CALL TO ORDER:
The January 6, 2016 meeting of the Hopkinton Planning Board was called to order at 7:00 P.M. by Chairman Al DiOrio.

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Al DiOrio, Hazel Douthitt, Amy Williams, and Frank Sardone were present.

Also present were: James Lamphere, Town Planner; Kevin McAllister, Town Solicitor; and Harvey Buford, Conservation Commission.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
Ms. Douthitt moved to approve the minutes of the December 2nd 2015 meeting.
Mr. Sardone seconded the motion.
All members approve. Motion passes.

NEW BUSINESS:
Development Plan Review – Pre-Application — Construction of proposed addition to Hopkinton Plaza – Plat 25, Lot 155A – 229 Main Street

The applicant was represented by Vincent Naccarato, attorney, from 96 Franklin Street in Westerly.

Mr. Naccarato described the planned addition to the Planning Board. It is a 4,700 square foot expansion to the front of the existing store. The expansion will create no additional employees for the facility. It is intended to provide more room for the business to operate. Mr. Naccarato submitted an existing plan that was approved in 2012 that never materialized into a building. The existing plan showed the new paved area for parking and existing paving that access’s the rear of the store. The plan also indicates the property’s well and its distance from the paved area. Mr. Naccarato then called his first witness: Chris Shea, the project’s professional engineer.

Mr. Naccarato: Please state your name address and profession.
VN: You supervised the drawings and stamped the submission for this expansion?
CS: Yes, I supervised the drawings. The plans are stamped by Sergio Cherenzia, but I’m the Director of Engineering so I was directly involved in the submission. Mr. Cherenzia is also a professional engineer.

Ms. Shea then described the project further. The expansion is 4,700 square feet, for a total building area of 10,154 square feet for the liquor store and an existing 58 seat restaurant next door. The parking plan was based on the town’s zoning ordinance. Ms. Shea showed the Planning Board the differences on the map between the paved areas on the previously approved plan and the new expansion plan (Exhibit A). 44 parking spaces are required for store and 20 parking spaces are required for restaurant, for a total of 64 space. The expansion does replace some existing parking, so the loss is offset by a small increase of pavement on the back of the property (side opposite Route 3). The plan creates 67 spaces. The existing well is a public well because it services the restaurant. There is very little parking within 100’ of the well, and the well is up-gradient. The potential for increased run-off will be collected into a subsurface detention system that includes the existing detention basin. There are no changes to other utilities as a result of this expansion.

Mr. Naccarato: The septic system is more than adequate to handle the expanded area?
Ms. Shea: Yes, there is no increase to the system based on the number of employees.
VN: And the drainage, they are detention basins?
CS: There are detention basins, some subsurface filtering systems, and a stub for anticipated future development.
VN: Are any state permits required for this project?
CS: No permits are required.
VN: The Dunkin Donuts property is not part of the project, correct?
CS: No it won’t be impacted in any way.
VN: How much of the site is utilized in this plan?
CS: Ground coverage is at about 22% with this increase.
VN: And there is more room for additional parking in the future?
CS: Yes.

Questions from the Planning Board:

Mr. DiOrio: The infringement into well radius area won’t trigger DOH application?
Ms. Shea: The new building from the 2012 plan was designed to be connected to this well and to be much closer. That conditional approval was required conditional to testing after construction, which was to take place within 10’ of the well. In this plan, the parking is down-gradient from the well, so from a stormwater perspective, the water wouldn’t move towards the well.

Mr. DiOrio: No Board of Health permit will be needed for this application?
CS: I’ve found nothing in the regulations that would require a permit.

Mr. DiOrio: How are you handling the oil and petroleum runoff from parking lot?
CS: Our plan is a deep hooded catch basin before discharging into the detention system. It should be sufficient under the old state stormwater regulations.

Mr. DiOrio: So you won’t fall under the new stormwater regulations?
CS: No.

Mr. DiOrio: Will there be a DOT physical alteration permit?
CS: Yes, we’ll be sending a letter to DOT requesting to know whether a physical alteration permit would be required.

Mr. DiOrio: The traffic control symbology on the plans, is that currently on the ground?
CS: No, it’s just in the plan. But if the town were to request it, we’d be willing to add it.

Mr. DiOrio: It would be a good idea. This is a complicated intersection, and whatever we could do to improve it would help.

Mr. DiOrio: Lastly, will the building façade stay the same? What is the façade?
VN: It is currently concrete block.

Mr. Power: What is current will remain.

Mr. DiOrio: Does that work under our standards?
Mr. Lamphere: It could.

Mr. DiOrio: I just want you to know early that I’m concerned about façade. It isn’t offensive, but is the gateway of Ashaway and will now be twice as large.

CS: There is some screening from the tree line.

Mr. Sardone: You don’t see that much of it now, but adding 32’ could be noticeable.

Mr. DiOrio: Any questions from the audience?

Questions from the public:

Ms. Capalbo: I have a couple questions. Cemetery Lane is nice and is well-used, a façade that’s not concrete block would be appreciated. This parking lot is very busy. Larger trucks come in all the time. With these parking islands, that may need to be addressed. And the back edge of lot should be landscaped in some fashion, since it’s so close to the cemetery.

