

## MINUTES

**June 2, 2009**

Chairman Paul Petit called the Planning Commission Meeting to order in the City Council Chamber at 7:15 p.m. The following Commission members were in attendance:

Paul Petit, Chairman  
Charles Rossi, Vice Chairman  
Michael Smith  
Gene Nadeau

Also present were:

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

Those members of the public in attendance were: Joseph Caldarone, Ryan Caldarone, Abel Rego, John Bolton, Esq.; John DiBona, Esq.; John Pariseault, Esq.; Kelly Coates, Ken Bock, Dan Bock, Cheryl Bock, Jose Custodio and Maria Custodio.

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Upon motion made by Mr. Rossi and seconded by Mr. Smith, the Commission unanimously voted to *approve* the minutes of the May 5, 2009, Planning Commission Meeting.

### ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS

**JOSE B AND MARIA N ABILIHEIRA AND JOSE A AND MARIA P CUSTODIO 63-65 DROWNE STREET CRANSTON RI 02905 (OWN/APP)** have filed an application for permission to leave an existing attached 15' X 24' sunroom and an attached 20' X 27' carport/garage [west side] with restricted set back and an attached 14' X 27' carport [east side] on an existing legal non-conforming two-family dwelling and a detached 66' X 10' 614 sf shed with restricted side and rear set back and lot coverage and an 8' X 24' covered front porch at **63 Drowne Street**. AP 2/5, lot 2791, area 7,026 +/- sf, zoned A-6. 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 property's residential use is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map, which calls for residential, more than 8 units per acre.
2. The applicant's existing lot coverage is 42%; where 35% is the maximum allowed by the Zoning code.

3. Of the 107 residential dwellings located within the 400' Zoning notification radius, 4 have lot coverages of between 35 and 38%, which is attributed to the fact that those 4 lots are between 3,522 and 3,687 sq. ft.
4. Aerial photos show that with the exception of 2 small sheds located in either rear property corner, and the sunroom at the rear of the house, all of the remaining additions and sheds on the applicant's property were built after 2004; all without building permits.
5. The total area of the accessory structures on the applicant's lot is 1,724 sq. ft. The City's aerials show that the largest accessory structure on lots within the 400' radius is a 22' x 25' unattached garage. (550 sq. ft.).
6. The existing 8.5' right side yard setback for the attached carport is conforming.
7. The shed in the rear has a 0' right yard setback, where 5' is required by the Zoning Code.
8. The existing attached garage and shed on the left of the house both have 2.3' side yard setbacks.
9. The 66' x 10' shed abutting the 68.75' rear property line, has a 1.7' rear yard setback, where 5' minimum is required by the Zoning Code.
10. The existing porch on the front of the house has a 19.1' front yard setback, where 25' is required by code.
11. GIS analysis shows that over 68% of the houses located within the 400' radius, have restricted front yard setbacks, but only 31% have restricted rear yard setbacks.

Recommendation: Upon motion made by Mr. Smith and seconded by Mr. Rossi, the Commission unanimously voted to recommend *denial*. Although the majority (68%) of the houses in the neighboring area have restricted front yard setbacks, the remaining rear and side yard setbacks, and excessive lot coverage on the applicant's property do not conform with the character of the surrounding neighborhood, and therefore the proposal alters the general character of the neighborhood, and impairs the intent and purpose of the Cranston Zoning Code.

Aye votes: Chairman Petit, Mr. Rossi, Mr. Smith and Mr. Nadeau. There were no nay votes.

**GEOFFREY M TAPPER 84 SEAVIEW AVENUE CRANSTON RI 02905 (OWN/APP)** has filed an application for permission to exceed the maximum height limitation for a new single family home at **84 Seaview Avenue**. AP 1, lot 162, area 13,907 +/- sf, zoned A-12. Applicant seeks relief from Sections; 17.92.010 Variance, 17.20.120 Schedule of Intensity.

This application was withdrawn by the applicant.

**SARKIS YEPREMIAN 2 SWEET CORN DRIVE CRANSTON RI 02921 (OWN) AND YUEXIANG GUO 453 MERCER STREET JERSEY CITY NJ 07302 (APP)** have filed an application for special permit to operate a health spa including therapeutic services and skin care at **708 Reservoir Avenue**. AP 9/5, lot 322, area 3352 +/- sf, zoned C-4. Applicant seeks relief from Sections; 17.92.020 Special Permit, 17.20.120 Schedule of Intensity, 17.88.010 Sub-Standard Lot of Record.

