

Gary Wassmer

13 Worden Circle  
Cheshire, CT 06410  
(203) 271-2731  
wassmerg@gmail.com

September 30, 2014

State of Connecticut  
Connecticut Siting Council  
10 Franklin Square  
New Britain, CT 06051

Re: Docket No. 451

To whom it may concern,

I write to ask to be an intervener and to pre-file testimony as required by the Council.

My intentions are to bring notice to several inconsistencies with of Town of Cheshire's Land Use Regulations.

The town's plan of conservation and development specifically notes that wireless siting should be where they will not adversely impact scenic views (pg. 36) however a structure of 180 feet will certainly impact scenic views. Additional inconsistencies are found in the following zoning regulations:

#### 80.7.2 Location Standards

(A) The proposed facility is located in the least preferred location of the four listed, and there is little evidence that the more preferred locations have been investigated.

(B) The proposed facility is in a residential zone, when the regulations prefer a tower to be in an industrial or commercial district.. Of the three locations listed, only one is not in a residential zone and there are no locations listed as being investigated in the I-2 zone encompassing Blacks Road and East Johnson Road. I do not see in the application anywhere the applicant pursued other districts before siting in a densely populated residential district. Sites listed as 4, 5 and 6 in the application package Attachment 3 are also in residential zones.

#### 80.7.6 Co-Location Standards

(A) The town seeks to reduce the number of new stand-alone facilities to avoid the unnecessary proliferation of such towers which they believe is in the public interest. The application states that there are 45 existing communication facilities within a 4 mile radius of the site search area [attachment 4]. The application shows no evidence why the expanded service and new emergency equipment can't be sited at one of the existing communication facilities as opposed to a new stand-alone facility.

#### 80.7.10 Lighting Standards

(A) While the current proposal does not include any lighting, there is nothing that would prohibit AT&T from adding lights in the future, without any public hearing and further impacting the densely populated residential zone.

#### 80.7.12 Height Standards

(a) The site is proposed to be 180 feet tall but the town asks that wireless telecommunication facilities only exceed 150 feet if they can demonstrate that the minimum height isn't enough for equipment to function satisfactorily. The 3rd party assessment of the site [attachment 2] states that at 105 feet elevation the emergency equipment will see a "noticeable improvement." The application is not clear as to the difference in coverage for emergency services between the two heights or something in between and why 180 feet is needed.

Sincerely yours,



Gary Wassmer