

the lots. Mr. Principe noted that RIDEM was present on the site when soil evaluations for the septic systems were completed and that test pits were dug during the wet season. Planning Board members noted that the generalized wetlands locations depicted on the South Kingstown web GIS system show potential wetlands on the rear lots. Discussion ensued regarding the accuracy of the generalized wetlands data layer as compared to a site inspection by a biologist. Staff advised the Planning Board that the generalized wetlands layer identifies areas which may be wet but is not as accurate as a site inspection by a qualified expert. Staff indicated that a conditions of approval could be added to the approval to require the applicant to request a Determination from RIDEM relative to the presence of wetlands.

Planning Board members indicated that they would like to conduct a site visit to the property before the next regularly scheduled meeting on December 18, 2018.

Planning Board members asked staff why is they did not see an extension to their statutory review period for the subdivision associated with the applicant's request to continue at the October 23, 2018 meeting. Staff indicated that the Planning Board did not include said request in their motion during the October meeting. Discussion ensued regarding the willingness of the applicant to consent to a corresponding extension of the review period given the granting of the continuance in October. The applicant indicated they would be willing to grant such. Staff noted that this translated to a 36 day extension to the 90 day review period.

The Planning Board asked the applicant if they would be willing to locate the limits of disturbance for development on the site such that the existing vegetation to the rear of the future home sites would remain in order to provide a privacy buffer as requested by the abutting property owner Edward Sturgeon. The applicant indicated they plan to maintain all trees where possible and would be willing to use the rear setback for lots 3A and 3B as a limit of disturbance to protect the existing vegetation.

Mr. Murphy moved; Mr. Riendeau seconded; motion carried: **MOTION:** "The South Kingstown Planning Board hereby continues the Lewis Estates Major Subdivision Combined Conceptual Master Plan Public Informational Meeting and Preliminary Plan Public Hearing to its next regular meeting on December 18, 2018. Additionally the Planning Board hereby establishes a 36-day extension to the statutory review period of the subdivision as agreed to by the applicant."

VOTE: Mack – aye
Rubinoff - aye
Torello – aye
Riendeau – aye
Murphy– aye
DiStefano – aye
DiMasi - aye

5. **PRE-APPLICATION CONCEPT REVIEW, MAJOR SUBDIVISION – The Village at Curtis Corner**, a proposed fourteen (14) lot subdivision, with street creation, on a previously subdivided parcel, with waivers requested for the provision of less than the required frontage for three (3) of the proposed lots, AP 40-4, Lot 55, located on Curtis Corner Road, 5A Builders, LLC, owner/applicant

John Kenyon, attorney for the applicant, and Eric Prive, project engineer were present representing the application.

The applicant indicated that this parcel was previously before the Planning Board as a minor subdivision, the applicant is now seeking to develop the remainder parcel from the previous five (5) lot subdivision. The parcel contains approximately 28 acres of land with seven (7) acres suitable for development and a significant wetlands complex located in the western side of the property. The wetland edge has been delineated and verified by RIDEM. The parcel is located in Natural Heritage Areas a defined by RIDEM. The property is proposed for service with public water and sewer. Mr. Prive indicated that groundwater table depths between 4 and 8 feet were found on the property allowing for the use of stormwater infiltration using driveway trenches, and infiltration areas for the proposed cul-de-sac roadway. The applicant proposes to develop 14 lots on the remainder parcel including three (3) inclusionary zoning units.

The Planning Board and applicant discussed the proposal. The Planning Board indicated they support the elimination of curb cuts on Curtis Corner Road while maintaining the orientation of homes on the lots which front on Curtis Corner Road toward that street. Discussion ensued regarding the condition of the sidewalks on Curtis Corner Road, the applicant indicated they were in good condition. The Planning Board advised the applicant consider alternative connections to the Curtis Corner Middle School and sports fields. Discussion ensued

regarding the challenges of connection given the location of wetlands. The applicant indicated they have not determined what price point the affordable housing units will be developed at. Staff noted that the zoning ordinance requires inclusionary zoning units to be affordable to households making no more than 80 percent of the area median income. The Planning Board recommended the applicant consider ground the proposed street trees, sizing the homes to be modest in size to promote the overall affordability of the units built. The Board recommended use of a shared driveway for proposed lots 10 & 11. Discussion ensued regarding the width of the proposed roadway. Staff indicated that a traffic impact assessment will be required and a downstream carrying capacity study will need to be conducted relative to sewer provision.

E. DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW:

1. **DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW – The Prout School**, proposed construction of a multi-purpose synthetic turf athletic field, measuring approximately 330 feet by 195 feet, and associated site improvements including parking lot expansion, installation of athletic lighting and construction of new bleachers. The proposed development requires dimensional variances from the Zoning Board of Review, AP 50-4, Lot 19, located at 4640 Tower Hill Road, The Prout School, applicant, The Roman Catholic Bishop of Providence, owner

Nicole Kelley, the Prout School, and John Perry, project engineer were present representing the applicant.

The applicant summarized the proposed development of a synthetic turf athletic field and changes to the parking areas on the site of the existing private school. The purpose of the project is to provide a safe playing surface for student athletics which can withstand continued use during sports seasons. The applicant will need to receive approval from the Zoning Board or Review for dimensional variances regarding the height of athletic lighting proposed and setbacks for the field as associated structures relief needed would reduce the setback to between three and one feet in some areas.

The applicant indicated that they have reviewed the drainage following discussion with the Technical Review Committee and the project initially proposed an increase in stormwater discharge to the RIDOT right-of-way for Route 1. The applicant indicated they have been able to modify the drainage to reduce volume along with peak flow and will not need to seek approval from RIDOT for the change in volume. The applicant and Planning Board discussed drainage of the synthetic turf field itself.

The Planning Board and applicant discussed the proposed athletic lighting. The Board asked if lighting would spill over onto the right-of-way of Route 1 given the roads designation as a scenic roadway. The applicant indicated that the lights are positioned high in order to shine directly down upon the field and that no lighting would spill over onto US Route 1. The Planning Board asked staff to investigate the height of lighting located at the sports fields found at Old Mountain Field or the Curtis Corner Middle School for comparison. Board members asked if lighting will be dark sky compliant. The applicant they will be. Discussion ensued regarding the lighting plan submitted which shows some lighting from the fixtures extending onto the abutting property to the east. The applicant noted they will work with the lighting company to see if this can be mitigated. The Board asked the applicant to provide an idea of how visible 70 foot tall lighting structures would be from Route 1.

The Planning Board and applicant discussed the retaining walls which support the turf field. The applicant indicated the wall would be seven feet tall at its highest and taper down as it moved around the field. The Planning Board asked how much fill would be needed for the installation of the field. The applicant indicated that an exact number is not known at this time but several thousand yards of fill may be needed.

The Planning Board discussed any changes to the signage on the property. The applicant indicated there is no anticipated change in signage. Discussion ensued regarding the hours of operation, use of loud speakers, and number of sports events held. The applicant indicated that the school intends to rent the field out for other student athletes when the Prout School is not using the field for its own games and practices. The Board asked for a better understanding how the hours of usage for the field.

Resident Jenn Judge spoke regarding drainage of the field, interaction of drainage with the retaining wall, potential of weeds to take root in the synthetic materials and potential use of herbicides, and plantings proposed between the retaining wall and the property line.