

# **October 23, 2001 - Regular Planning Board Meeting**

## **CITY OF EAST PROVIDENCE**

### **PLANNING BOARD**

---

#### **MINUTES of October 23, 2001**

Present were: Messers. Almeida, Fisher, Gerstein, Poland, Robinson, Sullivan, Jeanne Boyle (staff), Diane Feather (staff), William Conley, City Solicitor.

#### **I. SEATING OF ALTERNATE MEMBER**

#### **II. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

##### **A. Minutes of August 14, 2001**

On a motion by Mr. Fisher, seconded by Mr. Almeida, the Board voted unanimously to approve the minutes of August 14, 2001.

##### **B. Minutes of September 11, 2001**

Ms. Boyle noted that these minutes included an action by the Board that is being appealed. She noted that the appeal will not take place prior to the next Planning Board meeting, so the Board may take their time reviewing them.

Mr. Robinson noted that he was present at the September meeting, but his name is missing from the list of those members that were present. Chairman Poland noted some typographical errors that need to be corrected. He asked that a corrected version of the minutes be placed in the Board's November packet. Ms. Boyle noted that staff would correct the items noted, but she also asked the Board to please call in with any other comments on errors, omissions or corrections.

Board members also asked for previous minutes of April, 2000 for the Waterview Subdivision review to be sent to them as a refresher. Stephanie will forward them to the Board.

### III. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD CORRESPONDENCE

### IV. NEW BUSINESS

#### *A. Bond Release for the Chafee Street Subdivision - Request by Eugene Voll*

Ms. Boyle reviewed the bond release and asks that the Board approve the full release.

On a motion by Mr. Almeida, seconded by Mr. Robinson, the Board voted unanimously to approve the full bond release of the Chafee Street Subdivision.

#### *B. Public Hearing - Comprehensive Plan - Residential Density Guidelines*

The proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan consist of amending the definition of low density development from eight or fewer dwelling units per acre to 5.8 dwelling units per acre. This equates to a minimum lot size of approximately 7,500 square feet, which is consistent with the minimum lot size in an R-3 zoning district.

Ms. Boyle stated that a land use plan is not supposed to be a replica of the zoning ordinance. We didn't take the Zoning Map and say here it is, this is your land use plan. It is suppose to have broader categories of land use. If we start to get into too fine gradation, then you are getting away from that whole concept of the general plan.

Mr. Poland asked if there were any other comments or suggestions? Ms. Boyle noted there would be a separate vote on this and the zoning.

#### *C. Proposed Changes to the Zoning Ordinance*

Ms. Feather stated that these two changes relate to what we just spoke about in terms of density in maintaining the character and consistency in the neighborhood. The first phase is to Section 19-133 which involves through lots that have frontage on two streets. She referred to the Heath Street/Silver Spring Subdivision frontage which is an example of a through lot. Back in the 1930's they had lots recorded back to back when they had frontage on one street and frontage on another. In some cases, you will only have development on one side of that on one lot and one person owning the two parcels. They are able to convey these separately; they have not merged under the other merger conditions that are outlined in Zoning. We are proposing to eliminate that language, having continuous frontage so that any lot would come under the merger position. Through lots would now be subject to the zoning merger.

Ms. Feather states the second phase is the modification to Section 19-139 which relates to the number of structures on a lot. In a R-5 or R-6 you could have two independent structures for use of residential purposes on the R-5 and R-6 and we are proposing to eliminate that so there would be no longer any residential districts where you could have two separate structures for residential purposes. You could continue to have a duplex in

an R-5 or R-6 District and it would not lower the number of units, it would just eliminate the as-of-right ability to put two separate structures on one lot in an R-5 and R-6.

Ms. Boyle pointed out that staff is looking at those districts as well as in terms of how many units should be permitted there and whether the lot sizes need some adjustments.

Ms. Feather stated if you look at the existing schedule of uses of Section 19-98 it starts off with residential and single family and you see a two-family on a lot having 50 percent greater, which goes into a two-family and three-family. Staff reviewed this and came up with some ideas about the proposed changes to that, but did not feel comfortable in presenting it to the Board at this meeting.

