

Planning Board

Worcester, Massachusetts

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

3:00 P. M. - View

Agenda

3:00 P. M. - View

1. Greenwood Street - more than one building on a lot
2. Miscoe Estates - request to waive one sidewalk
3. Clark Street Housing - request to waive one sidewalk

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

1. call to order
2. minutes of May 6, 1970
3. items of view
4. Greenwood Street - more than one building - preliminary
5. Goddard Park Ext. - preliminary subdivision approval
6. Harrington Way - wiring report
7. plans to be ratified
8. date of next meeting
9. any other business
10. recess

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

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

1. Zoning Ordinance Amendment - Art. I
2. Upland Gardens - subdivision
3. Upland Gardens - more than one building

8:00 P. M. - Regular Meeting - Room 209 - City Hall

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

The meeting of the Worcester Planning Board came to order at 4:30 P. M., June 24, 1970, in Room 209, City Hall.

Members present were Lloyd Anderson, Frederick R. Butler, Carlton B. Payson. Others present were Francis J. Donahue, Gerard F. McNeil, Alexander A. Pridotkas, John J. Reney and Charles Abdella.

Greenwood Street - more than one building on a lot. Attorney Lian and Mr. Garcia represented the petitioners for preliminary approval for more than one building on a lot. Attorney Lian reviewed the proposal to build 72 apartment units on the site.

Mr. Payson asked Mr. Reney for his suggestions on the utility layout. Attorney Lian asked that these comments be directed to Mr. Garcia who was acting as engineering consultant to the petitioners. Mr. Reney pointed out that the proposed sewer layout did not conform to the city's standards. He also requested that a street profile be submitted, and he informed Mr. Garcia that the street construction must also conform to city standards even though it was proposed as a private way. Mr. McNeil requested that the plans be amended to provide a minimum entry way of 12 feet on each side of the proposed median. He indicated that the radius at the curb line should be 25 feet. He also requested permission to rework the proposed parking arrangement.

Mr. Butler moved that the preliminary plan be accepted subject to the revisions discussed. Mr. Anderson seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 3-0 vote.

Sidewalk
Miscoe Estates - request to waive one sidewalk. Attorney Lian represented the petitioner's request to waive one sidewalk along the north side of Sandra Drive. Mr. Fantasia, the petitioner, was also present. Attorney Lian reviewed the request. He indicated that there were only two potential users of a sidewalk on that side of the street.

Goddard Park Extension - preliminary subdivision approval. Mr. William Kane, Mr. Raymond Moran, and Attorney Miller represented the petitioner for preliminary subdivision approval. Mr. Donahue explained that preliminary approval was not given when the plan was submitted at a previous meeting due to the need for a profile on the proposed retaining wall. He said that subsequent to that meeting, a definitive plan and a wall profile had been submitted to the department. Mr. Roney indicated that the 36 foot roadway was adequate. Mr. Kane said that the plan would be considered by the town of Shrewsbury at a public hearing on July 9. He pointed out that the height of the retaining wall had been reduced by 4 feet.

Mr. Anderson moved that the preliminary plan be approved. Mr. Butler seconded. The motion was carried by a 3-0 vote.

Miscoe Estates - request to waive one sidewalk. Mr. Anderson questioned the assurance by Attorney Lian that the lots on the northerly side of Sandra Drive cannot be split up and sold. Mr. McNeil agreed that the lots could be subdivided and sold off, and he raised doubts about the possible future density of the area. He indicated that no problem was presented by the present housing density.

Mr. Butler raised the question of setting a precedent which other developers might follow.

Mr. Roney pointed out that if the sidewalk were required and not frequently used, it would disintegrate and present a maintenance problem for the city.

Mr. McNeil pointed out that the decision must be made before the bond is released, since the bond is the Board's only control.

Mr. Anderson asked if a covenant could be established when the bond is released.

Mr. McNeil replied that such a covenant is held at the discretion of the developer and that it would not really be effective.

