

## **MINUTES**

July 12, 2016

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

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

Also present were:

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

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Upon motion made by Mr. Motte and seconded by Mr. Vincent, the Commission unanimously voted to approve the minutes of the June 7, 2016, Plan Commission Meeting.

### **ORDINANCES AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**6-16-09** - Ordinance in amendment of Chapter 17 of the Code of the City of Cranston, 2005, entitled "Zoning" (Change of Zone – 100 Sockanosset Crossroad). M-2 (Heavy Industrial) and S-1 (Open Space) to C-5 (Highway Commercial with conditions)

Mr. Lapolla explained Ordinance 6-16-09 proposes to change the zoning classification for a parcel of land identified as Assessors Plat 14 Lot 2 [Zoning Map Plot 14 Lot 2 and a portion of Lot's 14 and 1] located at 100 Sockanosset Crossroad from M-2 General Industry and S-1 Open Space to C-5 Heavy Business/Industry with conditions. The site consists of 22.89 acres and its current use is classified as a Business/Professional Office [Citizen's Bank]. The property is located within the Sockanosset Crossroad commercial corridor that currently houses Garden City, Chapel View and the Fountains [the former Training School site recently rezoned to a C-5 with Conditions]. It is bounded by Route 37 to the south, the Fountains, a City Fire Station and Library to the west, a mix commercial development to the east, and Sockanosset Cross Road to the north. The Site is owned by 100 Sockanosset, LLC who proposes the rezone to reflect the current use on site, to aid in a future redevelopment of the site and to make the site consistent with the Future Land Use Plan of the City's Comprehensive Plan. Staff would note that the ordinance, as proposed, was drafted with input from the Planning Department. It is designed to give 100 Sockanosset, LLC the flexibility to maximize a redevelopment of the site while allowing the City sufficient safe guards to ensure that any impacts from future development are mitigated. The controlling document for the zone change is entitled 100 Sockanosset Park 100 Sockanosset Cross Road Narrative Overview June, 2016. The document sets out the conditions by which the site may be developed. In brief:

- Section 3.A. lists the uses that are allowed within the zone.
- Section 3.C. requires that any major Land Development comply with the City Plan Commission's policy for traffic.
- Section 4.A. requires that any development comply with the applicable parking and loading standards set by Title 17 of the Code [zoning].

- Section 4.B. sets the dimensional and density standards by which the site may be developed. Section 4.B. allows the site to have 0' front, side and rear yard setbacks and allow a building height of 100' [subject to approval of the fire department.
- Section 4.C. requires that any development comply with Chapter 17.72 Signs of the City Code with the exception that "signs will be allowed on all exterior faces of the building."

Attorney Karen Browning, Moses and Alfonso, on behalf of the property owner, stated that the site currently contains Citizens Bank Operations. The current use is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, the property owner is seeking a re-zone to C-5.

Kelly Coates, Senior Vice President, Carpionato Corporation, stated that the property owner is requesting C-5 zoning classification so that they may have more density and also be allowed to "go vertical; possibly with some residential". The C-5 zone classification will bring this parcel more in line with what now exists at Chapel View. Any future proposals will be subject to Development Plan Review.

Commissioner Bittner questioned the amount of traffic. Mr. Lapolla referred to the Plan Commission traffic policy that was adopted two years ago. He stated that any future development would be subject to the policy. Commission Chairman Smith questioned Section 4-C. Mr. Coates responded, stating that any future development will comply with the Chapel View sign ordinance. He further stated that the developer is looking to intensity the commercial use.

Public Works Director, Ken Mason, questioned Mr. Coates on the 15 trees that were removed in front of the site for the construction of a tiered stone wall. Mr. Coates responded, stating that he thought Garofalo and Associates had been working with him on this matter. Mr. Coates stated that; "he will see to it".

Douglas Doe, 178 Lippitt Ave., stated that he would like the trees in front of Citizens replaced. He stated that Garden City is zoned C-3. He expressed concern that a C-5 zone allowed home improvement centers in the schedule of uses. He suggested that home improvement centers (or big box stores) be removed. He further stated that the Bike Path should be included on the plan. Mr. Lapolla responded, stating that the metes and bounds Bike Path easement is included.

