

**TOWN OF HOPKINTON
PLANNING BOARD**

**Wednesday, March 4, 2020
7:00 p.m.**

**Hopkinton Town Hall
1 Town House Road, Hopkinton, RI 02833**

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Alfred DiOrio called the March 4, 2020 Hopkinton Planning Board meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chairman Alfred DiOrio, Vice Chair Amy Williams, Carolyn Light, Emily Shumchenia (Planning Board Alternate), Ronald Prellwitz, and Keith Lindelow were present.

Also present were: Sharon Davis, Hopkinton Town Council Liaison; James Lamphere, Hopkinton Town Planner; Attorney Sean Clough in place of Attorney Kevin McAllister, Hopkinton Town Solicitor; and Talia Jalette, Hopkinton Senior Planning Clerk.

John Pennypacker, Hopkinton Conservation Commission Liaison, was absent.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A MOTION WAS MADE BY KEITH LINDELOW AND SECONDED BY RON PRELLWITZ TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE FEBRUARY 5, 2020 MEETING.

IN FAVOR: DIORIO, LIGHT, PRELLWITZ, LINDELOW

ABSTAIN: WILLIAMS

OPPOSED: NONE.

MOTION PASSED 5-0.

OLD BUSINESS:

Re-instatement of Preliminary Plan – Pukas Minor Subdivision – Plat 27, Lot 197, Nichols Lane. Stanislaw and Brenda I. Pukas, applicants.

James Lamphere, Hopkinton Town Planner, spoke on behalf of the applicants, Stanislaw and Brenda Pukas.

Mr. Lamphere: “This particular project received Planning Board approval back in September 2nd of 2009. The applicants did not proceed to file a Final Plat with the Planning Department within one year of preliminary approval. Moreover, they did not file a Final Plat with the Planning Department within one year from July 1st, 2017, the date to which the State of Rhode Island extended validity under their tolling legislation. Therefore, this plan has expired as of now. So, the applicants are here tonight to have it reinstated at the point which it failed. The application was approved with conditions, three conditions actually. The first one is that the applicant receive DEM subdivision suitability approval. They actually went further with that, and they actually got an approved OWTS design. Test holes have been dug, the design is noted on the Final Plan here, as the conditions stated. Also, that the applicant incorporate into the plans, and to any deeds to a buyer for the proposed new lot, a water availability certificate, in the form that the Planning Board has approved. Over here, they have the standard water notation that appears on all of our subdivision plans, that was approved by the Planning Board. Basically, it states that the applicant has examined the water availability in the area and they found that it is adequate to service a home, one residential home. The final condition that was put in place by the Planning Board is that access to this new lot is to be off of Nichols Lane, and not the side street, Hill Street. That has been put on the plan right here. So, we have the septic, water notation, driveway location. Everything is done in accordance with the Planning Board conditions of approval. And, so, tonight, we’re asking the Board to re-instate it. It will come back for Final Plan Review with me, because it was delegated to the Administrative Officer back then. And so, they’re ready to proceed. This is really ready for final approval as it is right now, just alter this to say ‘Final Plan’, we get it recorded, it’s done. Now, the Subdivision Regulations, while they changed in 2014, they did not change in a way to affect this particular subdivision, so I don’t really see any reason why we can’t reinstate it. The other alternative would be, if you choose not to reinstate it, the applicant could certainly come back, and start the thing all over again, and it would be done one way or another. This is probably the most expeditious way to do it.

Chairman DiOrio asked whether the On-site Wastewater Treatment System (OWTS) depicted on the site plans would still be located in the western-most lot, which Mr. Lamphere confirmed in the affirmative. There were not any other questions from the Planning Board or the public.

MS. WILLIAMS RECOMMENDED THAT THE BOARD REINSTATE THE PRELIMINARY PLAN, AS SUBMITTED, AND DELEGATE FINAL PLAN APPROVAL TO THE PLANNER.

MR. DIORIO MADE THE MOTION.

MR. PRELLWITZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

IN FAVOR: MR. DIORIO, MR. PRELLWITZ, MR. LINDELOW, MS. LIGHT, AND MS. WILLIAMS.

ABSTAIN: NONE.

OPPOSED: NONE.

MOTION PASSED 5-0.

Amendment to Approved Preliminary Plan – 3 Lot Minor Subdivision – Sarah Land Company – Plat 25, Lot 54, Maple Court. Sarah Land Company, LLC, applicant.

Mr. DiOrio recused himself, and provided a recusal form, as he had conducted surveying work for the applicant. He left the room, and Ms. Williams, Vice Chair, stepped in as Chair. Attorney Margaret Hogan, of the Law Office of Hogan and Hogan in Charlestown, RI, filling in for Attorney Tia Priolo, represented the applicant.

Ms. Hogan: “We’re here this evening, this is an application for, pardon me, for a subdivision that was approved back in 2007, I think it was – quite some time ago. Did not proceed to construction. Obviously, we all know we had a recession, and everything got delayed. So, we’re now at the point of construction, and during that process there became some confusion as to what was approved and what was not approved, and it’s my understanding that the Town Engineer or someone hired by the Town to review it has come to the determination that the original plan approval required underground utilities. Rather than appeal that and get into a big fight, basically, the applicant has decided to just request relief if the Board finds that was a condition, to request relief from that. The rationale for that is, if you drive down Maple Court, coming to the terminus of that road, and coming into the new subdivision, you’ll find that the entire route going in, of course, is above ground utilities. And, putting in underground utilities, in this location, is going to require disruption to the last property before you get to the applicant’s property. I do have a couple of photographs that I’ll submit for your consideration. I’ll just show them to you, one by one, and bring them up, I assume, to the Clerk. I have pre-marked them as Applicant 1A, 1B, and 1C. So, I’ll review them with you, if I could. Looking at this one, this first one, A, you’ll see, there’s a telephone pole here. This is on the adjacent property, and right past the telephone pole, in front of the vehicle, is this property owner’s driveway, and then I draw a straight line from that telephone pole to the property pole here. So, basically, where that hard pen line is, is where all we’d have to dig it all up, in order to put underground utilities. So, we would have to disrupt this gentleman’s driveway, his front - what looks to be his front yard, which, of course, is not, but it looks like it is, and so we feel that that’s a major disruption. So, that’s A. The second photo is B, and that’s standing somewhere in between the pole and this terminus, approximately like where that tree is, right here. Standing in that, and taking the photograph, towards the subdivision, you’ll see, again, I’ve drawn a hard line, pen line here, as to, again, where the disruption would have to be, going through the property line. We can see the subdivision area all completed down below. And then, the third photograph, is one standing in the subdivision, looking up the hill, up the drive, if you will, towards that abutting property owner’s household, and illustrating the above ground utility poles, as well as the finished roadway and drainage and etcetera, and all that would have to be dug up in order to install these underground utilities. So, first, I would like to bring those up to the Clerk, I guess. So, basically, if the request is to permit the installation of above ground utilities, to be consistent with the neighboring property, and to be consistent, we believe, with the original intent of the approval back in 2007. The owner is here if there are any questions. I do know that your Planner has given you some guidance in a

