

# May 8, 2006 - Regular Planning Board Meeting

CITY OF EAST PROVIDENCE

## PLANNING BOARD

---

### MINUTES OF MAY 8, 2006

Present were: Messers. Batty, Cunha, DiTraglia, O'Brien, Robinson, Jeanne Boyle, Patrick Hanner (staff), and Erik Skadberg, City Engineer.

#### 1. Chairman's Remarks

Mr. Robinson welcomed the newest member of the Board, Mr. Bruce DiTraglia who replaces Ted Sullivan. He said Mr. DiTraglia has been a member of the Planning Board in the past and on behalf of the Board would like to welcome him back and looks forward to working with him.

Mr. Robinson also thanked Ted Sullivan for his years of dedicated service to the Planning Board. He said that Mr. Sullivan was appointed in 1999 and served continuously on the Board since that date. He also continues to serve the City as the sealer of weights and measures for the City of East Providence. Mr. Robinson said that Mr. Sullivan always spoke his mind and there was never a doubt that he would fight for what he believed was in the best interest of the City. We wish Ted the very best in his future endeavors. He asked that the City send a short note to Mr. Sullivan thanking him for his years of service.

#### 2. SEATING OF ALTERNATE MEMBER

It was noted that Mr. Cunha would be seated tonight in place of Mr. Almeida.

#### 3. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

##### A. Minutes of February 13, 2006 (to be submitted)

It was noted these minutes would be forthcoming.

##### B. Minutes of March 13, 2006

On a motion by Mr. Batty, seconded by Mr. O'Brien, the Board unanimously voted to approve the March 13, 2006 minutes.

Mr. Cunha questioned the motion since he said he thought he was seated as a voting member at this meeting, but noted that his name was not in the roll call of votes. Since there is a question on this, the Chair asks that this motion of approval be rescinded until Stephanie can check the tape.

On a motion by Mr. Batty, seconded by Mr. DiTraglia, the Board votes to rescind the approval of the March 13<sup>th</sup> minutes until further review. They will be revised and put back on the June 14<sup>th</sup> agenda for review.

#### C. Minutes of April 10, 2006

Mr. DiTraglia asked about the sidewalks and the pedestrian plan and said he thought the Plan was an excellent idea. Ms Boyle said that staff is proceeding with the completion of the Pedestrian Plan and that the first two chapters were presented to the Board at the April 10 meeting. The Plan was put together by Chelsea Pierce, the graduate student intern. It has not been finalized yet. The Board liked the use of the Geographic Information System to give a real rationale basis for determining whether or not sidewalks should be put into place and the prioritization. As yet there has not been specific language drafted for the Board to review whether or not funds could be required to be paid to the City in lieu of the Plan. Ms. Boyle states it might require City Council action as a specific ordinance. Once we put together specific language, then the City Solicitor will review it.

It was noted the minutes of April 10 will note the correction that Mr. O'Brien's name be in the minutes as being in attendance since during the roll call votes his name does appear throughout the minutes. These revised minutes will be revised to reflect that and will be on the June agenda for approval.

### **3. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD CORRESPONDENCE**

None.

### **4. NEW BUSINESS**

#### A. Risho Avenue Reclassification

Ms. Boyle states she has provided additional information to the Board tonight that was not available at the time the packets went out. She said this is an easement describing the rights of the abutting property owners associated with this street.

This matter was referred at the request of Michael Mizrahi. It was referred to the City Council who referred it to the Planning Board. It was explained that Risho Avenue is not a city street, but a private drive which connects with Amaral Street. Ms. Boyle noted that one of the concerns that Mr. Mizrahi has is that it is a heavily trafficked private roadway. He asks whether or not this should be taken over as a City street. The Public Works Director's concern is that this was constructed as a private roadway, not as a City street. As such we have no affirmation that it was built to City standards. There are speed bumps located at a couple of different locations along this roadway which is not acceptable as a City street. There may be other concerns regarding the type of pavement and other infrastructure that is in place. The position of the Planning Board in the past is that it must meet City standards if we are to accept it. There is a lot of public traffic that goes up this street. We also have provided to the Board copies of the easement language associated with that. A number of the abutting property owners, especially the large businesses are assigned rights to pass and repass along this private right-of-way. One option might have been considered was to close it off to traffic, but

you cannot close it off to traffic without prohibiting access to all of these businesses that are located along there.

