

LITCHFIELD PLANNING BOARD

JUNE 1, 2010

Minutes approved 7/20/2010

Members present:

Alison Douglas, Chairman
Edward Almeida, Vice Chairman
Jayson Brennen, Clerk
Leon Barry
Frank Byron, Selectmen's Representative

Members not present:

Carlos Fuertes
John Miller, Alternate

Also present:

Joan McKibben, Administrative Assistant
Steve Wagner, Nashua Regional Planning Commission, Circuit Rider

AGENDA:

- 1. GRACE FREE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, 11 COLBY ROAD, TAX MAP 20 LOT 28. THE APPLICANT IS PROPOSING A 6, 623 SQ. FT. ADDITION TO THE EXISTING BUILDING INCLUDING A 264 SEAT SANCTUARY IN THE NORTHERN COMMERCIAL DISTRICT.**

- 2. T-MOBILE NORTHEAST, LLC IS REQUESTING SITE PLAN REVIEW AND APPROVAL TO INSTALL, OPERATE, AND MAINTAIN A WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY ON A 140' UNIPOLE TOWER AT A SITE OWNED BY TABERNACLE BAPTIST CHURCH MAP 2 LOT 29, 240 DERRY ROAD, LITCHFIELD, N.H. IN THE HIGHWAY COMMERCIAL ZONE.**

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- **Minutes 5/4/2010**
- **Correspondence**

Chairman Douglas called the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m.

1. GRACE FREE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

David Jordan, SFC Engineering Partnership, Inc. was present representing the applicant. Pastor McClelland was also present. There were no abutters present.

Application approval - The Board had approved the waivers at the May 4th meeting. Mr. Wagner referred to Lou Caron's letter dated April 28, 2010. Also, there is still a question on the lighting. Mrs. Joan McKibben (Conservation Chairman) told the Board that a letter from the Conservation Commission is forthcoming. The Commission had no problem with the impervious area being greater than 15% but they would like a note on the plan that the drainage areas will be cleaned annually and so certified to the Code Enforcement Officer. Mr. Leon Barry pointed out that it should also state on the plan that the cleaning would be done either in the spring or the fall. Also, there is no updated letter from the Fire Department.

At the site walk on May 12, 2010, the Board discussed that the existing lights are coming off located at the west side of the building and that new lights on 25 foot poles would be installed. Two new lights on the southeast side of the building would be placed on 16 foot poles and extra shielding added due to an abutter's concern and a note added to the plan regarding a timer. The slope to the southeast of the building was going to 3:1 but new grading it will be a 2:1 slope in order to have a flatter area at the bottom of the slope and allow emergency service to get around the building. Mr. Wagner did not think with the 2:1 slope that the fire trucks would be able to get around the building. Mrs. McKibben said it is not to be able to drive around the building but rather just to have a flatter area.

Lighting - Note 7 on the plan, Sheet 3, states all pole mounted site lighting shall have the full cut off luminaries to reduce light trespass. The floodlights on existing building are to be removed. All exterior lights to be on timers set to turn lights on only when evening activities occur currently Wednesdays and Sundays and lights shut off at 9:00 p.m. A letter from the abutter was reviewed.

Mr. David Jordan reviewed the site plan. There is an expansion of the parking area, the existing house is going to be removed, the driveway remains in the same location, width is 24 feet, and there would be parking on three sides of the building. They have addressed all but two items in Lou Caron's letter. The request to look at the detention basin to lower it to provide water quality has been done and they propose to lower it by 6 inches. The 2:1 slope is to keep water away from the building and keep a level area adjacent to the building for foot traffic; and they will keep the standard trees in front of the property by pushing the grading back for the septic and it has been noted on the plan. They had proposed six (6) white pines along the back edge of the parking area and they have moved them upslope on the top to afford better screening for the abutter. The other component is the lighting and they just received a revised lighting plan from their consultant. At the last meeting, there was a request to lower two light poles to 16 feet and they have done that by changing the type of fixture...and this will be included in the final plans and the lights will be shielded so there will be very little light emanating from the back.

They provided a draft easement document for the drainage system connecting through the abutter's property to existing catch basin near the garage next door. Mr. Jordan said there

was an easement put in place 10 years ago and the location of the drainage pipe is different than what was shown 10 years ago so the easement document has to be revised. Town Counsel will have to review the document.

