

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW MEETING MINUTES – March 17, 2022

State of Rhode Island

County of Washington

In Hopkinton on the seventeenth day of March, 2022 A.D. the said meeting was called to order at 7:07 PM by Zoning Board of Review Chairman Jonathan Ure in the Town Hall Meeting Room with a moment of silent meditation and a salute to the Flag.

PRESENT: Jonathan Ure, Joe York, Daniel Baruti, Ronnie Sposato, Zoning Board Clerk: Tiana Zartman; Building Official Anthony Santilli; Alternate Member Chip Heil was in attendance remotely

Absent: Member Daniel Harrington, Alternate Member Phil Scalise; Town Council

Liaison Michael Geary

Sitting as Board for Petition I: Ure, York, Heil, Baruti, & Sposato

Member Harrington previously recused himself from the application.

Petition I – Determine completeness of application/consider waivers (cont.)

A Petition for a Dimensional Variance to allow a reduction in lot frontage. Petition filed by Nick Mandes on behalf of Clarks Falls, LLC with mailing address of 15 Clarks Falls Rd, North Stonington, CT 06359, for property owned by Clarks Falls, LLC located at 0 Tanner Lane, Ashaway, RI 02804, and identified as AP 5 Lot 57E, an R-1 Zone and filed in accordance with Section 9 of Chapter 134 of the Zoning Ordinances of the Town of Hopkinton, as amended.

Petition II – Determine completeness of application/consider waivers (cont.)

A Petition for a Special Use Permit to allow for a single family residence. Petition filed by Nick Mandes on behalf of Clarks Falls, LLC with mailing address of 15 Clarks Falls Rd, North Stonington, CT 06359, for property owned by Clarks Falls, LLC located at 0 Tanner Lane, Ashaway RI 02804, and identified as AP 5 Lot 57E, an R-1 Zone and filed in accordance with Sections 8C and 10 of Chapter 134 of the Zoning Ordinances of the Town of Hopkinton, as amended.

Applicant or representative present.

Filing fees paid and notice posted.

Discussion.

Decision.

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW MEETING MINUTES – March 17, 2022

Attorney Todd Romano states he represents Clarks Falls LLC and was present with principle member Nicholas Mandes. Attorney Romano requests he explain the project again. He explains the applicant, Clarks Falls LLC has engaged Tony Nenna of On-Site Engineering Inc. to prepare an onsite water treatment system site plan, which had been submitted to the Department of Environmental Management on March 15th. Mr. Romano says the plan includes soil erosion, storm-water control measures, and the contours that are required. He has 11x12 copies of the plan to give to the board, however, they will also submit official copies to the zoning officer. He expects the RIDEM to approve the plan within two to three weeks. The approval will be submitted to the zoning officer, as well. Joe Toscano also prepared a zoning site plan that he has copies to submit to the board. Attorney Romano explains a letter from Ecotones was previously submitted by the applicant to satisfy Checklist Item D which requires a letter from a biologist indicating wetlands on the property. Previously submitted was a survey, satisfying Checklist Item A and an abutter's list and radius map was previously submitted, satisfying Checklist Item B.

Chairman Ure stated the applicant previously asked for a waiver for Checklist Item A and the Board never received a survey map. There was discussion amongst the Board as to what was received previously.

Chairman Ure states there is no site plan on file showing where the proposed structure will be located. The representative submits documents including a boundary survey map, a plan showing the proposed onsite wastewater treatment system, a radius map showing abutters within 200' of the subject property, and the onsite wastewater treatment system construction permit submitted to RIDEM.

There was discussion amongst the Board and Attorney Romano in regards to missing items from the site plan submitted. Chairman Ure explains Checklist Item A requires the distance between the proposed structures and the boundary lines and the submitted site plan does not include those measurements. Attorney Romano explains they are only requesting a

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW MEETING MINUTES – March 17, 2022

dimensional variance in regards to road frontage, but agrees to include the dimensions on the site plan.

Member Baruti asks the representative about the neighbor's driveway on the plan prepared by Mr. Toscano and if it is suggesting encroachment outside of the easement area. Member Baruti asks the representative if that is an issue. Mr. Romano states that it may be, but it would be between Mr. Edwards and Mr. Mandes.

