

MINUTES

October 3, 2017

Chairman Smith called the City Plan Commission Meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. in the City Council Chamber. The following Commission members were in attendance:

Michael Smith, Chairman
Fred Vincent
Lynne Harrington
Gene Nadeau
Robert Strom
Kimberly Bittner
Kathleen Lanphear

Also present were: Peter Lapolla, Planning Director
Stephen Marsella, Esq. Assistant City Solicitor
Jason M. Pezzullo, AICP, Principal Planner
J. Resnick, Clerk

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Upon motion made by Mr. Vincent and seconded by Ms. Bittner, the Commission unanimously voted (7/0) to approve the September 5, 2017, Plan Commission Minutes.

SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT

Batcheller Avenue Minor Subdivision

Minor Subdivision without street extension
Preliminary Plan
Batcheller Avenue, St. Mary's Drive
AP 8, Lots 1267, 253-257

Mr. Paul Carlson, Insite Engineering, representing the Diocese of Providence, explained that the seven lots will be reconfigured into four lots, with one lot for the existing office building.

The applicant has proposed to subdivide the parcel and create three (3) additional house lots in the following manner:

- Parcel 1 – 12,591 square feet with 77.5' of frontage;
- Parcel 2 – 6,000 square feet with 60' of frontage;
- Parcel 3 – 8,000 square feet with 80' of frontage;
- Parcel 4 – 1.4 acres with 91' of frontage (existing office building).

The applicant is requesting a waiver for the provision of sidewalks as there is no network with which to connect. A portion of Lot 1 is under wetland jurisdiction and an RIDEM wetlands jurisdiction letter will be sought. It is not located in a FEMA flood plain. All of the proposed lots will be serviced by public water and sewer.

Mr. Frank Card expressed concern that the end of Batcheller Avenue is the only access point to Randall Pond for fishing. He asked that the access be maintained. Mr. Pezzullo stated that the existing access will not be altered but the public will not be allowed to block resident's driveways by parking boat trailers within the public right-of-way.

Mr. Pezzullo stated that the proposed subdivision conforms to the B-1 zoning district and the Cranston Comprehensive Plan for density and use. He further stated that there could possibly be two two-family homes as the subject parcel is zoned B-1 which allows this land use by-right. The proposed subdivision does not require street extension.

Mr. Vincent asked that a notation be added to the final plan that the public access to Randall Pond be maintained.

Upon motion made by Mr. Vincent and seconded by Ms. Lanphear, the Commission voted (6/0 – Ms. Bittner recused) to adopt the Findings of Fact denoted below and approve this Preliminary Plan, with waiver for sidewalk provision; subject to the following conditions.

Findings of Fact

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 9/22/17 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 and its resulting density conform to the Comprehensive Plan – Future Land Use designation of “Residential - Less than 10.89 units per acre”.
3. The proposed subdivision conforms to the dimensional regulations of the B-1 zoning district and will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the Cranston Zoning Code.
4. There will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed subdivision as shown on the Preliminary Plan. However, proposed Parcel 1 will require RIDEM approval for the construction of a single or two-family home at this location.
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 Batcheller Avenue, an improved public roadway 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 \$1,780.38 (\$593.46 x 3) at the time of Final Plat recording.

2. Payment of outstanding application fees in the amount of \$285 (\$405-Preliminary, \$160-Pre-Application) at the time of Final Plan application.
3. Sewer design plans to be submitted to the public works department and Veolia Water and approval shall be granted prior to Final Plan application.
4. Proof of RIDEM wetlands approval for the construction of a single or two-family home on proposed Parcel 1 shall be provided.
5. Final Plan application to appear before the Plan Commission if the DPW Director determines that a performance guarantee is required for the installation of sewers within the City's right-of-way.
6. Notation to be added on the final plan to maintain public access to Randall Pond.

Phenix Woods

Major Subdivision with street extension
Master Plan
Phenix Avenue / Wilshire Lane
AP 22, Lots 226 and 227

Attorney John DiBona, representing United Home Construction; which has a purchase and sale agreement on the subject property, explained the total area of the site is approximately 7.4 acres. The site is zoned A-20 which allows single-family residential homes with 125' of frontage and 20,000 square foot lot size. A portion of Lot 226 will be merged with Lot 227. Wilshire lane will be 30 ft. wide while proposed Brielle Lane will be 24 ft. wide.

The applicant proposes to subdivide the parcel by constructing 1,000+/- linear feet of roadway (connecting Wilshire Lane to Phenix Avenue and one new cul-de-sac *Brielle Lane*) and creating ten new house lots and one drainage utility lot. All of the proposed lots will be serviced by public water and private septic systems. The proposed subdivision conforms to the A-20 zoning district and the subdivision conforms to the Cranston Comprehensive Plan for density and use.