memorandum, and had provided you with the original subdivision approval. I do note that conditions one through five do not include a requirement for underground utilities, so we would respectfully request the Board's consideration of this request, and I clarify that it wasn't required originally, or to modify the approval differently. Thank you."

Ms. Williams: "So, Jim, can you provide me a little background on that? So, it wasn't required in the initial, so the applicant's coming before us today because there's gonna be a change on their plans?"

Mr. Lamphere: "I'm a little concerned, I'm a little, kind of, mystified how this even came, became an issue, and I think the applicant is concerned that because there was a diagram put on one of the sheets, sheet four of six, okay, that had a 'typical' roadway section on it, and it looks like it was lifted right out of our Subdivision Regulations. And if you look at that diagram, you're going to see things that are underground. You're going to see a fire alarm. I don't even think a fire alarm is part of, is proposed, as part of this subdivision. You're going to see a gas line, and it says 'if required'. You're going to see cable TV, electric lines, and again, that's a 'typical' roadway section. The way I looked at it, is that it was put there for illustrative purposes, not, not to show that all of these things are going to be a part of this particular subdivision, okay. And, so, to back that up, I did a little research, and I looked at the minutes pertaining to this particular project. There was no discussion in the minutes among the Planning Board members about putting the utilities underground, okay. And, as the attorney just pointed out, none of the conditions of approval specified underground utilities. It's been my experience, over twenty years, is that when, that underground utilities, when required by a Planning Board, are something that is specifically called out, okay, by the Board, okay. So, I then went to our subdivision regulations, which were in effect, governing this, and I could just read to you, exactly, what it says in the Sub. Regs., and it says that: 'the Subdivision Regulations governing review of this subdivision state that all electric communication, meaning telephone, fire alarm, and cable TV, as well as street lighting lines, may be installed underground at the discretion of the subdivider.' I would rest upon that right there."

Ms. Williams: "For sure."

Mr. Lamphere: "Short of the Board making a definitive statement otherwise, it's their discretion to put them above ground."

Ms. Williams: "Okay."

Mr. Lamphere: "So, I don't really see this as a big issue at all."

Mr. Lamphere asked the Planning Board to make a motion "to the effect that the Planning Board sees no reason to require the applicant to provide underground utilities." Carolyn Light stated that she had visited the property, and that she was confused how the project had progressed to this point when this discussion had not been had. Ms. Williams, Mr. Lamphere, and Ms. Hogan continued the discussion.

Ms. Light: "I, I went to the property, and I was a little confused – that the road's there."

Ms. Hogan: "Okay."

Ms. Light: "So, I looked at the map, and I said, 'It's either a typo or something happened between Friday and Sunday, maybe I've got the wrong drawing. The, the road's in? The drainage is started? And I just wonder how it gets that far?' Maybe it's me, being naïve? The road's in."

Ms. Williams: “Don’t they already put the roads in, though, before they started that, initially? It’s already been phased in, to a certain point, Jim?”

Mr. Lamphere: “Well, I think I see what Carolyn is driving at, is that, I guess, normally, if, if one was to put in underground utilities, you probably would have put it in, earlier. But, for some reason, again, like the attorney, I don’t know how this, this came to be an issue, whether it was our Town Engineer that, that, that peer-reviewed this, and I might add, too, that this road was reviewed – the construction was reviewed, inspected, by Crossman Engineering, which is our consultant. And so, possibly, as a matter of fact – that’s exactly how it happened. Crossman pointed out, on the plans, he mentioned, called out the fact that, underground utilities was shown there, in the ‘typical’ drawing. And so, some, some people feel as though that if anything is put on a drawing anywhere, that it definitely means that is has to be installed, okay. I don’t , I’ve seen many, many plan sets in my day that have ‘typical’ this, ‘typical’ that, on, on back pages, that are basically there for illustrative purposes, not, not telling, specifically, the materials or what-not that’s gonna go into this. And so, so I think out of, because of what our engineer brought to the fore, and because the applicant here wants to make sure, before he does any more work on that, he just wants to get this clarified, right now, with the Board, that he does not have to put them underground. So, I think that’s how it came about.”

Ms. Hogan: “Thank you, Mr. Lamphere. That is, that is exactly it. It arose during the final inspections, and the applicant was pretty surprised by the interpretation, so that’s why we’re here, to get it clarified.”

Mr. Prellwitz stated that while he is a “big fan” of underground utilities, “what he saw here, to impose that [the installation of underground utilities] now, where, coming from the back field, so to speak, you know. There’s a lot of work that’s been done, it’s not specified, the rest of the neighborhood has above ground [utilities], I’ll just bite my lip and go with the above ground.” Ms. Williams stated that while she also preferred underground utilities, it would be up to those who would be purchasing the homes to determine if they wanted to live in the neighborhood with above ground utilities. There were not any other comments from the Planning Board, the applicant, or the public.

MR. LINDELOW MADE THE MOTION THAT WE RECOMMEND THE PLANNING BOARD HONOR THE REQUEST PUT FORTH BY THE APPLICANT TO ALLOW ABOVE GROUND UTILITIES.

MR. PRELLWITZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

IN FAVOR: MR. PRELLWITZ, MR. LINDELOW, MS. WILLIAMS, MS. LIGHT

ABSTAIN: MR. DIORIO

OPPOSE: NONE.

MOTION PASSED 4-0.

Second Pre-application – Major Land Development Project – Fairview Estates – AP 18, Lot 7K, 66 Fairview Avenue. Shoreline Properties, Inc., applicant.

