

MINUTES

September 1, 2020

Chairman Smith called the City Plan Commission Meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. via Zoom.

The following Commission members were in attendance: Chairman Smith, Ken Mason, Robert Strom, Ann Marie Maccarone, Kathleen Lanphear, Frederick Vincent, Joseph Morales and Robert Coupe. Commissioner DiStefano was absent.

The following Planning Department members were in attendance: Jason M. Pezzullo, Planning Director, Douglas McLean, Principal Planner, Joshua Berry, Senior Planner, Joanne Resnick, Clerk.

Also attending: Steve Marsella, Assistant City Solicitor.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Upon motion made by Mr. Vincent and seconded by Mr. Mason, the Commission voted (7/0 -Mr. Morales abstained) to approve the minutes of the February 22, 2020, Plan Commission/City Council Site Walk Meeting.

Upon motion made by Mr. Coupe and seconded by Mr. Mason, the Commission unanimously voted (8/0) to approve the minutes of the July 7, 2020, Plan Commission Meeting.

Upon motion made by Mr. Strom and seconded by Mr. Mason, the Commission voted (6/0 - Mr. Vincent and Ms. Lanphear abstained) to approve the minutes of the August 11, 2020, Plan Commission/City Council Site Walk Meeting.

ORDINANCE RECOMMENDATION

Ordinance 7-20-04 Ordinance in amendment of Ch.17 of the Code of the City of Cranston, 2005, entitled "Zoning" (Change of Zone – New London Ave.). Petition filed by Coastal Partners LLC, Mulligan's Island LLC, and State of Rhode Island.

The applicant submitted a written request for this matter to be continued to the next Plan Commission Meeting on October 6, 2020. Ms. Lanphear expressed concern that the "90 day clock" is continuing and that the commissioners would have insufficient time to review the revised plan. Attorney Bolton, on behalf of the applicants, stated that the request indicates the clients' agreement with this continuance. He emphasized that his client is consenting to the additional thirty days needed for review.

Mr. Vincent pointed out that the application was not signed by the State and asked whether or not this application was ever deemed complete. Mr. Pezzullo responded, stating that the application was signed by RIDOT, however, the Planning Department didn't realize that this was an inappropriate entity that signed the application. Mr. Berry pointed out that the application was submitted to the City Clerk's office as this is an application for a change of zone, not a subdivision application.

Mr. Vincent expressed concern with Parcels 3 and 4. Attorney Bolton stated that he expects to submit a revised plan prior to the next Plan Commission Meeting. He acknowledged that the traffic study is not done,

nor is the peer review of that study. He stated that he is prepared to ask for another continuance if the necessary materials are not received in time.

Mr. Marsella stated that the Plan Commission has 45 days to make their recommendation. He stated that, "as Mr. Bolton said, the applicant would always agree so as to avoid a negative recommendation on the ordinance". Mr. Vincent then asked if "the clock starts again if there are changes made to the proposal". Mr. Marsella responded, stating that "if the clerk deems this is a new (major change) proposal then it may be considered a new ordinance". Mr. Bolton then stated that "changes, as long as they are made at a public meeting, may proceed".

Upon motion made by Mr. Strom and seconded by Mr. Vincent, the Plan Commission unanimously voted (8/0) to continue this matter to the October 6, 2020, Plan Commission Meeting.

Ordinance 7-20-03 Ordinance in amendment of Chapter 17 of the Code of the City of Cranston, 2005, entitled "Zoning" (Citizens Guide to Land Development Process). Sponsored by Councilmembers Hopkins and Paplauskas.

Mr. Pezzullo explained that the Citizen's Guide will not be as detailed as the ordinance suggests but instead will be "something more broad and not very deep". He stated that it should not be viewed as a developers guide to the process.

Ms. Pauline DeRosa, 97 Cypress Drive, stated that it was she who suggested the creation of this type of document.

No further public comment was offered on this matter.

Upon motion made by Mr. Vincent and seconded by Ms. Lanphear, the Commission unanimously voted (8/0) to recommend approval of the proposed ordinance.

