



Stratham Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
January 18, 2017
Municipal Center, Selectmen's Meeting Room
10 Bunker Hill Avenue
Time: 7:00 PM

Members Present: Bob Baskerville, Vice Chairman
David Canada, Selectmen's Representative
Jameson Paine, Member
Tom House, Member
Nancy Ober, Alternate
Lee Paladino, Alternate

Members Absent: Mike Houghton, Chairman

Staff Present: Tavis Austin, Town Planner

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

As the Chairman was absent, the Vice Chair Mr. Baskerville took roll call. Mr. Baskerville asked Ms. Ober if she would be a full voting member for Mr. Houghton. Ms. Ober agreed.

2. Review/Approval of Meeting Minutes

a. January 04, 2017

Mr. Paine made a motion to accept the meeting minutes from January 4, 2017. Motion seconded by Ms. Ober. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Paine suggested the Board hear the 2 preliminary consultations for cell tower locations first. The rest of the Board were in agreement. Ms. Paladino recused herself for these 2 applications due to a conflict of interest.

3. Public Hearing(s)

- b. Verizon Wireless, represented by McLane Law Firm, 900 Elm Street, Manchester, NH 03101 for the property located at 57 Portsmouth Avenue, Tax Map 9 Lot 006.** Conditional Use Permit application, Site Plan Review Application, and Special Exception Permit application pursuant to Sections 19.4.2 and 19.7 of the Stratham Zoning Ordinance to construct a 150' tall monopole wireless service facility, associated antennas and cabling, and installation of ground based telecommunications equipment and fencing.

Mr. Austin informed the Board that since the last meeting the third party RF report was now available complete with the applicant's response to the report.

1 Mr. Manougian, attorney representing Verizon started by saying the ZBA voted unanimously in
2 favor of granting a special exception at the last meeting in accordance with Section 17.8.2.c and i
3 1-6. Tonight they are there to seek approval for the conditional use permit and site plan review.

4 Mr. Manougian referred to the third party RF report done by Menkes to review the third party
5 review report done by Mr. Keith Vallente of C-Squared Systems. He said they had addressed the
6 comments of the third party reviewer. The Menkes report commented that Verizon hadn't
7 provided a RF emissions report; they have done that now and was part of the latest packet. Mr.
8 Manougian said he believed it was mentioned at the first joint ZBA/Planning Board meeting that
9 one star RF report and analysis prove that they comply with the FCC requirements concerning
10 emissions so that matter is off the table and not before the Board to look at. He introduced Keith
11 Vallente from C-Squared Systems who provided the original RF report for Verizon. Mr. Vallente
12 said that he felt in general that the Menkes report was generally supportive and came to similar
13 conclusions. The Menkes report talked about a lack of calibration data related to the model used
14 in his report; that data has now been provided.

15 Mr. Vallente showed some slides to explain better how he collects calibration data.

16 The Menkes report referred to other structures in the area; Mr. Vallente said there weren't any to
17 analyze in the area. In terms of alternative technologies; the report touched on small cells which
18 were brought up at the last couple of meetings too. As explained those would be a solution to
19 complement the macro site tower, but this is an extensive coverage gap which is something the
20 report tends to agree with. Mr. Vallente continued that the report refers to a lack of specific
21 information related to poor data volume and cell blocking; this is information which is highly
22 proprietary for Verizon and he doesn't even have access to that information. However they do
23 add information about general data in terms of population and what the site would add in terms of
24 extra coverage and what it would off load from surrounding sites currently offering marginal
25 coverage. That is what really hurts the network; there is a lot of shopping along the Route 33 and
26 that is all on the fringe of coverage so any service that does get in there just eats up a lot of
27 resources from the far off surrounding sites. That is why they need a dedicated site in this area to
28 better serve Stratham. As Mr. Manougian alluded to, there was no official emissions report
29 submitted, but their original report showed that the emissions are less than 2% of allowable
30 emissions in accordance with the FCC.

31 Mr. Baskerville asked if they had looked at existing structures. Mr. Vallente said they did look at
32 surrounding properties. The primary intent is to avoid towers, but in this instance there aren't any.

33 Mr. Austin said that Mr. Vallente seemed to have touched on all the comments made by the third
34 party reviewer. However he doesn't know if the Planning Board is satisfied with the response.

35 Mr. Paine said while the issues concerning the third party RF report have been addressed, they
36 haven't addressed the previous concerns of the Board. It doesn't address the multiple locations or
37 shorter tower heights that the Board has asked them to look at. Mr. Fredette commented that they
38 had lowered the original height to 130' as a concession. Mr. Paine reminded Mr. Fredette that the
39 Board has serious concerns about the currently proposed location due to aesthetics and this tower
40 will be a huge eyesore. He continued that if this was a lower alternative in multiple locations, that
41 concern could be offset. Tonight they have heard from another applicant about 2 other viable
42 locations. Mr. Fredette said they are not in a position at this time to build more than one facility
43 and they did come to Stratham a few years ago looking to build a couple of sites. One was already
44 built. They co-located on the Varsity Wireless tower and it worked to provide coverage for a
45 portion of the Town. For the gap in coverage, they did explain why moving closer to the Route
46 101 won't work. Mr. Paine responded that their proposal should consider where they are building
47 it too. Mr. House said somebody had mentioned that Verizon had talked to the people at Audi.
48 Mr. Fredette said they do consider locations when applying for a tower and the Audi dealership
49 location would work. The reason they didn't choose that location was due to the significant

1 amount of opposition from Bittersweet Lane when they were going to erect a 90' monopole, which
2 would have been invisible from Bittersweet Lane, was voted down. Based on the search ring
3 provided by the engineers, they could choose to locate the tower either on the east or west side.
4 They chose the west side because the same folks would see the tower if placed on the east side.
5 Not only that they dropped the height of the tower – it is 40' shorter than the Varsity Wireless
6 tower and this is the first one that Verizon would build in Stratham. Mr. Paine said it doesn't
7 matter if it is the first or fifth tower, they need to protect the aesthetics of the Town. Mr. Manougian
8 added that the third party report doesn't raise that issue and he agrees with their analysis. He said
9 also that they have explained already about the multi tower solutions and co-locating on structures
10 and there aren't buildings high enough to help with coverage in the Town. Mr. Manougian
11 continued that this is their third bite at the apple; there's a gap here and it's up to the Board to
12 decide what it wants to do. He said the Board can deny the application if they want, but the Federal
13 court will be behind Verizon and the Town will spend a lot of money on that. Verizon has tried
14 the Town's solutions and Mr. Graham had contacted him to see if Verizon would be interested in
15 their alternative locations, but they are both outside the search ring so they won't serve Verizon's
16 needs; those 2 towers will not help them so this is Verizon's only really viable solution and the
17 third party consultant hasn't said anything differently.