In regards to the site walk, an inspection and maintenance of the drainage system and some of the wording is covered on the erosion control plan, Sheet 5...Note 6 specifies basins are to be inspected annually and they need to add to the plan the timeframe and that it would be certified as such to the Code Enforcement Officer.

Roof runoff - Detail on Sheet 7 of 10. Mr. Jordan: The concern had been letting the water from the roof going into crush stone and filter strip adjacent to the building and that the water could travel outside the foundation wall into the footing drains and not get the infiltration. We tried to get the roof runoff into the ground rather than pipe it into the detention basin to provide a separation between the filter strip and the footing drain. What we are doing is actually lining on two sides of the crush stone so up against the building and directly underneath it is going to be impermeable liner. The storm would then allow the water away from the building providing a disconnect for that direct flow straight down the foundation to the footing drain. That detail was provided on the plan submitted to Lou Caron and it is believed he concurred with that design.

The septic information is noted on the cover sheet and the waivers will be noted on the recorded sheets and also the conditional use permit if approved would be noted. The dimension of the parking lot is noted on the plan.

Conditional Use Permit - Mr. Almeida **MOTIONED** to grant the Conditional Use Permit to Grace Free Presbyterian Church, Tax Map 20 Lot 28 pending the written agreement from the Conservation Commission that we modify Note 6 on Sheet 5 that the drainage is to be cleaned yearly and reported to the Code Enforcement Officer. Mr. Barry seconded. Motion carried 5-0-0. It was noted to insure that the site improvements are completed, the Code Enforcement Officer would inspect the site and the Certificate of Occupancy would not be granted until all improvements have been made.

Mr. Jordan said that the steeple would be moved. The Board reviewed the architectural plan. The building would be wood frame and clapboard same as existing structure. It will be the same color. Mr. Barry asked if the Fire Chief is okay with not getting the fire truck around the building. Mr. Wagner: It is my understanding the Fire Chief is okay with the design.

Chairman Douglas Opened the meeting to public comment. There was no public comment. Chairman Douglas Closed public session.

The Fire Chief's letter dated March 30, 2010, was reviewed. Mr. Wagner indicated that the situation has changed according to a conversation with the Fire Chief that he would

not require additional water supply. The Board needs another letter from the Fire Chief. Mr. Jordan said that the Fire Chief is looking for a firewall separation between the addition and existing building and that they provide a new fire alarm system.

All in all, the applicant agreed to return in 90 days and to report back to the Board every 30 days in writing.

Chairman Douglas **MOTIONED** that we approve the application for Grace Free Presbyterian Church, 11 Colby Road, Tax Map 20 Lot 28 for a 6,623 sq. ft. addition to the existing building including a 264 seat sanctuary in the northern commercial district with the following conditions: 1. Include in the final plan the new revised lighting where the poles are to be lowered to 16 feet mounted height with full cut off shields; two lights. 2. Receive a review from our attorney regarding the easement document language. 3. Add to Sheet 5 note 6 that the bottom of the sediment basins shall be inspected annually and cleaned as necessary and that an annual inspection to take place every May. 4. Updated written Fire Department agreement. 5. Noted on the plan construction hours will be No Sunday construction, Monday thru Friday 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. and Saturday 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. 6. Note on the plan regarding the driveway and drainage completion before issuance of Certificate of Occupancy. 7. These conditions must be met in 90 days with a written update to the Town attention Joan McKibben and the Planning Board every 30 days. 8. Add the waivers and conditional use permit will be noted on the plan. Mr. Almeida seconded. Motion carried 5-0-0.

2. T-MOBILE NORTHEAST

Present: Jennifer Lewis (Lawyer with Prince Lobel), Andrey Tsikanovsky (Hudson Design), Dinesh Dasani (RF Engineer) and four abutters: Sue Powers, Kevin Powers, David Cook and Irene Maslanka.

Application Acceptance - All fees have been paid and abutters noticed.

