



The City of Worcester

Planning Board Meeting Minutes Wednesday, March 11, 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 (*Participated Remotely*)
Anthony Dell’Aera (*Participated Remotely*)

Board Members Absent: Brandon King

Staff Present: Michelle Smith, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services (DPRS)
Olivia Houle, 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: 0 Chester Street (PB-2025-048) – Definitive Site Plan

Request to Continue the Public Meeting & Hearing to April 1, 2026
Extend the Constructive Grant Deadline to April 23, 2026

Item 2: 0 Farrington Street (PB-2024-065)

Request to Leave to Withdraw without Prejudice

Item 6: 12 Malden Street (PB-2026-019) – Definitive Site Plan & More Than One Building on a Lot Plan

Request to Postpone the Public Meeting & Hearing to April 1, 2026
Extend the Constructive Grant Deadline to April 23, 2026

On a motion by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. Dell'Aera, the Board voted 4-0 to grant the postponements and withdrawals.

New Business:

Item 3: 172-174 Shrewsbury Street (PB-2025-085)

- a. Public Meeting – Definitive Site Plan
- b. Public Hearing – Special Permit (IZ) for relief from minimum off-street parking and/or loading requirements, parking dimensional requirements, and landscaping requirements (Article VII, Section 6.A.ii)

Mark Borenstein, attorney on behalf of the applicant, Parkside Holdings Inc., described the applications before the Board and provided a video presentation for the proposal. Through the video, he stated the project seeks to renovate and expand the existing historic Jewett Gamage Auto and Wagon Works building by adding two new stories to the rear portion of the structure to create residential housing. He described the existing conditions and location of the property, noting its placement along Shrewsbury Street within a mixed-use and transit-accessible area, and outlined the proposed site improvements, including parking, landscaping, and pedestrian amenities. He explained that seven of the units will be affordable to households earning between 60 and 80 percent of the area median income. He stated the new development will provide a total of 44 new residential units.

Michelle Smith, DPRS, summarized the proposal before the Board and the relief sought by the applicant. She explained that the project is located in the BG-3 zoning district within the Commercial Corridors Overlay District along Shrewsbury Street and involves converting an existing building into a fully built-out three-story structure with approximately 44 residential units. She outlined the requested special permit relief, including an increased percentage of compact parking spaces, reduced drive aisle widths, deviations from landscaping requirements, and a reduction in required off-street parking through inclusionary zoning incentives and a transportation demand management plan. She described the staff-recommended conditions of approval and noted there are several conditions the applicant would like to review with the Board, particularly those related to EV charging and site design elements. She highlighted the parking and bicycle parking ratios and emphasized the need for clarification on parking management and maneuverability within the site, specifically ensuring vehicles can exit without backing onto the street. She noted the presence of a historic door on the building that should be preserved and referenced additional design considerations to maintain the building's historic character. She also stated that DPW engineering comments were not included in the Planning staff memo but should be incorporated into the Board's decision.

Mr. Borenstein, on behalf of the applicant, responded to staff comments and formally requested the Board grant the recommended waivers. He outlined several requested modifications to the conditions of approval, including striking the requirement for installed EV chargers while maintaining EV-ready infrastructure, noting the applicant is open to adding chargers in the future. He also requested an amendment to the affordable housing parking condition to require that at least seven parking spaces be bundled with the affordable units rather than all such spaces. Additionally, he asked that the portion of the condition related to e-bike charging be removed, while still providing the required bicycle parking spaces. He further requested that corresponding language in the site plan approval be updated to reflect these changes and that a specific site plan condition related to parking lot design and snow storage be struck.

Mike Andrade of Graves Engineering addressed several of the conditions of approval and provided additional detail on the site design. He explained that the proposed snow storage area would remain on pavement rather than being converted to a pervious surface due to concerns about the low-lying nature

of the parking lot and the potential for melting snow to create runoff that could flood the building's crawl space or adjacent properties, including nearby ball fields. He noted that keeping snow storage on pavement allows runoff to be properly captured and managed through the site's drainage system. He also discussed the parking layout, stating that compact spaces were placed in areas with more constrained maneuverability and that turning movement analyses were conducted for all parking spaces. While acknowledging that some spaces may require multiple movements to enter and exit, he confirmed that all vehicles would be able to maneuver within the site without needing to back out onto Risso Court.

