

BROCKTON PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
Wednesday, November 5th, 2025 - 6:00 PM

Chair Toni Goncalves opened up the meeting with a Roll Call...

Members present are

- Toni Goncalves - Planning Board Chair
- Iolando Spinola - Planning Board Vice-Chair
- Marty Crowell - Planning Board Member
- Matthew Gallagher - Planning Board Member
- James Sweeney - Planning Board Member
- John Fay - Interim Director of Planning & Economic Development
- Evan Sears - Planner II
- Brendan Weeks - Deputy Fire Chief
- Isaiah Thelwell - Administrative Assistant

ANR

737 Warren Avenue

Planner Evan Sears explained that the proposal was a reconfiguration of land previously shown as a definitive subdivision, noting that a portion had already been split off for a new lot on Packard Way and that the current request involved reorganizing the remaining property into two lots. He described how the existing business would remain on the corner of Warren and Myrtle, while one parcel would eventually be conveyed to the abutting property owner to the south. Sears emphasized that all roads were already constructed, frontage requirements were met, and no new utilities or streets were required, meaning the plan did not meet the legal definition of a subdivision and could proceed as an Approval Not Required plan.

A motion was made (Crowell) and seconded (Sweeney) to certify that the proposed plan did not constitute a subdivision and did not require Planning Board approval. The motion passed by unanimous roll call vote.

Review and Acceptance of Minutes

The Board reviewed the minutes of the last Planning Board meeting that took place on **10-07-25**

A motion to accept was properly made by Matthew Gallagher, seconded by James Sweeney. The motion was unanimously approved (5-0).

1. R-5 Senior Residential Zoning Map Amendment

Attorney James Burke explained that the Senior Housing Ordinance was returning to the Planning Board for an additional hearing after City Council narrowed the geographic scope of the ordinance from a broader area to two specific parcels, one near Thatcher Street by the convent and another on North Quincy Street. Because this change constituted an amendment, City Council required the ordinance to be sent back to the Planning Board to satisfy statutory public hearing requirements before final map confirmation. Burke noted that the ordinance itself had already been passed and that final approval of the revised map was expected at the Council's second meeting in November. Sweeney clarified that the hearing was procedural in nature, which Burke confirmed.

The board then voted to recommend the ordinance favorably, with

A motion was made (Sweeney) and seconded (Gallagher) to recommend the ordinance favorably. The motion was unanimously approved (5-0).

2. 40R Site Plan Review

Property: 28 Frederick Douglass Avenue

Parcel ID#: 091-013

Applicant: Neighborworks Housing Solutions, Inc

Representative: Neighborworks Housing Solutions, Inc

Robert Corley, CEO of NeighborWorks Housing Solutions, and Tim Doherty, Real Estate Development Director, presented the proposed redevelopment of the historic Grayson Hotel on Frederick Douglass Avenue, a vacant property for approximately 20 years, into a 19-unit mixed-income residential building under the Downtown Brockton Smart Growth Overlay District (40R). Corley outlined NeighborWorks' background and recent Brockton developments, including Sycamore and Main, the Lincoln School senior housing project, and 1200 Montello, emphasizing the organization's experience with historic rehabilitation and affordable housing. Doherty detailed the project program, including 8 studios, 10 one-bedroom units, and 2 two-bedroom units, shared amenity space on the ground floor, installation of an elevator and secondary egress, and extensive historic preservation measures. The board discussed requested waivers, most notably the absence of on-site parking, which the applicant addressed through excess capacity at the adjacent Sycamore and Main garage and a backup agreement with the Brockton Parking Authority. Additional waivers related to setbacks, open space, ground-floor elevation, and street trees due to site constraints. Board members raised questions regarding parking impacts, fire access, unit sizes, rents, utilities, fire suppression, and potential off-site tree mitigation, to which the applicant responded, including agreement to coordinate tree planting elsewhere downtown. The board also requested a future site tour prior to site plan approval.

A motion was made (Sweeney) and seconded (Crowell) to approve 28 Frederick Douglass Avenue with the added condition to coordinate tree planting elsewhere downtown. The Motion was approved by unanimous vote.

Waivers Granted:

Parking Section 27-96(1) – Reduction of on-site parking requirement by 16 spaces to 0 spaces.

3. Definitive Subdivision

Property: 0 Bellevue Avenue

Parcel ID#: 172-591

Applicant: Easton Ventures LLC

Representative: PMP Consulting

The Planning Board next considered a definitive subdivision application for 0 Bellevue Avenue, with P&P Consulting representing Easton Ventures LLC. Attorney Burke introduced the project, explaining that the proposal involved subdividing an existing 63,630-square-foot parcel into two conforming lots that met minimum lot size requirements but would require frontage relief from the Zoning Board of Appeals. Burke also noted that an encroachment identified during due diligence had been resolved through an agreement with the abutter, whereby a small, nonessential portion of land would be conveyed to the neighboring property owner to eliminate the issue. Edward Jacobs of PMP Consulting then presented the subdivision plan, detailing the lot sizes, frontage dimensions, existing wetlands on the southern portion of the site, and a drainage easement created to protect an existing headwall and drainage pipe. Jacobs further explained that sidewalk improvements and street trees were proposed along Bellevue Avenue.

A motion was made (Gallagher) and seconded (Sweeney) to approve the definitive subdivision under standard conditions. The motion passed by unanimous vote (5-0).

Waivers Granted:

Section IV. A. 1 – Frontage Lots 1 and 2

Section IV. B. – New Streets

Section IV. F. – Utilities

4. Discussion Topic

1036 Ash Street Definitive Subdivision Special Conditions

The board discussed the definitive subdivision special conditions for 1036 Ash Street. Chair Goncalves introduced the item and referenced a memorandum from City Engineer Chike indicating that the proposed intersection design complied with standard City of Brockton intersection design standards. Planner Sears explained that the matter related to a previously approved definitive subdivision on Ash Street Extension off West Chestnut Street, where one of

the conditions of approval required the developer to meet with DPW to determine the appropriate intersection design. The memo from the City Engineer had been submitted to address that condition, and the purpose of the discussion was for the board to determine whether the submission satisfied its intent or whether additional measures were warranted.

Sweeney expressed concerns that the proposed improvements represented only a minimal, bare-bones approach and did not adequately address long-standing safety issues at the Ash Street and West Chestnut Street intersection. He cited a prior traffic study recommending a full traffic signal, noted worsening traffic conditions, referenced a recent accident involving a school bus near the Kennedy School, and raised concerns about the lack of sidewalks, crosswalks, and pedestrian safety features. Crowell and Spinola generally agreed with these concerns, emphasizing the need for more substantial pedestrian infrastructure, such as curb extensions, sidewalks, and potentially a crosswalk with a Rapid Rectangular Flashing Beacon (RRFB), to improve safety.

Attorney McCluskey, representing the applicant, noted that the subdivision approval had already passed its appeal period and was ready to be recorded, but stated that his client was willing to work with the city to address safety concerns if development proceeded. Chair Goncalves clarified that no vote was being taken and requested that the applicant consider incorporating additional safety improvements, specifically suggesting a crosswalk with flashing beacon infrastructure, and report back. The board ultimately agreed that the applicant should return at a future meeting with a proposal detailing specific intersection and pedestrian safety improvements sufficient to satisfy the original condition of approval.

A motion was made (Sweeney) and seconded (Crowell) to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed by unanimous vote.