Regional Impact - Notices were sent to communities within 20 miles (RSA12K). Also, per RSA36:54-58 there are two aspects of regional impact. In this case the only issue is the height of the tower and that is being dealt with in the application under the viewshed requirements and RSA12k notification. Mr. Byron **MOTIONED** that the proposed project of Tabernacle Baptist Church T-Mobile Northeast LLC Case 1005 LIT SP M2-L29 does not meet the requirements to be considered a regional impact. Mr. Almeida seconded. Motion carried 5-0-0.

Waivers requested - The Board is in receipt of written requests for a waiver from Section 150.4 Traffic Impact Study and Section 165.22 setback from property line 150% of the height of the tower. The applicant has provided a letter for a conditional use permit.

Mr. Wagner said that he reviewed the submission requirements with the applicant. Attorney Lewis presented a draft agreement for co-location on the pole and said that the applicant agrees to allow space for the Town to co-locate.

Outstanding items: In the application there is a full study regarding NEPA and an inventory of towers in the area and provided a map of the towers in the area. Section 165.01 a b c d e f g all have been submitted in writing. Information regarding the radio frequency exposure was provided. Mr. Wagner said that everything has been submitted for application acceptance except Section 165.22 and 150.4. “There are a few changes that occurred for the waiver relief from 150% of the height of the tower and by moving the tower to the southeast corner they would attain 100% of the height of the tower staying on the Tabernacle property. Essentially the fall zone and the standards asked for is a setback of 150% of the height of the tower from property lines or a structure. Even without moving the tower, they meet the requirement for the structures but they couldn’t meet the requirement from the property line and my rationale was if we could at least get the fall zone within the property then they have a reasonable argument for a waiver before the Board because the tower is not going to fall across the property line and affect an abutter.”

They have submitted a request for a conditional use permit. Mr. Wagner: We have everything we need in writing at this time.

Chairman Douglas Opened the meeting to public comment and explained that the only discussion at this time is on application acceptance.

Mrs. Sue Powers, 10 Cutler Road, asked for an explanation of the waiver regarding not meeting the property line. Mr. Wagner explained the meaning to those present. Basically, if the tower fell, it would fall on Tabernacle’s property. Mrs. Powers asked whether or not they had researched hooking up to another cell tower in the area rather than building a new one. It was said that the location they are choosing is one of the few places they can close the gap in coverage.

Mr. David Cook mentioned the tower being too close to the school. He was told that this would be discussed at the application approval process. Mrs. Powers asked what happens if the tower has to come down because of abandonment, etc. She was told that there has to be inspections of the tower annually, insurance coverage and a bond put in place in case it is abandoned.

Chairman Douglas Closed public session.

Mr. Barry **MOTIONED** to accept the application for T-Mobile Northeast LLC for approval to install and operate a Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) on a 140-foot

monopole tower at the site of Tabernacle Baptist Church Map 2 Lot 29, 240 Derry Road, Litchfield, located in a highway commercial zone. Mr. Almeida seconded. Motion carried 5-0-0.

Application Approval - Attorney Jennifer Lewis came forward to say the applicant proposes to install and operate a 140 foot unipole tower. The tower is going to be built so that the antennas will be interior mounted. It is a stealth design and built to look like a flagpole and allows for two additional carriers. The applicant is aware there may be a need for the Town to co-locate on the tower. Pursuant to the ordinance, the applicant has requested two waivers: traffic impact study and fall zone requirement.

Andrey Tsikanovsky explained the plan to those present. Sheet C1, which is the site survey, the site would be located in the back of Tabernacle Church and access to the site would be through the existing parking lot and through a proposed gravel access drive. The area is flat so there would be no significant grading nor any proposed tree clearing. They would be adding one utility pole underground to a transformer. To provide additional screening they are proposing evergreen shrubs to be planted 6 feet tall, 5 feet apart. They are moving the tower to meet the 100% fall zone which is 140 feet height of the pole to the nearest property line. This was discussed.

The tower is what is called a unipole tower meaning antennas would be hidden inside a canister and there would be no antennas mounted to the exterior pole. It is a slim look and the diameter of the canister is 24 to 26 inches. On the ground you will see two concrete pads about 5x9 side by side. T-Mobile would occupy the first top two spots on the tower and two additional spots available for future carriers. They are proposing an eight (8) foot stockade fence for screening. The natural compound would be 48x48 feet.

