

**STATE OF RHODE ISLAND CITY OF EAST PROVIDENCE
COUNTY OF PROVIDENCE ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW**

MINUTES

A meeting of the East Providence Zoning Board of Review was held at 7:00 P.M., on Wednesday, 6 May 2015, in the City Council Chambers, East Providence City Hall.

The following members were present:

Eugene Saveory – Chairman

Michael Beauparlant – Vice-Chairman – ARRIVES LATE

John Braga

Pier-Mari Toledo

Antonio H. Cunha

Richard Croke, Sr. – 1st Alternate

Gary Pascoa – 2nd Alternate

Edward Pimentel – Zoning Officer / Clerk

Timothy Chapman – City Solicitor

Chairman Saveory announces that it is the policy of the Zoning Board of Review to caution all petitioners that they have the right to counsel before the Board and failure to do so at this time does not constitute sufficient grounds for a change in circumstances under the

eighteen-month repetitive petition clause. All petitioners are also cautioned that if the petition is approved, all construction must be done in compliance with the submitted plan(s), application and testimony presented to the Zoning Board of Review. A change of any sought must obtain the requisite approval of the Zoning Board of Review. All work that deviates from the approval will be ordered halted and promptly removed. Comments will be limited to the petition being heard and no comments will be heard that do not pertain to an item scheduled on tonight's docket. He also notes that it is the policy of the Board that no new agenda item will be heard after 10:30 PM.

Chairman Saveory also notes that the Board welcomes any commentary from the public provided it solely pertains to an item on tonight's docket.

A. Swearing in of the Zoning Officer

Chairman Saveory asks City Solicitor Chapman to swear in the Zoning Officer, Mr. Pimentel.

II. SEATING OF ALTERNATE MEMBERS

Chairman Saveory informs the public that Mr. Beauparlant will be arriving shortly, and therefore Mr. Croke, 1st Alternate, will be both a

participating as well as voting member until such time that Mr. Beauparlant arrives.

III. APPROVAL OF ZONING BOARD MINUTES

Chairman Saveory asks for approval of the 3 December 2014, Zoning Board of Review Minutes. Motion by Mr. Croke to approve the 3 December 2014, Zoning Board of Review Minutes. The motion is Seconded by Ms. Toledo, and Unanimously approved.

Chairman Saveory asks for approval of the 1 April 2015, Zoning Board of Review Minutes. Motion by Ms. Toledo to approve the 1 April 2015, Zoning Board of Review Minutes. The motion is Seconded by Mr. Croke, and Unanimously approved.

IV. ZONING OFFICER'S REPORT

Chairman Saveory announces that there is no report this month.

V. CORRESPONDENCE / DISCUSSION

Chairman Saveory announces that there are no correspondence or items to be discussed this month.

VI. STAFF REPORTS

A. Planning Department Staff Report – Previously Submitted.

B. Complaint list – Dated April 2015 – Previously submitted.

Chairman Saveory announces that the referenced documents are already rendered part of the official record.

VII. CONTINUED BUSINESS

1. VSH Realty, Inc., and Cumberland Farms, Inc., 2812 Pawtucket Avenue, being Map 309, Block 06, Parcel 007.00, in a Commercial 2 District. (Dimensional Variances - Petition No. 6579)

Attorney Dylan Conley formally requests that the respective matter be continued to 10 June 2015.

The Board decides to await the arrival of Mr. Beauparlant to assure a quorum for 10 June 2015.

Motion by Mr. Beauparlant to continue the subject petition to the 15 July 2015 regularly scheduled meeting of the Zoning Board of Review. The motion is Seconded by Mr. Croke, and Unanimously

approved.

2A Stanley Engineering Inc., C/o Ellsworth Stanley and Americo Real Estate Company – 360-362 Taunton Avenue, being Map 306, Block 01, Parcel 016.00, in a Commercial 3 District. (Use Variance - Petition No. 6577)

Zoning Officer explains to the Board that the applicant has yet to complete the DPR process, and therefore the matter must be continued. He did explain this to counsel and expected some form of written request for the continuance. That was not received, regardless a set date must be set.

Motion by Mr. Braga to continue the subject petition to 10 June 2015. The motion is Seconded by Ms. Toledo, and Unanimously approved.

