

Feedback from Public Workshops & Neighborhood Focus Group

North Kingstown Route 2/102 Visioning Process

Fall 2012

For a full set of materials related to these three working sessions including summaries of previous meetings, please see the project webpage at

<http://www.northkingstown.org/visioning-process-routes-2-and-102>

This summary of the discussions at three public events was prepared by Ona Ferguson, facilitator of the Rt. 2/102 Visioning Process to assist Stakeholder Group members in their deliberations.

Table of Contents

- A. Overview and Executive Summary
- B. Notes from Public Workshop 1, October 4, 2012
- C. Notes from Neighborhood Focus Group, October 10, 2012
- D. Notes from Public Workshop 2, October 15, 2012
- E. Feedback on Scenarios from all 3 events
 - Appendix A: Attendance at Public Workshops
 - Appendix B: Scenarios Discussed

Note that Section E, Feedback on Scenarios from all 3 events, contains the themes from the discussions at those events about the future scenarios. The scenarios, described in more detail in Appendix B, are:

- A. Conservation Design - Presented on Oct 4 & 10
- B. Mixed-Use Village Scenario (Residential Focus) – Presented on Oct 15
- C. Village Scenario (Commercial Focus) - Presented on Oct 4 & 10
- D. TDR Village Scenario (Commercial Focus) - Presented on Oct 4 & 10
- E. Current Buildout - Presented on Oct 4 & 10

A. Overview and Executive Summary

Background - In October 2012, three events were held to gather public input and perspectives on the future vision for the Rt. 2/102 area in North Kingstown, RI. These events were held to learn public sentiment and opinions at the mid-point of the work of a Stakeholder Group appointed by the Town Council. The Town Council convened this Stakeholder Group to generate a community vision for the western intersection of Routes 2 and 102. More detailed information regarding how this process was conceived and how the Stakeholder Group was convened can be found on the project website.

One of the primary driving factors for this process is the reality that the North Kingstown Comprehensive Plan must be in compliance with the Rhode Island Land Use 2025 State Guide Plan Element. Even small intensifications to zoning, according to state officials, would require that a plan and vision for this intersection be developed. The group has been meeting regularly to explore interests, increase understanding, highlight and refine options. When it reconvenes in late October, the group will start to develop the components of a possible vision for the area and seek agreement on what should happen at the western Rt. 2/102 intersection. If this group reaches consensus or broad-based support for a recommendation, the Town Council and the Planning Commission will take that under serious consideration.

Public Engagement & Participation - These three events were designed to give members of the public an opportunity to share their perspective. There was also a way for people to give their input online to the same questions asked at the first two public events (results from that will be available separately). These meetings were attended by at least 100 distinct members of the public who signed in at one or more of the three events described here, 14 members of the Stakeholder Group, and the members of the Project Team.

Themes – Please read this set of notes for the themes that emerged from each separate discussion. In many cases, the themes from different discussions were diverse and sometimes are in conflict. However, there were general common themes that arose at all the sessions, which the Stakeholder Group should take, into careful consideration. Among those things many people said were key in the study area for any future vision are:

- A safe walkable, bikeable neighborhood which people can get into and out of on foot, bike or in a car.
- An area that has added value – is pretty, welcoming, ideally rural or town-like.
- A vision that will not burden the town with additional financial demands.
- A future that will protect or enhance neighbors' property values.
- A place that has character and, if commercial is allowed to develop, commercial use that is unique to the setting in design and scale.
- A desire to protect open space and the golf course.
- Beautiful landscaping and design to enhance the way the place looks and buffer views of any commercial development from both the roadway and neighboring commercial.
- To prevent large scale commercial and, for some, any new commercial from moving in.
- There were varied and strongly felt opinions also about what type of housing is appropriate, with some saying a variety of housing types could work and others arguing for single family
- A concern that commercial development not be allowed to grow continuously out from Route 4.

B. Notes from Public Workshop 1, October 4, 2012

On October 4, 38 members of the public gathered at Wickford Middle School to share their thoughts on a vision for the Rt. 2/102 study area. Members of the Visioning Stakeholder Group also attended to hear the feedback from the broader public.

The Study Area Today - Participants wrote down the first 5 words that come to mind when they think of the study area (the Rt. 2/102 intersection) today. This is their list, sorted by number of repetitions (indicated in brackets) then alphabetized. Words without a bracket beside them were suggested only once.

