

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING OF JULY 11, 2005  
SUBJECT TO APPROVAL AT THE NEXT REGULAR MEETING**

**I. CALL TO ORDER:**

**Meeting was called to order at 7:06 p.m., Jeffrey Partington, Vice-Chairman, presiding.**

**Members Present:** Jeffrey Partington, Leo Felice, Bruce Ferreira, Mike Lupis, Jim Libby, Christopher Desjardins, and Jeff Presbrey.

**Members Absent:** Ray Levesque

**Others Present:** Ray Cloutier, Zoning Board Chairman, Joe Raymond, Building Official, Tom Kravitz, Town Planner, and Christine Langlois, Recording Secretary.

**II. ATTENDANCE REVIEW:**

The Vice-Chairman acknowledged that one member was absent.

**III. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES:**

The **minutes of the Planning Board meeting of June 6, 2005** were read. *A motion to accept the minutes as presented was made by Mr. Ferreira, seconded by Mr. Felice, and carried unanimously by the Board.*

**IV. CORRESPONDENCE:**

There was no correspondence to discuss this evening.

**V. OLD BUSINESS:**

**Subdivision:**

**Sweets Farm Estates, East Avenue, Harrisville; Map 144, Lot 19:** *Preliminary Minor Review (tabled from last month's meeting):* Attorney Thomas Romano, Kevin Moran, from DiPrete Engineering, and Michael Desmond, of Bryant Associates, were in attendance to represent the application. Attorney Romano began the discussion by stating that the proposed three-lot minor subdivision plan had been before the Planning Board last month and during that review, several questions arose, and will be answered this evening. He noted the proposal would create two one-acre parcels located within the R-40 zoning district and the remaining area, within the F-5 zoning district, would remain subject to a comprehensive permit application filed last year and currently within the court system for a determination. He noted that if the Board approved the request for the two lots, any previous application for development of this property would have to be amended. The issues raised during last month's review dealt primarily with engineering modifications and questions regarding site distances. He added that Mr. Desmond, of Bryant Associates, had prepared a report to address the Board's concerns with site distances, and he proceeded to hand out the report to the Board members. Before he turned the presentation over to Mr. Moran, he outlined the items requested by the Board from last month's review: infiltration system to be provided; updated abutters listing;

evidence of any easements to the cemetery. In regards to any easements to the cemetery, he noted a title search was completed and found that the cemetery was created within the deeds, with certain rights-of-way but no specific easement provided. He then turned the presentation over to Mr. Moran.

Mr. Moran stated that he had received the comments from the last meeting and noted the following corrections made:

- Drywells for Lots 1 and 2 – resubmission includes two drywells, one for each lot, sized for the roof runoff from the proposed structures, as well as coinciding calculations.
- Zoning Boundary – revised to be the same on both sheets.
- Limit of Disturbance – revised for both lots to be closer to the proposed grading, house and ISDS design. The proposed water service locations have been design to coincide with the proposed driveways.
- Cemetery Easement – no specific easement outlined, as previously discussed by Attorney Romano and as evidenced by deeds provided for the Board’s review.
- Sight Distance – addressed by a report prepared by Bryant Associates.

The Board noted that it was suggested at the last review that consideration be given to moving the proposed driveway for Lot 2 further away from Whipple Avenue. Mr. Moran stated that their first approach was for Bryant Associates to review the possibility of moving the driveway before incorporating the movement into the plan. He added that it could be moved if the Board made it a condition of approval. The Board noted that there was some concern in regards to “flooding” on the property. Mr. Moran stated that he believed the concern was for flooding from a northwesterly adjacent property, although he has not experienced this flooding during the several times he has been onsite. He noted that the proposed drywells will be able to eliminate runoff from the site and that the limits are generally upgrade – noting an area of good vegetation.

