

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

**May 26, 2021**

Pursuant to Governor Baker's March 12, 2020 Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A, §18, and the Governor's March 23, 2020 Order, as amended, imposing strict limitation on the number of people that may gather in one place, this meeting was conducted through remote participation. The meeting was livestreamed from the City of Worcester website and via the local cable access channel and is available for streaming online. Public participation was facilitated through a call-in number, 415-655-0001 (Access Code: 1601714991), which was publicized on the posted meeting agenda and during the video broadcast.

**Planning Board Members Participating:** Albert LaValley, Chair  
Eleanor Gilmore, Clerk  
Conor McCormack  
Toni Molinari  
Edward Moynihan

**Planning Board Members Not Participating:** None

**Staff present:** Stephen Rolle, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services  
Marisa Lau, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services  
Jody Kennedy Valade, Inspectional Services Division  
Jennifer Beaton, Law  
Alexandra Kalkounis, Law  
Nicholas Lyford, DPW

**Call to Order** – Mr. LaValley called the meeting to order at 5:30

**Requests for Continuances, Extensions, Postponements, and Withdrawals**

**Continuances**

- 1) **26 Apthorp Street & part of 7 Darrow Street (PB-2021-024)**  
Request to Continue the Public Meeting to June 16, 2021  
Extend the Constructive Grant Deadline to July 8, 2021

**Postponements**

- 2) **1103 Millbury Street (PB-2020-076) – Definitive Site Plan**  
Request to Postpone the Meeting to June 16, 2021  
Extend the Constructive Grant Deadline to July 8, 2021
- 3) **7 Svea Street & portion of 195 Vernon Street (PB-2021-007) – Definitive Site Plan**  
Request to Postpone the Public Meeting to June 16, 2021  
Extend the Constructive Grant Deadline to July 8, 2021

**4) Attleboro Street (PB-2021-012) – 81-G Street Opening & GRO Ch. 12 Sec. 12**

Request to Postpone the Public Meeting to July 7, 2021  
Extend the Constructive Grant Deadline to July 29, 2021

**5) 573 Grafton Street (PB-2021-020) – Definitive Site Plan**

Request to Postpone the Public Meeting to July 7, 2021  
Extend the Constructive Grant Deadline to July 29, 2021

**Leave to Withdraw**

**13) 316 Lincoln Street (ZA-2021-002) – Zoning Map Amendment**

Request Leave to Withdraw without Prejudice

On a motion by Ms. Gilmore, seconded by Mr. Moynihan, the Board voted 4-0 (Molinari absent) to approve the requested continuances and postponements for the above named applications and for Item #13 to recommend the petition be returned to City Council per the petitioner's request for leave to withdraw.

---

**New Business**

**6) 60 Wall Street and Montreal Street (from Wall Street to Oakham Street) (PB-2021-021)**

- a. Public Meeting – Definitive Site Plan
- b. Public Meeting – G.R.O. Chapter 12 Section 12 Private Street Improvements

Zac Couture with H.S. & T on behalf of applicant asked for clarification on number of votes needed for approval of street alteration; Jen Beaton of the Law Department confirmed.

Mr. Couture described existing site conditions and that applicant is proposing to improve Montreal Street and extend utilities – water, sewer, and drainage mains – up Montreal Street from Wall Street; drainage main will only come up far enough to service the first two proposed units; described erosion control measures in first phase; described second phase of project building four single-family attached dwelling, each with their own driveway, and a retaining wall to the rear; described limitations on roof runoff.

Law Department had no comment.

Zoning had no comment.

Nick Lyford of DPW stated that all concerns related to utilities have been addressed.

Mr. Rolle explained to the Board the approvals before the Board, and described the recommended conditions of approval and that conditions e and g can be eliminated.

Mr. Rolle asked the applicant whether there were outfall or overflow accommodations should there be a significant storm; Mr. Couture explains that overflow would come out the gutter on to Montreal Street and into catch basins.

Mr. Rolle asked the applicant whether he would be amenable to reconstructing or repairing sidewalk on Wall Street adjacent to the property; Mr. Couture stated he was.