Rural [6]	Confusing driving lanes	Quicker moving
Busy (traffic) [5]	Contemplative	Quiet
Gateway [4]	Contentious	Restaurant
Residential [4]	Cost	Rural/urban
Confusing [3]	Development	Safety 2 total
Small shops [3]	Dilapidated	Scenic
Accidents [2]	Economic stimulus	Slow moving traffic
Agricultural [2]	Equity	Small restaurants
Commercial-free [2]	Exhausted	Spacious
Congestion [2]	Farm land	Speed control
Dangerous [2]	Food/dining	Speeding
Farmland [2]	Going easily	Tax generator
Golf course [2]	Green	Tourist shops
Increasingly loud [2]	Holiday traffic	Traffic (police)
New growth [2]	Home value	Traffic light
Res/commercial [2]	Ignoring lights	Transitional
Road access [2]	Isolated, lonely	Tree lined streets
2 + 102 Intersection	Law	Trees
Accident prone	Mixed residential	Ugly
Adult community	Nature	Under/developed
Badly designed	Needs change	Unplanned
Behind the times	Neighborhood blight	Variable traffic density
Beneficial to town	Open Space (nature)	Waiting
Better access	Pandora's box	Water protection
Business	Pass through	Water quality/quantity
Challenging (driving)	Place to reflect	Water zoning
Change	Preservation	Way of life
Commercial buildout	Project timeline	Welcoming
Condo/single family homes	Prone for village concept	

Large Group Discussion - Project Team members then presented background on the visioning process and on some key topics related to the study area, and participants discussed some issues as a large group. Key topics and concerns raised included:

- The need to not further burden the town's budget, the need for tax generation and so to consider townhomes and single family homes less likely to stress the school system.
- The desire to keep existing commercial properties in the study area but not allow for others since there are already two other commercial areas in North Kingstown (Wickford Junction and Post Road).
- A desire for trees to buffer different uses.
- A need to address traffic safety and congestion issues.
- A desire for a walkable and bikeable area.
- A desire to think about what we don't have in the area and seek to build that (e.g. neighborhood stores), rather than duplicating things that exist elsewhere.
- Hope that big box stores not be allowed in the study area.
- Questions about how this process links to the Rolling Greens CVD application process.
- A desire for this vision to be part of a whole.
- A desire to keep the golf course.
- A concern that sprawl or a commercial corridor not extend to this study area.

Responses to Scenarios

Each participant then got a chance to share his or her individual feedback on four development scenarios. These scenarios were developed to give people something to respond to and to give an example of the variety of options for different parcels under different types of vision. Participants had the opportunity to indicate what they liked and didn't like about each scenario, and then to identify the three points people had made that they felt most strongly about, which are indicated in brackets in this summary. In discussions about all of the scenarios, some people mentioned that they liked the set-back bike path that connects to the east, south and west. Each note taker took notes slightly differently, so comments are captured slightly differently for each scenario. See Appendix B for a description of the scenarios.

The notes on the responses to the scenarios can be found in Section E of this document, organized by scenario.

C. Notes from the Neighborhood Focus Group, October 10, 2012

On October 10, 65 neighbors who live or work in or near the study area gathered at the Masonic Lodge to share their thoughts on a vision for the Rt. 2/102 study area. Members of the Visioning Stakeholder Group attended to hear the feedback from the neighbors. At the request of the representatives on the Stakeholder Group who represent neighbors, the structure for this Focus Group largely followed that of the first Public Workshop, with a bit less presentation and a bit more time for large group discussion. The feedback on the four scenarios was also somewhat less formal.

The Study Area Today & In The Future - Participants wrote down the first 5 words that came to mind when thinking of the study area (the Rt. 2/102 intersection) today. This is their list, sorted by number of repetitions (indicated in brackets) then alphabetized. Words without a bracket beside them were suggested only once. They were also asked to indicate, confidentially, whether they thought the area in the future should be mostly residential, mostly commercial, or a mixture of both. Of those who turned in responses, 30 people indicated that the area should be mostly residential, and 15 indicated that it should be a mixture of both. No one indicated they thought it should be primarily commercial.

Rural [21]	Messy [2]	Leaving city behind
Traffic [11]	Non-cluttered [2]	Large residential Lots
Open [8]	Picturesque [2]	Limited growth
Country /Country setting [7]	Relaxing [2]	Local charm
Farming [6]	Safe for kids [2]	Losing rural character
Peaceful [5]	Speed [2]	Low/no traffic
Quiet [5]	Unsafe [2]	Max green space
Trees [5]	Appropriate commercial use	Mishmash
Accidents [4]	Beautiful Sunsets	Native grown
Beautiful, open space [3]	Calming	No walkability
Dangerous intersection [3]	Cars	Non-congested
Green [3]	Convenient store	Non-urban
Natural [3]	Drab	Not heavily developed
Quaint [3]	End of general civilization	Nutty traffic
Residential [3]	Family	Old (dated)
Scenic [3]	Family style ownership	Outdoor recreation
Tradition [3]	Fields	Pastures
Water questions [3]	Fresh air	Peace & quiet
Beautiful [2]	Gateway to beaches	Pedestrian
Bike friendly [2]	Gateway to farming	Poorly designed
Busy [2]	Golf course	Privacy
Home / Homey [2]	Grass	Quality of life
Increased traffic [2]	Hawks	Quiet surroundings
Local [2]	Inviting	Recreation

