

Kenneth J. Hopkins  
Mayor

Beth Ashman, MCP, AICP  
Acting Planning Director

Steven Frias  
President

Robert Coupe  
Vice-President



Thomas Barbieri  
David Exter  
Kathleen Lanphear  
Lisa Mancini  
Nicole Renzulli

Frank Corrao P.E.  
Acting Public Works Director

Thomas Zidelis  
Finance Director

## CITY PLAN COMMISSION

City Hall – 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Room 309  
869 Park Avenue – Cranston, RI 02910

### MINUTES

## CRANSTON EAST HIGH SCHOOL AUDITORIUM

6:30PM – TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 2025

---

### JOINT MEETING WITH CITY COUNCIL

**“Garden Grove redevelopment of Mulligan’s Island”**

#### **JOINT WORKSHOP WITH CITY COUNCIL**

*Special Pre-Application*

AP 15/4, Lot 8

1000 New London Avenue

### CALL TO ORDER

Commission President Frias called the meeting to order at 6:33 p.m. in the Cranston East Auditorium.

The following Commissioners were in attendance for the meeting: Commission President Steven Frias, Commission Vice-President Robert Coupe, David Exter, Nicole Renzulli, Thomas Barbieri, Kathleen Lanphear, Lisa Mancini, and ex-officio members Frank Corrao, Acting Director of the Department of Public Works, and Thomas Zidelis, Director of the Finance Department.

The following members of the City Planning Department were in attendance: Beth Ashman, AICP, Acting Director; Jonas Bruggemann, Senior Planner; Grace Brownell, Planner Technician, and Toby Arment, Municipal Fellow.

The Following City Council Members were in attendance for the meeting: Council President Jessica Marino, Vice-President Daneil Wall, Richard Campopiano, Christopher Buonanno, Bridget Graziano, Andy Andujar, and Frank Ritz Jr. Kirsten Haroian and Michael Traficante were absent.

Also present was Tracy Nelson, City Clerk.

Acting Planning Director, Beth Ashman provided an overview of the expectations for the workshop in addition to the history of the subject site. Ms. Ashman stated the owners of Mulligan’s Island wish to leave the operations of its commercial recreation facility to develop the property for a new use. Ms. Ashman stated the current zoning on this property is a Mixed Planned Development (MPD), specifically for recreational use. Ms. Ashman asserted the intent of the workshop is to move the city forward in crafting a zoning proposal that benefits the Cranston community. As for historic background, Ms. Ashman stated the property was stated-owned land which was sold by the EDC in 1997 to Golfing Partners LLC as part of Phase II of the Howard Industrial Park. She stated the previous large scale development proposal of Costco was received negatively by the city, as it was deemed incompatible with the surrounding area. Ms. Ashman then discussed the various themes raised in previous discussions regarding the development of this property such as that residential development should have a compatible density to abutting residential properties. She noted that the state will take a close look at sight lines due to the prison. She also noted the need for a traffic study. Ms. Ashman concluded by introducing Toby Arment, Municipal Fellow, to discuss the current

*Individuals requesting interpreter services for the hearing impaired must contact the Dept. of City Planning at (401) 780-3136 seventy-two (72) hours prior to the meeting.*

residential demand in Cranston.

Mr. Arment estimated the city needed 2,900 market rate housing units in order to maintain a healthy vacancy rate and 1,600 more low- and moderate-income units if the city wanted to reach the state's 10 percent goal. Lastly, Mr. Arment presented statistics regarding impacts of new construction on school enrollment.

