

BRONCO HIGHWAY (ROUTE 102)  
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT STUDY REPORT

**ADDENDUM**  
**February 2003**

Rhode Island Department of Transportation

On page 35, the statement “RIDOT requested that the Town...” has been modified as the request of Rhode Island Department of Transportation to read as follows:

*RIDOT requested that the Town reach agreement with property owners along Route 102 (the residential property owners in particular) that access from these properties would be on Victory Highway and/or a cross street. Upon reaching agreement, RIDOT would work with the Town to set the freeway line on plat maps to inhibit access to Route 102.*

Burrillville Redevelopment Agency

Issue # 1: Sewer and Water Infrastructure

*Based upon comments also received by the Burrillville Sewer Commission, documentation related to future wastewater facility capacity has been revised to clarify that the proposed 210,000 gpd future capacity is available town wide and not just for development along Route 102.*

Issue # 2: Implementation and Land-Use Controls

*A sentence referring to Appendix B Innovative Land Use Controls, the document used by the committee in determining appropriate alternative planning techniques has been incorporated into page 37.*

Burrillville Sewer Commission

On page 9; 2. Sewer, the Sewer Commission recommended clarification with regards to the estimate of unused future capacity.

*The text has been revised to the following: “the treatment plant will have the potential to accommodate an additional 210,000 gpd throughout the entire town.”*

On page 29; 5. Extend and improve..., the commission requested that the recommendations set forth by the Route 102 committee clearly state that there is presently no plan for sewer extensions that would provide service to most of the commercial/industrial areas outlined in this report.

*In response to this request, the second sentence has been revised to the following: "This will include providing sewers in some of the village centers along Route 102, but will not provide service to most of the commercial/industrial areas outlined in this report."*

Burrillville Planning Board

*No changes required based upon comments received. Zoning changes proposed in the Development Management Study Report are advisory and it is at the discretion of the Planning Board that they be recommend to the Town Council for approval.*

Harrisville Fire Department

*No changes required based upon comments received.*

Nasonville Vol. Fire Department

*No changes required based upon comments received.*

Burrillville Conservation Commission

*No changes required based upon comments received.*

Burrillville Land Trust

*No changes required based upon comments received. The Route 102 Committee's Development Management Study Report includes a conceptual plan, which shows a potential industrial park at the north end of town. The committee examined other alternatives for the north end such as residential development and open space. As a result it was determined that in all likelihood the property will not remain vacant forever and the town and community at large would benefit most from development that will improve tax base and lead to job creation.*

Building Official

On page 3; Number 3 Set Project Limits: The study area is defined as including all areas within one half mile of major intersections on Route. 102. Would suggest a change in the language to

*...and all areas within one half mile of the intersections of Broncos Highway with Lapham Farm Road, Clear River Drive, Douglas Pike and within one half mile of the Joslin Road overpass.*

On page 29; Number 6 "Revise zoning...to...correct problems caused by zoning boundaries that split properties." This paragraph has been revised to read as follows:

*6. Revise zoning within the Development Management District to eliminate the existing strip commercial development zone, establish new commercial and industrial parks, and correct potential problems caused by zoning boundaries that split some properties.*

#### Figure 19

Would suggest that the Smith properties (231-22 and 23) remain in some sort of Commercial District. The principal parcel has an orchard and other farm uses including a substantially large “fruit stand” with potential future use as a commercial building. Changing the zoning on this parcel to R-40 would invite sub-division along Bronco Highway into individual lots. Also, the principal use of lot 23 is an antenna site for a ship to shore communication corporation located in Newport. Were theses removed from the site in the future (leased), this parcel would also be open to small lot sub-division along Bronco Highway.

*The recommendation for Split zone parcels 231-22 and 231-23 has been changed from all R-40 to Highway Commercial on Figure 19.*

There are five parcels on the north side of Lapham Farm Road that abut the Town’s newly acquired industrial site (212-1) (the Lambert property). Are these parcels intended to be left as split zoned parcels? If so, why are these parcels, which are within the study area not identified in the proposed revisions?

*Split zone parcels 212-23, 212-30, 231-2, 231-3, 231-4 and 213-1 have been revised to reflect a change to R-40 on Figure 19.*

Noting the concerns of the residents along Steere Farm Road and Hemlock Estates, does extending the industrial zoning district over the entire parcel the Town purchased seem prudent? This would be a situation where I believe a split zoned lot can be beneficial.

*Proposed zoning for parcel 212-1 has been removed and Figure 19 now reflects the original zoning designation.*

The open space parcel around Hemlock Estates (177-57) should remain in the same zoning district as the residents’ parcels. The Open Space zoning district was specifically included in the Zoning Ordinance to identify State Management Areas. Other sub-division, including Lyn-mar Estates and Whitney Estates within the study area, also have open space tracts of land which are not being identified for re-zoning, which would be correct.

