

May 2, 2006

MINUTES

Chairman William Guglietta called the Planning Commission meeting to order in the Cranston High School East Auditorium at 7:08 p.m. The following Commission members were in attendance:

William R. Guglietta, Esq., Chairman
Paul M. Petit, Vice Chairman
Councilwoman Paula McFarland
Marco Schiappa, P.E., Public Works Director
Stephen Devine
Charles Rossi

Also attending were: Jared L. Rhodes II, Planning Director
Jason M. Pezzullo, Principal Planner
Lynn Furney, Senior Planner
Vito Sciolto, Esq., Asst. City Solicitor
April Costa, Stenographer
Joanne Resnick, Clerk

Also attending were:

Carol Myron	John Iafrati	Anna Iafrati
Tom Dettore	Gary Malloy	Frank Resende
John Macera	Lori Carlino	Mario Carlino
John DiBona	Robert Murray	Frank Paolino
Kevin Morin	Peter Alviti	Syl Pauley
Katherine Smith	Katherine King	Joseph Manney

MINUTES

Upon motion made by Mr. Rossi and seconded by Mr. Petit, the Commission unanimously voted to *approve* the minutes of the April 4, 2006 meeting.

ORDINANCE COMMITTEE ITEMS

Ordinance #2-06-07 – Ordinance amending the Comprehensive Plan of 1992 (Burton St. II)

Ordinance #2-06-08 – Ordinance in amendment of Chapter 30 of the Code of the City of Cranston, 2005, entitled "Zoning" (Change of Zone-Burton St. II)

Chairman Guglietta stated that these ordinances were before the Planning Commission on April 4, 2006, at which time a majority vote on recommendation was not reached, therefore they are again before the Commission this month for determination.

Attorney John DiBona, representing the applicant, Carlino Testa Developers, LLC, explained that the proposal is for an addition to an approved (September, 2004) 16 unit condominium development which followed a Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Zone Change, from A-6 (single family residential, minimum 6000 sq. ft.) to B-2 (single, two and multi-family dwellings). He explained that this proposal would provide further buffering and transition from the commercial businesses that exist to the south of the subject property. He further explained that a petition submitted last month may have incorrectly characterized the roadway access issue to neighboring property owners and that a petition in objection to the proposal has since been negated by a new petition, with signatures obtained by Mr. Carlino, explaining that the proposal is for access to the new development from Cady Street. Mr. DiBona explained that approximately 20 homeowners have asked to have their names removed from the previously submitted petition as they are in favor of the proposed development with access through Cady Street. Mr. DiBona submitted these petitions to the Commission (see attached).

Chairman Guglietta then obtained sworn testimony from applicants Mr. Carlino and Mr. Testa that the signatures on the affidavits/petitions provided were obtained and witnessed by them. These affidavits/petitions are attached and made part of these minutes.

Mr. Mario Carlino, applicant, confirmed that Mr. Iafrati mistakenly obtained the signatures on the petition presented last month, which contained language that stated that access to the proposed development would be from Burton Street. Mr. Carlino stated that he has obtained 65 signatures of those in favor of the proposed zone change, with 20 of those residents asking to have their names removed from the petition that was submitted last month.

Mr. Peter Alviti, P.E., Hudson Place Associates, gave a brief analysis of the traffic that would be generated by the proposal. He stated that five single-family homes could be constructed on the property, which would each generate 5.57 average daily trips, with a total of 48 average daily trips that could be generated by five single family homes. The proposed use would generate 5.86 average daily trips per unit for a total of 53 average daily trips; a nominal impact to the existing neighborhood.

Mr. Carmine Cece, representing his father who owns a small business on Atwood Avenue, stated that his father was not notified of last year's public hearing but was notified of this public hearing. He stated that his father is concerned about debris and diesel fume emissions created during the construction of this development and about the possible disruption to his business during this period.

Attorney Robert Colagiovanni, representing Mr. John Iafrati and several homeowners in the area, stated that there are 60 names on the affidavit/petition presented, with 20 residents requesting that their names be removed, leaving 40 homeowners who have concerns about the effects on the water and sewer service in the area. He explained that in September, 2004, the two ordinances approved were done so in consideration of 16 condominium units to serve as a buffer between the residential and commercial uses. The property can currently be used to build four single-family homes, and the applicant's proposal for nine additional units is generated by greed. On behalf of the residents he represents, he is requesting a recommendation of denial for the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment and zone change.

Mr. Tom Dettore, 80 Cornell Street, a direct abutter, stated that the multi-family/transitional area had already been achieved with the September, 2004, approved zone change. He feels that single-family use of this parcel is appropriate. He stated that several properties on Cornell Street already abut commercial property. He further stated that there is no hardship involved in this case.

Mr. John Macera, 234 Randall Street, stated that he has known one of the applicants, namely Mr. Mario Carlino, since childhood and can attest to Mr. Carlino's character and integrity. Mr. Macera

stated that Mr. Carlino informed him that the proposal would not utilize access from either Randall Street or Burton Street and has kept his word and presented a plan that depicts access to the proposed development from Cady Street.

Mr. John lafrati clarified that Mr. Carlino's original proposal, September, 2004, was for the closure of Berry Street, not Burton Street.

No further public testimony was offered.

Mr. Rhodes presented his staff memo, which is attached and made part of these minutes. He explained that if single-family development were proposed, it would directly abut commercial property and that current zoning regulations would allow four single-family homes to be built on the subject property. The proposal would add five additional units to the area and have a negligible effect on the existing community. He stated that a specific development proposal for the subject parcel is not required to be submitted as part of these proceedings. Discussions with the owner/applicant indicate, however, that the intent is to expand the condominium development proposed for the adjacent lots onto the subject parcel. This adjacent condominium development has received Master Plan approval from the Planning Commission. He further stated that the justification for the proposed Comprehensive Plan and Zoning amendments are the same as those originally put forward by the previous Planning Director in his staff memorandum of August, 2004, recommending approval of the initial Comprehensive Plan and Zone changes on the adjacent parcels.

