

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING OF FEBRUARY 6, 2006  
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, Bruce Ferreira, Leo Felice, Rick Lemek, Jeffrey Partington, Michael Lupis, Jim Libby, Christopher Desjardins, and Jeff Presbrey.

**Others Present:** Ron Faford, Town Council Liaison, Joseph Raymond, Building Official, Tom Kravitz, Town Planner, and Christine Langlois, Recording Secretary.

**II. ATTENDANCE REVIEW:**

The Chairman acknowledged that all members were present this evening.

**III. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES:**

The **minutes of the Planning Board meeting of January 9, 2006** were read. *A motion to accept the minutes as presented was made by Mr. Ferreira, seconded by Mr. Partington, and carried unanimously by the Board.*

**IV. CORRESPONDENCE:**

- Coastal Features Newsletter

**V. OLD BUSINESS:**

**Minor Subdivision:**

**Highland Estates, RKM Investment, LLC, Snake Hill Road, Map 198, Lot 1 and Map 197, Lot 15: Preliminary Plan Review/Public Hearing for Rural Residential Compound:** Attorney Peter Ruggiero, John Mulhearn, of RKM Investments, Kevin Moran, of DiPrete Engineering, Edward Pimentel, Planning & Zoning consultant, to represent the request. Attorney Ruggiero informed the Board that the engineer, Mr. Moran, had not yet arrived, but began discussions by stating that the plan represented a five-lot, 67-acre rural residential compound with the F-5 zoning district. He told the Board that the owner, Mr. Mulhearn, had sent out supplemental notices to abutters of the meeting, besides meeting personally with several of the abutters to explain the project. He then turned the meeting over to Edward Pimentel.

Mr. Pimentel stated that he is an urban planning professional who was hired by the applicant to review the rural residential compound proposal and determine its adherence to the requirements within the ordinance for rural residential compounds as well as to all requirements of a minor land development project. He told the Board that the property is approximately 67 acres, with an additional amount of frontage, with wetland constraints for access, along Snake Hill Road. Approximately 19.26 acres or 29% of the total land area would be defined as land suitable for development, with a good portion of the property being reserved as open space (62-64%). He noted that he had conducted an analysis of the surrounding neighborhood, which supported the fact that the proposed

development is consistent with the neighborhood. He further conducted a zoning consistency analysis as well as a land development regulations consistency analysis and found the development to be consistent with the Zoning Ordinance and fulfills the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. The Board asked whether Mr. Pimental had found any easements on the property. Mr. Pimental said that he had not conducted any easement research. Mr. Mulhearn stated that no easements were located on this property during a title search and turned the meeting back to Attorney Ruggerio.

Attorney Ruggerio, referring to a memo from the DPW Director, dated November 23, 2005, noted that in regards to item #1, the plans have been corrected to include underground utilities; in regards to item #2, he stated that this will be a private roadway and that a supplemental memo from the DPW required a street light only at the entrance from Snake Hill Road; in regards to item #3, required a correction on the plan to reference the roadway as private. In regards to bonding, he requested that a bond amount be determined this evening, if the Board felt comfortable enough to vote approval of the request, so that the applicant could have the flexibility to either bond the project, and construct the roadway prior to recording a final plan. And that the applicant be allowed to submit the final plan to the Administrative Officer and not the Planning Board. He then turned the meeting over to Kevin Moran, an engineer from DiPrete Engineering.

