



**Stratham Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
May 3, 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

Members Absent: David Canada, Member
 Tom House, Secretary
 Nancy Ober, Alternate
 Lee Paladino, Alternate

Staff Present: Tavis Austin, Town Planner

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

The Chairman took roll call.

2. Review/Approval of Meeting Minutes

a. April 19, 2017

Mr. Paine made a motion to approve the April 19, 2017 meeting minutes as presented. Motion seconded by Mr. Houghton. Motion carried unanimously.

3. Public Hearing—

- a. Reiss Subdivision**, application by property owner John Reiss, represented by Bruce Scamman, Emanuel Engineering. *Minor Subdivision application* for a proposed subdivision of 16 Emery Lane, Stratham, NH 03885 (Tax Map 13 Lot 38) to create two (2) new building lots.

Mr. Austin confirmed the application was complete.

Mr. Houghton made a motion to accept the application for John Reiss, 16 Emery Lane, Stratham for the property located at 16 Emery Lane, Map 13 Lot 38 as complete. Motion seconded by Mr. Paine. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Bruce Scamman, Emanuel Engineering representing John and Susan Reiss, took the floor. Mr. Scamman shared the location of the property for the benefit of the audience and said they were there a couple of years ago with another minor subdivision and were here now to subdivide further the land that was left over. They had a private road with a shared driveway for the previous minor subdivision and at the time the Board said that if the applicant came back for a third lot, a full sized road design would be required. They have come back with a design including drainage calculations. The road has been located further back from the property line and the right of way has been widened. Previously Mr. Lavery had requested that the sheet flow drain off into the fields that are there. The Board asked the applicant to look at it a little more deeply than that for this application so they have created a bio swale that runs almost the length of the road until the end of the curve and they have put one across the end of the hammerhead too. The bio swale will take the water off of the pavement, treat it and infiltrate it back into the groundwater. There are good gravel soils on the slope so there will be a lot of infiltration. There will be a net decrease in runoff once the road is created. Additionally all the proposed houses will have to have infiltration around them which will provide a net decrease in drainage in those areas also.

Mr. Scamman said they have a waiver request for a 22' wide road and are proposing a public road. They feel that this will be similar to all the subdivisions that have happened in Town for the last 4 years where new roads go in and they are allowed to put in public roads. He doesn't see anywhere in the regulations where this is prohibited. They have submitted an amended drawing to D.O.T. The previous road at the entrance was 0.4' so it is narrower than what they did before.

Mr. Baskerville said he is interested in the design of the bio swale and that in his view between that and the entrance he does think an engineering review is necessary and there is also the issue of long term maintenance. He asked if the applicant is proposing an association for the maintenance or if the Town will maintain the swales. Mr. Scamman replied they did the same basic design for Subaru. Mr. Baskerville suggested to the Board that a third party review should be done by Civilworks and they should have Mr. Lavery's opinion on maintenance costs of long term bio retention swales. Mr. Scamman said when he spoke to Mr. Lavery about the retention swales, his biggest concern was with larger plant material.

Mr. Paine referred to the bio swales and said both seem to cross the majority of the parcels they service. He asked if they would put in a culvert or would that take away the functionality of the swales. Mr. Scamman said you could do a culvert, but he wasn't expecting to do one; he was expecting it to be like a dam to slow the water down when it goes down the hill. At the moment the swale has rock at the base of it. It goes down through the bio retention soils and would go down into the rock beneath it, and the water will infiltrate. Mr. Scamman said it doesn't seem it would need much, however they could put in a culvert if so wished. Mr. Paine said he would hesitate to put in a dam-like structure somewhere where water is expected to flow. Mr. Baskerville agreed with Mr. Paine.

Mr. Paine referred to the waiver request and said he doesn't have a problem with it. Mr. Austin said the private way, Betty Lane was designed and planned already. Mr. Scamman said it was originally approved for 18'.