Mr. Sardone: Is handicap parking sufficient? Is there a slope cut in walkway?
CS: Yes, there are enough handicap spaces. It would be relatively flat, save cross-slope for drainage. Accessible spaces are near the top of the lot, away from any slope. There are stairs to provide access to the lower area.

Mr. Buford: Is the applicant reserving further development rights for this property?
CS: I would imagine yes, considering the previous plan and current about of coverage.

HB: Is the existing well a transient well?
CS: I believe it’s a non-transient well. We were not adding any employees, so the existing water line should remain relatively unchanged, unless there were to be future development. A more expansive development was approved in 2012, which had conditional approval after testing to the well.

HB: The plan is to have the retail space move forward into that space and the storage is expanded?
CS: Yes, it will be a net benefit for trucking. You’ll have them making larger, less frequent trips. The extra space is intended to provide extra storage.
HB: And there’s no reason to go before the Zoning Board?
VN: No permits are necessary, no.
HB: Is there going to be any consideration to pedestrian or bicycle access to the plaza, in a way where they don’t have to negotiate the intersection?
Ms. Williams: There is a sidewalk there.
Mr. Sardone: It goes to the edge of the driveway.
Mr. Power: There is access to the property from Cemetery Lane.
Mr. Page: I’m an abutting resident. Harvey asked about future development, and I wanted to ask about the septic system. Will the new pavement affect the septic at all?
CS: Nothing will change with the septic system.
VN: The owner isn’t taking future development off the table, so a future project might affect the septic system.

Mr. Naccarato called his next witness, Mr. Craig Power, Vice President of Operations for the store.

Mr. Power first addressed the store’s façade. He said that the side of the building is clapboard, not concrete block, and would continue on the planned expansion as well. The expansion will be for retail space, allowing wider aisles, realigned fixtures, and other changes to make the store more convenient for the customer. No new employees are planned. The store receives shipments multiple times per week, and the expansion allows them to receive larger shipments less frequently. The applicant is willing to work with the Planning Board to improve the plan. Mr. Naccarato confirmed with Mr. Power that the new expansion will reduce truck traffic to the store, and that the new entrance to the store will be on the front of the expansion.

Questions from the Planning Board:

Ms. Williams: Will there be any changes to the lighting?
Mr. Power: The lighting will be the same both inside the store and out.
Ms. Williams: Can the light be seen from store?
CP: It can be seen from the Dunkin Donuts across the parking lot.

Questions from the public:

Ms. Capalbo: If you improve the lighting and go with LED, Hopkinton’s Dark Sky ordinance so poles should be lower.
CP: We’ve put a sign up for the larger trucks not to park there. With your permission, we could replace the sign that someone tore down.
Mr. DiOrio: We could consider that.

Mr. Naccarato had no further witnesses and Mr. Power was excused. Mr. DiOrio asked the Town Planner for his opinion on the project.
Mr. Lamphere: I’d be interested to know whether the well was a gravel-pack well or a bedrock well. The Department of Health has two different protective radii for them. So while a permit may not be required for this, they do have guidelines for best management practices.

Mr. Naccarato asked about the Development Plan Review ordinance as it relates to this plan. He asked if the Planning Board was going to exercise their option to forgo further unnecessary rounds of review. He believed there to be minimal impacts to the environment and to traffic and that this project was only the expansion of an existing use. He requested that the application be turned over to the administrative officer for further review and approval.

Mr. DiOrio disagreed with the idea that the Planning Board should accelerate the project to be approved administratively. He thought it more appropriate to re-appear before the Planning Board for at least one more review, with the possibility of consolidating review stages. Ms. Douthitt agreed that the Planning Board should be involved. Ms. Williams noted that the impact of the addition is minimal, and asked what additional information the Planning Board would need to review. Mr. DiOrio said his concern wasn’t with the technical aspects of the project, but that the property is one of the most prominent retail spaces in the village of Ashaway and should be visible and available for more public comment. The other members agreed and decided that the application would come back before the Board under Development Plan Review. Mr. Lamphere confirmed for Mr. Naccarato that there would be no more additional public hearings with required notice to abutting neighbors. The Planning Board decided to move forward with Development Plan Review, advised the applicant to work with the Town Planner on their next submission, and no vote was taken on the matter.

OLD BUSINESS: None

SOLICITOR’S REPORT:
The Town’s new solicitor, Kevin McAllister, introduced himself to the Planning Board. Mr. McAllister will be the solicitor for both the Town Council and Planning Board.

PLANNER’S REPORT:
• The Tefft-Kenney Administrative Subdivision was completed during the month
• The Natural Hazards Map corrections have been made after the Planning Board’s public hearing and has been added to the Town Council’s agenda for February 1st.

CORRESPONDENCE AND UPDATES: None

PUBLIC COMMENT:

DATE OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING: February 3, 2015
ADJOURNMENT:
MS. WILLIAMS MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING IN MEMORY OF HAROLD WALKER, PLANNING BOARD MEMBER WHO PASSED AWAY THE PREVIOUS WEEK.
MR. SARDONE SECONDED THE MOTION
ALL MEMBERS APPROVE. MOTION PASSES.

The meeting adjourned at 8:00pm.

Attest: __________________________________________

Sean Henry, Planning Board Clerk

Approved: