

January 8, 2019
MINUTES

Chairman Smith called the City Plan Commission Meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. in the Cranston High School East Auditorium. He introduced and welcomed new commissioners, Robert DiStefano and Joseph Morales.

The following Commission members were in attendance:

Michael Smith, Chairman
Fred Vincent
Ken Mason, P.E.
Robert Strom
Kathleen Lanphear
Steven Spirito
Ann Marie Maccarone
Robert DiStefano
Joseph Morales

Also present were:

Jason M. Pezzullo, AICP, Planning Director
Stephen Marsella, Esq., Assistant City Solicitor
Douglas McLean, AICP, Principal Planner
Joshua Berry, AICP, Senior Planner
J. Resnick, Clerk

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Upon motion made by Mr. Spirito and seconded by Mr. Mason, the Commission unanimously voted (9/0) to approve the minutes of the December 4, 2018, Plan Commission Meeting.

Upon motion made by Ms. Maccarone and seconded by Mr. Vincent, the Commission voted (8/0 – Ms. Lanphear abstained) to approve the minutes of the December 8, 2018, Plan Commission Meeting.

CAPITAL BUDGET AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP)

Mr. Pezzullo stated that the departmental submissions are still coming in. The first draft of the CIP will be presented next month and the final draft in March.

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS

RODNEY W. RYAN and ROBYN A. RYAN (OWN/APP) have filed an application to convert an existing attached garage to living space at **76 Lake Garden Drive** A.P. 37, lot 333, area 8287 s.f., zoned A8.

Applicant seeks relief per Section 17.92.010 variance; Section 17.20.120 Schedule of Intensity Regulations.

VARIANCE REQUEST: To allow the conversion of an attached garage (considered an accessory structure) into a bedroom (considered part of the primary structure) that would encroach 1.9' into the 10' side yard setback and 0.3' into the 25' front yard setback. [17.20.120 Schedule of Intensity]

FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. The applicant proposes to convert an existing attached garage to a bedroom on the northern side of the dwelling.
2. There are no proposed expansions to the footprint of the existing structure as part of the immediate application.
3. The subject property is an A-8 zoned lot and is currently occupied by a single family residence.
4. The surrounding neighborhood within 200' is comprised entirely of single family dwellings zoned A-8.
5. The subject property is a corner lot at the intersection of Lake Garden Drive and Stone Drive. As a corner lot, the property is interpreted to have two front yard setbacks (abutting Lake Garden Drive and Stone Drive, respectively) and two side yard setbacks.
6. The existing attached garage is currently 8.1' from the side property line to the north, and 24.7' from the front property line to the west (abutting Lake Garden Drive).
7. Per the City Zoning Code, the setback requirements for an accessory structure (which includes attached garages) is 5' for the side setback and 25' for the front setback. The setback requirements for a primary structure (which includes all living space/bedrooms in a dwelling) is 10' for the side setback and 25' for the front setback.
8. Regarding the requested side setback relief: the current condition of the garage (8.1' from side property line) is in compliance with the accessory side setback requirement (5'), however, the proposal to convert the attached garage into a bedroom triggers the side setback requirement for a primary structure (10'). The dimensional relief necessary to allow the conversion represents an encroachment of 1.9' into the 10' side yard setback.
9. Regarding the requested front setback relief: the City Zoning Code requirement relating to the front setbacks does not change based on the type of structure (accessory or primary), so dimensional relief is necessary to allow the work to occur 0.3' within the 25' front setback.
10. The current dwelling is 23.5' from the front property line to the south (abutting Stone Drive), encroaching 1.5' into the 25' front setback. Since the southern portion of the dwelling is not subject to any work being proposed in the immediate application, staff finds that no dimensional relief is necessary relative to the existing conditions of this side of the structure/lot.
11. The subject parcel (8,287 ft²) meets the minimum lot size for the A-8 zone (8,000 ft²), and the proposed lot coverage percentage (18.3%) is below the maximum lot coverage amount allowed by zoning (30%).
12. The use of single family residential is consistent with zoning and with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use allocation of Single Family Residential 7.26 – 3.64 units/acre. No change of use is proposed.