SUBDIVISION AND LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS

Replat Oaklawn Plat Lots 86, 87, 88 & 89

Minor Subdivision without street extension
Two (2) additional house lots
21 Turner Avenue
AP 18-4, Lots 485, 486, 489, and 490

Mr. Berry reminded the Commission that on December 3, 2019, they had approved the application to subdivide the same parcels conditioned upon the applicant being granted relief for lot area and frontage. The ZBR did not grant said relief, therefore, the subdivision did not move forward.

Mr. Berry presented his staff report to the Commission and stated that the applicant proposes to subdivide/merge the existing four (4) lots into three (3) lots for the purposes of creating two (2) additional buildable lots. There is a pre-existing conforming single-family dwelling on site which is to remain on proposed Parcel A which would consist of 8,000 ft² on the northern portion of the property. Proposed new buildable parcels B and C contain 6,000 ft² each. The applicant is seeking relief for a 3.7' encroachment into the required 8' side yard setback. All parcels in the proposed subdivision will have direct frontage along Turner Avenue. The applicant proposes to raze the existing home should zoning not be granted this time. The result would be 3 conforming lots for development. The proposed development would be serviced by public water and public sewer systems. The proposal is consistent with the density prescribed by the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map with an allocation of Residential 7.26 to 3.63 units per acre.

The applicant's attorney, Christopher Dividio, stated that Mr. Berry explained the proposal well and had nothing else to offer.

Neighboring property owner, Mr. Mike Luciano of 26 Turner Avenue, expressed concern with the encroachment and with parking and the “blind hill” when approaching from the north. He stated that this is a safety issue. He suggested that only one home be built with a circular driveway so that vehicles can exit in a forward motion rather than have to back out into the street. Finally, he stated that if the existing home needs to be torn down, “so be it”.

Mr. Vincent inquired about the slope of Turner Avenue as to its effect on ingress and egress of the proposed lots. Mr. Berry stated that the Plan Commission does review the application for slope, ingress and egress. He stated that the Traffic Safety Division did not express concern with this proposal. Mr. Pezzullo stated that “we have never denied a subdivision based on the steepness of a hill” as a mild slope does not equate to unbuildable. Ms. Maccarone suggested the Traffic Safety Division look at this proposal again. Staff noted that the DPW has already reviewed this proposal twice.

Mr. Ogilvie, 20 Turner Avenue, expressed concern with the existing roadway and icy winter conditions.

Attorney Dividio stated that the City’s Traffic Division and DPW has done their job in reviewing this application. He also stated that traffic safety testimony should be taken from experts.

Mr. Luciano stated that he “is a traffic expert because I’ve lived in this neighborhood for fifty years”. He also stated that he was responsible for having stop signs installed by the City.

Ms. Lanphear suggested the Traffic Safety Division take another look at this again and make recommendations on possible mitigations.

Mr. Vincent stated that he would like to see cars be able to exit driveways in a forward motion. The developer, Barbara Gaglione, stated that she would construct a hammerhead to accomplish this request.

Assistant City Solicitor, Steve Marsella, then stated that the issue of traffic should be dealt with by the Zoning Board of Review. The subdivision replat does not rely on the side setback zoning relief.

Upon motion made by Mr. Coupe and seconded by Mr. Vincent, the Plan Commission unanimously voted (8/0) to adopt the Findings of Fact denoted below and **APPROVE** this Preliminary Plan, with a waiver for the provisions for sidewalks and curbing, subject to the conditions following the findings.

Findings of Fact

This Preliminary Plan application was reviewed for conformance with required standards set forth in RIGL Section 45-23-60, as well as the City of Cranston’s Subdivision and Land Development Regulations.

RIGL § 45-23-60. Procedure – Required findings. (a)(1) states, “The proposed development is consistent with the comprehensive community plan and/or has satisfactorily addressed the issues where there may be inconsistencies.”

1. The proposed subdivision is consistent with the City of Cranston Comprehensive Plan policies and Future Land Use Map (FLUM). The proposed resulting density of approximately 6.53 units per acre is consistent with the FLUM’s designation of the subject parcel as “Residential 7.26 to 3.63 units per acre.”
2. The proposal is consistent with Comprehensive Plan Goal HG-5, “Conserve housing resources, especially affordable housing units, to preserve the base housing stock, as the costs of locating and constructing new housing units are significant.”
3. Significant cultural, historic or natural features that contribute to the attractiveness of the community have not been identified on site.

