

2 **TOWN OF HOPKINTON**  
4 **PLANNING BOARD**

6 **Wednesday, August 3, 2016**  
7 **7:00 P.M.**

8 **Hopkinton Town Hall**  
9 **One Town House Road, Hopkinton, Rhode Island 02833**

10 **CALL TO ORDER:**

11 The August 3, 2016 meeting of the Hopkinton Planning Board was called to order at 7:00  
12 P.M. by Vice Chair Amy Williams.

14 **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

15 Amy Williams, Hazel Douthitt, and Frank Sardone were present. Al DiOrio and Tom  
16 Holberton were absent.

18 Also present were: Josh Bedoya, Planning Board Alternate; James Lamphere, Town  
19 Planner; Kevin McAllister, Town Solicitor; Sean Henry, Planning Board Clerk; and  
20 John Pennypacker, Conservation Commission.

22 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

23 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES WAS TABLED TO THE END OF THE MEETING.

24 **NEW BUSINESS:**

26 Development Plan Review - **Pre-application** – Village Wine and Spirits Proposal – Plat  
27 23 Lot 57 – 26 Alton Bradford Road. Dennis & Patricia Plante, applicants.

28  
29 After provided with a summary of the Development Plan Review process by Planner  
30 Jim Lamphere, Ms. Williams turned the meeting over to Attorney George Comolli, who  
31 was present for the applicants Dennis and Patricia Plante. Mr. Comolli provided a brief  
32 history of the property in the application. The property is one formerly owned by  
33 Richard Grills which was not among those donated by him for purposes of preservation.  
34 The lot was previously non-conforming, but was reconfigured along with several  
35 surrounding lots to become conforming lots intended for economic development  
36 purposes. The applicants are purchasing Lot 57, subject to the Development Plan Review  
37 and a transfer of a liquor license to the location. This site is a former residence, a pre-  
38 existing Dutch colonial house. The applicants plan to use the existing structure as part of  
39 their larger commercial structure. The planned building is a 55,000 square foot building,  
40 which includes part of the existing house. The property is partially zoned for both  
41 Neighborhood Business and Manufacturing. At a previous Town Council meeting, the  
42 Council asked that the address for the business be created before the license would be  
43 transferred. After outlining the contents of the plan submission, Mr. Comolli called Mr.  
44 Plante as his first witness.

2  
4  
6  
8  
10  
12  
14  
16  
18  
20  
22  
24  
26  
28  
30  
32  
34  
36  
38  
40  
42  
44

Dennis Plante is the applicant for the Village Wine and Spirits plan. He has owned and operated several package stores in Rhode Island. He has recently moved to Hopkinton and does not currently own any other stores. He wants to create a store at this location because there are not any other stores within several miles and there is space for adequate parking. Mr. Plante plans to use the existing building for storage for storage and an employee-only area. He anticipates about ten employees being needed for the store, which will operate 9am-9pm during the week, 9am-10pm Saturdays, and 10am-6pm on Sundays. The Planning Board held any questions for Mr. Plante until after the end of the applicant’s entire presentation.

Mr. Comolli’s next witness was John Patrick Walsh, architect for the project. Mr. Walsh is a registered architect in the State of Rhode Island and Connecticut. He was retained by Mr. and Mrs. Plante for the purposes of designing the proposed package store. Mr. Walsh demonstrated using the plans that they need to remove part of the existing building, but want to retain most of it because it is an iconic building for the area. He showed the Planning Board several angles of the proposed building and pointed out the prominent features, namely the roofline and arch from the existing house. The roof will be sloped and have a parapet, with some sort of shingling. The lighting features are planned to be dark-sky compliant, which will involve down-lighting on the building and downward-facing lights on the walkways and parking area.

Mr. Comolli next called Anthony Nenna, registered engineer who prepared the plans that were submitted to the Planning Board. At Mr. Comolli’s request, Mr. Nenna described the plans to the Planning Board. He explained that the existing building is on the north side of the property with a gravel driveway going to the south of the property. There are currently two wells on the property, of which one will be used for irrigation and the other for the building. The current proposal entails relocating the entrance to parking area to the south of the property, in order to create easier access for trucks to unload. The entrance will be divided by an island, and there will be a truck turnaround behind the building for trucks to use when unloading. There are four points of collection for the stormwater drainage system, which he explained would require permits from DEM. A new septic system would also have to be installed on the northwest corner of the lot. Mr. Nenna explained that the façade of the property will be grass and flower beds, with some existing trees. The project meets zoning setback requirements and exceeds parking requirements by several spaces (15 required, 25 planned). The parking plan includes two handicap access spaces on the south side of the building, and employee parking at the rear of the building. Mr. Nenna said that the next step of the process would be to obtain the required permits from the state. Mr. Comolli closed his presentation and invited any questions from the Planning Board.



