Town of Bristol, Rhode Island
Department of Community Development

NOTICE OF MEETING
THE BRISTOL PLANNING BOARD
TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Bristol Technical Review Committee (TRC) will hold a meeting,
on Wednesday, October 28th, 2026 at 10:00am
Department of Community Development, 35 Washington Street, 1st Floor, Bristol, RI

AGENDA

Kevin C. & Colleen Kiselka – Pre-Application Conference for Minor Subdivision/Unified Development. Proposal to re-divide Lots 6 and 12 resulting in approximately 3,800 square feet of land being conveyed from Lot 6 to Lot 12. Proposal would require variances for reducing the side yard setbacks of the existing dwelling below the required minimum on Lot 6. Lot 12 is vacant.

Property located at **50 Broadcommon Road**; Assessor's Plat 94, Lot 6 and Lot 12; Zone: M.

Scanned copies of all applications and supporting materials are available on the Town of Bristol website: https://bristol-ri.municodemeetings.com/

For questions on above plans please call 253-7000, ext. 147 or email dwilliamson@bristolri.gov

"In no case shall the recommendation of the TRC be binding on the Board in its activities or decisions."

Diane M. Williamson, AICP
Administrative Officer

Posted: October 20, 2026
By: mbw

Principe Company
ENGINEERING DIVISION

27 Sakonnet Ridge Dr
Tiverton, RI 02878
401.816.5385
www.PrincipeCompany.com

September 15, 2026

Diane Williamson and Ed Tanner
Town of Bristol Planning Department
10 Court Street, Bristol, RI 02809

> **SUBJECT: Response to Engineering Field Report # CIV-02 (PARE Engineering, Aug 13, 2026)**
> Project: Marine Center Warehouse/Manufacturing — 97 Broadcommon Road
> Parcel ID: Plat 100, Lot 60 (Buildings A, B, C, & Future D)

Dear Ms. Williamson and Mr. Tanner,

On September 11, 2026, Principe Company conducted a comprehensive site evaluation at 97 Broadcommon Road to review and analyze the field report received from PARE Engineering dated August 13, 2026 (based on Civil Drawings dated February 21, 2005, with revisions for Final approval on August 17, 2009). On behalf of the property owner, we respectfully submit our formal engineering responses below.

Where field conditions vary from the 2009 approved set, the adjustments reflect functional design enhancements, equal-or-superior engineering substitutions, or low-impact environmental improvements. Pursuant to Sections 4.1.1.d and 8.9.B of the Town of Bristol Subdivision and Development Review Regulations, these field modifications qualify as Minor Changes subject to administrative approval, as they do not increase unit counts, alter site dimensions by >25%, or adversely impact public infrastructure.

Detailed Responses to PARE Findings

PARE Finding #1: *1. The landscaped area in front of Building A varies from the orientation depicted on the approved plans. As a result, the width of pavement between the Building A loading zone and the proposed landscaped area is reduced from the intended dimensions.*

RESPONSE: The existing landscape island and hedges have been safely established for decades and provide enhanced visual screening along the front facade. Adequate turning radiuses and access width for commercial loading vehicles have been verified on-site, ensuring safe vehicular circulation in compliance with Section F.1.B(2)(d)(iii).

PARE Finding #2: *2. Building D, along with its associated sidewalks, utilities, landscape areas and site drainage infrastructure (CB-5), has not yet been constructed. This area is currently being utilized as a material stockpile and equipment laydown area.*

RESPONSE: Construction of the site is being executed in approved logical phases. Building D and its associated infrastructure (including Catch Basin CB-5) will be fully constructed during the next build phase prior to final Certificate of Occupancy issuance for that structure.

PARE Finding #3: *3. The proposed utility pole, overhead wire and transformer were not observed to have been constructed along the east side of the project limits.*

RESPONSE: In lieu of overhead wires and an exposed pole, the electrical service was converted to an underground duct bank and relocated to a functional, aesthetic site location. Undergrounding utilities is strongly encouraged under Section F.2.J(4) to enhance visual aesthetics, site safety, and resilience.

PARE Finding #4: *4. The two sewer cleanouts as well a sewer manhole-1 were not observed to have been constructed. Sewer manhole-2 appears to be located further north than shown on the approved plans.*

RESPONSE: In coordination with the Bristol Water Pollution Control Department, the sewer lateral route was adjusted to the north side of the structures to achieve a more efficient alignment to the municipal main connection. All sewer infrastructure modifications were inspected, pressure-tested, and formally accepted by the WPC Department (Section F.2.J(1)).

