



The City of Worcester

Planning Board Meeting Minutes Wednesday, April 22, 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:

Conor McCormack, Vice-Chair
Stephen Toomey
Brandon King (*Participated Remotely*)

Board Members Absent:

Albert LaValley, Chair
Anthony Dell'Aera

Staff Present:

Michelle Smith, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
(DPRS)
Stephen Cary, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services (DPRS)
Leslie Rodriguez, DPW (*Participated Remotely*)
Kobe Boaten, LAW

Call to Order:

Board Chair Conor McCormack called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm.

Mr. McCormack 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 May 13, 2026
Extend the Constructive Grant Deadline to June 4, 2026

Item 2: 28 Harrington Way (PB-2025-093) – Special Permit

Request to Postpone the Public Meeting to May 13, 2026
Extend the Constructive Grant Deadline to June 4, 2026

Item 3: 17 Pearl Street (PB-2026-027) – Definitive Site Plan & Special Permit Extension of Time

Request to Postpone the Public Meeting to May 13, 2026
Extend the Constructive Grant Deadline to June 4, 2026

Item 7: 25 West Chester Street (ZA-2026-002)

Request to Postpone the Public Meeting to June 3, 2026

Extend the Constructive Grant Deadline to June 25, 2026

On a motion by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Toomey, the Board voted 3-0 to grant the postponements and withdrawals.

Old Business:

10. Portions of the Belmont Street/Plantation Street Corridor/Green Hill Area (ZA-2026-005)

a. Public Hearing – Zoning Map Amendment

Michelle Smith, DPRS, provided the update on the petitioner's behalf. She stated that based on prior board discussion and public concerns about future development near Belmont Street and Reactory Drive, two parcels originally included in the rezoning proposal were removed: 0 and 257 Belmont Street. She explained that staff also removed a small RS-7 zoning area on conservation land to avoid creating an isolated zoning "bubble." Ms. Smith stated the revised petition now proposes changing about 160 acres to BG-3.0 zoning and 36 acres to RS-7 zoning, affecting 23 properties total. She explained the changes are intended to reduce outdated manufacturing zoning around the UMass campus area while better aligning residential and open-space uses. Staff noted that any further action at the City Council level would include additional public hearings and opportunities for community comment.

Public Comment:

No Public Comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. McCormack, stated that the revised zoning changes reflected the issues discussed at the previous meeting. He also agreed with staff's explanation that if any additional public comments were raised, there would be another opportunity for residents and stakeholders to speak at the upcoming Economic Development Subcommittee meeting.

Mr. Toomey asked whether concerns from the Shrewsbury Street Business District had been addressed; Ms. Smith explained that a neighborhood meeting was taking place at the same time as the Planning Board meeting, with the petitioner attending to hear questions and concerns directly from residents and business owners. She noted that most public comments were requests for clarification about the proposal, and that the only formal opposition previously received had come from the council for Wuxi, which was already reflected in the revised petition.

Ms. Smith further explained that the Planning Board's role was only to make a recommendation, while the matter would continue to the Economic Development Subcommittee and eventually the City Council. Additional concerns raised at the neighborhood meeting could be addressed at those later stages, and the proposal could still be supported, modified, tabled, or rejected as the process moved forward.

Mr. King stated no comment.

On a motion by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Toomey, the Board voted 3-0 to recommend in favor of the proposed zoning map amendment, as amended.

List of Exhibits:

- Exhibit A: Petition – City Manager; referred to Planning Board on 3/11/2026.
Exhibit B: Proposed Rezoning Maps; dated 3/2/2026
Exhibit C: Existing Zoning Map; 2/3/2026
Exhibit D: Public Comment Letter; 3/28/2026

New Business:**Item 3. 1103 Millbury Street (PB-2026-008)****a. Public Meeting – Definitive Site Plan**

Attorney Joshua Lee Smith introduced the project team for a proposed development at 1103 Millbury Street and explained that, because only three voting members were present, the applicant was not seeking a vote that evening and instead wanted to present the updated proposal and continue discussions with the board. He stated the project involves an approximately 84,000 SF, three-story multifamily building with 40 residential units above a podium-style parking structure. He described the proposed parking which includes a total of 80 parking spaces, with 46 spaces in the garage and 34 surface spaces. The team noted they had already received approvals from the Zoning Board of Appeals for a special permit and height variance, and had also met several times with neighbors and the local councilor.

