



**Stratham Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
April 5, 2017  
Municipal Center, Selectmen's Meeting Room  
10 Bunker Hill Avenue  
Time: 7:00 PM**

---

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

Staff Present:           Tavis Austin, Town Planner

---

**1. Call to Order/Roll Call**

Mr. Baskerville, Vice Chairman took roll call. He explained that the previous Chairman, Mike Houghton is now a Town Selectman and with that the Planning Board's Board of Selectmen representative and Mr. Canada is no longer a Town Selectman, but a regular member.

Mr. Baskerville said the Board needed to have an election of offices for the positions of Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary. Mr. Paine made a motion that Mr. Baskerville be the Chair, himself as the Vice Chair and keep Mr. House as Secretary. Motion seconded by Mr. Canada. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Canada said he had been on the Heritage Commission for the last 9 years and he would like to continue in the role of a Planning Board representative. Mr. Houghton made a motion that Dave Canada serve as the Planning Board representative to the Heritage Commission. Motion seconded by Mr. Baskerville. Motion carried unanimously.

**2. Review/Approval of Meeting Minutes**

**a. March 15, 2017**

Mr. Paine made a motion to accept the meeting minutes for March 15, 2017 as presented. Motion seconded by Mr. House. Motion carried unanimously.

### 3. Public Hearing(s)

- a. **Verizon Wireless, represented by McLane Law Firm, 900 Elm Street, Manchester, NH 03101 for the property located at 58 Portsmouth Avenue, Tax Map 9 Lot 15** for a Conditional Use Permit application and Site Plan Review application pursuant to Sections 19.4.2 and 19.7 of the Stratham Zoning Ordinance for the construction of a proposed 130' monopole and 12'x16' concrete equipment pad with cabinets and generator, enclosed within an 8' tall wood stockade fence.

Ms. Paladino recused herself. Mr. Baskerville asked Staff if they considered the application complete. Mr. Austin said for the purposes of moving into a public hearing, he considered the application complete. There are some recommended conditions in the staff review that clarify some points that will probably be brought up tonight as there are some site plan elements to be included. Mr. Austin continued that subsequent to the balloon float that occurred on March 28, 2017, the applicant has submitted additional information with regard to the photo simulations that were done in conjunction with that balloon float. They were not included in the packet as following the workshop discussion with the Planning Board that information received after the notification of the public hearing, additional information would not be brought forward without action from the Planning Board to do so.

Mr. Austin touched on the topic of Gateway roads in the review and how it would impact the area subject to tonight's discussion should the Board want to entertain that. He added that this was also prepared after the public notice.

Mr. Baskerville asked the Board their opinion about reviewing the information submitted after the public notice. Mr. House felt they should see the Gateway information.

Mr. Paine made a motion to accept the application as complete so as to open the public hearing. Motion seconded by Mr. Baskerville. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Baskerville explained the procedure for the meeting to the audience.

Mr. Victor Manougian, representing Verizon Wireless introduced himself as well as Chip Fredette, Robert Baker, Keith Vallente and Matt Filbin.

Mr. Fredette started by discussing page Z3 from the site plan drawings. He said Verizon Wireless intends to use an existing paved driveway with a non-exclusive easement from the land owner to travel around the back edge of the property behind the storage bins to the proposed facility. Proposed utilities will come in from the street along the existing pole line to the last pole which sits in the middle of the lot. Verizon would take its utilities from that pole and go underground to the site. On sheet Z-4 an existing tree line is shown; the Landlord agreed to allow them to place their lease area behind that vegetative screening which consists of 20' – 25' tall arbor vitae, which was one of the issues with the former application at Scamman's House and Garden. They will have a stockade fence, plantings on one of the corners and the access will be in and out of the compound. The tower will be a galvanized steel monopole that allows them the ability to run the cables inside the pole so the only thing on the exterior will be the antennas themselves. The peak height of the antennas is 130' as is the pole itself. The setbacks adhere to the requirement for residential buildings.

