

March 10, 2003 - Regular Planning Board Meeting

CITY OF EAST PROVIDENCE

PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES OF MARCH 10, 2003

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

Present were: Chairman Poland, Messrs. Almeida, Cunha, Gerstein, Robinson, O'Brien, Sullivan, Diane Feather (staff), Patrick Hanner (staff), Zac Gordon (staff), Alan Corvi, City Engineer, and Tim Chapman, Assistant City Solicitor.

I. SEATING OF ALTERNATE MEMBER

Mr. Cunha was seated as Mr. Almeida was not present at the start of the meeting.

II. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

A. Minutes of February 10, 2003

On a motion by Mr. Cunha, seconded by Mr. O'Brien, the minutes of February 10, 2003 were approved and made part of the Board's official record.

It was noted the minutes below would be forthcoming.

B. Minutes of December 11, 2001

C. Minutes of November 12, 2002

D. Minutes of February 12, 2002

III. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD CORRESPONDENCE

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Appl. #2002-26 Minor Subdivision, Applicant: Maria DaRocha, 198 Anthony Street

Present and representing the applicant was Martin P. Slepko, Esq. Mr. Slepko stated that this subdivision proposes the creation of a two lots, that fully comply with zoning, including the City's parking requirements. The purpose of the subdivision is for the creation of a single family dwelling to be located on the proposed parcel 18.1. Mr. Slepko further stated that he had read the opinion of the Planning Department, and that the conditions stated in the Planning Department opinion were reasonable.

Patrick Hanner gave the staff presentation. Mr. Hanner stated that the applicant is proposing a two (2) lot subdivision on existing City Streets, a Minor Subdivision. There are two stages of plan review, Preliminary and Final. The Planning Board may vote to delegate Final Plan approval to the Administrative Officer. The Board must make a decision within sixty-five (65) days of the issuance of the Certificate of Completeness, which was issued on February 18, 2003.

Mr. Hanner stated that the applicant is proposing the creation of two parcels, 18 & 18.1 as shown on the plan. Parcel 18 is proposed at 9,694 square feet and parcel 18.1 is proposed at 6,494 square feet. A single-family dwelling is proposed for parcel 18.1 and an existing two-family dwelling is located on parcel 18. The property is zoned R – 6 which requires a minimum lot area of 5,000 square feet, minimum lot width of 50 feet, minimum lot depth of 100 feet, front setback of 15 feet, rear yard setback of 20 feet, and side yard setback of 8 feet. In addition, the applicant is proposing to replace the existing sidewalks and restore the existing granite curbing to City standards fronting parcels 18 & 18.1.

Mr. Hanner stated that the Zoning Officer noted that no zoning relief is required for the two proposed parcels, 18 & 18.1. However, during the review by the Zoning Officer it was realized that the basement unit located at 198 Anthony Street was installed without obtaining the proper building permits. This led to a physical inspection of the property by the City's Building Official, Electrical Inspector, and Plumbing Inspector. The Building Official and Electrical Inspector noted that the basement unit fully complies with all building and electrical codes. However, the City's Plumbing Inspector noted that two violations are present. First, the kitchen sink drain is not properly vented and second, a shower valve is not the anti-scald type. It was also observed by the Zoning Officer that a third unit was once present on the second floor and an existing 220 watt electrical line must be removed by a licensed electrician.

Mr. Hanner stated that regarding the required finding of Comprehensive Plan, the land use associated with this subdivision is consistent with the Land Use 2010 plan, the Zoning Officer has noted that no zoning relief is necessary for the two proposed parcels., the lots are served by sewer, water, and gas, there appears to be no negative environmental impacts from the proposed subdivision, and the two proposed lots have physical access to Anthony Street.

Mr. Hanner stated that staff recommends that the Board delegate final plan approval to the Administrative Officer; and further recommends, that the Planning Board grant Conditional Approval of the subdivision, as proposed, subject to the following conditions:

1. That a note be placed on the final plan that states, "The residential use of the proposed dwelling, to be located on parcel 18.1, be restricted to single-family uses and accessory uses in perpetuity";

2. That the applicant must set granite or concrete bounds at each end of the proposed dividing property line;
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 that 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. Poland asked if the Board has any questions. The board had no questions. Mr. Poland asked Mr. Slepchow if he had any questions or concerns regarding staff recommendations. Mr. Slepchow stated that the staff recommendations appear reasonable.

