

East Greenwich Planning Board  
Town of East Greenwich  
February 3, 2021  
7:00 PM  
Virtual

Present: Nate Ginsburg, Chair; Ben Lupovitz, Vice Chair; Chris Pels; Eric Jautaikis; Marc Gertsacov  
Absent:  
Staff: Lisa Bourbonnais, Planning Director; Aaron Lindo, Planning Technician; Mark Conboy, Town Engineer; Joe Duarte, Public Works Director; Mike Ursillo, Solicitor; Peter Skwirz, Solicitor

### 1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:06 by Mr. Ginsburg

### 2. Roll Call

### 3. Consent Agenda

**A: Recent Administrative Actions** - In certain circumstances, the Planning Director, acting as the Administrative Officer for subdivisions and land developments, is authorized to grant final plan and decision approvals. According to RI General Laws Section 45-23-37, such actions are to be reported to the Planning Board. The following outlines such actions taken during in December, 2020:

- Record Plan #986 – The Final Plan set for the 96-unit Brookside Terrace major land development at 1470 South County Trail – Map 71, Plat 10, Lot 378.
- Record Plan #987 – Related, the minor subdivision plan that was approved as part of the aforementioned Brookside Terrace Final Plan. It involves modifying an easement to a Town Pump Station at the back of the lot to essentially give the pump station to the Town.

Ms. Bourbonnais briefly explained the administrative actions listed above.

### 4. Master Plan Review with required Public Information Meeting.

**GDubon Properties, LLC** for the Forest Lane Subdivision for property located at 35 & 55 Forest Lane; Map 19 A.P. 19 Lots 1 and 2 (Zoned F-2, Farm). The Applicant seeks to develop the 17.6 acre site with five homes. The two existing lots will become five single-family residential lots ranging in size from roughly 2 to 5 acres each. The project will yield four net new homes which qualifies it as a minor project which can ordinarily skip the Master Plan stage. Roadway waivers appear necessary, however, and this relief requires that the project proceed like a Major application. The project site sits at the end of Forest and Canterbury Lanes at the West Greenwich Town line.

David Iglizzi, the attorney for the applicant, represented the application along with Bruce Hagerman, the project engineer, and Chris Reynolds, the developer.

Mr. Iglizzi briefly explained the site and noted that the only relief reused was a waiver regarding the length of the cul-de-sac. The project is at Master plan stage and is conceptual with no hard engineering done.

Mr. Hagerman presented the application and was sworn in along with Mr. Reynolds. Mr. Hagerman shared his screen and presented the application. The 17.6 acre site is located on the western edge of East Greenwich. The site contains an existing house. The foundation of the burned down house is in good shape. There is a portion of the site that was filled. The existing house is accessed via a gravel road. The parcel is in the F2 farming zone. Water access end before the site.

He presented a radius map with existing conditions that displayed the existing structure and wetlands. the proposed project will extend Forest Lane by 586 feet. The current length is approximately 931 feet which necessitates the waiver for exceeding the 1000 feet for a cul-de-sac. The new road would be similar to what is on Canturbury Lane. The 5 lot design caters to the existing dwellings. There will be new septic systems and new wells installed as well as a fire cistern. The stormwater management will be accomplished by extended dry detention basins, sand filters, and dry wells. The site is currently higher than the existing cul-de-sac and the applicant should be able to raise the grade and potentially eliminate the retaining walls. As shown, the retaining walls are 4 feet high.

Answering a question regarding the size of the homes proposed, Mr. Reynolds commented that the homes are to be similar in size to the houses in the surrounding neighborhood i.e. 2500 square feet, 2-3 bedrooms, 2-3 car garage.

It was noted that the applicant has seen the staff report. It was noted that there were other staff level concerns from past negative incidences involving cisterns. The cisterns will not be the responsibility of the fire department or the town. The concern about the 1000 foot cul-de-sac waiver is because of fire apparatus access. A cistern is one way to alleviate that concern. Mr. Hagerman explained that the cistern details will be reviewed by the fire department prior to submittal and will be maintained by a HOA. It will be located outside of the ROW on private property. The applicant will work with the fire department regarding the location and maintenance plan.

