

Kenneth J. Hopkins
Mayor

Michael E. Smith
President

Jason M. Pezzullo, AICP
Planning Director



CITY PLAN COMMISSION

Thomas Barbieri
Richard Bernardo
Robert Coupe
David Exter
Steven Frias
Kathleen Lanphear
Lisa Mancini
Thomas Zidelis

Minutes

Tuesday, April 4th, 2023 – 6:30 PM

Cranston Central Library – 140 Sockanosset Cross Road

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chairman Coupe called the meeting to order at 6:36 p.m. in the James Giles Community Room at the Cranston Central Library, 140 Sockanosset Cross Road.

The following Commissioners were in attendance for the meeting: Chairman Michael Smith (*arrived 7:02 p.m.*), Richard Bernardo, Thomas Barbieri, Robert Coupe, David Exter, Steven Frias, Kathleen Lanphear, and Lisa Mancini. Commissioner Thomas Zidelis was absent.

The following Planning Department members were in attendance: Jason M. Pezzullo, AICP, Planning Director; Douglas McLean, AICP, Principal Planner; Gregory Guertin, Senior Planner; Alexander Berardo, Planning Technician; and Amelia Lavallee, Planning Department Intern.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

(votes taken)

- 3/7/23 Regular City Plan Commission meeting
- 3/20/23 Special City Plan Commission meeting

Mr. Frias proposed to add several comments for clarification purposes in three sections of the draft 3/7/23 minutes, namely in the Fire Department budget discussion (p.3), the Residences at Oaklawn major land development discussion (p.6), and the Eden Crest Plat minor subdivision discussion (p.10).

Upon motion by Mr. Frias, and seconded by Mr. Bernardo, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to **amend and approve** the regular City Plan Commission meeting minutes of 3/7/23 with Mr. Frias' suggested edits.

Mr. Frias also requested that several edits and additions be made on pages 2, 4, and 5 of the draft 3/20/23 minutes.

Upon motion by Mr. Frias, and seconded by Mr. Exter, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to **amend and approve** the special City Plan Commission meeting minutes of 3/20/23 with Mr. Frias' suggested edits.

2022 HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN (5-YEAR UPDATE)

(vote taken)

- Resolution authorizing the adoption of the 2022 Cranston Hazard Mitigation Plan update. Sponsored by Mayor Hopkins and Council President Marino

Director Pezzullo said the consultant (VHB) worked with a municipal committee on the 5-year update of the Hazard Mitigation Plan, the full draft of which was completed last Fall (and has been available for

viewing on the Planning Department's webpage for 5-6 months). He said that RIEMA and FEMA both approved it already, and following the Commission, the last step will be for the City Council to pass a resolution of adoption. He then said FEMA informed the City that its regulations have changed, and as a result, the City has until April 19th to approve this update or else the process will have to be restarted under the new regulations – a process that will probably take at least two years.

Mr. Frias asked if Director Pezzullo could speak to NRCS and how it relates to discussions in the draft plan of potential buyouts of high-density residential properties in floodplains. Director Pezzullo said the NRCS is a federal agency that is funded to offer voluntary buyouts to property owners located in areas that it has calculated that it is not financially feasible to protect from flood damage in the long term. Mr. Bernardo asked if that process was similar to what FEMA did after the 2010 Floods, but Director Pezzullo said the main differences would be that FEMA offered the City a 25% match for property buyouts, while the NRCS would administer and finance the buyouts with another third-party group.

Upon motion made by Mr. Bernardo, and seconded by Mr. Frias, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (6-0) to forward a positive recommendation on the resolution of adoption for the Hazard Mitigation Plan to the City Council.

ORDINANCES AND LAND DEVELOPMENTS

(votes taken for all items)

OLD BUSINESS

- **1-23-04** - Ordinance in amendment of Chapter 17 of the Code of the City of Cranston, 2005, Entitled "Zoning" (Change of Zone – 1381 Cranston St. and 767 Dyer Ave. – **Cranston Print Works Project**). **M-1 zone with conditions to allow multi-family development.**
(Continued from the 3/7/23 agenda)
- **"Cranston Print Works" Public Informational Meeting** (vote taken)
MASTER PLAN – Major Land Development
Redevelop the former mill complex into a maximum of 150 multi-family apartments and self-storage units.
Current Zone M-1 (M-1 with special conditions is proposed (**Ord. 1-23-04**))
AP 8, Lots 195, 1617, and 2711
1381 Cranston Street
(Continued from the 3/7/23 agenda)

Senior Planner Gregory Guertin gave the Staff presentation. Mr. Guertin said the applicants of record, CPW True Storage, LLC, had submitted both a Major Land Development – Master Plan application and a Zone Change ordinance in relation to its proposal to redevelop the remaining historic buildings that comprise the Cranston Print Works mill complex into a mixed-use facility of 129 residential units and mini-storage facilities.

