

Kenneth J. Hopkins
Mayor

Michael E. Smith
President

Jason M. Pezzullo, AICP
Planning Director



Richard Bernardo
Robert Coupe
James Donahue
Steven Frias
Michael Igoe
Kathleen Lanphear
Ann Marie Maccarone
Frank Ritz

CITY PLAN COMMISSION

Cranston City Hall
869 Park Avenue, Cranston, RI 02910

MINUTES

Tuesday, June 7th, 2022 – 6:30PM

3rd Flood - City Council Chamber, 869 Park Avenue, Cranston RI

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Michael Smith called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. in the Council Chamber, 869 Park Ave, and welcomed the two new commissioners, Richard Bernardo and Michael Igoe, to their first meeting.

The following Commissioners were in attendance for the meeting: Chairman Smith, Richard Bernardo, Robert Coupe, Steven Frias, Michael Igoe, Kathleen Lanphear, and Frank Ritz. James Donahue and Ann Marie Maccarone were absent.

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

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- | | | |
|-----------|---|--------------|
| ▪ 4/20/22 | Special Joint Site Walk | (vote taken) |
| ▪ 5/03/22 | Regular City Plan Commission Meeting | (vote taken) |
| ▪ 5/18/22 | Special City Plan Commission workshop (Housing) | (vote taken) |

Upon motion by Mr. Ritz, and seconded by Ms. Lanphear, the City Plan Commission voted 3 to 0 to **approve** the Special Joint Site Walk meeting minutes of 4/20/22 (Commissioners Bernardo, Coupe, Frias, and Igoe abstained).

Upon motion by Mr. Ritz, and seconded by Ms. Lanphear, the City Plan Commission voted 4 to 0 to **approve** the regular City Plan Commission meeting minutes of 5/3/22 (Commissioners Bernardo, Coupe, and Igoe abstained).

For the May 18th Special Housing Workshop minutes, Mr. Frias requested that the words "of apartments" be added to his statement regarding the workability of a 15% target for an inclusionary zoning ordinance for clarification on which segment of the City's housing stock his suggestion concerned.

Chairman Smith asked if the other Commissioners had any other changes to put forward; none did, so he asked for motions to accept Mr. Frias' edits and to approve the amended minutes.

Upon motion by Mr. Frias, and seconded by Ms. Lanphear, the City Plan Commission voted 5 to 0 to accept Mr. Frias' recommended edits to the Special City Plan Commission Housing Workshop meeting minutes of 5/18/22 (Commissioners Bernardo and Igoe abstained).

Upon motion by Mr. Frias, and seconded by Mr. Coupe, the City Plan Commission voted 5 to 0 to **approve** the Special City Plan Commission Housing Workshop meeting minutes of 5/18/22 as amended by Mr. Frias (Commissioners Bernardo and Igoe abstained).

ORDINANCES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- **4-22-04** – Amendment of the 2010 Comprehensive plan for the City of Cranston, As Amended 2012 (661 Park Project / Legion Bowl redevelopment).
Amends the Future Land Use Map from Neighborhood Commercial/Services to Mixed Plan Development and includes the site into the Land Use Element
661 Park Avenue - AP 3, Lots 289, 291, 1695 & 1696
(Request to **CONTINUE** this matter to the July 12th regular meeting by applicant)

Upon motion made by Mr. Bernardo, and seconded by Mr. Coupe, the City Plan Commission voted 7 to 0 to **continue** the matter to the July 12th regular meeting of the City Plan Commission.

- **4-22-05** – Amendment of Chapter 17.84 of the Code of the City of Cranston, 2005, Entitled "Zoning" (Change of Zone – 661 Park Avenue / Legion Bowl redevelopment)
Amends the zoning map from C-3 to C-3 *with conditions* for allowed uses, density, parking, height and affordability
661 Park Avenue - AP 3, Lots 289, 291, 1695 & 1696
(Request to **CONTINUE** this matter to the July 12th regular meeting by applicant)

Upon motion made by Mr. Bernardo, and seconded by Mr. Ritz, the City Plan Commission voted 7 to 0 to **continue** the matter to the July 12th regular meeting of the City Plan Commission.