2B. Stanley Engineering Inc., C/o Ellsworth Stanley and Americo Real Estate Company – 360-362 Taunton Avenue, being Map 306, Block 01, Parcel 016.00, in a Commercial 3 District. (Dimensional Variances - Petition No. 6578)

Zoning Officer explains to the Board that the applicant has yet to complete the DPR process, and therefore the matter must be

continued. He did explain this to counsel and expected some form of written request for the continuance. That was not received, regardless a set date must be set.

Motion by Mr. Braga to continue the subject petition to 10 June 2015. The motion is Seconded by Ms. Toledo, and Unanimously approved.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

1. Petition No. 6582: Adriano D. and Flora M. Barbosa, seek Dimensional Relief, to permit construction of an addition onto a single-family residence, without complying with the following dimensional criteria, for property located at 98 Greenwich Avenue, being Map 408, Block 16, Parcel 004.00, and located within a Residential 3 District.

A. Dimensional Variance, to permit retention of the accessory shed, without complying with the requisite accessory (side-yard) setback pursuant to Section 19-144(b) – Three and fifty-five one-hundredths (3.55) foot variance, resulting in the referenced shed being situated within approximately one and forty-five one-hundredths (1.45) feet of the westerly (side) property boundary.

B. Dimensional Variance, to permit retention of the accessory shed,

without complying with the requisite accessory (rear-yard) setback pursuant to Section 19-144(b) – Two and ninety-five one-hundredths (2.95) foot variance, resulting in the referenced shed being situated within approximately two and five one-hundredths (2.05) feet of the northerly (rear) property boundary.

C. Dimensional Variance, to permit retention of the referenced decking, without complying with the requisite rear-yard setback requirement pursuant to Section 19-145 – Two and thirty-seven one-hundredths (2.37) foot variance, resulting in the referenced decking being situated within approximately twenty-two and sixty-three one-hundredths (22.63) feet of the northerly (rear) property boundary.

D. Dimensional Variance, to permit construction of the referenced addition, without complying with the requisite side-yard setback requirement pursuant to Section 19-145 – Three and fifty-five one-hundredths (3.55) foot variance, resulting in the referenced addition being situated within approximately eleven and forty-five one-hundredths (11.45) feet of the easterly (side) property boundary.

[NOTE: There is an existing protrusion into the easterly side-yard there is dimensionally non-conforming. Given that it is a pre-existing conditions, no relief is required. It is nevertheless being documented for historical purposes. The referenced protrusion is situated approximately nine and twelve one-hundredths (9.12) feet off of the

easterly (side) property boundary.]

E. Dimensional Variance, to permit construction of the referenced addition and retention of the stated improvements, resulting in exceeding the maximum building coverage requirement pursuant to Section 19-145 – Four and seventy-six one-hundredths (4.76%) percent variance, resulting in the subject property being covered approximately twenty-nine and seventy-six one-hundredths (29.76%) percent with total structures.

F. Dimensional Variance, to permit construction of the referenced addition and retention of the stated improvements, resulting in exceeding the maximum impervious lot coverage requirement pursuant to Section 19-145 – Four and twenty-one one-hundredths (4.21%) percent variance, resulting in the subject property being covered approximately forty-nine and twenty-one one-hundredths (49.21%) percent with total impervious surface, inclusive of all structures.

Attorney Joseph Lamagna, with law offices at 2417 Mendon Road, Woonsocket, RI, informs the Board that he is legal counsel to the subject petitioners.

Attorney Lamagna informs the Board that the subject petitioners have resided in the subject premises for over 25-years. The property itself, and placement of the residence pre-dates their ownership.

Furthermore, the residence pre-dates the adoption of the zoning regulations. The present residence is already dimensionally non-compliant, being situated eleven-feet off of the side-yard. The present proposal is to enclose an existing porch and extend said porch for future living purposes. The addition will not extend beyond the already existing encroachment, yet nevertheless fail to comply with the present 15-foot side yard requirement.

Adriano Barbosa, 98 Greenwich Avenue, East Providence, RI, subject petitioner, is properly sworn in.

Adriano Barbosa provides the following information in response to questions from legal counsel.

