

MINUTES

April 4, 2017

Chairman Smith called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 7 p.m.in the City Council Chamber. Chairman Smith introduced new Commissioner, Kathleen Lanphear, and gave a brief synopsis of her background. All welcomed Ms. Lanphear to the Commission. The following Commission members were in attendance:

Michael Smith, Chairman
Kenneth Mason, P.E.
Mark Motte
Lynne Harrington
Gene Nadeau
Fred Vincent
Robert Strom
Kimberly Bittner
Kathleen Lanphear

Also present were:

Peter Lapolla, Planning Director
Stephen Marsella, Esq. Assistant City Solicitor
Jason M. Pezzullo, AICP, Principal Planner
Lynn Furney, AICP, Senior Planner
J. Resnick, Clerk

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Upon motion made by Mr. Vincent and seconded by Mr. Mason, the Commission voted (7/2 Mr. Motte and Ms. Lanphear abstained as neither were present at the last meeting) to approve the minutes of the March 7, 2017, Plan Commission Meeting with minor corrections.

SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT

555 Wilbur Avenue Minor

Minor subdivision without street extension (One additional house lot)
Preliminary Plan
AP 21/1, Lot 117

Attorney Robert Murray, on behalf of property owner Edward D. DiPrete, stated that “this is a rather straight forward subdivision”. Mr. David Russo, P.E., stated that the entire parcel is approximately 57,250 sq. ft. The parcel is zoned A-12 and the rear of the parcel is zoned A-20. The proposal is for a 12,100 sq. ft. for the construction of a single family home. The existing home, pool and tennis court will remain on a 45,150 sq. ft. lot. The project will be connected to public water and sewer. A portion of the existing stone wall will be removed for installation of a driveway.

Mr. Mario DeAngelis, 70 Mollie Drive, asked if the lot being created will be for sale. He also expressed concern with the water table in the area. Mr. Russo responded, stating that the home will be connected to

public sewers. A soil evaluation will be done prior to a home foundation going in. Mr. Lapolla stated that the sale of the lot is not germane to this meeting.

Mr. Pezzullo explained that the lot line configuration for Lot B will require a waiver from section XII. D. 4. a. which states: *Lot Lines: Side lot lines shall be substantially at right angles to straight street lines or radial to curved street lines for their full length from the front to rear with the following exception:*

- a. *Side lot lines may deviate from this requirement in areas where natural constraints such as watercourses, wetlands, etc., or **where prudent subdivision practices necessitate special consideration**. In all such cases, the burden will be on the subdivider to justify such deviation in design.*

He recommended that the City Plan Commission grant a waiver from this provision because, in the staff's opinion, this lot line configuration, as submitted, falls under prudent subdivision practice for several reasons. The resulting lot for the existing home will not be undersized, will not need relief from any zoning setback requirements, has adequate frontage on a city street, and does not impinge at all on the shape or design of the proposed new lot. The rear of the proposed lot with the existing home contains residential amenities that the owner wishes to keep intact which include a swimming pool and tennis court. He stated that he does not believe it is in our purview, nor would it serve any demonstrable public benefit, to require the applicant to split the lot evenly simply to meet this standard.

Upon motion made by Mr. Motte and seconded by Mr. Vincent, the Commission voted (9/1 – Ms. Harrington voted nay) to adopt the Findings of Fact denoted below and approve this minor subdivision, with waiver for sidewalks and lot line configuration; subject to the following conditions of approval.

Findings of Fact

Positive Findings

1. An orderly, thorough and expeditious technical review of this Preliminary Plan has been conducted. Property owners within a 100' radius have been notified via first class mail on 3/20/17 and the meeting agenda has been properly posted. Advertisement for this minor subdivision is not required under Section V.C.2.h of the City of Cranston Subdivision Regulations since no street extension is proposed.
2. The proposed subdivision and its resulting density of approximately 1.5 residential units per acre is consistent with the City of Cranston Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map which designates the subject parcel as "Residential" allowing 3.26 to 1 residential units per acre".
3. The proposal is consistent with the City of Cranston Zoning Code. All proposed lots conform to the area and frontage requirements of the **A-12** single-family residential zone.
4. There will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed subdivision as shown on the Preliminary Plan.
5. The proposed subdivision promotes high quality appropriate design and construction, will be well integrated with the surrounding neighborhoods and will reflect its existing characteristics.
6. The proposed subdivision will not result in the creation of individual lots with such physical constraints to development that building on those lots according to pertinent regulations and building standards would be impracticable.
7. The property in question has adequate permanent physical access on Wilbur Avenue, an improved public roadway located within the City of Cranston.
8. The proposed subdivision provides for safe and adequate local circulation of pedestrian and vehicular through traffic, for adequate surface water run-off and for a suitable building site.
9. Significant cultural, historic or natural features that contribute to the attractiveness of the community have not been identified on site.
10. The design and location of streets, building lots, utilities, drainage and other improvements conform to local regulations for mitigation of flooding and soil erosion.