Mr. Rolle stated that conditions of approval a and b for the street alteration can be eliminated, but condition 2 should remain.

#### Public Comment

There was no public comment.

#### Board Discussion

Mr. Moynihan asked whether facades of each unit would vary by color; Mr. Couture confirmed that they would; Mr. Moynihan expressed that he was pleased that this was the case; Mr. Moynihan asked if there would be backyards; Mr. Couture answered that there would be a small backyard about 11ft in width; Mr. Moynihan asked for clarification about addresses of houses across the street; Mr. Couture clarified.

Ms. Gilmore asked DPW whether sewer main comment was addressed; Mr. Lyford stated that they are comfortable with revised plan that was provided.

Ms. Molinari had no comment.

Mr. McCormack had comment.

Mr. LaValley had no comment.

On a motion by Ms. Gilmore, seconded by Mr. Moynihan, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan and G.R.O. Chapter 12 Section 12 Private Street Improvements subject to staff-recommended conditions of approval, striking Definitive Site Plan recommended conditions 1e, 1g, 1h, and G.R.O. Chapter 12 Section 12 recommended conditions 1a and 1b, and to grant waivers as described in the staff memo.

### **7) 7 & 9 Modred Court (PB-2021-035)**

#### a. Public Meeting – Definitive Site Plan

Ms. Lau gave a summary of the project; two proposed single family dwellings on two currently vacant lots; applicant will use patios instead of decks at the back of dwellings to be in compliance with rear yard setbacks.

Brian MacEwan of GRAZ Engineering on behalf of applicant Daniel Yarnie explained that there are updated architectural plans showing proposed adjustment to the deck locations; explained that applicant is aware that specs of proposed retaining wall need to be submitted to DPRS; described that 100% of building roof runoff will be infiltrated; confirmed the waivers being requested and the reason they are being requested.

Law had no comment.

Zoning had no comment.

DPW had no comment.

Mr. Rolle suggested that condition 1i be changed to to “adjust or eliminate decks to comply with setback requirements.”

Public Comment

No public comment.

Board Discussion

Ms. Gilmore had no comment.

Ms. Molinari had no comment.

Mr. McCormack had no comment.

Mr. Moynihan had no comment.

Mr. LaValley had no comment, other than to say he is in support.

On a motion by Ms. Gilmore, seconded by Mr. Moynihan, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan, subject to staff recommended conditions of approval, amending condition 1i to state the proposed decks shall be adjusted or eliminated in compliance with the required setbacks, and to grant waivers as described in the staff memo.

**8) 173 (Lot 1) Ludlow Street (PB-2021-036)**

a. Public Meeting – Definitive Site Plan

Ms. Lau gave a summary of the project; the lot was divided off from an existing lot with a single-family dwelling; there is an existing driveway, wall, steps, and fence on the lot, all of which will be removed; the pathway from the proposed driveway to the front door was added and materials to be used will be labeled; proposed location of tree in front-yard was moved.

Zac Couture on behalf of applicant Rob Judson explained that portion of sidewalk will be reconstructed; pathway to house will be asphalt; Cultec unit had been updated and is designed to accommodate 100% of roof runoff; front yard will be less than 40% impervious.

Law had no comment.

Zoning had no comment.

DPW had no comment.

Public Comment

No public comment.

Board Discussion

Mr. McCormack had no comment.

Mr. Moynihan had no comment.

Ms. Gilmore had no comment.

Ms. Molinari had no comment.

Mr. LaValley agreed that it was straightforward and had no comment.

Mr. Couture formally requested waivers.

On a motion by Ms. Gilmore, seconded by Mr. Moynihan, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan, subject to staff recommended conditions of approval, and to grant waivers as described in the staff memo.

**9) 160 Goddard Memorial Drive (PB-2021-037)**

a. Public Meeting – Definitive Site Plan

Ms. Lau gave a summary of the project; Prematech LLC is applying for site plan approval; presently on premises is 27,000 SF manufacturing building with associated parking; applicant seeks to construct a 9100 SF addition and 300 SF storage building; Ms. Lau discussed recommended conditions of approval, included erosion controls and a guardrail; noted that separate approval will be needed for chemical storage; noted that DPRS had asked applicant how pedestrians will access the building, and where new dumpster location would be.

