

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING OF OCTOBER 4, 2004
SUBJECT TO APPROVAL AT THE NEXT REGULAR MEETING**

I. CALL TO ORDER:

Meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m., Ray Levesque, Chairman, presiding.

Members Present: Ray Levesque, Leo Felice, Bruce Ferreira, Jeffrey Partington, Mike Lupis, Jim Libby, Brian Lanoie and Christopher Desjardins.

Members Absent: Jeffrey Presbrey

Others Present: Ron Faford, Town Council Liaison, Tom Kravitz, Town Planner and Christine Langlois, Recording Secretary.

II. ATTENDANCE REVIEW:

The Chairman noted that one member of the Board was excused.

III. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES:

The **minutes of the Planning Board meeting of September 13, 2004** were read. *A motion to accept the minutes as presented was made by Mr. Ferreira. The motion received a seconded from Mr. Felice and carried unanimously by the Board.*

IV. CORRESPONDENCE:

- Two Notices of Wetlands Alterations filings from RIDEM, one approved; one denial

V. NEW BUSINESS:

Land Development:

Harrisville Village, Mowry & Steere Farm Roads, Harrisville; Map 160, Lot 34: *Informational Meeting/Master Major Land Development Plan Review:* Attorney Andrew Teitz, Will Gates, of Gates, Leighton Associates, Scott Rabideau, of Natural Resource Services, Inc., Russell Crossman, of Crossman Engineering, Norbert Therien, of National Surveyors-Developers, Inc., and Mark Bard & Victor Bevilacqua, of Harrisville Village LLC, were in attendance to represent the request. Attorney Teitz began the discussion by stating that the Board would be reviewing the Master Major Land Development plan for Harrisville Village, which allowed for the creation of 67 units, 20% of which would be considered affordable units. He stated that the proposal was in compliance with the Town's Comprehensive Plan – in keeping growth within the villages – where services and infrastructure is available. Noting that some time has passed since the initial inception of the project and the fact this was a public informational hearing, he turned the presentation over to Will Gates, of Gates, Leighton Associates, to outline the proposed housing and layout of the project.

Mr. Gates presented to the Board a Master Major Land Development entitled, "Harrisville Village, Burrillville, Rhode Island, prepared for Harrisville Village, LLC, prepared by Gates, Leighton & Associates, Inc. for Map 160, Lot 34", and explained that

the property consists of 34.9 acres, bounded by Mowry Street and Steere Farm Road. He reiterated the proposal allowed for the creation of 67 family units within a planned village area - within walking distance of Downtown Harrisville. In essence, the plan is creating a "neighborhood" similar to neighborhoods of the past (parallel clustered housing with garages located to the side of the units, village common, front porches, which foster socialization) with longevity and low maintenance. He furthered passed around a sheet of photographs, displaying current local housing in the town, which is being considered for this project. He noted the presence of a small town common area, with the proposed housing facing the open space common area, being available to the residents of the development. He added that the development would be privately maintained, overseen by an association of the owners. He pointed out that the aim is for low traffic, low speed, narrower roads (22 feet in width) with a cape-cod berm, with a high quality, rural nature - parting from the urban feelings of as curbing and curb cuts. Referring to the project layout, he noted that of the 34.9 acres, the development would occur on the most disturbed portion of the property, adding that the property was formerly a gravel operation. He pointed out the added amenity of a proposed trail system - accessible to the public - following along an old right-of-way, to include the movement of overhead utility lines that would allow for the trail's continuation to Steere Farm Road. He explained that there was a single access entrance proposed from Mowry Street, with an emergency exit to Steere Farm Road, with breakaway gate. He told the Board that there have been discussions with the Town's engineer in regards to approaching the RIDOT to allow for a second or primary means of access from Steere Farm Road, but noted that Crossman Engineering had noted accelerated speeds on Steere Farm Road when conducting the traffic analysis. He finally added that this type of proposal would meet the current market high quality demand for housing units with this character and size (900 to 1,800 sq/ft). He then turned the presentation over to Scott Rabideau, of Natural Resource Services, Inc., to address the wetlands issues.