Mr. Scamman said lot shape was discussed at the last meeting. They would like to submit the design to D.E.S. for approval and the configuration of the 3 lots and existing lots as is. Mr. Austin said he doesn't see any conflict between the 3 lots and the regulations.

Mr. Jeremy Riecks, Doe Run Lane wondered how long it would take the Highway department to plow that road and he is against it. He thinks to make this a public road for the benefit of 3 or 4 houses at the expense of the tax payer is not right and he is certainly concerned with who pays for the bio swale in the years ahead. He asked if it is designed to keep pollutants out of the surface water. Mr. Scamman said it is basically a treatment filter. Mr. Riecks said he assumed consideration would be given to putting a restriction on people using pesticides and fertilizers in that area.

Mr. Scamman said they have chosen a hammerhead design as they are quicker for the Town to plow over a cul-de-sac design. Swales are part of almost every road in Town and there are dead ends adjacent to this on Butterfield Lane, Raeder Drive, and Doe Run Lane to name a few.

The topic of safety and emergency vehicles was mentioned. Mr. Scamman said they had submitted turning templates.

Mr. Baskerville said he would like to do a site walk. Mr. Houghton said if it is proposed as a Town road, it should go out to third party review and he would welcome the opportunity to go and visit the site. Mr. Paine agreed.

Mr. Paine made a motion to have a site walk on June 7, 2017 at 6:30 pm. Mr. Paine added that the design should be sent out to third party review by Civilworks. Mr. Austin said he can send it to Civilworks post haste if the Board would like. Mr. Paine said he was OK with that. Motion seconded by Mr. Houghton. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Houghton made a motion to continue the hearing to June 7, 2017. Motion seconded by Mr. Paine. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Houghton made a motion to close the public hearing for a non-public to discuss pending litigation. Motion seconded by Mr. Paine. Motion carried unanimously.

b. NON-PUBLIC SESSION

Mr. Paine made a motion to close the non-public session and seal the meeting minutes at 8:40 pm. Motion seconded by Mr. Houghton. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Paine made a motion to reopen the public hearing. Motion seconded by Mr. Houghton. Motion carried unanimously.

c. 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.

Mr. Austin shared that the applicant had submitted extra information since the last meeting and confirmed that the relevant information had been sent out for a third party RF review as requested by the Board. Mr. Austin said an invoice had been received which would be paid for by Verizon Wireless.

Mr. Victor Manougian, McLane Middleton, attorney representing Verizon Wireless took the floor and introduced Chip Fredette, Robert Baker, Keith Vallente and Matt Tilton. Mr. Manougian ran through all the additional materials that had been supplied as a result of the discussion with the Board last time.

Mr. Chip Fredette took the floor and talked through the RF third party report's conclusion which validates that the data provided for the predicted Verizon coverage is sufficient and accept them as representative for the purpose of determining the existing and proposed coverage in the area of consideration. The report goes on to say that Verizon's coverage gap is appreciable and a new cell site at 58 Portsmouth Avenue would mitigate that gap.

Mr. Fredette referred to the appraisal done by a certified appraiser and said it shows there is no effect on property values. The appraisal also included a survey done across 15 states about whether there had been any impact on property values due to the presence of a cell tower. There were 172 replies all of which said "no".

Mr. Paine referred to the third party RF report and said it does say that a cell tower at this site won't entirely eliminate the gap but along with traffic from other surrounding cell sites seems to indicate that there will be enough coverage at this location. He wondered about perhaps adding another tower to a site that has existing coverage although the coverage might not be to whatever level.

Mr. Erdem Matoglu, Bittersweet Lane said he sent a letter to the Board and Board of Selectmen suggesting co-location at the Long Hill site. The letter was sent to the Town's third party RF reviewer. He would like his proposal to be considered and in his opinion there are multiple solutions and more elegant solutions more fitting to Stratham.