ANALYSIS:

The applicant proposes to convert an existing attached garage to a bedroom on the northern side of the dwelling. The application states that the conversion is to accommodate a family member who is aging in place. There are no proposed expansions to the footprint of the existing structure as part of this application. The conversion of the attached garage to a bedroom triggers a more strict side setback requirement, and as a result the project requires relief for an encroaching into the side setback without a physical expansion of the structure. In an abundance of caution, relief is requested for the front yard setback along Lake Garden Drive due to the fact that the proposed work will take place within the front

yard setback. All dimensional relief being requested is for improvements made within the existing footprint of the structure.

The surrounding neighborhood is comprised of single family dwellings in an A-8 zone. The nearby properties are built at a similar density level to the subject parcel. Approval of the variance is not perceived to have a negative effect on the character of the neighborhood or the general welfare. The proposed work would not alter the footprint of the home, and the requested relief is considered to be relatively minor in nature compared the required setback amounts (variance for encroaching 1.9' into the 10' side yard setback and 0.3' into the 25' front yard setback).

RECOMMENDATION: Due to the fact that the modifications to the home would not expand the footprint of the building, and that there is no perceived detriment to the general welfare or character of the neighborhood, on a motion made by Mr. Vincent and seconded by Mr. Mason, the Plan Commission unanimously voted (9/0) to forward a **positive recommendation** on this application to the Zoning Board of Review.

SUBDIVISIONS AND LAND DEVELOPMENTS

Natick Avenue Solar *(Continued from December 4th, 2018)*

Master Plan - Major Land Development (30 Acre / 8MW Solar Farm on 64 acre site)

Natick Avenue

AP 22, Lots 108 and 119

Mr. Berry presented the basic information of the application from the first December 4, 2018, Plan Commission Meeting. He talked about the Plan Commission site visit and general observations of the overall parcel. He presented his slideshow presentation, stating that ground-mounted solar panels can be placed on land with slopes up to 25%. He stated that since the first iteration, the southeast corner has been revised from last month and some panels have been removed. The landscaping and screening plan illustrates how existing mature trees will be removed in certain areas to be replaced with smaller screening vegetation to buffer the existing residents from the panel areas. The buffer planting plan illustrated how the panels will be located and screened approximately 400' back from Natick Avenue.

Mr. Marsella noted that the two new commissioners (Robert DiStefano & Joseph Morales) have reviewed all of file documents up to that point and would be able to take part in all discussions and vote on the application.

Attorney Murray, representing the applicant SSRE, stated that the solar farm proposal is a use allowed by-right in the A-80 zoning district. Mr. Dave Russo P.E., DiPrete Engineering, spoke to the commission about the revised plan, and stated that there will be further testing and evaluation to determine the extent of ledge outcrops on site. He stated that the panels originally proposed in the southeast corner of the site have been removed due to the presence of ledge. As far as water runoff and drainage onsite, he stated that a RIDEM permit will be required for discharge into the existing wetlands areas and that the state requirement is for zero net runoff post-construction.

Commissioner Lanphear asked where the removed panels will be relocated to maintain the 8.1 MW produced. Mr. Russo stated that currently they have not been relocated and that energy could be accommodated elsewhere onsite. Commissioner Vincent stated that some of the proposed panels have encroached into the depicted buffer area. Mr. Russo responded, stating that none of the panels have been located within this 50 ft. setback buffer. Mr. Vincent also expressed concern with re-seeding, and Mr. Russo stated that the RIDEM would set forth development requirements necessary for re-seeding and stabilizing the site. Attorney Murray stated that the developer will follow the city ordinance of not removing topsoil and that

the site would be properly stabilized. He further clarified that “500 panels have been removed out of 20,000” and the 8.1 MW will be maintained.

Mr. John Cotter, RLA, representing SSRE, stated that the landscaped screening plan has not been fully prepared at this time, but select viewshed areas have been identified where significant plantings will be required. Mr. Cotter has identified the need for screening vegetation with heights of 8-10 feet in height with a mix of species. Attorney Murray stated that the developer “will do their best to satisfy everyone” regarding screening and the vegetated buffer areas.