Mr. Nick Piampiano, project engineer, reiterated Mr. DiBona's comments. He further stated that the stormwater runoff will be to the proposed drainage lot. Above-ground utilities will be installed, with a streetlight at the intersection of newly proposed Brielle Lane. OWTS are proposed for all lots. RIPDES permits from the RIDEM have been sought.

Ms. Harrington asked if conservation design had been considered. Mr. Piampiano stated that due to the presence of on-site septic systems, and the need to make the roadway connection, conservation subdivision would not result in any meaningful land conservation.

Ms. Astrid Morales, 6 Wilshire Lane, expressed concern with the connection of Wilshire Lane, as well as potential flooding. As the proposed detention pond is located adjacent to her property, she asked if the detention pond could possibly be relocated. She also expressed concern with "above ground" septic systems proposed. She also asked if a traffic study has been done. Attorney DiBona responded, stating that the City wants the roadway to connect for provision of City services. Mr. Piampiano also responded, stating that the septic has not yet been designed. With a 2-4 ft. water table, he stated that there should not be a problem. The detention pond is proposed at the lowest point on the site and that it has been designed as a shallow, grass depression.

Mr. Fred Wolstencroft asked if ledge was present on the site. Mr. Michael Diderian, 15 Cohasset Lane, expressed concern with ledge and runoff and having an "appropriate buffer zone". Mr. Piampiano responded, stating that there "were a lot of test holes (7-8 ft.)". He stated that Lot 10 had ledge at 82", 74", 65" and 50", which will not impede septic design.

A resident at 1604 Phenix Avenue expressed concern with traffic and stated that the new street opening will be located across from her home. Mr. Lapolla responded, stating that this development would probably add in the range 6-7 cars at peak hour.

Mr. Pezzullo presented his staff report and stated that the Wilshire Lane cul-de-sac bulb was created with a defeasible easement. He further stated that City service departments prefer that roadways be connected whenever possible. He stated that the proposed detention basin will be grass that will be mowed and will not have a perimeter fence. He further stated that the City does not require buffering from a single-family residential home to another single-family residential home. The applicant has proposed a conventional major subdivision with street extension, something which is not very common in Cranston. The Residential Planned District standards have been applied on a regular basis with most of our recent major subdivisions. In this particular case, the narrow lot geometry and the City's desire to connect Wilshire Lane to Phenix Avenue prevents the RPD regulations from being utilized. The applicant shall be required to install precast concrete curbing in accordance with the Subdivision and Land Development Regulations.

Upon motion made by Mr. Nadeau and seconded by Ms. Bittner, the Commission voted (6/1 – Mr. Vincent recused) to adopt the Findings of Fact denoted below and approve this Minor subdivision, with waiver for sidewalk provision; subject to the following conditions:

Findings of Fact

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 9/21/17 and the meeting agenda has been properly posted. Advertisement for this major subdivision was published in the 9/20/17 edition of the Cranston Herald.
2. The proposed subdivision and its resulting density of approximately 2 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 3.63 to 1 residential 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.
4. There will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed subdivision as shown on the Master Plan.
5. The proposed subdivision promotes high quality appropriate design and construction, will be well integrated with the surrounding neighborhoods and will reflect its existing characteristics.
6. The proposed subdivision will not result in the creation of individual lots with such physical constraints to development that building on those lots according to pertinent regulations and building standards would be impracticable.
7. The property in question has adequate permanent physical access on Wilshire Lane and Phenix Avenue, 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 outstanding Pre-Application (\$300) and Master Plan (\$370) application fees totaling \$670 at the time of Preliminary Plan application;
2. Applicant shall coordinate with the Providence Water Supply Board for the design and location of the proposed water main extensions prior to submission of Preliminary Plan;

3. Applicant shall coordinate with the Department of Public Works as their desired width of Brielle Lane, as well as the location of utility / light poles in the neighborhood.
4. Obtain RIDEM approval for the proposed drainage utility lot prior to submission of Preliminary Plan.
5. Preliminary Plan application shall detail the complete removal of the existing Wilshire Lane cul de sac and provide a plan for the restoration of the front yard for AP 22-2, Lot 320.