Mr. Barbosa informs the Board that he has resided at the subject property for approximately 23-years, and it has been configured as such since well prior to his ownership. His objective is to extend the first-floor to be in-line with the present side-yard, and add a second-floor as well as for purposes of realizing a master bedroom and bathroom. There is simply not enough room to accommodate the entire family. If he is unable to expand the property, he will most likely have to relocate. The increases in both building and impervious lot coverage is quite minimal, mere percentages. He will simply be squaring off the front of the residence maintaining the same side-yard setback. When he submitted the plans, an issue regarding the existing shed was also raised, and therefore relief

pursued out of an abundance of caution. It has always been present. They simply vinyl-sided and installed new flooring. He did not introduce or place it too close to the property boundary. He has never received any neighborhood complaint. In fact, it is well-screened by existing vegetation.

Zoning Officer informs the Board that there is prior zoning history associated with the property. When conducting a site inspection, they did observe that a deck was added to the rear of the residence that had not been included in the prior submission. The referenced deck is two or so feet too close to the rear property boundary, and must therefore also receive relief from the Board. The present plan documents the presence of the deck with requisite setbacks and coverages. The shed in question was documented on the prior plan, however the relief was to foundation and not necessarily gutter overhang. Finally, there is other moveable accessory structures and debris that has been brought to the attention of the Zoning Officer and were observed when conducting the respective site inspection.

Chairman Saveory queries the Board, beginning with Ms. Toledo.

Ms. Toledo notes for the record that she does not necessarily have any objection to the present proposal. However, she is somewhat concerned about the excessive growth of improvements. This includes the original addition, followed by decking that has yet to be approved, accessory structures, and finally relief for the most recent

proposed improvement. She wants assurance that there will be no further intensification of the property. Mr. Barbosa responds that had he the money back in the 1990s, he would have pursued all of the referenced improvements in a singular application.

Ms. Toledo inquires if the end product is three-bedrooms? Mr. Barbosa responds in the affirmative.

Ms. Toledo notes that she will hold off judgement until hearing from any neighbors that may be present.

Zoning Officer informs Ms. Toledo that he understands her concern regarding the vast improvements. However, he cannot preclude future applications to the Zoning Board of Review. That does not necessarily mean that they have to be approved, but a property owner has the right to be heard.

Mr. Braga notes for the record that he did conduct an inspection with the Zoning Officer, and has to state that the property is well-maintained. He did observe construction materials and other debris, and inquires if he is involved in the trade. Mr. Barbosa responds that it is no longer his full-time occupation. Regardless, he has a place of business in Seekonk, where he maintains and runs the now part-time construction business. Mr. Braga notes that there was some items, however they were not necessarily out of order.

Mr. Braga notes that the relief sought is quite reasonable. Clearly, a permit should have been first obtained for the deck, however the associated relief is not unreasonable.

Mr. Cunha notes for the record that he too does not find the proposal unreasonable. He too did read where the Planning Department is recommending no further intensification of the property. He finds this somewhat objectionable, because it is the Board's discretion to conclude when, and if, a request is unreasonable. He then thanks Mr. Barbosa for investing in his property, rather than relocating outside the City.

Mr. Pascoa notes for the record that he has neither any questions and/or comments.

Mr. Croke asks the petitioner if he is willing to accept as a condition of approval that it remain a single-family residence in perpetuity. Mr. Barbosa responds that he has no objection to accepting said condition.

Chairman Saveory inquires if the rear portion of the addition is merely the stairwell to access the upper story? Mr. Barbosa responds in the affirmative.

Chairman Saveory inquires if there will be any windows in the proposed stairwell? Mr. Barbosa responds in the affirmative, noting

that it is a very small. Chairman Saveory explains that he is concerned about neighbor's privacy. Mr. Barbosa responds that he did not include any side windows for that very purpose.

Chairman Saveory inquires if the gutters on the shed redirect water onto the petitioner's property? Mr. Barbosa responds in the affirmative.

Chairman Saveory inquires if there is anyone present who would like to speak in favor of the subject petition. Hearing and seeing none, Chairman Saveory inquires if there is anyone present who would like to speak against the subject petition.

Linda Kurtz, 93 Walmer Avenue, East Providence, RI, requests permission to speak against the subject petition. Ms. Kurtz is properly sworn in.

Ms. Kurtz informs the Board that she resides directly behind the subject petitioner. Her family have resided in the subject home for over 50-years. She does not necessarily have an objection to the present proposal. The petitioner does take good care of the residence. She does however take objection to the statement that the accessory shed has always been present and was introduced pre the petitioner. Her stepdad approached Mr. Barbosa when it was being introduced, and he was informed that there was a minimum five-foot setback. The referenced accessory structure is at best one-foot off of

their property. It is far too close to their property. She just recently moved back to the residence, and is therefore her first opportunity to address this concern. She would respectfully request that the shed be moved such that it is not directly upon her property.