Mr. Andrew DuFour of Main Drilling and Blasting, speaking for SSRE, stated that his is a 52 year old company. His company worked on the new Citizens Bank complex in Johnston where the Tennessee Gas Pipeline also exists. He stated that if any blasting is required within 100 ft. of the pipeline an inspector will be present. His company works closely with the State Fire Marshall, as required, and will use seismograph equipment to measure vibration as required. Mr. DuFour spent time carefully explaining the steps required in the overall blasting process. Mr. Vincent questioned if in his experience had any blasting damaged wells or septic systems to which Mr. DuFour responded that it had not. He also stated that his explosives don't contain “florites” which are considered a hazardous or poisonous material. Attorney Murray assured everyone that any blasting would be done carefully and not indiscriminately.

Mr. Ed Pimentel, AICP, Planning Consultant representing SSRE, presented a summary of his planning study; stating that he has been involved with a dozen solar projects. He stated that the City has a precise definition in the Comprehensive Plan regarding solar projects and that this project was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. He further stated that the Zoning Code was amended as well to permit (these projects) as a matter of right and the zoning is consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Walter Lawrence, 745 Natick Avenue, stated that he attended the site tour and was offered compensation from SSRE to allow trimming of his trees to prevent shading the abutting panels. He presented an arborist report that spoke to the concerns of topping off of trees. He also expressed concern with the Tennessee Gas Pipeline.

Attorney Patrick Doherty, on behalf of several neighboring property owners, delivered Ashley Sweet's resume and report, stating that she should be recognized by the Commission as an expert in planning. He also provided a letter from the Associate Director of Statewide Planning noting that the City's Comprehensive Plan is considered expired by the State, but is in effect for local decision making. He stated that the Statewide Planning program had concerns with the Cranston Comprehensive Plan amendment specifically relating to solar farm development. He stated that the site will be denuded after construction. He asked that Ms. Sweet be “qualified” as an expert. City Solicitor Stephen Marsella stated that the Plan Commission does not qualify experts.

Ms. Sweet, planning consultant representing abutting neighbors, presented the summary of her study. She stated that this project is in conflict with many elements of the City's Comprehensive Plan. She stated that the proposed project is not passive solar but is actually active solar. She stated that the applicant should be seeking a zoning variance as the project exceeds the lot coverage in an A-80 zone. She noted the competing interest for land for solar versus housing. She stated that the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Code use table are inconsistent in that the Comprehensive Plan identifies solar as an alternative energy. She stated that only the cleared area of the site be considered for this development. She stated that the buffering and screening as proposed is inadequate. In reference to the panels that were removed from the Southeast corner, she stated that the full plan should be in front of the Commission.

Attorney Doherty again addressed the Commission, noting that a solar moratorium is pending. He questioned whether the proposed housing plan depicted by the applicant could even be built due to the constraints of the property. He urged the Commission to place conditions on this development with a larger setback buffer. He ended by urging the Commission to deny the project.

Ms. Drake Patten, 684 Natick Avenue (Hurricane Hill Farm), stated that she would hold the developer, Southern Sky, to their commitment of working with the community. She then distributed copies of a letter prepared for the Commission. The letter itemized a number of conditions the neighborhood would like incorporated into the design if the Commission ultimately saw fit to approve the project.

Mr. Douglas Doe, 178 Lippitt Avenue, stated that he has been asked by other communities in Rhode Island to share his experiences and to speak at various public meetings. He spoke at length and disputed the findings of Mr. Dave Russo's letter presented last month to the members of the City Plan Commission. He stated that the buffering proposed by the developer is inadequate and the sites cannot be hidden by screening.

Mr. Kevin Wilbur, 51 Country Lane, stated that he was in favor of the proposed solar farm development rather than a residential subdivision.

Ms. Rachel Clark stated her concerns about potential blasting onsite. She mentioned the Town of Tiverton's halt to such projects and asked what would happen to the solar panels in 25 years. She stated that solar panels belong on rooftops and landfills, not in greenspace.