Mr. Ginsburg asked for an explanation about the DEM violation from 1990. Mr. Hagerman explained that the work has been completed and the violation has been lifted. The violation was under prior ownership and the new owner (the applicant) had to clear the violation in order to get clear title. Mr. Reynolds added that the wetlands have been remediated and restored. There was a lot of concrete onsite which was dealt with. There was also a solid waste violation on the property which was cleared out. Minor plantings were installed with a consent agreement stipulating that the plantings must remain alive for a year.

Mr. Jautaikis asked about the affordability requirement for having 5 lots. Ms. Bourbonnais replied that the affordability requirement is enforced when there are 5 new lots. There are only 3 new units with 2 houses by right so there is not an affordability requirement and the units can be market rate.

Ms. Bourbonnais asked about the buffering from the wetlands in regards to the septic and the wells. Mr. Hagerman replied that there is no work proposed within 50 feet of the wetland perimeter nor will there be an disturbance with in the 50 foot wetland perimeter. The septic systems will be more than 50 feet away and the wells will be outside of the perimeter.

Mr. Lupovitz asked about the suggested conservation easement over lots 1 and 2. Ms. Bourbonnais

commented that when the applicant entered into an agreement protecting the wetlands, it is a consent agreement. The Town likes to make it as clear as possible and have a notation on the record plan in addition to an agreement recorded in the land evidence records. A third layer of protection is an actual conservation easement. It is up to the Planning Board how much protection is needed. Usually, the standard practice is as much protection that can be obtained to make sure the wetlands are protected. The discussion can be deferred until the preliminary plan hearing. It was noted that the applicant does not have an objection to a conservation easement.

Mr. Jautais asked for more information regarding the different options and how they are imposed. Ms. Bourbonnais explained that the applicant provided the consent agreement with DEM with conditions that would get recorded. The applicant will also provide a plan that is a record plan that will also be recorded. Staff would ask for a clear notation on the plan depicting where the conservation easement is. The 3<sup>rd</sup> later is easement language which the applicant grants to the Town to preclude future development. Any and all of those would be sufficient protection.

Mr. Ginsburg asked if the fire chief had weighed in on the project. Ms. Bourbonnais replied that both the fire chief and the fire marshal were part of the technical review meeting. They are pleased that an actual road is being built. The 1000 gallon cistern meets the criteria and they would like to see the HOA language for maintaining the cistern as well as inspect cistern after installation.

Mr. Ginsburg noted that the boulder retaining wall was a bit of a concern. Mr. Duarte commented that the concern at the beginning was the amount of space it could take out of the shoulder area for utilities. It could be pushed more toward the property lines. The northern side would be supporting the roadway but would require long term maintenance requirements. The town does not want to maintain retaining wall and would rather see the burden on the property owners instead. It is thought that there could be grading adjustments made to eliminate the walls all together.

Mr. Iglizzi commented that he had the benefit of reviewing the draft motion and had a conference with Ms. Bourbonnais. At a conceptual level, the level of design that is required is going to require additional engineering at the preliminary level. The applicant would like to defer any conditions imposed until the preliminary level when there will be more concrete engineering designs. He requested that condition number 4 be deferred for discussion until the preliminary plan meeting when there is more information. Mr. Ginsburg was in support of striking condition 4 from the motion.

Mr. Iglizzi also suggested that condition 6, referencing the existing cul-de-sac, be deferred until the preliminary plan meeting so that there is more engineering done. It would be more beneficial when there is a design plan and a landscaping plan. The applicant will have final designs as required by the regulations and would like to make a proper presentation at that time. The applicant has every intention to restore the site to the specifications of the Town.

