

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW, SITTING AS THE BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING  
MINUTES – October 21, 2021

State of Rhode Island

County of Washington

In Hopkinton on the twenty-first day of October, 2021 A.D. the said meeting was called to order by Zoning Board of Review Chairman Jonathan Ure at 7:09 P.M. in the Town Hall Meeting Room.

PRESENT: Jonathan Ure, Ronnie Sposato, Joe York, Daniel Harrington, Daniel Baruti, Alternate Chip Heil, Solicitor Per Vaage of Gidley, Sarli, & Marusak LLP  
Zoning Board Clerk: Tiana Zartman

Absent: Alternate Member Phil Scalise; Town Council Liaison Michael Geary

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

(Member Daniel Baruti recused himself for Petition I)

Petition I

A petition filed on an appeal of the decision of the Hopkinton Planning Board filed by Revity Energy LLC appealing two of the conditions set by the Planning Board granting the development plan for photovoltaic solar energy system located at 15 Frontier Road and identified as AP 7, Lots 62, 62A, and 63, filed by Revity Energy LLC in accordance with R.I.G.L. 45-23-67, as amended.

Applicant or representative present.

Presentation of parties' positions

Board deliberations.

Decision.

---

\*\*\*\*A Stenographer was present.\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*A transcript will be filed as part of this record.\*\*\*\*\*

---

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW, SITTING AS THE BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING  
MINUTES – October 21, 2021

Chairman Ure asks if the applicant was in attendance. He summarizes that the testimony had been nearly concluded and asks if either side wishes to add anything to the record. Attorney Maggie Hogan for the Planning Board and Attorney Nick Nybo for Revity Energy LLC both state they have nothing further to add. Chairman Ure asks if any members of the public wish to speak. No one comes forward.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER SPOSATO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER HARRINGTON TO CLOSE THE HEARING. ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

SO MOVED

Chairman Ure explains that the Board will deliberate and gather findings of fact. He clarifies that there are two issues to address: Whether or not the Planning Board made an error of law imposing condition number five which relates to the vegetative buffer on Maxson Hill Road and on condition number twenty-six which relates to the allowed hours of operation. The Board of Appeals must decide, under general laws, planning regulations, zoning ordinance, including the DPR ordinance, and section 13.5 of the general code, if the Planning Board has authority to impose these conditions. Chairman Ure clarifies that the Board of Appeals should not change the judgment. They are only to ensure the Planning Board made their decision appropriately. Attorney Vaage continues to clarify that the Board of Appeals cannot substitute judgement for the Planning Board, but must ensure that the decision of the Planning Board rested on legally competent evidence. They must evaluate the position based on the presented evidence. In this particular case, the Board of Appeals will determine if the Planning Board had authority to impose the two conditions.

Chairman Ure begins stating some findings of fact. The subject property is located at 15 Frontier Road, Assessor Plat 7, Lots 62, 62A, and 63. The applicant, Revity Energy LLC, filed for Development Plan Review (DPR) before the Planning Board seeking to construct 11.3 megawatt direct current photovoltaic solar energy system (PSES) on the subject property. The property is zoned Industrial and a PSES is a

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW, SITTING AS THE BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING  
MINUTES – October 21, 2021

permitted use. There was no zone change required in connection with this project. The areas to the east and southeast of the subject property on Maxson Hill Road are zoned RFR-80 which is a residential zone. Revity Energy LLC's DPR application came before the Planning Board for pre-application on November 6, 2019 and for DPR on March 4, 2020, June 3, 2020, July 1, 2020, July 15, 2020, August 5, 2020, September 2, 2020, and October 7, 2020. On October 7, 2020, after the Planning Board approved the applicants plan, it was subject to twenty-six conditions. The applicant is challenging two of the conditions on the basis that the Planning Board lacked the authority to impose them. Condition number five is being challenged as it relates to the existing vegetation in the 100 feet setback along Maxson Hill Road will remain in place and be supplemented with additional evergreen trees that have a minimum height of six feet at the time of planting as set forth in the approved landscaping plan.

Chairman Ure continues with condition number twenty-six that states all site work shall be performed Monday through Friday between the hours of 8:00 am through 5:00 pm EST.

The zoning ordinance addressing dimensional regulation requires that when a commercial or manufacturing property abuts a residential zone, district boundary, the side and rear yard setback area abutting the residential boundary shall also be maintained in a vegetative condition. This is found in the Hopkinton Zoning Ordinance in Section 6, Footnote 2.