Road repair problems	Settled, not commercial	Transition to farms
Rural entrance to South County	Slow moving traffic	Unspoiled
Safe	Small business	URI
Scenic views	Starting to look like Warwick	Welcoming
School problems	Summer	Wildlife
Seasonal business	Traffic medium too heavy	
Seasons	Tranquil	

Large Group Discussion – Participants asked many questions about the process and the reason for this visioning effort. They then shared ideas of what they would like to see in the future in the study area. Elements of a vision they articulated included:

- A desire for walkability.
- A desire for any changes to be toward developing it beautifully into a small, warm country setting, with local business' in lieu of big box stores or chain store typologies (e.g. country general store, native restaurants).
- The desire for something unique, with character, to use rural design to draw people through tourism.
- The need for recreational space, open space, and parks, possibly by buying development rights.
- A need for both biking and walking connectivity from Oatley's to Walmart. A desire to enhance the bike route along Route 2.
- A desire to keep the rural flavor of the area.
- A desire to see mostly residential development, changing commercial zoning to low density residential.
- A hope that the area can continue to feel like a town, not a city.
- A desire to create a gateway feel of the intersection, like that at the Narragansett rotary.
- A hope that drive-throughs will not be allowed.
- A desire to keep existing big trees.
- A desire to have a neutral effect on water supply and quality.
- A desire to reverse the urban sprawl tendencies of North Kingstown.
- A need for uniform design standards that unify the built environment and keep the quality of the space rural/agricultural and unique, limiting signage and protecting viewing of stars in the night sky by lighting limitations.
- A desire for any development to occur with families in mind.

Responses to Scenarios – Participants gave feedback on the same four development scenarios presented at the first Public Workshop (Scenarios A, C, D and E). Their feedback is summarized in Section E. Unlike at the October 4 Public Workshop, the discussions were more conversational and less structured, so there was less of a focus on getting people to indicate their top priorities. Instead, neighbors were milling from scenario to scenario sharing what they liked and didn't like about each freely, with some staying for longer periods of time at particular scenarios.

D. Notes from Public Workshop 2, October 15, 2012

On October 15, 17 members of the public gathered at Wickford Middle School for the follow up to the first public workshop. This was a smaller group than the previous two, and again members of the Stakeholder Group attended to listen and, this time, participate.

Ona Ferguson, process facilitator, shared her synthesis of some of the themes that emerged at the first two sessions, including:

- The importance of the character of this area, wanting it to remain or even become more of a small, warm, country setting
- The potential to provide an option that blended the residential focus of the Conservation Development concept with the Village concept...something in between
- The desire to keep open space and the golf course
- Concern about sprawl (commercial spreading continuously from the east)
- The desire that anything that happens in this area add value to the place
- A desire to prevent any big box stores and a desire to have any commercial be small- or neighborhood-scale (such as single-story boutiques, agricultural related businesses like Schartner's Farm Stand).
- A desire to make the area less messy and a little more beautiful.
- A desire for good design with standards preventing neon signs.
- The importance of improving safe and efficient movement of traffic, people and vehicles. A suggestion to make Beacon Drive one-way if that would help.
- The desire for bicycle and pedestrian connectivity. A desire to make Rt. 2 more walkable and bikeable, perhaps with a pedestrian walkway.
- The importance of beautification, trees, landscaping
- A hope that commercial development will be set back from the intersection
- A desire to buffer residents on Plain Road from any commercial development
- The importance of protecting water, and for retail uses to conserve water, promote re-use, etc.
- A desire for a parking lot for a bike path so people could start biking from this area.
- The importance of not burdening the town and residents financially
- Preserving Morris Farm and the Schartner parcel
- Willingness by some to have some townhomes, others preferring single family homes
- A desire for real walkability
- A desire for this area to continue to feel like a town, not a city
- A desire for a dark sky (preventing light pollution)
- A desire for this to become a gateway

Project Team members presented a fifth scenario that fits between the most residential (Scenario A – Conservation Design) and the next most residential (Scenario C - Village Scenario (Commercial Focus)). They developed this scenario in response to feedback from the first two events that it would be nice to see something with slightly more commercial than Scenario A and less than Scenario C. This new scenario, labeled Scenario B in these notes, is entitled Mixed-Use Village Scenario (Residential Focus). Participants gave their feedback in a large group on this scenario, raising concerns in particular about safety, traffic, and the impact of smaller homes and lots on real estate values. See notes in section E. below.

