

## **LINCOLN PLANNING BOARD**

**APPROVED**

**MAY 24, 2017**

**The regular meeting of the Planning Board was held May 24, 2017. This meeting was at the Lincoln Town Hall, 100 Old River Road, Lincoln, Rhode Island. Chairman Bostic called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. The following members were present Ken Bostic, William Murphy, Jeffrey DelGrande, John Hunt, Mike Reilly, and Gerald Olean. Member Jeffrey Almond was absent.**

**Also in attendance were Town Planner Al Ranaldi and Town Engineer Leslie Quish and Town Solicitor Anthony DeSisto. Elizabeth Gagnon kept the minutes. Quorum met.**

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

**Chairman Bostic reminded members that the consent agenda is normally voted on in total unless a member motions to remove an item. Motion was made by Member Olean; second by Member Reilly accept the Consent Agenda as presented. Motion was approved by all members present.**

**Member Olean rescues himself from Item #4 on the agenda: Minor Subdivision Review, Cobble Hill Subdivision due to a business relationship with the Surveyor.**

## **Minor Subdivision Review**

**a. Cobble Hill Subdivision                      AP 15 Lot 30, 31 & AP 19 Lot 129**

**Preliminary Plan Discussion/**

**- Howard R. Smart Trustee Etals                      Cobble Hill Road**

**Approval**

**Town Planner Ranaldi: This is a Minor Subdivision. It is under the 2016 Subdivision Regulations. It represents the subdivision of one lot into three residential lots and the reconfiguration of two existing lots. It looks confusing but it is really not. There are three (3) existing lots. They are shifting property lines around to accommodate one (1) lot being subdivided into three (3) lots. The original lot would be getting two more buildable lots on Cobble Hill Road. There are no waivers, no subdivision waivers and no zoning requirements. They meet all of the zoning requirements for that area. The utilities for the new lots are located within Cobble Hill Road. The utilities for the existing houses obviously are connected. There is one thing that we did see when we were out in the field and that is a shallow area in front of the new proposed lots that hold the storm water. And when whoever buys these lots and develops them we would then be looking to make sure the grading is correct to eliminate that problem. It goes on public property and private property so we would be addressing at the building permit stage for whichever lot comes in first and followed by the second lot. The TRC reviewed everything and it meets all of our regulations so we recommend approval of the**

**Preliminary Plan and approval of the final plan with the following conditions:**

- 1. The existing garage on AP15 Lot 30 shall be removed or demolished before the Final Plan is approved and recorded. The appropriate permit will be required by the Building Inspector's office.**
- 2. The applicant shall demarcate the new property lines as displayed on the submitted plans.**
- 3. A note be placed on the recorded plan stating, "During the building permit review state, the Department of Public Works will review the proposed grading plan of the lots and the corresponding house and driveway to ensure that the existing low spot along the roadway where road drainage collects is addressed."**

**Attorney John Sherkarchi: Attorney John Sherkarchi for the applicants. Two abutters consented to the application. When we first started the project it was a little complicated. We reduced it down to what Steve did. It is pretty simple. A few parcels will be moved around and two new lots will be created on Cobble Hill Road. The applicants are aware of the TRC recommendations. We are more than happy to abide by those conditions. Randall Lane is historically got a little odd street it doesn't really exist. The sign is not there. This is a nice opportunity to clean up some bad situations as far as access. For thirty or forty years no one has really knows for sure that the water lines and the sewer lines come from these properties to feed Lladnar Drive. So Public Works, water department, sewer department had discussion clean it up and reaffirm some easements. One of the**

main reasons we switched some of the property was to avoid having to go to Major Subdivision. The owners are here is you have any questions.

Member DelGrande: Do the lines go through the property now or are you unsure? Attorney Shekarchi: They go through now but they are very vague and one doesn't even exist. We want to reaffirm that.

Chairman Bostic: Does anybody else have any questions? Solicitor

DeSisto: And Al recommended that the final be handled administratively. Member Reilly makes a motion to approval the Preliminary Plan, second by Member Hunt. Motion approved by all members present. Motion by Member Reilly makes a motion to approve the final plan with the following conditions and delegate final plan approval to the Administrative Officer, second by Member Murphy. Motion approved by all members present.

### **Major Subdivision Review**

a. 304 New River Road

AP35 Lot 132 & 133

Preliminary Plan Discussion/

-Mark Donfrancesco

304 New River Road

Approval

Town Planner Ranaldi: This application is under the 2005 Subdivision Regulations. They are in front of the Board at Preliminary Plan stage. It is a major land development. It represents the combination and redevelopment of two (2) residential lots into a

seventeen (17) unit apartment building with associated parking and stormwater management. Six of the units will be restricted as affordable units. The property received approval from the Town Council in July 2015 to abandon the abutting right of way which was Central Street and Avenue D. The areas that made up the right of way were divided between the abutting property owners. On October 4, 2016 the application received a dimensional variance for the lot width.

On May 16, 2017 the application was certified as Complete. The Board has one hundred and twenty days (120) or up to September 13, 2017 to make a decision. If the Board remembers this application is redeveloping two lots there were some pretty old houses that were removed combining those two lots, abandoning the right of way and developing this as an apartment building basically across the street from Northern Elementary. The building would be closest to New River Road and behind it would be an apartment building. It is impervious parking material. One of the things that came up at Master Plan was concern about the drop and pick up the kids at the school. And one of the things that we saw was that the existing neighbor was parking in front. The applicant is proposing to add a parking area so that those cars would be taken off of the road and pretty much open up that area as much possible to increase visibility lines for this project and for the existing situation. They received the dimensional variance that they needed and also a Special Use Permit for multi-family units. The public utilities are available on New River Road. Wetlands and stormwater was being addressed. They meet the parking requirements and traffic we just spoke about. One of the

things that we are looking to see happen sooner than later is other than the condition abandonment of the streets is that they move forward with abandoning them and coming in with administrative subdivision. We would like to see that happen as soon as possible. It actually makes the project actually be what they presented here. It is not big deal but we would like to have that happen sooner than later. Based on the TRC's review we recommend that the application proceed to a Public Hearing in June.