First Motion

On a motion by Mr. Sullivan, seconded by Mr. Robinson, the Board delegated final plan approval to the Administrative Officer.

Second Motion

On a motion by Mr. Sullivan, seconded by Mr. Robinson, the board grants conditional approval, as proposed, subject to the five (5) stipulations recommended by Planning Staff.

Roll Call Vote

| | |
|--------------|-----|
| Mr. O'Brien | Aye |
| Mr. Cunha | Aye |
| Mr. Robinson | Aye |
| Mr. Sullivan | Aye |
| Mr. Poland | Aye |

B. Appl. #2002-28 Minor Subdivision, Martello Street and Warwick Avenue,
Applicant: Santa Quattrucci

Zac Gordon gave the staff report on the proposed subdivision. Mr. Gordon indicated that the applicant was proposing a four (4) lot subdivision on existing street frontage (Martello Street & Warwick Street), to be improved with raised ranches, with garages beneath. Mr. Gordon further noted that the proposal would involve taking two (2) existing lots, each measuring 12,150 square feet, and subdividing them into four (4) equal lots, each measuring 6,075 square feet. Mr. Gordon explained that the existing site topography slopes gently from the northeast to the southwest and that the site is currently

improved with a single detached garage. Mr. Gordon stated that the proposed lots were in conformance with existing zoning dimensional requirements for the R-4 District, with the exception of lot depth. The proposed lots would measure 90 feet, while the ordinance requires 100 feet. Mr. Gordon advised the Board that the applicant was seeking waivers from the City requirements for granite curbing and sidewalks. Mr. Gordon also indicated that the proposed subdivision was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Gordon reviewed the staff recommendation for the Board. With respect to the requested waivers, staff was recommending that the waiver request for granite curbing be denied, while the request for a waiver from the requirement for sidewalks be granted. Finally, the staff was recommending Preliminary & Final Approval for the proposed minor subdivision, subject to the following conditions:

1. that the title block be revised to indicate Final Plan status;
2. 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;
3. that the applicant obtain the necessary dimension relief from the Zoning Board of Appeals.
4. that the existing detached garage be demolished; and
5. that erosion control measures be installed prior to the construction of the new dwelling.

Mr. Gordon also indicated that staff was recommending final plan approval be delegated to the administrative officer.

Assistant City Solicitor swore in Mr. Mateus, the applicant.

Chairman Poland asked the applicant if he would like add anything to the staff report. Mr. Mateus indicated that he was satisfied with the recommendation and deferred to the Board for any questions.

Mr. Poland noted that the agenda indicated that the applicant was “Santa Quattrucci”, when in fact the legal owner for this parcel was the Estate of Santa Quattrucci. Mr. Gordon noted that the applicant was actually Luis Mateus. Mr. Poland asked if members of the Board had any questions for either the applicant or staff. Mr. Poland began by noting that the Zoning Officer, Ed Pimentel, had indicated in a memo that the current subdivision plans show parking in the front-yard setback, which was not allowed under the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Poland noted that there appeared to be room for locating such parking outside of the front

yard setback (by shifting the houses back), but if the applicant wanted to retain the current site layout, Zoning Board approval would be required.

Board discussed followed on the requested waivers by the applicant. Mr. Sullivan indicated that he was not in support of waiving the requirements for curbing or sidewalks and made a motion to deny both requests. Motion seconded by Mr. O'Brien.

Mr. Almeida was seated as voting on this subdivision.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Almeida – Aye
Mr. O'Brien – Aye
Mr. Sullivan – Aye
Mr. Robinson – Aye
Mr. Poland – Nay

Waivers denied by vote of 4-1.

With respect to the request for subdivision, Mr. Poland noted that the staff recommendation to grant Preliminary and Final approval could not occur, as Zoning Board approval was still required.

Mr. Sullivan made a motion to grant "Preliminary Plan Approval" to the applicant's request for minor subdivision, subject to the following conditions:

1. that the title block be revised to indicate Final Plan status;
2. 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;
3. that the applicant obtain the necessary dimension relief from the Zoning Board of Appeals.
4. that the existing detached garage be demolished; and
5. that erosion control measures be installed prior to the construction of the new dwelling.