Chairman Ure explains there is a question of the legality of his client using a telecommunications easement and not a driveway for access to the parcel. Attorney Romano states that the right of way was recorded into the land evidence records of the town and the Town Council in 1987 recognized Tanner Lane as a private road for emergency 911 purposes.

Attorney Romano proceeds to explain the history of the lots. Mrs. Tanner previously owned lots 57A, 57B, 57C, 57D, and 57E. The lot 57B is owned by Lupine Land Company. Lot 57D is owned by Mr. Edwards, Lot 57E is owned by Clarks Falls LLC. Mr. Romano could not recall who owns lots 57A and 57C. The first lot to be subdivided was 57B, followed by 57C. The combined lots of D and E were transferred to her son and daughter-in-law sometime in the 1980's. The son, Ralph Tanner, then subdivided the lot into D and E in 1985. Mr. Romano claims that the subdivision was permitted and allowed a landlocked parcel to be created as long as there was an outlot. Chairman Ure asks for clarification on what the definition is of an outlot. Mr. Romano explains that it could be a narrow lot that doesn't conform to standards. Mr. Romano continues to explain the subdivision was allowed if there was a designated mapped street. Mr. Romano says the regulations include a definition for a street that allows for a right of way. Mrs. Tanner had created a right of way going from Tomaquag Road to the southern boundary of lots D and E prior to being split. Mr. Romano says determining the validity of the lot is outside the purview of the Zoning Board of Review.

Member Baruti disagrees with Attorney Romano and explains that the parcel is a unique piece of property with some questions regarding these issues. Member Baruti explains the

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW MEETING MINUTES – March 17, 2022

Board wants to make sure those are clear before the hearing so no one can second guess the timeline. Mr. Baruti explains that emergency services set out and reconfigured the streets and highways for the purposes of ending the duplicity of numbered houses in Ashaway and Hope Valley. Member Sposato says the Town Council had input. Member Baruti states only after the project was complete. Attorney Romano explains all that is required is to provide a deed to Lot 57E as well as the recorded right of way showing access from Tomaquag to the southern boundary of the lot.

Chairman Ure explains that when the application first came before the Board in November, an incorrect deed was referenced. The representative is claiming they do legal access to the lot. Chairman Ure continues to say he wants to ensure they do in fact have legal access because this parcel has unique issues. Attorney Romano explains there is an easement of twenty feet on Mr. Edwards' lot and twenty feet on Clarks Falls LLC's lot.

Member Sposato asks if both lots were created at the same time, how can one lot be buildable while the other is not. Member Baruti states he is only considering the application before the Board now and cannot comment on a decision he did not participate in with regards to Mr. Edwards' property.

Mr. Romano goes through the timeline for the parcel stating on December 31, 1985 the right of way is recorded followed by the deed for Lot 57E, and then the deed for Lot 57D. Member Baruti asks if a house was built on the lot. Mr. Romano believes there was. Mr. Romano then continues to say the deed was conveyed to Mrs. Tanner's son and daughter in law and retained Lot 57E for herself. Member Baruti asks when Mrs. Tanner sell Lot 57E. Mr. Romano explains that it was passed onto her grandson Mr. Whewell.

The Board agrees to go through the checklist and discussion can continue at the hearing stage.

CHECKLIST ITEM A: Three (3) copies of a site prepared by, and signed and stamped by, a professional engineer or professional land surveyor at a scale of no less than one (1) inch = forty (40) feet clearly showing:

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW MEETING MINUTES – March 17, 2022

- Name and address of property owner(s)
- Date, north arrow, graphic scale, lot dimensions and area
- Plat & lot, zoning district(s) and setbacks
- Existing and proposed structures, and their relationship & distances from lot boundary lines
- Existing and proposed parking areas and walkways
- Existing and proposed landscaping, as it relates to the request
- Existing streets, 911 address, wells, septic system
- List of names and address of all property owners within 200 feet of subject property
- Any peculiar site conditions or features

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER YORK AND SECONDED BY MEMBER SPOSATO TO DEEM CHECKLIST ITEM A AS COMPLETE CONTINGENT UPON SUBMITTAL OF THE DISTANCES BETWEEN THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE TO THE BOUNDARY LINES PRIOR TO THE HEARING. ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

SO MOVED

CHECKLIST ITEM B: Three (3) copies of a separate map indicating all property owners within 200 feet of the subject property and/or all those property owners and entities which require notice under Section 45-24-53 R.I.G.L., and depicting a zoning district boundary and uses of all neighboring properties.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER SPOSATO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER YORK TO DEEM CHECKLIST ITEM B COMPLETE. ALL WERE INF AVOR.

