

**DEPARTMENT OF CITY CLERK
CITY HALL
OCTOBER 21, 1997
PUBLIC HEARING**

CITY OF PROVIDENCE

**CITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON URBAN REDEVELOPMENT,
RENEWAL AND PLANNING
PUBLIC HEARING**

Notice is hereby given pursuant to Rhode Island General Laws Title 45 Comprehensive Planning and Land Use Regulation Act, Chapter 22.2-8 (Adoption of Comprehensive Plans), Chapter 22.2-12. (Updates and Amendments), and the Providence Home Rule Charter - Section 101.4(1) - held by the City Council Committee on Urban Redevelopment, Renewal and Planning in the Council Chambers, 3rd Floor, City Hall, Providence, Rhode Island, on TUESDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1997, starting at the time noted below.

1. 6:00 P.M. - To amend "Providence 2000: The Comprehensive Plan," Proposed Land Use Maps in the following manner:

Section 1 - "Proposed Land Use Map: Non-Residential Map" by inserting Limited Commercial to that area of Plainfield Street, from Rye Street to Ralph Street, one lot deep and that are generally bounded from 493 Plainfield to 411 Plainfield Street, one lot in depth.

Section 2 - "Proposed Land Use Map: Residential Map" by deleting the Medium Density Residential beginning at that area of Plainfield Street, from Rye Street to Ralph Street, one lot deep and that portion of Low Density Residential generally bounded from 493 Plainfield Street to 411 Plainfield, one lot in depth.

Pursuant to the requirements governing the adoption and amendments of Redevelopment plans, including RIGL 45-32-1, Public Hearing and 11, Notice of Hearing on Plan, the Committee on Urban Redevelopment, Renewal, and Planning of the City Council will conduct Public Hearings on the following, starting at the times noted below:

2. 6:10 p.m. - An Ordinance in Amendment of and In Addition to Chapter 1997-15 of the Ordinances of the City of Providence - Approved April 18, 1977, Entitled "An Ordinance Approving and Adopting the Official Redevelopment Plan for Federal Hill East" for the Acquisition of Assessor's Plat 28, Lot 709, on 108 Vinton Street.

3. 6:20 p.m. - An Ordinance in Amendment of and In Addition to Chapter 1979-26 of the Ordinances of the City of Providence - Approved June 22, 1979 and Entitled "An Ordinance Approving and Adopting the Official Redevelopment Plan for the West End Project" for Additional Acquisition.

4. 6:30 p.m. - An Ordinance in Amendment of and In Addition to Chapter 1986-53 of the Ordinances of the City of Providence - Approved October 23, 1986 and Entitled "An Ordinance Approving and Adopting the City Vacant and Abandoned Properties Plan Program" for Additional Acquisition.

Complete copies of the proposed amendments indicated above may be examined and copied, at cost, in the Office of the City Clerk, City Hall, Providence, Rhode Island and in the Office of the Department of Planning and Development, 400 Westminster Street, Providence, Rhode Island, Monday through Friday from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

All persons interested in the above are respectfully requested to be present at the time and place to be heard thereon.

INDIVIDUALS REQUESTING INTERPRETER SERVICES FOR THE HEARING IMPAIRED MUST NOTIFY 751-0203 (TDD), 48 HOURS IN ADVANCE OF HEARING DATE.

Michael R. Clement City Clerk	Committee on Urban Redevelopment, Renewal and Planning Councilwoman Josephine DiRuzzo, Chairwoman Councilman Kevin Jackson, Vice Chairman Councilman John H. Rollins Councilwoman Balbina A. Young Councilwoman Carol A. Romano
----------------------------------	--

The Committee on Urban Redevelopment, Renewal & Planning, Public Hearing, meets this day in the City Council Chambers at 6:00 o'clock p.m.

PRESENT: Chairwoman DiRuzzo, Vice Chairman Jackson.

ABSENT: Councilman Rollins, Councilwoman Young, Councilwoman Romano.

Also present are Thomas Deller, Department of Planning & Development and Barbara A. Poirier, Second Deputy City Clerk.

