



The City of Worcester

Planning Board Meeting Minutes Wednesday, June 3, 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
Stephen Toomey
Carlos Rosende, Alternate
Brandon King (*Participated Remotely*)
Anthony Dell’Aera (*Participated Remotely*)

Conor McCormack, Vice-Chair

Board Members Absent:

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

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

POSTPONENTS

Item 8: 25 West Chester Street (ZA-2026-002) – Zoning Map Amendment

Request to postpone the Public Hearing to August 5, 2026

Extend the Constructive Grant Deadline to August 27, 2026

WITHDRAWALS

10. 500 West Boylston Street (ZA-2026-007) – Zoning Map Amendment

Request to Leave to Withdraw without Prejudice

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

Old Business:

Item 1: 0 Chester Street (PB-2025-048)

a. Public Meeting – Definitive Site Plan

James Tetreault was present representing Expedited Engineering LLC on behalf of the applicant Modern Structures, Inc. He described that what is proposed is construction of four single family homes on the south side of Chester Street, adjacent to the last numbered house which is number 31. He stated he has previously appeared before the Planning Board and has spent time responding to staff and engineering department comments to better address concerns about the slope behind these lots. He described how the site layout was designed with regard to the steep slopes on site.

Chair LaValley asked for additional comments from city staff.

Michelle Smith, DPRS, noted that the Board heard this item in December 2025. She explained the applicant had continued based on concerns at the time related to groundwater, the amount of regrading and some concerns related to the slope stability. She noted that staff is satisfied with this last iterations based on the information that was provided by the geotechnical engineer, as well as the adjustments that they have made to the plans. She noted the recommended conditions of approval are in the staff's memo.

Mr. Tetreault noted that they have seen the conditions set forth and have no objections to those proposed by staff.

Leslie Rodriguez, DPW, is available online described the existing location of an easement and that there is city infrastructure on the rear of these lots that is located outside of the cross country easement. She stated a new easement should be put in place or the applicant should shift the easement location to more appropriately reflect the location of the infrastructure. She recommended adding a new condition, "prior to the release of the decision or a building permit which will be that the applicant provide a recorded 81X plan reflecting the revised easement locations in line with existing locations in line with existing infrastructure."

Public Comment:

No public comment.

Board Discussion:

Board member King stated no comments or concerns.

Board member Dell'Aera stated no comments or concerns.

Board member Toomey stated no comments.

Board member Rosende stated no comments.

Chair LaValley noted that staff have spent a considerable amount of time, multiple departments working with the applicant and feels that they have come to a good solution.

On a motion by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Toomey, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan for 0 Chester Street subject to staff recommended conditions of approval, as modified during the discussion.

List of Exhibits:

- Exhibit A: Definitive Site Plan Application; filed 6/5/2025; prepared by Expedited Engineering, LLC
- Exhibit B: Project Narrative; prepared by Expedited Engineering, LLC
- Exhibit C: Site Plans; dated 11/13/2025; revised 5/26/2026 prepared by Expedited Engineering, LLC
- Exhibit D: Architectural Plans; dated 7/9/2025; prepared by Mark S. McCarthy
- Exhibit E: Drainage Report; dated 10/31/2025; prepared by Expedited Engineering, LLC
- Exhibit F: Supplemental Drainage Report; dated 10/31/2025; revised 3/13/2026 prepared by Expedited Engineering, LLC
- Exhibit G: Mounding Analysis; submitted 11/12/2025
- Exhibit H: Pre-development Drainage Area Plan; dated 10/10/2025; prepared by Expedited Engineering, LLC
- Exhibit I: Post-development Drainage Area Plan; dated 9/18/2025; revised 3/13/2026 prepared by Expedited Engineering, LLC
- Exhibit J: Geotechnical Analysis; dated 3/24/2026; prepared by Luna Engineering Inc.
- Exhibit K: Retaining Wall Design; dated 5/26/2026; prepared by Testa Engineering Associates

New Business:

2. 28 Harrington Way (PB-2025-093)

- a. Public Hearing – Special Permit (Accessory Dwelling Unit) to modify the dimensional requirements for an ADU (Article IV, Section 8.G.5)

Donald O'Neil, attorney on behalf of the applicant Joe Paladino in connection with this request for a special permit for a proposed ADU at 28 Harrington Way. He described the proposal to the Board which is to construct an ADU over 900 SF on the second floor of a new detached garage. Mr. O'Neil described the property location and noted that the proposed location meets all of the setback requirements that would apply to a primary structure on the property.

Michelle Smith, DPRS, explained that the applicant is requesting a special permit for an ADU. She stated there is an existing two-family dwelling in an RL-7 zone. She described the proposal which is to construct a two-story detached a detached garage with an ADU on the second story. She stated the applicant obtained approval from the Zoning Board of Appeals to install a garage of this size and they are in front of this board to consider whether it is appropriate to exceed the by-right threshold of 900 sq. ft. for an ADU. She reminded the Board that they have had previous discussions about this 900 sq. ft threshold and that it is based on state law. She stated they are proposing 1,296 sq. ft for this ADU.

She described the neighborhood composition and other regulatory approvals the applicant will need to obtain. Ms. Smith outlined the recommended conditions of approval.

