



**EAST PROVIDENCE WATERFRONT
SPECIAL DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT COMMISSION**

**Design Review Committee (DRC) Meeting
Minutes of April 30, 2009**

Members: John Gregory, DRC Chairman
Jeanne Boyle, Executive Director
John Pesce
Bruce Chick
Stephen Coutu

Staff: Roberta Groch, AICP- Planner

Consultants: Glen Fontecchio, Fontecchio & Associates
Sara Bradford, Bradford Associates

Chairman Gregory called the meeting to order at 6:35PM.

1. Approval of Minutes

A. DRC Minutes of January 27, 2009

VOTE: A motion was made to approve the minutes of the January 27, 2009. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved without discussion.

B. DRC Minutes of March 2, 2009

VOTE: A motion was made to approve the minutes of the March 2, 2009. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved without discussion.

2. New Business

A. Workshop- Village on the Waterfront

Mr. Gregory opened the meeting by stating that the primary purpose of the evening was to review the submitted Village on the Waterfront (VOTW) plans and application for completeness.

Ms. Christine Engustion, attorney for the applicant, introduced Carla Baker, who represents Chevron. She stated that Chevron's next step will be to start the remedial activities at the site this year. They have a very tight timeline for the project; any delay will cost them a year, as they must perform some remedial activities in dry weather. Mr. Gregory asked that the team consider a longer review period than the usual forty-five days from the issuance of a Certificate of Completeness. Ms. Baker stated that she understood the review period to be ninety days, which would work with the Chevron timeline.

Michael Hennessey, principal of Village on the Waterfront, LLC, stated that the team has had many meetings with RIDEM regarding the remediation. They have also met with RIDOT regarding the land swap for land along the water. He also stated that the team has been working for several years with various City departments.

Landscape Architecture

Mr. Wilfred Gates of Gates Leighton Associates (GLA), landscape architect for the project team, said that the plans submitted to the Commission in April were based on revisions to the March

plans that were suggested by the Commission and its consultants. Ms. Sara Bradford, landscape architect for the Commission, asked if GLA had spoken with the Coastal Resource Management Council (CRMC): Mr. Gates stated that they have taken the CRMC requirements and pulled them back into the site for continuity and transition. Ms. Bradford asked that a line be placed on the plans that show the delineation of CRMC jurisdiction, along with a written explanation of how the proposed plant material for the west side of Waterfront Drive relate to the existing vegetation. Mr. Audie Osgood of DiPrete Engineering (engineering consultant for VOTW) stated that there will be no pervious pavement on the site due to the water table level and contamination issues: they are, in fact, trying to lower the water table. Ms. Bradford pointed out that the paving stones were encroaching on the walkability of the paths and that the pear trees shading the parking lots may block views of the water.

Mr. Gates explained the living walls proposed for the project: it is a wire-framed retaining wall that contains soil and plantings. They will select plants that will survive a windy, salt-water environment. He is looking for agreement on the concept from the Commission.

Architectural

Mr. Glen Fontecchio, architectural consultant for the Commission, asked what the rest of the site will look like after Phase I is completed: there needs to be some plans that address what the site will look like at different periods of time. Ms. Baker stated that there will be extensive site clearing (except for the CRMC areas) which will give them an idea of what else needs to be removed from the site: they will then oversee the site. They are concentrating on Phase I, the staging for which will be at the north end of the site. Ms. Diane Dooley of DiMella Shaffer, the team's architectural consultant, stated that all of the grading for the entire site will be done during Phase I site preparation.

Mr. Fontecchio also asked that the following items be addressed:

- Show snow removal areas for paved plaza
- Develop a typical cross-section that shows that the ten percent transparency minimum is being met
- Demonstrate that Burgess Street view corridor is not obstructed. The view corridors are intended to be along the street lines but the proposed view shows a building rather than the existing trees: this needs clarification.
- Plantings intended to screen parking lots should work during the winter, not just spring and summer.
- Ensure that lighting from the parking lots is not spilling over onto Veteran's Memorial Parkway (VMP).
- Rooftop equipment on the townhouses is slightly obstructing.
- Cable rails should be open so as not to obstruct views.
- A more columnar tree should be chosen for plaza planters to keep views open.
- A cross-section of a green roof should be provided, with planting details
- Show details and sections of retaining wall at southern end of Waterfront Drive, grade changes, etc.
- Scenic Highway Board approval of the project: this can be addressed as correspondence after approval by the Waterfront Commission.
- Typical building elevation (when design is at the ten percent stage).

