

# **November 9, 1999 - Regular Planning Board Meeting**

## **CITY OF EAST PROVIDENCE**

### **PLANNING BOARD**

MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 9, 1999

Present: Messers. Poland, Fisher, DiTraglia, Sullivan, Diane Feather (staff), James Moran (staff) and Stephen Coutu, City Engineer.

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

Mr. Sullivan was seated as a voting member.

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

A. Minutes of April 13, 1999

On a motion by Mr. Fisher, seconded by Mr. DiTraglia, the minutes of April 13, 1999 were unanimously approved by the Board.

B. Minutes of August 17, 1999

On a motion by Mr. DiTraglia, seconded by Mr. Fisher, the minutes of August 17 were unanimously approved by the Board.

C. Minutes of September 14, 1999

On a motion by Mr. DiTraglia, seconded by Mr. Fisher, the minutes of September 14 were unanimously approved by the Board.

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

On a motion by Mr. Fisher, seconded by Mr. DiTraglia, the following correspondence was approved by the Board:

A. Memo to the City Council dated 9/16/99 Re: Disposition of City-owned Land, Narragansett Avenue and Sherman Street.

## **IV. NEW BUSINESS**

### **A. Kent Farm Estates Release of Performance Bond**

Mr. Moran explained to the Board that Mr. Winfield Tucker has asked for a reduction in his performance bond. His letter was referred to the Department of Public Works for their

recommendation. They provided comments that basically identify that the work has been substantially completed with the exception of several items that are listed in the memorandum dated November 4, 1999 by City Engineer Stephen Coutu, namely concrete sidewalks, loam and seed areas which are approximately 50 percent complete. He stated granite bounds are approximately 25 percent complete, as-built drawings from the engineer need to be provided, and miscellaneous work such as drainage cleaning, replacement of dying trees, clean up and any other worked deemed necessary by this office until the subdivision is fully accepted.

Mr. Moran stated that the Department of Public Works suggests that 90 percent of the bond be released and 10 percent of the \$69,000 be retained to complete these final elements in the subdivision. He stated the Department of Planning concurs with the recommendation of Public Works.

Mr. Moran explained that for this particular bond, the City Finance Director required that Mr. Tucker double the amount of stock to cover the bond in case there is any kind of volatility in the stock market to cover any fluctuations.

Mr. Poland stated that he took a ride through the subdivision and thought they did a nice job on everything.

#### *Motion*

On a motion by Mr. Fisher, seconded by Mr. DiTraglia, the Board voted unanimously to approve the recommended 90 percent reduction of the bond.

#### Roll call vote

Mr. DiTraglia           Aye

Mr. Fisher             Aye

Mr. Sullivan           Aye

Mr. Poland             Aye

## **B. Redesignation of Enterprise Zone Areas - Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan.**

Mr. Moran explained to the Board that the City has been designated for the past five years as an Enterprise Zone community. He said there are nine communities in the state that have received this designation. The purpose of the program is to promote job growth in the City through the provision of tax benefits. He stated that the Enterprise Zone designation is expiring at the end of this year, and one of the requirements that the Enterprise Zone

Council requires is that we provide a redesignation application to them no later than November 15, 1999.

Staff has prepared an application that basically answers all the questions of the Enterprise Zone Council, and also provided the answers relating to how we have managed the enterprise zone over the past five years and how we propose to manage it in the next five years. Also provided is what we are going to be changing as part of a new designation. They also wanted new statistics as to what the numbers were in terms of job growth, which we did provide.

Mr. Moran stated the City Council has endorsed this at the last City Council meeting, and enacted a resolution at the last meeting in support of this application. Another requirement of this application is that the Planning Board reviews the application for consistency with the City's Comprehensive Plan. He stated staff has reviewed the Economic Development Element of the Plan, which calls for the use of enterprise zones in promoting economic development in the City.

The Planning Department recommends that the Planning Board certify this redesignation as consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Moran stated staff would be approaching the Enterprise Zone Council to do a presentation before the end of the year.

Mr. DiTraglia commended Planning staff for the excellent job they did on the application and noted how organized and complete it is.

Mr. Poland noted that over 200 jobs have been created in the last five years as a result of the enterprise zone designation. Mr. Moran stated that it does not cost us a great deal to administer the program, we basically roll it into our regular economic development promotional opportunities. He stated that we see it as a beneficial tool for promoting our waterfront development in the future as well.

