

MINUTES

June 2, 2015

Chairman Smith called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. in the City Council Chamber. He announced that the agenda item involving Garden Vista would be re-advertised and heard next month. The following Commission members were in attendance:

Michael Smith, Chairman
Kenneth Mason, P.E.
Mark Motte
Kim Bittner
James Moran
Robert Strom
Lynne Harrington

Also present were:

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Upon motion made by Mr. Motte and seconded by Ms. Harrington, the Commission unanimously voted to approve (with one minor correction) the minutes of the April 7, 2015, Plan Commission Meeting.

Upon motion made by Mr. Moran and seconded by Ms. Bittner, the Commission unanimously voted to approve the minutes of the May 5, 2015, Plan Commission Meeting.

ORDINANCE RECOMMENDATIONS

Ordinance #04-15-05 - Amending the Comprehensive Plan of 2010 (Cumberland Farms-Intersection of Park and Warwick Avenues).

Mr. Lapolla explained the process for this application, stating that the request is to amend the subsection entitled "Land Use Plan Map" by deleting the designation "single/two family Residential" for the real properties located at 135 Warwick Avenue and 161 Park Avenue and adding the designation "Neighborhood Commercial/Services". The following ordinance (Ordinance 04/15/06) proposes to rezone the lots in question to C-3. This ordinance would change the land use classification of the properties so that a C-3 zoning classification would be consistent with the Future Land Use Plan of the 2010 Comprehensive Plan.

Attorney John Bolton, on behalf of the applicant, referred to a presentation board that depicted the proposed layout of the Cumberland Farms mini-mart/gas station. He explained that the current zoning allows a gas station. A C-2 zone allows a convenience store. He stated that "the quirk in the Zoning Code does not allow both in a C-2 Zone". Referring to the presentation board, he stated that one curb cut has to be located 100 ft. away from the intersection. He stated that the residential properties are needed for safety and to enable the curb cut and to allow for adequate buffer. He stated that the curb cut on Park Avenue also will allow fuel tankers to make deliveries.

Planner Joe Lombardo stated that the area is a mixture of commercial and residential. The proposal is for a 5,000 sq. ft. building on a one acre parcel. He presented his written report to the Commission. He re-iterated that the proposal is to re-zone the entire parcel C-3, stating that this "would be a revitalization project as the site is usually vacant". He further

stated that it is his opinion that the Comprehensive Plan change and the zone change are consistent and the proposed changes are in an area that is already developed.

Commissioner Harrington asked about the effect this would have on the existing mini mart down the street, as well as increased traffic and asked "why do we need another one". Mr. Lombardo responded, stating that this proposal would improve the existing conditions and no additional traffic would be added. He stated that, in general, competition favors the consumer. He further stated that each business "has their own business plan". Mr. Lapolla stated that we cannot and should not use the impact on existing businesses to approve or disapprove a project.

Commissioner Motte asked how a Cumberland Farms store of this scale would benefit the neighborhood and how often this type of facility is built in a residential, historical zone. Mr. Lombardo responded, stating that a 4000 – 5000 sq. ft. building is in scale with other businesses in the city. The site is 50,000 sq. ft. He also stated that Cumberland Farms provides a service and convenience.

Maureen Chleck, McMann and Associates, a traffic expert, presented a traffic impact study and explained how data was obtained. She said traffic is projected to grow at one percent a year. She stated that pass by traffic would be 63% (97 vehicle trips) in the AM, with a level of service C. The PM pass by traffic would be 66% (123 vehicle trips) with a level of service D. She stated that a PM level of service from D to E could result, with the unnoticeable difference of 4 seconds. She stated that this proposal would not have an impact in this area.

Mr. Michael Schlesinger, neighboring property owner, presented a site feasibility report prepared by Jonathan Stevens and expressed concern with traffic.