2 Mr. Nenna: The lot is approximately four feet higher than the entrance. The relocated  
4 entrance to the lot was done to increase the sight lines and give better access for the  
trucks to get to the unloading area in the back of the building, and prevent them from  
having to make an S-turn.

6 Ms. Williams: I think the applicant really tried to preserve the character of the house.

8 Mr. Comolli: We will assure that no drainage will go onto the highways, and the ten  
extra spaces above the number required can be a pervious surface.

10 Mr. Walsh: The software program that we used on this project projects an actual scale  
image on the plans. This is what the building will look like, aside from colors and  
12 finishes that can be changed. The applicants wanted to restore and maintain the existing  
house, and with the addition, do something that complements it. We didn't want to do a  
14 box store or anything like that. The cost comparison is 1;1, it becomes more of a  
maintenance issue. The goal of the project is to create a really nice and inviting business  
16 that will complement the area. We talked about exposed beams and interesting lighting  
fixtures, and give it a rustic look. Although the building is big, when you see the parapet  
and the roof lines, from the street those features will make it unique.

18 Mr. Sardone: One of my concerns is the vertical siding.

20 Mr. Walsh: It could be changed to something else. We could use a fiberglass shingle or  
clapboard.

Ms. Douthitt: Maybe you could bring some samples to the Board.

22 Mr. Walsh: We could put a materials board together. We talked about doing a vertical  
pattern to break up the appearance. The finishing is not final yet, and the goal is to  
24 prevent the property from becoming a strip mall.

Ms. Capalbo: Is there adequate space for the wine tastings you talked about doing?

26 Mr. Plante: There is enough room, yes.

28 Mr. Comolli concluded the proposal by asking if the Planning Board would find that the  
project should move forward with Development Plan Review subject to the stipulations  
30 discussed previously. He stated that they're prepared to move forward subject to  
obtaining ISDS and drainage permits from DEM, a signage permit for the sign, and  
32 submitting the application to the Town Council for the liquor license. When asked for  
the Planner's opinion, Mr. Lamphere suggested that the sign be moved back from the  
34 road to increase visibility, that the applicant provide more detail for the traffic study,  
and told the Board about his concern for the split zoning of the lot. A split zone lot can  
36 extend a use up to 30 feet into the other zone. However, the zoning line goes through the  
middle of this lot and the addition is more than 30 feet from the line. The town may  
38 need to be moved or the issue be evaluated by the Zoning Official, or it could mitigated  
through obtaining a variance from the Zoning Board.

40 Ms. Williams stated that she would like to see the project come back before the Planning  
42 Board for further review, and that she'd like to see the split zoning issue resolved, because  
the plan may not be able to legally proceed as presently constituted. The plan also needs  
44 several approvals from state agencies. Since the Planning Board appears to be supportive of  
the plan, the outstanding details can be worked out within the Development Plan Review  
46 process.

2  
4  
6  
8  
10  
12  
14  
16  
18  
20  
22  
24  
26  
28  
30  
32  
34  
36  
38  
40  
42  
44

MR. SARDONE MOVED THAT THE APPLICATION CONTINUE TO DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW, SUBJECT TO THE APPLICATION BEING REVIEWED BY A ZONING OFFICIAL TO EVALUATE THE SPLIT-ZONE USAGE, THE NECESSARY PERMITS BEING OBTAINED, THE SIGN BEING MOVED BACK FROM THE ROAD, THE CURB CUT BEING APPROVED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, AND FURTHER NOTICE BE PROVIDED TO NEIGHBORING PROPERTY OWNERS (VIA CERTIFIED MAIL) OF THE MEETING AT WHICH LIQUOR LICENSE WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE TOWN COUNCIL.  
MS. DOUTHITT SECONDED THE MOTION  
ALL MEMBERS APPROVE. MOTION PASSES.

At this time, 8:00pm, Chair Al DiOrio arrived to the meeting and joined the Planning Board.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

Development Plan Review – **Plan Submission** -- Construction of proposed addition to Hopkinton Plaza – Plat 25, Lot 155A – 229 Main Street

Attorney Vincent Naccarato was in attendance to present for the applicant, KSL Realty. He explained that the proposed project was an expansion of the Hopkinton Liquor Depot package store at the Hopkinton Plaza in Ashaway. The project was last before the Planning Board in January of 2016, where the Board moved to continue to the next phase of Development Plan Review. Mr. Naccarato explained the applicant has since obtained the required variance for the property. He then called on the project’s engineer, Sergio Cherenza to present the plan to the Board: The applicants were seeking a 3720 sq ft. addition to the front of the existing liquor store, which will create a total of 10,620 sq ft, 9000 sq ft of which will be designated for retail space. The expansion area will displace about 10 parking spaces, which will be relocated to the north side of the parking lot. The plan also calls for the addition of painted traffic symbols and landscaped islands in the lot, in order to help direct traffic, but will not change the traffic configuration. The septic system is currently on the north side, but does not need any expansion because no new employees will be needed as a result of the expansion. For the same reason, the current well will require no upgrades either. The restaurant next door to the liquor store will not be altered during this expansion. Mr. Cherenza also informed the Planning Board that the project required a Physical Alteration Permit from the state and they had an approval pending at the time of the meeting. He also received a permit from the Department of Health stating that the well would still be adequate for the property.