Mr. Rabideau informed the Board that he had been hired by the developers, in the summer of 2002, to delineate the freshwater wetlands on the property. He noted the presence of a fish pond, a stream to the rear of the property, a number of smaller, intermittent streams and small forested wetlands throughout the site. The primary freshwater system is the fish pond located on Mowry Street. He stated that the wetlands have been verified by RIDEM, conducted in May, 2004. He added that subsequent to the freshwater wetlands verification process, the developers had requested approval from RIDEM to locate the access from Mowry Street within the already disturbed area of the overhead electrical lines. He noted that they had further requested the ability to relocate the overhead electrical lines to the easterly side and shift the easement from the utility company. Both requests have been granted (Insignificant Alteration from Wetlands permit/approval from Narragansett Electric). He then turned the presentation over to Russell Crossman, of Crossman Engineering, to address any traffic impacts.

Mr. Crossman stated that Crossman Engineering was retained to provide traffic engineering services as well as utility and stormwater permitting. In regards to the water service, he submitted a letter received from the Harrisville Water District offering

approval of service for this project, recommending connection to the existing 12-inch water main on Steere Farm Road, as well as the existing 6-inch line on Mowry Street. Additional requests include the installation of a fire hydrant on the southwest corner of the property and submit plans detailing the water main design and technical specifications prior to construction activities. In regards to sewer connections, he stated that preliminary discussions have taken place with the Sewer Department and that they were informed of two existing lines on Mowry Street and Steere Farm Road. It is the recommendation that the development connect into the Steere Farm Road line. In regards to the stormwater management, as this is only the master plan review, he stated that final design plans have not yet been completed. In anticipation, he noted that all 67 units will have rooftop drains with two proposed underground infiltration areas to handle all stormwater – resulting in no net increase. He added that the proposal will also include a Vortechnic unit for water quality permitting measures for RIDEM, as well as the Town of Burrillville stormwater management standards. In regards to traffic, he noted that a traffic study had been conducted, addressing the specific areas of: intersection of Steere Farm Road & Central Street; intersection of Mowry Street and Harrisville Main Street and the Mowry Street proposed entrance. Outlining the traffic report, he stated that Mowry Street is a two-lane roadway, with an assumed speed limit of approximately 25 m.p.h. and is approximately 20 feet in width. Steere Farm Road is also a two-lane roadway, approximately 23 feet in width, with a posted speed limit of 25 m.p.h. Harrisville Main Street is approximately 28 feet wide at its intersection with Mowry, with a posted speed limit of 25 m.p.h. Continuing onto traffic counts, he recapped the following numbers taken during a.m. (7:30 to 8:30 a.m.) and p.m. peak times:

Mowry Street	a.m. peak time	23 vehicles eastbound
	a.m. peak time	10 vehicles westbound
	p.m. peak time	24 vehicles eastbound
	p.m. peak time	27 vehicles westbound
Main Street	p.m. peak time	102 vehicles northbound
	p.m. peak time	123 vehicles southbound
Steere Farm Road	p.m. peak time	58 vehicles northbound
	p.m. peak time	61 vehicles southbound

He proceeded to explain to the Board why the entrance from Mowry Street is the preferred access based on the amount of site distance available in comparison to the possibility of a Steere Farm Road entrance. He stated that the projected number of trips from this development would be approximately 30 trips in the a.m. and approximately 35 trips in the p.m. In summary, he added that this development would not provide a degradation of the level of service on the adjacent streets. Mr. Kravitz added that if there is a second entrance from Steere Farm Road, the proposed number of trips would be cut in half, but that the developer should not review the traffic exclusive to this development. There maybe further development on Mowry Street in the future.

As the presentation at this time was complete, Attorney Teitz then asked for questions or comments from the Board. The majority of Board members emphasized that they were not comfortable with a single access for a development of 67 units. They expressed their desire for the developers to work with the RIDOT in arriving at a solution to the Steere Farm Road/Central Street intersection in order to provide a second means of access to this development. The Board questioned whether this was a private road and also questioned the trash pickup. Attorney Teitz replied that it was a private roadway, trash removal and snow plowing would also be privately maintained by the association. In regards to the private trash removal, the Board questioned the location of dumpsters. Attorney Teitz, noting that the issue of trash removal had not been discussed in length, stated that it was probable to have a common area for each of the buildings proposed.