Member Olean: What determines what subdivision regulation this go under? Town Planner Ranaldi: The date that it is filed. Member Olean: Not the date that it is complete? Town Planner Ranaldi: Certified as complete. Member Olean: In other words this was certified as complete on May 16th. I just want to make sure that the math turns out right here. We have been working on this a long time. When it is Certification of Completion then it should be under the 2016 Regulations. Town Planner Ranaldi: If it came in now it came in under Master Plan that is when the 2005 Regulations were in existence. Member Olean: The Master Plan filing not Certificate of Complete. Solicitor DeSisto: No the Certificate of Completeness in the Master Plan. When the Master Plan application is filed that is the entire application through the entire process, Preliminary and Final also. Member Olean: When is it filed not when it is complete? Solicitor DeSisto: When it is certified as complete at the Master Plan level. Member Olean: I am just confused with the wording because over here it says on May 16th the project received a Certificate of

**Completeness. Solicitor DeSisto: The Preliminary Plan application was certified as complete. Member Olean: Ok the Preliminary Plan but not the Master Plan? Solicitor DeSisto: The Master Plan was certified as complete back then and that is the Regulations it covers. Member Olean: I just wanted to make sure the numbers were right that's all.**

**Member DelGrande: I have a quick question for AI. You said on the abandonment of the street and the corresponding administrative subdivision, you tried to move that along what would help that.**

**Member DelGrande: I think the applicant can address that. It is nothing that the Board has to deal with? Town Planner Ranaldi: We**

**would like it to happen sooner rather than later. We encourage the applicant to get it sooner than later. William Bernstein: I am**

**representing the applicant to answer that question. The subdivision will be filed forthwith we are just waiting to address the TRC concerns**

**but it is ready and will file that sooner rather than later. Any other questions I here to answer. Member Olean: You said forthwith can**

**you give a date like within the next month sooner than later can drag on. William Bernstein: I can assure the Board it will be done before**

**the Public Hearing. Member Olean: You said was done. It hasn't been done yet. William Bernstein: It hasn't been filed. Member Olean: The**

**answer was it was done. I am trying to get very specific here for the record. William Bernstein: What I am saying it will be filed before the**

**Public Hearing in probably two or three weeks. Member Olean: Thank you.**

**David D'Amico: My name is David D'Amico and I am with the firm D'Amico Engineering Technology. I am a Professional Engineer in the State of Rhode Island and we have offices at 2080 Mineral Spring Avenue, No. Providence, RI and I was thinking of going over the things that have changed since we last seen the plan. There have been some minor changes in essence and that was all going through the state process relative to DEM. We had a wetland permit. We have received a preliminary insignificant alteration of wetlands and we have also received a physical alteration permit for the access of the driveway that is. The TRC had some comments on the administrative subdivision plan so we were just holding off, the plan had held off in combining all the lots to make sure we did not want to be presumptuous until we have total approval of this project. So we were just holding off until we got all the state permits. And we have also allowed some more review of this and we have added some other areas that the staff was looking for. So this plan now the one you are looking at here is ready to be recorded, the major change is that the owner, the applicant really couldn't work out an agreement with the abutting property owner for the access. If you recall we were showing a driveway access to the condominium association here. In working with the owner this turned out not to be possible to get that in a compromising manner. Mark is here if you have any questions on that. But based on that we made some revisions to the site. So what we did was we had those visitor parking spaces on that lot in hoping to get an easement for that. But that is not going to happen.**



What we did was Mark worked out an agreement with the abutting property owner that is going to be receiving another twenty feet of land because of this project and because of the abandoning of the road. To provide him with an additional side parking lot you can see that is a double row of parking for them. And they can actually get four vehicles in there. That was also something that DOT wanted us to do. DOT really didn't like the proximity of the way the curve was going into this abutting property owner. So we really had to work that out and DOT was definitely a catalyst to get that. So that is really the major change in the configuration of the development. We have gone through. And this project I don't know how many actually exist in the Town right now but the pavement structure will be entirely impervious structure. We also worked out with DEM in some of the preliminary meetings that we had primarily because we actually are building a portion of this in DEM's regulated wetland area. It was already a disturbed area and that is something that they understand but there is a little give and take. And one of the things was to do really conventional drainage design here wasn't something that they were interested in so we went with a permeable pavement structure which is within their stormwater regulations as a practice that is what we have here. There are no catch basins. There is no detention pond. All there is permeable pavement and so essentially you will look in there and you will see a black top. It is a permeable surface so the water will run right through it and there is a stone reservoir under there for the low frequency storms just that so it can percolate into the sub strata there; which we have very good soil here for that.

And then we are also taking the roof drains and putting them actually below the pavement structure and that is really considered a URT underground injection control. So we actually had to get a permit for that too. There are actually two permits for this project. So I don't know if that is unique in Lincoln. So that is how we handled the drainage and we have the permit for that. Other than that we have an extensive landscape plan. That is something you all haven't seen for the last time. That was something that DEM wanted us to do primarily for the buffer areas.

Chairman Bostic: So in the beginning you were going to have an extra entrance which was more or less going to accommodate the condo association next door maybe for the Fire Dept. or something?

D'Amico: Well it was actually something derived during the Council Meetings and hearings for the bid. That abutter showed up and was interested in getting that access and the owner worked that out with them and said listen we will offer that access.

Chairman Bostic: So you couldn't come to an agreement so you grabbed a couple of extra parking spots really better off.

D'Amico: Well it just gave a just a little bit more room I don't think we have added any.

Chairman Bostic: You haven't added any.

D'Amico: We didn't really add any. No. We have actually four spots over your regulations and those four spots are what we consider parking spots. We were able to accommodate them luckily with the abutter next door.

Member DelGrande: Did you say you gave then twenty feet so that it would make the road abandonment easier?

D'Amico: In the road abandonment if a forty

foot right of way so it automatically splits down the middle so they were getting that drive because that original plot was essentially right up against (inaudible). There is a written agreement a signed agreement we actually had to get that for DOT. I believe we have submitted that in past review if not we will provide it. I thought that was important to submit I believe I did. Member DelGrande: Mr. Solicitor do we need anything on that? Solicitor DeSisto: Not at this time no. Member Murphy: So each tenant has two parking spots? D'Amico: I believe your regulations are two spots per unit yes Sir. Member Delgrande: Is the DOT all set with that. D'Amico: Yes Sir they are. We are moving the guardrail, we are adjusting the guardrail. I believe I have submitted all the permits and I will double check and make sure that was in the package. Member Olean: You said you have given the abutter two parking spaces, where did you make those two parking spaces? D'Amico: There were actually four. You can get four in here. This is forty feet back from the right of way. Member Olean: It is no marked off-street parking right now. Member Olean: You are basically giving them a drive way when the road gets there. D'Amico: That is correct. We are going to build it for him. We actually have to reconstruct a small retaining wall that he has on the side. We are putting some funds into that. Member Olean: I would just like to verify numbers. In our subdivision regulations it is 17 units therefore he needs 34 parking spots. I just want to get the numbers straight. Is that correct? D'Amico: Yes Sir. Member Olean: So that is 34 parking spots that you need. The site plan shows 36 parking sports these are the words I am reading. Is that correct? D'Amico: We have

17 units, we need 34 parking spots required to provide for that also an additional four parking spaces for additional visitors. Member Olean: So 34 and 4 should be 38? D'Amico: That is correct. That is what we have. Member Olean: According to the TRC report the site plan shows thirty-six parking spaces. All I want is the correct numbers. Count how many parking spaces you have on the print if you don't mind. D'Amico: There is thirty-seven. Member Olean: Ok all I want to do is have the numbers. Do you agree that there are thirty-seven parking spaces? D'Amico: I counted thirty-seven. Member Olean: In other words the site plan shows that we changed to say thirty-seven I am talking about the TRC. Two ADA and three visitors. Just so that everything is correct on there so later on we can't come back to you and say you have too many parking spots. D'Amico: Yes.