Mr. Moran told the Board that the proposed project is adjacent to Snake Hill Road in the east and Tarklin Road to the south. The property contains approximately 67 acres and is surrounded by wetlands to the south-southwest. Wetland edges displayed on the plan have been verified by RIDEM in 2004 as well as test holes on the site. Soil evaluations have been conducted and witnessed by the state. He explained that the property contains Canton-Charlton soils within the development area, with Walpole soil to the south. The property has three areas of frontage: one area of approximately 50 feet in the far northeast corner; another area in the central easterly portion of the site and more extensive frontage on Snake Hill Road to the southeast. Access is proposed through the 50-foot strip area as a 50-foot right-of-way with a foundation of paved and gravel portions. He explained that for a distance of about 300 feet of the proposed roadway there is a grade of 8% - which they were concerned would washout in heavy rains - so they are proposing for this portion to be paved with a chip seal surface course with the balance of the roadway area being graveled. Drainage will be a combination of open and closed - with drainage structures located at the low point, a detention pond located just to the south, near the central portion of the road and up near the five lots in the cul-de-sac. He stated that the overall plan calls for the creation of five lots in accordance with the rural residential compound ordinance - with two acres suitable on each lot. Approximately 42 acres of the property will remain as open space. The project will be serviced with private wells and ISDS systems. He noted that RIDEM has reviewed the wetlands - drainage, roadway, layout, limits of work, detention pond - receiving an insignificant alteration permit in 2004. RIDEM ISDS has reviewed and approved the subdivision for site suitability for the five lots, with an existing ISDS approval for the first lot having been

done prior to this subdivision proposal and still valid. ISDS has not been conducted for the other four lots.

Referring to the DPW Director's memo, Mr. Moran stated that the roadway will be a private roadway and was simply a typo on the plan. He explained that the project would have underground utilities and has made a correction to Sheet plan #4 General Notes to state underground utilities – electric, cable, telephone. In regards to the request for street lighting, he told the Board that in discussions with the DPW Director, it was decided that the applicant would only be required to provide street lighting on an existing pole (P1#47) on Snake Hill Road southwest of the entrance. This lighting change was corrected in the narrative report as well as the plan.

In regards to the landscaping of the project, Mr. Moran stated that a landscaping plan, included in the submission on Sheet #7, was prepared by Diane Soule, a registered landscape architect. The plan allowed for various types of plantings along the roadway (street trees) and along the RIDEM-approved limit of work area; a typical fence along a portion of the entranceway, and a wall feature along the roadway.

Mr. Ruggiero then asked Mr. Moran to discuss an encroachment problem along the roadway entrance with an abutting neighbor. Mr. Moran told the Board that while a survey was being conducted, it was discovered that an abutting neighbor's (Busse) driveway exits through this property onto Snake Hill Road where the proposed roadway is planned. He stated that they are proposing to accommodate this error by providing a tie-in from their driveway to the new roadway. Mr. Mulhearn added that he had met with Mr. Busse earlier today and discussed working out an agreement where Mr. Busse would have a more defined entrance to his driveway – once the roadway has been staked out. Mr. Moran also pointed out additional encroachments from neighboring abutters further along Snake Hill Road where there is a shared driveway and forks off to each of the properties. Mr. Ruggiero noted the applicant would be willing to grant easements to each of these properties if the Board did not have a problem with this approach. He then asked if there were any questions or comments from the Board members.

Mr. Presbrey, referencing Sheet #5, noted that test pit #5 at the detention pond had been disclaimed, probably due to high water and asked if they intended for the detention pond to remain wet. Mr. Moran stated that it was because of a high water situation, and yes it would have water, based upon the RIDEM Stormwater Design Manual requirement of one-foot separation between water table and bottom of pond, for this type of detention pond. A perimeter drain within the berm of the pond on the outside edge of the pond should provide the one-foot separation. Mr. Presbrey noted that along the roadway, the proposal includes a retain wall, which appears to be about 10-feet in height in some areas and asked if they would be boulder retaining walls or pre-cast block. Mr. Moran noted the proposal calls for two retaining walls: one boulder retaining wall and the other a Versalok type wall, with reinforcement. Mr. Presbrey suggested a guardrail to address any safety issues. Mr. Ruggiero suggested a wood-type guardrail for aesthetic reasons.