The Board, noting that 20% of the proposed units would be affordable, questioned the location of the proposed affordable units. Attorney Teitz noted that the affordable units would be scattered throughout the development and the affordable units would be constructed in the progress of the development. The Board asked if the proposed walking trails would have any connections to the abutting property, which will be pursuing development with an associated trail ways. Attorney Teitz said it is the developer's intent to have connectivity of the two walking paths – that a “stub” was being proposed to connect with the adjacent abutting parcel.

Based upon the amount of disturbance, the Board questioned why detention ponds were not proposed. Mr. Crossman responded that all of the drainage is proposed to be underground – the detention areas are underground. Mr. Rabideau added that because of the type of soils in the area (Hinckley-Sandy loam) and the low water table (3-4' of separation from the water table), this unique situation allows for underground water detention. The Board questioned whether the utilities are proposed for underground. Attorney Teitz said they were.

The Board asked what type of materials is being considered for the exterior of the buildings. Mr. Gates stated that the developer would be researching the current, high-tech materials available on the market which have the appearance of wood, but would not be the typical vinyl siding material and are low maintenance. Mr. Teitz added that at the next level of review they would be providing samples of the chosen materials. The Board voiced dislike with the buildings 19 & 20 – much too large compared to the rest of the development.

The Board questioned the location of several of the proposed buildings in proximity to the 100-foot riverbank setback – adding that it appears several of the buildings might encroach on the setback. Mr. Gates said he thought the buildings were outside the riverbank setback, but stated that he would review the layout again to be sure the buildings were outside the setback. Mr. Rabideau added that it is the intent to remain outside of the setback and if they come within any area of the setback, the development would have to file an Application to Alter Freshwater Wetlands – which carries with it a one-year review.

The Board questioned whether the developer would still allow access to the pond for seasonal recreation and whether any parking would be made available. Mr. Rabideau told the Board that there current is no parking area for the pond and that most residents would park their vehicles along the roadway. It is the intent of the developer to allow access to the pond for its use but there will not be any parking made available. He added that the developer would also be conducting repairs to the dam so that the pond can maintain its water level. The dam repair activity, as such, will not require a RIDEM permit.

For the benefit of Crossman Engineering, the Board informed Mr. Crossman of another housing project (Stillwater Heights), which will take place in close proximity to this proposal, and suggested he review the proposal and incorporate any traffic generated by that proposal into the traffic analysis he recently conducted for Harrisville Village. In regards to the movement of the overhead power lines, the Board requested written approval from National Grid for this process.

As this proposal is considered a Village Planned Development, the Board requested, in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance, a statement from the developer demonstrating the appropriateness and compliance of this project with the Town's Comprehensive Plan. Attorney Teitz stated that he thought the statement would be submitted at the Preliminary Plan stage. It was further pointed out that under the VPD Ordinance approximately 16 of the proposed units would require a variance in regards to exceeding two units per building, as this property lies within a designate historic district (Zoning Ordinance Section 11-8.9.3).

In regards to RIDEM's comments from their correspondence of May 5, 2004, the Board noted a number of comments regarding the wetlands flagging – in particular five of those comments would reduce the wetland edge on the property. Within the western side of the property (where a potential second connection to Mowry Street could be provided) the wetlands edge, indicated on the plans, could be eliminated. DEM stated that this area was not wetlands but could be indicated as a forested wetland. They requested further review of RIDEM's comments compared to the current plan. Mr. Rabideau explained that there is an intermittent stream that crosses the property in that location and that he had to acknowledge the stream and a crossing. The developer has chosen to cross the stream at an area of minimal impact – at the existing utility lines. He added that an approval from September 4, 2004 approves the movement of the overhead utility lines closer to the wetlands. He noted that with the Preliminary Plan the Board will see all of the changes to the wetlands flagging and if buildings are lost during the process, so be it. The Board felt strongly that the plan before them to review and approve did not represent a true statement of the wetlands and suggested that the Preliminary plan definitely reflect the true wetlands locations.

As there were no further questions from the Board, Mr. Levesque then asked if members of the audience had any questions or comments.