18 Mr. Austin wanted to clarify that the third party reviewer did not come up with alternatives because
19 he wasn't asked to do so; it was to review the data and technology behind Verizon's RF report.
20 Mr. House said that is correct and that the RF is out of local control anyway as it is federally
21 mandated. Mr. Fredette said from a health concern aspect it is.

22 Mr. Baskerville opened the floor up for public comment reminding people to keep comments brief
23 and to try not to repeat the subject matter.

24 Mr. Jeremy Riecks, Doe Run Lane spoke to alternative locations and said there is an antenna
25 behind Bell & Flynn which has one of their communications antennas for their vehicles and said
26 perhaps that site could be reviewed to see if it would be helpful as a co-location or a monopole.
27 He visited the Stone church in Newmarket recently and he noted on the new Newmarket Housing
28 Authority there were cell phone sector antennas located on the outside of the building which would
29 indicate that a macro site could be located on a structure like the church if suitable. He said he
30 has already brought up the suggestion of using a power pole or right of ways. Mr. Riecks asked
31 if the applicant was looking at other frequencies and as the frequency goes up, the distance drops.
32 He asked if the current location serves needs for the future at different frequencies.

33 Mr. Fredette answered that Verizon's licensing for frequency bands are as follows: 700 megahertz
34 is the lowest, 850 for cellular which they have been using since the mid-80s and PCS band which
35 is 1900 megahertz used in the 90s and most recently the AWS band which is at 2100 megahertz.
36 They presented the 700 megahertz as it's the best in terms of achieving better coverage. It will
37 eventually operate across all frequency bands.

38 Mr. Riecks asked where the gaps will be when using the higher frequency and what do Verizon
39 then have to do to come back and fill in those gaps. Is this seen as the end all be all or is this the
40 thin wedge where a tower goes in but it doesn't cover the 2100 megahertz or the other frequencies.
41 As an aside he happened to see the Exeter west pole and he's seen a crew installing a new
42 additional sector and it's not the same size as the existing ones and he's wondering if it's one of
43 the other frequency antennas. Mr. Fredette said he couldn't speak about that particular tower. In
44 terms of the difference in coverage, the higher frequencies are generally deployed for capacity
45 purposes so there will be overlays and underlays with the base coverage 700 megahertz. The
46 higher levels of frequency provide the same level of service just more capacity, but don't cover as
47 great an area. As usage goes up, demand goes up and the frequencies go up.

48 Mr. Baskerville asked if all frequencies are done from one array. Mr. Vallente said on the plans
49 it states tri factor amount; most sites have three sectors to cover all around them and on each sector

1 there are 4 antennas. One antenna per frequency is generally used for a variety of reasons. Lower
2 frequencies require larger antennas. Mr. Baskerville asked if all Verizon antennas look like this
3 one. Mr. Vallente said this was standard for Verizon.

4 Mr. Dan Mcauliffe, Tall Pines Drive and member of Conservation Commission. He was on the
5 Ad Hoc committee trying to distribute the \$5 million bond and 88% of the Town voted on being
6 able to get the conservation easements in keeping with the character of the Town and the Town
7 heritage. The view shed was one of the criteria for considering the conservation easements. This
8 one is right in the middle of the Town and represents how the Town used to be. Residents pay
9 taxes for this view shed. It blows him away that this iconic view that everybody paid money for
10 representing what the Town really wanted is in jeopardy tonight for the sake of some money. If
11 emergency calls were the issue here that would be something different, but it's about people
12 wanting to stream faster. This represents the heritage, the culture and just the natural resources of
13 the Town.

14 Mrs. Lankler thanked Mr. Paine for addressing alternative locations. She has a hard time believing
15 that this is the only location and is deeply offended by this.

16 Mr. Wool said the Town has a Master Plan which is a document which is the basis for the
17 development of zoning and building regulations in a town. It is required by the State. The Town
18 has a comprehensive zoning ordinance which is built on a well-defined Master Plan with a vision
19 statement. He read the vision statement. He continued that the Master Plan was put together by
20 the citizens in this community. There are several chapters within the Master Plan, one of which
21 is public utilities which includes Telecommunications and it says although the need for these
22 facilities is fully recognized by the Town, the towers themselves can be unsightly and a nuisance
23 to surrounding property owners. The Master Plan also mentions view sheds and requests that the
24 Planning Board look at these telecommunication towers with the view shed in mind. Mr. Wool
25 said not to worry about going to court as mentioned by Verizon's lawyer because they all say that.
26 He thinks the Board can hang their hat on the Master Plan which is very strong and provides the
27 Board with the information to do what they have to do.

28 Mr. Tim Horvath, Robin Glen Road said apart from the issue with the aesthetic, he wanted to
29 mention health concerns. There are studies demonstrating that there have been health effects
30 recorded within 300 – 400 meters of towers 90' tall. He wanted to emphasize that the FCC may
31 have its standards and regulations, but science is ever changing and it's been very difficult to find
32 any correlation between cell phone radiation and cancer, but if you read the May 21, 2016 issue
33 of Scientific American, the national toxicology program recently did find such a correlation where
34 it's proven. He thinks more research is important.

35 Mr. Baskerville informed the audience that all reports received by the Planning department were
36 on line for people to access and read.

37 Mr. Kirk Scamman said he was opposed to the cell tower. They operate a corn maze every year
38 and the first thing everybody asks is if they are going to get lost in the maze! Some of the drop
39 zone for this tower is over the farm and he feels this will be very detrimental to their business. He
40 has other concerns about things like screening.

41 Mr. John Hutton said he has had a corn maze since 2005 and when you have a tower that people
42 can hone in on, it does take away from the maze experience and it's hard to work with.

43 Mr. Baskerville said he had a letter from Mr. Doug Scamman. Mr. Scamman has reviewed the
44 plans which shows a significant portion of the fall zone impacting his parcel Tax Map 9 Lot 119.
45 He appreciates the importance of adequate cell service in the community, but he does have
46 questions and concerns relating to the fall zone. His intentions are to continue farming the land,
47 but must also look to what future generations can have for uses and options: he is concerned the
48 designation of the fall zone would preclude an otherwise permitted mixed use on the property

1 under the Gateway zoning, and asks if he would be required to eliminate the potential for any
2 residential use within the area of the property that lies within the fall zone. He wants to know if
3 there are any aspects of the applicable building or electrical fire codes that become more stringent
4 for structures that might be erected on the property within the area of the fall zone.

5 Mr. Doug Scamman was present at the meeting and added another concern to his letter, namely
6 that he had heard that some people had expressed that they feel he hasn't done his duty in trying
7 to protect his land. He doesn't begrudge his son Karl for applying for the cell tower, but the 500'
8 it encroaches onto his property takes away from that. The best thing he has done is make sure this
9 land will be a farm for ever so he takes exception to people when they say that.

10 Mr. Wool informed the Board that there will be a letter in the Exeter Newsletter on Friday
11 concerning this application; it deals with the protected land and \$2 million and he would like to
12 apologize to Mr. Scamman as he mentions him in that letter as not having done his due diligence.