Mr. Guertin shared several maps, graphics, and photographs taken during site visits to establish the site context in the Laurel Hill neighborhood, specifying that the City's maps as generated through GIS should be considered illustrative only, and that the applicant's maps are slightly more precise. He noted the property is currently zoned M-1 and has a Future Land Use designation of Special Redevelopment Area. He said the surrounding neighborhood contains a mix of zones and noted that the applicant seeks to rezone the property to "M-1 with conditions." He displayed site plans to show the location of proposed self-storage buildings as well as the proposed parking and circulation arrangements.

He then offered the Planning Analysis. Speaking first to the choice of using the M-1 zone standards as the base for the rezone, Mr. Guertin began by observing that certain uses that are allowed by-right in the M-1 zone are not compatible with residential uses, but then said Staff does not foresee the creation of any nuisances being created through the rezone. He reasoned that multifamily residential and self-storage (a by-right use in the M-1 zone) should coexist well, as self-storage is known to generate little traffic or environmental impacts. He further noted that the Development Plan Review Committee would have jurisdiction to review any potential future proposals to add new commercial or industrial activities to the site. He shared a chart comparing the dimensional standards for signage as allowed in the M-1 zone

with the standards that the ordinance specifies, but said Staff doesn't have concerns that the applicant would propose signage at the maximum dimensions allowed under the proposed ordinance.

Mr. Guertin also said the ordinance called for up to 150 residential units to be built on-site to afford the developer some flexibility in case future engineering plans are revised and the unit count deviates slightly from their current plans (which are to build 129 residential units, comprised of 5 three-bedroom, 94 two-bedroom, and 30 one-bedroom units). He said that the resulting residential density from this proposed development would be 3.06 units/acre (7.22 units/acre if calculated using only upland area). Mr. Guertin added that even if they built the maximum 150 units allowed under the draft ordinance, they would still fall well within the density limits of the surrounding neighborhood, and in any case the subject parcel's FLUM designation specifies no density limit. He said the Comp Plan specifically identified the Print Works complex as an area to target for redevelopment. The proposal also meets City's requirements for both multifamily residential units and exceeds the requirements for the self-storage component.

Finally, Mr. Guertin said Staff made positive recommendations on both the ordinance and the MLD – Master Plan application and specified the conditions of approval proposed for the latter. *(Chairman Smith joined the meeting at 7:02 p.m.)*

Atty. Robert Murray, representing the applicant, thanked Mr. Guertin for his presentation and Planning Staff for their help. He said he was very pleased to be affiliated with the project, particularly because the developer (Brady Sullivan Properties) has an excellent track record of high-quality mill redevelopment projects. For the benefit of the newer Commissioners, he recalled that an initial Site Walk was held in summer 2021 and provided additional background on the project's permitting path, including its Development Plan Review Committee hearing in summer 2022. He said the applicant team would give one presentation covering both the ordinance and MLD components of the project.

Chris Reynolds, Senior Project Manager with Brady Sullivan Properties, clicked through a PowerPoint presentation showing the company's track record of completed mill restoration projects in the state of Rhode Island. He said Brady Sullivan has taken advantage of state Historic Tax Credits for numerous projects, which has given them numerous occasions to work with the RI Historic Preservation & Heritage Commission and incorporate RIHPHC's attention to preserving the historic integrity of these structures into their redevelopment plans.

The precise mix of units generally is determined by the unique characteristics of each mill building, but Brady Sullivan generally focuses on two- and three-bedroom units. Despite this, the company primarily targets "empty nesters" and younger people who are just beginning to live on their own as prospective tenants, as opposed to families. The amenities usually found in their projects – like office space, community gathering spaces, and workout rooms, but notably not playgrounds – in turn reflects the interests of their target demographics.