Member Olean: The second question is, I am going by the TRC that you are well aware of; construction of the wall may require an easement. Did you find those that require an easement yet?

D'Amico: We discussed that. All the work is being done from our property. We don't need an easement to go on to their property to construct that wall. I am going by the wording that is front of me.

D'Amico: We are saying there is really no reason for us to have an easement because all the work is being done from our side. Town

Engineer Quish: We discussed this at the TRC meeting and I've said there is no need to take that comment away. Member Olean: But it is

not taken away. I can only go by the report that is in front of me.

Member Olean: If you want to strike that we can strike that. Town

**Engineer Quish: You can strike it. Member Olean: As long as it goes on the record.**

**Member Reilly: All this is a recommendation to us. I am just trying to get everything straight so that when we move forward. We can change anything. This is a recommendation to us. Town Engineer Quish: I have dealt with the parking spaces many times there are thirty-eight spaces. It is not thirty-seven it is not thirty-six.**

**Member Reilly: I make a motion to move the project to a Public Hearing, second by Member Hunt. Motion was approved by all members present.**

### **Major Land Development Review**

**Cumberland Farms Redevelopment AP06 Lot 345,387,389 346,347**

**Preliminary Plan Discussion/**

**-Cumberland Farms**

**823 Smithfield Avenue**

**Approval**

**Town Planner Ranaldi: This application is in front of the Board for a Preliminary Plan Discussion. It is under the 2016 Subdivision Regulations and represents the redevelopment of three (3) existing commercial properties into one. It would be a new gasoline filling station no automotive repair strictly accessory sales of related products: six gasoline pumps and associated parking. They received a Certificate of Completeness on May 16, 2017 and the Board has**

until September 5, 2017 to make a decision. This was before the Board two months ago and at that time when the Board reviews it was very much into the Preliminary Plan of design. So not much has changed I would say that more detail has been provided. The greatest type of study that needed to be done and some engineering had to be done was there is an 18" drainage pipe. It goes through the property. DOT had some requirement that they addressed. Other than that it is the same exact layout and configuration at the Master Plan. They meet all of our requirements. The traffic report said there would be a slight increase. We discussed this. There are a number of different types of uses we feel these uses are being eliminated. It is one use. We feel that the traffic is not going to be of great concern in this particular area. Other than that there is nothing to be reviewed they meet all of our requirements. We put down that they will need a Physical Alteration Permit for Preliminary Plan Approval; approval from Narragansett Bay Commission; approval from DEM wetlands and DEM Underground Storage Tank Program. The TRC recommends that the application goes to a Public Hearing in June.

Nicole Verdi (sp) Cumberland Farms: At Master Plan was before you few months ago in the meantime we did go before the Zoning Board and we did get some relief before the Zoning Board. We received a Special Use Permit for the (inaudible) and we also received a Special Use Permit for the signage. We gave as much information as possible and that did include a traffic study. I have with me today Phil Henry who is a Civil Engineer. I think unless you object I am going to

have Phil go through a little bit of the status of the permit.

**Phil Henry: For the record my name is Phil Henry with Civil Design Group Professional Engineers licensed in the State of Rhode Island. If you recall even at the Master Plan level we attached this project as a whole right at the onsite. So as this project evolved there were very little modifications or additions. We did modify the plan based on your comments, based on DEM's comments, based on the TRC's comments. But not much has changed in fact since we last met. Two minor items to note on the grading plan our drainage system from the parking lot is collected here via inlets and then piped and then ultimately piped to the rear end of the property. That device right there was just a regular drain. In review with the Town Engineer she recommended that be changed to a storm type device and we were happy to accommodate that. That was a change and we also met with RIDOT as well as the Town on site to access the 18" drainage pipe. That 18" drainage pipe that traverses through the site starts here at an inlet in the road. And then currently it cuts right across the site. What we are proposing to do is take from its starting point and traverse it around the new building and tie back into the existing pipe up 20' upstream of its discharge pipe. We really don't want to touch the last 20' because it is a pretty significant slope there. There is a lot of debris there. There is a lot of trees that we are going to be removing but I don't think anyone could argue that it is stable. I think we want to keep it stable. So what we are doing and DOT is still in the process of reviewing this. Just yesterday we are hiring a video guy to**

inspect that drain for structural integrity downstream and up. Just to make sure that the last 20-25' is in good condition. Because if it is not we will replace it but if it is functioning properly we don't see a need to replace and risk removing more trees and destabilizing that slope.

Member Murphy: The drain water goes where? Henry: That drain takes the roadway drainage and then it discharges it towards the back. And all of this is largely degraded now. There is all trash back there. There is a lot of debris. I actually went out there and identified areas to be cleaned up and that has been added to that plan.

Member DelGrande: Mr. Solicitor when they move that does the easement move with it or do you have to make an adjustment?

Solicitor DeSisto: My understanding is that the pipe will be moved within the easement area. Is that correct? Is that a correct assumption?

Henry: Yes I think we are still vetting that out. If it still physically lies within the easement area then we don't need to create a new easement we may need to amend some of the language. But if it does traverse outside depending on the ultimate conveyance of that drain line we may need to create a new easement. So that is still to be determined but it will be housed within an easement.

Member Olean: You are going to be in favor of the state correct? Henry: Correct.

Member Murphy: That is a real concern that the water flows. That place is muddy. Henry: Yes and if you think about it our site doesn't



really play a role in that other than the fact that it is just underneath our site. Our site is not hydrologic ally connected to that pipe. It just so happens to be traversing underneath the building. Member DelGrande: The last 20' of property is that... Henry: It is our property. That connection point occurred right behind the building. It is right on our property line there. On the plans in order to clean that up that area back up we would be requesting the Town for a temporary easement just to go physically on that property and remove the debris and the tires and the trash. As far as state permitting we received approval from the Sewer Commission. We received conditions of approval from the Water Commission. We received UST approval from DEM. And we currently awaiting for our approval from DOT and DEM for the stormwater piece. We hope we receive resolution on both of those within the next three weeks. The plans have remained significantly unchanged since you last saw them.

Member Reilly: I make a motion to move this project to a Public Informational Hearing in June, second by Member Murphy. Motion was approved by all members present.