Mr. Richard Bowling, 18 Beaver Creek Ct., stated that "in Walden Woods there are 82 homes on 1/3 acre lots with 26 wooded acres". He stated that he moved there because it was "in the woods". He expressed concern with the potential encroachment for this project.

Attorney Murray read the Comprehensive Plan's 45-22.2-13 (Compliance and Implementation) element and stated that the existing Comprehensive Plan is valid. He stated that there is no dispute in this city right now that solar is allowed in the A-80 zone as a matter of right.

Mr. Pezzullo, Planning Director, disputed the characterization that the Cranston Comprehensive Plan is expired or invalid for local land use decision making. He stated that the Comprehensive Plan was adopted by the State of Rhode Island in 2012, and expired by the State in 2017. Mr. Pezzullo explained that the locally adopted plan is evergreen and is the valid. He stated that the City's first solar farm project was appealed to the Platting Board and the State Superior Court and the City prevailed both times. Mr. Pezzullo stated that he disagreed significantly with Ms. Sweet's report that was handed to the Commission when she began her presentation.

Mr. Berry, Senior Planning for the City, gave the staff recommendation of approval and the conditions of approval, noting that this project is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Upon motion made by Mr. DiStefano and seconded by Mr. Strom, the Commission unanimously voted (9/0) to close the public comments public portion of the public informational meeting. Mr. Vincent stated that the conditions of approval do not adequately address the various concerns raised and that the Commission should address Ms. Patten's itemized concerns with the developer. He further suggested attaching her submission to the conditions of approval. Upon motion made by Mr. Vincent and seconded by Ms. Lanphear, the Commission unanimously voted (9/0) to add Ms. Patten's list as a ninth condition of approval. Attorney Murray stated that Mr. Palumbo will work with the community and the Plan Department to address these concerns.

Ms. Lanphear expressed concern with the relocation of the solar arrays from the Southeast corner of the property. She stated that we don't have a plan that shows us all of the solar panels. Mr. DiStefano agreed, therefore, upon motion made by Mr. DiStefano and seconded by Ms. Lanphear, the Commission voted (6/3 – Mr. Mason, Mr. Strom and Mr. Spirito voted nay) to continue this matter to the February 5, 2019, Plan Commission meeting to be held in the City Council Chambers, in order to allow the applicant sufficient time to submit a revised site plan that shows all of the proposed panels required to produce the intended 8.1 megawatts of energy. Additionally, upon motion made by Mr. Vincent and seconded by Ms. Lanphear, the Commission unanimously voted (9/0) to add Ms. Patton's "Request of Abutters" as a condition of the potential

Master Plan approval as a vehicle to engage in a dialogue with the Plan Department and the applicant to address the concerns.

Whiting Street Minor Subdivision - Preliminary Plan

Minor Subdivision with street extension
Applicant seeks to improve and connect the final segment of Whiting Street
Five (5) additional single-family house lots are proposed
AP 12-4, Lots 1065-1070 & 1106

At the applicant's request, upon motion made by Mr. DiStefano and seconded by Mr. Strom; the Commission unanimously voted to continue this matter to the February 5, 2019, Plan Commission Meeting in the City Council Chambers.

PERFORMANCE GUARANTEE

The Oaks at Orchard Valley - Existing Letter of Credit set to expire

Upon motion made by Mr. Vincent and seconded by Mr. Spirito, the Commission unanimously voted to continue this matter to the February 5, 2019, Plan Commission Meeting in the City Council Chambers.

Ordinance 12-18-01 - Ordinance Placing a Moratorium on Solar Farms Pending Review of Zoning and Performance Standards

Mr. Pezzullo stated that a six-month moratorium has been proposed by the City Council in order to examine and evaluate the existing regulations for solar farms. He explained the reasons why a temporary stay on new solar farms was necessary during this time period and how the City will use this time crafting a new code. He further stated that no one should expect the State to have specific guidance for all the different communities of Rhode Island as they are all very different.

Upon motion made by Mr. Strom and seconded by Mr. DiStefano, the Commission unanimously voted (9/0) to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council Ordinance Committee on the proposed Ordinance 12-18-01.