Atty. John Mancini of Mancini Carter, PC, 56 Pine St. 3<sup>rd</sup> Fl, Providence was present on behalf of the applicant and owner of Mulligan's Island. Mr. Mancini provided additional background on the property and the previous MPD path of travel. He stated the original intent for the parcel was an expansion of the prison or the Howard Complex. Between 1998 and 2001, there was discussion between the City Council and the Planning Department of how the site should be rezoned, so it would not be an encroachment to the surrounding neighborhoods or negatively affect future development with the corner of Sockanosset Crossroad. Mr. Mancini stated the property was then approved as a Mixed-Use Development. He stated the client would like to continue with MPD and is proposing to add a residential component in addition to the existing recreation use, as large-scale commercial has been deemed not viable. He stated the proposed residential use is a need in Cranston and the overall state. He stated the intended future process is to establish an understanding of what zoning will permit on the site, and then design, and develop the site accordingly. Mr. Mancini then spoke to unique opportunities this parcel presents for housing due to its size, infrastructure availability, and accessibility to city resources. Mr. Mancini concluded by posing the question to the City Council and City Plan Commission of what type of development they would like to see. Mr. Mancini then introduced Gregory Guglielmo of DiPrete Engineering, 2 Stafford Ct. Cranston for the presentation of the Concept Site Plan and example images of proposed housing development options.

Mr. Guglielmo presented on the submitted conceptual Plan, in stating the following concepts are included: multi-family 3-4 story buildings, duplex and triplex units, single-family residences, a commercial/retail lot, open space, an improved park area, a new entrance to New London Avenue, in addition to the proposed right-of-way along New London Avenue. Mr. Guglielmo stated there is a proposed 50-100 ft. natural buffer surrounding the existing single-family homes. Mr. Guglielmo further asserted there are opportunities here to add recreational or commercial uses. He then presented example images of different housing development types: apartments, multi-family condominiums, duplex/triplex condominiums, and single-family homes.

Mr. Mancini stated the Applicant submitted a draft ordinance which would allow the use of residential in addition to the existing recreational use. Such ordinance would also establish the applicable conditions placed by the Plan Commission and City Council.

Plan Commission Frias invited the Plan Commission to engage in discussion:

- Vice-President Coupe inquired what percentage of the concept plan is reserved for open space.

In response, Mr. Guglielmo stated roughly 30%.

- Commissioner Corrao inquired how much of the site is owned and leased.

Mr. Mancini stated there is a 12-acre ribbon of land along New London Avenue which is state owned and leased from the state.

Council President Marino invited the Council to engage in comment:

- Councilman Wall represents Ward 6 which encompasses the neighborhood of the proposed area. Mr. Wall spoke to the issues raised by the neighborhood. He stated the neighborhood would like to know the proposed density of the site in as it relates to traffic, increased flooding, and school capacity. He stated as a whole, the school system may have some openings, but the schools in Western Cranston are at capacity. Mr. Wall further expressed neighborhood concern over the proposal for the existing playground park to be relocated. Mr. Wall concluded by stating he is in favor of placing conditions on the project.

*Individuals requesting interpreter services for the hearing impaired must contact the Dept. of City Planning at (401) 780-3136 seventy-two (72) hours prior to the meeting.*

In response, Mr. Mancini stated the conditions should be discussed openly. Potential conditions could include a particular formula for density and the requirement of a traffic study. Mr. Mancini asserted stormwater drainage will be better resolved on a site with new development, due to the extensive reviews required by RIDEM. He stated the project team is amenable to a condition in which the playground would be rebuilt to the same standards in the same general area.

Council President Marino thanked the Applicant's representatives for taking a collaborative approach in recognizing the importance of receiving feedback from the community in addition to the two bodies which will review this proposal. Ms. Marino requested clarification from Stephen Marsella, City Asst. Solicitor that the conditions would be solid. She inquired in terms of having a rezoning with conditions, if this is considered permissible.

In response, Stephen Marsella stated he disagrees with the concept of having a mixed-use development with conditions. He stated you can have an approved mixed-use development that is approved according to the ordinance through the City Council. He stated the previously approved mixed-use developments are specific buildings, with specific plans that were approved by the City Council and the City Plan Commission. What you can have is an approved mixed-use development that is reviewed by the City Plan Commission and approved by the City Council. There is a method to make changes in which the applicant needs to go again before the Plan Commission and the City Council. The conditions are essentially the approval.

Mr. Mancini stated the City Council has within its purview to change the zone with conditions, and stated the applicant understands and is willing to return each time a change is needed. He stated this project will develop in phases.

