

June 9, 2003 - Regular Planning Board Meeting

CITY OF EAST PROVIDENCE

PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES OF JUNE 9, 2003

Present were: Messrs. Almeida, Cunha, Gerstein, O'Brien, Robinson, Jeanne Boyle (Staff), Patrick Hanner (staff), Alan Corvi, City Engineer, and Tim Chapman (Assistant City Solicitor).

I. SEATING OF ALTERNATE MEMBER

Mr. Robinson announced he would be sitting in as Chair in place of Mr. Poland who could not make this meeting. Mr. Robinson states that the first order of business would be the seating of the alternate member and will be two alternate members seated. Mr. Gerstein will be sitting in place for Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Cunha will be sitting in for Chairman Poland.

II. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

A. Minutes of November 12, 2002

On a motion by Mr. Almeida, seconded by Mr. Cunha, the Board approved the minutes of November 12, 2002

B. Minutes of May 12, 2003

On a motion by Mr. Almeida, seconded by Mr. Cunha, the Board approved the minutes of May 12, 2003

It was noted the minutes of Feb. 10, 2003, March 10, 2003, and April 14, 2003 would be forthcoming.

III. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD CORRESPONDENCE

On a motion by Mr. Almeida, seconded by Mr. Cunha, the Board voted to approve the correspondence listed below and make it part of the Board's official record.

A. Memo dated 5/16/03 to the City Council, Re: Lease of City-owned land at Lyon Avenue – Metacommet Office Park

B. Memo dated 5/14/03 to the City Council, Re: Abandonment Request of North Brow Street.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Appl. #2003-04 Minor Subdivision – Ellis Street Applicant: Evelyn A. Doherty

Martin Sleprow, attorney for Evelyn A. Doherty was sworn in by Assistant City Solicitor Tim Chapman.

Mr. Paul Doherty of Barrington, RI was also sworn in.

Attorney Martin Sleprow noted he represents Evelyn Doherty who could not be here tonight. In place of Mrs. Doherty is her son Paul. Mr. Sleprow noted that the lot that fronts on Pawtucket Avenue is vacant land. They are requesting a subdivision so that a single-family house can be constructed on the Pawtucket Avenue side. It is in an R-3 zone, which is 7500 footage for a single-family lot. Both lots meet that the 75 x 100 ft standard.

Mr. Sleprow stated that the problem lies with the placement of the existing house so far back from the Ellis Street line that a variance from the side yard requirement for the existing house will be needed and they are asking for preliminary approval from the Board tonight. After that we will go before Zoning in July and ask for two-dimensional variance; one for 15 feet setback requirement to show 7.15 feet and the other 27 percent to 25 percent in the percent of coverage.

Mr. Sleprow at this time addresses the Planning Department issues.

Regarding the distance of the 7.15 feet, he states that staff would like to see a greater distance here. He agrees with that and told his client that he thought it is more important to maintain the 75-foot width on Pawtucket Avenue, but if the Board feels, as the staff does, we can easily go back another three feet and make that 10.15 feet instead of the 7.15 feet. The house will be some sort of ranch or colonial. We can move the house over 3 feet and put the garage on that side.

He notes that he can go to 10.15 which would keep both lots legal, it would change the nature of the variance and notes he is willing to follow the staff recommendation.

Regarding the granite curbing, Mr. Sleprow noted that there is already granite and sidewalks on Pawtucket Avenue. He notes that Staff would like granite curbing on the Ellis Street side, but asks that that be waived because there is no curbing on Ellis Street. Where the new lot is being created, there is curbing and sidewalks and to start with curbing on Ellis Street would seem to be a punishment for the landowner since there is no curbing there.

He noted that staff has said that the applicant has enough coverage and it does meet the standards of the Comprehensive Plan. He asks that the Board grant preliminary plan

approval of this subdivision and if the Board sees fit to ask the applicant to adjust the lot lines so that the side yard setback variance is less. The Doherty's are intending to build a house there so that Evelyn Doherty can move into the newer house and the existing house will be sold.

Acting Chairman Robinson asked the Board if they have any questions or comments.

Ms. Boyle at this time has Patrick Hanner go through the staff recommendation

Mr. Hanner noted that the applicant is asking for preliminary plan approval and this subdivision requires some variances. The process requires that if the Board grants preliminary plan approval, to which the applicant will then proceed to the Zoning Board. If the Zoning Board grants the required variances, the applicant can either return to the Planning Board for final plan approval or tonight the Board can vote to give final plan approval to the Administrative Officer.

