

## **HOPKINTON PLANNING BOARD HYBRID MEETING**

**JUNE 14<sup>th</sup>, 2023 at 7:00 PM**

### **MOMENT OF SILENT MEDITATION AND SALUTE TO THE FLAG**

Chairman Prellwitz led the Planning Board and those in attendance in the Pledge of Allegiance.

### **CALL TO ORDER:**

Chairman Prellwitz called the meeting to order at approximately 7:03 PM

### **ROLL CALL:**

Chairman Prellwitz, Mr. DiOrio, Ms. Shumchenia, Mr. Lindelow, Ms. Light, Mr. Wayles and Ms. Bolek all present. Planner Jalette, Solicitor Hogan and Mr. Spellman all in attendance.

### **PRE-ROLL FOR JULY 5<sup>th</sup>, 2023 PLANNING BOARD MEETING:**

Chairman Prellwitz, Ms. Light, Mr. DiOrio, Mr. Lindelow, and Alternates Mr. Wayles and Ms. Bolek will all be in attendance. Ms. Shumchenia advised she would be unavailable.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Planner Jalette explained to the Planning Board that while the February 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2022 Regular Planning Board Meeting minutes were approved at the May 4<sup>th</sup>, 2022 Regular Planning Board Meeting, (after an extension to complete and file the minutes per RIGL 42-46-7(b)(1), had been granted) the footer on page 1 incorrectly read, "Hopkinton Planning Board- February 5<sup>th</sup>, 2022 Regular Meeting". The minutes have been corrected and revised to correct this discrepancy exclusively.

Ms. Shumchenia made a motion to amend the minutes as discussed. Her motion was seconded by Ms. Light. Chairman Prellwitz, Ms. Shumchenia, Ms. Light, Mr. Prellwitz, Mr. DiOrio and Mr. Lindelow all voted to approve the motion. There were no votes in opposition or abstentions.

### **OLD BUSINESS:**

Setting of Workshop Date- Preliminary Plan- Public Hearing- **BRUSHY BROOK** – 140-Unit Comprehensive Permit- Plat 32, Lots 1, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 21, 23, 25, 27, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 41, 42, 44, 46, 48, 50, 52, 54, 56, 58, 60, 62, 63, 65, 67, 68, 69, 70, and 71, located at 130 and 0 Dye Hill Road, 0 Brushy Brook Drive, 0 wedge Road, 0 Green Lane. LR-6-A Owner, LLC., and Realty Financial Partners, applicants.

Planner Jalette advised the Planning Board she sought to set a date for this exercise so the Planning

Board could discuss this matter at hand. Mr. DiOrio wanted to clarify that the Public Hearing had not been closed. Discussion then began as to availability of the Planning Board members to achieve this meeting. Solicitor Hogan discussed moving the regular meeting from July 5<sup>th</sup>. Planner Jalette advised she could research the availability of the meeting room. Attorney Landry discussed his availability and suggested July 12<sup>th</sup>, 2023 as a suitable date as he had other clients. It was determined to seek to move the meeting from July 5<sup>th</sup>, 2023 to July 12<sup>th</sup>, 2023. Consensus of the Board was the 12<sup>th</sup>. The second meeting was also discussed to hear the findings. July 24<sup>th</sup> was discussed. A consensus of the Board was to move that meeting to July 24<sup>th</sup>, 2023 to render a decision.

Ms. Shumchenia moved to set a Workshop date for the Brush Brook Public Hearing to July 12<sup>th</sup>, 2023 at 7 PM at Hopkinton Town Hall, and set a decision date of July 24<sup>th</sup>, 2023. Her motion was seconded by Ms. Light. Chairman Prellwitz, Mr. DiOrio, Mr. Lindelow, Ms. Shumchenia and Ms. Light all voted to approve this. There were no votes in opposition or abstentions.

Mr. DiOrio queried as to when the Planning Board was closing the Public Hearing. He was concerned that this couldn't be done at a Workshop. He wanted to see that the matter be placed as an agenda item. Solicitor Hogan stated the word Workshop was procedural in nature. She advised it would be posted as a meeting, minutes would be acquired and the matter be clarified and discussion made amongst the Planning Board members. Tonight they simply seek to set the meetings into the future. The Planning Board will be reviewing the voluminous files of this proposal. Planner Jalette discussed how to make this more user friendly and permissions to access information on the town sites given. Transcripts in particular need to be reviewed and items accessed digitally and online.

