



The City of Worcester

Planning Board Meeting Minutes Wednesday, February 18, 2026

Worcester City Hall – Levi Lincoln Chamber,
with remote participation options available via Zoom online at
“<https://worcesterma.zoomgov/j/1617314979>” and call-in
number 1-669-254-5252 (Access Code: 161 731 4979 #).

Attendance:

Board Members

Present:

Albert LaValley, Chair
Conor McCormack, Vice-Chair (*Participated Remotely*)
Stephen Toomey
Anthony Dell’Aera (*Participated Remotely*)
Brandon King (*Participated Remotely*)

Board Members Absent: *None*

Staff Present:

Michelle Smith, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services (DPRS)
Rose Russell, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services (DPRS)
Todd Miller, ISD (*Participated Remotely*)
Leslie Rodriguez, DPW (*Participated Remotely*)
Kobe Boaten, LAW

Department

Call to Order:

Board Chair Albert LaValley called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm.

Mr. LaValley read requests for continuances, postponements, and withdrawals into the record.

Item 1: o Chester Street (PB-2025-048) – Definitive Site Plan

Request to Continue the Public Meeting & Hearing to March 11, 2026
Extend the Constructive Grant Deadline to April 2, 2026

Item 2: o Farrington Street (PB-2024-065)

Request to Postpone the Public Meeting & Hearing to March 11, 2026
Extend the Constructive Grant Deadline to April 2, 2026

On a motion by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. King, the Board voted 5-0 to grant the postponements and withdrawals.

New Business:

Item 14: 1 & 3 Suburban Street (ZA-2026-001)

a. Public Hearing – Zoning Map Amendment

Wood Partners, represented by Managing Director Jim Lambert and attorney Joshua Lee Smith, stated they are requesting a zoning change to convert a portion of a split-zoned property from RS-7 to RG-5 to create uniform zoning across the site. Mr. Lee Smith stated that currently, the “as-of-right” plan would allow 264 multifamily units and 25 single-family homes (289 total units). He acknowledged that with the proposed rezoning, the developer would instead be able to build 288 multifamily units and eliminate the single-family homes, resulting in a similar overall unit count but a more consolidated layout. He noted that the developer proposes permanently preserving approximately 3–4 acres of the northern portion of the property through a conservation or deed restriction and that the request is framed as addressing Worcester’s housing needs while improving zoning consistency and preserving open space.

Michelle Smith, DPRS, clarified that the Planning Board is only making a recommendation to City Council regarding the proposed zoning map amendment, not approving a specific development project. She stated the request would rezone approximately 7.75 acres from RS-7, which allows only single-family homes with lower height and setback limits, to RG-5, which permits a full range of residential uses by right, including duplexes, townhouses, and multifamily buildings up to eight stories or 90 feet. She noted that the property was historically zoned RG-5 until the late 1990s and provided context about past subdivision proposals and surrounding land uses, which are primarily single-family with some multifamily along Highland Street. She also explained that part of the site falls within a “managed growth area” under the city’s long-range plan, where increased housing density near transit is encouraged, while emphasizing that this vote concerns zoning classification rather than a specific building proposal.

Public Comments:

Sarah Simsarian, 10 Haviland Street, asked whether the developer had already purchased the property and raised concerns about neighborhood outreach. The developer confirmed they have not purchased the property but hold an option to buy it. Ms. Simsarian stated she and several neighbors did not receive notice of any prior meetings and only became aware of the proposal through a zoning notice and a newspaper article. She questioned how neighbors were selected for earlier discussions and expressed concern that outreach appeared limited or “handpicked” rather than broadly communicated to the entire neighborhood.

Albert LaValley explained that the developer first secured an option on the property and may have conducted informal outreach, possibly through the city councilor, to gather general feedback. He emphasized that the current meeting is a formal public hearing where abutters and the public receive official notice and have the opportunity to ask questions and share opinions. He explained that the Planning Board’s role is only to make a recommendation to the City Council. He noted that regardless of whether that recommendation is favorable or unfavorable, the matter will proceed to the City Council’s Economic Development Subcommittee for another public hearing with additional opportunity for public input and that ultimately, the full City Council has the authority to approve or deny the zoning change.

Ms. Simsarian asked for clarification on whether the developer was proposing two separate development options — single-family homes versus a multifamily apartment complex — or if the single-family homes were simply what is allowed under the current zoning. Ms. Simsarian also asked whether

the developer is only interested in building the multifamily project and requested clarification on whether the proposed multifamily units would be rentals, condominiums, or co-ops.

Mr. LaValley clarified that the developer is not committing to either plan at this stage and stated the two plans shown were for illustration: one reflects what could be built “as of right” under the current zoning, which includes multifamily buildings plus a single-family subdivision, and the other reflects what could be built if the zoning is changed, consisting solely of multifamily units at roughly the same total unit count but concentrated in a smaller footprint. He emphasized that tonight’s decision is only about whether that type of use should be allowed through a zoning change and explained that if the project advances, the developer would need to return for formal site plan approval, where details like layout and unit count would be reviewed. He noted that under the rezoning scenario, the developer has also indicated they would preserve or restrict the remaining land from future development.

Ms. Simsarian expressed strong opposition to the proposed zoning change. She raised concerns about existing traffic congestion in the neighborhood, particularly related to school drop-off and pickup at Doherty High School, rush hour flow along Highland Street, and ongoing enforcement issues such as illegal parking and idling on Haviland Street. She argued that adding new housing units would worsen already significant traffic problems. She also voiced concerns about out-of-town developers building rental units rather than affordable, for-sale housing, stating a preference for ownership opportunities over what she described as luxury rentals. Additionally, she referenced past disputes with the Highland House property, claiming prior promises to preserve land were not upheld, and expressed skepticism about similar preservation commitments in this proposal.

Tony Economou, district City Councilor, explained that his initial involvement came after being asked to gather neighborhood leaders from the Hammond Heights and Saxon Road groups for an informal meeting with the developer at Blessed Sacrament Church. Addressing the proposal, he emphasized significant concerns about traffic impacts, noting recent discussions about reconfiguring Highland Street and arguing that any required traffic study should examine a broad area, including Salisbury Street, Flag Street, Richmond Avenue, Pleasant Street, Park Avenue, and surrounding cut-through streets.