Regarding the specifics of the Print Works site, Mr. Reynolds said that the main redevelopment challenge is that the mill complex was expanded through multiple additions, which created large amounts of windowless interior space that is not suitable for residential conversion. Brady Sullivan's solution is to dedicate the windowless interior space to self-storage use. Another unique characteristic of the property that constitutes a help, rather than a hindrance, to redevelopment is the size of the site: there is ample room for surface parking, which is not common in Brady Sullivan's experience.

Finally, Mr. Reynolds said the only new construction contemplated in this proposal will be some self-storage buildings on higher ground (closer to Dyer Ave) in the northern end of the site. Mr. Reynolds said the applicant had originally considered adding a new three- or four-story residential building on the northern end of the site as well, but because it would have been located on lower ground (near the pond) and been located in a flood plain, the applicant decided it didn't feel the need to pursue an extra component for the project that would have likely entailed long-term negotiations with RIDEM.

Chairman Smith asked the applicant to consider preserving a 200-year-old tree on the property and asked if they had any plans involving the historic canal. Mr. Reynolds said new RIDEM wetland

regulations recently came into effect, and since it will take time to determine what the regulations allow and prohibit, they hope to have more clarity in the future on what to do with the canal. Chairman Smith also observed that the building proposed for the corner of Cranston St & Dyer Ave needs to be treated carefully because of its high visibility in a historic area.

Mr. Bernardo asked if Brady Sullivan would only develop the project or if it intended to remain the owner; Mr. Reynolds confirmed they typically own the projects they develop. Mr. Bernardo explained that the adjacent Print Works dam was designated a high-hazard dam under the newly-approved Hazard Mitigation Plan, so the City will need Brady Sullivan (as the owner) to give the City assurances that the dam will be inspected every two years, with copies of the inspection reports to be shared with the City. Mr. Reynolds said they'd be happy to cooperate as Mr. Bernardo described. Mr. Frias asked whether the dam's risk designation reflected its current condition, or the impact it would have if it failed. Mr. Bernardo indicated that it was the latter. Mr. Frias then inquired about the dam's current condition; Mr. Reynolds said RIDEM studied it about five years ago and found it was in relatively good condition and probably only needed minor repairs.

Michael Malynowski, P.E./Senior Project Manager with Allen & Major Associates, a company which he said has worked with Brady Sullivan to facilitate the self-storage components of prior development projects. After reviewing the existing conditions on-site, Mr. Malynowski discussed the applicant's redevelopment plans. He said there would be new parking and circulation arrangements serving the existing buildings labeled A through D on the plan; that the new two-story self-storage building to be erected at the corner of Cranston and Dyer would be built within the existing paved area; and the new self-storage area to the north will be built on a portion of the site that is vacant today, but historically accommodated additional mill buildings.

Mr. Malynowski said detailed stormwater plans would be submitted at the next phase of review, if the project receives Master Plan approval, but summarized the current plans by noting that stormwater detention and infiltration systems, as well as a redesign of the water and sewer systems on-site, are envisioned. He also confirmed no changes would be made within the floodplain that would alter its shape or otherwise affect it. Finally, he said the applicant intends to maintain the oversized curb cut on Cranston Street and will open two additional curb cuts on Dyer Ave for access into the self-storage area, which itself is a low traffic generator.

Speaking more generally to the question of site contamination and remediation, Mr. Reynolds added that prior to the applicant's purchasing the property, they conducted a site investigation of 25 test pits and monitoring wells and found the site was not very contaminated, considering its past use. They found minor PCB contamination inside the building and small pockets outside that would require soil removal. They are following RIDEM standards for remediation and noted the rear area of the site would need to be capped with two feet of clean soil.

Scott Thornton, P.E., of Vanasse & Associates, first discussed his methods in creating his Traffic Analysis, which was peer-reviewed by Pare Corporation. He said that he gathered five hours' worth of traffic count data, including the morning and afternoon peak hours, at several nearby intersections: Dyer/Puritan, Dyer/Governor, Dyer/Cranston, and Haven/Cranston. He reviewed traffic volumes and crash data to get a sense of existing conditions, and factored 5-year projections for future traffic growth as well as nearby proposed projects, namely the Knight's Corner development, to build the future conditions and determine what traffic impacts the Print Works redevelopment would have.

Mr. Thornton then shared his findings. He said the applicant's proposal is expected to generate between 60 and 70 vehicle trips during peak hours, with the self-storage component accounting for 15-21 trips during peak hours. He said the Cranston/Dyer intersection functions somewhere in the C- to D-range under existing conditions, with the eastbound lane on Cranston St already near capacity. As the Print Works redevelopment would push that component of the intersection over capacity, Mr. Thornton recommended modifying the signal timing to accommodate the change in traffic. This would result in a return to, or potentially even an improvement over, no-build conditions.