Ms. Shumchenia then made a motion to move the regular meeting from July 5<sup>th</sup>, 2023 to July 12<sup>th</sup>, 2023 at 7 PM at Hopkinton Town Hall. Ms. Light seconded this motion. Chairman Prellwitz, Mr. DiOrio, Ms. Light, Mr. Lindelow and Ms. Shumchenia all voted to approve this motion. There were no votes in opposition or abstentions.

This concluded the night's actions on the matter.

Workshop- Master Plan- Public Informational Meeting- Major Land Development Project- **Skunk Hill Road Solar**- Plat 18, Lots 8, 13, and 14, 0 Arcadia road, 0 Lisa Lane, and 145 Skunk Hill Road. Skunk Hill Road Solar, LLC., applicant.

Solicitor Hogan wanted to ensure all Planning Board members had received a memorandum she had forwarded. She advised that this document she had referenced was sent to both Mr. Craven and Mr. Ryan's office. This was a summary she had made of nearly 700 pages of transcripts to assist the Planning Board. That she had condensed the data in them to 13 pages. Discussion was made that the documents provided from the Planner had security conditions that made them difficult for the Planning Board members to access. Planner Jalette advised she could provide a flash drive so as to access the documents. Solicitor Hogan also stated she could provide a list of exhibits to the Board electronically.

Mr. DiOrio stated he wanted to make a suggestion and set an objective for the Boards review that evening. He wanted to review the exhibits and review expert testimony, he had at this point not reviewed all the information provided. He wanted to ascertain the level of comfort other Board members had with discussion after only partial review of the matter. Mr. DiOrio wanted to know a due date for the Board for its decision on the matter. Solicitor Hogan stated the “point” of this night was review and discussion of this “massive” record (just of testimony). She also referenced a significant number of exhibits. Ms. Shumchenia said she appreciated the “cataloging” that was provided and the spreadsheet. It provided all of the elements of the record and made everything easy to find. She was confused by what appears to be multiple versions of files. The 2021 version of the Master Plan she was concerned may no longer be relevant. She wanted a most current version provided. Ms. Light concurred with her assessment. Planner Jalette advised due to the platform utilized by town government, it may limit what can be given out, and protected so as to not compromise what can be literally provided.

Ms. Shumchenia stated she has taken time to review all of the documents and that she is familiar with the documents in question. This so she believed that we can collectively highlight or at least identify what are going to be sticking points for the Planning Board to discuss. Planner Jalette advised that she wanted to note that the file and record is still “evolving” as she reviews still a significant amount of information. She is doing all she can to avoid missing anything. Chairman Prellwitz asked where exactly was the direction the Board could go, so that, in discussion, they could target individual member’s concerns. Mr. Wayles discussed how he wanted to review just how the zoning change had occurred, and how that decision was handed to the Planning Board. He wanted to look at that process thoroughly. This he articulated allowed a good staging point for review. Ms. Light discussed that no one has really addressed how decommissioning of this field will be handled. Solicitor Hogan wanted to indicate that the decommissioning could be handled at another later stage of review.

Mr. DiOrio wanted to discuss what constituted the concept of “significant environmental impact”. He wanted to know what constituted or qualified for that category. Some of the items discussed were not, he stated, candidates for a discussion of a significant negative environmental impact. He believed these impacts needed to be defined and he believed the applicant needed to be availed the opportunity to discuss mitigative strategies. Planner Jalette advised a member of the public sought to give input. Solicitor Hogan advised this portion of the meeting was for Board discussion only. Ms. Bolek felt the Crossman Engineering peer review would lead to the ability to address this. She referenced specifically his (Mr. Cabral’s) discussion of addressing the Northern Long Eared bat and also as to the tilling of the soil on a solar array. She felt this was a good source of data to draw from, and defined the concept of significant well. Mr. Wayles felt this was a good source as mitigative strategies are discussed, and he specifically referenced the Board could require that step. Mr. DiOrio wanted to know how the Board looked at the word “no” in significant environmental impacts. Mr. DiOrio believed this was a significant hurdle for the applicant to move. He stated that it was a “big rock to move”. Chairman Prellwitz discussed the testimony of Mr. Tremblay specific to the Northern long eared bat and felt this was very worthy of review on that issue as it is a protected species.

