

Hon. Kenneth J. Hopkins
Mayor

Michael E. Smith
President

Jason M. Pezzullo, MCP, MPA, AICP
City Planning Director



Robert Coupe
Vice-President

Thomas Barbieri
David Exter
Steven Frias
Kathleen Lanphear
Lisa Mancini

Justin Mateus P.E.
Public Works Director

Thomas Zidelis
Finance Director

CITY PLAN COMMISSION

City Hall – 3rd Floor, Room 309
869 Park Avenue, Cranston, Rhode Island 02910

MINUTES CITY HALL – 3rd FLOOR, COUNCIL CHAMBER 6:30PM – TUESDAY, MAY 7, 2024

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chairman Coupe called the meeting to order at 6:34 p.m. in the Council Chamber, 869 Park Avenue.

The following Commissioners were in attendance for the meeting: Robert Coupe, Thomas Barbieri, David Exter, Steven Frias, Justin Mateus, Lisa Mancini, Thomas Zidelis, and Kathleen Lanphear. Chairman Smith was absent for the meeting.

The following Planning Department members were in attendance: Jason M. Pezzullo, AICP, Planning Director; Brianna Valcourt, Senior Planner; Jonas Bruggeman, Senior Planner.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

(votes taken on each item)

- 3.5.24 Regular Meeting

Upon motion by Mr. Frias, and seconded by Mr. Exter, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to amend the regular City Plan Commission meeting minutes of 3.5.24 with Mr. Frias' suggested revisions. Mr. Coupe abstained from voting as he was not present for the 3.5.24 City Plan Commission meeting.

Upon motion by Mr. Zidelis, and seconded by Ms. Mancini, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to approve the regular City Plan Commission meeting minutes of 3.5.24, as amended. Mr. Coupe abstained from voting as he was not present for the 3.5.24 City Plan Commission meeting.

- 3.14.24 Special Meeting

Upon motion by Mr. Frias, and seconded by Mr. Zidelis, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (8-0) to amend the special City Plan Commission meeting minutes of 3.14.24 with Mr. Frias' suggested revisions.

Upon motion by Mr. Coupe, and seconded by Mr. Frias, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (8-0) to amend the special City Plan Commission meeting minutes of 3.14.24 with Mr. Coupe's suggested revision.

Upon motion by Mr. Zidelis, and seconded by Mr. Exter, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (8-0) to approve the special City Plan Commission meeting minutes of 3.14.24, as amended.

▪ 4.3.24 Regular Meeting

Upon motion by Mr. Frias, and seconded by Mr. Exter, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (8-0) to amend the regular City Plan Commission meeting minutes of 4.3.24 with Mr. Frias' suggested revisions.

Upon motion by Mr. Coupe, and seconded by Ms. Mancini, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (8-0) to approve the regular City Plan Commission meeting minutes of 4.3.24, as amended.

ORDINANCE RECOMMENDATION

(vote taken)

- **“04-24-01”** **PUBLIC HEARING**
Ordinance in amendment of Chapter 17 of the Code of City of Cranston, 2005, Entitled “Zoning”
(Change of Zone – 0 Sage Drive, Plat 35, Lot 2)
Change of zone from the existing **A-80** to **A-20**

Director Pezzullo provided context of the application, staff analysis and recommendation.

Vice Chair Coupe invited the applicant to speak on the matter.

Atty. Elizabeth Noonin of Adler Pollock & Sheehan P.C., on behalf of the applicant, provided background and context of the application. Ms. Noonin stated following the denial of the application by the City Council, litigation ensued and the applicant's team has since filed in petition of the court for relief. After speaking with the city's solicitors, the applicant has come to a consent order. Ms. Noonin stated the Council's denial was inconsistent with the comprehensive plan, referenced in documents entered into the court of the pending matter. The applicant has since re-filed the application with the plan as presented.

Edward Pimentel, on behalf of the applicant, provided an updated report relevant to the application. Mr. Pimentel stated that the current density of the property as classified and designated in the future land use map is a range between nine to an excess of thirty units. The applicant seeks to create eight units with a density of 1.25 acres per unit. Mr. Pimentel stated that this application will realize consistency with the existing future land use map.