Councilor Economou stated that a traffic light at Highland and Suburban Road as well as completion of sidewalks should be considered as part of any approval. He also expressed concern about approving a broad zoning change without a detailed project plan, suggesting the board should see exactly how much land would be rezoned and how the remaining land would be permanently protected, whether through conservation or deed restriction. He concluded by stating he would closely monitor the proposal as it moves through the City Council process.

Chris Comeo, 286 Highland Street, expressed opposition to the zoning change, stating that maintaining the current zoning would reduce the likelihood of increased stormwater runoff, wetland impacts, traffic, parking, and noise issues. He voiced concern that rezoning the property could intensify development and increase these impacts. He also criticized the presentation of the alternative “as-of-right” plan, interpreting it as a pressure tactic suggesting that a more disruptive subdivision could proceed if the zoning change is denied. Additionally, he raised specific concern about potential downhill stormwater effects, noting that changes to drainage patterns could negatively impact his property.

Ruth Steward, Suburban Road, and former City of Worcester tree advocate, urged the board to deny the zoning change, arguing that upzoning would lead to significant tree loss and environmental harm. She referenced Worcester’s past canopy loss from the Asian Longhorned Beetle and studies showing increased urban heat island effects following tree removal. She expressed concern that clearing trees on this site would worsen flooding risks, destabilize soil, reduce water absorption, and potentially expose contaminated fill, particularly given the area’s wetland characteristics. She concluded that removing large areas of tree canopy in a neighborhood already affected by environmental loss would be poor planning and a public safety concern.

Fred Nathan, Tatnuck neighborhood resident, raised concerns about the traffic impact of adding 288 housing units to the site. He referenced proposed changes to the Highland Street/Newton Square rotary that could reduce lanes from two to one and argued that adding potentially over 500 additional vehicles

would significantly worsen congestion, especially during peak hours. He questioned whether the area's infrastructure can handle that level of growth and emphasized the need for common-sense planning. He also briefly mentioned concerns about housing affordability, noting uncertainty about what qualifies as "affordable housing," but focused primarily on traffic impacts.

Katie Silverstein urged the board to deny the zoning change, arguing that expanding the RG-5 zone would enlarge an already inconsistent zoning area and undermine the integrity of the zoning code. She contended that upzoning the entire parcel while informally promising later conservation restrictions is inappropriate and that the burden is on the petitioner to prove the change serves the public interest. Ms. Silverstein raised significant environmental and public safety concerns, describing the site as historically a peat bog and landfill with unstable, wet soils that may function as wetlands. Citing geotechnical reports and historical accounts, she warned of risks related to flooding, groundwater contamination, soil instability, subsidence, and even underground peat fires if the land is disturbed. She argued that the site's geological and hydrological complexities, combined with proximity to established neighborhoods and schools, create too many unknowns to justify a zoning change without further study. She concluded, stating that upzoning would signal endorsement of high-density development on land that may be unsuitable for it and asked the board to reject the petition.

Riley Larkey, Haviland Street, echoed prior environmental concerns and submitted a copy of a January 2024 geotechnical report prepared by Yankee Engineering for a prior prospective buyer. He stated that after reviewing the report, that developer chose not to proceed with purchasing the property. Quoting from the report, he noted recommendations for additional subsurface testing and referenced the site's soil classification, suggesting unstable and uncertain subsurface conditions. He argued that the findings support concerns about why the land has remained undeveloped and reinforce the risks associated with changing the zoning.

Paula Rosenbloom, Haviland Street, urged the Board to deny the zoning change, citing environmental and safety concerns tied to the site's history as "Peat Meadow," a former peat bog and dumping ground. She shared her recent experience discovering coal ash beneath her own property while constructing an accessory dwelling unit, highlighting the area's unstable and potentially contaminated soils. She expressed concern that increased development on adjacent peat and landfill terrain could cause land shifting, flooding, or structural damage to nearby homes, including her own. She also referenced past legal disputes with a previous property owner following an earlier zoning denial and asked the Board to uphold the existing RS-7 zoning to protect surrounding residents and historic neighborhood integrity.

Noel Schofieac, Suburban Road, expressed concern about severe existing traffic congestion, particularly during school drop-off and pickup hours. He strongly supported the call for a comprehensive traffic study and stated that no further steps on the proposal should proceed until such a study is completed, arguing that adding potentially hundreds of additional vehicles would significantly worsen existing conditions.

Chris Canaracus asked why the developer is pursuing a zoning change when the "by-right" plan appears viable, questioning whether the by-right option is economically feasible and whether the developer would proceed with it if the rezoning fails.

Mr. Lambert responded that if the zoning change is denied, they would move forward with the by-right plan. However, he stated their preference is to obtain the rezoning because it would allow them to develop a smaller portion of the site and preserve more land, which they argued addresses some of the concerns raised. When asked directly which option is more economically beneficial, Mr. Lambert declined to comment.

Al Trachamus, a Germain Street resident, argued that the existing RS-7 zoning already allows relatively dense single-family development—approximately six units per acre—and noted that with accessory dwelling units now permitted, the potential density could effectively double. He contended that RS-7 already supports meaningful housing production and questioned the need for additional upzoning. He also raised concern that expanding RG-5 would increase what he described as spot zoning and

questioned whether that serves a public interest. Finally, he asked for clarification regarding setback requirements in RG-5, specifically whether multi-family low-rise and high-rise buildings are subject to defined dimensional standards or if certain setbacks are listed as not applicable.

Michelle Smith clarified that in the RG-5 district, multi-family dimensional requirements are structured with a base standard that applies to the initial unit, with additional units layered under the zoning framework. She explained that typical setbacks in RG-5 are generally 15 feet in the front and rear, and 8 to 10 feet on the sides, with a 10-foot exterior side setback on corner lots. She also reiterated that height limits differ by building type, as previously discussed.

Mr. Trachamus reiterated that RG-5 setbacks do exist but emphasized that rezoning to RG-5 would permanently allow significantly more intensive development, including buildings up to 90 feet, regardless of the current developer's stated intentions. He cautioned that once rezoned, a future developer could pursue the full extent of what RG-5 permits. He argued that expanding RG-5 would increase spot zoning in the area and does not clearly serve a public interest. He urged the Board to recommend denial of the zoning change, stating that it is inconsistent with the surrounding residential character and existing zoning framework.