Mr. DiOrio returned for the application, and resumed his role as Chair of the Planning Board. Patrick Freeman, a registered professional engineer from American Engineering working for the applicant, as well as the applicant, Joseph Catelli, of Shoreline Properties, Inc., appeared before the Board.

Mr. Freeman stated that since their first pre-application meeting, the applicant had incorporated the recommendations made by the Board into their plans. The applicant “added a 40-foot, no-cut buffer to the southerly edge of the parcel” as a way to increase the buffer along this border. A 40-foot, no-cut buffer was also added to the northern border of the property. The applicant had contacted the abutter, Gregory Whitman, to discuss the prospective placement of the roadway into the project area. Mr. Freeman said that Mr. Whitman “doesn’t have any objection”, and provided the Board with a letter written by Mr. Whitman to that effect. The letter was not notarized, but it was signed.

Mr. Freeman said that this was “advantageous”, as it would allow the applicant to use “the road to where it has been previously cleared and graded”. This would serve to preserve some trees and “reduce the impact to the site”. It would also allow them to “salvage” a utility pole, which had been featured on the plan in a different location. They also “compensated for the reduction in open space in that area by providing double the open space required by the ordinance” in the whole development.

Mr. DiOrio wanted more information about the current status of the existing buffer strip abutting the adjacent property owner.

Mr. DiOrio: “Now, what’s going on in that buffer strip? Is it – well, describe it to me. Is it currently vegetated?”

Mr. Freeman: “It’s currently vegetated. It would, as of right now, the existing gravel drive, it goes, it’s, it would be within that ten-foot open space, and then the right-of-way, the gravel drive goes into that right-of-way, as it exists now. It’s mimicking the existing conditions on-site.”

Mr. DiOrio: “And are you proposing any plantings within that thirty-foot strip?”

Mr. Freeman: “It shouldn’t be required – it’s already wooded, but we could definitely add something within, along the edge of that right-of-way to increase the buffer, put in fencing, or what you want.”

Mr. DiOrio: “I’d like to suggest that you consider that. I know this is a pre-application, but that would be my first thought. I appreciate you going to the abutting property owner, and at least discussing this with him. Unfortunately, while it’s great to have a document on-file, this is hardly notarized, a commitment for subsequent property owners, so I still feel somewhat compelled to look out for that person’s interest.”

Mr DiOrio then asked Mr. Lamphere to elaborate on some of the information about the prospective roadway that was provided to the Planning Board about the project. Mr. Freeman explained why the road was proposed for the particular location in question.

Mr. Lamphere: “In the narrative that was provided to the Planning Board, they mention a ‘residential compound, private road’. And so, with this being a cluster design here, they,

if they're proposing to have this road to be in private ownership, rather than Town owned and maintained, it looks like the Planning Board has some latitude to have some relaxed standards in this, but we don't really know what they are. And so, cutting right to the chase in my Memo, I would suggest that when the applicant prepares a Master Plan, and, keep in mind, we're in pre-application stage right now, we're only here to guide the applicant as much as we can. We're not, we're not committing to any particular plan at this point in time, okay? They're going to bring us a Master Plan, because this is a Major Land Development project, right, and at the Master Plan, the Planning Board can tweak it further. I would recommend the Planning Board advise the client to go out and have a peer-review with Crossman, our engineer, in advance of the Master Plan, or maybe in preparing it, and, because, they also mention here they want to change, they're requesting a reduction in the length of grade from 2.5% to something else. So, because of the cutting and filling in here, and even, even if this road is to remain a private road, because of the people who are going to be living there, okay, I think we owe it to them to make sure that this road has adequate drainage, and I think a peer-review is in order here. And, it also could be, potentially, have some impact on a Town road, that it leads to, so I think Crossman should really take a look at this. These folks can go forth and prepare a Master Plan, and then provide that to Crossman to critique, and then come back to the Board at some point in time, but, like I said, the two issues I pointed out in my memo are the open space, which now seems as though they're going to go back to, at least on the northern part there, they're going to go back to the same dimension that they originally came to the Board with last meeting, with the ten-foot, or was it nine-foot, I believe, the last time."

Mr. DiOrio: "No, I don't interpret it that way at all. Is that your proposal?"

Mr. Freeman: "That is what we intend to do, yes."

Mr. DiOrio: "Then we have an issue, because I don't really care what the abutting property owner has to say. Not in terms of accepting ten feet. You're showing me thirty feet right here?"

Mr. Freeman: "Yes."

Mr. DiOrio: "I think that's consistent with our direction last time around. Why are we going backwards?"

Mr. Freeman: "There's a few reasons. So, we, let me bring up another plan."

Mr. DiOrio: "Thank you, Jim. I was not clear on that."

Mr. Freeman: "We did a proposed profile for that road section, and, as you can see, there's some pretty significant cuts within the first four hundred feet of the proposed road, roadway, and that's mostly caused by the fact that we pulled that road twenty feet into the hill. Fairview Avenue is fairly flat, so when we pulled that entry way twenty feet this way, twenty feet southerly, it doesn't affect the beginning of the road, but it affects the first four hundred feet. By pulling it into that hill, it creates some very steep cuts, and going back to what Jim said about the 2.5%, it's required to be 2.5% within one hundred and fifty feet of the centerline of the intersection of the road. So, we're holding two and a half feet for seventy-five feet, instead of one hundred, because otherwise, it would push that whole portion where it's cut deep into that hill, it would pull it even farther into that hill, and then you have a gully, essentially. So, that's one reason we're asking to move it back, only because it, it's working with the land as opposed to against it."

Ms. Light stated that she had visited the property, and asked if rock blasting would be necessary to complete the project. She also said that the existing duplex on the property looked vacant. The applicant responded.

Ms. Light: "I went to the property, and all of this discussion also lends itself to the fact that it looks like they're going to have to be some blasting, or something going on in there? And there's, and that duplex that's there, that's there looks vacant and just questionable. It's not maintained."

Mr. Catelli: "I'm Joe Catelli, the owner. I bought the property, we're renovating that for family."

Ms. Light: "Yeah."

Mr. Catelli: "One of the gentlemen that works for me, eventually, we're gonna sell it to him, you know, and hopefully we're gonna have three, brand new lots, that's all. But that's in the middle of being renovated. We're there all day, working on it. The house was built in the 90s. It wasn't an old house, it's just not maintained, so."