The project architect, Jesse Hildenberg, described revisions made in response to neighborhood and zoning feedback. He stated these changes included lowering the building height, simplifying the façade design, and creating a more uniform exterior appearance. He noted each unit would include either a patio or balcony, while shared amenities would include a gym, community office space, and outdoor common areas.

Me. Lee Smith explained the plans have also been updated to reflect environmental conditions imposed by the Conservation Commission, including a 50-foot wooded buffer at the rear of the property. Due to this of this new buffer, Mr. Lee Smith asked the board to consider removing previously proposed fencing and arborvitae plantings, arguing they were no longer necessary. Mr. Lee Smith stated they agreed with most staff recommendations and would continue refining the plans with city staff before returning for further review.

Michelle Smith, DPRS, explained that the proposal would likely be continued because several engineering and site design issues still needed more review. She stated the project is presented as a three-story multifamily building with 40 units and 80 parking spaces and that the sloped terrain makes parts of the structure appear taller. She stated the building is being set into the hillside along Millbury Street, requiring significant excavation, retaining walls, and fill work. Due of these conditions, she stated staff's main concerns focused on stormwater management, drainage, groundwater impacts, slope stability, and long-term site safety. She requested additional technical information, including a cut-and-fill analysis, retaining wall drainage details, and geotechnical review to ensure groundwater would not create erosion or icing hazards.

Ms. Smith also raised concerns about the steep rear slope shown on the plans, noting that a 2:1 grade may require permanent stabilization measures beyond simple vegetation. Regarding the proposed 50-foot wooded buffer at the rear of the property, she said staff does not oppose removing fencing and arborvitae plantings but recommended confirming what mature trees would actually remain within that buffer. She explained that this would help ensure the wooded area provides real privacy and screening for neighboring homes. Overall, she said these unresolved technical issues were the main reason they were not yet comfortable recommending conditional approval

Public Comment:

No Public Comments.

Board Discussion:

Mr. McCormack agreed with staff that the project needed additional review before moving forward, especially regarding drainage, stormwater management, and known groundwater concerns in that area of Millbury Street. He said more technical information should be provided so staff could fully evaluate whether the site design was safe and appropriate.

He also stated he is comfortable with removing the proposed arborvitae plantings and fencing at the rear of the property, calling that request reasonable. However, he supported staff's recommendation that the applicant first document the mature trees that would remain in the 50-foot vegetated buffer to determine whether the natural buffer would be substantial enough to provide the privacy and screening intended for neighboring properties.

Mr. Toomey and Mr. King echoed the comments of Mr. McCormack.

On a motion by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Toomey, the Board voted 3-0 to continue the meeting to the May 13th Planning Board meeting.

List of Exhibits:

- Exhibit A: Application & Statement in Support; filed 1/15/2026; prepared by Joshua Lee Smith, Bowditch & Dewey, LLP
- Exhibit B: Layout Plan; dated 2/27/2026; prepared by McCarty Engineering, Inc.
- Exhibit C: Site Plan set; revised 2/3/2026; prepared by McCarty Engineering, Inc.
- Exhibit D: Architectural Plans; dated 1/6/2026; prepared by Dixon Salo Architects
- Exhibit E: Slope Stability Letter; dated 1/28/2026; prepared by John C. Spink & Linea Cronin, P.E.
- Exhibit F: Survey; dated 1/28/2026; prepared by HS&T Group
- Exhibit G: Stormwater Management Report; dated 11/24/2025; prepared by McCarty Engineering, Inc.
- Exhibit H: Supplemental Soil Testing Data; dated 1/9/2026; prepared by Lawrence C. Greene
- Exhibit I: Traffic Impact & Access Stud; dated 10/29/2024; prepared by Fort Hill Infrastructure