Commissioner Stephen Devine stated that the word 'transitional' is key and that we accomplished the 'transition' area with the previous zone change. It is his opinion that Burton Street, a paper street, is the natural break for the zone. He expressed concern with any future expansion of the 'transition' area and stated that the existing buffer should remain. In view of the on-going Comprehensive Plan update, he questioned whether it would be practical for all vacant lots in the City to be considered for transitional zoning

Chairman Guglietta stated he is in agreement with Mr. Devine but felt that the existing Stop & Shop Supermarket on Atwood Avenue has changed the character of Cornell Street along the properties it abuts. He stated that the Commission is asked to consider the Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Change of Zone proposal only and that the recommendation rendered at this meeting should be consistent with what was approved by the City Council in 2004, which is that access to any future development of the subject parcel be via Cady Street.

Councilwoman McFarland pointed out that the rear yard setbacks would be unchanged at 20' whether the subject parcel is zoned A-6 or B-2.

Comprehensive Plan Amendment (Ordinance 2-06-07)

There being no further testimony, the Commission moved to a vote. On the matter of *Ordinance 2-06-07*, the Planning Commission, upon motion made by Mr. Schiappa seconded by Mr. Petit, voted to adopt the Findings of Fact denoted below and to forward them to the City Council with a recommendation of *approval*, with the condition that access to any future development of the site only be through Cady Street.

Findings of Fact

1. The subject lots are approximately 26,955 S.F. in size, are located along an unimproved portion of Burton Street, are presently undeveloped and are owned by the applicant.
2. Under the current Comprehensive Plan and zoning designations a maximum of 4 conforming single-family lots could be developed on the subject parcel. If the designations were to be changed as proposed by this and its companion ordinance number 2-06-8 a maximum of 6 multi-family/condominium units would be allowed by right (exclusive of the Burton St. Area currently proposed for abandonment).

3. Directly to the east of the subject parcel lies a series of 16 lots that currently carry the same comprehensive plan and zoning designation as are being sought for the subject parcel. These lots were designated for “multi-family transitional use” in the comprehensive plan and zoned for “single, two or multi-family residential use” in 2004 as the result of the City Council’s passage of ordinances 2004-40 and 2004-41 respectively which came with a recommendation for approval from the City Planning Commission.
4. The properties to the North and West of the subject parcel are zoned and primarily developed as single family residential properties on 6,000 S.F. lots. The property to the South is zoned C-2 – “neighborhood business,” sits at the corner of Atwood and Phenix Avenues, and currently contains a Super Stop & Shop and a free standing bank.
5. The proposed change will extend the existing “multi-family transitional” zone along the vacant parcels further separating and buffering the commercial uses located along Phenix and Atwood Avenues from the single-family zone located to the north and west of the subject parcel.

Aye votes: Chairman Guglietta, Mr. Petit, Mr. Schiappa, Mr. Rossi and Councilwoman McFarland. Nay vote: Mr. Devine.

Change of Zone (*Ordinance 2-06-08*)

On the matter of *Ordinance 2-06-08*, the Planning Commission, upon motion made by Mr. Rossi and seconded by Mr. Petit, voted to adopt the Findings of Fact denoted below and forward them to the City Council with a recommendation of *approval*, with the condition that any future development of the site is to be accessed only through Cady Street.

Findings of Fact

1. The proposed change of zone from A-6 (Single-family uses on 6,000 S.F. lots) to B-2 (single two and multi-family units) is consistent with the City of Cranston’s 1992 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map as amended.
2. The proposed change is consistent with each of the applicable purposes of zoning as presented in section 45-24-30 of the Rhode Island General Laws and 17.04.010 of the City of Cranston Zoning Code.

Aye votes: Chairman Guglietta, Mr. Petit, Mr. Schiappa, Mr. Rossi and Councilwoman McFarland. Nay vote: Mr. Devine.

Ordinance #3-06-05 – Ordinance amending Chapter 17 of the Code of the City of Cranston, 2005, entitled “Zoning” (Change of Zone-Phenix Avenue)

Attorney John DiBona stated that the applicant wishes to be allowed to construct a home for his sister and daughter. He stated that neighboring property to the north is currently zoned A-20.

Mr. Peter Alviti, P.E., provided testimony stating that the site is suitable for development and could possibly be subdivided to create an additional two lots. The proposal is to create two single-family homes on the combined 3.36.acres. There is sufficient water and sewer capacity to support development of this type. The existing roadways can support the negligible traffic that will be generated.

No members of the public offered testimony on this matter.

Mr. Jared Rhodes presented the staff’s memo and Findings of Fact, which is attached and made part of these minutes. He stated that the Comprehensive Plan calls for a residential density of one to four units per acre. He noted that surrounding properties to the West, North and East are currently zoned A-20 and are developed accordingly. He stated that this zone change will not alter the character of the surrounding area but will actually bring the existing zoning into conformance with the Comprehensive Plan’s Future Land Use Map.

There being no further testimony, the Commission moved to a vote. Upon motion made by Mr. Petit and seconded by Mr. Schiappa, the Commission unanimously voted to adopt the following Findings of Fact and to forward a recommendation of *approval* to the City Council for their consideration.

Findings of Fact

1. The subject lots are approximately 3.7 acres in size, contain three single-family homes and are therefore developed at a density of 1.2 units per acre.
2. Surrounding properties to the West, North and East are currently zoned A-20 and are developed accordingly.
3. The Cranston Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map designates the property for residential use specifying allowable densities ranging from 1 unit per acre to 4 units per acre.
4. The property's current A-80 zoning designation allows a maximum residential density of only .5 units per acre and is therefore inconsistent with the intent and purpose of the Comprehensive plan.
5. The proposed A-20 zoning designation would allow a maximum residential density of 2 units per acre.
6. The proposal therefore is consistent with the comprehensive plan and serves to implement its intent and purpose.
7. The proposed change is consistent with each of the applicable purposes of zoning as presented in section 45-24-30 of the Rhode Island General Laws and 17.04.010 of the City of Cranston Zoning Code.

Aye votes: Chairman Guglietta, Mr. Petit, Mr. Schiappa, Mr. Rossi, Mr. Devine and Councilwoman McFarland. There were no nay votes.

SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Orchard Meadows – Preliminary Plan

Major Subdivision with street extension
Pippin Orchard Road
AP 33, Lots 15 and 124

Mr. Peter Alviti, P.E., Hudson Place Associates, representing the applicants, Nove Partners, LLC of 1615 Pontiac Avenue, Cranston, RI, gave a brief explanation of the Preliminary Plan proposal to subdivide the existing 9.78 acre parcel into eleven lots; ten new building lots and one detention basin lot. He explained that the proposal received Master Plan approval several months ago, and there has been only one change; the lot line between Lots 4 & 5 was moved four feet. He stated that the development will be serviced by the Town of Johnston Public Water System and through the City of Cranston public sewer system, for which there is adequate pressure for domestic usage.

Commissioner Marco Schiappa questioned Mr. Alviti about ownership of maintenance of the proposed water service. Mr. Alviti responded that the Town of Johnston will maintain and bill the homeowners for their usage.

Commissioner Stephen Devine asked if the Physical Alteration Permit obtained by the applicant includes installation of the water line. Mr. Alviti responded that it does include installation of the proposed water line.

Ms. Katherine Smith, previous Land Trust President, asked if consideration was given to setting lots back from the street due to the close proximity to the Historic Farm Route. Mr. Rhodes responded that the homes will be situated on the new subdivision road being created and not Pippin Orchard Road.

Ms. Katherine King, Land Trust Member, asked if a zone change was necessary for this project. Mr. Rhodes explained that this is an A-20 zone and that the lots, as proposed, conform to the Cranston Zoning Ordinance.

No further public testimony was offered.

Jason Pezzullo, Principal Planner, presented the Planning Department's staff memo, Findings of Fact and Conditions for Approval, which are attached and made part of these minutes. He stated that this project received Master Plan approval in March, 2005. Since that time the applicant has secured all of the necessary permits that were required at the time of the Master Plan approval. He stated that staff recommends approval for waivers for the provision of sidewalks and a reduced pavement width of 28 ft.

Mr. Pezzullo noted final plan set notation shall include final homeowners association documents and easements to specify that the association, and not the City, is the recipient of the landscaping easements and responsible for the proposed landscape elements along Pippin Orchard Road.

Chairman Guglietta asked for clarification of the conditions that require the homeowner's association responsibility. Commissioner Schiappa responded that sub-drains are located between the properties to help improve the water tables and that the final homeowners association documents and easements should specify that the association, not the City, is responsible for the sub-drain system as well as landscaping on Pippin Orchard Road. Mr. Alviti responded that all sub-drains are to be removed.

There being no further discussion, the Planning Commission moved to a vote. Upon motion made by Mr. Rossi and seconded by Mr. Petit, the Commission unanimously voted to adopt the following Findings of Fact and to *approve* this Preliminary Plan with waivers for the provision of sidewalks and a reduced pavement width of 28' subject to the conditions 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 requested mailing and the meeting agenda has been properly posted. This major subdivision proposal has been properly advertised per Section V.F.3.g of the City of Cranston Subdivision Regulations and the notice appeared in the 4/13/06 edition of the Cranston Herald.
2. The proposed subdivision, and its resulting gross density of approximately .98 residential units per acre, is consistent with the City of Cranston Comprehensive Plan and its Future Land Use Map which designates the property in question as "Residential" allowing one to four residential units per acre.
3. The proposal is consistent with the City of Cranston Zoning Code. All proposed lots conform to the area and frontage requirements of the **A-20** single family residential zone.
4. There will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed subdivision as shown on the Preliminary plans, with the required conditions of approval obtained from the RIDEM.
5. The proposed subdivision promotes high quality appropriate design and construction, will be well integrated with the surrounding neighborhoods, and will reflect their existing characteristics.
6. The proposed subdivision will not result in the creation of individual lots with such physical constraints to development that building on subject lots, according to pertinent regulations and building standards would be impracticable.

7. The property in question has adequate permanent physical access to Pippin Orchard Road, an improved public roadway, located within the City of Cranston. The resulting lots will also have adequate permanent physical access to the proposed roadways of Braeburn Circle and Westland Court.
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 suitable building sites.
9. Significant cultural, historic, or natural features that contribute to the attractiveness of the community have not been identified on the site.
10. The design and location of streets, building lots, utilities, drainage improvements and other improvements conform to local regulations for mitigation of flooding and soil erosion.

Conditions for Approval

The following conditions shall apply to this Preliminary Plan, in addition to other applicable state and local requirements.

1. Revise note #12 under "Retention Basin Maintenance by the City of Cranston" to reflect that the City will not accept a sediment removal frequency of less than 5 years.
2. Plan set notation, Final Homeowners Association documents and easements to specify that the Association, and not the City, is responsible for the subdrain system.
3. Plan set notation, Final Homeowners Association documents and easements to specify that the Association, and not the City, is the recipient of the landscaping easements and responsible for the proposed landscape elements.
4. Homeowners Association documents to reference the RIDEM wetland jurisdiction and to summarize prohibited activities within this area.
5. Final written approval of sewer design by Veolia Water.
6. Payment of Western Cranston Water District fees of \$13,520 (\$1,352 x 10) at the time of plat recording.
7. Payment of Western Cranston Capital Facilities Impact Fees of \$13,895 (\$1,389.50 x 10) at the time of plat recording.
8. Provide a Performance Bond in the amount of \$510,000, with a 2% administrative fee of \$10,200.
9. Provide approved 911 plans and 911 notification letters at Final Plan submission.

Aye votes: Chairman Guglietta, Mr. Petit, Mr. Schiappa, Mr. Rossi, Mr. Devine and Councilwoman McFarland. There were no nay votes.

Greenfield Commons – Master Plan Reinstatement and Preliminary Plan

Major Land Development, RPD, with street extension
AP 12, Lots 3158, 3166, 3167 and 3234

Americo Scungio, attorney representing the applicant, stated that this proposal received Planning Commission approval on June 8, 2004, and that the applicants are requesting reinstatement of the Master Plan approval.