Mr. Fredette said last time the Board wanted to know there was adequate access for emergency vehicles to reach the site. Using the non-exclusive easement, the access is suitable and a note has been added to the plan to reflect that.

Mr. Fredette sought permission to show the photo simulations. The Board decided that as there were so many people at the meeting, it made sense to allow the simulations to be shown. Mr. Fredette explained that they float a red weather balloon; the string of which is to the height of the structure and the balloon itself gives perspective and scale to the crew who does the work. Mr. Fredette shared the photos with the Board and public.

Mr. Baskerville asked about the topography slides. Mr. Fredette said the company produces these maps to save themselves work later on. The red areas represent areas where the balloon could possibly be seen. The blue represents areas that could be seen if there were no trees whatsoever. Areas with no shading at all are areas where the balloon would be invisible based on topography alone. Mr. Baskerville confirmed that it is possible in some of the red areas that the balloon might not be seen. Mr. Fredette confirmed it to be so.

Mr. Fredette ran through a propagation map which shows all the existing service to Stratham and outlying areas. He pointed out where Verizon Wireless has co-locations and commented that where possible Verizon will try to co-locate; this is the first time they are looking to build their own tower as there are no options to co-locate to cover this gap in coverage.

Mr. Keith Vallente explained the coverage maps; the green represents the targeted level of coverage and the fawn color is a slightly lower threshold of coverage and the white areas are where the coverage becomes unreliable.

Mr. Manougian said they are aware of communications from the residents to the current Landlord. He doesn't want to minimize their concerns, but the residents are going too far with the private Landlord. The same thing happened with the Scamman property; they are threatening not to buy these people's merchandise. Mr. Manougian said this is private property which is allowed through zoning so it should be the Landlord's decision. He reviewed the concerns that he has seen to date which range from health, ascetic looks, and the style of tower, property values and newer technologies. Mr. Manougian reminded people that for the Bunker Hill site application they had a safety specialist, Don Hayes present on health issues. He has worked in the field of radiation and safety for almost 30 years and he reviewed the application. He agreed with the conclusion that the site would comply with the FCC guidelines for public exposure and added that using a cell phone exposes a person to 20 times more energy than a cell tower. The style of a monopole with 4 arrays meets Section 19.2.3 and 19.2.5 of the Ordinance. A stealth style has been requested by some, but if they do that the antennas have to be stacked on top of each other and there is no way 4 carriers will fit on there. A lot of residents keep raising the possibilities of using small cell technology that is used in cities and towns by using mostly telephone poles. That was discussed and explained by Mr. Fredette and Vallente that macro sites are needed to be able to do it and there are none in this area that would cover the gap. Mr. Manougian said property values were discussed for both previous applications and the Board was satisfied with the report that was submitted that showed there was no conclusive evidence that property values would be lowered as a result of the cell tower. The same report will apply for this application as it's in the same area.

Mr. Manougian said he was happy to go through how they meet the Ordinance requirements for a conditional use permit and the only waiver they are requesting is from the storm water drainage plan requirements under Section 4.3.2.f. They are asking for it as they are taking a site that is paved with hot top and they are going to put their compound in that area which will

cut the hot top and be replaced with gravel so what is impervious now is becoming more pervious which will reduce that.

Mr. House asked if the Board could look at the Gateway plans. Mr. Austin explained that the plans showed different colored roads and streets. Red represents avenues and purple represents streets. There is a red and a purple road that crosses the subject property which aren't particularly tied to this application. The Technical Review Committee (TRC) met a week ago to discuss the future for Gateway roads as more development comes into the Gateway district. One of the topics of discussion was where are these roads really going to go once you move beyond the conceptual plan that was voted in with the zoning and start moving things around with existing development and anticipated future development within the Gateway district. The second image in front of the Board is where the purple street from the zoning map lays on the property. Once the TRC got to this point, they looked at this application in conjunction with it and the concern was raised as to where the purple street would go relative to the cell tower. The TRC would like the road not to go behind the storage units. The property owner's representative was at the TRC meeting and understanding that the road discussion may happen with their anticipated Audi application they would like the road to run around to the rear of their existing building rather than through their existing development. TRC agreed it made sense, but where the road should go provides more land east of the north/south thinner line. It was contemplated that Audi's redevelopment may put the building blocks in place for the road to go where you see the line to the west of the storage units, but the interim road construction may in fact go east of the storage units until the property redevelops. Mr. Austin questioned how close the tower pad and proposed landscaping will be to the road. The pieces that have already been adopted in 2013 are now coming into play with 2017 applications.

Mr. Fredette said they were informed at the site walk that the road would come behind the storage units. Mr. Paine asked if Mr. Fredette meant he was informed by the property owner. Mr. Fredette said he mentioned there was a discussion about a possible road coming across the back of the property. He was never aware it would cut through the middle of the property. Mr. Canada said doesn't it behoove to work with the property owner. Mr. Austin agreed. Mr. Canada said that sometimes back roads aren't straight, they have to be gerrymandered around to suit. Mr. Austin said if you look to the east of the purple road, there is less developable land. Mr. Paine said he doesn't have an issue as it relates to the location of the tower with regards to future Gateway roads.

Mr. Austin made the Board aware that there is one thing missing which is a landscape plan that goes to Section 5.2. of the Site Plan regulations. The applicant could request a waiver or turn in a stamped landscaped plan from a Landscape Architect.

Mr. Houghton said he would like a better understanding of the long term strategic view and asked if there are locations in Town that would do a better job in solving the coverage gaps. If you think about the future and 4G becoming 10G is there another answer which incorporates more than one tower. Mr. Fredette said there wasn't and this tower is the solution which was echoed by the third party RF engineer in his review for the Scamman property. Mr. Austin referred to the white area and said it looks like there could be a need for another tower in the future closer to what is known as Town Center or the bend just before heading to Stratham 1. Mr. Fredette said had the Bunker Hill site been approved, a lot of the white area would have been covered.

Mr. Houghton confirmed his understanding that Verizon doesn't currently have a long term strategy for coverage in Stratham. Mr. Fredette said as of right now that they did not have a long term strategic plan. Mr. Austin asked if it was reasonable to assume that not having such a plan could mean in 5, 8, 10 years another tower request will be made in that area. Mr. Fredette said he can't answer that, but up until now Verizon has survived using co-locations. Mr. Canada asked what it would take to fill the white gap to the east. Mr. Vallente explained it all has to do with topography and the challenge they have now is the Bunker Hill itself which is why it was such a good location. A taller tower would help, but based on the previous applications, they decided to go with 130' which will provide substantial enough coverage to the north and the primary objective is the commercial area along the Route 108/33 corridor. He added that the white space doesn't mean that there isn't any coverage, it's just not reliable. He doesn't know Verizon's plans for that white area at this time; usage tends to dictate business decisions. Mr. Canada repeated that his question was what it would take to fill that void. Mr. Vallente said a tower would be required in the general area of High Street and Winnicutt Road, but there's a lot more to it than just filling a white space such as volume and demand. Mr. Canada asked what the effects would be if they went with a higher tower. Mr. Vallente replied it would improve things to a certain extent, but not fill in the white space. Mr. Canada asked about the coverage if it was put on Stratham Hill. Mr. Vallente said there are still too many other hills and valleys and it wouldn't solve the coverage for the whole town.

Mr. Austin said for the benefit of the public, a lot of these questions are related to 2 other applications as well as this one for cell towers received by the Planning Board. One of the things the Planning Board is grappling with is the potential eventuality that if this one is approved and the other 2 are approved, that's 3 towers between the Route 101 and Stratham Hill Stone. He clarified that the Town is not looking for sites, but the Planning Board does have to receive every application and give it its own due diligence in accordance with the regulations. In balancing that they are well aware of the multiplicity of the applications coming in.

Mr. Paine said this area is zoned to have residential over time and this is a highly visible structure. The other towers that Verizon is using for co-location are not in a business district where there are a lot of people through the area. The tower in Exeter's business district is only 57.9 feet substantially lower than what is being proposed here. He asked why they couldn't have multiple lower height towers to fill the gaps. Mr. Paine said the applicant hasn't addressed substantial comments received from the Board at the previous meeting regarding the aesthetics of the Town. Must there be 4 co-locations? What about an internal pole? He feels the applicant isn't addressing some of the concerns which have been raised before.

Mr. Fredette said they have addressed the concerns, but they haven't been able to make concessions for reasons that have been given. Mr. Paine said Stratham's regulations ask for innovative technology and this design isn't innovative.

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

Mr. Abrami, Tall Pines Drive said his concern is precedence. He worries that this Board would set a precedent if this moved forward. He has looked at the Ordinance and Section 19.2.2 and

doesn't feel this application meets the criteria. He talked about property values and the fact that some people have only just moved in and now they may have a cell tower in their back yard. He addressed aesthetics and said there is a pretty good view of the tower. He forgot about the balloon test until he came off the 101 and drove past Stratham Heights Road where he could see the balloon all the way up until Bunker Hill Avenue.

Mr. Nesvold, Bittersweet Lane asked about the third party RF report done for the previous application at the Scamman location. It didn't talk about other locations. He wanted to know why a third party hadn't been brought it to give locations that would benefit everybody in the Town as opposed to taking Verizon's word as to what the best location would be.

Mr. Rubin, Apple Way said they pay the Planner to make recommendations to the Planning Board, are repeater towers possible? Mr. Vallente said the concept of a repeater is that you have an existing macro site and you have a smaller site that takes that signal and spreads it out a little further. The trouble is that they are now outdated with modern networks where capacity is a driving issue. Repeaters also require a line of sight which in this Town would cause problems and additionally they don't afford any visual capacity because they simply re-broadcast from an existing site using the same resources so it would not be a solution for this area. Mr. Rubin asked if that was considered for Bunker Hill. Mr. Austin said the Town Planner is not an RF professional nor is the Town Planner going to make suggestions or recommendations of appropriate towers to fit RF needs within the Town, but in the staff review he did suggest that the Planning Board is being asked yet again to consider one application for one provider to a community where there might be more than one cell service provider. In the staff review, the Planner suggests contacting a third party RF reviewer utilizing the coverage maps that were submitted by the applicant to show what the coverage is in the area and then propose a solution. Mr. Baskerville clarified that the third party reviewer reviewed the study done by Verizon. He said that this is the fourth time Verizon has applied for a new tower since 2007 and the first 3 were denied by various means. The Planning Board wants to come up with what is the Stratham solution. When they go to private landowners, the Board can only give them advice, but they can't direct them. Mr. Rubin asked if they would be willing to share their towers at a cost. Mr. Baskerville said he believes the applicant takes the top location and below that other carriers can use the arrays underneath. Mr. Austin added that there is a proposed condition in the staff review that suggests that as the Planning Board moves forward, that some certification that the tower which is currently proposed is structurally capable of handling at least 4 times the weight of the Verizon array.

Mr. Feeney, Bittersweet Lane said he read the third party analysis for the Scamman site and it was very telling. He was disappointed that the Board hasn't asked for another third party report for this application. He said in many ways the one done for the Scamman site was damning. In the conclusion it said that no RF emissions report was submitted as required by the Town's Ordinance. Mr. Feeney continued he wasn't sure that the health concern was being taken seriously enough and it is required by the FCC to know what the emissions are from the cell tower. They didn't know that for the Scamman site and not for this site either. Mr. Feeney requested the coverage slide be shown and said the third party report called into question the coverage plot saying that it lacked calibration data and details to validate the conclusions both for the need and proposed location of the new tower. The review said that the Board should require that the supporting calibration data and missing data be supplied. Mr. Feeney said the report also stated that Verizon used models that depicted a larger coverage

gap than would be used for other models so there was some question about the validity of the assumptions made there. Mr. Feeney read from the report, “assuming that the uncertainty of the predicted coverage plots can be resolved, the proposed cell site does leave a substantial coverage gap to the east which would require an additional site”.