Erosion control/drainage - Mr. Tsikanovsky said the area is flat so there would not be much grading but being near existing wetlands the compound would not start any closer than 25 feet from wetlands. They are also providing silt fencing and hay bales for the construction phase. They determined that the impact for the impervious to be 2% of the overall lot area...this number is an exaggeration because the only impervious area in the compound is the concrete pads. The 2% is an exaggeration because it takes into account full access drive and the full area of the compound...they took everything as impervious but in reality it is not impervious because it is gravel for the road and gravel for the outside compound but they wanted to show the worse case scenario. In reality, impervious is closer to ½ percent. Also they did a balloon test and simulations are included in the application package.

The plan has not been reviewed by the Fire Department. Mr. Byron is concerned with the high-tension line running down the side of the building and its ability to block firefighting capabilities on the backside. To this, Mr. Tsikanovski said that there should be enough clearance to get around the side of the building and that whole area is opened so there is no problem to get to the side of the building.

Mr. Byron: My concern is the back of the building and getting fire equipment in there.

Mr. Tsikanovsky: There is open area from the parking lot...right now there is no additional access to the site and there is a fire lane marked on the existing parking lot so if the Fire Chief has any comments on the access to the back of the building, we are not going to be changing anything.

Mr. Byron: Well, you are running a high tension line right down the side.

Mr. Tsikanovsky: It is not a high tension line...for three carriers it will be 120 to 40 voltage...

Mr. Tsikanovsky told the Board that he is open to any comments by the Fire Chief and they would contact the Fire Department. He then suggested they could go underground from the existing pole if that is what the Fire Chief wants.

Mr. Byron: If you do that, will there be interference with septic lines?

Mr. Tsikanovsky: We will have to take another look and see what we can do.

Mr. Barry asked if the area where the dirt road is going to go would support a fire truck to go around the back and asked if it is dry. Mr. Tsikanovsky: Yes (dry). It is shown on the detail, Sheet 3, of which it shows construction of the road to be compacted gravel with 4 inches of crushed stone on top.

Mr. Barry asked if test pits were performed. It was said that they have not done any ground testing as yet.

Mr. Wagner: One thing to note...the wetlands around the compound is a man-made swale created for drainage...not a natural wetlands.

Talk continued. There is a soil analysis but no structural engineering provided for the foundation at this time. Mr. Byron asked what the fall radius is for ice coming off the tower.

Mr. Tsikanovsky: A tower of this kind usually ice is going to be on the surface of the tower so any ice coming down is going to come directly down the mast of the tower. So, the impact would be within 5 to 10 feet from the site of the tower.

Mr. Jayson Brennen asked what the options are regarding pole designs. This was discussed. Unipoles have a fiberglass canister, or several canisters stacked on top so no antennas are mounted outside and they are of lower visibility.

Chairman Douglas asked what would stop it from breaking during heavy winds. She was told that the tower is designed that the sway itself does not exceed the allowable structural deflection. Applicant did not have the allowable number but said that it does vary based on winds, location and height, etc. Mr. Tsikanovsky said this type of pole does not easily come down - if you have a tower coming down, then there is nothing standing out there...you are talking about 200 mile an hour winds. The breaking point is going to be at the base of the tower but the tower can be designed to have a breaking point at the midpoint to provide a certain level of comfort to the abutters and planning boards.

It was asked what the proposed unipole is designed regarding the breaking point.

Mr. Tsikanovsky: It is basically the same concept...it is really over designing the foundation so the tower's mast is going to have a higher breaking point at mid point than at the foundation.

Mr. Byron asked if it is designed to have a break point at a particular location.

Mr. Tsikanovsky: It is designed that way...it is designed to fail approximately in the middle as opposed to breaking at the base.

Mr. Wagner suggested regarding a comment as to danger to the school that it might be worth looking at what the breaking point is to protect the school. Andrey: Absolutely, that can be something we can look at and consider for the design of the tower itself...we have not done a detail design of the tower itself at this point.

Att. Lewis said that towers can be designed with crumble points at the mid point so that it does not fall like a tree; it would actually crumble upon itself.

Mr. Leon Barry referred to a statement in the safety plan regarding people *coming in contact with radio frequency energy as a consequence of their employment. There is a potential for exposure...*and it then says *second uncontrolled and general population* which is the abutters *applies to the exposure in general public may experience and are generally unaware of the potential exposure.* So, there is a potential of exposure from that tower by what it says right in your notes.