Mr. Kravitz questioned the site distance of 380 feet to the east for the western driveway, noting the affect of heading downhill on East Avenue, prior to its intersection with Whipple Avenue, and the drop in the roadway, and his concern in regards to the second hill when approaching the crest. Mr. Desmond stated that he did not feel anything would be accomplished by moving the driveway for Lot #2 to the east. Although the site distance is 380 feet (more than adequate for ASHTO requirements), because of the proximity of the driveway to the “crest”, the site distance cannot be increased. He stated that he felt there was not adequate reason to change the location of the proposed driveways.

As there were no further questions, *a motion to approve the Preliminary Minor Subdivision for Sweet Farm Estates was made by Mr. Ferreira because the proposed subdivision is in conformance with the Town’s Comprehensive Plan, specifically, Chapter V Affordable Housing Strategy, Goal V.2. “Promote a safe, sanitary and well constructed housing through new construction and renovation of existing structures”;*

*and Chapter IX Land Use, Policy IX.1.a. “Develop residential, commercial, industrial and mixed-use areas which are compactly grouped, attractive and compatible with the ability of land and water resources to support the development”; the subdivision is compliant with the Town’s Zoning Ordinance; there will be no significant negative environmental impacts as evidence by a notice from RIDEM dated November 26, 2004; the subdivision will result in the creation of two buildable lots; and the proposed lots do have adequate and permanent physical access to State Route 107; conditioned upon receipt of a Physical Alteration Permit from RIDOT. The motion received a second from Mr. Lupis and carried unanimously by the Board.*

**Land Development:**

**Union Pond Village, High Street, Pascoag; Map 174, Lot 133:** *Conceptual Major Plan Review (Continued discussion):* Mr. Bruce Rylah, principal, was in attendance to represent the proposal. He stated that he had been before the Board last month proposing an 18-unit condominium project on High Street in Pascoag in the rear of the CVS plaza. He noted that the site had been chosen because of its ideal location in proximity to the Downtown Pascoag area and the ability for future residents to walk to local services. Since that meeting he stated that he received a letter, dated June 9, 2005, from the Planning Board Chairman, offering a summary of the discussions and suggesting that his project proceed with a calculated density of ten units – based upon the underlying R-20 zoning district and notwithstanding the presence of the A-80 aquifer overlay district. He expressed concern as to the feasibility of the project based on only allowing ten units – especially with having to provide two affordable units out of the ten units. He suggested allowing for three five-unit structures as an alternative to the original 18-units requested. He noted a conversation with a local traffic engineer in regards to traffic impacts from this development and to the fact that the previously mentioned stop sign on Route 100 (Church Street) would not be considered if a traffic study was conducted in this area. (Previous discussions pointed out that a number of drivers fail to stop when approaching this stop sign and that failure to “stop” would be a police enforcement issue.) He requested that the Board reconsider either the 18 or 15 units for this proposal. He further noted from the correspondence the request for extension of the Pascoag Riverwalk, asking where the Riverwalk was intended to be constructed. He further referenced a correspondence he received from Rhode Island Housing in regards to the sale price of affordable units based upon 70% and 80% of median income.

Mr. Partington stated that his recollection from previous discussions was for eight- to ten-units, with two affordable units and the request for justification to increase the number of units. Mr. Kravitz stated that a very detailed development proforma should be submitted to substantiate the number of units Mr. Rylah is requesting. In regards to the Riverwalk plan, Mr. Kravitz stated that the proposal has been in existence for several years and would constitute the development exaction for recreation purposes. Whether Mr. Rylah constructs it or provides a recreation fee for its construction by the Town, the Riverwalk will go forward. He noted that RIDEM has supported a bridge structure in the rear of the former New York Department store property – why wouldn’t they support its continuation to the passive fishing area. He added that Rhode Island Housing has

provided the figures to Mr. Rylah so that he can estimate his potential income from the affordable units. The Board reiterated the importance of providing the development proforma as justification for additional units, and proof that the additional units would be in the best interest of the citizens of Burrillville. The Board pointed out a concern with an abutting neighbor in regards to a turnaround right-of-way. Mr. Rylah responded that the front property has a right-of-way to the garage and not a turnaround. The Board still noted concern with an increase in traffic in the entrance vicinity due to the proposed units. Mr. Rylah noted several attempts to purchase the house in the front of his property in order to create an "intersection" entrance, but to no avail. He added that the Board should realize that he is in the business to make money – if he was a non-profit organization, it would be a different story. Mr. Partington added that Mr. Rylah was in the business to make money – the Planning Board is in the business to protect the interests of the Town; if those two can come together, that's fine; however the Board is not in the business of helping Mr. Rylah make a profit.

## **VI. NEW BUSINESS:**

### **Subdivision:**

**Narragansett Improvement Co. and Dennis R. & Nancy C. Groleau, Gazza Road and Peach Orchard Road, Mapleville; Map 250, Lots 2 & 3; Map 268, Lot 1: Preliminary Minor Plan Review:** Patricia Kelly, of International Mapping, was in attendance to represent the request. She began the discussion by stating that the currently parcel is approximately 28.5 acres in size and that the plan proposes for the creation of three 2.8-acre lots along Gazza Road, with the remaining 18 acres being merged with a gravel bank lot to the south (also owned by Narragansett Improvement) and approximately 2 acres to the north being deeded to an abutter. The three lots along Gazza Road would have sufficient frontage in accordance with the F-2/A-120 aquifer overlay district. She noted the project has received wetlands verification from RIDEM, dated October 2004, and would not result in any alterations to wetlands or wetland buffers. She also noted RIDEM ISDS site suitability approval for all three sites. She pointed out a previous concern by the Town of a small area, approximately 1,800 square feet, where the roadway pavement encroached upon proposed Lot #2 and that they are prepared to deed this area to the Town. The other Town concern was in regards to the original survey – which has been submitted with this submission package.

The Board questioned the limits of disturbance. Ms. Kelly stated that as she had previously addressed, RIDEM had reviewed and verified the wetland flagging locations, and they were able to maintain all the grading and site work outside of DEM's buffers. The limits of disturbance are as close to the proposed wells as can be established to allow for proper drainage and ISDS development, driveway access, etc. Mr. Kravitz elaborated on the concern that the limit of disturbance encompasses the entire frontage along Gazza Road; in particular the excessive grading behind Pole #32 as such grading would be removing several mature trees. Based upon the proposed ISDS location for Lot 2, the regrading seems unnecessary. Ms. Kelly agreed to limit the regrading and to maintain the mature trees in that area. The Board questioned whether calculations were prepared for the aquatic site on the property. Ms. Kelly said that calculations had been prepared –

unfortunately she did not have them available tonight, but it was the opinion of Natural Resource Services that there was no jurisdiction setback that applied to that site. The Board noted that according to calculations, there appeared to be a 50-foot buffer to this aquatic site. Ms. Kelly said that she would recheck this issue with Natural Resource Services. The Board also noted that soil data for Lot 1 test hole #9 should be 383.

As there were no further questions from the Board, *a motion to approve the Preliminary Minor Subdivision Plan for Narragansett Improvement Co. and Dennis & Nancy C. Groleau was made by Mr. Libby because the subdivision is consistent with the Town's Comprehensive Plan, specifically Chapter V Affordable Housing Strategy, Goal V.2 "To promote a safe, sanitary and well constructed housing through new construction and renovation of existing structures"; and Chapter IX Land Use, Implementation Action IX.1.a.1, "Promote low overall residential densities in those areas where public services are currently unavailable or not planned to be available"; the subdivision is in compliance with the Town's Zoning Ordinance; there will be no significant negative environmental impacts from this subdivision; the subdivision will result in three buildable lots; and the proposed lots have adequate and permanent physical access to Gazza Road conditioned upon slight modifications to the limits of disturbance areas to minimize the impact to the existing grades of Lot #2 to be shown on the final plan. The motion received a second from Mr. Desjardins and carried unanimously by the Board.*