Findings of Fact:

1. The application is in conformance with the City of Cranston Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map's designation of Commercial and Services for this area of Reservoir Avenue.
2. The entire building has been used for office space since its zoning variance conversion from 2 family residential in 1980.
3. Using the parking requirement for retail business and service establishments in the Zoning Code, the building's 1248 sq. ft. of gross floor area on the first floor, requires 5 off street parking spaces. No plans were submitted for the second floor, therefore, additional spa or office space would require 5 additional parking spaces.

4. The property's existing parking area at the rear of the building, can accommodate only 2 cars, perpendicular to Essex Street. The spaces do not allow for egress from the parking area in a forward motion; and therefore, do not conform to the Zoning Code. (The plan submitted shows 6 spaces that are not drawn to scale, and are double stacked.)
5. GIS analysis shows that there are 3 additional (existing) mixed use/commercial businesses fronting on Reservoir Avenue on the same block between Wollaston Street and Essex Street. Only one of those businesses has a legal parking area for 4 cars (where vehicles may enter and exit the parking area in a forward motion). Therefore, customers for the health spa would have to park on the residential street (Essex St.).
6. Twelve of the remaining 13 commercial businesses on Reservoir Avenue within the 400' zoning notification radius, have conforming parking lots.
7. The floor plan submitted shows three separate workrooms with doors.

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

1. Insufficient off-street parking. The two off-street parking spaces are insufficient; five spaces are required by Code for the proposed use on the first floor only.
2. 5 additional parking spaces will be required for the office use on the second floor.

Note: The staff recognizes that in the recent past, businesses located on Reservoir Avenue with insufficient parking areas have created on street parking nuisances on the abutting residential streets.

Aye votes: Chairman Petit, Mr. Rossi, Mr. Smith and Mr. Nadeau. There were no nay votes.

**DENNIS P CALDARONE 76 PACKARD STREET CRANSTON RI 02910 (OWN) AND JOSEPH AND RYAN CALDARONE 76 PACKARD STREET CRANSTON RI 02910 (APP)** have filed an application for permission to leave an existing legal non-conforming two family dwelling on an undersized [lot 2794] and build a new 24' X 32' single family dwelling on the abutting undersized [lot 2795] at **76 Packard Street**. AP 6/3, lot 2794 & 2795, area 6640 +/- sf, zoned A-6. Applicant seeks relief from Sections; 17.92.010 Variance, 17.20.120 Schedule of Intensity, 17.88.010 B, Sub-Standard Lot of Record.

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 Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map, which calls for residential, more than 8 units per acre.
2. A Zoning variance request for the same 24' x 36' dwelling was denied by the Zoning Board in December 2004.
3. The average lot size for the 110 single family dwellings located within the 400' zoning notification radius, is 4,734 sq. ft. The proposed single family lot is 30% smaller than the neighborhood average.
4. Only 5% of the residential buildings located within the 400' radius are two family dwellings; the average lot size for those 2 family houses is 5,251 sq. ft.
5. The applicant's 2 family dwelling is proposed to be left on a 3,320 sq. ft. lot, which is smaller than the average lot size for a single family in the neighborhood's 400' radius.
6. Though there are 3,320 sq. ft. lots located within the radius, 67% of the lots in the neighborhood are larger.
7. Photo shows an additional parking area for the existing two family will be eliminated in order to construct the new single family house.

8. The existing density for the 122 dwelling units within the radius (includes single and 2 family) is 9.6 units per acre. The proposed density for the applicant's two lots is 19.7 units per acre; therefore, the application will alter the general character of the surrounding neighborhood and impairs the intent and purpose of the Cranston Zoning Code, and the Comprehensive Plan upon which the Zoning Code is based.

Recommendation: Upon motion made by Mr. Rossi and seconded by Mr. Smith, the Commission unanimously voted to forward this matter without a recommendation.

Aye votes: Chairman Petit, Mr. Rossi, Mr. Smith and Mr. Nadeau. There were no nay votes.