Mr. Syl Pauley, P.E., Civil Tech Engineering, explained the proposal to construct an RPD condominium complex consisting of ten dwelling units in five structures. Access to the site will be on Greenfield Street which will be extended 600'. He explained that drainage will be accomplished by use of catch basins, pipes and culverts that will traverse the roadway. Three detention basins are proposed, with 1.39 acres of open space for residents use. Existing wetlands

on the westerly side of the property have received RIDEM verification and a conservation easement for this area is proposed.

The development will be serviced by City water and sewer. The Providence Water Supply Board has requested a pump station that will be owned and maintained by the homeowners association. Also, as the development will be serviced by the City's sewer force main, Mr. Pauley explained that each condominium unit will have its own pump that will be maintained by the homeowners association. Underground utilities are proposed, with infrastructure to be maintained by the homeowners association as well. Mr. Pauley explained that two fire hydrants are proposed; one to be located adjacent to the pump station and a second connected by a dry line along the private right-of-way in the vicinity of the Keegan parcel.

Ms. Carol Myron, 40 Bellevue Drive, stated that she has been a resident of the area for the past year and a half and asked the Planning Commission if access from Scituate Avenue to the proposed condominium development has been considered as this project will increase traffic on Greenfield Street.

Mr. Rhodes responded to Ms. Myron's concerns and stated that prior subdivision submittals on the adjacent property have shown that the grades of the property are too steep to allow roadway construction. He further explained that in June, 2004, a traffic impact analysis was conducted and the final determination was that the existing roadway could sufficiently handle the amount of traffic that would be generated by this type of development.

No further public testimony was offered.

Mr. Rhodes then presented the Planning Department's staff memo dated April 28, 2006, which is attached and made part of these minutes. He explained that in June, 2005, the previous engineer had health concerns that prevented the project from moving forward. He explained that the RPD allows the applicant to reduce the lot size while the number of dwellings will remain the same as those shown in the conventional subdivision plan. He further explained that open space is a requirement of the RPD and that the proposal conforms with the requirements. He stated that the applicant has received an Insignificant Alteration Permit from RIDEM.

He noted that the Public Works Department has stated that 6" concrete curbing is required for the public portion of Greenfield Street rather than asphalt berm. In addition, they also require that a 40' wide right-of-way be maintained for the entire length of the Greenfield Street extension, with a minimum pavement width of 26'.

Mr. Rhodes further stated that Veolia Water expressed concern that the plans, as submitted, are acceptable for Master Plan approval only and are not of sufficient detail for Preliminary approval at this time.

The Planning Commission had placed several conditions on the approval of the Master Plan in 2004. Staff has detailed the status of those conditions in section VI. of the memo dated April 28, 2006 which is attached to these minutes. Mr. Rhodes stated that one of the previous concerns of the Planning Commission at the time of Master Plan approval was the right-of-way access over the subject property to the Keegan property to the South. The applicant has since provided Planning Staff with signed legal documentation detailing the modified right-of-way that will follow the Greenfield Street and the private roadway to access their property to the south.

Mr. Rhodes reiterated comments received from Mr. Kerry Anderson, Building Inspector, stating that the decks on units #9 and #10 violate the required zoning setbacks. The roof overhang as shown on Parcel A is now on the property line, and the existing dwelling on Parcel B is now violating the rear zoning setback requirement.

Mr. Rhodes stated that Mr. Steven Pilz of the Cranston Conservation Commission provided a detailed list of comments and concerns for the proposed development and that a detailed response to each comment is provided for in the staff memorandum referenced above.

Master Plan Reinstatement

There being no further discussion, the Planning Commission moved to a vote. On the matter of Master Plan Reinstatement, upon motion made by Mr. Petit and seconded by Mr. Devine, the Commission unanimously voted to adopt the Findings of Fact denoted below and to *approve* reinstatement of the Master Plan subject to the following conditions.

Findings of Fact

The following findings of fact are offered in accordance with Section VIII. B. of the Cranston Subdivision and Land Development Regulations relating to the criteria needed for the granting of reinstatements.

1. The subdivision is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and with the prior approval including all conditions attached thereto;
2. The Subdivision and Land Development Regulations are substantially the same as they were at the time of original approval;
3. The zoning of the subdivision parcel is substantially the same as it was at the time of the original approval;
4. Physical conditions on the subdivision parcel are substantially the same as they were at the time of the original approval; and
5. Applicable state or federal regulations are substantially the same as they were at the time of the original approval.

Conditions of Approval

1. Submit a letter of sanitary sewer system preliminary design approval from Veolia Water at Preliminary Plan re-submittal.
2. Roadway width for Greenfield Street extension shall maintain a minimum 40' wide ROW for its full length with pavement width to match the existing 26' width on Greenfield Street.
3. Public portion of Greenfield street extension to require concrete curbing as opposed to asphalt berm.
4. Redesign the pavement extension along Lot 3208 so that the need for a retaining wall is eliminated and shift the pavement width to the west so as to allow vehicular access to the property.
5. Submit engineering documentation that the emergency spillway of proposed Detention Basin 3 and the surface drainage from the cul-du-sac will not impact AP 12, Lot 2837.
6. Submit a completed Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control checklist addressing the concerns raised by the Conservation Commission.
7. Obtain all variances necessary from the Zoning Board of Review or reconfigure the plan to alleviate the need for relief. Issues to be addressed include the nonconforming side yard setback that will result on proposed Parcel A, and the rear yard setback on proposed Parcel B. The plan sets also need to be revised to consistently denote whether units 9 and 10 are going to have decks on the sides of the units or patios at the rear. Rear yard setback relief will also be required if these units are to have decks on the rear as shown on sheet 4 of 9. If necessary, variances are to be provided after Preliminary Subdivision approval and prior to Final Plan submittal.
8. Submit Private Homeowners Association documents and open space conservation

easement for staff review. Verify that the Private Home Owners Association will be responsible for the maintenance of all proposed detention facilities and open space.