Mr. Presbrey questioned whether site distance was reviewed. Mr. Moran said that the site distance was established with the Preapplication stage and noted that the site distance was quite good in both directions. Referring to the landscape plan, Mr. Presbrey questioned the types of trees that would be preserved on Lot 1 in lieu of planting street trees. Mr. Moran stated that the site contains mainly hardwood, deciduous (oak) trees. Referring to the Profile sheet, Mr. Presbrey noted an error with the profile – the base elevation not matching. Mr. Moran said he would check it. Mr. Presbrey noted that on Sheet #10 the diameter of the catch basin detail was not provided, adding that he suggested a six-foot diameter with a hood, especially with the gravel roadway proposed. Mr. Moran said he would make the correction.

Mr. Partington questioned the grades in the area of the cul-de-sac – as the existing conditions map states that one side is at 410 and the other side is 400 – what will the base grades be when complete. Mr. Moran stated that the proposed grade would be about 402. Mr. Partington then noted the height of the proposed house for Lot 2 would be about 26-28 feet higher over a length of 60-80 feet and asked if there was any proposal for some type of retention wall. Mr. Moran stated that the proposal did not include any retaining wall in the vicinity of Lot 2, adding that it appears to be a 3-1 slope. The proposal is to just grade the area and if during construction boulders become available, then perhaps a short step wall. Mr. Partington questioned the slopes of the proposed driveways. Mr. Moran stated the driveways were at about 10%. Mr. Partington requested additional information regarding the grades, retaining walls, etc, at the next plan submission.

Mr. Ferreira suggested that the applicant considered lighting along the private road in light of the proposed grades and surface conditions of the roadway. Mr. Lemek asked if they would be providing easements for the driveways that are encroaching on the property. Mr. Ruggerio said that the applicant would be willing to do that and asked if it would be acceptable to the Board. Mr. Levesque said that would be acceptable.

As there were no further questions from the Board, the Chairman closed the regular meeting at 7:44 p.m. and opened the Public Hearing. He asked if anyone from the audience would like to speak.

Joseph Breault, of 685 Snake Hill Road, told the Board that the proposed access was like a pond and wondered how RIDEM would allow it. He then asked who would be responsible if damage to properties occurred during blasting because Snake Hill Road is all rock. Mr. Levesque informed him that the blasting isn't what happens when renovating major highways, and that there are also instruments that can be placed in a house to monitor the blasting. Mr. Felice also added that photos of the interior of adjacent buildings can be taken prior to blasting in the event of any damage. Mr. Breault questioned the location of the proposed retaining wall in comparison to his rear back porch. Mr. Moran explained the location of the wall as compared to the grades and the location when the wall is at its highest. Mr. Breault asked how close the first house of the development was to his property line. Mr. Moran estimated approximately 180 feet.

Finally, Mr. Breault asked for the square footages of the proposed homes. Mr. Mulhearn stated that the smallest house would be no less than 2,000 – 2,200 square feet.

Susan Dunham, of 680 Snake Hill Road, stated that the development received their approval from RIDEM in 2004 when it was an extremely dry year – noting that their well had gone dry in 2004. She also voiced concern with having adequate water within the aquifer for the development. Mr. Moran explained that RIDEM reviews wetlands based upon a criteria that includes vegetation and soil characteristics and having an exceptionally wet or dry year doesn't affect their review. In regards to the well issue, he noted that this development represents low density – large lots with minimal number of dwellings – and shouldn't have any impact on the aquifer. No hydrological study was conducted and the next step in the process is to test for the individual wells. Mrs. Dunham also voice displeasure on having a street light on Snake Hill Road near the entrance as the light will shine into her home. Mr. Mulhearn pointed out that the street light request came from the DPW Director. Mr. Levesque told him that he would talk with Mr. Bernardo regarding his request.

