



Tower Hill Landings Annex

Major Land Development – Multi-household Development Project 2095 Kingstown Road

Pre-Application Concept Plan

<u>Received</u>	<u>Review Time</u>	<u>Deadline</u>	<u>Incomplete</u>	<u>Complete</u>	<u>Decision Time</u>	<u>Decision Deadline</u>
February 21, 2020	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Technical Review Committee Meeting - March 11, 2020

The applicant, Christopher Bicho, and other members of the team including Russ Johnson, David Wolfe, Steve Cabral, and John F. Kenyon discussed this application with the TRC.

Mr. Cabral described the property and the overall project which includes a total of eleven (11) units, of which two (2) would be affordable. With regard to Section 401 (Zoning – Dimensional Requirements), Mr. Parker indicated that within the Kingstown Road Special Management District the front-yard setback *could* be reduced to zero *by* the Planning Board, however, it was NOT automatic and was intended to allow for required parking to be situated in the rear of the building. Mr. Parker also pointed out that transition yard landscaping would be required along the property line to the northwest in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance.

With regard to Section 604 (Zoning – Kingstown Road Special Management District), Mr. Parker indicated that a no-access easement in favor of the Town of South Kingstown would be required, that a landscaped street yard between the building and the street is required, and that all structures located within the Kingstown Road Special Management District are limited to 7,500 square feet of gross leasable floor area (GLFA).

Mr. Parker also outlined that the Subdivision and Land Development Regulations requires that the parking lot be setback from the wall of the building, that there be screening from the abutting residential property to the northwest, that accessory uses shall not exceed 800 square feet and that 10% of the developable area (5,358 square feet for this property) must be dedicated as open space, of which the type shall be dictated by the type of occupants and approved by the Planning Board.

The applicant expressed concern with the size of the proposed structure (~16,000 GLFA) and it's relation to the 7,500 square foot restriction outlined within the Kingstown Road Special Management District. The applicant inquired if there were a benefit to splitting the project into two (2) structures instead to abide by the 7,500 square foot limitation. Mr. Parker advised that it would change the use from Multi-household Detached Structure (Use Code 12) to Multi-Household Land Development Project (Use Code 12.1) and there were different standards that would be applicable.

Mr. Schock indicated that he would like to see sidewalk along the length of the property and Mr. Bourbonnais requested that a Physical Alteration Permit (PAP) be completed to permanently close the existing curb cut on Kingstown Road. Mr. Parker indicated that he would put a comparison of regulatory requirements together for the project as Use Code 12 or Use Code 12.1 and send to the applicant for their use and consideration.

Item/Issue Discussed	Recommendation
Front-yard Setback	Provide justification for the reduced front-yard setback for consideration by the Planning Board.
Landscaping	Transition yard landscaping will be required along the property line to the northwest in accordance with Section 402.9(B) of the Zoning Ordinance.

	A landscaped street-yard is required between the building and the street in accordance with Section 604(D) & 604(E) of the Zoning Ordinance.
	Landscape screening is required abutting the residential property to the northwest per Subdivision & Land Development Regulations.
Structures	Structures within the Kingstown Road Special Management District are limited to 7,500 square feet of gross leasable floor area (GLFA) per Section 604(I) of the Zoning Ordinance.
Access	A Physical Alteration Permit (PAP) was requested to permanently close the existing curb cut on Kingstown Road.
	A no access easement in favor of the Town is required per Section 604(B) of the Zoning Ordinance.
	Consider installation of a sidewalk along the length of the property.
Parking	The parking lot must be setback from the wall of the building in accordance with the Subdivision and Land Development Regulations.
Accessory Uses	The floor area of accessory uses shall not exceed 800 square feet in size in accordance with the Subdivision and Land Development Regulations.
Open Space	At least 10% of the developable area of the parcel must be dedicated as open space in accordance with the Subdivision and Land Development Regulations.