Council President Marino invited the Council to engage in comment:

- Councilwoman Graziano stated concern about fire and police response because there is one way in and one way out, soil suitability, and flooding issues. Ms. Grazio requested that she have review of a Stormwater Prevention Plan and see soil suitability testing a head of time. She stated stormwater management should be held at a higher level. Ms. Graziano stated she does not believe the wetland resource areas are accurately delineated on the plan. She stated she would like to see affordable housing included within the residential proposal. Ms. Graziano concluded in stating she is in support of a new playground.
- Councilman Campopiano inquired if the applicant foresees pursuing a tax stabilization going forward. Mr. Campopiano expressed further concern for school impacts.

In response, Mr. Mancini stated the applicant does not foresee pursuing tax stabilization.

- Councilman Buonanno stated this proposal will be a hard sell for him. Mr. Buonanno expressed strong concern for traffic congestion and school capacity. Mr. Buonanno stated Kettle Point should never be used as an example development for this site. He stated the Garden City School currently has 537 students, which is more than what was anticipated prior to the merging of the Waterman School and Garden City Schools. He stated he will need the applicant to demonstrate to the City Council that the amount of tax money generated from this proposal will outpace the city's costs associated with the development. Mr. Buonanno concluded in inquiring if the southern entrance is conceptualized as a signalized entrance.

In response, Mr. Mancini stated this is a plan, not a development, and once the applicant had a development, he would come back. He stated he wanted to see if the city wants commercial on this site, a mixture of commercial and recreational, or residential.

- Councilman Ritz stated he appreciates the collaborative approach on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Ritz inquired about commercial vehicle traffic on site.

In response, Mr. Mancini stated there would be no commercial vehicles.

*Individuals requesting interpreter services for the hearing impaired must contact the Dept. of City Planning at (401) 780-3136 seventy-two (72) hours prior to the meeting.*

- Councilman Andujar stated the city should come together to obtain the state-owned land so the city can control how it is developed.

Commission President Frias invited the public to engage in public comment:

- John Hill, Chair of the Historic Cemetery Commission, 19 Bradford Rd. Cranston, RI 02910 stated he was pleased to see the historic cemetery on site would be surrounded by an open space buffer and does not expect Commission to have an objection so long as the buffer is maintained.
- Lev Porvow, 136 Roslyn Ave. Cranston, RI 02910 expressed support for the conceptual residential proposal, as Cranston needs more affordable housing.
- Annette Bourne, 51 Community Dr. Cranston, RI 02905 expressed support for the conceptual residential proposal due to the need for more diverse housing types.
- Martha Custer, 50 Community Drive, 02905 expressed support for the conceptual residential proposal, due the need of more affordable housing.
- Gail Harvey, 445 Meshanticut Valley Pkway, Cranston RI 02920, expressed support for the conceptual residential proposal due to the need for responsible housing.
- Pauline DeRosa, 97 Cypress Drive, Cranston RI 02920, stated she is the founder of Garden City Alliance. Ms. DeRosa expressed concern regarding traffic circulation in addition to the impacts on city services and school capacity.
- James Muro 105 Concord Ave., Cranston RI 02920 expressed support for the conceptual residential proposal, due to the need for more market rate and affordable housing.
- Kate Caito, 97 Hilltop Drive Cranston RI 02920 expressed preference in the conceptual residential proposal over the previous large-scale commercial proposal. Ms. Caito expressed concern regarding the issues of school capacity, availability of city resources, traffic circulation, as well as site lines. Ms. Caito further expressed concern for the potential relocation of the existing neighborhood playground. Ms. Caito provided the recommendation to locate buildings on the site in physical proximity to existing neighboring buildings of similar heights. Mr. Caito concluded in stating that more than a 50 ft. buffer is needed between the existing neighborhoods.
- Joe Magrino, 11 Beckman Ave. Cranston, RI 02920 expressed support for the conceptual residential proposal due to the need for more affordable housing but expressed concern regarding the city resources to handle this project.
- Anthoy Melillo, Vice-Chair of the School Committee, 33 Harvard St. Cranston, RI 02920 expressed concern for the potential impact this proposed project could have on the existing over-burdened school system and city infrastructure. Mr. Melillo provided reference to Garden City Elementary School and Western Hills Middle School as examples of schools that are currently at capacity. Mr. Melillo provided recommendation that a school capacity and traffic impact study be provided as part of this application.
- Marcus Stevenson, 87 Garden Hills Dr. Cranston RI, 02920 expressed opposition to the proposed conceptual residential proposal due to the existing issues regarding traffic congestion and school capacity. Mr. Stevenson stated Mulligan's Island is not a viable site for housing and provided a recommendation for the site to be redeveloped with an indoor recreational facility.
- Hilda Riccio, 144 Woodstock Ln. Cranston RI, 02920 expressed concern for the existing issues regarding school capacity, and traffic congestion. Ms. Riccio expressed opposition toward the inclusion of commercial uses. If anything, she suggested an over fifty-five senior living community for the site.
- Christopher Paplauskas, State Representative District 15, 14 Highland St., Cranston RI 02920 stated the following issues were raised to him by residents: proposed height of buildings and the proposed buffer, the impact on the school system, the relocation of the existing playground.
- Matthew Souza 4 Grove Ave. Cranston RI, 02920 expressed support for the conceptual residential proposal due the need for more affordable housing.