Mr. Donahue pointed out that the precedent had already been set, that there were other examples of sidewalk waivers. Mr. Anderson indicated that he was less worried about the precedent than he was about possible future development. Mr. McNeil agreed, and pointed out that it would then become the city's responsibility to assume half the cost of sidewalk construction. Mr. Reney said that in actuality, the city has never built any sidewalks on that basis. Mr. McNeil suggested that the sidewalk requirement be substituted by a request for landscaping along the easement.

Mr. Payson moved that the sidewalk requirement on the northerly side of Sandra Drive be waived and that the Board request the developer to landscape the easement with trees instead. Mr. Anderson seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 3-0 vote.

Mr. Anderson moved that the request for a sidewalk waiver on Myrna Road be denied. Mr. Butler seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 3-0 vote.

Clark Street Housing - request to waive one sidewalk. Mr. Payson said that there appeared to be no problems with the request to waive the sidewalk on the east side of the entrance drive.

Mr. Butler asked how wide a sidewalk was required. Mr. McNeil replied that the sidewalk width would have to ^{be} 4 feet as per the subdivision control laws.

Mr. Anderson moved that the sidewalk requirement on the east side of the entrance drive for a distance of 500 feet be waived. Mr. Butler seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 3-0 vote.

Harrington Way - wiring report. Mr. McNeil explained that the matter was presently before the Public Service Committee. Mr. Pridotkas reported that due to the opening of the new Science Museum, there was a possibility of going underground from Franklin Street to the school, and of going overhead from the school to Hamilton Street until such time as these overhead wires could be placed underground.

Mr. McNeil reviewed Commissioner Hynes report that no official action to allow the omission of underground wiring on Harrington Way had been taken.

Mr. Anderson asked what action the Board could officially take.

Mr. McNeil replied that the Board could make its views known at the next Public Service Committee meeting.

Mr. Butler made a motion that the Board reiterate its position that all wires must be placed underground within the 2 mile limit. Mr. Anderson seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 3-0 vote.

Request to make Cohasset Street public. Mr. Donahue explained the petition.

He pointed out that there was a sewer easement in Cohasset Street, but no sewers. He said that the section of Cohasset Street in question, from Warner Avenue easterly, was involved in the Worcester Housing Development Corporation plan for 12 duplex units. He explained that normally the petition would receive a #5 priority because of the lack of sewers.

Mr. McNeil explained that the Worcester Housing Development Corporation subdivision would involve a public street. The access of the subdivision would involve a public street. The access to the subdivision would then be from Warner Avenue, a public street, to Cohasset Street, a private street, to the subdivision road, a public street. He added that there would have to be a way of maintaining access to Warner Avenue. He said that the Worcester Housing Development Corporation would like the matter to be referred to the

City Council for action. He said that his recommendation would be to send the petition back with a #5 priority rating, with a rider to the effect that since the Worcester Housing Development Corporation will provide needed housing, that the Council should act on the petition with other than a #5 priority. Mr. Anderson asked if the existence of a private way as part of the access would hurt the development of the Worcester Housing Development Corporation land. Mr. Donahue replied that the Department of Housing and Urban Development was worried about the access.

Mr. McNeil asked Mr. Roney what the maximum distance for connecting to a sewer was. Mr. Roney replied that the maximum was 100 feet.

Mr. Anderson made a motion to refer the petition to the City Council with a #5 priority rating with a request that the Council consider the petition in light of the needed housing which the Worcester Housing Development Corporation intended to provide. Mr. Butler seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 3-0 vote.

Wedgewood Subdivision. Mr. Donahue explained that due to an engineering mistake, a new plan had to be submitted. The new plan was accompanied by a request to extend the bond. Mr. Roney explained that according to Commissioner Hynes, a temporary turn-around was not permissible, that all subdivision streets must be built to the city's specifications and that any cul-de-sac would be subject to these regulations. Mr. Roney noted that in actuality, the cul-de-sac in question was located beyond the bonded area. Mr. Payson made a motion to approve the new plan as submitted. Mr. Butler seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 3-0 vote.

Date of next meeting. The date of the next meeting was set for Wednesday, July 15th at 3:30 P. M.