CHAIRWOMAN DIRUZZO: I would like to welcome you to the public hearing before the Committee on Urban Redevelopment, Renewal & Planning. I am the Chairwoman of this Committee and to my left is Councilman Kevin Jackson who is the Vice Chairman of the Committee. We have four items to be heard before us this evening, and we will be taking public testimony in regard to the items on the agenda. There will be no decisions made this evening. We will just take your testimony and review it at a subsequent meeting before we make our decisions. I want to apologize for starting late, we had some problems with taking

October 21, 1997

-2-

testimony on the record. The stenographer did not show up so we will be taping the testimony.

6:00 O'CLOCK PM: An Ordinance Amending Providence 2000, The Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 1994-52, No. 798, Adopted on December 27, 1994.

CHAIRWOMAN DIRUZZO: This includes an area of Plainfield Street. We have some people who wish to speak on this. I will ask Attorney Charles Pisaturo, Sr., and Attorney Charles Pisaturo, Jr. to speak on this.

MR. PISATURO, SR: Will the Department of Planning & Development be making a presentation?

CHAIRWOMAN DIRUZZO: Yes they will. We have with us tonight Mr. Tom Deller, Deputy Director of Planning & Development.

MR. DELLER: The petition this evening is for an amendment to the City's Comprehensive Plan, Providence 2000, to change the land use designation for a portion of land along Plainfield Street from Laurel Hill Avenue to two lots beyond Dewey Street from low density and medium density residential to limited commercial. The Department, at the request of the former Councilman Igliazzi studied the land use from Laurel Hill to Odd Fellow Square and identified a number of properties that are commercially used at present that are called to be limited residential in the Comprehensive Plan. Based on our study, it was felt that an amendment should be recommended for the Comprehensive Plan, and I will hold up this map that shows the lots and grades. These lots in color should be changed in the Comprehensive Plan Map to limited commercial. It is a total of about 20 lots. That's all I have at this time.

MR. PISATURO, SR: Thank you Madam Chairperson and Councilman Jackson. Before we get started I would like to introduce the petitioners, who are the owners of the Three Ring Liquor, and they are here tonight. John Santino, his wife Viola. They have come here directly from their establishment in which they work every day. They have owned and operated this property for over 50 years in the same location. We want to thank you for the opportunity to appear before you, and I will not be lengthy. This section of Plainfield Street is near Olneyville. It has been primarily a commercial highway and an arterial highway for many, many years. The City Plan Commission who studied this, as Mr. Deller has pointed out, voted unanimously to recommend this change that we are here for tonight, and the department staff recommends that this change be passed as well. The map that is presented for the change was not drawn by the petitioners or their attorney's, but it

October 21, 1997

-3-

was drawn by the department. The professionals for the department. We would like to submit five pages of petitions of support from community residents and the property owners of the streets that are mostly affected by the proposed change. These petitions contains 76 signatures in favor, thus if we had chosen to, we could have partially or nearly filled this chamber with people who feel this is a proper zoning change request.

We also would like to introduce the letter from former Councilman David Igliazzi, now Councilman Emeritus. This was addressed to the Committee on Ordinances who initially heard this.

September 12, 1997

Deputy Majority Leader
Rita M. Williams
Vice-Chair, Committee on Ordinances
c/o City Clerk's Department
City Hall
Providence, RI 02903

Dear Vice-Chairwoman Williams and Members of the Ordinance Committee:

Please be advised as follows:

1. As the councilman from the 7th ward, I recently sponsored an ordinance in amendment of the City of Providence Zoning Ordinance - with regard to a portion of Plainfield Street.
2. As a lifelong resident and a councilman for seven years, with extensive neighborhood involvement, I am very familiar with this portion of Plainfield Street. And, I am of the opinion that the proposed zoning change from R-3 and R-2, to a C-1 limited commercial zone, is consistent with the zoning pattern and the existing uses of this section of Plainfield Street.

Thanking you for your consideration in this matter, I remain

Sincerely,

David V. Igliazzi
Councilman Emeritus

The map prepared by the staff at Planning & Development, you will note that the area in question tonight that is supposed to be changed, is sandwiched in between a C-4 use almost across the street about 60 yards, and a C-2 use beginning at Webster Avenue on the same side that Three Ring Liquor is situated at. In the area that is affected by the proposal change of the uses there that are specified by code numbers, these are the uses, a two family house with a commercial use, a jewelry manufacturing company and parking next door to that for the manufacturing company, a carpenter shop, a multi-family plus a commercial use. I am going along where it starts after the C-4. This would be across the street from the location of the liquor store, and it is included in the area that would be affected by this proposed amendment. A multi-family dwelling and