*Individuals requesting interpreter services for the hearing impaired must contact the Dept. of City Planning at (401) 780-3136 seventy-two (72) hours prior to the meeting.*

Zoom public comment:

- Rachel McNally, 113 Hilltop Drive Cranston, RI 02920 inquired how the proposed commercial use would be integrated. Ms. McNally further stated this site will not solve the affordable housing crisis and expressed concern for the school capacity issue.
- Daria Brashear, 1900 Borad Street Cranston, RI 02920 stated this proposal will not solve the affordable housing crisis.
- Dan Muse, 60 Hill Top Drive Cranston, RI 02920 expressed preference for the conceptual residential proposal over a large-scale commercial use. Mr. Muse further expressed concern for the existing issues regarding traffic congestion, flooding, and the open-ended nature of the proposed ordinance. Mr. Muse further inquired who would be in charge of managing the buffer zone between the existing residential neighborhood and the new development.

Commission President Frias stated he has a significant issue with the proposed ordinance wording, as it is a blank check which gives the owner carte blanche to put whatever housing and how much housing the applicant wants. He stated in Cranston, MPDs have specific requirements as to the number of housing units and parking spaces Mr. Frias further stated the better way to approach this is for Mr. Mancini to go out to the market himself, come up with the best desired plan, present the proposal to the City Plan Commission, and then start the discussion. Otherwise, it was putting the cart before the horse. Mr. Frias stated this is a broadly written ordinance that he would have significant problems supporting and stated he would be open to hearing Mr. Mancini's points at an appropriate time as to why it is essential to have a broadly written ordinance. Mr. Frias stated he is skeptical of the commercial need for a broadly written ordinance because other MPDs have not needed such an ordinance. . He asserted one of the goals with the Comprehensive Plan is to improve existing recreation facilities. Mulligan's Island is an important recreational facility and has been such for a generation. Mr. Frias stated he knows there is the need for more housing but would need more information in regard to why recreation is not discussed as a viable alternative, where there is a demand for an indoor recreation facility in this area. Mr. Frias asserted if the applicant decides to pursue the proposed conceptual residential proposal, he will need a credible fiscal impact study. Mr. Frias stated in regard to the issues raised about school capacity, he cares about data specific to Cranston. He stated his perception is residential housing is a net negative fiscally for the city. Mr. Frias estimated that the proposal will likely result in 300 to 400 units, which is a large amount of housing and could negatively impact the schools. He expressed concern about traffic congestion. Mr. Frias further pointed to the fact that creating a road through the local park would go against a goal in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Frias stated the Commission typically does not put housing in locations in close proximity to nuisances, and prisons are typically considered a nuisance. Mr. Frias stated he would like to see the applicant provide data in regard to what housing next to prisons look like. He further stated if housing is placed close to the prison, there will be a constant friction related incompatible uses. Mr. Frias concluded in stating the Cranston is exempt from the Affordable Housing Comprehensive Permit, as 25% of the city's housing stock are apartments and 15% of the apartments are affordable. He stated if the conceptual residential proposal is pursued by the applicant, he would like to see 15% of the mutli-family units designated as affordable housing.

