

Hopkinton Planning Board
Minutes
February 16, 2010

Vice Chairman Timothy Britain opened the Hopkinton Planning Board meeting of Tuesday, February 16, 2010, beginning at 7:15 PM in Hopkinton Town Hall. Members present: Jane Bradstreet, Edwin Taylor and James O'Brien. Members absent: Chairman Bruce Ellsworth, Celeste Hemingson, Bethann McCarthy, Michael Wilkey, Cettie Connolly and Clarke Kidder.

I. Review Minutes and Notice of Decision of December 8, 2009 and January 12 and 26, 2010.

Review of the Minutes and Notices of Decision was deferred to the March 16, 2010 meeting.

II. Application(s):

#2009-13 New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC on behalf of AT & T Mobility, Inc. - Jonathan McNeal of SAI Communications addressed the Board to request Site Plan Review and modification of a Conditional Use Permit pursuant to Section 3.10 (Personal Wireless Service Facilities) of the Hopkinton Zoning Ordinance. Applicant proposes to replace three (3) existing antennae with six (6) antennae on array, extending from the frame of the tower, and the installation of an additional 5' x 7' concrete pad at the base of the tower to accommodate additional radio equipment. The existing three-carrier, 90-foot telecommunications tower was approved by the Planning Board on April 15, 2003. The monopine is owned by Eastern Properties; however, the property is owned by Thomas Komisarek and is located at 67 Farrington Corner Road in the R-3 district, Tax Map 257, Lot 12. This is a continuation of the January 12, 2010 hearing.

Mr. McNeal provided a brief overview of the project, explaining that AT&T proposes to replace the existing three (3) antennae with six (6) antennae at the 87-foot level of the existing tower. The purpose of the replacement is to provide additional service to their customers.

Mrs. Robertson noted that throughout the Board's review of the application there were three issues that were to be addressed by the Applicant. Item one, a decrease in the distance of the proposed antennae from the monopine, which has been done and shown on the revised plans. Item two, a structural analysis indicating whether or not the existing monopine could support the additional antennae. The structural analysis had been provided to the Board following their November meeting. The analysis confirmed that the monopine is adequate to support the additional antennae. Lastly, the Planning Board requested that the Selectmen reach out to the owner of the monopine requesting the replacement of the missing branches. It was noted that Planning Board at their April 15, 2003 meeting approved the monopine with the condition that the owner maintain the camouflaging techniques of the monopine, so to reduce the aesthetic impact of the facility. In response, Mr. McNeal noted that AT&T discussed the matter with the tower owner, ETS. The result is that AT&T and the tower owner have come to an agreement on facilitating the repairs to the monopine. AT&T has agreed to replace the fallen limbs on the monopine so as to restore the appearance of the monopine to the condition when it was built. The repairs will be performed during the construction of the modifications to the AT&T installation. Mr. McNeal had provided the Planning Board and Selectmen with a letter confirming AT&T's intentions.

There was no public testimony.

Mrs. Bradstreet, seconded by Mr. Taylor, moved to approve application #2009-13 as presented with the same conditions as imposed on the tower owner and AT&T on April 15, 2003. Motion carried unanimously.

III. Adjournment.

With no other business to come before the Board, Vice Chairman Britain declared the meeting adjourned at 7:25 PM. The next regular scheduled meeting of the Planning Board is Tuesday, March 16, 2010, at 7:00 PM in the Town Hall.

Karen L. Robertson
Planning Director

In accordance with RSA 677:15, any person(s) aggrieved by any decision of the Board concerning application(s) may present to the Superior Court a petition, duly verified, setting forth that such a decision is illegal or unreasonable in whole or part and specifying the grounds upon which the same is claimed to be illegal or unreasonable. Such petition shall be presented to the court within thirty (30) days after the Board's final decision regarding the application in question has been filed and becomes available for public inspection in the Planning Office.