October 21, 1997

-4-

accessory use is next, two family and a commercial use, an accessory use for the two-family followed by a one-family with an office that was used as a doctor's office before and an attorney's office, and then on the corner of Dewey Street, a funeral home, an operational funeral home, William T. Forde's, and next to that is a two family house, and then there is a commercial use for a florist shop. That's basically on that side, and as I said on the same side C-2 begins just about where I left off on Webster Avenue on the same side of the street. At the Ordinance Committee, some of the people who spoke did not seem to understand what a C-1 limited commercial zone was and the uses of it. Somehow they pictured that this would be heavy commercial and it would become different and it would change, so what is a C-1 limited commercial zone. The best way to find out is to look at the zoning code, and in Article I on page 3, it is defined in a general way. Section 101.2-Limited Commercial District. This zone is intended for neighborhood/commercial/residential areas that primarily serve local neighborhood needs for convenience, retail services and professional office establishments. You will note the use of the phrase (slash) commercial/residential. So you see the definition of the code envisions that there will be residential uses in this C-1 zone. Thus a C-1 zone does not have to be all light commercial. It will probably include some residential uses as this area does, but it is an arterial highway that has been getting more commercial as the years pass. That is what we have here on this stretch of Plainfield Street, primarily, substantially, commercial, with some limited residential use. What uses are permitted according to the Providence Zoning Code in a C-1 limited commercial zone. The uses are set forth, very specifically in Section 56, Appendix A, of the Providence Zoning Ordinance. This is a page from it with some notes. Section 56. Retail Trade-Neighborhood Establishments. Apparel and accessories- household appliances, art supply, bakeries, books, newspapers and periodicals, cameras and photographic supplies, new or used, confectionery, coin or stamp shop, custom tailoring, dairy products sold in a store, drugstore, a fabric store, floor covering, retail, florist, fruits and vegetables, retail, gift shop, groceries and delicatessen, retail, hobby shops, home furnishings and equipment, jewelry retail, liquor store, meat and fish retail, musical instruments and supplies retail, office supplies or equipment, stationery or art supplies, pet store, radio/television/audio/video and computer equipment, sales and/or rental, shoetree, sporting goods and bicycles retail, variety store. That's it. So that most of these permitted uses, many of them are already situated along Plainfield Street,

either in this section or very close by. Note that there are only limited retail businesses allowed, and they must serve a local neighborhood need. There is no danger here of any dramatic changes where undesirable heavy commercial uses would crop in, because those are prohibited in this proposed C-1 limited commercial use. We agree with the Department of Planning & Development, and with the City Plan Commission and their conclusions and vote unanimously, and we ask that this committee favor the proposed amendment. My colleague, Charles Pisaturo, Jr., will continue.

MR. PISATURO, JR., attorney on behalf of Three Ring Liquor and in support of the proposed amendment. A couple of points. First the Comprehensive Plan defines limited commercial other than what already has been said as being occupied by businesses that serve the neighborhood, and is located on arterial roads. Plainfield Street is certainly an arterial road. It comes from Plainfield Pike and connects Route 10 to Route 295. We have already named some of the properties in the area on the specific property or area to be changed, showing consistency with the zone change. Allow me to cite a Rhode Island Supreme Court Case because I think it is pertinent. The facts are almost on point there where the Johnston Town Council had an amendment of its zoning ordinance before it, and had passed that amendment, and there were some neighbors who had challenged the action. It is called Verdecchia vs. Town Council. The Supreme Court had held that the council certainly had the authority to re-zone the property and the area. That the change complied with the statutory requirement of comprehensiveness in the enabling legislation, as was found by the study submitted by the Planning Department, and it found that the new zone was consistent with the zoning pattern in the area. At nauseam we have told you and explained how all the properties in the area make this change consistent with the zoning pattern in the area. So this amendment addresses the reality of the uses currently in place there and existing on the section of Plainfield Street and perhaps the trend to continue there, which is again limited commercial uses. Again, we have submitted already a list of owners in support of the amendment, and we respectfully request that the committee approve the zoning change. We would certainly be happy to answer any questions that the committee might have.

CHAIRWOMAN DIRUZZO: Are there any other people who would like to speak on the Plainfield Street proposal?