After a brief discussion, the Board and staff was okay with the suggestions. Public welfare is paramount. At preliminary, there will be more details that will show how the area is going to be restored.

Public comment was opened at 7:48.

John Ireland, of 30 Forest Lane, was sworn in.

Mr. Ireland wanted to know the extent of the impact in regards to his frontage and the side of his property as well as how much tree clearing will be done. Mr. Hagerman replied that the construction of the sand filter and the detention basin will require tree removal. The applicant could consider moving the sand filter further away. Access for maintenance to the basin can be revegetated. The sand filter is more or less at grade. There will be higher canopy vegetation along the roadway that will be cleared within the ROW. There is no work being proposed on Mr. Ireland's property but the driveway will probably be extended minimally. The existing cul-de-sac will be removed and graded. The detention basins are collected by 4 catch basins collecting storm water runoff. The stormwater enters the sand filter which allows some infiltration. As the water passes through, some of the pathogens and bacteria get removed. Higher volume goes into the detention basins to mitigate peak flow.

Don Dunwoody, of 2080 Frenchtown Road, was sworn in.

Mr. Dunwoody asked if there was any consideration to connect Canterbury Lane and Forest Lane. He is also aware of the debris field and the concrete on the property and is concerned about the runoff. In regards to the connectivity, Ms. Bourbonnais gave background information. About 20-25 years ago, Canterbury Lane had regulations in place capping the street to 1000 feet. When the roadway ended 1500 feet in, permission was given on the premise that someday it would connect. It is a good planning practice to have street connectivity for public safety. It was assumed that Canterbury would connect. When the Town became aware of the wetlands in the area, that changed. It is difficult to get wetland crossing permission from DEM and it is not a good practice in general. The Town conceded to the notion that it would not connect because of the preservation of the wetlands.

Mr. Hagerman added that the wetlands have been verified by DEM. There is no stream but there could be some channels that do not meet the definition of a stream. As far as the stormwater design, the applicant will meet all state and local regulations. Soil tests have yet to be performed at this stage as it is conceptual. Everything that has been mentioned, the applicant is aware of. All of the stormwater mitigation features are outside of the 50-foot wetland perimeter. The only thing that is relatively close is a well near the perimeter. The elevation difference to the wetland is probably 26 feet vertically and 150 feet horizontally.

Tom Opishinski, of 81 Shippee Road, was sworn in.

Mr. Opishinski commented that on lots 1 and 2, the water flows down into the wetland area. The change in land use of residential will change the nutrient load as yards will get fertilized. Mr. Opishinski was concerned about the potential for future development. Ms. Bourbonnais commented that any further addition to the cul-de-sac would require a new waiver and approval by the Planning Board in a public meeting. The waiver is the tool in the tool box to prevent that from happening. The project is at master plan and will come before the board 2 more times. Mr. Opishinski asked if there would be any studies performed regarding the additional nutrient loading from the runoff. Mr. Ginsburg noted that DEM regulations are clear about the distance from the wetland. Mr. Hagerman added that nothing has been specifically regarding this project. DEM has the power to review the nutrient load and there will be an operations and maintenance manual that will be a part of the HOA.

Bill and Elizabeth Saunders, of 20 Forest Land, were sworn in.

The Saunders' were concerned about the water resources, specifically regarding consumption and wastewater. They asked is there had been anything done about the water availability with respect to the recent drought as

well as the direction of the wastewater. They also commented about the Forest Lane extension, citing the width of the street would be crucial.

Regarding the availability of well water, Mr. Hagerman commented that there have not been any studies performed at the current stage. The engineering of the stormwater is designed to recharge as much as possible. One of the next steps for the project is a subdivision suitability study to be submitted to DEM. They look at the cumulative impact from the stormwater systems. Engineering will be done at a later stage. Regarding the roadway, under regulations, the applicant can go down to 24 feet, which is what is proposed. The paved width is 30 feet for the new extension. The 24 feet is to minimize runoff.