SO MOVED

CHECKLIST ITEM C: A soil erosion and stormwater control plan with supporting calculations based on standards approved by the USDA Soil Conservation Service and in conformity with the RI Erosion and Sediment Control Handbook.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER YORK AND SECONDED BY MEMBER SPOSATO TO DEEM CHECKLIST ITEM C AS COMPLETE CONTIGENT UPON

SUBMISSION OF APPROVAL FROM RIDEM TO THE ZONING OFFICIAL. ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

SO MOVED

CHECKLIST ITEM D: A letter from a biologist indicating that there are no freshwater wetlands on or in proximity to the site such that the application is regulated by the RI Freshwater Wetlands Act. In those instances where the application is regulated by the RI Freshwater Wetlands Act, a physical alteration permit issued by the RI Department of Environmental Management, and where applicable, the US Army Corp of Engineers, shall be required.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER YORK AND SECONDED BY MEMBER SPOSATO TO DEEM CHECKLIST ITEM D AS COMPLETE. ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

SO MOVED

CHECKLIST ITEM E: Location of existing septic system. Where construction requires approval by RI DEM – Division of Land Resources for an individual sewage disposal system or change of use permit for the proposed activity, attach a copy to the application.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER YORK AND SECONDED BY MEMBER SPOSATO TO DEEM CHECKLIST ITEM E AS COMPLETE CONTINGENT UPON SUBMITTING THE APPROVAL FROM THE STATE TO THE ZONING OFFICIAL.

Member Baruti clarifies that the approval has to be submitted before the hearing. Chairman Ure explains that even if the Zoning Board completes and approves the application, the applicant cannot receive a building permit without an approved septic plan.

CHAIRMAN URE, MEMBER YORK, MEMBER HEIL, AND MEMBER SPOSATO VOTED IN FAVOR. MEMBER BARUTI OPPOSED. MOTION PASSED.

SO MOVED

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW MEETING MINUTES – March 17, 2022

There was discussion amongst the Board in regards to clarifying the previous motion. Chairman Ure again explains the applicant cannot avoid having an approved septic plan from the state. He says if the plan is not approved by the state, the applicant cannot move forward with the project.

CHECKLIST ITEM F: Traffic Study addressing the potential impacts of the proposed activity.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER SPOSATO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER YORK TO GRANT THE REQUESTED WAIVER FOR CHECKLIST ITEM F.

Member Heil asks the Board to consider requiring the traffic study because of the questions of the right of way. Chairman Ure says that requiring a traffic study for a residential use in a residential zone is irrelevant since it is not mixing a commercial use with a residential zone or causing an influx of traffic. Member Heil states he just wants the Board to consider the potential outcome of waiving the traffic study. Chairman Ure explains that a traffic study will not address the legality of the lot or the homeowners' access rights.

ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

SO MOVED

CHECKLIST ITEM G: On a separate site plan, indicate existing and proposed topography at two (2) foot intervals.

Mr. Romano explains that they request it be waived, but the plan prepared by Mr. Nenna shows topography at a one (1) foot interval. Member Baruti asks if the representative prefers a waiver. Mr. Romano says no.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER SPOSATO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER YORK TO DEEM CHECKLIST ITEM G AS COMPLETE. ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

SO MOVED

CHECKLIST ITEM H: Provide evidence that the proposed water supply has sufficient supply to support the proposed activity and is drinking water quality.

Attorney Romano explains the site will contain a private well as most do in Hopkinton. He states they will ask for a waiver if required, but are asking that it be deemed complete since the site plan includes a proposed well. Members Baruti and Sposato state they prefer to waive the checklist item.