Mr. Paul Durfee, North Scituate, also expressed concern with the possibility of a home improvement center. Mr. Lapolla stated that "zoning is all inclusive". He stated that the City will deal with impacts and mitigation of any and all proposals during the Development Plan Review process.

Mr. Coates stated that he did not say that there would not be a COSTCO. He stated that the concern with a home improvement center on that site stems from "an old Home Depot proposal".

Upon motion made by Mr. Motte and seconded by Mr. Vincent, the Commission voted (6/1 – Ms. Harrington voted nay) to recommend approval of this zone change request to the City Council.

## **SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT**

**SSRE RI Gold Meadow Farm** – Master Plan  
Major Land Development without street extension  
Large Scale Solar Farm – 60 acres  
Lippitt Avenue (east side)  
AP 23, Lots 6,7,8,15,20 and 36, AP 30, Lot 240

Attorney Robert Murray, on behalf of SSRE, stated that he was involved with the 42 lot subdivision in 2009. He stated that the site comprises 108 acres. In 2015 a plan was approved to amend the 2009 plan for 39 lots (some lots have been sold). He stated that SSRE will lease the property; which is zoned A-80, which allows solar farms by right. The applicant will comply with the performance standards set forth by the City Council. Financial surety will be provided. He further stated that if this is not approved, the property owners intend to go forward with the residential subdivision. In conclusion, he stated that on June 29, 2016, a neighborhood meeting was held at which "there was good dialogue and many questions were answered".

Ralph Palumbo, SSRE director, stated that he has a number of these projects in Massachusetts. He stated that "they have a great amount of experience". All setbacks will be respected. FAA approval is being sought for glare. He stated that it is an attractive sight because it is mostly flat. The company plans to start a nine month construction process next year. 15-21 megawatts are proposed, which will require about 50,000 panels. The panels will face south and range from 3-3 ½ ft. to 11-12 feet off the ground. The inverters will be centrally located and noise emitted is the "magnitude of a dishwasher". The project will connect at the Lippitt Road access road. "Low grow grass" is proposed between the panels

and will be cut 2-3 times per year. Electrical maintenance will be done twice a year. The panels system life is 25-30 years. Inverters need replacing every ten years. In 25 years, the company may choose to extend their lease. Bonding will be provided for decommissioning. The perimeter will be surrounded by a six foot chain link fence. The panels are warranted for snow and wind load. The panels contain vegetable oil, therefore, there is no toxicity. He acknowledged that the access road is not paved and there is washout. He stated that he will work with the neighbors regarding improvements and maintenance of the road.

Dave Russo, project engineer, DiPrete Engineering, stated that he also has been involved with the site since 2009. RIDEM has flagged wetlands and that permit is still valid. Wetlands are in the eastern portion of the site. The Fire Department has requested the access road around and through the center of the project. Drainage components will be constructed in accordance with RIDEM, probably with crushed stone. RIDEM is now working to flag some areas of the site. He stated that the fence will run along the buffers. The dirt road access will be improved. He stated that it "looks like a berm has formed over the years". Any improvements will be in accordance with RIDEM. All panels will be within the setbacks. The fence will not be seen from Lippitt Avenue. The closest property owner is about 200 feet away.

Commissioner Vincent asked if there is a restriction on the unused portion of the site that it remain open space and if a bond would be provided for the roadway upgrade. Mr. Murray stated that RIDEM will determine the unusable areas. Mr. Mason stated that the access road is not a City owned road. Mr. Murray stated that Mr. Palumbo is committed to improving and maintaining the road.

Commissioner Harrington stated that "it appears there is less open space with this proposal than the 39 lot subdivision". She asked if the leases lasts in perpetuity. City Solicitor, Steve Marsella, stated that the applicant can extend the lease and further stated that any approvals "run with the land". Mr. Murray stated that the 2015 RPD of the 108 acres provided 74 acres of open space, which included wetlands and buffer. Suitable open space was 38 acres. Ms. Harrington asked how this project would be taxed. Mr. Pezzullo stated that this matter is beyond the Plan Commission's purview. He mentioned that Governor Raimondo recently passed legislation on how these facilities can be taxed. Mr. Murray noted that the property owners will continue to pay the taxes on this land. Mr. Palumbo stated that he always works out a tax agreement with any community he has worked with. He stated that \$5,000 per megawatt is the usual "going rate".