Mr. Duarte added that 24 feet is the Town's standard. It is more than adequate and is the standard for residential roads in town.

Mr. Igliazzi noted that a HOA is being created for this project. There is nothing existing and it is being created because of the cistern. The HOA would be responsible for the cisterns and the drainage ponds. They would have a legal responsibility for the maintenance.

Danielle Place, of 91 Shippee Road, was sworn in.

Ms. Place also voiced concerns about the wells. She has heard of several wells that have had issues and have had to drill new well in dry years. New wells are a concern. She asked if there would be studies done.

Regarding the impact of the wells, Mr. Hagerman replied that a lot if it depends on how the aquifer is constructed which has to do with the soils. With that in mind, he could not make an educated guess yet. There have been preliminary test pits performed and the aquifer is fairly deep. The eastern part is deep and the western part is more shallow.

Alyssa Opishinski, of 81 Shippee Road, was sworn in.

Ms. Opishinski was concerned about the light pollution that might occur from the houses, noting that wetland wildlife is often affected by light pollution. Mr. Hagerman replied that the only lighting for the new project would be at the fire cistern and low street lighting. In regards to consideration for the lighting of homeowners, it was noted that there is a compliancy requirement to follow any light ordinances with the Town. Ms. Bourbonnais commented that the project is at master plan. The project still has hurdles to go through and there will be another advertised public hearing at the preliminary plan stage. At the next stage, there will be hard engineering which includes landscaping and lighting plans. For lighting there is the dark skies regulation but there are no regulations for single family residence lighting. The town is more concerned with town property and rights of ways.

Gregory Stevens, of 7 Forest Lane, was sworn in.

Mr. Stevens repeated the same concerns as previous abutters, including the significant grade change to the wetlands impacting runoff, and wells running dry.

Public comment was closed at 8:39

Board comments and questions.

Mr. Yoder commented that the concerns of the neighbors are all very valid. The staff report addressed a lot of the comments and concerns.

The application and plan narrative were marked as exhibit 1 and the staff report was marked as exhibit 2. It was noted that there is a draft motion that was issued and as discussed, item 4 has been struck and half of

item 6 has been struck.

Mr. Gertsacov made a motion to approve the draft motion. Mr. Lupovitz seconded the motion which was unanimously approved.

**5. Comprehensive Permit Application: Master Plan Review with required public informational meeting on a project called “The Post on Main.”**

**Sathuan K. Sa** on behalf of applicant *The Imperial at Greenwich II, LLC* for property located at 1016 Main Street; Map 64 A.P. 5 Lot 218 (Zoned MUPD and M/LIO). The Applicant seeks to redevelop the site known as the former American Legion Hall as a 30-unit multi-family residential project to be called The Post on Main. Applicant has submitted a Comprehensive Permit request since 26% of the units (8 of 30) will meet the State’s definition of Affordable. The application as submitted specifically seeks Master Plan approval of the project described but will, by necessity, also include improvements to adjacent parcels, namely Assessor’s Map 64, Plat 5, Lots 158 and 219 which were part of the Final Plan approved in February, 2020 for *The Imperial on Greenwich* (38 units accessed via Greenwich Boulevard). A major plan revision to the approved “Imperial” project will thus need to be reviewed concurrently.

**6. Comprehensive Permit Application: Revised Final Plan Review with required public hearing on the project called “The Imperial on Greenwich.”**

A decision was recorded on February 26, 2020 approving the referenced project but modifications are now required as the applicant seeks to develop an adjacent parcel in conjunction with the “Imperial” project (See “Post on Main” discussion above.) Section 41 of the current Land Development Regulations requires that when a major revision like this one is filed, the project reverts back to the Preliminary Plan level of review, a new public hearing must be held, duly advertised and noticed, and a new decision must be rendered.