SUBDIVISIONS AND MAJOR LAND DEVELOPMENTS

- **661 Park Project (Legion Bowl) PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL** (vote taken)
MASTER PLAN – Major Land Development w/o street extension
Mixed-Use Residential/Commercial redevelopment
69 Residential Units, First Floor commercial on Park Avenue
661 Park Avenue - AP 3, Lots 289, 291, 1695 & 1696
Currently Zoned C-3 with a proposal for a new C-3 *with Conditions*
(Request to **CONTINUE** this matter to the July 12th regular meeting by applicant)

Ms. Lanphear asked if the language in RIGL Section 45-23-40(c) would present a procedural concern for the proposed continuance. She said she was not opposed to granting the continuance in principle but wondered if the Commission should do so before the applicant agrees in writing to waive the 90-day public comment period in exchange, as the statute requires. Mr. Berry said that the applicant has been highly cooperative with the Commission and the request for a continuance is simply intended to give the applicant team more time to thoroughly review its traffic study. Planning Director Jason Pezzullo echoed this sentiment and added that a waiver would be unnecessary in this case – the Commission could ask questions or even deny the project altogether if it decides it is not satisfied with the proposal. Solicitor Steve Marsella noted that the full applicant team was not present to agree to those terms and that the motion before the Commission was strictly

concerning whether or not to grant a continuance. Atty. John DiBona, who was present at the meeting and representing the applicant, offered to prepare a written waiver, thus resolving the matter.

Upon motion made by Mr. Bernardo, and seconded by Mr. Igoe, the City Plan Commission voted 7 to 0 to **continue** the matter to the July 12th regular meeting of the City Plan Commission.

- **“20 Goddard Drive Warehouse”** **PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL** (vote taken)
 MASTER PLAN – Major Land Development w/o street extension
 210,000 +/- square foot warehouse development on 16.74-acre site
 Zoned M-2 (General Industry)
 20 Goddard Drive – AP 13, Lot 39

Mr. Berry introduced the Master Plan Major Land Development project, which would construct a warehouse/trucking terminal facility on a 210,000 ft² site off Goddard Drive. The project would be a by-right use, as the site is currently zoned M-2 (General Industry). Mr. Berry noted that the Future Land Use Map designation of Government/Institutional – a holdover from its previous use as part of a state correctional institution – would not necessitate a Comp Plan amendment because the current Zoning designation takes precedence. He shared maps showing the site’s proximity to Route 37 and Interstate 95, its frontage on Goddard Drive and Kenney Drive (access would be provided only from Goddard), and its separation from residential areas in the general vicinity. He showed the existing building on site, which is proposed to be demolished, and spoke to the anticipated location of the new building on the site. Finally, he discussed the grading plan, which will allow for more parking space at the northern end of the site and more loading space at the southern end, and the traffic design.

Mr. Berry said that the Fire Department didn’t note anything concerning at this point but will be interested in seeing details about the precise use of the property once an end user is identified. He also noted that the Bureau of Traffic Safety agreed with the findings in the traffic study.

Atty. Bob Murray then introduced the applicant team, which included Richard Corrin, principal of 20 Goddard, LLC; Sam Hemingway, P.E., of Garofalo Associates; and Herman Perralta, P.E, of Beta Group. Atty. Murray said that following the informational session held during the previous month’s Plan Commission meeting, the applicant had proceeded to the Master Plan stage of the project. He emphasized that the Master Plan approval is conceptual in nature and reiterated that the applicant intends to construct a trucking/warehousing facility, but has not yet chosen an end user. He explained that the applicant must first demonstrate that the project is viable before it can attract serious interest from prospective end users. Depending on the particular needs of the end user that is ultimately chosen, there could be minor layout changes made to the plan between now and Final Plan approval, but the fundamental aspects of the project as presented tonight would remain the same. He said the project would go before the Development Plan Review Committee prior to Preliminary Plan approval.

Atty. Murray then invited Mr. Hemingway to speak to some technical aspects of the project. Mr. Hemingway noted that an initial investigation had been conducted on the site conditions and went on to note that the site is currently served by the state sewer system but will later be connected to the city system. He said the site was developed into its present form before modern stormwater runoff standards were adopted, so the redevelopment will strive to reach the “gold standard” of contemporary stormwater management design. Finally, he said that the applicant is prepared for the project to have to meet high pollutant standards, but they are not certain this will end up being the case.

Chairman Smith invited members of the public to speak, but none did. He then invited the Commissioners to offer their comments.