#### Recommendation

Ms. Boyle states that staff is recommending to the Board that they advise the City Council to accept this as a public street provided that it be upgraded by the property owner to City standards which may or may not be acceptable to the property owner. Ms. Boyle states the applicant is out of state and is not at the meeting tonight.

Chair Robinson asks if anyone is here on behalf of the application. There was none.

Chairman Robinson asks the Board if they have any comments or questions for staff. Mr. DiTraglia asks what it will cost the City to take over this piece of road. Ms. Boyle states that it would only cost whatever it would take to plow the street. We do not recommend that the City take on any of the costs associated with upgrading this roadway to meet City standards. In the staff recommendation we make it clear that the owner bear the costs. As part of that they would have to go through the subdivision process before the Board. Mr. Robinson asks what it would take to bring the street up to City standards. Ms. Boyle answered that the speed bumps have to be removed and also when it is built we do not necessarily know what is in the ground. We don't know what the water and drainage system is. It does not appear to meet standards as far as the width of the right of way, curbing, sidewalks, and all the other standards associated with the public street. It would be very expensive. This street extends over the three property owners.

Ms. Boyle states that Mr. Moran did fax a copy of the staff recommendation over to Mr. Mizrahi and did inform him of tonight's meeting. She states that if the City Council chooses to accept the recommendation and make it a public street, it does have to go through the Planning Board's process for subdivision. At that point, all the property owners would have to be co-applicants to the petition. Mr. Coutu's recommendation is that it be denied outright. Staff is recommending some middle ground which would be yes we will take it if you improve it, but the Council will have the final say.

There were no other comments from the Board.

Mr. Robinson asked the public if they had any questions. There were none.

#### MOTION

On a motion by Mr. Batty, seconded by Mr. DiTraglia, the Board voted to recommend to the City Council that they deny this request as it stands now, but if the property owners, as a group, want to bring this street up to City standards, then the Board would review it.

#### Roll Call Vote

Mr. Batty	Aye
Mr. Cunha	Aye
Mr. DiTraglia	Aye
Mr. O'Brien	Aye
Mr. Robinson	Aye

B. Minor Subdivision – Application No. 2006-04-Admin, Lynn Avenue, applicant: Michael West, Map 405, Block 1, Parcel 5

The attorney for applicant, Michael West, states that Mr. West proposes to create three parcels and to construct two family dwellings for a total of six units. He described the parcel and states it is a through-lot that fronts on Vineland Avenue as well as Lynn Avenue. They propose access to the garages on Vineland Avenue. We have submitted the plans and they are complete. We request approval which includes a request for waiver regarding sidewalks. He states that Mr. West is available for any questions. He noted he received and have reviewed the recommendations of the Planning Department. You will be driving in off of Lynn Avenue, but to access the garage you will be coming in off of Vineland.

At this time, Patrick Hanner went through the staff recommendation. He states it is a minor subdivision on existing frontage. The applicant proposes to create three parcels. On each of the three parcels the applicant proposes two family dwellings for a total of six units. A two family dwelling is an allowed use within an R-4 District provided there is 8,750 square feet which the applicant has met on two of the parcels. Parcel 5 exceeds the minimum requirement. These are through lots and access is provided from Lynn and Vineland Avenues with two driveways per each parcel on Lynn Avenue and one driveway entrance on Vineland Avenue that will provide access to a two car garage. Drywells are proposed connected to the roof gutters of the two family dwellings and the garages.

Mr. Hanner states that staff has reviewed the application. It was certified complete on April 26 and notice was mailed to the abutting property owners. It is important to note to the Board that currently under review by the City is a four lot subdivision directly adjacent to this. The frontage is on Lynn Avenue. That four lot subdivision is proposing two family dwellings for each parcel; a total of eight dwelling units. He asked that the Board keep in mind that there will be 14 units in total with these two subdivisions. The later development will be coming before the Board possibly in June. The Planning Department in their stipulations is recommending that the notation #8 and notation #14 be removed from the Plan.

It is the opinion of staff that these three parcels that are proposed are being proposed to the reasonable extent for an R-4 District for a two family dwelling to be located and meeting the minimum qualifications. With regard to notation #8 we feel that the Subdivision Regulations establish the procedure for an applicant to come back to the City after an approved plan to request a modification. The regulations state that if zoning is required, it is deemed to be a major modification which requires Board approval and if it is a minor modification, it would be done by the Administrative Officer's review. The regulations will assure that the conditions of the Board have been met and that improvements including utilities have been installed to the City's specifications.

