MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING OF MAY 1, 2006
SUBJECT TO APPROVAL AT THE NEXT REGULAR MEETING

I. CALL TO ORDER:

Meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m., Jeffrey Partington, Vice-Chairman, presiding.

Members Present: Jeffrey Partington, Bruce Ferreira, Leo Felice, Michael Lupis, Jim Libby, and Jeff Presbrey.

Members Absent: Ray Levesque, Christopher Desjardins, and Rick Lemek.

Others Present: Ray Cloutier, Zoning Board Chairman, Tom Kravitz, Town Planner, and Christine Langlois, Recording Secretary.

II. ATTENDANCE REVIEW:

The Vice-Chairman acknowledged that three members were absent and excused from the meeting.

III. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES:

The **minutes of the Planning Board meeting of April 3, 2006** 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:

- Notice from the Uxbridge Planning Board in regards to a hearing for Trans-Canada Marketing
- Notice of Insignificant Alterations to Wetlands from RIDEM
- Planning Commissioner's Journal

V. OLD BUSINESS:

Minor Subdivision:

Edmund & Annette Delmonico, Nichols Road, Nasonville; Map 185, Lot 15: ***Submission of Information Required as Conditions of Preliminary Minor RRC Plan Approval:*** Mr. Partington read into the record correspondence received from Attorney Thomas Hefner, the Delmonico's lawyer, dated April 25, 2006, requesting a continuance to next month's Planning Board meeting due to the family still in mourning over the death of Mr. Delmonico. *A motion to continue the submission of information required as conditions of the Preliminary Minor RRC plan approval for Edmund & Annette Delmonico to the June 5, 2006 Planning Board meeting was made by Mr. Ferreira, seconded by Mr. Presbrey and carried unanimously by the Board.*

VI. NEW BUSINESS:

Consider & Act upon Downtown Pascoag Redevelopment Plan & Ordinances: Mr. Kravitz informed the Board that the Downtown Pascoag Redevelopment Plan &

Ordinances is a result of the Burrillville Redevelopment Agency's effort for revitalization of the Pascoag Redevelopment Area –A. He referenced a list of general goals that were suggested during the Burrillville Redevelopment Agency's solicitation of public input during their public hearings for the Redevelopment of Pascoag. In particular he referenced the "triangle area" in Pascoag, where South Main Street, High Street, Sayles Avenue and Pascoag Main Street converge, noting that the plan is proposing to reduce the amount of land required to streamline traffic turning from Sayles Avenue towards High Street and improving movement through that intersection. He noted that the Plan & Ordinances would be forwarded to the Town Council for a public hearing and acceptance. *A motion to forward a favorable recommendation to the Town Council for acceptance of the Downtown Pascoag Redevelopment Plan & Ordinances was made by Mr. Ferreira because the plan is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, specifically Chapter V – Housing & Affordable Housing Strategy Policy V.1.f, Implementation Action V.1.f.1; Chapter VI – Circulation Goal VI.1, Policy VI.1.d, Implementation Actions VI.1.d.3 and VI.1.i.1; Chapter VII – Economic Development Implementation Actions VII.1.a.10 and VII.1.a.11; Chapter IX – Land Use Policy IX.1.a; Goal IX.2, Implementation Actions IX.2.b.1, IX.2.b.3, IX.2.d.3, IX.2.d.4, IX.2.d.5, IX.2.d.6; Policy IX.2.e and Implementation Action IX.2.e.2. The motion received a second from Mr. Felice and carried unanimously by the Board.*

At this point, Mr. Felice recused from discussions on the next item.

Subdivision:
Hill Farm Estates, Barbero and McIntosh, West Road, Harrisville; Map 72, Lot 11 & 12; Map 73, Lot 1 & 3: ***Conceptual Minor Plan Review:*** Mr. William McIntosh, principal, and Ms. Elizabeth McKenzie, of EMAC Engineers, were in attendance to represent the request. Mr. McIntosh told the Board that he is the owner of the Map 72 Lots 11 & 12 and Map 73, Lots 1 & 3, and that it is his intention to develop the property, which is approximately 54 acres, as a five-lot rural residential compound, utilizing 50 feet of frontage on West Road as the access. He noted that engineering studies have been completed to minimize impacts to the land, and create a nice environment for families who will live in the RRC. He added that he currently resides in the house on the right hand corner of Map 72 Lot 12 and would be there to oversee construction of the buildings, as well as be a member of the homeowner's association for the compound. He stated that they were able to receive permission from Duke-Algonquin Energy to cross the existing gas pipeline on the property.