Motion seconded by Mr. O'Brien.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Almeida – Aye
Mr. O’Brien – Aye
Mr. Sullivan – Aye
Mr. Robinson – Aye
Mr. Poland – Aye

Motion by Mr. Sullivan, seconded by Mr. Robinson, to delegate final plan approval to the Administrative Officer.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Almeida – Aye
Mr. O’Brien – Aye
Mr. Sullivan – Aye
Mr. Robinson – Aye
Mr. Poland – Aye

Motion approved 5-0.

C. Appl. #2003-2 LDP Master Plan submission for 989-991 Waterman Avenue, Applicant: Lehigh Realty, LLC (proposed office building)

Ms. Feather explained that the proposed development was the Master Plan for a proposed Land Development Project (LDP). The proposed development is for a 12,000± two-story office building with fifty-four (54) associated off-street parking spaces. She noted that Section 19 – 261 of Chapter 19, Zoning requires that any development requiring 50 or more parking spaces must obtain land development project approval. Ms. Feather stated that land development projects must follow the three plan stage process for major subdivision - Master Plan, Preliminary Plan, and Final Plan.

Ms. Feather noted that the Land Development and Subdivision Review Regulations require that the Planning Board hold a *Public Informational Meeting* at the Master Plan stage, with a Public Hearing required at the Preliminary Plan stage. She noted that this evening’s meeting was the Public Informational Meeting. As far as the public notice requirements, Ms. Feather noted that a display ad for the Public Informational Meeting was published in the Providence Journal on Friday, February 28, 2003, and that a notice of the proposal and the public informational meeting date was mailed via certified mail to all property owners within a 200-foot radius of the perimeter of the property on February 26, 2003.

Ms. Feather noted that a master plan is defined as: “An overall plan for a proposed project site outlining general, rather than detailed, development intentions; it describes the basic parameters of a major development proposal, rather than giving full engineering details.” She noted that detailed engineered drawings, including building

elevations, and all required state and federal permits are required for the preliminary plan stage.

Ms. Feather noted that the applicant is proposing the construction of a 12,000± square foot two-story office building. There will be no stairway or elevator connections between the first and second floor, and each floor will have two separate means of egress, and there will be “upper”, “mid-level” and “lower” parking lots on the site. The parcel consists of 1.02 ± acres and has frontage on Waterman Avenue and North Revere Street (a City right-of-way). Utilities, including sewer and water, are available in Waterman Avenue. Stormwater drainage will be handled through a series of catch basins and underground infiltration galleys.

Ms. Feather noted that the property has frontage on North Revere Street. North Revere Street is a 40-foot wide City right-of-way, but not an accepted City street. It is improved with asphalt, but is not improved to City standards (minimum pavement width, granite curbing and sidewalks). The applicant is proposing to utilize this as its sole means of access and egress. The three existing curb openings on Waterman Avenue will be closed. New granite curbing and sidewalks will be installed on Waterman Avenue to close off these existing driveway openings.

Ms. Feather described the existing conditions of the site. She noted that the proposed building would be situated in the southeast corner of the property, towards the rear and lowest portion of the site. The highest point is the southwest corner, towards the rear of the property (along the North Revere Street frontage). The “upper parking lot” would be located in this high point on the lot. The narrative of the application states that the second floor of the proposed structure is provided with two footbridges that allow direct access to the upper parking lot.

Ms. Feather noted that the applicant is proposing a total of 54 off-street parking spaces. A total of 60 off-street parking spaces are required based on a square footage of 12,000 square feet (1 space per each 200 square feet of gross floor area), so *a variance will be required for the amount of off-street parking*. She also noted that a variance for location of off-street parking would be required because part of the off-street parking is located within the required zoning front yard on the North Revere Street frontage.

Ms. Feather noted that the Zoning Officer had objected in his memorandum to the location of the dumpster and loading area in the same location. Ms. Feather noted that if the trash storage area is moved to another location on the site, that this may impact the off-street parking as shown on the current site plan, and therefore may impact the variance request for the total number of spaces.

Ms. Feather noted that a variance would also be required for maximum percent of coverage. Section 19 – 145 of Zoning permits a maximum lot building coverage of 40 percent in the Industrial – 1 zoning district, and a total maximum impervious coverage of 60 percent of the lot, whereas the building and pavement for the parking areas covers approximately 64 percent of the lot. She noted that there is no perimeter buffer on the

easterly side lot line, and there appears to be continuous pavement between this and the adjoining property, which is also owned by the applicant. She noted that this should be addressed in the Preliminary Plan.