Mr. Vallente said Verizon did respond to that third party review and an emissions report was submitted, along with calibration data. Mr. Feeney asked about a crane test to which Mr. Vallente explained that models are such that crane tests aren't necessarily needed and you can't always access sites. The model that Verizon uses is an industry accepted tool.

Mr. Manougian addressed the issue of precedence and said just because you allow one company to come in, the next one will still have to comply with the Ordinance and have the burden of proof to show another site is needed. He said the other 2 preliminary applications for other cell tower sites are bogus. He challenged the Board to get in touch with the applicant for those cell tower applications to see if Varsity Wireless will build those towers. Mr. Baskerville said they have not received formal applications for those. Mr. Manougian repeated that those 2 sites won't work and there is no data backing up that they will work. Mr. Austin added that he partially agrees with comments that Mr. Manougian just made and he concurs he has not heard anything from Varsity Wireless or any other carrier; it was the property owner. He contacted the property owner before the application before the Board tonight and asked the property owner if he intends to move forward. He responded in the affirmative. Mr. Austin said the Board has just received this application and hasn't yet determined if it will seek third party review yet. He continued that should it appear on record that the Board bases this application on the one at 57 Portsmouth Avenue (Scamman site) there would be an inherent problem so he asked the Board to limit discussion that way.

Ms. Mataglu, Bittersweet Lane said this tower is very visible and the photos don't represent that. On the slide which shows existing sites, the one at Long Hill has been omitted. Wouldn't it make sense if Verizon analyzed how it would affect their coverage if they were on that tower? Mr. Baskerville said the Board will discuss that. She also questions some of their coverage data.

Mr. Keene, Doe Run Lane agreed with the Board that it needs to find a Stratham solution. The Board has already pointed out that this will not cover anything north of the Traffic Circle. It also leaves a big shadow to the south of Route 101. Mr. Keene sees that something will come in to fill those gaps at some point in time. He feels that the third party reviewer should be used to find out how many towers Stratham may need. Two thirds of the signal is useless and fires into Bunker Hill anyway. He feels a tower closer to the 101 would cover the shadow down in Exeter a little bit better and reach up to the backside of Bunker Hill. Mr. Keene said he was on the Planning Board when the Toyota, now Audi site plan was approved and the storage warehouse in the back. He recommended looking back at that plan and making sure this cell site won't interfere with any of their traffic patterns.

Mr. Kirk Scamman, Frying Pan Lane said when the Guilfoyle site was approved there was talk about putting in a paper road half on Guilfoyle's site and half on his own property. He doesn't know where that is as he doesn't see it and he is very concerned about how the future roads will go off of his property across the Audi property. There was also talk about connecting up to Bittersweet and he doesn't know how that all gets laid out.

A resident, Bittersweet Lane wanted to focus on the property values report which always talks about the existing towers, but it doesn't talk about a tower next to a newly developed area.

Mr. Ciccanesi, Bittersweet Lane asked if the option of the back side of Shaws as a location has been exercised and if not, why not. Mr. Baskerville said that site was one of the 2 preliminary applications already discussed. Mr. Paine added that Verizon had been asked to look up and down the entire corridor for alternative locations and it's ultimately up to them to do their due diligence. Mr. Ciccanesi referred to the 3D topographical map and an area with red. Mr. Vallente said that they already have a site there.

Mr. Baskerville asked the applicant if he wanted to address any of the questions asked so far.