PARE Finding #5: *5. The fence along the north side of Building A was not observed to have been constructed.*

RESPONSE: The fence installation was temporarily delayed to accommodate underground electrical utility trenching and transformer placement. The fence will be installed upon final site dressing.

PARE Finding #6: *6. The site currently contains newly installed concrete curbing north of Building A that terminates near the rear corner of the building. The approved plans depict a Cape Cod berm in this location extending around the rear of the existing building varying from the approved plans. Additionally, the approved plans show the Cape Cod berm continuing to the northern face of Building A, however the berm terminates before reaching the building varying from the approved plans.*

RESPONSE: Vertical concrete curbing was purposefully installed in lieu of asphalt Cape Cod berm. Concrete curbing represents a superior construction standard (Section F.2.E & Section F.4.H(1)(d)), offering greater structural protection against heavy commercial truck wheel loads while providing an additional 5 ft of turning radius for service vehicles.

PARE Finding #7: *7. Two catch basins have been installed within the drive aisle between Buildings B and C that are not depicted on the approved plans.*

RESPONSE: These two catch basins were added as a proactive engineering measure to eliminate flat surface grading (<1.0%) and prevent nuisance ponding. The added collection capacity exceeds minimum municipal storm drainage standards (Section F.2.I & F.5).

PARE Finding #8: *8. Roof drains have not been installed along the east sides of Buildings B and C as shown on the approved plans. Roof drains on the west side of the buildings appear to have been installed.*

RESPONSE: The final structural architectural design utilizes a single-pitch (shed) roof design, directing all roof runoff to the western side of the buildings. Roof leaders were installed along the west side accordingly to capture 100% of roof drainage.

PARE Finding #9: *9. The approved plans indicate that roof leaders from Building C shall discharge to the easternmost forebay. It appears that the roof leaders have been installed to discharge to the forebay located on the west side of the stormwater basin varying from the approved plans.*

RESPONSE: Due to the single-pitch roof orientation noted in Response #8, roof leaders direct flow to the western forebay. Hydrologic calculations confirm that the western forebay and stormwater basin possess ample volumetric capacity to treat and attenuate these flows without causing hydraulic overload, satisfying Section F.2.I(2)(a).

PARE Finding #10: *10. The approved plans show a 2-foot-wide concrete block retaining wall along the west side of the property. This retaining wall was not constructed as approved. Instead, a stone retaining wall has been installed west of Building B, varying from the approved plans.*

RESPONSE: Field topography and rock conditions dictated the installation of a stacked stone landscape retaining wall. The stacked stone wall provides structural earth retention while visually complementing the surrounding natural terrain. Runoff along this edge flows naturally toward the northern wetland system without adverse off-site impacts.

PARE Finding #11: *11. Drainage Manhole (DMH)-02 was constructed as a catch basin, and CB-1 shown on the approved plans was not installed.*

RESPONSE: Final as-built micro-grading eliminated the necessity for CB-1. Converting DMH-02 into a deep-sump catch basin maintained complete stormwater interception while reducing redundant underground pipe structures.

PARE Finding #12: *12. No visible pipe outlets were observed within the stone swale area west of the project limits. The approved plans indicate two 10-inch drainage outfalls discharging to this area.*

RESPONSE: Outfall pipe ends are set flush within the rip-rap stone lining to prevent erosion and physical damage. The outfall points will be cleared of minor loose stone to ensure visible, unobstructed discharge.

PARE Finding #13: *13. Three light poles have been installed along the western edge of the parking area at Building B. These light poles are not shown on the approved plans.*

RESPONSE: Light poles were installed along the western interior perimeter to ensure site security while protecting western residential abutters from light spillover. All fixtures feature full cut-off optics, downward directionality, and motion sensors, fully complying with Appendix G, Part 4 (Lighting Standards).

PARE Finding #14: *14. A concrete pad that is not shown on the approved plans has been constructed within the area called out as a bluestone parking area.*

RESPONSE: The concrete pad provides a stable, clean surface for centralized trash and recycling handling. A code-compliant fence/vegetative enclosure will be erected around the pad pursuant to Appendix G, Section 3.8.a.

