

Minutes for Town of North Smithfield Planning Board

Kendall Dean School, 83 Green Street

Thursday, February 5, 2015, 7:00 PM

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm.

1. Roll Call and Introductions: Present: Gary Palardy, Dinna Finnegan, Lucien Benoit, Scott Lentz and Dean Naylor. Also in attendance were Town Planner Robert Ericson and Town Solicitor David Iglizzi. Cynthia Roberts arrived at 7:06.

2. Minutes: The January 8, 2015 minutes were approved. Motion by Dr. Benoit, second by Mr.,. Lentz with all in favor (5-0). The January 15, 2015 minutes were approved as corrected. Motion by Dr. Benoit, second by Mr. Lentz with all in favor (5-0).

3. Disclosure: This is where anyone can disclose potential conflicts on matters before the Planning Board. There were no disclosures. Chair Naylor asked all members to introduce themselves for the benefit of new member Gary Palardy and 1st Alternate Dinna Finnegan.

4. Master Plan, Major Land Development: Slater Village with public hearing

Applicant: DAS Contracting Corp

Location: 1118-1156 Victory Hwy

Assessor's Plat 1 Lots 127, 134 & 330

Zoning: Urban Residential (RU) with rezoning conditions

Discussion, vote or other action by the Planning Board. Mr. Ericson announced that the applicant's attorney Richard Kirby has asked for a continuation to March 5 with continued tolling. He explained tolling, state review periods and the concept of constructive approval.

Dr. Benoit moved to continue Slater Village to March 5, 2015. Second by Ms. Roberts with all in favor (5-0).

5. Site Plan Review (following the Major Land Development process):

Wide World of Indoor Sports

Applicant: ATM Development LLC

Location: 621 Pound Hill Rd

Assessor's Plat 8 Lot 299

Zoning: Manufacturing (M)

Discussion, vote or other action by the Planning Board. Attorney Chris O'Conner introduced the project, explaining that changes were made as a result of pre-application guidance. The applicant would like Master Plan approval and a favorable recommendation to the Zoning Board of Review.

Joe Casali, PE said he expects RIDEM to review the project and issue a RIPDES permits. He does not expect to need dimensional relief. There is an existing stormwater drainage system, and the applicant expects to connect with it, adding low-impact design features to

pre-filter the stormwater.

Mr. Palardy asked about traffic flow in and out of the site. Mr. Casali replied that the applicant staggers field times to minimize the turnover volume at any given time. Dr. Benoit asked about the proposed retaining walls. Mr. Calasi said they would be cast-in-place concrete. Dr. Benoit asked about failure to file a local SWPPP or obtain permission for gravel removal. Mr. Ericson and Attorney Igliozzi concurred that the applicant could remediate in parallel with this plan.

Mr. Ericson noted a substandard parking aisle nearest the inflatable building. No current Class I survey was done, so the applicant is responsible for any dimensional relief needed.

Mr. Casali explained the condominium structure that divides the site into two areas. Mr. Ericson asked for documentation that people would have parking on both sides of the site. Attorney O'Connor said he would provide a copy of the lease. Attorney Igliozzi said that would be sufficient.

Dr. Benoit noted that the agenda did not list a public hearing. Mr. Ericson agreed, explaining that the information meeting is functionally a public hearing. The newspaper ad and direct notification were done correctly. Attorney Igliozzi proposed a continuation of the hearing with additional postcards to the public

(they were fewer than 10 abutters).

The applicant asked for a continuation to March 5, because Mr. Casali would be out of state. Owner Steve Sangermano spoke of the need to get the project finished by October 1. Mr. Iglizzi said there is only one Special Use Permit involved, and it would be modified for the addition.

Dr. Benoit moved to continue the application to March 5, 2015 and send postcard notices to the abutters. Second by Gary Palardi with all in favor (5-0).

While the applicant's team was packing up, Mr. Ericson explained the difference between subdivisions, land development projects and development plan review.

6. Capital Budget Requests: Police, Finance, School Department, Public Works, Parks and Recreation. Discussion, vote or other action by the Planning Board.

Mr. Lentz asked why we don't have capital budget numbers for the previous five years. Mr. Ericson explained the history that led to a change in Finance Director. He also noted the lack of capital spending in 2008 – 2010. Ms. Finnegan asked which capital projects were included in the Annex renovation bond. Mr. Ericson replied that there was little or no overlap, and the bond's renovation work would

probably be postponed until at least FY17.

Mr. Lentz asked how we can understand the relationship between operating and capital budgets. Mr. Iglizzi said the Planning Board makes capital recommendations for one year. Mr. Ericson explained that there is no understanding, and there has been no written definition for capital. He further explained that Lincoln has an 11-member Budget Board that integrates the operations and capital budget. Very few planning boards do capital budgeting. Mr. Naylor noted that setting town-wide priorities is new this year and at the Budget Committee's request.

Mr. Palardy asked why the police cruiser tablets were so expensive and whether they can break down the software costs. Mr. Iglizzi suggested that Planning Board members send Mr. Ericson questions to be answered by departments at the next meeting.

7. Proposed Zoning Amendments: Discussion, vote or other action on consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and other recommendations for proposed amendments to Section 7.9 (dumpsters) and Section 6.13 (parking and storage of certain vehicles).

Mr. Lentz explained the changes he proposed in Section 6.13 to achieve consistency with the Comp Plan. Dr. Benoit moved that Section 6.13 is consistent with the Comp Plan. Mr. Lentz seconded

with all in favor (5-0).

Mr. Lentz explained the changes he proposed in Section 7.9 for clarity. Ms. Finnegan recommended adding temporary to the text before cleanout. Attorney Igliozzi said there was no reason to return it just for that correction. Dr. Benoit noted a missing space in the text. Mr. Palardy recommended changing said dumpster to a dumpster. Dr. Benoit moved that the Planning Board find Section 7.9 consistent with the Comprehensive Plan as corrected. Mr. Palardy seconded with all in favor (5-0).

8. Planning Update: Summary of new developments with the Comprehensive Plan, public facilities improvement, new commercial and manufacturing projects, planned bridge work, applications in the pipeline, BRV Heritage Corridor projects, energy projects, Planning Board appointments, information distribution, and meetings schedule.

Mr. Ericson explained how to avoid any perception of a quorum outside of meetings. He also discussed the impact of not having a second alternate.

Mr. Ericson said he went to Sandywoods for the Solarize Tiverton and Solarize Little Compton kick-off. The Office of Energy Resources is most pleased that we now have two Solarize people on our Planning Board!

Dr. Benoit asked if the issue of shared driveways can go on the agenda. Mr. Ericson agreed and further suggested that we soon make the changes we have already discussed.

Ms. Finnegan and Mr. Palardy requested full-size plans. Mr. Palardy also wanted PDF files. Mr. Ericson noted that the plan files are very large, so we will need to use Google Drive.

9. Adjournment: Dr. Benoit moved that the Planning Board adjourn. Second by Ms. Roberts with all in favor (5-0). The meeting ended at 9:07.

Submitted by Robert Ericson on February 10, 2015