The Fountains at Chapel View

Major Land Development without street extension
233,000 square feet of commercial space – 3 Phases
Master Plan
Sockanossett Cross Road
AP 14, Lot 15 & portions of AP 14, Lots 2 and 22

Attorney Thomas Moses, Moses and Alfonso, stated that approximately 233,000 square feet of mixed commercial development is proposed. The site will have primary access off of Sockanosset Crossroad at the #100 Sockanosset. It will be anchored by a big-box retailer (to be announced), smaller scale retail shops, restaurants, a parking garage and fueling station. A pedestrian bridge is proposed from the parking area into the main site. He further stated that this project will meet any standards required by RIDOT and the City's traffic regulations.

Planning Consultant Joseph Lombardo, AICP, stated that the majority of the site was rezoned to C-5 with conditions in April, 2015, and the C-5 zoning district specifically permits the proposed uses. The remaining portion is zoned MPD (original Chapel View site) and will be subject to a zone change before the City Council to C-5 with conditions, which allows the proposed mix and density of uses by right. He stated that this project is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan as well as the subdivision and land development regulations.

Mr. Strom asked about the proposed traffic light placement. He stated he assumes that this development will bring additional traffic volumes. He also asked if access from Route 37 was possible. Mr. Bob Clinton, traffic engineer, stated that the property owners have been meeting with RIDOT and intend to mitigate the traffic. Mr. Coates further stated that "the Fung administration, RIDOT and Carpionato Corp. have been working together and will examine the all major roads involved. He stated that access from Route 37 is being explored. He has also met with the library and has heard some of their traffic concerns. He stated that all of these concerns will be mitigated and properly engineered prior to the submission of the Preliminary Plan. He further stated that he will work with the City's traffic engineer their chosen consultant who will conduct a peer review of his own work.

Ms. Harrington expressed concern with the amount of "blacktop" in a project such as this and asked if permeable pavement will be considered. Ms. Moses responded, stating that the developer will "look at it".

Mr. Vincent asked about the "rationale of phasing" and the abandonment of Power Road. Mr. Coates responded, stating that Phase I will be the garage and surface parking as well as infrastructure, Phase II will be construction of the buildings and Phase III will be further retail. Mr. Moses stated that RIDOT has approved his client's purchase of Power Road. He stated that access to State property will end in a cul-de-sac, as required by the State. An access plan for the Fire Department has been approved by the State and the City's Fire Chief. The section of the road that abuts the library and fire station will be maintained.

Attorney Robert Murray, on behalf of CFS Partners, 45-105 Sockanosset Crossroad, expressed concern with the proposal, stating that this is "beyond the run of the mill" application. His client is concerned with the large scale of the proposal as "we don't know the future of Citizen's Bank parcel once it is vacated". His client is concerned with traffic and would like to have RIDOT's opinion, "in writing", of the effect on State roads. He stated he would like to see an impact assessment done. He asked that the Commission "hit the pause button" and further asked for a "workshop" to engage the community.

Mr. Douglas Doe, 178 Lippitt Avenue, expressed concern with any future expansion of the library and traffic and loss of access to Power Road. He asked that this matter be continued. Attorney Moses responded,

stating that a neighborhood meeting was held at the library to address residents concern with traffic. He stated that his client has “a pretty aggressive traffic plan”.

Mr. Lapolla reminded everyone that this is a Master Plan proposal, essentially conceptual, which does not require the level of detail that is required at the time of Preliminary Plan submittal. He stated that traffic improvements must be done prior to issuance of a CO (Certificate of Occupancy). He stated that this project will go out to peer review once the applicants traffic study has been submitted. He stated that Hill side Drive and Sockanosset Crossroad should be included in the traffic study.

Ms. Lanphear questioned Finding of Fact #8 “The proposed major 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.” Mr. Pezzullo responded, stating that the City’s traffic safety department had given his opinion based on his own criteria and based on the Master Plan level of detail required. Mr. Vincent asked that Finding of Fact #8 be revised.

Mr. Vincent then asked that the impact of traffic from Citizens Bank be considered. Attorney Moses stated that as of November, 2018, Citizens Bank will be relocating and the traffic generated there could go “back to a much less dense use”. Mr. Moses further stated that there have been several meetings with the Technical Review Committee; stating that the applicant is aware of the issues that need mitigation and “it will be done”. He asked that the Commission keep in mind what they are approving; “a very preliminary plan”.

Mr. Murray stated that “traffic is not better today than prior to the development of Chapel View”. He stated that he did not know about the neighborhood meeting that was held. He again asked that the proposal be further reviewed; noting the Traffic Safety Division’s concerns. He asked that neighboring property owners have input on proposed curb cuts. He again asked that an impact assessment be completed.