13 A resident from Doe Run Lane asked that should there be further development in the future, what
14 the allowable maximum height of buildings is. Mr. Austin said approximately 80' of the tower
15 would still be visible. Mr. House said he thought the maximum building height was about 35'.
16 The resident explained that Doe Run Lane is behind the BMW dealership and they had issues with
17 the expansion of that dealership last year and she was amazed at the amount of time spent on
18 landscaping and sidewalks to make it look beautiful to fit in with the Gateway and yet the Town
19 might be considering putting this big pole in which will stand out in the middle of the vista.

20 Mr. Keane, Doe Run Lane said he was on the Master Plan committee in 1998 and was also
21 involved in the BMW application. He wanted to take the opportunity to thank the Scammans for
22 what they have done for the land there.

23 Ms. Knab, Conservation Commission Chair, referred to the comments about the Audi dealership.
24 She said they have been coming to meetings and expressing interest in having the cell tower on
25 their property and while Verizon express concern about public opinion, just like this application
26 it is private property and between the land owner and Planning Board. She doesn't accept the
27 excuse that Verizon is afraid of the abutters over there at Market Street. She feels like the Town
28 is being punished because of the bad experience Verizon had at the last Town meeting, but she
29 hopes Verizon does realize that many people view this spot as one of the prettiest in Town and
30 many hours went into making the easement happen. There is a reason people are against this
31 location and it's not just out of spite.

32 Mr. Canada said he'd like to read into the record some correspondence he had received about this
33 application. Karl and Suzanna Fier say this will have a very negative impact on the Town, please
34 do anything you can to stop this and Kerry Fletcher, Bunker Hill Avenue, strongly opposes the
35 cell tower on Portsmouth Avenue and the Heritage Commission is very strongly opposed as it
36 feels it will have significant impact on an historic site which they will be pursuing with the State
37 Board. Mr. Austin said the Heritage Commission was asked for its comments under what is called
38 the 106 Review which is part of the overarching NEPA review. Mr. Canada is referring to the
39 Heritage Commission's response to that. The Historical Society was sent the same letter; they
40 have responded that they have no response.

41 Mr. Baskerville asked the Board if it wanted additional information or is it comfortable to move
42 the application to decision stage. Mr. Paine asked Verizon if they had received any comments
43 back from the division of historical resources. Mr. Fredette said they hadn't received anything
44 official back from the State yet. Mr. Austin added that the consultant requested comments, if any
45 to be submitted within 30 days on a letter dated December 15, but postmarked December 23, 2016
46 so he isn't surprised the applicant hasn't received a formal response yet.

47 Mr. Manougian said that at more and more planning board meetings he goes to or within the
48 industry, he is hearing more and more often that fall zones are archaic. Monopoles don't fall, guy

1 towers fall which is where the fall zones started. Having said that, they are dealing with the current
2 ordinance which does allow this. The setback has to be 125% from off property existing
3 residential structures; there aren't any existing residential structures within that. He has asked for
4 a waiver just in case, but they don't need to comply with that. He said that the tower, as it's going
5 to be built, will be 87' from Mr. Scamman's property.

6 Mr. Fredette said he understands that people are concerned that they have not satisfied the
7 alternative site consideration. Since 2007 they have been looking for a site on and off; the first
8 location they looked for was a site here at the Town office. They sent a letter to the neighbor who
9 lives opposite the offices, but she wasn't interested. They were in a bidding war with a tower
10 building company called TRM for a site at the baseball field. They gave a sweeter deal which the
11 Town signed and it went to Town vote which rejected it. They came back several years later to
12 look at the police department; there is no space at that site and the tower and cupola that is there
13 cannot be used. They looked at the congregational church, but it is too short and too close to their
14 existing site in Newfields. They contacted Mr. Paul Deschaine about Bunker Hill, but the
15 selectmen voted unanimously in favor, as did the zoning and planning boards, but the Town voted
16 against it. During those proceedings they were heavily opposed by Mr. and Mrs. Foss. He did
17 ask them after the meeting if they would be interested and they said they wouldn't be. The search
18 ring was getting a lot smaller now. He talked to Mr. and Mrs. Scamman who respectfully declined
19 and then they looked at the location suggested by the Planning Board, but as he explained they
20 were all too close to the existing footprint which brings them back to the Scamman's Garden
21 Center. From a RF perspective the Audi Dealership would work, but he opted for this side of the
22 road because of the opposition of the folks who lived near the suggested Bunker Hill site. Mr.
23 Fredette said once bitten, twice shy.

24 Mr. Brad Jones said Verizon's business problems are not the Town's problems. They are trying
25 to do the best for the citizens of this Town and make the best decision for now and future
26 generations. Verizon's attorney may be right when he said earlier that Verizon doesn't have to do
27 this or that, but that doesn't make what is being proposed right for the citizens of this Town just
28 because Verizon can get away with it.

29 Mr. Feeney, Bittersweet Lane said he was at the Town meeting in opposition to the previous
30 application for the top of Bunker Hill, primarily for the reasons of safety. He echoes the concerns
31 about health risk as there are studies still being done. He feels the suggested location at Audi is
32 still awfully close to Bittersweet Lane so he can appreciate Mr. Fredette's predicament and he
33 could see him being met with the same resistance. He found it interesting that Mr. Fredette said
34 that Verizon are allocating all their resources to this one tower and he wondered why they couldn't
35 allocate all their resources to 2 structures instead.

36 Mr. King asked if there would be a yes or no vote tonight. Mr. Baskerville said he didn't know
37 yet. Mr. King asked that aside from the outcome, would the other 2 locations be off the game
38 plan. Mr. Baskerville explained that these are separate applications and the other two haven't
39 been submitted yet as formal applications. Verizon isn't involved with the other 2 locations. Mr.
40 King asked if Verizon is proposing one tower, why the other applicant was proposing 2 towers.
41 Mr. King asked if they could eliminate the one tower application and get one tower in the right
42 place such as down by the 101 bypass. Mr. Baskerville said they can respond to people, but they
43 can't precede the issue.

44 Mr. Baskerville asked about the waiver mentioned by Mr. Manougian. Mr. Austin said at the
45 original presentation he had mentioned the fall zone and whether or not the Planning Board wanted
46 to consider the fall zone because of the Gateway supporting mixed use development. By default
47 though, this application does comply with the regulations. As, however the applicant applied for
48 a waiver, from a process perspective it should be addressed. Mr. Austin said if the Board is not
49 seeking any more information, the public hearing should be closed and the Board should proceed
50 taking action on the application.

1 Mr. Baskerville confirmed that the Board didn't feel the need to go back to the third party RF
2 consultant for further information. The Board concurred with that.