After discussing Scenario B, participants in the full group gave immediate feedback via individual keypads to a suite of photos depicting different building and layouts and to a series of questions. The questions asked with the relevant images and the numbers of who indicated support for what can be found on the project website (<http://www.northkingstown.org/visioning-process-routes-2-and-102>). Note that Stakeholder Group members present were contributing their preferences and/or observations with those of the members of the public, as they were *not* asked to only observe this activity. Note also that some of the questions were missing a “none of the above” or “other” option or were clarified more fully during the exercise. This activity was intended to get a sense of the opinions of those present on some general ways the future might look and to give people a chance to say specifically what they think about some key questions such as “do we want to preserve the golf course?” (74% yes and 26% don’t care), “do we want bike path connections from this area to other places?” (71% yes and 29% don’t care), and “should we allow drive-throughs?” (77% said no, 14% said yes, 9% don’t care). There are many more questions and opinions expressed in the full document.

E. Feedback on Scenarios from all 3 Events

Conservation Design Scenario (Scenario A)

From October 4:

What do you like?

- It keeps the golf course [14]
- It is primarily residential [13]
- This is the lowest density neighborhood, the best of the four scenarios [6]
- It doesn’t add unnecessary commercial development, it doesn’t allow for empty storefronts and businesses [6]
- The setback of Rolling Greens development, so it is a private residential community [3]
- It maintains the character/feel of the area [3]
- There isn’t any commercial use right by the houses on Plain Road [2]
- Routes 102 and 2 are dangerous, people shouldn’t be trying to walk there and this concept will limit that type of dangerous circulation [1]
- It is what I envisioned for a possible future of the area when I bought my house [1]
- Traffic is addressed with the roundabout [1].
- It doesn’t create too much new traffic on Rt.102 to Exeter [1]
- It doesn’t draw people from other places to this area, which is nice for neighbors
- It keeps the existing businesses
- Clustered housing, assuming it doesn’t cause extra nitrate loading
- Nice, clustered, curvy design

What don’t you like?

- There are not enough daily services within walking distance. It might be nice to have some neighborhood businesses, which this scenario hardly has, to decrease travel time to services for people living here [7]
- It would be better if the commercial were setback 300’ [4]
- Concerned about traffic (speed, and neighbors having to drive to everything) [3]
- Clustering houses in a recharge area [3]
- If the houses are 3-4 Bedroom, they have higher impact on schools and taxes than other types of houses [3]

- If the residences are 3-4 bedroom houses, there would be high water use with pools, etc. [2]
- There might be empty homes because people aren't attracted to live in the area [1]
- Some agricultural land gets sacrificed to residential development /residential development starts to encroach on agricultural land, a hard trend to reverse [1]
- There's overall incongruity in development patterns between this and what is going on right nearby (across Route 4, for example) [1]
- It could mean a lot of school buses are in the area [1]
- It isn't a village
- There isn't much neighborhood, the houses are pretty spread out
- Big residences

What (in this case residential) uses would be appropriate?

- A healthy mix of residential types. [Everyone in one discussion group agreed with this]
- 55+ (senior) housing including town homes as part of a mix [3]
- Some affordable housing as required [3]
- Single family houses [1]
- Don't want any affordable housing here
- No multi- or two-family homes because they/apartments would decrease the value of the property and just become projects.

From October 10:

What do you like?

- Character
 - It keeps the rural feel / Character [7]
 - It is the same as what we have today
- Limited commercial & mostly residential
 - No big commercial [10]
 - It doesn't add any commercial [6]
 - No big commercial on the south side, to keep property values [6]
 - It is mostly residential [5]
 - Little commercial
 - Residential south of the intersection
- Creates/protects open space [3]
 - Open space below the intersection [5]
 - Greenspace, setbacks, trees
 - It is compact and preserves open space
- Recreation
 - It maintains the golf course [7]
- I like this one the best [5]
- Traffic
 - It probably won't add much traffic to the south [2]
 - Least increase in traffic
 - Minimal traffic
- Housing stock
 - Single family homes
 - High density housing
- It preserves current zoning [2]

- Oatley's would be viable with new neighbors
- Least impact on water
- It is the least dense
- It is the least sprawly

What don't you like?

- Traffic
 - Concerned that it doesn't address traffic from URI and summer traffic from these residents [2]
 - Concerned about traffic from Rolling Greens to the one intersection, needs another exit for residents
- Safety
 - Concerned about safety of pedestrians
- Commercial
 - Want a bit of commercial – could have a library or post office branch so people don't drive everywhere [1]
- Property Values
 - Worried that small lots will decrease the value of the homes on these sites

Other:

- Want more recreation:
 - It would be nice to add a playground
 - There should be a bike path added east/west and to the south
- Important that both commercial sites remain village scale / single story
- There is no need for more homes in North Kingstown

Mixed-Use Village Scenario (Scenario B)

From October 15:

What do you like?