Ms. Kara Karouni, Market Street spoke about property values. She said they have approximately 20 families in their neighborhood and she is sure nobody would have bought their house had this tower been on site. It makes a huge difference when buying a home if you have a 130' pole there. In her opinion there is no way it wouldn't affect property.

Mr. Richard Feeney said they had all talked about different formations and designs, but this is going to be an eyesore. There are people who won't buy a house near a cell tower so the market loses potential buyers. Some people perceive there could be a health effect as well. He referred to the Master Plan and under Section 8.5 that the Planning Board should participate in any future development of a regional telecommunications plan to help minimize the need for additional telecommunication towers in the Town and region and achieve other common objectives with the surrounding towns. He said there should be a grander plan. Mr. Feeney referred to the third party RF report related to the site at 57 Portsmouth Avenue which only considered Verizon's coverage and didn't consider other cell tower coverage and co-location. It was verbally dismissed and never put in the report.

Mr. Baskerville said they had talked about not allowing as many people on the tower, stealth towers and Mr. Baskerville said his understanding was if the tower goes up, make sure we allow four on it so then there may not be even more towers. Mr. Baskerville said he understood the reference to the Master Plan but he said some people are of the opinion there are going to be more towers in Town. Mr. Austin read from the third party RF report that states that co-locating on the Long Hill cell tower puts Verizon too close to the tower at 313 Portsmouth Avenue where they are also co-located. The third party reviewer also believes there will be more towers in the future. Mr. Austin

said he asked the third party reviewer if he was able to provide an overview of where other towers might be needed in the Town, but he was unable to give a response to that due to a lack of propriety data from the various providers. Mr. Baskerville said that as a Board they do try to plan for the future and after this is done, they may sit and call in their own RF engineer and ask if they should change the regulations for the future.

Mr. Manougian said the key part is that Verizon needs a western and central part of Stratham, not Long Hill Road. The Ordinance doesn't require them to provide a 5 year or longer study of the needs for Stratham regardless if they have one. There is also no requirement to build a 2-site solution. He quoted the case of Daniels v Londonderry where 30 – 40 sites were looked at by Verizon including some multiple sites, but they held that you can't solve the gap by trying to shoe in from the outside to the center. In that case, the Town allowed the installation and it went all the way up to the NH Supreme Court.

Mr. Jay Nesvold, Bittersweet Lane made the Board aware that on January 18 the Board did set a precedent when looking at Ordinance Section 19.7.2 subsection c 1 – 10. The minutes show the Board deliberated over this for the site at 57 Portsmouth Avenue and gave reasons why it was denying it from issues such as the view shed to the corn maze. This particular tower is moving 600' away from that site and it is being put near residential homes. With the Gateway district being evolved and Market Street planned to become an extension of that, the mixed use facilities that everybody wants to have means that people will literally be living on top of this tower all the time. He wanted to remind them they denied the previous application due to the view issues, but if it approves this application, the Board is essentially approving this in someone's back yard.

Mr. Abrami, Tall Pines Drive said this seems to be providing better coverage for the stores from Route 101 up until Bunker Hill. He remembers there was talk about putting a tower by Shaw's which he would support as it's not a residential area and would seem to cover the target area.

Mr. Matoglu, Bittersweet Lane said if this was located at the Long Hill site he doesn't see why the signal should be able to go all the way up to the horizon as it doesn't see any obstruction. Two miles is nothing for this signal to be satisfactory. They talk about it having overlap coverage with the 313 Portsmouth Avenue but they should be able to adjust that; it's an engineering problem. It could be put at the Shaw's site too as this signal should go 15 miles and we are talking about two miles. He asked why Stratham should settle for a less engineered solution if there is a more satisfactory solution for everybody which could be solved with a different engineering solution.

Mr. Feeney, Bittersweet Lane said he understood the Board's position that it is beholden to addressing this tower on its own. He referred to the 57 Portsmouth Avenue site and said all the same reasons for denial exist here as they did there.