**b. Lincoln Mall Retail Expansion**

**AP41 Lot 007**

**Master Plan Discussion/**

**-Highlands Property Management, LLC**

**622 George Washington**

**Hwy Approval**

**Town Planner Ranaldi: This application is under 2016 Subdivision Regulations. It is in front of the Board at a Master Plan level. It represents an expansion of the Lincoln Mall complex with the addition a 9, 825 square foot building with associated parking and stormwater management system. The building is proposed to be located between the existing Bank and McDonalds. It is zoned BL-0.5.**

**On May 16, 2017 the application received a Certificate of Completeness. The Board has until September 13, 2017 to make a decision. This is a pretty clear cut application. They would be installing the building. It is currently a parking lot. There are cars with no definition of where to park. It is haphazard over there. They are proposing to put the building basically in line with the Bank and outline the Bank's parking and their parking with landscaped isles. All of the stormwater would be put into the existing system that is underground. One of the things that we did note is that McDonalds during lunchtime there are a lot of landscape trucks, trailers, big 18 wheeler trucks that come in there. Right now because there is no definition for that parking lot they are parking where they can. So the Director of Public Works recommended there be some type of signage or demarcation in the pavement area where those trucks could park. The lower right hand side would work well for this. They have the correct zoning. They have the met all the required zoning. The utilities, there is public sewer and water in the complex. It needs the Lincoln Water Commission approval by final plan and Narragansett Bay Commission. Stormwater as I said before would be incorporated into the existing system. They meet parking**

requirements. When the Mall came in front of this Board in I believe it was 04 they had all of their parking needs. This meets whatever they need. They have quite a number of extra parking spots. This meets it and they still have extra parking spots within the complex itself. We received a traffic report and that said that it would be negligible the impact to the area. Both entrances to the Mall at signalized and we don't have any concerns with that. So based on our review the Technical Review Committee feels that they successfully met the requirements of Master Plan and recommend that they go for Public Informational Hearing in June.

Richard Bourdonnais: My name is Richard Bourdonnais I am a Civil Engineer with Garofalo & Associates. I am a Civil Engineer and Landscape Architect. I think that effectively describes everything I don't want more to say. It is an infill project. A 9,000 square foot building, multi-tenant, mixed use. Perhaps a couple of restaurants are what we are thinking. Quick serve type restaurants. We oriented the parking and I think it helps us in a couple of different ways. Primarily believe it help us to introduce some greenscapes which we didn't have before. We received a couple of comments in addition to what Mr. Ranaldi was saying. We received a couple of comments from Engineering one was for increased tank design and things like that. We provided that I believe it is in your plan set. We made submission to NBC and we handed to the Water Department here for their review as well. We were asked at Technical Review to add a couple of larger vehicle spaces and we have done that. I believe it

shows in the set and some signage that will be located up near the entrance here, closer to McDonalds. The sign shows on the plans as well. Because this site is relatively limited in a conceptual sense and we have a specific building size and have sort of tolerance of what that area is going to be able to take and that building 9,000 square feet. We took the plans a little further along and what we are going to see in Master Plan I think something else we discussed a little bit but we are hoping to perhaps combine. I don't know if we have enough time to request this or not we are hoping to perhaps combine Master Preliminary. Our thought is as this project moves forward and if we are successful and if everything goes well for us it would be the same plans that could be for the next four months. We are just hoping that can happen and that would be something we can perhaps discuss if it is something that is normally done or never done. We would be happy to talk about it if we could.

Other than that it is a straightforward project.

Member DelGrande: Did you request a drive thru at all?

Bourdonnais: No. Member Reilly: I have a question regarding the bank. The bank has a drive through. I know it is not your project.

Bourdonnais: Well it is. Member Reilly: So how does the bank drive through traffic and everything going to work with your development?

Is there going to be any kind of conflict with how people are going to get in and out of the drive through? Bourdonnais: Well we haven't

changed much between this area and the bank. Member Reilly: It is

wide open right now. Bourdonnais: Well it is but the bank access is

to the North and circulation happens around the building and our thought is that the bank would exit similar to what they are going today. They are going to be filtered through. They would also have the option to head across the back of our building and go to McDonalds if they wanted to. We believe that the orientation that we are providing here is cleaner. What is happening today is that these parking spaces that are between the bank and what is shown as Cox Communication here they are backing into that isle and that will continue to happen but it happens actually all the way down. So we are trying to eliminate some of that. This is actually at the request from the Town to perhaps look at how that circulation works. We believe we have managed it pretty well. Chairman Bostic: You are also adding those islands to define the main entrance way that goes along the middle. Member Reilly: That is great because right now it is a free for all. Bourdonnais: And if you notice that on the other side where Five Guys, Starbucks and Chili's are, it flows much nicer. It is not a free for all. A little more control right. It is sort of like when you look at roads you have lines; interstate effectively treats it as a network versus. Chairman Bostic: As far as combining the two does that Tony would that create any kind of issue? Solicitor DeSisto: You have the authority to do it under the State Statute. The question is whether or not you feel it is appropriate in this particular instance. The representation has been made that not much is going to change between the Master Plan application and the Preliminary. If you agree with that then is something that would be heard. Member Olean: Is there any Public Hearings that were eliminated? Solicitor DeSisto:

**You have a Public Hearing at the Master Plan level and that is the Preliminary Plan. That would eliminate one of your Public Hearings yes. Member Olean: I don't disagree with you but I don't like to eliminate the public in any way. And that is the only drawback on this.**

**I don't foresee any problem with the public but we have never eliminated the public a chance to talk. Bourdonnais: I agree but in this situation we would be notifying for the next meeting. Should that meeting be and correct me if I am wrong, but if there is this serious opposition at that point would it be an opportunity for you to say listen you need to do this again the following month. The Preliminary doesn't have to happen next month unless it goes smoothly it could happen. To say that we are eliminating, you just wouldn't be notifying twice but it could potentially an extension of the Public Hearing. Unless I am wrong? Member Olean: So at this right now you are not looking to do that? Bourdonnais: What I am suggesting is that we combine it but what we would be doing I you guys suggested we combine it we come back next as a Preliminary application so I would be submitting these plans, the same plans that you have. We would a Preliminary Plan application. We would notify as though it is a Preliminary Plan application. At that point there would be a Public Hearing you could extend that Public Hearing another month if you needed to but everybody would be notified just as there were. It is just that wouldn't be notified again. Member Murphy: So what are you saying is if there are no issues at that first meeting then there is no need for another one? Town Planner Ranaldi: The difference is a Public Informational is with just a mailing**

**a Public Hearing is a certified letter. You are eliminating the Public Informational meeting but you are going right to a Public Hearing. Member Murphy: What are you saving just a month? Bourdonnais: We would save two months if things go well next month. If it doesn't go well next month then we would be saving a month. Again the public would notified again for August because they are going to be notified for June and we would come back in July for an Informational Hearing for Preliminary then we notice for ours. So would have two extra meetings. They would be the same plans, everything would be the same. Member DelGrande: Mr. Solicitor could you send out a letter that had a letter notarized for the abutters with no objections.**

**Solicitor DeSisto: I am looking at the Statute right now. It is 45-23-39-C and it says "the Planning Board may vote to combine the review stages and to modify and/or waive requirements as specified in Sections 45-23-62. "Review stages may be combined only after the Planning Board determines that all necessary requirements have been met by the applicant." That would mean tonight if you were to vote combine you would have to make a determination that the plans that have been submitted meet the requirements of the Preliminary Plan Review.**

**Member Murphy: So it wouldn't be a problem combining it? Solicitor DeSisto: You have the ability to do it you just have to make the determination that the plans that you have satisfy the requirements for the Preliminary Plan stage. Member Olean: The hearing that we**

would have the public comes once. Correct. Member Olean: Ok. The hearing that we have how would people be notified? Bourdonnais: The people are going to be notified over the next two weeks by mail for the June meeting. Regardless of whether. Member Olean: Is that Certified mail? Bourdonnais: Certified mail. It is just as any other notification except in the case we will say Preliminary Plan Review. We will go straight to the Preliminary Plan Review. Town Planner Ranaldi: One of things that the Board would have in its advantage is they would start the clock over when it is certified Preliminary Plan. So you would start the 120 days. Let say June 1 it's certified as complete we will start the 120 days June 1 forward. You are eliminating two meetings.

Chairman Bostic: So why couldn't we go into that first Public Hearing and if everything goes ok with that then we will give you the approval to come combine the two. Bourdonnais: Because I would still be coming in for two because the way your ordinance is written I would still be coming in for an Informational meeting in July and a Public Hearing in August. It would be exactly the same. Basically what it is skipping the Informational Hearing because again at Master or Preliminary they are going to see the same plans, the abutters? If it is highly contested again you would have the option to extend it the extra month. We would be in the same place except a month earlier. Member Murphy: So that covers you if the public has a problem. Town Engineer Quish: I have no issues. Town Planner Ranaldi: I think the public is being invited to see the plan in a better situation by



certified letter. If you go with an Informational then a certified they are seeing the same thing. Town Solicitor DeSisto: You can do it if you are comfortable doing it. This it is something that you have the ability to do. Member Murphy: You have the ability to say no. We are not happy with it. The public is not happy with it. And then we move it on to the next phase. Chairman Bostic: Do we have to vote on moving it out to another month or does the applicant just agree to come back? Do we have to do a vote for that? Town Solicitor DeSisto: You can continue the hearing. If you vote to combine you are not approving anything. Basically what you will do next month is you will be reviewing it for Master and Preliminary Plan approval at the same time. So you are not approving anything tonight if you make a combination. Member Murphy: You're eliminating or prolonging it and it may not be an issue at all. If it is then we will vote. Solicitor DeSisto: You are not approving anything tonight. Chairman Bostic: So if there is any kind of issues with our residents you are not going to have a problem with going through the full process. Bourdonnais: No but they may say they want something that they want this they want that you will have the option at that point and say listen come back. The clock is still going for you guys it still puts you in the same position. It could actually if we make submission in June if could still go to August as well. So it is not like you are losing any options. It is just that if everything goes clean then we can be done next month rather than say we have no options if we don't. With zero problems we would still be looking at August. Member Olean: I just don't feel comfortable eliminating the public.

**There is nothing wrong with this project. It is a good project.**

**Member Reilly: You are having a public hearing. Bourdonnais: We are eliminating the Informational Hearing. Town Solicitor DeSisto: I am assuming you are going to resubmit the Preliminary Plan application.**

**Bourdonnais: We would have to do that in the next week or so. Town Solicitor DeSisto: Yes you would. And that will start the clock running again even though you are going to be approving Master Plan at Preliminary you have 120 days from that date to do both because of this vote; if you took the vote to combine. You cannot undo your vote to combine. Chairman Bostic: The only thing I can see to go along with it is there is only one Lincoln Mall. Member Olean: We will be addressing the traffic flow. Whether you need signage or something. Bourdonnais: As part of the application we will include a bank drive through directional and also bank exit directional.**

**Member Murphy: What motion needs to be made Mr. Solicitor?**

**Solicitor DeSisto: The first motion to be made is to combine the Master Plan and Preliminary Plan stages of review for this application. Member DelGrande: I make that motion, second by**

**Member Reilly. Motion approved by all members present. Solicitor**

**DeSisto: Second motion would be set the matter down for a Public Hearing at the next meeting conditioned upon the applicant filing a Preliminary Plan application within the week. Member DelGrande: I**

**make that motion, second by Member Murphy. Chairman Bostic:**

Wait a minute. Bourdonnais: Yes, the application can be made over the next week or so. Member Murphy: No next week. Bourdonnais: Next week yes that is fine. Member Olean: You have no problem getting the mailings out? Do we have a list of abutters? Member Murphy: And they will be certified? Bourdonnais: Yes. Motion made by Member DelGrande, second by Member Murphy. Motion was approved by all members present.

Chairman Bostic: Correspondence/Miscellaneous: All set.

Chairman Bostic: Solicitors Report.

Town Solicitor DeSisto: In fact no new reports since the last meeting.

Chairman Bostic: Secretary's Report.

Member Reilly: I make motion to dispense with the reading of the minutes of January 25, 2017 and September 28, 2016, second by Member DelGrande. Motion approved by all members present.

Chairman Bostic: Is there any problems with the drafts? Member Reilly: I make a motion to accept the minutes of January 25, 2017 and September 28, 2016, Second by Member Hunt. Motion approved by all members present.

Member Reilly: I make a motion to adjourn, second by Member

**DelGrande. Motion approved by all members present. Meeting adjourned at 8:15 pm**

**Respectfully submitted:**

**Elizabeth A. Gagnon**

**Secretary to the Planning Board**

**Technical Review Committee**

**May 19, 2017**

**Town of Lincoln – Planning Board**

**100 Old River Road**

**Lincoln, RI 02865**

**Dear Honorable Members,**

**On Tuesday, May 16, 2017 at 3:00 PM, the Technical Review Committee met to review the agenda items for the May 24, 2017 meeting of the Planning Board. In attendance were Al Ranaldi,**

**Russell Hervieux, Peggy Weigner, Leslie Quish, Jeff Almond, Romeo Mendes, and Michael Gagnon. Below are the Committee's recommendations.**

### **Minor Subdivision Review**

#### **a. Cobble Hill Subdivision AP15 Lots 30, 31 & AP19 Lot 129 Preliminary Plan Discussion /**

##### **- Howard R. Smart Trustee Etals Cobble Hill Road Approval**

**This application is under the 2016 Subdivision Regulations and represents the subdivision of one lot into three residential lots (AP15 Lot 30) and the reconfiguration of two existing lots (AP15 Lot 31 and AP19 Lot 129). The proposed new residential lots will have access from Cobble Hill Road. The two existing lots will have their lot lines reconfigured. The applicant is not requesting any subdivision waivers or zoning variances. This project is classified as a minor subdivision. The project is at the preliminary plan review stage.**

