

MINUTES

December 1, 2015

Chairman Smith called the City Plan Meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. in the City Council Chamber. The following Commission members were in attendance:

Michael Smith, Chairman
Kenneth Mason, P.E.
Mark Motte
James Moran
Lynne Harrington (recused on Hope Farm Matter)
Fred Vincent
Kimberly Bittner
Robert Strom

Also present were: Peter Lapolla, Planning Director
Stephen Marsella, Esq., Assistant City Solicitor
Jason Pezzullo, AICP, Principal Planner
J. Resnick, Clerk

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Upon motion made by Mr. Motte and seconded by Mr. Moran, the Commission unanimously voted (8/0) to approve the minutes of the November 3, 2015, Plan Commission Meeting.

ORDINANCE RECOMMENDATIONS

42 Kensington Road – Petition for abandonment from William & Colleen Coggins

Mr. Pezzullo stated that this abandonment is associated with the Coggins Plat that received preliminary plan approval from the Commission on October 6, 2015. The proposal is to abandon the terminus portion of Kensington Road. .

Upon motion made by Mr. Vincent and seconded by Ms. Bittner, the Plan Commission unanimously voted (8/0) to forward a positive recommendation for abandonment as this petition is consistent with the approved subdivision for this property.

11-15-01 Ordinance approving Cranston 2015 Multi-Hazard Mitigation Strategy

At its December 21, 2015 meeting the City Council will consider the adoption by ordinance a Multi-Hazard Mitigation Strategy for the City of Cranston [2014 update]. The Multi-Hazard Mitigation Strategy is a FEMA required document/planning process designed to help local communities identify and assess natural hazards that could impact a community and to develop strategies/programs to mitigate those impacts.

This current update Multi-Hazard Mitigation Strategy was prepared by staff of the Department of Planning with the assistance of a Hazard Mitigation Committee and with the assistance CDR Maguire hired through a FEMA grant.

The Strategy

- Identifies the natural hazards that may impact the City:
 - Flood Related Hazards
 - Winter Related Hazards
 - Hurricanes
 - Wind, Lightning and Hail Storms
 - Tornadoes
 - Geologic Related Hazards: Earthquakes
 - Coastal Erosion
 - Wildfire and Drought.
- Assesses the probability of an occurrence for each hazard.
- Identifies the risks [impacts] to be expected for natural hazards including an assessment of public facilities, fiscal impacts and impacts to the City's Population.
- Identifies/assesses the City's current programs and capabilities to address natural hazards.
- Identifies a range of actions that could be taken to mitigate the impact from the occurrence of a hazard.
- Suggests a program to both implement the mitigative actions identified and to update the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Strategy on a periodic basis.

The Multi-Hazard Mitigation Strategy, as briefly summarized above, has been reviewed and approved by FEMA. As a final step in the planning process, FEMA requires the City to formally adopt the approved Strategy. Therefore, upon motion made by Mr. Vincent and seconded by Ms. Bittner, the City Plan Commission unanimously voted (7/0) to recommend that the City Council adopt the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Strategy as approved by FEMA.

11-15-03 Ordinance in amendment of Chapter 17.24 of the Code of the City of Cranston, 2005, entitled "Zoning" Performance Standards (Solar Power)

At its November 23, 2015 meeting, the City Council introduced a proposed amendment to Title 17 of the City Code [Ordinance 11-15-03] establishing performance standards that would govern the establishment of solar power facilities. The ordinance is as follows:

Section 1: Chapter 17.24 entitled "Performance Standards – Generally" is hereby amended by adding thereto the following new section:

17.24.020 Solar Power Performance Standard

Site Preparation

Clearing of natural vegetation shall be limited to what is necessary for the construction and operation of the solar power facility. Top soil will not be removed from the site. Top soil will not be disturbed except as required for installation of the facility.

Lighting

Lighting of solar power facilities shall be limited to requirements for safety and operation and shall not shine light onto abutting properties.

Noise

Applicants for a building permit to construct a solar power facility must submit a noise study as part of their application. The noise study assesses the potential impacts at nearby noise receptors (e.g. residences) due to sound emitted by the solar power facility's electrical equipment including, but not limited to, inverters and transformers. The noise study is required to demonstrate that the facility, as designed, does not exceed a 40 decibel noise level (approximately the noise level experienced in a quiet office or library). The city's review engineer will assess the noise study to determine acceptable distance from the solar facility to the nearest residence or receptor.