In response, Mr. Mancini stated all the points made by Mr. Frias are well taken. He stated he will provide the necessary research and data to address all issues raised by Mr. Frias. Mr. Mancini stated that recreation is not impossible, but it is a challenge. He stated a recreational complex would be a commercial facility and would have similar issues as a big box. However, he does not believe recreation should be abandoned completely. He agreed that putting housing next to nuisance is not a good idea, but he argued that there is a need for housing. He stated although Cranston is exempt from the Affordable Housing Comprehensive Permit, it does not mean that the Commission cannot accept and review such. He argued rejection of a permit would have to be grounded on good cause, and the applicant would go to court.

In response, Mr. Frias stated he was not afraid of a lawsuit. He also stated in the 1998 plan that was approved by this City Council, the proposal included a two-story indoor recreational facility in it. He stated the residents would likely not consider such a facility as commercial but instead as consistent with the original intent for the property, which was recreational.

*Individuals requesting interpreter services for the hearing impaired must contact the Dept. of City Planning at (401) 780-3136 seventy-two (72) hours prior to the meeting.*

Mr. Mancini asserted he is not opposed to a good recreational planning on that site and will look into it.

Plan Commission President Frias invited the Commission to provide comment:

- Commissioner Lanpher stated the language that concerns her the most within the proposed ordinance is the language regarding residential uses which makes it permitted by-right on the property. Ms. Lanpher stated there are recent court decisions that have suggested that once a use is allowed by-right on a property, what the City Council or the City Plan Commission can do is very limited. She stated the proposed language does not provide any certainty for the Commission.
- Commissioner Renzulli stated she appreciates the collaborative approach by the applicant and that he did not attempt to jam through a plan with 400 units. She hoped they consider alternative options. Ms. Renzulli further expressed concern about school capacity, and the nuisances in regards to Harrington Hall and the prison.

Upon a motion made by Plan Commission President Frias and seconded by Plan Commission Vice-President Coupe, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (9-0) to adjourn the joint workshop at 9:16 p.m.

Upon a motion made by Councilman Campopiano, and seconded by Councilman Wall, The City Council voted unanimously (7-0) to adjourn the joint workshop at 9:16 p.m.

### **RETURN TO REGULAR MEETING**

The following Commissioners were in attendance for the meeting: President Steven Frias, Vice-President Robert Coupe, David Exter, Nicole Renzulli, Thomas Barbieri, Kathleen Lanpher, Lisa Mancini, and ex-officio members Frank Corrao, Acting Director of the Department of Public Works, and Thomas Zidelis, Director of the Finance Department.

The following members of the City Planning Department were in attendance: Beth Ashman, AICP, Acting Director; Jonas Bruggemann, Senior Planner; and Grace Brownell, Planner Technician.

Plan Commission President Frias called the meeting to order at 9:22 p.m. in the main auditorium, Cranston East High School.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- 2.4.25 City Plan Commission Meeting

Upon a motion made by Commissioner Barbieri and seconded by Commissioner Exter, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (9-0) to approve the minutes as distributed. Commissioners Coupe, Renzulli, and Lanpher abstained.

### **EXTENSIONS**

- **“Knights Corner Development”**

Major Land Development Project- Master Plan

Extension Request: May 2, 2026

Proposal: The redevelopment of the existing church building, and the construction of four (4) large-scale apartment buildings, as well as associated parking, landscaping, and accessory recreational amenities.

Zoning District: C-2

Owner/Applicant: N.E Development Fund, 1 LLC

1388 & 1390 Cranston Street,

AP 8, Lots 203 & 2739

### **PUBLIC MEETING**

Atty. Robert Murray of Taft & McSally LLP, 21 Garden City Dr., Cranston RI, 02920 was present on *Individuals requesting interpreter services for the hearing impaired must contact the Dept. of City Planning at (401) 780-3136 seventy-two (72) hours prior to the meeting.*

behalf of the applicant to present the extension request.