The Board noted a memo from the DPW regarding a review of the plan and asked if Mr. McIntosh had received a copy. He stated that he had not. The Board suggested providing him a copy of the memo so that he and his engineer could address the DPW's concerns, adding that the DPW had reviewed the plan based upon a Preliminary Plan review and that the memo could help when Mr. McIntosh was ready to submit his preliminary plan. Mr. McIntosh told the Board that he was looking to model this RRC after the Crestwood Estates RRC located further down on West Road. The Board questioned the road access over the pipeline and Duke Energy's permission to create a

roadway over the pipeline. Ms. McKenzie stated that Duke Energy has provided written permission as well as an easement for access over their pipeline easement for the RRC. The Board questioned any safety concerns for the gas pipeline. Ms. McKenzie said that Duke has not raised any safety concerns in regards to proximity of houses to the gas pipeline. She noted that test pits were dug by the energy company to determine the depth of the gas pipeline, which was determined to be 2' to 3' below grade, requesting that the developer provide 4' to 5' of coverage for the roadway. She also added that they would have to determine how the electrical utilities would cross the gas pipeline, noting that Mr. McIntosh preferred underground. Mr. McIntosh noted that two risers have been requested within the crossing area, noting that an engineer will be on sight while the roadway construction takes place in that area.

Noting that the RRC ordinance allows for a minimum of 50-feet for frontage, and that proposed Lot 2 would literally have no frontage and access over a major utility company easement, the Board suggested that the lot line between Lot 2 & 3 be reconfigured to allow frontage for Lot 2. Mr. McIntosh stated that he owns a small strip of property within the pipeline easement (approximately 70 feet along the easement) that is being used for the driveway access to Lot 2. The Board noted that they would prefer Lot 2 have some form of frontage. The Board questioned access to the RRC through the existing lot on West Road. Ms. McKenzie stated that when the plan was submitted, the final boundary survey had not been completed. By the next level of submission the plan should reflect a street access with the existing house having access from the proposed roadway. The Board noted that the narrative stated that the general maximum slope for the driveways was from 8 to 12% and that the Board preferred the same grade as the roadway, which is 8%. The Board voiced concerned with the length of the driveways in regards to emergency vehicles. The Board asked if Mr. McIntosh was considering underground utilities. Mr. McIntosh stated that the Pascoag Utility District would like to come in from West Road at Pole #13, underground to Mr. McIntosh's current house, then underground to the pipeline to two risers above the pipeline, then underground back to the proposed houses. The Board suggested that a written waiver be submitted with the Preliminary submission requesting a waiver from the regulations on underground utilities because part of the utilities will be aboveground.

Ms. McKenzie, noting that they are awaiting the site suitability application approval from the State as well as accommodating the Board's comments this evening, verbally requested, and would follow up with a written request, that the applicant be allowed to combine the Preliminary and Final plan submissions The Board felt that if the applicant can obtain all of the necessary information that is required for both levels of submission, and could meet the notification requirements, they did not have a problem with the applicant combining the review levels.

Mr. Felice returned to the meeting.

Land Development:

G.S. Industries, South Main Street, Pascoag; Map 247, Lot 27: ***Final Minor Plan Review:*** Mr. Norbert Therien, of National Surveyors-Developers, Inc., and Mr. Bert Mountford, owner of G.S. Industries, were in attendance to represent the request. Mr. Therien began by stating that the Planning Board had reviewed and approved the Preliminary plan for this minor land development several months ago as well as offered an advisory opinion to Zoning for this development, in particular the proposed addition exceeding the 25% building coverage requirement (the new addition bringing the building up to 34%). He noted that during that review, the Board had seen drainage plans for the development that allowed for drainage to run along Davis Drive and eventually discharge into a neighboring property's wetland. Permission had been obtained from the property owner to allow for the drainage to flow over their property. This plan had been prepared by Joseph Casali, of Casali Engineering, and had been approved by Richard Bernardo, DPW director. Mr. Therien then stated that upon further review of the drainage plans, Mr. Casali and Mr. Bernardo determined that a detention pond on G.S. Industries' property would better serve the development and be maintained by the property owner. The plans before the Board tonight represent the change in the drainage. Mr. Therien also noted that the Zoning Board had unanimously granted the variance from the building coverage requirement.

The Board questioned the new addition's elevation being higher than the existing building. Mr. Therien stated that the new addition was at the same elevation as the existing building – it was just a typo on the plan. The Board questioned maintenance of the detention pond. Mr. Therien stated that the detention pond would be located on the G.S. Industries property and would be solely maintained by G.S. Industries.

