

Kenneth J. Hopkins
Mayor

Michael E. Smith
President

Jason M. Pezzullo, AICP
Planning Director



Ken Mason, P.E.
Robert Strom
Frederick Vincent
Kathleen Lanphear
Ann Marie Maccarone
Robert DiStefano
Robert Coupe

Cranston City Hall
869 Park Avenue, Cranston, RI 02910

CITY PLAN COMMISSION

November 2nd, City Plan Commission Meeting

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Michael Smith called the City Plan Commission Meeting to order at 6:34 p.m. in the Council Chamber, 869 Park Avenue.

The following Commissioners were in attendance for the meeting: Chairman Smith, Ken Mason, Ann Marie Maccarone, Robert Coupe, Kathleen Lanphear, and Frederick Vincent. Robert DiStefano and Robert Strom were absent.

The following Planning Department members were in attendance: Jason M. Pezzullo, Planning Director; Doug McLean, Principal Planner; Joshua Berry, Senior Planner; and Alexander Berardo, Planning Technician.

Also attending: Steve Marsella, Esq., Assistant City Solicitor.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Lanphear noted three typos in the draft minutes for the 10/5/21 City Plan Commission meeting but said the draft minutes were otherwise fine.

Upon motion made by Commissioner Lanphear, and seconded by Commissioner Vincent, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously to **approve** the regular City Plan Commission meeting minutes of 10/5/21, with the final version incorporating the requested revisions.

SUBDIVISIONS & LAND DEVELOPMENTS

“Trolley Barn Plaza” (vote taken)

PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL MEETING

Master Plan - Major Land Development
Proposed bank with drive-thru, gas station / mini mart with drive-thru, drive-thru restaurant, retail auto parts / warehouse distribution on 6.91-acre site
Zoned M-2 (General Industry),
777 Cranston Street – AP 7, Lot 1
(Continued from the October 5th Public Informational Meeting)

Atty. Nicholas Goodier presented the application on behalf of the applicant. He stated that he would pause the review clock in his correspondence with Planning Staff.

Upon motion made by Commissioner Coupe, and seconded by Commissioner Mason, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously to **continue** the matter to the 12/7/21 meeting.

An additional motion was made by Commissioner Coupe, and seconded by Commissioner Mason, to continue all other agenda items relating to the Trolley Barn application (Ordinance Recommendations 9-21-01 and 9-21-02) to the 12/7/21 meeting. The City Plan Commission voted unanimously to **continue** these matters to the 12/7/21 meeting.

- **9-21-01** Ordinance in amendment of the 2010 Comprehensive Plan for the City of Cranston, as amended 2012 (777 Cranston St.). Amend the Future Land Use Map Designation from Special Redevelopment Area to Highway Commercial/Services. Amend the Comprehensive Plan to remove references to the Trolley Barn Special Redevelopment Area. **(vote taken)**

This item was continued to the 12/7/21 City Plan Commission meeting.

- **9-21-02** Ordinance in amendment of Ch. 17 of the Code of the City of Cranston, 2005, entitled "Zoning" (Change of Zone – 777 Cranston St.). Amend the zoning from **M-2 General Industrial** to **C-5 Heavy Business, Industry with conditions**. **(vote taken)**

This item was continued to the 12/7/21 City Plan Commission meeting.

ORDINANCE RECOMMENDATIONS

- **8-21-01** Ordinance in amendment of the Cranston 2010 Comprehensive Plan for the City of Cranston, as amended 2012 (840 & 846 Oaklawn Ave.) – Amend the Future Land Use Map Designation from **Single/Two-Family Residential, less than 10.89 units per acre** to **Highway Commercial**. **(vote taken)**

Senior Planner Joshua Berry presented the ordinance by noting that the amendment to the Future Land Use Map amounts to a change of use from Single Family Residential to Highway Commercial. He also noted that the applicant had no major development plans at this time, but that the amendment would reduce land use conflicts by making the entire stretch of Oaklawn Avenue commercial. He said that planning staff considers the amendment the cleanest way to bring the area in conformance with zoning and recommends that the Commission make positive recommendations to the City Council on the Comp Plan ordinance amendment.

Upon motion made by Commissioner Vincent, and seconded by Commissioner Mason, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously to forward a **positive** recommendation to the City Council.