Decommissioning and Abandonment

A solar power facility which has reached the end of its useful life or has been abandoned consistent with abandonment section shall be removed. The owner or operator shall physically remove the facility no more than 150 days after the date of the discontinued operations.

Removal shall consist of

1. Physical removal of all installations, electrical equipment, all appurtenant structures including but not limited to, equipment shelters, storage facilities, transformers, substations, security barriers, fences, overhead and underground electric lines.
2. Disposal of all solid and hazardous waste in accordance with the law.
3. Stabilization or revegetation of the site as necessary to minimize erosion.

Abandonment

A solar facility shall be considered abandoned when it fails to operate for more than one year. If the owner or operator fails to remove the installation within 150 days of abandonment, or the proposed date of decommissioning, the city may enter the property and physically remove the installation.

Financial surety

Before receiving a building permit, owners or operators of a solar power facility shall provide a form of surety, either through escrow account, bond or otherwise, to cover the cost of removal in the event the city must remove the facility and remediate the landscape. In no event will the amount exceed 125 percent of the cost of removal and compliance as determined by a qualified engineer hired by the city and paid for by the owner operator. The qualified engineer shall include an estimate of all costs associated with removal and remediation and a mechanism for figuring increased removal costs due to inflation.

ANALYSIS

As noted above, the ordinance will set performance standards to govern the installation of a solar power facility as authorized through §17.20.030 Schedule of Uses of the City Code. With the exception of the section that addresses “Decommissioning and Abandonment,” the performance standards, as proposed, already exist, in some form, within Title 17 of the City Code. Section 17.20.090 regulates impacts from noise and lighting. Section 17.84.140.C regulates site preparation.

With regard to the standards set for noise, the Commission would note that the ordinance will require a noise impact assessment “at nearby noise receptors (e.g. residences)...” The Commission would suggest that “nearby noise receptors” is an amorphous standard subject to interpretation. The Commission would further suggest that whenever possible, standards should be specific and suggest that the ordinance be amended to read as follows:

“Applicants for a building permit to construct a solar power facility shall submit a noise study as part of their application. The noise study assesses the potential impacts to the nearest off site residential noise receptor due to sound emitted by the solar power facility’s electrical equipment including, but not limited to, inverters and transformers. The noise study is required to demonstrate that the facility, as designed, does not exceed a 40 decibel noise level (approximately the noise level experienced in a quiet office or library). The city’s review engineer will assess the noise study to determine acceptable distance from the solar facility to the nearest off site residential noise receptor.

With regards to the standards governing the decommissioning of a solar power facility, the Commission would note that a discussion of how and when a facility would be decommissioned would have taken place during a permitting process [Development Plan Review, Major Land Development. The proposed ordinance will now set the standards to inform that discussion.

The Commission would further suggest that, to the extent that the ordinance sets performance standards for an authorized use, the ordinance will be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Future Land Use Plan designates a land use and the Land Use Element specifies an appropriate zoning classification based on the land use designation. Neither the Future Land Use Plan nor the Land Use Element identifies appropriate uses with a particular zoning class and the standards by which those uses are to be implemented.

RECOMMENDATION

The proposed zoning ordinance is consistent with the City of Cranston Comprehensive Plan and with RIGL § 45-24-30 “General purposes of zoning ordinances” with regard to the following applicable purposes:

- (1) Promoting the public health, safety, and general welfare.

- (14) Providing for efficient review of development proposals, to clarify and expedite the zoning approval process.

(15) Providing for procedures for the administration of the zoning ordinance, including, but not limited to, variances, special-use permits, and, where adopted, procedures for modifications.

Therefore, upon motion made by Mr. Motte and seconded by Mr. Vincent, the City Plan Commission unanimously voted (7/0) to forward a favorable recommendation on Ordinance 11-15-03 conditioned on the Noise section of the ordinance being amended as follows:

Applicants for a building permit to construct a solar power facility shall submit a noise study as part of their application. The noise study assesses the potential impacts to the nearest off site residential noise receptor due to sound emitted by the solar power facility's electrical equipment including, but not limited to, inverters and transformers. The noise study is required to demonstrate that the facility, as designed, does not exceed a 40 decibel noise level (approximately the noise level experienced in a quiet office or library). The city's review engineer will assess the noise study to determine acceptable distance from the solar facility to the nearest off site residential noise receptor.