**Wolf Hill Lots for Michael & Joyce Scurka, Knibb Road, Pascoag:** *Conceptual Minor Review of Rural Residential Compound:* Michael & Joyce Scurka, principals, were in attendance to represent the request. Mr. Scurka explained that the property consists of 150 acres off of Knibb Road and that his proposal is to create a five-lot rural residential compound. He explained that because of the unique configuration of the lot, it does not allow for more creative alternatives, adding that there is not much of a difference between Concept 1 and Concept 2. He noted that half of the property will be maintained as open space, as required by the RRC ordinance, and that it is his intent to allow equal access to this open space for each property owner of the compound. He pointed out a telephone company easement through the rear of the property, as well as a small trail, within the open space area. He further handed out correspondence he received from RIDEM in regards to the wetlands flagging verification and a few minor problems with the verification process. He noted that the correspondence essentially stated that there was too much flagging, which would not affect the proposal whatsoever. He also handed out a third conceptual plan for the Board's consideration.

The Board asked why most of the development is occurring on the beginning portion of the property with the rear portion consisting of only the open space area. Noting the existence of an existing "road", Mr. Scurka stated that he has proposed the actual roadway in accordance with the Town's maximum length of 1,000 and stated that anything over that amount would require a waiver. The Board noted that in certain cases, they have waived this regulation should it make sense for the property. He noted the front portion of the property is cleared and very picturesque and suitable for houses. The Board suggested that a cul-de-sac turnaround should be provided at the end of the

proposed roadway to allow access for emergency vehicles. Mr. Kravitz asked if they had considered a donation of land to the Burrillville Land Trust, as they have actively been trying to create a corridor of open space in that area. They currently own a parcel adjacent to this property. Mr. Scurka told the Board that when he first purchased the property and decided to develop it, he had contacted the Burrillville Land Trust but did not receive any response from them. Mr. Kravitz stated that he would contact the Land Trust and inform them of Mr. Scurka's intention, noting that at the next level of submission, their comments would be sought on this project.

The Board ultimately directed Mr. Scurka to continue the process with Concept Plan #2.

At this point, Mr. Libby recused from discussions for the Jesse Smith Library.

**Land Development:**

**New Jesse Smith Library, Stillwater Complex, East Avenue, Harrisville; Map 160, Lot 80:** *Preapplication Major Plan Review:* Mr. Jay Litman and Pam Choi Redfern, of Newport Collaborative, Randy Collins, of Gates, Leighton Associates, and Scott Adams, of Edwards & Kelsey, were in attendance to conduct the presentation. Mr. Litman began by stating that the purpose of the presentation this evening was to bring the Planning Board through the phases of the Stillwater Mill Complex project. He displayed the original Master Plan for the Stillwater Mill Complex from October 2003, which had been provided to the development team at the start this project. In the October 2003 the library was shown as being placed in the upper portion of Lot #80 (Fontaine property acquired by the Town), along the East Avenue side of the complex. He explained that redevelopment of the Complex is slated to be conducted in four phases – Phase I being the Stillwater Heights Senior Housing projected (currently under construction); Phase II being the development of the former Fontaine property, which includes construction of the new Jesse Smith Library and a small section of Lot #69, which is the access roadway from Harrisville Main Street (following the original Master Plan which includes a loop road coming through the property and offering a village main street feel, with parking along the street); Phase III being redevelopment of the Clocktower Building and construction of a Senior Center; Phase IV being the private development with retail buildings. He stated that tonight the discussion would be of Phase II – the new Jesse Smith Library.