Commissioner Bittner stated that this matter is similar to the Hope Farm Solar project and asked if it made "more sense to wait for the Superior Court and Platting Board decisions". She further stated that "it would give us guidance". Solicitor Marsella stated that these applicants have the right to proceed with this project. He further stated that the Platting Board decision has no bearing on this project. Mr. Palumbo, SSRE, stated that he is concerned with the phase out of solar tax credits, stating that "the financial feasibility would be lost". Attorney Murray stated that he does not anticipate an appeal as the time has passed to appeal the ordinance (that allows solar farms by right). Mr. Lapolla addressed the concern with consistency with the Comprehensive Plan.

Douglas Doe, 178 Lippitt Ave., stated that Southern Sky has been very forthcoming. He proceeded to criticize RES America of the Hope Farm Solar project. He stated that, "the DPR Committee set landscaping standards for Hope Road" and he would like to see the same buffer. He stated that "he would like to see interior roads rather than exterior roads". He stated that "he thinks the Commission should have a site visit". He expressed concern with roadway washout and truck traffic and suggested "someone keep a traffic log". He also expressed concern with dumping in the wetland areas and with the fence being in the wetland area. He stated that he has received a list of the Massachusetts projects that the company has complete and noted that they were smaller scale projects. He stated that he would like information on new electrical poles that will be used and would like the road extended to Lippitt Avenue.

Elizabeth Santilli, 192 Lippitt Avenue, stated that "this road is important to the four houses that use this road and the new user should be involved in maintenance". She expressed concern with runoff. She stated that, "35 years ago there was blasting there". Mr. Palumbo reiterated that he will be a substantial participant in the upgrade and maintenance of the road.

Mr. Pezzullo referred to his staff report. He stated that the existing Comprehensive Plan does not reference renewable energy, however, this is a use allowed by right. He stated that the next Comprehensive Plan will have an energy component. He stated that "we have the opportunity to preserve this land in the future". This parcel is not on the Historic Farm Route, as the previous solar proposal was.

There being no further comment, the Commission moved to a vote. Upon motion made by Mr. Vincent and seconded by Mr. Motte, the Commission voted (5/2 – Ms. Bittner and Ms. Harrington voted nay) to adopt the Findings of Fact denoted below and *approve* this Master Plan, subject to the following conditions.

#### Findings of Fact

**45-23-60 Procedure – Required findings. – (a) All local regulations shall require that for all administrative, minor and major development applications the approving authorities responsible for land development and subdivision review and approval shall address each of the general purposes stated in R.I.G.L. 45-23-30 and make positive findings on the following standard provisions, as part of the proposed project’s record prior to approval.**

**(1) The proposed development is consistent with the comprehensive community plan and/or has satisfactorily addressed the issues were there may be inconsistencies;**

The proposal is consistent with the City of Cranston Comprehensive Plan. See Section VII. of this staff memo.

**(2) The proposed development is in compliance with the standards and provisions of the municipalities’ zoning ordinance;**

The proposed large scale solar power facility is consistent with the Cranston Zoning Code which authorizes this as a use allowed by-right.

**(3) There will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed development as shown on the final plan, with all required conditions of approval;**

The site’s wetlands have been flagged and verified by the RIDEM. The developer has indicated that they will conform to the most recent stormwater standards as promulgated by RIDEM (no increase in the rate or volume of runoff from the site pre and post condition). The site will have very little impact on the environment as most of the site will be pervious either as gravel or grass.

**(4) 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. 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; and**

Building on this lot according to all pertinent regulations will not be impracticable based upon the materials submitted to date at the Master Plan level of detail.

**(5) 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.**

The proposal has permanent physical access to Lippitt Avenue, a public street within the City of Cranston.