11-15-05 Ordinance amending the FY 2016 Capital Budget to include the expenditure of Library Impact Fees.

The City Council has forwarded the following ordinance to the City Plan Commission for a recommendation:

Section 1: Pursuant to amend Section 15.040 of the City Code and R.I.G.L. Section 45- 22.4-5, the City of Cranston seeks to utilize/apportion \$450,000 of its impact fee proceeds that have been collected by it on behalf of the Library Department toward a Capital Improvement - specifically a major renovation of the Youth Services Department of the Cranston Central Library located at 140 Sockanosset Cross Road.

Section 2: Under Sections 6.12 and 6.17 of the City Charter, the City of Cranston seeks to amend its fiscal year 2015-2016 Capital Budget so these funds may be expended for the aforementioned capital improvements within the present fiscal year.

Section 3: This Ordinance shall take effect upon its final adoption.

On 5/1/14, the City Plan Commission held a public hearing to amend the Subdivision and Land Development regulations with the following language:

Section III – General Requirements, I. Dedication of Fees / Land for Public Improvements, 1. Capital Facilities Development Impact Fees, b. Major Capital Facilities Needs:

~~Library – New Branch~~ ~~————— \$450,000;~~
Library – Central Library Addition - \$450,000

In addition, Planning Department staff explained the need for this change to the regulations as it relates to the Capital Facilities Development Impact Fees. The following is the content of that memo for your convenience:

Section I. 1. of the Subdivision and Land Development Regulations lays out the process and the specific capital projects under which the city currently collect Capital Facilities Development Impact Fees.

The City Plan Commission is empowered to amend this section under the following section:

*Section I.1.c. Establishment of Facility Service Area: In order to properly assess the Fee for each functional category to those development reasonably related to the facility need created, the following service areas are hereby established. These service areas shall be recognized for the lifetime of their corresponding funds or until such time, if any, that the standards currently used are amended. **Service areas may be expanded, reduced, moved geographically, added or deleted only by a majority vote of the Planning Commission.***

Library – Western Cranston. (Western / Central Cranston)

At issue is the need to eliminate the requirement that the City collect Capital Facilities Impact Fees for the expressed purpose of building a “New Branch” in “Western Cranston”. The original intent when this section was drafted by the City Plan Commission was to see the construction of a new library or a significant library addition to the elementary school in western Cranston, Orchard Farms located on Scituate Avenue. It was a rational decision at the time, and one would still think this would still be an ideal location for the systems expansion. However, the Library Director has had many discussions with staff and he and his Board of Directors have decided that a new stand-alone facility does not fit the vision for his Department moving forward. The need to hire additional staff in a time of shrinking budgets is one the main reasons why this option is untenable.

Library feels that an amendment to this section removing the language for a new branch and inserting the Central Library Addition, as well as change Western Cranston to Western / Central Cranston will best serve the needs of the city moving forward.

Staff supports the policy decision to change the proposed language and also to consolidate services into a central location. Staff also feels that this amendment was necessary to maintain the integrity of the Capital Facilities Impact Fee process to ensure that these projects will continue to be capitalized as new construction occurs throughout the City. Staff recommends **approval** of the proposed amendment.

The proposed City Council ordinance 11-15-05 to amend the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and authorize the use of \$450,000 in Capital Facilities Impact Fees for the **Central Library Addition** is consistent with the Subdivision and Land Use Regulations as specifically amended on 5/1/14. Therefore, upon motion made by Mr. Motte and seconded by Mr. Strom the City Planning Commission unanimously voted (7/0) to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council Ordinance Committee.

SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT

Hope Farm 10 MW Solar Array

Master/Preliminary Plan
840 Hope Farm Road
AP 23, Lot 12, AP 24, Lot 66

Commissioner Harrington recused herself on this matter and left the chambers for the entire proceedings.

Mr. Pezzullo began by explain that a vote is needed to waive the RIDEM wetland delineation requirement for Preliminary Plan Review among other waivers required by the applicant. He stated that as far as the wetlands onsite are concerned, this parcel is “not unknown to the staff and the Commission”. Mr. Lapolla stated that we have waived this requirement for other projects, namely the Stop and Shop on Warwick Avenue and the proposed apartment complex on Scituate Avenue (the Carpionato project). Attorney Bolton stated that the applicant has submitted their application to RIDEM. He also stated that the site received RIDEM wetland approval for the previously proposed 30-lot subdivision. Mr. John Starbuck, VHB, project engineer, stated that they submitted the application to RIDEM in September. He stated also that the land has been altered by agricultural use since the previous RIDEM approval in 2006.

Commissioner Bittner expressed concern with the outdated RIDEM verification. Mr. Starbuck stated that the wetlands have been flagged. Attorney Bolton stated that, if by some odd chance there are significant changes, the applicant will be back before the Commission.

Mr. Douglas Doe, 178 Lippit Avenue, stated that he spoke with a biologist today who stated that there are additional issues and have stopped trying to delineate the wetland edge. He stated that the Plan Commission shouldn't be approving this without all of the information. Mr. Pezzullo responded, stating that if RIDEM finds that certain areas should not be disturbed, then the City will not allow it. He further stated that the final plan set has to be modified in accordance with any RIDEM approval. Mr. Bolton added that the applicant is not creating any impervious surface, the land will be left pervious.

Ms. Bridget Graziano, 191 of the City's Conservation Commission, expressed concern with the intermittent stream. She stated that she has never been on the site and her comments are based on the plans. She also expressed concern with the use of healable footings. Attorney Bolton assured her that the applicant will be 100% compliant with RIDEM.

Councilman Mario Aceto stated that the Plan Commission was in violation of the open meetings law and Robert's Rules for electing to take an agenda items out of order. City Solicitor, Steve Marsella, stated that the commission chairman has the prerogative to take matters out of order. He stated that he will be glad to defend the Plan Commission on this matter and it is up to the Commission if they wished to continue. Mr. Pezzullo stated that he recommends that the final plan application be heard before the Commission to ensure that all remaining items can be reviewed by the Commission.

Ann Marie Brunn, Ocean Avenue, expressed concern that Commissioner Harrington was removed from the meeting. Chairman Smith responded, stating that Ms. Harrington recused herself. Mr. Lapolla stated that Ms. Harrington has shown that she has prejudged the project by attending the Ordinance Committee meeting last week (November 2015) and has chosen to recuse.

Upon motion made by Commissioner Motte and seconded by Commissioner Strom, the City Plan Commission voted 6-1 (Commissioners Motte, Strom, Moran, Smith, Mason, Vincent - AYE, Commissioner Bittner - NAY) to grant the waivers detailed in **Section VI. Waivers** of the Final Draft version of the staff memorandum dated 12/1/15 (Waivers of Subdivision and Land Development Regulations, as amended Section(s) III.J.2.c, III.J.2.d, III.J.3.c. 2-7, III.J.3.c.11, III.J.3.d.1-5). The granting of these waivers to accept an incomplete application was necessary in order for the public hearing to proceed to the consideration of the combined Master/Preliminary Plan application. Ms. Bittner voted against the waiver and expressed concern that Ms. Harrington was not allowed to vote on this matter. Mr. Lapolla stated that the Commission should base their decisions solely on what is presented at the public hearings.

Mr. Marsella stated that the decision to recuse is based on Supreme Court case law. If she had remained, it presents a grounds for appeal. He stated that she recused herself voluntarily because she has spoken against the project at previous meetings. He further stated that the Commission is taking this matter "piece meal" and suggested that the Commission stick to their format of the Planning Department giving their presentation and the applicant giving their presentation and then take public comment.

At this point the application was accepted as complete by the Plan Commission with the approval of the required waivers, upon motion made by Commissioner Motte and seconded by Commissioner Vincent, the City Plan Commission then voted unanimously (7-0) to combine the Master and Preliminary Plan stages of approval.

The applicant then gave their presentation. Mr. Starbuck stated that the applicant will make the change to the access roads to 20 ft., in accordance with the Fire Department request. The existing vegetation and stone wall will be maintained. Mr. Bolton stated that the applicant will be compliant with zoning requirements. He also stated that no soil will be removed from the site.

Mr. Vincent asked what would be seen from Hope Road. Mr. Starbuck stated that you would not see the panels when leaves are on the vegetation. He stated that the arrays will be 12 ft. tall at the high end and 2 ft.

high at the low end. He stated that the existing drainage ditches will be eliminated. He stated that there are significant mature trees that will buffer the site. Mr. Bolton stated that the arrays will be 8 ft. 4 " tall, not 12 ft.

Ms. Bittner expressed concern with a 9 ft. chain link fence. Mr. Starbuck stated that a 6 ft. fence is proposed. Mr. Pezzullo stated that the buffer plantings will be reviewed during the DPR process to take place after Master/Preliminary Plan process and before appearing back before the Plan Commission for Final Plan consideration.

Mr. Dan Boyd, RES, stated that the sound will be well below what may be required in the proposed performance standards for Solar Arrays ordinance. The inverters will be located within the site. The transformer and switch gear will be near the driveway. Security cameras will be installed, if needed. The project will take about six months to construct.

Mr. Strom asked about tax revenue. Mr. Bolton stated that the tax is based on megawatts. The project will generate about \$50,000 in tax revenue. He stated that discussion of taxation has not yet occurred with the City Council and that this is a rough estimate based on agreements with other communities in other states.

Mr. Lapolla reviewed the project for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map. He stated that the City Council voted to authorize solar power as a use by right. Ms. Bittner stated that the Comprehensive Plan often mentions maintaining the rural character of western Cranston and this project is not consistent with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. Chairman Smith reiterated that this is now a use by right. Mr. Lapolla explained that the Comprehensive Plan calls for the preservation of open spaces in western Cranston which this proposal accomplishes by keeping the land free of new residential construction in the near and long term.

Mr. Doe objected to Ms. Harrington's having to recuse herself. He stated that this project was not specifically discussed at the City Council meeting. He objected to what was submitted to the Plan Commission and compared it to project submissions in Johnston for a similar project. He found fault with the staff report regarding how many panels there will be. He expressed concern with the deer habitat and the proposal for a 6 ft. fence, which he feels is inadequate. He proceeded to read a letter from the State of Maine Audubon Society. He expressed concern with noise. He asked for a one month delay in approving this project to get "critical information".

Ms. Eugenia Marks, Audubon Society, expressed concern with vegetation and the lawn mowing proposed. She also expressed concern with existing trees shading the panels. She requested that no herbicide be used. She expressed concern with invasive plants and asked that they be removed. She stated that a 6 ft. fence is inadequate and suggested a 10-12 ft. fence. She is concerned with noise during construction and with decommissioning. The applicant stated that decommissioning is something that is standard for this site as all the apparatus has recycle/reuse value at the end of the multi-year lease.

Ms. Bridget Graziano asked if drainage calculations would change with a 20 ft. roadway. Mr. Starbuck stated that the calculations would change but the volume would be unaffected. Ms. Graziano also expressed concern with meadow lawn and asked that herbicide not be used. She read from a statement she had prepared. She expressed concern with footings and the number of panels proposed. She stated that soils will be changed. She expressed concern with woddles and also asked that a 6-12 inch gap be provided at the bottom of the fence for migration of amphibious species. The entirety of her comments and responses from the applicant are part of the Final Draft memo submitted to the City Plan Commission.

Mr. Bolton responded, stating that the applicant has a lot of experience with constructing solar arrays. He stated that the soil rating will actually be improved, based on Ms. Graziano's statements. He stated that Condition of Approval #5 should state that the ordinance, as introduced, as the ordinance has not been passed yet.

Mr. Pezzullo then reviewed his staff memorandum and presented his analysis to the commission. He also stated that no abutters within the notification radius have commented or even inquired on this application.

Ms. Bittner expressed concern that the public has not received enough information and that “we are rushing”. Mr. Lapolla responded, stating that this project was acknowledged and discussed with the applicant and planning staff during the City Council meetings. The public, within 200 ft., has been notified for Development Plan Review. The project was advertised in the newspaper, and certified, return receipt, notices have been sent. There also have been several articles and editorials in the Providence Journal.

Mr. Vincent stated that the Commission has received a lot of information tonight, and all of the points made will be addressed. Chairman Smith expressed concern with the removal of soil. Mr. Pezzullo stated that the applicant will not remove soil and site will be planted with grass.

Mr. Carmino Mobilia, 16 Coral Ct., stated that he did not receive a notice and the Commission should consider sending more notices. Mr. Pezzullo stated that their home well outside of the notification radius at least 500’ from the boarder of the property.

Ms. Lisa Gibb, 45 Rhodes Avenue, stated that she knocked on doors and provided flyers to residents, who stated that they had not heard of the project. Mr. Bolton responded, stating that this is precisely why this is a good site for this. “If people were “leafletted”, why aren’t they here?”

Upon motion made by Commissioner Motte and seconded by Commissioner Mason, the Commission voted (6-1) to support staff recommendation and adopt the Findings of Fact documented below and *approve* the combined Master/Preliminary Plan with the waivers detailed in Section VI. Waiver in the Final Draft version of the staff memorandum dated 12/1/15 (Waivers of Subdivision and Land Development Regulations, as amended Section(s) III.J.2.c, III.J.2.d, III.J.3.c. 2-7, III.J.3.c.11, III.J.3.d.1-5.) and conditions documented below

Positive Findings

1. An orderly, thorough and expeditious technical review of this Master/Preliminary Plan has been conducted. Property owners within a 100’ radius have been notified via Certified and Return Receipt Requested mail on 11/20/15 and the meeting agenda has been properly posted. Advertisement for this Master/Preliminary Plan was published in the 11/18/15 edition of the Cranston Herald.
2. The proposed Master/Preliminary Plan and its resulting land use is consistent with the City of Cranston Comprehensive Plan’s Future Land Use Map which designates the subject parcel as Residential – Less than one unit per acre. The City Council after 3 months of public debate specifically authorized Solar Power as a use allowed by-right in land zoned A-80. The use is therefore consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
3. The proposal will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the Cranston Zoning Code. The Cranston Zoning Code specifically allows solar farm arrays as a use by-right in the A-80 zone.
4. There will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposal as shown on the Master/Preliminary Plan. The RIDEM wetlands permit will determine how the wetlands and stormwater management will function. This determination will be required at the Final Plan submission.
5. The proposed Master/Preliminary Plan promotes high quality appropriate design and construction, will be well integrated with the surrounding neighborhoods and will reflect its existing characteristics.
6. The proposed Master/Preliminary Plan 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 Hope Road, an improved public roadway located within the City of Cranston.

8. The proposed Master/Preliminary Plan provides for safe and adequate local circulation of pedestrian and vehicular through traffic, for adequate surface water run-off and for suitable building sites.
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

The following conditions ***shall*** be met by the applicant prior to filing a Final Plan application with the Planning Department:

1. Obtain the final RIDEM Wetlands Permits. The Final Major Development Plan set shall be consistent with this State approval;
2. Verification from the Cranston Fire Department that the proposed maintenance access ways are accessible for public safety vehicles;
3. Obtain **Final** approval from the Development Plan Review Committee;
4. Final Plan application shall appear before the City Plan Commission to verify that all (City Council Ordinance 11-15-03) performance standards including noise, visual impacts / vegetative landscape buffers, stormwater runoff, lighting, long-term maintenance, decommissioning, and environmental requirements have been met prior to recording the Record Plan in land evidence.
5. Submission of a performance bond for the Building Inspections Department for decommissioning in accordance with proposed standards found in City Council Ordinance 11-15-03.

PLANNING DIRECTORS REPORT

Residential Planned District (RPD) – Mr. Lapolla had no comment on the RPD

Revisions to the Sign Ordinance – Mr. Lapolla stated that we have to decide how electronic signs and reader boards are permitted.

Upon motion made by Mr. Vincent and seconded by everyone, he wanted to congratulate Mr. Kevin Flynn on his retirement.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion made by Mr. Motte and seconded by Mr. Moran, the Commission unanimously voted to adjourn at 10:10 p.m.

NEXT MEETING January 5, 2016 – City Council Chamber, 7 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Jason M. Pezzullo, AICP
Principal Planner/Administrative Officer