Commissioner Lanphear requested further clarification of the application process and phase of review thus far, dating back to 2021. Ms. Lanphear recalled that this application had been presented to the City Plan Commission as an ordinance proposal in September of 2021 and approved unanimously by the Commission. The application then came before the City Council-Ordinance Committee and was remanded to the City Plan Commission due to questions about public notice. The item was then re-noticed for hearing in November 2021. Ms. Lanphear stated that the official minutes of the City Plan Commission from 11.2.21 reflect a vote of (5-1) by the Commission for “no specific recommendation” to the City Council-Ordinance Committee. Ms. Noonin's account of the litigation process followed as previously stated. Ms. Lanphear inquired if her recount of the process thus far is correct. Asst. City Solicitor Marsella added that the application had previously come before the Commission in 2017 with a positive recommendation in 2017.

Vice Chair Coupe invited members of the public to comment on the application.

- Janice Cataldo, 65 Sage Drive - Voiced opposition to the application based on infrastructure and school capacity constraints.
- Vincent McCrystal, 65 Sage Drive – Voiced opposition to the application.
- Joe Narcisi, 22 Carraway Drive - Voiced opposition to the application.
- Stephen Rougas, 33 Carraway Drive – Suggested that the Commission put forward a negative recommendation on the application. Mr. Rougas argued that the documents brought forward within the application do not provide any evidence of a sustainable capacity for growth, per RIGL comprehensive planning provisions.
- Mildred Morrero, 25 Carraway Drive – Ms. Morrero stated her opposition to the proposal. Ms. Morrero shared concerns about traffic related to travel along Alpine Estates Drive, and school/police/fire capacity.

Seeing no further in-person discussion, Vice Chair Coupe invited members of the public attending virtually to speak on the matter.

- Annette Osberg, Belle Isle Way – Voiced concerns regarding the application.
- Christy Narcisi, 22 Carraway Drive – Stated opposition against the application. Ms. Narcisi shared concerns about infrastructure and school constraints.
- Jonathan Weitzner, 1 Lace Circle – Voiced opposition to the proposal.
- Tricia Gilmore, 4 Pepper Mill Lane – Ms. Gilmore voiced opposition to the proposal. Ms. Gilmore stated that comprehensive plans are not legally binding documents. Ms. Gilmore questioned Mr. Pimentel's previous statements regarding conformance with Rhode Island law, in which she reiterated that the comprehensive plan is not a legally binding document.

Vice Chair Coupe invited other members of the public to speak on the matter.

- Cheryl Carbone, 4 Thyme Drive – Ms. Carbone voiced opposition to the proposal, stating that the project would not benefit Cranston residents.

Atty. Noonin responded to comments made by members of the public, confirming that the comprehensive plan is a legally binding document passed by the City Council. Ms. Noonin referenced specific requirements of the Commission to review ordinance recommendations with specified guidelines. Atty. Noonin reiterated that the existing comprehensive plan is law and the governing document for land use. Ms. Noonin stated that if the application were approved by the Council, it would again come before the City Plan Commission in which concerns regarding schools, tax base, housing and infrastructure may be addressed at that time. Ms. Noonin stated as an advisory opinion, the issue before the Commission concerns consistency with the comprehensive plan which the applicant seeks to comply with.

Mr. Coupe accepted a motion to close public comment.

Upon motion made by Ms. Mancini and seconded by Mr. Zidelis, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (8-0) to close public comment.

Vice Chair Coupe invited members of the commission to speak on the matter.

Mr. Frias stated that the commission provides recommendations and makes determinations as to general consistency with the comprehensive plan and also a demonstration of recognition and consideration of each of the applicable purposes of zoning. Atty. Noonin affirmed.

Mr. Frias publicly disclosed that members of the public relative to this application had contacted him directly via email, of which he did not read the emails, but did receive them. Mr. Frias stated that he disclosed this information to Director Pezzullo prior to the meeting.

Mr. Frias stated his interest is on the purposes of zoning, specifically in relation to providing orderly growth and development that recognizes the availability and capacity of existing and planned public and private services and facilities. Mr. Frias shared concerns about the capacity of Orchard Farms Elementary School. Ms. Noonin clarified that this is a request of rezone for compliance with the comprehensive plan designation, of which the comprehensive plan accounts for anticipated student population growth and school capacity. Mr. Frias reiterated concerns about the impact of the proposed development on the local elementary school. Ms. Noonin restated that the comprehensive plan is the ultimate rule of law for land use decisions as it exists currently. Mr. Frias argued that his issue with the proposal is the lack of capacity at the local elementary school and the request for rezone that could potentially worsen capacity issues. Ms. Noonin restated that this is not a request for rezone but to bring the subject lot into compliance with the comprehensive plan which factors in student population growth and school capacity. Mr. Frias argued that this information is out of date and not applicable to this request. Ms. Noonin responded, stating that this application must be considered under the prevailing law of which the basis is the city's 2012 Comprehensive Plan.

