

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING OF JUNE 6, 2011  
AT THE JESSE SMITH LIBRARY COMMUNITY ROOM  
SUBJECT TO APPROVAL AT THE NEXT REGULAR MEETING**

**I. CALL TO ORDER:**

**Meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m., Jeff Partington, Chairman, presiding.**

**Members Present:** Jeff Partington, Marc Tremblay, Leo Felice, Bruce Ferreira, Michael Lupis, Dov Pick, Christopher Desjardins and Jeff Presbrey.

**Others Present:** Kevin Heitke, Town Council liaison, Ray Cloutier, Zoning Board Chairman, Joseph Raymond, Building Official, Thomas Kravitz, Planning & Economic Development Director, and Christine Langlois, Deputy Planner.

**II. ATTENDANCE REVIEW:**

The Chairman acknowledged that all members were present.

**III. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES:**

The **minutes of the Planning Board meeting of April 11, 2011** were read. *A motion to approve the minutes was made by Mr. Presbrey, seconded by Mr. Desjardins and carried unanimously by the Board.*

**IV. CORRESPONDENCE:**

- Zoning Board Agenda for April 11, 2011
- RIDEM Notice of an Insignificant Alteration Permit for the Town of Burrillville

**V. NEW BUSINESS:**

**Land Development Review:**

**JJP Pascoag, LLC/CVS, High Street, Pascoag; Map 174, Lots 132 & 133; Map 191, Lot 114:** *Review of Proposed Signage/Advisory to Zoning Board:* Before the presentation began, Mr. Partington asked Mr. Kravitz to expound on the Zoning Ordinance section dealing with signage that the Board would be utilizing in their review this evening. Mr. Kravitz stated that the Board would be reviewing the application in accordance with Section 30-157. Sign Regulations, as well as language within the Land Development Regulations and the citations within the Town's Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Gary McCoy, of Poyant Sign Co., was in attendance to represent the request from CVS for signage at their remodeled building in Pascoag. He stated that they were working to minimize the signage as much as possible, based upon the Town's revised signage regulations. He explained that the current building contains internally-illuminated lettering, which is approximately 134 sq/ft in length and four feet in height. The proposal is to have two signs on the building on each side of the corner entrance, both facing the roadway for exposure to vehicles passing from Church Street (Route 100) and traveling up High Street. The signs would be smaller in size, approximately 3 feet, and internally-luminated for visibility, noting the importance of visible exposure. The second proposal is for a new free-standing sign near the entrance, to replace an existing free-standing sign, currently with a height of approximately 12 feet. The new sign would be approximately 24 feet in height and contain an electronic message board. He noted that upon further review, the proposed free standing sign probably wouldn't be accepted

by the Board and stated that he would make further modifications on this particular signage. He noted other incidental signs, such as signs directing patrons to the “drive-thru pharmacy” and “full service” signage, not really dealing with advertising. He told the Board that he was hoping to receive direction and a recommendation from the Board to bring to the Zoning Board for relief. He asked if the Board had any questions.

Mr. Presbrey, Mr. Desjardins and Mr. Pick did not have any issues with the proposed building signage. They did express concerns with the proposed free-standing pylon sign.

Mr. Lupis noted that the Zoning Ordinance states that Burrillville “. . . encourages the use of monument signs that are indirectly lighted . . . and no more than five feet in height.” He stated that CVS is not located on an extensive roadway, such as Route 2 in Warwick, but a small community road which would not require elaborate signage. “Everyone knows there’s only one CVS in Town.” Mr. Kravitz then projected examples of signage on a CVS building in a neighboring community. Mr. Lupis stated that he liked that particular kind of signage, especially the signage on the building with the gooseneck lighting. Mr. McCoy told the Board that studies conducted proved there was more lighting spilled to the side with the gooseneck lighting vs. the individual, self-contained lighting. The current proposal is for the self-contained lighting. He noted that in previous applications, they have been known to install the self-contained lighting, but have also included the gooseneck – lighting only the individual lettering and not the gooseneck – giving the visual appearance of indirect lighting. Mr. Lupis then questioned the size of the lettering. Mr. McCoy stated that the “CVS” lettering is 36-inches; the “pharmacy” lettering is around 26-inches. He further mentioned the use of “halo” lighting, which still contains the individual metal lettering but allows for the light source to spill out of the back in a white shade, allowing for a halo look around the letter.