Chairman Saveory inquires if the shed has been expanded, because previous testimony indicated no. Mr. Barbosa responds that if it did expand, it was by no more than two-feet, instead of being a 10-foot by 10-foot to maybe a 10-foot by 12-foot.

Chairman Saveory informs Ms. Kurtz that the applicant does acknowledge the proximity of the shed to the property boundary and is requesting the respective relief.

Mr. Braga notes for the record that if this is concern, as has been testified to tonight, it should have been addressed when the work was being completed. Considering the neighbor approached the property owner, he should have subsequently contacted the appropriate officials. It is difficult to accept the complaint some 20-years later.

Mr. Cunha inquires if there is a foundation associated with the shed? Mr. Barbosa responds that it is a wooden floor and sits atop cement blocks.

Mr. Braga inquires of the grand-fathered status of the shed and need for setback relief? Zoning Officer responds that although having

been testified regarding pre-existing legal non-conforming status, evidence would have to be presented substantiating said status. Regardless, the petitioner has testified that he expanded the shed, minimally by two-feet, and clearly that portion is not pre-existing. It was for these reasons that he mandated the obtainment of setback relief.

Chairman Saveory then inquires if there is anyone else present who would like to speak against the subject petition. Hearing and seeing none, Chairman Saveory queries the Board for a motion.

Motion by Ms. Toledo, based on all the evidence and testimony presented to the Zoning Board of Review and the personal knowledge of the members of the Board of the land and area of the City of East Providence, the Zoning Board hereby finds:

1. The hardship from which the applicant seeks relief is due to the unique characteristics of the subject land or structure and not to the general characteristics of the surrounding area, and not due to a physical or economic disability of the applicant excepting those physical disabilities addressed in RIGL 45-24-30(16).

2. The hardship is not the result of any prior action of the applicant and does not result primarily from the desire of the applicant to realize greater financial gain.

3. The granting of the requested variances will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of this chapter or the city's comprehensive plan upon which this chapter is based.

4. That the relief to be granted is the least relief necessary.

Ms. Toledo hereby further finds pursuant to Section 19-45(b) of the City of East Providence Zoning Ordinance:

5. In granting the dimensional variances, that the hardship that will be suffered by the owner of the subject property if the dimensional variances are not granted shall amount to more than a mere inconvenience.

Ms. Toledo moves that the dimensional variances be Granted subject to the petitioner fulfilling the following conditions:

1. Applicant properly obtain a building permit for the rear decking.

2. Subject property shall remain a single-family residence in perpetuity.

3. Petitioner(s) obtaining any, and all, necessary permits.

4. Strict compliance with the submitted site plan (or amended site

plan as it may be applicable), all exhibits, and entire testimony provided during the respective hearing.

Chairman Saveory asks Mr. Barbosa if he accepts the conditions of approval just stipulated, understanding that strict compliance means that any deviation will necessitate revisiting the Zoning Board of Review; said revisit may be requested by either the Zoning Officer or any member of the Zoning Board of Review. Mr. Barbosa that he fully understands and accepts the conditions just stipulated.

The motion is Seconded by Mr. Cunha.

Roll Call Vote:

Ms. Toledo - Aye There is the presence of hardship.

Mr. Braga - Aye Hardship has been demonstrated. If the shed was such a

concern, it should have been addressed at that time.

Mr. Cunha - Aye There is sufficient presence of hardship. As for the shed it

is unclear whether it is, or is not, pre-existing.

Mr. Croke - Aye Concurs with Mr. Cunha's comments.

Chairman Saveory - Aye The property and residence pre-date the adoption of the zoning regulations.

Dimensional variances unanimously granted, subject to the aforementioned condition(s).

Chairman Saveory informs the public that Mr. Beauparlant has arrived and therefore Mr. Croke will be a participating member solely for discussion purposes.

1. VSH Realty, Inc., and Cumberland Farms, Inc., 2812 Pawtucket Avenue, being Map 309, Block 06, Parcel 007.00, in a Commercial 2 District. (Dimensional Variances - Petition No. 6579)

Attorney Dylan Conley once again formally requests that the respective matter be continued to 10 June 2015.