Mr. Hanner noted that the application was certified as complete on May 14th and notice was mailed to the immediate abutters. The applicant is proposing a single family dwelling on the proposed Parcel 7 and the property is zoned Residential-3. The subdivision will require a variance for the proposed side yard setback for Parcel 6. Being proposed is 7.15 feet and an R-3 district requires a 15-foot minimum side yard setback. It is being proposed with a 27 percent lot coverage and an R-3 District requires a maximum of 25 percent. Mr. Hanner noted that staff reviewed the plan and it is our opinion that the property line can be moved several feet to the north and the proposed width of this dwelling of 42 feet can be decreased to 38 feet. This would allow a greater side yard distance for the proposed existing house on Parcel 6. This is one of the conditions by Staff.

Required Findings to the Comprehensive Plan

Mr. Hanner noted that the land use associated with this subdivision is consistent with the Land Use 2010 Plan. Sewer, water and gas utilities are available to the proposed dwelling and are currently connected to the existing dwelling and that the two proposed parcels are located on a relatively flat area. No physical constraints appear at present. Parcel 6 has physical access to Ellis Street and Parcel 7 has access to Pawtucket Avenue.

There are existing sidewalks and existing curbing along Pawtucket Avenue. Staff recommends that the existing curbing be installed along the frontage of the existing house. Staff feels that curbing along this existing house would delineate the roadway which would provide for safety along Pawtucket Avenue since there are a lot of pedestrians that walk along that street.

Staff Recommendation the following:

A. that the Board delegate Final Plan Approval to the Administrative Officer;

B. that the proposed lot line be relocated by several feet and decrease the width of the proposed dwelling in order to increase the side yard setback and decrease the percentage of lot coverage for the proposed parcel 6;

A greater attempt can be made by the applicant to conform to the dimensional requirements for an R-3 district;

C. that the Board waive the requirement for the installation of sidewalks along the frontage of the two proposed parcels and require the installation of granite curbing along the frontage of the proposed parcel 6;

D. that the Board grant conditional approval of the subdivision as proposed subject to the following four conditions:

1. that any and all of the required variances be obtained from the Zoning Board of Review, and that a note be placed on the Final Plan indicating the variances granted, the date of the Zoning Board approval, and recorded book and page;

2. that the title block of the Final Plan be revised to indicate Final Plan status;

3. 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; and

4. that the proposal shall meet all applicable City, State, and/or Federal regulations and requirements.

Ms. Boyle noted that we do not typically recommend that a lot line be shifted because the 75 feet isn't accomplished and said she can understand why Mr. Slepko recommended that to his client. The distinction is that it is a corner lot and even though the 7.15 feet is defined under Zoning as a side yard or side setback, it actually functions as a rear yard. This is why we thought it was important to try to increase that distance. She also stated that per Mr. Slepko's suggestion that the driveway and parking area be shifted over to the southern part of Parcel 7, it would provide more privacy given how limited the distance is between the two properties.

Mr. Slepko stated he agrees with the staff stipulations and will amend the plan at final before the Administrative Officer.

First Motion

On a motion by Mr. Almeida, seconded by Mr. O'Brien, the Board voted to grant conditional approval of the subdivision subject to the staff recommendations listed above.

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Almeida	Aye
Mr. Cunha	Aye
Mr. O'Brien	Aye
Mr. Gerstein	Aye
Chair Robinson	Aye

Second Motion

On a motion by Mr. Almeida, seconded by Mr. O'Brien, the Board voted to delegate Final Plan Approval to the Administrative Officer.

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Almeida	Aye
Mr. O'Brien	Aye
Mr. Cunha	Aye
Mr. Gerstein	Aye
Chair Robinson	Aye

B. Appl. #2003-06 Minor Subdivision – Linden Street, Applicant: Stephen and Joseph D. Ptaszek, Map 403, Block 21, Parcel 56

Attorney Shawn R. Donahue representing the applicants Stephen and Joseph D. Ptaszek was sworn in. He noted they received their Certificate of Completeness on May 11, 2003. He said it is the intent of the applicants to enhance the neighborhood by this development. He noted that the applicants have a deep commitment to the community and said their parents continue to reside within 200 yards of the proposed development. The applicants have successfully completed other projects in the immediate vicinity on Dalton Street next to their parents.

The applicants request the Board's favorable review of the proposed subdivision and at the appropriate time will discuss a modification of the plan.