Mr. Borenstein further addressed staff comments regarding the management of on-site parking. He explained that the project is intended to serve residents who primarily do not own vehicles, given the limited supply of 17 parking spaces for 44 units. He stated that parking spaces will be leased on a first-come, first-served basis, and once all spaces are occupied, no additional parking will be available. He noted that this arrangement will be clearly communicated to prospective tenants during the leasing process.

Public Comment

No Public Comments.

Board Discussion:

Mr. McCormack stated he is excited for this project to move forward and stated he has no issue with the special permits requested or the waivers. He stated he is also amenable to support the modifications to conditions requested by the applicant.

Mr. Dell'Aera stated he agrees with his colleague but does have concerns with navigating the cramped parking area for handicap parking.

Mr. Andrade responded to Mr. Dell'Aera's concern and confirmed that the handicap aisle would not need to be utilized to get a vehicle out of the space in question.

Mr. Toomey stated he has some concerns with the proposed parking, particularly in the winter months when snow is present. He also noted he is concerned that residents of the building will utilize parking that is reserved for the abutting park.

Mr. Borenstein stated he understands there is a barrier in place for the park's parking facility and residents will be notified that parking in that lot is not acceptable.

Mr. Toomey stated he is concerned that parking will be problematic.

Ms. Smith stated the Board could add a new condition 6e under the requirements for the Transportation Demand Management Plan to read "*Tenants shall be advised that parking in the municipal lot off of Risso Court is not permitted*".

Mr. LaValley stated he feels this proposal is in alignment with Worcester Now|Next and he is happy to support as conditioned by staff.

On the motion, by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. Dell'Aera the Board voted 4-0 to close the public hearing

On a motion by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. Dell'Aera, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan and Special Permit subject to staff recommended conditions of approval, adding condition 6e to the Special Permit, modifying conditions 1, 7, and 8 of the Special Permit, striking condition 1f of the Definitive Site Plan and modifying condition 1j of the Definitive Site Plan as described in the discussion.

List of Exhibits:

Exhibit A: Definitive Site Plan Application; filed 10/10/2025; prepared by Mark A. Borenstein

- Exhibit B: Special Permit (IZ) Application; filed 7/22/2025 (clerked 2/26/2026); prepared by Mark A. Borenstein
- Exhibit C: Site Plans; revised 10/22/2025; prepared by Graves Engineering Inc.
- Exhibit D: Survey; dated 5/27/2026; prepared by B&R Survey, Inc.
- Exhibit E: Arch Plans; dated 10/14/2025; prepared by Acropolis Design Consultants
- Exhibit F: Stormwater Report; dated 9/23/2025; prepared by Graves Engineering Inc.
- Exhibit G: Traffic & Parking Assessment Report; dated 9/23/2025; prepared by Stonefield Engineering and Design LLC
- Exhibit H: Transportation Demand Management Plan; dated 9/22/2025; prepared by Stonefield Engineering and Design LLC

Item 4. 112 & 116 Rodney Street (PB-2025-085)

a. Public Meeting – Definitive Site Plan Amendment

Olusola Esan, general contractor and owner of 112 and 116 Rodney Street, described the request before the Board to amend a previously approved site plan. He explained that during construction, adjustments were needed due to site conditions, including reducing the height of a retaining wall from six feet to under four feet based on soil topography. He noted that coordination with National Grid required utilities to be placed underground, which was not reflected in the original plan. He also stated that the parking layout was reconfigured to increase the number of spaces and that stormwater management was revised to utilize a single pipe system as recommended by DPW and engineers. Additionally, he explained that the separate driveways for each property are now proposed to be combined into a shared driveway with an easement, creating additional green space on the site. He concluded by noting that construction on one building is already underway and that approval of the amendment would allow work on the exterior to proceed.