Jeffrey Walsh, of 430 Tarklin Road, asked if he would be able to see the proposed house on Lot #3 of the development from his back window. Mr. Moran stated that the house is approximately 800 feet in the woods. Mr. Walsh also noted many car accidents on Snake Hill Road near the corner due to icing problems. Mr. Moran stated that the proposal did not include any drainage improvements on Snake Hill Road and that the development would not be placing any more water onto Snake Hill Road. From the shoulder of Snake Hill, everything drains back into the site.

Ernest Smith, of 755 Snake Hill Road, also voiced concerns with the drainage.

As there were no further comments or questions from the audience, the Public Hearing was closed at 8:04 p.m. and reopened the regular Planning Board meeting.

*A motion to approve the Preliminary Minor Rural Residential Compound subdivision of Highland Estates, Snake Hill Road, was made by Mr. Partington with the conditions that:*

- *the roadway profile be checked by DiPrete Engineering including the details in regards to guardrails and lighting;*
- *subject to RIDEM approval of ISDS designs for the individual lots; and*
- *the submission of three driveway easements that address the encroachments from abutting properties on Snake Hill Road;*

*because the subdivision is consistent with the Town's Comprehensive Plan; the subdivision is in compliance with the Town's Zoning Ordinance; there will be no negative environmental impacts; the subdivision will not result in the creation of unbuildable lots; and all lots in the subdivision will have adequate and permanent physical access to a public street. The motion received a second from Mr. Ferreira and carried unanimously by the Board.*

*A motion to set the bond amount for Highland Estates in accordance with the DPW Director's memo dated January 4, 2006, at \$225,055 and inspections fees at 2% of the bond amount or \$4,500 was made by Mr. Partington, seconded by Mr. Ferreira and carried unanimously by the Board.*

## **VI. NEW BUSINESS:**

### **Major Land Development:**

**G.S. Industries, 885 South Main Street, Map 247, Lot 27: Combined Master/Preliminary Plan Review/Public Hearing for Major Land Development:** Mr. Norbert Therien, of National Surveyors-Developers, Inc., and Mr. Bert Mountford, principal, were in attendance to represent the request. Mr. Therien informed the Board that Mr. Mountford is the owner of GS Industries, located on South Main Street near the most northerly entrance of Davis Drive in the Burrillville Industrial Park. He stated that the plan before the Board this evening represented an addition to the existing structure which falls under the review guidelines of a Major Land Development. The plan displays the addition of a new loading dock next to the existing loading is located, creating an alleyway from the main structure into the new addition, proposed to be 75' x 150', utilized as a warehouse. Parking requirements will be met and remain the same. He explained that the addition will reflect the existing building in regards to exterior design and landscaping.

The Board asked what type of business was conducted there. Mr. Mountford stated that GS Industries prints labels for major companies – health & beauty aids, food industry.

The Board questioned the location of the sewer line. Mr. Therien, in reviewing the existing plan, realized that the sewer line was incorrect on the plan. He noted the sewer line currently runs from the main entrance to the building straight out to South Main Street. The proposed new sewer line will run from the new addition down to the existing line in the front of the building and out to South Main Street.

In regards to runoff, Mr. Therien told the Board that several soil evaluations, prepared by him, conducted on site as well as an on-site meeting with the DPW Director. Due to the relative high water table in this area, the proposal will allow for the use of roof leaders and underground storage facilities on site, with a shallow detention basin located in the rear southern portion of the site. In addition, the applicant will install a drainage system within Davis Drive, (no cost to the Town), and eventually discharge into the wetlands. He noted a plan prepared by Natural Resource Service Inc. illustrating the discharge and that Natural Resource Services also flagged existing wetlands on an abutting property owned by Daniele Proscuitto. He added that a letter of commitment from Proscuitto indicating that GS Industries has the ability to enter the property and to utilize it for a proposed drainage system to handle the increase runoff of the site as well as eliminating an existing drainage problem on Davis Drive. A RIDEM application will be required for

discharging into the wetlands. He also noted a drainage problem on the northerly side of the property, nearest the new addition, with an abutting neighbor. He said that surface swales to carry any runoff from this area into the detention pond are proposed

Mr. Therien also noted that because the property is located in the GI zoning district, the maximum building coverage requirement of this zone is 25%. With the existing building and the proposed addition the building coverage will be approximately 34.13% - exceeding the 25% maximum coverage. He stated that the plan would require a variance from the Zoning Board and asked for a favorable advisory from the Board, should they choose to approve the plan tonight. He noted that no other facilities would be required and no additional access to the property would be required.