3 Mr. House asked Mr. Austin for the exact wording in the ordinance about setbacks. Mr. Austin
4 read from Section 19. 6.4.i. Mr. House said if there was a building there in the future and the
5 tower should fall, would the tower fall on top of the building within the setbacks? Mr. Austin said
6 it his opinion that the building would be able to be developed in compliance with the Gateway
7 business district. He has spoken with the Code Enforcement official and the regulations for putting
8 in a tower are very simple. It has to be built out of a non-combustible material, and appropriately
9 attached to the ground. It doesn't say it has to be "x" number feet away from any structure. Mr.
10 Baskerville asked Mr. Doug Scamman if he had signed an easement or a waiver or any of his
11 rights. Mr. Scamman said if the tower was still there in 50 years, they would have to keep it away
12 that far. Mr. Austin said he didn't know if that was true. Mr. Austin added he was not aware of
13 anything in the regulations that would preclude an otherwise permitted mixed use on the property
14 which was raised as one of Mr. Scamman's concerns. Mr. Austin talked about building and
15 electrical fire codes and said it would all be strictly dependent on whatever the building would be
16 next door. If it was a daycare center with an outdoor play area that might be different than a mixed
17 use 3-story structure, but that would be true of any 2 developments with a property line down the
18 middle.

19 Mr. Mcauliffe, Tall Pines Road said the difference between this application and the one turned
20 down at Town meeting is that this is on commercial property as opposed to being on Town
21 property. He would be happy to see a vote on this even though it is not on Town property. Mr.
22 Austin said the reason it went to Town vote was to do with the leasing of Town property. Mr.
23 Austin took the opportunity to explain the difference between the BMW application and this one;
24 the BMW application was being processed under the Gateway regulation whereas this one is
25 subjected to the Telecommunications section of the zoning ordinance which functionally over
26 writes the underlying zoning district.

27 Mr. Brad Jones believes that the Town should err on the side of caution when it comes to the
28 confusion if down the road a residential property is built close to the tower or not. He doesn't
29 believe it when they say the tower won't fall and it would devalue any property he puts near the
30 tower anyway.

31 Mr. John Cosco, Butterfield Lane echoed others' views that he enjoyed the view and going to the
32 corn maze. He asked the Board to ask itself is it more important for a kid to receive a text in 1
33 second or 5. Is it more important for a kid to experience a sunset over a landscape that are
34 disappearing everywhere because of big business? He was born next to a cell tower and there is
35 no scientific correlation, but when he was 10 months old, he had a fist sized neuroblastoma tumor
36 in his chest. He will not bring his kids to Scamman's farm to do any of the activities if that cell
37 tower is there.

38 A resident asked if there was any weight to the argument that the language states this landscape is
39 protected, but if the tower goes up it no longer will be. Mr. Baskerville said he hasn't read the
40 language of the easement, but it is just for that property. The resident said she is referring to the
41 landscape.

42 Mr. Canada commented that Karl Scamman has never paid a dime for the view shed from his
43 property. He stressed that this is not Doug Scamman's property.

44 Mr. Manougian wanted to point out that they have submitted a report from a radiation safety
45 specialist who came and spoke at the Bunker Hill meeting. He said he was here as an independent
46 consultant and has worked in the area of radiation for almost 30 years and spoke about the potential
47 of exposure from RF fields. He said you have to look at 2 different fields; firstly the site being
48 licensed by the FCC. Mr. Hayes said he looked at many reports and he looks at 3 different things;
49 did they use the proper parameters, the proper methodology and did they make the proper

1 assumptions. If those 3 things are in line with one another, then the proper conclusion will be
2 reached. He found everything to be correct in Mr. Vallente's report and agreed with the conclusion
3 that the site would in fact comply with FCC guidelines for public exposure. He added also that
4 using a cell phone exposes a person to 20 times more energy than the cell tower.

5 A resident pointed out that Mr. Hayes was hired by Verizon to say what Verizon wanted him to
6 say and he can imagine that the guy wants future business with Verizon so he certainly isn't going
7 to say things that Verizon won't like.

8 Another resident said when she thinks of the fall zone, she doesn't think of the tower falling down,
9 but of a protective zone so nothing is built close enough to receive whatever a tower radiates. She
10 feels the use of future land will be limited by this tower.

11 Mr. Paine made a motion to close the public hearing. Motion seconded by Mr. House. Motion
12 carried unanimously.

13 The Board started with the waiver and decided it wasn't necessary.

14 Mr. Canada moved that the Board take no action on the request for a waiver due to the fact that it
15 is not needed according to the Ordinance as there are no homes in the fall zone. Motion seconded
16 by Mr. House. Motion carried unanimously.

17 Mr. Austin directed the Board's attention to the criteria for considering the cell tower application
18 from Section 19.7.2.c. He also provided a definition of what a view shed is within a legal
19 framework, namely an identified and protected view shed i.e. henceforth by Town meeting vote,
20 the Town of Stratham has declared the following area between x and y vector a view shed.

21 Mr. Baskerville said he moved into the area in 1982 and when they drove around the general area,
22 this view was special. An enormous amount of effort was put into the Gateway district zoning
23 and how it should look. Added to that a lot of money was spent on this easement. In his opinion
24 this isn't a standard location; it's extremely special and unusual. Mr. Paine concurred with
25 everything said by Mr. Baskerville and added it maintains the agricultural heritage of the
26 community. He stressed the importance of the Master Plan part of which is to protect the resources
27 in Town and not just at the Scamman's Farm. Mr. House agreed and thanked Mr. Wool for
28 reminding everybody about that. The only thing Mr. House wanted to point out is that Gateway
29 regulations do not apply to this application. Ms. Ober agreed with everything that was being said.
30 Mr. Canada said there was no question that a cell tower is needed; he can't get great service at all
31 and is disappointed that the previous proposal was voted down by the Town. He did refer to
32 Section 19.2.2. which refers to reducing adverse impacts on such things as aesthetics,
33 environmentally sensitive areas and historically significant locations to name a few. Looking at
34 some of the criteria for the conditional use permit, he feels there are several of those not met by
35 this application.

36 Mr. House asked if the Board was permitted to ask the applicant to talk to Audi. Mr. Austin said
37 even if the Board had a fully executed agreement with Audi, the Board would still need to act on
38 this application.

39 The Board ran through the criteria per Section 19.7.2.c.

40 i. Height of proposed tower or other structure.

41 Mr. Baskerville said this has a lot to do with surrounding topography, tree coverage and foliage.
42 There are no 85' tall trees in this area. In the pictures provided by the applicant, there is nothing
43 close to the height of the tower. This is extraordinarily visible and in front of a view that
44 historically and now has been a center piece of the Town. Mr. Austin pointed to 19.7.2.c.vi.
45 which refers to the design of the tower having design characteristics that have the effect of
46 reducing or eliminating visual intrusiveness. Mr. Baskerville said the Board talked about
47 making this a mono pine, but that wouldn't help. There is nothing in the design that Verizon

1 can do with this tower. Mr. Baskerville asked if companies wishing to co-locate on a tower
2 have to come before the Board. Mr. Austin replied they didn't, however if the tower was made
3 taller to accommodate a co-location then that would require coming back before the Board.

4 ii. Proximity of tower to residential development or zones

5 Mr. Baskerville said that wasn't a big issue here.

6 iii. Nature of uses on adjacent and nearby properties

7 Mr. Canada said he thinks that doesn't sit well with surrounding properties. Mr. Baskerville
8 referred to the effect this tower could have on the corn maze and said this does have issues
9 with nearby properties. Mr. Paine added with regards to scenic qualities and visual intrusions.
10 Mr. Baskerville thinks this will also affect people from wanting to move into this area.

11 iv. Surrounding topography

12 Mr. Baskerville said it is neither on top of a hill nor low and there's a complete absence of
13 tree coverage and foliage. Mr. Paine said as it sits lower with the topography of the road, that
14 makes it more visible.

15 v. Surrounding tree coverage and foliage

16 This was discussed under number iv.

17 vi. Design of the tower, with particular reference to design characteristics that have the effect of
18 reducing or eliminating visual obtrusiveness.

19 Mr. Paine said at this point he doesn't see any design characteristics that reduce the visual
20 obtrusiveness. Mr. Canada asked about internal arrays. Mr. Paine said they had asked that
21 of the applicant, but they chose not to present that as an option.

22 vii. Proposed ingress and egress to the site.

23 Mr. Paine and Mr. Baskerville couldn't see any issues with that.

24 viii. Availability of suitable existing towers and other structures as discussed in Section 19.7.3.c.

25 Mr. Paine said the key here is other structures and not necessarily a monopole. The Board
26 has asked the applicant to present other alternatives that would include multiple towers at
27 multiple locations instead of one single location and that wasn't presented as part of the
28 package. The next meeting they came forward with the exact same proposal as previously
29 so nothing was discussed about multiple shorter towers or any other micro devices. Mr.
30 Canada said that he personally thinks they've discussed that just fine and this one tower
31 would satisfy most of the problems and maybe then you could fill in with some micro. He
32 thinks they've answered that question adequately. Mr. Paine responded that if there is one
33 tower and it serves the area, but if the tower is in an area that is not suitable by public input,
34 then there are concerns. With those concerns, the Board asked the applicant to review
35 alternatives that could consider multiple tower locations to address those visual concerns and
36 aesthetics. Mr. Canada felt they had, just not what Mr. Paine was hoping to hear. Mr. House
37 said he never really heard anything about the Audi location from the applicant. Mr. Canada
38 pointed out that at this point they are contractually obliged to Karl Scamman so they can't
39 go and be under contract with somebody else. Mr. Baskerville said he felt the applicant had
40 proven there isn't an availability of suitable towers in this corridor.

41 ix. Visual impacts on view sheds, ridgelines, and other impacts by means of tower location, tree
42 and foliage clearing and placement of incidental structures.

43 Mr. House said they have discussed this and he is having problems with the blending in and
44 aesthetic of this tower. Mr. Paine referred to 19.2.2. and said this tower will have an adverse

1 impact on everything in this sub section. Mr. House added it does mention flight corridors
2 which doesn't apply.

3 x. Availability of alternative tower structures and alternative siting locations

4 Mr. Baskerville said that they all believe there are other possibilities out there. Mr. Paine
5 repeated that they had asked the applicant to provide alternative studies which he doesn't
6 believe they have seen any alternatives presented in a package to the Board not as far as
7 viability. They have heard about some structures word of mouth, but not in a package.

8 Mr. Paine said based on the information discussed this evening, the input received from the
9 public and the information provided to the Board by the applicant for this proposal, Mr. Paine
10 made a motion that the Board deny the application for a conditional use permit application
11 for Verizon Wireless represented by McLane Law Firm, 900 Elm Street, Manchester, New
12 Hampshire for the property located at 57 Portsmouth Avenue, Tax Map 9 Lot 6, an
13 application pursuant to Sections 19 of the Stratham Zoning Ordinance to construct what is
14 presented here as a 150' tall monopole wireless service facility as has been presented by the
15 applicant as a 130' tall monopole wireless service facility, associated antennas and cabling,
16 and installation of ground based telecommunications equipment and fencing as previously
17 provided and discussed based on Section 19.7.2. Factors Considered in Granting Decisions.
18 The nature of this use on the adjacent, nearby properties, namely the conserved Scamman
19 Farm property and the potential to substantially disrupt the scenic view shed of the property
20 and also the fact that the property is located at a low point in the topography which provides
21 more than ample opportunity for the general public to view it through this scenic view shed,
22 also because of the surrounding tree coverage and foliage is non-existent, there is nothing
23 there to protect and shield this site from the general public so it's in the open view shed of
24 the public. The design of the tower, there has been no apparent attempt to reduce or eliminate
25 the visual obtrusiveness of the tower within this section of the corridor which adversely
26 affects the visual aesthetic of this conserved property and what has been discussed as
27 potential availability and suitable existing towers or existing locations within the corridor
28 namely the Audi Dealership location or similar locations. It should also be noted the
29 applicant's proposed a single tower facility that there has been no other alternative presented
30 such as multiple tower locations within the corridor which would help to offset the height
31 and open disruption of view shed. Mr. Baskerville suggested adding a comment regarding
32 the extremely unique nature of this particular view shed being extraordinary and the Town
33 has spent a tremendous amount of effort and money in protecting this specific view shed. In
34 addition Mr. Paine would like to highlight the points brought before the Board with regards
35 to the Master Plan and the emphasis on the Town to protect its agricultural heritage and the
36 aesthetic in this area as has been discussed with numerous efforts to protect the aesthetic with
37 our 2-way business district through this corridor that helps to drive the desire to maintain an
38 agricultural view to this area and this tower would detract from that ascetic. Motion seconded
39 by Mr. House. Motion carried unanimously to deny the conditional use permit.

40 Mr. Austin explained that in order to review this site plan application, a conditional use
41 permit application would need to be approved. The applicant can be asked if they would like
42 to pursue with the site plan application so if they want to apply in the same location, they
43 could move forward. For clarity the Planning Board should deny the site plan review
44 application.

45 Mr. Baskerville asked if the Board wanted to discuss the site plan review application. He
46 felt it was a moot point in light of the conditional use permit application being denied.

47 Mr. Paine made a motion that as the conditional use permit application for the cell tower
48 doing business as Verizon Wireless was denied, the site plan application can be denied as

1 there is no use permitted on the property currently. Motion seconded by Mr. House. Motion
2 carried unanimously

- 3
4 **c. Ober Subdivision and Lot Line Relocation, represented by Bruce Scamman, Emanuel**
5 **Engineering, Inc.,** 118 Portsmouth Ave. Stratham, NH 03885, for the property located at 91
6 Willowbrook Avenue, Tax Map 19 Lot 37. 2-lot, Minor Subdivision and Lot Line Relocation
7 application to create one new parcel.

8 Ms. Ober recused herself. Ms. Paladino returned to the Board and Mr. Baskerville asked Ms.
9 Paladino if she would be willing to be a full voting member. Ms. Paladino agreed to do so.

10 Mr. Bruce Scamman, Emanuel Engineering took the floor and introduced the applicants. He said
11 they would start with the lot line adjustment first followed by the minor subdivision of the larger
12 lot which will be left.

13 The parcel is at the corner of Willowbrook and Lovell Road. There are 2 lots and as they are just
14 short of the land required for a 2 lot subdivision, the Obers have worked with the neighbors to
15 achieve that through a lot line adjustment. The amount of land that will change hands is a small
16 triangle of 0.15 acres. There is 400' of frontage; in this district only 100' is required per an 1 acre
17 lot.

18 Mr. Scamman showed the proposed lots on the plan; one is existing so there will be one new lot.
19 One requirement missing on the plan which will be added is a cut line. They are proposing putting
20 in a 20' no cut easement along the rear property line in the area of the new lot. There were 4 passing
21 test pits on the new proposed lot and 2 passing test pits on the existing lot even though there are
22 septic systems on both lots.

23 There are 3 existing wells, the well for the smaller lot is on the larger lot's property and has been
24 there for some time. There is a 10' wide easement going out to it. That well radius is shown on
25 the plan along with the existing one and the new proposed lot is being shown with its own well
26 radius. He has met with Mr. Colin Laverty, Town Roadway Agent and Mr. Austin on site and they
27 looked at the location of the driveway. Mr. Laverty has requested they put the driveway on the
28 other side of the telegraph pole as he believes that will keep the area cleaner around the existing
29 guard rail. Mr. Scamman referred to the plan and indicated where there would be a longer sight
30 line and said it will be better for the sharp corner on the other side of the utility pole. They've
31 added a 4,000 S.F. reserve area on all 3 lots.

32 Mr. Austin said in addition to the staff review, he would be working on lot line relocations and
33 whether they actually needed to come before the Board for action. As this one is happening
34 concurrently to the subdivision Mr. Austin asked Mr. Scamman to submit both applications to get
35 it considered by the Planning Board. Mr. Austin said the 2 lot subdivision is unique in Stratham in
36 that the subdivision regulations Section 2.4 Minor Subdivision Approval state a public hearing is
37 only required if an abutter or applicant requests one. Mr. Austin said staff feels that this meets or
38 exceeds what is required for the Manufactured Housing district (MAH) as presented.

39 Mr. House made a motion to accept the application for the Ober Subdivision for the property
40 located at 91 Willowbrook Avenue, Tax Map 19 Lot 37 and 39, a 2-Lot minor subdivision
41 application to make one new lot in association therewith a lot line adjustment. Motion seconded
42 by Mr. Paine. Motion carried unanimously.

43 Mr. Baskerville asked if the applicant had applied for a State subdivision approval. Mr. Scamman
44 said they hadn't, but explained that sheet C3 of the plan set would be sent to NHDES for said State
45 subdivision. He said it makes it easier to do a separate plan for NHDES.

1 Mr. Paine asked Mr. Austin if there is anything unique about this being in the MAH zone. Mr.
2 Austin said the only difference is that it is 1 acre and 100 feet. The setbacks are also a little different,
3 but that comes later.

4 Mr. Paine asked if there were any conflicts with the new proposed driveway with any other access
5 points. Mr. Scamman said there are no driveways opposite this one; Aberdeen Drive is in the
6 neighborhood. Mr. Scamman added there are no wetlands on the lots and indicated the wetlands
7 delineation on the plan.

8 Mr. House said he concurred with Mr. Lavery's suggestion concerning the driveway.

9 Mr. House made a motion to approve the Ober subdivision for the property located at 91
10 Willowbrook Avenue, Tax Map 19 Lot 37 and 39, a 2-Lot minor subdivision application to create
11 one new lot associated with a lot line adjustment with a condition that the NHDES State
12 Subdivision is approved and that they meet all other Town of Stratham requirements as per the
13 subdivision regulations. Motion seconded by Ms. Paladino. Motion carried unanimously.

- 14 **d. Massidda Subdivision, represented by Bruce Scamman, Emanuel Engineering, Inc., 118**
15 **Portsmouth Ave. Stratham, NH 03885, for the property located at 8 Oxbow Farm Road, Tax Map**
16 **8 Lot 22. 2-lot Minor Pork-chop Subdivision to create one new parcel.**

17 Mr. Austin said this is covered under the minor subdivision regulations with the twist that this is a
18 pork chop lot subdivision.

19 Mr. Baskerville asked Ms. Ober to return as the full voting member and Ms. Paladino returned to
20 being an alternate.

21 Mr. Scamman took the floor again. He reminded the Board he had been before them last year
22 concerning this subdivision as a preliminary hearing. There were discussions concerning frontage
23 and the right of way. He has met with Mr. Lavery to discuss the right of way who is in favor of
24 expanding the right of way as it will help with drainage and with any work he will need to do. By
25 doing that, 250' of frontage has been created which is enough for a pork chop lot. Their goal
26 tonight is to get some feedback and discussing a site walk. They have test pits that passed and
27 enough good soil to permit a pork chop lot. The new lot will be over 3 acres in size. With Mr.
28 Scamman is Mr. Mike Donahue, attorney.

29 Mr. Austin said he'd been struggling with this application for a couple of reasons: He understands
30 why Mr. Lavery sees some value in having an increased right of way, he doesn't necessarily oppose
31 increasing the right of way either as it was originally proposed at the preliminary consultation or
32 as proposed now; it could conceivably be done in both of those iterations as a private right of way
33 opposed to a public right of way. Obviously it won't be helpful to Mr. Lavery if it is a private
34 right of way.

35 Mr. Austin said in the past the issue of irregularly shaped lots has been raised by the Planning
36 Board, however there is no definition in the regulations as to what constitutes an irregular or regular
37 shaped lot. Mr. Austin continued that this does, however what is proposed here is functionally
38 equivalent to every cul-de-sac, tear drop, roundabout etc that has been developed in the Town of
39 Stratham. Professionally, Mr. Austin would be inclined to suggest to the Board that the regulations
40 be modified if this is in fact demonstrating a development pattern that shouldn't be furthered in the
41 future.

42 Mr. Canada agreed with Mr. Austin and said the Board needs to address the issue of gerrymandering
43 frontage. He said if you look at the Sullivan subdivision 110' frontage is on the circle but if you
44 draw a straight line, it would amount to 96' of frontage. Mr. Canada said the Board is seeing more
45 of these and he feels it goes against the spirit of the ordinance and all these cul-de-sacs are going
46 to end up requiring more time. Clearly a straight line through which the Planning Board envisaged
47 years ago would be a much better way for the Town.

1 Mr. Canada finds the Sullivan application egregious because they want a cul-de-sac for frontage
2 reasons, but want to build a hammerhead as it's cheaper.