Leslie Rodriguez of DPW stated no additional comments.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

Board Discussion:

Board member King had no comments.

Board member Dell'Aera, through the Chair, said he was concerned about the size of the ADU given the statute. He noted that although the Planning Board had made exceptions when circumstances suggested that adhering strictly to the 900 sq. ft. would be problematic, he is not sure that is the case here. He is hesitant to support this application.

Board member Toomey had no comments and plans to vote to approve.

Board member Rosende had no comments.

Chair LaValley noted that he is sensitive to Mr. Dell'Area's comments. However, he thinks that they could build this garage regardless. He understands the rationale behind the 900 sq. ft. and does not consider it to be a problem if you are putting a unit within an existing structure.

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

On a motion by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Dell'Aera the Board voted 5–0 to approve the Special Permit for 28 Harrington Way, subject to staff recommended conditions of approval.

List of Exhibits:

- Exhibit A: Special Permit Application; clerked 3/13/2026; prepared by Donald J. O'Neil, Attorney
- Exhibit B: Survey; dated 1/6/2026; prepared by HS&T Group, Inc.
- Exhibit C: Architectural Plans; dated 7/27/2025; prepared by JR Associates Design Services

Item 3. 26 & 28 Milton Street (PB-2026-017)

- a. Public Meeting – Definitive Site Plan
- b. Public Meeting – Public Meeting – MGL 81-G and/or GRO Ch. 12, §12, Private Street Improvement

Donald O'Neil, an attorney from Worcester, was present to request a site plan approval for Milton Street Properties, LLC at 26 & 28 Milton Street. He stated the project previously obtained Zoning Board approvals and this application contains the definitive site plan approval and also 81G improvements to the roadway in front of the property. Mr. O'Neil noted to the Board that the planned roadway improvements are significant compared to the existing road conditions and would be an

overall enhancement to the neighborhood. He stated the vast majority of the recommended conditions of approval suggested by staff are acceptable and that the applicant will request the waiver identified in the staff memo. He noted under DPW conditions C and L appear to be duplicative. He addressed staff comments regarding the proposed stormwater management infrastructure.

Through the Chair, Michelle Smith, Planning Division, said that the Board has in front of them a site plan application that is triggered both by the steep slopes that were present on the property that warranted some of the retaining walls, as well as the number of units. She stated that because there is a private street where there is work proposed, the planning board governs and oversees any construction activities that occur there. She described the staff recommended conditions of approval and noted that she will let Ms. Rodriguez speak to the conditions brought up by Attorney O'Neil. Ms. Smith stated that if DPW is amenable to an alternative, she suggests adding language to keep what is proposed but indicate an alternative to prevent ponding that is acceptable to the Department of Public Works, to allow for some resolution outside of the meeting. She noted that the proposal is a partially retroactive and that these structures are mostly constructed without building permits. She noted the larger retaining wall was constructed prior to the acquisition by the current owner back in 2007 under a prior building permit, it was constructed in a manner inconsistent with the plans that the planning board had approved at that time.

Smith noted that the Zoning Board of Appeals did grant a series of relief for the height of the setbacks for the retaining walls, as well as for the front yard impervious and driveway setbacks for a few of the lots. That was granted back in February and now the applicant is[2=]. seeking approval for the remainder of the site improvements, as well as the improvements to create adequate access and frontage for the intensity of the development here.

Leslie Rodriguez, from DPW, stated DPW recommends the installation of a new catch basin on the road to prevent washouts on the road. She said that the details for the pavement have to be 1 1/2 inch top and 2 for the binders.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

Attorney O'Neil said that the applicant is installing two catch basins and they are on the plans.

O'Neil said he wanted to discuss condition K which talks about the removal of the pavers, and replacement with pervious pavers that have already been installed. He noted the applicant feels that that is not necessary, and they have provided that with the infiltration. He also discussed item L which appears to be duplicative.

Joe Graham, the engineer on record for this project came forward. He stated that he received this project after it had been substantially completed in portions and noted one of the areas that they tried to limit the re-disturbance is that rear patio paved area. He stated they could install a slot trench or a trench drain that is routed to that shared infiltration system in the front. He noted that much of the site is impervious, and managing it was a challenge, especially with the tiered retaining wall systems. To adequately address all of the flow, he stated they would prefer to keep the pavers in the rear as a closed drainage system through a trench drain routed to that infiltration system that provides enough recharge to meet the stormwater regulations.

Chair LaValley asked if that was already constructed.

Mr. Graham noted that drainage system was in the process of construction when they received the project.

Mr. Graham then addressed the roadway improvements and noted there was an improved sewer extension plan that had that profile and that is what DPW is referencing in item L.

Chair LaValley stated there is a condition on the memo that is requiring them to provide a profile in showing proposed grading in utilities and the applicant is saying that that's part of the sewer extension plan already.

Mr. Graham noted that they can recreate it and put it on a sheet if that is needed as well.

Attorney O'Neil said that if that's the case, they can leave the condition in.

Board Discussion:

Chair LaValley noted that applicant's opinion on Condition K which requires a substantial portion of the lot as impervious, including retaining some concrete pavers in the backyard. He stated staff has requested a condition to remove them and the applicant requests that we strike that condition.