Mr. Sam Hemingway, P.E. of Garofalo & Associates, representing the applicant, was sworn in by the Board and described the elements of the proposed development to the Board. Also present was the applicant, Mr. John Pesce and Richard Bourtanais, also of Garofalo. Wilfrid L. Gates, of Gates, Leighton & Associates, was also present and spoke on the landscaping features of the plan.

Chairman Poland asked Mr. Pesce what kind of tenants would be located in the building. Mr. Pesce noted that his realty company, Lehigh Realty, would be the primary tenant, and said the remainder would be filled by general office uses, but not medical offices. Chairman Poland noted that the existing realty company appears to have a low parking generation rate, and that the mix of uses would likely generate fewer total parking spaces in use at the same time. He noted a parking report previously made to the Planning Board on this subject, and Ms. Feather concurred except to note that the lower parking demand from mixed uses is more predominantly seen in buildings of greater than 40,000 square feet.

Chairman Poland asked if there was anyone in attendance who wished to speak on the project or had any questions. There was no one present wishing to speak on the project.

North Revere Street Access and Waivers Discussion

Ms. Feather stated that the Department of Public Works noted in their memorandum that North Revere Street should be developed to applicable City standards, 24-foot pavement width, granite curbing and sidewalks, or in the alternative, since North Revere Street will essentially become a driveway entrance for this development, they question whether a street abandonment would be more appropriate. (If North Revere Street were to be abandoned, the area of the street would be divided in half and would become the property of the abutting owners to the centerline. Street abandonment is an action of the City Council.) Ms. Feather noted that the applicant had not requested street abandonment.

Ms. Feather noted that the applicant is not proposing to install granite curbing along North Revere Street. (The applicant is requesting a waiver from being required to install granite curbing along both sides of the 165-foot portion of North Revere Street from its intersection at Waterman Avenue to its dead end.) Ms. Feather noted that the applicant is also requesting a waiver from the requirement of installing sidewalks along both sides of North Revere Street, and is proposing to install a sidewalk along the east side only of North Revere Street.

Ms. Feather noted that Planning recommends that staff and the applicant explore and resolve the issue of street abandonment prior to advancing to the preliminary plan

stage. She noted that there may be practical site design and access reasons for each of the abutting property owners on North Revere Street to necessitate that the 40-foot North Revere Street to remain as is.

Mr. Chapman noted that in the event North Revere Street is not abandoned, the applicant should seek an easement from the City to utilize this portion of North Revere Street as the driveway access for this development.

The Board altered #1 of the staff recommendation to request that the issue of ingress and egress for the property be resolved prior to the submission of a Preliminary Plan, and the vote on the requested waivers was therefore not taken.

VOTE

LDP/Master Plan

On a motion made by Mr. Sullivan, seconded by Mr. Almeida, the Board voted 5- 0 to grant ***Conditional Approval*** of the Master Plan, *as proposed*, subject to the following conditions:

1. That the issue of ingress and egress for the proposed development be resolved prior to Preliminary Plan submission (including exploration of the question of whether the applicant should request an easement from the City to utilize North Revere Street right-of-way);
2. That all comments of the Department of Public Works (as noted in the attached memoranda) be addressed and incorporated into the Preliminary Plan submission;
3. That the applicant obtain a Physical Alteration Permit (PAP) from RIDOT (to be submitted at the time of submission of the Preliminary Plan);
4. That the applicant determine whether an Underground Injection Control (UIC) permit is required from the Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management (RIDEM) for the proposed construction disturbance and stormwater system, and if one is required, to obtain and submit said permit at the time of submission of the Preliminary Plan);
5. That any and all required variances are obtained from the Zoning Board of Review;
6. That the Preliminary Plans be based upon the approved Master Plans, and further that the Preliminary Plan and supporting documentation meet the requirements of the East Providence Land Development and Subdivision Review Regulations and Chapter 19, Zoning, including building elevations; and

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

Roll Call Vote

| | |
|----------|-----|
| Almeida | Aye |
| O'Brien | Aye |
| Sullivan | Aye |
| Robinson | Aye |
| Poland | Aye |

D. Disposition of City-owned property – Bentley Street Garage, 20 Bentley Street, Map 206, Block 30, Parcel 6.

Zac Gordon provided an overview of the staff report for this item. Mr. Gordon noted that under the terms of the City Ordinances, any disposition of City-owned property must first be reviewed by the Planning Board and a recommendation made to the City Council. Mr. Gordon noted that the City Council had forwarded the Bentley Street Garage property to the Planning Board for its review and recommendation.