**On May 16, 2017, the project received a Certificate of Completeness. According to our Subdivision Regulations, the Planning Board shall, within sixty-five (65) days of certification of completeness or within such further time as may be consented to by the applicant, approve the preliminary plan as submitted, approve with changes and/or conditions, or deny the applicant, according to the requirements of Section 8. A decision on the preliminary plan review must be made by July 20, 2017, or within such further time as may be consented to by the applicant.**

**The preliminary plan submission included the following:**

- **“Lincoln, RI Minor Subdivision Plan, prepared for Howard R. Smart Trustee Etals, AP 15 Lots 30, 31 and AP 19 Lot 129, Cobble Hill Road Lladnar Drive, Zone RS-12 & RS-20, dated April 5, 2017 and revised on May 5, 2017 and prepared by Marsh & Long Surveying**

### **Site Layout**

**The Technical Review Committee reviewed the project submission. The original lot AP15 Lot 30 is a total of 2.14 acres in size. This lot will be divided into three lots. The two new residential lots meet the square footage requirements for the RS-12 zone and will front along the existing Cobble Hill Road. The original lot will be reduced to 1.6 acres. The original lot has existing monumentation. The new lots, if approved, should be demarcated according to the submitted plans. The Technical Review Committee recommends that demarcation of the new property lines be a condition of final plan approval. There is an existing house, garage, and barn on the original lot 30. The submitted plans indicate that the existing garage is to be removed. As a condition of final plan approval, the Technical Review Committee recommends that the existing garage be removed or demolished before the final plan is recorded. An appropriate permit would be required by the Building Inspector’s office.**

**The Director of Public Works noted that road drainage collects in front of the two proposed lots. This situation can be addressed with proper grading of the future house sites. During the building permit review stage, the Department of Public Works will review the**

**proposed grading plan of the lots to ensure that this low spot is addressed. The Technical Review Committee recommends as a condition of Final Plan approval, that a note be placed on the recorded plan stating, “During the building permit review stage, the Department of Public Works will review the proposed grading plan of the lots and the corresponding house and driveway to ensure that the existing low spot along the roadway where road drainage collects is addressed.”**

**The other two existing lots, AP15 Lot 31 and AP19 Lot 129 are proposed to have their property lines reconfigured. AP15 Lot 31 will increase in size from 20,100 square feet to 21,840 square feet, while AP19 Lot 129 will decrease in size from 25,565 square feet to 20,811 square feet. Each newly reconfigured lot will still meet the zoning requirements for where they are located.**

### **Zoning Requirements**

**The front portion of the project is located within Zoning District RS-12. The rear of the project is located within Zoning District RS-20. The proposed subdivision and the reconfiguration of the existing lots meet all of the requirements of their respective zones.**

### **Utilities**

**Public sewer and water for the two proposed lots are located within Cobble Hill Road. The exact utility connection locations will be addressed at the building permit stage. Stormwater management will be required for each new house. The exact design and type of**

**stormwater management systems depends on the size and location of each new house as well as the location and size of each new driveway. A detailed review and approval of each new lot's house placement, driveway location, and stormwater management system will be addressed at the building permit review stage.**

**Based on the project's submission, the Technical Review Committee feels that the application successfully addresses the requirements set out in the Town's Land Development and Subdivision Regulations. Therefore, the Technical Review Committee recommends Approval of the Preliminary Plan of this minor subdivision. The Technical Review Committee recommends Approval of the Final Plan with the following Conditions:**

- 1. The existing garage on AP15 Lot 30 shall be removed or demolished before Final Plan is approved and recorded. The appropriate permit will be required by the Building Inspector's office.**
- 2. The applicant shall demarcate the new property lines as displayed on the submitted plans.**
- 3. A note be placed on the recorded plan stating, "During the building permit review stage, the Department of Public Works will review the proposed grading plan of the lots and the corresponding house and driveway to ensure that the existing low spot along the roadway where road drainage collects is addressed."**

#### **Major Land Development Review**

- a. 304 New River Road AP35 Lot 132 & 133 Preliminary Plan Discussion /**



**- Mark Donfrancesco 304 New River Road Approval**

**This application is under the 2005 Subdivision Regulations and represents the combination and redevelopment of two residential lots into a 17 unit apartment building with associated parking area, and stormwater management area. Six units will be restricted as affordable units. The property owner received approval from the Town Council in July 2015 for the abandonment of the abutting right-of-ways recorded as Central Street and Avenue "D". The area that made up the right-of-ways was divided between the abutting property owners. The subject property has a combined area of 52,011 square feet. An administrative subdivision is needed to finalize the two road abandonments. On October 4, 2016, the application received a dimensional variance for the lot width.**

**On May 16, 2017, the project received a Certificate of Completeness. According to our Subdivision Regulations, the Planning Board shall, within one hundred twenty (120) days of certification of completeness or within such further time as may be consented to by the applicant, approve the preliminary plan as submitted, approve with changes and/or conditions, or deny the applicant, according to the requirements of Section 8. A decision on the preliminary plan review must be made by September 13, 2017, or within such further time as may be consented to by the applicant.**

**The preliminary plan submission included the following:**

- Preliminary Plan Review Site Plans for Proposed Residential Development AP 35 Lots 132 & 133, 304 New River Road, Lincoln**

**Rhode Island, prepared by D'Amico Engineering Technology, Inc. and revised March 22, 2017.**

- Project Narrative and Drainage Analysis Report for A proposed Residential Site Development 304 New River Road, Assessor's Plat 35 Lots 132 and 133, Lincoln RI, prepared for 1383 Atwood Realty, LLC, prepared by D'Amico Engineering Technology, Inc., dated November 22, 2016.**
- RIDOT, Physical Alteration Permit No. 161130-A Approval Letter, 304 New River Road, Lincoln, RI. (Assessor's Plat 35 Lots 132 & 133. Reconstruction of Existing Driveway Opening, dated March 28, 2017.**
- Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management, Insignificant Alteration – Permit. Wetlands Application No. 16-0295 and UIC Program File No. 001752, dated February 17, 2017.**

### **Site Layout**

**The Technical Review Committee reviewed the project submission at the Preliminary Plan review level. The proposed project is to remove the existing house, combine the two lots and construct a 17 unit apartment building, associated parking area, and stormwater management area. Six units will be restricted as affordable units. The building will be located on the eastern side of the parcel fronting on New River Road. The western portion of the parcel contains a wetlands complex. The proposed apartment building will be three stories and a mix of one bedroom and two bedroom units. Access to the property is from New River Road. The site plans show a sidewalk that circles the building and extends up to New River Road.**