Mixed-Use Development at 100 Sockanossett

Master Plan - Major Land Development (Former Citizens Bank Site)
Two-story, 200,000 sq.ft. of office space
Four-story, 450 space parking structure
Three-story Commercial Recreation / Entertainment Center (Topgolf)
100 Sockanossett Crossroad
AP 14, Lot 2

Mr. McLean gave an overview of the project. He explained that the applicant has proposed a mixed-use development consisting of three primary components:

- 1) The reuse of a portion of an existing building (former Citizens Bank headquarters) for office and retail uses.
- 2) New golf entertainment center (Topgolf).
- 3) New structured parking garage.

The existing building on the 22.55 acre site is being partially demolished and the remaining sections of the building along Sockanosset Cross Road will be 1- 2 stories in height. The proposed golf entertainment center in the rear of the property will consist of a 3-story building and driving range area

surrounded by poles and netting up to 190' in height. The proposed parking garage will be 4-stories high and will be centrally located on the property in order to service all of the proposed uses.

This parcel was originally zoned as C-5 (Heavy Business / Industry) and was rezoned in 2016 to allow for additional uses and alternative dimensional standards that allow greater intensity of development on the site. The current zoning on the site, and the proposed zoning amendment as part of the immediate application, are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan – Future Land Use Map which designates the parcel as “*Highway Commercial/Services*”. The Comprehensive Plan identifies the Highway Commercial/Services designation as being suitable for the most intensive types of commercial uses in the City, and further describes the intent of this designation as being “oriented toward providing services to citywide and regional markets”.

He stated that a peer review of traffic was received the day before the meeting. He stated that it reflects fewer trips in the AM and PM peaks but will increase in the evenings and weekends.

Mr. Kelly Coates, Carpionato Corporation, stated that this is an “entertainment” development. He stated that Topgolf has entered into a 20-year lease agreement. He noted the Garden City Shopping Center’s interest in this project as entertainment as a new anchor. He stated that this project is a “key office amenity” and weekend use of the Topgolf facility will be more social use. He stated that there will be more traffic in the evening and weekends. He stated that Topgolf has done their diligence and they want to be at this location. He finished by stating that this development will not be looking for a tax treaty or tax break from the City.

Mr. Robert Clinton of VHB, traffic engineer for the developer, distributed his response to the peer reviewed traffic study. He stated that there is a 35% reduction in office space. The driveway will be aligned with the liquor store across the street. He explained the TIGER Grant project, which will go to bid this year, and roadway work will begin in 2020-21. He stated that a larger study, going forward, will be conducted regarding holiday traffic. He stated that signal timing will be optimized.

Mr. Joseph Lombardo, planning consultant for the applicant, provide a fiscal impact analysis. He stated that this project will generate approximately \$1.4 million a year in tax revenue. The facility will employ 125-150 full-time jobs. He also stated that the project is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan-Future Land Use Map. Mr. Strom added that the additional tangible tax, as well as the restaurant tax, will also benefit the city.

Mr. Thomas Sweeney, real estate consultant for the applicant, stated that the proposed changes are “consistent with the heavy C-5 Zone”. He stated that the project is well designed and will complement the surrounding area.

Mr. Robert Waldo of the Topgolf corporation presented the development proposal. He stated that it is a “sports entertainment venue”. He stated that the sound system is controlled and monitored within the building. He stated that “no light will extend beyond the boundaries of the parcel”. He stated that “the light dies out 150 ft. into the outfield”. He stated that the northern most residence is 1,400 ft. away. The hours of operation have not yet been determined. He stated that there will be security staff from 6 p.m. to 8 a.m. He stated that the bays are rented per hour at \$25 - \$50 per hour and the facility can accommodate up to 1,000 guests.

Mr. Kevin Wilbur, 51 Country Lane, Mr. Adam Lupino, 62 Highland Street, and Mr. Carlos Samborano, expressed their support of the project. Mr. Arthur Jordan, 35 Lincoln Park Avenue, on behalf of the Laborers International Union, and the 1,100 union members that live in Cranston, spoke in favor of the project as well.