Member Heil suggests that the applicant provide evidence that the surrounding properties have well water according to the RI Department of Health and have that be sufficient. Member Sposato states that with his history of the Board, they have never asked for such documentation. Chairman Ure explains that it is required to drill a well to have a functioning home and to receive a certificate of occupancy.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER SPOSATO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER YORK TO GRANT THE REQUESTED WAIVER FOR CHECKLIST ITEM H. ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

SO MOVED

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER YORK AND SECONDED BY MEMBER SPOSATO TO APPROVE BOTH THE SPECIAL USE PERMIT AND DIMENSIONAL VARIANCE CHECKLIST COMPLETE CONTINGENT UPON PROVIDING A PLAN INCLUDING THE DISTANCE BETWEEN THE LOT BOUNDARIES AND THE PROPOSED STRUCTURES AND SUBJECT TO SUBMITTAL OF APPROVAL BY THE STATE FOR THE PROPOSED SEPTIC PLAN FOR CHECKLIST ITEMS C AND E.

Member Baruti explains he would be more comfortable with a waiver of the septic approval as opposed to a condition in the future. He states that if a waiver is granted for water, then the same logic can be applied to the septic system. Mr. Romano explains that if the applications are granted, it can be conditional based upon the receipt of approvals by the RIDEM if they have not already been obtained.

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW MEETING MINUTES – March 17, 2022

Chairman Ure says they are currently only approving the checklist so the Board can move forward to the hearing portion of the application. He explains the zoning official can't give a certificate of occupancy or a building permit without an approved septic design. Member Baruti states he would just prefer to be consistent on the two issues.

Member Heil explains that he's uncomfortable issuing waivers on a wastewater treatment plan since it has serious implications for the entire project. He would prefer to be more restrictive rather than granting a waiver.

Chairman Ure and Member Sposato agree that this is the way the Board has operated in the past. Chairman Ure states the approval depends on the State and the applicant intends to have an approved septic.

Member Baruti states he just wants to be consistent and have a record that can be reviewed and supported. Member Baruti says there are two issues that are very similar and are approached differently. Chairman Ure states that the Board has, traditionally, moved forward upon approval so they can continue to the hearing. The Board can have the hearing while waiting for approval from the State.

ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

SO MOVED

Mr. Romano asks the Board if there are lingering questions so he can address them at the hearing. Member Baruti admits he is struggling with the creation of the lot. Member Baruti states what Mr. Romano says makes sense, that he has read the right of way and understands how it was created, but he is struggling with the way Mrs. Tanner did it. Mr. Romano agrees that it is difficult to present, but that he doesn't believe it's in the Board's purview since there is a recorded deed for the lot with a recorded easement specifically for passing and repassing.

Member Heil agrees with Member Baruti's concerns, but feels it's not the Board's place to question decisions that were made in the past. He states the Board should let the applicant

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW MEETING MINUTES – March 17, 2022

present their case with evidence as it is now. Attorney Romano states the recorded deed and right of way prevent any further questioning. He says that if somebody else disagrees, then they need to bring forward competent evidence. Member Baruti states he doesn't want to perpetuate something that was done incorrectly in the past. Mr. Romano states he has to adhere to the standards for a dimensional variance and the special use permit, both of which are specific, and the issues are outside of those limitations. Member Baruti disagrees and says it's a fundamental job of the Board to make sure they are satisfied and that it is a legal existing lot.

The hearing will be scheduled for May 19, 2022 at 7:00 pm.

Sitting as Board for Petition III: Ure, York, Heil, Baruti, & Sposato

Petition III – Determine completeness of application/consider waivers

An application for an Aquifer Protection Permit to allow a brewery of beer, wine, and distilled alcoholic beverages within the existing structure. Petition filed by Quinlan Enterprise, with a mailing address of 401 Main Street, Ashaway RI 02804, for property owned by Hopkinton Industrial Park LLC located at 15 Gray Lane, Ashaway, RI 02804, and identified as AP 4 Lot 12, a manufacturing zone and filed in accordance with Appendix A – Zoning District Use Table, Use Category #510, a Primary Protection Zone – “A = Aquifer Protection Permit.”

