

Approved As Amended  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
**October 6, 2021**  
**7:00 PM**  
**Jamestown Town Hall**  
**93 Narragansett Ave.**

**I. Call to Order and Roll Call**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. and the following members were present:

Michael Swistak – Chair	Duncan Pendlebury – Vice Chair
Rosemary Enright – Secretary	Mick Cochran
Bernie Pfeiffer	Dana Prestigiacomo

Also Present:

Lisa W. Bryer, Town Planner  
Wyatt Brochu, Esq, Town Solicitor  
Donald Powers, Architect  
Rico DiGregorio, Applicant  
John Mancini, Esq.  
Sam Crisafulli, DiGregorio Corp. Project Manager  
¥Junko Yamamoto, Architect  
Roberto Viola Ochoa, Architect

**II. Old Business**

- 1. 29 Narragansett Avenue, AP 9 Lot 631, Jamestown, RI. Proposal to develop a 3 residential unit, 3 commercial unit Multi-Family Structure in CD Zoning District.**

**Discussion and/or action and/or vote**

- a. Development Plan Review; review under Zoning Ordinance Article 11,**

- b. Recommendation to Zoning Board on:**

- i. Special Use Permit for Multi-Family Structure per Zoning Ordinance 82-301**
- ii. Variance for Lot Size, 10,254 square feet, where 20,000 square feet are required**
- iii. Variance for 3 story building where 2 stories max are permitted per Zoning Ordinance Table 3-2**

Applicants team present:

Rico DiGregorio, Applicant  
John Mancini, Esq.  
Sam Crisafulli, Project Manager  
¥Junko Yamamoto, Architect  
Roberto Viola Ochoa, Architect

Anthony DiGregorio, DiGregorio Corp.

John Mancini, Esq attorney for the applicant introduced the project.

Lisa Bryer, Town Planner, gave the project background from a review standpoint.

Y Junko Yamamoto, Architect presented the latest set of drawings.

They applied the recommended roof form which helps to scale down the building. It is still a symmetrical building. The higher middle peak provides hierarchy. She added posts on the ground floor level and at the office entrances on the first floor. She applied roof trim to increase the importance of the second floor. They chose to not follow the guidance of the (peer review) Architect and left the south façade as is, as requested by the client. On the east and west sides they extended an applied roof line to give more weight to the second floor. They added small details also.

Don Powers, Architect, working on behalf of the Town.

Most of the comments were to reduce the 3-story building to a two-story building scale. He was the author of the Design Guidelines from 2009. His comments were not meant to be a directive but direction to guide the architect in how to re-design. He showed the suggested revisions on the screen and discussed the changes that were not incorporated after the first round of comments.

The south side of the building is incongruent in terms of design and it can be argued that that is unimportant but I could also argue that it is important to all the neighbors behind.

Don stated he appreciates the cooperation of the applicant.

Duncan asked about the materials which will be used. Y Junko, said they do not have all that identified yet. But they will use fieldstone from the local area at the base of the building. Main body of the building is cedar shingles. They will paint the wood on the ground floor. The entire building is wood except for the stone base. Duncan asked about the large blank areas on east and west sides. Y Junko stated it is wood. Duncan asked what type of surface/wood on the first floor of the sides. Balcony railings are wood. Duncan asked about the awning. Y Junko responded the frame is painted wood and the roofing will be metal.

Mike Swistak asked Y Junko about average height. Y Junko stated that the average grade (height) is more than 35 feet. The main roof is about 38' from the average grade. Lisa stated that this will be important to know the exact height for the zoning variance and the recommendation from the Planning Commission.

Rosemary asked about the elevation shown as 101.6"; is that the ground floor? Y Junko said that is not the average grade. Assuming that 101.6 is ground floor average grade. The average ridge is about 37' and the highest peak is not known at this time. She will calculate it.

Don said not to get too concerned about overall height because it is needed to scale down the large building. Duncan mentioned that the Planning Commission encouraged them to add the height to balance out the building since it was a large volume. Don stated that the maximum elevation is noted as 142'2" and they are starting from an arbitrary 101.