Conditions of approval

1. Applicant shall patch curb to curb on Wilbur Avenue after the installation of all proposed utilities;
2. Provide a performance guarantee in the amount of \$7,620, with a separate 2% administrative fee of \$152.40 at the time of recording.
3. Impact fee payment of \$1,389.50 at the time of final plate recording.

ORDINANCE RECOMMENDATION

Ordinance #01-17-11 Comprehensive Plan Amendment (Relating to Renewable Energy and Solar Power Generation) – *Tabled and rescheduled from the 3/7/17 meeting*

Attorney John Bolton reiterated his comments made last month, stating that the ordinance is proposed as a general application to the City. On 11/23/15 the City Council adopted zoning amendments to allow solar arrays in A-80, M1, M2 and S1. He stated that at that time the Council and Plan Commission found the ordinances to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan as it existed at that time. He stated that currently two appeals are pending in the RI Superior Court claiming that the ordinances passed were not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. He stated that, at this time, he is seeking this amendment to make it clearer that solar projects are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. He further stated that in adopting this amendment it sends a message that the City is in favor of these types of facilities and will clarify any “gray areas”. He stated that State law requires an update to the Comprehensive Plan every five years and also provides that the “Plan” can be amended up to four times per year. Mr. Lapolla clarified this statement; stating that an update is required every ten years.

Attorney Landry, Cavanaugh and Cavanaugh, spoke in support of Attorney Bolton’s comments and stated that he does not feel that these appeals will affect the pending projects. He stated that making these amendments will further the goal of enabling these projects and reaffirm that the City “wants these types of projects”.

Ms. Ann Marie Bruin, 126 Ocean Avenue, stated that she is against this amendment; stating that she does not think “we need to backdate this ordinance because someone is being sued”. She stated that the Planning Department “has fallen down badly” on this matter. She further stated that “the City of Providence will benefit from the power generated here (Cranston)”. She finished by stating that solar panels” should be on rooftops and in commercial areas”.

Attorney Robert Murray stated that the PUC has been involved and mentioned that developers bid through the RFP process. Some savings will be realized by the City of Providence, however, Providence does not have a lot of open space that would allow for these types of projects.

Douglas Doe, 178 Lippitt Avenue, stated that the Conservation Commission is planning a workshop on this matter. His written comments in their entirety:

“I respectfully request that the Planning Commission return a negative recommendation for ordinance 01-17-11 for the following reasons:

Planning Department staff has provided repeated assurances that the Comprehensive Plan allows solar projects in the A-80 zone. This ordinance is superfluous.

New state regulations require that [Comprehensive Plans](#) include a Planning for Energy element with zoning policies and siting standards. (Element 9, p. 15) See the new [Cumberland Comprehensive Plan](#). (p. 110)

Cranston should begin working on the element using the opportunity to review the current policies and standards for deficiencies and necessary improvements. Of course, Res Americas recommendations would be considered along with all comments submitted by the public in an open transparent process.

Allowing a private developer and their attorneys to write the first draft of this element is neither good government nor good planning.

This ordinance continues the piecemeal approach to solar zoning policies in Cranston that, so far, have approved the clear cutting of 70 acres of woodlands.

Such actions have nothing to do with land conservation.

Comments:

The 2015 November 23 City Council [minutes](#) record that Res Americas' attorney, John Bolton, "stated that they are not looking to amend the Comprehensive Plan. Per the City Planner, these Ordinances are consistent to the Comprehensive Plan as it is today." Written and presented by Res Americas and Mr. Bolton, this proposed ordinance merely serves as an after the fact justification for the decisions of 2015. Res Americas and Mr. Bolton are trying to use the Comprehensive Plan amendment process to obtain a back dated insurance policy because they are apparently worried about the city losing the lawsuit filed against the zoning change. This is neither good planning nor good government.