- The ratio of commercial to residential is reasonable / better than with some other scenarios
- The buffer to houses on Plain Road
- The bike path

What don't you like?

- The residential development is too dense and the lots are too small per residence.
- Don't want more commercial. We already have enough empty commercial space in North Kingstown and other places that are in decline.
- Concern about traffic (it could take years for the state DOT to address this appropriately). Concern about safety of entrance & exits & accidents, and concern that traffic could back up even further if a new light were added.
- There's no infrastructure for this additional development – this would be starting from scratch.
- Concern of the impact of clustered homes / cottages on current residential neighbors. What is the impact on land values? What is the cost to the town of cluster housing?

What would improve this scenario?

- There are enough residences in North Kingstown already. If there is more residential, it should be age restricted. Education is expensive.
- Fewer buildings and homes, more larger homes.
- More trees to buffer the commercial that is shown on Rolling Greens.
- A well-established playground or some parks.
- There should be restaurants as part of the mix (but there is a concern about nitrate loading for restaurants).
- This needs to be walkable, there has to be a safe way to cross the streets between these different village sections.
- There needs to be a safe way for bikes to cross Route 4 and the other roads.
- The rotary needs to be simple to use and work safely.
- Shift most of the commercial development to beside Oatley's so there is a balance of traffic between different areas.
- Keep the commercial to what is currently zoned.
- Address traffic in the neighborhoods (safety, speeds) in addition to on Routes 1 & 102.
- If a commercial building is vacant, could we establish some serious fine for the property owner so it continues to financially benefit the town?
- Because the infrastructure isn't in place for this development, we should downzone.

Other:

- Would like to know how many additional automobile trips would be added through the intersection to the current daily number of approximately 23K for each new building.
- Because we have such low levels of commercial in North Kingstown compared to the amount of residential use we have, our taxes are higher than those in some nearby communities.

Village Scenario (Commercial Focus) (Scenario C)

From October 4:

What do you like?

- Walkability/Bikeability - walkability [6]; IF commercial, this is a better way to connect - more walkable/bikeable [2]; Like connection by bike on east and west of Route 4 [2]; Would be nice to ride bike on 102 [1]
- Traffic - Good traffic layout; Roundabout
- Type of Development
 - Like Residential [3]; Only residential down Route 102
 - Like to see Rolling Greens now and not across the street in 20 years [1]
 - Like Golf Course [13]; Keep Golf course [3]; Like open space (golf course and Morris Farm); Open space (use TDRs) [1]
 - Like small coffee/Jitters [1]; Small restaurant /deli; Small commercial OK - nice not to have to go to Post Rd [1]; Quaint commercial good - like Wickford - serve daily needs [2]
 - Offices; Office OK; Smaller scale commercial - local - doctors office [1]; Daytime uses
 - Keep more agricultural on Schartner parcel
 - Over 50; no kids; low water usage [3]; Like 55+ - won't impacts schools [2]; Less impact on town services if 55 yrs and over and if sewers in future more cost effective [5]
- Design
 - Like setbacks [1]; Like commercial set back off of 102 [9] / Rural buffer [2]
 - Continue mixed use design across Route 102 to Corner Tavern and Bald Hill

- Energy saving design; Like less sprawl design/cluster; Houses closer together gives a sense of security
- Prefer this one to other scenarios – better; Recent Rolling Greens (submission) OK - not bad

What don't you like?

- Commercial
 - Don't like any commercial beyond what is allowed by current zoning [10]; No commercial at all - mom and pop's can't stay in business - too much competition - not needed [4]; Don't like scale of commercial - amount and size - rather see neighborhood scale businesses [2]; Don't like commercial (hard to survive; competing with Home Depot and Walmart) [1]; Don't like amount of commercial [1]; Beginning of Route 2 in Warwick; Don't want to have Tiogue Ave or Bald Hill [1];
 - Post Road vacant property; Empty store ½ mile away [3]
 - 102 already built up
 - This plan is too congested
 - A lot of development to the east; preserve west of Route 4
 - Need better buffer between Bald Hill Nursery development and Plain Rd; Want more buffer between Bald Hill Nursery and Plain Rd
 - No bank, pharmacy, coffee shop; No fast food
 - Creating isolated pockets of commercial (Rt. 4, Wickford Junction etc) - not walkable between pockets; Hard to integrate with Wickford Junction
- Traffic - Route 2 is one lane both directions – dangerous
- Schools/Fiscal - Like kids but not school impact [1]
- Environment
 - Impervious cover and concentration of impervious cover in groundwater overlay [2]
 - Would put pressure on Exeter to develop too - will lose farmland [2]

Other?