The PSES ordinance in effect at the time of the DPR and applicable to this project contains a section entitled PSES Design Guidelines. The PSES Ordinance, which was adopted on January 22, 2019, under Section C, Subsection 1 titled Land Clearing and Environmental Cultural Impact consists of five paragraphs. All PSES shall be constructed and operate in a manner that minimizes any adverse visual, safety, and environmental impacts. The design of the PSES shall use materials, colors, textures, screening, and landscaping that will blend the facility into the

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW, SITTING AS THE BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING  
MINUTES – October 21, 2021

natural setting and existing environment. The proposed PSES shall be designed and will be constructed so that the ground leveling is limited to those areas needed for effective solar energy collection and so that the natural ground contour is preserved to the greatest extent practical. In instances where a parcel is rezoned from residential to a commercial or manufacturing use for the purpose of accommodating a PSES, existing soil conditions shall be maintained to the maximum extent practicable. No blasting will be conducted on the parcel in conjunction with any activity related to the construction of a PSES, including land preparation.

In instances where a parcel is rezoned from RFR-80 to a commercial or manufacturing use for the purposes of accommodating a PSES, clearing of any existing vegetation on the subject parcel for the purpose of constructing, operating, and maintaining a PSES shall be limited to a maximum of 40% of the total area of the parcel. Clearing of any existing vegetation within the front, rear, and side-yard setback area is prohibited, unless explicitly approved by the Planning Board. The PSES and equipment shall not have a significant adverse effect or impact upon soils or water resources or quality of other natural resources of the surrounding area.

Under Section 15A of the Zoning Ordinance requires DPR for all permitted uses except single family and two-family homes along with their accessory uses. Section 15A requires DPR shall only be based on the specific and objective guidelines set forth in the DPR Ordinance Section 13.5 of the Town Code.

Under Section 13.5 of the Town Code, Item 75 is the Developmental Plan Review General Criteria and Standards. The introduction to that section states that the following guidelines and standards include the design review guidelines contained in the Town of Hopkinton and Land Subdivision Regulations are to be used by the Planning Board in judging applications for Developmental Plan Review. The design standards set forth in this section shall serve as the minimum requirements for approval of a developmental plan application. In all instances, the burden of proof that all design standards have been met shall be on the applicant. The burden of

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW, SITTING AS THE BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING  
MINUTES – October 21, 2021

proof shall include the production of evidence necessary to complete the application.

In that section, Item C is titled Ecological Considerations. That section states that the development, insofar as practical, shall result in minimal degradation of unique or irreplaceable land types and in minimum adverse impact on the critical areas such as streams, wetlands, areas of the aquifer recharge and discharge, steep slopes, highly erodible soils, areas with a high water table, mature stands of vegetation, and extraordinary wildlife nesting, feeding, or breeding grounds.

In the same section, Item D is titled Landscape. The landscape shall be preserved in its natural state insofar as practicable by minimizing tree removal. Chairman Ure explains the rest of the section doesn't seem quite applicable to this appeal.

Item G entitled Soil Erosion and Stormwater Control and subsection number two states: The development shall be so oriented to the site so that grading and other site preparation is kept to an absolute minimum. Construction and other development plans calling for cutting and filling or stripping of vegetation may not be approved by the Planning Board if it is determined that the proposed land use could be supported with less alteration of the natural terrain and vegetation.

Subsection six under the same Item G states: The development proposals shall strive for maximum retention of the natural features and qualities of the site, and development shall seek to enlarge these features and qualities.

In the Code of Ordinances, Section 13.5, Item 76 titled Planning Board Review/Decision, Item A states that in reviewing the development plan, the planning board shall take into consideration the public health, safety, and general welfare, the comfort and convenience of the public in general, and of the residents of the immediate neighborhood in particular, and shall set any appropriate conditions and safeguards in harmony with the general purpose and intent of all

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW, SITTING AS THE BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING  
MINUTES – October 21, 2021

local regulations, and according to the general criteria and standards set forth herein. Some of the improvements that the planning board may approve as conditions include, but are not limited to, the following: Subsection 7 states “Screening, fences, walls, landscaped areas, planting strips, and other landscaping treatment that will enhance and buffer the premises and ensure compatibility with surrounding uses. Acceptable vegetation is outlined in the Town of Hopkinton Land Development and Subdivision Regulations Design Review Guidelines.” Subsection 9 of the same item 76 states “Mitigation of negative impacts as deemed necessary and appropriate in accordance with all federal, state, and local regulations.”