Acting Chairman Robinson asks the Board if they have any questions.

Attorney Donahue distributed some pictures to the Board for the record noting how close the trees are to the thoroughfare. The applicants have presented plans which include sidewalks on their property. It would be the only piece of property on that street that has a sidewalk and would require demolishing these beautiful trees. Seek modification of plan to allow trees to remain.

At this time, Mr. Hanner made the staff presentation.

Mr. Hanner stated the applicant is proposing two lots which is classified as a minor subdivision. The COC was issued on May 12th and notice was mailed to the immediate abutters. The applicant is proposing two lots; lots 1 and 2 as shown on the plan

consisting of 7,500 square feet. A single family dwelling for the proposed lot 2 with the relocating the existing garage. The property is zoned Residential 3 and the Zoning Officer has noted that the two lots conform to the zoning requirements. The Plan proposes the installation of curbing along the frontage of the two parcels. Mr. Hanner noted that after conversations with the City Engineer, it was found that requiring the installation of curbing would mean removing the two trees; one being the 48” in diameter tree and the other a 30” diameter tree. Staff requests that the Board waive the requirement of the installation of curbing and sidewalks in order to protect these trees which aesthetically add to the neighborhood.

Required Findings to the Comprehensive Plan

Mr. Hanner noted that the proposed subdivision is consistent with the Land Use 2010 designation. The Zoning Officer has noted that the subdivision does comply with Zoning. There are all utilities available to the proposed dwelling and are connected to the existing dwelling. There are no physical constraints. The parcels are located on a relatively flat area, they have access to Linden Avenue and staff is recommending the waiver of street curbing and sidewalks. Regarding drainage, surface water runoff would be through over-land flow with some infiltration on-site.

Staff Recommendation

- A. That the Planning Board delegate Final Plan approval to the Administrative Officer;
- B. That the Board waive the requirements for the installation of curbing and sidewalks along the frontage of the two parcels;
- C. Based upon the discussion, staff recommends that the Planning Board grant conditional approval of the subdivision, as proposed, subject to the following five conditions:
 - 1. That the residential use of the property be restricted to single-family use and accessory uses in perpetuity;
 - 2. That the applicant post an improvement guarantee in an amount determined by the Public Works Department for any required improvements to the City’s right-of-way;
 - 3. That the title block of the Final Plan be revised to indicate Final Plan status;
 - 4. That the Final Plans be based upon the approved Preliminary Plans, and further the Final Plan and supporting documentation meet the requirements of the East Providence Land Development and Subdivision Review Regulations; and
 - 5. That the proposal shall meet all applicable City, State and/or Federal regulations and requirements.

Mr. Stephen Ptaszek, 151 Dover Avenue, East Providence and Mr. Joseph Ptaszek, 144 Hoyt Avenue, East Providence were sworn in by the Assistant City Solicitor. Mr. Cunha asked if the existing garage was going to stay on the same lot? They answered yes, and that the lot would be part of the new proposal. They said they are up in the air as to whether they will move it to the side and if they cannot move it, they will take it down. There is no proposed garage for the existing dwelling that is there now.

Attorney Joseph Keough is sworn in and represents the immediate abutters, Patrick and Christen Lynch as well as several other concerned neighbors. He submits a petition to the Board by the neighbors who object to this proposal. He notes that the subdivision meets most of the technical criteria if not all, but indicates that it goes against the Subdivision rules and Comprehensive Plan itself in that it will not protect the health, safety, and welfare of the residents in this area. Approval of this subdivision will not serve to protect the natural built environment, will have a negative impact on the neighborhood, and will not promote positive land use since it is a more intense use in the area than what it calls for. Further, Mr. Keough states that in Section 5 of the subdivision rules, it does not comply with the Comprehensive Plan and does not provide for the safe circulation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic on that street, nor does it provide for the preservation of the features that make the neighborhood an attractive place to live.

Attorney Keough states the comprehensive plan is aimed at promoting development that is compatible with the comprehensive plan, supports the value of abutting land, and promotes efficient and safe street layout. The neighbors are concerned with traffic, density, and safety.

Attorney Keough states that the Rumford neighborhood is described in the comprehensive plan as a quiet, historic residential neighborhood. An area that is designated as low density. The subdivision adds considerable to the density of the area. This plan shows a subdivision that will create one additional dwelling. The applicants own a separate buildable lot on the street. Approval of the subdivision will result in two additional single family homes on the street. Approval will change the character of the neighbor. This is a narrow dead-end street with no turnaround.

Attorney Keough states an attempt has been made to save two trees and a considerable amount of vegetation and trees must be removed to accommodate the proposed lot line. The character and aesthetics of the neighborhood will change. There is no indication what type of single-family home will be constructed. There are parking issues. This plan shows that the garage will be removed and a single lane driveway with room for two cars. Single lane driveways result in one car parked on the street. The plan also shows the proposed garage. The street is a dead-end street with no turnaround and with a considerable amount of children living on the block. Adding two dwellings is not inline with the comprehensive plan and general purpose of the subdivision rules, Attorney Keough requests that the Board deny the application.

Attorney Donahue states that the Planning Department has reviewed the application and recommended approval. Attorney Donahue further states that the developers are from the neighborhood, their parents live in the neighborhood, and they take pride in the property.

Mr. Almeida asked what type of dwelling the applicants intend to build on the proposed parcel. Attorney Donahue stated a single family dwelling, not a raised ranch. Mr. Donahue further stated that they have completed similar projects and take great pride in their work. There are no variances sought in this proposal. The density issues that Mr. Keough mentioned have been reviewed by experts and those determinations are contained in the City's comprehensive plan. This proposal meets those very strict guidelines. The subdivision proposes to relocate the existing garage within the setback requirements.

Mr. Keough states that the Ptaszek's live in the neighborhood but they do not currently live or intend to live on Linden Street. Further, there is no indication regarding the type of house that is proposed, only a footprint on the plan.

Mr. Donahue states that a determination by the applications regarding their permanent place of residence and that the applicants have built a Cape Cod style house in the past.

He notes that the Rumford area of the City is described in the Comprehensive Plan as a quiet, historic, residential area which is designated a low density area. This subdivision would add more density to this neighborhood and change the character of the neighborhood. Also it is on a dead-end street with no turn-around.

Acting Chairman Robinson asks if the Board has any questions.

Mr. Almeida asks that the people's petition that was distributed to the Board be made part of the record.

On a motion by Mr. Cunha, seconded by Mr. Almeida, the Board unanimously voted to make the petition part of the official record.

Attorney Donahue states that he disagrees with Mr. Keough's comments about the proposal not being in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan and subdivision regulations. The Planning Department knows those rules inside and out and they agree with the applicant and is recommending that this proposal be approved. He states that the developers have the best intention and that their parents still reside and have ties in that neighborhood.

Acting Chairman Robinson asks what type of construction that his clients propose? He states it will be a single family dwelling, but not a raised ranch, possibly a Cape Cod.

He notes that his clients have completed their projects and take great pride in their work, there are no variances being sought here, the density issues have been reviewed by City staff, and those determinations are in keeping with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Keough said that even though the Ptaszeks live in that neighborhood, they do not live on that particular street and would not be affected by this development. In addition there is no indication from them in writing that a raised ranch would not be built there so they have no idea what kind of house would be built.

Mr. Donahue spoke in favor of this development and said there has not be any determination by either of these individuals about their permanent residences in that particular neighborhood. They finished a Cape Cod house in the Rumford section and have done other nice properties in the neighborhood.

Public Comments

Donna DelleFemine, 29 Linden Avenue was sworn in. She states that the neighbors are trying to preserve the integrity of the street, our homes and where we have invested our money for 18 to 25 years. She said the developers have intentions, but not the same intentions that we (the abutters) do. She notes that one of the houses that they built on Dalton is a raised ranch and that is the type of home they do not want to see built. Our position is that we want to preserve the trees, the street, and the nice sized lots.

Mr. Donahue clarifies the fact that the trees were removed by the City, not the developer.

Mary Lynch, 104 Wilson Avenue was sworn in. She testifies that she lives on the corner and everyone who lives on that street has to drive by her house. She is against this development and notes that she has four children and when cars come flying around the corner they cannot see. It is also a safety issue, and the addition of more houses will cause more traffic. There are 12 children under the age of 15 that live on that street. As it is, cars cannot turn around properly and they have to back into other people's driveways.

Jennifer Healy of 17 Linden Avenue is sworn in and states her opposition to the development in that her house is directly across the street and notes is impossible to back out of her driveway because the street is already too narrow. It will make getting in and out of the driveway more difficult. Along with the development there will be big trucks blocking that narrow road and make it hard for people to get in and out. It will take away from the neighborhood.

Joshua Lamb, 17 Woburn Road, was sworn in and voiced his concerns about the development. He stated his land abuts the property where the proposed development will be. He is also concerned about the street and wants to preserve the area because it is part of the community and this was one of the attractions he had when he purchased the property.