- If commercial, make it more walkable [1]
- Not South County Commons - too dense [1]
- 55 yr+/density good but not location; Nice plan, wrong location - not in center of town - out of place [1]
- Sustainability of businesses that don't already exist in town [1]
- Where is access to Schartner on Route 102?
- Need change to corridor with better design
- What does town gain from developing here?
- All has to relate to each other; mix residential into Schartner and Corner Tavern

From October 10:

What do you like?

- The golf course

What don't you like?

- Area isn't preserved
- This is out of place for the whole town

- There is no need for more affordable housing
- There are too many intersections
- I don't like the commercial, it should be removed. There is too much commercial / height. Buildings should not be higher than 2 stories
- Existing neighborhoods would be impacted
- Traffic would increase
- The village is really a mini-mall
- Concern about lighting at night
- There should be more green space.

Other?

- Could there be more of a mix between the Village Scenario (C) and the Conservation Design Scenario (A)? [Note: this triggered creation of Scenario B]
- Could the commercial be in the middle?
- Schartner's parcel should be changed to residential.
- Bald Hill Nursery and the Corner Tavern should be left as is.

Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) Village Scenario (Commercial Focus) (Scenario D)

From October 4:

What do you like?

- The golf course remains / stays agricultural [12]
- Preservation of farm [3]; keeps open space [1]
- Likes residential [3]
- Want residences for those over age 55 [2]
- The set backs off road for Rolling Greens [1]; setbacks are adequate
- Likes convenience of commercial for residential [1]
- Less commercial on Rolling Greens
- Condos and small shops
- 2 or 2.5 story, but not too high
- Like South County commons, living with commercial

What don't you like?

- Too much commercial [unanimous minus 1 participant], volume is inappropriate [9], too dense, too tall [4], too much too big doesn't fit [3]
- Cant support all this commercial [4]; too much business competition [1]; not enough market share; don't want so much concentrated commercial [3]
- Way out of character [3]; looks out of place [1]
- Too dense for ground water overlay [3]; water usage too high [1]
- Commercial too close to road needs setbacks [3]
- Don't like anything about it [3]
- Trade off not worth it, open space preservation not worth density gains [2]
- Unsafe for bikes [2]
- Vacant properties will be an eyesore [2]; economic & market don't support commercial [2]
- Not the thing I'd like to see [1]
- Worst intersection in state for traffic/speeding [1]

- Keep community of homes but use smaller stores [1]
- Neighborhood, pharmacy, too much commercial, needs small business
- Nursery commercial is too close to residential
- Don't like it
- Horrible entry to town

Other

- Want a plan for Schartner's
- Want TDRs to stay on table [1]
- Neighborhood commercial connect to houses

From October 10:

What do you like?

- Open space no longer zoned commercial
- Pathways
- High end multi-family
- Setback off the road
- Smaller houses; beds
- Single housing
- Golf course
- Connect bike path here to Wickford
- Keep open space
- Compromise – not so much impact on Beacon/Lang
- Top of the shop apartments
- Keeps agriculture
- Village/small shops/internal boulevard

What don't you like?

- Too dense commercial, don't need more commercial
- More commercial will result in traffic "cut through" in residential neighborhoods
- No high buildings
- South County Commons ugly
- Low end multi-family
- High density commercial
- Affordable housing
- No commercial – get rid of it all
- Higher density not worth the trade off for TDR
- Not enough buffer
- Light pollution
- Too many buildings
- Residential too dense – water
- No college rentals here
- Traffic
- Don't want to lose property value
- Right turn out of Beacon Dr. (immediately into commercial)

Suggestions?

- Move Bald Hill Nursery to Schartner's parcel to protect existing residential neighborhoods
- Concentrate commercial to Rt. 102 to prevent impacts to Beacon Drive

Current Buildout Scenario (Scenario E)

From October 4:

What do you like?

- Nothing [11]
- Limits on commercial development [9]
- Bike path [7]
- Sticks with current zoning [6]
- Size (not huge) [4]
- Feel of suburbia [2]
- Residential use (fits into surrounding area) [1]
- Spreading out residential units (likes conventional residential rather than cluster) [1]
- Roundabout
- Residential lot size

What don't you like?

- Eliminates Golf Course [19]
- Commercial size and layout [8]
- Large lot residential [5]
- Loss of Agricultural land [4]
- No conservation [4]
- Too many intersections [4]
- Sprawl [1]

Other

- Impacts on infrastructure and Town services [1]
- Potential school redistricting
- It's straight and boring (conventional residential subdivision layout vs. cluster)
- No interconnections

From October 10:

What do you like?