The following neighboring property owners and concerned citizens expressed concern with their property values, negative impact on the neighborhood, traffic, safety and pedestrian safety, lighting, cut-through traffic, the scale of the proposal, fire trucks not being able to get out of the nearby fire station due to traffic, safety of the crossing guard, the removal of historic homes, flooding and run off due to increase in impervious surface; and retail competition. They were: Jim Kearns, Michael Schlesinger, Kim (?), John (?), Gretchen Batch, Bill Brinson, Pat April, Sheila Resseber, Mary Mowden, Matt Gendron, Denise Marsinko, Maral Tashian, Marcia Fallor, Diane Lewis, Councilman Stycos, Sara Lee and Barbara Rubine.

Attorney Bolton briefly responded to some of the comments, stating that the property has been vacant since 2003 and has had a history of vacancies and problems.

Mr. Lapolla stated that the Development Plan Review Committee could require landscaping and buffering but also expressed concern with the scale of the project. Commissioner Moran stated that the site is a "failed commercial property" but had some concern with traffic. Chairman Smith stated that "this is a neighborhood commercial area, not a highway commercial area".

Mr. Motte motioned that the "burden of proof has not been met to change the Comprehensive Plan", therefore, motioning that there be no amendment of the Comprehensive Plan and no favorable recommendation. The motion was seconded by Ms. Harrington. Voting to support Mr. Motte's motion were Chairman Smith, Ms. Harrington, Ms. Bittner and Mr. Motte. Voting against Mr. Motte's motion were Mr. Mason, Mr. Strom and Mr. Moran. Since the majority of the Plan Commission did not vote to move Mr. Motte's motion, the vote did not carry.

Ordinance #04-15-06 - In Amendment of Chapter 17 of the Code of the City of Cranston, 2005, Entitled 'Zoning' (Change of Zone – Warwick and Park Avenues Intersection)

Mr. Strom motioned to support the staff recommendation to change the parcels in question to C-3. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mason. Mr. Moran, Mr. Strom and Mr. Mason voted to support Mr. Strom's motion. Mr. Motte, Ms. Bittner, Ms. Harrington and Chairman Smith voted against Mr. Strom's motion. Since the majority of the Plan Commission did not vote to move Mr. Strom's motion, the vote did not carry.

SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENTS

Chapel View – Final Plan
Mixed-Use Planned District / Major Land Development
Restoration of landscape islands

Mr. Lapolla stated that at its January 6, 2015 Plan Commission meeting, the Commission set, by vote, a series of conditions which required the owners of the Chapel View MPD to restore landscape islands in the parking fields at the front of Buildings

1000 and 2000 and at the front of Buildings 3000 and 4000. In taking its vote, the Commission imposed the following conditions:

- A cash bond [cash or check] in the sum of \$20,000, payable to the City of Cranston shall be provided to the City.
- Work on restoring the islands shall begin by March 15, 2015 and be completed by April 15, 2015.
- If work on restoring the landscape islands neither started nor completed within the required time frames, the \$20,000 cash bond shall be forfeited to the City of Cranston.
- If work on restoring the landscape islands neither started nor completed within the required time frames, amendment Number 9 as issued by the City Plan Commission on October 15, 2014 shall no longer be valid.

At its April 7, 2015 meeting the Plan Commission extended the time to restore the landscape islands due to winter conditions. The Commission voted to set a May 1, 2015 start date and a May 15, 2015 completion date. The work had not been started. The Department asked the City's Finance Director to deposit \$20,000 in cash bonds in the City's general fund, and it has requested that the City's Inspector of Buildings begin a formal enforcement proceeding regarding this ongoing violation of the MPD. In addition to the above, Mr. Lapolla suggested that the Plan Commission schedule, as an agenda item, a confirming vote on the rescission of the October 15, 2014 amendment to Chapel View MPD.

Mr. Coates admitted that the company had been remiss in starting the restoration project and respectfully requested an additional thirty days to complete the project. Assistant City Solicitor, Michael Glucksman, recommended granting the additional time.

Commissioner Strom, the City's Finance Director, stated that Carpionato Corporation is the largest tax payer in the City. He stated that he recently toured bond agency representatives through the Chapel View and neighboring Garden City Center shopping centers, and the bond agency representatives were "very impressed". He further stated that the City bond rating has been upgraded. He was in support of giving this developer an additional thirty day extension.

Mr. Lapolla further suggested a \$10,000 penalty be imposed. Mr. Coates stated that the penalty really is his company's loss of credibility and assured the Commission that the work would be complete within thirty days.

Chairman Smith suggested a 45 day extension with the \$10,000 penalty. Mr. Coates requested ten days to provide the \$10,000 bond.

Upon motion made by Mr. Motte and seconded by Mr. Mason, the Commission unanimously voted (7/0) to extend the deadline for restoration of the landscape islands another 45 days and require a \$10,000 performance bond that shall be provided within the next ten days.

Garden Vista – Preliminary Plan
Major Land Development (RPD) without street extension
5 duplex units (10 total)
Randall Street, Bellevue Drive - AP 12/6, Lot 2285
Request to reconsider condition of approval (power line easement)

Mr. Pezzullo stated that this matter will be re-advertised and heard at the July 7, 2015, Plan Commission Meeting.

DeSimone Estates – Preliminary Plan
Minor Subdivision without street extension (2-new lots)
Newbury Street and Kearney Street
AP 10/2, Lots 590-595, 602-607, 616 and 1476

Mr. Pezzullo stated the subject parcels are located at the corner of Newbury Street and Kearney Drive, AP 10-2, Lots 590-595, 602-607, 616 & 1476 and is zoned **A-8** (8,000 sq. ft. lot with 80 ft. of frontage). The property owners and applicants are Alexander & Theresa DeSimone, 50 Kearney Street, Cranston RI and Cindy M. Notarianni, 10 Kearney Street, Cranston RI.

The proposed subdivision will allow for two new single family house lots:

- Parcel 1: 80' of frontage with 14,045 sq. ft. of land area;
- Parcel 2: 80' of frontage with 13,198 sq. ft. of land area;
- Parcel 3: (existing home) 265' of frontage with 16,383 sq. ft. of land area;
- Parcel 4: (existing home) 103' of frontage with 10,123 sq. ft. of land area.

All lots conform to the A-8 zoning requirements, are consistent with the Cranston Comprehensive Plan – Future Land Use Map, and will be serviced by public water and sewer.

Attorney Jim Iacoi, representing the buyer, reiterated Mr. Pezzullo's comments.

Ms. Shannon ?, a resident of Newbury Street, expressed concern that the road is narrow and there are no drains in the street. She also expressed concern with pedestrian safety as there are no sidewalks. Mr. Pezzullo assured her that the street will be repaved curb to curb.

Ms. Sepanian, 35 Newbury Street, expressed concern with driveway placement. Mr. Pezzullo responded, stating that the driveways will not affect her property.

No further public comment was offered on this matter. Upon motion made by Mr. Motte and seconded by Mr. Strom, the Commission unanimously voted (7/0) to adopt the Findings of Fact denoted below and *approve* this Preliminary Plan, with waiver for sidewalk provision; 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 first class mail on 5/20/15 and the meeting agenda has been properly posted. Advertisement for this minor subdivision is not required under Section V.C.2.h of the City of Cranston Subdivision Regulations since no street extension is proposed.
2. The proposed residential subdivision lots conform to the Comprehensive Plan – Future Land Use designation of "Residential 7.26 – 3.64 units per acre".
3. The proposal will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the Cranston Zoning Code as the lots are proposed consistent with the A-8 zoning district.
4. There will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed subdivision as shown on the Preliminary 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 lots in question have adequate permanent physical access on Newbury Street, an 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, 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

1. Payment of Eastern Cranston Capital Facilities Impact Fee in the amount of \$1,186.92 (\$593.46 x 2).
2. Move or completely remove the existing shed from Record Lot 616.
3. Complete curb to curb repaving in front of proposed lots 1 & 2 upon completion of utility work and prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

Champlin Heights – Master Plan

Major Land Development with (private) street extension

150 apartment units in three buildings

Scituate Avenue

AP 20/4, Lot 2128 and AP 12/6, Lot 3108

Attorney John DiBona, on behalf of the applicant, Champlin Heights II, LLC, stated that the proposal is for a 150 unit apartment complex in three buildings that abuts Champlin Hills. Each building will be three stories and conform to the B-2 zoning district. A 1985 zoning ordinance limited the amount of buildings that could be constructed on the site. He requested a waiver from the provision of a verified wetland edge at this stage.