*Proposed zoning for parcel 212-1 has been removed and Figure 19 now reflects the original zoning designation.*

The parcel owned by the Harrisville Fire District (177-42) is identified as a parcel requiring a zone change (black triangle). This parcel is a good example of a split zone parcel (black circle) and the correction is logical. Make note that similar to the open space parcel at Hemlock Estates, these lots are not in the study area.

*No change required per comment.*

The industrial parcel recently purchased by the Burrillville Industrial Foundation with frontage along Clear River Drive and Central Street (178-5) is listed for split zone correction making the whole parcel General Industrial. The Town has approved three sub-divisions on this property since 1999 (plat book 24, pages 18, 29, and 31). The residual frontage on Central Street has been identified by the Burrillville Industrial Foundation to be sub-divided into one final residential lot consistent with the neighboring lots once access to Clear River Drive had been created. Changing this area of the parcel to General Industrial goes against the B.I.F. testimony in the variance hearing to complete the sub-division of the parcel to date. I would suggest a zone line parallel to Central Street at the rear of the rest of the existing residential lots be continued encompassing the area between new lot 178-106 and 161-23. You might wish to continue the zone line through 161-21 and 161-22. Although these two lots are identified as lots for a split parcel zoning correction (see two overlapping dots on map), there already exist two residences on these lots adjacent to Central Street. Changing the zoning to general industrial and, in effect, putting access onto Central Street in between relatively small existing developed residential lots is, in my opinion, not good planning.

*Proposed zoning for parcels 161-21, 161-22 and 178-5 has been removed and Figure 19 now reflects the original zoning designation.*

I would suggest split zoned lots on the other three identified lots for corrections on Central Street. Those being 178-6, 9 and 15. As the residential development is further back from the street, I would suggest a zone line approximately parallel to Central Street and at a depth approximate to the rear of the three residential lots between (178-10,11& 12).

*Proposed zoning for parcels 178-6, 178-9 and 178-15 has been removed and Figure 19 now reflects the original zoning designation.*

The most northerly lot identified as requiring a zone change in this same GI district, map 161 lot 5, is part of the Burrillville High School Property, encompassing the Levy Rink, and the athletic fields. I would suggest the zoning of this parcel, which is a split zone parcel, be left as it is currently zoned.

*Proposed zoning for parcel 161-5 has been removed and Figure 19 now reflects the original zoning designation.*

The rear lots located on Whitney Lane closest to Whipple Avenue are split by the R-40 and R-20 district. I would recommend they be designated R-40, along with the open space parcel (162-80). You might also consider changing the last two lots, already developed residentially, from R-20 to R-40 to keep the district intact from the Whitney open space lot to Bronco Highway. These lots, 162-7 and 162-8, comprise approximately 1.6 acres.

*Split zone parcels 162-55, 162-56, 162-57, 162-58, 162-59, 162-60, and 162-80 have been revised to reflect a zoning change to R-40. Lots 162-7 and 162-8 have been changed to R-40 as requested to keep the district intact.*

I am not sure why a zoning clarification (black square) is required for the Adler Brothers' industrial sub-division (formerly map 179 lot 103) in the General Industrial district.

*This zoning classification is not listed in Section 11-4.1 Zoning districts and zoning map, as an actual designation and as such should not be depicted as a separate district on future mapping. Special restrictions for a site in a given district should possibly be depicted in another manner on the mapping. This discrepancy occurs on other parcels throughout town as well.*

The Zoning Ordinance defines the Village Commercial district as: "The Village Commercial district is intended to re-enforce the existing mix or texture of the older mill villages in Burrillville." I would suggest that the lots identified for a zone change to VC in Glendale and Nasonville (map 113 lots 11&12, and map 131 lot 7) be changed to General Commercial, a very similar district. The General Commercial district "is envisioned as a broader mix of uses, though still heavy in services and still predominantly in small buildings or occupying small spaces. In this district there will be a heavier reliance on on-site parking; however, where General Commercial districts coincide with existing village development, on-street parking will still be allowed for businesses in older building."

*Proposed zoning designations to parcels 113-11, 113-12 and 131-7 have revised to General Commercial as requested.*

#### Downtown Pascoag Association

*No changes required based upon comments received.*

#### Additional Revisions

On page 25; V. Public Participation, the following sentence has been added as a reference to Appendix A.

*Materials related to the public participation process are attached as Appendix A.*

On pages 39 and 40; Proposed Zoning Changes Table.

*The table has been revised in order to reflect changes made to Figure 19.*