Alexandra, Haviland Street, urged the Planning Board to deny the proposed zoning change from RS-7 to RG-5. She stated that based on the information presented, the change would pose risks to surrounding properties and negatively impact current homeowners. While acknowledging the importance of economic development, she emphasized that the city has a responsibility to protect existing residents and their property values. She asked the Board to uphold that responsibility and reject the rezoning request.

Joe Haddad, Worcester resident, suggested that since the developer can proceed under the existing by-right zoning, the neighborhood may benefit more from working collaboratively rather than opposing the project outright. He noted that Worcester needs housing and that the site is in a walkable area near schools, stores, and services. He encouraged using the rezoning process to negotiate community benefits such as walking trails, affordable or ownership housing options like condos, over-55 units, or other improvements, rather than risking a purely by-right development with less neighborhood input. He emphasized the challenges younger residents face in buying homes and suggested that thoughtful development with oversight could be more beneficial than resisting change entirely.

Greg Dorsler, Worcester resident and volunteer trail builder, emphasized the ecological and recreational value of the site's open space. He noted its proximity to existing green spaces such as Salisbury Park, Bancroft Tower, Newton Hill, and land owned by the Greater Worcester Land Trust, suggesting the parcel could serve as a key green corridor linking neighborhoods through future trail connections. While encouraged that the developer's proposal leaves a portion of the land undeveloped, he expressed hesitation about approving a zoning change based solely on a future promise of conservation restrictions. He stated he would be more comfortable if permanent conservation protections were secured first, before any zoning change is granted, to ensure long-term preservation of the open space.

Mr. Lambert responded that discussions with Colin Novak of the Greater Worcester Land Trust specifically addressed the possibility of preserving a portion of the property to help connect existing trail networks, filling a current gap between nearby open spaces. He indicated that if the land were restricted or donated, it could facilitate the kind of green corridor connection described by the previous speaker.

Keith Linhares, Worcester resident, urged the Planning Board to recommend denial of the zoning change, arguing that the proposal conflicts with the city's long-range planning goals under *Now | Next*. While expressing general support for density in appropriate locations, he contended that this project prioritizes housing unit counts over thoughtful urban design, infrastructure readiness, and environmental sustainability. He raised concerns about building on a peat meadow and wooded land,

questioning how such development aligns with flood resilience standards and the city's Urban Forestry Master Plan goal of expanding tree canopy. He argued that incremental approvals of projects like this undermine broader zoning reform and balanced neighborhood growth, and he asked the board to consider whether the proposal truly reflects the vision outlined in Worcester's comprehensive plan.

Alex Czamara, Highland Street, raised engineering and environmental concerns about developing high-density housing on peat soils. He explained that construction would likely require deep excavation to reach stable ground, which could disrupt groundwater patterns, destabilize soils, and alter natural drainage. He also noted that adding impervious surfaces like buildings and parking lots would displace water currently absorbed by peat and trees, increasing flood risk to surrounding properties. While acknowledging that development on peat is technically possible with proper mitigation strategies, he stressed that more geotechnical study and monitoring are needed before approving a zoning change, warning that proceeding without a clear engineering plan could put the community at risk.

Dennis Shea, Suburban Road, urged the Board to reject the zoning change, citing concerns about traffic, soil instability, and public safety. He argued that adding six apartment buildings could result in hundreds of additional vehicles, overwhelming Suburban Road and Highland Street. He described firsthand observations of prior soil testing that revealed landfill debris and wet, unstable ground conditions, stating the land functions like a former dump and peat area. He warned that development would likely require deep foundations or piles to reach stable ground and expressed concern about long-term structural and frost-related issues, as well as potential costs falling on taxpayers after developers leave. He also raised fire access concerns, noting that emergency vehicles may not be able to traverse the soft ground, and mentioned the presence of wildlife, including deer and bald eagles, as additional environmental considerations.

Kim Ciborowski, Beechmont Street, strongly opposed the proposed rezoning. She described the site as one of the last significant green spaces near the center of the city and emphasized its long-standing role as wildlife habitat for deer, foxes, coyotes, rabbits, and even bald eagles. She expressed concern about traffic impacts, particularly potential access onto Haviland Street, and criticized further tree removal following prior losses associated with Doherty High School construction. While acknowledging the broader need for housing, she opposed rental-focused development and urged preservation of the land as open space, arguing that rezoning would harm the environment and neighborhood character.

Kirsten, Worcester resident, raised concerns about pedestrian safety. She noted that the curve on Suburban Road lacks a complete sidewalk and is already used by students from nearby schools who sometimes walk in the street. She questioned how increased foot traffic and vehicle traffic from the proposed development would be safely managed, particularly given what appeared to be limited site access points.

Joshua Lee Smith responded by thanking residents for their comments and emphasizing that the zoning vote is only an early step in a longer approval process. He noted that detailed issues raised, such as geotechnical studies, traffic impacts, environmental review, and engineering, would be thoroughly examined during future stages like site plan review and any required special permits, with input from city staff, agencies, and the public. He clarified that the plans shown are conceptual and for illustrative purposes only. Regarding conservation, he stated that no developer could legally impose a restriction before securing approvals, but if the zoning change and project are approved, a permanent conservation or deed restriction could be established "in perpetuity." He argued this would provide lasting land preservation, whereas the current RS-7 zoning allows a by-right single-family subdivision that any developer could pursue without offering preserved open space. He rejected the idea that showing the by-right subdivision plan was a threat, calling it simply a factual representation of what current zoning permits. He concluded by reiterating that Wood Partners is an experienced developer with a successful Worcester track record and expressed willingness to continue discussions as the process moves forward.

Board Discussion:

Mr. LaValley speaking in his individual capacity noted that in eight years on the Planning Board, he has rarely seen such strong public turnout for a zoning map amendment. He explained that the board is composed of volunteer citizens and that its role is only to make a recommendation to City Council, which ultimately decides zoning changes after additional hearings. He acknowledged being generally supportive of housing production and eliminating split-zoned parcels, which this site currently is. While recognizing that the area has a suburban character and that concerns raised—particularly about geotechnical and environmental conditions—appear legitimate, he stated those issues would be thoroughly reviewed at later stages if the project proceeds. He also suggested that working with the developer may yield better outcomes than opposing a project that could proceed under existing “by-right” zoning. Ultimately, he indicated he would vote in favor of recommending the zoning change.

Mr. McCormack thanked residents and staff for their input and emphasized that the board’s role is limited to considering the zoning map amendment, not the specific development design. He noted that the board generally supports correcting split-zoned parcels and sees merit in creating consistent zoning across the site. While acknowledging significant concerns raised about environmental issues, traffic, and due diligence, he stated those matters would be addressed at later stages if the project advances. He also commented that the conceptual design shown does not align well with the goals of the city’s Now | Next plan and appears suburban in style, suggesting there is room for improvement. Overall, he indicated he would be inclined to support the zoning change from a zoning consistency perspective while recognizing that detailed project review would occur later.

Mr. Toomey asked whether the applicant considered rezoning only a portion of the 7.74-acre area rather than the entire parcel, noting that only part of the land may be necessary to accommodate the proposed development. He acknowledged that spot zoning is generally discouraged but suggested that a more limited rezoning—such as approximately 1.4 acres—might represent a compromise, leaving the remainder under its current RS-7 designation

Mr. Lee Smith responded that rezoning only a small portion of the 7.74 acres was considered but would not achieve the broader goal of creating zoning consistency across the site. He explained that part of the purpose of the request is to “clean up” what is currently a disjointed mix of RS-7, RG-5, and RS-10 districts, with the RS-7 portion acting as a bridge between areas. He stated that extending RG-5 would create a more uniform zoning layout rather than constitute spot zoning, noting that much of the land is already RG-5. He also emphasized the need for flexibility at later stages of review. If the project advances to site plan or ZBA review, the Board may request changes to building placement, parking layout, or design, which could require adjustments across different portions of the property. Rezoning the full area, he argued, provides the flexibility necessary to respond to Board feedback during detailed review, whereas limiting the rezoning could constrain those options.

Mr. King stated that he agrees with Board Member McCormack’s perspective and would be inclined to support the zoning change based on the Board’s past practice of addressing split-zoned parcels. He emphasized that any future development plans would return to the board for detailed review, at which time the Board could ensure alignment with neighborhood character and planning goals.

Mr. Dell’Aera stated that he is not inclined to support the proposed zoning change. He expressed concern that the greater density being contemplated under RG-5 zoning is not appropriate for this particular area and indicated he would not support the amendment.

On the motion, by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. King the Board voted 5–0 to close the public hearing

On a motion by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. King, the Board voted 4-1 (Dell’Aera opposed) to favorably recommend the proposed rezoning petition to City Council.

List of Exhibits:

Exhibit A: Application; received 12/17/2025; submitted by Samuel K. Forgue, P.E.

Exhibit B: Site Plan; revised 1/22/2026; prepared by Expedited Engineering

Exhibit C: Soil Suitability Assessment; dated 6/28/2021; prepared by Arthur Allen, S.E.

Exhibit D: Memo to DPRS staff; dated 12/4/2025; prepared by Expedited Engineering

Exhibit D: Waiver Request List; received 1/22/2026; prepared by Expedited Engineering

Exhibit E: Survey; dated 8/17/2026; prepared by HS&T Group Inc.

Item 3. 149 Malden Street & 0 Morgan Street (PB-2025-088)

a. Public Hearing – Definitive Subdivision Plan

b. Public Meeting – Definitive Site Plan

Kevin Quinn of Quinn Engineering, representing Lauring Enterprises, presented the Morgan Estates subdivision proposal for 14 lots, including 13 residential homes and one remaining parcel, with a 413-foot extension of Morgan Street ending in a cul-de-sac. He stated the project includes compliant stormwater management and sidewalks on both sides of the street and requires Conservation Commission approval. He stated three waivers are requested: allowing a 600-foot dead-end length, a reduced road curvature radius, and relief from submitting a large-tree survey. Mr. Quinn stated the waivers are modest, do not compromise public safety, and support housing production, including one inclusionary zoning unit.

Michelle Smith clarified that the application before the board includes both a definitive subdivision for road construction and a site plan for the 13 single-family homes. She stated the proposal extends Morgan Street by 413 feet with a cul-de-sac and includes standard stormwater management features. She explained that most staff conditions are routine, though she highlighted concern about a proposed interceptor swale along the rear of the lots, which is intended to direct roof runoff to a detention basin near adjacent wetlands. She stated staff requested additional detail to ensure the swale will function properly long-term. She also noted that a previously requested sidewalk waiver has been withdrawn, utilities will now extend from existing Morgan Street rather than through wooded land, and an older expired subdivision approval will be formally superseded to avoid record confusion. Ms. Smith noted that approximately five acres of forest would be cleared; while the applicant proposes more trees than required, staff suggested exploring whether homes could be positioned closer to the street to reduce grading and tree removal. She concluded, stating the project has received Conservation Commission approval, and staff requested further clarification on the swale design and building placement rationale.

Mr. Quinn explained that the interceptor swale is designed to capture surface water runoff and direct it into the stormwater system. He stated that, based on his experience, such swales are generally reliable if properly designed and maintained. He explained that the design aims to generate sufficient flow velocity to keep the channel clear and functional over time, with occasional heavy rainfall helping to maintain it. He acknowledged that periodic maintenance would be required but indicated the swale is expected to perform as intended.

Leslie Rodriguez, DPW, stated no comment.

Public Comment

City Councilor Tony Economou stated they have previously expressed concerns about the project and reiterated traffic impacts as a primary issue, particularly regarding Brooks Street, which they described as narrow and already used as a cut-through. He also raised concerns about how additional homes and families could affect nearby school traffic. The resident asked the Planning Board to take these neighborhood traffic impacts into consideration when making its decision.

Maria, Worcester resident, spoke to confirm that the Board had reviewed emailed concerns submitted by Dena Tedeski within the required timeframe. She raised objections to multiple waiver requests associated with the subdivision, including reductions to the required centerline curve radius, extension of the allowable dead-end road length, and proposed driveway and access widths that she stated do not meet city ordinances. She argued that the waivers prioritize developer profitability over public safety and questioned the precedent of granting multiple ordinance deviations. She also expressed concerns about fire truck maneuverability, roadway grade compliance with NFPA standards, sidewalk and curb

impacts, stormwater basin access widths, proposed use of berm curb instead of granite curb, and potential strain on aging water infrastructure. Additionally, she questioned the reliance on a proposed homeowners association for project maintenance, noting that surrounding neighborhoods do not have HOAs. She urged the Board to deny the waivers and require full compliance with city standards.