**(b) Except for administrative subdivisions, findings of fact must be supported by legally competent evidence on the record which discloses the nature and character of the observations upon which the fact finders acted.**

The above findings of fact have been supported by legally competent evidence and testimony from expert witnesses qualified by the City Plan Commission on the record which discloses the nature and character of the observations upon which the fact finders acted.\*

#### Conditions of Approval

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

1. Municipal Lien Certificates verifying that all taxes are paid up to date;
2. Obtain **Preliminary** approval from the Development Plan Review Committee;
3. Verification from the Cranston Fire Department that the proposed maintenance access ways are suitable for public safety vehicles;
4. Obtain alteration permit from the RIDEM for wetlands and stormwater management;
5. Submit draft operation and maintenance plans with the Preliminary Plan application;
6. Consult with the Cranston Public Works Department to the appropriate level of improvements to the private roadway as to ensure no negative impacts from this development on Lippitt Avenue.
7. RIDEM compliance with storm water management.
8. Presentation of a plan for preservation of the remainder of the site.

**Champlin Hills** – Preliminary Plan  
Major Land Development w/o street extension  
Multi-family residential 72 units  
Scituate Avenue (southerly side)  
AP 20/4, Lots 2113 & 2117

Attorney John DiBona, on behalf of the property owner, West Bay LLC, gave a history of the project and the two recent amendments for height and 10 more units and a pool and club house. He stated that the project has all of the necessary state and local approvals. He stated that commitments were made to the Turning Point Condominium Homeowners Association. He stated that traffic concerns have been addressed. He stated that this is not an affordable housing project.

Steve Garofalo addressed traffic. He stated that nothing has changed from the previous meetings. Traffic estimates for this project for both am and pm were 33 trips am and 42 trips pm. The existing Scituate/Comstock, Scituate/Phenix intersections 20/20 traffic levels of Service remain the same – Level C. The speed limit is 30 mph. There is adequate site distance for a speed limit of 45 mph.

Rich Bourbonnais, Civil Engineer, stated that utility connections are to Scituate Avenue. The applicant will be making sewer improvements to the City sewer systems. Three drainage areas are proposed, with underground infiltration. He stated that the drainage structures are “on the high end for what is usually seen for this type of development”. There will be decreased flow to abutters as well. The project has received RIDOT, PAP, RIDEM, RIPDES and UIC permits. Native plant material is proposed. Evergreen screening on the east and west side is proposed.

Mr. Coates stated that the front building dumpster will be moved two parking spaces toward the road, which was approved by the DPR Committee. He stated that Mr. Bourbonnais will have the neighbors choose their plantings, however, the neighbors will be required to water the new plantings.

No public comment was offered on this matter.

Upon motion made by Mr. Motte and seconded by Ms. Bittner, the Commission unanimously voted (7/0) to adopt the Findings of Fact denoted below and *approve* this Preliminary Plan, subject to the following conditions.

#### 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 6/27/16 and the meeting agenda has been properly posted. Advertisement for this major land development was published in the Cranston Herald consistent with Section V.C.2.h of the City of Cranston Subdivision Regulations on 6/28/16.
2. The proposed major land development and its resulting density of approximately 9.52 residential units per acre is consistent with the City of Cranston Comprehensive Plan’s Future Land Use Map which designates the subject parcels as “*Residential*” allowing less than 10.89 residential units per acre”.
3. The proposal is consistent with the B-2 Multi-Family zoning district. Under the existing zoning, the applicant has the right to develop 91.8 units where 72 units are proposed. The proposal will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the Cranston Zoning Code.
4. There will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed subdivision as shown on the Preliminary Plan and the RIDEM has granted all required permits.
5. The proposed land development promotes high-quality appropriate design and construction, will be well integrated with the surrounding neighborhoods, and will reflect its existing characteristics.
6. 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.
7. The property in question has adequate permanent physical access on Scituate Avenue, an improved public (State) roadway located within the City of Cranston. Applicant has received the required Physical Alteration Permit to access this roadway with addition traffic.
8. The proposed land development provides for safe and adequate local circulation of pedestrian and vehicular through traffic, for adequate surface water run-off and for a suitable building site.
9. Significant cultural, historic or natural features that contribute to the attractiveness of the community have not been identified on site.

10. The design and location of streets, building lots, utilities, drainage and other improvements conform to local regulations for mitigation of flooding and soil erosion.