Continuing Mr. Litman stated that the development team had reviewed the patterns of the Stillwater Mill that fits the site – a collection of buildings looped together, built as needs of the industry grew. From this intriguing pattern emerged the proposed building with its many geometries – working well for library planning – with maximum use of the site. Amenities with this project include a connection to East Avenue from stairs that will lead eventually to a proposed Riverwalk; views of the waterfall and the river from within the library; green areas surrounding the library building; sitting walls out front. He noted that the Burrillville Redevelopment Authority has reviewed this Plan and have approved the direction of the Master Plan, a little different than a walking village, because this was a former industrial site.

He then proceeded to review the waivers that would be required for this project to happen. The first listing included **architectural waivers**:

- **Waiver #1:** *Demolition of historic buildings is prohibited and only considered after a structural assessment as presented to the Planning Board by a registered architect. Vacant, historic buildings shall be stabilized and preserved until rehabilitated.* Mr. Litman noted that even since the original Master Plan was adopted, it was determined that the mill buildings immediately in back of the Restaurant & Town Hall Annex, as well as the Dye House, were slated for demolition. He noted they have studied the Dye House and determined that a portion may be rehabilitated into a Town Senior Center. As the library has been designated for this portion of the site and is approximately 25,000 square feet, and the fact of various subsurface soil conditions (unconsolidated fill, which is an entire additional mill underneath the previously removed mill, to be removed), and stabilization of the site, the historic buildings must be removed. He noted continued correspondence to Rick Greenwood, of the Historic Preservation.
- **Waiver #2:** *Where a flat roof not meant to be visible from the street is used in the building's design, decorative cornices and parapet walls should be used to screen the roof and to delineate the building's profile.* Mr. Litman noted that although there are several flat roofs proposed for the library, the elevation of the site is being increased from 323 to 325. Studies conducted conclude that these flat roofs will not be seen from East Avenue because of this increased elevation. He also noted that the proposal includes utilizing cornices on the flat roof areas. Any normal roof equipment would be placed back out of view.
- **Waiver #3:** *Roofs shall have no less than two of the following features: Parapets <15% and 1/3 of the height of the supporting wall; overhanging eaves no less than 3 feet past the supporting wall; sloping roofs that do not exceed the average height of the supporting walls, with an average slope greater than or equal to 1 foot of vertical rise for every 3 feet of horizontal run and less than or equal to 1 foot of vertical rise for every 1 foot of horizontal run; three or more roof slope plans.* Mr. Litman explained that the main reading room of the building has a barrel-vaulted roof, with exposed wood trusses riding across the ceiling. The bow-string truss and curved roof shape were considered because of aesthetics (although not original to this site but typical of main factory buildings in the region); the idea suits well with the aesthetic massing of the building and it echoes the arch of the adjacent bridge on East Avenue. He noted no appreciative cost differences between the bow-barrel and gable and added that there are studies currently being conducted with the Library Building Committee to determine which roof line would be suitable. He pointed out that the overhang for this type of roof is six feet. Several Board members expressed dislike of the barrel-vaulted roofline – being more in favor of a traditional gable roof.

He then turned the presentation over to Randy Collins of Gates, Leighton Associates to offer an explanation of the site/landscape waivers.

Mr. Collins told the Board that his firm had developed the original Master Plan and is very familiar with the site. He noted the following **Site/landscape waivers**:

- **Wavier #1:** *A landscaped buffer strip at least 10 feet wide, continuous except for approved driveways, shall be established adjacent to any public road except in instances where the Planning Board deems this would unduly detract from the adjacent streetscape and/or architectural character of the area.* Mr. Collins explained that it is not appropriate to maintain a 10-foot buffer strip in front of the library as the roadway runs directly up to the main entrance to the library. He added that there will be plantings direct adjacent to the building.
- **Wavier #2:** *Parking areas shall be located to the rear or sides of buildings out of sight from passing traffic to the greatest extent possible.* Mr. Collins stated that because the roadway will eventually be a public road, in envisioning a full build-out of the Stillwater Mill Complex, parking is proposed for along the roadway. Also it would be extremely difficult to place the parking to the rear of the library due to the site constraints.
- **Waiver #3:** *Fences and walls should be architecturally appropriate. Walls should be terraced with wall sections no more than 5 feet in height.* Mr. Collins told the Board that within the preliminary review of the project, the proposal included constructing a wall (from the East Avenue side) just staged off the existing line of an adjacent property. In order to terrace the wall, it would extend out into the Town's property. With the existing grades, the proposal calls for an eight-foot tall wall. He pointed out that the connection from East Avenue along the property line to the green spaces surrounding the library building has always been envisioned in the Master Plan as connected areas to a green space created as a "common" as part of Phase III. The proposed terrace system would serve to break up the continuous wall.