The Planning Department staff has made clear their belief that the Comp Plan as written supported the zoning changes made in 2015 making this ordinance superfluous.

We should take our time to develop a comprehensive Energy Element that meets the state's standards. The Cumberland energy policy adopted as part of their new Comprehensive Plan and their process should serve as a model for Cranston. What is going to happen by Lippitt Ave., Seven Mile Road, and probably elsewhere has nothing to do with land conservation. Justification of that destruction does not belong next to the conservation goals and policies of the comp plan.

*Lines 41-44: At the end of LUP-1.3, inserting, "Preserve existing farmland and developable land that is currently undeveloped, by **temporally removing the development potential** through land banking by allowing the land to be used for passive alternative energy generation such as solar power."*

This language is detached from reality and is repeated in the ordinance 5 times. The ordinance (line 76) proposes to include the language within the Comprehensive Plan's [Land Use](#) section on preserving farmland with conservation actions: purchase the land, development rights, or conservation easements or use conservation subdivision regulations. (pp. 41-42). Yet the zoning change is being used to justify the clear cutting of at least 70 acres of woodlands and probably more. The developer of the Lippitt Ave. and Seven Mile road projects, Southern Sky, might as well open up their own logging company. Their actions have nothing to do with land conservation. The attached plan for the Seven Mile Road subdivision shows limited disturbance on the 10 acres while the solar project proposed the complete clear cutting of the woodlands outside of the wetland buffer.

temporally

Meaningless. The Southern Sky submission to the Public Utilities Commission ([Docket No. 4694](#)) proposes a 25 year lease with an option to renew for 5 years. Are they really going to remove that infrastructure in 30 years? Why wouldn't they or another party update the solar panels and continue to collect checks for themselves, their net metering partner, and the landowner? The fact is we do not have definitive timeline for these projects.

removing the development potential:

Lippitt Ave – 60 acre clear-cut, scrapping off every shred of vegetation and wildlife, Building a nearly two mile long gravel road Installing a 1.3 mile long chain link fence, Nearly 60,000 solar panels, Plus transformers, invertors, buried wires, concrete padsm 14 foot wide stone infiltration ditches. If anyone believes that this is not development, I'd be happy to give them a personal site visit to show them exactly what is being destroyed and developed. Southern Sky's proposed lease agreement does not include removing "any road, utility installations, or building foundations." (p. 4) How does this square with Cranston's solar ordinance?

This is development to remove development potential, a variation of “we had to destroy it to save it.”

Land Banking – the new buzz words

A real estate investment term. Popular in California, if Google searches are any indication.

“Renewable Energy Production and Consumption”

Placed under the Land Use Element

The current state Comp Plan Standards Manual adopted in 2016 January requires a Planning for Energy element. Renewable Energy Production and Consumption discussions belong in the Energy Element. Renewable energy has been under discussion within Planning for almost 2 years. If the administration believes that the comp plan needs an energy component, then let us have a discussion of a comprehensive renewable energy policy that follows the current standards.

*The ordinance includes the statement: “The Zoning Ordinance should permit the development of renewable energy production facilities in appropriate areas, including, **without limitation**, in the A-80, M-1, M-2 and S-1 zoning districts...”*

“Without limitation” in a residential zone. I’ve already noted the destruction caused by the current policy. If 60 acre clear-cuts are okay, then why not 80 or 100? When is enough enough? Do you really want to approve a policy of no limitations?

Lines 68-71

“The Zoning Ordinance should be modified to identify which types of renewable energy production facilities are to be allowed within the City, the zoning districts in which such facilities are to be located, and the standards by which such facilities are to be developed.”

You’ll notice that the ordinance uses the wrong verb tense: future instead of past. The city council took these actions in 2015. Simply put: the statement is not accurate.

The remainder of the ordinance is essentially a repetition of lines 42-44.”

Commissioner Lynn Harrington stated that “she was there in August, 2015, and she didn’t understand what was being proposed”. She stated that in the past 1 ½ years there has been time to develop alternative energy policies. She urged the Commission to have a workshop that is all inclusive as other communities have done.