**Sathuan K. Sa** on behalf of applicant *The Imperial at Greenwich, LLC* for property being Assessor’s Map 64, Plat 5, Lots 158, and 219 proposed for development as 38 units of residential development with ten deed-restricted affordable units and all related parking, access, lighting, landscaping and other amenities.

John Garrahy, the attorney representing both applications, requested that “The Post on Main” and “The Imperial on Greenwich” be consolidated into 1 hearing with 2 motions. The Board accepted the request.

Along with Mr. Garrahy, Joe Casali and Bill Lavery, both engineers on the project, were introduced. Mr. Garrahy commented that the Imperial is a comprehensive permit and some Board members are familiar with it. The reason the application is back for an amendment is because the applicant has purchased the former Legion Post property and the abutting Narragansett Improvement property. Development was constrained and as a result, there were some requirements that can now be alleviated. The applicant is asking for amendments to be made for improvements to be made. There is a request for a private road so that the Narragansett Improvement land is not land locked. The first request is an amendment for the Imperial to have a realignment. In this corner of the town, it is appropriate to have this kind of project. It helps the town meet some of the affordability requirements.

Mr. Casali and Mr. Lavery were both accepted as experts as they have been in front of the Board and previously been accepted as experts. Mr. Casali was sworn in. He shared his screen and went through a PowerPoint presentation with an overview and explanations. Mr. Casali explained that the applicant would

like to extinguish the public ROW because there is no need to provide an easement to the same property owner. The applicant would also like to reconfigure Imperial Way. The cul-de-sac will remain until the roadway is extended one day. The plan is to extend the ROW and private road. There are no changes to the units and the amendment is to just get the site elements reconfigured.

The applicant is also on the docket for “The Post on Main” which consists of a 3 story 30-unit structure and is very similar to the Imperial building. He went on to explain the unit layout. 8 of the units will be LMI units which is greater than the requirement. In terms of access to the building, there will be 30 parking spaces under the structure. 33 additional parking spaces will be provided on site to provide parking spaces to both the Post on Main and the Imperial on Greenwich for overflow. There is an existing sewer easement that is to be conserved. There is improved geometry on the roadway which improves the intersection. There is a proposed fire truck access between the buildings and a gravel extension for gated emergency access to the Narragansett Improvement land.

In regards to the drainage, the applicant has worked with CRMC to get pre-approvals. Water moves to the south westerly area and the applicant is very cognizant of the water that goes into the Maskerchugg River. There are proposed UIC stormwater detention systems that will feed into the existing approved detention system from the Imperial project. Water mains, fire hydrants, and sewer details were explained and shown in the presentation. He also explained the zoning relief required and permitting requirements via PowerPoint presentation.

John Shevlin, the project’s traffic expert, was sworn in and recognized as an expert by the Board. Mr. Shevlin presented the traffic analysis via slides. The study area was extended to Old Forge Road to 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue and Rocky Hollow Road. For the study, peak hour conditions were adjusted to consider the Covid pandemic compared to other studies. There was an 18% change in traffic found. DOT is find that the changes are 18-20% in regards to volume of traffic. Mr. Shevlin gave an explanation of the safety analysis and the site distance summary and concluded that the project is low severity. The project is a low generator of traffic. Also performed were a capacity analysis and intersections analysis.

Mr. Ginsburg commented that the intersection of Greenwich Boulevard and Post Road is difficult and asked if there were any foreseen issues at peak volume time. Mr. Shevlin replied that one of the things that helps is the signalized intersection to the south. It helps with cars getting in and out. He does not see any existing problems in the area.

Mr. Yoder asked if there were any sort of traffic patterns relating to Our Lady of Mercy school and church to the north. Mr. Shevlin commented that the traffic pattern is usually off peak with the school.

Ms. Bourbonnais commented that adjustments from the pandemic was a good assumption and asked if future development of the other two lots the developer holds was taken into consideration. Mr. Shevlin explained that the traffic analysis was done for only the current project.

John O’Hearne, the project architect, was sworn in and considered an expert by the Board. Mr. O’Hearne explained the units and the LMI locations. There will be 18 2-bedroom units and 12 1-bedroom units. The market rate units and the LMI units will have the exact same square footage so there is no discrimination. There are added amenities as well as covered accessible parking and a 3<sup>rd</sup> floor deck. Mr.

Garrahy added that there aren't many details at the current stage but will be forth coming at the preliminary stage.

Ms. Bourbonnais asked if the Imperial and Post structures were one way in and one way out or two way. Mr. Casali replied that both structures are one way in, one way out for the underground parking.

Mr. Ginsburg asked about the 200-foot setback from the river. Mr. Casali replied that CRMC has jurisdiction at the 200-foot setback line and to go into that setback would require an assent from the CRMC. There was an attempt to maintain the existing tree line which is why the building is not symmetrical. It was designed to garner support from the CRMC. The limit of disturbance is site dependent to the Maskerchugg River. The dependency is to hold the limit of disturbance. The site has grandfathered rights and an agreement was made so that the new building would not be any closer and would not disturb the tree line.

Mr. Ginsburg commented that one of the things he liked about the Imperial project were the walking trails and asked if there had been any discussion in extending the trails or creating a river walkway. Mr. Casali replied that some of the walkways would continue and there is an expectation that the patrons are going to take advantage of a walking trail. The details would be flushed out with a defined landscape plan.

Mr. Yoder commented on the slope down to the river and noted that there will be more waste because of it. He asked if there was any consideration for a maintenance crew to collect garbage and maintain the area. Mr. Casali replied that a HOA is proposed for both buildings to have personnel in place to take care of the maintenance. It is hoped that it is a huge improvement from a trash pickup perspective.

Ms. Bourbonnais asked about the intersection to Greenwich Boulevard. Mr. Shevlin replied that there is a 3 way stop at Greenwich Boulevard as shown on the plan with stop bars and signage. Mr. Ginsburg noted that the intersection looks like a public three-way intersection and suggested that there be signage indicating the private residence. Mr. Garrahy agreed that it would be good to indicate that. Mr. Casali noted that it is a preference to use a sign indicating that in addition to indicating there is no outlet.

Mr. Ginsburg asked if the staff report and draft motion has been read and if the applicant agreed to the easement proposed. Mr. Garrahy confirmed that the staff report and draft motion had been reviewed. He also agreed to the easement noting that access is needed to the other lots. The applicant is working on acquiring other parcels to extend the road to Rock Hollow Road for access.

Mr. Ginsburg noted that the road width is being decreased from 24 feet to 22 feet which would require another waiver. Mr. Duarte commented that the Town is not averse to a private road and would like to see HOA language about maintenance to decrease the burden to the Town. Decreasing the road width is unfavorable for several reasons. There is a concern about the centerline radius that is less than the Town's standard and he would like to see it softened.

Ms. Bourbonnais commented that prospect of a private road being a through street is new and unique. The desire to keep people from going down a new road is understood and narrowing often helps. She asked Mr. Duarte if the curvature of the road add to the traffic calming. Mr. Duarte commented that the radius of 150 feet would have much effect. The radius would have to be smaller to have an effect. There would have to be some other kind of design. Ms. Bourbonnais noted that it is hard to process not knowing what is in store for

the other vacant parcels. Mr. Duarte commented that there will be utility easements and other easements that are going to affect the vacant lots that need to be considered. Mr. Casali pointed out that AMTRACK has a formalized access easement on lot 243. If the applicant has to give reciprocal easements to maintain stormwater and sewer access, it should be easy enough to do so.

Mr. Lupovitz asked Mr. Garrahy what the intention is with the two vacant lots. Mr. Garrahy replied that he believes that they are going to be developed in a similar way to the current projects to include multifamily development but it is not known yet. Mr. Casali commented that the parcels have been analyzed and it has been determined that they will be difficult to work with due to the slope. It will not be possible to get many units on the lots because of the topography. It is estimated that there can be 20-30 units on the 3.5 acre lot and maybe 15-20 on the 2.5 acre parcel. A lot is going to be dependent on the input from the fire department. The current projects have different topography.