9. Provide a landscaped buffer to screen the proposed above-ground water boosting station on the revised Preliminary Plan and address whether this station will be for domestic use, fire control, or both.
10. Clearly identify areas for tree preservation.
11. Payment of Western Cranston Capital Facilities Impact Fees of \$ 13,895.00 (\$1,389.50 x 10) at the time of Final plat recording.

Aye votes: Chairman Guglietta, Mr. Petit, Mr. Schiappa, Mr. Rossi, Mr. Devine and Councilwoman McFarland. There were no nay votes.

Preliminary Plan Approval

On the matter of Preliminary Plan approval, staff found the submittal inconsistent with the conditions imposed on the Master Plan approved on June 8, 2004 and as revised above on May 2, 2006 through the re-instatement process and therefore, upon motion made by Councilwoman McFarland and seconded by Mr. Devine, unanimously voted to continue the public hearing and further deliberations to its July 11, 2006 meeting and established May 23, 2006 as a deadline for the applicants submittal for July 11 consideration.

Staff noted these time frames were necessary to ensure that reviewing entities such as Veolia Water, the Public Works Department and its Engineering Division have sufficient time to conduct their analysis and provide written responses to the Planning Department.

Aye votes: Chairman Guglietta, Mr. Petit, Mr. Schiappa, Mr. Rossi, Mr. Devine and Councilwoman McFarland. There were no nay votes.

Farm House Lane – Master Plan

Major Land Development, RPD, with street creation
AP 23, Lot 12
AP 24, Lots 66 and 105

Attorney John DiBona, representing the applicant, Mr. Frank Paolino, began by explaining that the proposed lot size in this Residential Planned Development is significantly smaller than what is required in an A-80 zone. The proposal is to subdivide the 78 acre parcel into 33 lots; one for the existing home, three for open space/drainage utility lots and 29 for new building lots. He stated that the Land Trust is extremely concerned about preserving the agricultural nature of the land and the developments visual impact on the City's Historic Farm Route.

Kevin Morin, P.E., stated that the site consists of 78 acres and has over 2,800 feet of street frontage on Hope Road and the site is presently used as a tree farm. The eastern portion of the site contains the Narragansett Electric Company easement and wetland streams traverse the property running east to west. He noted that the proposed development will be serviced by public water and sewer and presented the conventional and RPD layout plans in detail.

In concluding the presentation, Mr. DiBona noted that the applicant had been meeting with the Planning Director since the submittal and agreed to: 1) revise the RPD layout to reduce it to a maximum yield of 30 units, 2) route the common driveway of proposed Lots 2 and 3 to the existing Lot 1 curb cut, 3) provide a 50 ft. right-of-way to serve as a potential future access point between the subject abutting lot and 4) widen the proposed pavement width to 28 ft. between the subject and abutting lot.

Mr. Gary Malloy, adjacent property owner to the south and west, raised a concern that the proposed development would cut off access to his property and leave his property landlocked. Mr. Rhodes reiterated that the applicant is willing to provide a 50' wide right-of-way to access Mr. Malloy's property to the west. This proposed right-of-way would provide Mr. Paolino as well as Mr. Malloy a secondary means of ingress and egress to their respective properties. Mr. Schiappa echoed the need for the right-of-way and explained that it should not be misconstrued as the primary access to Mr. Malloy's property. He further explained that if and when Mr. Malloy intends to develop his property, the RIDEM will not deny him access from Hope Road due to the presence of wetlands.

Mr. Tom Dettore, 10 Silo Drive, asked if the newly constructed RISE line was a dedicated line or available for tie in. Mr. Schiappa responded that the RISE line is available for property owners to connect.

Ms. Katherine Smith, Land Trust Member, expressed concern with 1) the reduced lot size in the RPD proposal compared to the conventional plan, 2) the proposed roadway crossing the 100 ft. riverbank wetland, 3) preservation of the existing vegetation along the perimeter of the site and the proposed large tracts of preserved open space, 4) and the applicant's attempt to preserve the ecology of the site and its habitat, asking that existing vegetation remain untouched. She also asked if the developer would consider the possibility of providing a walking path to and around the ½ acre cul-de-sac bulb.

Mr. Rhodes addressed Ms. Smith's comments, stating that the 100 ft. riverbank wetlands will need to be altered for the proposed roadway crossings. In response to concerns raised regarding the subdivision's location along the Cranston Historic Farm Route, Mr. Rhodes stated the owners/developer have worked to preserve the rural character of Hope Road by proposing an RPD.

Mr. Rhodes presented the staff memo dated May 1, 2006, which is attached and made part of these minutes. He explained that the conventional subdivision plan allows for a total yield of 30 units. The RPD plan will actually allow for a total of 31 units given that the proposed configuration of Lot 1 would allow for its further subdivision into two lots. This is in conflict with the City's RPD requirements and requires that Lot 1 have a deed restriction preventing any future development or subdivision of that lot into perpetuity. He recommended that the common driveway proposed for Lots 2 and 3 be routed over the existing curb cut presently located on Lot 1 with corresponding deed restriction prohibiting additional curb cuts along Hope Road.

Mr. Joseph Manny, 571 Hope Road, asked the Commission who owns the sewer and water lines that will be brought into the development. Mr. Schiappa responded that only the portion of the sewer that lies in the public road is owned and maintained by the City, and The Providence Water Supply Board owns and maintains the public water lines in the roadway.

Mr. Rhodes stated that the developer will be responsible for a water main installation and the reconstruction of Hope Road. He further stated that the City is trying to maintain the rural character of Hope Road and preserve as much of the existing vegetation as possible, but it will be difficult to control encroachment on the open space areas as they will be under the jurisdiction of the homeowners association.

Chairman Guglietta questioned the dimensions of the proposed buffer area. Mr. Rhodes stated that the developer has proposed a 200 ft. easement. The City has asked him to consider an additional 200 ft., which would produce a 400 ft. conservation easement. The additional 200 ft. the developer was asked to consider is primarily within the jurisdiction of the RIDEM.