Michael Andrade, on behalf of applicant, described manufacturing operations and purpose of addition and chemical storage outbuilding; stated that engineers have been in contact with Fire Department regarding hazardous chemical storage; discussed how drainage will be handled and basins to be used; addressed recommended conditions of approval and asked for condition 1g regarding erosion controls to be struck, addressed condition 1i regarding pedestrian access, and addressed condition 1j.

Law Department had no comment.

Zoning had no comment.

DPW had no comment.

Mr. Rolle suggested adding condition of approval I that location of chemical storage building be in compliance with applicable codes for material types stored; Mr. Andrade stated that he was amenable to that.

Public Comment

No public comment.

Board Discussion

Ms. Molinari had no comment.

Mr. McCormack had no comment.

Mr. Moynihan expressed that he was pleased that the Fire Department had been consulted; asked applicant if they were adding more parking spaces and if they were for employees; Mr. Andrade confirmed that they were and that they would be primarily for employees; Mr. Moynihan expressed that he would like to see the infrastructure for EV charging installed while there is the opportunity; Mr. Andrade stated that there is no plan to do so currently, but that there is space to do so in the future; Mr. Moynihan expressed the importance of EV charging; asked staff to confirm that site can handle excess stormwater discharge from added impervious surface; Mr. Andrade stated that there is a proposed raingarden that will handle stormwater and that full stormwater report has been produced to be in compliance with DPW; Mr. Lyford of DPW confirmed that they were in compliance.

Ms. Gilmore echoed Mr. Moynihan's comments on EV charging infrastructure; asked staff to confirm that they were comfortable with striking condition 1g; asked Mr. Rolle to confirm language of added condition 1l.

Mr. LaValley had no further comments.

On a motion by Ms. Gilmore, seconded by Mr. Moynihan, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan, subject to staff recommended conditions of approval, adding a condition 1l that the location of the chemical storage building comply with applicable codes for material types stored there and striking condition 1g, and to grant waivers as described in the staff memo.

**10) 1023-1025 (aka 1029) Southbridge Street (PB-2021-039)**

a. Public Hearing – Amendment to Special Permit to allow an Adult Use Marijuana Establishment – Storefront Retailer Use

Daniel Glissman, Attorney, on behalf of client Cultivate, explained that Cultivate received their Special Permit from the Planning Board in November 2019 and has received all necessary approvals from the state and anticipate opening in early June; explained the purpose of the amendment is to reflect change of name to Cultivate Leicester and change of ownership to a subsidiary of Cresco Labs; explained that there is no proposed changes to site and operations.

Phil Silverman, on behalf of Cresco Labs, explained that Cresco will be the new owner of Cultivate Leicester and gave an overview of the company.

Jen Beaton of the Law Department confirmed that they have met with applicant and are satisfied.

Zoning had no comment.

DPW had no comment.

Mr. Rolle had no comment, given that site is already constructed; recommended two additional conditions 1) that special permit amendment be conditioned on approval of ownership transfer by CCC and 2) conditioned on Host-Community Agreement being fully executed with the City; Mr. Glissman stated that they were amenable to that.

Public Comment

No public comment.

Board Discussion

Mr. Moynihan had no comment.

Ms. Gilmore had no comment and wished the applicant luck.

Ms. Molinari had no comment.

Mr. McCormack had no comment.

Mr. LaValley had no comment.

On a motion by Ms. Gilmore, seconded by Mr. Moynihan, the Board voted 5-0 to close the public hearing.

On a motion by Ms. Gilmore, seconded by Mr. Moynihan, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the Amendment to Special Permit for an Adult Use Marijuana Establishment – Storefront Retailer subject to staff-recommended conditions, adding two conditions for approval of the ownership transfer by the

Cannabis Control Commission and the full execution of the amended Host Community Agreement by the City, and granting waivers and accepting petitioners' findings of fact as modified by staff.