- **8-21-02** Ordinance in amendment of Chapter 17 of the Code of the City of Cranston, 2005, entitled "Zoning" (Change of Zone – 840 & 846 Oaklawn Ave.) – Change the zoning from A-6 to C-3. **(vote taken)**

Atty. John DiBona, representing the applicant, stated this change will bring the site into conformity with the surrounding area.

Chariman Smith opened the meeting for public comment. No comment was offered by any member of the public.

Senior Planner Joshua Berry also recommended the Commission make positive recommendations on the related ordinance so as to change the zoning to further support the applicant's efforts to bring the lot into conformance with the surrounding area, from an A-6 zone to a C-3.

Upon motion made by Commissioner Coupe, and seconded by Commissioner Vincent, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously to forward a **positive** recommendation to the City Council.

- **7-21-17** Ordinance in amendment of Chapter 17 of the Code of the City of Cranston, 2005, entitled "Zoning" (Change of Zone from A-80 to A-20 – **0 Sage Drive**). **REMANDED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ORDINANCE COMMITTEE ON 9/15/21. (vote taken)**

Senior Planner Joshua Berry said that this item had been remanded back to the City Plan Commission by the City Council for reconsideration, due in part to concerns over a potentially-misleading mailer that had been sent out. He noted that the proposal is to change the current zoning (A-80) to conform with the Future Land Use Map designation (A-20). He also noted that although there are no development plans at this time, the zone change could permit the construction of up to eight single-family lots, if the rezoning was approved.

The applicant's attorney, Joe Shekarshi, representing the owner, Thomas Casali, said that he had an engineer present to answer questions but wanted to rest on previous testimony (from the September 7th meeting) prior to the opening of the public comment period.

Chairman Smith opened the meeting to public comment.

The following residents voiced their opposition to the proposed zoning ordinance during the public comment period:

- Andrea Pena - Opposed
- Janice Cataldo - Presented letter discussing her opposition (letter not in record or provided to staff)
- Bill Kristol
- Susan Bucci
- Annette Osberg - Said applicant threatened to undertake pig farming on the parcel if rezoning was not approved
- Gary DiRaimo - Against the extension of the cul-de-sac
- Gary Bucci – Concerned about Sage Drive and impacts on youth sports
- John Marland - Opposed
- Cheryl Carbone - Opposed
- Anthony Manfredi
- Julia Givens - Concerned about children attending Orchard Valley School
- Stephanie Socia
- Joe Narcissi - Opposed
- Frank Givens - Not against development, but opposes the rezone
- Lindsay Delfry - Doesn't want development and concerned about high water tables in her neighborhood
- Steve Rugas

Many of the residents echoed some or all of one another's comments during the public comment period. The comments given during this session are summarized by the following claims:

- The city's Comprehensive Plan is expired and now outdated, so its recommendation to rezone this site in the manner proposed should be reconsidered;
- The benefits to the City of approving the zone change (increased tax revenue from future homeowners residing on the subdivided parcels) would be outweighed by the costs (increases in traffic, water runoff, water consumption, and students in local schools);
- Approving the amendment could lead to a "domino effect" of further development in western Cranston, or at least set a precedent that would be difficult to reverse or control; and
- The applicant's conduct toward residents of Alpine Estates has been adversarial and lacking transparency, which has led to concerns that he may develop the site in a way that reduces abutters' property values.

Finally, the applicant's civil engineer, David Provencal, P.E., addressed a few of the residents' concerns. He stated that the subdivision plan he drew is only conceptual and that it would have to be reviewed prior to approval. He also said that the residents of Alpine Estates themselves live on land that had formerly been zoned A-80 but is now A-20, and questioned the fairness of denying the applicant an opportunity to see his land rezoned similarly. Finally, he added that he had worked as a planner for many years and said it was not unusual for a municipal Comprehensive Plan to be outdated, since they take years to prepare.

Upon motion made by Commissioner Coupe, and seconded by Commissioner Lanphear, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously to **close** the public comment portion of the Public Hearing.