3 Mr. Mike Donahue explained that the applicant wants to add 6,415 S.F. of additional right of way
4 which will give a radius within 10' of the cul-de-sac design. The purpose of that is to achieve what
5 he would call a legal, irregular lot. On the ground the design isn't changing apart from at some
6 point along the driveway would be the driveway for the new pork chop lot. In the original design
7 the driveway was too close to the Miller property at 6 Oxbow Farm Road. For a property like this,
8 a pork chop lot makes sense. The location of the house on the new lot is up for discussion.

9 Mr. Baskerville said this is a good sized lot at the end of a cul-de-sac and he is assuming the frontage
10 on the cul-de-sac now is enough for the subdivision to create a pork chop, but not a regular second
11 lot. They are proposing putting in an extra circle to give more land to the Town so a cul-de-sac
12 bulb is coming off another cul-de-sac bulb off a hammerhead to create that extra frontage. He has
13 never seen anything like this before. Mr. Austin said he doesn't think the existing right of way line
14 would necessarily have to stay, but for illustration it's a bubble on a bubble. Mr. Baskerville said
15 the normal procedure would be that they ask for a variance for less frontage to do a second lot, but
16 instead of going before the ZBA, they are creating this unique frontage situation. The extra 50' of
17 frontage for the pork chop is at a very sharp angle and it is actually only 23' wide. He doesn't think
18 it meets the spirit and intent of the ordinance. Mr. Baskerville said what if somebody comes to the
19 Board and they have enough frontage, but think they can add an arc to create an extra 10'. Mr.
20 Austin said the odds of running into a scenario like this one is not likely.

21 Mr. Donahue said if this would go before the ZBA, the first thing they would have to look at is
22 whether there is a hardship or if there is any other way of accomplishing this that would be within
23 the standards of the ordinance. There isn't a normal cul-de-sac there in terms of what the
24 regulations say; there is a 70' radius there. The regulations say a radius should be 113', but a radius
25 is not required at all for a hammer head. This hammer head, doesn't meet all the standards either.
26 He recommended the site walk.

27 Mr. Baskerville asked Mr. Donahue if he would recommend an agreement be put in place as to
28 who should maintain the easement. Mr. Austin asked the Board if they would want to review before
29 moving forward with the application or a condition that it exists. The Board didn't respond.

30 Mr. Baskerville invited public comments. Mr. Richard Miller, neighbor and abutter started by
31 acknowledging the fact that his neighbor Mr. Massidda had kept him informed every single step of
32 the way. They walked the lot together too using the plans. His concern is with the location of the
33 septic and proposed house. They came to a decision as to the best location for the house and then
34 he had a discussion with Mr. Massidda that maybe there is a way to figure out how to change the
35 existing property line although he was concerned about additional plans. Mr. Miller's suggestion
36 is that rather than resurveying everything that the property line could be moved down. He
37 commented on the new lot size being around 3 acres when the average lot size in the neighborhood
38 is 7 acres. The house size is appropriate for the neighborhood, but to put a large house on a small
39 lot like that will have an effect on property values in the area.

40 Mr. Baskerville said a lot has to do with State regulations and how things work with the State. The
41 Planning Board is here to do the subdivision and once the lot is created the house can be built
42 anywhere; the size, location or what it looks like is not the Planning Board's decision.

43 Mr. Canada said he thinks that Mr. Baskerville's concerns about circumventing the ZBA is well
44 stated and Mr. Miller's concerns bring that out. He feels the Board is acting like a ZBA when it
45 shouldn't be. Mr. Austin added that if the Planning Board denied this application, they would then
46 be able to apply to the ZBA with clear hardship because they have no other alternative as vetted by
47 the Planning Board which means they would be back before the Planning Board again if the
48 variance was approved.

1 Mr. Donahue said they will follow the subdivision plan. What matters is not so much the size of
2 all the lots in this neighborhood, but how much use of the land is available on these lots. There is
3 a lot of useful land on both of these lots. He thinks that should the Board go out to the site it will
4 see that the additional 6,415' is not going to change the neighborhood.

5 Mr. Massidda said the reason they were trying to build a larger house was to avoid hurting the
6 neighborhood. They felt if they put a smaller house on there, it would be more detrimental to the
7 neighborhood.

8 The Board scheduled a site walk for February 1, 2017 at 4:30 pm.

9 Mr. House made a motion to continue this application to February 1, 2017, regular meeting. Motion
10 seconded by Ms. Ober. Motion carried unanimously.

11 12 **4. Public Meeting(s):**

- 13 **a. Pipers Real Estate Cell Tower, represented by Rob Graham,** Preliminary Consultation for cell
14 tower location and site plan for commercial storage building at 142 Portsmouth Ave, Stratham, NH
15 Tax Map 17 Lot 19.

16 Mr. Rob Graham explained that they have removed the storage building component from the
17 version of plans before the Board. Mr. Mark Stevens introduced himself and explained the plan
18 was a schematic drawing to show the location of 142 Portsmouth Avenue also known as Pipers
19 Landing. He indicated where the cell tower would be located as well as 4 pad sites for equipment;
20 it would be a multiple user cell tower. It will be about 120' – 130' tall. He will confirm the height
21 before they go to the formal stage. The design will be the same as the tower located at 313
22 Portsmouth Avenue and be set up for 4 or 5 users. Mr. Stevens said Radio Frequency (RF) wise,
23 he has been told this is a great location given the hill and topography in Stratham. He doesn't
24 believe the tower will be visible for anybody. The only vegetation that would be cut on site would
25 be one tree, and they are a couple of hundred feet from the property line apart from the back corner
26 where they are close to it, but it's all woods and similarly zoned.

27 Mr. Baskerville said eventually the Board will need a larger and more detailed plan as there is a
28 requirement of 125% of the fall radius and he asked about the existing house on the property. Mr.
29 Stevens said it is not occupied currently, but it will be occupied as an office building, not a house.

30 Mr. Canada asked if the 125% fall zone was for abutting properties. Mr. Baskerville realized it
31 was for off-site properties. Mr. House asked if the green lines on the plan represented access. Mr.
32 Stevens confirmed that was what they represented. It will be an unpaved access driveway. Mr.
33 House asked about retaining walls. Mr. Stevens showed where a retaining wall would go and added
34 the leach field is higher than the building will be so they will need to bring the elevation up.

35 Mr. Paine asked about fencing. Mr. Stevens said it will be fenced and screened. Mr. Paine said
36 the pads will need some kind of shed. Mr. Stevens said he has been told that the newer tower
37 locations don't have sheds because the equipment is waterproof. The pads are 10' x 20' with 5' of
38 separation between each pad. Mr. Paine asked if Mr. Stevens would be open to alternative designs.
39 Mr. Stevens said he would be willing to talk about it. Mr. Baskerville checked that Mr. Stevens
40 understood the type of information that would be required for a formal hearing. Mr. Stevens
41 explained that the cell tower company would be the people applying for the tower and that the
42 Board had worked with the company before.

