

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

6 **April 3, 2013**
7 **7:00 P.M.**

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

12 **CALL TO ORDER**

13 The April 3, 2013 meeting of the Hopkinton Planning Board was called to order at 7:00 P.M. by
14 Acting Chairman Howard Walker.

16 **MEMBERS PRESENT**

17 Howard Walker, Hazel Douthitt, Joseph Escher, Donald Simmons, and Carolyn J. Doyle.
18 Al DiOrio was not present.

20 Also present were: James Lamphere, Town Planner; Scott Levesque, Town Solicitor; Barbara
21 Capalbo, Town Council Liaison; and, Harvey Buford, Conservation Commission.

22 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

24 MR. SIMMONS MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 6, 2013 MEETING AS RECORDED.
MR. ESCHER SECONDED THE MOTION.

26 MESSRS. ESCHER, WALKER, SIMMONS, AND MSSES. DOUTHITT AND DOYLE APPROVE.
MOTION PASSES.

28 **Preliminary/Final Plan – Crook Minor Subdivision – 3 Lot, No Road Creation – Plat**
30 **16, Lot 22C. Camp Yawgoog Road, Spring Street and Wincheck Pond Road. James H.**
31 **Crook, Jr., applicant.**

32 Joseph Lombardo, planning consultant, represented the applicant. There is a total of 6.8
33 acres, zoned RFR-80. There are no dwellings on the property. There is a small building
34 on proposed Lot 1. This application has combined Preliminary and Final. They have
35 sent post card notification to everyone within 500 feet. Sheet 1 shows Route 138 as the
36 high point of the property which slopes down to Wincheck Pond; a difference in
37 elevation of 20 feet. Sheet 2 indicates the subdivision plan. Lot 1 will have 88,000 square
38 feet; Lot 2, 94,000 square feet; and, Lot 3, 112,000 square feet. All lots have frontage and
39 physical access to Wincheck Pond. There are no proposed docks or paths to the pond.
40 Sheet 3 displays RIDEM approval for OWTS for the three lots, each designed for a four
41 bedroom home. There are two small infiltration trenches on each lot to collect and treat
42 surface water. An insignificant alteration permit has been obtained. Each lot will have
43 an individual driveway.

44

2 MR. SIMMONS MOVES TO APPROVE THE THREE LOT MINOR SUBDIVISION, AP 16, LOT 22C,
BASED ON THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS OF FACT:

- 4 1. THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE
COMMUNITY PLAN;
- 6 2. THIS DEVELOPMENT IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE STANDARDS AND PROVISIONS OF
THE TOWN’S ZONING ORDINANCE;
- 8 3. THERE WILL BE NO SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FROM THE
PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AS SHOWN ON THE FINAL PLAN;
- 10 4. THE SUBDIVISION, AS PROPOSED, DOES NOT RESULT IN THE CREATION OF INDIVIDUAL
12 THOSE LOTS, ACCORDING TO PERTINENT REGULATIONS AND BUILDING STANDARDS,
WOULD BE IMPRACTICABLE. THESE LOTS DO NOT APPEAR TO HAVE ANY PHYSICAL
14 CONSTRAINTS TO DEVELOPMENT THAT MAY BE CREATED, IF IDENTIFIED AS
PERMANENT OPEN SPACE, OR PERMANENTLY RESERVED FOR A PUBLIC PURPOSE ON
16 THE APPROVED, RECORDED PLANS;
- 18 5. THESE LOTS HAVE ADEQUATE AND PERMANENT PHYSICAL ACCESS TO A PUBLIC
STREET. LOT FRONTAGE ON A PUBLIC STREET WITHOUT PHYSICAL ACCESS SHALL NOT
BE CONSIDERED IN COMPLIANCE WITH THIS REQUIREMENT;
- 20 6. THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PROVIDES FOR SAFE CIRCULATION OF PEDESTRIAN
AND VEHICULAR TRAFFIC, FOR SURFACE WATER RUN-OFF CONTROL, FOR SUITABLE
22 BUILDING SITES, AND FOR PRESERVATION OF NATURAL, HISTORICAL, OR CULTURAL
FEATURES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO THE ATTRACTIVENESS OF THE COMMUNITY; AND,
- 24 7. THE DESIGN AND LOCATION OF STREETS, BUILDING LOTS, UTILITIES, DRAINAGE
IMPROVEMENTS AND OTHER IMPROVEMENTS IN THE SUBDIVISION SHALL MINIMIZE
26 FLOODING AND SOIL EROSION.

Ms. DOYLE SECONDS THE MOTION.

28 MESSRS. WALKER, SIMMONS, ESCHER AND MSES. DOYLE AND DOUTHITT APPROVE.
MOTION PASSES.

30

**CDBG – Review of Town of Hopkinton 2013 Community Development Block Grant
32 Application Proposed Activities for Consistency with Comprehensive Plan.**

34 Mr. Walker said the Planner circulated a memo indicating the proposed uses for the
CDBG monies and the amounts to be allocated to the proposed uses. He did not see
any inconsistencies between these proposed uses and the Town’s Comprehensive Plan

36

Ms. Douthitt questioned why there were two separate amounts for the Warm Shelter.

38

2 Mr. Lamphere said the Warm Shelter submitted two separate activities; one for their
normal operations; one which qualifies as over the cap. If the town has \$300,000 of
4 activities, we could submit this as over and above that, which is what the Warm Shelter
did. The total amount for all the applications is \$316,607. He put that in, over the cap,
6 which gave us more money to put into other things the town might want, such as the
rental rehab program, which was moved up to \$130,000.