Michelle Smith, DPRS, summarized the site plan amendment request before the Board. She explained that the proposal involves previously approved three-family properties that were originally granted approval in 2023 and amended in 2024, with a building permit issued in 2025, and that the applicant is now seeking additional modifications following changes made during construction. She described the shift from two separate properties with individual parking areas to a shared configuration with a common driveway, noting that this change consolidates site elements and reduces impervious surface area. She outlined that the applicant has obtained other zoning relief, including for parking quantity, lot area, frontage, setbacks, reduced drive aisle widths, landscaping buffers, and compact parking spaces. She noted several staff conditions, including adjustments to parking stall dimensions, installation of guardrails, and improvements to maneuverability within narrow drive aisles. She also raised concerns regarding slope stabilization and erosion control, requesting clarification on grading, the use of erosion control measures, and potential retaining walls where slopes may be too steep. She stated that most conditions have been addressed, but several outstanding items remain for the applicant to clarify.

Mr. Esan responded to staff comments.

Ms. Smith stated drainage for the retaining wall should be shown on the plan and the Board should add that as a condition.

Leslie Rodriguez of DPW stated that drainage for retaining wall should not be connected to the city system and a detail should be included in the plans.

Mr. Esan explained that the proposal includes completing the retaining wall to align with the building foundation and introducing green space along the slope to help mitigate erosion. He noted that the area

beneath the retaining wall will incorporate a French drain system connected to the stormwater system at the rear of the property to manage runoff. He stated that portions of the site, particularly near 112 Rodney Street, will be maintained as green space, and that certain parking areas could be adjusted or removed as needed since required parking has already been satisfied. He also addressed concerns about maneuverability, indicating that vehicles would be able to navigate the space without obstruction. Additionally, he noted that site representatives had visited the property and confirmed that certain areas of concern, including grading near property boundaries, are level and not excessively steep.

Ms. Smith requested clarification regarding the proposed retaining wall drainage. She stated that if the applicant's intent is to include a drainage system connected to the municipal stormwater system, this detail should be formally incorporated into the approval. She recommended that the Board add an additional condition of approval requiring the retaining wall drainage to be interconnected with the city storm drain system.

Leslie Rodriguez of DPW responded to the discussion regarding drainage and clarified that the proposed drainage system should not be directly connected to the municipal stormwater system. She sought clarification from the applicant regarding references to a French drain, to which the applicant clarified that the system is a perimeter drain intended for stormwater management rather than a direct connection from the building. Ms. Rodriguez stated that detailed plans of the drainage system must be submitted for review so that DPW can properly evaluate the proposal and ensure compliance with requirements.

Ms. Smith sought clarification on the status of drainage and site conditions, noting some confusion regarding what had been constructed versus what remained proposed, particularly given prior construction activity and a cease-and-desist order on exterior work.

Through discussion with the applicant and DPW, it was clarified that no perimeter drainage system is proposed for the retaining wall and that stormwater management will follow the previously approved design connecting on-site systems to the city line. Ms. Smith recommended that the Board include a condition requiring the applicant to submit a letter from a professional engineer confirming that the retaining walls have been installed in accordance with engineering best practices and manufacturer specifications. She also noted that additional plan revisions should clearly show updated grading and slope stabilization details in certain areas of the site.

Public Comment

No Public Comments.

Board Discussion:

Mr. McCormack stated he is amenable to adding the new condition und prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

Mr. Dell'Aera stated he supports the project and he's glad the new condition is being added.

Mr. Toomey stated he agrees with his colleagues.

Mr. LaValley encouraged the applicant to ensure he's paying close attention to requirements and conditions.

On a motion by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. Dell'Aera, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan Amendment subject to the staff-recommended conditions of approval and requested waivers, adding new condition under "prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy" as described in the discussion.

List of Exhibits:

Exhibit A: Application for Definitive Site Plan; received 1/15/2026; prepared by Olusola Esan

Exhibit B: Architectural Plans; dated 8/1/2025; prepared by Dias Design & Construction

Exhibit C: Site Plan; revised 2/18/2026; prepared by HS&T Group, Inc.