Mr. Wayles stated he too wanted to look at all testimony of “no significant negative impact’. He wanted to focus there. Chairman Prellwitz concurred. As to the long ear bats, are they really there, and Chairman Prellwitz gave an analogy of a Sasquatch also being a potential. Mr. Wayles said he did not want to dig too deeply into the “what if”. The Board, he felt, sought definitive data in and from, the testimony. Mr. DiOrio asked again as to the Board’s standing on this question of no significant environmental impact. Solicitor Hogan stated they should focus on and define exactly what is or could be a significant negative environmental impact. She suggested that the Planning Board list them and then discuss them one by one. To define what is an impact and has it or can it be mitigated. She focused on surface water run-off and drainage issues among other matters as relation to soil erosion and this project. This being done to flesh out the facts and enable discussion. In what she described to Board members as a “grid format”. Ms. Light again brought up the long ear bat and what was the status on this property. Ms. Shumchenia then discussed the concept as to habitat. Chairman Prellwitz discussed the testimony that they (the bats) are in Jamestown Rhode Island and this location is outside the maximum flight radius. Ms. Shumchenia felt the restrictions on the cutting schedule is sufficient to protect the habitat and she would be supportive of this as a condition. Ms. Shumchenia referenced the testimony of Mr. Cabral of Crossman Engineering on the subject.

Ms. Shumchenia stated an impact that has been on her mind has been the hydrology on the site. This is impactful and her area of concern was specifically to the concern of water run-off and drainage. She had concerns and saw the recent site visit to another site in a nearby town as concerning. These concerns led her to conclude that the Planning Board should have to have at least contemplated, or this issue needed to have increased review. She was particularly concerned as to the impact as to the density of solar panels on site. Ms. Light affirmed and agreed with Ms. Shumchenia’s point. Chairman Prellwitz stated he thought Ms. Shumchenia had made a very good point. Mr. Wayles also brought this concern forward, and wanted to see it discussed further. Mr. Wayles sought the review of drainage flow from the site, and likely need to develop strategies to protect the abutters from negative impacts. Discussion was made as to issues with site drainage and density and as to if or will or could a bond be required to protect abutters. This was a point made by Mr. Wayles and affirmed by other Board members. Mr. DiOrio asked if this could be achieved by simply reducing the density of the panels on site. Ms. Shumchenia reiterated that storm water management and water drainage management of the project site should be a continued point of emphasis. Ms. Shumchenia continued her concern for soil erosion on site and discussed impervious surfaces and site drainage from the panels. She was concerned that a “pervious surface could be made impervious at this site”.

Mr. Wayles was concerned as to who was going to manage Goat Rock. Solicitor Hogan said that was an issue that could be put off to later. She did not see that matter as something that would impact immediate decision making. Ms. Shumchenia wanted to entertain the thought of Mr. DiOrio that the density of panels presented too much risk. Would the Planning Board have to provide a plan? Solicitor Hogan advised that definitive evidence would have to be forwarded clearly affirming the opinion. She advised that significant research in the record should be made. Mr. DiOrio wanted to opine that the

Brushy Brook decision “although x as to approval y here”, was very “meticulous” in its fact finding and a possible point of reference. Mr. DiOrio qualified that point with if the Board wanted to entertain that line of thinking. Ms. Shumchenia wanted to look at previous plans where there were far less density of panels as she recalled. Mr. Wayles discussed reviewing the Comprehensive Plan and to its impact on this proposal. Solicitor Hogan discussed the land use map plan, and changes be it the comprehensive plan and, or in the zoning ordinance. The change she indicated was to the future land use map. This was all referenced in the Town Council’s zoning change. Typically when there is a zone change and the land use map is changed, Solicitor Hogan found it unusual, and she was “surprised”, that they had opined on a specific application. This impacted the implementation of this zone change. Mr. DiOrio indicated while some doors are closed, that some of the elements that the town council based their decision on no longer exist. He asked if this gave the Planning Board latitude. This specifically is to the opportunity as to potential town tax revenue. That tenet is he believed now due to State legislation recently, is completely gone. Solicitor Hogan then clarified as to the zoning change made by a previous Town Council. Mr. DiOrio stated that now that the Planning Board has to “live” with the decisions made, and is the groundwork now “faulty” due to its age and changes now existing? Does the Planning Board have the latitude to say that things have changed since this decision? Attorney Hogan advised that this could certainly be raised in the Planning Board decision. They can reference that there has been a substantial change in circumstances. This from the time the Council voted on this matter to where the town finds itself today. Ms. Light referred that the solar project reduced energy dependence, and referenced again decommissioning. Solicitor Hogan stated this was a scenario the town can address later. She discussed changes from preliminary to final stages of development. Chairman Prellwitz discussed reading the transcript of the decision and how the court had ruled. Ms. Light discussed terms of revenue for the town of Hopkinton. Ms. Light opined that the Town Manager should insert himself and renegotiate the deal for more favorable terms for Hopkinton. She discussed Revity as a situation the town can draw comparison to. There was affirmed a point of no public comment by Solicitor Hogan after a party wanted to speak from the audience in attendance.