Lauren, Worcester resident, spoke in opposition to the proposed development, noting that there have been prior unsuccessful attempts by the same applicant to develop the property. She questioned the applicant's ability to complete the project in compliance with city standards and on schedule, citing past inaction and concerns raised by City Councilors, residents, and the Conservation Commission. She outlined several objections, including the number of requested waivers, emergency vehicle access, traffic and pedestrian safety, environmental impacts, and neighborhood character. She focused particularly on ADA and PROWAG compliance, arguing that the proposed sidewalks and wheelchair ramps would not connect to an existing sidewalk network, could direct pedestrians into the roadway, and may not meet slope and landing requirements. She urged the Board to consider these safety and compliance concerns before approving the project.

Dina Tedeschi, Worcester resident, stated that she had previously submitted detailed written comments, along with comments from another Morgan Street resident, and wanted to reinforce key concerns. She noted that images shown of the site depict it during full foliage, but for roughly half the year the trees are barren, which she believes would increase sound and light impacts on both existing and future residents. She also questioned claims that the development would feel "private," arguing that the proposed homes appear closely spaced and may lack meaningful separation, particularly near 50 Morgan Street. Additionally, she expressed skepticism about the project's contribution to housing needs, especially if built gradually, and raised concerns about the developer's experience, stating that her research suggests the developer's background is primarily in renovations rather than residential subdivision development.

Board Discussion:

Mr. LaValley stated that he is not particularly enthusiastic about this type of subdivision, especially due to the setback of the houses from the roadway, which he feels is not fully consistent with the vision outlined in the Now | Next plan. However, he acknowledged the need for a diversity of housing types across the city. He noted that the project has undergone extensive staff review and outlined the Board's options as either approving the proposal as presented or continuing the hearing to request that the applicant relocate some of the buildings. He indicated he was not convinced that further revisions would be productive and expressed that he was inclined to support the proposal unless there was additional discussion from other Board members.

Mr. McCormack thanked city staff and members of the public for their input and acknowledged the extensive review the project has undergone. He expressed support for the inclusion of sidewalks in the revised plan, noting that while the broader sidewalk network cannot be controlled by the Board, adding sidewalks within the subdivision is a positive step toward long-term connectivity. Regarding the requested waivers, he indicated he was comfortable supporting them. He also referenced staff's suggestion to consider moving the homes closer to the street to reduce tree loss, encouraging the applicant to reconsider that option in light of public and staff feedback. Overall, he stated that the project has been thoroughly reviewed, includes numerous conditions, and he would be willing to support both the definitive subdivision and site plan.

Mr. Toomey asked for clarification regarding the earlier discussion of the curve radius waiver, specifically requesting the speed assumptions associated with a 150-foot radius versus a 275-foot radius. He also asked staff to clarify the origin of the 500-foot maximum dead-end road standard, questioning whether the number is arbitrary and where it comes from, noting that a similar waiver request had come before the Board previously.

Ms. Smith responded that they could not speak to the exact origin of the 500-foot dead-end standard, as it predates her tenure, but noted that 500 feet is not an uncommon maximum length for dead-end roads. She explained that such limits are often related to emergency access considerations, including minimizing the need for fire apparatus to back up without adequate turnaround space. She added that while zoning measurements can have some arbitrary elements, the purpose of the dead-end limitation is generally to encourage roadway interconnection where feasible. She also noted there is a potential

connection to Malden Street and suggested the applicant could further explain why that connection is not being pursued

Mr. Quinn responded that they evaluated a potential connection from the cul-de-sac to Malden Street but found the topography between those points to be too severe to allow a compliant roadway under subdivision rules and grading standards. He stated that the terrain makes the connection virtually unbuildable and noted that a prior engineering review in 2005 reached the same conclusion. He added that the proposed cul-de-sac provides adequate turnaround space, which addresses concerns about emergency vehicles needing to back up despite the dead-end length exceeding 500 feet.

Mr. Quinn responded that a 275-foot radius of curvature is typically associated with a design speed of approximately 45 miles per hour, while a 150-foot radius corresponds to a design speed of about 25 miles per hour. He noted that communities often apply a uniform curvature standard across roadway types, whether major roads or smaller subdivision streets.

Mr. King expressed his support for the project.

Mr. Dell'Aera asked staff to respond to a resident's comments regarding the proposed reduction in centerline curve radius and its potential impact on emergency vehicle maneuverability, specifically requesting clarification on how the resident's testimony compared to the emergency vehicle turning analysis shown on the submitted plans.

Ms. Smith responded that both the Department of Transportation and Mobility and the Fire Department reviewed the emergency vehicle turning plan and had no comments, indicating they were satisfied with what was shown. Staff acknowledged that the turning template appears to approach the curb at the southern end of the cul-de-sac bulb and may slightly mount the curb, but does not appear to extend onto the sidewalk. She also clarified that granite curbing and concrete sidewalks are not mandated by the subdivision regulations, but the applicant has agreed to provide them consistent with current city standards.

Mr. Dell'Aera stated that he did not have any major issues with the proposal but expressed that fewer houses might result in a more satisfactory outcome for all involved. He indicated that, given the direction of the project, he would be inclined to support it with the conditions recommended by staff.

On the motion, by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. King the Board voted 5-0 to close the public hearing

On a motion by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. King, the Board voted 5-0 to approve the Definitive Subdivision Plan, Definitive Site Plan, and rescission of the prior Certificate of Approval for the Morgan Estates subdivision (2005, as amended 2010) for 149 Malden Street and 0 Morgan Street, with the finding that the prior approval had expired as of July 21, 2015 and is therefore void, and that the newly approved Definitive Subdivision Plan shall supersede the previously recorded plan, subject to the staff-recommended conditions of approval and requested waivers.

Item 5. 37 Summerhill Avenue (PB-2026-005)

a. Public Hearing – Definitive “Frontage” Subdivision Plan

Donald O'Neil, attorney, appeared on behalf of Sherri Klene, owner of 37 Summer Hill Avenue. He stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals previously approved relief to allow the division of the property into two lots, noting that the requested relief was minimal as the lots were close to meeting frontage and area requirements. He indicated he had reviewed staff's recommended conditions of approval and had no objections. He requested waivers of the subdivision rules and regulations, except those pertaining to ANR plans.

