

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND  
TOWN OF EAST GREENWICH PLANNING BOARD

\* \* \* \* \*

PROCEEDINGS AT HEARING IN RE:

**COMPREHENSIVE PERMIT - MASTER PLAN  
REVIEW PUBLIC HEARING:**

**Division Road Neighborhood, LLC**

\* \* \* \* \*

May 3, 2023, 7:00 P.M.

Town Hall  
125 Main Street  
East Greenwich,  
Rhode Island 02818

**BEFORE:**

BENJAMIN LUPOVITZ, CHAIRMAN

MATTHEW RENNINGER

MATTHEW YODER

ANDREW SHARTENBERG

TARA WOOD

**APPEARANCES :**

FOR THE  
PLANNING BOARD.....ANDREW M. TEITZ, ESQUIRE  
TOWN SOLICITOR

FOR THE  
APPLICANT.....WILLIAM R. LANDRY, ESQUIRE

**ALSO PRESENT :**

ALBERT RANALDI, JR., PLANNING DIRECTOR  
CHRISTINA MARSEGLIA, PLANNING TECHNICIAN  
ANDREW NOTA, TOWN MANAGER

I N D E X

	<u>PAGE</u>
<b><u>SPEAKERS</u></b>	
ROBERT VESPINA	56
RENU ENGLEHART	57
TAMMY ALLAIRE	61
NISHANT SHARMA	66
PAUL LIU	70
DENISE SHAPIRO	72, 122
WILLIAM WEEDON	78
ISABELLE TADMOURY	82
DENNIS MONTY	84, 123
CHRISTOPHER SMITH	90
ARLEN BRICKMAN	91
SABRINA WEISS	92
ANDREW BLAIS, ESQUIRE	93
MARY MADEN	100
DAVID CHAMPAGNE	103
ELIZABETH RODGERS	105
MICHELLE THOMAS	109
CHERI WALTON	109
PAUL STAVRAND	111
SUSAN CARDONES	114

GREGORY WEISS	115
WILLIAM LANDRY, ESQUIRE	124
MOTION made by MR. SHARTENBERG to adjourn	131
SECONDED by MR. RENNINGER	131
VOTE (Show-of-hand/voice vote) (Approved)	131

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, **PAMELA A. NEWBERG**, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, accurate, and complete transcript of my notes taken at the East Greenwich Planning Board meeting held on May 3, 2023.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 25th day of May 2023.

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/ Pamela A. Newberg  
**PAMELA A. NEWBERG,**  
**NOTARY PUBLIC**

1 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Good  
2 evening, everyone. Welcome to the East Greenwich  
3 Planning Board meeting of May 3, 2023.

4 Sitting as voting members this evening we  
5 have from my left, Matt Renninger, Tara Wood,  
6 Andrew Shartenberg and Matt Yoder.

7 Joining us also from staff this evening we  
8 have Al Ranaldi, our Planning Director. We have  
9 Christina Marseglia, our Planning Analyst with us  
10 this evening. We also are blessed with the presence  
11 of Tim Wheeler from the IT Department in town who  
12 doesn't usually attend these things, and also  
13 Andy Nota our Town Manager, and also our  
14 stenographer this evening is?

15 COURT REPORTER: Pam Newberg.

16 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Pam Newberg.  
17 Welcome, Pam.

18 COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Also with us  
20 this evening is our counsel, Andy Teitz.

21 The first item we have on our agenda this  
22 evening is Planning Board Administration item,  
23 Meeting Minutes, note for the record: Official  
24 transcript of the April 19, 2023, Planning Board

1 meeting was requested and is being produced.

2 The other note for the record is  
3 Administrative Officer issued Final Plan approval  
4 to residences at Coggeshall comprehensive permit -  
5 Map 054 Plat 011 Lot 166. Record Plan #1015 was  
6 recorded on April 6, 2023.

7 The next item on our agenda this evening is  
8 Comprehensive Permit - Master Plan Review - public  
9 hearing. Division Road Neighborhood. This is a  
10 continued session from two weeks ago during which we  
11 had representatives from the Applicant, Mr. Landry,  
12 present to us more details about the project.

13 My understanding, Mr. Landry, is that you  
14 completed the presentation, and this evening we're  
15 just going to pick up with public hearing.

16 MR. LANDRY: Yes. Yes, thank you.  
17 We haven't closed our case, but we've concluded our  
18 presentation, this part of it.

19 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Thank you.

20 Mr. Landry, do you have all of your witnesses  
21 back this evening?

22 MR. LANDRY: With the exception of  
23 Mr. Lombardo who had another hearing. He's the  
24 planning expert, but we have Mr. Clinton, Mr. Lake,

1 and Nicole Reilly, engineer, architect designer and  
2 traffic engineer.

3 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Welcome back.  
4 Thank you.

5 So I think where we're going to start this  
6 evening is with the Board, and we didn't have an  
7 opportunity the last time -- you know, I have a few  
8 other comments, I'm sorry, before we get into that.  
9 Just so like last time there's a hard stop this  
10 evening, the meeting will end at 10:00. I expect  
11 that there will be a number of people who will want  
12 to make comments, and we are going to do our best to  
13 try to get through and provide an opportunity for  
14 everybody who wants to speak to share their thoughts  
15 with us.

16 I also will say that if we can't get to all  
17 of the interested people who wish to share their  
18 thoughts, that we will continue again to another  
19 meeting, so I ask for your patience while we get  
20 through the opportunities for everybody who wishes  
21 to say something to present to the Board and  
22 everybody this evening. So thank you all for  
23 returning.

24 Those people that attended the meeting last



1 time, thank you for, as I said then, staying in the  
2 game and continuing with the process and hanging on  
3 and being patient. The Board appreciates that, the  
4 Town appreciates that.

5 So with that said, what I'd like to do is  
6 invite Members of the Board, based on the meeting  
7 two weeks ago, to ask questions of witnesses, make  
8 comments, anything you wish to contribute at this  
9 time. So anybody that would like to say anything,  
10 or ask a question, go right ahead, please.

11 MR. YODER: I guess I'll start.

12 I mentioned it in the last meeting, but one  
13 of the main concerns that I have, we talked about it  
14 a little bit is, and I would like to hear more about  
15 it, if possible, is where we are in the  
16 archeological study, what the ramifications are when  
17 that starts, or if it's started, and how the results  
18 from that will affect the development.

19 I think everyone agrees that what we don't  
20 want is to get started and find artifacts in the  
21 land and then have to stop completely on the  
22 development. Knowing that there is all over this  
23 town all sorts of various archeological artifacts  
24 and pieces that, well, it would be great to know

1 where you're at with that, what the plans are going  
2 forward with that, and I think we need some concerns  
3 that -- that's one of my main concerns here.

4 MR. LANDRY: Mr. Chair, would you  
5 like us to respond as we go along here or all at  
6 once? What's your preference?

7 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: I'm sorry, can  
8 you please repeat that?

9 MR. LANDRY: Would you like us to  
10 respond as we go along or all at once? We have no  
11 preference.

12 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Yeah, so we're  
13 going to try to follow the same format when people  
14 speak, which is, addressing questions one at a time,  
15 but I would ask, you know, that we all consider the  
16 time this evening. I don't know how much we're  
17 going to need to get through everybody, so, yes,  
18 please address the question.

19 MR. LANDRY: I'll try to keep it  
20 as tight as we can.

21 Mr. Yoder, your question is, we mentioned last  
22 time, we did engage public archeological at this  
23 stage, conceptual stage, not preliminary plan where  
24 it would normally be done.

1           They have initiated their work. They've been  
2 working for several weeks. They are pursuing a  
3 permit for excavation on portions of the site to  
4 determine, you know, what is there. That starts  
5 with a comment period by some interested  
6 stakeholders, cultural stakeholders, historic  
7 stakeholders.

8           That comment period has been completed, and  
9 they're moving based on that to the permit-pulling  
10 phase. We'll do some work on the site and generate  
11 a report, we understand within a matter of weeks,  
12 not necessarily months, and so we expect to have a  
13 handle on it.

14           We know there are two archeological sites of  
15 interest. They're both to the east of the project  
16 entrance, historic cemetery, and some remnants of an  
17 old stone foundation. We are contending to preserve  
18 that entire area, not disturb it at all, and make it  
19 a feature of the development.

20           We're not aware of anything else on the site,  
21 but we'll find out, and it won't be long, and we do  
22 intend to address all that during this master plan  
23 stage of review.

24                           MR. YODER: Great.

1 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Anybody else?

2 MS. WOOD: I have a question as it  
3 relates to safety and the traffic study. So I am  
4 not a traffic expert, I am a minivan mom who drives  
5 around town, so this is more of my own personal  
6 experience, but I noted that the traffic study does  
7 not take into effect the South County Trail and  
8 Division Road intersection, and to me, just in my  
9 own personal experience, that is already a very  
10 hazardous area.

11 You've got Dave's and a gas station, people  
12 coming on and off 95, so I would feel better if we  
13 could potentially expand the traffic study to  
14 include that intersection.

15 MR. LANDRY: I'll ask Mr. Clinton  
16 to respond as to how typical it would be to evaluate  
17 that intersection.

18 MR. CLINTON: Yeah, for the  
19 record, Robert Clinton, VHB.

20 We talked with the Town and the peer reviewer  
21 before we did our study just to make sure that our  
22 study area was large enough to include the  
23 intersections they felt were relevant to our  
24 specific project. You know, there is a significant

1 amount of traffic, probably about half of the  
2 traffic is going to be heading eastbound out of the  
3 site to and from Route 2, and then approximately  
4 half the other traffic will go the other direction,  
5 so a significant amount of traffic will be heading  
6 through that intersection.

7 That intersection is under jurisdiction of  
8 the Rhode Island Department of Transportation.  
9 They'll be looking at the traffic study that we did,  
10 and they'll be looking, again, to see if our study  
11 area is appropriate for the size of our project, so  
12 you can put in a request to the DOT. As part of the  
13 PAP process, we will be submitting, you know, the  
14 traffic study to them, and they'll be, you know,  
15 reviewing the information that we give them.

16 MS. WOOD: Are you saying that  
17 you're done with it, that you would not expand it  
18 even if our town -- if we ask our town, our Town  
19 Traffic Consultant to consider expanding it as well?

20 MR. CLINTON: That I --

21 MR. RANALDI, JR.: She may be on  
22 zoom right now. Her name is Anna.

23 MS. NOVO: Hello.

24 MR. RANALDI, JR.: Hi Anna.

1 (MS. ANNA NOVO APPEARING VIA ZOOM)

2 MS. NOVO: Just for the record,  
3 we -- we looked at the scope of the study. One of  
4 the things that we wanted to look at, one  
5 intersection of Division, Route 2, all the way down  
6 to the interchange with Route 4, that has been  
7 analyzed very thoroughly through many projects that  
8 the town has had, and we had multiple consultants  
9 review it.

10 The State implemented the roundabout in front  
11 of New England Tech. All of these improvements were  
12 determined to have a longer rising period, and they  
13 accounted for a lot of the growth rate from the  
14 town. So it is congested, but a lot of the  
15 improvements that are there, are probably the  
16 maximum that you can do at this time unless you  
17 build that interchange that can accommodate  
18 additional traffic.

19 Now, to me, the scope for this project needed  
20 to be within a reasonable length, and so I don't  
21 think that extending the traffic around it all the  
22 way down through the intersection of Division and  
23 Route 2 is going to make that much of a difference  
24 from what we have today.

1 COURT REPORTER: Excuse me, can  
2 you please state your name for the record.

3 MS. NOVO: I'm sorry. My name is  
4 Anna Novo. I'm the senior traffic engineer for the  
5 Town of East Greenwich, consultant that does all the  
6 review for the Town.

7 MS. WOOD: Okay. Well, I would  
8 disagree with that. I think half of the traffic is  
9 going to be coming in through that intersection and  
10 the other half is going the other way. I'm not sure  
11 why you would ignore one side of the traffic  
12 intersection. So I'm hesitant -- if that's your  
13 outcome, I do have reservations around it, and I  
14 also have another question around the scope because  
15 my understanding is the traffic study was around  
16 peak hours and, again, just from personal  
17 experience, within the week, I got off 95, the exit  
18 before East Greenwich, I got onto New London  
19 Turnpike, and I made a left on Division, and I  
20 immediately was behind a garbage truck, and there  
21 were four cars ahead of me behind the garbage truck,  
22 so garbage truck, four trucks, and then me.

23 I don't live in the area. I don't know how  
24 often this happens. It must be pretty regularly if

1 I just happened into it, and I was probably for four  
2 minutes waiting as the truck went, we would pause,  
3 then we'd all go up to the next house and then we'd  
4 have to pause then all go up to the next house, and  
5 then every single one of us was attempting to cross  
6 the double yellow line to get past it to save time,  
7 which is not appropriate and is illegal, and it's  
8 highly dangerous, and there was enough traffic  
9 coming at us that nobody took that risk.

10 So I'm wondering if we could consider  
11 expanding the study to off-peak hours because I just  
12 don't know if you add so many new cars to the road,  
13 how it would be safe because I think you have a lot  
14 of people tempted to cross the double yellow line  
15 and potentially have just very serious head-on  
16 injuries.

17 MR. CLINTON: I'm not sure if you  
18 want me to answer that as a peer reviewer. I'll  
19 take a first stab at it.

20 Typically a traffic study is done looking at  
21 the peak hour. We did do what's called an ATR,  
22 which is automatic traffic record count to get the  
23 volumes every hour for an extended period, number of  
24 days, and the typical traffic study procedures



1 include looking at the peak hours because that's the  
2 worst and highest volumes of the day, so if you can  
3 get an intersection of a roadway to operate  
4 efficiently during the peak hours, the roadway  
5 obviously has enough capacity to handle a lower  
6 volume of traffic.

7           There are occasions, streets that have school  
8 buses stop on them, you know, they cause delays  
9 along roadways. This development, they're proposing  
10 to have the school buses go into the development  
11 itself so you won't have stops along the roadway to  
12 have, like, children get on and off the school  
13 buses. So, and then as far as the garbage, that's  
14 going to be internal to the site, too, so this won't  
15 contribute to those delays during the off peak.

16           MS. WOOD: I think the added  
17 traffic would contribute, right, so if on Division  
18 Road now every family that has a child that goes  
19 there, the bus stops at their driveway, so you could  
20 have an incredible number of stops and even though  
21 -- so if you take a bus, and you go into the  
22 development, great, you're not going to add more  
23 stops, but I think my angle is more around the side  
24 of you have so many more cars, and I think starting

1 with the peak hour is a great starting point for a  
2 traffic study, but just because we haven't seen  
3 anything like this in the town, I just thought it  
4 might make sense to consider expanding it past the  
5 peak hours to more the daily living hours to see if  
6 you would be, you know, if it would be safe.

7 MR. CLINTON: The levels of  
8 service, you know, during the peak hours are, you  
9 know, we have acceptable levels of service during  
10 the peak hours, so it's kind of reducing the volume  
11 of traffic that's on the roadway during the off-peak  
12 hours, so it's going to work better than it does  
13 during the peak hours. That's not a typical --

14 MS. WOOD: Well, my experience is  
15 that literally I was on the road for five minutes  
16 waiting for a garbage truck, so I don't know, and  
17 that was off peak, so I don't know if there's  
18 anymore cars. And also the other thing I noticed is  
19 there's no shoulder. There's no way for the garbage  
20 truck to, like, sort of tuck in a little bit so  
21 people can get by. There's just absolutely going to  
22 be, I think, a lot of gridlock and problems with  
23 that.

24 MR. SHARTENBERG: So one of the

1 things I noticed with the traffic study is that it  
2 basically focused on the intersection of New London  
3 Turnpike and Division Road and then past the  
4 development going down Division Road. It didn't  
5 take into account Westfield Drive at all, and you're  
6 proposing to put the main entrance for the  
7 development directly across Westfield Drive.