Larry Castonguay, of 55 Mowry Street, stated concerns with the amount of housing within this development and that Mowry Street would not be able to handle the traffic. He informed the Board that a portion of the property, located near Steere Farm Road, was used by the Stillwater Mill owners to dump oil dye and asked if it has been investigated with RIDEM. The Board noted that they were unaware of this dye disposal site. He also pointed out a former landfill in the western portion of the property. The Board noted that they were unaware of this form landfill. Mr. Castonguay then pointed out the location of the sewer lines, and the lack of, in another location on Mowry Street. He added that he has lived on Mowry Street for a long time and had witnessed several near-miss car mishaps. He further questioned whether sidewalks would be proposed on Mowry Street to the nearby school. Mr. Levesque said there would be no sidewalks to the school. Mr. Castonguay finally asked what impact this project would have on the school system. Attorney Teitz stated that this type of development does not typically attract large families. He noted a projection of approximately 8 children from this proposal.

Gary Delgizzi, of Mill Street, Oakland, asked for the definition of affordable housing. Mr. Kravitz explained that RI Housing establishes the income ranges for affordable from 30% to 80% of area median family income. Mr. Teitz stated that it is based on 80% of the medium income and the number of individuals living in the household. Up to 32% of that can be utilized for housing costs, including maintenance fees, taxes, insurance. He added that they have estimated the affordable units for this development to be in the price range of \$159,000 and \$189,000 depending on the size, to meet the affordability criteria, but would meet the requirements of RI Housing. Mr. Delgizzi asked the housing price of the average home. Mr. Teitz stated the price range for the rest of the units would be \$249,000 to \$279,000.

Helen Bond, of 135 Mowry Street, stated that she has lived on Mowry Street for 57 years and has seen seven cars come through her bushes, the railings and foundation of her home. She pointed out that there is heavy traffic through the area.

Karin Newbiker, of 141 Mowry Street, questioned whether the traffic study reviewed the area of Harrisville Main Street, at its intersection with East Avenue, where the new stop sign has just been located. She feared that with the added traffic from the development, the cars would be backed up further than they already are. Mr. Crossman stated that the study did not include that intersection; however he said that there would not be a full increase in traffic as the majority of vehicles leaving Mowry Street would be heading toward Central Street.

Sherry Kinsella, 20 Forest View Lane, stated that Mowry Street narrows to almost a one-lane road not far from the entrance to this development and asked if that narrowing had been taken into consideration when conducting the sight distance. Mr. Crossman replied that the projected sight distance towards that location was 385 feet, and were not aware of any narrower of the roadway. He added, however, that the amount of traffic from the

development heading in that direction would be minimal compared to traffic heading towards Harrisville Main Street.

Joyce Lavallee, of 115 Mowry Street, stated that she lives directly across from the pond, with her house being only 15 feet from the Mowry Street and that there is a lot of traffic on Mowry Street, some of which has traveled onto her lawn.

Brian Mulligan, 225 Steere Farm Road, noting that if the intersection of Steere Farm Road & Harrisville Main Street is changed and there is a restriction of trucks from Steere Farm Road, the trucks would be forced to continue on Central Street, which is winding and very narrow. He stated that Route 98 (Steere Farm Road) is much wider and better for truck traffic.

Matt Trimble, of 27 Steere Farm Road, asked if the cluster of trees on the plan, next to the proposed second entrance, represent existing trees. Mr. Levesque replied they were.

As there were not further questions or comments from the public, Mr. Levesque asked for the Board's decision. *A motion to table the review of the Master Major Land Development Plan for Harrisville Village until the developer submits a new plan incorporating all of the Board's comments was made by Mr. Lanoie. The motion received a second from Mr. Partington.* Under discussions, Attorney Teitz was concerned with the timeframe for Planning Board review and action. Mr. Kravitz stated that he had not exceeded the timeframe for his review as the Administrative Officer and that the Planning Board has 120 days from the date of certification of completeness to render a decision. Attorney Teitz requested the Board's approval of the Master Plan, conditioned upon applying to RIDOT for the second entrance, so that the application to DOT can be strengthened by the Board's approval. The Board stressed that they were not comfortable with the plan before them and that they required more information to reach a comfort level for acceptance of this proposal. *The motion passed with eight members in favor (Mr. Ferreira, Mr. Partington, Mr. Levesque, Mr. Lupis, Mr. Libby, Mr. Lanoie and Mr. Partington), one opposed (Mr. Felice.)*