Kelly Coates, Senior Vice President, Carpionato Corporation, stated that the proposed units will be comparable to their existing Chateau properties, which currently rent for \$1,200 for an efficiency and \$1,945 for a three bedroom unit. The

units will be exclusively market rate. He stated that the company performs an extensive criminal background check on all apartment applicants, further they the company "has a very difficult profile". He stated that they are designing these apartments to the empty nester. The complex will have a pool. There will be one entrance in and out. The project should produce 2%-3% school children. He stated that he is seeking the city's assistance in enforcement of the 30 MPH speed limit. He mentioned that the plan for Champlin Hills has received RIDOT approval. There will be a 200 ft. setback on the eastern border, a 100 ft. setback on the southern border, and a 300-400 ft. setback from Scituate Avenue. He stated that the "property is wrapped with a natural buffer". The site is not maxed out with development; 8-9 acres will be left untouched. There will be garages provided on site for residents for an additional rental fee.

Mr. Richard Bourbonnais, Garofalo and Associates, stated that the total parcel is 16.7 acres. A 60 ft. wide National Grid easement will be provided. The development provides for two parking spaces per unit.

Mr. Steve Garofalo, stated that he conducted a traffic study. The 7-9 a.m. and 4-6 p.m. peaks were studied from Ivy Lane to Western Hills Lane, as well as the Scituate Avenue/Phenix Avenue and Scituate Avenue/Comstock Parkway intersections. He stated that the a.m. peak generated 74 vehicle trips, and the p.m. peak generated 91 vehicle trips. He stated that the Scituate Vista complex consists of 230 units. He noted that more traffic is distributed to Phenix Avenue. With the exception of one leg, he stated that "there is no difference between the no-build and build situations". He stated that the "speed study" revealed that cars traveled at 40-42 MPH on Scituate Avenue.

Ms. Katherine Vehement, Celebrity Condominiums, stated that residents cannot get out for their driveway and asked that a traffic light be provided. She also expressed concern with speed. She asked that another exit for the new development be considered. She stated that the area near the apartments on Scituate occasionally floods. She presented a petition of those opposed to the project.

Ms. Joan Garalnik, Celebrity Condominiums, expressed concern with the placement of the entrance. Ms. Barbara Brousseau, also Celebrity Condominiums, expressed concern with traffic. Ms. Cindy St. Louis, Celebrity Condominiums, expressed concern with the manmade detention pond, to which Mr. Bourbonnais explained that the development actually decreases flow.

Mr. Pezzullo stated that the proposal is a by-right development. The biggest concern is that a significant sewer upgrade needs to be done. The sewer upgrade proposal shall be completed prior to the applicant's submission of the Preliminary Plan.

Upon motion made by Mr. Motte and seconded by Mr. Moran, the Commission unanimously voted (7/0) to adopt the Findings of Fact denoted below and *approve* this Major Land Development proposal, with waiver for submittal of RIDEM verified wetlands edge at Master Plan; subject to the following conditions.

Findings of Fact

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 on 5/26/15 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 5/27/15.
2. The proposed major land development and its resulting density of approximately 9.0 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 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 186 units where 150 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 Master Plan.
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.
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 Preliminary Plan application with the Planning Department, the application shall be in receipt of the following items:

1. Physical Alteration Permit (PAP) from the RIDOT, including any State required traffic analysis;
2. RIDEM Freshwater Wetlands verified wetlands edge and any alteration permit, if deemed necessary;
3. Providence Water Supply Board final engineering approval;
4. Veolia Water approval of sewer engineering stating that the plans conform to Annex A - Design of Sewers and that both proposals are considered in tandem: including upgrading certain downstream portions of the Cranston sewer system.
5. Preliminary Plan Approval granted by the Development Plan Review Committee;
6. Municipal Lien Certificate certifying that all taxes are paid up to date;
7. Traffic Study Analysis for total anticipated build out plans submitted in accordance and compliance with Plan Commission's policy for traffic impacts at the Development Plan Review stage.
8. Payment of Cranston Herald newspaper display advertisement in the amount of \$111.20.