**KENNETH L AND CHERYL A BOCK 210 TOMAHAWK TRAIL CRANSTON RI 02921**

**(OWN/APP)** have filed an application for permission to leave an existing single family home on a proposed 37,188+/- sf [lot 17] and build a new 32' X 44' raised ranch style single family dwelling on a proposed 32,818+/- sf [lot 286] with restricted frontage and access from South Comstock Parkway at **210 Tomahawk Trail**. AP 25, lots 17 & 286, area 69,392 +/- sf, zoned A-20. 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 proposed use for this application is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map, which calls for residential, 1-4 units per acre.
2. The proposed new lot's frontage on South Comstock Parkway is 19.37', where 125' frontage is required in this zone.
3. All 58 single family dwellings located within the zoning 400' radius have the required street frontages for the zone in which they are located.
4. The average lot frontage of the 18 houses located within 400' of the applicant's frontage along South Comstock Parkway, is 136.6 feet.
5. The proposed lot is only 97' at it widest point, which is the rear property line, located a distance of 807 feet from the front property line on South Comstock Parkway.
6. The proposed parcel's left side lot line is the rear yard of 5 single family lots, that had to maintain rear yard minimum building setbacks of 30 feet. The proposed house is to be located 15' from its side lot line, as the lot is not wide enough to allow for a 30' yard setback.
7. The subdivision received Master Plan Approval from the Plan Commission, to allow the applicant the opportunity to apply for a dimensional variances from the Zoning Board; however, several waivers are still needed from the Subdivision and Land Development Regulations.
8. A site visit and photos show that there appears to be a sight distance issue for the proposed driveway location; that issue will be reviewed by the city traffic engineer.

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

1. Creating a lot with 19.37' feet of frontage, where 136.6 feet is the surrounding neighborhood average, will alter the general character of the surrounding neighborhood area, and impairs the intent and purpose of the Cranston Zoning Code, and the Comprehensive Plan, upon which the Zoning Code is based.
2. The proposed lot cannot satisfy the minimum 125' lot width anywhere within its 807 foot length.

Aye votes: Chairman Petit, Mr. Rossi, Mr. Smith and Mr. Nadeau. There were no nay votes.

**ABEL AND LISA REGO 105 HARVARD STREET CRANSTON RI 02920 (OWN/APP)** have filed an application for permission to convert an existing one car garage into living space with restricted side yard set back at **105 Harvard Street**. AP 10, lot 1027, area 8592 +/- sf, zoned A-8. 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 property's residential use is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map, which calls for residential, 4-8 units per acre.
2. The hand drawn site plan submitted indicates the existing left side yard setback for the garage is 8'. A 10' side yard setback is required for living space in an A-8 zone.
3. GIS shows the abutting property's building setback is 10 feet, which is an 18' separation distance between the proposed living spaces of the two houses.
4. No exterior additions are being proposed.
5. Converting a garage to living space will not alter the general character of the neighborhood, or impair the intent and purpose of the Cranston Zoning Code, and the Comprehensive Plan, upon which the Zoning Code is based.

Recommendation: Upon motion made by Mr. Smith and seconded by Mr. Rossi, the Commission unanimously voted to recommend *approval* with the condition 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. Rossi, Mr. Smith and Mr. Nadeau. There were no nay votes.

**SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT**

**Roger Plat – Preliminary Plan - Phase I**

Major Subdivision without street extension  
Hodsell Street and Arthur Street  
AP 5/1, Lots 20 and 1831

Mr. Pezzullo explained the proposal to subdivide the two existing lots into three lots: one (1) for the existing home, and two (2) new building lots for development. Lot 1 will have 8,012 square feet of land area with 25.18 feet of frontage; Lot 2 will have 9,940 square feet of land area with 25.18 feet of frontage; Lot 3 will have 6,309 square feet of land area with 70.32 feet of frontage. This subdivision will require waivers from the Subdivision and Land Development Regulations. All proposed lots will be serviced by public water and sewer.

The applicant received Master Plan approval for this subdivision on January 6, 2009 and is now requesting phasing the subdivision in order to market the existing home on the corner of Hodsell and Gardner. Once this home is sold, the applicant anticipates using the proceeds to complete the site cleanup of the rear portion of the site, which is at the heart of this overall subdivision. The applicant received the required variances from the Zoning Board of Review on 3/24/09. The City Plan Commission will still need to consider the associated waivers from the Subdivision and Land Development Regulations when the Preliminary Plan Phase II has been submitted.

Due to the fact that proposed Lot 3 is exactly as the Plan Commission approved, there is no obstacle to preclude the phasing of this project. Also, there were no specific conditions of approval which would have precluded this lot and existing home from being subdivided earlier. All of the conditions referred to proposed lots 1 and 2.

Engineer, John Caito, submitted an affidavit of notification to abutting property owners, noting that only two parties did not pick up their notice. Also, he requested that the final plan approval be handled administratively. Mr. Pezzullo responded, stating that the appropriate bond amount will be duly noted prior to the recording of the final plan.

Upon motion made by Mr. Rossi and seconded by Mr. Smith, the Commission unanimously voted to adopt the following Findings of Fact and *approve* Phase 1 (Lot 3) of this Preliminary Plan subject to the condition denoted below.