Motion by Mr. Beauparlant to continue the subject petition to the 10 June 2015, regularly scheduled meeting of the Zoning Board of Review. The motion is Seconded by Ms. Toledo, and Unanimously approved.

[Five-Minute Recess.]

Chairman Saveory reconvenes the meeting, informing the public that

Mr. Beauparlant has to leave for personal reasons, and therefore Mr. Croke will continue to both participate and vote on tonight's agenda items.

2. Petition No. 6583: Margaret A. Farley, seeks Dimensional Relief, to permit construction of an addition onto a single-family residence, without complying with the following dimensional criteria, for property located at 57 White Avenue, being Map 313, Block 07, Parcel 003.00, and located within a Residential 4 District.

A. Dimensional Variance, to permit construction of the referenced addition, without complying with the requisite side-yard setback requirement pursuant to Section 19-145 – Two and two-tenths (2.20) foot variance, resulting in the referenced addition being situated within approximately five and eight-tenths (5.80) feet of the northerly (side) property boundary.

B. Dimensional Variance, to permit construction of the referenced addition, without complying with the requisite side-yard setback requirement pursuant to Section 19-145 – Seven (7) foot variance, resulting in the referenced addition being situated within approximately one (1) foot of the southerly (side) property boundary.

[NOTE: There is an existing entryway that presently encroaches onto the adjacent Parcel 004.00. This encroachment will be extinguished

and the stated entryway reduced to within one-half foot off of the respective southerly (side) property boundary. Due to the improvement in existing conditions, dimensional relief is not required. However, said improvement is directly tied to the strict conditions pursuant to all other obtained dimensional relief. Failure to correct will result in extinguishing said relief.]

C. Dimensional Variance, to permit construction of the referenced addition, resulting in exceeding the maximum building coverage requirement pursuant to Section 19-145 – One and four-tenths (1.40%) percent variance, resulting in the subject property being covered approximately twenty-six and four-tenths (26.40%) percent with total structures.

D. Dimensional Variance, to permit construction of the referenced addition, resulting in exceeding the maximum impervious lot coverage requirement pursuant to Section 19-145 – Two (2%) percent variance, resulting in the subject property being covered approximately forty-seven (47%) percent with total impervious surfaces, inclusive of all structures.

Samuel George, 6 Tanglewood Drive, East Providence, RI, petitioner's contractor, is properly sworn in.

Margaret Farley, 57 White Avenue, East Providence, RI, subject petitioner, is properly sworn in.

Chairman Saveory queries the Board, beginning with Mr. Cunha.

Mr. Cunha inquires about the project specifics? Mr. George responds that it will consist of a rear addition and exterior deck.

Mr. Cunha inquires about the purpose for the addition? Mr. George responds that it will be used as a living room.

Mr. Pascoa notes for the record that he does not have any questions and/or comments.

Mr. Croke inquires about the proximity of the improvement to the shore-line? Mr. George responds that it is a rather substandard lot, and will therefore be quite close. As for the side property boundaries, it will either remain the same or actually improve.

Mr. Croke does acknowledge that there is the presence of hardship resulting from both the substandard lot characteristics and placement of the pre-existing residence. He would guess that the residence has to be from around the turn-of-century. Ms. Farley responds that her family has owned it for over fifty-years. Furthermore, it is her understanding that it was constructed as early as the 1920s.

Mr. George notes that the plans illustrate a four-foot crawl space.

However, since submission of the plans, they have considered introducing a full basement due to limited storage. Zoning Officer notes that that is the discretion of the Board.

Ms. Toledo notes that she too has no concerns.

Mr. Croke inquires as to the side bumpout? Mr. George responds that that is a side entrance, which will be razed and rebuilt.

Mr. Braga inquires if there will be any improvement with the side entrance from a setback perspective? Mr. George responds that the present side entrance may in fact be encroaching, but minimally is mere inches from the property boundary. The new entrance will be reduced to provide a greater setback off of the side property boundary.

Mr. Braga inquires as to why the proposed decking along the southerly side is a mere one-foot or so? Mr. George responds that the design was to remain in-line with the proposed entry way. It should be notes that the existing footprint is even closer.

Chairman Saveory concurs with Mr. Croke, the property is quite substandard. He would also note that it is consistent with other past neighborhood improvements.