Mr. Thornton also said the project should not adversely impact the circulation of emergency vehicles from the nearby fire station because current conditions include an emergency signal and clear lines of sight between the Print Works property and the fire station as well as up Cranston Street.

Mr. Bernardo suggested that changing the lights to allow opposing left-turns might also facilitate the traffic situation at the Cranston/Dyer intersection, but then he voiced a belief that the intersection needed more than just changes to the light timing. He asked the applicant to consider sharing the cost of upgrading the signaling with the Knight's Corner developers. Atty. Murray said they would consider his request and want to ensure synergy between both projects. Mr. Frias asked Atty. Murray whether he was prepared to make any specific commitments in that moment to improving the situation at that intersection, but Atty. Murray said he felt it was better to wait until the Preliminary Plan phase of review, when more detail has been gathered and presented to the Commission and more specific traffic solutions can be identified.

Mr. Frias asked Mr. Thornton whether his traffic estimates were based on national averages, which he confirmed. Mr. Frias then asked whether the estimates account for the unit mix of a multifamily proposal, explaining that it seemed strange to him that 99 of the total 129 units will be two-bedroom, but they project only 73 vehicle trips at peak hour. Mr. Thornton said these numbers reflect the fact that people have different schedules, so not everyone leaves or enters the property during the peak hours. Mr. Bernardo told Mr. Frias that the ITE standards (which Mr. Thornton referenced in developing his traffic estimates) do balance the different uses and said he felt the estimates were reasonable, although he noted it would be even more useful for the Commission to have been able to review traffic data from other (completed) Brady Sullivan projects. He asked if Mr. Thornton knew whether Brady Sullivan maintained records of such data, but he said he didn't know at that time.

Mr. Coupe asked whether the parking spaces along the Dyer Ave-facing side of Building A would be blocked in the event that a vehicle queue forms on-site while people try to exit onto Cranston St during peak hours. Mr. Thornton said that the Print Works site could theoretically contain a fairly long queue, but said the peak hour estimate is a queue of only one vehicle in length. He offered to review the distances after the meeting, but suspected it wouldn't be an issue in practice.

Chairman Smith asked how many employees once worked at the Print Works complex, but no members of the applicant team knew the numbers. Chairman Smith then reframed his question to ask whether the redevelopment represented a more or less traffic-intensive use than it was in its industrial heyday. Mr. Horton said in comparative terms, the site would probably have once drawn two or three times as much peak-hour traffic as it would under the current redevelopment concept.

Ms. Lanphear then asked why the Project Parking Demand table (244 parking spaces proposed) on the site plan seemed to result from different calculations than the text of the ordinance (2 parking spaces per dwelling unit with an additional 12 spaces for storage). Mr. Horton said the site plan may have been updated since the analysis was done. Atty. Murray specified the ordinance contains the phrasing they want, so if there are discrepancies, the applicant would prefer that language rule.

Before he introduced the next member of the applicant team, Atty. Murray took a moment to acknowledge the lack of affordable housing component in the project. He said that Brady Sullivan first stated in August 2021 that it doesn't incorporate affordable housing into its business model. Atty. Murray added that he and Director Pezzullo previously calculated that the Print Works project would not add so many new market-rate rental units to the City's total pool that it would cause the City to fall below the threshold of exemption from having to entertain Comp Permit applications. He finally said that it was up to the Commission to decide whether the project's contribution to historic preservation outweighed its lack of contribution to the City's affordable housing supply.

Mr. Frias thanked Atty. Murray for addressing the matter and said his main concern with the project was the lack of an affordable housing component. Mr. Frias said the Print Works site was located on a RIPTA line and in proximity to other multifamily housing units, which were characteristics that seemed conducive for new affordable housing. He then acknowledged that the affordable housing aspect was more important to him (on an individual level) than the historic preservation aspect because the city would lose

local control over its own zoning regulations if it loses its exemption from Comp Permits. Solicitor Marsella qualified that statement by saying the Comp Permit process does not eliminate local control altogether, but instead shifts decision-making power to the Planning Commission and specifies criteria against which projects must be judged.