GRANT DULGARIAN:I am not in favor of one of the wings that seemed to have grown from the original proposal. It would seem that by looking

at the existing land use along this stretch of Plainfield Street that the louder, that the most focused zoning would be between Ralph and Rye to be allowed to be changed to C-1, but that the stretch of Plainfield Street, that additional block that is east of that be allowed to remain residential. According to the land use chart of the Department of Planning & Development that block is primarily residential currently, so it would seem inappropriate to change that block from residential to commercial. The block between Ralph and Dewey has five buildings on it and the majority of them are residential, so I would recommend that the proposed change stop at Ralph Street and go no further east than that. I suggest as an example of the concept of instead of having whole stretches of arterioles be commercial, instead the commercial portions of arterioles be focused...I refer to the study that was done to Broadway a number of years ago by the Department of Planning & Development in conjunction with the Providence Preservation Society and when they looked at that street, they recommended that two or three nodes be transferred into commercial zone areas and the balance of Broadway remain to be residential. I would think that that would be the best kind of programmed and evolving development to allow to occur on Plainfield Street. What we don't want is a bunch of properties to be advertised to be available for commercial rentals and then not go rent it because there is not that much demand for it, so they become vacant. I think we are better served by the more occupancy of residential. That's what we have there currently, and I would think the petitioners would be served by the zoning change, but the neighborhood would be reserved by the zone change not being quite as extensive.

CHAIRWOMAN DIRUZZO: I am going to enter the petition entered by Attorney Pisaturo as "Exhibit #1", and the copy of the letter of the former Councilman Igliazzi to the Ordinance Committee as "Exhibit #2".

ATTORNEY PISATURO, JR: I have been referring in my presentation and my father's as well, to a staff report, or a report prepared by the Planning Department, and I just wanted to ask if that was part of the record. If it is not, I would submit a copy as part of the record.

MR. PALMIERI: That was attached to the Ordinance that was submitted to the City Council, so it is part of the record.

ANN MARIE FOLCARELLI: I live at 21 Ralph Street. In terms of the proposal, I agree with Mr. Dulgarian that the zone changes regarding the space between Ralph and Rye on the southern side of Plainfield Street pertaining particularly to Three Ring Liquors, is commercial use right now. They have done

a lot of changes or work to fix that up. The businesses on the other side could use some improvement, but the stretch of land between Ralph and Dewey, as you head east, on the northend side of Plainfield are predominately residential. There are a couple of small businesses on the north side of that, but they blend in well with the residential feel of the neighborhood. Right now, as a resident of that neighborhood, I have a lot concerns in terms of was there a traffic study done on Plainfield Street. Can it accommodate more business traffic because of business. I know that trying to get out of the end of Ralph Street onto Plainfield Street in the morning, a lot of times even in the middle of the day, if this particular business has run an ad in the newspaper,I don't know that having more traffic in that stretch is going to be a beneficial thing to the neighborhood. Also we have been working to try to revitalize the neighborhood so that they would be residential, so that people will come back and live in those areas. I don't know that having more traffic and more commercial activity is going to be conducive to owner/occupied residences, and we are going to end up with more absentee owners which we have and has become a real blight on that area for the time being.

CHAIRWOMAN DIRUZZO: I want to thank you for your input and your testimony. No decision will be made this evening. We will have a subsequent meeting to discuss this prior to making our decision.

Our next proposal is :

An Ordinance in Amendment of and in Addition to Chapter 1977-15 of the Ordinance of the City of Providence Approved April 28, 1977 Entitled "An Ordinance Approving and Adopting the Official Redevelopment Plan for Federal Hill East" for the Acquisition of Plat 28, Lot 709, 108 Vinton Street.

CHAIRWOMAN DIRUZZO: The only speaker we have for that project is Councilman John Lombardi. So prior to his coming here.....

MR. DELLER: This amendment to the Federal Hill East Redevelopment Plan has been submitted by Councilman Lombardi. This request is for the acquisition of one lot, 108 Vinton Street, which is assessors Plat 28, Lot 709. This property is a blighted property on Vinton Street. It does not qualify for the City's abandoned property program, and therefore Councilman Lombardi has requested that the redevelopment agency amend the redevelopment plan and use some of the neighborhood improvement bond funds to acquire this property, to knock it down and make the vacant lot available to adjacent owners. At the councilman's request, we have submitted this to you for the amendment of the Redevelopment Plan.