Item 5. 465 & 467 Lake Avenue (PB-2026-016)

- a. Public Meeting – Definitive Site Plan
- b. Public Hearing – Special Permit (ADU) to modify the dimensional requirements for an

Donald O'Neil, attorney on behalf of Kathleen and Charles Trainer, described the proposal before the Board for the property at 465–467 Lake Avenue. He explained that the site currently contains two existing single-family homes on one lot, which is a pre-existing nonconforming condition, and that the applicant proposes to demolish the structure at 465 Lake Avenue and reconstruct it further back on the lot in compliance with setback requirements. He noted that in order to retain two dwelling units on the property, the second structure at 467 Lake Avenue is proposed to be classified as an accessory dwelling unit (ADU), which requires a special permit due to its size exceeding 900 square feet. He also stated that site plan approval is required due to the slope of the lot exceeding 15 percent. He described the existing U-shaped driveway configuration with two curb cuts, noting that the proposal seeks to maintain this layout with minor adjustments, which will require additional zoning relief. He requested that the Board grant the necessary waivers and outlined minor concerns with staff-recommended conditions, including clarification on required tree plantings along the frontage and a request to retain an existing gravel area within the right-of-way for parking flexibility.

Michelle Smith, DPRS, summarized the proposal for site plan approval and a special permit to allow an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) greater than 900 square feet. She explained that the site contains two existing single-family homes on one lot and that the applicant seeks to classify the smaller structure as an ADU, which requires a special permit due to exceeding the 900 square foot threshold. She noted that site plan review is triggered by the steep slope of the property and outlined that the proposed driveway configuration is intended to improve circulation and avoid backing onto the street, though it requires multiple zoning reliefs that are still pending before the Zoning Board of Appeals. She discussed staff concerns related to stormwater management, including the need for soil testing to confirm infiltration capacity, as well as potential impacts on mature trees and the importance of offsetting canopy loss through new plantings. She also addressed concerns regarding an existing gravel area near the frontage, noting a preference for stabilization through vegetation or pavement due to proximity to Lake Quinsigamond and water quality considerations. She indicated that staff would support flexibility in tree planting locations, including coordination with DPW and Parks within the right-of-way if necessary, and stated that the remaining issues for Board consideration primarily relate to the gravel area and required tree plantings.

Leslie Rodriguez of DPW confirmed that landscaping would be preferred in the existing gravel area.

Public Comment:

No Public Comments.

Board Discussion:

Mr. McCormack stated he has no issues with the special permit requested. He stated if DPW is amenable to having trees within the ROW and the applicant is amenable to the area noted by staff, he is okay with that. He noted he agrees with staff that landscaping would be preferable in gravel area in light of the lake.

Mr. Dell'Aera asked how common it is for existing dwellings to be classified as an ADU; Ms. Smith stated this is a unique circumstance.

Mr. Dell'Aera stated he supports but asked for clarification on DPW engineering comments. Ms. Smith responded.

Mr. Toomey stated he has no issue with the special permit given the unique circumstance here. He does have concerns with current canopy being removed for the reconstruction of the single-family.

Mr. O'Neil stated the Conservation Commission is also reviewing this plan and they are required to replace any trees removed over 5" in diameter.

Mr. LaValley stated he wants to be sure trees can be placed in ROW per the applicants question.

Ms. Smith suggested modified language for condition 1a to read *"Reflect a minimum of three tree plantings along the property's frontage, in coordination with the DPW&P, within the ROW to the degree that the departments are willing to issue a permit for such trees, and provide one additional tree located along the northwestern property line (between 465 Lake Ave & the neighboring property). All trees shall be of [city recommended species](#) of no less than 3" caliper inches."*

On the motion, by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. Dell'Aera the Board voted 4-0 to close the public hearing

On a motion by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. Dell'Aera, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan and Special Permit subject to staff recommended conditions of approval modifying Definitive Site Plan condition 1a as described in the discussion.

List of Exhibits:

Exhibit A: Application for Definitive Site Plan; received 1/15/2026; prepared by Donald J. O'Neil

Exhibit B: Special Permit Application; clerked 2/26/2026; prepared by Donald J. O'Neil

Exhibit C: Survey Existing Condition; dated 6/22/2024; prepared by Jarvis Land Survey, Inc

Exhibit E: Architectural Plans ADU; dated 1/28/2026; prepared by BB&R Design-Build

Exhibit D: Architectural Plans Single-Family Dwelling; dated 2/2/2026; prepared by BB&R Design-Build

Exhibit F: Site Plan; revised 2/13/2026; prepared by Graves Engineering

Exhibit G: Stormwater Report; dated 1/14/2026, revised 2/4/2026; provided by Graves Engineering.