8 Every single school in the town is accessed  
9 down Moosehorn Road to Division Road. So it just  
10 makes sense that the traffic coming out of the  
11 development will be going down Westfield Drive to  
12 Miss Fry Drive to Moosehorn Road to access the  
13 schools as well as pretty much all places south  
14 going on Route 2 and Route 4. And you didn't have  
15 the study include anything about the level of  
16 service on Westfield, Miss Fry or Moosehorn aside  
17 from the intersection. So Westfield Drive and  
18 Miss Fry Drive are residential neighborhoods with  
19 not very wide streets, so we're proposing to have a  
20 lot of new residents using the schools going down  
21 through these neighborhoods, and the traffic study  
22 just doesn't address that at all.

23 So do we have comments on that or thought as  
24 to why you did not have that in your scope?

1 MR. CLINTON: Again, we went  
2 through the study area with the Town and also with  
3 the peer reviewer, and these were the intersections  
4 that were determined.

5 MR. SHARTENBERG: Did anybody  
6 that was involved with that have school-age children  
7 and understand how you're going to get to school?

8 MR. LANDRY: Mr. Shartenberg, I  
9 think we covered this last time where I'm not sure  
10 what the through traffic is through that --

11 MR. SHARTENBERG: You covered  
12 it very cursory --

13 MR. LANDRY: Pardon me?

14 MR. SHARTENBERG: It was a very  
15 cursory --

16 MR. LANDRY: Well, that's because  
17 I think we have a complete solution.

18 MR. SHARTENBERG: I would disagree  
19 with that.

20 MR. LANDRY: I'm sorry, I haven't  
21 told you what it is yet.

22 We would -- if that's a problem in that  
23 neighborhood with people going through the entry via  
24 through-road, the people going to school, it

1 shouldn't be. It's a residential neighborhood.

2 MR. SHARTENBERG: Have you driven  
3 it?

4 MR. LANDRY: I've been in there,  
5 and I had a hard time getting out of it, but it  
6 should not be a through-road. There should be no  
7 through-access declared there. We can put it in our  
8 covenants for our subdivision. The Town can put up  
9 a sign.

10 It's not our intention or plan or expectation  
11 that any substantial degree of traffic from this  
12 development will go through that residential  
13 development nor should it be allowed to go through  
14 that residential development.

15 MR. SHARTENBERG: Well, I just  
16 don't understand how nobody that was involved with  
17 this study would have driven and tried to figure out  
18 what the routes to school are and then include it in  
19 that traffic study.

20 It says you rated the level of service for  
21 all of the other area, but you didn't do it for  
22 there.

23 MR. LANDRY: Well, because we're  
24 not expecting -- we didn't think it's a problem, and

1 if the Town doesn't want to see people cutting  
2 through that neighborhood, they should declare it.  
3 We will support it, and we'll put it in our  
4 covenants that that's not a through-street, that  
5 there's no through traffic through that road.

6 We all went in there. The owner went in  
7 there. We all went through that road. It did not  
8 look to us like a convenient -- particularly  
9 convenient way to go through. I don't know --

10 MR. SHARTENBERG: It's pretty much  
11 the only way. If you're coming directly out of the  
12 entrance, the eastern entrance, it's going be  
13 directly across Miss Fry Street, down Westfield  
14 Drive, Moosehorn to the schools, and you're going to  
15 have four hundred something residents that are  
16 coming here for the school system going to those  
17 schools.

18 MR. LANDRY: Well, they could take  
19 a right and down --

20 MR. SHARTENBERG: They're not  
21 going to do that.

22 MR. LANDRY: There is no through  
23 traffic --

24 MR. SHARTENBERG: I'm just asking

1 why you didn't include that.

2 MR. LAKE: I think I can answer.

3 I did speak with the people that were  
4 involved and then looked at the map. Those of us  
5 that live here know that when you go straight to  
6 town, you've got to go slow. Those are the ones  
7 that actually make the direct connections.

8 In this case, it's a pretty circuitous route  
9 to cut through. It would be going out of your way  
10 to go down through Westfield and across Miss Fry and  
11 go back over to Moosehorn.

12 MR. SHARTENBERG: And if you want  
13 to get down to Moosehorn, you're going to go  
14 directly across --

15 MR. LAKE: No, Division Road is  
16 further, so I think the majority of people would  
17 turn on Division and then turn on Moosehorn. It's a  
18 much more direct route.

19 MR. SHARTENBERG: You could have  
20 answered that by including that in the traffic study  
21 so that we could have had an idea of the level of  
22 service because you rated that from A to F, so there  
23 would be an existing level of service and then a  
24 level of service change after this goes in there if

1 you included it in the traffic study.

2 MR. CLINTON: The vehicles exiting  
3 the development includes all of the traffic that --  
4 all of the traffic exiting the development is not  
5 going to go down one of those roads.

6 MR. SHARTENBERG: I'm saying  
7 people are going to be accessing the school as well  
8 as points south as well going on to Route 2 and  
9 Route --

10 MR. CLINTON: Right, but the  
11 volume of traffic coming out of the site is going to  
12 be all of the traffic. The people going down those  
13 roads is less than all of the traffic, so if we  
14 analyze the worst-case scenario, which is all of the  
15 traffic exiting the site, the other intersections in  
16 there are going to work better than the site  
17 driveways, and the site driveways operate  
18 efficiently, so the volumes on those other roads, if  
19 they're going to the school, are coming out of the  
20 site, so the site driveway volumes are higher than  
21 the traffic going opposite, in the morning, okay,  
22 and then in the evening, the people coming to the  
23 development, are not all coming the route that  
24 you're saying.



1           Some are going to take the other -- the other  
2 routes. There's multiple choices to get to the  
3 site, and the traffic is going to be dispersed those  
4 different routes.

5                       MR. LANDRY: We can supplement.

6           We've never said no to anything that anyone  
7 asked us. I've never met you. I don't think I've  
8 ever spoken with you. We've been at this for  
9 several months, and all we've done is try to address  
10 everything that someone has raised. So we have no  
11 aversion to taking a look, speaking further with the  
12 Town's Traffic Engineer about Division Road.

13           I think what Mr. Clinton was trying to say is  
14 that every traffic study, the standard practice is  
15 to look at the levels of service and, you know,  
16 there may be something unusual happening, like a  
17 garbage truck, but that -- but if the road can  
18 handle the level of service based on the number of  
19 trips that are generated, that's still an A or a B  
20 level of service, or a C. Those are all very good  
21 levels of service.

22           It's like when you had New England Tech, I'm  
23 sure there were more people on that road that --  
24 fewer people before New England Tech, and probably

1 the same number of garbage trucks, so the level of  
2 service on that road remained excellent, and the  
3 analysis that the Town's Traffic Engineer and our  
4 engineer did using all of the standard computations  
5 is still a very good level of service with the  
6 additional traffic. So if that's the case at the  
7 worst time of day, if that garbage truck, you know,  
8 is there or happens to be there during the peak  
9 hours, it's only going to be better later.

10 MR. SHARTENBERG: Yeah, but you're  
11 talking about Division Road. I'm talking about --

12 MR. LANDRY: I'm talking to  
13 Miss Wood's question because these are both  
14 questions about things we should take another look  
15 at.

16 My answer to you is that we don't think  
17 that's going to make any difference. I suspect the  
18 Town's Engineer doesn't think it's going to make any  
19 difference, but that doesn't mean we won't do it.  
20 We'll take a look at anything you want us to look  
21 at.

22 MR. SHARTENBERG: I'm sure all of  
23 the neighbors are going to beg to differ.

24 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Yeah, let me

1 weigh in here for a second.

2 The point is well taken, Miss Wood, and,  
3 Mr. Shartenberg, with regard specifically to the  
4 egress in the morning from the new development  
5 directly across the street into Westfield.  
6 Certainly we can appreciate the concern of all  
7 people in the neighborhood that it could potentially  
8 drive more traffic through there.

9 I do have a question for Mr. Clinton which  
10 is, in these traffic studies, sir, do you take into  
11 consideration, specifically, additional school  
12 traffic, school buses, parents taking their kids to  
13 school in a specific circumstance like this? Is  
14 that considered in your study?

15 MR. CLINTON: Yeah, the trip  
16 generation -- the Institute of Transportation  
17 Engineers Trip Generation for residential  
18 developments includes all traffic. It includes  
19 vehicular traffic, deliveries to those homes, it  
20 considers school buses. It considers all of the --

21 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: I understand,  
22 but are they all lumped into one bucket as a general  
23 group -- they aren't segmented? So, in other words,  
24 they're not looking at peak school transportation

1 periods?

2 So we've got several schools, several bus  
3 routes, several kids going in different directions,  
4 parents going in different directions, just so that  
5 we're all clear here, do studies, in general, yours  
6 and all studies, take a look at a particular  
7 development, a particular circumstance, analyze  
8 those heavy periods of school traffic and weigh that  
9 into the determination.

10 MR. CLINTON: Yeah, the volumes by  
11 ITE are by peak hour, the generator, okay, the peak  
12 period when the generator generates traffic, and it  
13 does it by the peak of the adjacent street, and  
14 usually the -- and in this case, the highest volume  
15 is during the peak hour of the adjacent street, you  
16 know. The schools are earlier than the PMP. The  
17 morning peak is more in line with the school times,  
18 so those overlap a little bit more so you see the  
19 morning peak, the peak of the generator is  
20 comparable to the peak of the adjacent street, so I  
21 don't know if that answers your question or not.

22 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Well, it did,  
23 but at this point I'll assume the answer is no  
24 unless you clarify it further, and you can specify

1 and demonstrate that it takes a look at that. I  
2 know it would be a difficult thing to do if it does  
3 do that, but I will say that I think some of these  
4 comments are driven by living in a community and  
5 knowing full well what happens for a couple of hours  
6 in the morning when school is in; lots of buses;  
7 lots of parents; lots of kids moving all over the  
8 place; and when you come out of this new  
9 development, there could potentially be, for  
10 whatever reason, an additional route that doesn't  
11 exist now for all these people who don't live there  
12 now to get to Moosehorn and use that as a route, and  
13 so if I'm living in that neighborhood, I would have  
14 a concern, reasonably so.

15 MR. CLINTON: Yeah, there, again,  
16 there's the peak of the schools, we could do an  
17 analysis of the peak of the schools, and obviously,  
18 like you said, the traffic patterns are going to be  
19 different, the directional traffic, but it's not  
20 going to be as high or as intense as the peak hour  
21 that we analyzed, you know.

22 There is going to be different traffic  
23 patterns, and there are going to be impacts to both.  
24 There's different roadways. There's different

1 turning movements, but the worst-case scenario that  
2 we looked at was the highest volumes of the adjacent  
3 street traffic and the highest generation volumes of  
4 the site, so we looked at the absolute highest  
5 volume, and you're correct, there will be different  
6 traffic patterns during those different time  
7 periods.

8 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Well, okay, so  
9 since we're on the subject, does anybody else have  
10 anything else?

11 MR. SHARTENBERG: So why wouldn't  
12 you be analyzing Westfield and Moosehorn not the  
13 intersections where they come out on Division, but  
14 the streets themselves, as part of this study? Why  
15 wouldn't you? And why is it you just assumed that  
16 we're only going to be using New London and Division  
17 as the main roads, and we're not considering the  
18 other roads?

19 MR. CLINTON: Well, we looked at  
20 the highest volume intersections, so if those  
21 intersections operate at level of service C or  
22 better, the other intersections, which have lower  
23 volumes than the site driveways, are going to  
24 operate better than normal --

1                   MR. SHARTENBERG: But we're not --  
2                   so you keep coming back to intersections. I'm  
3                   talking about the actual roads themselves. Is there  
4                   a difference there or not?

5                   MR. CLINTON: There is. There is.  
6                   The roadways actually have a capacity of a thousand  
7                   vehicles in each direction, okay, and Division Road  
8                   has much more traffic than any of those side  
9                   streets. So if Division Road is at 30 percent of  
10                  its capacity, which -- and may increase to  
11                  approximately 40 percent of its capacity, these  
12                  other roads are well below that thousand vehicles in  
13                  each direction during peak hour. So we're talking  
14                  those roads can easily handle the traffic volumes.

15                  CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Yes, but  
16                  neither of those roads are the roads that are being  
17                  brought to your attention.

18                  MR. SHARTENBERG: Exactly. You  
19                  keep coming back to the roads that aren't going to  
20                  be used.

21                  CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: And we can  
22                  certainly accept that also the roads that we are  
23                  referencing won't have all of the traffic either at  
24                  any particular time, so that's not of concern.

1 MR. SHARTENBERG: Additionally --

2 MR. TEITZ: May I?

3 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Go ahead.

4 MR. TEITZ: Yeah, I mean, I think  
5 it's good to raise these questions, and you're  
6 raising it, and you've got the answer, no, they  
7 didn't look at it, but going back and forth over  
8 whether they should or not, this isn't the time.

9 You're into your master plan. In your master  
10 plan approval, you may deny it, or if you approve  
11 master plan, you can put in a specific condition;  
12 you shall do an updated traffic study that shall  
13 consider the following; X, Y and Z roads as well.  
14 You have that power to do it, but I think just  
15 arguing back and forth now whether they should do it  
16 really isn't useful.

17 MR. SHARTENBERG: So, to clarify,  
18 we can ask them to do that?

19 MR. TEITZ: You can require them  
20 to do that, yes, but not -- at the next step.  
21 That's what I'm -- this is master plan. I think  
22 it's good to ask; did you look at it; what did you  
23 look at? You've teased that information out,  
24 they've only looked at the major arterial roads and



1 not -- and that's fine, and that's something you can  
2 require as a condition of the next step.

3 MR. SHARTENBERG: Since we're  
4 beating a dead horse here, and then I'll drop the  
5 issue in a second, I did also want to get on record  
6 that Middle Road should, in my opinion, be included  
7 in -- the intersection of Middle Road and Route 2,  
8 as Tara said, should be included in the traffic  
9 study.

10 The reason being is that there's a lot of  
11 traffic at 8 a.m. in the morning dropping kids off  
12 at the high school, the day cares, everything else  
13 around there. It backs up significantly at that,  
14 and now we're talking about putting four hundred  
15 more units that are going to be coming down, so that  
16 does need to be included as well.

17 MR. LANDRY: Okay. And, again,  
18 we're not saying no to anything here, taking note.

19 My inclination is that within perhaps this  
20 stage of review we can provide some additional  
21 information on these other areas so, you know, we're  
22 -- this particular issue was very carefully peer  
23 reviewed by the Town's traffic expert so, you know,  
24 I hope -- the traffic experts were in agreement as

1 to what made sense to look at the worst-case  
2 conditions, but that doesn't mean we can't go beyond  
3 that, and we will work with the Town's consultant to  
4 find the best way to do that.

5 MR. RENNINGER: I have one just  
6 final clarification on the traffic study.

7 When you said the worst-case scenario you've  
8 looked at, but it seemed that school hours wasn't,  
9 what makes the worst-case scenario worse than the  
10 time that we kind of think would have the most  
11 traffic?

12 MR. CLINTON: Yeah, like I said,  
13 the peak hour of the adjacent roadway, like, people  
14 commuting to and from work and the people that live  
15 in that development that are going to and from work  
16 it is the peak hour.

17 MR. RENNINGER: Overlaps.

18 MR. CLINTON: Yeah. And, like I  
19 said, the morning peak, people going -- dropping  
20 their kids off at school, kind of coincides with  
21 that morning peak. It falls within the 7 to 9  
22 period in the morning and then the 4 to 6 period in  
23 the afternoon. And there is another peak during the  
24 -- during the school period, at two to --

1 MR. RENNINGER: Two to four.

2 MR. CLINTON: Two to three, yeah,  
3 but that afternoon peak isn't as high as a  
4 concentrated peak of everybody coming home from  
5 work.

6 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Mr. Clinton,  
7 again, as I understand, Division Road is at  
8 30 percent capacity now, do I have that --

9 MR. CLINTON: Approximately, yeah.  
10 That's the western section, yes.

11 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: And I think I  
12 saw the number somewhere, but I don't remember what  
13 it was. Once the project is completed, how much  
14 will be added to that capacity?