Ms. King stated that while she appreciates Mr. Rhodes attempt to maintain the rural character of Hope Road, however, it is her opinion that the Land Trust should be given ownership of this open

space in order to maintain the aesthetics of the Historic Farm Route on Hope Road. If the Land Trust cannot ensure the protection of this corridor, it may jeopardize their ability to secure funding for other projects in the future.

Attorney DiBona explained that conservation easements have been accomplished in other areas where property owners maintain ownership of the RIDEM land and also because that portion of the property regulated by the RIDEM.

In summary, Chairman Guglietta stated that the developer has made a reasonable proposal for this parcel of land, and the Preliminary Plan should provide a suitable conservation easement.

There being no further discussion, the Commission moved to a vote. Upon motion made by Chairman Guglietta and seconded by Councilwoman McFarland, the Commission unanimously voted to adopt the Findings of Fact denoted below and to *approve* this Master Plan submittal with waivers for roadway width, length, and the provision of sidewalks, subject to the following conditions.

Positive 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 mailing and the meeting agenda has been properly posted. This major subdivision has been properly advertised per Section V.F.2.c of the City of Cranston Subdivision Regulations. The required advertisement appeared in the 4/19/06 edition of the *Cranston Herald*.
2. The proposed subdivision and its resulting gross density of approximately .38 residential units per acre is consistent with the City of Cranston Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map which designates the property in question as "Residential" allowing less than one residential unit per acre.
3. The property in question has adequate permanent physical access to Hope Road, an improved public roadway located within the City of Cranston.

Negative Findings of Fact:

4. The proposal is not consistent with the City of Cranston Zoning Code and Subdivision Regulation requirements for Residential Planned Districts (RPD). The RPD plan allows for one more unit than would be permitted under the conventional subdivision plan.
5. Applicable permits from the Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management have not been received as of this date and therefore the environmental impact of the development is uncertain at this time.
6. Applicable permits from Veolia Water and the Providence Water Supply Board have not been approved as of this date and therefore it is uncertain as to whether the development will result in the creation of individual lots with such physical constraints that building on those lots according to pertinent regulations and building standards would be impracticable.
7. The proposals failure to provide for a future secondary point of access and roadway connection with the abutting parcel does not promote high quality design and construction, and compromises its integration with the surrounding area.
8. The proposals failure to provide for a future secondary point of access and roadway connection with the abutting parcel compromises the City's ability to provide for safe and adequate local circulation and vehicular through traffic between the two parcels.
9. The property is a significant contributor to the City's Historic Farm Route yet additional opportunities to preserve the rural / agricultural character of the area through open space provision could be furthered.
10. The proposals conformance with local regulations for mitigating flooding and soil erosion is uncertain at this time.

Conditions of Approval

1. Revise RPD layout to yield a maximum of 30 allowable units or place a deed restriction with corresponding plan notations on lot 1 prohibiting its further subdivision into perpetuity.
2. Common driveway proposed for lots 2 and 3 to be routed over the existing curb cut presently located on Lot 1 with corresponding deed restriction prohibiting additional curb cuts along Hope Road placed on lots 2 and 3 and shared driveway easement placed over lot 1.
3. The "Suitable Area Calculations" Table of sheet 6 to be revised to show calculations for all open space parcels and conformance with the City's RPD requirements for open space provision.
4. Open space parcels to be appropriately numbered (lot 31, 32, 33 etc.) on the Preliminary Plan submission and owned by the Homeowners Association.
5. Areas and recipients of proposed conservation easements to be addressed at the Preliminary review stage.
6. Detailed landscape/buffer planting plan designed to screen the view of the proposed development from the City's Historic Farm Route to be provided at Preliminary review. Plan to address the existing vegetation and nursery stock located within the proposed open space and conservation areas.
7. Provision of a 50' wide public right-of-way (paper street) between proposed Farm House Lane and abutting A.P. 23 Lot 11 to be appropriately included in the layout and design so as to provide for the possibility of potential future secondary point of access.
8. Written approval from Veolia water for the design and installation of proposed sewer utilities.
9. Written approval from the Providence Water Supply Board for the design and installation of the water main extensions required along Hope Road and the proposed Farm House Lane.
10. Receipt of applicable RIDEM permits.
11. Preliminary plan submittal to detail all necessary infrastructure installations and repairs to be undertaken by the applicant within the Hope Road right-of-way.
12. Proposed Farm House Lane's pavement width to be increased to 28'.
13. Draft Homeowners Association documents to be provided at Preliminary submittal including reference to the presence and location of conservation easements and RIDEM regulated wetlands on site and acknowledging the Association's responsibility for the care and maintenance of the proposed detention facilities.
14. Installation of granite bounds to allow easy identification of the conservation and wetland jurisdictional limits in the field.
15. Applicant to propose realignment of Hope Road and its right-of-way in the vicinity of the existing home so as to improve sight distances along the existing curve.

Aye votes: Chairman Guglietta, Mr. Petit, Mr. Schiappa, Mr. Rossi, Mr. Devine and Councilwoman McFarland. There were no nay votes.

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW ITEMS

BARBARA WHITE 27 RAVEN CIRCLE CRANSTON RI 02921 (OWN/APP) has filed an application for permission to build a 627+/- SF family accessory apartment with an attached single car garage at **27 Raven Circle**. AP 35, lot 278, area 21,124+/- SF, zoned A-20. Applicant seeks relief from Sections; 17.92.020 Special Use Permit, 17.24.010 F Accessory Family Apartments.

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 and will not impair the intent or purpose of the Comprehensive Plan.
2. The proposed addition does not change the density of the surrounding area, and will not impair the intent or purpose of the Zoning Ordinance.
3. The proposed accessory family apartment addition exceeds the maximum allowed square footage by 27 sq. ft. but meets all remaining specific requirements in the zoning code.
4. The proposed 26.33' x 24' addition and 13' x 21' garage meet all required yard setbacks. The proposed rear garage addition only requires a 10' rear yard setback, and not 30 feet as noted in the application.
5. The 16 ft. wide driveway approach to the new rear garage cannot provide a sufficient turning radius width for entrance into the garage from the driveway. A minimum entrance width of 24 ft. is required for a 90 degree turn into the new garage from the driveway.