In response to Mr. Frias' statements about overcrowding in the schools, Vice Chair Coupe inquired if the commission must consider zoning differently because the school department shifts elementary school students from one school to another. Asst. City Solicitor Marsella stated that the comprehensive plan is the prevailing law of which staff bases review and recommendation on. Concerns regarding traffic, drainage, and school capacity may be discussed in the preliminary plan process at a later stage of review.

Commissioner Lanphear inquired if the City Plan Commission's objective at this stage is to consider whether or whether not the proposal is consistent with the comprehensive plan. Ms. Noonin restated that it is her view, based on current state law, that the comprehensive plan prevails as the governing document, and the other purposes of zoning are to be recognized and considered. Ms. Lanphear proposed a hypothetical scenario in which the commission found the proposal to be inconsistent with the comprehensive plan, it would not be useful to Council based on provisions of the consent order. Asst. City Solicitor Marsella declined to make a determination on what the City Council can or cannot do, as only the Council is bound by the consent order. Mr. Marsella stated that if the commission were to forward a negative recommendation on the ordinance to the Council with specific reasons, and if those reasons were unrelated to the comprehensive plan then they may be considered by the Council.

Commissioner Zidelis inquired about previous recommendations made on this matter. Atty. Marsella clarified that there was a positive recommendation forwarded in 2017, positive recommendation forwarded in 2020, referred back because of notice and then no recommendation forwarded. This board does have the right to forward no recommendation if that is entertained. Mr. Zidelis then inquired, with the impending comprehensive plan update, if the future land use map designation may potentially change for the subject parcel. Director Pezzullo stated theoretically the FLUM designation of the lot could change with the comprehensive plan update. Commissioners engaged in discussion about the hypothetical.

Seeing no further discussion by the Commission, Director Pezzullo re-read staff recommendation.

Atty. Marsella stated that the commission is charged with providing an opinion, and if the board does not act the application would move forward as a positive recommendation.

Mr. Zidelis made a motion for no specific recommendation, seconded by Mr. Frias.

- Mr. Frias restated his concerns of the application to meet the purposes of zoning, specifically orderly growth in relation to capacity concerns of Orchard Farms Elementary School.

Ms. Lanphear made a motion to amend the previous motion, to recite that the commission finds that the application is not consistent with the applicable purposes of zoning (ref. §45.24.52) in that it does not adequately address the availability and capacity of existing and planned public and or private services and facilities including schools and no evidence that the proposal promotes public health, safety, and general welfare.

- Mr. Zidelis accepted the amendment.
- Vice Chair Coupe asked Atty. Marsella if Ms. Lanphear's proposed finding is consistent with no recommendation. Mr. Marsella affirmed.

Mr. Frias seconded the amended motion.

- Vice Chair Coupe voiced support for no specific recommendation, but disagreed with the finding that the request is not consistent with the purposes of zoning. Mr. Coupe stated that school capacity issues are citywide concerns, and if zone change or development requests are rejected by the commission based on that finding it may deter future similar requests. Mr. Coupe stated that the school department frequently shifts students between schools throughout the city. Mr. Coupe stated his support for the motion of no specific recommendation.

Upon motion made by Mr. Zidelis, and seconded by Mr. Frias, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (8-0) to adopt no specific recommendation, as amended.

SUBDIVISION & LAND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

(votes taken on each item)

- **"The Almberg Plat"**

PUBLIC HEARING

Unified Development Review
PRELIMINARY PLAN – Minor Subdivision with Zoning Relief
2-lot Subdivision with 1 new single-family house lot
Zoning District: A-8 (Single-Family, 8,000 sq. ft.)
AP 15/1, Lots 541-545
Bateman Avenue, Catherine Street, Jennie Street

Commissioner Barbieri left prior to this discussion and did not participate for the remainder of the meeting.