RIGL § 45-23-60. Procedure – Required findings. (a)(2) states, “The proposed development is in compliance with the standards and provisions of the municipality’s zoning ordinance.”

4. All of the proposed lots will conform to zoning.
5. Zoning relief is requested for the existing residence to encroach into the relocated side property line. Approval of the subdivision shall be conditioned to zoning relief, or if relief is denied, the demolition or relocation of the existing structure so there is no encroachment.
6. The proposal will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the Cranston Zoning Code.

RIGL § 45-23-60. Procedure – Required findings. (a)(3) states, “There will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed development as shown on the final plan, with all required conditions for approval.”

7. There is no proposed vegetation clearing other than for the footprint of a potential structures. With the exception of the existing single-family residence and associated improvements, the rest of the site is currently undeveloped grass lawn with a few trees and bushes.
8. The Rhode Island November 2018 Natural Heritage map shows that there are no known rare species located on the site.

RIGL § 45-23-60. Procedure – Required findings. (a)(4) states, “The subdivision, as proposed, will not result in the creation of individual lots with any physical constraints to development that building on those lots according to pertinent regulations and building standards would be impracticable. (See definition of Buildable lot). Lots with physical constraints to development may be created only if identified as permanent open space or permanently reserved for a public purpose on the approved, recorded plans.”

9. 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.
10. The design and location of building lots, utilities, drainage and other improvements conform to local regulations for mitigation of flooding and soil erosion.

RIGL § 45-23-60. Procedure – Required findings. (a)(5) states, “All proposed land developments and all subdivision lots have adequate and permanent physical access to a public street. Lot frontage on a public street without physical access shall not be considered in compliance with this requirement.”

11. The properties in question will have adequate permanent physical access on Turner Ave, a public roadway located within the City of Cranston.
12. 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.

Conditions of approval

1. The applicant shall receive the necessary relief from the Zoning Board of Review for the encroachment of the existing residence into the side yard setback on Parcel A. Should relief be granted, the adjacent side yard setback for proposed Parcel B shall be 12 feet instead of 8’ feet. If relief is denied, the existing residence must be demolished or relocated as to eliminate the encroachment into the side yard setback and the side yard setback for Parcel B will be 8’;
2. The applicant shall pay the Eastern Cranston Capital Facilities Impact Fee in the amount of \$1,186.92 (\$593.46 per new buildable lot) at the time of Final Plan recording.

Sintra Seven Minor Subdivision

Minor Subdivision without street extension
One (1) additional house lot
Intersection of Clarence and Magnolia Street
AP 5, Lot 99

Attorney John DiBona explained the proposal to subdivide a 10,000 sq. ft. lot with an existing single-family house into two lots. He stated that 79% are on 5,000 sq. ft. lots in the 400 ft. radius. He stated that a colonial style home is proposed, in keeping with the character of the neighborhood. If approved, one new lot will host the existing single-family house on 5,000 sq. ft. of land, and the other new lot will be a vacant buildable parcel on 5,000 sq. ft. of land. The application requires dimensional variances for substandard lot size (proposed 5,000 sq. ft. where 6,000 sq. ft. is required) for both new parcels, and a substandard frontage variance (50' where 60' is required). This application will require subsequent approval for dimensional relief from the Zoning Board of Review. The proposed subdivision is located in a B-1 zone. The proposal conforms to the Future Land Use Map and Comprehensive Plan Housing Element.

Mr. McLean concurred with Mr. DiBona's introduction of the project. No public comment was offered on this matter.

Upon motion made by Mr. Vincent and seconded by Mr. Coupe, the Plan Commission voted (7/1 – Ms. Lanphear voted nay) to adopt the Findings of Fact denoted below and **approve** this Preliminary Plan, subject to the following conditions.

RIGL § 45-23-60. Procedure – Required findings. (a)(1) states, "The proposed development is consistent with the comprehensive community plan and/or has satisfactorily addressed the issues where there may be inconsistencies."

1. The Cranston Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map designates the subject parcels as "Single/Two Family Residential Less Than 10.89 units per acre". The proposed density of the project is 8.71 units/per acres (including the pre-existing single-family dwelling) so the project is in conformance with the Future Land Use Map despite the need for a lot size variance. Additionally, the Land Use Plan Element recognizes that many existing lots in the eastern portion of the city are undersized, and the Comprehensive Plan supports the development of these lots, stating: "...the City grants variances routinely when properties are 5,000 square feet limiting the purpose and effectiveness of the existing minimum size requirements. The City needs to address this issue and consider changing regulations to reflect the higher density in these areas, which are essentially built out and have an older housing stock." The Comprehensive Plan supports the development of undersized lots and provides clear policy direction relevant to this proposal. Furthermore, the proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan Housing Element in that development of infill lots is encouraged in Eastern Cranston.
2. Significant cultural, historic or natural features that contribute to the attractiveness of the community have not been identified on site.

RIGL § 45-23-60. Procedure – Required findings. (a)(2) states, "The proposed development is in compliance with the standards and provisions of the municipality's zoning ordinance."

3. The proposed lots will require zoning relief for substandard lot size and frontage. Should approval be granted through a separate decision by the Zoning Board of Review, the project will be in compliance with the City's zoning ordinance

4. The proposal will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of the Cranston Zoning Code.

RIGL § 45-23-60. Procedure – Required findings. (a)(3) states, “There will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed development as shown on the final plan, with all required conditions for approval.”

5. Clearing of vegetation (trees and bushes) would be needed in order to accommodate development on the proposed new buildable lot. However, the vegetation does not provide environmental habitat, and is located within a dense urban neighborhood. Additionally, the project will be subject to all local, state and federal standards regarding environmental impacts. Thus no negative environmental impacts are anticipated.
6. The Rhode Island November 2018 Natural Heritage map shows that there are no known rare species located on the site.

RIGL § 45-23-60. Procedure – Required findings. (a)(4) states, “The subdivision, as proposed, will not result in the creation of individual lots with any physical constraints to development that building on those lots according to pertinent regulations and building standards would be impracticable. (See definition of Buildable lot). Lots with physical constraints to development may be created only if identified as permanent open space or permanently reserved for a public purpose on the approved, recorded plans.”

7. 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.
8. The design and location of building lots, utilities, drainage and other improvements conform to local regulations for mitigation of flooding and soil erosion.

RIGL § 45-23-60. Procedure – Required findings. (a)(5) states, “All proposed land developments and all subdivision lots have adequate and permanent physical access to a public street. Lot frontage on a public street without physical access shall not be considered in compliance with this requirement.”

9. The properties in question will have adequate permanent physical access on Magnolia Street or Clarence Street, public roadways located within the City of Cranston.
10. 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.

Conditions of approval

1. Applicant shall receive variance approval for substandard lot area and frontage from the Cranston Zoning Board of Review prior to filing the Final Plan Application with the Cranston Planning Department.
2. Payment of the Eastern Cranston Capital Facilities impact fee in the amount of \$593.46 (1 new unit) must be submitted at the time of final plat recording.

Champlin Hills (Major Amendment) – (Extension Request)
Master Plan – Major Land Development w/o street extension
Major Amendment #1 to Final Recorded Plan (Champlin Hills)
Adult Day Care / Medical Clinic
Scituate Avenue, AP 24/2, Lots 2112, 2116 & 2117

Upon motion made by Ms. Lanphear and seconded by Mr. Morales, the Commission unanimously voted (8/0) to grant a one year extension of time of the Master Plan approval originally granted on October 3, 2017.

The Fountains at Chapel View – (Extension Request)

Master Plan – Major Land Development w/o street extension
233,000 sq.ft. of commercial space – 3 phases
Sockanossett Cross Road
AP 14, Lot 15 & portions of AP 14, Lots 2 and 22

Upon motion made by Mr. Vincent and seconded by Mr. Coupe, the Commission unanimously voted (8/0) to grant a one year extension of time of the existing Master Plan approval.

PERFORMANCE GUARANTEE

“The Oaks at Orchard Valley”

Existing Letter of Credit set to expire

Mr. Pezzullo explained that this Letter of Credit can probably be released. Public Works Director, Ken Mason, stated that his department is awaiting confirmation that granite bounds have been set and as-builts have been provided.

No vote was taken on this matter. A letter was sent to the property owner informing them that once the Public Works Department is in receipt of the two outstanding items noted above, they will be in a position to recommend release of the existing Letter of Credit.

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS (See Planning Staff memos for detailed analysis)

- **SINTRA SEVEN, LLC. (OWN/APP)** has filed an application to sub-divide an existing parcel of land leaving an existing dwelling with restricted area, lot width and frontage at **90 Clarence Street**, A.P. 5, lot 99; area 5,000 sf. zoned B1. Applicant seeks relief per 17.92.010 Variance; Section 17.20.120 schedule of Intensity Regulations.

Due to the fact that the application is consistent with the Cranston Comprehensive Plan, and due to the fact that the proposed lot size and frontage is consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhood, upon motion made by Mr. Coupe and seconded by Mr. Strom, the Plan Commission voted (7/1 – Ms. Lanphear voted nay) to forward a **POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION** on the **90** Clarence Street matter to the Zoning Board of Review.

-
- **SINTRA SEVEN, LLC. (OWN/APP)** has filed an application to sub-divide an existing parcel of land and construct a new single family dwelling with restricted area, lot width and frontage at **0 Clarence Street**, A.P. 5, lot 99; area 5,000 sf. zoned B1. Applicant seeks relief per 17.92.010 Variance; Section 17.20.120 schedule of Intensity Regulations.

Due to the fact that the application is consistent with the Cranston Comprehensive Plan, and due to the fact that the proposed lot size and frontage is consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhood, upon motion made by Mr. Vincent and seconded by Mr. Mason, the Plan Commission voted (7/1 – Ms. Lanphear voted nay) to forward a **POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION** on the **0** Clarence Street matter to the Zoning Board of Review.

-
- **RICHARD CARDELLO (OWN) AND BARBARA GAGLIONE (APP)** have filed an application to leave an existing single family dwelling and create a new lot with a restricted side yard setback at **21 Turner Street** A.P. 18, Lot 489 and 490, total area 8,000 sq.ft. Zoned A6. Applicant seeks relief per Sections 17.92.010 Variance; Section 17.20.120 Schedule of Intensity Regulations.

Considering that the increased setback on Parcel B would offset any negative impact, that the relief requested is the minimum relief necessary, that denial would not reduce the number of proposed homes and would amount to more than an inconvenience, that the proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan in terms of density and housing policy, upon motion made by Mr. Vincent and seconded by Mr. Morales, the City Plan Commission unanimously voted (8/0) to forward a **POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION** on this application to the Zoning Board of Review.

- **MARCIA B. SMITH and MARVIN M. SMITH (OWN) and WINES AND MORE OF RI, INC. (APP)** have filed an application to install a new digital and animated sign at **125 Sockanosset Crossroad**, A.P. 10, Lot 1489; area 2.32 ac; zoned C3. Applicant seeks relief per 17.92.010; Section 17.72.010 Signs.

Due to the findings that the proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the character of the commercial area, and due to the assertion that this business should be allowed to have animated sign in place of its changeable copy sign (with restrictions), upon motion made by Ms. Maccarone and seconded by Mr. Coupe the Plan Commission voted (7/1 - Ms. Lanphear voted nay) to forward a **POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION** on this application to the Zoning Board of Review, with restrictions to the sign's luminescence, animation, and frame change timing, and to limit the advertising to on premises content only.

- **ALBERT BACCARI and VIRGINIA A. BACCARI (OWN/APP)** have filed an application to construct an addition to an existing legal non-conforming auto repair shop with restricted rear yard setbacks at **880 Park Avenue** A.P. 9 lot 169; area 21,014 s.f.; zoned C3. Applicant seeks relief per 17.92.010; Sections 17.92.020- Special Use Permit; 17.88.030 (A) - Extension; 17.20.120 – Schedule of Intensity Regulations.

At the applicant's request, upon motion made by Mr. Coupe and seconded by Mr. Vincent, the Plan Commission unanimously voted (8/0) to **CONTINUE** this matter to the October 6, 2020, Plan Commission Meeting.

- **LOMBARDI FAMILY, LLC(OWN/APP)** Has filed an application to install a Minor Accessory Solar Energy System at **45 Burlingame Road**, A.P. 24, Lot 1; area 177.50 ac; zoned A80. Applicant seeks relief per 17.92.020 Special Use Permit; 17.92.010 Variance; Sections 17.20.030 Schedule of Uses, 17.20.090 (L), Specific Requirements, 17.24.020 Solar Energy Systems.

At the applicant's request, upon motion made by Mr. Strom and seconded by Mr. Maccarone, the Plan Commission unanimously voted (8/0) to **CONTINUE** this matter to the October 6, 2020, Plan Commission Meeting.

PLAN COMMISSION POLICY – Commission Rules of Procedure – *Length of Meeting*

(Time Limitation)– The Commission shall not consider new matters or take new testimony after 10:30 P.M. This rule may be waived by an affirmative vote of a majority of the Commission members in attendance)

Ms. Lanphear urged the Commission to think about the idea of instituting a policy where no new testimony or new matters or vote would be taken after 10:30 pm unless waived by an affirmative vote of the majority of the Commission members in attendance.

Mr. Morales asked if the Commission would have to vote to continue the matters we did not hear. Mr. Pezzullo responded, stating that the agenda would be structured so that the matters other boards/committees rely on our recommendations are heard first.

Mr. Coupe suggested considering a time limit for public comment. Mr. Marsella noted that other cities and towns have such limits and stated that he will look into what other commissions/boards are doing and formulate wording of these policies.

Upon motion made by Ms. Lanphear and seconded by Mr. Vincent, the Commission unanimously voted to continue this matter to the October 6, 2020, meeting for further discussion of these matters.

APPLICATION CHECKLISTS - Plan Commission consideration as Policy

Mr. Berry informed the Commission that the items on the checklist “are everything we look at”. He noted the State Board of Registration requirements have been added. Ms. Lanphear suggested the addition of “by the applicant and all owners of record” in the signature section. The Commission praised Mr. Berry for his work on the revision of the checklists, with Mr. Vincent suggesting a press release “to let the public know that the checklists are available on line”.

Upon motion made by Mr. Vincent and seconded by Ms. Maccarone, the Commission unanimously voted (8/0) to adopt the checklists with the addition of Ms. Lanphear’s suggestion.

PLANNING DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Update: Advisory Committee – Natick Avenue Solar

Mr. Pezzullo stated that the first meeting was held last Tuesday and all are invited to attend to see how we are handling the Natick Solar buffering plan.

Comprehensive Plan –

Mr. Pezzullo stated that pre-Covid 19 Pandemic each ward would have had a meeting. He stated the need to get moving once again with public meetings, but was unsure just how we want to approach this question.

Signs –

Mr. Pezzullo noted that we are still working on this item internally and that we will have an amendment prepared when it is ready.

Subdivision Regulation Amendments –

Mr. Pezzullo stated that we have been holding joint pre-application meetings with the City Council on large projects. He stated it would be good to memorialize this process within the Subdivision and Land Development Regulations.

Development Plan Review –

Mr. Pezzullo stated that an amendment should be made to the DPR regulation that requires direct notice to abutters and newspaper advertisement.

Citizens Guide to Development –

Mr. Pezzullo stated that this document will be completed within the next couple of months.

Unified Development –

Mr. Pezzullo stated that “if unified development is adopted, the Plan Commission would be able to “act on limited zoning matters”.

Hazard Mitigation Plan –

Mr. Pezzullo informed the Commission that the Department has received a \$35,000 grant for updating this plan.

Policy Document -

Mr. Pezzullo informed the Commission that the first draft of this document has been done by Peter Lapolla and was submitted to Chairman Smith.

Transition Report –

Mr. Pezzullo explained that he will be “setting the stage for the next few years and will note the need for additional planning department staffing”.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion made by Mr. Vincent and seconded by Mr. Coupe, the Plan Commission unanimously voted to adjourn at 9:40 pm.

NEXT REGULAR MEETING – October 6 - 6:30PM – Teleconference/Zoom