

2 **TOWN OF HOPKINTON**
4 **PLANNING BOARD**

6 **Wednesday, December 6, 2017**
7 **7:00 P.M.**

8 **Hopkinton Town Hall**
9 **One Town House Road, Hopkinton, Rhode Island 02833**

10 **CALL TO ORDER:**

11 The December 6, 2017 meeting of the Hopkinton Planning Board was called to order at 7:00
12 P.M. by Chairman Al DiOrio.

14 **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

15 Al DiOrio, Amy Williams, and Tom Holberton were present.

16 Also present were: James Lamphere, Town Planner; Kevin McAllister, Town Solicitor; and
18 Sean Henry, Planning Board Clerk.

20 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

21 MS. WILLIAMS MOVED TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 1, 2017 PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

22 MR. HOLBERTON SECONDED THE MOTION.

23 MR. DIORIO, MS. WILLIAMS, AND MR. HOLBERTON APPROVED. MOTION PASSES.

24 **OLD BUSINESS:**

25 None

28 **NEW BUSINESS:**

29 PY 17-18 CDBG Residential Housing Rehabilitation Program - Review activity for consistency
30 with Hopkinton's Comprehensive Plan.

31 Mr. Lamphere introduced the activities that the Town proposed to receive CDBG funding for
32 during PY 17-18, which this year was limited to housing rehabilitation funds. Geoff Marchant,
33 the Town's CDBG Administrator, proposed an amount of \$75,000 for the program. The
34 Planning Board is needed to certify that the CDBG activity does not conflict with the Town's
35 Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Williams noted that the rehabilitation activity should be added as
36 a goal to the Plan to help low and moderate income residents.

37 HAVING REVIEWED THE PROPOSED ACTIVITY, MR. HOLBERTON MOVED THAT THE PLANNING
38 BOARD CERTIFY THAT THE ACTIVITY DOES NOT CONFLICT WITH THE POLICIES SET FORTH IN THE
39 HOPKINTON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN. MS. WILLIAMS ADDED THAT THE ACTIVITY FURTHERS THE
40 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN GOALS H-2 AND H-3.

41 MR. DIORIO SECONDED THE MOTION.

42 MR. DIORIO, MS. WILLIAMS, AND MR. HOLBERTON APPROVED. MOTION PASSES.
44

2 Major Land Development – **Pre-application meeting** – Telecommunications Tower – AP 16
4 Lot 38 – 346 Spring Street – Industrial Tower and Wireless, LLC, applicant.

6 Attorney Nicholas Gorham was presenting for the applicant. John Champ, Kevin Delaney,
8 and Rick Fosey were also present for Industrial Tower and Wireless. Mr. Gorham began by
10 stating that the project had already gone before the Zoning Board for a special use permit,
12 and decided to go down the checklist in the subdivision regulations for Major Land
14 Developments. Mr. DiOrio interjected, stating that the Planning Board does not review
16 projects by ticking off the checklist, the Planning Board does not certify the application as
18 complete, and that he had concerns about the content of the application that he hoped to
20 resolve at the pre-application stage. He noted that there are several deficiencies on the survey
22 plans as presented, and that any plans that are submitted need to comply with applicable
24 procedural standards. Mr. Fosey attested that the surveyor knows the standards. Mr. DiOrio
provided examples of several of his concerns, including expiration of the surveyor’s license,
and information that is required by law that does not appear on the plans. Mr. DiOrio
addressed several other deficiencies in the checklist, cautioning the applicant to return with a
complete application at the Master Plan stage.

20 After a discussion on the travel of the application between the Planning Board and Zoning
22 Board, the applicants showed the Board the photos and simulations of the balloon test that
24 was performed for the site. The applicants floated a balloon at the height of the proposed
tower for five days, then used photos of the balloon to simulate what the tower would look
like.

26 Questions from the Planning Board:

28 Ms. Williams: Is there any lighting on the tower?

Mr. Fosey: No lighting.

30 Ms. Williams: Have you built other towers?

Mr. Fosey: Yes, we have two other towers in Hopkinton.

32 Mr. DiOrio: What is the bond for?

Mr. Fosey: The bond is for decommissioning, in order to return the site to previous conditions.

34 Mr. Holberton: I appreciate the annoyance with having to go through two sets of reviews, but
36 you’ll have to go through the checklists for Master and Preliminary Plan stages, which are
more extensive than Pre-application. You can’t rely on the Board to tell you what you need.

Ms. Williams: Why is the tower so far back on the property?

38 Mr. Fosey: For screening purposes, and to keep the fall zone entirely on the property.

Ms. Williams: Is the driveway a gravel surface?

40 Ms. Fosey: This is correct.

42 The Board concurred that there were no debilitating issues with the concept of the plan, and
44 that the applicant could return at a future meeting for the next stages of review.

THE PLANNING BOARD DOES NOT VOTE FOR A PRE-APPLICATION

2

SOLICITOR’S REPORT:

4

None

6

PLANNER’S REPORT:

8

Mr. Lamphere updated the Planning Board on the status of the Comprehensive Plan. After the latest round of state review, the Statewide Planning Program has sent a letter tentatively approving the plan in its current form, contingent on Town Council adoption.

10

CORRESPONDENCE AND UPDATES:

12

None

14

PUBLIC COMMENT:

16

Ms. Capalbo asked if the commercial tower use would be taxed at the commercial rate or the RFR-80 residential rate. Mr. Lamphere stated that the Tax Assessor would likely tax it at the commercial rate, because that is the use of the property.

18

DATE OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING: January 3, 2018

20

ADJOURNMENT:

22

MS. WILLIAMS MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING

MR. HOLBERTON SECONDED THE MOTION

24

MR. DIORIO, MS. WILLIAMS, AND MR. HOLBERTON APPROVED. MOTION PASSES.

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 P.M.

26

28

Attest: _____

Sean Henry, Planning Board Clerk