For the record, Mr. Kravitz pointed out that the Zoning Ordinance is very clear on requiring external illumination vs. internal. He advised the Board on being very specific as to their preference of gooseneck lighting, or internal lettering, so that the applicant has clear direction.

Mr. Partington questioned Dunkin’ Donuts’ lighting as they are an adjacent business to CVS. Mr. Kravitz said the Dunkin’ Donuts sign has the gooseneck lighting.

Mr. Ferreira questioned the need for a free-standing sign adjacent to the street, when the proposed building signage size, combined with the building height, appears to be sufficient exposure, especially given the exposure from two different directions. He voiced concerns with the free-standing, or monument, signage affecting site distance. If CVS insists on the pylon sign, he suggested moving it to avoid blocking the site distance.

Mr. Felice stated that he was in agreement with moving the street signage. He noted that he was in agreement with the gooseneck lighting as it continues the common theme with adjacent businesses. He asked to see something further on the monument sign. Mr. Partington stated that he believe the reason for the additional signage on the roadway is to attract traffic heading down High Street, from the top of hill. This is the only angle that was not covered by passing vehicles. Mr. McCoy agreed, adding that CVS is looking to

construction a new building, with everything new, including the signage – a complete package.

Mr. Tremblay pointed out that the “green” area on the plan showing the location of the free-standing sign did not include several large pine trees located there. He noted that this area was also to include a “rain garden” or swale which is part of the storm water plan. He said he did not feel the sign could be moved due to these other features. He added that CVS is a destination site and that additional signage on the roadway is not necessary.

Mr. Kravitz suggested providing the Board with examples of the other lighting options, especially the halo lighting option. *A motion was made by Mr. Presbrey to continue the review of the proposed signage for CVS. The motion received a second from Mr. Desjardins and carried unanimously by the Board.*

**Adler Properties, Clear River Industrial Park, Lot 123 Industrial Building, Burrillville; Map 179, Lot 123:** *Pre-Application Plan Review:* Mr. Nick Piampiano, of Advanced Civil Design, and Mr. Jeremiah Adler, of Adler Bros., were in attendance to represent the request. Mr. Adler told the Board their intent is to construct another metal industrial building similar to the one that was constructed on 70 Locust Lane in the Clear River Industrial Park, and to have the building contain the same aesthetics as the Locust Lane building. The footprint of the new building will be 11,680 sq/ft and will consist of five units. Additional doors and windows were added on the front and back and sides to allow for splitting the building into the proposed five units. Originally three tenants were committed but now the building is being modified to allow for five tenants, each with an equal amount of building space.

Mr. Kravitz noted that during the initial subdivision review, the wetlands were flagged and verified by RIDEM. This particular lot does not contain any wetland areas so no approval from RIDEM is required. The only approvals necessary would be the PAP approval from the DPW and approval of the drainage calculations to be sure all storm water remains on site. He noted that the applicant has requested the ability to conduct clearing activities during the planning process, which he stated would be contingent upon discussions this evening.

Mr. Piampiano told the Board that the site is approximately 1.8 acres in size and slopes from the rear of the property towards the roadway with roughly a 12-foot grade difference. They will attempt to keep the grades to 3%. Drainage will flow to the front and into an underground injection system. He noted test holes have been conducted and that the soils in the area are quite good – outwash soil with a till, mostly sand and gravel. Test holes in the rear of the property went down to 18 feet and were dry. Test holes conducted in the front, after a recent rain, were dug to 12 feet and found dry. The site will be serviced by public water and public sewer.

Mr. Presbrey questioned the need for the retaining wall in the rear, suggesting that the site could be graded to a 3-to-1 slope. He also noted that with the recessed loading dock, they would have to consider some type of drainage transition. Mr. Piampiano said they are aware of it, but the elevation in the rear is still much higher than the front.

Mr. Tremblay questioned whether any tree clearing would be within the required residential 100-foot setback to the neighboring parcel within the General Industrial zoning district, especially in the area where grading will take place. Mr. Piampiano stated that any clearing in that area would be re-vegetated upon completion of the re-grading. Mr. Adler added that they would be retaining the services of a landscape architect for the rescreening of the sloped area in order to meet the setback requirements. Mr. Tremblay questioned whether the buffer was to be a “no clear” buffer and asked for clarification as to what type of setback this is. Mr. Kravitz noted that the existing pines are mature growth which doesn’t provide much screening. They expressed their intent to replace these trees with hemlocks and rhododendrons to fill where the older trees have left space. Mr. Tremblay asked for verification that the applicant intended to re-vegetate within the cross-hatched area. Mr. Adler stated that they haven’t established what will happen but will have the landscape architect prepare an appropriate plan.