#### Conditions of Approval

Prior to submission of the Final Plan application with the Planning Department, the applicant shall be in receipt of the following items:

1. Municipal Lien Certificate certifying that all taxes are paid up to date.
2. Payment of Western Cranston Capital Facilities Impact Fee in the amount of \$100,044 (\$1,389.50 x 72) at the time of Final Plat Recording.

### **ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS**

**WILLIAM T AND COLLEEN M COGGINS 42 KENSINGTON ROAD CRANSTON RI 02905 (OWN/APP)** have filed an application for permission to leave an existing single family dwelling with restricted side yard set-back and two existing detached garages with restricted frontage and side yard set-back on a proposed 31,416+/- SF lot [parcel A] with the remaining 8139+/- SF for a proposed [parcel B] at **42 Kensington Road**. AP 2/2, lots 935 & 2334, area 39,555+/- SF, zoned A-6 & A-12. Applicant seeks relief from Sections; 17.92.010 Variance, 17.20.120 Schedule of Intensity, 17.64.010 F (2) Street Access Curb Openings.

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

#### Findings of Fact:

1. The application is consistent with the designated residential density of the 2010 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map, 3.63 to 1 unit per acre.
2. The proposed Minor Subdivision was given a Preliminary Approval by the Plan Commission with the conditions that the City Council abandon the portion of Kensington Road that will be merged with lot number 935, and Zoning Board relief be approved for the dimensional nonconformities created by the abandoned road.
3. The City Council approved the abandonment of a portion of Kensington Road on Feb. 22, 2016.
4. Half of the larger garage building was formerly located on the right of way for Kensington Road; the street abandonment now locates the entire building on a privately owned parcel, but creates a rear yard setback of 2.9 ft., requiring variance relief of 17.1 ft.
5. The smaller garage will have a rear yard setback of between 1 ft. and 1.2 ft., requiring relief of 19 ft.
6. That same street abandonment creates street frontage of 51.45 ft. for the new parcel, which formerly had 67.5 ft. of frontage.
7. All of the restricted setback conditions are existing, none of the buildings will be moved.
8. For almost 2 years, the applicant has been paying taxes on the two garages and the property upon which the structures are located.

Recommendation: The Commission finds that the application is consistent with the 2010 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map, and finds that the application will not alter the general character of the neighborhood, or impair the intent or purpose of the Zoning Ordinance or the Comprehensive Plan upon which the ordinance is based. Upon motion made by Ms. Harrington and seconded by Ms. Bittner, the Commission unanimously voted (7/0) to forward a positive recommendation on this application to the Zoning Board.

**HOWARD GOLDSMITH 71 WOODLAND TRAIL SOUTH KINGSTOWN RI 02879 (OWN) AND EUGENE AND MICHAEL ORSI 35 GILCREST DRIVE WEST WARWICK RI 02893 (APP)** have filed an application for permission to install an electronic message board at **530 Wellington Avenue**. AP 3/2, lot 107, area 236,966+/- SF, zoned M-2. Applicant seeks relief from Section 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. This business is located on the end of a large 141,600 sq. ft. industrial building that contains several businesses, all of which have wall signs that face Wellington Avenue.
2. Section 17.72.010 B.1.b. of the Sign Ordinance, states the applicability and effect of this section is “to allow certain signs that are small, unobtrusive and incidental to the principal use of the respective lots on which they are located.”
3. Section 17.72.010 B.1.c. states the effect of the section is “to prohibit all signs not expressly permitted by this section.” (Electronic message boards fall under that category)
4. Page 34 of the Comp Plan, in the Land Use Strategies and Actions section, reads: *The City should adopt design and signage guidelines along commercial corridors, such as Reservoir Ave., Park Ave., Elmwood Ave., Atwood Ave. and Oaklawn Ave., to improve the attractiveness and quality of the business.* To the extent that the existing sign ordinance is assumed consistent with the Comp Plan, an electronic message board would be inconsistent with the Comp Plan, because said sign is explicitly prohibited by the Zoning Ordinance.
5. The Zoning Ordinance permits 45 sq. ft. of wall signage in an M-2 zone.
6. The applicant’s business is cluttered with 6 existing signs - 3 rectangular wall signs, a large canopy sign over the entire storefront entrance, with an additional large oval wall sign to the left of the showroom door (under the canopy), and a large banner sign attached to the chain link fence at the front of the property.
7. Signs fall under the definition of Accessory use, as signs are incidental to and customarily associated with the principal use on site. Electronic signs as noted above are prohibited. Sec.17.92.020 Variances, states “In granting a use variance, the subject land or structure cannot yield any beneficial use if it is required to conform to the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance”. The business already has 6 signs.
8. The applicant is not seeking a dimensional variance, but is seeking a use variance for a sign not allowed. As such, the review standard should be greater than the presence of a mere inconvenience.
9. The existing wall sign on the northerly wall of the building is 60 sq. ft. alone. (4’ x 15’) The canopy sign is 3’ x 13’ (39 sq. ft.)
10. The proposed electronic message board is 3’ x 8’ (24 sq. ft.) and will be installed under the existing 4’ x 15’ wall sign.