4. 12 Malden Street (PB-2026-019)

- a. Public Meeting – Definitive Site Plan
- b. Public Hearing – More Than One Building on a Lot

Attorney Joshua Lee Smith presented a proposal on behalf of Wolf Farms LLC for a townhouse-style development at 12 Malden Street. He stated the project would build 12 townhouse units across a multi-acre site, arranged in four buildings with three units each and connected by a shared internal driveway. He stated each unit would include a two-car garage, with additional driveway parking spaces bringing the total to 48 spaces. He noted the site had already received a zoning change to RL-7 and prior approvals from the Zoning Board of Appeals, including special permits and variances.

The project architect explained that each townhouse would be about 1,360 square feet and built slab-on-grade with no basement. He stated the ground level would contain a garage, storage, laundry, and

entry area; the main floor would include living space, kitchen, and a rear deck for a second means of egress; and the top floor would contain three bedrooms. The team stated the project would meet building and energy code requirements and was presented as a straightforward residential development

Michelle Smith, DPRS, explained that the proposal at 12 Malden Street required board review because it involved 12 units and multiple residential buildings on one lot. She noted the project includes 48 parking spaces, which was more than typical, and said most comments focused on site design rather than the use itself. She described the staff recommended conditions of approval, which include a lighting plan, additional windows on one interior-facing elevation, more trees along the shared driveway, and narrower driveways where possible to reduce pavement and improve the appearance of the site.

Ms. Smith also noted the project had already received zoning relief for density and that the 12-unit proposal triggered inclusionary zoning requirements. She said stormwater reports showed runoff rates would not increase, but additional technical updates and standard construction management conditions would still be required before development could move forward.

Attorney Joshua Lee Smith responded to staff conditions for the 12 Malden Street townhouse project and asked for several modifications. He requested that addressing and driveway naming requirements be moved to the building permit stage rather than earlier in the process. He also opposed adding more windows on one side elevation, saying bedrooms already had enough natural light and the solid wall space was useful for furniture layout.

He also pushed back on several landscaping conditions, arguing the 12-unit project already included a strong planting plan with 19 shade trees plus shrubs and grasses. He said additional trees were unnecessary, narrower individual driveways could make garage access too tight, and planting behind the retaining wall could create maintenance and structural issues. He added that the project already included multiple tree species and enough vegetation to soften the site and reduce pavement impacts.

Public Comment:

No Public Comments.

Board Discussion:

Mr. McCormack said they had no issue with moving Conditions 1O and 1P to the building permit stage, noting those requirements would need to be completed before permits were issued anyway. However, they did not support removing the landscaping and tree-related conditions. He described the 12 Malden Street proposal as heavily dominated by cars and pavement, with 48 parking spaces for 12 units appearing excessive. Because of that, he wanted staff's tree and site-improvement conditions to remain in place to help reduce impervious surface, add shade, and improve the overall design. He also asked the applicant to confirm they are formally requesting waivers from subdivision regulations as part of the approval

Mr. Toomey stated no comment.

Mr. King said they were generally comfortable with the applicant's requested changes for the 12 Malden Street project. He specifically supported removing Condition 1E because of concerns about protecting the structural integrity and maintenance access of the retaining wall. He also had no issue with moving Conditions 1O and 1P so those requirements would apply before issuance of a building permit rather than earlier in the process. Overall, Mr. King expressed support for the proposed revisions.