Mr. Robert Clinton, PE, VHB, stated that the applicant “has a couple of mitigation plans” they are considering. He assured the Commission that the developer knows that he has “to live with” this project. He stated that a full traffic impact and access study will be prepared as the project proceeds. The study area will consist of the following roadways:

- New London Avenue (Route 2) from Chapel View Boulevard to Sockanosset Crossroad/Meshanticut Valley Parkway
- Sockanosset Cross Road from New London Avenue (Rt. 2) to Pontiac Avenue
- Pontiac Avenue from Route 37 West Ramps to Sockanosset Crossroad

The study will also include the following intersections:

- New London Avenue (Rt.2) at Chapel View Boulevard
- New London Avenue (Rt.2) at Sockanosset Crossroad/Meshanticut Valley Parkway
- Sockanosset Crossroad at Midway Road
- Sockanosset Crossroad at Power Road
- Sockanosset Crossroad at Chapel View Phase II/Costco West Driveway
- Sockanosset Crossroad at Chapel View Phase II/Costco East Driveway
- Chapel View Boulevard at Power Road
- Pontiac Avenue at Sockanosset Crossroad
- Pontiac Avenue from Route 37 West Ramps to Sockanosset Crossroad

Chairman Smith responded, stating that the Commission needs “a little bit more assurance that we will not be entering into something with negative ramifications”. In response, Attorney Moses mentioned the other property owners along Sockanosset Crossroad and how “we now have a developer willing to bear the burden of making the necessary improvements”.

Mr. Pezzullo reiterated that this project has been to the Technical Review Committee (same members of the Development Plan Review Commission) which “is an unusual step for any Master Plan application”. He further stated that this application has been under review for several months and feels that the Planning Department and the City has enough information to move forward with the Master Plan approval at this time.

He mentioned that there were “concerns” but nothing that amounts to a negative comment from any of the various City departments that took part in this review.

Attorney Moses then proposed that the applicant will submit an interim traffic report to be presented prior to their Preliminary Plan application. The Commission agreed to the submission of an interim traffic report meeting as long as the Commission is given adequate time to review the traffic report.

Upon motion made by Mr. Vincent and seconded by Mr. Nadeau, the Commission voted (5/1/1) – Ms. Lanphear abstained, Ms. Harrington voted nay) to adopt the Findings of Fact denoted below and approve this Master Plan submission subject to the following conditions.

Findings of Fact

Positive Findings

1. An orderly, thorough and expeditious technical review of this Master Plan has been conducted. Property owners within a 100’ radius have been notified via first class mail on 9/21/17 and the meeting agenda has been properly posted. Advertisement for this major subdivision was published in the 9/20/17 edition of the Cranston Herald.
2. The proposed commercial land development is with the City of Cranston Comprehensive Plan’s Future Land Use Map which designates the subject parcel *Highway Commercial*.
3. The proposed major land development is consistent with the special C-5 with conditions zoning district which was established by the City Council in April 2015.
4. Based upon the information provided by the applicant, and the low level of detail required at the Master Plan stage of approval, the application as submitted does not pose a significant negative environmental impact risk if the plan remains consistent within the RIDEM regulatory framework for the management of stormwater management.
5. The proposed major land development promotes high quality appropriate design and construction, will be well integrated with the surrounding area and will reflect its existing characteristics.
6. The proposed subdivision will not result in the creation of individual lots with such physical constraints to development that building on those lots according to pertinent regulations and building standards would be impracticable.
7. The property in question has adequate permanent physical access on Sockanossett Crossroad, an improved public roadway located within the City of Cranston.
8. Based upon the information provided by the applicant, and the low level of detail required at the Master Plan stage of approval, the application as submitted does not pose a significant risk to safe and adequate local circulation of pedestrians, vehicular through traffic, adequate surface water run-off, or for the creation of a suitable building sites.
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. Prior Preliminary Plan application, the applicant shall appear before the City Plan Commission to discuss the full scope of the planned and required traffic study to ensure commission members are given the opportunity to provide input into how the overall study will be executed;
2. Prior to Preliminary Plan application, the applicant shall apply to the Development Plan Review Committee to verify that all required performance standards have been met, including the requirement for a detailed traffic study with peer review by the City;
3. Applicant shall coordinate traffic design work with the Department of Public Works, Traffic Safety Division during the formation of mitigation action strategies;

4. Applicant shall be in receipt of all required approvals from outside agencies prior to submission of Preliminary Plan application for consideration by the Plan Commission;
5. Submission of the traffic report prior to consideration of the Preliminary Plan before the Plan Commission to afford planning staff the opportunity to conduct the peer review of the methodologies and findings.

