longden stated the fire department asked that the 4 parking spaces and concrete curbing be removed to provide a clear unobstructed way from street access point to all exits. He is amenable to make that change as well as the ones mentioned in the DPRS staff memo and in DPW&P's memo.

Mr. Adams stated that his conditions are in the memo and he recommends the first one be amended to state that they are proposing a 12 inch pipe.

Ms. McCabe stated that staff respectfully recommends approval of the Definitive Site Plan with a condition that 8 copies of the final revised plans are submitted to DPRS prior to the release of the decision, that a fence be installed on the retaining walls, that snow storage not be located in the landscape buffers, all exterior lighting be fully shielded and directed downward, that the DPW's comments be outlined in their memo be addressed including altering the driveway, that the parking area be reconfigured per the Fire Departments comments, and that the final revised plans lists and show all of the conditions of the ZBA and Planning Board. The applicant worked with the Fire Department after receiving staff's comments and have submitted a revised parking layout plan showing the four parking spaces removed from the center of the lot to adjacent to the building in response to the Fire Department comments. The requested revisions from DPRS staff include plan annotations, and the addition of 1 more handicap parking space.

Mr. Mitra asked what the applicant plans to do with the residents during this process. Mr. Murphy stated that through attrition and not accepting any new patients they can decrease their numbers significantly but they would look for temporary lodging at skilled nursing facilities for the rest of the residents.

Mr. Truman asked how they plan to keep the snow out of the landscape buffer and Atty. Longden explained that they will be pushing it against the retaining wall. It will not touch the landscaping since that will be planted on top of the retaining wall. Mr. Rolle asked what fencing material will be installed and Mr. Mason stated it was not decided yet but it would be comparable to other materials in the area.

Jo Hart, Worcester resident, commented that this property should have an interior loading dock.

Atty. Longden responded that there is a loading dock in the building where trucks pull into off of Main Street and are not sticking out in the sidewalk.

Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Mitra, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan with the conditions noted in the memo, modifying the four spaces will be relocated per Fire Department's memo, and modifying comment #1 on DPW&P's memo to a 12 inch pipe.

#### **List of Exhibits.**

Exhibit A: Definitive Site Plan Application; received on October 11, 2012; prepared by Merrimack Health Group, Inc.

Exhibit B: Plans (sheets 1 – 5); dated July 11, 2012 and revised on October 11, 2012; prepared by Meridian Associates [Engineering Firm Name].

- a) Parsons Hill Photometric Plan; dated July 9, 2012; prepared by Reflex Lighting
- b) Elevations (sheets A0.0 & A3.0); dated September 24, 2012; prepared by Architectural Consulting Services.

Exhibit C: Stormwater Management Report for parson's Hill Nursing and Rehabilitation Center 1350 Main Street; prepared for Merrimack Health Group, Inc.; prepared by Meridian Associates, Inc. dated October 11, 2012.

Exhibit D: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Division of Planning & Regulatory Services to the Planning Board; re: 1350 Main Street (PB-2012-057) – Definitive Site Plan; dated November 9, 2012.

Exhibit E: Project Review Comment Sheet from the City of Worcester Fire Department; received October 17, 2012.

Exhibit F: Memorandum from the City of Worcester Department of Public Works & Parks to the Planning Board; re: 1350 Main Street Definitive Site Plan – PB-2012-057; dated November 9, 2012.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **7. Eaton Place and Mercantile Street – Alteration of Public Layouts (ST-2012-023)**

Mr. Fontane stated that these streets are in the process of being constructed as they are part of the City Square project. The plan before the Board proposes two changes: 1) to add a portion to Mercantile Street and 2) to add piece of road behind the Unum building and attach it to Eaton Place. Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Ochoa-Schutz, the Board voted 4-0 to recommend this alteration to City Council.

### **8. Approval Not Required Plans:**

#### **a) 14-16 Birch Street (Public Street) (AN-2012-036)**

Ms. McCabe stated that at the last meeting 14-16 Birch Street was before the Planning Board showing 2 lots without adequate frontage under the 81L exemption but without proof that they were built prior to Subdivision Control Law in 1939. The applicant agreed to the continuance and submitted the deed dated 1906. Assessing records list the structures built in 1905.

There are currently 2 – 3 family houses on the lot and they are proposing to subdivide the lot to create 2 parcels so that each house is on its own lot. The required frontage for 3-family dwellings in the RG-5 zone is 60'. As proposed Lot 1 = 30' & Lot 2 = 20'. Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Mitra, the Board voted 4-0 to endorse.

#### **b) 230 Park Avenue (Public Street) (AN-2012-039)**

Mr. Fontane stated that the plan before them creates a parcel around the existing Fire Alarm & Telegraph building at 230 Park Avenue in accordance with the Special Legislation that shows the 1.7 acre parcel being removed from park purposes from the City's existing park land (Elm Park) for future development of the existing building. This is the site of proposed Spencer Savings Bank. Mr. Fontane stated staff recommends endorsement.

Upon a motion by Mr. Ochoa-Schutz and seconded by Mr. Truman, the Board voted 4-0 to endorse.

**c) 731-733 Franklin Street (Public Street) (AN-2012-040)**

Ms. McCabe stated that the applicant wishes to subdivide the existing lot to create 2 lots for each of the duplex units. As proposed, both lots have 35' of frontage in the RL-7 zoning district which requires 35' of frontage. Upon a motion by Mr. Mitra and seconded by Mr. Ochoa-Schutz, the Board voted 4-0 to endorse the plan.

**d) Lanesboro Road Alteration to Public Road**

Ms. McCabe stated that this needs to be continued to another meeting. This was added to the agenda in case this item was received but it is not yet ready and will return to the Board at an upcoming meeting.

**9. Carriage House Lane Subdivision – Bond Reduction Request**

Mr. Adams stated that the Board should not vote on this item because the Developer has submitted a request to withdraw the bond reduction request. The email from the Developer was in the supplemental packets. The Developer's original request was for a bond reduction from the \$85,000 that is currently being held by the Board for the completion of the work.

**DECISIONS FROM PRIOR MEETINGS**

There were no decisions signed at this meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Upon a motion by Mr. Rolle and seconded by Mr. Ochoa-Schutz, the Board voted 4-0 to adjourn the meeting at 9:20 p.m.