Engineering

Mr. Stephen Coutu, Department of Public Works Director, stated that there was no drainage report for the project included in the application. Mr. Osgood said that there is no requirement for retention on the site, only conveyance and water quality: they were planning on submitting it to RIDEM for water quality first and waiting until the project was approved before sizing pipes. Mr. Coutu requested a general drainage narrative (including pipe sizing) from Mr. Osgood as soon as possible, including a discussion of Waterfront Drive.

Mr. Coutu stated that the view corridor at the Cross-Bay water line easement be opened up (Sheet 22); Buildings 9 and 10 seem very close to the easement. Mr. Osgood said that buildings foundations will be located just below the pipes. Some filling will be done about the pipes (approximately four feet) and can take the added load. Mr. Coutu requested that the maximum space possible be given to the pipes: Mr. Hennessey stated that he felt the site can be reshuffled to increase Mr. Coutu's comfort level. This will not be a required completeness item: it will be addressed after the first round of DRC comments. Mr. Coutu would also like a profile of the pipes with grading and their relation to the proposed development.

Traffic Impact Study

Mr. Paul Greenaway, traffic engineer for the VOTW team, stated that a conceptual plan for the VMP roundabout at the project entrance will be submitted to the RIDOT with the team's Physical Alteration Application (PAP); once they have received approval from RIDOT they will submit it to the City for review. They are also working on an engineered plan. Ms. Boyle requested the design before the PAP is issued: the City generally works on traffic issues concurrently with the PAP process, as a collaborative process. The City's traffic consultant stated that volumes at the main entrance do not match trip generation: the distribution of the traffic and the trip generation data should be balanced with the trip distribution data. A PAP application will not be submitted for the northern Waterfront Drive extension.

Mr. Gregory stated his concern that there is no mention in the report on the impact of the roundabout on South Broadway. Mr. Greenaway stated that the project will contribute a low volume of traffic: the VMP flows freely at that location and the geometry of that intersection would make a roundabout problematic. Mr. Gregory stated that there was no Level of Service (LOS) report for VMP; at some point, a project at Kettle Point may become active again and this will have an impact on the VMP. Mr. Greenaway replied that what is there now will not be there when the project is developed, which is why they did not examine Lyon and Warren Avenues.

Phase III will require the extension of Waterfront Drive (WD); Phases I and II can function with access from VMP only. Building approval and building permits of Phase III will be tied to WD. Master plan approval will be given for the entire project, with a detailed approval of Phase I; the Applicant must return to the Commission for subsequent approval.

Because the project is tied to approval of Tax Increment Financing (TIF), Mr. Gregory would like to see more information on the TIF such as dollar value, how it relates to tax revenue, TIF for all phases versus Phase I, etc. A TIF proposal will be submitted during the WC's review process of the VOTW development application.

Ms. Boyle requested that the submitted list of deviations be corrected and resubmitted to reflect only deviations, not all of the issues that do not comply with City zoning. Ms. Engustian stated

that the team anticipates a subdivision of the land, potentially along the lines of phasing and did not want to create a delay with the Planning and Zoning Boards: the team will scale the list back to include just Waterfront Commission deviation requests. Ms. Boyle stated that the Waterfront Commission can eventually treat these as Conditions of Approval. Only Waterfront Drive will be a public street: other streets will be private and may require a waiver. In the Waterfront District, City zoning does not apply: there will be no need to appear before the Zoning Board, as performance zoning in the District is all that applies. Deviations will be submitted to the Hearing Panel.

The meeting adjourned at 9:40PM

Respectfully submitted,

JEANNE M. BOYLE
Executive Director

JMB/RG