Attorney Joshua Lee Smith responded that the project was not truly overparked, explaining the 48 spaces were counted largely because each townhouse has a two-car garage with driveway space needed for vehicle access. He said the paved area was functional rather than excess parking, but the applicant was willing to narrow the individual driveways as long as they remained wide enough to serve the 16-

foot garage doors. This change, he said, would reduce impervious surface and address one of the board's concerns.

After discussion, the board members thanked the team for being flexible and suggested narrowing each driveway by about two feet across the project. They also asked the applicant to consider adding two shade trees in place of shrubs near certain rear units to provide more shade over paved areas. The applicant agreed, and the board moved toward revised conditions that would keep some landscaping improvements while removing others

On the motion, by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Toomey the Board voted 3–0 to close the public hearing.

On a motion by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Toomey, the Board voted 3-0 to approve the MTOB Plan and Definitive Site Plan subject to staff recommended conditions of approval, striking Definitive Site Plan conditions 1 e, f, & h, modifying condition 1 d to read “Reduce driveway widths to align them with the garage doors to the extent possible to allow two vehicles to enter and exit.” and moving conditions 1 o & p to under “prior to issuance of a building permit”.

List of Exhibits:

- Exhibit A: Definitive Site Plan & More Than one Building on a Lot Application; filed February 5, 2026; prepared by Bowditch & Dewey, LLP
- Exhibit B: Stormwater Management Report; dated December 23, 2025; revised March 4, 2026; prepared by J.M. Grenier Associates, Inc.
- Exhibit C: Architectural Plans; dated January 25, 2026; revised March 24, 2026; prepared by Acropolis Design Consultants
- Exhibit D: Site Plans; dated December 23, 2025; revised March 24, 2026; prepared by Carlos Ferrera, P.E., J.M. Grenier Associates & MP Design Consultants
- Exhibit E: Existing Conditions Survey; dated November 13, 2024; prepared by James Patrick Smith, P.L.S., Tauper Land Survey Inc.
- Exhibit F: Landscaping Plan; dated December 23, 2025; revised January 20, 2026; prepared by J.M. Grenier Associates & MP Design Consultants
- Exhibit G: Drainage Maps; dated December 23, 2025; revised March 24, 2026; prepared by Carlos Ferrera, P.E., J.M. Grenier Associates & MP Design Consultants
- Exhibit H: Vehicle Turning Plan; dated December 23, 2025; revised March 24, 2026; prepared by Carlos Ferrera, P.E., J.M. Grenier Associates & MP Design Consultants
- Exhibit I: Zoning Board Decision; ZB-2026-010

Item 6. 4 Brandt Lane & o Grafton Street (PB-2026-032)

a. Public Meeting – Definitive Site Plan Amendment

Attorney Steve Madaus presented a request to amend a previously approved definitive site plan for a multifamily housing development at 4 Brandt Lane, located off Grafton Street. He stated the original project covered approximately 16.9 acres and included five four-story multifamily buildings and explained that the amendment focused on Lot 4, where environmental constraints such as a man-made channel and wetlands required redesign. After discussions with state environmental agencies, he stated the proposed building on Lot 4 was significantly reduced from about 147,000 SF to 92,000 SF. He noted the total number of dwelling units on that lot would decrease from 112 to 69, and parking would be reduced from 160 to 104 spaces. Across the entire development, he explained the total number of units would decrease from 491 to 448, while total parking would drop from 793 to 737 spaces.

The project engineer explained that the building was moved farther from the wetlands to avoid stream impacts, with parking now concentrated on the south side and within a garage. He stated stormwater systems were relocated, amenity areas were redesigned, and new features such as a dog park, bicycle storage, patio space, and indoor common areas were added. He noted the redesign also removes pavement from wetland areas, restores buffer zones, and relocates the stream into natural soil rather than over pavement.

Mr. Madaus stated the applicant is generally comfortable with staff's recommended conditions of approval, requesting only minor edits to tree-species requirements so they would remain consistent with any future Conservation Commission orders. Overall, the revised plan was presented as a smaller and environmentally improved version of the previously approved development

Stephen Cary, DPRS, said the revised proposal at 4 Brandt Lane made major improvements, including a 40% smaller building footprint, fewer units and parking spaces, and a narrower access road to reduce impacts on the nearby stream. He stated that staff's remaining conditions mainly focused on pedestrian safety, such as reducing excess pavement, adding landscaping, creating a crosswalk, and clarifying the walking loop so the site would be more walkable and safer for residents.

Public Comment:

David Dixon, Worcester resident, spoke on behalf of neighbors who use Pine Hill Road, a private dead-end road off Grafton Street that serves about 90 residents and is their only access point. He said residents were concerned about how construction traffic from the proposed development could affect safety and access during the building process. He asked the board to require that construction vehicles, contractor parking, and staging activities not use Pine Hill Road, and that emergency access for residents always be maintained. He also requested that the developer's stated willingness to upgrade Pine Hill Road to public road standards be made a formal condition of approval, with clear timing and coordination requirements.

Mr. McCormack clarified that the current hearing only concerned an amendment for one building within the larger approved development at 4 Brandt Lane, and that all conditions from the original approval would still remain in effect, noting that the existing conditions already require rehabilitation of Pine Hill Road for 225 feet from Grafton Street. He noted the conditions also restrict construction traffic so vehicles must use Brandt Lane rather than Pine Hill Road, except for limited work directly related to improvements in that area.

In response to resident concerns, Mr. Madaus added that prior plans included a full reconstruction of Pine Hill Road, a new sidewalk, and street lighting to improve safety.

Mr. McCormack emphasized that these road improvements were part of the original approval and must be completed before occupancy of the project, which should help reassure nearby residents.

Board Discussion:

Mr. McCormack said he had no concerns with the revised proposal, noting the building had been reduced in size because of wetland requirements and that the project would also decrease impervious surface on the site. He also supported the applicant's requested adjustment to Condition 1M. He added that he appreciated staff's review, especially comments related to pedestrian circulation and vehicle turning movements and said they were ready to move the matter toward a motion if the applicant had no further questions.

Mr. Toomey stated no comment.

Mr. King asked whether the proposed walking loop would be physically marked on the site; Mr. Madaus explained that the label was intended to show there would be a continuous walking path around the

development, which had been presented as one of the project's amenities. He clarified that part of the route follows a fire lane, which would not be used regularly by vehicles and would mostly function as an open paved area where residents could walk, however, he confirmed there were no specific plans at that time to add pavement markings or other on-site demarcation for the walking loop.

On a motion by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Toomey, the Board voted 3-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan Amendment subject to staff recommended conditions of approval, modifying condition 1 m to read "All proposed trees should be from the Recommended Tree Species list or in conformance with the plans filed with the Conservation Commission".

List of Exhibits:

- Exhibit A: Definitive Site Plan Amendment Application; filed 04/03/2026; prepared by Mirick Law
- Exhibit B: Site Plan; revised 3/25/2026; prepared by Thompson-Liston Associates, Inc.
- Exhibit C: Landscape Plan; revised 3/25/2026; prepared by Thompson-Liston Associates, Inc.
- Exhibit C: Lighting and Photometric Plan; dated 3/23/2026; prepared by Reflex
- Exhibit D: Floor Plans, Elevations, & Rendering revised 3/17/2026; prepared by Mangel Destefano Architects
- Exhibit E: Stormwater Report; revised 3/11/2026; prepared by Thomas-Liston Associates Inc.

8. 15, 17, 19 Milton Street (ZA-2026-003)

a. Public Hearing – Zoning Map Amendment

Attorney Todd Rodman introduced a zoning map amendment request on behalf of Seven Brookfield Realty LLC covering items 8 and 9 of the agenda, including 15, 17, and 19 Milton Street. He explained the separate agenda items were part of the same overall rezoning effort. Mr. Rodman stated properties are currently zoned MG-2.0, but he argued that manufacturing has largely left this part of the city.