Mr. Vincent stated that he has recently been in contact with Shauna Bedland of the Rhode Island Department of Energy about the new state law dealing with tangible property taxation and on any regulations for this land use. Ms. Bedland has offered to give a presentation to the Plan Commission on the best practices for regulating alternative energy projects. Mr. Vincent further stated that the Department of Energy offers this as a free service for municipal planning boards around the State and that staff should arrange a presentation for an upcoming meeting. The rest of the Commission was in agreement to invite Ms. Bedland to give her presentation.

Commissioner Mark Motte stated that the Comprehensive Plan is a living document. He rejected the notion that anything has been done improperly. He explained that the term ‘land banking’ is explained in non-technical terms in the amendment. It is not a formal ‘land banking’. In this application, the term “land banking” refers to the temporary removal of the development potential by allowing the land to be used for passive alternative energy generation such as solar power.

Attorney John Bolton stated that the proposed amendment is “completely consistent” with the Comprehensive Plan and rejected any notion that there has been a lack of transparency on this matter. He stated that “this has been fully vetted and is consistent with the Commissions’ decision that this is good policy”.

Commissioner Kimberly Bittner mentioned a list of five items that are consistent with the A-80 zone. She stated there is a need for a comprehensive ordinance that addresses all of the concerns.

Planning Director, Peter Lapolla, gave a history of the zoning ordinance. He stated that the impacts from solar panels are minimal. He stated that rather develop property in the conventional way, allowing solar arrays provides property owners an opportunity to earn income from their property by leasing their land to the solar farm developers. He stated that the proposed ordinance sponsored by the City Council really asks the question, 'should we amend the Comprehensive Plan'. He stated that we have consistently said that zoning is separate from the Comprehensive Plan. He further stated that planners are supposed to take a long term view. He stated that housing is permanent. He further stated that the environmental impacts are far less with solar panels versus housing.

Commissioner Bittner stated that "we created the use without the proper regulations in place". Commissioner Vincent expressed concern with some of the language in the proposed ordinance. He stated that the City Council would not approve the proposed conservation subdivision ordinance. Mr. Lapolla responded, stating that the "sticking point" on the RPD ordinance was the fact that it was being made mandatory.

Attorney Bolton stated that "the Plan Commission's role is to give a recommendation on the ordinance, as submitted, not to re-write it".

Commissioner Gene Nadeau questioned the RIGL 45-22-2-6(b)(8) requirement. Jason Pezzullo responded, explaining that all cities and towns will need to address alternative energy in their next Comprehensive Plans. He stated that at the time of the last update, these types of energy were not on the horizon.

Mr. Doe then challenged the August, 2015, minutes; where he said there was no mention of solar. He stated the proposed Lippitt Avenue Subdivision would have preserved 69% of the land. He stated that the idea that solar farms are not development is "ludicrous". Attorney Bolton responded, stating that the useful life of the arrays is 20 years, and that is why a decommissioning ordinance was passed.

Commissioner Kathleen Lanphear then asked if legal counsel for the City had reviewed the draft ordinance. Attorney Bolton responded, stating that the City Solicitor must sign off once approved by the council. Attorneys Marsella and Landry clarified/gave a history of the process.

Commissioner Harrington asked if there would be a discussion of the language in the ordinance as she did not feel that this "has been vetted by the Plan Commission" and she did not understand the term 'land banking' as it was used. Commissioner Motte clarified this for her, explaining that a developer could choose to purchase or lease the land to be used for alternative energy. Land banking in this context is essentially taking it out of residential use.

There being no further comments on this matter, the Commission moved to a vote. Upon motion made by Mr. Strom and seconded by Mr. Motte, the Commission voted 6/3 (Mr. Vincent, Ms. Bittner and Ms. Harrington opposed) to send a favorable recommendation on this ordinance proposal to the City Council.

RESIDENTIAL PLANNED DISTRICT (RPD) – Status report and discussion

Mr. Lapolla referred to a visual presentation that depicted the amount of development in Western Cranston in increments of five years. This proved to be quite enlightening to everyone. He stated that the feedback concern on the proposed RPD ordinance was the fact that conservation subdivision would be mandatory. What is now proposed is that RPD development would be the developer's choice. The City would not assume maintenance of public improvements should an RPD not be chosen. Conversely, a density bonus and City maintenance would be provided to those choosing to develop using the RPD.