The final member of the applicant team to present, Francis Spinella, of FJS Associates, Ltd, then addressed the Commission to speak to the Fiscal Analysis that he had prepared. He said he had been a housing consultant for 30 years in RI and had prepared his analysis using data from other Brady Sullivan properties in the state whenever possible. He explained that multifamily projects rarely show a positive fiscal impact, with school-aged children usually being the primary driver of municipal service costs. (He also said Cranston spends roughly \$10,000 per student.) Given the average number of children housed within Brady Sullivan mill renovation projects, Mr. Spinella estimated the Print Works redevelopment would bring a net benefit of \$364,000 to the City annually.

Mr. Frias noted that the high-end ratio of how many children might be expected to live at the Print Works project would translate to 13 children, which is almost double the anticipated number (8). Mr. Spinella said that the revenue estimates were conservative and are high enough that the project would still turn a healthy profit for the City even if the actual number of children was double the anticipated number. Mr. Spinella further said he expected most of the two-bedroom units would be occupied by single residents. Mr. Frias said he felt the Fiscal Analysis was thorough.

Atty. Murray concluded by saying the ordinance associated with the Master Plan application is the framework that will allow the redevelopment of the site. Addressing Mr. Guertin's comments in the presentation and Staff Memo, he explained that the choice to use the M-1 zone as a base for the rezone was not related to signage standards, but rather a reflection of self-storage being an allowed use in that zone. The building height and off-street parking figures in the ordinance are further meant to reflect the existing conditions.

Chairman Smith then invited the public to comment on the matter.

- Frank DeFruscio, President and founder of DeFruscia Industries, Inc. (located across the Pocasset River from the Print Works complex), first sought clarity on how to interpret his property falling within the notification radius depicted on the Assessors Map, and then asked if there would be a contingency plan in place to widen Cranston Street if traffic one day becomes a larger issue. Atty. Murray observed that there are numerous physical constraints to road widening, such as the bridge and the river, and Mr. Bernardo said road widening does not change the street's capacity, but it could introduce new speeding issues, and for those reasons the City will pursue upgrading the signalization as the primary means of traffic mitigation. Mr. DeFruscio finally asked if the project would cause enough additional pressure on the gas supply as to cause issues; Atty. Murray said they don't know what the demand level will be yet, but would inform him once they know.

Seeing no other commenters, Chairman Smith asked for a motion to close the public comment period. Upon motion made by Mr. Bernardo, and seconded by Mr. Barbieri, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (8-0) to close public comment.

Chairman Smith first asked for a motion on the proposed ordinance. Mr. Frias asked for a chance to discuss the matter further, introducing a motion to amend the ordinance by adding a condition of approval that 15% of the units must be deed-restricted affordable housing. Ms. Lanphear seconded the motion for discussion purposes.

Ms. Lanphear said she appreciated Mr. Frias' consistency on important matters like affordable housing but felt that an exception to requiring an affordable component could be reasonably justified on several grounds that were unique to the Print Works site, namely its FLUM designation of "Special Redevelopment Area," its potential for historic preservation, and its defining presence in the neighborhood (which makes it a key component of the City's Knightsville revitalization efforts). She also

noted that the applicant has a proven track record of success in taking on mill reconversion projects. Finally, Ms. Lanphear said that the Commission's general stance toward affordable housing – that multifamily developments should dedicate at least 15% of the units as affordable – should remain unchanged even if an exception is granted.

Mr. Coupe said he agreed with Mr. Frias' concern for maintaining as much local control over development proposals as possible, but having learned earlier from Mr. Reynolds that the projected rental rates (market price) would be \$1,800/month for one-bedroom units and \$2,200/month for two bed-room units, he believed that the redevelopment project wouldn't be feasible if the developer had to charge affordable housing rental rates. Mr. Coupe said he was firmly pro-affordable housing, and believed that the City might well push for more than 15% as a baseline affordable component in future projects, but he didn't want to imperil the Print Works project by adding Mr. Frias' proposed condition of approval.

With Mr. Frias and Ms. Lanphear having already provided the motion and second, respectively, the City Plan Commission proceeded to a vote. The motion failed by a vote of 2-6, with Mr. Frias and Mr. Exter voting Yes. Chairman Smith then asked for another motion.

Upon motion made by Mr. Bernardo, and seconded by Mr. Barbieri, the City Plan Commission then voted unanimously (8-0) to forward a positive recommendation on Ordinance #1-23-04 to the City Plan Commission.