Another resident talked about property values and said the appraisers report only has one example of where a new home was being built at the same time as a cell tower. She said she has studies that look at this and say otherwise. She added that this will affect people from wanting to move into this area and those currently living in Stratham.

Mr. Valeri, Market Street said they would not have bought their house in this development had they known about this cell tower so it's common sense to him that it would affect property values.

Mr. Dachsteiner, Bittersweet Lane said he has no issue with coverage at all although he is with AT&T and wondered why Verizon was having coverage problems.

Mr. Fredette said there is a gap in coverage and he can't talk for AT&T.

Mr. Paine asked if there is a speed or a data load that can only handle a certain quantity of data.

Mr. Vallente said it varies out in the field as it is based on where users live. The other problem is that there are other far off sites that are trying to serve busy areas like Routes 33 or 108 and traffic that goes to that area of Brown Ave or 2 miles away which is on the fringe of the coverage of the Verizon cell sites. When you put all that usage on the edge of a cell, it creates an even greater burden and so sucks up the availability from all over the network. It is a combination of limited capacity from the Stratham sites and the poor coverage in this area.

Mr. Paine asked what numbers are looked at to determine whether a site is appropriate. Mr. Vallente said they look at the coverage afforded by the surrounding sites. Mr. Paine asked how the coverage will compare with the new site versus the current coverage. Mr. Vallente tried to explain using a map that showed coverage and said a signal of 95dBm is considered a decent benchmark for good coverage.

Mr. Houghton asked Mr. Vallente to explain the budget. Mr. Vallente explained it is all about having enough coverage so people don't have dropped calls. It looks at loss of coverage due to obstructions such as trees or going into buildings.

Mr. Riecks said he thinks that if they had a distributed antenna system with a small lower antenna and other antennas located on telephone poles or similar structures like they do in other places, he thinks it can be done, it's just a question of money. Mr. Riecks knows that they changed out the antenna recently at the Exeter site and wondered if increasing the height of that antenna would help provide more bandwidth.

Mr. Fredette said it can't be done in Stratham as those are solutions used in busy downtown, heavily developed areas such as college campuses. There needs to be a macro site and smaller cells help offload the capacity off of the macro site. Mr. Austin said he had asked Mr. Menkes, the third party reviewer this question and he affirmed what Mr. Fredette is saying. Mr. Fredette added that the smaller cell sites are generally located lower and Stratham is a heavily forested area.

Ms. Feeney, Bittersweet Lane said they are not opposed to a cell tower, but they are looking for a solution for everybody living in Stratham. It feels a little like an "us" and "them" mentality. She feels like people aren't listening. The Board has asked for different solutions but a monopoly is still being discussed. She feels like there has to some sort of engineering solution and if they all work together she feels there must be a solution to fit with the long term plan for Stratham. Part of that is that residents don't want this in the neighborhood.

Mr. Dachsteiner added that Verizon has looked at this from their perspective only so have not necessarily based their application on the infrastructure around. The fact that AT&T doesn't have an issue he wonders if Verizon has looked at all the co-location opportunities around.

Mr. Fredette responded that he didn't know what AT&T needs and plans are, he only knows what Verizon's needs and plans are. He said he can say with almost certainty that Verizon is co-located on every one of the towers that AT&T are co-located on.

Mr. Houghton said if he remembers correctly, Verizon had applications for the Municipal Center parking lot, Bunker Hill, the Scamman Farm and now the Audi Dealership. He asked Mr. Fredette to share what other locations they have reached out to about locating on their properties. Mr. Fredette said they started with a search ring and other properties they looked at were the Scammans who weren't interested so they moved to the property at 57 Portsmouth Avenue. There are no existing structures upon which they can co-locate and there are few parcels that give them the

ability to meet setbacks and even fewer that would afford them some kind of camouflaging. This is a commercially used area of which 90% is auto dealerships. This 58 Portsmouth Avenue site is the next best location available.