Recommendation: Based on the fact that the request is inconsistent with the Comp Plan, and based on the fact that the applicant is seeking a use variance for an accessory use not allowed, upon motion made by Mr. Motte and seconded by Ms. Harrington the Commission voted (5/2 Nay: Mr. Strom and Mr. Vincent) to forward a negative recommendation on this application to the Zoning Board.

**THE HEMINGWAY TRUST UNDER AGREEMENT DATED 12/1/2008 1414 ATWOOD AVENUE JOHNSTON RI 02919 (OWN/APP)** has filed an application for permission to have a driveway opening greater than that allowed by ordinance at **100 East Hill Drive**. AP 16, lot 571, area 20,039+/- SF, zoned A-8. Applicant seeks relief from Sections; 17.92.010 Variance, 17.20.120 Schedule of Intensity, 17.64.010 F (2) Street Access Curb Openings.

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

Findings of Fact:

1. The 2010 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map designates this area of the City as Residential.
2. Per the Zoning Ordinance, the maximum curb cut opening allowed in a residential zone is 20 feet.
3. No curb opening permit from the City’s Public Works Department was taken out by the applicant.
4. The survey as-built site plan, shows a curb cut opening of 27’- 9.6” was installed.
5. The site plan submitted by the applicant shows substantial encroachment of the applicant’s new stone wall onto State of RI land.

Recommendation: Upon motion made by Mr. Vincent and seconded by Mr. Motte, the Commission unanimously voted (7/0) to make no specific recommendation on this application, as the width of a driveway is not a Comprehensive Plan issue.

**BIGNEY AND BARROS PROPERTIES LLC 334 EAST AVENUE PAWTUCKET RI 02860 (OWN/APP) AND NURSING PLACEMENT INC 334 EAST AVENUE PAWTUCKET RI 02860 (LESSEE)** have filed an application for permission to install an LED electronic message board at **480 Reservoir Avenue**. AP 6/2, lot 1446, area 5000+/- SF,

zoned C-4. Applicant seeks relief from Section 17.92.010 Variance, 17.20.120 Schedule of Intensity, 17.92.010 Signs.

The applicant requested a continuance of this application.

Upon motion made by Mr. Vincent and seconded by Mr. Motte, the Commission unanimously voted (7/0) to continue this matter to the August 2016 Meeting.

**SANA DEVELOPMENT PONTIAC LLC 10 SOUTHERN INDUSTRIAL DRIVE CRANSTON RI 02921 (OWN) AND FERRANRI PROPERTIES INC 29 LARK INDUSTRIAL PARKWAY SMITHFIELD RI 02828 (APP)** have filed an application for permission to use a former preschool building for a professional office and light manufacturing at **1081 Pontiac Avenue**. AP 10/4, lot 23, area 16,849+/- SF, zoned A-8. Applicant seeks relief from Section 17.92.010 Variance, 17.20.120 Schedule of Intensity, 17.20.030 Schedule of Uses, 17.92.010 Signs.

Upon motion made by Mr. Vincent and seconded by Mr. Motte, the Commission unanimously voted (7/0) to continue this matter to the August 2016 Meeting.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Upon motion made by Mr. Strom and seconded by Mr. Motte, the Commission unanimously voted to adjourn at 10:20 pm.

**NEXT MEETING** August 2nd, 2016 – City Council Chamber, 7 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Jason M. Pezzullo, AICP  
Principal Planner/Administrative Officer