Board member King said that he approves removing Condition K for now.

Board member Dell'Aera stated he defers to Staff's judgement on this one. He noted the attempt to engineer this with the existing pavers in place is a suboptimal solution given the sheer amount of the impervious surface, he prefers to err on the side of caution.

Board member Toomey agreed with the board member Dell'Area and sides with staff recommendation to remove the existing pavers.

Board member Rosende deferred to staff and suggested they keep that condition.

Chair LaValley noted that the litmus plan for him is if the Board would approve this plan regardless of the fact that they have already built a substantial portion of it. He stated he has never seen so much paving in the backyard and if it was a new project, he would not vote to approve it and will not vote to approve it retroactively. Chair LaValley asked Mr. O'Neil how he would like them to proceed.

Attorney O'Neil replied that the applicant will remove the pavers.

On a motion by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Dell'Aera, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan for 26 and 28 Milton, subject to staff recommended conditions of approval.

On a motion by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Dell'Aera, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the Ch. 12, §12 Private Street Improvements subject to staff recommended conditions of approval of page 2 of the memorandum.

List of Exhibits:

- Exhibit A: Definitive Site Plan Application; filed 2/4/2026; prepared by Donald J. O'Neil, Attorney
- Exhibit B: Chapter 12, §12 Application; filed 4/21/2026; prepared by Donald J. O'Neil, Attorney
- Exhibit C: Survey; dated 8/12/2025; prepared by Robert D O'Neil, Professional Land Surveyor.

- Exhibit D: Site Plan; dated 10/27/2025; revised 4/25/2026; prepared by Joe Graham, Civil Engineer
- Exhibit E: Architectural Plans; dated 9/15/2023; prepared by Gallant Architecture
- Exhibit F: Stormwater Report; dated 1/10/2026; revised 2/2/2026 prepared by Joe Graham, Civil Engineer
- Exhibit F: Retaining Wall Report; dated 1/10/2026; revised 2/2/2026 prepared by Joe Graham, Civil Engineer

4. 264 Stafford Street (PB-2026-038)

a. Public Meeting – Definitive Site Plan

Todd Rodman, attorney with the law firm of Cedar and Chandler in Worcester, on behalf of the applicant the Grandfamilies Village LLC, the proposed buyer of the property on Stafford Street. Introduced members of the project team who were present at the meeting. Mr. Rodman gave a brief overview of the project, which was followed by a presentation by Dr. Dixon on the Grandfamily village concept and why it is needed. He stated the applicant has reviewed the staff memorandum, and they have ironed out the details. He stated they are here tonight for a definitive site plan review of an unusual, unique and much needed category of housing. He stated the proposed grandfamily village is designed to support grandparents who are raising their grandchildren and will provide up to 39 units of affordable housing in a single low-rise multi-family building. He stated all of the units are going to be affordable at 60% AMI and due to the nonprofit educational purpose of this proposed community, they received a Dover Act zoning exemption from the code department. He noted, without this zoning exemption, this multi-family low-rise building would not have been permitted in the RS-7 zone.

Dr. Moses Dixon explained the concept of having grandparents raising their grandchildren, also known as grandfamilies and provided a thorough summary of statistics and benefits provided by this form of housing.

Steve Cary, Planning Division, noted that before the Board is a site plan approval for about 60,000 sq ft. multi-family building and associated site improvements. He stated the building is going to contain about 39 dwelling units with 45 surface parking spaces. He noted the building is setback from Stafford Street by quite a ways and accessed through a sort of private driveway. He described the site circulation and fire truck accessibility. He described the staff recommended conditions of approval.

Leslie Rodriguez from DPW described the DPW recommended conditions of approval.

Matthew Ashley with Bohler Engineering highlighted the conditions of approval and the additional tree plantings requested where there may be potential for interference with the infiltration system. He also noted they are not opposed to providing additional screening around the transformer but want to add some language that National Grid would have to sign off on that. They will work with staff on what is appropriate and with National Grid.

Steve Cary noted that staff would prefer to see a vegetative swale near the stone channel at the rear of the property.

Mr. Ashley stated that they plan to do the riprap slope for less maintenance and just for the volume of water that theoretically could come off of that slope during rain events. He stated the slope would be below the patio area, not visible to the abutters and for those reasons, they would like to keep the riprap swale vs. the vegetative one.

Mr. Cary noted that Staff is comfortable with that but would defer to the Board.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

Through the Chair, Mr. Rodman noted that one of the requests in the staff memo was for the submission of complete architectural plans before the decision is released and he requested clarification on that. Secondly, he noted that there is a continued reference to “Kettlebrook Way” which really just an historic reference to a subdivision that was proposed in late 1997. He noted they may be proposing a different street name and want the flexibility to work with city staff and the fire department.

Chair LaValley asked if requiring a street name is the purview of the Planning Board.

Michelle Smith, Planning Division, asked which specific condition that they seek to modify.

Mr. Rodman responded item 1B, “street sign naming the driveway Kettlebrook Way,”.