Planning Board Meeting - April 30, 2020

John Kenyon, attorney for the applicant; Steve Cabral, Crossman Engineering; and applicants Chris Bicho and Russ Johnson all participated in this meeting to represent this application. Discussion ensued with Planning Board members asking questions in regard to the number of parking spaces proposed, spaces required per unit, number of occupants per unit, etc. Ms. Goins reminded applicant that more than three unrelated occupants per dwelling requires a special use permit.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

=====

Conceptual Master Plan

<u>Received</u>	<u>Review Time</u>	<u>Deadline</u>	<u>Incomplete</u>	<u>Complete</u>	<u>Decision Time</u>	<u>Decision Deadline</u>
May 5, 2020	25	May 30, 2020	May 15, 2020	--	--	--
May 28, 2020	10	June 7, 2020	--	May 29, 2020	90	August 27, 2020

Technical Review Committee Meeting - May 13, 2020

Appearing on behalf of the applicant were: Chris Bicho, Russ Johnson, Stephen Cabral (Crossman Engineering), and Attorney John Kenyon.

Note: TRC member Pam Rubinoff left the meeting at 12:26 PM and did not participate in this matter.

The applicants noted that they had revised their plans per the comments of the Planning Board at the pre-application hearing and that they are seeking the same waivers discussed at that hearing. To comply with the

Subdivision and Land Development Regulations, the original plan for a single-building was split into two buildings with the same total number of units.

The Planning Board’s parking questions were reviewed. Given the parking requirements for units with unrelated occupants, the proposed 44 spaces will be slightly over the 40-space minimum requirement. Also, even with the 44 new spaces, the combined parking for the adjacent multi-unit housing uses will still be 50 spaces fewer than would be required under the Zoning Ordinance.

The parking lot will use porous pavement to reduce runoff. Rooftop runoff will be directed to an underground storage and sand filter system to comply with TMDL requirements.

Staff noted that the zoning requirement for a 100’ setback and 50’ landscape buffer from Kingstown Road are superseded by the Kingstown Road Special Management District overlay, which permits a zero-foot (0’) setback with the approval of the Planning Board. In the present case the applicant is proposing a landscaped 25’ setback along Kingstown Road with a sidewalk to connect the units in the two structures to the bus stop area.

A waiver is required from the requirement for a 50’ separation between the buildings. It was not possible to separate the buildings further to meet the 50’ separation requirement as designed. Instead, the applicant proposes to separate the buildings by a 10’ landscaped walkway.

Mr. Schock asked about the applicant’s plans for dealing with the grade change along the north-south axis and whether there would be much cut and fill or whether there would be a retaining wall. Mr. Cabral said that they did not plan to cut much below grade due to the high water table and that there might be a small 2’ wall near the sand filter system.

Mr. Schock also inquired about where the sewer connection would be. Mr. Cabral said that they planned to connect to the sewers in Kingstown Rd. Mr. Schock replied that those connections were 6-inch laterals and that a flow analysis would be required.

Mr. Parker stated that the landscaping requirement at the zone change along the northern property boundary called for a “full landscape screen” and opined that the landscaping on the plan did not seem to meet that requirement. Mr. Cabral stated that the concept plan was prepared by a design tech and that a final landscape plan would be prepared by a landscape architect to meet the applicable requirements after concept approval.

Item/Issue Discussed	Recommendation
Parking	Parking necessary to accommodate requirements for unrelated residents living in a single dwelling unit. Total parking for adjacent multi-unit projects is less than required by zoning ordinance. Use of porous paving materials requires Planning Board approval per § 703 of Zoning Ordinance.
Landscaping	A formal landscape plan will be required for Preliminary Plan. Plan must address “full landscape screen” requirements along zone boundary.
Sewer	Flow analysis required for connection to 6” laterals in Kingstown Road.

TRC Action

A motion was made by Mr. Schock to move the matter on to the Planning Board with a favorable recommendation subject to the above-referenced comments. The motion was duly seconded by Mr. Bourbonnais and was unanimously approved. *(Ms. Rubinoff did not vote having left the meeting at 12:26 PM.)*

Conservation Commission Meeting – June 4, 2020

Appearing on behalf of the applicant were: Russ Johnson, Stephen Cabral (Crossman Engineering), and Attorney John Kenyon.

Following review and discussion with the applicant’s Attorney, John F. Kenyon, Project Manager, Russ Johnson, and Engineer, Steven Cabral, P.E., the following motion, made by Ms. Joubert and duly seconded by Mr. Wyman, was unanimously approved 6-0 (M. Bradywood; D. Flanders; C. O’Connor; M. Talbot-Rabuano; J.V. Wyman):

Motion: “The Conservation Commission recognizes that the shared access from Rolens Drive, the reduced frontage of the buildings, and closer siting of the buildings is one way of reducing impervious cover which is recommended. We are a bit concerned about the depth to the water table and the filling that is going to occur; but without more information, they will need to rely on RIDEM to ensure that all protective measures are taken. The curbing along Route 108 seems to be one way to reduce runoff crossing into the property and down-gradient toward the wetland. We are pleased to see the use of pervious pavement, but are concerned that if RIDEM doesn’t approve permeable pavement due to water table depth or any other condition, that the applicant would have to come back to us with other types of stormwater management measures that could be accommodated to reduce runoff to the same extent possible.