#### Findings of Fact

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 mailing and the meeting agenda has been properly posted. Advertisement for this major subdivision was published in the 5/14/09 and 5/21/09 editions of the Cranston Herald.
2. The proposed subdivision, and its resulting density of approximately 9.7 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. The proposed Phase I subdivision is consistent with the Cranston Zoning Code and does not require variances of relief from the Zoning Board of Review.
4. There will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed subdivision as shown on the Preliminary Phase I Plan.
5. The proposed subdivision promotes high quality appropriate design and construction, will be well integrated with the surrounding neighborhoods and will reflect its existing characteristics.
6. The proposed subdivision will not result in the creation of individual lots with such physical constraints to development that building on those lots according to pertinent regulations and building standards would be impracticable.
7. The property in question has adequate permanent physical access on Arthur Street and Hodsell Street, improved public roadways located within the City of Cranston.
8. The proposed subdivision provides for safe and adequate local circulation of pedestrian and vehicular through traffic and adequate surface water run-off.
9. Significant cultural, historic or natural features that contribute to the attractiveness of the community have not been identified on site.
10. The design and location of streets, building lots, utilities, drainage and other improvements conform to local regulations for mitigation of flooding and soil erosion.

#### Conditions of Approval

The following condition shall apply to this Preliminary Plan – PHASE I approval, in addition to other applicable state and local requirements:

1. Final Record Plan submission shall depict 6" concrete curbing and concrete sidewalk along the frontage of Lot 3.

Aye votes: Chairman Petit, Mr. Rossi, Mr. Smith and Mr. Nadeau. There were no nay votes.

#### **PERFORMANCE GUARANTEE**

### **Birchwood Estates**

Major Land Development

Discussion for possible bond revocation

Mr. Pezzullo informed the Commission that the applicants have been notified of this meeting, however, they were not in attendance. Planning Director, Peter Lapolla, stated that the applicant's will be notified, by certified mail, of the decision of this meeting.

Therefore, upon motion made by Mr. Rossi and seconded by Mr. Smith, the Commission unanimously voted to require the submission of a signed construction schedule and contract detailing how and when the roadwork will be completed prior to the July 7, 2009 City Plan Commission meeting.

If by the July 7, 2009 meeting these items have not been provided to Public Works and/or the Planning Department, the City Plan Commission has authorized the administrative officer to begin the process of exercising the performance guarantee to obtain the funds from Hartford ITT Bond #02BCSAA8195, in the amount of \$135,250, to complete this infrastructure work.

Aye votes: Chairman Petit, Mr. Rossi, Mr. Smith and Mr. Nadeau. There were no nay votes.

Ordinance #3-09-2 - In Amendment of Chapter 17.64.101 of the Code of the City of Cranston, 2005, entitled "Off Street Parking".

Ordinance 3-09-2 proposes to prohibit the parking of vehicles within front and corner lawns. However, the ordinance fails to define vehicle. [Note: Vehicle is not already defined within the zoning ordinance.] While it could be assumed that the proposed prohibition applies only to motor vehicles, the ordinance does not so specify. This being the case, the amendment, if enacted, would technically apply to all vehicles including bikes and scooters. The ordinance needs to define what vehicles are to be covered by the ban. [Note: Boats on trailers and towed trailers may not be considered vehicles.]

Section 17.04.030 Definitions of the Zoning Ordinance provides definitions for "yard", "yard, corner side" and "yard, front." However, lawn is not defined. If the City is going to ban parking on front lawn yards and corner side lawn yards in residential zoning districts, a definition of lawn should be provided. Without a definition, a prohibition of parking on lawns can be circumvented by increasing the size of driveways in the front or corner side yards. In a worse case scenario, a resident could simply pave his whole front yard and claim it as a driveway. [Note: the Zoning Ordinance currently does not provide performance standards which regulate the location and size of driveways.]

While strictly not a question of zoning, the ordinance fails to deal with the fact that vehicle ownership in many older neighborhoods exceed the ability to accommodate parking of these vehicles on site. Given the City's current ban on overnight on-street parking, a ban on parking within front and corner side yards may place residents in the untenable situation of having too many vehicles with no way to legally park them. If the City wishes to prohibit parking on front and side lawns within residential districts, said ban needs to be imposed in conjunction with a review of the City's policies on over night on-street parking.

Upon motion made by Mr. Rossi and seconded by Mr. Smith, the Commission unanimously voted to make an unfavorable recommendation on the zoning amendment as proposed. The City needs to formulate a clear definition of a 'driveway' and provide performance standards.