Mr. Berry then gave the planning staff's final advisory recommendation (read from PowerPoint presentation):

Based on the findings that Ordinance #07-21-17 is not just consistent with but prescribed by the Comprehensive Plan, is consistent with the surrounding land uses and existing development pattern, the City Plan Commission forwards a positive recommendation on Ordinance #07-21-17 to the City Council.

Mr. Berry then expanded upon the recommendation. He contended that residents' concerns regarding a "domino effect" were somewhat overstated in light of the fact that this proposed rezoning is specifically called for in the Comprehensive Plan. He also displayed a list of A-80 lots for which zone changes had been requested (and which had been subsequently built upon) to show that there were few sites in the city that could fall victim to such a domino effect even if it were to occur. Commenting on these, he cited examples of other developments which were examples of "conservation subdivisions," which concentrates the built portions of the lots into an area more akin to a density one would observe in an A-20 zone. Finally, Mr. Berry noted that potential impacts of development on schools, water, etc. were not within the purview of the City Plan Commission and that these concerns would be raised at a future step in the approval process. Planning Director Jason Pezzullo echoed Mr. Berry's comments, adding that one of the benefits that had so far been overlooked was that it would increase the supply of housing, which is a need in the city.

Commissioner Lanphear asked whether there were more currently-undeveloped, A-80 zoned lots for which rezoning might also be sought. Mr. Berry said there were some, but that multiple goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan would point the Commission away from upzoning additional lots unless such a zone change was specifically prescribed in the plan (as was the case in this instance).

Commissioner Coupe asked if other developments had been subdivided from A-80. Director Pezzullo said yes, but drew a distinction between conserving more open space by increasing density vs. by decreasing lot size; he said that this proposal would be an example of the latter.

Commissioner Vincent thanked the public for attending the meeting and expressed his concern that the city cannot adequately define its growth management strategies to a point at which it could reasonably assure residents that a domino effect could not potentially occur.

Upon motion made by Commissioner Vincent, and seconded by Commissioner Maccarone, the City Plan Commission voted 5 to 1 (Commissioner Lanphear voted Nay) to make **no specific recommendation** to the City Council – Ordinance Committee.

SUBDIVISIONS & LAND DEVELOPMENTS

"Cosmo Plat - Replat of 'Garden Park No. 3' Lots 75-78" (vote taken)

PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL MEETING

Preliminary Plan - Minor subdivision without street extension

Creation of one conforming A-6 lot for single-family residential
Zoned A-6
175 Vallette Street – AP 11, Lot 1599

Senior Planner Joshua Berry gave the staff presentation and recommendation. He stated the applicant, Cosmo Properties, sought to subdivide the existing 14,000ft² lot into two conforming A6 lots. Providing further context, Mr. Berry noted that the applicant had merged this lot via administrative subdivision in 2012 to receive a single tax bill, but that doing so did not preclude him from asking for a subdivision later. He also said that the entire neighborhood is zoned A6 and that both lots which would result from the subdivision would conform to the A6 zone, although planning staff is recommending a shed be moved to ensure full conformance with setback requirements.

The applicant was represented during the meeting by Atty. Robert Murray, who gave a history of the parcel and stated that Cosmo Properties intended to build a single-family home on the new lot in conformance with the city's requirements.

Chairman Smith then opened the meeting to public comment.

- Ann Joyce Whitman said that she would not have bought her house had she known the abutting lot was buildable and worried that the new house would decrease her property values. She raised concerns over the potential impacts of construction activity, namely the loss of trees and the effects of digging. She also said the new structure would be “painfully close” to her own, to the extent that she expected she and her future neighbor would be able to “hear each other’s phones ring and toilets flush” through open windows. She added that “what is legal is often not right” and recalled that public sentiment and regulation surrounding smoking, seatbelts, etc changed as new information came to light. She said she hoped no building would go up on the site and suggested alternative uses for the land, such as a community garden operated by a nonprofit to support the handicapped.
- Lisa Cattani expressed her concerns over whether the new home would be a rental property, what the parking impacts would be, and whether the location of the driveway into the new lot would result in a blind corner on the street. She said that her now-deceased neighbor Frank purchased the vacant lot to prevent it from being built upon. She added that the lot had sentimental value as the place “where the neighborhood came together” and noted that Frank “laid his dogs to rest” on the land as well. She expressed displeasure that the site’s current owner hasn’t kept up with site maintenance and felt it was disrespectful to “stick a house in someone’s backyard.”
- Linda Tagliaferri said she was worried that the future driveway was situated on a blind corner and considered it a safety issue, particularly for the young children nearby who like to ride their bikes in the neighborhood. She said she would be ready to reconsider her opposition once she was given reasonable assurance that the location of the driveway wouldn’t risk getting her children killed in an accident.

Upon motion made by Commissioner Vincent, and seconded by Commissioner Mason, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously to **close** the public comment portion of the Public Hearing.

Mr. Berry then gave the planning staff’s final advisory recommendation (from PowerPoint presentation):

Staff finds this proposal consistent with the standards for required findings of fact set forth in RIGL Section 45-23-60 as well as with the City of Cranston’s Subdivision and Land Development Regulations. Staff therefore recommends that the Planning Commission adopt the documented findings of fact and approve the Preliminary Plan application, subject to the conditions denoted below:

- 1) *The applicant shall remove or relocate the existing shed so that no new nonconformity is created by the proposed lot line.*
- 2) *The applicant shall install granite curbing along the frontage of the lots where it does not already exist, except as to allow for a driveway for Parcel B.*

- 3) *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 the final plat recording.*

Mr. Berry reiterated that the proposal before the Commission was a by-right proposal, and that since the applicant had enough land to conform to all zoning requirements without need for relief, he had a right to subdivide. He urged the Commission to give greater weight to the laws on the books when making their decision.

Commissioner Lanphear asked if plans had been distributed to Engineering, Traffic, and Fire, why had only Fire responded? Director Pezzullo said that those departments were given the plans but sometimes do not respond to minor projects. He had met with staff members from each of those departments and they raised no concerns. Commissioner Mason, as the Director of Public Works, who also oversees the Traffic Engineering Division, also said that they had looked at the plans and had no issue with the subdivision.

Then upon motion made by Commissioner Mason, and seconded by Commissioner Coupe, to accept staff's positive recommendation on the proposal, the City Plan Commission voted 3-2 to **approve** the subdivision (Commissioners Lanphear and Maccarone voted Nay; Commissioner Vincent abstained). The motion to approve therefore failed.

"Comstock Industrial" (vote taken)

PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL MEETING

Master Plan - Major Land Development

Construct 2 new buildings on the 17.31-acre property for the purpose of large-scale industrial, manufacturing, warehousing and trucking activities

Zoned M-1 (Restricted Industrial)

Comstock Parkway – AP 36, Lot 46

Principal Planner Douglas McLean presented the staff analysis to the Commission. He stated that this item is a Master Plan Public Informational Meeting, and that this is Stage 2 of 4 in the Major Land Development process. He noted that the parcel is currently zoned M-1 and that the Future Land Use Map also designates the site as Industrial. Comstock Industrial LLC plans to build two buildings (270,000 ft²) for warehousing, manufacturing, trucking, and ancillary office uses, which Mr. McLean said were all by-right uses.

Attorney Robert Murray, representing the applicant (Comstock Industrial, LLC), said he believed the parcel is the largest undeveloped commercial site in the city and that its development could offer important economic development benefits. He also noted that the proposed uses are all by-right and therefore no relief is being sought. Finally, he also said that Comstock had opened dialogue with neighbors prior to the meeting, but stressed that this stage is only conceptual approval, so more precise details will be determined and discussed later. Atty. Murray then introduced the development team to provide their comments.

Dana Nisbit, Professional Engineer with DiPrete Engineering, said that DiPrete conducted a site survey. She said that wetlands occupied the center of the parcel but that it was not located in a flood hazard area nor in a designated environmental//heritage area. She also said that water and sewer were available, that one curb cut was being proposed, and that no dimensional variances would be requested. Finally, she said that drainage design would be the next item to prepare and submit for RIDEM review.

Edward Pimentel, a consultant retained by Comstock Industrial LLC with 35 years of planning experience and expertise in Comprehensive Plan consistency, said his review showed this site has been intended and zoned for industrial use going back at least 30 years, so the applicant's intended development is consistent with zoning. He added that some areas of concern would be addressed during preliminary design, such as locating the heavy trucking component of the site plan away from the abutting housing.

John Carter, PLS, a registered landscape architect for the applicant, participated in a site visit to observe the existing vegetative buffering. He stressed that the landscaping plan is only conceptual at present, but

that the current plan is to landscape at nearly twice the minimum required landscaping, leaving the wetland and its associated buffer undisturbed. Mr. Carter also said that they looked into how views for residential owners to the south would be impacted by the development.

Paul Bannon, a Traffic Engineer, relayed his experience having been involved in a half-dozen traffic studies for that and adjacent sites over the years. He conducted traffic counting, obtained accident data, and developed trip generation estimates. Mr. Bannon said that the major intersections are handling traffic well and that adequate traffic capacity exists to safely accommodate the new development. He further noted that recommendations were made for enhanced safety, such as a stop bar and crosswalk on Western Industrial Drive, and that there was sufficient room for ingress/egress to the driveway for large trucks. Finally, he also said that Fuss & O'Neill was hired by the City to serve as a third-party traffic reviewer.

John Walsh, the developer and principal of Comstock Development LLC, spoke of his vision for the property. He envisions a distribution center with the tenant of the larger building being a national company and said that traffic would be slow and steady during the day, as opposed to a 24-hour operation. He projected roughly 140 employees working at the site but said it would be designed to accommodate more. Mr. Walsh stated his belief that this was the right use for the parcel and said it would be a shame to break up such a large parcel, since Rhode Island has plenty of small, obsolete industrial lots which are difficult to cobble together for larger industrial uses.

Commissioner Mason asked Mr. Bannon if the corners and road width for Western Industrial Drive will be sufficiently designed to accommodate for the trucking needs. He said yes, and that the necessary turning radii would be documented in the next phase of design.

Commissioner Vincent asked Mr. Walsh if the employee parking on the 60-foot buffer on the southern edge of the property could be widened by moving the building northward. He said it was not possible without shrinking the size of the building due to the presence of the wetland and that reducing the building's size would alter the range of tenants to which it could appeal.

Commissioner Vincent asked Mr. Bannon why he estimated 80% of traffic to and from the site would be flowing to the north of the site. He replied that it is because the on- and off-ramps to I-295 are located to the north.

Commissioner Lanphear asked Mr. Pimentel to clarify whether his prior comment regarding the adjacent condo development's high density residential zoning constituting a "zoning gradient" was a known fact or a supposition. He replied that it was his presumption based on examples he has seen during his career.

Following the applicant's presentation, Chairman Smith opened the meeting to public comment.

Atty. Amy Gowitz, representing Crossroad Condos, advocated that the Commission impose firm restrictions on the hours of operation, reduce the size of the buildings, provide a potential sound wall for noise mitigation, and buffers before allowing the application to move forward.

Peter Friedrichs, planning expert representing the opposition, said that he would want to see a peer review of the traffic study as well as staff comments and wondered if there would be turning issues for the trucks. He also said that impacts should be felt equally across both sides of the boundary line, so tractor trailers should be kept to the north of the building. Finally, he said the developer should install more landscaping on his side of the property line.

William Duarte, Crossroad Condo association resident, expressed concerns about noise, traffic, emissions, and the nearby child daycare.

Aldo Testa voiced concern over multiple elements of the proposal, particularly its size, and felt a comprehensive impact study should be conducted. He also felt that a visual aid such as a 3D rendering would be helpful to review.

Jason Barry, of 39 Scituate Avenue, said he was worried about traffic, noise, light pollution, turning radii, and buffers. He also said the proposed development would be the size of three convention centers.

William Duarte, returning for a second comment, asked whether the developer could fly balloons over the property to provide another visual aid in understanding the proposed structures' size.

Chairman Smith asked that the public submit comments to the planning staff by December 1st. Mr. McLean said staff recommended continuing the issue to the 12/7/21 City Plan Commission meeting.

Upon motion made by Commissioner Vincent, and seconded by Commissioner Mason, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously to **continue** the matter to the 12/7/21 meeting.

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW - RECOMMENDATIONS

- **VASQUEZ PROPERTIES, LLC (OWN) and MARISELA VASQUEZ** have filed an application to allow signage installed without benefit of a permit exceeding the allowable square footage to remain at 455 Reservoir Avenue A.P. 6, lot 1011 zoned C4. Applicant seeks relief per Sections; 17.92.010 Variance, Section 17.72.010 (C)(4) Table 17.72.010 (5) Signs. **(REQUEST TO CONTINUE TO DECEMBER 7, 2021 BY THE APPLICANT)**

Upon motion made by Commissioner Mason, and seconded by Commissioner Vincent, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously to forward a **positive** recommendation on the application to the Zoning Board of Review.

- **GANSETT ENTERPRISES, LLC (OWN) and DAVID MEDEIROS (APP)** have filed an application to convert an existing non-conforming residence above first story business use to a two family dwelling with restricted lot size at 50 Gansett Ave, A.P. 7, lot 2157; area 5,405 sq.ft. zoned C2. Applicant seeks relief per Section 17.92.010-Variance; Sections, 17.20.120- Schedule of Intensity Regulations.

Upon motion made by Commissioner Maccarone, and seconded by Commissioner Lanphear, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously to forward a **positive** recommendation on the application to the Zoning Board of Review.

- **WILLIAMS I. PENEFIEL and LESBIA SANTOS (OWN/APP)** Have filed an application to legalize a third living unit in an existing two family dwelling at 234 Garden Street, A.P. 5, Lot 345; area 5,000 s.f. zone B1. Applicant seeks relief per 17.92.010 Variance, Sections 17.20.090(A) Specific Requirements; 17.20.120 Schedule of Intensity Regulations.

Upon motion made by Commissioner Mason, and seconded by Commissioner Vincent, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously to forward a **positive** recommendation on the application to the Zoning Board of Review.

- **BETHANY MURGA (OWN/APP)** has filed an application to construct an addition to an existing dwelling encroaching into the required side yard setback at 74 Priscilla Drive, A.P. 21, lot 86; area 111,315 s.f.; zoned A8. Applicant seeks relief per Section 17.92.010-Variance; Sections 17.20.120-Schedule of Intensity Regulations.

Upon motion made by Commissioner Vincent, and seconded by Commissioner Lanphear, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously to forward a **positive** recommendation on the application to the Zoning Board of Review.

- **ALBERT CASALI and THE ALBERT CASALI REVOCABLE LIVING TRUST (OWN/APP)** have filed an application to construct an addition encroaching into the required rear yard setback at

1776 Cranston Street, A.P. 11, lots 275, 276; area 14,962 s.f; zoned C5. Applicant seeks relief per Section 17.92.010-Variance; Sections 17.20.120- Schedule of Intensity Regulations.

Commissioner Lanphear asked if planning staff's recommendation said that parking spaces were required, but that the existing ones were located on state property. Mr. McLean confirmed this and said that the staff recommendation only concerns building expansion, so parking would be raised separately.

Upon motion made by Commissioner Vincent, and seconded by Commissioner Lanphear, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously to ***continue*** the application to the 12/7/21 meeting to allow the applicant time to address the technical elements within the proposal.

- **F9 PROPERTIES, LLC (OWN/APP)** has filed an application to convert an existing building to be used as a showroom and for retail sales at 115 Niantic Avenue A.P. 7, lot 2190; area 8,917 sq. ft. ; zoned M2. Applicant seeks relief per 17.92.010-Variance; Sections 17.20.120-Schedule of Intensity Regulations; 17.64.010 -Off Street Parking; 17.72.010- Signs; 17.88.040- Change of Use.

Due to the finding that the proposal is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan - Future Land Use Map, Planning staff did not provide a positive recommendation on this application; however, staff did not have any outstanding concerns with the proposed use and is of the view that small-scale retail at this site will not negatively alter the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

Therefore, upon motion made by Commissioner Mason, and seconded by Commissioner Maccarone, the City Plan Commission voted 4 to 1 (Commissioner Lanphear voted Nay) to forward ***no specific recommendation*** on the application to the Zoning Board of Review.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT – Director Pezzullo had no report to submit.

ADJOURNMENT / NEXT REGULAR MEETING – Tuesday, December 7th – 6:30 PM – 869 Park Avenue, City Hall Council Chamber (**vote taken**)

Upon motion made by Commissioner Lanphear, and seconded by Commissioner Vincent, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 11:55 p.m.