Ms. Boyle also noted that regarding those two notes we have never had a subdivision approved with that type of language incorporated in it. Mr. Robinson asks the applicant's attorney if he has any problem removing that language from the site plan? The attorney said no, they do not intend to make any modifications that would not meet the Zoning Ordinance or Subdivision Ordinance.

Regarding notion #14, Mr. Robinson states that you would not be restricted if you do not have this language in it. Ms. Boyle states that these lots are being developed very close to the maximum extent permissible under Zoning. They meet Zoning. If the language was lacking in that it said there be no further subdivision does not preclude the applicant from having to go before the Board and request that with due notice.

Mr. Robinson said that if there is nothing in the language at all, do they still need to come back to subdivide anyway? Ms. Boyle states not necessarily. Without that restriction on the plan, if there was in fact an administrative subdivision, this Board would not see it and notice would not go out as it did in this particular subdivision. If the language is incorporated in these particular plans, then the Planning Board could be assured that if there are changes from this plan that may or may not be approved by the Planning Board tonight, that at least that public forum would be the one in which it takes place.

Mr. Robinson asks if there is a request for waiver of sidewalks with respect to Vineland. Staff answered yes. He said he is concerned about the Board's consistency in the past. There is an on-going issue with sidewalks and curbing requirements. There has been a real push to try and be consistent with that. Mr. Robinson states he will support granting the waiver regarding the sidewalks because he doesn't think it makes sense on to have them on Vineland Avenue.

For the record, Mr. Robinson also states that he supports the idea to require in-lieu payments where the City regulations would require it. If the circumstances of a particular project suggests that it is impractical or does not make sense, the applicant should and still be required to pay that sum into the City funds.

Mr. Cunha asks what the purpose is of having the garage on one street with the driveway on the other. The attorney said it allows for more parking. It also does not obstruct the access on Lynn Avenue. If you could only access it from Lynn Avenue, then you would have to pave a significant amount to get all the way to the back to where the garage is. There will be a walkway from the garage to the house.

Mr. West's attorney states that if it is the Board's desire to limit that, we can put language in there that we would return to the Board if there is a modification and if it requires us to exceed the Zoning Ordinance dimensional requirements. If we meet the setbacks set forth in the Zoning Ordinance I do not see a need to have to return.

Ms. Boyle responded that this Board is in charge of subdivision regulations. Whether or not you meet zoning regulations is something that is the purview of the Zoning Board of Review. I would think that the Planning Board would still want to have some interest in any modifications that take place whether or not they do require zoning variances because they may have implications associated with the Land Development Subdivision Regulations which this Board is charged with implementing and enforcing.

It was suggested instead of a 38 x 28 it would be a 38 x 42. Mr. Robinson said that is a modification that this Board would want to see.

Mr. Batty said if they wanted to increase the size of the building and it met the requirements of the Zoning Board, wouldn't it come before the Planning Board.

Ms. Boyle states that in the past there have been minor changes to the configuration of the particular house and that is fairly common place. It is not the type of thing that would go back to the Board unless it is substantial.

Mr. DiTraglia asks why the applicant wants to make a change now after already bringing these particular plans before the Board tonight. The attorney said there are a couple of house plans that would fit within the parameters provided by the Zoning Ordinance. This is based on the comments tonight by the Planning Department in their request that footnote #8 be changed. Because of those comments we should determine now exactly what we want to avoid having to come back to the Planning Board. We could reword number 8 and say that it is up to the discretion of the Administrative Officer to determine what modifications are being done.

Mr. Robinson states he is much more comfortable with what the staff is recommending to him, unless the City Solicitor says that what the applicant is suggesting is legal and it is a better way of doing it and what the staff has been doing the last 10 years.

Ms. Boyle explains that you are approving a plan in it's entirety, not just a general concept of some lines otherwise we would not be requiring people to submit plans to you with the level of detail and information that is on them. It is part of your consideration. If you are to approve the plan with this language taken out, staff would feel more comfortable with it and we would still treat this as any other subdivision. Minor modifications would be very minor and anything beyond that would be taken again before the Planning Board.

Mr. DiTraglia states that it is unfair that they come before the board tonight with a plan and then want to change it at the last minute. If that is the case, they should have to come back.

Mr. Robinson clarified that the staff is recommending that that language be replaced with a restriction that there be no further subdivision or adjustment of any property line into perpetuity. Ms. Boyle states that is correct.

Mr. Batty asks the applicant if he has a plan for Lot #5 to increase the size of that house. They answered yes. The house would be 38 x 42 as opposed to 38 x 28. The 38 x 28 will look like a rectangle whereas the 38 x 42 will be more proportional and will still meet the dimensional requirements.

Ms. Boyle said that because of the changes between preliminary and final, rather than delegating it to the Administrative Officer, we could also have the final approval come back before the Board. That would give the applicant, if there are some changes that they are going to do between preliminary and final, to come back and have the Board approve the changes. She still recommends that the language be stricken regardless of whether it comes before the Board for final approval.

Mr. DiTraglia asked how old the existing gas line is on the right side of the last lot and if it has been upgraded? Mr. Hanner answered that there is an existing gas line being proposed to be connected to parcel 5. The contractor will be checking that, not the City.

Mr. DiTraglia voiced his concern about the traffic going in and out of Vineland and Lynn Avenues and asked if safety precautions are in place or if there are any laws that state there should be markings? Ms. Boyle states not for a one or two family home. These are basically driveways just like a single family. He asked about the height of the fence and bushes and trees. It was noted that the site would be inspected and Mr. Hanner states that we are requiring as-builts. The notation on the plan states that the applicant will install the three trees on the property.

Mr. DiTraglia asked about the fire hydrant. Mr. Hanner states there is no fire hydrant, but that the closest one is 320 feet to the intersection of Metacomet Avenue. This is in the staff report. The Fire Department is requesting to have a hydrant installed at the intersection of Vineland and Metacomet which his part of the condition. Ms. Boyle states that we have a memorandum dated May 5, 2006 from the Fire Chief asking for that fire hydrant.

The attorney states they will not change the plans. If the language is adopted as proposed by the planner that any modification is done, we would return to the Board.

Mr. Hanner states that staff reviewed the application. All the General Purposes of the Subdivision Regulations have been addressed and Positive Findings were found on Section 5-4 of the Required Findings.

### **Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the Board delegate final plan approval to the Administrative Officer,

That the Board approve the applicant's request for a waiver of installation of concrete sidewalks along the frontage of the three proposed parcels on Vineland Avenue (as proposed on the plans); and

That the Board grant conditional approval as proposed subject to the following 10 conditions:

1. That a notation is placed on the plan that states no further subdivision or adjustment of any property lines occurs on the three (3) proposed parcels in perpetuity,
2. That notation #8 and #14 are removed from the site plan,
3. That the applicant install a fire hydrant at the intersection of Vineland Avenue and Metacomet Avenue,
4. That a notation is placed on the site plan that states, *"The applicant may utilize preexisting water service provided the line is copper tubing and meets City standards. The applicant must excavate the existing service to confirm that it meets city standards prior to installation"*,
5. That the applicant post an improvement guarantee in an amount approved by the Director of Public Works to be held by the City,

6. That any outstanding property taxes be paid to date before a final plan approval is granted,
7. That the title block of the Final Plan be revised to indicate Final Plan status,
8. That the Final Plans be based upon the approved Preliminary Plans, and further that the Final Plan and supporting documentation meet the requirements of the East Providence Land Development and Subdivision Review Regulations;
9. That the proposed shall meet all applicable City, State, and/or Federal regulations and requirements,
10. That upon project completion, final "as-built" plans be submitted on Mylar, and electronic format in AutoCAD version 14. The as-built drawings shall include all roadway and utility information, including final inverts, rims, sewer lateral depths, and locations (swing ties) to all permanent structures.

Mr. Robinson asks the Board if they have any comments. There were none.

Mr. Robinson asks if the public would like to speak.

### ***Public Comments***

Mr. Manual Lourenco, 44 Lynn Avenue, East Providence was sworn in by Chairman Robinson. He is concerned about the increase in traffic with additional cars and parking spaces. He states he pays over \$2,000 in taxes. He is against this type of development. Mr. Robinson explained to him that the law requires that when you have a certain amount of people living in a house, you have to have a certain amount of parking spaces and this plan has it.

Mr. Batty explained to Mr. Lourenco that there will be a driveway on each side of the house, plus a driveway in the back. The owners will be able to access these driveways from Lynn Avenue and there are parking spaces for two cars there on each side of the house, plus an additional two spaces from the two car garage.

