

Planning Board
Worcester, Massachusetts

Wednesday, August 11, 1971
3:00 P. M., City Hall

Agenda

3:00 P. M. - View

1. Gates Lane - preliminary more than one building
2. Lincoln Country Club - preliminary more than one building
3. Institute Road - amendment to urban renewal plan

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

1. call to order
2. Gates Lane - more than one building - preliminary
3. Lincoln Country Club - more than one building - preliminary
4. Elm Park - amendment to urban renewal plan
5. Neighborhood Facilities Grant - Model Cities
6. Nebraska Street - remove from Official Map
7. Communication from Attorney Caronna
8. Marden Street - priority
9. date of next meeting
10. plans to be ratified
11. any other business
12. recess

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

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

1. Zoning Ordinance amendments
Sections 15, 22, 24 and 40

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

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



The Planning Board met for its regular meeting on Wednesday, August 11, 1971 in Room 209, City Hall.

Members present were: Carlton B. Payson, Philip A. Segel, Frederic R. Butler, Lloyd Anderson and Carl H. Koontz.

Others present were: Gerard F. McNeil, Francis J. Donahue, Alexander A. Pridotkas and Thomas Langella.

The Board viewed the following areas:

1. Gates Lane - preliminary more than one building
2. Lincoln Country Club - preliminary more than one building
3. Institute Road - amendment to urban renewal plan

Mr. Payson called the meeting to order at 4:15 P.M.

Gates Lane - more than one building - preliminary. Mr. Hixon explained the plan to the Board. He said that the site was about 1-1/2 acres and that it was presently unoccupied. He said that the parking ratio was 1-1.

Mr. McNeil asked Mr. Hixon to explain the sewage system to the Board.

Mr. Hixon said that there was an existing sewer in Gates Lane and that they could pump to Gates Lane if necessary. He said that there was also a sewer stub which was built on Holland Road, and there was a right of way which was abandoned because the city owned both sides. He said that he would like to get an easement from the city for the use of the sewer stub.

Mr. McNeil asked Mr. Hixon if the surface water would have the same system.

Mr. Hixon said that the surface water would follow the existing pattern which was to go across his present property and then go into the swamp.

Mr. Segel asked Mr. Hixon what the price range was on these apartments.

Mr. Hixon replied that it would be in a \$200+ category for a two-bedroom apartment. He said that there was a total of 26 units.

Mr. McNeil explained to Mr. Hixon that the Master Plan of the city of Worcester showed a connection from Mill Street to Main Street. He said that if approval was given to this project, there would be but one alternative for the Gates Lane connector which would go through the frontage of this project.

Mr. Hixon explained to the Board that he wrote a letter to the City Manager and then read an answer received in September of 1970 stating that this connection could not be considered a valid factor in planning at this time. He said that when money was appropriated for right of way acquisition then it would become a factor.

Mr. McNeil asked Mr. Hixon if he would be willing to give the city the right of way across the front of his property if the city chose to use alternate no. 1.

Mr. Hixon said that alternate no. 1 would not be the most advantageous alignment. He said that there would be a problem as to how much of an easement the city wanted.

Lincoln Country Club - more than one building - preliminary. Mr. Frank Chapman presented the plan to the Board. He said that the site was 73-1/2 acres. Mr. Chapman explained the topography of the site. He said that the parking ratio was 1.5. He said that in the low rise family area there were 72 one-bedroom units, 556 two-bedroom units, and 72 three-bedroom units; in the low rise luxury area there were 60 two-bedroom units and 40 three-bedroom units; high rise luxury was 20 one-bedroom units, 70 two-bedroom units and 10 three-bedroom units; high rise elderly were 35 efficiency units, 280 one-bedroom units and 35 two-bedroom units; high rise singles were 60 efficiency units and 240 one-bedroom units. He said that the main access road would be from Lincoln Street. He said that they planned to have access roads connected with St. Nicholas Ave. and Goldthwaite Road.

Mr. Anderson asked if the access out to Goldthwaite Road, the right of way, was in existence or if they would require some property.

Mr. Chapman said that they would require some property.

Mr. Butler asked about the price range. He asked if these were to be luxury apartments.

Mr. Chapman said that it was to be non-luxury ~~but~~ with a moderate rent structure.

Mr. Butler asked if there would be any federal subsidies. Mr. Chapman replied that there would be federal subsidies.

Mr. Anderson moved to place it on the table and to refer it to Mr. Reney and the Law Department for recommendations. Mr. Segel seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 5-0 vote.

Elm Park - amendment to urban renewal plan. Mr. Anderson moved that the item be put on the table until the next meeting. Mr. Butler seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 5-0 vote.

Neighborhood Facilities Grant - Model Cities. Mr. Segel moved that the item be put on the table until the next meeting. Mr. Koontz seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 5-0 vote.

Nebraska Street - remove from Official Map. Mr. Donahue read the petition and then read a letter from Mr. Johnson concerning the traffic on Nebraska Street. The letter stated that it was the Bureau's opinion that Nebraska Street be retained as a public street.

Mr. Segel moved that Nebraska Street be retained as a public street as recommended by Mr. Johnson. Mr. Butler seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 5-0 vote.