**2**            Questions from the Planning Board:

**4**            Mr. DiOrio: Can you walk me through the pedestrian traffic flow from the ADA spaces?  
**6**            Mr. Cherenza: From those spaces, you'd use ramp and the door on the front of the building.

**8**            Mr. DiOrio: Is that also accessible from the parking spaces to the east?

**8**            SC: We tried to keep the parking elevation level with the building. Because of the changing grade, we'll have to have some steps up to the building from that side.

**10**          Mr. DiOrio: Folks that use those spaces can't step directly onto the concrete pad, and have to circle around and use the stairs?

**12**          SC: That is correct, that's why we put the ADA spaces on the other side.

**14**          Mr. DiOrio: That configuration seems complicated, but I'm sure you had a reason for doing it. My second question has to do with the existing detention areas. In your recommendation for cleaning those areas of sediment, is there a long-term program for removing this sediment, or was it a one-time thing?

**16**          SC: I'll have to consult with my client, but typically we'll come up with a maintenance program to keep those facilities up to speed.

**18**          Mr. DiOrio: I think it's great that you made the recommendation, and I'd like to see that continue.

**20**          Mr. Sardone: What does the elevation look like on the east side of the property?

**22**          SC: The plans themselves will look the same as they do now. The architect can address the building's design.

**24**          Mr. Sardone: What about the lighting plan?

**26**          SC: The applicant has reached out to National Grid. The plan will probably involve three light poles, all of which will be Dark Sky-compliant LED.

**28**          Ms. Douthitt: Is there anything you can do to improve ingress and egress from the north side of Route 3? The bushes there obstruct lines of sight.

**30**          Mr. Naccarato: Unfortunately, that property on the other side of the plaza is not owned by the applicant.

**32**          Mr. Sardone: The sign on the south side of the entrance also obstructs vision.

**32**          Mr. DiOrio: Unfortunately, the Planning Board has lamented that intersection often. I applaud your attempt to improve the entrance with the traffic symbols.

**34**          Ms. Williams: Will the islands obstruct drainage at all?

**36**          SC: The existing catch basins will service the parking lot.

**36**          Ms. Williams: There is no lighting plan included with this.

**38**          SC: I have a preliminary plan now. I can provide it if you like, or it can be made a stipulation of approval.

**40**           Questions from the public:

**42**           Mr. Pennypacker: Is the amount of new impervious surface offset by pervious surfaces?

**44**           SC: The square footage of the impervious area will not be changing, so it balances out with the pervious areas.

JP: I would also like to see a long-term maintenance plan for the basins.

2 Ms. Capalbo: Are more spaces going in the back after those ten are removed. Also, that  
4 parking lot is very busy, and the fact that it's open allows people to move about quickly.  
I would prefer the plan without the additional spaces.

6 SC: The regulations allow for more parking than required. Calculations indicate that the  
amount of impervious surface has been balanced. The islands channelize the traffic, and  
8 make it more orderly. The islands will be curbed with landscaping.

10 Mr. Naccarato next called John Herronian, Hopkinton Liquor Depot. When asked what  
the purpose of the expansion was, Mr. Herronian stated that the expansion would  
12 provide for increased retail area. Once displays are brought in and larger shipments can  
be accommodated, it will be easier to manage; therefore no new employees will be  
14 needed after project completion. He also stated that the siding that faces Main Street will  
be reviewed, and that they will talk to the neighboring property owner about visibility  
16 from the intersection. They would also be willing to create a maintenance plan for the  
detention basins. There were no questions for Mr. Herronian.

18 Mr. Lamphere explained to the Board the findings that would need to be made in order  
to approve the project under Development Plan Review. He said that, like the previous  
20 application, conditions can be attached to the motion for approval. Mr. DiOrio stated  
that he was satisfied with the plan and would not be inclined to have the applicants re-  
22 appear before the Planning Board, and the other members of the Board concurred.

