

**TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES**

**OCTOBER 27, 2022**

**5:30 P.M.**

**FIRST FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM**

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

**235 HIGH STREET, BRISTOL, RI**

The Technical Review Committee met for a concept review/pre-application meeting on the comprehensive permit proposal for 206 Bayview Avenue.

Present:

Technical Review Committee Members:

Diane M. Williamson, Administrative Officer  
Stephen Katz, Planning Board Duty Member  
Bob Sykes, Pare Engineering, Review Engineer

Owner/Applicant:

Danial Ferreira, Fairwind Properties, owner/applicant  
Nathan Chofay, Principe Engineering, design engineer  
Scott Spear, Applicant's attorney

The applicant presented an overview of the project which included 20 new dwelling units in addition to the 3 existing dwelling units in the existing building. The proposal would include 5 affordable housing units (25%) which would be rental at 80% AMI. The applicant's intended these units to be for professionals, graduate students, and families. A fire hydrant would be required and the Bristol County Water Authority was requiring an upgrade to the water service which the applicant would do.

Mr. Sykes, the Review Engineer noted that his early comments had been responded to by the designing engineer. However, he had concern about the grading for the drainage which went into the neighboring properties. He also had concerns about the drainage from off site and the shallow depths to bedrock. The drainage design would require an operation and maintenance plan for the owner to maintain the drainage including the pervious paving. It was noted that the design of the units did not include basements.

The applicant indicated there was room on the sight for plowing snow which would go to the south side were the drainage is. Ms. Williamson questioned the drainage location on the south side with all the drainage concentrated in one area rather than spread out along the development in several different areas. The concentrated location could cause impacts to the abutters.

Ms. Williamson also noted that there is only one play indicated being a 12x24 space, there is no buffer against the manufacturing and there is no land for any landscaping. The applicant noted that there was

an additional space which was 24x24 in the southeast corner near the manufacturing zone and that there was area behind the buildings which could be used for outdoor space. However, it was also noted that this area was very limited with steep grades. The applicant stated that he would also put portable basketball hoops in the parking area for recreation area.

The total number of parking spaces was discussed. It was noted that there are 60 parking spaces on the site with surface parking and one-car garages; 46 parking spaces are required.

The TRC discussed the density proposal and the concern about the overdevelopment of the site. The consensus was that the proposal was too dense and that two of the buildings (8 units) should be eliminated so that there are 12 new dwellings for a total of 15 units with the 3 existing. This is more in line with the density based on the inclusionary zoning requirements. With the reduced density, the total affordable housing units would be 4.

The TRC also discussed the floor plan of the proposed new dwellings which have 3 or 4 bedrooms and a relatively small living area that appears about the size of the one-car garage. There was discussion that the garage would be needed for storage since the units don't have basements. There was further discussion that perhaps some of the garages could be eliminated in the 4-bedroom units for a cost savings.

The applicant stated that he will take a solid look at reducing the density. He was hopeful that by reducing the density he would be able to eliminate the pervious pavement and maybe the need for a hydrant and an upgraded water service.

The TRC members agreed that the BCWA needs to sign off on the water service and the Planning Board will require an approval from that agency. The applicant indicated his engineer had done a study to show that the water was adequate; however, the TRC members want approval from the BCWA which the Planning Board will also want. The Fire Chief also needs to be consulted regarding the need for a hydrant and fire suppression systems.

The applicant was reminded that this is concept plan and the TRC provides input to the Planning Board; however, the TRC recommendations are not binding on the Planning Board and with the benefit of the public hearing process, the Planning Board may require even less density.

The applicant will review the proposal based on the TRC meeting and consider some options.

Meeting ended at 6:30 p.m.

Notes by Diane M. Williamson