Mr. Frias asked for clarification on why the project would be considered a by-right development if it was not consistent with the FLUM designation. Mr. Berry said that the notion of by-right refers to the current zoning code as opposed to the FLUM designation, so because the current zoning for the site is M-2, the proposal is by-right. Mr. Frias also asked whether energy sustainability measures (such as rooftop solar panels) that had been mentioned in the staff memo were going to be conditions of approval – he said he

was comfortable with leaving it as a recommendation, but he didn't want to require the measures in case the applicant later finds it will impose too much of a financial burden to pursue them. Mr. Berry confirmed that the language was only meant to encourage the applicant to explore incorporating energy sustainability measures into the final design, but that Staff was pursuing the same track as they had with the Trolley Barn site in not making it a condition of approval.

Finally, as Mr. Berry read the Staff recommendation and the associated conditions of approval, Mr. Frias asked that the term "electronic vehicle charging stations" be changed to "electric vehicle charging stations."

Upon motion by Mr. Frias, and seconded by Ms. Lanphear, the City Plan Commission voted 7 to 0 to accept Mr. Frias' recommended edit to the conditions included with the Staff recommendation for the 20 Goddard Drive Major Land Development Master Plan.

Upon motion by Mr. Bernardo, and seconded by Mr. Ritz, the City Plan Commission voted 7 to 0 to **approve** the Major Land Development Master Plan as amended.

- **"Briarwood Estates"** **PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL** (vote taken)
 MASTER PLAN – Major Subdivision with street extension
 14-lot subdivision with 12 new single-family house lots
 Zoned A-8
 New London Avenue & Briarwood Road – AP 18, Lots 1023 & 1026

Principal Planner Doug McLean gave the staff presentation for the Master Plan Major Subdivision project off New London Avenue and Briarwood Road. He said the applicant was proposing to subdivide two existing parcels totaling 5.8 acres into 14 parcels, 12 of which would be developed into single-family dwellings. He noted that both existing parcels host a single-family dwelling, and both dwellings would be left on their own conforming lots. He shared site plans and noted the location of the proposed extension of the city right-of-way. Besides sharing various aerial images, Mr. McLean also showed the Zoning map, which designated the subject parcels as A-8 and those in the surrounding neighborhood as a mix of A-8 and A-6. He added the proposal is consistent with the FLUM and its density recommendations.

Atty. Bob Murray then introduced members of the applicant team who were present for the meeting: Rudy Procaccianti, principal of Universal Realty, LLC; and Joseph Casali, registered P.E., of Joe Casali Engineering. Atty. Murray noted there had been a few prior iterations of the plan for this project, which is an increasingly-rare instance of a major subdivision occurring outside of an A-80 or A-20 zone, and said that this version introduces a 32-foot right-of-way to access an abutting property. He invited Mr. Casali to present the proposal in detail.

Mr. Casali said the two existing subject parcels to be subdivided (AP 18, Lots 1023 & 1026) will be framed off onto their own conforming lots as part of the subdivision process. The house at 1365 New London Ave (currently Lot 1026) will be left on a fully-conforming 18,000 ft² parcel; likewise, the house at 1375 New London Ave (Lot 1023) will be left on its own, conforming lot. Mr. Casali said this will leave about 5 acres to be subdivided into 12 new house lots. He said the houses would be around 1,600 ft² in size and would be designed in keeping with the character of the surrounding neighborhood. The lots on which the houses would be built will vary in size – some will be the minimum 8,000 ft², while others will be as large as 11-12,000 ft². He also noted that the runoff and drainage patterns of the site will remain largely the same post-development as they are now: the western portion drains down towards I-295, and the eastern portion drains down toward New London Avenue. (Mr. Casali said a stormwater management area will be set aside in the eastern end of the subdivision.)

Mr. Casali said the applicant wants to add just under 1,100 feet of roadway through the parcels to connect New London Avenue with Briarwood Road. He noted there is an existing sewer easement that will be preserved and that in addition to the sewer connections, the applicant would like to connect the existing water lines at both ends of the proposed road. He also called attention to another parcel (AP 12, Lot 2006) to which the applicant would like to build a 32-foot-wide right-of-way connecting to the proposed

roadway. (This parcel is presently accessed by a 15-foot right-of-way.) Mr. Casali said the applicant is seeking a waiver to allow the 32-foot right-of-way and might also seek one for relief from constructing sidewalks.