Recommendation

Upon motion made by Mr. Petit and seconded by Mr. Rossi, the Planning Commission unanimously voted to recommend *approval* with the following conditions:

1. That the applicant enters into the Zoning Board of Review's record of proceedings, sufficient evidence satisfying the remaining standards for the granting of variances relating to hardship, least relief necessary, mere inconvenience and reasonable use, as put forth in R.I.G.L. 45-24-41.
2. Locate the proposed garage 8 ft. to the east so that the required 24 ft. approach can be accommodated.

Aye votes: Chairman Guglietta, Mr. Petit, Mr. Devine, Mr. Rossi, Mr. Schiappa and Councilwoman McFarland. There were no nay votes.

HERITAGE PROPERTIES LLC 46 COLDBROOK DRIVE CRANSTON 02920 (OWN/APP) has filed an application for permission to build a two story two family dwelling on an undersized lot at the corner of **Cranston Street and Cavalry**. AP 8/1, lot 339, area 6750+/- SF, zoned B-1. Applicant seeks relief from Sections; 17.92.010 Variance, 17.20.120 Schedule of Intensity.

This application was reviewed for conformance with criteria (3) of R.I.G.L. 45-24-41 (c) “Standards for Variance” which reads as follows:

“That the granting of the requested variance will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the zoning ordinance or the comprehensive plan upon which the ordinance is based.”

Findings of fact:

1. The Comprehensive plan's Future Land Use Map allows for densities in excess of 8 units per acre, and therefore, the application is consistent with and will not impair the intent or purpose of the Comprehensive Plan.
2. The average lot size for the 23 existing legal 2 family units within the 400' radius is 6,012 S.F.

3. The proposal will result in a 2 family on a 6,750 S.F. lot, which is approximately 11% larger than the average 2-family lot size within the neighborhood.
4. Within the 400' radius, only 5 two-family dwellings are situated on conforming lots.
5. The application provides 4 off-street parking spaces. Two within the garage, and two outside the garage, as required by the Zoning Code.
6. Two-family structures are allowed in B-1 zones; therefore, the application will not alter the general character of the neighborhood, or impair the intent and purpose of the Zoning Code.

Recommendation

Upon motion made by Mr. Petit and seconded by Mr. Rossi, the Planning Commission unanimously voted to recommend *approval* with the following condition:

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

Aye votes: Chairman Guglietta, Mr. Petit, Mr. Devine, Mr. Rossi, Mr. Schiappa and Councilwoman McFarland. There were no nay votes.

DAWN GIARUSSO 41 SHERWOOD STREET CRANSTON RI 02920 (OWN/APP) has filed an application for permission to leave an existing two family home on a 5381 +/- SF [lot 1786] with restricted frontage, front and side yard setbacks and convert an existing two car garage into a single family home on the abutting 5694 +/- SF [lot 1785] with restricted frontage and side yard setback at **41 Sherwood Street**. AP 8, lots 1785 and 1786, area 11,075 +/- SF, zoned B-1. Applicant seeks relief from Sections; 17.92.010 Variance, 17.20.120 Schedule of Intensity, 17.88.010 Substandard 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 Comprehensive plan's Future Land Use Map allows for densities in excess of 8 units per acre. The proposed density for the two lots in question is 11.8 units per acre; therefore, the application is consistent with and will not impair the intent or purpose of the Comprehensive Plan.
2. The application will however, alter the general character of the surrounding area and impair the intent or purpose of the zoning ordinance.
3. Both of the applicant's lots have 40 ft. frontages. The average frontage of the 21 residential parcels on Sherwood Street is 68.6', therefore the proposal falls 41.6 % below the average frontages existing on the street.
4. The average parcel area for the 40 single family dwellings within the 400' radius is 6485 s.f. The single family component of the proposal is therefore 12.2 % smaller than the neighborhood average.
5. The average parcel area for the 27 two-family dwellings within the 400' radius is 6997 s.f. The two-family component of this proposal is therefore 23 % smaller than the neighborhood average.
6. The four off-street parking spaces required by the existing 2-family located on lot 1786 are currently provided for on lot 1785.
7. Development of lot 1785 for single family purposes will eliminate the 4 off-street parking spaces required by the existing 2 family located on lot 1786.

8. The four off-street parking spaces required for the existing 2 family cannot be provided for on lot 1786, due to its narrow frontage and existing building footprint.
9. The proposed single family on lot 1785 will have a 1' side yard setback for the 45' depth of the proposed building. The abutting lot, #1784, is currently vacant. Analysis using the City's GIS shows that only 18% of pre-existing houses in the 400' radius have side yard setbacks less than 3 feet.

Recommendation

In accordance with R.I.G.L. 45-24-14, and upon motion made by Mr. Devine and seconded by Mr. Schiappa, the Planning Commission unanimously voted to recommend *denial* for the following reasons:

1. The resulting lot areas and frontages do not conform to the averages in the surrounding neighborhood, and therefore, the application is inconsistent with the general character of the surrounding area, and will impair the intent and purpose of the zoning ordinance.
2. The four off-street parking spaces required by the existing 2-family house cannot be accommodated on site (assessor's lot 1786.)

Note: Though the abutting lot to the left of Lot 1785 is currently vacant, the applicant's proposed setback of 1' for the entire new building could become an issue if the abutting lot is developed.

Aye votes: Chairman Guglietta, Mr. Petit, Mr. Devine, Mr. Rossi, Mr. Schiappa and Councilwoman McFarland. There were no nay votes.

CARMINE BOSCIA 1 COLDBROOK COURT CRANSTON RI02920 AND PAUL AND GINA TRAINOR 7 STACEY DRIVE CRANSTON RI 02920 (OWN) AND CARMINE BOSCIA 1 COLDBROOK COURT CRANSTON RI02920 (APP) have filed an application, pending minor subdivision, for permission to leave an existing single family home on a proposed 11,000 +/- SF [lot 4] and build two new single family homes on proposed lots 3 and 2 with restricted frontage at **7 Stacey Drive**. AP 15/3, lots 576 and 1676, area 6750+/- SF, zoned B-1. Applicant seeks relief from Sections; 17.92.010 Variance, 17.20.120 Schedule of Intensity.