Mr. Fredette referred to Long Hill and explained that it would be redundant to use that tower as it would likely interfere with the site at the Varsity Wireless tower. He explained the interference. Mr. Manougian said he understands that the Board can get a third party review for the RF, but he doesn't want it to be a request for them to design a bunch of networks and see what works. The Ordinance doesn't allow for that, it just allows for the verification of any claims made by the applicant concerning technological limitations and feasibility for alternative locations as per Section 19.7.5 Mr. Baskerville suggests that the Board does send this out to third party review. Mr. Austin said he just heard it's a fine line between what the Planning Board asks the reviewer to do and a more defined line as to what the Planning Board can pass the cost onto the applicant for. He doesn't think there is anything to preclude the Board for asking for any study they want to pay for, it's a question of how much is the applicant responsible for. Mr. Baskerville said it would be good for the reviewer to speculate what the Town might need in the future. Mr. Austin said at the very least they could ask the RF reviewer to look at the 2 other sites to see what that might promulgate, not that that cost could be associated with the current application. Mr. Austin clarified that if the tower was at 4 West Road and another at Pipers Landing, what would the coverage look like and how does that compare to the RF report submitted for this application. The Planning Board would have a reasonable expectation of what might happen with 3 towers. Mr. Fredette said this is their 4<sup>th</sup> time and each time they have had to prove their choice of location and they are still being asked to prove it. He would expect that the Board will require just the same for any other future applicants. There are no other formal applications before the Board right now.

Mr. Houghton asked Mr. Fredette how many towers does it take to give maximum coverage and where would he locate the towers in a perfect World. Mr. Fredette asked what the Board would do with that information. Mr. Houghton said it would help the Board understand and he would be interested in Mr. Fredette's views as to how they can work more collaboratively to find the optimal solution and where in the Verizon World has that happened successfully. Mr. Baskerville added that in between applications the Board looks at the regulations to see if they are still really current. Mr. Canada questioned requesting a third party report when this site is so close to the previous site and wondered if they should ask the reviewer if it would be meaningful. Mr. Fredette said the site locations are essentially the same. Mr. Houghton said he wants to look at it strategically but Verizon is looking at it tactically, one pole at a time. Mr. Paine said the applicant is doing business as Verizon, but is there an actual person from Verizon Wireless that Mr. Fredette reports to and if so could they come in and provide some information as to a regional plan. Mr. Fredette said there isn't any wide range plan.



Mr. Nesvold asked what is stopping the Board from paying for a RF report. Mr. Baskerville said they may do a separate study after the third party report the Board can request under the regulations. Mr. Austin stressed that this application can't be beholden to that study that comes out at a future date.

Mr. House asked at what height does this pole differ from the one at the Scamman site and make a difference in far as the RF signals are concerned. Mr. Vallente said there is a difference of about 9'. Mr. Baskerville asked if their RF report addressed the height difference and location difference. Mr. Vallente said the report does not, it speaks to the proposed facility. Mr. Baskerville confirmed it reflects the current site. Mr. Vallente confirmed that was correct and it was a totally separate report.

Mr. House made a motion that the Board has a third party engineer review per the regulations because if there is a significant change and 9' makes a difference, the Board should know what that is. He added the RF report for the proposed wireless facility to be in Stratham, New Hampshire.

Mr. Austin confirmed the request is for a third party engineer review of the RF report for compliance with the regulations. Mr. House confirmed Mr. Austin was correct.

Motion seconded by Mr. Paine. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Austin said anticipating the Board won't take action on the project until receiving the report and without having any ability to ask the third party consultant to get that report within less than a week to stay within the noticing deadlines, he suggested the date of continuance not be the next meeting if that is amenable to the applicant unless there are other things the Board wants to consider with the understanding it would have to be continued again.

Resident, Stratham Heights Road said he understands they cannot change regulations mid-stream, but he remembers they spent a lot of time on the Gateway project and shares the opinion of the Board at looking at the long term solution for Stratham.