Aye votes: Chairman Petit, Mr. Rossi, Mr. Smith and Mr. Nadeau. There were no nay votes.

**RE: Ordinance 5-09-5** In Amendment of Chapter 17 of the Code of the City of Cranston, 2005, entitled "Zoning" (Change of Zone-New London Avenue) (amending the amount of signage in the MPD-Chapel View)

Attorney John Bolton, representing the applicant, Chapel View LLC, stated that the current ordinance provides for roughly 1,500 square footage of signage, which is inadequate for the number of tenants at the Chapel View development. He stated that the new signage proposal is a “reasonable budget for signage”. He further stated that the applicant would like to propose banner signage and that any and all proposed signage is subject to review and approval by the Historic District Commission.

Mr. Kelly Coates, Senior Vice President, Carpionato Corporation, distributed a packet of proposed signage which depicts examples of future signage that may be proposed, including some banners to be mounted on some of the buildings. He stated that this amendment proposal to the existing MPD will accomplish the following: 1) codify the signage, 2) would allow free-standing signs and, 3) would increase the overall square footage of signage allowed. He proceeded to review the packet. He stated that Phase I proposes three pylon signs to be located on Route 2 southerly of the sites main entrance, on Sockanossett Cross Road northerly of the Power Road access and at the Route 2 Sockanossett Cross Road intersection above the water pump station. Each new free standing sign would be up to 49.6’ in height and have an area of up to 1304.42 SF.

Phase II proposes an increase of roughly 4,363.02 of building signage to be added to the existing 1,492.61 of signage allowed and building number signage of 84 sq. ft., bringing the total to 5,939.63 square footage of building/building number signage allowed.

Phase III addressed window signage, banner signage and ‘buffer signage’. The banner signage request is for 600 sq. ft. The window signage request is for a total of 72 sq. ft. and ‘buffer/miscellaneous signage proposed is for 2,711 sq. ft.

Mr. Coates summarized by stating that the total square footage of signage would total 9,322.63. He stated that Chapel View has been a “signature project” for Carpionato Corporation and all signage will be “tastefully designed”.

Mr. Lapolla stated that the Planning Department has been meeting with the applicant to “work out” the increase signage proposed. The applicant submitted the sign calculations the day of this meeting. Mr. Lapolla suggested possibly a balloon test for the 49.6 ft. pylon signs proposed.

Mr. Bolton reminded the Commission that only a “sign budget” is requested at this time, not approval of any one particular sign proposal.

The Planning Commission acknowledged that the signage allowed at Chapel View through the existing MPD is inadequate. While in principal The Commission has recommended and supports an increase in overall signage allowed at Chapel View, the following changes to the ordinance amendment were recommended:

- Either a note or narrative shall be added to the ordinance amendment indicating that all new or modified signage to be installed at Chapel View shall be subject to the review and approval of the Cranston Historic District Commission for both size and design. No signage shall be installed without the Historic District’s Commission’s express written approval. Further, the note should include an acknowledgement that the total signage area authorized shall represent the maximum area allowed (not entitled).
- The ordinance be amended to indicate that only identity signs be allowed at free standing signs 2a, 2b, 2c, 3a, 3b, 3c, 4a, 4b, 4c 5a, 5b and 5c [the site’s two main entrances]. No tenant signs shall be allowed and said signs shall be modified in conjunction with or prior to the erection of the site two new free standing signs.

Upon motion made by Mr. Rossi and seconded by Mr. Smith, the Commission unanimously voted to make a favorable recommendation on Ordinance 5-09-5 subject to the condition that the ordinance is amended to include the two items identified above.

Aye votes: Chairman Petit, Mr. Rossi, Mr. Nadeau and Mr. Smith. There were no nay votes.

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**

Mr. Lapolla stated that the Future Land Use Map has been edited and is complete. The next step will be one more edit of the elements of the plan.

**PLANNING DIRECTORS REPORT / MISC**

Mr. Lapolla stated that the Harbor Management Plan is complete and has been submitted to RIDEM, Office of Water Resources, for approval.

On another note, Mr. Lapolla stated that he has been working on streamlining the permit process. This will be an interdepartmental process and will require editing of the Subdivision and Land Development Regulations, as well as the Site Plan Review ordinance.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Upon motion made by Mr. Rossi and seconded by Mr. Smith, the Commission unanimously voted to adjourn at 9:10 p.m.

**NEXT MEETING**

Tuesday, July 7, 2009, at 7 p.m. in the City Council Chamber

Respectfully submitted,

Jason M. Pezzullo, AICP  
Principal Planner/Secretary