Champlin Hills – Commercial Development

Major Amendment #1 to Final Recorded Plan (Champlin Hills)
Adult Day Care and Medical Clinic
Master Plan
Scituate Avenue
AP 24/2, Lots 2112, 2116 and 2117

Attorney Thomas Moses explained that the amended proposal consists of additional lots (2112 and 2116) for the construction of a 5,480 sq. ft. building specifically for adult day care and a medical clinic. Mr. Coates added that one of the two existing curb cuts will be eliminated. He stated that the medical clinic will be a “chronic care” clinic primarily for the use of the residents and Scituate Vista residents.

Ms. Harrington asked why the clinic parking is proposed on the Scituate Avenue side. Mr. Douglas Doe also expressed concern with parking in the front. Mr. Coates stated that the building will be less imposing setback and will be screened with landscaping. Mr. Pezzullo stated that shallow setbacks for commercial buildings are not appropriate for a roadway such as Scituate Avenue. This project will be subject to DPR approval. Chairman Smith asked about signage. Mr. Coates stated that there will be a stone wall across the frontage and will most likely have a street address. He stated that it will not be a storefront and will most likely have a pitched roof.

Mr. Pezzullo stated that this matter will go the Zoning Board of Review as, on its face, commercial development is not allowed in this area both in the Comprehensive Plan – Future Land Use Map which calls for residential less than 10.39 units per acre, nor in the Cranston Zoning Code as the lots are zoned A-20.

Staff worked with the applicant to propose a specific land use that would otherwise not be allowed within the zoning code but was still an acceptable complimentary or associated use. We looked back at two such examples from over ten years ago located on Comstock Parkway. This area is almost exclusively M-1 and M-2 Heavy Industrial & Manufacturing. The developer, Richard Licht, made the argument that children’s day care was a necessary and complementary use for workers within the M-1 and M-2 zoning districts and would function well as an accessory use. The City Plan Commission and the Zoning Board agreed not once, but twice for two separate adjacent proposals for the Pumpkin Patch 1 and 2.

The staff recommended adult day care, and the developer has added a small medical clinic. Given that the surrounding neighborhood is comprised of high-density housing geared towards adults nearing or at retirement age, this seems to make sense for a land use (while not authorized) that would serve the community in a meaningful way. Staff also feels that this proposal should be entertained as a major land development with the appropriate use variance considered by the Zoning Board of Review. Staff is inclined to support this application with the explicit condition that the commercial building **only** be utilized for the proposed adult day care and medical clinic. If the developer chooses a different use than what has been offered, the approval from the Plan Commission would therefore be negated.

Mr. Ron and Mrs. Joyce Jamison, Celebrity Condominiums, expressed concern with traffic on Scituate Avenue and asked if the State was doing a traffic study. They also asked about the medical clinic. Mr. Coates responded, stating that Mr. Garofalo has done a traffic study already and the medical clinic would be for “chronic care”.

There being no further public comment, the Commission moved to a vote. Upon motion made by Mr. Strom and seconded by Mr. Vincent, the Commission voted (6/1 – Ms. Harrington voted nay) to adopt the Findings of Fact denoted below and approve this amended Final Plan subject to the following conditions.

Findings of Fact

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 9/21/17 and the meeting agenda has been properly posted. Advertisement for this major subdivision was published in the 9/20/17 edition of the Cranston Herald.
2. There will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed subdivision as shown on the Master Plan.
3. The proposed subdivision promotes high quality appropriate design and construction, will be well integrated with the surrounding neighborhoods and will reflect its existing characteristics.
4. 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.
5. The property in question has adequate permanent physical access on Scituate Avenue, an improved public roadway located within the City of Cranston.
6. 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.
7. Significant cultural, historic or natural features that contribute to the attractiveness of the community have not been identified on site.
8. The design and location of streets, building lots, utilities, drainage and other improvements conform to local regulations for mitigation of flooding and soil erosion.

Negative Findings

1. The proposed commercial land development is inconsistent with the City of Cranston Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map which designates the subject parcel as "Residential" allowing less than 10.39 residential units per acre".
2. The commercial land development proposal is inconsistent with the A-20 residential zoning district of the Cranston Zoning Code.

Conditions of approval

1. The use of the commercial building is specifically limited only to Adult Day Care and Medical Clinic;
2. Applicant shall obtain the appropriate use variances from the Zoning Board of Review for Adult Day Care and Medical Clinic prior to beginning the Development Plan Review process.

ADJOURNMENT

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

NEXT MEETING November 7, 2017 – City Council Chamber, 7 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Jason M. Pezzullo, AICP
Principal Planner/Administrative Officer