Member Harrington discusses the required setback of a residential zone. He notes that the Planning Board went through great detail and mentions there are 15-20 pages of notes from August 5, 2020 that addresses the landscape and buffering in that zone. Member Harrington states that the chairman of the Planning Board, Mr. DiOrio stated they did not want to see any of the construction from the road and should not be just screened by a stockade fence. It should be include layering of vegetation. Member Harrington states he assumes the appellant had satisfied the Planning Board with the presented plans. They are appealing this item which is the setback to the residential zone, but the intent of the ordinance is to protect the residential zones. Member Harrington says there is solid evidence in the minutes and that one of the points of emphasis is to protect the visual impacts of the neighbors, the town, and the community.

Chairman Ure explains the two paragraphs he read into the record under Section C of the PSES. In those paragraphs, it includes interchangeable language that talks about if there was a required zone change in both paragraphs. Chairman Ure states that if someone wanted to look at it in a favorable way for something they were doing, they would cherry pick certain items in those paragraphs. Chairman Ure says throughout both of the paragraphs, the zone change is interchangeable with the whole discussion. Chairman Ure reads the paragraph again to highlight the verbiage. “In instances where a parcel is rezoned from residential to a commercial

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW, SITTING AS THE BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING  
MINUTES – October 21, 2021

or manufacturing use for purpose of accommodating a PSES, existing soil conditions will be maintained as maximum extent practicable.” In the second paragraph, it states clearing of any existing vegetation within the front, rear, and side yard setback areas is prohibited unless explicitly approved by the Planning Board. Chairman Ure explains that the second paragraph includes language about a zone change from RFR-80 to a commercial or manufacturing use. In this case, the parcel is in an industrial zone and did not require a zone change. Chairman Ure explains that this part of the ordinance uses language that interchanges and overlaps. He states that for someone to pull that particular language out to say this parcel didn’t require a zone change is to use the ordinance incorrectly. Chairman Ure goes on to say that other parts of the paragraph state no blasting will be conducted on any part of the parcel in conjunction with any activity related to the construction of the PSES including all land operation. Chairman Ure explains that one thought process is if there was a zone change, blasting would not be allowed, but would be allowed if there was no zone change. Chairman Ure states that the clear intent of the ordinance is to prohibit any blasting to be done on a PSES. The contours of the landscape should be maintained, which is addressed in the Development Plan Review guidelines and included in the Town Code. Chairman Ure explains that the zone change is interchangeable with the standard terminology and cannot be cherry picked out of the paragraphs. It is all encompassing.

Member Heil discusses that any vegetative changes in the buffer had to be explicitly approved by the Planning Board. Member Heil says that the issue was to the request the selective cutting of some of the taller trees, however, at the time of the decision by the Planning Board, the appellant was unable to say which trees would be cut. Member Heil explains it was based on models they had made that allowed for maximum capture of sunlight. Member Heil states that the Planning Board was given information that they deemed insufficient and in the determination, did not approve the excessive clearing. Chairman Ure states that this issue is covered under Section C of the PSES and overlaps with the Town Code Section 13.5, Items 75 and 76. Chairman Ure explains those particular sections talk

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW, SITTING AS THE BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING  
MINUTES – October 21, 2021

about the minimum degradation to the unique and irreplaceable land types, preserving natural resources in the natural state insofar as practicable by minimizing tree removal. Chairman Ure mentions the Soil Erosion and Stormwater Control Plan which talks about minimizing the impact and minimizing the stripping of the vegetation and mature growth. He states it's all intertwined throughout the codes and regulations of the Town that the intent is to minimize the impact of the system. The intent is not to maximize the overlay for a solar project – it's to work in harmony to get the best outcome. Chairman Ure explains the intent is not to cripple the project, but it also must protect the natural features of the community.