- Low height commercial
- Oatley's is still there
- Single family; large lots
- Keeps with Comprehensive Plan - minus general business
- Residential
- Houses
- Bike path; walking
- Continues old pattern from old neighborhood to new

What don't you like?

- Polluting aquifer
- No open space
- No size limit on commercial
- Potential traffic
- No golf course
- Too dense
- No recreation
- Large store space
- Sprawl
- Commercial out of character with the area
- All built out (residential and commercial)
- Schartner's is a business

Appropriate uses?

- Small businesses
- Wedding barns
- Winery

Appendix A: Attendance at Public Workshops

This list includes those who attended the in person sessions and signed in.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC			
	Public Workshop 1 October 4, 2012	Neighborhood Focus Group October 10, 2012	Public Workshop 2 October 15, 2012
Alexander, Betsy		X	
Alexander, Eric		X	
Almeida, Jim	X		
Alves, Deb		X	
Alves, Jeff		X	
Avancato, Lynda			X
Baldwin, Tanya	X		
Baton, Deb	X		
Battaglia, Carole		X	
Beatty, Bob		X	
Bullard, David		X	
Bullard, Meghan		X	
Costa, Rep		X	
Cotter, Elizabeth		X	
Cotter, Thomas		X	
Desantis, Kay		X	
Dioneo, Bob		X	
Duffy, Jerry	X		
Duncan, Dave		X	
Duncan, Jean		X	
Famiglietti, Bob	X	X	
Farnsworth, Dan		X	
Federici, Everett		X	
Fellecione, Sandy	X		
Freeborn, Jan	X		
Ganung, Ann		X	X
Ganung, Jim	X	X	X
Gardiner, Don	X		X
Gillette, Pam	X		X
Greene, Joann	X		
Haden, John		X	
Hahn, Bill			X
Hale, Lynn		X	
Hart, Robert		X	
Hawkins, Heather	X		
Hawkins, Robert	X		
Henson-Malory, Yvonne	X		
Hill, Chris	X		

Hummel, Abby	X		
Hyland, Sandra		X	
King, Ewa		X	
King, Peter		X	
Koehn, Harold	X	X	
Kolling, Deborah	X		
Lyndeblad, Bethany		X	
Lyndeblad, Conroy		X	
Lyndeblad, Sharon		X	
Lyons, Mary Kay		X	
Maine, Randy	X		
Maloney, Yvonne		X	X
Mann, Ronald		X	
Marcus, Susan	X		
McAller, Jan			X
McGee, Tim			X
McHugh, Candice		X	
McHugh, Patrick		X	
McKay, Kerry	X		
McKay, Lisa	X		
McKay, Steven	X		
McNamara, Sandra		X	
Mengan, Jessica	X		
Merrill, John	X		
Metro, John		X	
Montella, Salvatore	X		
Morris, Maryann		X	
Murphy, Eileen		X	
Nelson, Mary		X	
O'Farrell, Brian		X	
O'Sullivan, Alice	X	X	X
Ostrowski, Scott		X	
Pelleccione, Greig	X		
Piechocki, Joe		X	
Plante, Steve	X	X	
Ponte, Skip		X	
Pucino, Joan		X	
Rice Kathleen		X	X
Rice, Matthew		X	X
Rosendale, Michael		X	
Ross, John		X	
Sampson, David	X	X	X
Sampson, Maria	X	X	X
Schnebt, Bob	X		
Simeone, Josephine		X	

Simeone, Nicholas		X	
Sullivan, Don		X	
Sullivan, Melanie		X	
Thompson, Rick	X	X	X
Tingley, Suzanna		X	
Topakian, Lisa			X
Trask, Peter	X	X	X
Vanderbeck, Donna		X	
Vanderbeck, Jack		X	
Venditto, Paul		X	
Voso, Beth		X	
Wicker, Carl	X		
Wicker, Kyle	X		
Zucchi, Lynne		X	
Zupa, Jason	X		
[No Last Name Given], Nathan	X		

MEMBERS OF THE STAKEHOLDER GROUP AND PROJECT TEAM			
Stakeholder Group Members & Alternates	Public Workshop 1 October 4, 2012	Neighborhood Focus Group October 10, 2012	Public Workshop 2 October 15, 2012
Abbot, Michael	X		X
Cohen, Ahren			X
Dion, Paul		X	X
Hawkins, Mark	X	X	X
Kerr, Meg	X		X
Kolling, Thomas	X	X	X
Lyons, Al		X	
Maloney, Kevin	X	X	X
O'Sullivan, Colin	X	X	X
Oatley, Vaughn	X		
Pugh, Martha			X
Reiner, Jon	X	X	X
Schartner, Jr.,Richard	X		
Schartner, Rit	X		
Zucchi, Jeff	X	X	
Project Team Members			
Ferguson, Ona	X	X	X
Flinker, Peter	X		X
Kelly, Nathan	X	X	X
Lamond, Becky	X	X	X
Licardi, Sue	X	X	X
Reiner, Jon (See above)	X	X	X

Appendix B: Scenarios Discussed

The following is a quick summary of the scenarios discussed in the public engagement phase of this visioning project. Please see the project website for the five maps depicting what each might look like, a memo with a more detailed description of the scenarios, and to see the chart comparing the scenarios.