Mr. Gordon reviewed the specifics of the Bentley Street property, noting that it measures 31,780 square feet and is presently improved with a single story brick building, built in 1920. Mr. Gordon added that property is zoned R-6 Residential, which has a minimum lot area requirement of 5,000 square feet (50 feet of lot frontage; 100 feet of lot depth). Mr. Gordon noted that the Planning Director, Jeanne Boyle, had asked the Public Works, Finance and Recreation Departments if they had any interest in this property and all responded in the negative, with the Finance Director recommending that the building be sold “at the best price”. Mr. Gordon also noted that the Capital Facilities Committee had previously recommended that this property be sold for redevelopment.

Mr. Gordon informed the Board that the Planning Department had performed a careful analysis of this property and determined that it had no future productive use for the City and therefore should be sold to the highest bidder for residential development. Mr. Gordon also informed the Board that the City Council had indicated that the property should be restricted to “single-family” dwellings. Mr. Gordon stated that Jeanne Boyle had spoken to Bill Conley, City Solicitor, who had indicated that such a restriction would be possible, with the final wording of such a restriction to be determined.

Mr. Gordon concluded by stating that the Planning Department was recommending that the Planning Board advise the City Council that it approves of the sale of this property, for single-family use, based upon the absence of any City Department

interest in this property and given that the “highest and best” use of this property is for residential use.

Mr. Poland asked if any members of the Board had any questions. Mr. Almeida expressed concern that the City get the highest possible price for this property and asked the Assistant Solicitor if we could set a “minimum bid” price? Mr. Chapman indicated that there is a process for the sale of City properties, which is based upon obtaining the highest price. Mr. Gordon noted that the City had recently sold several properties through a realtor and was very satisfied with the sale price.

Mr. Almeida also asked about the presence of gas tanks and liability concerns. Mr. Chapman indicated that the City would normally sell property “as is”, with the buyer assuming any risk or cost for cleanup. Alan Corvi, City Engineer indicated that all the tanks, with the exception of the tank for the old furnace, had been removed from this site.

Mr. Almeida also asked how many lots could be developed from this site? Mr. Gordon indicated that the parcel measures 199’ x 160’. Based on the dimensional requirements for the R-6 District, a total of three (3) lots could be created. With Zoning Board approval, as many as six (6) lots could be created.

Mr. Poland asked if it was possible for the City to subdivide the land itself, and sell the parcels to first time home-buyers from East Providence as affordable housing. Mr. Poland noted that the City does not have to comply with zoning regulations and therefore could create these substandard lots.

Mr. Poland suggested that the Planning Department look into this option further.

On a motion by Mr. Almeida, seconded by Mr. Sullivan the Board voted to recommend to the City Council that the City – owned property located at 20 Bentley Street be sold to the highest bidder, and further that the use of this parcel be restricted to single family residential use. Second Mr. Sullivan.

Roll Call Vote

| | |
|--------------|-----|
| Mr. Almeida | Aye |
| Mr. O’Brien | Aye |
| Mr. Sullivan | Aye |
| Mr. Robinson | Aye |
| Mr. Poland | Aye |

V. CONTINUED BUSINESS

1. Staff Report

A. 483 North Broadway Subdivision

Ms. Feather provided an update to the Board on the 483 North Broadway proposed 3-lot subdivision. She noted that at a meeting of the Planning Board held February 10, 2003, the Board voted 5 – 0 to *Conditionally Approve* the Preliminary Plan for this subdivision, as proposed, subject to the following:

1. That Lots 1 and 2 be restricted to single-family use and accessory uses in perpetuity, and that a note stating such be placed on the Final Plan;
2. That a separate legal document detailing the stormwater management plan be submitted with the Final Plan and be subject to the review and approval of the City Solicitor, and be recorded in the City's Land Evidence records at the time of Final Plan recording;
3. That all comments of the Department of Public Works (as noted in the attached memoranda) not previously addressed, be incorporated into the Final Plan submission;
4. That the title block of the Final Plan be revised to indicate Final Plan status;
5. 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;
6. That the proposal shall meet all applicable City, State, and/or Federal regulations and requirements; and
7. That staff and the applicant explore the feasibility of moving the historic Ide House to the rear (most westerly portion) of proposed Lot 3 for temporary storage and then re-locating the house to a permanent site yet to be determined, (with the period for temporary storage limited to one year).