Ms. Light: "So, is the ledge that's all around there, is anything happening to that, or is that...?"

Mr. Freeman: "We're doing test holes tomorrow, so we'll have more information on that, but we're trying to avoid blasting, under all circumstances. I don't believe that we need to, the only concern is if we do hit ledge in the proposed roadway. It may require some additional work."

Ms. Light: "Some additional work, and that also that limits the water, the wells?"

Mr. Freeman: "The wells aren't going to be located in any areas with any extreme cuts or fills, so that shouldn't be an issue."

Ms. Light: "Well, I, you know, optimizing the place you put a well is what we're talking about, we're talking about feeding the properties."

Mr. Freeman: "There are existing wells on-site already. They were installed for the ten-foot yield plan, so they're not, all of them aren't ideally placed. We do have the existing well that you can see here, that services this dwelling, and then there's another well in the actual cul-de-sac that serves the other half of the duplex. So, there are wells on-site, we're repurposing that existing well for the proposed single family, the duplex would be an additional well, actually, but they do have wells on-site."

Mr. Lindelow asked why the applicant was not going with a yield plan for three duplexes, which would allow for more open space, as "ten feet of open space isn't much." Mr. Freeman explained that the current layout of the property was more conducive to the plan that they were proposing than a different configuration.

Ms. Williams, who had not been at the applicant's first pre-application meeting, asked if the topic of low- to moderate-income housing had been discussed in regards to this project. Pursuant to the Hopkinton Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance, paraphrasing Ms. Williams, "six dwelling units kicks in the low- to moderate-income requirements within the Town of Hopkinton." According to Mr. Lamphere, to abide by this ordinance, the applicant would need an additional, seventh unit. Mr. Freeman stated that the yield plan provided for six units, and he was not sure if the area would be able to accommodate an additional unit.

Mr. Freeman: “The yield plan, just to clarify, allows for six units, we wouldn’t be able to, I don’t believe, through the Ordinance, go with seven. I don’t know how that works.”

Ms. Williams: “So, reading our description, it says ‘a four-lot subdivision is classified as a major subdivision, because it consists of six dwelling units.’ Our low- and moderate-income plan is based on the number of dwelling units, and so it was at six, and so, I think that triggers it, if I am correct?”

Mr. Lamphere: “Yes, correct.”

Ms. Williams then stated that, as this was a pre-application meeting, the applicant could spend further time investigating this, and that she wanted to bring this topic to the attention of the applicant, as well as the Board.

Mr. Prellwitz brought up the presence of Native American ritual areas on the property, Goat Rock and Witch Rock.

Mr. Prellwitz: “In the budget narrative, it says ‘that there’s no historic – let me get my glasses – there are no known historic or archeological areas on-site’. Now, you’ve had that researched, or we’re just going by the fact that nobody’s come up and said...?”

Mr. Freeman: “Uh, no.”

Mr. Prellwitz: “I did see, we talked about this last time, I did see that you pulled it back, away from Witch Rock.”

Mr. Freeman: “Correct.”

Mr. Prellwitz: “And as I stated last time, when I started school in the early 50s, Witch Rock and Goat Rock were Native American ritual areas.”

Mr. Freeman: “So, we’ve actually spoken, well, Joe has spoken with both the Conservation as well as the Land Trust. We’re going to provide access to those sites. We won’t be disturbing the area, but, if people wanted to go, to those locations, I believe we were in talks about making that possible.”

Mr. Prellwitz: “Okay, good, thank you.”

Mr. Prellwitz was concerned that the private road would later be converted to a Town road, and wanted assurances that it would be up to the standards of a Town road. Mr. DiOrio stated that notations should be made to the plan that would state that this road would remain private in perpetuity.

Harvey Buford, who had been invited to visit the property, spoke about how there are important natural and cultural features on-site, and that he appreciated that the applicant was electing to use a cluster design, which would provide for ample open space on the property. Barbara Capalbo thanked the Board for “paying attention” to the road design, though she cautioned the applicant and the Board that “some people will use that road, whether they’re supposed or not” to access Witch Rock if another route is not devised. Mr. Prellwitz agreed that this was a valid concern, as parking on Fairview Avenue would be hazardous. Mr. Freeman stated that he had not discussed with the applicant, definitively, if, and how, Witch Rock could be accessed by the public. Ms. Light said that this could “create a liability”. Mr. DiOrio said that it would be left up to the applicant to “figure something out” and choose a course of action.

Development Plan Review – Photovoltaic Solar Energy System – Revity Energy, LLC – AP 7 Lots 62, 62A & 63, 15 Frontier Road. Revity Energy, LLC., applicant.

Attorney Kerin L. Browning, a partner in the law firm of Moses Ryan LTD, located in Providence, appeared on behalf of the applicant, Revity Energy, LLC. The property, located at the corner of Frontier Road and Main Street, is made up on three lots, totaling approximately sixty-four acres. The applicant appeared before the Board previously in November 2019 for a pre-application meeting.

The property is currently zoned “Manufacturing”, and the proposal is to develop the property into a fifteen megawatt solar project. A zone change would not be required for this project. There is a single dwelling unit on the site, which is a rental property. There would not be a change to the residence, and the current tenants are “supportive” of the project. According to Ms. Browning, “the project does meet all other dimensional requirements – zoning and other applicable ordinances.”

Ralph Palumbo, the President of Revity Energy, was in attendance, as was Audie Osgood, from DiPrete Engineers. Edward Pimental served as their zoning, land use, and planning expert, and John Carter, of John C. Carter Landscape Architects, their landscape architect, was also in attendance. Scott Rapideau, their wetlands expert from Natural Resource Services and Nicole Mulaphany from Sage Environmental were also there for the project.

Mr. Osgood stated that there were minor changes made to the Plan since the applicant had last appeared before the Board.

Mr. Osgood: “For those of you who were here before, I just want to start off with a couple of minor changes that have been made to the plan since we were at Pre-App. The solar field on the northern end of the field has been extended to the North by a couple of acres, so there’s a little bit of additional panels that equate to about an additional megawatt of yield, and about an additional two acres of proposed clearing on the site. Otherwise, the plan is pretty much as you saw it in the Pre-Application period.”