Applicant or representative present.

Filing fees paid and notice posted.

Discussion.

Decision.

Chairman Ure explains they will go through the checklist and ask questions of the applicant as needed.

CHECKLIST ITEM A: Four (4) copies of a site plan prepared by, and signed and stamped by, a professional engineer or professional land surveyor at a scale of no less than one (1) inch = forty (40) feet clearly showing:

- Name and address of property owner(s)
- Date, north arrow, graphic scale, lot dimensions and area
- Plat & Lot, zoning district(s), and setbacks

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW MEETING MINUTES – March 17, 2022

- Existing and proposed structures and their relationship and distances from lot boundary lines.
- Existing streets, 911 address, wells, septic system.
- List of names and addresses of all property owners within 200 feet of subject property
- Best management practice work-plan where required
- Any peculiar site conditions or features.

Chairman Ure explains that property owners to the west of the subject property, within the 200' radius that are located in North Stonington, Connecticut also need to be notified, as well as the Town Selectman of North Stonington. Chairman Ure clarifies it looks as though three lots in Connecticut need to be notified, Map 112 Lot 261, Map 112 Lot 3613, and Map 4 Lot 5.

Chairman Ure states that a best management work plan needs to be submitted with the application, which explains any hazardous materials that will be stored, the proposed use, and how the materials will be stored. If no hazardous materials are being used, then a statement saying so will have to be submitted.

Jason Quinlan states he can submit that, along with information on the septic system. Member Sposato says a letter from an engineer stating the brewery will not have more employees than what the system is designed for will suffice. Member Sposato states that the provided septic plan has a design flow of 4,950 gallons per day and that food preparation is now allowed per this design flow. Member Sposato says he's not sure if making beer is considered food preparation. Mr. Quinlan states he can ask Mr. Cherenzia for that information.

Member Heil asks if the existing well is sufficient to provide the water needed for the brewery. Chairman Ure tells Member Heil that would be a question for the hearing. Member Sposato thinks the well is considered a public well and the documentation should already be available.

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW MEETING MINUTES – March 17, 2022

Chairman Ure states the addition of the Connecticut abutters is required, along with a copy of the best management practice work plan.

CHECKLIST ITEM B: Four (4) copies of a separate map indicating all property owners within 200' of the subject property and/or all those property owners and entities which require notice under Section 45-24-53 R.I.G.L., also depicting any zoning district boundary and use of all neighboring properties.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER BARUTI AND SECONDED BY MEMBER SPOSATO THAT CHECKLIST ITEM B IS COMPLETE. ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

SO MOVED

CHECKLIST ITEM C: A soil erosion and storm-water control plan with supporting calculations based standards approved by the USDA Soil Conservation Service and in conformity with the RI Erosion and Sediment Control Handbook.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER BARUTI AND SECONDED BY MEMBER SPOSATO TO ACCEPT THE REQUESTED WAIVER FOR CHECKLIST ITEM C.

Member Baruti stated he accepts the waiver under the premise that the proposed activity is not exceeding the current footprint of the building. Chairman Ure agrees and states that the proposed use would be internal and soil erosion won't come into effect.

ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

SO MOVED

CHECKLIST ITEM D: A letter from a biologist indicating that there are no freshwater wetlands on or in proximity to the site such that the application is regulated by the R.I. Freshwater Wetlands Act. In those instances where the application is regulated by the R.I. Freshwater Wetlands Act, a physical alteration permit issued by the R.I. Department of Environmental Management and where applicable, the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers, shall be required.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER BARUTI AND SECONDED BY MEMBER SPOSATO TO GRANT THE REQUESTED WAIVER FOR CHECKLIST ITEM D. ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

SO MOVED

CHECKLIST ITEM E: Location of existing septic system. Where construction requires approval by R.I. DEM-Division of Land Resources for an ISDS (individual sewage disposal system) or change of use permit for the proposed activity, attach a copy to the application.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER YORK AND SECONDED BY MEMBER SPOSATO TO DEEM CHECKLIST ITEM E AS COMPLETE. ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

SO MOVED

CHECKLIST ITEM F: Traffic study addressing the potential impacts of the proposed activity.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER SPOSATO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER YORK TO GRANT THE REQUESTED WAIVER FOR CHECKLIST ITEM F.