Atty. Marsella explained this Commission must review specific projects such as subdivision requests requiring zoning relief under unified development review, per recent changes to state law.

Jonas Bruggeman, Senior Planner provided the staff presentation and recommendation regarding this application.

Atty. Robert Murray of Taft & McSally, on behalf of the applicant, provided context of the site and the nature of the request.

Asst. City Solicitor Marsella suggested that the commission open the discussion to public comment.

Vice Chair Coupe invited members of the public, both in-person and online to speak on the matter. Seeing no public comment, Mr. Coupe accepted a motion to close the public comment section of the meeting.

Upon motion made by Ms. Mancini, and seconded by Ms. Lanphear, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to close public comment.

Asst. City Solicitor Marsella suggested that the commission first review the request(s) for zoning relief included in the application.

Upon motion made by Mr. Zidelis, and seconded by Mr. Exter, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to grant all of the zoning variances sought by the applicant.

Mr. Bruggeman shared the staff recommendation of the subdivision proposal.

Upon motion made by Ms. Lanphear, and seconded by Ms. Mancini, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to approve the Minor Land Development Project – Preliminary Plan with associated conditions, noted below.

- Submission of letters of availability from the Providence Water Supply Board and Veolia Water for water and sewer availability, respectively.
- Curb-to-curb pavement restoration shall occur as needed in accordance with and to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.
- Payment of the Eastern Cranston Capital Facilities Development Impact Fee of \$593.46.

▪ **“Brewed Awakenings”**

PUBLIC HEARING

Unified Development Review
PRELIMINARY PLAN – Minor Land Development Project with Zoning Relief
Demolition and construction of a 4,000± sq. ft. drive-thru restaurant with associated parking and landscaping.
Zoning District: C4 (Highway Business)
AP 15/1, Lot 1015
Oaklawn Avenue

Mr. Bruggeman provided the staff presentation and recommendation regarding this application.

Atty. Robert Murray of Taft & McSally, on behalf of the applicant, provided context of the site and the nature of the request. Mr. Murray introduced the applicant and members of the applicant's team; David Levesque, applicant and owner of Brewed Awakenings; Louis Barone, P.E., DiPrete Engineering, Sheryl Guglielmo, DiPrete Engineering; Paul Bannon, RAB Professional Engineers, Inc.; Mark Butler, Matunuck Design Group Inc.

Mr. Murray stated that Mr. Levesque held a community meeting regarding the project in March 2024, and also presented the proposal at a Pre-Application conference with the Development Plan Review Committee in April 2024.

Atty. Murray submitted copies of Mr. Barone's resume for review by the commission. Mr. Barone provided a general overview of the existing conditions of the site. Mr. Barone described the parking layout, proposed landscaping, stormwater management system, and traffic conditions.

Asst. City Solicitor Marsella suggested that the commission consider voting in experts to qualify in as a part of unified development review. Mr. Murray requested that Mr. Barone be qualified as an expert of civil engineering.

- Mr. Frias inquired about the qualification of experts in review of proposals. Atty. Marsella clarified.

Upon motion made by Mr. Mateus, and seconded by Ms. Mancini, the City Plan Commission voted (7-0) unanimously to qualify Mr. Barone as an expert of civil and environmental engineering.

Mr. Levesque provided context of the proposal and site conditions.

Mr. Butler provided the Commission with a general overview of the proposed landscaping plan. Atty. Murray prompted Mr. Butler with questions regarding staff recommendations related to landscaping and fencing.

Atty. Murray invited Mr. Bannon to speak on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Murray requested that the Commission consider Mr. Bannon as an expert.

- Upon motion made by Mr. Mateus, and seconded by Mr. Zidelis, the City Plan Commission voted (7-0) unanimously to qualify Mr. Bannon as an expert of traffic engineering.

Mr. Bannon stated that it is his belief through review of the proposal that the site design as proposed will provide safe and adequate access to the property. Mr. Bannon stated that the applicant worked in collaboration with DiPrete Engineering for the design of driveway access and site circulation. The applicant's team conducted site visits at various times of day to gauge peaking characteristics, obtained accident data from the Cranston Police Department to determine any safety concerns, analyzed traffic volume on the adjacent roadway, and developed trip generation estimates using ITETripGen trip generation methods. Mr. Bannon provided further context of the site in relation to traffic and trip generation to and from the site.