Through the Chair, Michelle Smith stated that Staff is open to adjusting that, but she noted that generally there is an historical reference to the property and the City tries to avoid changing that once it has been established. She wanted to make sure that there’s not an expectation that there will be a change. They will adjust the language so there is not a necessity to come back to the Board.

Chair LaValley clarified for the applicant that if a different name makes its way through city politics, you would not have to come back before the Planning Board to make that change.

Chair LaValley noted that the architectural plans submitted are satisfactory in terms of scope, with the floor plans and elevations provided but there are a few discrepancies between the architectural plans and the site plan which is a common condition of approval.

Ms. Smith said to adjust B to state “reflect the location of a street sign at the intersection of Stafford Street and the driveway name consistent with city requirements.”

Mr. Cary said that Staff is comfortable striking condition G. Staff also recommended modifying Condition J1J with adding the language, “add one additional canopy tree and strike “on the northern side of the driveway such that there are trees every 50 ft along the driveway in accordance with subdivision regulations.” Also, striking “at the southeastern end of middle landscaping island at the southwest corner of the lot adjacent to the grass pavers.”

Mr. Cary suggested adding to Condition K, “subject to National Grid approval.”

Mr. Cary noted that there was one member online with their hand raised if the Chair was willing to entertain a public comment.

Kelly Flenigan from Worcester was online. She lives across the street and wondered when the visible construction would start and when it would be completed.

Chair LaValley answered that the applicant still had quite a bit of work to do in design.

Mr. Rodman responded that the applicant is in the middle of financing and expects construction to start in approximately one year, and it will be a one-year construction period.

Ms. Flenigan thanked him for those dates.

Steve Cary, Planning Division, through the Chair, had one other amendment to Recommended Conditions: Condition 10, under “perpetual conditions,” Staff will strike “Kettlebrook Way” and replace it with “driveway signage shall be maintained by the owner for the named private driveway.”

Board Discussion:

Chair LaValley asked the board if they had any comments.

Steve Toomey asked what the breakdown of the units in the development were.

Mr. Rodman responded there are 4-one bedrooms, 32 two-bedrooms and 3 or 4 three-bedrooms.

On a motion by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Dell'Aera, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan subject to staff recommended conditions of approval, modifying the following conditions, strike condition G, modify Condition J1J, modify Condition K and modify Condition 10, as articulated in the discussion.

List of Exhibits:

Exhibit A:	Definitive Site Plan Application; filed May 12, 2026; prepared by Todd
Exhibit B:	Rodman, Esq.
Exhibit C:	Definitive Site Plan; revised 05/08/2026; prepared by Bohler.
Exhibit D:	Architectural Drawings, dated April 29, 2026; prepared by Davis Square Architects.
Exhibit E:	Drainage Report; dated April 30, 2026; prepared by Bohler.
Exhibit F:	Dover Determination Letter; dated May 6, 2026; prepared by David C. Horne, Deputy Commissioner

5. 46, 51, 52 Modoc Street (PB-2026-041)

a. Public Meeting – Definitive Site Plan

Chair LaValley said they would review two at the same time. For 46,51,52 Modoc Street, a definitive site plan and also take an ANR related to the same property which is 14C.

Donald O'Neil, attorney on behalf of the applicant, St. Anthony's Realty LLC, in connection with this request for a site plan approval. He stated they had a previous site plan approval in connection with the subdivision for this property which was accepted within the last year and the applicant is seeking to amend the previous site plan approval to allow additional units to be constructed within the area that is available on the existing roadway. He stated they will replace the three proposed single-family units with duplex units which is consistent with the bulk of the other houses constructed on the street. He also noted they have submitted an ANR plan for the actual division of the land. Mr. O'Neil discussed the conditions of approval concerns regarding conditions a, b, and n.

Chair LaValley confirmed that Mr. O'Neil is okay with conditions A and B, and would like additional clarity on Condition N.

Steve Cary, Planning Division, explained that this is not an amendment to an existing site plan but this is a new site plan because of the scope of what was being proposed, compared to what was previously approved. He stated the original subdivision was three individual lots with single-family dwellings and now it has five lots with a total of 10 units with five duplexes. He confirmed these lots are part of a completed subdivision and road has been completed, as well as the sidewalks. He described the other lots within the subdivision.

Mr. Cary stated issues that they are trying to address with Conditions of Approval 1A and 1B is in reference to the lots #124 and #125, the driveway that crosses over lot #124, has the curb cut on lot #125 which does not meet the requirement for a 3-ft. landscaping buffer. He stated there are basically two curb cuts on lot #125 and two curb cuts are not allowed on less than 80 ft. of frontage within a residential zone. In order to fix that, he stated the building can be rotated slightly to the east, so that there's a zero lot line.

As far as other conditions of approval, Mr. Cary noted that there were a couple carried over from the prior approval, including some evergreen screening and some additional tree plantings. With regards to Condition N from the DTM Comment, he deferred to colleague Michelle Smith with regards to city specifications, noting the comment was less about the material and more about making sure they are constructing curb cuts, regardless of the material of the sidewalk, that the curb cut continue at grade, and not dip down.

Michelle Smith stated typically cement is the city standard, however, it is a new fully-constructed asphalt sidewalk. As Mr. Cary described, as long as that works with the driveway openings, the City wants to make sure that the pedestrian realm is preserved across the driveway, rather than dipping down to favor a vehicle.