**The Technical Review Committee reviewed the proposed site and the surrounding properties. There is a public school within close vicinity of the project. At the Master Plan review stage, the TRC and applicant discussed the options to provide a sidewalk to the existing crosswalk on New River Road to enable residents to cross New River Road and walk to the school. However, due to the unique configuration of the roadway and the location of the various buildings, there does not appear to be a reasonable option of adding a new crosswalk.**

**During this discussion, the Technical Review Committee noted that the abutting neighbor parks his cars in front of his house along New River Road. This situation is not ideal for traffic safety. The applicant reached out to the neighbor and offered to construct the neighbor a new driveway. This new driveway will provide the neighbor proper parking area other than along New River Road. The TRC agreed that this solution will help the traffic safety in this area.**

## **Zoning**

**The property is located within a RG-7 zoning district and will require a special use permit under section 260-9C: Multi-family, 3 or more units. Under Article VII – Inclusionary Zoning, the project will require a minimum of 20% affordable units (4 units). The project will also require a Dimensional Variance for the lot width. The applicant received a Special Use Permit to develop multi-family housing and a dimensional variance of 105 feet of frontage relief on October 4, 2017.**

**The applicant increased the number of affordable units from the required four (4) units to six (6) units.**

**The Zoning Official pointed out to the TRC that the original properties and paper streets have not been officially merged as approved during the street abandonment process and presented during the Zoning Board review and approval. The properties need to be merged into one large property via an administrative subdivision. This issue must be resolved before preliminary plan can be approved.**

### **Utilities**

**Public utilities are available within New River Road. The utility details and proposed connections were reviewed and are acceptable. The applicant provided sewer flow calculations at the Technical Review Committee meeting. A Narragansett Bay Commission permit is required as a condition of Preliminary Plan. Approval from the Lincoln Water Commission for the public water is required as a condition of Final Plan.**

### **Wetlands/Stormwater Runoff**

**The western portion of this property has a significant wetlands complex and associated 100 ft. riverbank wetland buffer. The applicant proposes a pervious pavement stormwater management system with associated drain outlet system and reservoir. This system will be located under the parking lot.**

**At the Master Plan review stage, this system was discussed and the Town Engineer expressed concerns about the system and the suitability of the parcel's soils. The applicant performed test pits and evaluated the underlying soil. The analysis indicated that the soils**

were acceptable for this type of system. Any stormwater management system must be designed and installed in accordance with the State of Rhode Island Storm Water Design and Installation Manual prepared by the Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management (RIDEM) dated December 2010 and amended March 2015. The RIDEM did a more in-depth analysis of the proposed stormwater mitigation measures and found that the proposal was acceptable. An Insignificant Alteration – Permit (Wetlands Application No. 16-0295) and UIC Program File No. 001752 permit was issued on February 17, 2017.

## **Parking**

The site plan shows 36 parking spaces, two ADA compliant parking spaces, and 3 visitor parking spaces. The proposed parking area is supported by a segmental block retaining wall. There is an area where there is seven foot (7 foot) drop between the parking lot and the abutting property. Construction of the wall may require an easement. The plan's details illustrate how the applicant will address pedestrian and vehicular safety for the area of concern. The plans also successfully addresses §260-31F of the Zoning Ordinance that requires an opaque fence between parking areas and adjoining residential areas for parking areas with more than 20 cars.

## **Traffic**

The proposed project is located within close proximity to Northern Elementary School which is located on the eastern side of New River

**Road. Many parents park along both sides of New River Road when they drop off and pick up their children. A traffic analysis was conducted and determined that the proposed 17 unit apartment building development will have no significant impact on the two nearby intersections on New River Road. The proposed access driveway will function at a level of service A for both the morning and evening peak hour. A Physical Alternation Permit from the Rhode Island Department of Transportation was issued on March 28, 2017.**

**Based on the project's submission, the Technical Review Committee feels that the application has successfully met the requirements of the Preliminary Plan review stage and recommends that this application proceed to a Public Hearing in June.**

### **Major Land Development Review**

**a. Cumberland Farms Redevelopment AP06 Lots 345, 387, 389, 346, 347 Preliminary Plan Discussion /**

**- Cumberland Farms 823 Smithfield Avenue Approval**

**This application is under the 2016 Subdivision Regulations and represents the redevelopment of three (3) existing commercial properties, made up of five lots that total 1.28 acres, into one (1) new Gasoline Filling Station (no automotive repair) including the accessory sales of related products, six (6) gasoline pumps, and associated parking. The subject properties are zoned VCMU (Village Commercial Mixed Use).**

**On May 16, 2017, the project received a Certificate of Completeness. According to our Subdivision Regulations, the Planning Board shall, within one hundred twenty (120) days of certification of completeness or within such further time as may be consented to by the applicant, approve the preliminary plan as submitted, approve with changes and/or conditions, or deny the applicant, according to the requirements of Section 8. A decision on the preliminary plan review must be made by September 13, 2017, or within such further time as may be consented to by the applicant.**

**The preliminary plan submission included the following:**

- Letter and enclosures dated May 1, 2017 RE: Cumberland Farms Preliminary Plan Submission for Major Land Development Plat 6 Lots 345, 346, 347, 387, and 389.**
- Site Plan Set for Cumberland Farms Store #1206, VSH#0484, Oracle # RI0484, 823 Smithfield Avenue (Route 126), Lincoln RI 02865, prepared by Civil Design Group, LLC with a last revision date of April 25, 2017.**

### **Site Layout**

**As stated above, the proposed land development project is to redevelop three (3) existing commercial properties, made up of five (5) lots that total 1.28 acres, into one (1) new Gasoline Filling Station (no automotive repair) including the accessory sales of related products, six (6) gasoline pumps, and associated parking. The proposed building will be 4,956 square feet in size and operate 24**

hours, 7 days a week. The entrance of the building will be orientated towards the intersection of Smithfield and Reservoir Avenues. The building will be parallel to Smithfield Avenue and the gasoline pumps will be parallel to Reservoir Avenue. A six foot high opaque fence will be installed along three sides of the property. New evergreen and deciduous trees and shrubs will be planted throughout the site.

During the Master Plan review stage, the Town Engineer and the Technical Review Committee had a question regarding the ownership of the 18" drainage pipe crossing through the site from Smithfield Avenue. This drainage line is owned by RIDOT. The applicant and the Town met with representatives of RIDOT to discuss the proposed improvements to the drainage outlet. The proposed design will be reviewed and approved through the RIDOT Physical Alteration Permit (PAP) review process. A PAP application has been submitted to the State.

## **Zoning**

The proposed project is zoned VCMU (Village Commercial Mixed Use) and received a Special Use Permit on April 11, 2017. The applicant also received their requested dimensional variances for rear yard setback relief as well as signage relief.