Oakland Village, Adler Bros. Development LLC, Oakland School Street & Victory Highway, Oakland; Map 179, Lot 56: *Informational Meeting/Master Major Development Plan Review:* Attorney Thomas Hefner, Brian Thalmann of Thalmann Engineering and Scott Adler, of Adler Bros. Development LLC, were in attendance to represent the request the request. Attorney Hefner stated that the plan had been before the Planning Board in May as a conceptual review, and the Board had requested several items be provided at the next submission. These consisted of: proof that several of the lots containing wetlands have at least 12,000 sq/ft of buildable area, the creation of common driveways for several of the duplexes on Oakland School Street and improved sight distance for proposed Lots 14 and 15, which have been satisfied by this revised plan. He noted that the property would have to be rezoned from its current zoning designation of General Commercial (GC) to Village Commercial (VC)

and that the plan would require several variances from the Town's Zoning Ordinance. He then turned the presentation over to Brian Thalmann, of Thalmann Engineering.

Mr. Thalmann presented a plan to the Board entitled, "Oakland Village Master Plan Submission, Oakland School Street & Victory Highway, Oakland, RI Map 162, Lot 40; Map 179, Lot 56, Major Land Development, dated May 25, 2004". He pointed out additional changes, which included:

- the lot, located toward the most easterly part of the site, being changed from a proposed house lot to a proposed vacant lot – to be deeded to the Town – being sited for a detention pond
- Phase II proposed mixed-use lots have been reconfigured to be serviced by a private driveway to all three lots
- parking area for the general store was adjusted to meet zoning requirements
- parking relocated to allow access from the proposed roadway
- minimized the number of accesses from Oakland School Street (reduced from 8 to 3).

He then asked if there were any questions from the Board members. The Board questioned access to proposed Lots 14 & 15 as it appears the property line does not extend to Oakland School Street. Mr. Thalmann said that the survey information is currently being reviewed to determine whether the area between the developer's lot and Oakland School Street is property or the state highway line and may necessitate a physical alteration permit application. He added that by the Preliminary submission, this information will be available. The Board questioned the alternative should it be private. Mr. Thalmann said that either private or state, they would pursue an easement

The Board questioned the location of a building envelope with respect to an existing easement for Narragansett Electric over proposed Lot #19 and asked if they had received a copy of the correspondence the Town received from Narragansett Electric in regards to the plan. Mr. Thalmann stated that they had not, but said that anything that is done has to be reviewed by National Grid according to their easement policy. No activity is proposed within that area.

The Board questioned whether the access to proposed Lots 17, 18 & 19 would be privately owned. Mr. Thalmann said it would be. In regards to the dwellings on this property, the Board questioned whether "garages" were being considered, as these buildings are also slated for mixed-use. Mr. Thalmann stated that upon submission of the final design, a house and garage would be much more marketable.

The Board requested some type of screening for the proposed detention pond area and asked for some of the existing trees, in that area, to remain. Mr. Thalmann said that he was trying to maintain an adequate sight distance for the new roadway entrance onto Victory Highway and that the traffic engineer had stated that the trees must be removed. He added he would investigate low growing shrubs as a replacement and that the project

has a registered landscape architect, as part of the design team, who has already identified certain trees that should remain on the property.

In regards to electrical utilities, the Board requested that underground utilities be considered when communicating with the utility company.

The Board asked if forested wetlands have setback requirements. Mr. Thalmann said there was not any setback requirement for the forested wetlands on the property as they are all less than the three-acre threshold established by RIDEM, as well as the special aquatic sites.

The Board pointed out that the proposed mixed-use dwelling for Lot 18 appears to be very close to the common driveway and suggested moving the building back a bit. Mr. Thalmann noted that there is an existing stone wall running in a southwest/northeasterly direction which they are attempting to preserve but still maintain the common driveway.

The Board requested the opportunity to view the elevated drawing of the proposed general store. Mr. Thalmann proceeded to pass the drawing around among the Board members. A comment was made on the size of the building. Mr. Adler responded that the building is proposed to have 3,200 sq/ft. Mr. Kravitz noted that during his review of the project, he had requested a smaller scale building – similar to a general cash store that had been historically located in Oakland – at approximately 800 sq/ft. The Board questioned the types of materials being considered for this building. Mr. Adler stated a form of vinyl siding that cannot be detected as vinyl siding.

