

MINUTES

February 3, 2009

Chairman Paul Petit called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. in the City Council Chamber. He welcomed Mr. Robert Strom, Finance Director, to the Planning Commission. He then announced that the subdivision proposal entitled, 'DSM Realty', would not be heard. Upon motion made by Mr. Petit and seconded by Mr. Moran, the Commission unanimously voted to *continue* this matter to the March 3, 2009, Planning Commission Meeting with the condition that the applicant be prepared to move forward or withdraw the application.

The following Commission members were in attendance:

Paul Petit, Chairman
Anthony Sylvia, P.E., Public Works Director
Robert Strom, Finance Director
Michael Smith
James Moran

Also present were:

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

Those members of the public in attendance were: Attorney Robert Murray, Attorney Peter Lacouture and Mr. Scott Moorehead, P.E.

MINUTES

Upon motion made by Mr. Moran and seconded by Mr. Sylvia, the Commission unanimously voted to *approve* the minutes of the December 2, 2008, Planning Commission Meeting.

PERFORMANCE GUARANTEES

Newbury Village Phase 1A – 1G

This agenda item was inadvertently placed on the agenda. The existing bond is a \$50,000 Public Works Bond, and this matter will be handled by the Public Works Department.

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW ITEMS

CRAIG CRAWFORD AND JAMES RYZEK 33 TAYLOR STREET CRANSTON RI 02920 (OWN/APP) have filed an application for permission to build an 8' X 15' kitchen addition with restricted rear yard setback at **33 Taylor Street**. AP 17/3, lot 1251, area 6400+/- sq ft, zoned A-6. Applicant seeks relief from Sections; 17.92.010 Variance, 17.20.120 Schedule of Intensity.

Upon motion made by Mr. Moran and seconded by Mr. Strom, the Planning Commission unanimously voted to *continue* this application as it must be re-advertised. The owner has requested a larger addition and needs to submit new site and building plans.

Aye votes: Chairman Petit, Mr. Strom, Mr. Moran, Mr. Sylvia and Mr. Smith. There were no nay votes.

MGMD REALTY GROUP LLC 1615 PONTIAC AVENUE CRANSTON RI 02920 (OWN/APP) has filed an application for permission to construct 16 condominium units in the town of West Warwick accessed from a private right-of-way on a portion of the property located in the city of Cranston at **1027 Providence Street / New London Avenue**. Area 11,238+/- sq ft, zoned A-8. Applicant seeks relief from Sections; 17.92.010 Variance, 17.20.030 Schedule of Uses.

Upon motion made by Mr. Smith and seconded by Mr. Sylvia, the Planning Commission unanimously voted to *continue* this application as it must be re-advertised. The original application did not contain the Plat and Lot numbers.

Aye votes: Chairman Petit, Mr. Strom, Mr. Moran, Mr. Sylvia and Mr. Smith. There were no nay votes.

AMALGAMATED FINANCIAL EQUITIES II LLC 1414 ATWOOD AVENUE JOHNSTON RI 02919 (OWN/APP) has filed an application for permission to convert the first floor storage area into one studio style apartment and convert 18 three bedroom units to 36 one bedroom units and convert 2 two bedroom units into 2 one-bedroom units and 2 studio style units with restricted off-street parking on an undersized lot in an existing legal non-conforming 50 unit apartment building at **455 Meshanticut Valley Parkway**. AP 16/4, lot 1257, area 108,892+/- sq ft, zoned C-2. Applicant seeks relief from Sections; 17.92.010 Variance, 17.20.090 (A) Specific Requirements, 17.64.010 (I) (13) Off-Street Parking.