Rose Russell, DPRS, provided an overview of the Definitive Frontage Subdivision plan for 37 Summer Hill Avenue. She explained that the proposal would divide the existing single lot, which has 112.82 feet of frontage, into two lots. She stated Lot 1, containing the existing house, would have 55 feet of frontage where 65 feet is required in the RL-7 zoning district and that Lot 2 would have 57.82 feet of frontage. She confirmed that both lots received frontage variances from the Zoning Board of Appeals on

December 8th, 2025. Ms. Russell noted that staff is recommending standard conditions of approval and clarified that, as part of the definitive frontage subdivision process, the new address must be inscribed on the plan. She indicated no amendments to the listed conditions were necessary and invited any questions from the Board.

Public Comment:

Margo, abutter to the property, spoke in support of the proposal. She stated that she sees no issue with adding a small additional house in the area, noting that there is sufficient driveway and street space and that she welcomes more neighbors

Board Discussion:

Mr. LaValley expressed his support.

Mr. McCormack expressed his support for the project.

Mr. Toomey stated no comment

Mr. King expressed his support for the project.

Mr. Dell'Aera expressed his support for the project.

On the motion, by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. King the Board voted 5–0 to close the public hearing

On a motion by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. King, the Board voted 5–0 to approve the Definitive Frontage Subdivision Plan for 37 Summer Hill Avenue, subject to the staff-recommended conditions of approval.

6. 171 Providence Street (PB-2026-006)

a. Public Hearing – Definitive “Frontage” Subdivision Plan

Donald O’Neil appeared on behalf of the applicant, Kyle Vu, regarding a Definitive Frontage Subdivision. He stated that zoning relief had been granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals in August, with minimal relief required for the existing three-family structure. He explained the proposal would create a new two-family lot that meets the applicable frontage and area requirements. He noted that he reviewed staff’s memorandum and had no objections to the recommended conditions of approval.

Rose Russell, DPRS, presented the Definitive Frontage Subdivision plan for 171 Providence Street. She explained that the proposal would divide the existing lot, which contains a three-family dwelling, into three separate lots. The existing three-family on Lot 1 is proposed to have 54 feet of frontage where 60 feet is required in the RG-5 zoning district and received a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals in August, 2025. She stated Lots 2L and 2R, proposed for a duplex, each meet the required 30 feet of frontage per unit in the RG-5 zone and are compliant. She noted that the addressing process has already been completed and that Lot 2L should be labeled 173 Providence Street and Lot 2R should be labeled 175 Providence Street. She stated that the conditions of approval are acceptable as written and invited any questions from the Board.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. LaValley expressed his support.

Mr. McCormack expressed his support for the project.

Mr. Toomey stated no comment

Mr. King expressed his support for the project.

Mr. Dell'Aera expressed his support for the project.

On the motion, by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. King the Board voted 5–0 to close the public hearing

On a motion by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. King, the Board voted 5–0 to approve the Definitive Frontage Subdivision Plan for 171 Providence Street, subject to the staff-recommended conditions of approval.

7. 120 Washington Street (Lot 3C) (PB-2026-009), 8. 120 Washington Street (Lot 3D) (PB-2026-010) & 9. 15 Gardner Street (PB-2026-011)

a. Public Meeting – Extension of Time – Definitive Site Plan

Anthony Rossi of Rossi Development appeared remotely regarding 120 Washington Street, Lots 3C and 3D. He explained that both are mixed-use projects, each consisting of approximately 40 or more residential units, two multifamily units, and two commercial spaces, which were approved by the Planning Board on January 15, 2025. He stated that due to construction cost escalation, high interest rates, tariffs, and related financing uncertainties, the projects have faced challenges moving forward. As a result, he is requesting an extension of the approvals.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. LaValley stated no comment

Mr. McCormack stated no comment

Mr. Toomey stated no comment

Mr. King stated no comment

Mr. Dell'Aera stated no comment

On a motion by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. King, the Board voted 5–0 to approve a two-year extension of time, through January 2027, for the Definitive Site Plans for Item 7 (120 Washington Street, Lot 3C), Item 8 (120 Washington Street, Lot 3D), and Item 9 (15 Gardener Street).

10. 378 Plantation Street (PB-2026-012)

a. Public Meeting – Amendment – Definitive Site Plan

Derek Masionis of VHB appeared on behalf of UMass Memorial Healthcare regarding an amendment to the Definitive Site Plan for 378 Plantation Street. He summarized prior approvals, including the 2022 renovation and expansion of the former Beaumont facility into a 72-bed inpatient hospital, the 2023 healing garden and accessible parking amendment, and the 2024 approval for a three-story overbuild. He noted that in January 2026, the project received a Determination of Need from the Department of Public Health to add 24 additional beds and four treatment rooms within previously approved shell space.

The current amendment proposes 32 additional visitor parking spaces in the upper portion of the site, bringing the total to 119 spaces. He explained that visitor parking demand is high, particularly during shift changes. The design includes two 6-foot retaining walls with a planted terrace between them to buffer the adjacent healing garden, a pedestrian walkway connection to the main entrance, and a small

shed pad for equipment storage. He also described plans for stormwater management, including deep-sump catch basins, a closed drainage system, a water quality unit, and a subsurface infiltration system, with overflow directed toward an existing wetland system. He noted that Conservation Commission approval has been received, with a minor adjustment to relocate a flared end section outside the 30-foot buffer. He concluded by noting that the facility has been operating successfully for over a year and that the additional beds and parking will support expanded services.

Rose Russel, DPRS, summarized the Definitive Site Plan amendment for 378 Plantation Street. She stated the proposal seeks approval to fit out previously approved shell space with 24 additional beds and treatment rooms and to construct a 32-space parking expansion, bringing the total to 119 spaces, which exceeds zoning requirements by eight spaces. She noted that the parking is dedicated to patients and visitors, with staff parking offsite. She outlined staff's recommended conditions of approval, including additional erosion control measures, confirmation of landscaping and buffering, particularly along the southern property line abutting a funeral home, and consideration of compact parking spaces to increase buffering and potentially add a space. She confirmed Conservation Commission approval had been granted. She also highlighted Department of Transportation and Mobility (DTM) comments, including a requirement to reconstruct the full sidewalk frontage along Plantation Street to city specifications and to meet updated EV parking standards. In response to a question from the Chair, she clarified that the sidewalk reconstruction is conditioned as part of the approval and that the applicant has been made aware of this requirement.