Communication from Attorney Caronna. Mr. McNeil read a letter from the City Manager stating that Attorney Caronna had requested the city to change its procedures relative to hearings by the Planning Board. Attorney Caronna suggested that the petitioners be notified of the decisions of the Planning Board in cases where the Planning Board was providing counsel to the City Council under the General Laws.

Mr. Payson suggested that a letter be sent to the City Manager stating that the Board did not concur with Attorney Caronna's request and also stating that the meeting held by the Board subsequent to the public hearing is open and the petitioner may attend and listen to the deliberations of the Board regarding his matter.

Marden Street - priority. Mr. Segel moved that this be tabled until the next meeting so that the Board could view the street. Mr. Butler 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 August 25, 1971.

Plans to be ratified. Mr. Anderson moved that the following plans be ratified:

#1498 - plan of land on Sachem Ave. owned by Tekla A. Nelson,
signed 7/22/71.

#1499 - plan of land on Paris Ave., owned by John Austin,
signed 7/27/71.

#1500 - plan of land on Carter Rd., owned by John & Genevieve Muszalski,
signed 8/2/71.

#1501 - plan of land on Massasoit Rd., owned by Daisy A. Smith,
signed 8/6/71.

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

Any Other Business - Tatnuck Gardens. Mr. Douglas Liston representing the petitioner, Mr. Ira Geshlin, said that the developer was asking for an amendment to an approved plan entitled Tatnuck Gardens, located at Tatnuck Square. He said that this amendment would permit the relocation of one apartment building and the relocation of the street to service the apartment complex as part of the plan submitted to the Board.

Mr. McNeil stated that he was in favor of the amendment and that the plan would be far superior to the plan previously approved.

Mr. Koontz moved that the plan be approved. Mr. ~~Butler~~^{Butler} seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 5-0 vote. *Mr. Segel voted to second.*

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

The Board reconvened at 7:30 P.M. for its public hearings in the Council Chamber, City Hall.

Zoning Ordinance Amendment Section 15. Mr. Payson read the notice of hearing. He then asked for those in favor of the petition.

Mr. Maher said that Sections 15, 22, 24 and 40 were not relative to Planned Unit Development. He said that he agreed that the Ordinance would remain the same but the heading needed rewording.

Mr. Sarkis Teshoian stated that he was opposed to the petition. He said that through the interpretation of the heading, Section 15 had been amended only in so far as Planned Unit Development was concerned. Mr. Teshoian said that he appeared before the Board on the basis of the proposed amendment Section 15, the capability of an RL-7 zone would be expanded by way of composing additional types of housing units. He said that the original Section 15 restricted construction in an RL-7 zone by Special Permit.

Mr. McNeil said that the Planning Board made a study of the Zoning Ordinance in connection with improving housing opportunity within the city of Worcester. He said that in order for Worcester to expand industrially and commercially there must be housing for the labor market. He said that in order for industry to expand there have to be people to take the jobs and in order to have places for those people to live, housing opportunity must be obtained. He said that the existing Ordinance did not meet the current needs in housing types available to people throughout the country. He said that after the Ordinance was studied, it was recognized that a town house was a valid type of single family unit which was currently meeting the needs of families throughout the country. He said that it was also recommended that Planned Unit Development be included as a part of the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Wall said that the Planning Board was not changing the Zoning Ordinance for the public's purpose but for private purposes.

Mr. Payson said that a case before the court at the present time would be under the present Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Payson asked for those opposed to the petition. There was no response. Mr. Payson then declared the hearing to be closed.

Zoning Ordinance Amendment Section 22. Mr. Payson read the notice of hearing. He then asked for those in favor of the petition.

Mr. Maher stated that he was in favor of the petition along with Mr. Duquette.

Mr. Teshoian stated that he was opposed to the petition.

Mr. Payson asked for those opposed to the petition. There was no response. Mr. Payson then declared that the hearing be closed.

Zoning Ordinance Amendment Section 24. Mr. Payson read the notice of hearing. He then asked for those in favor of the petition.

Mr. Maher stated that he was in favor of the petition.

Mr. James Robinson of 27 Outlook Dr. stated that he was opposed to the petition along with Mr. Teshoian.

Mr. Payson then declared that the hearing be closed.

Zoning Ordinance Amendment Section 40. Mr. Payson read the notice of hearing. He then asked for those in favor of the petition.

Mr. Maher stated that he was in favor of the petition.

Mr. Teshoian stated that he was opposed to the petition.

Mr. Payson then declared the hearing to be closed.

Regular Meeting - Room 209 - City Hall

Gates Lane - more than one building - preliminary. Mr. McNeil suggested that this be discussed with the City Manager.

Mr. Koontz moved that the item be tabled until the next meeting. Mr. Anderson seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 5-0 vote.

Lincoln Country Club - more than one building - preliminary. Mr. McNeil suggested that this be presented to the Health Department and also be submitted to Mr. Reney for recommendations. Mr. Anderson said that he would like an opinion from the Law Department also. He moved that the item be tabled until the next meeting. Mr. Segel seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 5-0 vote.

Zoning Ordinance Amendments Sections 15, 22, 24 and 40. Mr. Butler moved that the item be referred to the Law Department and be put on the table until the next meeting. Mr. Anderson seconded the motion. The motion was carried by a 5-0 vote.