Atty. Murray stated that the applicant's team had received the applicable permit by DEM and a notification of water availability from Veolia Water, provided to staff along with a stormwater report and O&M plan. Atty. Murray stated that the applicant will be obtaining a PAP from RIDOT.

Mr. Murray requested that the condition of approval by staff regarding shrubs not be imposed. Mr. Murray reviewed the zoning relief requested by the applicant. Mr. Murray stated under previous processes the applicant would request a waiver from specific standards by the Development Plan Review Committee, now to be granted by the City Plan Commission.

Vice Chair Coupe opened the discussion up to the Commission for discussion.

- Mr. Frias inquired about the landscaping coverage proposed. Mr. Barone stated that 10.2 percent landscaping is proposed within the property line, 14.8 percent total project area includes rights-of-way. Mr. Frias inquired about the proposed decrease in stormwater runoff. Mr. Barone stated that the proposed decrease in stormwater runoff is insignificant relative to the site and the character of Oaklawn Avenue. Mr. Frias inquired about the adaptive speaker systems report. Mr. Levesque

explained how the requirements included in the report will be met. Mr. Frias proposed a condition related to business hours of the café. Mr. Frias, specifically to cease drive-thru operations past 6:00pm. Mr. Frias then inquired about trip generation and traffic queuing.

- Ms. Lanphear asked Mr. Barone if the proposed landscaping in the right-of-way on Oaklawn Avenue narrows the existing pedestrian walkway or sidewalk. Mr. Barone stated that a walkway or sidewalk does not currently exist in that area of Oaklawn Avenue. Mr. Barone stated that the applicant is providing a proper RIDOT approved sidewalk and landscaping in the right-of-way.
- Mr. Mateus proposed a condition of approval for the applicant to include PAP documentation for review.

Vice Chair Coupe invited members of the public, both in-person and online to speak on the matter. Seeing no public comment, Mr. Coupe accepted a motion to close the public comment section of the meeting.

Upon motion made by Ms. Lanphear, and seconded by Mr. Exter, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to close public comment.

Seeing no further discussion by the Commission, Mr. Coupe entertained a vote on the zoning relief requested, subject to applicable conditions and in recognition of the required findings.

Upon motion made by Mr. Frias, and seconded by Mr. Zidelis, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to grant all of the zoning variances sought by the applicant, subject to conditions

Mr. Bruggeman provided the staff recommendation for the subdivision request. Following Mr. Bruggeman's review of staff recommendation and associated conditions of approval, Mr. Coupe entertained a motion on the matter.

Mr. Mateus made a motion to accept staff recommendation and to amend the condition of approval relative to fencing and requested that a condition be made requiring the applicant to submit DOT PAP documentation with associated submission materials. Ms. Lanphear seconded the motion. Discussion ensued.

Atty. Marsella explained that the Commission has the ability to reopen the public hearing for further clarification on the applicant's request, if deemed necessary.

Vice Chair Coupe entertained a motion to re-open public comment.

Upon motion made by Ms. Lanphear, and seconded by Ms. Mancini, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to re-open public comment.

Atty. Murray provided further clarification on the matter. Mr. Murray requested that the condition of approval regarding the wood fence requirement be amended to reflect a requirement for a wood composite fence. Mr. Murray also stated that the applicant is not proposing shrubs on the property in the state right-of-way. Mr. Butler proposed street trees as opposed to shrubs for greater durability, as noted on the landscaping plan.

Mr. Coupe asked for further clarification on the conditions of approval. Mr. Butler proposed an amendment to the condition of approval related to landscaping to accept the landscaping as proposed in the landscaping plan.

Seeing no further comment, Mr. Coupe accepted a motion to close the public comment section of the meeting.

- Upon motion made by Ms. Mancini, and seconded by Mr. Exter, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to close public comment.

Mr. Mateus re-stated his previous motion.

- Upon motion made by Mr. Mateus, and seconded by Ms. Mancini, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to accept staff recommendation with amended conditions of approval, as follows:

- Submission of letters of availability from the Providence Water Supply Board and Veolia Water for water and sewer availability, respectively.
- Curb-to-curb pavement restoration shall occur as needed in accordance with and to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.
- A six (6) foot solid wood fence shall be provided along the easterly property line.
- The landscape plan shall be approved as proposed.
- The Applicant shall seek approval of a physical alteration permit by RIDOT.