Attorney John Mancini stated that they will compute the elevations and are happy to come back

Roberto stated that having the stone pillars did not make sense. Now that there is more glass, the stone pillar did not fit.

Swistak asked about the rear of the building. Roberto stated that the suggested changes to the rear did not make sense to the interior of the building. Mike asked how close the building is now to the adjacent property retaining wall to the west. Junko stated 2 feet. The site plan is not updated. Rosemary asked how that small area is going to be maintained. Attorney Mancini stated it will be paved. Chair Swistak asked about drainage in that small area and Mancini stated that all drainage will be controlled on site and it will be reviewed at the building permit stage.

Landscaping. Attorney Mancini stated they will present a more detailed landscape plan at final approval and we can review it then. They will have it at zoning. Bryer noted that it should not be approved at zoning without Planning Commission approval first because if changes are needed another visit to zoning will be necessary. This is the purview of the Planning Commission.

Chair Swistak noted the sewer pipe on the site that services the adjacent neighbor; it crosses the southeast corner. The applicant stated that it will not be disturbed.

Sidewalks were discussed. Chair Swistak noted that the sidewalks on Narragansett should be replaced in kind if damaged. ~~Y~~Junko noted that the Green Lane sidewalks will be built with curbing. Bryer noted that all sidewalks should match the sidewalk specification in the village which is raised aggregate concrete.

Swistak asked Lisa whether we have enough information to finalize the draft motion. She stated that we still do not have a final elevation for the height variance. Rosemary is more comfortable waiting till the next meeting to make sure the wording and details are correct. Mike Smith disagreed with their interpretation of average grade on the plans. ~~Y~~Junko agreed that the notation on the plans showing average grade is wrong.

Wyatt strongly suggested that they talk to the building official to determine the zoning relief with the applicant. John Mancini wants to get it right but it is not the Planning Commissions prevue to determine what relief is needed. Rosemary stated that we are recommending the height variance but we don't know what that is at this point.

Attorney Mancini and Rico. DiGregorio agreed that the average grade of 100'2". It is incorrect on the site plan. Attorney Mancini suggested they go back on the 20<sup>th</sup>.

Rosemary stated that if the average grade is 100'2" and the height of the peak is 142'2" then the building is 42 feet high, and therefore you are requesting a 7-foot height variance.

There was extensive discussion regarding the original grade elevation and the fact that there is no assurance that the plans are correct and therefore what the maximum height of the building is.

Duncan read the definition of building height. It needs to be verified by the building official.

The development team is comfortable **recognizes the numbers are incorrect and they will correct them before going forward.** and taking the responsibility for the final numbers possibly not being correct.

Swistak asked for a poll of who is comfortable coming back and voting on the 20<sup>th</sup>. All Commissioners were in favor. **“Now, we’ll just, the commissioners, just to in good faith give them an indication of where you are today in terms of the recommendation based on the draft motion in front of you and those conditions that we added regarding sidewalks and landscaping and the fact that the applicant will come back for final development plan review approval after their stop in zoning. So based on that, I just want to, the question is, “Would you vote for a recommendation on the 20th of October?”**  
**Commissioner Cochran said “I’m not willing to commit either way.”**  
**Ms. Bryer asked “So Mr. Chairman, you’re asking if they’re willing to come back on the 20th? Is that what you just asked them?”**  
**Chairman Swistak said “yes, that was what he was asking. 5 Yay 1 Undecided**

This application was continued until October 20, 2021.

### III. Correspondence – all received

1. Administrative Subdivision – Carlson, Altamira
2. Administrative Subdivision – Brissette, Carney

### IV. Approval of Minutes Sept. 15, 2021: review, discussion and/or action and/or vote

Mick Cochran made a motion and Duncan Pendlebury seconded the motion to approve the minutes as written. The Following Members abstained: Swistak, Enright and Smith. All others in favor.

### V. Citizen’s Non-Agenda Item

Nothing Reported

### VI. Reports

1. Town Planner’s Report
  - Future meetings – topics and applications

### VII. Adjournment

Motion by Enright, second by Smith to adjourn. All in favor.

Attest:

Lisa W. Bryer, AICP  
Town Planner