Ms. Irene Renaud, 28 Lynn Avenue, Mr. Diamantina Souza, 40 Lynn Avenue, Ricardo J. Cardoso, 75 Tab Avenue, Robert Glaude, 77 Tab Avenue, Mr and Mrs. Erving Washington, 15 Vineland Avenue, Lucille Lerioline, 46 Tab Avenue, and Derrick Rose, 425 Warren Avenue were all sworn in by Chairman Robinson.

Mr. Washington states he does not feel the Board is being consistent. His concern is about the access of the garage and the density that this new development will create.

Mr. Robinson asked him why he made the statement that the Board is not consistent. Mr. Washington states the sidewalk waiver that is being requested by the applicant. He states he had to put curbing in at his property. Mr. Robinson asks him if he is stating that he wants sidewalks on Vineland Avenue. Mr. Washington states he does not want access on Vineland. He asks if they are going to have to pay for a new sewer lateral for these new homes. Mr. Robinson states he will defer to the Planning Department to address that particular issue. Mr. Robinson asks Mr. Washington why he thinks the Board is being inconsistent. Mr. Washington states that you are putting a whole of

people in a small area and there is already a new structure going up there. The property values will plummet.

To clarify Mr. Washington's statement about the new structure, Mr. Hanner explains that Mr. Washington is referring to the house which is under construction currently adjacent to this property which will be part of the subdivision currently under review by the City. It is a four-lot subdivision and the plan itself shows one existing structure and three proposed structures. That one existing structure is actually a structure that is currently under construction and it faces Lynn Avenue. Ms. Boyle states that that particular structure did not require Planning Board approval because there was no subdivision of land and it did not require an extension of a City street. It would only require a building permit.

Regarding to the issue of the new sewer lateral, Mr. Hanner states that the three proposed structures will be connected by the City sewer line from Lynn Avenue, not from Vineland. The only utility off of Vineland will be the gas line. Sewer and water will be provided off of Lynn Avenue.

Regarding the density issue, Ms. Boyle states that this particular district does allow two-family construction on these size lots. This area is zoned R-4 which permits a two family home on an 8,750 square foot lot. One of the lots that is being proposed is in excess of that. As far as zoning compliance this subdivision does meet Zoning requirements. You may be dismayed that the zoning requirements allow this much development, but the fact of the matter is that they do. The other guidance document is the Comprehensive Plan that talks about the density associated with this particular district and what is being proposed is consistent with the density guidelines associated with the Comprehensive Plan. The assumption that these are two family homes being constructed is that they are necessarily going to be of poor construction is true. This does meet City Zoning requirements. In regard to the statement made that it might drive down property values I don't know that, but I think that a well constructed development should have no impact on the property values. People are surprised that two-families are allowed in this particular district, but they are. It has been that way for many many years.

Mr. Ricardo J. Cardoso, 75 Tab Avenue states he is new to the neighborhood, looked in different areas and noticed a lot of the homes are occupied by the owners. He is concerned about these structures being rental properties. What happens if these properties are sold off to another developer and now these three houses and they want to re-subdivide; now they become six. Mr. Robinson states that they cannot re-subdivide without coming back to the Board and asking that that restriction be removed or revisited. These plans will be approved as is and recorded with the deed restriction that no further subdivision allowed. Mr. Cardoso is also concerned about the increase in traffic along Tab Avenue, the speeding issues and also that it could be used as a cut-through between Broadway and Centre. There will also be a burden on existing infrastructure. He asks that the Board consider curbing.

Mr. Batty states that the staff and Board go by the regulations and codes. He noted that he visited the site. The regulations state that the applicant is allowed to do this in this particular district. If the Board denied this, the applicant could take it to court.

Mr. Cunha states that he agrees with Mr. Batty. We are not a Board of compassion; we are a Board of the bylaws of the Comprehensive Plan and the City's Regulations. I am obligated to do what is right. The developer does have the right to development this property because is in with the regulations and the district.

Ms. Diamantina Souza, 40 Lynn Avenue states she does not understand why they can develop those three duplexes across the street from her house. It does not make any sense. We were never notified that they were going to be built. Ms. Boyle explained that a notice went out to the immediate abutters, not abutters within the 200 foot radius. A 200 foot radius is only for a major subdivision or where there are zoning variances.

Ms. Lucille Leriolino, 46 Tab Avenue voiced her concern and noted that fire apparatus cannot turn down those streets now. There is not enough parking spaces for the extras cars that will come with a new development like this. The street is too small. Where will they put the snow? They are trying to squeeze too many people into an area that needs to breathe. They took trees down and want to put asphalt on the ground.