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS

BARBARA M DEROBIO 10 DOYLSTON DRIVE CRANSTON RI 02905 (OWN) AND JENNIFER DEROBIO 10 DOYLSTON DRIVE CRANSTON RI 02905 (APP) have filed an application for permission to leave an existing one family dwelling on an undersized [lot 3745] with restricted front and side-yard setback and build a new 24' X 36' one family dwelling on the abutting undersized lot [3744] with restricted frontage at **10 Doylston Street**. AP 2, lots 3744 & 3745, area 9450+/- SF, zoned A-6. Applicant seeks relief from Section 17.92.010 Variance, 17.20.120 Schedule of Intensity, 17.88.010 Sub-Standard lots 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 existing single family dwelling located on two lots with combined area of 9,450 sq. ft. and density of 4.6 units per acre, is consistent with the prescribed density of the 2010 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map for this area of the City, that calls for density of 7.26 to 3.64 units per acre.
2. The vacant lot's proposed residential density of 10.75 units per acre, is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map
3. Six out of the ten single family dwellings fronting on Doylston Drive, are on lots that are 4,500 sq. ft. and smaller, and are also inconsistent with the prescribed density of the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map.
4. Seven lots fronting on Doylston Drive have frontages that are between 45 ft. and 50 ft., where 60' is required in this zone.
5. The abutting lot (#3743) has the same 45 ft. frontage as the applicant's lot.
6. The proposed house will have a front yard setback of 20 ft., where all ten dwellings fronting on Doylston Drive, have front yard setbacks of 20 ft. or less.
7. The proposed single family dwelling exceeds both side, and rear yard setbacks.
8. The existing garage on the applicant's developed lot will have a 1 ft. side yard setback.

Recommendation: Based on the Findings of Fact, the application conforms with the general character and density of the surrounding neighborhood; therefore, upon motion made by Mr. Motte and seconded by Ms. Bittner, the Plan Commission

unanimously voted (6/0) to forward a positive recommendation on this application to the Zoning Board, as the application will not hinder the intent or purpose of the Comprehensive Plan or the Zoning Ordinance.

LUCILLE NOTARIANNI REVOCABLE TRUST 116 SWEET BRIAR DRIVE CRANSTON RI 02920 (OWN /APP) has filed an application for permission to operate a fitness business from an existing building with restricted frontage, front, rear and side-yard setback on an undersized lot at **161 Macklin Street**. AP 11/2, lot 1654, area 6343+/- SF, zoned M-1. Applicant seeks relief from Section 17.92.010 Variance, 17.20.120 Schedule of Intensity, 17.20.030 Schedule of Uses, 17.64.010 Off-Street Parking.

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

Findings of Fact:

1. The application for a fitness business (commercial and services) is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan's 2010 Future Land Use Map, which designates this parcel and the surrounding area for industrial uses.
2. There are 15 buildings located within the industrial zone within the 400 ft. Zoning Radius; 13 are used for industry and 2 are commercial/service uses.
3. The application proposes to use the entire 40' x 60' building.
4. The building will contain two fitness rooms, two offices and a storage room.
5. The parking plan submitted has been disapproved by the City's Bureau of Traffic Safety.
6. The Economic Development Element of the Cranston's Comprehensive Plan, entitled *Strengthening and Preserving Existing Industrial Districts*, states: "...there is a danger that commercial and service development will erode an important job-creating resource for the City if they are allowed to occur in industrial zones."
7. The Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan states, "Commercial development should be restricted in industrial districts in order to maintain the existing industrial base and provide for future expansion."
8. Land Use Policy LU-4.3, of the Comprehensive Plan, states "Discourage infiltration of commercial and retail activities into industrial zones, particularly those that might lead to strip commercial development."
9. Economic Development Policy ED-3.1 states "Strengthen the standards for industrially zoned land to prevent the erosion of the City's supply of land suitable for these purposes."
10. In the recent past, the City's industrial base has been eroding though the issuances of Zoning Variances for other than industrial uses.