There are existing wetlands on the property. A Class One Boundary has been conducted. Most recently, the site in question was used as a golf driving range facility. According to Mr. Osgood, “the bulk of the central portion of the site has been cleared, and was regraded and shaped for that purpose in the past.” Further reworking would be required for this project in question.

Mr. Osgood: “So, there’s quite a lot of rolling terrain out here, that some of which would need to be reworked. We’ve tried to minimize that to the extent that we can, to limit earth work. There would be some, like I said, that the field is primarily located in this cleared area. There is some clearing proposed along the north end, on this portion of the property. That clearing totals approximately 9.8 acres, which is about 15% of the total property.”

The total fenced area for the project would be approximately 37.4 acres, which is about 58% of the overall parcel. An engineering design for storm water management has been submitted to the Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management, but the review of the submission has not yet begun. Two existing storm water control mechanisms, which were installed when the golf operations were still taking place, will be used by the current applicant. They will be maintained as they are.

The interconnection is proposed for the southwestern corner of the site. There will be “a few above ground poles, as we come into the property.” According to Osgood, “those are required to be above ground because of the equipment that’s mounted on those.” Aside from these poles, “after that, all electrical work will be done underground throughout the site.” The applicant is working with National Grid to move existing electric transmission lines and poles that cross the property and abut it on Maxson Hill Road, which would impede the construction of the solar array.

The panels will have a maximum height of twelve feet, with the average height being eight to nine feet. Construction traffic associated with the earth work and installation of the panels would take place, but after the construction of the project has concluded, the only traffic associated with the array would be from maintenance vehicles.

According to Mr. Osgood, there is a “pretty significant grade change” in the center portion of the site, with slopes that average about 20%, which would be too steep to build upon. They plan to regrade the slope to 15%. No water, sewer, or lighting would be proposed on-site. A decommissioning estimate is being drafted, totaling approximately \$190,000, “based on one of the previous projects that we’ve done here in Hopkinton that the Board has approved”, but the applicant would like to know more about how the Town has “advanced with establishing a decommissioning estimate”.

Mr. Prellwitz wanted to know if the project would be using a central bank. Mr. Palumbo responded that the project would be utilizing string inverters.

Ms. Browning stated that National Grid had determined that the project would be feasible, and that they would accept it. She also stated that Rhode Island Historical Preservation had communicated to the applicant that the project would not “have any effect on any historic features or properties.”

Edward Pimental, a consultant for the project who specializes in land use and planning, spoke next. He said that while he was a proponent of solar energy, he recognized that many residents were concerned about zone changes, destruction of the forest, inconsistency with the Comprehensive Plan, and a number of other issues in regards to solar installations throughout Town. He said that solar would be “fully regulatory compliant” and consistent with the Hopkinton Comprehensive Plan.

John Carter, a registered landscape architect, spoke after Mr. Pimental. He walked the entirety of the site to assess the existing vegetation on the property, and found that there

were “a significant number” of six- to ten-foot tall evergreens beginning to grow on the abandoned course, particularly White Pine and Red Cedar.

Mr. Carter: “Part of what we looked at, and my first reaction was, ‘Well, let’s move these things and reuse them.’ It’s kind of a win-win. Instead of bulldozing them down, we get to reuse them, and rather than the developer buying plants from nurseries and bringing them in to do buffering, so that was one of the things I recognized.”

Mr. Carter continued, explaining that while golf courses appear to be “a very bucolic place, green, rolling topography and so forth”, that they are, in fact, a “very intensive land use.” He stated that they “require excessive water, pesticide, fertilizer, mulch, and so forth.” He argued that a solar array would be a “little less” intense land use for the property than a golf course. He then described the surrounding area.

Mr. Carter: “There’s vacant land to the North – that’s undeveloped residential lots. There is one residence directly to the North, and the sort of Northeast corner. And then, on the east side, there’s several residential homes. They’re set, mostly set back, one hundred feet, approximately, from the road, that’s Maxson [Hill] Road, and there’s pretty extensive vegetation. Some White Pines, primarily deciduous. Most of the trees that surround the site are Maples, some Oaks, and White Pines. To the South, there’s an extensive planting, and it’s primarily White Pines, and you can see that in one of the pictures on the next sheet, and they’re pretty significant in size, and so you really can’t see anything into the site looking from the South. So then, we’re asked, ‘What can we do to mitigate the visual impact?’, so, the two places, or three really, that I would see, that would be significant would be what would you see from the ramp, at the on-bound ramp, what would you see from the houses across the street to the East, and then, the third, there’s one resident that we met, I met with the owners, and he and his wife, and talked about what we could do for them.”

Mr. Carter stated that drivers would not be able to see through the plantings on the road right-of-way and the change in topography to see into the site. He explained the current screening provided by existing plants, and that the priority would be to “fill in the gaps” with plants moved from elsewhere on-site. He would also plant along the entrance to the array so the panels would not be seen from the road. He said that the dense stand of White Pines on Frontier would provide a substantial buffer without any changes. He continued to describe the current vegetation on-site and the geography of the area.

Mr. DiOrio was the first to respond to Mr. Carter, and began by stating that he had a “boatload of questions”.

Mr. DiOrio: “So, let me stand back, and give you my objective. I don’t want to see this at all, okay? That’s where I would be focused. So, going through a couple of points that you talked about: from 95, I’m not prepared to give you credit for the fact that the vegetation in the State right-of-way’s going to be maintained. You can’t control that. They could come down and cut it tomorrow. So, you need to buffer on your property, which in my opinion, means you need to pull those panels back. You omitted -”

Mr. Carter: "Can I just ask -"

Mr. DiOrio: "Yup."

Mr. Carter: "You're talking about on the West side?"

Mr. DiOrio: "Yup, yup. You omitted the view from Route 3 in your analysis. So, as I'm on Route 3, I'm almost opposite the billboard, that's on the West side of Route 3, looking at your site. Completely visible."

Mr. DiOrio continued after the area in question was identified on the map for Mr. Carter.

Mr. DiOrio: "So you stand there, and you're looking right at that slope, that someone just said they're going to regrade. It's way up here. So, you need to figure out how to buffer that. And then, at the Southeast corner – I'm sorry if you're making notes – at the Southeast corner, the folks that live at that, generally around that intersection--"

Mr. Carter: "Yup."