- A. Conservation Design Scenario – This scenario for the future development of the intersection is based on existing regulations for Rolling Greens, and changing the zoning on the other three parcels, Schartner Bald Hill Nursery, Corner Tavern, and Bald Hill Garden Center, to residential. The Rolling Greens property could be built under this zoning today. The Morris Farm property (in Exeter) could be built to this development option today. As for the Corner Tavern and the Bald Hill Garden Center, this is what the current Comprehensive Plan states should be built on these properties in the future. These two properties are both currently zoned commercial. This scenario has approximately 54 house lots on the Rolling Greens property, 17 house lots on the Morris Farm (in Exeter), 5 house lots on the Schartner property, the Corner Tavern still has the restaurant on it, and the garden center has 5 house lots.
- B. Mixed-Use Village Scenario (Residential Focus) – This scenario shows the current proposal for Rolling Greens except for a reduction in commercial area from 50,000 square feet to 30,000 s.f. Each of the two Schartner properties, as well as the Bald Hill Garden Center site, would have 20,000 square feet of commercial and 15 residential units. For each of the three properties, these are shown as a mix of five two-bedroom homes, and ten one-bedroom cottages. This proposal would require a zone change and comprehensive plan amendment changing the Rolling Greens property as well as the Schartner parcels, Corner Tavern and the Bald Hill Garden Center to a Compact Village District (CVD). The Corner Tavern current restaurant use would remain unchanged in this scenario.
- C. Village Scenario (Commercial Focus) – This scenario for the future development of the intersection shows the Rolling Greens property as what the applicant would like to build on this piece of property and conceptually expands that development pattern to other commercially zoned pieces of land to the south and west including the Schartner land, the Corner Tavern, and the Bald Hill Garden Center. This proposal would require a zone change and comprehensive plan amendment for all of the focus parcels at the intersection including the entire Rolling Greens property, the Corner Tavern, the Bald Hill Garden Center, and the Schartner Bald Hill Nursery piece to a Compact Village District (CVD). This plan for RG has approximately 50,000 square feet of commercial space, including approximately 5,000 for a new Oatley’s restaurant, and approximately 106 residential housing units. This scenario has 60,000 square feet of office or retail uses at each of the Schartner properties, maintains 6,000 square feet of restaurant at the corner tavern, and adds 67,500 square feet of retail/office at the Bald Hill Garden Center site. The CVD zone does not allow a commercial building footprint to exceed 15,000 square feet for a parcel 10 acres in size or larger, and if a parcel is less than 10 acres, the largest commercial footprint allowed would be 10,000 square feet. Under this scenario, the maximum number of buildings with a 15,000 square foot footprint would be 3, 1 on the Rolling Greens property, 1 on the Schartner property, and possibly 1 on the Bald Hill Garden Center if they combined some of the land from the Tavern piece to their property to make it 10 acres in size.
- D. Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) Village Scenario (Commercial Focus) – This scenario for the future development of the intersection shows an example of a more dense “village

development” option for the intersection. Using TDR, the 120,000 square feet of commercial/office space that could be built on the two Shartner properties would be transferred across the street, with 50,000 s.f. added to the Rolling Greens commercial area, 2,500 s.f. added to the Corner Tavern property, and 67,500 s.f. added to the potential commercial development on the Bald Hill Garden Center site. This development option would thus have the same total amount of commercial development as the first village scenario, but the development would be more dense (2 or 2-1/2 story buildings instead of single story). Meanwhile both the Morris Farm and the Shartner properties would be permanently protected.

- E. Current Buildout Scenario - This scenario for the future development of the intersection shows what could be built today under the current zoning. These options could realistically meet all of North Kingstown’s groundwater protection requirements, and have sufficient water capacity to build at this development intensity. The specific development types and building sizes are indicated on the plan. This development scenario will include the loss of the golf course, the development of over 50 3-4 bedroom houses in North Kingstown at Rolling Greens, the development of over 120,000 square feet of office or retail on the Schartner property, approximately 75,000 square feet of retail on the garden center property, and either keeping a restaurant, or having a possible pharmacy or other large similar use on the corner tavern property.