Mr. Fisher asked Mr. Moran if he could give to the Board in bullet form as to the importance of continuing the enterprise zone.

Mr. Moran stated:

The waterfront is very much dependent on these types of programs when it relates to new job growth and businesses coming in to redevelop these properties. We will be able to offer them tax credits for job growth, which is a major contributing factor for major redevelopment of those areas.

Waterfront Drive Project - This project has received support in the northern and southern regions but continues to be un-funded in the central portion. The enterprise zone continues to promote that roadway as a critical tool for providing the growth necessary in the central city and Rumford portion of the city. There are a number of critical properties along that railroad corridor that would be extremely enhanced by the construction of Waterfront Drive.

Other issues that are critical in the Enterprise Zone are the redevelopment of our downtown areas. We have identified Riverside Square as a particular area that is being benefited through this program and also programs that were identified in the original course of action that will help to revitalize our downtown areas. He noted we have also identified the potential for Taunton Avenue to be rolled into that downtown element as well.

Ms. Feather noted that this is all part of implementing our Comprehensive Plan. She noted that we have been modifying our zoning ordinance over the past few years to try to bring it into consistency with our Comprehensive Plan and to try to attract the type of development that is identified in the Plan. She noted that one of the modifications to the Zoning Ordinance was the creation of the Business Technology Floating Zone. She said we are trying to attract high-tech and bio-tech types of employers, and noted this all ties into with what this Board and City Council have been doing to implement the Comprehensive Plan.

On a motion by Mr. Fisher, seconded by Mr. DiTraglia, the Board voted to accept the Enterprise Zone proposal as presented by the Planning staff to certify that it is consistent with the goals and objectives of the East Providence Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Fisher stated this is exactly what you need to do in this City to perpetuate economic growth.

**C. Edward Avenue and Frederick Street - Minor Subdivision, Appl. #99-13, Applicant: Russell Rivard, Map 303, Block 8, Parcels 6 and 7.**

Chairman Poland asked Russell Rivard to present the details of his application for a 4-lot subdivision. It was noted that this property extends through from one street to another,

with two lots fronting on the existing paved street Frederick Avenue, and two fronting on a section of Edward Avenue that is currently not constructed. Mr. Rivard stated that he is proposing to extend the pavement and install sewer and water for the two lots fronting on Edward Avenue and will construct single-family homes, and will also construct two homes on the existing Frederick Street frontage.

Ms. Feather provided an overview of the application and explained why the road construction aspect of this development was not going to be reviewed by the Planning Board. She stated that a subdivision for this property was submitted under the old regulations (prior to December 18, 1995), and was therefore "grandfathered" under the old process. Under the old process when a layout and grade was accepted for a road by the City Council (as was done in 1972), a developer could then come in and build the road under the review of the Department of Public Works. She noted that the construction of this road will follow that process. Ms. Feather stated that this is probably the first and last time the Board will see this particular scenario. She asked that the Board enter the staff memorandum and application into the record of the meeting.

Mr. Sullivan asked for clarification regarding the existing end of pavement for Edward Avenue. He stated that the assessor's map shows the road going through to Bourne Avenue. Ms. Feather showed the Board the 1981 aerial photograph of this area and pointed out the existing end of pavement. She noted that dashed lines on the assessors map shows the part of the street that is not constructed, i.e. a paper street, but noted that it is difficult to see the dashed lines for this particular street. Ms. Feather stated that the middle portion of Edward Avenue was accepted by the City (a layout and grade had been accepted by the City Council), but had not been constructed to date. She noted that Mr. Rivard will be extending the pavement for the lots fronting on Edward Avenue, and noted that a hammerhead-type of turnaround will be constructed so that emergency vehicles will be able to turn around.

Mr. Poland noted that there are no requests for any waivers for this proposed development, such as curbing and sidewalks. He asked if this was because the development is "grandfathered" under the old process. Ms. Feather noted that this is correct. Ms. Feather said that we specifically did not deal with waivers on this application because technically the only thing the Board is doing, and has the authority to do in this particular case, is to create the lots. She noted that everything related to the road and public improvements was grandfathered under the old system because of the submission of a plan prior to the adoption of the new regulations in December 1995.

Mr. Coutu stated that there was an accepted layout and grade for this street (1972) and that Mr. Rivard has submitted construction drawings to Engineering for pavement of the roadway, and for installation of utilities and drainage. He noted that the width of pavement would match the existing width. Mr. Poland asked Mr. Rivard how wide the pavement would be. Mr. Rivard answered 24 feet.