Member Heil explains he pointed out the portion that mentioned the vegetation in the PSES because the Board of Appeals is assessing if the Planning Board acted within the constraints of the ordinance. Member Heil suggests that the wording in the PSES document states the Planning Board had the authority. He goes on to say that the Planning Board could have granted additional clearing in the buffer if they deemed it suitable or appropriate based on the proposal by the developer. Member Heil states that the Planning Board had decided not to grant clearing in the buffer area. He explains that the wording in the ordinance gave the Planning Board authority to make that decision. He says the same intent was implied through several of the Town's ordinances and regulations, but the goal of the Board of Appeals is to find wording that indicates the Planning Board has the right to make that decision. Member Heil states that particular wording enforces the authority of the Planning Board to make that determination.

Solicitor Vaage reminds the Board of the arguments on the first condition regarding the brush. Attorney Vaage suggests the Board's responsibility is to decide if the first sentence regarding the zoning change applies to the entire paragraph or, as the Planning Board argued, if that's not a reasonable way to read that ordinance. Attorney Vaage summarizes in asking if the first sentence controls the rest of the paragraph and whether or not the rest of the paragraph is restricted to zone change situations. He goes on to ask whether or not it was a reasonable interpretation by the

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW, SITTING AS THE BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING  
MINUTES – October 21, 2021

Planning Board. Solicitor Vaage asked Attorney Hogan and Attorney Nybo to correct him if he was wrong. Attorney Nybo says he stated the arguments well.

Member Heil clarifies that he thinks the wording gives the Planning Board authority to decide if additional clearing was warranted in that buffer.

Chairman Ure states that the perceived problem is with the second paragraph in that section of the ordinance. He explains the ordinance cannot be cherry picked to prohibit blasting in an RFR-80 zone only or to not worry about air quality or soil in certain circumstances. Chairman Ure says it just happens to be the first sentence of the paragraph in specifying those certain criteria. The rest of the paragraph applies to the whole PSES. Chairman Ure thinks that's how the Planning Board read the ordinance and would be how he understood it.

Member York thinks the first sentence of that ordinance explains it all in that all PSES shall be constructed and operate in a manner that minimizes any adverse visual, safety, and environmental impacts. Member York emphasizes the ordinance states "all" and not just rezoned projects.

Member Heil clarifies Member York's point that the intent of the ordinance, regardless of zone change, is to protect buffers and protect landscapes to the greatest extent possible. Chairman Ure states they are looking at the ordinance from a planning view to see how they would read it and ask whether or not they would cherry pick from the ordinance and select sentences the apply or don't apply. Chairman Ure says these would have subsections or bullet points to pull that out and would not be encompassed in two paragraphs.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER YORK AND SECONDED BY MEMBER HEIL TO ACCEPT THOSE FINDINGS AND DELIBERATIONS AS THE FINDINGS OF FACT. ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

SO MOVED

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW, SITTING AS THE BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING  
MINUTES – October 21, 2021

Chairman Ure reminds the board of the other condition that is being appealed which is all site work shall be performed Monday through Friday between the hours of 8:00 am through 5:00 pm EST. Chairman Ure states the applicable ordinance is in the Hopkinton Town Ordinance in Sections 13.5, Items 75 and 76. Under Item 76, subsection A, it states that the Planning Board shall set any appropriate conditions and safeguards in harmony with the general purpose and intent of all local regulations, and according to the general criteria and standards set forth herein. Chairman Ure reads item 9 under that section which states mitigation of negative impacts as deemed necessary and appropriate in accordance with all federal, state, and local regulations. Chairman Ure states that item is very general and broad. He mentions the Zoning Board has made similar conditions and has implemented time constraints on certain activities or projects. He asks if, under the ordinances, guidelines, PSES that he has read, does the Board feel that the Planning Board would look at those and make a determination that the limiting of the hours of operation would protect the harmony of the community? Homes are located nearby on Maxson Hill Road and Frontier Road and would have to listen to the construction of the project, which could take a couple of years. Chairman Ure mentions he is subjected to noise from projects that have tractor trailer trucks hauling gravel and he lives miles away. He states that these homes are considerably closer to the project and asks that, if the project is allowed to happen from early in the morning until late at night seven days a week, when will the residents get peace? He thinks the last section applies since it encompasses the federal, state, and local regulations. He states one of the local regulations would be the sound ordinances or zoning ordinances. He asks at what point does a project become a nuisance. He states this project is not yet a nuisance, but constraint can prevent it from becoming a nuisance. He thinks that's where the Planning Board was coming from.