October 21, 1997

-8-

COUNCILMAN LOMBARDI: Madame Chairwoman this is as a result of several complaints with regard to 108 Vinton Street. Back in December it cumulated. It was snowing and I had my boots on and jeans and sweater, and I happened to leave my coat in my car, and the gentleman kept saying you have to come over, so I went in the house, and much to my dismay, it was a school day and there were 12 minor children on the first floor running around, and upstairs there was no furniture. The gentleman said he was moving and asked me to follow him into the parlor, and I noticed that it was black on the wall. There was a plastic chair, the only thing in the room, except for a table with lit candles. I started looking at the candles and I saw something walking and I thought it was an ant. He went into the kitchen and comes out and tells me he had something to give me. He wanted to give me some home-made wine. So looking at the candles, I see whatever walking and upon closer observation, I noticed that it was cock-roach. The gentleman came out and said I have to move my family out of this. We can't live under these conditions. So I said I don't blame him. He said do you think I should live like this. I looked up and saw the wall. It was an amazing thing. There were hundreds of thousands of cock-roaches at 10:30 in the morning. I consider myself someone who is pretty brave, but I literally stepped back. I had heard several stories. It's a fairly stable area. It's a house that my brother's best friend's grew up in that house, so we are very familiar with that house, but there was literally rodent infestation, the soot was in the walls, and it was leaking water, everything you could possibly imagine. So a few months later, Mr. Roach from environmental, I took him to the rear of it, and showed him the debris all over the place. And the odor, it literally smelled like there was a decomposing body there. I don't know whatever happened to that. It's been an ongoing problem for a number of years. The gentleman was from Cranston. He is an absentee landlord and I know that they have made several attempts to apprehend this gentlemen. He is exactly what the Providence neighborhoods do not need. He is classic, if you look in the dictionary, absentee landlord, this person's picture is probably in the Funk and Wagnel's. He is the surge of the neighborhood, and he is pretty good in evading the judicial process. Something has to be done. I asked Mr. Deller and Mr. Palmieri how we can address this problem. The house is just not habitable. I went there with Ramzi. He said it doesn't meet that 50 percent ratio, I don't know why. This is the other alternative that we have to pursue. I think we have to send the right message, and I think the right message is to do what we have to do. I would really like to see this Eric

Cody I think is his name, but I would really like to put this house where he lives in Cranston and see how he likes it. It's really problematic. The houses that are around it are owner occupied that have been there 50, 60, 70, 80 years. That's why I support this and I ask that this committee please consider it.

An Ordinance in Amendment of and in Addition to Chapter 1979-26 of the Ordinance of the City of Providence Approved June 22, 1979 and Entitled, "An Ordinance Approving and Adopting the Official Redevelopment Plan for the West End Project" for Additional Acquisition.

CHAIRWOMAN DIRUZZO: Councilman Allen wants to speak on this.

MR. DELLER: This is an amendment to the West End Redevelopment Project. There are three separate areas in the West End that we are looking to acquire through the purchase of condemnation. These areas have been identified with Councilman Allen and his project area committee. There are three lots on Cranston Street, 559, 565 and 571 Cranston Street. There are three parcels that are adjacent. They have derelict properties on them. There is several parcels on the corner of Huntington Avenue and Cranston Street. Some of them are vacant, some of them have burnt and abandoned buildings. We are looking to acquire those for a commercial development parcel in the area, and the third parcel, what is known in the neighborhood as the "Ice House". It is an old warehouse that is sitting there surrounded by residential properties. It is a blight. We are looking to acquire that and hopefully sub-divide it into new residential lots for the creation of additional owner/occupied property. This request was prepared in cooperation with Councilman Allen and I am sure that he would love to explain the petition to you.