Ms. Feather stated that in this case, no zoning variances are required and the changes required to make the Preliminary Plan a Final Plan are very minor. She noted that the

Board could combine Preliminary and Final approval with recording of the Final Plan subject to staff approval of the plan. She noted that if we did it this way we could post a Notice of Decision for both stages of approval and have the twenty-day appeal period start from that date, after which time Mr. Rivard could proceed. Mr. Poland stated that was fine with him.

Mr. DiTraglia asked Mr. Rivard if he understood and was in agreement with the recommendations of the staff memorandum. Mr. Rivard noted he that does understand and agrees with them.

Mr. Poland asked if there were any more questions for the staff.

Mr. DiTraglia asked if there was a particular reason why we are not paving all the way through to Bourne Avenue. Mr. Coutu answered that Mr. Rivard is only responsible for providing access and utilities for the property he owns. Mr. Fisher stated that this point should be clear for the record because someone may question why the street wasn't paved in its entirety. Mr. Fisher stated he thinks the best reason for not extending the street all the way through is to keep it from becoming a cut-through. He said over in that area you are dealing with a lot of families with young children, and you have to think about their safety.

Mr. Poland said that in years past the City did not require that you pave the entirety of your lot frontage, and noted that at one point you only had to pave enough for the minimum required frontage (40 feet). He noted that now they are requiring that Mr. Rivard pave completely in front of his lots and install a turn-around, which is good for snow plowing etc.

Ms. Feather stated she found two separate layout and grades on this street; one that went from 20 feet south of Bicknell for a distance of 150 north, and then the one involved in this particular development that picks up at 150 feet north of Bicknell and continues through to Ruth Avenue.

In regards to the stormwater drainage, Mr. Coutu stated that half of the road Mr. Rivard is constructing will slope towards Ruth Avenue, and the other half slopes towards Bicknell Avenue. He stated there are catch basins at the end of Edward and Ruth Avenues.

There were no questions from the public and no further questions or comments from the Board.

### ***Motions***

#### *Motion on the Staff Recommendation being Made Part of the Record*

On a motion by Mr. Fisher, seconded by Mr. DiTraglia the Board voted unanimously to accept the staff memorandum of November 5, 1999 as part of the record with the

elimination of letter "A" of the stipulations that recommended delegating final approval to the Administrative Officer.

Roll Call Vote

Mr. DiTraglia           Aye

Mr. Fisher               Aye

Mr. Sullivan            Aye

Mr. Poland              Aye

*Motion on the Application*

On a motion by Mr. Fisher, seconded by Mr. DiTraglia, the Board voted unanimously to grant preliminary and final approval of the subdivision as noted in Section B. of the staff recommendation dated November 5, 1999.

Roll Call vote

Mr. DiTraglia           Aye

Mr. Fisher               Aye

Mr. Sullivan            Aye

Mr. Poland              Aye

**D. Franklin Street Minor Subdivision, Appl. #99-16, Applicant: Luis A. Mateus, Map 513, Block 50, Parcel 2**

Mr. Mateus described the subdivision. He is proposing to demolish the existing building on the property (an abandoned church) and split the property into three lots. He said that he could build two duplexes on the property as of right. He stated that the property consists of four prior recorded lots that each has about 25 feet of frontage. He noted that the lots do not conform to the R-4 requirement for minimum lot depth (100 feet). He said the lots have sufficient lot area for this district (5,000 sq. feet). Mr. Mateus noted that the Zoning Officer is requiring this proposal to go to the Zoning Board of Review for a variance for lot depth.

Mr. Moran presented the staff recommendation and the required findings. It was asked that the staff memorandum be made part of the record at the point the Board votes. He

pointed the Board's attention to the memorandum of the Zoning Officer explaining that the proposal would be required to go to the Zoning Board for variance from Sections 19-145 for depth of lot (100 feet required) and 19-138 (a) side lot line (side lot lines must be at least 80 feet). Mr. Moran noted that the applicant is requesting waivers from the requirement for sidewalk and curbing.

Mr. Poland stated that he thought that on a corner lot you could have a side lot line of less than 80 feet but not less than 50 feet. Ms. Feather noted that the provisions of Section 19-138 (a) allowing a side lot line of less than 80 feet for corner lots applies "only when all other dimensional requirements are met", which is not the case with this property.