Chairman Smith then opened the meeting to public comments. The following individuals stepped forward to voice their thoughts:

- Dan Picard, 4 Briarwood Rd, expressed concern over the potential increase in traffic that the project could generate on neighborhood streets and at the intersections with New London Avenue. He asked if speedbumps could be put in the road as a traffic-calming measure.
- Jason Aponte, 8 Gaunt Dr, was worried that connecting Briarwood Rd with New London Ave would lead to more traffic in the neighborhood. He said he and his wife walk frequently in the neighborhood and already consider the lack of a stop sign at the intersection of Gaunt Dr and Manor Rd to be a safety concern.
- Gino Marchetti, 52 Manor Rd, wondered if the applicant would leave or plant any vegetated screening between his property and the proposed Lot 7, which he said was close to the minimum rear setback line and could have a clear sight line into his backyard. He also expressed some concern over traffic.
- Steve Capobianco, 61 Manor Rd, expressed concerns related to traffic because he has grandchildren who play in the street.
- Atty. Nick Goodier, 56 Pine St, Providence, representing Preservation Development, LLC (owner of AP 18, Lot 2006), said he appreciates staff's attentiveness to his client's concerns. He said they support the waiver request for a 32-foot-wide ROW and that his client might want to subdivide his own lot at some point in the future. He added he and his client would offer more feedback at the next stage of process, especially with regard to laterals being provided for utilities and the provision of small stormwater runoff mitigation measures.

With the public comment period concluded, Chairman Smith invited Mr. McLean to present the Staff findings, most of which were discussed during his earlier presentation (the project is a by-right subdivision, no relief or zone changes needed, consistent with the FLUM, etc.). Chairman Smith then invited the Commissioners to offer their thoughts.

Mr. Frias asked for more background as to why the applicant was requesting a waiver for sidewalks. Mr. Casali said that the applicant would prefer to emulate the conditions of the existing, surrounding neighborhood in the new subdivision, and sidewalks do not exist in the neighborhood. Upon Atty. Murray's request, Mr. Casali confirmed that aside from the inclusion of sidewalks, the lots in the proposed subdivision were otherwise designed to fully conform with all terms of A-8 zoning. Mr. Casali asked for the Commission's guidance on whether they would entertain a waiver from having to provide sidewalks, and if so, what the process should entail.

Chairman Smith said he generally supports sidewalks but could not think of any time in his tenure on the Commission that he advocated providing sidewalks when there was no existing network to which they could connect. Mr. Frias agreed with that perspective and said he had walked in the surrounding neighborhood before and knew the rest of the neighborhood didn't have them. He then asked whether Mr. McLean felt any sidewalk configurations would be preferable to others. Mr. McLean said that including a sidewalk on one side of the street could be beneficial, as it could connect to an existing sidewalk network on New London Avenue, but these decisions are normally made at the Preliminary Plan phase.

Mr. Frias then asked about RIDOT's involvement, which Mr. Casali explained was due to the fact that New London Avenue is a state road. Mr. Frias asked why the applicants said a right-of-way would be "partially rebuilt" in the street extension; Mr. Casali said the street extension would align with a small area that appeared to be the mouth of a paper street (an easement), so constructing the roadway in that alignment would constitute the rebuilding of a roadway. Regarding the traffic concerns expressed during the public comment period, Mr. Frias said he thought speeding, rather than a marked increase in cars on the road, would be the more important traffic challenge to result from the development. He said asked if stop signs could be installed or if other traffic calming measures were possible. Mr. McLean said the

design of the street extension, which was curved, constituted a traffic-calming measure in and of itself. Ms. Lanphear felt a condition of approval should be added that would prompt the applicant to bring findings to the Preliminary Plan phase as to which traffic-calming measures may or may not be suitable for inclusion in the design of the project.

Upon motion made by Ms. Lanphear, and seconded by Mr. Frias, the City Plan Commission voted 7 to 0 to add a condition regarding the consideration of traffic-calming measures to the Staff recommendation.

Conversely, Mr. Coupe asked why a condition had been included to prompt the applicant to provide a narrative if it seeks a waiver from providing sidewalks when that would happen anyway during the next phase of review. Mr. McLean said he thought it made sense to raise it at this point because the sidewalk question had come up at this stage of review.