This was reviewed. Mr. Tsikanovsky: Just to elaborate a little bit, there are several exposure limits; controlled and mandated each carrier complies with. The limit that you mentioned is one of the three and we have to provide an idea what that exposure limit may be however small it may be if at all to abutters. Usually, the high limit applies to anybody who is working on the tower itself...second level of exposure would be at the base of the tower and third level would be any amount of distance away from the tower. These antennas are mounted 140 feet in the air and the exposure on the ground is a very

low number compared to the limit required for exposure. As you move away from the tower, the actual exposure that anybody has, decreases pretty much as you go a certain distance.

Mr. Barry: But that does not say that on this; that is what you are saying.

Mr. Dasani said that there are two types of exposure to a person who knows that there is an exposure...uncontrolled or general population what the document is saying for people general or uncontrolled exposure if they climb on top of the tower that is when they exceed the limit. For people who work in the industry are aware of it for them that is what the limit is so the FCC says that we calculate the percentage of exposure allowed by the FCC and our exposure levels are generally 1 to 5% ranges of the FCC levels.

Mr. Barry: I hear what you are saying but as Mr. Cook brought up before in that whole area there are a lot of kids, there is a school there. Is that whole complete area going to be fenced in and locked so nobody can get in there?

He was told that the area would be fenced and locked.

Mr. Wagner: You are at the 140, 130 level, there is a 10 foot separation between antennas so you would have a co-location 120, 110 would be the best case scenario, what kind of exposure at ground level would you see at the 110 elevation?

Mr. Dasani: It actually would depend on what kind of carrier, what kind of frequency but it is going to be right under the FCC guidelines.

Mr. Brennen: What are the FCC guidelines?

Mr. Dasani: There is not a particular FCC number. What we do we generally calculate the exposure and then the FCC says what the percentage of that, or what is the percentage of the maximum allowable limit that the FCC has set.

Mr. Byron: So, the FCC sets limits for exposure?

Mr. Dasani: Yes.

Mr. Byron: So, what is the limit?

Mr. Dasani: You mean the actual number...I can find that out.

Mr. Byron: What are the calculations that you can observe at the bottom of the tower?

Mr. Dasani: We can do a calculation.

Mr. Brennen: It would be interesting to know what the FCC's limit is and then concentric a ring around the tower and tell us what the exposure is within those rings...every 50 feet or something like that. I want to know if the number the FCC has a million or whatever it is and at the bottom of the towers you are at 100,000, or 5,000...

Mr. Barry is concerned with the tower falling on the school and suggested considering a breaking point in the tower so the whole 140 feet would not fall. What is the weight of the antenna inside the post? He was told 20 to 40 lbs.

Talk ensued. The break point would be at the base of the foundation. Mr. Barry asked what happens if the pole falls on the church or school.

Mr. Brennen: If there is a tornado...it would break at the bottom right now and fall unless there was a secondary design which it would break at the middle.

Mr. Wagner: There is an engineering impact on that, too. Let's just say you have a wind say 200 miles an hour it could snap it but once it breaks you have that energy from 200 miles an hour wind so how far is it going to carry that piece before it hits the ground?

Mr. Barry: That is something we have to discuss because they did the layout based totally on the people who are living in the homes but yet it was not taken into consideration what happens if it falls on the school...or church.

Mr. Tsikanovsky: You must take into consideration that we are open to discussions as to which design is your preference. We can design it a number of ways...with the break point at the base or break point at mid point. Both have their own benefit so to speak. It is your choice...it can be done either way.

Att. Lewis: In terms of why we are measuring from the property line and residential dwellings is because under the ordinance that is what we are supposed to measure against.

It was said that the tower is about 70+ feet from the school.

Waivers - Section 150.4 waiver from the traffic impact study as described in 120.1 a of the regulations. It was said that there is zero impact. Mr. Wagner asked how the tower would be brought to the site. It was said in three to four sections so there wouldn't be a traffic concern.

It was noted that they would be meeting with the Conservation Commission on Thursday.