Assuming that the applicant has ownership of the parcel off of Rocky Hollow Road, Mr. Lupovitz asked Mr. Garrahy if the connecting road would become public. Mr. Garrahy replied that it is possible that it could be a public road if it is connected. Imperial way was a public road initially and it met all of the design standards. Mr. Casali thought it was a benefit to the town to make it private after having discussions so it was redesigned as a private road.

Mr. Lupovitz asked Mr. Duarte about his thoughts about the future responsibility of a completed road connecting Rocky Hollow Road to Imperial Way. Mr. Duarte replied the reason why the land development regulations were designed to make private roads to the specifications of public road was for this kind of situation. There have been instances where this has happened before and the Town has to take responsibility for it and it causes issues. He expressed that he is not averse to the private road but can see the private road being turned into a public road. He opined that the decision has to be thought out carefully about how the private road is laid out.

Mr. Casali pointed out that the existing 44 ROW is what exists today. The team will continue to have discussions with the town. He thought these fundamental discussions had already taken place with the town and that the road was designed to town standards. He also thought the town and the applicant were in an agreement that it would be better as a private roadway. Ms. Bourbonnais commented that it is in the Town's best interest and the Planning Board has strong incentive for the road to be designed to the Town's public road specifications in case the Town is asked to make it a public road. The Planning Board has the ultimate call if it is okay for the road to be private.

Mr. Lupovitz asked what kind of challenges it could present to the town and how can those challenges be mitigated. Mr. Casali commented that the road is going to be built to town standards. The one issue DPW did not like was the internal radius of 150 feet versus 200 feet. Mr. Duarte commented that it could be achieved with minor tweaking. The road is not far off from what the Town standards are.

Mr. Ginsburg asked Ms. Bourbonnais if she agreed that the Planning Board could proceed with the language in the decision to meet Town standards. Ms. Bourbonnais agreed and added that a final decision has already been made. It would be good to see the road design modified but it is in the decision.

Mr. Duarte commented that he would like to have the opportunity to talk to Mr. Casali about smoothing out

the radius of the road. Ms. Bourbonnais commented that the Planning Board will have another chance to review these projects at the next level of review.

#### Public Comment

Susan Hammond, 20 Greenwich Boulevard, was sworn in.

Ms. Hammond was concerned with the traffic patterns. There is no information on the impact to Greenwich Boulevard and there will be a significant increase in traffic flow.

Mr. Shevlin responded that looking at the site layout, the expectation is that the traffic would use the entrance from Main Street and not Greenwich Boulevard. It is anticipated that all traffic would use the easiest access point. The numbers are based on an industry standard. Ms. Hammond disagreed with that and believes that the neighborhood will be impacted by the development and if there is a way to mitigate it, it should be considered.

Bill Higgins, 88 Greenwich Boulevard, was sworn in.

Mr. Higgins was concerned about the traffic counts being skewed because of the pandemic. There are businesses that would usually generate a higher amount of traffic but currently do not because they are closed or have limited hours.

He also questioned why there is an agreement from CRMC when there wasn't a public hearing from the CRMC. Mr. Casali replied that there are preapplication meetings with CRMC. It is not an absolute approval but based on the preapplication meetings, there is an expected favorable outcome.

Mr. Garrahy requested a continuance on the amendment for the Imperial and a decision for the Master Plan for the Post on Main. Ms. Bourbonnais commented that it would make both plans at preliminary plan.

#### Board comments

Mr. Gertsacov commented that it might be beneficial to put a sign at the stop sign on Greenwich Boulevard for a no right hand turn. It is hard to police but it might have an impact.