8

Ms. Douthitt asked how Warm Shelter, which is in Westerly, helps Hopkinton residents.
10 How does it help people from Hopkinton?

12 Mr. Lamphere said theoretically they serve a number of people from Hopkinton.

14 Ms. Douthitt questioned how the people from Hopkinton get to Westerly to be helped.
Hopkinton does not have a shelter for homeless people. There is no access to public
16 transportation and the Warm Shelter doesn't always have space or help when
Hopkinton residents need it.

18

Mr. Walker added that not all homeless people are without transportation or the ability
20 to get to the Warm Shelter.

22 Mr. Lamphere said the application should include the number of Hopkinton residents
served. The Warm Shelter will never turn away a Hopkinton resident if they can
24 accommodate them.

26 Ms. Capalbo said there is a very small number of Hopkinton residents that they help.
The additional \$16,000 is of concern. If we are awarded \$300,000, the most we actually
28 get is \$70,000 or less by the time we receive the money. She would rather see more go
into rental rehab and things for the people in Hopkinton. She would like the money to
30 stay in town. The Warm Shelter has the jobs program and dress for success which she
sees as valuable. She would also like to see the monies go towards low income housing.

32

Ms. Douthitt said there is supposed to be a social worker at the clinic to screen and help,
34 but has found she is unable to contact her.

36 Mr. Walker said these applications from these organizations are for a designated amount
of money. The town may request a CDBG grant for monies equal to what has been
38 applied for. The Planning Board's assignment is to see whether the particular requests
are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. It is not the Planning Board's job to
40 determine which of these applicants are the most meritorious and who ought to get how
much money when funds are limited.

42

Ms. Capalbo asked where the development of housing outside of Hopkinton fits in with
44 the Comprehensive Plan.

2 Mr. Lamphere said the Planning Board’s role tonight, with regard to the Warm Shelter,
is to ask if that facility can serve a Hopkinton resident at some point in time. Does
4 contributing to the rehabilitation of that facility conflict with our Comprehensive Plan?
The Town Council on April 15, has the authority to do anything it wants with any of
6 these applications, including strike it entirely or change the dollar amount.

8 Ms. Capalbo again asked where it is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

10 Mr. Lamphere said he would look to the Housing Element of the Comprehensive Plan
and would also look at Economic Development. The Warm Shelter not only houses
12 people but also trains them for employment, and therefore, the two applications go hand
in hand.

14 Mr. Levesque said he would direct Ms. Capalbo’s attention to the two areas Mr.
16 Lamphere mentioned. There are very general statements in both sections that talk about
things that could fit into either reeducating, retraining people for employment, and for
18 housing.

20 Mr. Lamphere said our Comprehensive Plan does not say we should not help agencies
outside of the town.

22 Ms. Douthitt commented that a lot of the agencies are outside of Hopkinton, like the
24 Resource Center in Wakefield.

26 Mr. Walker asked if anyone sees any of these activities being inconsistent with the
Town’s Comprehensive Plan.

28 MR. ESCHER MOVES THAT THE CDBG APPLICATION, AS SHOWN TO US THIS EVENING, NONE
30 OF THE ITEMS ARE IN CONFLICT WITH THE TOWN’S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.

MR. SIMMONS SECONDS THE MOTION.

32 MSES. DOUTHITT, DOYLE AND MESSRS. SIMMONS, ESCHER AND WALKER APPROVE.
MOTION PASSES.

34 **Subdivision Regulations Review – Article XVI**

36 The Board reviewed Draft I, Article XVI of the *Land Development and Subdivision*
Regulations, and made changes, corrections and deletions. Article XVII was given to the
38 Board for their review at the May meeting.

40 **PLANNER’S REPORT – Administrative Business**

42 ► Mr. Lamphere went to Rockville Mill today. The playground material was
delivered. He did not see any benches, no lighting has been put in, and he did
not see too much action around the fence. The company they purchased the
44 playground equipment from was to install it; installation was on the invoice. Mr.

2 Lamphere did notice that three, pressure treated, 4 X 4 posts, were put in the
ground along the abutter’s property by the steps where the existing fence ends.

4

Mr. Walker has seen the posts also and they do not appear to have any specific
purpose. They appear to be about 50 feet apart.

6

8 ► Mr. Lamphere has been working with Tim Tefft and Fuss and O’Neill. Susan
Aitcheson called to say she is working with Mr. Carr on completing his part of
10 the project. She wants Cardinal Lane accepted by the town. Ms. Aitcheson and
Mr. Carr have met with DiPrete Engineering to prepare their plan for finishing
12 their project. Mr. McGarry has directed Mr. Lamphere to work with Ms.
Aitcheson and to contact Fuss and O’Neill to get our plan in house, so at the
14 meeting sometime next month, they will tell the parties exactly what they have to
do for the Town to accept their project.

16

CORRESPONDENCE AND UPDATES

18 ► Mr. Levesque said Brushy Brook is appealing the SHAB decision to Superior
Court.

20

PUBLIC COMMENT

22 ► Ms. Capalbo reminded everyone to vote on the school budget on April 9.

24 **DATE OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING:** May 1, 2013

26 **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 P.M.

28

30

Attest: _____

32 Lynda St. Amour, Planning Board Clerk

34 Approved: May 1, 2013