15 Anna, is that you?

16 MS. NOVO: I'm sorry, yes. I said  
17 the total in a 24-hour period is 3,300 vehicle  
18 trips. That's half of it would be entering, half of  
19 it would be exiting, but that is in a 24-hour  
20 period.

21 MR. CLINTON: Yeah, she's  
22 looking at --

23 MS. NOVO: And we looked at  
24 that in conjunction added to the cars that are there

1 today, and even with that number, which is about a  
2 60 -- what was it, around 60-something percent  
3 increase in traffic, they both have the capacity to  
4 handle that traffic.

5 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: The State of  
6 Rhode Island?

7 MS. NOVO: Yes, during the peak  
8 hours, which is the highest hour when you have the  
9 highest volume going westbound or eastbound, it can  
10 handle the traffic that is on that road.

11 MR. CLINTON: I think it's simpler  
12 to look at, you know, when you come out of the site,  
13 like I said, like half of the traffic is heading  
14 east, half the traffic is heading west,  
15 approximately, maybe 60/40, depending on the time of  
16 day, you end up with, if you look at the -- if you  
17 drew a line across the road and counted the cars,  
18 given the no-build condition, you'd have like  
19 30 percent of that thousand vehicles, okay, under  
20 existing conditions, eastbound, and then you'd have  
21 westbound is lower in the morning peak, so it's like  
22 30 percent in the -- in the morning and about, you  
23 know, 12 to 15 percent in the afternoon, and we're  
24 going to be increasing that to -- from 31 to 42

1 percent in the morning peak, and from 12 to 17, 18  
2 percent of that in the afternoon, so.

3 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Right. So  
4 that would suggest that there's enough capacity to  
5 handle the additional volume.

6 Anna, could you please briefly summarize your  
7 findings of the review of this study please so we  
8 can all understand your general feeling about it.

9 MS. NOVO: Okay. I have reviewed  
10 three traffic studies that the proponent had done.

11 The original had data that was based on 2020.  
12 I spoke to the Department of Transportation, safety  
13 unit. We agreed that we needed to do additional  
14 counts because we wanted it to have more  
15 representative data prior to COVID.

16 We looked at the approach that Bill Clinton  
17 (sic) used in order to come up with the projections  
18 of traffic. I compared some of these splits when he  
19 talks about 60 percent and 40 percent with the  
20 census data of where people in East Greenwich work,  
21 where they live, and how they, you know, how they  
22 traveled, each way they most likely used to get into  
23 the highway.

24 There is issues with now, based on all the

1 changes that have occurred with COVID, we looked at  
2 everything that we figure would help in the  
3 development of these splits.

4 The projections of the data in using the  
5 ITE manual, those data would just, as an aside,  
6 would just verify that our project here with that  
7 property that is a residential development and where  
8 we utilized the ITE maybe ten years ago in  
9 projecting into the future, and when we counted  
10 recently that development numbers, what we projected  
11 was almost identical to what we thought was going to  
12 happen in the future.

13 So I'm very confident with the amount of  
14 traffic that is being projected during the peak  
15 periods of the road.

16 In terms of the analysis, the accident data  
17 that we obtained, we evaluated that data. There is  
18 not a tremendous amount of accident in that section  
19 of the road. The intersection of -- the one in West  
20 Greenwich, Division Road and New London Turnpike,  
21 that intersection was analyzed by another consultant  
22 back in by around 2017/2018, and the Department of  
23 Transportation reviewed that and constructed some  
24 litigation. In 2019/2020, they finished that. That

1 intersection did not warrant a -- the traffic that's  
2 going to be generated by this site is not sufficient  
3 to increase the volume at that intersection to meet  
4 the warrant.

5 In terms of capacity levels to service, the  
6 analysis that we used, we're confident with the way  
7 they analyzed the intersection and the conclusion of  
8 the report.

9 I do know that the Department of  
10 Transportation will have to review this because  
11 anything you do on Division Road, whether it is  
12 single, winding, anything like that has to go  
13 through them. They have to approve it just like  
14 they did with the roundabout down on Division Road.  
15 You can't do improvements on the road without them  
16 approving the plans. It's not up to the Town to do  
17 that, and they're going to have to review this  
18 because this is a big residential development, and  
19 you have all of the things that trigger their review  
20 as well.

21 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Do you have  
22 any reservations or concerns about the ability of  
23 the existing infrastructure to handle the additional  
24 capacity?

1 MS. NOVO: You mean on Division  
2 Road?

3 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Yes.

4 MS. NOVO: No, I don't. My only  
5 concern would be, and that's something that has been  
6 discussed before, would be safety, in terms of  
7 school buses, to make sure that those school buses  
8 go inside that development to pick up and drop off  
9 kids. If they can't come up to an agreement to do  
10 that, then that will have to be done on Division  
11 Road, and that will have to be evaluated because  
12 that would not be -- in my opinion, that could cause  
13 a lot of bit of safety concerns during the time for  
14 the school buses to pick up and drop off.

15 The traffic engineer did not evaluate that  
16 because that was not a condition at the time. We  
17 all assumed that the school buses would be going  
18 into the development, and I -- the developer is  
19 agreeing to have a conversation with the school bus  
20 company that, you know, that services the town,  
21 because that's the main issue, and if you don't want  
22 all that happening in between the two driveways,  
23 because if you do, you'll probably have to do a pull  
24 out and things like that, and at that point you get



1 the state involved.

2 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Thank you,  
3 Anna.

4 So, Mr. Landry, I would say that you've heard  
5 all the commentary. Maybe a little bit closer look  
6 at some of these concerns is worth taking a visit  
7 at.

8 MR. LANDRY: Of course.

9 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Thank you.

10 Any other questions, comments from Board  
11 Members before we move on?

12 MS. WOOD: I have another one very  
13 quickly because I'm very anxious to hear public  
14 comment. So in the spirit of asking where we are,  
15 if things have been done, I am wondering if there's  
16 been any sort of study done on the environmental  
17 impact of development in terms of animals, dangerous  
18 species, plants, anything of that nature?  
19 Has there been any study done?

20 MR. LANDRY: Well, first of all,  
21 we handled the -- there's a small area of wetlands  
22 that we talked about that we're protecting and  
23 keeping all of the distances from. It's a highly  
24 developable site. The Town itself, by designating

1 it for high-density residential, concluded that it  
2 had -- it was an appropriate site for much higher  
3 densities than we're proposing, taking into  
4 consideration all of those factors.

5 We have to go through, in the preliminary  
6 plan stage, a DEM review of the storm water system  
7 that has a wildlife component to it; their impacts,  
8 other than drainage, that is done at the engineering  
9 stage. When we finalize the storm water management  
10 plan, we have a better idea from an engineering  
11 perspective what's going to stay, what's going to  
12 go, what the grade is going to be, what's the impact  
13 on the existing site. We have the engineer at that  
14 point.

15 You don't have to approve the project at  
16 preliminary if for some reason we cannot meet all  
17 the required health and safety standards and  
18 environmental standards. In fact, the law that  
19 covers this comprehensive permit says that all  
20 environmental considerations have to be satisfied by  
21 the final plan stage of review not even the next  
22 plan, preliminary plan stage, it's the final plan  
23 stage. So that contemplates a good hard look by DEM  
24 on all of these issues, the archeological issues.

1           From a concept perspective, we feel we've  
2           respected all applicable setbacks. We are leaving a  
3           lot of wooded areas of the site intact. You know,  
4           it obviously won't be the same habitat as it is  
5           today from whatever creatures are there, but that's  
6           something we have to address. We're not required to  
7           have it be exactly like it is today. It's not in  
8           the comprehensive plan for this site to be what it  
9           is today. It's the comprehensive plan for it to be  
10          a high-density development.

11                       MS. WOOD: So you will be doing  
12          that study you're saying?

13                       MR. LANDRY: That's part of the  
14          DEM review.

15                       MR. WOOD: Okay. I was just  
16          saying sooner rather than later and come up with any  
17          sort of seeing things you don't expect. I went to  
18          the site that Mr. Lake suggested, the Warwick Grove  
19          in Warwick, New York, and, in fact, there was a  
20          protected species in that area, so I'm sure that is  
21          something that we want to see if there is anything.

22                       MR. LANDRY: Yeah, any protected  
23          species, anything like that, natural heritage  
24          features, those are all scrutinized very carefully

1 by DEM, but in order to understand the impacts, we  
2 have to have a project design to propose, and that's  
3 what gets ironed out at this concept stage. That's  
4 all it is.

5 We really can't measure this against  
6 something that isn't at least a concept that makes  
7 sense subject to these other issues being worked out  
8 at the advanced stage, and the way -- the reason  
9 that they did that for major land development  
10 projects is that there is a phenomenal investment  
11 even at the conceptual stage that gets multiplied at  
12 the preliminary plan stage, but the idea is that if  
13 you can get to a concept plan, it justifies the  
14 investment in actually designing the roadways,  
15 looking at the grades of the site, and really  
16 understanding what comes, what stage, developing out  
17 a space plan, which you certainly will want a  
18 landscaping plan, buffering plan. All of those  
19 things are done at the next stage once we're at  
20 least vested in a concept.

21 It doesn't mean we're going to get approved  
22 for that concept, but it means that the concept  
23 could work subject to a number of issues being  
24 worked out. So that's absolutely part of the

1 process, everything you've asked about so far.

2 MS. WOOD: Okay. And one last  
3 comment is, I know that you mentioned that there is  
4 a historic cemetery on the site, and I know that we  
5 have an East Greenwich Historic Cemetery Commission,  
6 and I would ask that they be brought in, and you  
7 guys partner on it because they're the experts in  
8 that area.

9 MR. LANDRY: They certainly are.

10 We've done other developments with Union  
11 Studios where some of these folks never had good  
12 access to some of these cemeteries, and we try to  
13 make that better and easier to get to, and the whole  
14 process usually works better for the people who are  
15 stewards in the cemetery, so we absolutely involve  
16 them in the process.

17 MR. RENNINGER: I just wanted to  
18 ask one thing, confirm something that's already in  
19 the plans.

20 The distance between the buildings, the  
21 residential buildings, it looks like they're all  
22 going to be a minimum of 50 feet from each other; is  
23 that true?

24 MR. LANDRY: No, there is some that

1 will be less than -- did you say 15 or 50?

2 MR. RENNINGER: Fifty. Because I'm  
3 looking at the proposed regulations minimum  
4 distance, two abutting parcels from the proposed --

5 MR. LANDRY: Oh, two abutting  
6 parcels, yes. I thought you meant between  
7 buildings, the new buildings themselves. You mean  
8 between our buildings and abutting parcels?

9 MR. RENNINGER: No, actually, that  
10 raises another question. The buildings on the  
11 parcel, let's say type one, two, three, or four  
12 smaller ones, the front rear loading lots, what  
13 would be the distance between those building to each  
14 other?

15 MR. LANDRY: I can ask Mr. Lake to  
16 address it more specifically, but that was an issue  
17 that was discussed very extensively during the  
18 technical review process with the Fire Chief.

19 There are fire code regulations for distances  
20 between buildings. Those distances are affected by  
21 the type of the building as well as the construction  
22 standards that are associated with the buildings, so  
23 with a lot of discussion about construction types,  
24 the technical experts reached consensus with the

1 fire chief and the fire marshal, both of whom were  
2 at every meeting on this issue, and they were  
3 satisfied with the distances between the buildings,  
4 stated that, and I believe it's reflected in the  
5 staff report as well.

6 I think that some of those distances are  
7 considerably less than 50 feet, but they meet or  
8 exceed the code standards and are -- meet the  
9 satisfaction of the local safety officials.

10 MR. RENNINGER: Sure. I would  
11 just like to know what they are.

12 MR. LANDRY: I'd like to remember  
13 exactly what they are, but I think some are a lot  
14 smaller.

15 MR. LAKE: So, again, at the  
16 periphery, no less than 50 feet; but within the  
17 site, it would be no less than 15 feet, and it will  
18 vary because a lot of the lots are irregular, you  
19 know, so there might be one place that's 15,  
20 probably bigger in others, but that's pretty  
21 typical.

22 MR. RENNINGER: Fifteen is  
23 probably the minimum here?

24 MR. LAKE: Fifteen would be the

1 minimum, yeah, absolutely.

2 You can technically do less than that from  
3 the fire code perspective, but we feel like that's  
4 going a little far.

5 MR. RENNINGER: I appreciate that.

6 MR. SHARTENBERG: Are you familiar  
7 with the one down in North Kingston, is that -- are  
8 we talking farther apart than that one or closer  
9 together or similar?

10 MR. LAKE: I don't know that one  
11 specifically, but my assumption is those are  
12 probably in the 15 to 20-foot range. I'd be happy  
13 to check it out and follow up and let you know where  
14 that stands.

15 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Any other  
16 comments at this time? Questions? Okay. Great.

17 Before we move on, Mr. Teitz, what I'd like  
18 to do is just have you address everyone briefly, and  
19 just try to give them kind of a bird's eye overview  
20 of our authority and the kinds of things that we can  
21 use to reject the project like this and other things  
22 that we can't really fairly weigh in even though our  
23 opinions might have an affect on some of those  
24 aspects of this kind of development.



1                   MR. TEITZ: Sure. So I'll begin  
2 with the fact that most of your reviews have a set  
3 of standards that must be met, like, for  
4 subdivisions there's five points that must be met,  
5 and if an application doesn't meet all five of them,  
6 and fails any one of those tests, it is capable of  
7 being denied.

8                   With a low to moderate income housing at  
9 comprehensive permit, the process is a little bit  
10 different. The standards are asynchronous. There  
11 is one group of standards to approve and a totally  
12 separate group of standards for denial, and I think  
13 you have that information. We've supplied it  
14 several times in the past, and I think it's in this  
15 packet as well, the copy from the state law about  
16 what the findings would be if you were to deny it.

17                   And one of the key things is to realize that,  
18 at least as I see it, and I think this is the intent  
19 of the law is that -- that you're here to balance  
20 needs of the community. The General Assembly has  
21 already determined the need for affordable housing.  
22 It's certainly actually at the forefront in this  
23 session of the General Assembly as well, and I don't  
24 think anybody would probably doubt that in East

1 Greenwich. It's very hard for, you know, people,  
2 even your own children, you know, if they're not  
3 making a six-figure salary, it's hard to buy a house  
4 here. They're not going to be able to do it with  
5 the way the housing market has always been high and  
6 is now much higher.

7 So it is your job to balance that with the  
8 other factors including the health and safety of the  
9 current residents and the future residents who are  
10 there.

11 Things that cannot be considered by you  
12 include, for example, the impact on the schools or  
13 just the general fiscal impact. This may cost the  
14 town more money and maybe because there are more  
15 school-age children or maybe other reasons, or  
16 whatever, but that's not a reason that would  
17 substantiate a denial, that's not something you can  
18 deny it on.

19 Likewise, I know you've talked about the  
20 traffic, and any increase in traffic is not grounds  
21 for denial. The question is, is it a change to the  
22 health and safety. That's the question on the  
23 traffic. Those are the issues, and I'll actually  
24 say something: This is a master plan. There is

1 another stage still to go with preliminary plan,  
2 right?

3 MR. RANALDI, JR.: Yes.

4 MR. TEITZ: Okay. The way your  
5 head came up, I wanted to make sure I had it  
6 correct.

7 So we're at master plan here. The General  
8 Assembly could change that in the future. The  
9 General Assembly may actually do away with master  
10 plan stage for comprehensive permits in the future,  
11 but this one is here before you at the master plan  
12 stage. It will be coming back at preliminary plan  
13 stage, so that was, I kind of jumped the gun  
14 earlier, but I think that's something to realize,  
15 too, that, you know, you will have the ability, you  
16 know, if you find -- if you make the appropriate  
17 findings, you can deny it at master plan; or if you  
18 still have a lot of questions that need to be  
19 answered, those can be incorporated in your master  
20 plan decision that you can require those things to  
21 be addressed at preliminary; but the goal is not to  
22 have absolutely everything done.

23 I mean, in fact, legally they don't need a  
24 traffic -- they didn't need a traffic study for

1 master plan. Given the size of this and whatnot, I  
2 think obviously it's a major concern, everybody  
3 realized it, including the Applicant. They did it,  
4 and that's good to have that lead time on that and  
5 get going, but I don't think you have to consider  
6 that as the bible, this is it, it's not going to  
7 change. You absolutely can expand it and look at  
8 other issues as well, and other things that may come  
9 up, and that's the point of having this public  
10 hearing and having people speak and, you know, we  
11 may hear things we haven't heard at all today, and  
12 we might say, hum, we should take a look at that.

13 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Thank you,  
14 Mr. Teitz.

15 So that was for the benefit of everyone that  
16 comes to these meetings on a regular basis just to  
17 try to provide everyone with an idea of what we can  
18 and can't do with the scope of our authority.  
19 Sometimes it's not as simple as we don't like the  
20 project, we don't think that it fits into the town.  
21 That's not really a technical reason for us to  
22 reject a project like this.

23 The developer has a right to submit this  
24 application and present this project to the Town and

1 to the Board, and unless there's a real valid and  
2 technical reason and basis, it's difficult for us to  
3 just reject it outright because people in the town  
4 or residents or other people don't like it.

5 So that's what this process is all about, to  
6 try to weigh out the pros and cons then take a look  
7 at what are the concerns of the community, what are  
8 the concerns of the Town, and try to attempt to work  
9 with the developer that if there are ways to  
10 compromise that would make this more acceptable to  
11 everybody, then that's really what we're trying to  
12 do here and, if not, the Board always has the option  
13 to reject the project.

14 So with that said, I think we're going to  
15 start to transition into the phase of opening up the  
16 floor to comments, but before we do that, I want to  
17 get some idea of the numbers of people who are  
18 interested in speaking this evening. So first I  
19 will start with the folks in attendance here, if you  
20 could just raise your hands to get sort of a head  
21 count of what we're talking about. Okay. That's  
22 great. And then also, I'd ask all of the people who  
23 are in virtual attendance to raise your hand now and  
24 provide us with some ideas as to what those numbers

1 are as well, and if you could get those numbers, I  
2 would appreciate it.

3 What do we have? So it looks like about 25  
4 to 30. I'd say 15 to 20 in the room, total 25. Oh,  
5 seven more, so about 30. All right. So it's 8:00.  
6 We have two hours to do it. There might be a break  
7 in between here. That's a lot of people and a lot  
8 of comments and a lot of questions to answer.

9 So what we're going to do is have folks step  
10 forward, either virtually or live here in person,  
11 and we are going to try to ask everybody to be brief  
12 with their comments, a few minutes for everybody, so  
13 that we can be considerate of other folks that are  
14 interested in speaking.

15 We will accumulate the questions, and because  
16 of the numbers of people, the staff folks were  
17 generous enough to compile those questions, and then  
18 when we finish with all of the comments, we'll have  
19 the Applicant address the questions. I think that's  
20 the best way to proceed and use the most efficient  
21 use of our time.

22 So with that said, we're delighted to have  
23 everyone here who wants to speak, have a chance to  
24 speak, but there is a few ground rules in addition

1 to the ones I mentioned that I'd like to talk about  
2 now.

3 First, all speakers should provide their  
4 names and addresses and the names of the persons  
5 they are representing, if not themselves. To the  
6 extent reasonably possible, please try to avoid  
7 repetition of comments that have already been made  
8 by other members of the public, and I would stress  
9 that in meetings in the past where we've had a lot  
10 of people speaking, we've heard the same thing over  
11 and over and over again, so we ask you to be kind  
12 and considerate, and if someone else mentioned it  
13 before you, please hold your comments until the  
14 question is answered.

15 To the extent that you have any questions for  
16 the Applicant or its team, once again, please direct  
17 those questions to me, and I will try to get them  
18 answered for you with the help of the Planning  
19 Department staff.

20 I would prefer that every member of the  
21 public have a chance to speak once before any member  
22 of the public wants to come up and add an additional  
23 comment or question.

24 Once again, there's a hard stop at 10:00, and

1 if there are people that didn't have an opportunity  
2 to speak then, as I said earlier, we will continue  
3 until another session.

4 So we are ready to open up the floor. I  
5 think we're going to start here live first before we  
6 get to the virtual folks, so if you want to pull up  
7 a couple, three at a time to the podium to address  
8 your comments, then please do.

9 Welcome, sir.

10 MR. VESPIA: Robert Vespia,  
11 155 Shippeetown Road.

12 I just got this plan. I was looking at it,  
13 and I don't know if it's an updated one that came  
14 out after this one, but I'm looking at it, and it  
15 says across from Westfield Drive is the western  
16 access then if you go up Division, and I'm using  
17 that as a reference, when you go up Division to  
18 Westfield, the numbers go higher, some saying --  
19 they go up, and the next entrance is the eastern  
20 entrance.

21 I don't know if we're looking in the mirror,  
22 but you go from east to west not west to east when  
23 you're going up Division. So when I see this that  
24 you're going -- the main entrance is the western



1 entrance, and you're driving west up Division and  
2 you come to the eastern entrance, I'm saying  
3 something's wrong here, and if they can't get that  
4 right, what other parts of these plans are  
5 inaccurate?

6 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: So your  
7 question is what other parts of the plan are  
8 inaccurate?

9 MR. VESPINA: If they can't get  
10 east and west right, what else is wrong?

11 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Understood.

12 MR. VESPINA: And I'm looking at  
13 the terrace storm water ponds along, and I'm  
14 wondering if those are going to be open ponds, as in  
15 mosquitoes breeders, or they're going to be like the  
16 one that they have at New England Tech which is  
17 finished off on the top so all of the water is  
18 underneath so there's no exposed water to breed  
19 mosquitoes.

20 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Thank you,  
21 sir.

22 MS. ENGLEHART: Hi. My name is  
23 Renu Englehart, 2005 Division Road. I'm here  
24 tonight with permission of the Rhode Island Board of

1 Ethics.

2 I do want to take one second to ask a  
3 question about the traffic study, and the reason is  
4 that I think Miss Wood actually brought it up is  
5 that the intersections that were used using  
6 Division and New London Turnpike and Westfield, I  
7 sat on the '06 traffic study, Anna Novo was actually  
8 the consultant at that time, and one of the  
9 conditions that had come up was that in 2020, all  
10 levels of service on Division Road at every  
11 intersection would be at B (sic) or less, and at  
12 peak hours Division Road at Route 2 and Division  
13 would be an F, and they would be -- it would be an F  
14 on Route 2 on Middle Road, and it would be an E at  
15 Route 2 and Frenchtown Road.

16 I do think that it behooves this Board to  
17 make sure that there is a comprehensive traffic  
18 study for the entire town, and I would like to also  
19 point out that I believe the traffic engineer  
20 mentioned that something about East Greenwich  
21 traffic only.

22 I would point out that Division is being used  
23 by every town in western Rhode Island including  
24 Coventry, West Warwick and West Greenwich. It is a

1 state road. It goes all the way to West Greenwich,  
2 and it intersects with two other state roads, Route  
3 3 and Route 2. We get a ton of traffic.

4 I would also point out that on last Thursday  
5 the truck overturned on 95, and for two hours I  
6 could not get out of my driveway because every time  
7 there is an accident on 95, there are four exits on  
8 Division that go to 95, and that traffic ends up on  
9 Division and backs up, so there is no way that  
10 adding the additional traffic of this project would  
11 not affect me and all my neighbors.

12 I also would like to wonder, I am curious if  
13 they have the formal approval of water -- approval  
14 from Kent County Water. I'm on a septic and a well.  
15 I would like to make sure that unless they get  
16 permission from Kent County, that this project is  
17 denied. The same thing with the sewer line. I am  
18 on a well, and I would prefer not to have to deal  
19 with a septic system for four hundred units from  
20 this project.

21 And then, finally, I would like to also say  
22 the developer mentioned, I believe that, you know,  
23 they would be doing this in phases. The developer  
24 also owns this house at 1727 Division Road and has

1 claimed three times in front of boards in this town  
2 that he does not have the money and it is very  
3 expensive to fix this historical house up.

4 I believe that a condition of approval on  
5 this project should be that this house should be  
6 also maintained or renovated. I think this house is  
7 listed in the National Historic Register. It's also  
8 a historic house. It's the Roosevelt -- yeah, the  
9 Roosevelt House from East Greenwich.

10 This house is being let go by demolition by  
11 neglect, and I think it's a travesty that somebody  
12 who is proposing to build four hundred units in this  
13 town is unable to fix up one historical house in  
14 this town. That shows how much he actually cares  
15 about this town, so thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Before you go,  
17 I just -- I think I got four questions. I want to  
18 make sure that we're keeping track here. You would  
19 like to know if the Town would construct a  
20 comprehensive traffic study?

21 MS. ENGLEHART: Uh-huh.

22 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: You would  
23 like to know if there is a formal approval for a  
24 water supply from Kent County Water Authority?

1 MS. ENGLEHART: Right.

2 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: You would like  
3 to know the same thing about a sewer system?

4 MS. ENGLEHART: Right. And also if  
5 they have permission from DOT. I believe they are  
6 supposed to go under 95.

7 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Okay. And the  
8 final question will be, will the Applicant repair  
9 their historical house that is on Division Road?

10 MS. ENGLEHART: Right.

11 MR. RENNINGER: Was that 1724?

12 MS. ENGLEHART: 1727. It's  
13 directly across the entrance from Signal Ridge.

14 MS. ALLAIRE: Tammy Allaire,  
15 2403 Division Road. So I just want to get into a  
16 little bit of the traffic that -- some of the  
17 traffic that's not been brought up.

18 I consider myself a professional on Division  
19 Road watching that traffic. I have three kids,  
20 five-year spread. I've been down at that bus stop  
21 so many hours and, you know, we took into account,  
22 some mentioned garbage trucks, the FedEx trucks, the  
23 UPS trucks, we have the mail trucks, we have the  
24 buses, we have the landscapers, we have the general

1 home improvement people that -- it's a nightmare  
2 that street. We have moving trucks, all these  
3 trucks. You know, in this report, they're trying to  
4 say there's a one to two foot, you know, buffer.  
5 There's not. It's three inches to a foot. That's  
6 it. So when they pull over you have to, if you want  
7 to get by them, you have to clear that double line,  
8 you have to. There's no way around it. That road  
9 is so small, it's dangerous. And if you have that  
10 many more people, there's probably going to be,  
11 what, an extra thousand or 1200 cars coming out of  
12 that place. That's ridiculous, and then they went  
13 and they did the report. It should be the entire  
14 Division Road, the whole thing. It can't just be  
15 that little piece there. That makes no sense.

16 People get on Division Road, they go all the  
17 way down. It's not like they're cutting off and,  
18 you know, and then you talk about the neighborhoods,  
19 Westfield, I'll cut through there. If I'm going to  
20 hit traffic, I'm going to cut through that  
21 neighborhood. I'm going to cut through there. I'm  
22 going to cut through Signal Ridge. I'm going to cut  
23 through Stone Ridge to get around that traffic.  
24 It's a nightmare on that road.

1 I invite you to drive down that road and see  
2 the traffic that you actually hit on a daily basis  
3 and, you know, they did things at peak hours. I  
4 feel like a lot of people pay attention at peak  
5 hours. Try going there when it's not peak hours. I  
6 almost got hit head on the other day. Somebody was  
7 driving too slow, somebody wanted to pass him, he  
8 was on a curb, I slammed on my brakes, he missed me  
9 by maybe two feet, head-on. So it's a constant  
10 every day thing.

11 I've been living on that road for twenty  
12 years. I pulled out of that driveway probably ten  
13 thousand times, and every single time it's hit or  
14 miss. You know, they did this report, and they gave  
15 us, what, 85 percent, I don't even know what that 85  
16 percent meant where people are driving 41 to 42  
17 miles an hour. The speed limit is 35. What's the  
18 extra 15 percent? Are they doing 60? Are they  
19 doing 70 because I've seen people do that. We've  
20 had to call the cops numerous times to sit out there  
21 because people pass those buses. They'll either,  
22 you know, jack up or they'll just pass them or  
23 they'll pass them and stop because they knew they  
24 did something wrong, and it's every day.

1           You know, Renu mentioned that accident, and  
2 any time there's an accident on 95, it does get  
3 backed up, it gets really backed up, and when you  
4 get to Route 2, they let six cars go through that  
5 light. I measure it every time. It drives me  
6 crazy. The seventh person will run the light  
7 because you want to get through, and it's just --  
8 that's just the way it is, and those six cars get  
9 through and everybody is paying attention. If  
10 somebody is not paying attention, it's five cars,  
11 so, you know, they have to, I don't know, it's just  
12 not -- the road is a dangerous road as it is right  
13 now.

14           If you're going to add that many more  
15 vehicles on that road, it's just going to get more  
16 and more dangerous. Then they have things on here  
17 that they -- just don't even make any sense, you  
18 know, some of the numbers and things that they have  
19 on here.

20           First, they put something about accidents.  
21 So at first it was ten to forty crashes reported  
22 personal injury, and then they changed it to three  
23 of eight accidents. I'm very curious as to how that  
24 number got reduced that much, how they made that big



1 a mistake.

2 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: So is that a  
3 specific question that you'd like to present to the  
4 Applicant?

5 MS. ALLAIRE: Yeah.

6 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: What is the  
7 question again, please?

8 MS. ALLAIRE: Well, they mentioned  
9 they did a -- I don't know. In this paper, it says  
10 page six, crash data. So they mentioned ten to  
11 forty crashes, and then they changed it to three of  
12 eight. That's a big mistake.

13 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: So your  
14 question is why were the numbers changed in the  
15 report?

16 MS. ALLAIRE: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: In addition to  
18 that, we understand your concerns about the  
19 additional traffic.

20 MS. ALLAIRE: I think it's a big  
21 safety issue, very big safety issue, and people are  
22 going to cut through, like you said.

23 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: I think you've  
24 seen us spend a fair amount of time on the traffic.

1 I think we're all concerned about the traffic, and  
2 hopefully you speak for a lot of other people that  
3 have traffic on their mind, that certainly we will  
4 pay more attention to that particular aspect of this  
5 development, and I think you're going to hear more  
6 about that before the process is completed.

7 MS. ALLAIRE: I just want to say  
8 one more thing. I own the abutting property to the  
9 east side of this property. Bill Landry was our  
10 lawyer at that point, splitting up the property for  
11 us. We got all of our plan approvals and then he  
12 disappeared. I had to hire another lawyer, chased  
13 him down for three or four months, and then I had to  
14 hire another lawyer, so I want you to know what  
15 you're dealing with so, you know, there's a lot of  
16 deceit and deception going on here.

17 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Thank you.

18 MR. SHARMA: Good evening.  
19 Nishant Sharma, 2518 Division Street. For  
20 reference, right next to the main proposed entrance  
21 across from Westfield.

22 I'll do my best not to repeat concerning the  
23 questions. I do have concerns over the  
24 environmental impact.

1           Frankly, any time you're cutting down  
2 88 acres there's going to be a huge impact. We  
3 speak about the ponds, but if you actually go back  
4 there, it's brooks and tributaries that feed those  
5 ponds, and that will all be taken out, not to  
6 mention the impact on the animals and the existing  
7 wildlife.

8           I also have an issue with the extra traffic  
9 contributing to leaching a lot of our yards and  
10 driveways, but directly up to Division, as you know,  
11 just plastic and trash, there's always traffic, but  
12 actual chemicals from the vehicles will make an  
13 impact as well, and a lot of people have children  
14 and that could affect the sewer lines.

15           In terms of Division, there's tons of  
16 dangerous hidden blind driveways and curbs.  
17 Frankly, for me, I have to inch out of my driveway  
18 every single time, look both ways as it is. With  
19 added traffic, a huge safety issue, and there just  
20 seems -- there seems to be a lot of concern for the  
21 potential residents inside the development, but I  
22 would wish that the same amount of concern would  
23 seemingly be placed on the residents around the  
24 development.

1           You speak about slow traffic within the  
2 development while you add to that on Division and,  
3 again, it should be a residential road, and the  
4 people who currently live there treat it that way.  
5 You'll have new residents coming in possibly who  
6 don't know the area, who follow the traffic, would  
7 see a long, straight road, I think speeding will be  
8 an issue as well.

9           There will be also years of noise pollution  
10 and building construction. I think I heard it's  
11 possibly ten to eleven years, and in terms of the  
12 archeology, as you know, there are seven miles of  
13 historic stone walls that I assume go back to the  
14 16, 17th century that they used to herd sheep, and  
15 there is miles of those stone walls all throughout  
16 the 88 acres, and what will be done to those?

17           And the space between the actual development  
18 and the residences where we live around it, I don't  
19 think that will be sufficient. I know they'll do  
20 possibly as best as they can, but when the surveyors  
21 came, I can clearly see the pin markers that they  
22 tied on the trees, so there wouldn't be that big of  
23 a gap.

24           And I guess, finally, just quickly, in terms

1 of the traffic, as well, I agree that the review  
2 should be done for all of Division, but when you say  
3 there the capacity will only rise to 42 percent, I  
4 think I have a hard time believing that because if  
5 you isolate where all the traffic will be  
6 predominantly, New London Turnpike and all the way  
7 down to Route 2, but I would say Westfield and  
8 New London Turnpike, if you add a thousand more cars  
9 in the morning, at night during peak hours, and as  
10 Miss Wood said, if anything happens on that street,  
11 it backs up completely and possibly for half an  
12 hour, an hour, you add the traffic. And as things  
13 were discussed, the buses and everything, and, also,  
14 on Moosehorn and Division every time it rains and  
15 that's not the only place, but there's massive,  
16 massive floods.

17 I have a neighbor who lives there. He said  
18 the city can't do anything about it, and they spent  
19 hours and hours and hours there, and I only mention  
20 Moosehorn and Division because it's literally like a  
21 lake that forms, but that happens up and down  
22 Division, and any little discrepancy will push  
23 things back, and that's a huge concern for the  
24 children on the street, for the drivers, people

1 coming out of their driveways, the proposed streets  
2 in the development and Westfield are vastly wider  
3 than Division. So it doesn't make sense to put all  
4 of the through-traffic -- more of the traffic onto  
5 Division. There's no -- it's literally a two-way  
6 street that has been meandered down, so I just  
7 think, I think it's an unfortunate possibility to  
8 lose our neighborhood, how we live now.

9 I appreciate the need for affordable housing,  
10 but I think the state could have done it in a much  
11 different way. I think there is other areas and  
12 available buildings and federal money that can have  
13 been allocated for these purposes, and I'm sorry to  
14 say I disagree, and I have concerns. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Thank you.

16 Once again, just keep things moving along.  
17 Thank you, sir, for your comments, but if there are  
18 some comments that we heard before, we don't want to  
19 be too redundant here because we want to be  
20 sensitive and have everybody have an opportunity to  
21 speak. Thank you, sir.

22 MR. LIU: Paul Liu, 37 Miss Fry  
23 Drive.

24 They say a picture is worth a thousand words,

1 and I just e-mailed this picture to Mr. Novo to put  
2 it formally into the record for this hearing. It's  
3 a picture of the flood that just happened with the  
4 rain that we had a couple of days ago on Division  
5 Street, and I did go onto the street later so at  
6 least you can see what it looks like.

7 It references the problem that we have on  
8 Division Road every time it rains as our last  
9 speaker just alluded to. It covers the entire road,  
10 and basically it wasn't even -- some of the rain was  
11 heavy, but it speaks to another issue, and this is  
12 back to the safety thing.

13 We were listening to the consultants that the  
14 developer brought in the last meeting about how the  
15 drainage would just go in one direction, was going  
16 to flow away from the highway, et cetera, and there  
17 was adequate drainage capacity for the development.  
18 We beg to differ and, again, here is hard evidence.  
19 Every time it rains, you can go out and see for  
20 yourself.

21 The second thing, the picture is the curb  
22 that is right there on Division Street. This is  
23 between the entrance and the exit of their  
24 development, and it's a blind spot on Division that

1 everybody who drives that road knows about it, and  
2 you know that if you're ripping around the curb,  
3 because we're trying to exit our development at  
4 Westfield Drive at the same time as people are  
5 roaring around that corner going on average 42 miles  
6 an hour, even though the speed limit is 35, so in  
7 terms of a safety concern, I would ask and stress to  
8 this Board that is a huge concern because you're  
9 adding to a problem. It's a state road, but it's a  
10 known blind spot, and nobody has addressed this in  
11 any of the traffic issues that we talked about  
12 today. So those are my two points. Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Thank you,  
14 sir.

15 MS. SHAPIRO: Denise Shapiro,  
16 135 Westfield.

17 So I am the second longest resident living in  
18 Westwood Farm. I will represent myself and my  
19 husband. We have lived there for 25 years. We have  
20 no problem with the project, so that is not what  
21 we're here to talk about.

22 You've talked about peak traffic time. I  
23 would like to know what peak means. I have come in  
24 and out, my office is in Providence. Nobody is



1 coming in and out of the neighborhood at the same  
2 time. There are bus times, yes, that impacts our  
3 neighborhood in a very small way. So when you say  
4 peak traffic time, I find that there is no peak.  
5 People are coming and going all day in and out of  
6 our neighborhood. Division, as many people have  
7 said, lots of traffic all day.

8 I don't want to get into the traffic again,  
9 but I will say it is dangerous, and safety is a  
10 concern.

11 Someone mentioned the school buses. If the  
12 school bus company has not been asked if they can go  
13 into that development and have stops there, we must  
14 address that. That was something that came up this  
15 evening, so hopefully before anybody even moves  
16 forward, we will find out if the buses can even go  
17 into that neighborhood. Let's ask the school bus  
18 company.

19 As far as Division, very, very narrow road.  
20 I am a major biker. I hardly bike on Division. I  
21 walk my dogs there, carefully, scared. When I come  
22 out of my neighborhood and go up Division to  
23 Moosehorn, it is a very scary road. There is very,  
24 very little edge there, and now we're talking about

1 another 410 houses with at least 800 more cars. I  
2 can't even imagine how that will impact our safety  
3 and it is dangerous, dangerous. I think we're not  
4 talking about this being a very serious situation.

5 Again, we don't have a problem with the  
6 housing. We are talking about our safety. And of  
7 course people will cut through Westwood Farm. As a  
8 woman who lives on Division said, if there is  
9 traffic, people are going to be cutting through our  
10 neighborhood.

11 Something also came up tonight about, I think  
12 the woman said, who was asked about traffic; was  
13 anyone in our neighborhood; did anybody ask about  
14 traffic during any of this that was going on; where  
15 do you drive; how do you drive; when do you go? As  
16 far as I know, the answer is no.

17 Something also was mentioned about more  
18 people go east than west. I am one of those people  
19 that is very exact in my minutes. I know that it  
20 will impact what I do as far as going to places. I  
21 know exactly how long it takes me to get to work, to  
22 go down to Main Street. Obviously this will affect  
23 my time.

24 So I actually drive west on Division to get

1 onto New London there so that is much faster, it  
2 actually saves two minutes to get on the highway for  
3 me to go north on 95. So is that just something  
4 that we don't care about that we're going to be  
5 sitting in more traffic again? And people do go  
6 west not necessarily east. So I think that that's  
7 most of my initial, you know, dangerous, safety,  
8 traffic.

9           Someone did mention noise. I have lived in  
10 my neighborhood for 25 years. I am one of the  
11 farthest houses from the entrance. When I first  
12 moved in, I could not hear noise from the highway.  
13 I now hear noise all night long. That is because of  
14 the other development that went in on Division and  
15 New London Turnpike. So there will be a huge noise  
16 impact. Already if my husband who hears little, can  
17 hear the noise at night, that is a problem.

18           Noise pollution is another, so noise  
19 pollution. Pollution, in general, I think is  
20 something we have to look at. Someone mentioned  
21 animals, which is also a huge concern of mine;  
22 children; lots of animals; lots of coyote sightings  
23 much more than there used to be. Why is that?  
24 Because we've taken away the habitat of animals, and

1 the coyotes should certainly be able to live and  
2 survive, but there will be a huge impact if nobody  
3 does an animal study on environmental.

4 Everyone keeps talking about trees, ponds,  
5 and whatnot, but animals need to come in and say  
6 what is the impact on these animals. They are going  
7 to be living in our neighborhoods. That's not where  
8 they're supposed to be living. Right now there's  
9 woods and water, and that's where they're living, so  
10 I think that the -- how many acres is there, 88, or  
11 whatever it is, that will be a huge impact on the  
12 environment. I think that is it.

13 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Just so we're  
14 clear, did you have a specific question or questions  
15 for the Applicant? I made a lot of comments.

16 MS. SHAPIRO: Well, animals, I  
17 think that we need to look into the impact of  
18 animals in the environment, so I'm going to say yes,  
19 and I'm going to also say, just as far as not a  
20 question, let's look at the safety of pedestrians by  
21 closer cars were mentioned. I like to walk my dogs  
22 on that street, and people from Division come into  
23 my neighborhood and walk their dogs.

24 What is it going to be like when there are a

1 thousand plus people living across the street?  
2 They're going to be coming into our neighborhood.  
3 It's very dangerous on Division. So it's a comment.  
4 I think it needs to be evaluated as far as how does  
5 that impact our safety, and it's dangerous as it is  
6 right now. So I don't know what the question is.

7 The question is, can we make sure that it's  
8 not going to become more dangerous? I guess that's  
9 the question. It's a very dangerous road as it is.

10 UNKNOWN MAN: School buses was  
11 another thing.

12 MS. SHAPIRO: We need to contact  
13 the school bus company to make sure that the school  
14 bus company will let the buses go into this  
15 development because that came up this evening.

16 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Okay. Great.

17 MS. SHAPIRO: If they say no,  
18 what's that --

19 MR. RANALDI, JR.: Mr. Chairman,  
20 I spoke directly with the school bus company, and  
21 they confirmed that with an easement with a  
22 developer they could go onto the property.

23 MS. SHAPIRO: Okay. So my other  
24 question, again, is with the traffic, if you're

1 looking into the traffic, I don't think there is a  
2 peak time other than exactly when the buses are  
3 coming and going. People are coming and going all  
4 day. There is traffic all day. So there's no peak  
5 time from 7 to 9 in the morning. I go to work at 9,  
6 so I'm after that peak time, and I come home after  
7 7 p.m., so there's no peak time other than exactly  
8 when those buses are coming and going. So when  
9 you're looking at the traffic, if that is something  
10 that you're going to be evaluating, let's look at  
11 all day long not some quote/unquote peak time that  
12 you've come up with -- not you, the developer.

13 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: We all share  
14 your concerns about the safety and the traffic.  
15 Thank you.

16 MR. WEEDON: Bill Weedon, and I  
17 live at 6 Brookfield Court, East Greenwich.

18 COURT REPORTER: Please spell your  
19 last name.

20 MR. WEEDON: W-E-E-D-O-N.

21 So I live in the Westwood Farm development.  
22 My wife and I moved there about five years ago, and  
23 previously we lived in the Cowesett area of  
24 West Warwick and, you know, the reason we moved to

1 East Greenwich is because we enjoy it's a very  
2 quaint town, and we enjoy, you know, living in a,  
3 you know, in a certain area. We bought a two-acre  
4 lot where we can walk and go jogging and walk our  
5 pets, and this project has the potential, or is  
6 definitely going to change the whole character of  
7 our community, and so you notice there is nobody  
8 here standing up in favor of the project. Everyone  
9 is opposing the project because it has such a large  
10 impact on our investment and our quality of life.

11 And so the first question, sir, is how can we  
12 move the main entrance because our development,  
13 Westwood Farms, will be most directly affected by  
14 that, and we don't want these extra cars coming  
15 through there. A portion of the people going to  
16 school or wherever they're going will definitely be  
17 cutting through our neighborhood. Nobody wants  
18 that. People are out there walking their dogs or  
19 going for a morning walk or jog, and we don't want  
20 it. So what do we have to do to protect our  
21 neighborhood?

22 Do we have to make it a gated community?  
23 Do we need to put up speed bumps to protect people  
24 from flying through our neighborhood at 40 miles an

1 hour when we have kids that are, you know, getting  
2 on school buses or people walking their dogs?

3 The second question would be how can we  
4 reduce the scale of this project? Okay. There's  
5 nobody objecting to minimum housing. You know, most  
6 of the people here believe in having more affordable  
7 housing, but why does it have to be all in one  
8 place? Why does it have to be on our backs, the  
9 people in the Division Street, the Westwood Farms  
10 area? Why can't we reduce it to a more reasonable  
11 scale of project that's palpable to the  
12 neighborhoods that have invested in the community.

13 And traffic on Division Road, I think, is  
14 definitely way underestimated. The study is  
15 inadequate, in my opinion. We have in addition to  
16 all of the, you know, the trucks, mail trucks,  
17 FedEx, the snow plows, we have a big hill on  
18 Division Street that, in the wintertime, people have  
19 trouble getting up that big hill in a storm.

20 We also have the rotary that's by New England  
21 Tech, which is a bottleneck, and it will definitely  
22 make it more difficult to get in and out of the  
23 area.

24 Now, also, about how do we protect people --



1 there are people that jog and bicycle and walk on  
2 Division Street sometimes late at night. How do we  
3 protect their safety? All right.

4 And, also, finally, Mr. Liu alluded to it,  
5 how do we get in and out of Westfield? If this  
6 entrance has to be there, if that main entrance has  
7 to be directly across from Westfield, what are we  
8 going to do to allow us to safely get in and out of  
9 our neighborhood? Are we going to put a stop sign  
10 there on Division Road because we have that blind  
11 intersection. When you're coming out of Westfield  
12 looking to your left, if you're taking a left-hand  
13 turn, you got that corner that is there, it's very  
14 dangerous. And with all of these extra cars, if you  
15 got cars coming at you from across, directly across,  
16 you might have a car that's taking a right-hand  
17 turn, so now instead of you taking a quick look to  
18 the right and then to your left, now you've got to  
19 look across, so your attention is diverted, so it  
20 makes it more difficult to get out of our  
21 development.

22 So I just feel that, you know, the scale of  
23 the project is too big. I don't care how many of  
24 these, you know, these houses you can fit on a

1 postage stamp. You know, well, we could have made  
2 it bigger so we're being generous, you know, only  
3 making it four hundred houses. Okay. Make it more  
4 something that is more acceptable to the  
5 neighborhood, to the community, and then people will  
6 be less objectionable to it. Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Thank you,  
8 sir.

9 MS. TADMOURY: Isabelle Tadmoury,  
10 35 Westfield Drive.

11 I live about four doors down from Division  
12 Road right onto Westfield Drive, so I am one of the  
13 first houses that will be impacted by this project,  
14 and I can tell you while it's springtime now and the  
15 leaves are slowly coming back on the trees, during  
16 wintertime the noise from 95 is very loud. Some of  
17 my neighbors have alluded to it as well, but there  
18 is a significant difference between the wintertime  
19 and the summertime in my house as to how well we can  
20 hear the 95 traffic.

21 Now, if you're going to take down these  
22 trees, I understand I was at the last meeting that  
23 there is a plan to have a barrier, but I think it's  
24 unrealistic to think that there won't be a

1 significant impact on the noise pollution for our  
2 area and for the entire area as well as the air  
3 quality that will definitely impact us as well as  
4 the ten years that it's going to take for this thing  
5 to be built.

6 Now, I moved here from a big city for the  
7 purpose of having some quiet and country life.  
8 That's what we wanted for our kids. That's the  
9 reason we moved to East Greenwich; frankly, the  
10 reason why we moved to Rhode Island. There are  
11 plenty of places out of state where everything is  
12 cramped. It's character of this town and the reason  
13 people want to come here, not just the schools, it's  
14 the lifestyle that you're giving with these two-acre  
15 lots or one-acre lots.

16 This development, in my mind, is way, way too  
17 big, and I am frankly surprised that anyone wants to  
18 live just outside of the 95. Have we done a study  
19 on the increased capacity on the 95? We keep  
20 talking about Division, but 95 traffic has increased  
21 incredibly in the 12 years since we lived here.  
22 Okay. It was quiet during COVID, but let's not kid  
23 ourself, this is going to change. The environment  
24 is going to change. Climate change is going to

1 change.

2 This road gets a ton of traffic. There's a  
3 lot of noise that's going to increase for the entire  
4 neighborhood and, yes, 25 percent of these units  
5 will be used for moderate to low income housing, but  
6 the other 75 percent are people who are going to  
7 really spend a lot of money to be right next to a  
8 major highway. I'm not sure that that's really  
9 going to happen.

10 I would really strongly advise you to look at  
11 other lots, make this one smaller, find other  
12 opportunities for these types of housing. This is a  
13 big town. This is the only part of town that butts  
14 up to the 95, and it impacts all of us, as you can  
15 hear from all of these neighbors, you know.

16 Some of your -- the people who came and spoke  
17 last week didn't know, you know, they think that we  
18 live at the end of East Greenwich, and that it's in  
19 the boonies, but, frankly, there's a lot of us that  
20 live there, and we really will be impacted by this.  
21 Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Thank you.

23 MS. TADMOURY: Welcome.

24 MR. MONTY: Dennis Monty,

1 M-o-n-t-y.

2 I feel like I'm a foreigner here from West  
3 Greenwich. I live at 25 Pine Road Lane. It's the  
4 Cedar Ridge Condominiums. I'm the president of the  
5 association, and we did submit eight or ten  
6 questions back at the beginning of this, a year ago,  
7 and got most of those answered and, you know, we're  
8 comfortable with continuing to have that overseen  
9 and, hopefully, followed up with as it goes through  
10 the process.

11 But the two things that I did want to bring  
12 up is one of the setback issues around the property  
13 lines between Cedar Ridge and the new development.  
14 We've heard anywhere last presentation they went  
15 from 25 feet to 35 feet to 150 feet. I mean, I  
16 think it should be a minimum of 100 feet and, you  
17 know, after that if it's more, that's great. But if  
18 you start getting in where you're that close, it  
19 creates a lot of issues, I think, going forward. So  
20 certainly the setback between the Cedar Ridge  
21 properties and the properties of the Division Street  
22 project are something that's important.

23 Not to hop on traffic, but I'm going to speak  
24 one thing about traffic, and that is the

1 intersection of New London Turnpike and Division.  
2 If you drive it, you know it's not a 90-degree turn  
3 going from Division onto New London Turnpike. It's  
4 probably more like 45 if you're heading north and  
5 wanting to turn right to go toward 95. I've known  
6 more people who were leaning up on the curb or on  
7 the stones of that property in order to make that  
8 turn, and if they don't do that, they're actually on  
9 the oncoming lane of the traffic in the other  
10 direction.

11 The state did modify the intersection, but it  
12 was on the intersection coming out of New London  
13 Turnpike making a turn onto Division in either  
14 direction, and they widened it so that you could  
15 take a right turn while you're waiting to take a  
16 left turn. So that's something there.

17 What's interesting is that that house that's  
18 on the corner of Division and New London Turnpike  
19 appears to be being turned into an ice cream shop.  
20 Think about that on that intersection. They're in  
21 the process of renovating it currently. I can't  
22 find it in anybody's minutes, whether it's West  
23 Greenwich property or East Greenwich property, but  
24 I've heard the story now at least a half a dozen

1 times, and they are doing significant renovations,  
2 and the house right now is vacant. And if that  
3 becomes an ice cream store, the only place they can  
4 really park is across the street where typically on  
5 the weekend the bikers, not the motorcycles, but the  
6 bicyclers who are going out to the properties park,  
7 so think about the family that parks across there  
8 and then has to cross Division to get the ice cream,  
9 and the kids that have a potential -- we're talking  
10 about safety issues and walking there, big, big  
11 problem, so something has got to happen there  
12 whether it's stop signs that go in. I know the  
13 problem is it's the state that has to do this.

14 It would be really important if the state sat  
15 here and listened to some of this activity because  
16 they can say, oh, yeah, we can't do this or we can't  
17 do that, and all of those things, but they've got to  
18 listen, they're as responsible for it as anybody  
19 else. And then not only is that ice cream shop  
20 going to happen, but on the other side where the  
21 bicycle parking is, behind that it used to be,  
22 I think, an old scrap yard. That's going to be  
23 turned into a motor vehicle -- a motor home storage  
24 facility for off seasons and a storage facility, so

1 all of that back area is another project that's  
2 going to be going on. That has been approved and  
3 construction is supposed to be starting on that  
4 sometime this summer. That's a West Greenwich  
5 project that was approved.

6 So a lot of things are going to happen to  
7 increase this activity on Division, and the state  
8 has done a great job increasing the potential width  
9 of Division from New London Turnpike heading out to  
10 Route 3. If you head out in that direction, they're  
11 taking trees back probably 20, 25 feet on either  
12 side of the road, so I think as much for the  
13 electrical wiring to save that than anything else,  
14 but it's giving the potential that they can widen  
15 that side of the road, but as people have said when  
16 you head from New London Turnpike down toward Route  
17 2, you know, there's nothing on the sides of the  
18 road there, you're right up against it, and if you  
19 go to pull over for any reason, you know, you're in  
20 the gully.

21 So a lot of thought needs to be had, and I  
22 think a lot of pressure needs to be put on the state  
23 to do something to improve Route 2 in that direction  
24 to make it wider so that there is some capacity.



1           We've got to talk capacity, and I guess if  
2 all the cars are moving back and forth at the same  
3 time and not having to get out of each other's way,  
4 there probably is some capacity on that road, but if  
5 something causes an issue, whether it's an animal, a  
6 person, a bus, garbage truck, a mail truck, all of  
7 those things very quickly becomes a real safety  
8 issue.

9           So those are the two things I would bring to  
10 the attention, is pay more attention to the  
11 intersection of New London Turnpike and Division  
12 based on what's going to happen there and the  
13 geometry of that intersection because it's not  
14 right. Any time you have to make a turn, a hairpin  
15 turn to get onto a road, that's not a good thing,  
16 and then if you put an ice cream shop and other  
17 things there, a big problem, and can't there be  
18 something done to widen Division in that direction?

19           And, finally, keeping the buffer between  
20 Cedar Ridge and this new development at a minimum of  
21 100 feet with the natural trees that are there  
22 rather than cutting everything down and building,  
23 putting in some little pine trees or something that  
24 would grow in the next fifty years.

1                   CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Thank you,  
2 sir.

3                   MR. MONTY: Welcome.

4                   MR. SMITH: Christopher Smith,  
5 380 Moosehorn Road.

6                   I won't be redundant and mention traffic, but  
7 I would like a quick clarification from the -- from  
8 the panel. I believe you said that you do not vote  
9 on how it would impact the school, is that correct,  
10 that you do not vote on any impact on the school,  
11 that would not be part of the Planning Board's  
12 decision?

13                   CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Well, we were  
14 going to hold all the questions, but quickly, yes,  
15 we can't use that as a specific, technical reason  
16 for denying --

17                   MR. SMITH: So then I believe also  
18 I heard correctly that public services, fire and  
19 police would not be also, would be the same?

20                   CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Same.

21                   MR. SMITH: So I think, I'd like  
22 to know what you can actually deny or accept the  
23 project on.

24                   CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Well, we had

1 the counsel speak to that a little bit earlier, and  
2 in consideration of the time, we're going to allow  
3 the other people to ask their questions, but if you  
4 want to draft that as a question, we can present it  
5 to Andy at the end, and he can address it more to  
6 try to help out.

7 MR. SMITH: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Anybody else  
9 who is here with us this evening live that wishes to  
10 speak, now is the time, because after this we have a  
11 transition to the virtual group. I don't see  
12 anybody else coming up. One more here it looks like  
13 or maybe two. Hang on. Welcome.

14 MR. BRICKMAN: Arlen Brickman,  
15 3 Corr Way, and I also live in the Westwood Farms  
16 neighborhood.

17 Questions specifically that I would like to  
18 have them bring up is inside of their environmental  
19 assessment, I'd like to make sure that they include  
20 temperature changes for the area, so forested areas  
21 will have a different ambient temperature compared  
22 to what residential residences would be, and I  
23 believe that the wetlands is completely surrounded  
24 by houses, and I just want to make sure that while

1 they're doing this assessment, I'd like to know how  
2 those wetlands are going to be affected by the  
3 changes in the temperature from the ambient  
4 buildings and the roadways, which will raise the  
5 temperatures, and what will happen to the wildlife  
6 and the local flora and fauna --

7 COURT REPORTER: Excuse me?

8 MR. BRICKMAN: The flora and  
9 fauna.

10 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Thank you.

11 MS. WEISS: Hi, Sabrina Weiss,  
12 W-e-i-s-s, 10 Westfield Drive.

13 I don't think it was mentioned that Division  
14 Road is even more dangerous after peak hours in the  
15 evening when it gets dark, so I do think that that's  
16 worth looking into. Just last week we had to call  
17 several times because there were multiple lights  
18 out, and even with the lights, it's very difficult  
19 to see and people still fly down that road.

20 And then I just have a comment on the overall  
21 development, and I know this doesn't necessarily  
22 play into your decision or, you know, is not  
23 something that you can take into account, but I  
24 don't think that most of us are opposed to this

1 parcel being developed in a responsible way.

2           Something that stood out to me from last week  
3 was a comment the architect made comparing this  
4 development to the Hill and Harbour neighborhood,  
5 and that it's going to be a great neighborhood to  
6 trick or treat in, and I just have to say I think  
7 that's really where the comparison ends. You know,  
8 people who live in the Hill and Harbour do forego  
9 some space, but in exchange they have many  
10 amenities, such as walking to a wonderful main  
11 street, fields, playgrounds, library, restaurants.

12           This is basically like putting that in the  
13 middle of nowhere, and I just think that it's a  
14 parcel that could be developed in a more sustainable  
15 way, you know, put in the hundred-unit affordable  
16 housing, put in two-hundred units of affordable  
17 housing, whereas a quarter acre or a half an acre  
18 and has land to enjoy, and that is why people live,  
19 you know, west of Route 2 as opposed to in the  
20 downtown area. I think that that's what people  
21 deserve, so that's it. Thank you.

22                           CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Thank you.

23                           MS. WEISS: Welcome.

24                           MR. BLAIS: Good evening. I'm

1 Andrew Blais. I'm an associate attorney at  
2 Duffy & Sweeney in Providence, Rhode Island. The  
3 address is 321 South Main Street, Suite 400.

4 I'm here representing two individuals,  
5 Dr. Lund and Dr. Liu, and I have several comments  
6 and questions. I will try not to touch the traffic  
7 issues that have already been presented obviously,  
8 but I would note for the record, and I have two  
9 expert witnesses, one planner and one traffic  
10 engineer, both have done reviews of the project. I  
11 have their reports with me that I can present to the  
12 Board, but if this meeting does go to a third  
13 meeting, I would like to have them presented to the  
14 Board if that is permissible during public comment.

15 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Andy.

16 MR. TEITZ: Yes, obviously it  
17 would be nice if we had known about that sooner, but  
18 actually it probably would make sense if you've got  
19 the reports to submit them ahead of time. It seems  
20 pretty likely that this is going to go for another  
21 night, so you would have an opportunity to present  
22 your witnesses at that time.

23 MR. BLAIS: Great. If I could  
24 reserve then, if that's okay with the Board.

1                   CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: It is, but I  
2 would add for them to also be considerate of the  
3 time. We like to be fair in the process and afford  
4 them sort of kind of the time we've allowed  
5 everybody else this evening.

6                   MR. BLAIS: That is completely  
7 understandable and something that will definitely be  
8 the case. Would you like me just to do a quick  
9 summary, initial thoughts? I'll do that now for  
10 you.

11                   Initially, primarily, this is a five-percent  
12 population increase if all units have two people who  
13 live in the unit, just assuming that it's a  
14 five-percent increase for the Town of East  
15 Greenwich. That's a big deal, and a big deal in a  
16 zone that is currently zoned F-2, which is farming,  
17 agriculture -- agricultural, which means that each  
18 parcel is only supposed to -- the underlying zoning  
19 requires two acres to build a home.

20                   Primarily, one question I would ask the  
21 Applicant, I've seen it both ways in their  
22 application in the traffic study, is it 410 units  
23 that are being proposed to be built or 418? I can't  
24 tell from the various submissions, but I think

1 that's important.

2 This is the master plan stage, and I would  
3 completely acknowledge that it is a conceptual  
4 point, but at this time I don't think the concept is  
5 far enough along to be given master plan approval,  
6 and by that same token, as to 410 or 418 units,  
7 traffic obviously is an issue.

8 I'm not going to say much about it other than  
9 we agree with the Board and the public that the  
10 traffic study should be expanded to the Route 2 and  
11 Division Road intersection. That is obviously a  
12 crucial intersection for the town.

13 I would also note that the comprehensive plan  
14 designates Division Road, specifically, this  
15 portion, as a scenic road. My thoughts would be  
16 that with a one-hundred percent increase in the  
17 driving and the cars driving down that road, that  
18 might be detrimental to the scenic nature of that  
19 road.

20 The comprehensive plan also designates this  
21 property for a LMI, but that's not a silver bullet.  
22 In fact, if you look at the three areas that are  
23 designated for the comprehensive plan, there is  
24 another area right above, right to the north of 95,



1 that is populated by single family parcels and one  
2 parcel owned by the State of Rhode Island. I don't  
3 think that that situation would be called for LMI  
4 development because there are people living there.

5 There is -- when we look at the comprehensive  
6 plan, to suggest that this area should be rezoned  
7 for the purposes of LMI, the zone, the underlying  
8 zone hasn't changed at all. The Applicant wants  
9 this Board to look at it as an R-6 zoning district  
10 which would greatly increase the density that would  
11 be allowed, but if you look at what the zoning  
12 requirements would be if they applied the zone that  
13 was created under the comprehensive plan, a portion  
14 about of that LMI, it would be MUPD zone which has  
15 significant requirements that this application does  
16 not meet.

17 Right now zoning, just to develop as it is,  
18 in the F-2 zone, there would be about 35 houses that  
19 could be built on that property, that's assuming  
20 15 percent could be used for roads or wetlands, so  
21 35 houses. They're proposing 410 to 418. That  
22 would be over a thousand percent increase in density  
23 of that particular parcel.

24 I guess my question would be, is that

1 particular density necessary to make the project, or  
2 can it be decreased by the Applicant? Obviously the  
3 community character would also be changed because of  
4 the change in density, that's a huge density.

5 That's a density you would find in a city or a  
6 close-by suburb, and you're asking -- the Applicant  
7 is asking to put it in what is an agricultural,  
8 rural residential zone.

9 Solar protections obviously need to be  
10 addressed. There's no real understanding at this  
11 moment. Now, I know that this is master plan, yet,  
12 again, however, that could have a very big impact  
13 both on the density, and it also could just -- would  
14 affect what parcels have their own shape, so that's  
15 really important.

16 A couple of other things, really fast. There  
17 are a couple of submissions that are on the master  
18 plan checklist, requirements that weren't made. I  
19 know that the Applicant mentioned at the prior  
20 hearing the pro forma was submitted to Rhode Island  
21 Housing, but I don't know if the Town or the  
22 Planning Department has that information. I think  
23 that should be made available.

24 Also, the master plan checklist does call for

1 a rejection of population and the student  
2 population, and although that cannot be considered,  
3 it is something that is asked for in the master plan  
4 checklist.