Ms. Shumchenia referenced a confidential memorandum that was provided to the Planning Board by Solicitor Hogan. The memo recounted the positive findings the previous Town Council had made when they made the zone change. Specific language was utilized when they made the zone change. Although the Planning Board could not overrule or reverse the decision but did not have to include them either or incorporate them into the Planning Board decision. She discussed chapter 266 of the Hopkinton Ordinances, and the Solicitor had further discussed previous RFR80 findings of facts and possible verbiage this current Planning Board could use. Mr. Wayles discussed the matter further and indicated he felt that type verbiage may not be needed and they did not have to address this, and they did not have to say if they agreed with or disagreed with the previous Town Council’s actions. They should just review for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Light felt the language had to be carefully crafted due to the threat of litigation. Ms. Light advised she agreed with all points being made. Ms. Bolek felt this was all good points being made, and they fit together. Solicitor Hogan discussed the steps undertaken by the Town Council with regard to this matter. Ms. Bolek called for due diligence and

dotting of i and crossing of t efforts.

Ms. Bolek stated in the memorandum there was discussion of the soil and that this needs to be considered closely, as it went to the comprehensive plan. She felt density of the panels was a significant issue. Ms. Shumchenia echoed some concerns Ms. Bolek had had as to the cutting of trees on the property. Ms. Shumchenia believed this merited far more discussion. With no ordinance in town to preserve trees it is difficult to address these type matters. Ms. Light discussed a discussion she had had with Mr. Tefft that the trees “are coming down” as part of this discussion. Solicitor Hogan said much of the status of the land in question was in documentation in the application package, and all was in the testimony and acreage is discussed for review. Discussion is then made as to the land in question and its status in the application package for Board member review. Solicitor Hogan advised data is available as to how much of the property is forested and what the plans for deforestation were, basically all the elements of the land are there. Mr. DiOrio cautioned that verbiage discussed could be subject to interpretation. The applicant could also leave more land uncleared as well. That Mr. DiOrio stated is in their purview. Ms. Shumchenia wanted to review closely the Town Council changes and what was designed at that time as opposed to now. Solicitor Hogan stated that generation and interconnectivity has been set. Ms. Shumchenia stated a more efficient panel could take up less space as well. Chairman Prellwitz indicated that if you argue to reduce density you will have to back your concerns with facts. Mr. DiOrio wanted to focus on the big picture as to if this is the project for this site. The Planning Board is being cautioned not to turn a deaf ear to the community. Mr. DiOrio wondered if another project proposal and layout could necessitate a far different community response. The Planning Board could take on a negotiation role for Hopkinton. Ms. Shumchenia was concerned that ship may have sailed and they are reviewing what is the proposal at this point. Ms. Light said the governmental incentives make this line of thought all about the revenue.

Solicitor Hogan interjected and encouraged the Board to discuss the issue of unfragmented forest. She stated she knows the Board has been given the argument that you cannot cut unfragmented forest. Ms. Light was concerned that due to it being private property this did not apply. Ms. Shumchenia believed with a “large cutting” a permit is required. Mr. DiOrio believed the state had to take the cutting into its thinking, and that a “permitting process does not constitute a prohibition.” Solicitor Hogan stated that agencies have policies they seek to implement and achieve. She believes the legislature is reviewing a law that prohibits the utilities from developing into unfragmented forest for solar. This is under review it is not law not to at this point. If Hopkinton feels this land needs to be preserved you acquire funds and the town buys it. Ms. Bolek was concerned undergrowth if not managed exacerbates a fire risk at the forest level. Mr. Lindelow was concerned with economic considerations as much as the environmental impacts. He was concerned that the economic impacts on property values could not be part of the findings. He felt economic impact should be given the same latitude as environmental ones. The zoning devalue of property is not possible due to the Town Council ruling. Mr. Lindelow was concerned as to the length of the testimony given, and its having no bearing on the Planning Board ruling.