Turning to the Master Plan application, Ms. Lanphear asked to add in a condition of approval to the Staff Memo to bring the parking calculations into conformance with the language contained in the ordinance by calling for two parking spaces per dwelling unit and 12 spaces for the storage component, up to 150 units. Mr. Guertin said the total number of parking spaces that would result from the ordinance's formula would be higher than the site plan's proposed number. As the site is located on a bus line and Staff has asked for better bicycle and pedestrian amenities, he suggested that to require the ordinance's calculation to rule would result in overparking. Ms. Lanphear said she was trying to find a way to make the two halves of the proposal consistent with one another, but after Atty. Murray confirmed the applicant only envisioned 129 units (instead of the maximum 150), Ms. Lanphear said she no longer believed there was a practical need to for her proposed condition of approval.

Upon motion by Ms. Lanphear, and seconded by Mr. Bernardo, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (8-0) to approve the Major Land Development – Master Plan application as submitted.

NEW BUSINESS

- **2-23-01** - Ordinance in amendment of Chapter 17 of the Code of the City of Cranston, 2005, entitled "Zoning" (Change of Zone – 0 Plainfield Pike, AP 36, Lots 8 and 37). **Commercial Flex Space for Industrial Zones (vote taken)**

Principal Planner Doug McLean gave the staff presentation. He said the applicant proposed to rezone the subject site from M-2 to "M-2 with Commercial Flex Overlay." He reviewed various maps, graphics, and the site plan (which was shared for informational purposes only, as the project fell within the size range of the Development Plan Review Committee's jurisdiction).

Mr. McLean said the applicant had worked collaboratively with Staff to draft the ordinance, which gives the applicant a range of potential allowable uses and spells out the restrictions that would apply to those uses. Through the Planning Analysis, Staff felt the mix of allowed uses envisioned in the ordinance 1) were no more intensive than those uses that are already allowed in the M-2 zone; 2) wouldn't cause an undue nuisance for abutters or other tenants; and 3) were sufficiently varied to give the applicant ample opportunity to appeal to potential tenants. He said Staff felt the ordinance was well-conceived and made a positive recommendation.

Chairman Smith invited the applicant, Rob Calise, to address the Commission if he wished. Mr. Calise said that his plan was to build twelve 1,200 ft² commercial condominiums on the subject site, which is narrow and undevelopable for most other uses that would be allowed within the M-2 zone. He said there

is a market for spaces like this among tradesmen, contractors, hobbyists, and others, and he stressed that there would be restrictions against customer-facing and point-of-sale operations occurring out of the units.

Chairman Smith opened the matter to public comment, but seeing none, he asked for a motion to close the public comment period. Upon motion made by Mr. Exter, and seconded by Mr. Coupe, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (8-0) to close public comment.

Finally, upon motion made by Mr. Coupe, and seconded by Ms. Mancini, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (8-0) to forward a positive recommendation on Ordinance #2-23-01 to the City Council.

- **2-23-02** - Ordinance in amendment of Chapter 17 of the Code of the City of Cranston, 2005, entitled "Zoning" (Change of Zone – 35 Carlsbad St. Plat 7 Lot 3141 and 0 Carlsbad St. Plat 7 Lot 3744). **TACO warehouse expansion (vote taken)**

Planning Intern Amelia Lavallee gave a brief staff presentation. She said the applicant sought to rezone a split-zone subject parcel (M-2 & C-4) to "M-2 with Conditions." She shared graphics, maps, and the proposed site plan. She then ran through the Planning Analysis and showed the itemized Conditions of Approval that were listed in the Staff Memo, ultimately reporting that Staff made a positive recommendation.

Chairman Smith then invited the applicant team, comprised of Atty. Amy Goins, of Ursillo, Teitz & Ritch Ltd; John Giampietro, Senior VP of Operations, Taco Inc; Jan Greenwood, Civil Engineer with Woodard & Curran; Bob Kelliher, VP of Thermo-Mechanical Systems Corporation; Andy DiGiamo of Compass Group Architecture; and Kevin Flynn, Planning Consultant, to briefly introduce their proposal to the Commission.

Atty. Goins reported that she had distributed revised documents to the City the previous Friday, which included modifications to their landscape plans and increased the requested height variance from 45 feet to 60 feet. She then invited Mr. Giampietro to speak to the specifics of the proposal and answer questions as needed.