COUNCILMAN ALLEN: Thank you Madame Chairwoman and Members of the committee. The particular parcels that have been identified here are parcels that have been either eye-sores, underdeveloped parcels, or parcels that if joined together they could be some major development. The old "Ice House" is a parcel that is a parcel that is a large building. There is about maybe four or five major pieces to it. It has been an eye-sore for quite a long time. There was some activity going on there of illegal nature not too long ago and the State Police went in and they were fencing goods and stuff out of there. We need to get that on the market and into the hands of someone who wants to develop it and do some things that are going to be good for the neighborhood. The parcel on Huntington and Cranston Street, now there are probably four vacant lots there. There is a building

October 21, 1997

-10-

on the corner that has been empty for probably three years. They renovated it, they started to re-furbish it and they stopped. It is a good piece of property, but it is too small to do anything with and the owner, I believe is somewhere out of the country. It is an absentee landlord situation. The intent of putting together these pieces is to put together a group of parcels that could be developed with some emphasis on community development, economic development and the impact on the neighborhood in a positive way. Getting rid of some of the vacant lots and some of the buildings that are not working. One particular business, a liquor store, will be relocated elsewhere. The community doesn't have a problem with that piece of economic development. The third and final piece which is Parcel A, is on the corner of Cranston and Waverly. There are three lots. There is an abandoned building on the fourth lot, and what we are proposing to acquire those four pieces of property. They will knock the abandoned building down. We will develop that property in a way to develop some activity. There has been no-one identified for any of these pieces, but we know from living in the neighborhood and living there, unless you can amass several lots to do something, the lot is going to stay vacant. The abandoned building is going to stay there. We now have the opportunity to put together the parcels that make sense and we will be adding some jobs.

**An Ordinance in Amendment of and in Addition to
Chapter 1986-53 of the Ordinance of the City of
Providence Approved October 23, 1986 and Entitled,
"An Ordinance Approving and Adopting the Official
Redevelopment Plan for the Special Vacant Lot Project"
for the Acquisition of Additional Properties.**

MR. DELLER: This is an amendment to the Special Vacant Lot Project. What we are adding to the Special Vacant Lot is every property that has been identified as part of the demolition list that has been prepared by the Department of Inspection and Standards to be carried out through the neighborhood improvement project. The Department of Inspection and Standards has said that they are in their Phase I demolition. This does not mean that the Council person from each ward will approve every one of these properties. However, if Building Inspection doesn't identify a property and a council person does approve it, and they do knock the building down, the ordinance would allow the Redevelopment Agency to move in, acquire the property, clear title and make it available for re-use to either the adjacent owners or for re-development in accordance with the city's zoning. All this will do, if adapted, will authorize the Redevelopment Agency to acquire property once the building has been demolished. As you may

October 21, 1997

-11-

know in Part A of the Phase I program, 27 buildings either have been torn down or are in the process of being torn down. Phase II, which I understand will be starting shortly, which is an additional 25 buildings. Once this ordinance is adopted, the Redevelopment Agency will be able to begin acquisition of that first 50 or so properties.

CHAIRWOMAN DIRUZZO: If the council person reviews this list and finds that we are....I have one that I am looking at now which was supposed to come down, and I understand that Mr. Loqa has stated that he has found a developer for the house....

MR. DELLER: All we are doing at this point is adding every property that he has on his list. If that property does not come down, we have no interest in it, we will not proceed, and if he does not remove it, we will come back to you and asked that that property be removed from the list. The problem is this is such a volatile time. Property goes on the list, it comes off the list, it goes back on. It is hard to keep track. I want to put everything on the list so that once it comes down we can move forward. If it doesn't come down, then we will come back to you and amend the list and remove it.

CHAIRWOMAN DIRUZZO: This list does not concur with the list that the council people have.

MR. DELLER: I can only use the list that Mr. Loqa gave us. We will be back to amend this list a number of times.

CHAIRWOMAN DIRUZZO: There is no one who wishes to speak on this piece of property.

COUNCILMAN JACKSON: When a piece of property gets knocked down and the agency acquires it, what right does the present owner have to that property?

MR. DELLER: If the property is demolished, the building inspection is placing a lien against the property for the cost of the demolition. It is our proposal, and it is spelled out in the redevelopment plan, that when the redevelopment agency steps in and files in court condemnation, we will advise the City Solicitor's office, and suggest that they go to court and place a claim for any demolition or any back taxes so that the city can re-coup the cost that it has expended to demolish the property. Once we condemn the property, it is owned by the Redevelopment Agency and the former owner has no rights. Our intent is that they will get no money out of this if we can help it.

October 21, 1997

-12-

CHAIRWOMAN DIRUZZO: If there are no other questions, we can now conclude the hearing on the Special Vacant Lot Project, and we will conclude this hearing of the Urban Redevelopment Committee. Thank you for coming and thank you for your input.


SECOND DEPUTY CITY CLERK


ASSISTANT CLERK