Chairman Prellwitz cautioned the Board that what is in testimony is under constant review. Mr. DiOrio was concerned the Planning Board was being corralled into a bad situation. The Planning Board had to deal with a previous Town Council decision and try to get the best outcome for Hopkinton. Ms. Light was worried there were no positive findings as to this project being under review. What concerned Ms. Light who advised being candid, she saw this as a "train wreck" no matter what course of action that they took. Ms. Shumchenia felt that some of the findings she could (referencing 5.3) after review, she could contort herself, and find yes, but she did not feel this was the best product for this site. She felt that for many other issues it was an unequivocal no. She felt a "no" was appropriate but this was not in the Planning Boards purview. Mr. DiOrio felt no matter what they did this was going "upstate". He indicated that this Planning Board had a job to do and a duty to perform. He discussed options the applicant could have to make the plan more palatable after joint negotiation. Together making a path forward for a more easy yes.

Solicitor Hogan spoke to the Planning Board and said to address the questions on hand and focus on 3.5 and the subsections of it, and collectively road mark toward decision making. Focus on what complies and areas that need to be addressed, especially "no significant environmental impacts". What are they/ Are they negative? Have they been mitigated? These are all areas where the Planning Board should focus. Surface water run-off control, safe circulation on the property for vehicular and pedestrian traffic, Solicitor Hogan sought for the Planning Board to focus on checklist items such as traffic flow on the property and was expressing her concerns. Here she sought for the Planning Board to focus on the decision making roadmap in the regulations. Does it have adequate access to a public street? Preservation of cultural features? Mr. DiOrio concurred and sought to discuss the circulation of vehicular and pedestrian traffic. He travels it regularly and he had concerns. He found this an innocuous use of property but it still has to be built. He pondered what was the durational impact of the construction for this project on country roads.

Ms. Light spoke directly the impact of Goat Rock and long term impacts to the property. Solicitor Hogan referenced the testimony previously of Mr. Schroeder. She believed he testified that this could be completed in one year and there was no construction on the weekends. Use of the road was she believed taken into account. Mr. DiOrio stated it (construction traffic impacts) has been impactful in other locations in town and he is concerned for this one. He stated this is going to be a "busy thing". In the Town Council decision Solicitor Hogan noted, it was discussed that the access would come off of Skunk Hill Road. This is a topic that is likely going to be fleshed out later. Mr. DiOrio was concerned that at this point, what exactly is the direction the board should pursue. Solicitor Hogan stated you are deferring much of the concerns discussed to the next stage of review. Ms. Shumchenia discussed when this would be addressed if it's deferred and would it make or break the project later on. Discussion was made then as to the traffic on site, and impacts anticipated and when at a later stage for discussion. Mr. DiOrio was concerned do you state yes or no now. Planner Jalette then interjected, and stated you can deny at any time, but was not speaking to this project specifically. Mr. DiOrio reminded that a developer depends heavily on the actions of a Planning Board. Solicitor Hogan reiterated that this is not a point of

focus now, but will be at the stage of review that comes next and is made a point of emphasis for the applicant to understand. When you file your preliminary plan address the topic. Mr. Wayles then discussed decommissioning of the solar array. Solicitor Hogan again discussed the 20 point checklist.

Mr. DiOrio then sought a point of clarification as to if mitigating environmental issues had the same meaning as “no” impacts that he saw in regulations. Solicitor Hogan said the phrase goes together. It’s “no significant negative environmental impacts”, that she stated is the point of emphasis. Solicitor Hogan indicated that what is on the Master Plan phase checklist may not be required at the preliminary plan. This is why we have three stages of review she indicated. Mr. Wayles indicated he had some of the same concerns and confusion as to roles and phases that Mr. DiOrio does. He saw 3.5.3 as of concern to him, and will be deferred to final, “it has to be”. Mr. DiOrio was concerned they were kicking a can down the road for issues to be discussed reference environmental impacts with the applicant. Are they obliged to advise the applicant ahead of that stage of review as to their concerns? Mr. DiOrio stated that due to the situation the Planning Board found itself in he felt as though he was being squeezed into saying yes. Ms. Shumchenia then indicated that she believed if they documented what the concerns were for significant environmental impacts they would have to be addressed now, and through the other stages of review to follow. These concerns would have to be addressed and reversed at final. Solicitor Hogan asked what was the goal? Not yes or no but that they mitigated and addressed all the concerns in the process. Evaluate it piece by piece she stated. She stated people have property rights and if they comply with regulations a right to develop their property.