In terms of the design and installation of the asphalt for the permeable pavement parking lot, that the plans be reviewed by an outside expert, and there be an onsite inspector when the permeable parking lot is installed to ensure that the asphalt mix and the installation is correct; and that the maintenance contract afterwards be developed that would include no sand application, no salt if possible, vacuuming as needed, and prevention of runoff from polluted areas or potential pollutants, such as from the dumpster, where the dumpster would be on an impervious surface with curbing; and that a maintenance contract would be maintained and reports sent to the Town to keep track of the maintenance occurring. Also, no snow storage on the permeable lot should be allowed, whether that snow is coming from the Rolens Drive area or elsewhere, since that often contains sand. We are also concerned about construction during the wet season and during frozen conditions; so we would like to ensure that the Soil Erosion Sediment Control Plan addresses those issues carefully, and if necessary, provides for a third party inspector that would be there to conduct inspections and send summary reports to the Town. Landscaping plans should include the Town’s planting specifications in the subdivision regulations, using native species and low-input grasses without the use of fertilizer or irrigation.”

=====
Zoning Board Meeting – August 19, 2020

Applicant received a Special Use Permit allowing the occupancy of more than three (3) unrelated people.

=====
Preliminary Plan

<u>Received</u>	<u>Review Time</u>	<u>Deadline</u>	<u>Incomplete</u>	<u>Complete</u>	<u>Decision Time</u>	<u>Decision Deadline</u>
September 24, 2020	25	October 19, 2020	--	September 28, 2020	90	December 27, 2020

Technical Review Committee Meeting – September 9, 2020

Steve Cabral, PE, John Kenyon, Esq., Chris Bicho and R. Johnson appeared on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Cabral noted that the site plan is largely unchanged. The project is located in the Saugatucket TMDL area, so new porous pavement is proposed with stormwater and roofs draining to an underground system

with a sand filter. Drinking water and fire suppression is supplied via municipal water. The project will be connected to public sewer in Kingstown Road and will a 50% reduction in flow from the prior restaurant use. Parking is provided for 44 vehicles with the overage to provide extra parking for abutting residential uses and the likelihood of multiple unrelated occupants in the 4 bedroom units.

Mr. Parker reminded the board that waivers were being sought for: less than a 10 foot landscape perimeter on the southern boundary; less than 25 feet between the proposed buildings (*created by the Planning Board's request to use 2 buildings instead of one*) and less than the 100' front yard setback required for multi-household developments. Mr. Cabral noted that the perimeter landscaping waiver abutted an adjacent parking area; and the proposed 25' separation to Kingstown Road was authorized in the Kingstown Road SMD.

Mr. Flanders recommended that the applicant avoid the use of Blue Spruce in the landscaping plan due to blight and that the planting diagram be replaced by the town's required planting diagram and specifications in Article 13 of the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Parker noted that the applicant would need to identify a monitoring agent for the affordable units prior to Preliminary Plan approval.

Mr. Pimental noted that the plans should contain a design note specifying which units are affordable and the build-out schedule for those units. Mr. Cabral indicated that the affordable units were specified on Sheet C5 of the plans. (*A build-out schedule is not included.*)

Mr. Kenyon noted that the applicant had received a Special Use Permit from the Zoning Board for unrelated occupants.

Item/Issue Discussed	Recommendation
Landscaping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The landscape plan should not include the use of Blue Spruce due to blight. • The landscape plan should substitute the planting diagram from Article 13 of the Subdivision Regulations for the one used in the plan.
Comprehensive Permit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan must identify a monitoring agent for the affordable housing units prior to Preliminary Plan approval. • The plan should include a building timetable specifying when the affordable units will be constructed relative to the remainder of the units.

TRC Action

A motion was made by Mr. Riendeau to forward the application to the Planning Board with a positive recommendation subject to the issues discussed above. The motion was duly seconded by Mr. Schock and was unanimously approved on a roll—call vote.