Resident, Tall Pines Drive said he liked the way Mr. Houghton was thinking strategically. He asked Mr. Fredette if there has ever been a Town that has thought strategically about cell towers. Mr. Baskerville added if so are there towns that have done it well so the Board could look at those. Mr. Fredette didn't provide an answer.

Ms. Ciccanesi, Bittersweet Lane said if the district is being developed, is it possible to think about how high the buildings could be for Verizon to use them as co-locations rather than building another tower. She asked would there be a good spot to put those? Mr. Baskerville said that was a big question which they couldn't address tonight. Mr. Austin said there is a current limitation on height in the district, but the regulations for cell towers has not changed in a long time and certainly not in line with the changes made for the Gateway.

Mr. Nesvold thanked the Board for taking a step back and putting the brakes on to pursue all options. He implored the Board to pursue a third party analysis for what would be the best plan for the Town and not only in regard to Verizon, but there are other providers that will be coming once these towers go up asking for co-location. In his opinion the same reasons for denying the Scamman site, apply here and he asked if anybody else believed that Verizon wouldn't be back looking at another site if this one was denied.

Mr. House asked if the grade was being changed drastically at this site. Mr. Fredette said they weren't raising the slope. Mr. House asked if the fire trucks would be going around the storage units. Mr. Fredette said he guesses they will go the quickest way they can to a fire. Mr. House said because there are propane tanks there he wants to make sure they can get there. Mr. Fredette confirmed they can get there.

Mr. Paine asked if the applicant was comfortable with their choice of tower for this site. Mr. Fredette said he absolutely was. He was happy to resubmit other samples for other Towns. Mr. Baskerville referred to the earlier question of the property values report referring to existing towers, but not new towers coming in where there is a new development. Mr. Manougian said they don't look at the age of homes, but they do look at existing towers. He added that a real estate evaluation can't be done on a tower that isn't there.

Mr. Austin asked the Planning Board to consider asking the applicant for a master plan for the site from the property owner. He asked the Board if they wanted a stamped landscape plan or simply ask the applicant to provide a landscape plan to go along with Section 5.2 of the Site Plan regulations for a waiver. Mr. Austin would recommend a condition that best management practices be in place until the tower is completed, obviously those don't need to be in place if the tower proposal is denied.

Mr. Baskerville asked if the applicant was amenable to continuing the application to the May 3, 2017 meeting.

Mr. Houghton said on the RF report, page 2, 3rd paragraph, 6<sup>th</sup> line down speaks to aggressive historical growth and projected growth for mobile data in particular, instances arise where usage demand can no longer be supported by the site serving the area and new facilities must be integrated to provide capacity relief to over loaded sites. It says further down in the paragraph that Verizon will be able to fill the substantial coverage gap that it now experiences with a 126' antenna sight line at 58 Portsmouth Avenue as well as provide improved coverage capacity to residents and businesses and traffic corridors. Mr. Houghton said and yet the applicant talks about the tower basically taking care of current short fall. He asked what they were going to do in 2021. Mr. Fredette repeated that they don't have a master plan beyond this siting. Mr. Vallente said the intent of this is to show wireless mobile data usage is growing faster and faster for some time so they are not just there to improve coverage, it's both a coverage and capacity issue.

Mr. Houghton said to the Board current regulations for stealth poles has been stated as not being practical because we require co-location agreements that require too many arrays. Mr. Houghton said he'd like to throw out the idea that they don't require so many arrays. Mr. Baskerville said he understood Mr. Houghton, but one tower carries 4 carriers, if it changes to 2, will someone else then have to build another tower for another 2 carriers? Mr. Austin said the regulations don't state that there have to be 4 arrays. Mr. Houghton said he is trying to think of other ways outside of the box.

Mr. Houghton made a motion to continue the meeting to May 3, 2017. Motion seconded by Mr. House. Motion carried unanimously.

#### **4. Miscellaneous**

- a.** No miscellaneous items to report

**5. Adjournment.**

Mr. House made a motion to adjourn at 9:54 pm. Motion seconded by Ms. Ober. Motion carried unanimously.