The Board asked if discussions have taken place with the adjacent property owner in regards to the wall construction, and whether a stair or sloping access could be constructed in that vicinity. Mr. Collins stated that although there is a small stairway access in the vicinity of East Avenue, a stairway access could be provided in this other area. However, the stairway would be pretty significant but it is a possibility. The Board asked if the existing parking lot off of Harrisville Main Street would be maintained or regraded and whether the adjacent tree line to the south would be eliminated. Mr. Collins stated that the existing parking lot would be regarded. In regards to the existing tree line, he pointed out that there is considerable amount of area to the property line and although some trees may be removed, sidewalks will be placed along the roadway, and a line of street trees planted to carry the design theme in from Harrisville Main Street and around the Stillwater Mill Complex. He noted that several of the property lines are questionable and that a survey will be conducted shortly to determine the correct property lines.

Mr. Collins then turned the presentation over to Scott Adams, of Edwards & Kelsey.

Mr. Adams told the Board that the proposal is for the construction of a 1,650 foot roadway, with approximately 66 parking spaces. The roadway, for this phase, would have a dead-end cul-de-sac, with a 60' radius, constructed in a manner to accept the road construction of Phase III when it takes place, with an additional 15 parking spaces without having to remove material. Grading and site drainage will be addressed during this phase of development. He noted that the significant design problems of this project were dealing with the difficult grade differential, from the beginning to the end of the roadway, with a presently elevation difference of about 13'. This results in a grade differential from one side of the proposed library building to the other of approximately four feet. He noted another area of major constraint in the underground archway. Upon further investigation it was discovered that the archway opens into a cavern approximately 20 feet wide and 10 feet tall, extending in approximately 100 feet directly under the building location, within the vicinity of where the fill material must be removed. Preliminary discussions have taken place with RIDEM as to how to handle the flood zone issue, as part of the design for this facility. He added that the conclusion reached was the cavern was probably never used in the actual calculations for determining flood zone elevations, as no one knew it was there. So what then would result in a zero impact? It was estimated that by filling in the cavern the net would be approximately 1½ inches of increase across the entire area – pretty much an insignificant amount. He stated that RIDEM has granted a favorable review – not formally submitted as of yet – but at some of the meetings they have expressed consent with the revitalization efforts. Also, the flood zone now is approximately 1 foot above the existing ground, but the existing wall along the river helps because its elevation at 326, well above a 30-year storm event to crest the wall.

In regards to the Geotechnical Report, Mr. Adams noted material located underneath the facility – fill which includes anything from the kitchen sink to rolls of wool – which would have to be excavated to about a depth of 10 feet. Some of the material will be crushed on site and reutilized as much as possible to replace any fill removed and compliment fill being brought to the site.

In regards to the roadway construction, Mr. Adams stated that the proposal will be for a closed drainage system, flowing through a Vortechnic structure to retain the suspended solids, and ending in a 50x100 foot underground leaching basin (30-36" pipes surrounded by crush stone) – more cost effective than utilizing galleys.

The Board voiced concern with the cul-de-sac, being squared, and whether it's an invitation for parking and emergency vehicles access issues. Mr. Adams said there were several ways of dealing with that issue – striping, hatching, signage. Mr. Litman also suggested bollards with an unlocked chain, which emergency vehicles could remove should they have the need to enter that area.