The Board asked if the fire department would have a problem with the private driveway proposed for Lots 17, 18 & 19. Mr. Thalmann said that they have not solicited comments from the fire department but would be required to at the Preliminary review stage. Mr. Kravitz added that the fire department had reviewed the plan as part of the Town's solicitation of comments from departments and that the fire department had requested a 12" water main as opposed to an 8". They did not comment as to the driveway but a response could be solicited from them.

As there were no further questions from the Board members, the Chairman requested questions or comments from the public.

Mr. Roland Tremblay, of 14 Mill Street, asked why there are houses proposed on Oakland School Street at all. Mr. Thalmann stated that due to the configuration of the property, Lots 14, 15 & 8 cannot abut the subdivision road. The Board added that the developer has limited the number of accesses to Oakland School Street to minimize the impact on that street.

John Wheeler, of 20-22 Oakland School Street, asked if the existing field would be deeded to the Town, and not the fire department. The Board stated the Town to keep the fire musters activity going and events of that nature.

Charles Newell, of 1290 Victory Highway, questioned the stormwater direction when leaving the detention pond. Mr. Thalmann explained that runoff would flow into the detention pond, which then outfalls into the special aquatic site. The development cannot create an increase in the runoff from the site.

Scott Moore, of 1288 Victory Highway, noting ledge on the property, questioned whether any blasting would be conducted and expressed concern with the location of the property in proximity to the Oakland well. Mr. Thalmann said any blasting would be regulated by the State Fire Marshall's office and necessary permits would have to be obtained from them.

Bill Lockwood, 1384 Victory Highway, asked whether the detention pond would be fenced and mosquitoes. Mr. Thalmann stated that the detention pond is only three-feet in depth. He added the Town would be responsible its care and a maintenance schedule would be developed. Mr. Lockwood voiced concerns with protection of the wetlands in the vicinity of the detention pond. Mr. Thalmann stated the wetlands would not be affected by this detention pond.

Mary Keable, of 1360 Victory Highway, asked if the country store was necessary. The Board responded that the country store would maintain a country atmosphere by its presence. Mrs. Keable asked how many parking spaces were proposed for this store. The Board responded 26. Mr. Thalmann added that the number of parking spaces was determined by the Zoning Ordinance. She further asked for an example of a live-work dwelling. The Board stated a lawyer - work at home type business that doesn't generate traffic.

Gary Delgizzi, of 7 Mill Street, asked, in regards to the open space lot, if the three large older trees on the property would be preserved and the general store built on the other side of the trees. Mr. Thalmann said yes. Mr. Delgizzi was concerned with individuals tramping through the field to access the general store. He further questioned whether there would be sidewalks on Victory Highway. Mr. Thalmann stated that they are proposing sidewalks on the southerly and easterly side of the connecting road, with a pedestrian path proposed for between Lot 12 & Lot 8. Mr. Levesque added that it would be up to the state to provide sidewalks on Victory Highway, as it is a state road.

Tucker William, 1298 Victory Highway, questioned the size of the open space lot. Mr. Thalmann said the dimension of the open space lot is 277 x 187 encompassing 55,000 sq/ft. Mr. William asked if it would be owned by the Town and whether it would be changing much. Mr. Levesque said it would be owned by the Town and would remain an open field. Mr. William asked who would own the general store. Mr. Adler replied that the store would be constructed and owned by Adler Bros. and leased to a private individual. Mr. William then asked if a small machine shop could happen on the mixed used lots. Mr. Thalmann stated that any use would be regulated by the Town's Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Levesque offered the reference within the Zoning Ordinance, Section 11-

7-5 Home Occupations, and pointed out the types of allowed occupations (technology based services, computer network services, etc.).

Tom Trimble, of 26 Alice Avenue, asked if an assessment had been done in regards to the amount of blasting that may be necessary on the property. Mr. Levesque stated that at this stage of submission, the information is not necessary, but at the next level, test holes will be conducted to determine buildable area.

Lee Gilbert, of 1373 Victory Highway, stated that he was against the general store proposal. The Board stated that this proposal is the type of thing the Board likes to see. Mr. Kravitz added that he had contacted Pat Mehrtens, the Town Historian, when this proposal came in, and she had provided him with photos of an old historical Oakland cash store that was located in this area back around 1904. He stated the old store appeared to be about 20 feet wide x 40 feet or 800 sq/ft, and added that this was the type of building he would like to see on this property – specific to just serving the neighborhood. He noted the general store on the plan differed from what he thought should be in the proposal.

