CALL TO ORDER:
The May 2, 2018 meeting of the Hopkinton Planning Board was called to order at 7:00 P.M. by Vice Chair Amy Williams.

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Amy Williams, Tom Holberton, Ronald Prellwitz were present.

Also present were: John Pennypacker, Conservation Commission; James Lamphere, Town Planner; and Kevin McAllister, Town Solicitor.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
MR. HOLBERTON MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4, 2018 PLANNING BOARD MEETING.
MR. PRELLWITZ SECONDED THE MOTION.
MS. WILLIAMS, MR. HOLBERTON AND MR. PRELLWITZ APPROVED. MOTION PASSED.

OLD BUSINESS:

Town Planner James Lamphere explained that the applicant had called and said he was unable to attend the meeting due to an injury, and that he would be willing to appear at a future meeting if the Board wished to discuss the application with him. Mr. Lamphere outlined the extension request of the project for the Planning Board. Due to the project approval expiring at the end of the month of May, having been approved 11 years ago and been extended several times since then. The applicant was seeking to extend the approval for another year. Mr. Lamphere said that if the Board was willing to approve the extension beyond 90 days, they would have to make certain findings of fact to do so. He also explained the differences between if the project approval were allowed to lapse and be reinstated versus extending a current approval. The Planning Board discussed the implications of an extension and how long a project could reasonably be approved.
HAVING FOUND THAT THE DEVELOPER HAS BEGUN SITE WORK ON THE PROJECT, MR. HOLBERTON MOVED TO EXTEND THE PRELIMINARY APPROVAL FOR ONE YEAR, WITH THE EXPECTATION THAT THE APPLICANT WILL APPEAR BEFORE THE PLANNING BOARD FOR FINAL APPROVAL AT A FUTURE MEETING.
MR. PRELLWITZ SECONDED THE MOTION.
MR. WILLIAMS, MR. HOLBERTON, AND MR. PRELLWITZ APPROVED. MOTION PASSED.


Kevin McAllister, Town of Hopkinton solicitor, presented on behalf of the Town. The case came to the town as a result of a building certificate request. The property currently has a manufacturing building on it built in 1880, and has been used in that capacity, with various interruptions, since then. The property has been taxed as a manufacturing property. Lots 13B and the adjacent lot 13 both have manufacturing buildings, and it appears that the parcel was zoned residential in error at some point.

Mr. DiOrio arrived to the meeting at 7:13pm.

Mr. McAllister, after consulting with the Town Clerk and Town Manager, submitted the application to correct the error at no cost to the property owner because it was inappropriately re-zoned through no fault of their. Despite it being an error, Mr. McAllister thought it would be appropriate to go through the normal re-zoning process, which is why the application appears before the Planning Board for an advisory opinion to the Town Council.

Questions from the Board:

Ms. Williams: What was the facility originally named?
Mr. McAllister: The Town Clerk went back as far as she could go, and she thought that historically it had always been a manufacturing operation. Both lots 13 and 13B have held a mill structure since the 1880s. The lots were split in the 1970s. The name wasn’t mentioned.
Mr. Prellwitz: The property on the other side of the dam was turned into a hatchery. Is that part of the same property?
Mr. McAllister: I don’t think so, according to the map.
Mr. DiOrio: I would have thought that the property owner would be presenting this proposed change.
Mr. McAllister: I’m not advocating for this proposal. The owner brought this to the Town and asked if they could fix it. I thought it was unfair to charge the owner to fix this when, based on the consensus of the town staff, we thought it was a mistake. If we went through the owner, we’d have to charge them a fee, and I thought that was inappropriate. I can represent that the owner is aware of the proposal and is supportive of the change.
MR. DIORIO MADE A MOTION FOR A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION FOR THE PROPOSED ZONING AMENDMENT, HAVING FOUND THAT THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT SUPPORTS THE HOPKINTON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN’S LAND USE GOAL #2, TO PRESERVE THE HISTORIC CHARACTER OF THE VILLAGES AND SURROUNDING UNDEVELOPED AREAS, THAT ALSO IT SUPPORTS LAND USE POLICY #20, ENCOURAGE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT THAT IS COMPATIBLE WITH COMMUNITY CHARACTER AND SURROUNDING LAND USES, AND THAT IT IMPLEMENTS THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN BY BRINGING THE ZONING MAP INTO CONSISTENCY WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN’S FUTURE LAND USE MAP.

MR. PRELLWITZ SECONDED THE MOTION.
MR. DIORIO, MS. WILLIAMS, MR. HOLBERTON, AND MR. PRELLWITZ APPROVED THE MOTION.
MOTION PASSED 4-0.

NEW BUSINESS:

Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG) PY 2017 - Review activities for consistency with Hopkinton’s Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Lamphere summarized the contents of the Town’s CDBG applications for the Planning Board. There were four activates applying for CDBG funds: $146,138 to complete the Langworthy Field Master Plan improvements, the Johnnycake Center requested $82,675 for renovations to the front of their building, the WARM Shelter requested $70,000 for their employment readiness program, a group home on Fenner Hill Road requested $8,409 to renovate their kitchen facilities. And finally $15,000 in administration funds to the Washington County Community Development Corporation to manage the CDBG program for the Town. Projects will be brought to the Town Council for a public hearing, and the projects will be prioritized by the Council for application to the state. The Planning Board is tasked with certifying that the activities do not conflict with the Town’s Comprehensive Plan.

Questions from the Planning Board:

Ms. Williams: Westerly is not included in the Washington County CDC. I’m confused how Westerly could be included here on the application.
Mr. Lamphere: I’m not sure what the Town of Westerly is doing this year for CDBG. They’re either not applying for CDBG funds, or they’re doing it on their own. These non-profits are applying to the Town of Hopkinton, not Westerly.

MR. DIORIO MOVED TO CERTIFY THAT THE GRANT APPLICATIONS ARE NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THE GENERAL POLICIES SET FORTH IN THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.
MR. HOLBERTON SECONDED THE MOTION
MR. DIORIO, MS. WILLIAMS, MR. HOLBERTON, AND MR. PRELLWITZ APPROVED.
SOLICITOR’S REPORT:
Open Meetings Act Guidance

Mr. McAllister provided a brief description of the RI Open Meetings Act (“the Act”) for the Planning Board. The Act provides the public with a reliable expectation of what will be discussed at public meetings. The Act applies whenever a public body has a quorum for a meeting. Mr. McAllister emphasized that a “rolling quorum”, where members share matters amongst each other, is also in violation of the Act (with the exception of scheduling). This is most applicable in email chains where multiple people are attached. Site visits are permitted “provided that the group does not engage in a collective discussion during the site visit, or take any other action.” If the site visit were posted as a meeting, discussion would be permitted. The Board also asked several questions about compliance with the Act.

PLANNER’S REPORT:
Mr. DiOrio congratulated Mr. Lamphere on the work done on the Langworthy Field improvements project.

CORRESPONDENCE AND UPDATES:
None

PUBLIC COMMENT:
None

DATE OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING: June 6, 2018

ADJOURNMENT:
MR. DIORIO MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING
MR. PRELLWITZ SECONDED THE MOTION
MR. DIORIO, MS. WILLIAMS, MR. HOLBERTON, AND MR. PRELLWITZ APPROVED.
MOTION PASSED.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 P.M.