Mr. Rodman said the requested zone changes were intended to reflect current neighborhood conditions and provide more flexibility for future uses. He noted that he had met with city planning staff, the district councilor, and sent notices to affected property owners. Aside from one response from a resident of 19 Milton Street, he said no other concerns had been raised. He also stated the proposal aligned with the city's long-range plan, which identifies the area as a transformative growth district.

Michelle Smith of DPRS, explained that the petition would rezone 15, 17, and 19 Milton Street from MG-2.0 manufacturing to RG-5 residential, extending the existing residential district across the street. Ms. Smith said the area is now mostly residential, while the manufacturing zoning is a remnant from an older era. She emphasized that the Planning Board was only making a recommendation, with the final decision belonging to the City Council.

Ms. Smith reviewed how the change would shift allowed uses from industrial and commercial activities to residential uses such as single-family, two-family, and multifamily housing. She also noted concerns from one property owner who currently uses part of their lot for a trades business. Ms. Smith clarified that any lawful existing use could continue as a grandfathered nonconforming use, but future expansions or major changes could require special permits. Overall, Ms. Smith framed the rezoning as an effort to match current neighborhood character, support long-term reinvestment, and create more consistent land use along the corridor.

Public Comment:

Gail Lagoy, owner of 19 Milton Street, spoke against the proposed rezoning. She explained that her family specifically purchased the property because its MG-2.0 zoning allowed her husband, a tradesman, to both live and operate his small business there. She noted that for more than 30 years, the site has been used for storing equipment, materials, and work vehicles in a way that would not be allowed under RG-5 residential zoning. She argued that changing the zoning would hurt their livelihood and limit future options, such as selling the property to another tradesperson. Ms. Lagoy also said she was frustrated that the city did not directly consult the property owners before including their parcels in the rezoning request. While she supported redevelopment elsewhere in the neighborhood, she said the area already had significant new housing and would benefit more from preserving spaces where small business owners can both live and work. She asked the board not to change her property's zoning.

Board Discussion:

Mr. McCormack said he understood why the rezoning request was being made, noting the area is shifting away from older manufacturing uses toward commercial activity along Grove Street and residential reinvestment in the surrounding neighborhood. He said the proposal appeared consistent with what already exists on the ground, including the nearby single-family homes. He also acknowledged the concerns raised by the owner of 19 Milton Street, but said staff's explanation showed the existing business could continue as a protected nonconforming use, even if the property were sold and operated in the same way. Overall, he said the zoning change made sense in the broader neighborhood context and aligned with the city's long-range planning goals, while reminding residents that the proposal would still need further review by the Economic Development Subcommittee and City Council before taking effect.

Mr. Toomey stated no comment.

Mr. King asked staff to clarify how the rezoning would affect the existing business use at 19 Milton Street.; Ms. Smith confirmed that if the zoning changed, the current residential and business operations would not have to stop, clarifying that they would continue as a protected nonconforming use, meaning the property could keep operating as it does today. She also explained that if the property were sold, a similar business use could likely continue under the same protections, however, if a future owner wanted to significantly expand the operation or change it to a different type of business, additional review or a special permit might be required.

Mr. King expressed no further concerns.

Gail Lagoy asked whether, if the rezoning is approved, they could receive something in writing from the city confirming their right to continue the current business use and transfer that same protected use to a future owner. She explained that she wanted formal documentation rather than only verbal assurances given at the meeting. She said this was important because they have previously had to explain their zoning rights to different city departments and worried similar confusion could happen again if the property were rezoned.

Ms. Smith responded that staff could work directly with the owner of 19 Milton Street to document the existing general contracting use. She asked the owner to provide a written description of activities on the property along with photographs so the city could create a clear record of what is currently occurring there. She confirmed record could then be referenced in the future if questions arise about the protected use. She also said the city could coordinate with Inspectional Services to issue a formal zoning opinion or determination confirming the status of the use. She explained that if a future owner continued operating the same type of business in the same manner, the protected use would generally remain but a significant expansion or intensification of activity could require additional review or a special permit.