Francis Keating of Rumford was sworn in. She said she purchased her property 26 years ago from Mary Wilson, the original owner, and said Ms. Wilson was adamant that this land would always remain open space to the neighbors. She loved that land and planted beautiful plants and trees. Ms. Keating said that the prior owner would never have sold

the property unless she thought the new owner would live there and raise a family and this is why Ms. Wilson owner sold it to her.

Kristin Lynch, 26 Linden Avenue, Rumford states that she lives next door to the property where they are taking the garage down. She is concerned about the development because part of the reason she moved to Rumford was that the lot was not buildable and was such a unique property in East Providence. She has two small children and is also concerned about what they plan to build and feels the developer has been less than forthcoming about what they are doing. She said she approached them to buy part of the property to preserve it, and their initial reaction was yes that's a great idea, and the next thing she knows is that they have plotted it all out and never discussed it with her.

Mr. Joseph Ptaszek of 49 Dalton Street is sworn in. He states the developers have a good reputation. He went on to say that purchased his house 43 years ago and the people across the street had 9 children, he had four and up the street had three. You cannot park two cars across with someone driving up the middle. In regard to the trees there, he said that the developer made a mistake by not taking a picture of the limb that fell. It would have been a disaster. He stated that the City cut the trees down because of the safety issue. He notes that the developer has built houses before and has no intention of destroying that neighborhood. He notes he plants trees on his property and states he is proud of Rumford and does not want to destroy it. In regard to the backing out of the driveway, everyone has to turn their wheels when they back out and it would be no different than anyone's property.

Cindy Pierce, 17 Waldron Road is sworn in. She states that one of the things that she really loved about Rumford was the open space, foliage and historic homes. She is concerned about the home that is being proposed and does not feel it is in keeping with the other homes in the neighborhood and is therefore against this development. She said the neighbors want to keep a certain look about the neighborhood.

Mr. Stan Ptaszek also states that there are developers in the City that build houses out of cheap materials. The Ptaszek brothers build good quality homes with good materials. The home there will be a treat and aesthetically pleasing for that neighborhood

Mr. Donahue stated that the testimony heard from the abutting residents is appropriate and understandable, but asks the Board to go by the report of the Planning Department that this proposal is in full compliance with the ordinances and regulations. He asks that the Planning Board fully consider their testimony and information should be reviewed in the light of what would have happened if in fact they wanted to live in Rumford and were met with the same type of testimony. The individual that happens to have the corner lot if in fact there was an intention to detain the pieces in unified piece of property she would not be living their right now. He states this is a conforming proposal, the area that the house is to be built on is in an R-3 district and not a two-acre piece of land. At this time, Mr. Donahue respectfully requests that the Board approve this subdivision.

Mr. Joseph Keough states the proposal technically conforms but that when reviewing the narrative submitted by the petitioners they state that there will be no adverse affect on the neighborhood, but there will be an adverse affect on the neighborhood. Look at that street and where the markers are for this new subdivision of lots you know that lot will surely be built upon. Density will be increased a great deal on that street. It is a narrow street with no turn-around. To say that there will be no adverse affect on the neighborhood is not true. He states that the rules of the Comprehensive Plan are there to protect in an instance where you will meet the requirements, but when you adversely impact the neighborhood where this will and no promises of what will be built, I urge the Board to look more closely at this and ask that this application be denied.

Patrick Lynch, 26 Linden Avenue stated he agrees with the comments that have been made against this development and is very concerned about the history of that lot and what the previous owner wanted. He states Henderson lots are some of the finest gardens for decades and those properties have a lot of tradition in that area including the lot history. Mr. Lynch said he agrees with the neighbors in that it will have a negative affect on the neighborhood and said he would not have moved into the neighborhood if this is the way the layout was going to be. Not only will it have a negative impact on the value of the land, but it will also have a dramatic effect on the quality of life.

Laurel Ptaszek, 151 Dover Avenue is present and sworn in. She states she grew up in Rumford and lived on a dead-end street off of Greenwood Avenue, which did not have a turn-around. The street had 12 houses, a lot of kids, and feels that the traffic would not be any different with this new development. She said she has never had a problem pulling into the driveway or backing out.