Ms. Feather stated that since the Board's Conditional Preliminary Plan approval, the applicant has submitted revised Final Plans and draft legal documents relating to the stormwater detention basin maintenance and possible relocation of the historic Ide House. The Department of Public Works noted one item needing correction on the plans and they communicated this to the applicant's engineer. The draft legal documents were reviewed by Planning staff and appeared to be in order. The City Solicitor is currently reviewing these documents.

She noted that at the Board's February 10th meeting, Mr. Dippolito verbally offered \$5,000 as match funds towards moving and temporarily storing the Ide house on the most westerly portion of proposed Lot 3 so that the City could explore the logistics of moving the house to an alternative permanent location.

Ms. Feather stated that Mr. Dippolito has opened the house for inspection on two occasions so that city staff and a professional moving company could tour the interior of the house

and assess the feasibility of moving the structure. City Manager Paul Lemont and David Kelleher of the City's Historic Properties Commission also toured the building. She noted that the Ide House was deemed sound and able to be moved, and staff has been researching the costs aspects of short and long-distance moves and possible sources of funding, as well as ownership scenarios for the relocation and rehabilitation of the Ide House, i.e. a non-profit or the City.

She noted that at these inspections, Mr. Dippolito indicated he was open to discussions about permanently moving the Ide House to one of the two single-family residential lots being created with frontage on Merrill Street. Mr. Dippolito has noted that the house could stay in its present location while he proceeds with the construction of a single-family house on Lot 1, and then the Ide House could be moved a short distance to a permanent location at Lot 2. Mr. Dippolito would sell Lot 2 to the agency moving the house. An alternative scenario would be moving the Ide House to a City-owned location at Hunts Mills or to the Philip Walker House site at North Broadway and Massasoit, which is owned by Preserve Rhode Island.

Ms. Feather noted that City staff will continue to work with the applicant to determine the feasibility of moving the Ide House to a location yet to be determined, and will continue to explore costs and possible funding sources. As all parties have agreed, the Final Plan approval should proceed and need not be deferred until the question of whether the Ide House will be relocated or razed is determined. She stated that Planning Department staff will report back to the Planning Board when resolution of this issue is apparent.

Recommendation of Final Plan Approval to Administrative Officer

Ms. Feather noted that the applicant is moving forward with the submission of a Final Plan and staff recommends that the Planning Board "**Approve**" delegation of the Final Plan approval to the Administrative Officer. The City Solicitor will work with staff and the applicant's attorney to finalize the two legal documents associated with this plan – the stormwater maintenance agreement and the Ide House relocation agreement.

On a motion made by Mr. Sullivan and seconded by Mr. Almeida, the Board voted 5 – 0 to Approve delegation of Final Plan approval to the Administrative Officer.

B. Waterfront Planning and GeoNova/Ocean State Steel Project

Ms Feather gave a brief staff report and noted that the waterfront planning and the GeoNova/Ocean State Steel project were progressing.

C. Change of Meeting Start Time

Chairman Poland asked if it would be more convenient for members to move the meeting start time back to 7:30 p.m. Mr. Almeida noted that he is the Housing Authority Board which meets on the same day as the Planning Board so he would be late for meetings if they start at 7:00 p.m. All members concurred on a return to a 7:30 p.m. meeting start time.

VI. COMMUNICATIONS

A. Memo dated February 5, 2003 to the Zoning Board of Review from the Department of Planning Re: Requests for Variance or Special Use Permit to be heard on February 26, 2003 (copies previously submitted);

B. Copy of Memo to the Zoning Board from the Planning Department Re: "Appeal of Zoning Officer regarding Pond View Recycling to be heard on March 5, 2003 (copies previously sent to Board on 3/3/03.

C. Copy of Supplement No. 19, Feb. 2003 Revised Ordinances of the City of East Providence to all Board members (copies enclosed).

VII. ANNOUNCEMENT

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

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Peter Poland, Chairman

PP/JMB/sac