Mr. Almeida **MOTIONED** to grant the waiver to the traffic impact study, Section 150.4 subsection 120.1 a. The motion failed due to lack of a second.

Chairman Opened the meeting to public comment.

Mr. Cook: There is 6 1/2 acres of land, why not put it down in the corner away from everybody? There is over 6 acres...there is plenty of land. Why by all the houses and not in that corner?

He was told the Board is just acting on the waivers and this would be discussed later.

Chairman Closed public session.

An error was noted on Page 6 in the submission document where it refers to 120.1 c and it should be 120.1 a.

Mr. Almeida **MOTIONED** to grant the waiver from Section 150.4 of the Town of Litchfield Land Use Laws 2009 site plan regulations that requires applicant to submit a traffic impact study as described under Section 120.1 a of the regulations. Mr. Brennen seconded. Motion carried 5-0-0.

Waiver - Section 165.22a Applicant seeks a waiver because the proposed unipole will not meet the requirements of the Land Use Laws - setback is less than 210 feet from property line. Mr. Wagner: There are two components to the requirement under 165.22a. One is to be 150% of the height of the tower from a property line or the nearest structure in the residential district. They meet the distance for 150% of the tower's height from any structure in the residential zone; they only meet 100% plus a little bit of the tower's height from the nearest residential property line. So, they are asking a waiver from that portion. Basically the difference from 140 feet to 210 feet.

Chairman Douglas Opened the meeting to public comment. Mrs. Powers: I noticed, yes, it is in a commercial zone but should this thing go down, it will go down in the residential. Even if it is at the break point of 70 feet it still will fall in the residential zone, maybe not on residential property but in residential zone and some of us have pools, backyard structures, is this going to bounce when it falls, there are great winds out there...it seems like it is too much of a chance to take. I feel the pole is too tall.

Mr. Cook also concerned about his pool and shed...he feels that the measurements given are not correct. Mr. Tsikanovsky pointed out that the measurements are based on residential houses and not accessory buildings. Att. Lewis added that the ordinance requires taking measurements from the residences.

Mrs. Powers: I think they should meet all the requirements and the waiver not be granted.

Chairman Douglas Closed public session.

Mr. Almeida asked about designing the tower so it does not break and go flying.

Mr. Tsikanovsky: None of the pieces are going to go flying anywhere. What is going to happen the pole is going to tilt and stay bent at the mid point or worse case scenario, which I have never heard of any reasonable amount of weather conditions, that the tower would break at the base - it just does not happen. The structural criteria is very strict and it is designed to withstand substantial winds and ice specifically designed for this area as mandated by the structural engineer guidelines for the country. So, we are trying to design peace of mind. If you feel more comfortable with a design that provides a tilt at mid point, there is no difference in construction or cost benefit to the carrier versus the other but if this a peace of mind issue especially with the proximity to the school to go with a design that provides a mid point tilt...you can make that a requirement and the pole will be designed to that specification. I will try to give you an example of that for the next hearing and provide a sample design with more details.

As to the ordinance, Mr. Wagner: Structures under the definition is anything constructed or erected at a fixed location on the ground...so it would count towards the other structures on the property, not just the residential dwellings.

Attorney Lewis disagreed. Mr. Brennen pointed out that either way the tower itself would fall in the Tabernacle property. Chairman Douglas questioned what if it rolls or whatever.

Mrs. McKibben asked when they would do the core study of what the base ground is made of.

Att. Lewis: We perform geotech studies at the time we produce construction drawings. Under NEPA they have performed environmental studies and I think that includes testing the ground.

Chairman Douglas said the Board needs to be certain of that.

The entire foundation is below the ground about 10 to 15 feet below surface. Talk ensued as to the construction of the foundation. Mr. Barry asked how close the foundation is to the classroom and further questioned why the pad is not moved back closer to the baseball scoreboard.

Mr. Tsikanovsky: I do not have the history as to why this particular spot was chosen...this is the spot that was agreed upon for a variety of reasons by T-Mobile and the Church.

Mr. Barry asked if the whole pad could be moved back 50 feet, or 100 feet. Attorney Lewis pointed out that they had to stay within the highway district which is the reason for the location and then there is the setback requirement. Mr. Wagner: Is there a point on the property that meets the 210 ft. requirement?