## **Utilities**

All existing sewer and water services to the existing buildings will be cut and capped at the property lines and new service connections will be provided. Town sewer and water service are available and located



**in Smithfield Avenue. A formal submission to the Lincoln Water Commission for approval must be made prior to construction. The Town of Lincoln requests to be contacted during construction when the contractor exposes the existing sewer lateral so the Town can determine if the existing sewer lateral is suitable for reuse. This request should be noted in the construction plans.**

### **Wetlands/Stormwater Runoff**

**The existing properties as well as the proposed project contain significant areas of impervious area. According to the rules and regulations of the Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management, the proposed project can be reviewed under their redevelopment regulations. According to the Town Engineer, the submitted preliminary plans successfully address the stormwater runoff needs for the proposed project according to the redevelopment rules and regulations of DEM. The proposed design has been submitted to RIDEM for review.**

### **Parking**

**The proposed project requires 25 parking spaces. The revised site plan successfully meets the parking requirements of the VCMU zone.**

### **Traffic**

**The three existing commercial properties have a total of six (6) curb cuts onto Smithfield Avenue and Reservoir Avenue. The proposed project will reduce these curb cuts down to three (3) curb cuts.**

**According to the submitted Traffic Impact Study, the intersection will experience a slight increase in turning movement delays. This conclusion is based solely on the square footage of the proposed use.**

**The Technical Review Committee discussed the conclusions of the Traffic Impact Study. The Committee felt that while there may be a slight delay in turning movements, the overall traffic movements in and around the site will greatly improve due to the reduction of commercial uses within the site from three (3) to one (1) and the reduction of curb cuts from six (6) down to three (3).**

**All required permits will be required as a condition of preliminary plan approval:**

- a. Physical Alteration Permit from RIDOT.**
- b. Approval from the Narragansett Bay Commission.**
- c. Approval from RIDEM's Underground Storage Tank (UST) program.**
- d. Approval from RIDEM's Wetlands**

**Based on the project's submission, the Technical Review Committee feels that the application has successfully met the requirements of the Preliminary Plan review stage and recommends that this application proceed to a Public Hearing in June.**

**b. Lincoln Mall Retail Expansion AP41 Lot 007 Master Plan Discussion /**

**- Highlands Property Management, LLC 622 George Washington Hwy Approval**

**This application is under the 2016 Subdivision Regulations and represents the expansion of the Lincoln Mall complex with an addition of a 9,825 square foot building with associated parking and stormwater management systems. This retail building will be located in the southeastern corner of the property between the existing bank and fast food restaurant. The subject property is zoned BL-0.5 (Business Limited).**

**On May 16, 2017, the project received a Certificate of Completeness. According to our Subdivision Regulations, the Planning Board shall, within one hundred twenty (120) days of certification of completeness or within such further time as may be consented to by the applicant, approve the master plan as submitted, approve with changes and/or conditions, or deny the applicant, according to the requirements of Section 8. A decision on the master plan review must be made by September 13, 2017, or within such further time as may be consented to by the applicant.**

**The master plan submission included the following:**

- Cover Letter prepared by Garofalo & Associates, Inc. and dated April 21, 2017**
- Site Plan for Lincoln Mall Retail Expansion, AP 41 Block 007, 622 George Washington Highway, Lincoln, RI prepared by Garofalo & Associates, dated April 2017.**

- **Circulation & Traffic Assessment, prepared by Garofalo & Associates.**
- **Drainage Statement, Lincoln Mall - Retail Expansion - Master Plan Submission, AP 41 Lot 7, 622 George Washington Highway, Lincoln RI, prepared by Garofalo & Associates, dated April 21, 2017.**

### **Site Layout**

**As stated above, the proposed land development project represents the expansion of the Lincoln Mall complex with an addition of a 9,825 square foot building with associated parking and stormwater management systems. This retail building will be located in the southeastern corner of the property between the existing bank and fast food restaurant. New landscaped islands will define the parking lot of the bank and the new retail building. A loading zone for the new building is designated in the rear of the building.**

**The Director of Public Works noted that he often sees large trucks with trailers parked in the area where the proposed building is located. These trucks are there having lunch. He expressed concerns of how these trucks will navigate the new redesigned parking areas. It was suggested that directional signage be installed to direct these trucks to a large paved space behind the restaurant. The Technical Review Committee will work with the applicant's representative in developing a solution.**

### **Zoning**

**The subject property is zoned BL-0.5 (Business Limited) and this use**

is allowed by right. The Zoning Official requested an updated parking count to ensure that the entire complex meet the required parking standard.

### **Utilities**

Public sewer and water are available within the complex. Access to these utilities would be reviewed at the preliminary plan review stage.

Approval from Lincoln Water Commission of proposed service will be required at Final Plan. Approval from the Narragansett Bay Commission is needed for this expansion.

### **Wetlands/Stormwater Runoff**

The existing complex as well as the proposed project contains significant areas of impervious area. Stormwater runoff from the proposed building will be connected into the complex's existing subsurface infiltration system. The proposed design will be reviewed in greater depth at the preliminary plan review stage.

### **Parking**

The proposed project successfully meets the parking requirements of the BL-0.5 zone. However, the Zoning Official requested an updated parking count to ensure that the entire complex meet the required parking standard.

### **Traffic**

The applicant's engineer submitted a report title, "Circulation &

**Traffic Assessment”**, prepared by Garofalo & Associates. According to this report, the traffic impact within the complex and the surrounding area will be negligible. The Technical Review Committee feels that no future analysis is needed.

**Based on the project’s submission, the Technical Review Committee feels that the application has successfully met the requirements of the Master Plan review stage and recommends that this application proceed to a Public Informational Hearing in June.**

**Zoning Applications (\*) – June Zoning Board hearing.**

**James E. Langlois, 2 Holiday Court, Lincoln, RI – Application for Dimensional Variance seeking front setback relief for the addition of a porch.**

**AP 11, Lot 118 Zoned: RS 12**

**Members of the Technical Review Committee reviewed the submitted plans and application for Dimensional Variance seeking front setback relief for the addition of a porch. The application did not provide a reason or hardship as to why they are requesting a dimensional variance. Therefore, the Technical Review Committee could not offer a recommendation of this application.**

**Sean & Katherine McQuade, 600 Great Road, Lincoln, RI – Application**

**for Special Use Permit to keep chickens and a chicken coup on property located at 600 Great Road, Lincoln, RI.**

**AP 22, Lots 004 & 168 Zoned: RS 20**

**Members of the Technical Review Committee reviewed the submitted plans and application for a Special Use Permit to keep chickens and a chicken coup on property located at 600 Great Road, Lincoln, RI. The property is located in a secluded wooded area. There are no abutting neighbors. The Technical Review Committee recommends Approval of this Special Use variance. The Technical Review Committee feels that the Special Use variance will not alter the general character of the surrounding area and will not impair the intent and purpose of the zoning ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan.**

**Correspondence/Miscellaneous (\*)**

**a. Staff Reports**

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Albert V. Ranaldi, Jr. AICP**

**Albert V. Ranaldi, Jr. AICP**

**Administrative Officer to the Planning Board**