Upon motion made by Mr. Coupe, and seconded by Mr. Bernardo, the City Plan Commission voted 6 to 1 (Ms. Lanphear voted no) to strike the condition regarding the sidewalks from the Staff recommendation.

Finally, upon motion made by Mr. Coupe, and seconded by Mr. Bernardo, the City Plan Commission voted 7 to 0 to approve the Major Land Development Master Plan as amended.

- **“West Gate Estates”** **INFORMATIONAL** (no vote taken)
 PRE-APPLICATION – Minor Subdivision with street extension
 5-Lot subdivision with 4 new single-family houses
 Zoned A-80
 Laten Knight Road – AP 28, Lot 11

Director Pezzullo provided some background information on the proposal. He noted that the same site was previously proposed for a cluster-style subdivision in 2006 under the name Equestrian Estates, and although it had gone through the entire approval process and was ready to be recorded, the owners ultimately decided against that version of the project. The version now being proposed is more simplified.

Dave Russo, registered P.E. with DiPrete Engineering, then offered more details regarding the specifics of the project. He said DiPrete only got involved at the tail end of the original project, which would have been an 8-lot subdivision with a paved 40-foot-wide right-of-way running between two wetlands, but they have been involved throughout the design of the new proposal. He said the applicant is now seeking to subdivide the parcel, which currently hosts a horse farm, into six residential lots, each between a quarter-acre and a half-acre in size. The existing horse farm would continue to exist on Lot 5. The development would be accessed via the existing 35-foot right of way, which is paved at first but then turns to gravel. Traveling into the subdivision, this would then taper down to an unpaved private road of about 15 feet in width (or whatever minimum width the Fire Department deems acceptable), which would represent a much lower impact on the surrounding wetlands. Mr. Russo said he believes the proposal is appropriate for the character of Western Cranston but welcomed their thoughts and concerns.

Director Pezzullo said the width of the right-of-way would probably be a primary point of focus for the review of the proposal because it would not simply be a driveway. He said that private roadways are rare in Cranston and usually only found in the A-80 zone, but the standards for them are fairly loose. He expected that between Police, Fire, and DPW, the City would be able to determine which minimum width would be appropriate once utilities and dimensions were taken into account.

Solicitor Marsella asked for confirmation that the previous subdivision plan for this site was never recorded. Director Pezzullo said that was the case – it was not recorded, so that subdivision plan lapsed and went away.

Mr. Bernardo asked if the proposal was sufficiently similar in character to a residential compound that the City should rely on other towns' regulations and standards for residential compounds when reviewing the project. Director Pezzullo said Cranston didn't recognize residential compounds in its own code, but it

would be at the City's discretion to decide which standards to measure the project against. Mr. Russo said he could envision the Fire Department asking for a 20-foot-wide right-of-way.

- **"747 Pontiac Avenue" INFORMATIONAL** (no vote taken)
PRE-APPLICATION – Major Land Development w/o street extension
Office building conversion to 18 residential apartments w/ 41 parking spaces
Zoned A-6 (will require rezone or variance)
Pontiac Avenue – AP 9, Lot 146

Director Pezzullo briefly introduced the project by noting the owners, Omni Group, intend to convert an existing office building into an 18-unit residential building. Because of the number of units, the project would constitute a Major Land Development, so the applicant could ask for a variance or a special zone change. The building and parking already exist, so this project would constitute a true office-to-residential conversion project.

Bill DiStefano (President & CEO) and Mick Hogan (Vice President – Business Development & Leasing) of Omni Properties then introduced their proposal by providing a few more details. They said Omni had purchased the building about two decades ago, but then sold it and later re-acquired it. They said it always seemed like an apartment building to them, especially because it is in a residential neighborhood. They reviewed Omni's recent projects in Providence that have brought several hundred residential units online in recent years and said they were looking to convert this building into apartments as well. Finally, they noted that they are proposing to include three affordable units in the project.

Mr. Frias asked if the affordable units would be officially designated as affordable per state law or if they would simply be marketed at an affordable rate. Director Pezzullo said they would probably be eligible for state authorization, but that would be reviewed with the applicants – it could be a stipulation of the ordinance change.