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

Public Hearings. At 7:30 P. M. the Board met in the Council Chamber, City Hall, for the scheduled public hearings.

Upland Gardens - subdivision. The petitioner, Goldstein and Gurwitz, Inc., was represented by Attorney Joseph Lian Jr. of 507 Main Street, Worcester, Mass., and Paul Casey, Engineer.

Attorney Lian explained the proposed apartment plan, and he said that the necessary variance had been granted by the Board of Appeals contingent on the acceptance of the subdivision plan by the Planning Board.

Mr. Casey explained the lot layout and the drainage pattern. He pointed out that the maximum grade was 8% and the minimum grade was 0.75%.

Mr. Payson asked if anyone else were present in favor of the proposal.

Attorney Lian introduced Mr. Spear, of the Waverly Trust Company, holder of the option to purchase from Goldstein and Gurwitz.

Mr. Reney said that the plans were acceptable to his department.

Mr. McNeil told the Board of questions he had received from the abutters on the east side of the property. These questions concerned the location of a sewer easement to Upland Gardens Terrace, to avoid the necessity of installing a pumping station.

Mr. Doherty, of 59 Spofford Road, voiced his objection to the proposal. He said that too much traffic would be generated on Spofford Road, and he suggested that Upland Street be used as the access route.

Mr. Payson explained that the Planning Department had recommended the use of Spofford Road for an access route as well as Upland Street and Southold Road since three exits were desirable for a project of this size.

Mr. Doherty argued that the residents of Spofford Road had paid to have the street made public for their own benefit and not for the use of an apartment development. He pointed out that a number of children play along that street. Mr. Payson explained that the Planning Board had to consider access routes for the safety and welfare of the citizens in general, not the number of children on the street.

Mr. Payson asked if anyone else were in opposition. There was no response.

Mr. Henry Coty, of Matthew Real Estate in Westboro, Mass. one of the abutters, asked if he could connect a sewer through an easement through the Upland Property.

Attorney Lian said that he did not know how this proposal would affect the present plan. He said that it would take time to study the matter.

Mr. Payson suggested that the two interested parties get together privately to discuss the matter and work out a solution.

Mr. Payson then declared the hearing to be closed.

Upland Gardens - more than one building. Attorney Lian represented the petitioner Goldstein and Gurwitz, Inc., for more than one building on a lot. Attorney Lian explained the plan for 274 units on the three lots. Mr. McNeil asked Attorney Lian to explain the changes made in the preliminary plan.

Attorney Lian explained the shift in the original location of certain buildings and the relocation of parking and drainage. He displayed a rendering of the proposed units. He said that he had met with Mr. Sharistanian and checked the sewer arrangement with him.

Mr. Reney reminded Attorney Lian that the city reserved the right to make a final check on the plans.

Mr. McNeil reminded Attorney Lian of the Hatch Act, and its relation to the proposed brook drainage. Attorney Lian said that an application had already been filed with the Department of Water Resources.

Mr. Payson asked if there were any questions or opposition. There was none. The hearing was then declared to be closed.

Zoning Ordinance Amendment - Article I. Mr. Payson explained that the petition was sent by the City Council by William J. McManus.

Mr. Donahue explained that it appeared that a mistake had been made.

Mr. Payson said that since the matter was confusing, the Board could not make a recommendation until the item was clarified.

Mr. Donahue explained that there was no Article I, Section II, Clause a, Part 2, Subsection 5, as indicated on the petition.

The hearing was then declared to be closed.

The Board reconvened to Room 209 for their regular meeting.

Items of Public Hearing.

Upland Gardens. Mr. McNeil said that he had requested Attorney Lian to contact the abutters about the sewer easement. He recommended that the Board table a decision until July 15, 1970.

Mr. Butler moved that the petition be tabled until the next meeting.

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

Minutes of May 6, 1970. Mr. Anderson moved that the minutes of the May 6th meeting be approved as amended. Mr. Butler seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 4-0 vote.

The meeting adjourned at 8:20 P. M.