Mr. Lupis asked if the addition would require the hiring of additional employees. Mr. Mountford stated that if additional help is need, it would be at a minimal. It is primarily warehouse and wouldn't require too many employees. Mr. Lupis added that he was really making sure there was adequate parking. Mr. Therien stated that the current parking is adequate for present and future use. Mr. Levesque asked for the certified mailing green cards as evidence of the abutters' notification. Mr. Therien could not locate them and promised to bring them to the Planning Department tomorrow. Mr. Levesque asked why the drainage calculations had not been submitted with the review package. Mr. Therien stated that they are aware of having to submit drainage calculations to RIDEM and the Town's DPW.

As there were no further questions, Mr. Levesque closed the regular meeting and opened the Public Hearing at 8:28 p.m.

As there were no questions or comments from the audience, Mr. Levesque closed the Public Hearing at 8:29 p.m. and reopened the regular meeting.

*A motion to approve the Master/Preliminary Major Land Development plan for GS Industries was made by Mr. Partington, and to forward a favorable recommendation to the Zoning Board in regards to granting a dimensional variance in regards to lot coverage, pending the receipt of the certified return receipts for all abutters, drainage calculations and wetlands permit from RIDEM. In accordance with Section 45-23-60, the land development is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; the land development is in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance pending receipt of the zoning variance from the Zoning Board; pending receipt of the drainage calculations and wetlands permit from RIDEM, there will be no negative environmental impacts; the land development will not result in the creation of unbuildable lots; and the land development will have permanent, physical access to a public street. The motion received a second from Mr. Ferreira and carried unanimously by the Board.*

**Nason Mill Landings, LDD Enterprises, 770 Douglas Pike; Map 114, Lot 16: Preapplication for Major Land Development:** Mr. Don Leighton, of Gates-Leighton Associates, Mr. Rick Dearing, Mr. Dennis Darveau, and Mr. Jeff Lambert, of LDD Enterprises, LLC, Mr. George Gagnon, of O’Hearne Associates, and Mr. Joseph Delsesto, of Fuss & O’Neill, were in attendance for review of the Preapplication plan. Mr. Leighton stated that they wished to share their vision, worked on over the last year, for the former Turex mill building. He noted that there are still a number of issues to resolve – utilities, finding a use, number of variances needed for the plan before the Board tonight. He turned the meeting over to Mr. Dearing to offer a history of the site.

Mr. Dearing stated that the property was originally developed in 1825 by Leonard Nason, by constructing a short mill to manufacture axes and hoes, as well as a small residence for himself. In 1829 he purchased additional land and expanded the mill and constructed six dwelling units for employees of his mill. In 1858, Mr. Nason went bankrupt and sold the building to John Ashworth. In 1861, the mill received a contract from the government to provide bayonets for the Civil War, and supplied these bayonets from 1861 to 1865. In 1871, the wooden mill burned down. In 1881 the property was purchased by Horace Kimball, rebuilt and began manufacture woolens and cashmeres. Another fire occurred in 1882 and Mr. Kimball rebuilt the mill as it is today in the fall of 1882. Mr. Dearing noted that the last owner of the property was a division of Turex Plastics, who produced plastics and sold to Suran Wrap, and sandwich bag manufacturers. The property was vacated as of April 2005. Noting that they are all local individuals, he stated the property is viewed as the “calling card” to the entry into Burrillville along Route 102 and that they want to see a magnificent place that the Town would be proud of and are not afraid to put money into this project. He then turned the meeting back over to Mr. Leighton.

Mr. Leighton then provided handout materials to the Board:

- 11x17 colored Conceptual Perspective
- 11x17 colored Existing Conditions (2)
- 11x17 colored View of Carriage House Units
- 11x17 colored Historic Archive Photo Board
- 11x17 colored Nason Mill Landings Floor Plan
- 11x17 colored Aerial Photograph
- 11x17 Site Plan
- 11x17 Grading & Utility Plan.

Referring to the Conceptual Perspective, Mr. Leighton stated that the intent is to take the mill building, which has approximately 55,000 square feet, and create 29 units of mid- to high-end housing. The site is bordered on the west side by 750 feet of the Branch River, offering spectacular river views. The plan also proposes additional buildings providing 7 more units, for a total of 36 units.

Referring to the two Existing Conditions sheets, Mr. Leighton told the Board that in the late summer, a photographer, with a boom truck, was hired to take the photos of the property to obtain comprehensive views of the entire property. This also enabled the developers to view the property as seen from Route 102. He noted that the blue silos are half gone and will be totally removed shortly. Considerable work has taken place to clean up the site.

Referring to the View of Carriage House Units, Mr. Leighton noted that the handout represents an enlargement of the most southern half of the site and their intent to provide four additional buildings for the 7 additional units. Based on the property's history, these additional buildings would be placed where the original residences of the mill owner had been built. He noted that during various excavations, evidence of foundations was located in this area. Based upon the location of these old foundations, he added that the proposed new buildings would be placed where the former buildings were, fairly close to the street. He stated that the intent of the proposed plan is to change the character dramatically to create a strong residential street edge.

Referring to the Architectural Footprints for the 36 proposed units, Mr. Leighton stated that the units consist of 12 flats (in green), 17 townhouses (in red) and 7 loft units/garages (in blue). He then turned the meeting over to Mr. Gagnon. Mr. Gagnon reiterated Mr. Leighton's comments in regards to the numbers and types of units. He provided additional info in regards to the square footage of the proposed units. He offered the following:

- Green units would be one- and two-bedroom units; one-bedroom units would contain 1,520 sq/ft; two-bedroom units would contain 1,920 sq/ft;
- Red units 11 & 12, 16-22 would contain 1,820 sq/ft, with the exception of Unit #11 which is adjacent to the pedestrian pass-through;
- Red units 13-15 have a penthouse loft, with a deck overlooking the Branch River and would contain 2,260 sq/ft;
- Red units 23 & 24 would be two level, with three-bedrooms, would contain 2,470 sq/ft;
- Red units 25 & 26 would be one level with approximately 1,400 sq/ft;
- Red units 27, 28 & 29 would be two levels, two bedrooms, and would contain between 1,640 and 2,700 sq/ft;
- The business space along Douglas Pike would contain approximately 640 sq/ft; the indoor pool, for the residents, would contain 1,840 sq/ft, and have the pool level with an existing upper level to be used for poolside seating;
- Blue Carriage House units would contain 1,020 sq/ft and have with two-bedrooms and two car garages.

Referring to the Site Plan, Mr. Leighton stated that the property is bounded by Route 102 to the North, Douglas Pike to the East and South, and the Branch River to the West. He noted that the mill structure was left in excellent, clean condition. The one-story portion to the South will be used to the flats, the two-story portion will be used for the townhouses, a small office use (right up at the street), and the two-story portion, where the boiler units were located, will be used for a pool/fitness center. He noted the water tower, located on the northeast corner of the site, would remain, as it is structurally sound, and use as a landmark to the site. It also is the entrance point to the existing curb opening for a small parking lot, providing access to the units in the north. The major parking lot would have a new curb opening to bring traffic into the main parking behind the proposed new units, allowing the parking to be within the interior of the complex. It regards to the number of parking spaces, he told the Board that they are allowing for two vehicles per unit, or 72 parking spaces, with a provision of 84 parking spaces, in order to accommodate the small office use and visitor parking at both locations. There will be a control gated entry with parking spaces outside the fencing for additional spaces or for turnarounds. He noted that they are also trying to provide circulation for the fire department, which currently enters the site to access the Branch River, under the bridge for Route 102, for two of their pumper trucks. The proposed design would serve to ease and extend the fire trucks access.