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 proposed land development and its resulting density of approximately 28 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 more than 8 residential units per acre".
2. The proposed major land development received Master Plan approval from the City Plan Commission on December 2, 2008, with a condition that the "applicant shall receive the required variances for density and parking prior to filing the Preliminary Plan application with the Planning Department."
3. The multi-family formula in Section 17.20.090 the Cranston Zoning Code would permit 29 units on a lot that is 108,892 sq. ft. The building permit for the building was taken out in 1975. The City's Building Inspection's Department has no record of a Zoning Variance to construct the existing 50 units. However, the applicant does have a Zoning Certificate issued on June 8, 2005, by the Zoning Official, that states the use is legal, non-conforming.
4. The proposed conversion will add 21 units to the current, 50 units. The current density is one unit per 2,177 sq. ft. of land area. The proposal will result in a density of one unit per 1,534 sq. ft. of land area.
5. The proposed 71 units would require a total of 142 parking spaces for a conventional multi family development or 71 spaces for an elderly multi family development. The proposed site plan shows 65 parking spaces, and 20 garage spaces on the lot, for a total of 85. However, the Zoning Variance received in 2005 to construct the 2, 10 stall garage buildings with restricted rear yard setbacks on this lot has since expired, since the Building Inspections Department has no record that a building permit to construct the garages was issued on the variance within a one year period.
6. The narrative submitted with the application states that the reason that all of the 3 bedroom apartments are being converted to 1 bedroom apartments is because the tenants are primarily elderly, and don't need 3 bedrooms.

Note: The applicant would be able to convert to 85 units total, if the development was designated as elderly apartments. As long as there are 85 parking spaces on site, 85 elderly apartments would be allowed by right.

Recommendation:

Upon motion made by Mr. Smith and seconded by Mr. Sylvia, the Planning Commission unanimously voted to recommend *approval* of this application. Although the proposed density exceeds the maximum allowed in the Zoning Code, the staff recognizes that there is a need for smaller apartments to accommodate the needs of a changing older population, and therefore, recommends *approval* for the additional 21 units (71 total) and the proposed 65 parking spaces and 20 garage spaces on lot #1257, with the following conditions:

1. That the applicant enters into the Zoning Board of Review's record of proceedings, sufficient evidence satisfying the remaining standards for the granting of variances relating to hardship, least relief necessary, mere inconvenience and reasonable use, as put forth in R.I.G.L. 45-24-41.

Aye votes: Chairman Petit, Mr. Strom, Mr. Moran, Mr. Sylvia and Mr. Smith. There were no nay votes.

FV LLC 41 COMSTOCK PARKWAY CRANSTON RI 02921 (OWN/APP) has filed an application for permission to maintain an existing monument sign with restricted setback at **41 Comstock Parkway**. AP 36, lot 62, area 105,415+/- SF, zoned M-2. Applicant seeks relief from Sections; 17.92.010 Variance, 17.72.010 (7) Signs.

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. At the December 2, 2008 Planning Commission meeting, the Commission unanimously voted to recommend *tabling* until new plans are submitted that show dimension details and height details of the existing monument, and a site plan that shows the distance of the monument sign from the intersecting streets.
2. As of 1/30/09, no new plans were submitted.

Recommendation: Upon motion made by Mr. Sylvia and seconded by Mr. Strom, the Planning Commission unanimously voted to *table* this application until new plans are submitted.

Aye votes: Chairman Petit, Mr. Strom, Mr. Moran, Mr. Sylvia and Mr. Smith. There were no nay votes.