24 MR. DIORIO MOVED TO APPROVE THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, SUBJECT TO THE STIPULATIONS  
26 DISCUSSED DURING THE MEETING: THE PHYSICAL ALTERATION PERMIT BEING APPROVED, A  
MAINTENANCE PLAN FOR DRAINAGE INFRASTRUCTURE, A FINAL LIGHTING PLAN, AND THAT  
28 THE PROJECT IS GENERALLY CONSISTENT WITH THE HOPKINTON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.  
FINAL APPROVAL IS TO BE PERFORMED ADMINISTRATIVELY BY THE TOWN PLANNER.

30 MS. DOUTHITT SECONDED THE MOTION  
32 ALL MEMBERS APPROVE. MOTION PASSES.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

34 Discussion – **Rhode Island Senate Bill 2591 SUBSTITUTE A, AS AMENDED** –  
Legislation signed into law on 7/6/2016 stating that wetland buffer areas shall be  
36 included in the calculation of minimum lot area for parcels of land.

38 Mr. DiOrio said that he added this item to the agenda last month in case any members of  
the Board or the public wished to discuss the bill's implications. The Board conversed  
40 about how this would affect Hopkinton's lots. Mr. DiOrio noted that Hopkinton does  
not have many rectangular lots, so using traditional measurements has limited  
42 applicability to the town. With two acre lots being the standard, the change will not  
impact the number of lots to a significant degree. Ms. Williams agreed that this change  
44 would have little effect on the town. Mr. Pennypacker stated that he felt the law change  
subverted some local control. This instance may be benign to Hopkinton, but it was

2 probably passed with some specific places in mind. Mr. Buford agreed with Mr.  
Pennypacker that the bill eats away at local control of zoning, similarly to the steep slope  
4 bill. Mr. DiOrio noted that any changes could be tracked in future projects and examined  
with the other data in the town. Ms. Capalbo shared that she would approve of some  
6 smaller lots being available in the town for starter homes, because younger people are  
not able to move into the larger lots as easily. She felt that in order to get people to stay  
8 here, the areas where more density would be desired should be identified. Mr.  
Lamphere said that any improvements would still have to be built upland, and this bill  
10 doesn't allow anyone to build in the wetlands buffer areas. He thought that an area like  
Charlestown would be more affected than Hopkinton, because their zoning ordinance  
12 previously excluded these areas from development.

14 **SOLICITOR'S REPORT:**

Discussion – Posting of Planning Board meeting videos to the Town of Hopkinton website

16

18 Mr. McAllister brought this to the Board's attention because the town's policy on  
meeting record availability is currently being reviewed. He explained that the state's  
Open Meetings laws require that the minutes from public meetings be posted online.  
20 The Town Manager is making an effort to implement uniform procedures for the three  
major entities: the Town Council, Planning Board, and Zoning Board. Since the town  
22 would have to field requests for meetings information, it would be easier to have the  
information available on the town's website instead, including the video recordings that  
24 are currently only available for the Town Council meetings. He added that he thought it  
was a good idea from a legal point of view, and would be good to have a policy of  
26 transparency.

28 Ms. Douthitt and Mr. Sardone had no objections to the policy. Mr. DiOrio stated that he  
would be happy to oblige if the other bodies participate as well. Ms. Williams had  
30 concerns that people could use the information in a fashion that goes beyond freedom of  
information. She also pointed out that the Town Council is elected and the Planning and  
32 Zoning Boards are appointed. Mr. DiOrio added that he thought it would be beneficial  
for applicants to know exactly where the Board stood. No vote was taken, but all  
34 members consented to the meeting videos being posted to the town's website.

36 **PLANNER'S REPORT:**

Murre-Lorenson Administrative Subdivision – Plat 11, Lots 5 & 5B

38

**CORRESPONDENCE AND UPDATES:**

40 The RI Statewide Planning Program was still informally reviewing the town's  
Comprehensive Plan Update. The plan's maps have been completed by IT/GIS Director  
42 Ed Vazquez, and would be transmitted to the state for review soon. Mr. DiOrio asked  
that the Comprehensive Plan be kept on the agenda so that the Planning Board can stay  
44 up to date on the project.

**2 APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**4** THE PLANNING BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE JUNE 1,  
2016 MEETING. THE MINUTES FROM JULY 6, 2016 WOULD BE HELD UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING.

**6 PUBLIC COMMENT:**

**8** Mr. Harvey Buford said that he would like to review a copy of the Comprehensive Plan  
draft sent to the state.

**10** Mr. DiOrio asked that, going forward, if an agenda item is moved to the top of the  
meeting, that for clarity it be indicated in the agenda.

**12**

**DATE OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING:** September 7, 2016

**14**

**ADJOURNMENT:**

**16** MR. DIORIO MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING

MR. SARDONE SECONDED THE MOTION

**18** ALL MEMBERS APPROVE. MOTION PASSES.

**20** The meeting adjourned at 9:40.

**22**

Attest: \_\_\_\_\_

**24** Sean Henry, Planning Board Clerk

**26** Approved: