

by the Planning Board. The applicant and TRC discussed the timing of the required approvals. The TRC stated the approval of the Operation & Maintenance Plan should be received prior to preliminary plan approval. Approval of the Public Safety Preparedness and Response Plan should be received prior to final plan approval.

Recommendation

The TRC recommends the application be placed on the Planning Board agenda for November 28, 2017.

Item/Issue Discussed	Recommendation
Request for Combined Review Stages	Provide a written request to the Planning Board for combined Conceptual Master Plan and Preliminary Plan review prior to November 7, 2017, for consideration during Pre-Application review.
Abutters	Provide the names of abutting property owners and property owners immediately across any adjacent streets.
Soils Map	Provide a copy of the soils map of the subject parcel with a general analysis of the soil types and suitability for the proposed development, including information on appropriate water table elevations and flood potential.
Public Safety Preparedness and Response Plan approval	Receive approval of the facility’s Public Safety Preparedness and Response Plan from the Director of the Emergency Medical Services prior to final plan approval.
	Receive approval of the facility’s Public Safety Preparedness and Response Plan from the Chief of Police prior to final plan approval.
	Receive approval of the facility’s Public Safety Preparedness and Response Plan from the Chief of the Union Fire district prior to final plan approval.
Operation and Maintenance Plan approval	Receive approval of the facility’s Operations and Maintenance Plan from the Director of the Department of Public Services prior to preliminary plan approval from the Planning Board.

- 2. **CONCEPTUAL MASTER PLAN REVIEW, FLEXIBLE DESIGN RESIDENTIAL PROJECT – Hillside Commons,** proposed development of 19 detached residential units as a multi-household land development project with associated parking and infrastructure improvements, AP 57-2, Lot 59, located at 76 Kelley Way, Scot Halberg, owner/applicant

Representing the applicant: Eric Prive, DiPrete Engineering, John Kenyon, project attorney, Scot Halberg, applicant

Discussion

The applicant stated the project went before the Planning Board in May of 2107 for pre-application review. The parcel is approximately three (3) acres in size and is located off Kelley Way. The proposed development consists of nineteen (19) free standing dwelling units including the density bonuses associated with the provision of inclusionary zoning units, and development of two-bedroom dwelling units. During the pre-application review the Planning Board recommended the applicant determine if any significant landscape features existed on the property which could be incorporated into the site layout and determine if the amount of visitor parking could be reduced on the site. The landscape architect conducted an evaluation of the features existing on the site and determined that two significant copper beech trees located on the parcel should be preserved. The applicant has modified the configuration of dwelling units on the parcel to incorporate these trees. The applicant has reduced the number of visitor parking spaces and made it into parallel parking to increase the size of the green space located within the loop of the proposed access road. The projects landscape architect has evaluated the existing vegetation along the buffer from Kelley Way, and determined the existing vegetation sufficient to provide a visual buffer as such the applicant does not propose additional planting with the vegetative buffer. The parcel requires 0.46 acres of open space to be provided. The proposed development provides 0.86 acres of open space on the parcel.

The TRC recommended the applicant remove the existing note on the plan set identifying the area to be landscaped within the buffer if the applicant does not intend to include additional plantings.

The TRC and applicant discussed stormwater management. The applicant stated the stormwater infrastructure will utilize dry wells for the units and intends to incorporate some low impact development features including some small bio-retention areas. The parcel will be served by public water and sewer. The applicant has done soil testing and the soils will accommodate infiltration on site. The applicant noted a portion of the green space on the parcel is located upgrade from the site infrastructure which limits the ability to incorporate infiltration features in that area. The water table testing on the site yielded results between 4 and 6 feet. At this time they believe they may be able to handle all stormwater with the use of the dry wells and infiltration features under consideration. The applicant noted they will have more detail on stormwater for the preliminary plan review.

The applicant noted that the possibility to include accessory solar energy on the site was discussed with the Planning Board during the pre-application review and the applicant is open to incorporating solar into the proposed development by offering that option on some of the proposed units. The applicant will bring additional information regarding solar to the meeting with the Planning Board. The TRC noted that a new round of the solarize program is about to launch in South Kingstown.

The TRC and applicant discussed the location of the proposed units to the western property line. The applicant initially proposed a 10 foot no-cut buffer along the property line since that time the units have been moved forward on the site to provide more separation. The applicant no longer proposes to have the area include a no-cut buffer. The applicant does not intend to clear the existing vegetation located along the property line during construction, that existing vegetation will be located outside of the limit of disturbance. The TRC advised the applicant to remove the note from the plan set that regarding the no-cut buffer if it is not in fact proposed.

The TRC asked if the applicant will keep the existing stone wall located on the parcel. The applicant will assess the condition of the stone wall to determine if it is possible to keep the feature.

The applicant and TRC discussed the revised layout of the site. The applicant noted a parcel adjacent to the site is currently undeveloped, the proposed access drive has been designed to potentially accommodate possible future connection to that parcel if development occurs at a later time.

The TRC advised the applicant to incorporate diversity of architectural features into the construction of the proposed units to provide a more variety appearance. The TRC and applicant discussed the possibility of a condition of approval requiring the facades be varied along the street. The applicant stated they would be accepting of such a condition which may include variation of the roof line, façade materials, or other variations.

The TRC stated a rendering depicted the view of the proposed development from Kelley Way is a requirement of the Special Management District, such a rendered must be provide prior to review by the Planning Board. The TRC and the applicant discussed the rendering given that the proposed units will be one story structure, and the exact architect has yet to be determined.

The TRC and applicant discussed the proposed developments plan for sanitary sewer connection. The applicant stated the units will utilize a gravity connection to reach the junction point with the existing sewer main located in Kelley Way.

The TRC provided the following list of items, as included on the Conceptual Master Plan checklist, which will need to be submitted by the applicant to receive a certificate of completeness. A fiscal impact statement, written confirmation from Suez Water that water services is available, inclusion of the location and nature of outdoor refuse storage and collection and recycling areas should be added to the plan set, the projects proposed construction schedule and phasing of development should be included in the project narrative or on the plan set.

Item/Issue Discussed	Recommendation
Removal of inaccurate plan notes	Review the site plans to remove the notations regarding the installation of landscaping within the vegetative buffer, and the proposed 10 foot no-cut buffer to accurately reflect the proposal.
Accessory solar energy	Pursue the ability to provide solar energy systems as an option for the proposed dwelling units.
Façade variation	Provide a varied appearance to the proposed dwelling units.
Fiscal impact statement	Provide a fiscal impact statement for the proposed development.
Water service	Submitted written confirmation from Suez Water indicating that the plans have been reviewed and is able to provide water service.
Outdoor refuse and recycling areas	Include on the plan set the proposed location of outdoor refuse storage and collection and recycling areas.
Construction schedule and	Include notation of the construction schedule and any proposed

Item/Issue Discussed	Recommendation
proposed phasing of development	phases of the development within the plan set or project narrative.
View from Kelley Way	Provide a rendering of the view of the proposed development from Kelley Way.
Conservation Commission review	Receive an advisory review from the Conservation Commission for the proposed development.

3. COMBINED CONCEPTUAL MASTER PLAN & PRELIMINARY PLAN REVIEW, MAJOR LAND DEVELOPMENT PROJECT – 84 Old Tower Hill Road, a proposed 25,950 square foot self-storage facility, AP 57-2, Lot 60, located at the rear of 84 Old Tower Hill Road, Fred W. Smith, Inc., owner, Bluedog Capital Partners, LLC, applicant

Representing the applicant: Dave Russo, DiPrete Engineering, Mellissa Lawson, Lacuna Design, Sarah Harris and Richard Tasca, Bluedog Capital Partners, applicant

Discussion

The applicant summarized the proposed development. The existing site today is a mix of gravel and dilapidated asphalt, there is limited vegetation, some wetlands located on the rear of the parcel. The proposed development will utilize an existing access driveway. The building will have a footprint of approximately 26,000 square feet and will contain three stories. Parking is provided around the building with ADA accessible parking in the front. The project proposes connection to public water and sewer. A physical alteration permit has been issued from RIDOT for the curb cut and the use of the property. The proposal has been reviewed by the RIDEM wetlands division. The site will be surrounded by a fence. The applicant is proposed a retaining wall due to the grading of the site.

The applicant proposes sand filters with sediment forbays on the site. There is an existing issue with petroleum contamination on the site; the environmental engineer working on the project will be present at the Planning Board meeting to present his findings. The applicant stated that RIDEM did not want to see water infiltration proposed on the site, and a fully capped site is proposed. The sand filter features will be lined to prevent infiltration while still providing for water quality. The water runoff on site will flow into the wetland to the north of the property.

The applicant noted that the proposed color of the building has been changed to a green color which is part of the CubeSmart branding pattern in response to the Planning Board’s feedback during the pre-application review. The TRC requested that the building rendering include an orientation reference to assist the Planning Board in identifying the view presented in relation to the site layout. The building entrances should be added to the site plan, including the entrances to the building and where any outside storage entrances will be.

The TRC discussed the TMDL in effect on the Indian Run Brook as related to the proposed development. The applicant noted that RIDEM did not see an issue with the proposed development as related to the TMDL. Mr. Rosen stated the TMDL in effect is for levels of metals. The TRC noted