Mr. DiOrio: "It seems to be that you're taking credit for the vegetation that's on their property, so, we don't, we're not gonna look at it that way, at least I'm not. We're gonna look at you are required to buffer their visual impact on your property. So, those panels? They have to be pulled back. The idea of using small trees to do your buffering, we made this mistake early on. I applaud your use of natural vegetation, but if you think we're gonna to wait for this to be screened, you might want to reconsider that. So, go ahead and implement your small trees, but we're gonna want to see some full growth trees here, buffering the visual impact, and we're gonna want to see it right away."

He also brought up the impact of shade on solar arrays, his recommended course of action in regards to the aforementioned issues, and the process of establishing decommissioning fees.

Mr. DiOrio: "I do want to mention decommissioning, because the question was asked, but the idea of this whole thing about 'We can't have shade because the panels won't function properly', you're absolutely correct. I get that. You know what the answer is? Pull the panels back. Don't cut the trees. Pull the panels out of the way. And then, with regards to decommissioning, it came up earlier, I just want to touch upon it, while it's on my mind. So, this is the, this is going to be our test case for the decommissioning – I know it doesn't have anything to do with your testimony – so you're going to give us your analysis. We're going to hand it to our peer-review person. They're gonna rip it apart. They're going to give you a new one."

Ms. Browning: "Is that Crossman?"

Mr. DiOrio: "Uh, we might let them start."

Ms. Browning: "Okay."

Mr. DiOrio: "But I'm not convinced that they have the in-house capabilities. That remains to be seen."

Ms. Light echoed Mr. DiOrio's comments about reducing the footprint of the proposed array.

Ms. Light: “You came here with a bigger plan, and making the footprint of the solar project smaller was the opposite of what’s happened here, since November. So, at some point, we’d like you to hear the comments of the Planning Board.”

Ms. Shumchenia also expressed concerns about buffering the project and additional clearing.

Ms. Shumchenia: “In a site that is mostly cleared, I think there’s no excuse for any clearing. I would like to see a plan with no further clearing, when you have so much available space, number one. Number two, I think the buffers, with all of the neighboring property lines, do need to be increased. These panels should be pulled in more towards the center of the property. And, lastly, this one isn’t really your fault at all, but we’re now faced, the Planning Board is faced, with thinking about some of these projects in the terms of the cumulative impacts on the neighborhood and the surrounding area because this particular parcel is very close to two recent zone changes from residential to commercial to accommodate solar farms, so, or, these large solar installations, so the neighbors that we have been talking about, and the abutters that we have been talking about, are now, will be exposed, if your project proceeds to, well, a patchwork of solar developments in their immediate area, and I don’t think we have a great solution yet for how to deal with the impacts on those individuals and those properties, but I just wanted to raise it. I think it’s very important, and if I was a resident in this neighborhood, I would want the Town to consider it.”

Ms. Browning responded to Ms. Shumchenia in regards to clearing on the property.

Ms. Browning: “I hear those concerns, especially as to clearing, it makes sense. We are in conformance with the ordinance, and as you know, the ordinance does speak to both maximum usable area of the lot, and the ability to clear, and we are within those constraints and we have made sure that we are in those constraints, but your, your concern is noted.”

Ms. Browning also noted that the applicant sent a courtesy notice “to be a good neighbor” to five hundred-foot radius abutters, although that was not required “for that very reason”.

Ms. Browning: “We want be a good neighbor, we want to talk to our neighbors, and we want to make sure that their concerns are heard both here, and if they have to speak to us privately as well.”

Mr. DiOrio continued the conversation by asking Mr. Lamphere if he had anything to add. Mr. Lamphere stated that, “the Board does have the authority to kick back these things where they abut residential zones.” They were given this authority in the PSES ordinance. He also reminded the Board that the Development Plan Review ordinance says that “within seven months from the date of the Pre-Application meeting, the Board is supposed to come to a decision on this, so in this particular case here, we’re looking no

later than the June 3rd Planning Board meeting. So, that date is gonna crop up faster than what we think, being March already.”

Ms. Browning read from the Sage Environmental report, which featured information about the transformer fluid and the protective pads.

Ms. Browning: “The transformers will be located on an equipment pad, that includes containment that will be sufficient to contain at least 125% of the fluid found in the transformers. And then, later on, the report concludes, ‘containment system will protect soil from the release of any transformer fluid, should a leak occur.’”

Ms. Browning also stated that the project would conform to the noise ordinance, and that, according to the Sage Environmental report, “there is minimal impact on critical environmental areas.”

Mr. Buford mentioned the aquifer protection area, and asked about the statuses of the wells in the vicinity. He also said that it would be great if there could be an easement to the wetlands on the property. Mr. Prellwitz was also interested in learning about the status of the wells in the area, particularly the well for the campground near the proposed site.

Ms. Mulaphany of Sage Environmental spoke about the water sources in the area and how the prospective solar installation would not impact them.

Ms. Mulaphany: “It is in a wellhead protection area, and it is in a noncommunity well water, however, this site is not going to use any herbicides, solvents, it’s not going to use any fertilizers or anything like that. All of the treatment to any of the grasses, or what has to happen, would be mechanically done. And the oil in the transformers isn’t going to be in a containment system to do it, so there’s no pollution that can happen. There’s no waste generated at the site, so there’s nothing that would impact the well waters in that area.”

Mr. Lamphere asked the applicant provide information about what each solar panel contains.

Mr. Lamphere: “If you recall, last month, there was a solar developer here who claimed that these solar panels contain nothing hazardous to the environment. And, and I would suggest that, in this particular instance here, I’d like to see the applicant specify exactly what product is gonna be used here for a solar panel, because there are different ones. And, I’d also like to have an expert come in, and break that solar panel down into every single component that’s in there, and provide an assessment of what could, potentially, worst case scenario, for rot or rust or whatever, okay, to contaminate. I’d like to know, I’d like to know exactly what type of threat that panel poses to the aquifer.”

Ms. Browning said that the Sage Environmental report included information about “all of the specified equipment used”. Mr. Lamphere continued.

Mr. Lamphere: "I want to know, particularly, I want to take that thing apart and dissect it."

Ms. Browning: "Yeah."

Mr. Lamphere: "Molecule by molecule. I want to know what's in that thing."

Mr. DiOrio asked Ms. Browning to provide an expert who could speak to these components. Ms. Mulaphany responded.

Ms. Mulaphany: "So the panels themselves are encased in glass."