Mr. Leighton noted a major issue the developers had to deal with was the sluiceway or tailrace and headrace. The headrace begins just above the bridge and comes into the site, a portion which has been filled in over the years, continuing through the building, which any remaining open areas will be filled in by the developers. The tailrace continues off the site and is still active today because of the Branch River's breaching onto another property and entering the tailrace as it exist the site. It continues on over, several other properties, before it enters the Branch River again. It serves as an active outsource for drainage for this site as well as other properties along the East side.

In summary, Mr. Leighton stated that based upon the research conducted, the developers feel that the residential component is the best fit for this structure. He noted that because the property is currently zoned Limited Industrial (LI), the developers realize they would have to request a zone change (to Village Commercial VC), as well as various other zoning relief (site currently occupies 45% of impervious surface – regulations require 40%; proposed carriage house buildings only 16 feet from property line – regulations require setback of 40 feet). He then turned the meeting over to Mr. Delsesto to discuss utilities and drainage issues.

Mr. Delsesto told the Board that the developers are hoping to connect into the Town's sewer system, as it is proposed to extend down Douglas Pike in the near future. He noted a substantial review process and that the public sewers will probably be in place by the time this project receives its approvals. He noted a situation with locating water and that hydro-testing will be necessary, adding that they would be approaching the Department of Health for a community well. In regards to drainage, the developers are proposing to

capture stormwater with an UIC system and there will be no increase in peak flow. He noted a comment from the DPW Director in regards to an outflow exiting onto an adjacent property and added that further investigations will be conducted to see if there is an existing easement for such a purpose. He noted that the developers have looked into extending the natural gas line to the development as utilizing propane gas in tanks was not an option. He pointed out that the project would have to be reviewed by RIDEM for a freshwater wetlands permit (outleting drainage into a wetland); RIDOT for a physical alteration permit; RIDOH for well issues. The Board asked if there was another option if sewers were not available. Mr. Delsesto said that an alternative plan was to utilize an existing septic system on site – but had to check into its current size, what it could handle, and is there room for an additional septic system in that location. The soils are pretty good in this area.

The Board asked how they had arrived at 84 parking spaces. Mr. Delsesto said they included the parking within the garages with one space outside. The Board questioned parking for all the units in the mill building. Mr. Delsesto said that they were still in the process of working that out. Mr. Leighton pointed out that the parking would be designated and if someone parked in another person's spot, they probably would hear about it. The Board suggested a canopy over the walkway for resident having to walk a distance to get to their homes. They voiced concern with the amount of parking surface as compared to green area for any children and residents of the development. The developers pointed out small deck spaces with each of the carriage house units as well a small amount of green space on the street-side of the buildings.

The Board voiced concern with not being able to attract businesses to the site instead creating residential units. Mr. Darveau outlined his efforts to attract businesses over the past year and the fact that the demographics were not great enough for these businesses to relocate, as well as traffic counts. Mr. Leighton offered the Board members an opportunity to conduct a site walk of the property to verify first hand the information provided at the meeting this evening.

The Board asked if the tower would be functional or just for aesthetics. Mr. Darveau stated that it was just for aesthetics. The Board suggested utilizing the tower for water should the developers not be able to receive approval for a community well. Mr. Darveau stated that the tower, although in good condition, was not functional. He noted a meeting with the Nasonville Fire Marshall in which it was noted that there are currently four hydrants on property, which are pump-driven. When the sprinkler system is activated, the hydrants are active. The headwall before the dam feeds a 24-inch concrete pipe that feeds the sprinkler system. When the sprinkler room is dismantled, they are proposing to convert the fire hydrants to constant pressure hydrants, and also install additional hydrants to assist the fire department.