5 I think drainage should be a big  
6 consideration as well, and I would ask the -- I  
7 would ask the Applicant to address that a little bit  
8 further especially in a situation where there is  
9 already flooding on the roads.

10 Finally, there is another requirement on the  
11 environmental issues. There are trees throughout  
12 the -- obviously, the 80 acres of land. There are  
13 some requirements to note and tag trees of interest,  
14 significant trees, I guess, but at this time the  
15 plan does not call for that. That has not taken  
16 place, and if there were significant trees, and the  
17 plan needed to be changed, the density would likely  
18 need to be changed with it. So I don't think it's  
19 too early to require that.

20 And, finally, I'm sorry, asking for -- the  
21 Applicant is asking for literally millions of feet  
22 in dimensional relief, which, again, goes to  
23 density. Fifteen feet doing houses is something,  
24 again, that you would see in a city or a suburb and

1 not in a rural agricultural, so with that I end my  
2 comments. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Welcome.

4 MS. MADEN: Mary Maden,  
5 180 Sanctuary Drive.

6 I'll start with my question. It may have  
7 been answered at the last meeting, but I was on zoom  
8 and taking care of grandchildren, so I don't know if  
9 it was answered.

10 Has the Applicant studied or projected the  
11 impact on the growth of our school system over the  
12 period of time? And the reason I ask that is, in  
13 our community, we have to balance everything, and  
14 currently we have concern over our schools and the  
15 growth of the student population and three schools  
16 that now we're going to be having, which is  
17 wonderful, we're going to be having open tours of  
18 them to see what the needs are for these schools.

19 I spent 47 years in public education. I  
20 believe in public education. I'm probably about  
21 twice the age of many of the people in this room who  
22 still has kids in school. I have four grandchildren  
23 in this town and three other relative children in  
24 this town. They have enjoyed wonderful education.

1 One is through the system, completely finishing his  
2 sophomore year at Virginia Tech, and the other  
3 six -- three, six, yup, the other six will be going  
4 through the East Greenwich public schools, and I  
5 want the quality of schools to be maintained for  
6 everyone's kids. That's the most important thing,  
7 the absolute, so please consider that.

8 And I know we said a lot about traffic, but I  
9 live on Sanctuary Drive. We have only 62 condos,  
10 maybe 35 to 40 percent of my neighbors spend half  
11 the time in Florida, and I am really glad that we  
12 have a traffic light out on Division. Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Anybody else  
14 this evening in the room that would like to speak  
15 before we move on? Okay.

16 I propose we take a five minute break and  
17 then we will go to zoom. Thank you.

18 (RECESS)

19 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Once again,  
20 recording in progress. If you're attending the  
21 meeting virtually, if you haven't done so already,  
22 please raise your hand and indicate that you would  
23 like to make a comment or ask a question, and I  
24 would ask you, again -- I don't know where the

1 number is. We have more coming up. I'll start with  
2 Greg Weiss. They keep popping up. It looks like we  
3 have six people with comments and questions. All  
4 right.

5 I will remind the folks virtually, you're  
6 bound by the same rules that we asked earlier, that  
7 you provide your name and address or names of the  
8 people that you're representing and share with us  
9 your comments.

10 With that said, I'll go in order. Let's have  
11 the first virtual question, please. You may want to  
12 announce their names, so it doesn't list their name.  
13 I'm looking at the right, at the top. You've got  
14 Greg Weiss.

15 MR. WEISS: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: All right.

17 Mr. Weiss, sir, you have a question, and  
18 please address your question to the Board.  
19 Mr. Weiss, if you can hear me, you have your hand  
20 raised, but you're muted. Okay.

21 We've got Jamie Whelan, please, if I read  
22 that correctly. Welcome.

23 UNKNOWN VOICE: Good evening. I've  
24 already had my answer from the traffic questions.

1 Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: You're welcome.

3 If you do not have a question and don't wish  
4 to speak, please check and see if your hand is  
5 raised and remove it. Otherwise, the folks who have  
6 their hands raised virtually, we're going to ask you  
7 to present your questions and comments to the Board.

8 Next in order is someone identified as  
9 Chapad, C-h-a-p-a-d, I believe. Are you with us?

10 MR. CHAMPAGNE: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Hello, sir.  
12 Please state your name and address for the record.

13 MR. CHAMPAGNE: Yes. My name is  
14 David Champagne. The address is 2545 Division Road.  
15 My sister Denise Petrarca owns the property, and my  
16 mother, Lorraine Champagne, lives at that property.

17 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Thank you.  
18 Please, proceed.

19 MR. CHAMPAGNE: Yes, the way I  
20 understand it, I guess a lot of the planning hasn't  
21 been done for the storm ponds at this time, I guess  
22 that's correct?

23 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: If that's a  
24 question, then we will present it to the Applicant.

1           Is that your question?

2                           MR. CHAMPAGNE: Well, I am  
3 concerned about the storm drains because everything  
4 is flowing to our -- toward our property, and the  
5 concern, the question is, is how they're going to be  
6 constructed or engineered because we're concerned  
7 that the water will drain and seep into the ground  
8 and contaminate the well. That was brought up at  
9 the last time, and we don't feel that the cost for  
10 us to have water should come at our expense, so we  
11 were wanting to get on record that during  
12 construction if the wells are contaminated, that  
13 anyone in the area, certain area that has wells,  
14 that the contractor would install a filtration  
15 system to take out the contaminants, you know,  
16 instead of hooking us to the waterlines. So that  
17 would be a question. And then once the contractor  
18 knows that the condo association would take the  
19 responsibility for the contamination to the wells --  
20 so because if they have significant rain, if they  
21 flood, we have flooding that overflows the storm  
22 drains, you know, that could contaminate our wells  
23 because they showed you a picture of that corner  
24 that floods on Division already, and a lot of the



1 water, all the storm drains are coming toward or a  
2 couple of them are coming toward Division in that  
3 area.

4 So we want a contingency on record that  
5 someone is going to absorb the costs as to how it's  
6 going to affect our property. That would be that  
7 question.

8 The other one would be, someone brought up  
9 about mosquitos that they're going to, you know,  
10 breed mosquitos, that the builder, while under  
11 construction, would spray for mosquitos, and then it  
12 would go to the condo association to maintain that,  
13 the mosquitos now, and also I feel that it's a  
14 safety hazard for the children and the animals in  
15 that area, and they should consider testing those  
16 storm drains in.

17 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Thank you,  
18 sir.

19 The next virtual attendant with questions and  
20 comments is, I can't read the whole name,  
21 Elizabeth Rodgers, please. If you can hear me,  
22 please state your name and address for the record.

23 MS. RODGERS: Hi, my name is  
24 Elizabeth Rodgers. I am a resident at 2555 Division

1 Road. Actually, right next door to 2545 Division  
2 with the previous resident speaking.

3 I am speaking on behalf of my husband and my  
4 children, ages six and three, who are residents and  
5 who came to this area in the last seven years to be  
6 in a really nice rural community, and our concerns  
7 are directly related to the environmental impact  
8 that this new development raises. Our questions  
9 surround the environmental leaching.

10 Most of our residences, as previous neighbors  
11 have cited, have wells and well water. I'd like to  
12 understand what the environmental impacts -- what  
13 will be done to account for the groundwater and any  
14 leaching possibilities.

15 I would also like to understand what are the  
16 stipulations that are being included for the  
17 demolition? We are currently on a slab and the area  
18 is incredibly rocky. We've had to remove a number  
19 of boulders on our front lawn to accommodate a new  
20 septic system, and my understanding is that behind  
21 us it will be the same.

22 Are there any considerations for our  
23 residences to ensure that our property is maintained  
24 in a safe -- stability and safe foundation as we're

1 doing demolition as well. And I'd also like to  
2 understand, as it impacts the environment, about  
3 waste generation, the large-scale economic and  
4 environmental impacts of large-scale developments,  
5 construction increases pollution as well as noise  
6 pollution, as other residents have also stated.

7 I'd like to understand what studies are being  
8 done to assuage the health and safety of us as we  
9 will be most directly affected as we will abut this  
10 property.

11 In addition, I really would also like to  
12 understand the so-called leaching pond behind there,  
13 what are the guardrails that are going to be  
14 surrounding them? To me they sound like glorified  
15 mosquito ponds. They're just going to be a runoff  
16 for the organization.

17 I have two small children. We've put up a  
18 fence. We've taken great care to ensure that our  
19 property has guardrails up to help with the mosquito  
20 population, but as the previous residents have  
21 stated, those are glorified mosquito ponds. How are  
22 we going to ensure that those are not going to be  
23 waste water runoff to our properties and then  
24 further damage our foundation, further damage the

1 flooding of the streets and account for the increase  
2 in lack of proper drainage.

3 Our house floods constantly. The city has  
4 not fixed it for a number of years. I have years of  
5 photos, documentation, fixing those drainage. As a  
6 previous resident and many others have stated, all  
7 of that groundwater and all of that runoff floods  
8 downhill in front of our house, degraded our  
9 property, our lawn, the street.

10 I know we can't talk about the school system  
11 and the affect on the financial implications, but  
12 how is this going to affect our property value in  
13 the long run as well? We're going to be packing in  
14 people like sardines behind our house, and speaking  
15 in a more opinionated fact, it feels as though this  
16 corporation is taking advantage of the fact that we  
17 have a niche for the housing requirements within  
18 there, taking advantage of that, to allow people to  
19 be packed into this environment. Why is this  
20 happening? And it feels like a very corporate greed  
21 that's just going to affect us in the long run, our  
22 school system, municipality, to the taxes that we  
23 pay. I would like to understand how the long-term  
24 effect is going to be. Thank you for your time.

1                   CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Thank you.

2                   Next participant is M.Thomas. Welcome.  
3 Please state your name and address for the record.

4                   MS. THOMAS: Michelle Thomas,  
5 5 Westfield Drive, directly across the street from  
6 one of the entrances.

7                   I have been to every meeting, read the  
8 newspaper every day, researched the Town minutes,  
9 but somehow I missed how this parcel of land  
10 received a zone change.

11                  Can you please clarify this for me as all of  
12 these issues that are being talked about tonight  
13 resulted in a change, and I thought that any time  
14 that a zone change happened the residents of the  
15 town were to be notified. So please enlighten me,  
16 if you could.

17                  CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Thank you.

18                  Our next virtual participant, I think, is it  
19 Cheri? Okay. We're with Cheri Walton. Are you  
20 there?

21                  MS. WALTON: Yes, I am.

22 Cheri Walton, 2447 Division Road.

23                  So I'm an abutting -- abutting property. I  
24 have two questions. One I didn't post on the -- the

1 action, and it involves the wildlife, but I would  
2 just be more specific as to why I think it would be  
3 a good idea to do that sooner rather than wait for  
4 when DEM comes in.

5 My concern is that there has already been a  
6 loader that went back there, probably a year ago,  
7 and there's already been trees that have been  
8 knocked down. I have permission to walk that  
9 property line, not on that property, but next to it,  
10 so I have seen the activity. It has now been  
11 removed. It was also parked behind like the  
12 historical cemetery for quite sometime where trees  
13 were knocked down.

14 If you look at the Rhode Island Wildlife  
15 Action Plan, there are significant amounts of  
16 species that are identified as great conservation  
17 need, and I would like to specifically draw  
18 attention to ones that -- I'm not a specialist, this  
19 is why I said it would be good. I've personally  
20 seen a black bear in that area as a child. There is  
21 cottontails, bobcats, bats, moles, turtles, rats,  
22 snakes. There is so many species that are already  
23 in that area, and the fact that there is some  
24 archeology studies that's going to be done, I

1 imagine there's going to be some disturbance  
2 already, so I think having that study done sooner  
3 rather than later is very important.

4 My second question: I'm very happy to hear  
5 last week that there is an archeological study being  
6 done. My grandmother, Becky Ann Thompson, formerly  
7 Carpenter -- the historical cemetery, maybe it's  
8 family folk law, but my question is: Are they  
9 prepared for the potential of unmarked graves and  
10 archeological artifacts besides those within the  
11 historical cemetery?

12 There have been doctors that lived in this  
13 house, you know, we're talking 1600 -- 1700. There  
14 is definitely a potential for that, as well as  
15 Narragansett tribe that earlier settled into the  
16 area, so I just question have they thought of that,  
17 and then what is the process, if anything, like  
18 that?

19 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Thank you.  
20 All right.

21 Our next participant, as identified, is Paul,  
22 virtually. Paul, are you with us?

23 MR. STAVRAND: Yes, this is  
24 Paul Stavrand. Can you hear me?

1                   CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Yes, please  
2 give us your address.

3                   MR. STAVRAND: 100 Pheasant Drive.

4                   CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Thank you, and  
5 your comment or question, sir.

6                   MR. STAVRAND: Yeah, I have a couple  
7 of questions.

8                   In the peak hour traffic study and generally  
9 the traffic study, were the construction vehicles  
10 that will be entering and exiting this development,  
11 construction site, included in the modeling study,  
12 and of note, that construction vehicles will be  
13 present for multiple years?

14                   CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: We've got  
15 that. We've got the question, I believe; is that  
16 correct, Al?

17                   MR. RANALDI, JR.: Yes.

18                   CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: We have it.  
19 Thank you, sir.

20                   MR. STAVRAND: And then the other  
21 is, there are numerous studies showing the health  
22 risks of living near a highway due to both sound and  
23 highway -- and the highway air quality impacts. The  
24 question is, have studies been conducted on this



1 land for the health of potential new residents for  
2 living in close proximity to 95, and then has the  
3 construction vehicle noise and pollution been  
4 included in any study since they'll be present for  
5 multiple years? So the multiplied impact of highway  
6 and construction vehicles could have high health  
7 impacts on any potential residents in the  
8 development.

9 This would be especially impactful on both  
10 newborns and older residents, and as you can  
11 consider, that any newborn, if this construction  
12 continues for multiple years, could be the first  
13 decade of their lives that they're experiencing  
14 higher levels of air pollution and higher impacts on  
15 sound, and sound is -- and then you can read the  
16 studies online that it's noted that sound impacts  
17 your health.

18 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Thank you,  
19 sir.

20 MR. STAVRAND: Thank you very  
21 much.

22 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Our next  
23 virtual participant is Susan Cardones.

24 Ms. Cardones, are you with us?

1 MS. CARDONES: Yes. Good  
2 evening. Can you hear me?

3 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Yes, please  
4 state your name and address for the record.

5 MS. CARDONES: Susan Cardones,  
6 23 Eldridge Avenue.

7 And my question is for the Town's traffic  
8 consultant, Miss Anna Novo. Several times she  
9 mentioned, in regards to the traffic, that the roads  
10 can handle it, and I was just wondering if she could  
11 clarify what the basis for that is. I know that  
12 major highways can handle traffic, but what -- I  
13 felt like things were so specific when they were  
14 describing the numbers and computation, but when it  
15 gets to the nitty gritty of what it would feel like,  
16 it was just, like, oh, the roads can handle it.

17 I would like to hear from her or anybody else  
18 in traffic what they mean when they said that the  
19 roads can handle the load. Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Thank you.

21 Our next participant is Greg Weiss.  
22 Mr. Weiss, are you there, sir?

23 MR. WEISS: Yeah. Can you hear  
24 me now?

1                   CHAIR LUPOVITZ: Yes, please state  
2 your name and address for the record.

3                   MR. WEISS: Gregory Weiss,  
4 10 Westfield Drive. I am one house in from Division  
5 Road, opposite where the main entrance of the  
6 proposed development will be.

7                   I do also have a question for Miss Novo.  
8 Did she say that there would be 3,300 more car trips  
9 in a 24-hour period, or is that what I heard?

10                  CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: We'll put that  
11 on the list of questions and have it addressed.

12                  MR. WEISS: Okay. Anyways,  
13 listening to everyone's concerns tonight, it  
14 definitely seems to me there will be a significant  
15 impact on the health and safety of the current  
16 residents and future residents, especially with  
17 vehicular traffic, pedestrian traffic, emergency  
18 services, the runoff from the streets that are  
19 already flooding, the preservation of natural  
20 historic and cultural features, the neighbors  
21 already talked to you about. And the reason many of  
22 us live here is because this part of the town has  
23 always been rural since its founding, and that's why  
24 we're here.