THE NARRAGANSETT ELECTRIC COMPANY D/B/A NATIONAL GRID C/O MICHAEL F RYAN PRESIDENT 280 MELROSE STREET PROVIDENCE RI 02907 (OWN) AND THE NARRAGANSETT ELECTRIC COMPANY D/B/A NATIONAL GRID C/O DANIEL MCINTYRE PE 25 RESEARCH DRIVE WESTBOROUGH MA 01582 (APP) have filed an application for permission to relocate two existing 115 kV transmission lines and the construction of a new 345 kV transmission line on a north-south right of way [4.2 miles X 250' Cranston portion] with height in excess of that allowed by ordinance west of **Interstate Route 295**. AP 23, lots 11,12, AP 24 lots 1, 2, 66, 8, AP 28 lots 6, 8, 25, 28, 31, 44, 47, 55, 57, 59, 61, 63, 65, 66, 72, 96, 98, 100, 132, 196, 197, AP 34, lots 10, 12, 14, 20, 53, 104, AP 36 lots 33, 127, 128, 131, 133, area 127.28+/- acres, zoned A-20, A-80, B-2, M-1, M-2, S-1. Applicant seeks relief from Sections; 17.92.010 Variance, 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 Comprehensive Plan does not specifically address public utilities, other than public sewer or public water, as those items relate to future development and lot size in the Western side of the City.
2. The existing power lines are a grandfathered use, as they existed since the 1950s, prior, to the current zoning code.
3. The City's GIS shows that much of the Narragansett Electric Company's transmission line is located on undeveloped land next to or in wetlands, over farmland, within the Western Cranston Industrial Park and through a private golf course. The application will require both DEM Wetlands and Army Corp of Engineer approval.
4. The existing 345kv double pole structures average 75' in height. The heights of the new 345kv monopoles will average 100' in height, with a range from 85' to 125', depending on topography. The new metal monopole structures that support the transmission lines will be placed 350' to 400' apart. The height of transmission line structures is a result of the design of the line and clearance requirements specified in the National Electrical Safety Code.
5. The Project is proposed on an existing transmission ROW that is presently occupied by three existing electric transmission lines. Therefore, the Project will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the Zoning Ordinance or the Comprehensive Plan.
6. The electric and magnetic fields (EMF) studies be completed, reviewed, approved and accepted by the State Energy Facility Siting Board (EFSB) and by the DPW Director on behalf of the City of Cranston. Testimony by the NGRID presented noted that there EMF studies are expected to be completed approximately Summer, 2009.

Recommendation: Upon motion made by Mr. Sylvia and seconded by Mr. Moran, the Planning Commission unanimously voted to recommend *approval* based on the above findings with the following conditions:

1. That the applicant enters into the Zoning Board of Review's record of proceedings, sufficient evidence satisfying the remaining standards for the granting of variances relating to hardship, least relief necessary, mere inconvenience and reasonable use, as put forth in R.I.G.L. 45-24-41.
2. Submittal of an Electromagnetic Field Study is to be completed by the Department of Health to the satisfaction of the National Grid Citing Board.

Aye votes: Chairman Petit, Mr. Strom, Mr. Moran, Mr. Sylvia and Mr. Smith. There were no nay votes.

THOMAS MOONEY 108 MAYFIELD AVENUE CRANSTON RI 02920 (OWN/APP) has filed an application for permission to convert an existing attached garage into living space with restricted side and front yard setback on an undersized lot at **108 Mayfield Avenue**. AP 15, lot 1234, area 5116+/- SF, zoned A-6. Applicant seeks relief from Sections; 17.92.010 Variance, 17.20.120 Schedule of Intensity. No attorney. filed 10/26/08.

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. At the December 2, 2008 Planning Commission meeting, the Commission voted to table the application, to allow the applicant to consider the placement of a bedroom addition to the other end (easterly end) of the house, where there is a 17 ft. side yard setback, and re-submit a revised plan. The applicant has decided to go with the original application.
2. The application's residential use is consistent with the City of Cranston Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map which designates the subject parcel as "Residential" allowing 4-8 units / acre.
3. The building has a 19.2' existing front yard setback for the house, and a 21.4' front yard setback for the existing attached garage.
4. The existing side yard setback for the garage is 3.4', where 5' is required for an accessory building; however, the proposed conversion of the garage to living space would require a minimum side yard setback of 8 feet.
5. The house on the abutting lot to the west, has a 9.1' side yard setback, leaving only 12.5' between living spaces if the proposal were to be approved.
6. The plans show the proposed 12' x 22' garage conversion will be used as a single bedroom, located off of the existing kitchen.
7. The bedrooms are located at the other end (easterly end) of the ranch house, where the existing side yard setback is 15.8 ft., with a row of hedges along that side lot line.
8. The neighboring house that shares the easterly lot line, has a 17 ft. setback; therefore, there is 32.8 ft. of separation between the dwellings, which would be a more advantageous location to construct a bedroom addition on the applicant's house.
9. An analysis using the City's GIS shows that out of the 71 residential dwellings within the 400' zoning notification radius; only 4 (5.6%) of the dwellings have a restricted side yard setback that is similar to the applicant's dimensions. Therefore, the application is not consistent with the setbacks of 94.4% of the surrounding neighborhood.