Mr. Tom Wolcheck expressed concern with traffic and questioned the validity of the traffic study. He noted the concerns that have been expressed from outside communities where Topgolf operates. He is concerned with how this project might affect the overall quality of life for Cranston residents.

Mr. Michael Friedman, owner, Mulligan's Island, stated that this project "will have a devastating impact on his small business". He however did not speak against the project but asked the Plan Commission to be open minded if his business were to seek new zoning at his facility in the future.

Attorney Robert Murray, on behalf of CFS Partners, owner of the Crossroad Office Park, which consists of seven buildings with 68 tenants, expressed concern with the proposal. He asked that the Commission "table this project until further study is complete and the training school development (the Fountains at Chapel View) is considered". He agreed that morning traffic will be less, however, "traffic is the issue". He stated that "there are many stakeholders in this corridor". He stated that "you have to look at this (traffic) going forward". He questioned the traffic counts provided by VHB.

Mr. McLean read a statement provided by Mr. Stephen Boyle, Cranston Chamber of Commerce, in favor of the project.

Upon motion made by Mr. DiStefano and seconded by Mr. Mason, the Commission unanimously voted (9/0) to close public comments.

Chairman Smith noted that "this is the most complete and well thought out Master Plan proposal that (has been presented) in his ten years here (on the Plan Commission)".

Ms. Lanphear expressed concern with "Section 4" (regarding parking) of Mr. Coates' handout. She asked if this proposed parking "is typical". Mr. Pezzullo responded, stating that the condition "is consistent with mixed use developments we have done". He explained that it behooves the developer to provide the parking they need for their tenants.

Upon motion made by Mr. DiStefano and seconded by Mr. Vincent, the Commission unanimously voted (9/0) to adopt the Findings of Fact denoted below and approve this Master Plan proposal subject to the following conditions.

Findings:

1. An orderly, thorough and expeditious technical review of this Master Plan has been conducted. Property owners within a 100' radius have been notified via first class mail and the meeting agenda has been properly posted. A display advertisement was published in the Cranston Herald on 12/27/18.

RIGL § 45-23-60. Procedure – Required findings. (a)(1) states, "The proposed development is consistent with the comprehensive community plan and/or has satisfactorily addressed the issues where there may be inconsistencies."

2. The proposed mixed-use development is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan – Future Land Use Map designation of the parcel as "Highway Commercial/Services," because this designation is suitable for the most intensive types of commercial uses in the City. The proposed uses for the site (commercial recreation, office, retail, and structure parking) and the proposed intensity/scale of development on the site are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's vision for the Highway Commercial/Services designation. Additionally, the Comprehensive Plan describes the intent of this Future Land Use Map designation as being "oriented towards providing services to citywide and regional markets".
3. JDL Enterprises provided a report entitled "Planning Report on: Amendment to City of Cranston, RI Zoning Ordinance" dated December 2018, received by the Planning Department on January 3, 2019 finding that the proposed Master Plan application and associated zoning change are consistent with the City of Cranston's Comprehensive Plan.

RIGL § 45-23-60. Procedure – Required findings. (a)(2) states, "The proposed development is in compliance with the standards and provisions of the municipality's zoning ordinance."

4. The proposed mixed-use development is **not** compliant with the current standards and provisions of the zoning ordinance for this parcel of land. It is understood that the applicant has proposed a zoning amendment, and if such an amendment is approved without modification then this negative finding is converted into a positive finding of compliance with the zoning ordinance.
5. The proposed mixed-use development application is consistent with the *majority* of the zoning provisions currently in place for this parcel of land. The primary zoning provisions that need to be amended for the application to be completely compliant are as follows: 1) add commercial recreational as an allowed use (Topgolf facility), 2) increase the maximum accessory height to 190' (poles and netting), and 3) increase signage allowance.
6. The proposed zoning amendment associated with this Master Plan application is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, as further detailed in the accompanying staff memo to the City Plan Commission entitled "Staff Report - Ordinance #12-18-02". A finding of consistency with the City's Comprehensive Plan is a fundamental component in the Plan Commission's consideration of the appropriateness of the requested zoning amendment.

*RIGL § 45-23-60. Procedure – Required findings. (a)(3) states, "There will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed development as shown on the **final** plan, with all required conditions for approval." (emphasis added)*

7. The current site is almost entirely paved except for the perimeter slope areas, parking lot landscaped islands, and a small wetland in the south-east corner of the lot. The proposed development will allow for more on-site drainage infiltration than currently exists on the site. The applicant has proposed permanent stormwater management measures that will fully mitigate the impacts to stormwater runoff, and will comply with the City of Cranston Stormwater Ordinances and the Stormwater Management Standard and Performance Criteria of the RI Stormwater Design and Installation Standards Manual (RISDISM). The project will be subject to all local, state and federal standards regarding environmental impacts. Further details will be provided if the project moves to the DPR and Preliminary Plan stages of Development. Based on the Master Plan level of review, staff finds that there positive indication that there will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed development as shown on the final plan, with all required conditions for approval."

RIGL § 45-23-60. Procedure – Required findings. (a)(4) states, "The subdivision, as proposed, will not result in the creation of individual lots with any physical constraints to development that building on those lots according to pertinent regulations and building standards would be impracticable. (See definition of Buildable lot). Lots with physical constraints to development may be created only if identified as permanent open space or permanently reserved for a public purpose on the approved, recorded plans."

8. The proposed project does not incorporate a subdivision of land or any improvements that would create physical constraints to development such that future building would be impracticable.

RIGL § 45-23-60. Procedure – Required findings. (a)(5) states, "All proposed land developments and all subdivision lots have adequate and permanent physical access to a public street. Lot frontage on a public street without physical access shall not be considered in compliance with this requirement."

9. The property in question has adequate permanent physical access from Sockanosset Cross Road, an improved public roadway located within the City of Cranston.

10. The proposed project will result in a net traffic reduction to and from the site compared to the previous use on the site (Citizens Headquarters) or the potential future use of existing building as high density office.

Conditions of Approval

1. City Council approval of the requested change of zone submitted in association with this Master Plan application prior to a Preliminary Land Development Plan submittal;
2. Preliminary Development Plan Review (DPR) Committee Approval prior to a Preliminary Land Development Plan submittal to the Plan Commission;
3. Conservation Commission review and comment on the Preliminary Development Plan Review, including but not limited to street trees, landscaping, and proposed vegetative screening;
4. Veolia Water approval of sewer engineering stating that the plans conform to Annex A - Design of Sewers;
5. Obtain final design approval from the Providence Water Supply Board;
6. All required reviews, permits, and approvals to be granted by the various state or federal agencies with jurisdictional authority for the project, including but not limited to: RIDEM, RIDOT, RIHPHC, Federal Highway, prior to a Preliminary Land Development Plan submittal;
7. Detailed traffic analysis of the proposed development compliant with the City Plan Commission policy for traffic mitigation prior to a Preliminary Land Development Plan submittal;
8. Final lighting, landscape screening and sign design to be given final approval by the Plan Commission at the Preliminary Land Development Plan phase.

Ordinance 12-18-02 - Zone Change / Major Amendment – 100 Sockanosset Cross Road. Petition filed by 100 Sockanosset LLC. (Commercial Recreation) relief per Section 17.92.010 variance; Section 17.20.120 Schedule of Intensity Regulations.

Upon motion made by Mr. Spirito and seconded by Mr. DiStefano, the Commission unanimously voted (9/0) to forward a positive recommendation on this matter to the City Council Ordinance Committee.

Upon motion made by Mr. Vincent and seconded by Ms. Lanphear, the Commission unanimously voted (9/0) to continue the remaining agenda items to the February 5, 2019, Plan Commission Meeting in the City Council Chamber.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion made by Mr. DiStefano and seconded by Mr. Strom, the Commission unanimously voted to adjourn at 12:55 a.m., Wednesday, January 9, 2019.

NEXT MEETING

February 5, 2019, at 7 p.m. in the City Council Chamber

Respectfully submitted,

Jason M. Pezzullo, MPA, MCP, AICP
Planning Director