Michael Keable, 1363 Victory Highway, questioned the number of proposed parking spaces for the general store parking lot. Mr. Levesque noted that the Zoning Ordinance determines the number of parking spaces based on the square footage of a building. If the building is downsized, the number of parking spaces will decrease. The Board asked the developer to decrease the size of the building. Mr. Adler said he would check feasibility compared to size.

Attorney Hefner told the Board that the proposal would require several waivers from the Subdivision & Land Development Regulations, specifically size of a non-village roadway and the centerline distance from the intersection of Owen Avenue and Clinton Avenue to the proposed roadway – the plan has approximately 100 feet. Mr. Thalmann added that the plan would require a recommendation from the Planning Board to the Zoning Board in regards to relief from two lots (Lot #8 & Lot #11) within the A-80 Aquifer Overlay District in regards to frontage and lot area.

As there were not further questions from the Board, *a motion to forward a favorable recommendation to the Town Council on the rezoning of Map 162, Lot 40 and Map 179, Lot 56 from General Commercial to Village Commercial was made by Mr. Partington. The motion received a second from Mr. Ferreira and carried unanimously by the Board.*

Mr. Kravitz pointed out that the applicant has not mentioned providing affordable units for this development, of which 20% of the total number of units would have to be affordable according to the Town's regulations, as well as proof of the subsidy provided for the affordable units. Attorney Hefner stated that he had been unaware of Burrillville's approved Housing Plan and that the affordable units would be addressed at the next level of submission

A motion to approve the Master Major Subdivision/Land Development Plan for Oakland Village was made by Mr. Ferreira, because the plan is in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan; the plan will be in conformance with the Zoning Ordinance once the property has been rezoned; the plan does not create any significant negative environmental impacts; the plan does not create any unbuildable lots; and all proposed lots will have adequate and permanent physical to a public street. The motion received a second from Mr. Partington. .

Acceptance of Road Improvements:

Route 102 Industrial Complex, Bronco Highway-Route 102, Burrillville; Map 212, Lot 1: *Report from DPW Director on Status of Road Improvements/Recommendation to Council for Acceptance of Daniele Drive:* The Board reviewed a correspondence from Richard Bernardo, DPW Director, regarding his inspection of Daniele Drive as to its completeness. *A motion to forward a recommendation of acceptance of Daniele Drive into the Town's Roadway System, to the Town Council, based upon Mr. Bernardo's final inspection was made by Mr. Partington. The motion received a second from Mr. Ferreira and carried unanimously by the Board.*

VI. OTHER BUSINESS:

Report from Administrative Officer:

Mr. Kravitz noted that during the month of September the following Certificates of Completeness were issued: **Harrisville Village, Mowry & Steere Farm Roads, Harrisville** (Conceptual Major Land Development – 12 units); **Oakland Village, Adler Bros. Development LLC, Oakland School Street & Victory Highway, Oakland** (Master Major Land Development – 18 lots); and **John Drury, Colwell Road, Nasonville** (Administrative – 2 lots). The following plans were rejected at incomplete: **Johnathan & Isabel Maynard, Brook Road, Harrisville** (Preliminary Minor – 2 lots); **Richard Fox, Granite Street, Harrisville** (Administrative – 2 lots); and **James & Emily King, Black Starr Road, Mapleville** (Administrative – 2 lots). He noted endorsement of the following: **John Drury, Colwell Road, Nasonville** (Administrative – 2 lots); and **George Brouillard, East Wallum Lake Road, Pascoag** (Administrative – 2 lots).

Planning Board Discussions:

Classification of Plans Discussion: Mr. Kravitz informed the Board that he had attended a seminar on the classifications of plans sponsored by the Board of Registered Land Surveyors and that he had questioned what type of class the Town can legally accept for plan where small lots are being created from very large parcels. He reported that a Class I would be required on newly proposed lots with a Class IV being acceptable on the remaining land. In regards to mergers and conceptual plans, he said a Class IV would be acceptable as well. He added that he would incorporate this information into the Subdivision & Land Development Regulations.

Mr. Levesque then read into the record a resignation from Mr. Lanoie. The Board members wished him the best on his future endeavors.

A motion to adjourn was then made at 9:50 p.m. by Mr. Ferreira. The motion received a second from Mr. Felice and carried unanimously by the Board.