Commissioner Vincent expressed concern that this is not in the best interest of homeowners. Mr. Lapolla stated that the market would most likely drive any decision by the developers. City Solicitor, Steve Marsella, further stated that homeowners would have the opportunity to petition the City Council to accept the roads. He stated that it would be up to the City Council to accept this or not.

Commissioner Bittner stated that no one had a copy of the RPD ordinance with them. Other commissioner's agreed that they did not have it either. Mr. Pezzullo suggested another joint workshop with all of the stakeholders. All agreed, therefore, a workshop will be scheduled some time in May.

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS

SYLVIA A. BERNIER (OWN) AND UNITED HOME CONSTRUCTION CO., INC. (APP) have filed an application for permission to build a 1,288+/- SF single family home with restricted lot width and frontage at **0 Rose Street**. AP 8/1, lot 913, area 6,250+/- SF, zoned B-1. Applicant seeks relief per Section 17.92.010 Variance, Section 17.20.120 Schedule of Intensity.

This application was reviewed for conformance with criteria (3) of R.I.G.L. 45-24-41 (c) "*Standards for Variance*" which reads as follows: "*That the granting of the requested variance will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the zoning ordinance or the comprehensive plan upon which the ordinance is based.*"

Findings of fact:

1. The application for a single family is consistent with the 2010 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map that designates this area of the City as "*Single/Two Family Residential, Less than 10.89 units per acre*"
2. The lot has 50 feet of frontage, where 60 ft. is required.
3. Nineteen out of 26 lots on Rose Street within the 400' radius, are lots with 50 ft. frontages; therefore, the application will not alter the general character of the neighborhood.
4. The proposed house meets all required front, side, and rear yard setbacks.

Recommendation: The Commission finds that the application will not alter the general character of the surrounding neighborhood, and is consistent with the 2010 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map; therefore, upon motion made by Mr. Nadeau and seconded by Ms. Bittner, the Plan Commission unanimously voted (9/0) to forward a positive recommendation on this application to the Zoning Board.

R.I.B. REALTY, LLC. (OWN/APP) has filed an application for permission to operate a Dance / exercise studio in a portion of an existing building on an undersized lot at **66 Libera Street**. AP 12/4, lot 3141, area 26,700+/- SF, zoned M-1. Applicant seeks relief per Section 17.92.010 Variance, 17.20.120 Schedule of Intensity, 17.20.030 Schedule of Uses.

This application was reviewed for conformance with criteria (3) of R.I.G.L. 45-24-41 (c) "*Standards for Variance*" which reads as follows: "*That the granting of the requested variance will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the zoning ordinance or the comprehensive plan upon which the ordinance is based.*"

Findings of fact:

1. The 2010 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map designates the westerly side of Libera Street as Highway Commercial/Services. The easterly side of Libera Street is designated for Industrial use. As the applicant's lot is located on the easterly side of Libera Street, the application for a Commercial use is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
2. The building's floor plan submitted, shows the proposed dance studio will occupy 2,700 sq. ft. of the building. The building also contains a 3,420 sq. ft. manufacturing unit, a 3rd, 2,300 sq. ft. manufacturing unit at the rear of the building, and a 4th, 1,950 sq. ft. manufacturing unit in the basement.
3. The application states that there is a jewelry manufacturing use that is remaining in the building.
4. Of the 6 buildings located on the easterly side of Libera Street within the 400' radius, 5 are Industrial uses.
5. All of the buildings on the westerly side of Libera Street also front on Atwood Avenue. Those buildings are commercial uses, which is consistent with the Comp Plan.
6. The Land Use Policy 4.3 on page 8 of the Comp Plan states: *Prevent the intrusion of commercial land retail activities into industrial zones, particularly those that might lead to strip commercial development. However, mixed-use commercial office and industrial parks and auxiliary commercial activities that serve the needs of an industrial park should not be discouraged.*
7. The Economic Development Policy 3.1 on Page 12 states: *Strengthen the standards for industrially zoned land to prevent the erosion of the City's supply of land suitable for these purposes.*
8. The City's limited inventory of industrial space has been eroding over the past several years due to the granting of commercial zoning variances in M-1 and M-2 zones.
9. The site plan shows 24 parking spaces for the exiting jewelry manufacturing company, the additional 3 industrial units, and the proposed dance studio.