Regarding the taxes on the property, Mr. Mateus stated he wanted the Board to know that the church on the property previously made it tax exempt, so there was no tax bill generated on December 31, 1998. He said that when he closed the property in April 1999, there was no tax bill. He said that when he came in for the subdivision he got a letter from the Tax Division stating there were taxes due, and he noted that he has paid these taxes in full.

Mr. Moran noted that regarding the request for a waiver from granite curbing, the Department of Public Works and Planning are recommending that the sidewalks be waived, but that granite curbing be required along the entire frontage of the development based upon the characteristics of the neighborhood in general. He also noted that the DPW memorandum identifies several issues that would need to be incorporated into any decision. At this time, Mr. Moran read the Department of Public Work's comments on this subdivision. He noted that these items have been incorporated into the staff recommendation and they would have to be addressed in the final plan.

### Recommendation

Mr. Moran outlined the staff recommendation. Based on the finding that the proposed subdivision is consistent with the East Providence Comprehensive Plan, that it meets the General Purposes of Article 1 of the Regulations and that the required positive findings of Section 5-4 can be met, the Planning Department recommends *Conditional Approval* of the requested Preliminary Plan submission subject to the following:

1. That all comments in the technical staff memoranda to the Planning department be incorporated into the plans as submitted; and that any and all conditions of the Planning Board approval be reflected in the Final Plan submission;
2. that the Final Plans and supporting documentation be based upon this Preliminary Plan approval, and that the Final Plans meet all City regulations and ordinances, and all applicable State and/or Federal Regulations;
3. That granite curbing be installed along the frontages of all residential lots within the development;

4. That all back taxes, including any accrued interest be paid in full prior to the submission of the Final Plans. The Assistant City Treasurer would provide the Planning Department with this statement stating that the taxes have been paid.

5. That the structure currently located on the existing parcel, be demolished and/or removed from the property prior to the submission of the Final Plan and;

6. That all necessary zoning permits are obtained prior to Final Plan submission;

Mr. Moran stated that staff is recommending that Final Plan approval be delegated to the Administrative Officer, as allowed by the Regulations.

Ms. Feather asked Chairman Poland if he thought it would be appropriate for staff to do an overview of the subdivision process for the general public in attendance at the meeting. Mr. Poland answered yes.

Ms. Feather explained that this Board and other Planning Boards in Rhode Island operate under State Law and that State Law defines different classes of subdivision and the process by which they are reviewed. She noted that the subdivision before the Board this evening is classified as a Minor Subdivision on Existing Frontage. She noted that these types of subdivisions do not require a Public Hearing by the Board, but noted that this is the public meeting at which they will be able to make any comments. Ms. Feather noted that because this proposal requires variances from the Zoning Ordinance, Mr. Mateus will have to go to the Zoning Board of Review to request those variances. She noted that State Law requires that the applicant come to the Planning Board for Preliminary approval, and if preliminary approval is given the applicant then goes to the Zoning Board for approval, and comes back to Planning for final approval if the variances are granted. She noted that Final Approval is typically delegated to the Planning Director, who serves as the Administrative Officer under the subdivision regulations.

Chairman Poland asked for any public comments at this time.

Deborah Cook, 1 Alison Court, Riverside stated she is concerned about the safety issue because there is a lot of traffic especially in the afternoon on Crescent View Avenue. She said there are numerous accidents at Metropolitan Park Drive, Crescent View and Willett Avenues and stated that having more cars at these new residences will create a safety problem.

Ms. Cook stated her second concern is the demolition of the church and where all the debris will go. She asked if it would be used for fill for these new houses and asked where the asbestos and contamination will go when the church is demolished. She noted another concern regarding the absence of fire hydrants and the CYO Club being next door.

Mr. Steve Harris, 21 Peck Avenue stated that he is concerned about the on-street parking.

Mr. Keith Gonsalves, 2 Ramsay Street stated his property abuts this lot and is concerned about the new houses that have already been put in the neighborhood which only have one- car driveways. He noted that most people have more than one car and the other car or cars end up parked on the street. He is also concerned about additional traffic in the neighborhood.

Mr. Craig Harris, 15 Ramsay Street stated his concern about the parking of the vehicles also. He wants to know if Mr. Mateus is putting up two two-family houses or two duplexes, and noted there is a difference. He said that a two-family with one unit on the first floor and the second unit on the second story takes up less room on the lot and keeps more open space than a duplex with side-by-side units. He stated that the proposed lots are not typical of the neighborhood and said that most of the lots in the area are larger. He noted that Mr. Mateus added two small houses on Peck Street, and stated they do not want to see any more small houses like that in the neighborhood. He stated we need land for the children to play in and is concerned about all the traffic this would generate. He stated if Mr. Mateus plans to build two two-story homes they would not have a problem with that, but they do have a problem with duplexes and they do object to three houses on undersized lots that do not meet zoning requirements and that will create a lot of congestion. He noted that if curbing is installed that will force people to park in a way that will impede traffic flow on the streets, especially when people have parties.

Regarding the demolition question, Mr. Mateus stated he has contacted Pond View Recycling about putting a dumpster on the lot and noted that all the demolition debris will be placed in the dumpster and taken to their facility. Mr. Coutu stated a demolition permit from the Building Inspector is required. Mr. Poland asked Mr. Coutu to explain about the asbestos certification. Mr. Coutu answered that the Building Inspector must go through the structure and if no asbestos is found, he will issue certification and demolition may proceed, but if there is asbestos, it has to be removed with special procedures prior to commencement of demolition.

There was a brief discussion of parking and location of parking on the lot. Mr. Poland noted that you cannot park in the required front yard setback, which in this case is the first 15 feet of the property. He noted that the driveway for each single-family house would probably be 10 feet in width by 40 feet in length. Mr. Mateus stated the types of houses will be colonials or raised ranches with attached garages.

In regard to the fire hydrant, Mr. Moran explained that the Fire Department reviewed the plans and provided a favorable review and found the plans to be acceptable. Mr. Poland stated there are fire hydrants in the area. Mr. Poland stated that the Fire Chief is very strict when it comes to fire regulations and if he had any concerns about the hydrant, he would have mentioned it in his memo.

Mr. DiTraglia asked what the proposed driveway width is. Staff answered 10 feet wide and the side yard setback is eight feet.

Regarding the issue of traffic safety at the rotary, Ms. Feather stated that you would not notice any appreciable difference as far as additional traffic generated by this development. Ms. Feather noted she drives through the rotary every day is aware that there are a high number of accidents throughout the rotary area every year. Ms. Feather explained that the RI Department of Transportation proposed to eliminate that rotary and to create a signalized intersection in the early 1990's, and the Planning Department thought this would improve traffic safety. However, she noted that many property owners and residents in that area at the time objected to any modification to that rotary, and therefore RIDOT did not proceed with their plans. She stated that if people have traffic safety concerns about the rotary they should contact their Ward 4 council member.

Mr. Sullivan stated he does not like congestion, does not like three houses in this area and feels building the duplexes would be a better way to go. He stated he does not like houses very close to each other and would prefer just two houses on that lot.

Mr. Fisher stated he agrees with Mr. Sullivan that the congestion of more cars would not benefit this neighborhood.

Mr. Poland stated there was a request for waivers on sidewalks and granite curbing. Mr. Poland stated we need to be consistent and if we asked Mr. Mateus to submit a request than we should have asked Mr. Rivard to submit a request. He stated when the Board first approved the new subdivision regulations, the questions came up about putting curbing on existing streets, and staff said they would make developers conform to the existing conditions in the neighborhood. (Mr. Poland stated there is no curbing and there are no sidewalks along Frederick Street.) Mr. Mateus stated he would install granite curbing, but there is no granite curbing there now.

Ms. Feather noted that in the review of Mr. Rivard's proposal, staff specifically addressed the question of whether we could apply the current regulations to Mr. Rivard's development and felt that we could not, although she conceded that perhaps we should have asked him to submit a request for waivers from sidewalk and curbing for the Frederick Street frontage (with the Edward Avenue frontage "grandfathered" under the old regulations and process).

Mr. Poland asked staff if the proposed lots were consistent with the lots in the neighborhood. Mr. Moran stated there is there is a mix of lots such as 8,000 square feet and those of 4,000 square feet.

Mr. Poland asked if there were any other questions.

Mr. DiTraglia asked the people in the audience if they felt there should be granite curbing and sidewalks with these new homes. They stated yes, it would enhance the neighborhood.

Mr. Coutu spoke recommending the installation of granite curbing. He noted that curbing is important for the protection of the roadway edge. He also noted that you have to start

somewhere with the installation of curbing. He noted that if these properties have curbing installed now, then as other developments occur in the area they could match that condition. He also stated that the City is re-instituting the cost-sharing curbing program that the Department of Public Works had back in 1991. Mr. Coutu noted that under this program the property owners would pay for the materials while the City paid for the installation. He noted that this was a very popular program and expects that the City will receive many requests for curbing when the program begins again.