Mr. Masionis explained that access to the parking lot is controlled by gated entry islands. He stated that during construction of the parking expansion, a portion of the upper lot would be fenced off to maintain some available parking. He noted that a temporary curb cut along Plantation Street had previously been used for equipment access and would likely be used again. On behalf of the applicant, he requested that the condition regarding sidewalk reconstruction allow coordination with the Department of Transportation and Mobility to determine the precise limits of sidewalk work in connection with the temporary curb cut permit.

Board Discussion:

Mr. LaValley stated no comment

Mr. McCormack stated no comment

Mr. Toomey stated no comment

Mr. King stated no comment

Mr. Dell'Aera stated no comment

On a motion by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. King, the Board voted 5–0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan Amendment for 378 Plantation Street, subject to the staff-recommended conditions of approval, as amended to modify Condition 1L as discussed.

11. 1256 West Boylston Street (PB-2026-013)

a. Public Meeting – Definitive Site Plan

Patrick Healy, civil engineer from Thompson Liston Associates, appeared on behalf of Sharon Bucheri regarding proposed construction of a single-family home on a previously approved lot. He explained that the site originally received site plan approval in 2007 and has since undergone several revisions through the Conservation Commission and review by DCR due to its location within the watershed. He stated that during the permitting process, it was determined that a small portion of the lot exceeds 15% slopes, triggering the need for site plan approval. He noted that the proposed driveway crosses part of this steep slope area, and the driveway, culvert crossing, and grading for the replication area have already been completed under Conservation Commission oversight. He explained that the property is

served by city sewer and water, has an active Order of Conditions, and holds water quality certification from DCR.

Mr. Healy noted that the remaining issue raised in staff review concerns whether a proposed bulkhead at the rear of the building would violate rear yard setback requirements. He stated the applicant has requested clarification under the applicable zoning exemption and stated that if the bulkhead is determined to be noncompliant, it will be removed and the foundation footprint will remain as currently constructed.

Rose Russel, DPRS, noted that the project received Conservation Commission approval for the intermittent stream crossing and that a culvert has already been constructed. She stated a foundation permit was issued in the fall; however, it was later identified that work occurred within areas exceeding 15% slope, triggering the need for site plan approval. As a result, she explained the application before the Board is partially retroactive. Ms. Russell acknowledged this oversight and thanked the applicant for working through the process.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. LaValley stated no comment

Mr. McCormack stated no comment

Mr. Toomey stated no comment

Mr. King stated no comment

Mr. Dell'Aera stated no comment

On a motion by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. King, the Board voted 5–0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan for 1256 West Boylston Street, subject to staff recommended conditions of approval, striking Condition 1F.

12. 31 & 33 Bridgeport Street (PB-2026-014)

a. Public Hearing – Definitive “Frontage” Subdivision Plan

b. Public Meeting – Definitive Site Plan

Attorney Donald O’Neil appeared on behalf of MPI Home LLC and Rentvest LLC regarding 31 and 33 Bridgeport Street. He stated the applicant previously obtained zoning relief to re-separate the lots into two buildable parcels requiring frontage and area variances and is now seeking Definitive Frontage Subdivision approval for both lots and Definitive Site Plan approval for the new structure at 33 Bridgeport Street. He noted that the applicant addressed staff’s recommended conditions with updated plans, including relocating the rear door, enhancing the front façade with decorative treatment over exposed foundation areas, and revising the garage design from two doors to one larger door. Regarding the existing street tree, he stated the applicant agreed to coordinate with the City to determine if it can be preserved and, if so, to construct a compliant sidewalk around it to maintain ADA accessibility. He concluded, stating the applicant requests approval of the three waivers associated with the Definitive Frontage Subdivision and indicated acceptance of the remaining staff conditions.

Rose Russell, DPRS, presented the application for 31 and 33 Bridgeport Street, noting that although the lots appear separately in the City’s GIS system, they are considered merged for zoning purposes. She stated the applicant obtained relief from the Zoning Board of Appeals to formally re-separate the parcels and is now seeking Definitive Frontage Subdivision approval.

She explained that at 31 Bridgeport Street, 50 feet of frontage is proposed where 60 feet is required in the RG-5 district and at 33 Bridgeport Street, 50 feet of frontage is proposed where 75 feet is required in the RL-7 district. She stated Site Plan Review is triggered by disturbance of slopes exceeding 15% in the front yard and highlighted concerns regarding the existing street tree and sidewalk condition. She noted that DTM recommends either removing the tree and reconstructing the sidewalk within the right-of-way or preserving the tree and constructing a minimum 4-foot accessible path of travel, potentially requiring a sidewalk easement on the applicant's property. She also noted accessibility considerations for the building entrance, given that the primary entrance includes stairs, and encouraged ensuring a compliant accessible route is maintained. Additionally, she discussed tight site maneuverability within the garage and driveway area, acknowledging that updated plans consolidating the garage doors addressed prior concerns. She indicated the applicant demonstrated that vehicle turning movements are feasible within the constraints of the site.

Leslie Rodriguez, DPW, noted that the street is newly constructed and, as a result, the applicant will be required to pave from curb to curb along the project frontage.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. LaValley stated no comment

Mr. McCormack stated no comment

Mr. Toomey stated no comment

Mr. King stated no comment

Mr. Dell'Aera stated no comment

On the motion, by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. King the Board voted 5–0 to close the public hearing

On a motion by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. King, the Board voted 5–0 to approve the Definitive Frontage Subdivision Plan and the Definitive Site Plan for 31 and 33 Bridgeport Street, subject to staff recommended conditions of approval.

13. 342 West Boylston Street (PB-2026-015)

a. Public Hearing – Special Permit (CCOD) to allow a multi-family dwelling (high-rise) use (Article IX, Section 5.B.)

b. Public Hearing – Special Permit (CCOD) to obtain relief from the maximum front yard setback dimensional requirement (Article IX, Section 6.A.6)

c. Public Hearing – Special Permit (CCOD) to reduce the minimum number of required parking & loading spaces (Article IX, Section 7.C.)

d. Public Hearing – Special Permit (CCOD) to modify the dimensional requirements for off-street parking & loading (Article IX, Section 7.E.)

e. Public Meeting – Definitive Site Plan

Mark Borenstein, attorney with Prince Lobel, appeared on behalf of 342 West Boylston LLC. Mr. Borenstein presented a video outlining the proposed redevelopment of 342 West Boylston Street, a currently blighted 20,000-square-foot corner lot in the BL-1 zoning district and Commercial Corridors Overlay District (CCOD).