Mr. Giampietro said Taco's Cranston facility is its largest as well as the company's global headquarters. He said the proposed 97,000 ft² expansion included 55,000 ft² of new lab space, 12,000 ft² dedicated to research and development, and 37,000 ft² for future manufacturing growth. The expansion should create 16 new jobs in the short-term, with additional jobs to follow once the future manufacturing space is developed. He also briefly addressed the parking plan.

Mr. Flynn also addressed the Commission, pointing to the FLUM designating the site as Industrial. He agreed with Staff's findings and said he had itemized multiple goals and policies in the Comp Plan that supported the proposal.

Chairman Smith opened the matter to public comment, but seeing none, he asked for a motion to close the public comment period. Upon motion made by Ms. Lanphear, and seconded by Ms. Mancini, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (8-0) to close public comment.

Finally, upon motion made by Mr. Exter, and seconded by Mr. Barbieri, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (8-0) to forward a positive recommendation on Ordinance #2-23-02 to the City Council.

- **Champlin Hills** **Informational** (no vote taken)
PRE-APPLICATION – Major Amendment to a recorded major land development
Major Land Development w/o street extension
Multi-family residential - 90 total units (18 new units) and associated amenity clubhouse
Scituate Avenue (southerly side)
AP 20/4, Lots 2112, 2116 and 2117

Chairman Smith noted that the 10:00 p.m. deadline was fast approaching and asked whether the Commission wanted to hear any additional items before voting to continue those it did not have a chance to hear to a future meeting.

Upon motion made by Mr. Frias, and seconded by Mr. Exter, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (8-0) to continue the Champlin Hills public informational meeting to the beginning of the Wednesday, April 19th Special Meeting of the City Plan Commission.

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW – RECOMMENDATIONS

(votes taken for all items)

- **GARFIELD AVE FOODS, LLC. (OWN) and LAMAR CENTRAL OUTDOOR, LLC (APP)** have filed an application for special permit to modify an existing double-sided billboard to an electronic double-sided billboard at **110 Garfield Avenue**, A.P. 7, lots 2561-62, 2593-97, and 3768, area 29,091 sf. zoned M2. Applicant seeks relief per Sections 17.92.010 Variance; 17.72.010 (7) Signs. 17.92.020 Special Permit; 17.20.120 Schedule of Intensity Regulations.
- **OLDCASTLE APG NORTHEAST INC (OWN) and LAMAR CENTRAL OUTDOOR, LLC (APP)** has applied to convert an existing electronic billboard sign to an equal sized standard vinyl billboard at **0 Park Avenue**, A.P. 11, lot 1870; area 2.04 ac, zoned M1. Applicant seeks relief per Sections 17.92.010 Variance; 17.72.010 (7) Signs. 17.92.020 Special Permit; 17.20.120 Schedule of Intensity Regulations.
- **JOSEPH DECRISTOFARO (OWN/APP)** has applied to the Board to construct a new single-family dwelling on an under-sized lot at **0 Armington Street**, A.P. 2, lot 3268; area 5,500 sf; zoned B2. Applicant seeks relief per Section 17.92.010- Variances; Sections 17.20.120- Schedule of Intensity Regulations.
- **SCW18, LLC (OWN/APP)** has filed an application to subdivide an existing lot into two parcels allowing three existing accessory structures (not to be used for residential dwellings) to remain on lot 2 with reduced frontage, side and rear setbacks at **295 Oaklawn Avenue / 0 Dean Street**, A.P. 17, lot 1338, Parcel 2. Applicant seeks relief per Section 17.92.010- Variances; Sections 17.60.010(A), - Accessory Uses; 17.20.120- Schedule of Intensity Regulations.

Upon motion made by Mr. Frias, and seconded by Ms. Lanphear, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (8-0) to continue all Zoning items to the beginning of the Tuesday, May 2nd Regular Meeting of the City Plan Commission.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

(no votes taken)

Director Pezzullo said he had nothing to share for his Director's Report at that time.

UPCOMING MEETINGS / ADJOURNMENT

(vote taken)

- Wednesday, April 19th, 2023, 5:30PM – **SPECIAL City Plan Commission Meeting NATICK SOLAR Master Plan Continuance** – City Hall Council Chambers, 869 Park Avenue
- Tuesday, May 2nd, 2023, 6:30PM – **Regular City Plan Commission Meeting** – City Hall Council Chambers, 869 Park Avenue

Upon motion made by Mr. Coupe, and seconded by Ms. Lanphear, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (8-0) to adjourn the meeting at 9:44 p.m.