Chairman Saveory inquires if there is anyone present who would like

to speak in favor of the subject petition. Hearing and seeing none, Chairman Saveory inquires if there is anyone present who would like to speak against the subject petition. Hearing and seeing none, Chairman Saveory queries the Board for a motion.

Motion by Mr. Cunha, based on all the evidence and testimony presented to the Zoning Board of Review and the personal knowledge of the members of the Board of the land and area of the City of East Providence, the Zoning Board hereby finds:

1. The hardship from which the applicant seeks relief is due to the unique characteristics of the subject land or structure and not to the general characteristics of the surrounding area, and not due to a physical or economic disability of the applicant excepting those physical disabilities addressed in RIGL 45-24-30(16).

2. The hardship is not the result of any prior action of the applicant and does not result primarily from the desire of the applicant to realize greater financial gain.

3. The granting of the requested variances will not alter the general character of the surrounding area or impair the intent or purpose of this chapter or the city's comprehensive plan upon which this chapter is based.

4. That the relief to be granted is the least relief necessary.

Mr. Cunha hereby further finds pursuant to Section 19-45(b) of the City of East Providence Zoning Ordinance:

5. In granting the dimensional variances, that the hardship that will be suffered by the owner of the subject property if the dimensional variances are not granted shall amount to more than a mere inconvenience.

Mr. Cunha moves that the dimensional variances be Granted subject to the petitioner fulfilling the following conditions:

- 1. Petitioner(s) obtaining any, and all, necessary permits.**
- 2. Strict compliance with the submitted site plan (or amended site plan as it may be applicable), all exhibits, and entire testimony provided during the respective hearing.**

Chairman Saveory asks Ms. Farley if she accepts the conditions of approval just stipulated, understanding that strict compliance means that any deviation will necessitate revisiting the Zoning Board of Review; said revisit may be requested by either the Zoning Officer or any member of the Zoning Board of Review. Ms. Farley responds that she fully understands and accepts the conditions just stipulated.

The motion is Seconded by Mr. Croke.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Cunha - Aye Pre-existing substandard lot of record. This is consistent

with the neighborhood, in other words rendering the pre-existing summer cottages habitable for full time living purposes. He also appreciates the improvements and remaining within the City, rather than relocating.

Mr. Croke - Aye The property is quite substandard, resulting in great difficulty in realizing any improvement. He would also note that the placement of the residence is pre-existing.

Ms. Toledo - Aye

Mr. Braga - Aye The property does pre-date the adoption of the City's

Zoning regulations. The lot is quite substandard and these lot conditions were not the result of any prior action of this owner.

Chairman Saveory - Aye The proposed improvements are quite in-line with other neighborhood improvements, and therefore is consistent.

Dimensional variances unanimously granted, subject to the aforementioned condition(s).

3. Petition No. 6584: Fernando E. Pereira, seeks a Special Use Permit, to both retain and expand onto a pre-existing three-unit apartment building – said expansion consisting of decking and roof overhang – referenced improvements being deemed an expansion of a pre-existing non-conforming land use pursuant to Section 19-413 ‘Alteration of Nonconforming Use’, for property located at 10 – 12 Birch Street, being Map 105, Block 03, Parcel 003.00, and located within a split-zoned Residential 6 District and Commercial 3 District.

Chairman Saveory announces the next petition, but no one is present.

Zoning Officer notes that he does not understand why no one is present. He did not receive any communication. Regardless, it has always been the Board’s customary practice to grant at least one (1) unexcused absence, in case it was due to an emergency. He would therefore recommend a continuance. He will communicate to the petitioner that he must be in attendance.

Motion by Mr. Braga to continue the subject petition to 10 June 2015. The motion is Seconded by Ms. Toledo, and Unanimously approved.

IX. PROCEDURES

Chairman Saveory announces that there are no procedures to be discussed.

X. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Saveory announces that the next meeting of the Zoning Board of Review is scheduled for Wednesday, 10 June 2015, at 7:00 PM, in the City of East Providence Council Chambers, City Hall, East Providence, RI.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn by Ms. Toledo. The motion is Seconded by Mr. Cunha and Unanimously voted to adjourn. Meeting is adjourned at 9:00 P.M.

Edward Pimentel, AICP

Zoning Officer / Clerk

Secretary