7. 8 Paradox Drive (Lots 1 & 2) (PB-2026-021)

a. Public Hearing – Definitive "Frontage" Subdivision Plan

Joshua Lee Smith, attorney on behalf of the applicants, Jesse and Michelle Abdelnour, introduced the project and described a proposal to subdivide an approximately 23,000 square foot lot currently containing a single-family home into two separate lots. He explained that one lot would retain the existing home while the newly created lot would be developed with a new single-family residence. He noted that a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals had already been obtained to address insufficient frontage on one of the resulting lots, while all other dimensional requirements would be met. He stated that the applicant is generally in agreement with the staff recommendations and conditions, requesting only minor clarification on one item.

Michelle Smith, DPRS, clarified details regarding the subdivision and administrative process. She explained that the City's addressing coordinator will assign official street addresses to the newly created lots upon plan approval, which will streamline the permitting process and eliminate the need for a separate street number request when applying for a building permit. She described the proposal as a frontage subdivision, noting that while both resulting lots meet lot area requirements, one lot will not meet the required frontage of the zoning district in which it is primarily located.

She stated that although the applicant has already obtained a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals for this deficiency, a waiver from subdivision regulations is also required to allow the division. She further noted that, because no new road construction is proposed, the applicant is also seeking waivers from roadway construction requirements, and that the conditions of approval outlined in the staff memo address these items.

Public Comment:

No Public Comments

Board Discussion:

Conor McCormack stated that he had no issues with the proposed frontage subdivision. He noted that the applicant's attorney had raised a question regarding one of the conditions, specifically related to the addressing coordinator, and confirmed that the clarification provided by staff addressed that concern. He indicated that he had no further comments.

Mr. Lee Smith sought clarification regarding the timing of a condition related to the addressing coordinator, noting that several conditions were tied to actions required prior to the release of the decision and wanting to ensure the process would not cause delays.

In response, Ms. Smith clarified that the condition should instead be tied to the endorsement of the plan rather than the release of the decision and noted that the addressing process is typically completed quickly, often within a few days. Mr. Lee Smith acknowledged the clarification and expressed understanding of the revised timing

Stephen Toomey expressed his support

Anthony Dell'Aera expressed his support

Albert LaValley expressed his support

On the motion, by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. Dell'Aera the Board voted 4–0 to close the public hearing

On a motion by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. Dell'Aera, the Board voted 4–0 to approve the Definitive Frontage Subdivision Plan subject to the staff-recommended conditions of approval.

List of Exhibits:

Exhibit A: Definitive Frontage Subdivision Plan Application; clerked 2/26/2026; prepared by Joseph Duquette, Attorney

Exhibit B: Definitive Frontage Subdivision Plan; dated 2/9/2026; prepared by HS&T Group, Inc

8. 11 Hammond Street (PB-2026-023),

- a. Public Meeting – Definitive Site Plan
- b. Public Hearing – Special Permit (IZ) for relief from minimum off-street parking and/or loading requirements, parking dimensional requirements, and landscaping requirements (Article VII, Section 6.A.ii)

Todd Rodman, attorney with Cedar & Chandler, appeared on behalf of Main South Community Development Corporation, the purchaser of the subject property, and introduced members of the project team. He described the proposal as a 48,700 square foot, five-story multifamily development consisting of 41 affordable housing units, 35 surface parking spaces, and associated site improvements. He explained that the project would redevelop a vacant funeral home parking lot into affordable

housing, reduce impervious surface area by over 7,000 square feet, and serve low-income residents, including seniors, with several fully accessible units included. He stated that the applicant is seeking site plan approval due to the number of dwelling units and an inclusionary zoning special permit to allow a reduction in required parking. He noted that additional parking relief will be sought from the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Michelle Smith, DPRS, summarized the proposal for a site plan approval and inclusionary zoning special permit. She explained that the project involves redeveloping an existing parking lot into a five-story, approximately 48,000 square foot building with 41 residential units and 35 parking spaces, resulting in a reduction of impervious surface and improved stormwater management. She outlined the requested parking reduction, noting that while the applicant can reduce required parking to 41 spaces through inclusionary zoning incentives, additional relief will be needed from the Zoning Board of Appeals due to the proposed 35 spaces. She highlighted that the parking ratio remains consistent with or higher than similar developments and noted the inclusion of both interior and exterior bicycle parking, as well as a transportation demand management plan. She described site improvements including pedestrian amenities, landscaping, and stormwater infiltration measures, and noted minor staff comments related to vegetation, walkway connectivity, and potential enhancements such as additional seating and pathways to improve accessibility and usability of the site. She stated that overall, staff's comments are largely minor and invited the applicant to address specific conditions of concern.

Mr. Rodman responded to staff comments and outlined the applicant's position on various conditions of approval. He confirmed that the applicant is agreeable to several conditions, including the addition of shade trees along Hammond Street, extension of the pedestrian walkway to provide direct access from the street to the outdoor plaza, and the installation of additional lighting along the building frontage. He clarified that two EV charging spaces will be operational at occupancy while the remaining spaces will be EV-ready, and agreed to adjust EV parking locations in accordance with fire department recommendations, except for the accessible space which must remain near the building. He also addressed comments regarding site features, stating that no existing trees will remain but additional street trees will be planted as requested, and that the basement community room will function as flexible common space without a fixed program. He noted that the applicant does not intend to include raised garden beds, based on prior experience, and reiterated earlier comments regarding e-bike charging infrastructure. He concluded by indicating that the project team would provide further clarification on erosion control and site stabilization.

Ron Mendes of Graves Engineering provided additional details on site design and erosion control. He explained that the project includes 35 parking spaces, underground stormwater infrastructure to manage roof runoff, and replacement of existing curb cuts, while reducing impervious surface by approximately 7,000 square feet. He stated that erosion control blankets are proposed for sloped areas, noting that most slopes are at or below a 3:1 ratio and are limited in extent, making blankets an appropriate stabilization method. He added that existing site conditions are currently steeper in some areas and that the proposed grading would improve those conditions.

Ms. Smith outlined recommended modifications to the conditions of approval based on the applicant's requests. She suggested revisions to bicycle parking conditions to allow flexibility in e-bike charging infrastructure, modifications to site plan conditions related to transformer placement or screening, and updates to EV charging requirements to reflect two operational charging spaces at occupancy. She also recommended adjustments to fire department conditions to allow exceptions for accessible parking spaces and clarified options for the Board to consider in modifying the conditions accordingly.

Public Comment

Daniel Hyman, a homeowner at 16 Allen Street, spoke in support of the overall development but raised concerns about its impact on neighboring properties. He stated that his family's home directly abuts the

project site and emphasized concerns regarding the placement of the dumpster, noting that it would be located very close to his backyard grilling area. He requested that the dumpster be relocated, potentially to an area used for snow storage. He also expressed concerns about loss of privacy and requested the addition of landscaping, such as bushes or trees, along the property line to provide a buffer. Additionally, he raised concerns about the placement of EV charging infrastructure and exterior lighting, stating that lighting from the site could significantly impact his home. He emphasized that while he supports development, he is seeking reasonable modifications to preserve privacy and minimize impacts on his property.

Mr. LaValley stated funding for this project is highly regulated. He encouraged the abutters to work with the developer to resolve their concerns.

Board Discussion:

Mr. McCormack stated he is excited to support the project and see the affordable units provided. He also noted he is happy the developer is willing to work with the abutters.

Mr. Dell'Aera stated he is looking forward to seeing the developer work with the abutters.

Mr. Toomey stated this is a great development and an improvement to the neighborhood.

Mr. LaValley stated this is much needed affordable housing and he is happy to support.

Ms. Smith suggested modifying Special Permit condition 2d to read *“38 bicycle parking spaces interior to the building, with some outlets available to enable charging, and 10 covered exterior bicycle parking spaces shall be maintained on-site”*.

She also suggested modifying Definitive Site Plan condition 1c to read *“Relocate the proposed transformer to a less prominent location the property or provide vegetative screening (e.g. tall ornamental grasses or evergreen shrubs) to minimize the visual impact of the equipment”*, condition 1e to read *“Reflect provisions for e-bike charging within the bicycle room”*, condition 1n to read *“Modify the site plan to include two EV operational spaces at occupancy”*, and condition 1z to read *“EV parking spaces to be placed further away from the building except any spaces required to be accessible”*.

Mr. LaValley stated he would like to see the developer work out the issues with the abutters and they could add a condition that allows the applicant to relocate the dumpster in favor of working with the abutters.