This application was reviewed for conformance with criteria (3) of R.I.G.L. 45-24-41 (c) "*Standards for Variance*" which reads as follows:

"That the granting of the requested variance will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the zoning ordinance or the comprehensive plan upon which the ordinance is based."

Findings of Fact:

1. On April 4, 2006, the Planning Commission voted to approve the associated Minor Subdivision application (see attached).
2. Proposed Lots 2 and 3 do not conform to the frontage requirements of the City of Cranston Zoning Code. In accordance with RIGL 45-23-41 relating to the criteria for the granting of variances, the Planning Commission found that the proposed subdivision will not alter the general character of the surrounding area.
3. The subdivision and the resulting density of 4.5 residential units per acre are consistent with the City of Cranston Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map which designates the subject parcels as "Residential, allowing more than 8 units per acre".
4. The entire neighborhood is zoned A-6. Properties in the surrounding neighborhood are primarily single-family uses.
5. The subdivision does not result in the creation of individual lots with such physical constraints to development that building on those lots according to pertinent regulations and building standards would be impracticable.

6. The application 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.

Recommendation

Upon motion made by Mr. Petit and seconded by Mr. Rossi, the Planning Commission unanimously voted to recommend *approval* with the following condition:

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

Aye votes: Chairman Guglietta, Mr. Petit, Mr. Devine, Mr. Rossi, Mr. Schiappa and Councilwoman McFarland. There were no nay votes.

GLORIA J COHEN 66 CALAMAN ROAD CRANSTON RI 02910 (OWN/APP) has filed an application for permission to build a 24' x 30' two story addition to an existing legal non-conforming single family dwelling with restricted front and rear and side yard setback at **66 Calaman Road**. AP 9/5, lot 2136, area 5866+/- SF, zoned A-6. Applicant seeks relief from Sections; 17.92.010 Variance, 17.20.120 Schedule of Intensity. No attorney. **This Application was TABLED.**

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 Planning Commission recommended denial on this application on March 7, 2006, since the addition resembled an additional, stand alone living unit, and resulted in a 7' rear yard setback, which was inconsistent with the general character of the neighborhood.
2. The Zoning Board of Review subsequently tabled the application on March 8, so that the applicant could resubmit plans showing a smaller addition.
3. The applicant has since submitted a revised plan that reduces the addition's footprint from 24' x 30' to 20' x 24.
4. Whereas the original proposal would have resulted in a rear yard setback of 7 feet, the revised proposal increases the proposed rear yard setback to 14.53 feet, where 20 feet is required.
5. Analysis using the City's GIS System indicates that the average rear yard set back for those properties located on the same block as the subject property is 30', but by removing the existing garage, the proposed addition increases the existing rear yard setback of 10.03' to 14.53', thereby reducing the existing nonconformity.
6. Whereas the original proposal was for a two story addition, the revised proposal is for a single story addition, with a proposed second story addition instead, on the existing single story house.
7. The proposed addition is 480 sq. ft., and contains a bathroom, bedroom, and living room.
8. The revised proposal and its corresponding floor plans resolve the initial concern that the addition was to serve as a stand alone additional living unit.
9. The proposed addition does not alter the density of the subject parcel or the character of the surrounding area, and therefore, is consistent with, and will not impair, the intent or purpose of the Zoning Code or the Comprehensive Plan on which it is based.

10. The proposed addition will decrease the existing driveway length by 7.5 ft. which will eliminate one parking space in the driveway. A recent photo shows two cars in the driveway and a Sports Utility Vehicle and six-wheel truck parked on the applicant's lawn.

Recommendation

Upon motion made by Mr. Petit and seconded by Mr. Rossi, the Planning Commission unanimously voted to recommend *approval* with the following conditions:

1. That the applicant enters into the Zoning Board of Review's record of proceedings, sufficient evidence satisfying the remaining standards for the granting of variances relating to hardship, least relief necessary, mere inconvenience and reasonable use, as put forth in R.I.G.L. 45-24-41.
2. Provide an appropriate number of paved, off-street parking spaces for the total number of household vehicles, and obtain a curb opening permit from the City of Cranston's Public Works Department, if necessary.

Aye votes: Chairman Guglietta, Mr. Petit, Mr. Devine, Mr. Rossi, Mr. Schiappa and Councilwoman McFarland. There were no nay votes.

EXTENSIONS OF TIME

Lippitt Farm – Master Plan AP 30, Lot 250

Mr. Rhodes presented the staff memorandum, dated May 1, 2006, which is attached and made part of these minutes, found the following and recommended approval.

1. The applicant is committed to the project and continues making regular progress in addressing RIDEM wetland and ISDS permitting requirements.
2. The inability to attain RIDEM Subdivision Suitability approval due to "inconclusive" as opposed to "unacceptable" soil evaluation findings represents "good cause" for the extension.
3. Granting of the extension will provide the time needed for the applicant to complete the RIDEM permitting requirements and advance the proposal to the Preliminary subdivision review stage.

Upon motion made by Councilwoman McFarland and seconded by Mr. Rossi, the Commission unanimously voted to *approve* the applicants request for a one year extension of time.

Note: Granting of the extension will provide the time needed for the applicant to complete the RIDEM permitting requirements and advance the proposal to the preliminary subdivision review stage. Future requests for additional extensions are not to be considered unless RIDEM Subdivision Suitability approval has been received prior to May 2, 2007.

MISCELLANEOUS

Comprehensive Plan

Mr. Rhodes stated that he met with Mr. Ken Buckland of The Cecil Group in late April. At that time they went through each amendment of the existing 1992 Comprehensive Plan so as to ensure that those amendments are included in the Comprehensive Plan update. He and the consultant are meeting every two weeks and seem to be making progress.

DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, June 6, 2006 at 7 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chamber

ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion made by Mr. Devine and seconded by Mr. Petit, the Commission unanimously voted to adjourn at 10:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jason M. Pezzullo
Principal Planner/Secretary