Member Heil suggests that the Board consider the fact that breweries often have tastings or tours that might impact traffic in the area. Member York states that the building already has a couple hundred people who work at the facility. Chairman Ure agrees and says that the building is currently zoned as commercial and the building itself has a massive parking lot. Chairman Ure states since the proposed use will be in an appropriate zone, traffic does not seem applicable since it doesn't seem to have issues currently. Chairman Ure asks for clarification from the representative if it will be just for manufacturing of alcohol or if it will be more of a restaurant and provide seating. Mr. Quinlan states it would just be for manufacturing of alcohol.

ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

SO MOVED

CHECKLIST ITEM G: On a separate site plan, indicate existing and proposed topography at two (2) foot intervals.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER SPOSATO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER YORK TO GRANT THE REQUESTED WAIVER FOR CHECKLIST ITEM G. ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

SO MOVED

CHECKLIST ITEM H: Provide evidence that the proposed water supply has sufficient supply to support the proposed activity and is of drinking water quality.

Member Sposato asks if there was a waiver requested for the checklist item. Chairman Ure asks the applicant if anything was provided for information on the well. Mr. Quinlan stating there was nothing provided.

Member Sposato states the existing well has already been approved by the State and is considered a public well per the Health Department and doesn't see a need for more information. Member Heil states he is uncomfortable with waiving the requirement because of the change of use. Member Sposato disagrees and states it isn't a use change. Member Heil clarifies and states that the system might have supported the previous use, but because he doesn't know what's required for the new use and what the output of the well is, he would like documentation. Chairman Ure states that the checklist item is requesting sufficient supply and even if some Board members are aware of the history of the property, the checklist asks for evidence.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER BARUTI AND SECONDED BY MEMBER YORK TO CONSIDER CHECKLIST ITEM H COMPLETE CONTINGENT UPON SUBMITTAL OF DOCUMENTATION SHOWING THAT THE CURRENT WATER SUPPLY IS SUFFICIENT FOR THE PROPOSED USE AND IS OF DRINKING WATER QUALITY.

Chairman Ure suggests to the applicant to provide a letter from an engineer showing the volume of the well or a certificate of approval from RI DEM. He explains it's usually a simple document showing how many gallons are used, how many gallons will be going into the septic, the capacity of the well. He says the Board can use this information to determine the proposed use will be compatible with the existing system.

ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

SO MOVED

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER BARUTI AND SECONDED BY MEMBER YORK TO DEEM THE AQUIFER PROTECTION PERMIT COMPLETE CONTINGENT UPON THE ADDITION OF THE CONNECTICUT PROPERTY OWNERS BEING ADDED TO THE ABUTTER LIST, NOTIFICATION OF SAID CONNECTICUT PROPERTY OWNERS AND THE TOWN OF NORTH STONINGTON, THE SUBMITTAL OF A BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES WORKPLAN, AND PROOF THAT THE WELL HAS ADEQUATE SUPPLY TO SUPPORT THE PROPOSED ACTIVITY AND SYSTEM SUITABILITY.

Member Sposato states that a letter from Sergio Cherenzia stating the proposed use will not impact the septic system as designed will also suffice.

ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

SO MOVED

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER YORK AND SECONDED BY MEMBER BARUTI TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES FROM THE FEBRUARY 17, 2022 ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW MEETING.

CHAIRMAN URE, MEMBER YORK, MEMBER BARUTI, AND MEMBER SPOSATO APPROVED.

MEMBER HEIL ABSTAINED.

MOTION PASSED.

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW MEETING MINUTES – March 17, 2022

SO MOVED

A discussion was had amongst the Board in regards determining the validity of a lot. Mr. Vaage advises the Board to contact him individually with advice on how an application should be handled, but the current setting is not the appropriate place for such a discussion.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER SPOSATO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER YORK TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:07 PM. ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

SO MOVED

Respectfully Submitted,
Tiana Zartman
Zoning Board Clerk

Next Scheduled Meeting: May 19, 2022