Mr. DiOrio: "Yep, I understand."

Ms. Mulaphany: "And so all of the, like I said, I have heard the concerns that people have brought up, about 'there's metals in there', things of that nature. They're intact, and as long as they're not damaged, all of that material that's in there, it can't escape to the environment. So, if someone comes along with a sledge hammer, and attacks it, then yes, then it could be exposed."

Mr. DiOrio: "It's not, it's not that complicated. Listen, I've been on solar projects myself. I've been, I've stood there, and seen the smashed panels on the ground. Damage happens. It doesn't have to be somebody with a sledge hammer."

Mr. DiOrio wants an expert who the Planning Board can expect to address problems and provide answers, "just like you've done for your storm water, just like you've done for your landscaping." Mr. Prellwitz and Ms. Light both asked for as much information as possible about the panels.

Mr. Palumbo asked Mr. Lamphere who he should hire for this task.

Mr. Lamphere: "Well, first of all, this is sort of similar to the previous application we had before us, where a 'typical roadway section' was there. I've seen many sheets like this before, that could be construed as a 'typical solar panel'. I want a firm commitment – I'm looking for a firm commitment. You can give me a technical bulletin like that, with a 'typical solar panel' in there. I want – I don't want a 'typical solar panel'. I want to know, precisely, what solar panel you're using on here. I'm familiar with a couple of manufacturers, okay, and I want to know, I want to know what's going on that site, and then I want somebody, maybe a manufacturer's representative, maybe a chemical engineer, whatever it takes. I want you to break it down, and, again, I'm pinning you to the wall here, or I'm attempting to, because I want to address the concerns that are out there in the public. Are there, 'cause there seems to be some wild concerns. Either these panels are very harmful to the environment, we have some people in the public now saying, 'You know, you can't even get rid of these things. You have to take them to a special landfill with the nuclear material.' Look, let's put all these things to rest right now. Break it down. A chemist can do it, if you needed a chemist."

Mr. Palumbo: "Yeah, let's do it. I totally agree with you. As I have done with all of my projects, I use the same panel, LG, top of the market. We'll have someone from them, or a chemical engineer, come in and do that. LG has reclamation, they're a Fortune 500 company, and they have, when I buy the panels, it is included that they have a reclamation program. So I buy it, they take it, they dispose of it, so it's not like a lost, lost

art here. There are very few panel manufacturers that do that. So, I get what you want, let's drill down on it. We'll get it, okay."

Mr. Palumbo stated that he did not want the Planning Board to change their decommissioning process, but wanted to make the Board aware that they go through "great lengths to spend money to deal with Tier 1 providers to prevent the atmosphere of distrust or lack of knowledge."

Ms. Light asked for documentation from LG. She stated how helpful a decommissioning expert would be, and Mr. Palumbo agreed.

Eric Bibler of Woodville Road spoke during the time for public comment. He was very concerned about preserving the rural character of the Town. He spoke about the visual impact of the interconnection apparatus on the neighborhood. He was happy to hear that LG has a reclamation program in place. He is also concerned by the decommissioning fees that the Town Council has instituted for other projects.

Patty Debigar, of Maxson Hill Road, also spoke. She spoke, vehemently, against the solar project being proposed. She said that the applicant "just did not understand the way of life, being out here." Mr. Prellwitz responded.

Mr. Prellwitz: "I have something to say. You keep saying that 'we're doing this.' Every advisory, since I've been on the Board, a year and a half, every advisory opinion that we've given to the Town Council has been in your favor. You, as the public. And not you, but other people, come up here and they're giving us a bad time about the Planning Board doing this and doing that. We've been on your side the whole time. You're really trying to make friends, aren't ya? That's all I've got to say."

Sharon Davis, the Town Council liaison, spoke about decommissioning fees, and asked if the trees featured on the landscape drawing would be indicative of the plantings on-site. Mr. DiOrio responded.

Mr. DiOrio: "So, just bear with me for a moment. So, it was alluded to earlier, I may as well tell you. That this, this idea, of the Town Council setting things like decommissioning amounts and buffers and whatever else you think you can do. As of this point, I'm prepared to override that. So, when this applicant comes before us, the one that you just approved, they're going to get a whole different look at decommissioning, and if they don't like it, I'm going to direct them to come back to you, and they can fight about it in your court, because this is just unacceptable."

A woman from Maxson Hill Road spoke about how the last thing she wanted to see in the neighborhood would be more solar panels. She said that she would have supported it, if not for the solar project down the road, which she referred to as a "devastation." Mr. Bibler spoke again about being sensitive to abutters, especially when a zone change has taken place. Ken Braiser, of Maxson Hill Road, said that these projects were "ruining the whole nature of the Town."

Ms. Light spoke about the complexities of decommissioning, and how it was a process that was still being defined. She said that it was an “issue that was bigger than Hopkinton”. Mr. Bibler spoke again, and suggested that a performance bond be used for decommissioning.

Mr. Palumbo stated that he was “willing to collaborate” on the project, to “try to find a path to hire the experts” needed for this insight. He also said that the solar installation should not make noise at night as it will not be in operation without the power of the sun.

Mr. Lamphere stated that this project was one of many coming to the Board in the coming months and years. He said he did not want to see the applicant return on numerous occasions for that very reason. Mr. DiOrio asked what other process would be possible. Mr. Lamphere encouraged the applicant to begin to work with Crossman to peer-review the plans for the project. He suggested that, moving forward, “a project of this nature should be viewed as a Major Land Development project”. He also said that he didn’t want applicants to leave these meetings feeling mystified or without a coherent directive to follow. Mr. Palumbo said that he had was going to develop revisions in response to the comments from the Planning Board and the public. Ms. Williams asked if the Board had determined how far the panels should be pulled back from the edge of the site. Mr. DiOrio asked if, in order to make this determination, a site walk with the landscape architect would be possible. Mr. Palumbo said that would be reasonable.

MR. LINDELOW MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLANNING BOARD REQUIRES PEER REVIEW OF THE PROJECT BY CROSSMAN ENGINEERING, AND MOVED TO A CONTINUATION OF THE PROJECT UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING. MR. PRELLWITZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

IN FAVOR: MR. PRELLWITZ, MR. LINDELOW, MS. WILLIAMS, MS. LIGHT, MR. DIORIO

ABSTAIN: NONE.