Mr. Poland asked if our ordinance allows apartment houses? Ms. Boyle answered yes. And suppose someone wanted to put two apartment houses. Ms. Boyle stated that is something staff will look at. She said you can also do multi-family in a C-1 District and staff will be reviewing whether the R-5 should continue to be a multi-family district.

Mr. Sullivan inquired where it states: "not more than one structure used for residential purposes shall be built upon any single lot in any R-1 to R-6". He asked if that meant that the City wants to allow double structures on lots 5 and 6? Ms. Boyle stated for now we are prohibiting it. Mr. Poland stated that the shaded areas noted are added so they are adding R-5 and R-6.

Mr. Poland asked if there were any other revisions in zoning that we are suppose to be doing. Ms. Boyle stated we addressed all the other issues at the last meeting. Ms. Boyle stated that in terms of future zoning, staff is looking at the parking regulations. She stated we tried to relax the driveway ordinance and will fine tune it and consider a proportional limit to how much pavement people can put in their front yards.

Mr. Poland asked if there were any questions or recommended changes of the Board?

#### Motion on Comprehensive Plan Amendment

On a motion by Mr. Sullivan, seconded by Mr. Fisher, the Board voted to recommend approval of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment as contained in the staff recommendation.

#### Roll Call Vote

Mr. Almeida	Aye
Mr. Fisher	Aye
Mr. Robinson	Aye
Mr. Sullivan	Aye
Chairman Poland	Aye

#### Motion on Zoning Ordinance Amendment

On a motion by Mr. Sullivan, seconded by Mr. Fisher, the Board voted to approve the Zoning Ordinance amendments as contained in the attached staff recommendation.

## Roll Call Vote

Mr. Almeida	Aye
Mr. Fisher	Aye
Mr. Robinson	Aye
Mr. Sullivan	Aye
Chairman Poland	Aye

Ms. Feather states that this recommendation will go to the Council on November 6, 2001. It is advertised for three weeks prior to the November 6 Council meeting, and there also will be a display ad for the Comprehensive Plan that will go into the newspaper this week and again after the adoption of the Plan by the City Council.

## V. CONTINUED BUSINESS

### A. Staff Report

#### 1. Comprehensive Plan

Ms. Boyle noted that there are other larger changes to the Comprehensive Plan that staff is working on. This update is a couple of years behind schedule. Portions will go before the Board sometime in December. Staff is working on the elements now. Ms. Boyle stated in terms of major developments, there seems to be a lull right now and we are taking advantage of that in getting the Comprehensive Plan updated.

Ms. Boyle announced to the Board that we have a new Planner on staff, Patrick J. Hanner. She stated he is a graduate of the University of Rhode Island graduate planning school. He has been of great assistance on a lot of the work we are doing right now and we are very pleased to have him with us. Mr. Hanner will be presenting one of the projects at the next meeting.

Mr. Poland asked Ms. Boyle the status of the TACO development. He stated he had been getting some inquiries on it. Ms. Boyle stated there are some issues that are not related to the land use that TACO is trying to address. She states we have not had much communication from them lately, but we hope that they are still interested. She noted staff is not reviewing anything on this project which is unfortunate because the development plans were very close to getting a Certificate of Completeness (COC).

### B. Carpiato Development - Reardon Avenue

Ms. Boyle stated the City is waiting for a revised traffic report from them.

## VI. COMMUNICATIONS

On a motion by Mr. Almeida, seconded by Mr. Fisher, the Board voted to approve the communication below:

A. Memo dated 9/23/01 to the Zoning Board of Review regarding requests to be heard on 9/26/01.

Mr. Poland noted he did not get a copy of the Zoning Board cases for September.

## VII. ANNOUNCEMENT

The next meeting will be held on November 13, 7:30 p.m., Room 306.

On a motion by Mr. Fisher, seconded by Mr. Robinson, the Board voted to adjourn at 8:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter Poland, Chairman

PP/JMB/sac