Mr. Robert Glaude, 77 Tab Avenue states he agrees with the prior neighbors' comments. He is worried about it being rental property, the crime, and the increased traffic. He states he has two small children. He said he is considering moving out of East Providence.

Another neighbor spoke and said that this development will create an unsafe situation. There will be more cars etc. Vineland is half dead-end; the other half goes to Centre Street. There have been accidents and also the fire apparatus could not get by because of the parking situation. It is unsafe for the children. There will be an accident if people don't stop at the stop sign. The driveway is very close. They play basketball there. There will be too many cars and there is no place for the plows to put the snow.

At this time, Mr. Robinson suggests a motion to take a recess so that the Board can confer with the Planning Department.

### **Motion**

On a motion by Mr. Batty, seconded by Mr. DiTraglia, the Board voted to take a recess.

After conferring with the Planning Department and since there were a number of concerns raised tonight by a lot of people, it has been suggested that the Board continue this matter to the next meeting.

Since Chairman Robinson cannot attend the next meeting on June 12, the Board voted to change it to Wed., June 14<sup>th</sup>.

### **Motion**

On a motion by Mr. Batty, seconded by Mr. DiTraglia, the Board unanimously voted to change the meeting from June 12 to **June 14<sup>th</sup>, 7:30 p.m., Room 306.**

**C. Appl. #2006-11 LDP Major – Wampanoag Ponds, 1279 Wampanoag Trail, Applicant: Wampanoag Partners, LLC, “Scoping for Outside Professional Peer Review”**

Ms. Boyle explained that the Board has the authority to request peer review, professional studies that are done in support of an application. This peer review is conducted at the developer's expense. We will solicit bids from qualified professionals and then the developer must post the amount and we select from that list.

This application is for a major residential development called Wampanoag Ponds which is located at 1272 Wampanoag Trail. This is also known as Leonardo Farms. The applicant proposes a 321 unit multi-family development with a clubhouse. There are a number of traffic issues with the Wampanoag Trail. Because of these issues staff thought is very important that we be allowed conduct a peer review of the traffic study being performed by the applicant. We are recommending that the firm of Camp Dresser and McKee be selected to perform the peer review because of their background and knowledge of drainage issues in the vicinity of the Southeast Drainage District. Another issue associated with this development is that it has been used for many used as a sand and gravel operation. That has resulted in a very very deep hole in the center of the site. There will have to be a lot of moving of soil in order to grade it so that the topography is suitable for development.

We have required a geotechnical study to be done by CDM as part of the submission for this development and are asking for approval to go out for peer review of the geotechnical study as well.

Staff is asking of the Board tonight approval to require this outside professional review of three areas; traffic, drainage, and geotechnical. This is a major development with three stages of approval; master, preliminary and final.

Mr. Cunha asked about the clubhouse. Ms. Boyle described it as a clubhouse in a condominium complex. The clubhouse is not open to the public. There may be some apartments. An analysis will be done to determine how many are 55 plus and how many are not. This is not an over 55 development purse, but they expect the market to be empty nesters and younger people without children. This will be a multi year absorption in all likelihood.

It was asked about the contamination found on the site. Ms. Boyle said there was a small amount during the do diligent stage, but it relatively small. The purchaser of the site is addressing this issue. Unlike most of the development on the waterfront, this is not a big issue in this particular development. If there was a more substantial issue, the Board has the ability to ask for additional review as part of the preliminary plan. With the three-step process we do have the opportunity to flush out what the issues are at the master plan stage.

Motion – approval of the peer review

On a motion by Mr. Batty, seconded by Mr. DiTraglia, the Board unanimously voted to approve the peer review study of drainage and geotechnical review study.

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Batty	Aye
Mr. Cunha	Aye

Mr. DiTraglia	Aye
Mr. O'Brien	Aye
Mr. Robinson	Aye

## **5. CONTINUED BUSINESS**

### **A. Staff Report - None**

## **6. COMMUNICATIONS**

The Board made the communication below part of its official record.

Memo dated April 11, 2006 to the Zoning Board from the Planning Department, Re: Requests for Variance or Special Use Permit to be held on April 26, 2006

## **7. ANNOUNCEMENT**

### **A. Next Meeting – Wednesday, June 14, 2006, 7:30 p.m., Room 306**

## **8. ADJOURNMENT**

On a motion by Mr. DiTraglia, seconded by Mr. Batty, the Board voted to adjourn the meeting.

JMB/sac