1 I'm wondering -- one of my neighbors said how  
2 is this parcel rezoned, and I don't believe it was  
3 actually rezoned, but I have a sort of question:  
4 How was it identified in the comp plan for more  
5 density? Did the developer maybe help the Town  
6 identify this parcel when the comp plan was being  
7 drafted? And the comp plan does call for a  
8 mixed-use zone. That's not what's being proposed,  
9 and I would say that this proposal is not consistent  
10 with the comp plan even though the developer goes on  
11 and on about how it is.

12 So the traffic, I know we've heard so much  
13 about it, but I would ask you board members to  
14 please, come to Westfield Drive, take a left out of  
15 Westfield Drive onto Division for yourself, and  
16 you'd see the sight line is so very limited, and  
17 when you do that, imagine another thousand cars  
18 coming directly at you when you turn, just -- just  
19 try it. It's really -- you're taking a chance every  
20 time you do it, and people fly around the corner,  
21 you can't see them coming, so how will this not --  
22 adding that much more traffic to this intersection,  
23 how can it possibly not be a significant impact on  
24 the health and safety of the current residents?

1           And then going more to that, the developer  
2           says no one is going to cut through Westwood Farms  
3           because it's meandering, but when Division Road is  
4           at a standstill, people are going to look for a  
5           cut-through, and our children are going to be at  
6           greater risk.

7           Lastly, the removal of trees and natural  
8           environment will be forever taken, it will increase  
9           the flooding issue, and this land, it's important to  
10          know, has been identified on DEM maps as critical  
11          area to safeguard Rhode Island's full species and  
12          habitats, and some of it is actually DEM natural  
13          heritage area.

14          The clearing of trees in ten years, plus the  
15          construction will negatively impact the quiet  
16          enjoyment of the current residents already in the  
17          area. And I know you said that you can't consider  
18          the schools, but it's only common sense while the  
19          Town is working on a bond to address the school  
20          situation, that has to be somewhat factored in. I  
21          don't know how you do it, but, I mean, that's common  
22          sense.

23          And thank you all for your time. I  
24          appreciate what you do, and have a good night.

1                   CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Thank you,  
2                   sir.

3                   Anymore people attending virtually that have  
4                   a question? We're about to close that part of the  
5                   meeting if we don't see any hands raised, so this is  
6                   your last chance. If you have a question, please  
7                   raise your hand now. Okay. It looks like we've  
8                   completed the virtual participation.

9                   Thank you all, you folks virtually, and folks  
10                  here this evening for your patience. We know it's  
11                  been a long process, so we have a list of questions  
12                  for the Applicant.

13                  What I would say, Mr. Landry, after listening  
14                  to a lot of these comments is that I'm certain that,  
15                  like us, you heard a number of major concerns  
16                  repeated by a number of people who spoke this  
17                  evening, and I just -- the top of the list of  
18                  concerns that were repeated that I heard, the first  
19                  one and the biggest one appears to be traffic and  
20                  related to that safety.

21                  So I think it goes without saying, and I'm  
22                  speaking for the Board and all people who mentioned  
23                  traffic that because of the amount of tension to  
24                  that specific aspect of your project, that perhaps

1 it would be in your interest to better clarify,  
2 focus more attention on some of the comments that  
3 you heard this evening and revisit the project, and  
4 if you are prepared at the next meeting to make some  
5 comments about anything that might be considered in  
6 your project to be changed at this stage after  
7 listening to all of the feedback, and then we would  
8 welcome those comments. So traffic and safety,  
9 drainage, you know, including leaching concerns.

10 We heard comments about impact on wildlife  
11 situation. We heard impact on environment, in  
12 general. We heard a lot of comments with regard to  
13 the size of the project, and with people asking  
14 whether or not you would consider reducing the  
15 number of units and take into consideration an  
16 adjustment in density.

17 We heard comments about is there going to be  
18 an archeological study or review, and we also heard  
19 comments about noise and, in particular, how that  
20 would be affected, especially in proximity of  
21 Route 95 and the noise that's already generated by  
22 the high volume of traffic out there. So those, I  
23 think, were some of the most common concerns and  
24 comments that I heard this evening.

1           Beyond that, Members of the Board, do you  
2 have any other comments with regard to the questions  
3 that came in or any other aspect?

4                   MR. YODER: I think you covered  
5 it.

6                   CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Okay.

7                   MR. RENNINGER: Just a couple of  
8 things in my notes.

9           Obviously the decrepit building that the  
10 developer has on Division is a concern. I'd like to  
11 hear more about that.

12           I know noise pollution, air quality tied into  
13 environmental, flooding concerns popped up, and we  
14 obviously saw and heard a lot of evidence that was a  
15 little more drastic than possibly discussed two  
16 weeks ago, and those are the ones that I can add.

17                   MR. YODER: One of the others  
18 that I think could be clarified better because there  
19 seems to be some confusion amongst the questioners  
20 is; what was it zoned; what is it currently zoned;  
21 why was it changed; what are the ramifications of  
22 that? And I think just making sure everyone is on  
23 the same page as to what it would be would be wise.

24                   CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Is that on



1 your list of questions?

2 MR. RANLADI, Jr.: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: It is  
4 because I think Andy and Al would be able to address  
5 some of that as it pertains to the comp plan.

6 MS. WOOD: I think maybe the  
7 attorney raised this, to get some sort of population  
8 and student population projections, as part of  
9 information outstanding.

10 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Great.

11 So, once again, I want to thank all the  
12 people who attended the meeting in person and  
13 virtually. You know, this has been a long process,  
14 and we've got some more to go. You've all been very  
15 kind with your time and interest and concerns, and  
16 we hear you all, so thank you, everybody, for  
17 sharing your thoughts with us this evening.

18 We have a few more minutes left of the  
19 meeting before we stop at 10:00. If you want to  
20 knock off a couple of questions, Al, I think if  
21 you'd like to present those to the Applicant and  
22 have him address, we're okay with that. We might as  
23 well use the time. I'm coming up for a second time.

24 MS. SHAPIRO: I'm coming up for

1 a second time. Denise Shapiro.

2 Someone did mention when asked what do you  
3 mean we can handle the traffic, so I would  
4 definitely like clarification from her about what  
5 does that mean we can handle the traffic.

6 And I have lived in this neighborhood,  
7 Westwood Farms, for 25 years. Division has been  
8 repaved or paved three times since I've moved there,  
9 so I think another question is, what does it do to  
10 the degradation of the street? So with all these  
11 cars traveling on Division now, what's that going to  
12 do to the street? Again, it's now in the process of  
13 being paved for the third time in the 25-year span.  
14 That's a lot of repaving for not a lot of cars, and  
15 I think our neighbors have -- how many houses?

16 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sixty.

17 MS. SHAPIRO: So sixty houses, and  
18 now you're talking about 410 units. So that's my  
19 final comment.

20 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Thank you.

21 MR. SHARTENBERG: Going back to  
22 the traffic, I think that the largest concern that a  
23 lot of people have is safety, and I feel that the  
24 traffic study and the explanations we have been

1 provided so far deal with levels of service without  
2 an explanation of are there any safety metric or  
3 methodologies baked into that level of service, and  
4 if the Applicant can address that the next time  
5 around, that would be appreciated by the Board, and  
6 I'm certain by the public as well.

7 MR. MONTY: Could I just --

8 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Yes.

9 MR. MONTY: Dennis Monty.

10 Just in talking about the safety and the --  
11 what you just brought up, it would be interesting to  
12 know what the width of Division is and what the  
13 requirements of the streets are that are being put  
14 into the development because it sounded like there  
15 is some pretty wide streets that were going into  
16 this development with parking and all of these other  
17 things going on, and we know that there is no  
18 parking on Division at all. We know that the  
19 streets are very narrow.

20 So it would be an interesting comparison just  
21 to say, yes, it's safe, but maybe it's something  
22 that can be looked at as a part of that process as  
23 well.

24 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Thank you.

1                   MR. RENNINGER: And I just wanted  
2 to reiterate with the questions, I want to make a  
3 note that you did mention the setback concerns, and  
4 I just hope that the Applicant can answer that as  
5 well.

6                   CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: So, with that,  
7 Mr. Landry, would you like to begin the process of  
8 responding to the questions?

9                   MR. LANDRY: Well, I could, but I  
10 would prefer to meet with my group before doing  
11 that. I mean, there are a lot of diverse questions.  
12 We don't have a lot of time, and I don't have the  
13 authority to do much other than to answer the  
14 questions that I know.

15                   I would like to raise an issue for your  
16 considerations going forward that I think it's been  
17 touched on by some of the later speakers here, and  
18 that is the issue of the -- of whether there should  
19 be a commercial element or not in this development.

20                   One of the speakers said that this is a  
21 mixed-use zone. It's not a mixed-use zone. It is  
22 contemplated in the -- in the comprehensive plan as  
23 a residential mixed-use zone.

24                   The text indicates that commercial uses will

1 be allowed, permitted, this is in your staff report,  
2 but there's nothing about commercial uses being  
3 required. And the area, the study area that that  
4 observation was made about includes this property,  
5 but it includes a lot of other properties in the  
6 area, including properties that are zoned commercial  
7 highway.

8 The area that the comprehensive plan was  
9 encouraging the Town Council to rezone, which has  
10 never been done, they have not rezoned anything,  
11 they can still do that, it stretches from  
12 Shippee Road to the east of us past our development  
13 to -- toward West Greenwich.

14 It also spans the highway. It goes over to  
15 Crompton Road on the other side of the highway, so  
16 there are areas more than two thousand feet away  
17 from our property and zoned commercial already that  
18 are part of that intended zone.

19 It certainly was not the intent to require  
20 both commercial and residential on every parcel.  
21 There's another -- there's another five acres within  
22 the area on the map in 6A -- not five acres, but I  
23 think it's more than -- it's about one or two acres  
24 at the -- to the northwest of our parcel that's

1 currently under some type of commercial use. That  
2 fronts on New London Turnpike. It's that area, the  
3 Town designates, swings around the Cedar Ridge  
4 Condominiums, it has frontage on New London -- on  
5 New London Road, and that is a potential commercial  
6 site.

7 I have to reiterate, that the instructions we  
8 were given in designing this project over the last  
9 several months, and this goes back a long way, the  
10 Town Manager at the time, Lisa Bourbonnais, the  
11 Town Planner, was that this particular site does not  
12 lend itself to commercial use. The neighbors would  
13 not be happy with commercial use. We were told that  
14 the Town doesn't want Cedar Ridge, architecturally,  
15 but it doesn't want South County Commons either.  
16 And it's important to note that the zone that was  
17 contemplated designated these 800 or so units  
18 density on this property for residential units only.  
19 So if there were a commercial element here, the  
20 commercial element would be in addition to the  
21 residences that have been designed, and the  
22 comprehensive plan said that where commercial  
23 elements are introduced, the residence should be  
24 upstairs. So that's a different kind of project.

1 That's not the project we were encouraged to pursue  
2 at the master plan level.

3           There would have been different types of  
4 developers interested in doing that. That is South  
5 County Commons. You've got a -- you've got a  
6 village with all kind of commercial uses, and you've  
7 got very high density and large buildings. Many of  
8 the residences would be above commercial, but they  
9 don't have to be. South County Commons, you have  
10 condominiums, big apartment buildings, movie  
11 theaters, all kinds of things. That was not what we  
12 told -- we were told was Division by the person who  
13 was involved in drafting that comprehensive plan,  
14 and we believe that.

15           Now, that's not to say that we are resistant  
16 to having some commercial element in this project,  
17 you know, smaller scale.

18           We understand and our client's team has  
19 researched this that if you have less than a  
20 thousand units, you really can't self-support some  
21 type of retail business. It just doesn't work.  
22 It's not economically feasible.

23           We would not have a problem with some type of  
24 commercial element that's designed to lose money or

1 break even that might be of service to the  
2 development and the surrounding area.

3           There will be a community building at the  
4 head of the park that's being proposed to be built.  
5 That will be some type of a post -- a post office.  
6 There's potential for a package services shipment,  
7 coffee shop.

8           One thought was that some of the shops on  
9 Main Street might be interested in bringing food  
10 over and having that available as part of the coffee  
11 shop in the morning, maybe having commercial  
12 memberships to the gym that could be for the benefit  
13 of people in the surrounding area.

14           We could have some live-work units where  
15 there's some type of commercial element on the first  
16 floor, and you've got the owner of that business  
17 would be able to live on the second floor. It could  
18 be an assortment of those things. There's no  
19 aversion to it. It would be a different design.

20           The architects that have Division -- of that  
21 development that Miss Wood saw, I don't know if  
22 there's any type of commercial influence there, but  
23 I doubt that it's very significant if there is, and  
24 their architects feel that that would be a negative



1 -- could be a negative influence if it was more than  
2 neighborhood scale, development scale commercial  
3 that's more of a convenience than anything else.

4 We certainly don't want a gas station, or it  
5 could be a little convenience store that serves the  
6 surrounding area, but the potential is there that  
7 that store could be out of business at some point if  
8 it can't be sustained based on the development  
9 itself, and that's not anything that anybody really  
10 wants.

11 So we're not evading the issue at all. We've  
12 given a lot of thought to it. That was one of the  
13 easier questions for the Town to answer when we were  
14 asking questions about what our approach should be  
15 and the emphasis was on high quality, high density,  
16 but high quality, residential development that  
17 wasn't all apartments, that wasn't all big  
18 buildings, and that had a deep diversity of housing  
19 types, and a great sensitivity for outstanding  
20 architecture and walkability, and a lot of things  
21 that people here are talking about. That's the  
22 direction we went into.

23 But we are at the concept stage. We can  
24 change our minds on the way this goes if you feel

1 strongly that you want some commercial element or a  
2 significant commercial element, you know. We don't  
3 think it would be a great idea, but this is the time  
4 to put it on the table. So we've all got a lot of  
5 things to think about, and we thought maybe we'd  
6 include that.

7 I've discussed this with this Planner. In  
8 some ways, it's unfortunate that there was such a  
9 big change in the -- in the planning structure of  
10 the town all at once. There's only one, well, one,  
11 I think the Chair maybe, is the only person who  
12 served on other developments that I've been involved  
13 in, in the last several years here.

14 There's been a big change on the Board. The  
15 whole Planning Department has changed over. They've  
16 left behind a blueprint of what they want -- they'd  
17 like to see here. That's still there, but their  
18 own planning preferences are, you know, not there  
19 right now and, you know, we really don't want to  
20 redesign this project, but we're not running away  
21 from some type of reasonable commercial component to  
22 this project, so I just wanted to put that out  
23 there.

24 CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Thank you.

1           So we only have a couple minutes left before  
2 we close the meeting, and I'm just reiterating,  
3 Mr. Landry, that I think what would be nice to hear  
4 the next time we get together are some of your  
5 feedback, the Applicant's feedback, on what you  
6 heard this evening, and before we weigh in heavily  
7 on some of those issues, whether or not there are  
8 any new developments in your planning strategy with  
9 regard to the project that we should hear at that  
10 time.

11                   MR. LANDRY: Okay. Thank you.

12                   CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Thank you,  
13 sir. Okay. Let's see here now, I believe that is  
14 it, right, Al? I don't have the agenda in front of  
15 me. That's it, right?

16                   MR. RANALDI, JR.: Yes.

17                   CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: Okay. So, on  
18 that note, do I have a motion?

19                   MR. SHARTENBERG: Motion to  
20 adjourn.

21                   MR. RENNINGER: I'll second it.

22                   CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: All in favor.

23                   (VOICE VOTE/SHOW-OF HANDS VOTE)

24                   CHAIRMAN LUPOVITZ: That's a

1 wrap. Thanks, folks.

2 (APPLICATION HEARING ADJOURNED AT 10:00)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24