Ms. Bolek commented on safe passage of traffic, and asked specifically what was the ability to secure and demand a bond be present. She was concerned as to the impact of this proposal during its construction on the community roadways. She discussed ponding on the roads several times as a result of trenching. Solicitor Hogan stated that damage to property can make the developer and his construction assets liable. If in the record you believe this to be an issue you can flesh out your concern and call for it to be done. Mr. DiOrio asked if you could rely on your individual experience, and Solicitor Hogan indicated you could, however you could not simply state “I know this won’t work” without giving reasons. One must give specifics. Mr. DiOrio concurred and stated you must have a record and documented files to do this. Chairman Prellwitz concurred and said you can’t spitball a project. Chairman Prellwitz discussed was this in place during the projects construction or after. Mr. DiOrio said the point was well taken but the concerns appeared to be during construction. Discussion then went to if there would be concerns with parking proximal to Goat Rock. Would parking be available for access to the property for people to view it. This was a consideration for this project many of the members of the Board referred to. Chairman Prellwitz said this was another tentacle on the octopus and not something he thought sought often. Ms. Light stated that up until this project this location was never discussed. Ultimately disposition of the property will be an issue decided between the Narragansett tribe and the Land Trust.

Discussion was made by Chairman Prellwitz as to needs for Police traffic control on site as the construction moves forward. Both Solicitor Hogan and Mr. DiOrio discussed this was not a different



need than other large scale sites in town. Mr. Wayles concurred. Mr. DiOrio believed the Planning Board had drilled down areas of concern for discussion and review. Solicitor Hogan indicated a significant amount of information was there for review. She suggested that more progress needs to be made and she may need to see the Board review and do a deep dive and have another meeting of this type. This will allow the Planning Board to come to a definitive decision or at least a consensus.

Mr. DiOrio wanted an example of what they would seek to accomplish at a next meeting. Mr. Lindelow stated an affirming argument has been made, but he wants to review the opposing arguments more closely. Ms. Light discussed the 20 additions need to be incorporated into this decision the Planning Board is about to make. Solicitor Hogan discussed this document and encouraged its review. Mr. DiOrio asked specifically as to visibility in the Town Council ruling, and asked it to be defined and enquired if it could be altered by this Planning Board. Solicitor Hogan stated that she saw this ruling as a floor, and saw no reason that it could not add a more stringent condition. Mr. DiOrio concurred this was the minimum. He saw this as a philosophical approach that would assuage many abutting property owners concerns. Solicitor Hogan advise that in findings of facts indicate that multiple people spoke on multiple topics and this needs to be carefully reviewed before implemented. She recommended going through the voluminous transcripts for conditions the applicant had already agreed to.

Chairman Prellwitz advised all should review the packets provided. Mr. DiOrio asked what was the window to the next meeting. Discussion was then made as to Board members availability to meet. Dates were also discussed for meetings and reflective associated decision dates. Chairman Prellwitz cautioned against delays and not putting a time crunch on the Board. Mr. Wayles pointed out the availability of Attorneys had to be taken into consideration. The decision was made to meet on July 19<sup>th</sup>, 2023 regarding this application. The Board stated they would meet both on July 12<sup>th</sup>, and July 19<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Shumchenia moved that they would continue this meeting for Skunk Hill with no public input until July 19<sup>th</sup>, 2023. Her motion was seconded by Ms. Light. Mr. DiOrio, Mr. Lindelow, Chairman Prellwitz and Ms. Shumchenia all voted to approve the motion there were no votes in opposition or abstentions.

## **NEW BUSINESS:**

None

## **SOLICITOR'S REPORT:**

Nothing to report

## **PLANNER'S REPORT:**

Nothing to report

**CORRESPONDENCE AND UPDATES:**

No Correspondence and updates

**PUBLIC FORUM:**

No Public Forum during this format

**DATE OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING:**

July 12<sup>th</sup>, 2023 at 7 PM

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Ms. Shumchenia made the motion to adjourn that was seconded by Ms. Light. Mr. DiOrio, Mr. Lindelow, Chairman Prellwitz and Ms. Shumchenia all voted to adjourn. There were no opposing votes or abstentions.

Meeting adjourned at 9:51 PM

Michael Spellman

Senior Planning Clerk