On the motion, by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Toomey the Board voted 3–0 to close the public hearing.

On a motion by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Toomey, the Board voted 3-0 to recommend in favor of the proposed zoning map amendment.

List of Exhibits:

Exhibit A: Petition – Todd Rodman, attorney, on behalf of 7 Brookfield Realty LLC, petitioner; referred to Planning Board on 3/10/2026.

Exhibit B: Base Zoning Map of proposed RG-5 (Residence, General) extension at 15, 17, & 19 Milton Street.

9. 4, 7 & 8 Brookfield Street, 19 Glennie Street, 270, 278, 282-284, 288 & 300 Grove Street, 15 North Street, 2, 4R & 4A Powers Court (ZA-2026-004)

a. Public Hearing – Zoning Map Amendment

Attorney Todd Rodman on behalf of Seven Brookfield Realty LLC presented the zoning map amendment request. He said the same reasoning discussed for the Milton Street parcels applied here: the goal was to update zoning so it better matches the uses that already exist in the neighborhood.

Mr. Rodman added that this petition was more straightforward because it involved only business properties and no residential parcels, making it less complicated than the earlier request. He said the proposal simply reflected the ongoing transition and reinvestment already taking place in the area

Stephen Cary, DPRS, explained that the second petition would rezone 13 properties bounded by Grove Street, North Street, and Glennie Street from MG-2.0 manufacturing to BG-3.0 business zoning. He noted the parcels have historically been industrial, but most manufacturing uses have disappeared, with only one remaining legacy industrial business still operating. He said the rezoning would better match what already exists in the area, including medical offices, a bank, and a café. He noted the rezoning would also allow a wider range of business and residential uses while supporting denser redevelopment consistent with the city's transformational growth goals under the Now|Next plan. Overall, he described the proposal as a way to modernize outdated zoning and align regulations with current neighborhood conditions.

Public Comment:

No Public Comment.

Board Discussion:

Mr. McCormack expressed his support for the petition and stated it aligns with the ongoing changes happening in the area.

Mr. Toomey stated no comment.

Mr. King stated no comment.

On the motion, by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Toomey the Board voted 3–0 to close the public hearing.

On a motion by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Toomey, the Board voted 3-0 to recommend in favor of the proposed zoning map amendment.

List of Exhibits:

Exhibit A: Petition – Todd Rodman, attorney, on behalf of 7 Brookfield Realty LLC, petitioner; referred to Planning Board on 3/10/2026.

Exhibit B: Base Zoning Map of proposed BG-3 (Residence, General) extension at 4, 7 & 8 Brookfield Street, 19 Glennie Street, 270, 278, 282-284, 288 & 300 Grove Street, 15 North Street, 2, 4R & 4A Powers Court.

Other Business (Public Meeting)

11. Approval Not Required (ANR) Plans

- a. AN-2025-008 – 3 Sherer Trail (Private)
- b. AN-2026-019 – 242 Greenwood Street (Public) & Strasburg Street (Private)
- c. AN-2026-020 – 4 Svea Street (Private)
- d. AN-2026-021 – 1 Attleboro Street (Private) & Clay Street (Private)
- e. AN-2026-022 – 497 Granite Street (Public)
- f. AN-2026-023 – Harding St & Pond St (Public)

Stephen Cary, DPRS, described ANR items 11 b, e, & f to the Board. He stated items 11 a, c, & d are not properly before the Board.

On a motion by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Toomey, the Board voted 3-0 to endorse ANR plans 11b, e, & f.

12. Communications

No discussion.

11. Board Policy and Procedures

No discussion.

12. Approval of Minutes

On a motion by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Toomey, the Board voted 3-0 to approve the minutes from the 4/1/2026 meeting.

Adjournment

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