▪ **“McDonald’s”**

PUBLIC HEARING

Unified Development Review

PRELIMINARY PLAN – Minor Land Development Project with Zoning Relief
 Demolition and construction of a 4,500± sq. ft. double drive-thru restaurant with associated parking and landscaping.
 Zoning District: B-1 / C-5 (Single- & Two-Family Residential / Heavy Business, Industry)
 AP 7/1, Lots 632, 3669, 3514, & 3488
 923 Cranston Street & Webster Avenue

This application was withdrawn by the applicant.

EXTENSION OF TIME

(vote taken)

▪ **“Legion Bowl” a/k/a 661 Park Project**

PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL

MASTER PLAN – Major Land Development Project (Book 6518 Page 89)
 Mixed-Use residential/commercial redevelopment, 69 residential units, first floor commercial on Park Avenue.
 Zoning District: C-3 with Conditions
 AP 3, Lots 289, 291, 1695, & 1696
 661 Park Avenue
Request to extend the Master Plan Approval for two (2) additional years, (to July 13, 2026).

Atty. Marsella recused himself from the discussion due to an existing conflict.

Director Pezzullo stated that the nature of this request is a two (2) year extension of the Master Plan Approval. The applicant is seeking to keep their application current, working towards a Preliminary Plan.

Upon motion made by Mr. Zidelis, and seconded by Mr. Mateus, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to extend the Master Plan Approval for two (2) additional years, (to July 13, 2026).

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS (votes taken on each item)

495 INVESTMENTS, LLC (OWN/APP) has filed an application to request permission to allow barber shop, beauty salon / body art / day spa uses in an existing building zoned industrial at 495 Atwood Avenue, A.P. 12, lot 3116; area 13,300 sq. ft., zoned M1. Applicant seeks relief per §17.92.010 – Variances; and §17.20.030 – Schedule of Uses. Application filed 2/14/2024. Joseph Shekarchi, Esq. **To be continued pending completion of Development Plan Review process.**

Upon motion made by Mr. Zidelis, and seconded by Mr. Mateus, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to continue this matter to the regular City Plan Commission meeting of 6.6.24.

CRAIG SROKA (OWN/APP) has filed an application to request permission to construct an attached two-story car garage at 580 Natick Avenue, A.P. 18/1, Lot 1020, area 17,767 sq. ft., zoned A8. Applicant seeks relief per §17.92.010 – Variances; and §17.20.120 – Schedule of Intensity Regulations.

Upon motion made by Mr. Frias, and seconded by Mr. Mateus, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to forward a **positive recommendation** on the application to the Zoning Board of Review.

TYLER CORSI (OWN/APP) has filed an application to request permission to construct a 16' x 38.5' addition with a side yard setback of 6.60' where 10' is required at 94 Woodmont Drive, A.P. 15/4, Lot 1202, area 9,013 sq. ft., zoned A8. Applicant seeks relief per §17.92.010 – Variances; and §17.20.120 – Schedule of Intensity Regulations.

Upon motion made by Mr. Zidelis, and seconded by Mr. Mateus, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to forward a **positive recommendation** on the application to the Zoning Board of Review.

CITY PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

(no votes taken)

- Open positions / ongoing hiring process

Director Pezzullo stated that Asst. Director Kenneth R. Kirkland has since resigned from the Cranston Planning Department and solicitation for his position is planned for the coming weeks. Mr. Pezzullo stated that the Planning Department is again short-staffed with two unfilled full-time positions.

- Comprehensive Plan Update Process
- Ongoing / prospective grants
- APA RI Chapter – Award in recognition of the City's efforts to promote affordable housing

ADJOURNMENT

(vote taken)

Next Meeting | Tuesday, June 4, 2024, 6:30PM – **Regular Meeting**
City Hall – 3rd Floor, Council Chamber – 869 Park Avenue

Director Pezzullo stated that there was a typographical error on the agenda noting that the next regular meeting of the City Plan Commission was posted as being held on Tuesday, June 4th, but will be held on Thursday, June 6th.

Upon motion made by Mr. Zidelis, and seconded by Mr. Mateus, the City Plan Commission voted unanimously (7-0) to adjourn the meeting at 10:27pm.