**11) 781 & 783 Grove Street and 94 Parkton Avenue (PB-2021-040)**

a. Public Meeting – Definitive Site Plan

b. Public Hearing – More than One Building on a Lot

c. Public Hearing – Special Permit to allow a Continuing Care Retirement Community (CCRC)

Attorney Mark Borenstein, on behalf of applicant Goddard/Homestead Inc., gave an overview of the application, the applicant and their services, the subject site occupied by the former St Peter Marian High School campus, and where the development will take place; noted that there will be 6 EV charging stations with the potential to expand those numbers.

Kevin Dandrade, project engineer discussed the proposed site plan; noted that they have tried to work within existing developed area and level plateau; noted that they propose to reduce impervious surface and have performed detailed drainage study; noted that they have involved a landscape architect to design outdoor gathering spaces; discussed plantings introduced where possible to reduce heat island effect; discussed emergency service access; discussed pedestrian access to site from Grove Street; discussed parking and that special permit from Zoning Board of Appeals has been approved.

Attorney Borenstein described height and massing of the proposed building.

Attorney Borenstein described how the applicant meets the intent of Article X for the Continuing Care Retirement Community designation; noted that Goddard Homestead already provides the constellation of services at its other sites and will provide them at this site; noted that proposed development meets the specific definition of a CCRC as stipulated in the zoning ordinance; described the types of dwellings and facilities; discussed the dedicated open space and required parking; discussed traffic impacts, which will decrease from use as a high school.

Attorney Borenstein described the application for the More Than One Building on a Lot approval.

Law Department had no comment.

Zoning had no comment.

DPW had no comment.

Mr. Rolle described staff recommended conditions of approval for each of the three applications; noted that the revised memo had been emailed to the Board with two changes to the conditions; noted that secondary drive access will remain and will require easement.

Public Comment

Michael Vorado, neighbor, asked about provisions for any damage to neighboring properties due to blasting. Mr. Rolle replied that blasting is through a permit issued by the Fire Department and all of the procedures to ensure that neighboring uses are not damaged and to document those ahead of time are established through that permitting process. Mr. Dandrade replied that that ledge is fairly shallow on site, and that there is a deliberate permitting process around the blasting; because the foundation is basically being maintained, he does not expect blasting to be extensive and the project team will have a very clear picture of the mapping of the ledge prior to construction.

Board Discussion

Ms. Gilmore acknowledged the comprehensive nature of the applicant's presentation and how they meet the intent of the zoning ordinance; stated that she is glad to see a development that helps residents age in place; asked why the applicant did not request greater relief for number of parking spaces; Mr. Dandrade explained that given the visitors and services that will be provided over the years, excess parking will be used.

#### Public Comment

Patricia Toomey, neighbor at 727 Grove Street, described flooding in her neighborhood that had caused damage in her home over the last decade. She is concerned that blasting for the proposed project will exacerbate the flooding problems, for which a cause has not been determined. She also asked if 94 Parkton Avenue would be an entrance for the new facility. She did not feel that abutter outreach had been adequate.

Mr. Borenstein replied that the project will reduce the impervious surface on the property by over an acre and install new storm water management infrastructure, which will help improve site drainage rather than exacerbate those problems. The measures being proposed will reduce groundwater in the area. He also discussed prior efforts to reach out to abutters and Council. Regarding Ms. Toomey's second question, he confirmed that traffic will not access the site via 94 Parkton Avenue; a gated, emergency egress was deliberately provided via 751 Grove Street instead and the main entrance for St. Marian's will continue to serve the new development.

#### Board Discussion

Ms. Molinari asked what former athletic fields will be used for; Mr. Borenstein responded that the fields would be used as undeveloped open space and potentially recreation space for the residents.

Mr. McCormack asked what will happen with the former football field; Mr. Borenstein replied that they will return it to its natural vegetative state and it may be used for recreational space, such as a gazebo, but there are no immediate plans.