As there were no further questions from the Board, *a motion to approve the Final Minor Land Development plan for G.S. Industries was made by Mr. Ferreira because the land development is consistent with the Town's Comprehensive Plan, specifically Chapter VII – Economic Development Goal VII.1, Policy VII.1.a and Implementation Actions VII.1.a.4 and VII.2.a.1; the land development is consistent with the Town's Zoning Ordinance by the granting of the building coverage variance by the Zoning Board on April 11, 2006; the land development will not have any negative environmental impacts; the land development will not result in the creation of any unbuildable lot; and the land development has adequate and permanent physical access to a public street; conditioned upon Mr. Therien correcting the typo on the new addition's elevation. The motion received a second from Mr. Libby and carried unanimously by the Board.*

Harrisville Village, Steere Farm Road & Mowry Street, Harrisville; Map 160, Lot 34: ***Minor Change to Preliminary Major Plan:*** Mr. Mark Bard, of Harrisville Village LLC, was in attendance to request the minor change to Buildings 8 & 9 of Harrisville Village. He stated that the original plan showed Buildings 8 & 9 as three unit-buildings with detached garages. Based upon market responses, the drafting of the condominium documents and further review of the proposed buildings, he stated that the detached garages wouldn't sell because individuals would not be willing to walk from the garages to their homes. He stated that they were proposing to construct the three-unit buildings

with attached garages as outlined in the original plan as Building #1. All elevations would remain the same. He added that these two buildings are the only buildings that have the detached garages. He also noted that a good deal of fill would be needed in order to build the detached garages in the proposed locations. Several Board members did not have a problem with changing to attached garages, while several others felt that the original design was meant to promote a walking environment to this project. They also noted that the original buildings 8 & 9 design was a break in the repetition of buildings. Mr. Bard noted that each of the buildings offered some different detail which did not appear as repetition. The Board noted that if they did allow for a change, they would like to see a variation from the other buildings (dormer combination, different porches). The Board suggested swapping the buildings to allow for a single, common driveway going to four of the garages, and utilizing existing driveways for the single garages, thereby limiting the amount of asphalt. Mr. Bard said that he was not opposed to that suggestion. The Board also suggested changing from two three-unit buildings to three two-unit buildings. Mr. Bard told them that he had received his variance from the Zoning Board based upon 21-buildings with 67 units. If he changed the number of buildings, he would have to go before the Zoning Board again. For the benefit of the Board, Mr. Kravitz stated that Gates, Leighton, the architectural firm for Harrisville Village, had previously submitted a photo inventory of the neighborhood, with several buildings having detached garages – typical of the 1920's and 1930's – and tried to replicate that style. He also noted that this site planning technique is suppose to find ways to give people exercise when they may not really realize it and still buy into it because they like it. The gang mailboxes may do that – these detached garages might have done that. This change does add curb cuts, but the change also looses the dynamics of smaller outbuildings in position with the larger buildings.

As there were no further comments from the Board, *a motion to approve the plan to change Buildings 8 & 9 as three-unit buildings with detached garages to three-unit buildings with attached garages, as presented, was made by Mr. Felice. The motion received a second from Mr. Ferreira. Under discussions it was requested the applicant provide architectural drawings to distinguish from the other buildings to the Town Planner. Mr. Felice amended his motion to require architectural drawings be submitted to the Planner. The amended motion was seconded by Mr. Ferreira. Under additional discussions it was requested that Mr. Libby be given the opportunity to review the architectural drawings because of his expertise as an architect. Mr. Felice further amended his motion to state that the Town Planner or his designee would review architectural drawings prior to endorsing the changes to Building #8 & #9. The amendment was again seconded by Mr. Ferreira and carried with five in favor (Felice, Ferreira, Partington, Lupis and Libby) and one opposed (Presbrey). The original amended motion then carried with five in favor (Felice, Ferreira, Partington, Lupis and Libby) and one opposed (Presbrey).*

VII. OTHER BUSINESS:
Report from Administrative Officer:

Mr. Kravitz noted that during the month of April, Certificates of Completeness were issued for: **Thomas & Christine Rambacher and Jack L. & Lisa M. Blum, Hill Road, Pascoag** (Administrative – two lots); **Lucien Benoit, Douglas Pike & Victory Highway, Nasonville** (Administrative – Boundary Survey); **Hill Farm Estates, Barbero and McIntosh, West Road, Harrisville** (Preapplication Minor Subdivision RRC – 5 lots); **G.S. Industries, South Main Street, Pascoag** (Final Minor Land Development); and **Harrisville Village, Steere Farm Road & Mowry Street, Harrisville** (Minor Change to Preliminary Major Land Development –Buildings 8 & 9). There were no plans rejected as incomplete. The Administrative Officer endorsed the following plans: **Thomas & Christine Rambacher and Jack L. & Lisa M. Blum, Hill Road, Pascoag** (Administrative – two lots) and **Lucien Benoit, Douglas Pike & Victory Highway, Nasonville** (Administrative – Boundary Survey.

Planning Board Discussions: The Board had nothing further to discuss.

At this time, *a motion to adjourn was then made at 8:25 p.m. by Mr. Ferreira. The motion received a second from Mr. Libby and carried unanimously by the Board.*