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW, SITTING AS THE BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING  
MINUTES – October 21, 2021

Attorney Vaage clarifies that Chairman Ure stated “hours of operation” but the actual constraint was for the site work construction and insulation of the solar panels.

Member Heil says one of the ordinances that was brought up mentioned the consideration of health. He states when considering health, it should encompass psychological, mental, and emotional health and wellbeing. He continues saying that a long-term project like this one without restriction allows for continuous activity and can significantly affect ones health. He says there was consideration of that within the regulations mentioned.

Member Sposato asks if the request was just for Saturday work. Chairman Ure states that the appeal was for all hours of site work. Member Sposato asks if the appellant just wanted to work on Saturdays. Chairman Ure states they are appealing the condition of site work being contained to Monday through Friday through the hours of 8:00 am through 5:00 pm EST. There are no weekend hours allowed. Chairman Ure explains it is not the Board’s duty to decide if they should allow more hours. The Board is deciding if the Planning Board has the ability to make that condition. Chairman Ure states that the appellant can go back to the Planning Board to say the conditions are too restrictive and request leniency.

Member Harrington asks if anyone read in the minutes from previous projects that have been developed if there were issues and that is the reason why the hours were imposed. Member Sposato states he could not find any discussion at all, or at least, very little discussion. Chairman Ure states they had some discussion and it can be found in the transcript. Chairman Ure says he thinks Joe Moreau had brought it up and another resident or Planning Board member had also brought it up. He explains that the Zoning Board does have a background in land use and some members have been members for a long time. Members are aware of what some of the positives and negatives of the approved applications can be. Chairman Ure assumes that the Planning Board also knows these, as they have handled several of these applications

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW, SITTING AS THE BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING  
MINUTES – October 21, 2021

and have heard feedback from the community as to the negatives. Chairman Ure thinks that's where the site work constraints have come from in order to keep the overall health and wellbeing of the community in control. Chairman Ure states he doesn't think the Planning Board is trying to hamstring the appellant, but instead find a delicate balance with both in mind.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER HARRINGTON AND SECONDED BY MEMBER YORK TO ACCEPT THOSE FINDINGS AND DELIBERATIONS AS FINDINGS OF FACT. ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

SO MOVED

Chairman Ure states he would like to have a discussion in regards to the solicitor's opinion on interpreting the DPR. Chairman Ure asks if it's the job of the Planning Board or the solicitor to interpret planning regulations and/or the DPR. Chairman Ure clarifies that the solicitor of the Zoning Board can make a recommendation following the letter of the law, but the Board can choose not to use his recommendation at their own detriment. Member Sposato disagrees stating that the Board has the ability to go with their own opinion and not agree with the solicitor. Chairman Ure agrees and states that if the solicitors make the decision to how the Board rules, there is no point in having a board. He explains that the boards make decision based on the backgrounds and expertise and the solicitors are there to keep the Board out of legal trouble. Chairman Ure states it's ultimately the Planning Board's decision on how they interpret the DPR and not the solicitor. Member York agrees. Member Sposato agrees and states that it doesn't necessarily make the board correct and the mistakes are their own if it gets challenged in a court of law and they lose. Chairman Ure states it happens quite frequently whether it's the Town Council, Zoning Boards, or other boards of commission. It can get appealed and overturned when it gets to the state level. He thinks the solicitor is there to offer an opinion, but is not there to make a decision. Chairman Ure explains that the record made it seem that the Planning Board and solicitors were going back to the Town solicitor to see if they could do something and that didn't seem appropriate.

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW, SITTING AS THE BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING  
MINUTES – October 21, 2021

Chairman Ure says there's nothing wrong with asking them, but that it's not the solicitor's decision. Member Sposato states that in some cases, and not necessarily this case, that solicitors get too involved and the Board should be doing their jobs. Member Heil clarifies that the Planning Board, in interpreting some of these ordinances, were within their authority to do so. Chairman Ure affirms. Member Sposato clarifies that even if they weren't within their authority, it's still their decision to make, whether it be right or wrong. Member Heil asks if the point is that they're within their right to interpret these and that they may interpret the ordinances wrong. Member Sposato affirms. Member Heil clarifies that the solicitors are there to guide the members, but the members were within their authority to interpret the regulations. Chairman Ure states that it is their duty, as well as the members of the Zoning Board. Member Sposato states it's not if they personally believe the Planning Board did their jobs correctly or not, it's based on the facts provided. Chairman Ure agrees and states they did not sit through the six to seven months of testimony. Member Sposato explains it's a narrow task to see if the Planning Board ruled the way the Town ordinance and regulations read.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER HARRINGTON AND SECONDED BY MEMBER YORK TO ADD THAT DELIBERATION AS A FINDING OF FACT. ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