Mr. Moynihan asked whether the applicant would own the property; Mr. Borenstein responded that the applicant Goddard Homestead would be purchasing 781 Grove Street and 94 Parkton, but that the Diocese would remain the owner of 751 Grove Street where a day-care facility is; Mr. Moynihan asked if residential units would be owner or renter occupied, and whether they would be market-rate; Mr. Borenstein responded that they would be rental units, and that rental costs aim to be between luxury housing costs and HUD housing ("mid-market"); Mr. Moynihan asked how many full-time staff will be on the premises; Mr. Borenstein responded that Goddard Homestead is still determining but it is estimated to be 25-35 employees, at varying shifts each day and overnight; Mr. Moynihan stated that he appreciated the EV parking; Mr. Moynihan asked applicant to elaborate on dining services offered; Mr. Borenstein elaborated on dining options and services; Mr. Moynihan asked applicant to elaborate on recreational options offered beyond passive recreation; Mr. Borenstein responded that there are plans for a space for fitness and wellness classes but there are currently no plans for example a tennis court; Mr. Moynihan asked applicant to clarify whether in the future the facility would expand; Mr. Borenstein responded that the proposed building would remain as-proposed for the first five to ten years; Mr. Moynihan asked if a resident requires a higher level of care or an emergency, what options are available; Mr. Borenstein described the different levels of care offered; Mr. Moynihan asked staff to confirm that appropriate sewer infrastructure is in place to handle new residential units; Nick Lyford



confirmed that no issues are foreseen; Mr. Moynihan expressed his appreciation for the applicant's care in presenting to the Board and noted that he wished to see public transit access in this part of the city.

Mr. LaValley stated that the level of services offered here is more impressive than in recent CCRC applications.

On a motion by Ms. Gilmore, seconded by Mr. Moynihan, the Board voted 5-0 to close the public hearing.

On a motion by Ms. Gilmore, seconded by Mr. Moynihan, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan, More than One Building on a Lot, and Special Permit to allow a Continuing Care Retirement Community (CCRC) subject to staff-recommended conditions of approval, and to grant waivers as described in the staff memo.

**12) 113 & 115 Elm Street and 61, 65, & 67 Cedar Street (ZA-2021-001)**

a. Public Hearing – Zoning Map Amendment

Attorney Brian Falk, applicant representative, was available for questions.

Mr. Rolle gave an overview of the proposed zoning map amendment and staff memo. The amendment would affect properties with large 19th century building in the Elm Street area around the former Becker College site. The proposal would extend the RG-5 zone north of Elm Street and bring the zoning for these properties in closer alignment with their existing multifamily uses and expand opportunities for reuse of buildings that were recently used as dormitories. He also summarized City efforts to examine potential for redevelopment and reuse of Becker properties, which includes a study by the Historic Commission for the possible creation of a local historic district in this area.

Law Department had no comment.

Zoning had no comment.

DPW had no comment.

Board Discussion

Mr. McCormack had no comment.

Mr. Moynihan asked for some examples of uses that would be newly permitted if the amendment was approved by City Council. Mr. Rolle both residential zoning districts. The main difference is that more intensive uses (multifamily) are allowed by right in the RG-5 district instead of special permit; similarly, lodging houses are allowed by special permit in the RG-5 district, but not allowed under the current zoning. Professional offices are also allowed under some circumstances. He noted dimensional requirements are similar and parking requirements are the same in each district.

Ms. Gilmore noted she is a resident of the area and familiar with it as a result. She had general reservations about extending the zoning district to another street (Cedar) but agreed that the makeup of the neighborhood is compatible with the proposed change. She was concerned about potential demolitions of historic buildings in favor of increased density and asked the applicant to comment on their reasons for seeking the amendment.

Mr. Falk replied that he also represents the Worcester Railers Club, which has an agreement to purchase 65 Cedar Street. The club will be seeking a special permit from the Zoning Board of Appeals to permit a lodging house in the existing building for club players. Approval of the zoning amendment would be the first step in that process to maintain/restore the building and give it new life as a lodging house.

Ms. Molinari had no comment.