Mr. Paine said they did ask if Verizon could come up with some alternate tower structures and he hasn't seen any designs that address those considerations yet. Mr. Fredette said they are trying to hide what was a 150' proposal across the street and they agreed to reduce the height by 20' which is the bare minimum they can get away with. There aren't many options available to hide this 130' tower. He mentioned a flagpole style, but said it wouldn't work here because of the limitations of the equipment on the inside of it. Mr. Paine asked if they were more concerned with just Verizon's technology or other carriers' technology. Mr. Fredette replied only with Verizon's technology and in this case a flagpole would lose the co-location capacity. Verizon's concern would be getting their antennas at a minimum height with a structure that would suit carrying other carriers. Mr. Paine asked that if there were a reduced number of co-locators, would that affect the dimension of the structure. If Verizon's equipment fitted in a 3 pole cylinder, would more space or a larger structure be needed? Mr. Fredette said the only negative factor about that pole is the diameter is limited in size so there is no ability to twist and turn. It is not so much making it wider to solve a co-location ability, it will be a function of raising the height. Mr. Paine said if Verizon wanted to do a flagpole do they have an alternative analysis and what height would they need. Mr. Fredette said they don't have that analysis as they can't use one. The third party reviewer said the same in his report. Mr. Paine asked if they could work with bringing in a structure that accommodates helping the neighbors with something that isn't as visually intrusive and to remember they are going to also provide cell phone capacity that Verizon doesn't currently have. Mr. Fredette said they definitely can't do a flag pole, but they could talk about doing something called "T-Arm" mount as opposed to doing the traditional triangle array. A T-Arm mount stands about 18 inches off of the tower and you only put on 2 antennas on each set so you go from 12 panels to 6. The mounts are big enough to put the equipment behind the antennas and with this configuration the radio heads are hung on their own rig mount just below it so there is a cluster of equipment closer mounted. It is about 2 feet as opposed to 12 feet and there will be half as many antennas. It can't be hidden as such, but it will be less mass in the air and the cables will still run up inside the pole.

Mr. Baskerville asked what the diameter of the tower was. Mr. Fredette said probably about 20 inches. Mr. Paine asked if they didn't have the capacity to carry as many carriers, could the tower be brought down to a lower elevation. Mr. Fredette said 130' was the absolute minimum.

Mr. Baskerville explained that some applications are uncomfortable for the Board and sometimes they will deny an application. Sometimes those that are denied will take it to court and sometimes the Town wins and sometimes it loses. Mr. Baskerville reminded the audience of the 4 applications that Verizon had bought before the Town up until now and said every time the Town denies them, the Board runs the chance of them going to a judge and saying they have applied 4 times and are still without a tower.

Mr. Dachsteiner said he appreciates what the Board do, but in the spirit of concession, he feels closer to the Route 101 would be a better location even if there is overlap from other towers. Verizon is looking for the perfect solution which serves their need and their problem only. He feels like the search ring is a self-imposed one.

Mr. Riecks asked if there were any examples of T-Arm style towers in the area they can look at. Mr. Fredette said they didn't have an example they could show, but he had given the Chairman a specs sheet. It is a fairly new type of tower for Verizon.

Mr. Fredette said the search ring is an engineered design done by folks that do this every day. To put up a taller tower and expand the search ring wouldn't work. The Bunker Hill site was the best location.

Ms. Stacey Curran, Bittersweet Lane said she appreciated the situation the Board is in and hearing the option for a smaller tower. The reality is the smaller, less obtrusive pole is still in her back yard. She just wishes the location was in a non-residential area.

Another Bittersweet Lane resident said that they have a Town ordinance which gives the right to the Town to reject this tower.

Mr. Matoglu said there is no such thing as impossible and the co-location on the Long Hill Tower is still possible.