The Board pointed out that this proposal did not appear to address the Town's requirement for affordable housing. Mr. Delsesto stated that at a minimum they could try

to pursue the 10% and asked if they would be able to increase the density should they provide affordable units. The Board responded that the plan already shows an increase in density. Mr. Kravitz added that density bonuses are only allowed in the Village Planned Development (VPD) districts; otherwise there is a requirement of 20% for each new development.

The Board asked if any environmental testing has taken place on the property. Mr. Darveau stated that Phase I and Phase II Environmentals were conducted as recent as 1999 and 2000. He noted that they are in the process of removing two UIC's, which have been pumped, cleaned and hazardous waste removed offsite. The closure permit has been submitted to the State in order to remove the tanks. The rest of the site is clean. Once the tanks are removed, a new Phase I will be conducted and are confident that everything will be clean.

The Board suggested sidewalks along Route 7 to provide a cityscape effect and encourage development in the future. The Board asked if there were basements to these units. Mr. Darveau stated concrete slabs with the exception of one piece in the main building. The Board then asked if the heating/cooling would be rooftop. Mr. Darveau said the a/c would be rooftop - the heating would be interior, possibly natural gas or propane. The Board questioned the flood plain elevation from the river and how it relates to the floor elevation in the building, adding that FEMA usually prohibits residential units within the flood plain and requires waterproof/watertight all windows. Because most of this is a one-story building, there is less flexibility to place the residential uses on the second or third floors. Mr. Delsesto noted that the property is located with the Flood Zone B, between a 100-year and 500-year flood zone and that they would check to see what regulations apply.

The Board asked if this property was listed on the State list of Historical Mill Structures. Mr. Darveau said it was not. The Board noted that although the Town does not have stringent regulations regarding historic preservation, they hoped that the developer would follow proper historic measures in accordance with the state standards.

Mr. Kravitz suggested the applicant, when applying for a zone change, should seek a rezoning to R-12.

## **VII. OTHER BUSINESS:**

### **Report from Administrative Officer:**

Mr. Kravitz noted that during the month of January Certificates of Completeness were issued for: **Ronald Soroka, Doe Crossing Drive, Pascoag** (Administrative - two lots); **Dorothy Valent Estates, Barbero & McIntosh Development, Inc., West Road, Harrisville** (Administrative – Boundary Survey); **G.S. Industries, South Main Street, Pascoag** (Master/Preliminary Major Land Development); **Nason Mill Landings, LDD Enterprises, LLC, Douglas Pike, Nasonville** (Conceptual Major Land Development); and **Town of Burrillville, Stillwater Mill Complex, Clocktower Building, Harrisville**

**Main Street, Harrisville** (Administrative – Boundary Survey). There were no plans rejected as incomplete. The Administrative Officer endorsed the **Ronald Soroka, Doe Crossing Drive, Pascoag** (Administrative – two lots) plan.

**Planning Board Discussions:**

**Discussion of Acceptance of Town Zoning Map:** Mr. Kravitz told the Board that he had prepared an updated zoning map that included all zoning changes that have occurred since the Council had officially approved the 1995 Zoning Map. *A motion to accept an updated version of the Town's Zoning Map, which includes all zoning changes since the Council approved 1995 Zoning Map, and to forward a favorable recommendation to the Council for its acceptance was made by Mr. Ferreira. The motion received a second from Mr. Presbrey and carried unanimously by the Board.*

**Continued Discussion of Possible Rezoning of Lots Surrounding the Town's Waterbodies:** Due to the late hour, the Chairman suggested that this item be placed on the Planning Board's agenda for March 6, 2006 to continue the discussion.

*At this time, a motion to adjourn was then made at 9:50 p.m. by Mr. Ferreira. The motion received a second from Mr. Lupis and carried unanimously by the Board.*