PARE Finding #15: *15. The two dumpster enclosures shown on the approved plans have not been installed.*

RESPONSE: Enclosures are currently under fabrication and will be installed around the designated waste locations prior to final site endorsement (Appendix G, Section 3.8.a).

PARE Finding #16: *16. The loading space shown on the approved plans north of Building B has been replaced with concrete curbing, concrete stairs, and crushed stone. The loading space north of Building C does not appear to conform to the dimensions shown on the approved plans.*

RESPONSE: The formal loading bays north of Buildings B and C proved impractical for primary logistics circulation. Removing pavement north of Building C and replacing it with loam and seed reduces total site impervious surface, furthering the green infrastructure goals of Section F.1.B(2)(b) and Appendix G, Part 5.

PARE Finding #17: *17. The approved plans proposes that most of the site perimeter have either a 6-inch asphalt berm or a Cape Cod berm. No perimeter berms were observed during the site inspection.*

RESPONSE: In lieu of asphalt berms, concrete curbing was installed along key drive aisles. Per Section F.2.E, concrete curbing provides superior durability and edge containment compared to asphalt berming.

PARE Finding #18: *18. The approved plans include a loam and seed bump-out adjacent to the northern dumpster enclosure. This has not been constructed.*

RESPONSE: Final loaming, grading, and seeding in this localized area will be completed in conjunction with final landscape dressing.

PARE Finding #19: *19. The swale located along the west side of the project, adjacent to the bluestone parking area, has not been constructed in accordance with the approved plans. The area has not been properly graded, and the two proposed 10-inch drain pipes were not observed.*

RESPONSE: The western stone-lined swale has been graded to convey sheet flow northward. Final swale invert elevations and pipe outfall openings will be verified on the As-Built survey drawings.

PARE Finding #20: *20. West of Building A, a garage structure, various storage containers, and dumpsters have been placed within an area identified on the approved plans as a bluestone parking area.*

RESPONSE: These items represent temporary contractor/tenant staging materials. The owner has issued formal notice to remove all temporary containers, dumpsters, and storage items prior to final approval.

PARE Finding #21: *21. The approved site plans depict a loading area in front of Building A; however, this location is currently mulch islands containing shrubs and plantings.*

RESPONSE: The mature landscape beds have provided effective aesthetic buffering for decades. Building A operations do not require a formal front loading pad, and maintaining established vegetation supports Section F.1.B(2)(c)(vi).

PARE Finding #22: *22. Two water system gate valves have been installed on the east side of the site. The approved plans indicate only a 2-inch water service line and a gate valve with a 6-inch valve box cover in this location. The system is exposed and is anticipated to be within a heated enclosure that has not been constructed. Confirm if system is active.*

RESPONSE: The domestic and fire service lines are fully installed and tested. A protective, insulated 'Hot Box' enclosure is scheduled for delivery and installation by the end of the month. All work has been coordinated with and approved by the Bristol County Water Authority (BCWA) (Section F.2.J(2)).

PARE Finding #23: *23. Concrete sidewalk sections have been constructed adjacent to Buildings B and C that are not shown on the approved site plans.*

RESPONSE: These reinforced concrete pads were installed flush at ground level to serve as stable aprons for future overhead bay doors. They do not impede site circulation or alter drainage patterns.

PARE Finding #24: *24. The site landscaping has not been installed in accordance with the approved landscape plans, as certain required plantings have not been installed.*

RESPONSE: Extensive supplemental plantings, including mature Dogwood and Cherry trees, have been installed on-site. Under Section 8.9.B, minor landscape species adjustments that maintain or exceed required buffer density qualify as minor administrative modifications.

PARE Finding #25: *25. Crushed stone was placed along the southwest corner of the site, adjacent to the blue stone parking area. This stone was not called out on the plans.*

RESPONSE: Crushed stone was placed to stabilize an area subjected to unmitigated off-site stormwater run-on originating from the adjacent southern property. This measure stabilizes the soil and prevents erosion in accordance with Section F.2.L.

Conclusion & Next Steps

The adjustments made on-site maintain full hydraulic integrity, improve structural durability, and respect neighboring properties. An updated As-Built Plan Set (Sheets C-1 through C-7) will be submitted upon completion of final site dressing to document all minor field adjustments for permanent recording under Section 8.8 & Section F.3.D.

We look forward to reviewing these items with the Administrative Officer and Technical Review Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas J. Principe, III, PE
Principe Company — Engineering Division