Mr. O'Neil responded that he has no objection to that but just wanted to make sure it was a consistent material.

Leslie Rodriguez from DPW was online and had no additional comments.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

Board Discussion:

Board member King said that overall he was happy to approve with staff comments.

Board member Dell'Aera agreed with board member King.

Board member Toomey commented that there should be a buffer between the train tracks and where the people might be living.

Chair LaValley responded that this is out of the Planning Board's scope, but he assumes the railway company has a fence there.

Board member Rosende had no comment.

Chair LaValley commented that this item was on the agenda of his first meeting on the Worcester Planning Board on June 13, 2018 and he plans to continue supporting the project.

Mr. Cary requested that the ANR plan be endorsed to create the lots before the site plan can be approved.

On a motion by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Dell'Aera, the Board voted 4-0 to endorse the ANR14C.

On a motion by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Dell'Aera, the Board voted 4-0 to approve the Definitive Site Plan for 46, 51, 52 Modoc Street, subject to staff recommended conditions of approval.

List of Exhibits:

Exhibit A: Definitive Site Plan Application; filed 05/13/26; prepared by Donald J. O'Neil, Esq.

Exhibit B: Architectural Plans – Left Side Garage; dated 5/11/2026; prepared by Acropolis Design Consultants.

Exhibit D: Architectural Plans – Right Side Garage; dated 5/11/2026; prepared by Acropolis Design Consultants..

Exhibit G: Stormwater Report; dated 04/26/2026; prepared by Joseph Graham, PE.

6. 417 & 421 Cambridge Street (PB-2026-043)

a. Public Meeting – Definitive Site Plan

Donald O'Neil, attorney on behalf of the applicant for this project stated there are two existing ranch style houses at this location on Cambridge Street and described the surrounding properties. He stated the proposal is to add two stories to each of the structures to create two three family dwellings, for a total of six units. He stated the new structures will have a shared entrance on Cambridge Street and the parking has been divided among each individual property but is designed as a shared facility. Mr. O'Neil stated the conditions are acceptable but there is one condition about "fences on the property be a solid board fence.". noting there is some fencing on top of the retaining walls that is proposed as vinyl coated fence. Mr. O'Neil asked if that condition would apply to the fencing on the retaining wall.

Michelle Smith, DPRS, noted that this is an application for a site plan and the applicant was in front of the Zoning Board for a suite of relief earlier this year. She stated the applicant seek to construct an addition to add additional units above the existing single-family dwellings for a total of 6 units and she noted that the trigger here is both slope and the number of units for the project. She stated they propose to construct a central parking courtyard with approximately 9 spaces. She described the staff recommended conditions of approval.

Mr. Kelling, engineer on behalf of the applicant, noted that the on-site fencing is for slope protection and they are amenable to any condition sought by Staff.

Ms. Smith noted that there is a wall that connects between the two buildings, that is at the rear of the parking area is the area Staff referred to related to the fencing or Condition 1C. Ms. Smith pointed out on the screen that there is a chain-link fence between the two properties.

Mr. O'Neil would like to have the condition request a vinyl coated chain link fence instead of a solid board fence.

Ms. Smith explained that staff suggests not installing chain-link fences and deferred to the Board, if they want to allow it, Staff wants to ensure that it is vinyl-coated.

Chair LaValley noted that the condition states that they have the option to do black vinyl coated chain link fence which is the Board's minimum standard.

Leslie Rodriguez from DPW had no additional comments except the ones already provided.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

Board Discussion:

Board member King had no comment.

Board member Dell'Aera had no comment.

Board member Toomey had no comment

Board member Rosende had no comment.

Chair LaValley had no comment and looks forward to driving by to see what the applicant does with the fence.

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

List of Exhibits:

- Exhibit A: Application – 417 Cambridge Street; filed 5/1/2026; prepared by Donald J. O'Neil, Attorney
- Exhibit B: Application – 421 Cambridge Street; filed 5/1/2026; prepared by Donald J. O'Neil, Attorney
- Exhibit C: Site Plan; dated 1/8/2026, revised 3/17/2026; prepared by Level Design Group, LLC.
- Exhibit D: Architectural Plans; dated 1/30/2026; prepared by Goldstar Design Builders Inc
- Exhibit E: Survey; dated 8/8/2016; prepared by B&R Survey, Inc
- Exhibit F: Stormwater Report; dated 5/26/2016; prepared by Level Design Group, LLC

7. 30 Enid Street (PB-2026-044)

- a. Public Hearing – Special Permit (Accessory Dwelling Unit) to modify the dimensional requirements for an ADU (Article IV, Section 8.G.5) and to eliminate existing required parking spaces for the addition of an ADU (Article IV, Section 8.G.6)

Donald O'Neil, attorney on behalf of the applicant, stated this application involves an existing split-level house that had a parking garage underneath on a lot that is crossed by a City of Worcester sewer easement on the right hand side of the plan. He stated the house is a relatively new house but the owners have had a serious water infiltration issues, where a lot of water is coming into the house, coming off the road, going down the driveway and entering the structure. To prevent the water coming into the building, he stated they propose to convert some of the garage space into an ADU. He noted the basic footprint and the foundation of the house is not changing. He stated the ADU is within the existing structure but exceeds 900 SF which is why they are requesting a Special Permit from the Board. He also noted that the parking has been removed with the conversion to an ADU space which requires a Special Permit relief from the Board. He said that the owners are currently parking on the street which works for them. Attorney O'Neil reviewed the staff memo and noted the proposed conditions of approval are acceptable to the applicant.

Steve Cary, Planning Division, pointed out a picture to the flooding that occurred within the structure. To solve the flooding problem, he noted the applicant walled off the garage and converted that garage space to an ADU, noting this is partially retroactive approval. He stated the ADU is greater than 900 square feet which is one aspect of relief needed under the special permit and the applicant also needs relief because of the elimination of the parking spaces. He described the staff recommended conditions of approval.

Leslie Rodriguez from DPW stated no further comment.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

Board Discussion:

Board member King said that he would be happy to support this with the staff conditions.

Board member Dell'Aera would support this with the staff recommendations.

Board member Toomey had no comment

Board member Rosende had no comment.

Chair LaValley noted that it is novel to solve a flooding problem in your garage by putting an apartment there.

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

On a motion by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Dell'Aera, the Board voted 5–0 to approve the Special Permit subject to staff recommended conditions of approval.

List of Exhibits:

Exhibit A: Special Permit Application; clerked 5/13/2026; prepared by Innovation Builders.

Exhibit B: Survey; dated 4/29/2026; prepared by Connorstone Engineering.

Exhibit C: Architectural Plans; dated 9/19/2025; prepared by Acropolis Design Consultants

Exhibit C: Public Comment Letter; Borenstein; received 3/31/2026

9. 30 & 42 Lagrange Street (ZA-2026-006)

a. Public Hearing – Zoning Map Amendment

Chair LaValley noted because of conflict, he needed to recuse himself on this item, so he turned the gavel over to Board member King.

Attorney Donald O'Neil, representing the petitioner, provided an overview of the proposed zoning amendment and the history of the property. He explained that Worcester Lagrange, LLC had previously requested that the subject parcels be included within the Corridor Overlay Downtown Sub Area (CCOD), which was established on the property in 2020. The property consists of multiple parcels that were historically associated with a former machine shop and other industrial uses and has more recently been used as accessory parking. Attorney O'Neil stated that the property was intended to provide parking in connection with the larger Lagrange Mill development and that a prior site plan had contemplated parking on the subject parcel, including a more recent design showing 41 spaces. He explained that the proposed zoning amendment is intended to allow the property to function as a freestanding parking lot for the approved development at 98 Beacon Street, which contains 58 residential units but has limited on-site parking. He noted that a National Grid transformer would further reduce the available parking at 98 Beacon Street. Attorney O'Neil stated that the existing CCOD regulations do not allow the proposed parking arrangement because parking within the overlay must be accessory to the use and located on the same or a contiguous lot. He characterized this as a deficiency in the ordinance and stated that there is no available use variance process through the Zoning Board of Appeals to address the issue. He argued that the proposed zoning amendment would allow the 98 Beacon Street project to proceed without requiring the demolition of another nearby building to create

additional parking. He requested that the Planning Board recommend approval of the zoning amendment to the City Council.

Michelle Smith of the Planning Division reviewed the staff memorandum and clarified that the staff comments were specific to the subject parcel and focused on how removing the property from the CCOD would affect the purpose and intent of the district, zoning consistency, and the City's long-range planning objectives. Ms. Smith explained that the applicant is proposing to remove approximately 18,000 square feet from the CCOD, which is paired with the BG-6 Business General district and forms part of the City's MBTA Communities-compliant 3A district. Staff had contacted the State regarding whether the proposed amendment would affect the City's compliance and had not yet received a response. Ms. Smith noted that removal of the subject parcel would create the only area in the City containing BG-6 without the CCOD overlay and could establish a precedent for reducing the overlay elsewhere. Ms. Smith further explained that removing the CCOD would retain the underlying BG-6 zoning but eliminate certain restrictions and development incentives associated with the overlay. Uses that would become more readily available include lower-density and auto-oriented uses, including two-family dwellings, motor vehicle sales or repair, garages, automobile displays, and refueling. A non-accessory surface parking lot is also currently prohibited within the CCOD. The CCOD is intended to encourage pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use development through site design, dimensional, parking, and building design standards. Ms. Smith noted that the overlay provides significant flexibility for dense development, including relaxed dimensional requirements, no floor area ratio limitation for qualifying mixed-use development, reduced frontage requirements, and opportunities for multifamily, mixed-use, and commercial development. The overlay also includes requirements intended to promote active street frontages, pedestrian entrances, and ground-floor commercial uses. Ms. Smith clarified that neither the BG-6 district nor the CCOD establishes a minimum parking requirement for the subject development; rather, the CCOD establishes maximum parking allowances. She therefore stated that the applicant's parking constraints are not the result of a minimum parking requirement imposed by the zoning. Regarding the property's history and surrounding context, Ms. Smith noted that the property had historically been split-zoned RG-5 and MG-2 and was located between residential and former manufacturing areas. She explained that much of the surrounding industrial area has transitioned toward residential and mixed-use redevelopment. The subject property has historically been vacant or used for lower-density residential and accessory uses and, more recently, has been used as accessory parking associated with commonly owned property. Ms. Smith stated that the property is located within a managed growth area and within the walk shed of a transit corridor. It also abuts a transformative growth area identified in the City's long-range plan, including the redevelopment of former mill buildings for residential and mixed-use purposes. The area is identified as an artisan district intended to support a variety of uses, including residential, commercial, retail, food and beverage, and other complementary uses. Based on these objectives, staff determined that removing the CCOD from the subject parcel would be inconsistent with the City's long-range plan and the intent of the overlay district. Ms. Smith also reviewed the property's prior permitting history. A 2021 site plan approval contemplated 63 dwelling units, approximately 5,000 square feet of commercial space, and 85 parking spaces, although the subject area was not included in that approved development. In 2024, the applicant submitted a special permit request to exceed the maximum parking requirements. Although the site plan was ultimately withdrawn and the parking configuration was never approved for construction, the Board had granted relief to allow additional parking, and the design had included 41 spaces in the subject area. Ms. Smith noted that the Board had considered the parking as part of a broader package serving multiple neighboring developments.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

Board Discussion:

Board member Dell'Aera expressed a concern that the proposed application would create "spot zoning" and he believes the board should not be in support of this. He is sympathetic to the applicant, but he does not believe a zoning amendment is the solution.

Board member Toomey had no comment at the moment.

Board member Rosende had no comments.

Board member King agreed with board member Dell'Aera that the Board does not want to approve spot zoning, and he understands where the applicants' points lie, that this area is targeted for parking for a larger development. Board member King asked Staff, if they were to not recommend this to the City Council, what would their next steps be?

Michelle Smith, responded that the Board's recommendation is just that and City Council can choose whether to take it or not.

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

On a motion by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Dell'Aera, the Board voted 3–0 for a negative recommendation the proposed Zoning Map Amendment regarding 30 Lagrange Street to reduce the CCOD commercial corridors overlay district downtown sub area.

List of Exhibits:

Exhibit A: Petition – Worcester Lagrange Land LLC; referred to Planning Board on 4/14/2026.

Exhibit B: Proposed Rezoning Maps; dated 05/20/2026

11. 321 Greenwood Street (ZA-2026-008)

a. Public Hearing – Zoning Map Amendment

Joshua Lee Smith, attorney on behalf of the petitioner with respect to a zone change. He stated property is a split zone lot with the BL-1 zoning district and the rear portion is within the manufacturing district (ML-0.5). He noted that there is some history with respect to the parcels on Greenwood Street. He noted that there are some industrial types of uses to the east. He explained they seek to make the parcel uniform and make the entire parcel a BL-1 district, noting the BL-1 district would provide some encouragement to some types of residential uses which his client is exploring. He noted that the parcel directly to the south (325 Greenwood Street) went through the same exact process and is now a BL-1 zoned parcel.

Steve Cary, Planning Division, noted that it's a split zone lot with BL-1 toward the Greenwood Street side of the parcel. He described the differing uses allowed within the two zones. He then reviewed the history of the site. In terms of the Worcester Now Next comprehensive plan, he stated this area is designated as a managed growth area, calling for moderate increases in housing density. He stated the petitioner's interest in residential use would align with the Now Next Plan.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

Board Discussion:

Board member King had no comment.

Board member Dell'Aera had no comment.

Board member Toomey had no comment

Board member Rosende had no comment.

Chair LaValley had no comment.

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

On a motion by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Dell'Aera, the Board voted 4–0 to recommend in favor of the proposed Zoning Map Amendment on 321 Greenwood Street.

List of Exhibits:

Exhibit A: Petition – George Markopoulos on behalf of 321 Greenwood Street LLC; referred to Planning Board on May 5, 2026.

Exhibit B: Map of Proposed Greenwood Street BL-1.0 Extension; dated May 15, 2026.

12. 455 Grove Street (ZA-2026-009)

a. Public Hearing – Zoning Map Amendment

Stephen Madaus, attorney on behalf of the petitioner, stated they are seeking a favorable recommendation for a zoning map amendment to the zoning map, relative to a split zone for a property located on Grove Street. He stated the parcel is mostly zone BG-3 and a small portion of it. is located in the RL-7 zoning district. He stated the property has historically been used only for commercial purposes and the existing commercial garage on the site, is partially in the RL-7 zoning district. He concluded, stating they are seeking to amend the zoning map to have the lot zoned entirely in the BG-3 zoning district.

Steve Cary, Planning Division, noted that this is a straightforward request. He stated parcel is a split zoned parcel and the zoning map amendment would get rid of that split. He stated the eastern portion of the parcel is zoned RL-7, and this would extend the BG-3 zoning district to encompass it. He reviewed the allowed uses in BG-3.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

Board Discussion:

Board member King had no comment.

Board member Dell'Aera had no comment.

Board member Toomey had no comment

Board member Rosende had no comment.

Chair LaValley had no comment.

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

On a motion by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Dell'Aera, the Board voted 4–0 to recommend in favor of the proposed Zoning Map Amendment.

List of Exhibits:

Exhibit A: Petition – Meletios Chachrone; referred to Planning Board on May 5, 2026.

Exhibit B: Map of Proposed 455 Grove Street BG-3.0 Extension.

Other Business (Public Meeting)

13. Street Petitions

a. ST-2026-001 – Portions of Mill Street (Discontinue & Remove)

Mark Borenstein, attorney with Prince Lobel, represented the owner of 195 Mill Street, Worcester Mill, LLC, and was joined by principal owner Sam Adams. Mr. Borenstein explained that the petition seeks to discontinue and remove portions of Mill Street located in front of the subject property to facilitate acquisition of the property and the construction of a multifamily development. He stated that the petitioner has met with the Department of Transportation and Mobility (DTM) and Department of Public Works (DPW) and is working on a plan to ensure safe access and connections following the discontinuance. The petitioner would also grant any necessary easements to the City to allow for the maintenance or relocation of utilities on the property at the petitioner's expense.

Leslie Rodriguez of DPW provided staff comments and stated that she and Director of Engineering Andy Truman had reviewed the property and that DPW did not oppose the discontinuance of the identified portion of Mill Street.

Michelle Smith of the Planning Division provided comments on behalf of DTM. Ms. Smith explained that the petition involves discontinuing both a portion of the right-of-way in which the City has an easement interest and a portion of Mill Street that the City owns in fee through an historic taking. The discontinuance would facilitate the potential acquisition of the property for private development.

Ms. Smith noted that Coes Pond Reservoir and the associated park are located directly across from the property. The park is surrounded by a series of conservation easements and ownership interests that allow for a continuous pedestrian experience, including boardwalks and other features. She noted that the City has a future vision for enhancing this circulation and maintaining a comfortable pedestrian connection around the park as part of a future redesign of Mill Street, although such improvements are anticipated to be approximately 10 years out.

DTM expressed concern regarding the potential loss of right-of-way needed to accommodate the future redesign of Mill Street and emphasized the importance of maintaining clear pedestrian and vehicular circulation along the street. Ms. Smith noted that while the current property owner intends to develop the site privately, economic conditions can change and proposed development plans may not ultimately be realized. Once the right-of-way is discontinued, the City could lose the opportunity to utilize the property for future transportation or public improvements.

Ms. Smith stated that DPW and DTM's primary concern is ensuring that adequate protections are incorporated into any discontinuance so that Mill Street can continue to function appropriately and future City needs can be accommodated.

Chair LaValley asked about the Planning Board's role in the discontinuance process. Ms. Smith explained that the Planning Board is responsible for making a recommendation, after which the matter will return to the full City Council and be referred to the Public Works Committee for its own hearing and recommendation to the City Council. Ms. Smith recommended that the Board's recommendation be conditioned upon the concerns and comments raised by DTM and DPW being resolved to the City's satisfaction.

Public Comment:

No public comment.

Board Discussion:

Board member King had no comment.

Board member Dell'Aera, asked that with the remaining turnaround, would vehicles still be able to make that turn?

Through the Chair, Attorney Borenstein replied, "No." The ongoing discussions with DPW and DTM will ensure that any portions of the right of way that remain in effect are closed off if someone could access it. They are working to ensure safe access to and from Mill Street. He noted to the extent possible; they will eliminate the accessory roadway.

Board member Toomey had no comment

Board member Rosende had no comment.

Chair LaValley had no comment.

In a motion by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Toomey, the Board voted 4–0 to recommend in favor of the proposed street discontinuance, with the recommendations from the DPW and DTM.

14. Approval Not Required (ANR) Plans

a. AN- 2026-012 - 1439 Main St & 54 Bauer St (Public)

b. AN-2026-028 – 18 Crown Street (Public)

Stephen Cary, DPRS, described ANR items 14a-c to the Board.

On a motion by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Toomey, the Board voted 4-0 to endorse ANR plans 14a-c.

15. Communications

a. Invitation to Community Outreach Meeting for a Proposed Adult-Use Marijuana Establishment

16. Board Policy and Procedures

Chair LaValley asked Ms. Smith about the one-stop grant application that became available to the City's Planning Division.

Ms. Smith said that the board had taken a vote to authorize the local planning assistance hours that the Division has each year at CMRPC's quarterly meetings. Staff used the full allocation of those hours to write up a scope of services for overall of the City's subdivision regulations which date back to the early 1990s. They recommended that the Planning Division proceed with a Community Planning Grant as part of the one-stop funding program that the State has. They applied for \$90,000 grant from the State with a \$10,000 match from the City of Worcester which was paid out of the Economic Development consultant fees. Staff hoped that the

Planning Board could make a motion to support that application. This would bring those regulations into alignment with modern stormwater standards, adjusting road widths to allow for pedestrian and auto uses, etc.

On a motion by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Toomey, the Board voted 4-0 to support this application.

17. Approval of Minutes – 4/22/2026; 5/13/2026

On a motion by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Toomey, the Board voted 4–0 to approve the 4/22/26 & 5/13/26 minutes.

Adjournment

On a motion by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Toomey, the Board unanimously voted to adjourn at 10:08pm.