Recommendation: The application for commercial use in an industrial zone is inconsistent with the 2010 Comprehensive Plan and the 2010 Future Land Use Map that designates this property and surrounding area as "Industrial". Recognizing that industrial uses have been eroding over the past several years, upon motion made by Mr. Motte and seconded by Mr. Strom, the Plan Commission unanimously voted (7/0) to forward a positive recommendation on this application to the Zoning Board.

ANGELO E AND ROSA M MUCCIO 28 WOODVIEW DRIVE CRANSTON RI 02920 (OWN) AND ANTHONY MUCCIO 92 MACKLIN STREET CRANSTON RI 02920 (APP) have filed an application for permission to build a new 28' X 36' two story single family dwelling with restricted side yard set-back on a proposed 6449+/- sf lot [parcel A] and build a new 26' X 54' two story single family dwelling with restricted rear yard set-back on a proposed 6878+/- sf lot [parcel B] at **the corner of Holland Street and Royal Avenue**. AP 12/2, lots 1177, 1178 & 1179, area 13,327+/- SF, zoned A-8. Applicant seeks relief from Section 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 subdivision and its resulting density of approximately 6.6 residential units per acre is consistent with the City of Cranston Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map which designates the subject parcels as "Single Family Residential, 7.26 to 3.64 residential units per acre".
2. On March 3, 2015, the Plan Commission tentatively approved a Preliminary Subdivision Plan creating 2 undersized lots with undersized frontages, pending Zoning Board Approval. The two lot subdivision does not conform to the A-8 zoning classification for frontage and area. However the Plan Commission found that the proposal will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the general intent or purpose of the Cranston Zoning Code.
3. Parcel A has frontage of 56.03 feet, (where 80 ft. is required) and the site plan submitted shows a proposed side yard set back of 9.10 feet for the 36' x 28' dwelling, where 10 feet is required.

4. The site plan shows Parcel B has a rear yard setback of 13.90 ft. for the 54' x 26' dwelling, where 20 ft. is required, but a rear yard setback of less than 2 feet for the 12 x 14' deck.
5. Both of the proposed buildings meet the required front yard setback of 25'.
6. Of the 64 residential buildings that are located within the 400' Zoning notification radius, 19 buildings are on lots that are less than the 8,000 sq. ft. required in this zone. (The residential condo development also within the radius, was not included in the analysis.)

Recommendation: Based on the fact that the proposed development on the undersized lots in this area of the City still falls below the maximum density allowed on the 2010 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map, upon motion made by Mr. Moran and seconded by Ms. Bittner, the Plan Commission unanimously voted (6/0) to forward a positive recommendation on this application to the Zoning Board.

OTHER BUSINESS

Capital Facilities Impact Fees – Use of Library funds for the Central Library Expansion

Mr. Lapolla stated that in May, 2014, the Plan Commission voted to amend the City's Subdivision and Land Development Regulations, specifically the section entitled 'Dedication of Fees/Land for Public Improvements'. This amendment authorized the use of Western Cranston Impact Fees to fund an expansion of the children's services at the main library.

At the time of the amendment, the library had intended to construct an addition to the main library to accommodate the expansion. In exploring its' options and costs, the library and its consultants have concluded that a physical addition may not be needed. According to the library, their consultants believe that an expansion in services can be accommodated by reconfiguring existing library space to provide expanded children's services. This would be more timely and cost effective.

Given that the Commission, in voting to allow impact fees to be used to fund an expansion of children's services, did not specify the method by which the expansion may occur, it is the staff's opinion that the library may use the fees for an internal expansion.

PLANNING DIRECTORS REPORT – Residential Planned District

The Commission agreed to meet on June 23, 2015, at 5 p.m. to discuss this matter.

ADJOURNMENT Upon motion made by Mr. Strom and seconded by Mr. Moran, the Commission unanimously voted to adjourn at midnight.

NEXT MEETING July 7, 2015 – City Council Chamber, 7 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Jason M. Pezzullo, AICP
Principal Planner/Administrative Officer