Mr. Ptaszek said it will be a positive thing, it is a buildable lot, the square footage is there, and all the abutters on the other street are 5,000 square foot lots, this is a 7,500 square foot lot which is a good size lot in Rumford. It will be a good opportunity for a new family to grow up here just like we did. He said he is not going to build a raised ranch, but is looking to build a Cape. He said it is a personal thing and takes great pride in what he builds.

Acting Chairman Robinson thanked everyone for speaking tonight and commented that he cannot recall the last time when so many concerned neighbors came before the Planning Board. He states the only people that know this neighborhood are the people that actually live there and understands how they feel. He notes for these reasons he will vote to deny the application.

Mr. Cunha asked staff who removed the trees. City Engineer, Alan Corvi stated he was not sure, but that the Parks Department is the one that addresses tree problems.

First Motion

Mr. O'Brien made a motion to deny the application. There is no second motion.

Mr. Cunha stated that since this is a buildable lot he cannot support the motion to deny the application because the applicant has a right to build on their property.

Second Motion

On a motion by Mr. Cunha, seconded by Mr. Almeida, the Board votes to accept the staff recommendation to approve this subdivision upon the conditional approval of the subdivision subject to the following conditions:

1. That the residential use of the property be restricted to single family use and accessory uses in perpetuity;
2. That the applicant post an improvement guarantee in an amount determined by the Public Works department;
3. That the title block of the Final Plan be revised to indicate final plan status;
4. That the Final Plan be based upon the approved preliminary plans, and
5. That the Final Plan and supporting documentation meet the requirements of the East Providence Land Development and Subdivision Regulations; and
6. That the proposal meet all applicable City, State and Federal regulations and requirements.

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Almeida	Aye
Mr. Cunha	Aye
Mr. Gerstein	Aye
Mr. O'Brien	Nay
Acting Chairman Robinson	Nay

Motion on the Waivers of Sidewalks and Curbing

On a motion by Mr. Almeida, seconded by Mr. Cunha, the Board voted to waive the requirements of sidewalks and curbing.

On a motion by Mr. Almeida, seconded by Mr. Cunha, the Board voted to delegate final plan approval to the Administrative Officer.

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Almeida	Aye
Mr. Cunha	Aye
Mr. Gerstein	Aye

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Almeida	Aye
Mr. Cunha	Aye
Mr. Gerstein	Aye
Mr. O'Brien	Aye
Acting Chair Robinson	Aye

V. CONTINUED BUSINESS

1. Staff Report

A. Waterfront Redevelopment Plan

Ms. Boyle updated the Board on the Waterfront Redevelopment Plan. She said a draft was not available to the Council as yet. We are still working on it.

She noted a presentation was made to the Governor in April and one of the center pieces of the Plan was the proposal to construct a single point urban interchange on top of Route 195. There have been other discussions with staff as well as the Federal Highway Administration. They noted that the proposal needs to be scaled down in order for it to be fundable and in order for it to meet the permitting requirements. Revisions are being made to the draft plan. We intend to go to the Council with a draft plan within the next two to three weeks on the proposal.

B. East Pointe Development/GeoNova Negotiations

Ms. Boyle noted we have been proceeding with negotiations with the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the GeoNova project. She noted she is going to Washington D.C. with members of the Acting City Manager and Council. Nancy Remington will be meeting with HUD to try to rap up whatever technical issues remain on our application to them for funding for GeoNova. We will also be meeting with the Senators and Representatives to press our case for funding for the waterfront redevelopment project. We will also be talking to them about the issues associated with funding of the sewer plant. The GeoNova project will be closing in about a month's time and they will begin the remediation process sometime this summer. Once that happens they will be getting development plans into us for review and we hope to have something before the Planning Board within the next two to three months.

VI. COMMUNICATIONS

The Board voted to approve the following communications:

A. Memo dated 5/21/03 to the Zoning Board of Review from the Planning Department
Re: Requests for Variance and Special Use Permit to be heard on May 28, 2003

B. Notice – Travel Corridor Workshops

VII. ANNOUNCEMENT

A. The next meeting will be held on *Monday, July 14, 2003, 7:30 p.m.*, Room 306.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Cunha commented that he is under the impression that the Comprehensive Plan does not allow the Board to deny anyone to build on a buildable lot. Mr. Robinson states it is his understanding that he you find that it is not in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan, then you can deny it. Mr. Cunha then asked why the staff did not deny it. Ms. Boyle states that it was staff opinion that the proposal was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and therefore recommended to the Board approval. The development is well within the density of those regulations.

The meeting adjourned at 9:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Robinson, Acting
Chairman

MR/JMB/sac