Mr. Pick questioned whether there was a significant elevation difference between the property line and the slope. Mr. Piampiano stated that there was only about a 2 foot change in elevation within the buffer. He noted that the neighbors would not see much of the building – only a small portion of the top.

Mr. Ferreira questioned whether all of the five units would have access to the loading dock. Mr. Adler stated that only two of the units would have access to the loading dock. Noting the type of gravel in the area, Mr. Ferreira asked if they had considered installing a porous pavement. Mr. Piampiano stated that they had considered porous pavement; however, the site would require more control than the porous pavement could handle. Mr. Ferreira suggested they consider incorporating some of the details of the existing building facades. Mr. Adler said that they will be incorporating additional details to increase the aesthetics from the existing buildings.

Mr. Partington stated that the Board was not required to vote on this plan as it is a conceptual; however, he asked for their opinion as to whether the Board would allow the applicant to combine the next two levels of submission (master & preliminary). The Board had no objections to the applicant submitting a combined application for the master and preliminary plan phases. Mr. Partington then asked if the Board had any objections to allowing the applicant to begin clearing the property. Mr. Tremblay requested clarification from the Planner as to whether there were any restrictions to the setback buffer, when the original subdivision plan was approved, in regards to clearing the site. He further requested that the buffer area be flagged to prevent “over-clearing” the area.

Mr. Raymond then added that he had previous conversations with the Adlers in regards to what the 100-foot setback means. Based on the ordinance language, he said he told them that it actually is “10 feet on the neighbor’s property and 90 feet on theirs” as the neighbor cannot construct a structure, not even a storage shed, within 10 feet of the property line. Any changes to the property due to elevation changes would have to be replanted. He further added that this General Industrial district is a pretty well defined zone as it first appeared in the 1961 Zoning Ordinance.

*A motion was then made by Mr. Tremblay to suggest that a limit of disturbance be identified as a condition of proceeding with any clearing on the site out of concern for the neighbors. The motion received a second from Mr. Pick and carried unanimously by the Board.*

**Minor Subdivision:**

**Pascoag Village, South Main Street, Reservoir Road & George Eddy Drive, Pascoag; Map 210, Lot 23:** *Preliminary Plan Review:* Mr. Kravitz informed the Board that the developers for Pascoag Village had called earlier in the day requesting a continuation of this discussion as they have not secured the Conservation Easement that had been requested for this evening's discussion. *A motion to table discussion of the Pascoag Village Minor Preliminary Plan submission to the next Planning Board meeting was made by Mr. Partington, seconded by Mr. Ferreira and carried unanimously by the Board.*

**VI. OTHER BUSINESS:**

**Report from Administrative Officer:**

Mr. Kravitz noted that during the month of April, there were no Certificates of Completeness issued, no plans certified as incomplete and no plans endorsed. During the month of May, Certificates of Completion were issued for **Adler Properties, Clear River Industrial Park, Lot 123 Industrial Building, Burrillville** (land development plan) and **Pascoag Village, South Main Street, Reservoir Road & George Eddy Drive, Pascoag** (minor subdivision – 3 lots). There were no plans rejected as incomplete and no plans endorsed.

**Planning Board Discussions:** Mr. Presbrey asked Mr. Kravitz to explain the Notice of Insignificant Alteration Permit that was issued by RIDEM to the Town of Burrillville dated April 15, 2011 and received under Correspondence. Mr. Kravitz told the Board that the Town is currently working on improvements in the area of Sayles Avenue, which includes the construction of a small pedestrian bridgeway leading from the IGA to the existing Riverwalk. These improvements also include cleaning the existing culverts and drainage, and installing a bus shelter in the roadway right-of-way adjacent to the IGA.

Having nothing further for discussion, *a motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Tremblay at 8:05 p.m. The motion received a second from Mr. Ferreira and carried unanimously.*

Recorded by: \_\_\_\_\_  
M. Christine Langlois, Deputy Planner