### ***Motions***

#### *Making the Staff Recommendation Part of the Record*

On a motion by Mr. DiTraglia, seconded by Mr. Fisher, the Board voted unanimously to make the staff report and recommendation part of the Board's official records.

#### Roll Call Vote

Mr. DiTraglia           Aye

Mr. Fisher             Aye

Mr. Sullivan           Nay

Mr. Poland             Aye

#### *2) Waivers for Sidewalks*

On a motion by Mr. Fisher, seconded by Mr. DiTraglia the Board voted 3 to 1 to approve the requested waiver for sidewalks.

#### Roll Call Vote

Mr. DiTraglia           Aye

Mr. Fisher             Aye

Mr. Sullivan           Nay

Mr. Poland             Aye

#### *3) Waiver on Granite Curbing*

On a motion by Mr. Fisher, seconded by Mr. DiTraglia, the Board voted unanimously to deny the requested waiver from installing granite curbing.

#### Roll Call Vote

Mr. DiTraglia        Aye  
Mr. Fisher            Aye  
Mr. Sullivan         Aye  
Mr. Poland            Aye

*4) Motion on the Subdivision*

A motion was made by Mr. DiTraglia, seconded by Mr. Fisher, to *Approve* the requested subdivision subject to the staff recommendation with the exception of item number 4 relating to the payment of back taxes (they were paid prior to the meeting) .

Roll Call Vote

Mr. DiTraglia        Aye  
Mr. Fisher            Nay  
Mr. Sullivan         Nay  
Mr. Poland            Aye

*The vote was tied 2 in favor, and 2 opposed. The motion failed to carry the majority vote required (3 votes) and therefore was not approved.*

**V. CONTINUED BUSINESS**

*1. Staff Report*

A. Ms. Feather informed the Board that the General Assembly approved a bill in this past legislative session that slightly modifies the State Enabling on subdivisions and land development projects. She noted that the changes include shortening some of the timeframes for completeness review, and changing the definition of minor subdivision to remove the requirement that any non-residential development was automatically classified as Major. Ms Feather noted that the City's regulations would need to be amended to incorporate these changes, and noted that staff would be bringing the changes to the Board at the December meeting. She noted that these changes will be the first amendments to the regulations since we adopted them in December 1995, and noted that staff is not recommending any changes at this time other than to comply with the revised State Enabling.

B. Ms. Feather notified the Board that there is a base coat of paving at Picerne Property's Seaview Subdivision and noted that homes are presently under construction.

C. Mr. Moran notified the Board that the Bridgham Farm oak tree is now officially protected and is owned by the East Providence Land Trust as the result of an approved Administrative Subdivision plan.

In regard to the "Wood" property on the northeast corner of Warren and Pawtucket Avenues, Ms. Feather noted the applicant will be coming in to merge some of the Assessor's parcels on which the CVS Pharmacy currently under construction is located.

She noted this is for tax purposes, and since it is an Administrative Subdivision, the Planning Board will not review it.

#### Board Question

Mr. Poland noted that he had not seen an appointment by the City Council for the vacancy created by the resignation of Charles Goodwin. He asked staff to send a letter to the City Council regarding the need to fill the vacancy. He noted that it is important to have a full Board, especially since some major projects could be happening in the near future. Ms. Feather asked what the Board's pleasure is on presenting the plaque that was made for Mr. Goodwin. After discussion it was decided that arrangements should be made for Mr. Goodwin to receive the plaque at a City Council meeting, after which the Board would take Charlie and his wife to dinner. The date will be determined after Stephanie Camille polls the members.

### **VI. COMMUNICATIONS**

On a motion by Mr. DiTraglia, seconded by Mr. Fisher, the Board unanimously approved the following communications:

A. Memo dated September 25, 1999 to the Zoning Board of Review regarding Requests for Variance or Special Use Permit to be held on September 29, 1999;

B. Memo dated September 10, 1999 to the Zoning Board of Review from the Department of Planning, Re: Appeal Request of Arpad Merva.

C. Updated Zoning Ordinance supplements submitted by the Law Department on 9/1/99.

### **VII. ANNOUNCEMENT**

Next Meeting - December 14, 1999, 7:30 p.m., Room 306

## ***VIII. ADJOURNMENT***

On a motion by Mr. DiTraglia, seconded by Mr. Fisher, the meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter Poland

Chairman

PP/DF/JM/sac