43 Mr. Paine asked if there was any other development on the property at this time. Mr. Stevens said
44 not at this time although after the cell tower they may be considering something else.

45 Mr. Brad Jones said he owns property next door to this location and for Mr. Stevens to say this
46 tower won't be visible is ridiculous especially a multi-unit one. A lot of money has just been spent

1 on the Town Center and although he was apprehensive initially he has to admit it has made a great
2 difference and now Mr. Stevens wants to put this tower right in the middle. Mr. Stevens said he
3 doesn't think it will be visible.

4 Mr. Baskerville repeated that this application will be no different to other cell tower applications
5 so a balloon float test will need to take place and a simulation of what it will look like from various
6 locations.

7 Mr. Marty Wool asked Mr. Stevens if he had anybody interested in using this tower before it gets
8 built. Mr. Stevens said they are working on it. Mr. Wool asked if Mr. Stevens had spoken with
9 Verizon Wireless who have been working diligently for many months to get a cell tower in this
10 town. Mr. Stevens said this tower will be built as a multi-user tower and he would welcome them,
11 but he hasn't talked to them yet.

12 Diana Lankler asked if this tower would be in lieu of the Verizon at Scamman's Home and Garden
13 Center or in addition. Mr. Stevens said it would be in addition. She asked why the tiny town of
14 Stratham need 3 additional cell towers when the town already has multiple. Mr. Baskerville said
15 the applicants provide a map that shows where there is no coverage and there is an increase in data
16 usage nowadays. Mrs. Lankler asked if the Town has a limit as to what it is willing to accept for
17 cell towers. She asked if it would be easier be switch carriers rather than put up more towers.

18 Mr. Baskerville said they will do a thorough review of each application.

19 Mr. Kevin King agreed that to have 3 cell tower applications was crazy. The Town doesn't need
20 another cell tower especially as the Town has done a great job with the Town Center. Mr. Stevens
21 says you can't see it, but Mr. King said he's an abutter and the lighting of the building that is
22 adjacent to the proposed site at night is like day light. He has never complained about it, but he
23 can see a glow of lighting when you look north east. He can see the house all the time and extra
24 lighting was added. If driving from Greenland to Stratham you will be able to see a cell tower and
25 he can't imagine that anybody on the Board would find that a plus for Stratham. He asked about
26 the storage facility. Mr. King said he had an opportunity about 10 – 12 years ago to put up a cell
27 tower on about 60 acres on land on the Epping Road and he didn't do it mainly because of the
28 residents' opposition plus he doesn't like cell towers even when they make them look like trees.

29 Mr. Baskerville reminded everybody that this is a preliminary consultation.

30 Mr. Jones challenged Mr. Stevens that there will be trees in front of the tower. Mr. Stevens said
31 Mr. Jones was welcome to come and look at where the tower would go and he will see trees.

32 **b. Proposed Cell Tower, represented by Rob Graham,** Preliminary Consultation for cell tower
33 location at 4 West Road, Stratham, NH Tax Map 4 Lot 9.

34 Mr. Mark Stephens presented the application. He explained this would be a multi-user tower and
35 showed the proposed location on the plan. They are proposing a dirt access road back into the area
36 near the septic system and fence and they will build up the area 6' and use a retaining wall. He
37 said this tower will be the same as the one for 142 Portsmouth Avenue.

38 Mr. Baskerville asked if it was along the Route 101. Mr. Stevens said it was. Mr. Baskerville
39 asked if it was wooded between the fence and highway. Mr. Stevens said it was. Mr. Baskerville
40 asked how wide that area was. Mr. Stevens said about 40'.

41 Mr. House asked if Mr. Stevens knew what kind of trees there were in the wooded area. Mr.
42 Stevens said they are deciduous. Mr. Paine asked if they would consider a mono pine; as people
43 come around the corner of the 101 the first thing they see is that parcel. Mr. Paine observed it
44 was close to the property line and asked if it could be moved back. Mr. Stevens said they have an
45 easement that they gave years ago to protect the woodland and to buffer the brook so right now
46 they are set back off of the easement by 10'. Mr. Baskerville said it looks like the tower is also
47 within the shore land setback which will require a variance. Mr. Stevens said they have already

1 reached out to the conservation commission for a site walk and they will be attending a meeting.
2 Mr. Paine asked about drainage and the brook. Mr. Stevens said it will just be a gravel pad so it
3 will be recharge. Mr. Paine asked if maintenance would be monthly. Mr. Stevens said it would
4 be. Mr. Baskerville reminded the applicant that the Board will need to see all the same reports and
5 things as they did for Verizon.

6 Mr. Paine asked if the access road would ever affect the leach field. Mr. Stevens said they have
7 gone out there and dug up the side of the leach field to confirm grade and location and the leach
8 field wouldn't be affected. Mr. Paine asked Mr. Stevens if he anticipated that both sites will provide
9 necessary coverage. Mr. Steven said they believe both sites would provide enough coverage for
10 the entire Town of Stratham and there won't be a need for any more cell towers. Mr. Stevens
11 suggested the Board use their third party RF expert to analyze the 2 locations and if it costs money
12 he will be happy to reimburse those funds. Mr. House said they will need more information before
13 they can do that.

14 Mr. Marty Wool said one thing he would like the Planning Board to think about is that this site is
15 on the Epping side of the auto repair place; if you come down that road you can see right into the
16 auto repair shop; he suggests that the Board request that the landowner extends their vegetation
17 down and hopefully it will block some of that view in the process of building the cell tower. Mr.
18 Baskerville said the Board will definitely take a look at landscaping.

19 A resident from Frying Pan Lane asked if the balloon test for these towers could be done for 24
20 hours because the last one was only done for 4 hours so a lot of people didn't get to see it. Mr.
21 Baskerville said they will keep that in mind and see if it can stay up longer.

22 Mr. Fred Emanuel said if the Town has 2 hills, couldn't a tower be put up on each of those hills to
23 provide coverage. Mr. King said this site would probably fit better, but he doesn't understand the
24 need for 2 cell towers. He wondered about the land at the back of Stratham Hill Park. He feels
25 they should be allowed one of the locations preferable this one.

- 26
27 **c. Daley Subdivision, represented by Bruce Scamman, Emanuel Engineering, Inc., 118**
28 **Portsmouth Ave. Stratham, NH 03885, for the property located at 74 & 76 Willowbrook Ave. and**
29 **61 Lovell Road, Tax Map 23 Lot(s) 12, 13, 14. Preliminary Consultation for 8-lot subdivision.**

30 Mr. Baskerville explained that the applicant wanted to postpone the hearing for this consultation
31 until February 1, 2017.

32
33 **5. Miscellaneous**

34 There were no miscellaneous items to report.

35 **6. Adjournment**

36 Mr. House made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 11:07 pm. Motion seconded by Ms. Ober. Motion
37 carried unanimously.