Recommendation: The application for a commercial use (dance/exercise studio) is not consistent with the 2010 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map that designates this area of the City for industrial use. Upon motion made by Ms. Bittner and seconded by Ms. Harrington, the Plan Commission voted (8/1 – Mr. Nadeau voted nay) to forward a negative recommendation on this application to the Zoning Board, noting a safety concern on this street that has a high volume of truck traffic.

RJCA LLC., AFS Properties, LLC., Richard and Robert Caito (OWN), and Christy's Auto Rentals, Inc.(APP) have filed an application to construct a 15,640 sq.ft. building and operate a motor vehicle rental business on property at **0 Amflex Drive**. Parcels **A.P. 36/4 Lot(s) 1**, area 374,172 sq. ft. zoned **S-1, A-20; Lot 26**, area 162,771 sq. ft. zoned **S-1, A-20**; and **Lot 108**, area 25,634 sq. ft. zoned **M-2**. Applicant seeks relief per Section 17.92.010 variance; Section 17.20.030; Section 17.72.010 Signs Tables 17.72.010 (1); (7). 7.20.120 Schedule of Intensity,

This application was reviewed for conformance with criteria (3) of R.I.G.L. 45-24-41 (c) "*Standards for Variance*" which reads as follows: "*That the granting of the requested variance will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the zoning ordinance or the comprehensive plan upon which the ordinance is based.*"

Findings of fact:

1. The 2010 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map designates lot 26, and the northerly 700 ft. portion of lot 1 for Industrial Use. The application for a commercial use (motor vehicle rental) on those portions of the lots is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, as the use is not allowed in an industrial zone.
2. The proposed new 15,640 S.F. building's location and parking area is located entirely in the current A-20 single family zoning district.
3. The building will house a 2-story office section and the remaining area of the building is the maintenance garage with 10 service bays.
4. As of March 23, 2017 the applicant has not applied for, or received, the required preliminary approval for the proposed development from the City's Development Plan Review Committee.
5. The parking lot contains 358 parking spaces. 87 of those spaces are 10' x 30' to accommodate trucks.
6. The southerly edge of the parking lot is located 67 ft. from the property line of the nearest residential dwelling.
7. An Administrative Subdivision will be required to merge the lots.
8. The Land Use Policy 4.3 on page 8 of the Comp Plan states: *Prevent the intrusion of commercial land retail activities into industrial zones, particularly those that might lead to strip commercial development. However, mixed-use commercial office and industrial parks and auxiliary commercial activities that serve the needs of an industrial park should not be discouraged.*
9. The Economic Development Policy 3.1 on Page 12 states: *Strengthen the standards for industrially zoned land to prevent the erosion of the City's supply of land suitable for these purposes.*
10. The City's limited inventory of vacant industrial land has been eroding over the past several years due to the granting of commercial zoning variances in M-1 and M-2 zones.

Recommendation: The application for a commercial use (motor vehicle rental) is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map that designates this area for Industrial Use; however, the Plan Commission noted that this use could be compatible with the other businesses in the area, and therefore, upon motion made by Mr. Vincent and seconded by Mr. Motte the Plan Commission voted (8/1 – Ms. Harrington voted nay) to make no specific recommendation on this application to the Zoning Board.

PLANNING DIRECTORS REPORT - Electronic Posting of Submission Material – DISCUSSION

Mr. Pezzullo stated that he has met with GIS Coordinator, Maria Giarrusso, regarding electronic submission of all material. She suggested a digital library. He stated that he will invite her to the meeting next month to further discuss this.

Mr. Pezzullo also informed the Commission that he has sent out information for rooftop solar from the Department of Energy. Mr. Vincent mentioned that the "Energy Board" will come to our Plan Commission meeting if desired.

Chairman Smith reminded the members to file with the Ethics Commission.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion made by Ms. Bittner and seconded by Mr. Motte, the Commission unanimously voted to adjourn at 9:55 p.m.

NEXT MEETING May 2, 2017 – City Council Chamber, 7 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Jason M. Pezzullo, AICP
Principal Planner / Administrative Officer