

Kenneth J. Hopkins  
Mayor

Jason M. Pezzullo, AICP  
Committee Chairman  
Director of Planning



John Ireland  
Fire Department

David Rodio  
Building Official

Nick Capezza  
Engineering Division

Stephen Mulcahy  
Traffic Safety Division

## DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE

Cranston City Hall  
869 Park Avenue, Cranston, Rhode Island 02910

### DRAFT MEETING MINUTES 9:00 AM, WEDNESDAY, April 20, 2022 CRANSTON CITY HALL – 3<sup>RD</sup> FLOOR COUNCIL CHAMBER

#### 1. Call to Order

Principal Planner Doug McLean, as designee of committee member and Chairman Jason Pezzullo, called the Development Plan Review Committee meeting to order at 9:01 a.m. in the City Council chamber.

The following members were in attendance for the meeting: Stephen Mulcahy, Nick Capezza, and Franklin Paulino.

The following Planning Department members were in attendance: Doug McLean, Principal Planner; and Alex Berardo, Planning Technician.

Also attending: Atty. John DiBona, John Giusti, and Richard Bzdyra for Sprague Covington.

#### 2. “Sprague Covington Plat”

**Preliminary Plan** (vote taken)

*Location:* 1369 Park Avenue, Assessor’s Plat 11, Lots 273 and 4062  
*Zoning District:* C-2 (Neighborhood business) with Conditions. (condition is that subject property may have up to 8 dwelling units per approved zone change)  
*Owner/applicant:* Sprague Covington, LLC  
*Proposal:* The applicant proposes to merge the 2 lots into 1 lot, while developing the site with 8 housing units along with associated parking facilities and landscaping. The existing billboard on the property will be removed as part of this application.

Mr. McLean reminded the committee members that the City Plan Commission had previously voted to provide a positive recommendation on the zone change for this project and that the Council was favorable as well. He said that the applicants are past the Master Plan Approval stage and are now at the Preliminary Plan stage. He said the proposal before the Committee today provides additional detail, and noted that the flowed from the same baseline, but allows for up to 8 units. Mr. McLean also said that the abutters are strip-commercial uses and a multifamily apartment complex.

Mr. Bzdyra said that all utilities are present on the site and pointed out a few additional details regarding the site’s parking scheme: parking spaces will be located near the front of the site, behind a vegetated buffer, and accessible by one driveway. He also noted there would be turnarounds at both ends of the parking area.

Mr. McLean then invited the Committee members to provide their questions and comments.

Mr. Mulcahy asked whether the units would be apartments or condominiums. He explained that the City collects trash for condominiums but not apartments, so if the applicant wants the units to be apartments, they will need to update the site plans to show where dumpsters would be located. Mr. Giusti said that decision was pending the completion of a market analysis to decide where the demand was higher. Mr. McLean said that dumpsters require enclosures and must meet certain setback requirements, so it wouldn’t be aesthetically ideal to locate them in the front parking area. He said Planning staff will have to review the relevant sections of City code and felt the matter could be handled administratively as part of Final Plan approval.

Mr. Capezza asked whether the applicant opted for permeable pavement out of necessity for drainage, or if it was simply their preference. Mr. Bzdyra said it was the former and explained that his contact for RIPDES advised the applicant that permeable pavement should be used. He added that if the ownership model is condominiums, the pavement would be treated as a common element with maintenance to be funded through condo fees. After confirming that the project did not involve state permits, Mr. Capezza said that City standards would allow for asphalt paving, so he recommended the applicant opt for asphalt to reduce the maintenance burden and expense.

Mr. Mulcahy asked which address scheme would be used for the new units. As the applicant team had not yet considered the matter, he suggested they designate a single address for the property (in this case, 1369 Park Avenue) and distinguish the units by letters (Unit A, Unit B, etc). Mr. Capezza also asked whether there were any concerns over signage, but Mr. McLean said he didn't believe the applicant would need any variances for signage.

In Mr. Santucci's absence, Mr. McLean said he saw no issues with the applicant's proposed landscaping treatments for the site. Mr. Capezza asked whether the applicant had chosen which type(s) of trees would be planted along the sidewalks, as there are certain "street trees" that are adapted to our climate and do not grow so large as to uproot the sidewalks. The applicant reviewed the selected plants and the Committee found them satisfactory.

With all questions and comments having been posed, Mr. McLean briefly reiterated the two conditions that the Committee had discussed placing upon their approval of the plans:

- 1) Removal of references to permeable pavement in plans and in stormwater report, and replacement with conventional asphalt pavement
- 2) Addition of dumpster area for the eastern side of the property to the site plan

Upon motion made by Mr. Capezza and seconded by Mr. Mulcahy, the Development Plan Review Committee unanimously voted to approve the Preliminary Plan subject to the conditions above. The meeting was concluded at 9:38 a.m.