Recommendation: Upon motion made by Mr. Smith and seconded by Mr. Sylvia, the Planning Commission unanimously voted to recommend *denial* for the following reasons:

1. The already existing restricted side yard setback of 3.4' that is already nonconforming for the garage, is an insufficient setback for the addition of living space, especially when the house on the abutting lot is 9.1 feet from that property line.
2. The proposal to convert the garage into living space with a 3.4' side yard setback, will alter the general character of the surrounding area and impair the intent or purpose of the Cranston Zoning Code.

Aye votes: Chairman Petit, Mr. Strom, Mr. Moran, Mr. Sylvia and Mr. Smith. There were no nay votes.

SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Gold Meadow Farm – Preliminary Plan (cont'd from January 6, 2009)

Major Subdivision with street creation

Lippitt Avenue

AP 30/3, Lot 240 and AP 23, Lots 6, 7, 8, 15, 20 and 36

Attorney Robert Murray gave a brief history of this proposal, stating that a 42 lot cluster subdivision is proposed. He stated that the Master Plan was approved in July, 2001. He explained that at some time in 2002 the portion of the property owned by Alfred Joaquim was placed into receivership due to a shareholder dispute. The Joaquim interest was eventually sold to Mr. Rossi (CWW, LLC). In 2006 the parties of Gold Meadow Acres, LLC, had a dispute resulting in another receivership. Mr. Cerio (Gold Meadow Acres, LLC) eventually "bought out" his partner. All prior approvals received remained in effect (tolled) during the receivership process.

He further explained that in August, 2008, the applicants submitted their Preliminary Plan, which was placed on the October, 2008, Agenda. However, Mr. Sylvia, Public Works Director, requested an informal technical review, which was done in October, 2008. On January 22, 2009, the various City Departments (Mr. Sylvia, Mr. Ferguson and the Planning Department) met and reviewed Mr. Moorehead's revisions.

The applicant proposes to subdivide the existing 112.4 combined acres of land as a Residential Planned District (RPD) and create a total of 42 single-family residential lots. 62 acres will be divided into several open space lots with seven detention basins. The main portion of the subdivision will consist of 39 residential lots and will be serviced by public sewer and private wells. The second portion, the extension of Whispering Pines Drive, will consist of 3 additional residential lots and will be serviced by public water and private ISDS.

Phasing of this project is proposed (4 phases), and Mr. Murray also asked that the Commission vote to approve this proposal as well as partial waiver for sidewalks, curbing and roadway length.

Mr. Scott Moorehead, P.E., stated that the proposal has received RIDEM Insignificant Alteration Permit. The development will have no impact on the surrounding area; no net increase in runoff. Roughly 12 acres of the 112.4 combined area is taken up by roadway. Sixty two acres of open space is proposed. Recreational and open space areas are to be maintained by the homeowners association. A tree conservation plan was submitted and approved by the Conservation Commission at the time of Master Plan approval.

Area resident, Douglas Doe, 170 Lippitt Avenue, expressed concern with roadway width and sewer line placement as he has some type of drainage to the two springs that drain across his property. He asked that the proposed sewer line be placed further west. He also expressed concern with the proposed sidewalks and asked that sidewalk be stopped further into the development and not continue to Lippitt Avenue. The developer is in agreement with extending the sidewalk to the "first traffic island". The developer will also provide a defeasible cul-de-sac, excluding Phase 4, and duly recorded easements for each phase of development. Mr. Moorehead, P.E., will meet with Mr. Doe on site to determine placement of the sewer line prior to Final Plan submission.

Discussion ensued regarding Western Cranston Water District Fees. The new fee is \$3,070 per unit. The old fee is \$1,352 per unit. Due to the fact that this project originally began during the old fee structure, it was agreed that the old fee structure will be honored.

There being no further testimony, the Commission moved to a vote. Upon motion made by Mr. Sylvia and seconded by Mr. Moran, the Commission unanimously voted to adopt the following Findings of Fact and *approve* your Preliminary Plan submittal; with partial waiver for sidewalks, curbing and roadway length, and **phasing of the project** (4 phases) subject to the conditions denoted below.

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 certified and return/receipt requested mailing and the meeting agenda has been properly posted. This major subdivision proposal has been properly advertised per Section V.F.3.g of the City of Cranston Subdivision Regulations and the notice appeared in the 9/17/08 edition of the Cranston Herald.
2. The proposed subdivision, and its resulting gross density is consistent with the City of Cranston Comprehensive Plan and its Future Land Use Map which designates the property in question as "Residential" allowing less than one 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-80** single family residential zone as developed as a Residential Planned District.

4. There will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed subdivision as shown on the Preliminary plans, with the required conditions of approval obtained from the RIDEM.
5. The property in question has adequate permanent physical access to Lippitt Avenue, an improved public roadway located within the City of Cranston.
6. Significant cultural, historic, or natural wetland features that contribute to the attractiveness of the community have been identified on the site.
7. The proposed subdivision promotes high quality appropriate design and construction, will be well integrated with the surrounding neighborhoods, and will reflect their existing characteristics.
8. The proposed subdivision will not result in the creation of individual lots with such physical constraints to development that building on subject lots, according to pertinent regulations and building standards would be impracticable.
9. The proposed subdivision provides for safe and adequate local circulation of pedestrian and vehicular through traffic, for adequate surface water run-off and for suitable building sites.
10. The design and location of streets, building lots, utilities, drainage improvements and other improvements conform to local regulations for mitigation of flooding and soil erosion.

Conditions for Approval

The following conditions shall apply to this Preliminary Plan approval, in addition to other applicable state and local requirements. The applicant is waived from provision of sidewalk from Lippitt Avenue to the interior island.

1. Provide final written approval from Veolia Water for the proposed public sewer system at the time of Final Plan submission with the Planning Department.
2. Provide final written approval from 1.) City Engineer and 2.) Public Works Director at the time of Final Plan submission with the Planning Department confirming their satisfaction with the remaining details of the Final Plan.
3. Installation of permanent markers to allow easy identification of the conservation and wetland jurisdictional limits in the field.
4. Provide final Homeowners Association documents at the time of Final Plan submittal to reference the presence and location of the conservation areas (open space lots) and the RIDEM regulated wetlands on site. In addition, these documents shall detail the Association's responsibility for the care and maintenance of the proposed detention basins and recreational facilities.
5. Provide performance guarantees on the following schedule: a) **Phase 1** -\$1,220,000 with a separate 2% administrative fee of \$24,400, to be provided at the time of **Phase 1** Final Plan recording; b) **Phase 2** - \$780,000 with a separate 2% administrative fee of \$15,600 at the time of **Phase 2** Final Plan recording; c) **Phase 3** - \$402,000 with a separate 2% administrative fee of \$8,040 at the time of **Phase 3** Final Plan recording; d) **Phase 4** - \$190,000 with a separate 2% administrative fee of \$3,800 at the time of **Phase 4** Final Plan recording.
6. Payment of Western Cranston Water District fees of \$56,784 (\$1,352 x 42) at the time of plat recording.
7. Payment of Western Cranston Capital Facilities Impact Fees of \$58,359(\$1,389.50 x 42) at the time of plat recording.
8. Provide a conservation easement for the open space and wetlands areas to the City of Cranston at the time of Final Plan approval.
9. Excluding Phase 4, defeasible cul-de-sac shall be constructed and easements shall be duly recorded for each phase of development.

10. The placement of these sidewalks, excluding from Lippitt Avenue to the first traffic island, shall be clearly shown on the Final Plan submission.

Aye votes: Chairman Petit, Mr. Strom, Mr. Moran, Mr. Sylvia and Mr. Smith. There were no nay votes.

Chateau Apartments - Preliminary Plan

Land Development with no street extension

Meshanticut Valley Parkway

Assessors Plat 16/4, Lot 1257

Planning Director, Peter Lapolla, explained the proposal. The property owner and applicant is Amalgamated Financial Equities II, LLC, and Alfred Carpionato, 1414 Atwood Avenue, Johnston RI, 02919. The subject property is located on Meshanticut Valley Parkway, Assessors Plat 16/4, Lot 1257 and is zoned **C-2** (Neighborhood Business). Multi-family housing is a use allowed by-right within this zoning district.

The applicant has proposed to substantially renovate the interior of this building (Chateau Belvedere) by reconfiguring / subdividing some of the larger apartment units (3-bedroom) into smaller ones (1-bedroom and studio). The current 50 housing units will be increased to 71 total units. The application will then require parking and dimensional variances from the Zoning Board of Review. There will be no modification to the exterior of the structure.

Attorney John Bolton reiterated Mr. Lapolla's comments. He further stated that the proposal received Preliminary Plan approval from the Site Plan Review Committee in December, 2008. He mentioned that the proposal actually adds to the existing legal, non-conforming use with respect to parking. Two parking studies have been submitted, one from July, 2005, by Garofalo and Associates and one in Summer, 2008, which indicated there were significant parking spaces on site.

This proposal received a favorable recommendation to the Zoning Board of Review for their zoning variance requests. The application will be before the Zoning Board of Review on Wednesday, February 11, 2009.

There was no comment from members of the public on this proposal. There being no further testimony, the Commission moved to a vote. Upon motion made by Mr. Sylvia and seconded by Mr. Strom, the Commission unanimously voted to adopt the following Findings of Fact and *approve* your Preliminary Plan proposal subject to the conditions denoted below.

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 certified and return receipt mail on January 20, 2009 and the meeting agenda has been properly posted. Advertisement for this land development appeared in the January 21, 2009 edition of the Cranston Herald.
2. The proposed land development and its resulting density of approximately 28 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 more than 8 residential units per acre".
3. There will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed land development as shown on the Preliminary Plan.
4. The proposed land development promotes high quality appropriate design and construction and will be well integrated with the surrounding neighborhoods and reflect its existing characteristics.
5. The proposed land development 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.

6. The property in question has adequate permanent physical access on Meshanticut Valley Parkway, an improved public roadway located within the City of Cranston.
7. 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.
8. Significant cultural, historic or natural features that contribute to the attractiveness of the community have not been identified on site.
9. The design and location of streets, building lots, utilities, drainage and other improvements conform to local regulations for mitigation of flooding and soil erosion.

Negative Findings

10. The proposed land development exceeds the prescribed density and parking requirements of the Cranston Zoning Code which will require relief from the Zoning Board of Review.

Conditions of Approval

1. Payment of Eastern Cranston Capital Facilities Impact Fees of \$12,462.66 (\$593.46 x 21) at the time of Final plat recording.
2. Applicant shall receive the required variances for density and parking prior to filing the Final Plan application with the Planning Department.

Aye votes: Chairman Petit, Mr. Strom, Mr. Moran, Mr. Sylvia and Mr. Smith. There were no nay votes.

2009-2014 CAPITAL BUDGET AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

First Draft Presentation and Discussion

Mr. Lapolla presented the first draft Capital Budget document, stating that all previously bonded items have been appropriately noted. This year's Capital Budget requests total roughly 26 million dollars. Administration has asked the Commission to limit items appropriated to only those mandated or required by law. Therefore, the Planning Department will "cull" only those items that are required.

In closing, Mr. Lapolla mentioned that a list of projects has been submitted to the Department of Statewide Planning by the Administration for possible Federal Government stimulus funding.

ADJOURNMENT Upon motion made by Mr. Sylvia and seconded by Mr. Moran, the Commission unanimously voted to adjourn at 9 p.m.

NEXT REGULAR MEETING

March 3, 2009, at 7 p.m. in the City Council Chamber

Respectfully submitted,

Jason M. Pezzullo, AICP
Principal Planner/Secretary