OPPOSE: NONE.

MOTION PASSED 5-0.

Preliminary Plan – 3-Lot Minor Subdivision – AP 17, Lot 12, 135 Fairview Avenue. Bruce Brayman, applicant.

Mr. DiOrio recused himself, and provided a recusal form. He had worked on the project for the applicant. Vice Chair Amy Williams served as Chair. Mr. Lamphere provided background about the project.

Mr. Lamphere: “What we have is a proposed 3-lot subdivision, cutting two frontage lots off of Fairview Avenue. The project has come before the Board as a Pre-Application a while ago, and there was no objections stated by the Board at that time on these lots. Pretty simple. The applicant has gone forth and got OWTS permits from the State for two septic systems, and so they’re pretty much fixed where it is right now. Both lots have the

minimum frontage and area required by zoning. Outside of that, there wasn't very many comments at the Pre-App for the applicant. It's a pretty simple subdivision, so I just laid it out in a very simple Memo here to you, that I recommend that the Planning Board approve this Preliminary Plan, and delegate Final Plan review to the Administrative Officer. Don't know really what more there is to say about it."

For the project to move forward, the Board had to state that the seven findings were met.

Ms. Williams: "As Jim has stated, Mr. Brayman has met –it's, it agrees with the Comprehensive Plan, it adheres to the zoning, and so it's done all these thing, and we just have to state that we have found all of these things."

As it was Ms. Williams' last meeting, she was encouraged to read the motion.

MS. WILLIAMS MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLANNING BOARD HAS MADE POSITIVE FINDINGS OF THE FOLLOWING: THAT EACH SUBDIVISION IS CONSISTENT WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE HOPKINTON COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY PLAN, AND SATISFACTORILY ADDRESSES THE ISSUES WHERE THERE MAY BE INCONSISTENCIES, THAT EACH LOT IN THE SUBDIVISION SHALL CONFORM TO THE STANDARDS AND PROVISIONS OF THE HOPKINTON ZONING ORDINANCE, THAT THERE WILL BE NO SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FOR THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AS SHOWN ON THE FINAL PLAN WITH ALL REQUIRED CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL, THAT THE SUBDIVISION, AS PROPOSED, WILL NOT RESULT IN THE CREATION OF INDIVIDUAL LOTS WITH SUCH PHYSICAL CONSTRAINTS TO DEVELOPMENT THAT BUILDING ON THOSE LOTS, ACCORDING TO THE PERTINENT REGULATIONS AND BUILDING STANDARDS WOULD BE IMPRACTICAL, THAT ALL PROPOSED LAND DEVELOPMENTS AND ALL SUBDIVISION LOTS SHALL HAVE ADEQUATE AND PERMANENT LEGAL ACCESS TO A PUBLIC STREET, AND THAT EACH SUBDIVISION SHALL PROVIDE FOR SAFE CIRCULATION OF PEDESTRIAN AND VEHICULAR TRAFFIC, FOR SURFACE WATER RUN-OFF CONTROL, FOR SUITABLE BUILDING SITES, AND FOR PRESERVATION OF NATURAL, HISTORIC, OR CULTURAL FEATURES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO THE ATTRACTIVENESS OF THE COMMUNITY, AND LASTLY, THAT THE DESIGN AND LOCATION OF THE STREETS, BUILDINGS, LOTS, UTILITIES, DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS, AND OTHER IMPROVEMENTS OF EACH SUBDIVISION SHALL MINIMIZE FLOODING AND EROSION.

THEREFORE, THE MOTION WAS MADE THAT THE BOARD APPROVED THE PRELIMINARY PLAN, AND DELEGATE FINAL APPROVAL TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER WAS MADE BY MS. WILLIAMS. IT WAS SECONDED BY MR. PRELLWITZ.

IN FAVOR: MR. PRELLWITZ, MR. LINDELOW, MS. WILLIAMS, MS. LIGHT
ABSTAIN: MR. DIORIO.

OPPOSE: NONE.

MOTION PASSED 4-0.

Carol Klang-Peterson, a direct abutter to the proposed project, spoke before the Board. She wanted to commend the Board for including storm water mitigation in the Plan, but wanted to alert them to the fact that, since she has lived there, she has found that storm water tends to collect on the surface of the land instead of penetrating the earth immediately. This causes the water to pool against her foundation. Ms. Klang-Peterson stated that she “had done a great deal of regrading on our property to take care of than on our lot”, and that she was “very happy to see that drains were associated with the Plan”. She wanted the assurance that the drains featured in the Plan would be “large enough to contain” the storm water run-off from the houses that will be built, and “that they would not have a secondary outlet above the ground.”

SOLICITOR’S REPORT:

None.

PLANNER’S REPORT:

None.

CORRESPONDENCE AND UPDATES:

Mr. Lamphere read a letter from Sandra Boisvert, a Hopkinton resident, addressed to the Planning Board about the testimony provided by Liliana, Ms. Light’s granddaughter, at the previous month’s meeting.

Mr. Lamphere: “Dear Hopkinton Planning Board, I am writing to thank you for allowing Liliana to speak during the public comment section of the Pre-Application section session last night. She has a very valid concern, and was able to present it in a heartfelt manner than adults often struggle with. I believe allowing her this opportunity has played a valuable role in her education, and will play a role in her future endeavors. Therefore, I would appreciate it if you could give her the enclosed note, and want her to know how much her input was appreciated. Sincerely, Sandra Boisvert.”

PUBLIC FORUM:

Mr. Buford spoke about the Narragansett Trail project and the use of GIS in achieving the Land Trust’s objectives. He recommended the use of technical equipment to improve the meetings in Town.

Mr. Lindelow asked if Hopkinton had “reached our max” for solar projects. He wanted to know who the “beneficiaries” would be of these projects. Ms. Davis interjected that the Council views the projects as revenue.

ADJOURNMENT

MR. LINDELOW MADE THE MOTION TO ADJOURN. IT WAS SECONDED BY MR. PRELLWITZ.

IN FAVOR: MR. LINDELOW, MS. WILLIAMS, MR. DIORIO, MS. LIGHT, MR PRELLWITZ

ABSTAIN: NONE.

OPPOSED: NONE.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED 9:48 P.M.

Minutes Recorded by Talia Jalette, Senior Planning Clerk.