Upon a motion made by Commissioner Barbieri and seconded by Commissioner Mancini, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (9-0) to grant an extension of Master Plan Approval to May 2, 2026.

▪ **“Cranston Print Works”**

**PUBLIC MEETING**

Major Land Development Project- Master Plan

Extension Request: April 4, 2026

Proposal: The redevelopment of the Historic Cranston Print Works parcel into a mixed-use residential/commercial site with storage and multi-family housing.

Zoning District: M-1 with Conditions Special Redevelopment Area

Owner/Applicant: CPW True Storage, LLC & CPW Apartment, LLC

1381 Cranston Street

AP 8, Lots 195, 1617, 2711

Atty. Robert Murray of Taft & McSally LLP, 21 Garden City Dr., Cranston RI, 02920 was present on behalf of the applicant to present the extension request.

Upon a motion made by Commissioner Barbieri and seconded by Commissioner Mancini, the City Plan Commission voted (9-0) to grant an extension of Master Plan Approval to April 4, 2026.

**ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW-CITY PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS**

**P&P REALTY, LLC and HSM INVESTMENTS, LLC** have filed an application to allow a laundromat use in an industrial zone at 1420 Elmwood Avenue, A.P. 4, lot 2616; area 1.97ac; zoned M2. Applicants seek relief per Section 17.92.010- Variances; Section 17.20.030- Schedule of Uses. **Application filed 1/25/2025. John J. Garrahy, Esq.**

Senior Planner, Jonas Bruggemann provided a summary of the staff memorandum and his positive recommendation on the application.

Atty. John J. Garrahy of John J. Garrahy Law, LLC, 160 Westminster St. Providence RI, 02903 was present on behalf of the applicant and further provided an overview in regard to the proposed use variance. Mr. Garrahy stated this is a transitional area of Elmwood in which the proposed use would be consistent with the surrounding area.

Conversation ensued between Commission President Frias and Mr. Garrahy in which Mr. Garrahy stated that the property is currently vacant, and he stated if the property was allowed a commercial use, it would generate more economic activity for the City of Cranston.

Due to the findings that the requests for dimensional relief are consistent with the goals and purposes of the Comprehensive Plan; and due to the findings that the requests would be compatible with the character of the surrounding area; upon motion made by Commissioner Renzulli, and seconded by Plan Commission Vice-President Coupe, the City Plan Commission unanimously voted unanimously (9-0) to accept the Staff Recommendation and forward a positive recommendation on this Application to the Zoning Board of Review.

**HEIDY C. PAZ (OWN/APP)** has filed an application to request permission to alter a previously granted variance to construct a single-family dwelling on an under-sized lot at 175 Farmington Avenue, A.P. 8, lot 1022; area 4,500 s.f.; zoned B1. **Applicant seeks relief per 17.92.010- Variances; Section 17.20.120- Schedule of Intensity Regulations. Application filed 2/12/22. No attorney.**

Planner Technician, Grace Brownell provided a summary of the staff memorandum and her positive recommendation on the application.

Plan Commission President Frias invited the public to provide comment:

- Ward 3 Councilman Andy Andujar stated he spoke to many of the abutting neighbors of this property which are in support of the proposed application.

*Individuals requesting interpreter services for the hearing impaired must contact the Dept. of City Planning at (401) 780-3136 seventy-two (72) hours prior to the meeting.*

Due to the findings that the requests for dimensional relief are consistent with the goals and purposes of the Comprehensive Plan; and due to the findings that the requests would be compatible with the character of the surrounding area; upon motion made by Commissioner Renzulli, and seconded by Commissioner Mancini, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (9-0) to accept the Staff Recommendation and forward a positive recommendation on this Application to the Zoning Board of Review.