SO MOVED

The Board discusses how to word the decision and how the decision should be handled. Attorney Vaage clarifies that the options are to uphold the decision or to reverse/remand the decision based on the findings of fact. Chairman Ure suggests breaking the decision into two pieces since the Board could feel differently about each.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER YORK AND SECONDED BY MEMBER HARRINGTON TO UPHOLD DECISION MADE BY THE

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW, SITTING AS THE BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING  
MINUTES – October 21, 2021

PLANNING BOARD'S DECISION IN REGARDS TO CONDITION NUMBER FIVE. ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

SO MOVED

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER YORK AND SECONDED BY MEMBER HARRINGTON TO UPHOLD THE DECISION MADE BY THE PLANNING BOARD IN REGARDS TO CONDITION NUMBER TWENTY-SIX. ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

SO MOVED

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER HARRINGTON AND SECONDED BY MEMBER HEIL TO BREAK FOR A TEN MINUTE RECESS. ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

SO MOVED

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER HARRINGTON AND SECONDED BY MEMBER YORK TO RECONVENE THE MEETING AT 8:05 PM. ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

SO MOVED

Sitting as Board for Petition II: Ure, Sposato, York, Harrington, Baruti

Petition II

A petition filed by Peter F. Skwirz, Esq. on behalf of Tom & Cynthia Sculco on an appeal of the decision of the Hopkinton Planning Board; appealing the decision of the Planning Board granting the approval of the master plan application submitted by RI-95, LLC for a large scale photovoltaic solar energy system located on property identified on the Hopkinton Tax Assessor's Map as Plat 11, Lot 47A; addressed as 0 Palmer Circle, Hope Valley, RI 02832 in accordance with R.I.G.L. 45-23-67, as amended. Appeal is made subsequent to the former R.I.G.L reference and Article XV of the Hopkinton Subdivision Regulations.

---

\*\*\*\*A Stenographer was present.\*\*\*\*

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW, SITTING AS THE BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING  
MINUTES – October 21, 2021

\*\*\*\*\*A transcript will be filed as part of this record.\*\*\*\*\*

---

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER HARRINGTON AND SECONDED BY MEMBER YORK TO BREAK FOR A FIVE MINUTE RECESS. ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

SO MOVED

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER HARRINGTON AND SECONDED BY MEMBER YORK TO RECONVENE THE MEETING AT 9:55 PM. ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

SO MOVED

There was discussion amongst the board whether to extend the meeting until 10:30 PM or continue the matter to the next scheduled meeting. Attorney Landry, representing the owner of RI-95 LLC, states his memo was longer than the memos produced by Attorney Skwirz and Attorney Hogan. He is not sure if his argument could be heard within that time frame.

Chairman Ure asks if any members of the public would like to make any comments that could be made within the time that is left. Amanda Blau asks for clarification on where the documents could be found and looked at. Chairman Ure explains all materials are available at the Town Hall during their business hours. Joe Moreau of Old Depot Road speaks about the parcel and the meetings he had attended in regards to this project.

There was discussion between the members of the board and attorneys to decide when the next meeting should be held.

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW, SITTING AS THE BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING  
MINUTES – October 21, 2021

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER SPOSATO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER HARRINGTON TO CONTINUE THE HEARING TO THE DECEMBER 16, 2021 MEETING. ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

SO MOVED

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER YORK AND SECONDED BY MEMBER HARRINGTON TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JULY 15, 2021 BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING. CHAIRMAN URE, MEMBER HARRINGTON, MEMBER YORK, MEMBER SPOSATO, AND ALTERNATE MEMBER HEIL WERE IN FAVOR. MEMBER BARUTI ABSTAINED FROM VOTING. MOTION PASSED.

SO MOVED

A MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER SPOSATO AND SECONDED BY MEMBER YORK TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 10:12 PM. ALL WERE IN FAVOR.

SO MOVED

Respectfully Submitted,  
Tiana Zartman  
Zoning Board Clerk

Next Scheduled Meeting: December 16, 2021