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW - RECOMMENDATIONS (votes taken for all ZBR items)

- **PARK AVENUE REALTY, INC. (OWN) and NICO BELLA CRANSTON, LLC. (APP)** have applied to operate a restaurant in an industrial zone with reduced lot area at 1350 Park Avenue, A.P. 11, lot 1768, area 14,748 s.f., zoned M1. Applicant seeks relief per Section 17.92.010- Variance; Sections 17.20.030- Schedule of Uses; 17.20.120- Schedule of Intensity Regulations; 17.72.010- Signs. (Recommend **continuance** to July 12th, 2022)

Upon motion made by Mr. Bernardo, and seconded by Mr. Coupe, the City Plan Commission voted 7 to 0 to **continue** the matter to the July 12th regular meeting of the City Plan Commission.

- **ROBIN A. LETTERLE (OWN) and GREGORY J. DiZOGGIO (APP)** have filed an application to allow a garage addition built without benefit of permit and cited for violations encroaching into front and side yard setbacks at 97 Amanda Street, A.P. 18, lot 1501; area 8,000 s.f.; zoned A8. Applicants seek relief per Section 17.92.010- Variances; Section 17.20.120- Schedule of Intensity Regulations.

Due to the findings that the application is generally inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and that it alters the character of the neighborhood, upon motion made by Mr. Bernardo, and seconded by Mr. Ritz, the City Plan Commission unanimously voted (6-0) to forward a **negative recommendation** on the application to the Zoning Board of Review (Chairman Smith recused).

- **MIN NAING (OWN/APP)** has applied to the Board allow a new single-family dwelling to be constructed on an under-sized lot merged by zoning at 0 Randall Street, A.P. 12, lot 38; area 5,000 s.f.; zoned B1. Applicants seek relief per Section 17.92.010- Variances; Sections 17.20.120- Schedule of Intensity Regulations, 17.88.010- Substandard lots of record.

Due to the findings that the application is generally consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and that it does not alter the character of the neighborhood, upon motion made by Mr. Coupe, and seconded by Mr. Bernardo, the City Plan Commission unanimously voted (7-0) to forward a **positive recommendation** on the application to the Zoning Board of Review.

- **MIN NAING (OWN/APP)** has filed an application to grant relief on an existing single family dwelling encroaching into the side setback on an under-sized lot merged by zoning at 86 Randall Street, A.P. 12, lot 39; area 5,000 s.f.; zoned B1. Applicants seek relief per Section 17.92.010- Variances; Sections 17.20.120- Schedule of Intensity Regulations, 17.88.010- Substandard lots of record.

Due to the findings that the application is generally consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and that it does not alter the character of the neighborhood, upon motion made by Mr. Coupe, and seconded by Mr. Bernardo, the City Plan Commission unanimously voted (7-0) to forward a **positive recommendation** on the application to the Zoning Board of Review.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

(no votes taken)

Director Pezzullo said that Mr. Igoe, in his capacity as Acting Finance Director, had agreed to put the City's funding for the Comp Plan update into a special account, so he felt we could move forward with the process. He said he hoped to put a draft RFP before the Commission in July, but it would be a busy month, so it remains to be seen if it will be turned in time for the July meeting.

Moving on to the Hazard Mitigation Plan, Director Pezzullo said the draft plan has been completed and will go before the committee. He offered to put it on the agenda for next month's meeting if the Commission felt it was worthwhile, but the draft plan requires no immediate action on the CPC's part.

After Chairman Smith reminded the Commissioners of the GrowSmartRI conference that would be held later in the month, Director Pezzullo offered to reimburse the registration fees for any Commissioner who wished to sign up and attend. He noted the Rhode Island APA conference would be another good event to attend later in the year.

Finally, Director Pezzullo thanked the Commission for its participation in the Affordable Housing Workshop and said he appreciated the thought everyone invested in the topic, given its importance.

Commissioner Lanphear asked if there could be an update on the recent Superior Court decision regarding Natick Solar, but Solicitor Marsella interjected that the matter was not on the meeting agenda and would not be discussed.

ADJOURNMENT / NEXT REGULAR MEETING

(vote taken)

- Tuesday, July 12th, 2022 — City Hall Council Chambers, 869 Park Avenue

Upon motion made by Mr. Coupe, and seconded by Mr. Bernardo, the City Plan Commission unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting at 8:57 p.m.