He stated the proposal includes demolition of the partially constructed fast food building and construction of a four-story multifamily condominium building containing 24 units, including 10 Group 2 accessible units and 14 studios. He stated the units are intended for households earning 70% or less of Area Median Income. He noted the project includes 16 parking spaces (nine compact, six standard, one van accessible, with four EV spaces), new landscaping, accessible walkways, outdoor amenity space, and reconfigured curb cuts to improve site access and safety. Mr. Borenstein indicated there are a few conditions of approval and waiver requests to discuss with the Board, noting that discussions with staff have narrowed outstanding issues.

Michelle Smith, DPRS, explained that the application includes Site Plan Review and three Special Permits (with one recommended for withdrawal). She explained that the proposal is for a four-story, 24-unit affordable condominium building with 16 parking spaces. She indicated the requested relief includes allowing a high-rise multifamily use in the BL-1 district through the CCOD, modifying the maximum front setback, and reducing required parking and eliminating the loading space. She reviewed recommended conditions, noted requested modifications by the applicant, and highlighted key issues for discussion, including bike parking, parking and loading management, architectural details, landscaping, and retaining wall and groundwater design prior to issuance of a building permit.

Mr. Borenstein responded to staff's comments regarding the requested modifications to the conditions of approval. Specifically, he requested striking Conditions 1M and 1O, explaining that the site was designed to maintain safe sight lines at the northerly curb cut. He noted that the defined sight triangle area cannot contain shade trees or certain structures, including an outdoor bike rack, without compromising visibility. Mr. Borenstein stated that landscaping in that area is intentionally low to preserve sight lines and that bike parking is provided both internally (with capacity to meet the required 11 spaces) and externally to the north of the building. Additionally, he requested striking Condition BB, which would require reconstruction of curb ramps across Andover Street and installation of a new stop bar. He explained that the project is largely state-funded with limited resources and that the requested off-site improvements would impose additional financial burden beyond the scope of the development.

Public Comment:

Attorney Paul Novak appeared on behalf of the owner of 388–394 West Boylston Street and stated that while there is no objection to the development itself, there are serious concerns regarding insufficient parking. He explained that surrounding streets, including King Philip Road, Andover Street, and Grafton Street, already experience parking shortages, particularly during winter parking bans, and that vehicles are regularly ticketed and towed. Based on personal experience managing properties in the area, he asserted that nearly all studio and one-bedroom units have at least one vehicle, and reducing required parking from 27 spaces to 16 would create long-term neighborhood impacts. He urged the Board to consider requiring additional on-site parking, potentially by modifying the building design, to prevent overflow parking and associated issues for nearby residents.

Board Discussion:

Mr. LaValley stated that he was initially concerned about the proposed front landscaping but understands the need to maintain clear sight lines at the curb cut given the conditions along West Boylston Street. He then inquired whether the applicant is Commonwealth Builders.

Mr. Borenstein confirmed that the project is being pursued under the Commonwealth Builder Program (or a related funding variation). He explained that although ZBA variances were obtained previously, funding was not available at that time and that with potential funding now available, the applicant is moving forward in earnest with the development.

Mr. LaValley expressed his support.

Mr. McCormack expressed support for this project

Mr. Toomey expressed support for this project

Mr. King stated no comment

Mr. Dell'Aera stated no comment

On the motion, by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. King the Board voted 5–0 to close the public hearing

On a motion by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. King, the Board voted to approve the Definitive Site Plan and Special Permits for 342 West Boylston Street subject to staff recommended conditions of approval, moving Condition 1E to prior to building permit, striking Conditions 1M and 1bb, and amending Conditions 1N and 1O as discussed and to authorize withdrawal of the Special Permit for modifying the dimensional requirements for off-street parking & loading.

Other Business (Public Meeting)

15. Street Petitions

a. ST-2026-001 – Viele Avenue (Convert to Public)

Janice St. Amand, a resident of Viele Avenue, spoke regarding the condition and status of the private road. She explained that when she and her husband moved there in 1992, the road was unpaved and believed to end around numbers 30–40 due to a tree and wall placed by a former property owner, which effectively blocked through access. She states that over the years, she and her neighbors privately funded graveling and paving of their section of the road, though participation has declined and she and her husband have often covered the cost. She expressed concerns about emergency access, citing instances where fire and ambulance vehicles were unable to pass through due to the obstruction, requiring them to back down the street during emergencies.

Ms. St. Amand stated that she petitioned the City to convert Viele Avenue from a private to a public road, including a portion of Darling Street, to allow full connection through to Lorenz Street. She noted issues including poor drainage, potholes, and exposed infrastructure, and expressed her preference to have the City assume responsibility for the roadway rather than continuing private maintenance.

Leslie Rodriguez, DPW, stated no comment.

On a motion by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. King, the Board voted 5–0 to favorably recommend to the City Council the conversion of Viele Avenue from private to public, with a Priority One recommendation, incorporating DPW's recommendation to include a portion of Darling Street.

16. Approval Not Required (ANR) Plans

- a. AN-2025-008 – 3 Sherer Trail (Private)
- b. AN-2025-072 – 285 Tacoma Street (Public)
- c. AN-2026-003 – 132 Moreland Street (Public) & Orrison Street (Public)
- d. AN-2026-007 – 30, 42 & 50 LaGrange Street (Public) & Oread Street (Public)
- e. An-2026-008 – 0 Stockton Street (Public)

Rose Russell, DPRS, described ANR items 16 c & d to the Board. She stated items 16 a, b, & e are not properly before the Board.

On a motion by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. King, the Board voted 5-0 to endorse ANR plans 16 C & D.

10. Communications

11. Board Policy and Procedures

a. CMRPC Delegate

No discussion.

12. Approval of Minutes – 1/28/2026

No discussion.

Adjournment

On a motion by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. King, the Board unanimously voted to adjourn at 10:21pm.