**JESUS COLON (OWN/APP)** has applied to the Board to construct a new single-family dwelling on an under-sized lot previously merged for zoning at 0 Whiting Street, A.P. 12, lot 2890; area 4,736 sf; zoned A6. Applicants seek relief per Section 17.92.010- Variances; Section 17.20.120- Schedule of Intensity Regulations. **Application filed 1/22/2025.**

Senior Planner, Jonas Bruggemann provided a summary of the staff memorandum and his positive recommendation on the application.

Plan Commission Frias stated he will not be voting in favor of this application due to its inconsistency with the designated FLUM density and exceeds the density of the existing neighborhood, which is contrary to Policy LU-18.

Commissioner Lanphear stated she will not be voting in favor of this application due to her concern for the Commission setting the precedent to allow smaller lots to be built on with density that exceeds the FLUM

Due to the findings that the requests for dimensional relief are not consistent with the goals and purposes of the Comprehensive Plan; and due to the findings that the requests would exceed the density of the existing neighborhood; upon motion made by Commissioner Lanphear, and seconded by Commissioner Exter, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (6-3) to reject the Staff Recommendation and forward a negative recommendation on this Application to the Zoning Board of Review. Commissioner Vice-President Coupe, nay; Commissioner Corrao, nay; Commissioner Zidelis, nay.

#### **AMENDMENT TO SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS PUBLIC HEARING CONT**

- **“Administrative Subdivision Checklist”**
- **Minor Subdivision & Minor Land Development Projects Checklist**
- **Major Subdivisions & Major Land Development Projects Checklist**
- **Unified Development Review Fees**

Conversation ensued amongst the Plan Commission and the Asst. City Solicitor in regards to the legal process for voting on the presented checklists.

- Commissioner Zidelis inquired with staff as to whether the presented fees cover the costs required for Unified Development Review.

Ms. Ashman stated no analysis has been conducted in which she can answer as to whether the associated costs would be covered under these fees. Ms. Ashman stated she feels they are well-merited in terms of time dedicated to staff review.

- Commissioner Lanphear stated all checklists should require all owners of the subject property of the application to sign the application.

Plan Commission President Frias invited the public to provide comment:

- Atty. Robert Murray of Taft & McSally LLP, 21 Garden City Dr., Cranston RI, 02920 stated he does not believe that under the enabling statute for UDR that the City Plan Commission has the authority to establish additional fees but instead it must go through the City Council. Mr. Murray discussed the distinctions between the work and costs of the Zoning Department in comparison to the Planning Department's level of intake for a UDR application.

Conversation then ensued about the legal process needed to approve the proposed UDR fees. Asst. City Solicitor stated if the fees were included by reference within the previous advertising for the Subdivision and Land Development Regulations Public Hearing, such would be sufficient. However, there is the option to propose an ordinance to the City Council. Plan Commission President Frias stated he would feel more

*Individuals requesting interpreter services for the hearing impaired must contact the Dept. of City Planning at (401) 780-3136 seventy-two (72) hours prior to the meeting.*

comfortable if the City Council set the fees. He believed the Commission can vote to approve the checklists but not the fees.

Upon a motion made by Plan Commission Vice-President Coupe, and seconded by Commissioner Lanphear, The City Plan Commission voted unanimously (9-0) to approve the Subdivision and Land Development Regulation Checklists with the amendment as requested by Commissioner Lanphear.

### **CITY PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

- Tree Cover Technical Assistance

Ms. Ashman stated the city has an offer for tree technical assistance in which the planning staff will be working on with the Green Infrastructure Bank.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Upon a motion made by Commissioner Renzulli and seconded by Commissioner Corrao, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (9-0) to adjourn at 10:27 p.m.

Next Meeting | Wednesday, March 5, 2025, 6:00 PM – **Special Meeting on Capital Budget**  
City Hall – 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Council Chamber – 869 Park Avenue

Next Meeting | Tuesday, April 1, 2025, 6:30 PM – **Regular Meeting**  
City Hall – 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Council Chamber – 869 Park Avenue

*Individuals requesting interpreter services for the hearing impaired must contact the Dept. of City Planning at (401) 780-3136 seventy-two (72) hours prior to the meeting.*