Mr. Pels commented that he would like to see a revised design of the intersection to help the traffic flow.

Mr. Ginsburg said that he was really supportive of the project in general as it is a good place for it. There are some concerns from the neighbors which are valid. In general, the use is much better than what is currently there. It is the next step in the evolution of the Town but there are minor tweaks that could be made.

Mr. Jautais had issues with the draft motion as written for the Post on Main. On page 2 there is a minor mistake which Ms. Bourbonnais noted and corrected.

Regarding condition number 7, the street is proposed to be a private road. Mr. Garrahy clarified that the applicant has an approved development that has a public way. The proposal is to change that to a private way as part of the development. There is very little impact to the Post on Main project. He suggested to the Board to not act on the amendment for the Imperial and to give a Master Plan approval on the Post on Main. Ms. Bourbonnais suggested modifying the condition to read "construction of Imperial Way is proposed for access to the new dwelling units in addition to the ingress provided by Greenwich Boulevard, which is a Town road. This road will extend onto the adjacent lot 219 where it will terminate with an approved cul-de-sac. The permanent access easement serving lot 219 shall be recorded subject to review and approval by the solicitor's office."

Mr. Skwirz suggested that instead of approving the Master Plan, there could be a combined master and preliminary plan for the projects when it comes back before the Planning Board. That way it could still be considered at the preliminary stage but it would be combined with the master plan and it would be known what the nature of the roadway would be. Mr. Casali expressed concerned that doing so would be giving back the approval on the Imperial project and did not want to combine. There needs to be vesting in the Master Plan.

There was a three-minute recess to go over modify the draft motion.

Regarding the draft motion, Ms. Bourbonnais noted that conditions number 1-6 would remain the same. Condition number 7 would read: "New dwelling units proposed on adjacent lot 219 require adequate vehicular access. If that access is via a new street through the subject site, that street shall extend onto adjacent lot 219 and terminate with an approved cul-de-sac. If that street is not a public way, a permanent access easement serving lot 219 shall be recorded subject to review and approval by the East Greenwich Town Solicitor's office." Condition 8 will be removed and continue as condition 7: "A permanent access easement shall also be granted from lots 218 and 219 to lots 242 and 243 as well to ensure that they are not precluded from any future development." What was condition 9 will become condition 8: "If the proposed new structure is accessed via a private road, then there shall be no requirement for bonding public improvements as addressed by section 25 of the land development and subdivision review regulations, but all intersections, utilities, and other improvements are still subject to inspection by the EG DPW and all relevant inspection fees shall be paid." This is for the Post on Main master plan approval.

Mr. Jautaikis made a motion to approve the draft motion as amended by Ms. Bourbonnais. Mr. Yoder seconded the motion. The vote was 5-0-1 with Mr. Gertsacov abstaining.

The Imperial amendment was continued to a date certain on March 3<sup>rd</sup>.

**7. Extension** – Cove Homes, Inc. received Preliminary Plan approval in December, 2019 for a 63-unit major land development comprehensive permit project. Location is Frenchtown Road and Route 4, being Assessors Plat 30-11, Lot 650. Per Section A263-18 (H) of the Land Development regulations, initial preliminary plan approvals are good for one year but this time can be extended for good reason upon request. Cove Homes is assembling financing for their project and request additional time before returning for Final Approval.

Ms. Bourbonnais gave background information on the item, noting that the extension should have happened within 12 months but that it could not. A motion was made by Mr. Gertsacov for a one year extension of the approval, seconded by Mr. Ginsburg, and unanimously approved.

**8. Scheduling Reminder** – The Planning Board's next regular meeting will be a joint work session with the Town Council on February 17, 2021 at 7:00 PM to discuss growth and development issues.

**9. Minutes** – The Board is asked to review and approve minutes of the 1/6/21 meeting.

Mr. Ginsburg made a motion to accept the minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yoder and approved unanimously.

Mr. Ginsburg made a motion to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 11:36 PM