Continuing the presentation with the library building itself, Mr. Litman explained that the main entrance to the library begins at the curve of the proposed roadway with a ¾-view. The building consists of a series of forms – a two story form consisting of the community

center components on the ground floor and the children's library on the second floor; a one story component, containing a shed roof with clear story skylights, angled to take in the views of the waterfall with the main reading room areas and public service components of the library – circulation desk, reference desk; a two story component with a high bay, then a single story bay with the main public reading area – fiction and nonfiction, main reading tables and specialty reading spaces; and another one story component containing all of the administration functions, directly behind the stairs. To further described the interior, Mr. Litman stated that you enter through the main entrance, with an 11' to 12' high ceiling, where there is a concourse serving as the public circulation spine, connecting the Riverwalk and creating an access to the library from East Avenue. This would also allow access to the library along the Riverwalk for the seniors from the senior housing portion of the project. He stated that there would be a 117-seat large meeting room, a small meeting space for seminars with surrounding support services, with the main restroom facilities. The restroom facilities for the children are located in the second floor level, for the children's room. He noted the use of tall windows along the Riverwalk area where there are several reading areas to afford views of the waterfall and river. The use of these large windows also allows for reduction in the use of electric lighting. He noted that the children's library, being on the second floor, overlooks the main reading area. Upon entering the second floor, either by the staircase or the elevator, the first area encountered is the circulation desk, working from older readers at the front to younger readers at the back, with a parenting area that overlooks the river and waterfall. He also noted that they have planned for future expansion, for the next 20 years, if it becomes necessary at some point in the future to expand the library facility. He then offered the proposed elevation views from the East Avenue, in both directions, and the main entrance. In regards to the exterior, Mr. Litman stated that the exterior is principally brick with ground-face block, attempting to incorporate building materials most common for a former mill site. He further offered views of the interior building areas. Mr. Kravitz added that the presentation by the development team offered much more than what is required at this level of review and the master plan would have additional details.

The Board thanked the development team for an excellent presentation.

Mr. Libby returned to the meeting.

**Burrillville Self-Storage, Eleven Properties, LLC, South Main Street, Pascoag; Map 229, Lot 6:** *Request for Extension of Preliminary Plan Approval:* Referring to correspondence received from Jeffrey Hanson, of the John Caito Corporation, Mr. Partington noted that there was a request for an extension of the Preliminary Minor Land Development plan approval for the Burrillville Self-Storage proposal. *A motion to grant a one-year extension, to July 12, 2006, of the Preliminary Minor Land Development approval of the Burrillville Self-Storage plan was made by Mr. Ferreira. The motion received a second from Mr. Felice and carried unanimously by the Board.*

**VII. OTHER BUSINESS:**

**Report from Administrative Officer:**

Mr. Kravitz noted that during the month of June the following Certificates of Completeness were issued: **Narragansett Improvement Co. and Dennis R. & Nancy C. Groleau, Gazza Road & Peach Orchard Road, Mapleville** (Preliminary Minor – 5 lots); **Wolf Hill Lots for Michael & Joyce Scurka, Knibb Road, Pascoag** (Conceptual Minor RRC – 4 lots); **Donna Tansey & George Guertin, Life Estate of Louis & Shirley Guertin, Cherry Farm Road, Harrisville** (Administrative – two lots; 2<sup>nd</sup> submission); and **New Jesse Smith Library, Stillwater Complex, East Avenue, Harrisville** (Conceptual Major Land Development). There were no plans rejected as incomplete. The following plan was endorsed: **Donna Tansey & George Guertin, Life Estate of Louis & Shirley Guertin, Cherry Farm Road, Harrisville** (Administrative – 2 lots; 2<sup>nd</sup> submission).

**Planning Board Discussions:**

There were no additional items for discussion.

*A motion to adjourn was then made at 9:25 p.m. by Mr. Ferreira. The motion received a second from Mr. Lupis and carried unanimously by the Board.*