Mr. Byron suggested the waiver be tabled until a site walk is done. Mr. Byron **MOTIONED** to table the waiver until such time as we have a site walk. Mrs. Douglas seconded. Motion carried 5-0-0.

Irene Maslanka told the Board that two years ago the church contacted the abutters and offered to take them to the site. "I went up with them and we had to drive to the back of the property where the tower was going. At that point, I was for it; the tower was way in the woods and I would like to know why it was changed. Mrs. Douglas: That is some of the answers we are looking for.

Mr. Byron suggested they show fall zones and look at possible locations to put a tower. Mr. Byron: I would like the tower separate from the school so there is no 150% setback from the school but maybe there is a setback from the school that would give you sufficient comfort that you wouldn't drop into a classroom...if you can do it where you would satisfy the 150%, I am all in favor.

Mr. Tsikanovsky: We will research that.

Site walk - It was agreed to do the site walk on Tuesday, June 8, 2010 at 6:00 p.m. and they would maybe show other possible locations at that time.

Chairman Douglas Opened the meeting to public comment. Mr. Cook: Why that location and not in the back...

Talk went on as to location and it was noted that the location recommended by Mr. Cook that the tower would not meet the fall zone - it would drop onto State property.

Mrs. Sue Powers is also concerned that in the future something should happen and they would use the access from Cutler Road which abuts her property and also concerned that they would bring in trucks. Also, she asked why the tower is 140 feet when the tree line is 85 feet. She pointed out that the tower located at the Skate Park in Nashua is 85 feet. Mrs. Powers: Can you imagine what 140 feet is going to look like?

The abutters reviewed the pictures of the balloon test taken by the applicant. Mr. Kevin Powers told the Board that originally they were sent a letter stating not worry about it because they would hardly notice it from 102. Mr. Powers: We do not live on 102, we live on Cutler...and it is not going to be a big deal, it is a big deal to us.

Mrs. Irene Maslanka: The original site was okay...my main concern is that it has not been proven what is emitted from these towers as far as the environment is concerned. It is a proven fact that your property goes down 20% on the evaluation. I am getting along in years, I am not going to be in the house much longer and my girls are going to miss that 20%...so it does devalue the properties in the area.

Chairman Closed public session.

Items to be completed: 1. Review by the Fire Department. 2. Ground work. 3. Emissions impact calculations. 4. Information on design break points. 4. Fall zone circles: Two - one at the height of the tower and one 50% higher than the height of the tower. Att. Lewis suggested putting Items 1 and 2 on hold until it is decided exactly where the tower would be located. The Board agreed. 5. FCC numbers to calculate radiation and do circles at different heights for emissions. 6. Town Counsel to review documents: insurance, bonds, easement agreement with the church, etc. It was suggested that the applicant meet with the Selectmen and Emergency services regarding the draft agreement.

Chairman Douglas announced that this is continued to July 20, 2010, at 7:00 p.m. at Town Hall.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Rolling Acres III & IV - Mrs. McKibben told the Board that the notice of revocation was sent to all abutters. The owner is requesting a hearing on June 15, 2010, regarding Rolling Acres III. Also, a letter from the owner of Rolling Acres IV (Manoukian) was reviewed. Talk went on as to the bill owed the Town. Notice will be sent to the abutters regarding the hearing.

Chairman resignation - Mrs. Douglas presented Selectman Byron her resignation from the Planning Board due to her moving out of Litchfield. She regrets having to resign.

New member - Chairman Douglas **MOTIONED** to appoint Joel Kapelson as an alternate and have him go before the Board of Selectmen so he can be appointed. Mr. Barry seconded. Motion carried 5-0-0. Vice Chairman Almeida will forward a letter to the Selectmen recommending Joel Kapelson as an alternate member.

Minutes - Mrs. Douglas **MOTIONED** to accept the May 4, 2010, as amended. Mr. Barry seconded. Motion carried 3-0-2.

There being no further business, Mrs. Douglas **MOTIONED** to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Barry seconded. Motion carried 5-0-0. The meeting adjourned at 11:00 p.m.

Edward Almeida, Vice Chairman

Jayson Brennen, Clerk

Leon Barry

Frank Byron, Selectman

Lorraine Dogopoulos
Recording Secretary