Mr. LaValley emphasized Mr. Rolle's statement about many buildings in this area having similarly been used as dormitories under the Dover Amendment. Their conversion into lodging houses makes perfect sense in order to allow their use to continue under private landowners, now that the educational institution is gone. He would like to see the City expand efforts to change zoning in the neighborhood beyond these four parcels.

On a motion by Ms. Gilmore, seconded by Mr. Moynihan, the Board voted 5-0 to close the Public Hearing.

On a motion by Ms. Gilmore, seconded by Mr. Moynihan, the Board voted 5-0 to favorably recommend the zoning map amendment.

#### **Other Business**

#### **14. Approval Not Required (ANR) Plan(s)**

- a. 15-17 Nathaniel Court (Private) (AN-2021-023)
- b. 86, 88, & 90 Norfolk Street (Public) (AN-2021-028)
- c. 0 Burncoat Street (Public) (AN-2021-029)
- d. 2 Tyson Road (Public) (AN-2021-030)

On a motion by Ms. Gilmore, seconded by Mr. Moynihan, the Board voted 5-0 to endorse the ANRs.

#### **15. Subdivisions**

- a. Kiara Drive
  - i. Request for a partial, conditional release of the restrictive covenant
  - ii. Request to set a bond amount for Kiara Drive from stations 0+00 to 2+00
  - iii. Request to amend the performance agreement, secured by insurance bond, as the form of security for Kiara Drive from stations 0+00 to 2+00

Mr. Rolle summarized the requested releases and recommended motion.

On a motion by Mr. Moynihan, seconded by Mr. McCormack, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the requests as per the slide.

- b. Malden Woods
  - i. Request to accept a restrictive covenant as form of security for Danielle's Way and extensions of Castine Street and Whippoorwill Drive

Mr. Rolle summarized the requested releases and recommended motion.

On a motion by Ms. Gilmore, seconded by Mr. Moynihan, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the requests as per the slide.

#### **14. Draft Open Space Plan Update – Request for Comments**

Mr. Rolle described the draft plan as a scheduled update that will additionally set the stage for a chapter in the citywide master plan on open space. He noted the request was for the Board to review the draft and provide comments on the recommendations contained within. He also recommended a motion.

Ms. Gilmore complimented the comprehensive nature of the draft plan. She expected its incorporation into the master plan and other planning documents will serve the City well. The recommendations for the City to utilize new approaches to acquire land for open space (one example being the conversion of tax title foreclosure properties) are interesting and hopefully come to fruition. She noted that the City can be a lot more creative about how land is acquired and returned to beneficial uses for the public.

Ms. Gilmore also stated her appreciation for the focus on environmental justice (EJ) neighborhoods, noting she hopes other City plans, especially the master plan, will similarly emphasize these issues in order to help address long-standing inequalities for access to open space within underserved communities. She added that the injustices related to open space in dense urban neighborhoods has often been forgotten and she was glad to see this prioritized in the draft plan.

Mr. Moynihan supported spreading out access to open space to improve the quality of life for everyone in the city. He suggested a dog park be considered in District 1 over towards Great Brook Valley. He called the plan a good step forward and complimented City staff on the time and efforts put into the plan.

Mr. McCormack stated that he was impressed with the plan update and looked forward to its completion.

Mr. LaValley echoed Mr. McCormack's comment, and stated he found the plan thorough and informative.

On a motion by Ms. Gilmore, seconded by Mr. Moynihan, the Board voted 5-0 to issue comments as discussed.

#### **15. Approval of Minutes - 05/05/2021**

On a motion by Ms. Gilmore, seconded by Mr. Moynihan, the Board voted 4-0 (McCormack abstained) to approve the minutes.

#### **Adjournment –**

Mr. Rolle thanked Ms. Molinari for her service to the Board.

Mr. LaValley and Mr. Rolle briefly discussed state regulations pertaining to remote meetings. Mr. LaValley asked if the next board meeting will take place in person. Mr. Rolle stated it was a possibility and the Board will be updated.

On a motion by Ms. Gilmore, seconded by Mr. Moynihan, the Board voted to adjourn at 8:30 PM by unanimous consent.