Ms. Smith suggested adding a new condition to read *“The applicant may shift the dumpster in coordination with staff”*.

On the motion, by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. Dell'Aera the Board voted 4–0 to close the public hearing

On a motion by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. Dell'Aera, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan and Special Permit subject to staff recommended conditions of approval, modifying Special Permit condition 2d, modifying Definitive Site Plan conditions 1c,e,n,z and adding new Definitive Site Plan condition for dumpster flexibility as described in the discussion.

List of Exhibits:

- Exhibit A: Definitive Site Plan Application; filed 2/19/2026; prepared by Todd Rodman, Attorney
- Exhibit B: Special Permit (IZ) Application; filed 2/19/2026; prepared by Todd Rodman, Attorney
- Exhibit C: Project Impact Statement; filed 2/19/2026; prepared by Todd Rodman, Attorney
- Exhibit D: Site Plans; revised 2/19/2026; prepared by Graves Engineering Inc.
- Exhibit E: Arch Plans; dated 11/25/2025; prepared by Dixon Salo Architects

- Exhibit F: Stormwater Report; dated 2/5/2026; prepared by Graves Engineering Inc.
- Exhibit G: Transportation Management Program; dated 2/4/2026; prepared by Graves Engineering Inc
- Exhibit H: Public Comments; received 3.1.2026; submitted by Qihang Wu

Other Business (Public Meeting)

9. Approval Not Required (ANR) Plans

- a. AN-2025-008 – 3 Sherer Trail (Private)
- b. AN-2025-072 – 285 Tacoma Street (Public)
- c. An-2026-008 – 0 Stockton Street (Public)
- d. An-2026-009 – 3 Farrington Street (Private) & 17 Warner Avenue (Public)
- e. An-2026-010 – 14 Beverly Cove (Public) & 24 Saybrook Road (Public)
- f. An-2026-011 – 19 & 23 Bellevue Street (Public)
- g. An-2026-012 – 1429 & 1439 Main Street (Public) & 48, 52 & 54 Bauer Street (Public)
- h. An-2026-013 – 1 New Bond Street (Private)

Olivia Houle, DPRS, described ANR items 9b-d, f, & h to the Board. She stated items 9a & g are not properly before the Board.

On a motion by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. Toomey, the Board voted 4-0 to endorse ANR plans 9b-d, f, & h.

10. Communications

- a. CMRPC – Local Planning Assistance (LPA) Hours

Michelle Smith, DPRS, provided an overview of a request related to the Central Massachusetts Regional Planning Commission (CMRPC). She explained that the City receives a limited number of technical assistance hours annually from CMRPC, which can be authorized for use by the Planning Board Chair. She stated that staff is proposing to use these hours to develop a scope of work for a comprehensive overhaul of the City's subdivision rules and regulations. She noted that the current regulations are outdated, particularly with respect to street design standards, speed considerations, and stormwater management, and no longer reflect current planning practices. She explained that the goal of this effort would be to create a proposal and identify potential funding sources to support a full update of the regulations. She added that while the number of available hours is limited, this work would serve as an initial step to launch a broader project, and she sought general support from the Board before proceeding.

On a motion by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. Dell'Aera, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the use of LPA hours for subdivision rules and regs.

11. Board Policy and Procedures

- a. CMRPC Delegate

Michelle Smith, DPRS, explained the City's participation in the Central Massachusetts Regional Planning Commission (CMRPC), noting that the City holds designated delegate seats that contribute to quorum and participation in regional decision-making. She stated that the Planning Board typically appoints one member as a delegate, alongside a staff representative, and that delegates attend quarterly meetings where topics include agency business, funding opportunities, and regional planning discussions. She noted that attendance at these meetings allows the City to accrue local planning assistance hours, which can later be used for technical support. She described the commitment as four meetings per year and asked if any Board members were interested in serving in the role.

Mr. Toomey expressed willingness to serve as the delegate if needed.

On a motion by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. Dell'Aera, the Board voted 4-0 to nominate Mr. Toomey for the CMRPC delegate position.

12. Approval of Minutes

No discussion.

Adjournment

On a motion by Mr. McCormack, seconded by Mr. Toomey, the Board unanimously voted to adjourn at 7:44pm.