Mr. Houghton said the third party RF engineer engaged by the Town as a neutral participant in this process has on 2 occasions stated that Long Hill is not a suitable location. He continued that cell towers will come to Stratham and there isn't any neighborhood that wants them in their back yard. As a minimum the Town needs to do a lot of work on the regulations, but regrettably that does not change this application regrettably.

Mr. Matoglu said he is not crazy about the Long Hill location which is why in his letter he proposed moving this 4,500' south west in the more commercial industrial area.

Ms. Matoglu asked how the Board can deny the 57 Portsmouth Avenue application which is only 700' away. Mr. Austin said if Long Hill is too close to 313 Portsmouth Avenue, that if 57 is approved, this wouldn't be going in at 58 Portsmouth Avenue.

Mr. Manougian referred to a first circuit case which was T-Mobile v Cranston in Rhode Island. That court held that a wireless carrier only had to look at 3 alternate sites and that was sufficient for them to say this is the most feasible location. Mr. Fredette has testified at every hearing including tonight about alternate locations. In this case they have looked at more than 3 alternate sites and have filed for 4 alternate sites. Two of them they spent tens of thousands of dollars on legal and engineering fees and two of them, they signed leases, one with the Town and one with 57 Portsmouth Avenue. He continued that Federal law preemption was created to provide rapid deployment post 9/11. Currently 70% of 9/11 calls are made from cell phones so if this location is denied, in his view this would be a prohibition of cellular coverage and the Federal court would see that as a denial of service for this part of Stratham. He respectfully requested the Board grant the conditional use permit and approve the site plan with waivers for landscape and storm water.

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

Mr. Baskerville addressed Mr. Fredette and confirmed that he had agreed to submit a revision to the plans using the cut sheet given to the Board tonight. Mr. Fredette said that was correct. Mr. Paine asked if it was possible for the tower's pole's dimension to be reduced. Mr. Fredette said he didn't know the answer to that. Mr. Austin asked if the pole would be larger. Mr. Fredette said the pole would be a site specific design. The foundation will be based on the soil type. Mr. Baskerville said there will be less wind load on the tower, but Mr. Fredette can't state that tonight.

Mr. Fredette said that was true. Mr. Austin asked if their concession to the 6 panel carry for future carriers. Mr. Fredette said that wasn't up to him to decide. Mr. Austin said it was something for the Board to consider.

Mr. Baskerville said they should address the waivers. Mr. Austin reminded the Board that the first waiver was specific to a landscape stamp from a Landscape Architect. Staff has no issue with not receiving a Landscape Architect stamp for the few plantings planted around the fence.

Mr. Houghton made a motion that the Landscape plan as required under Section 5.2.n. Site Plan regulations does not require a stamped Landscape Architect stamp. Motion seconded by Mr. Paine. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Houghton referred to this monopole and the discussion about the T-Arms and the location of the arrays for Verizon. He asked if consideration would be given to not putting any other arrays up just than the Verizon array if the co-location agreement was waived. Mr. Fredette asked Mr. Manougian who said he didn't think they could do that. Mr. Manougian said Federal law requires co-location and requires the carrier who builds the tower to offer co-location to other carriers so they couldn't waive that as far as he knows. Mr. Austin said if AT&T came to Mr. Fredette and said they want to put an array on their tower and Verizon said that the Town had stated that only Verizon could go on the tower so you will have to discuss it with the Town, what would happen. Mr. Manougian said Verizon would get sued. Mr. Baskerville said he'd prefer a tower with 4 carriers on it rather than 4 separate towers.

Mr. Austin said the second waiver is for storm water as they are replacing impervious surface and replacing it with porous so the degree of run off will be lessened.

Mr. Houghton made a motion to waive the storm water plan as requested by the applicant. Motion seconded by Mr. Paine. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Austin said if it is helpful he can have the reference to the relevant section inserted into the minutes. Mr. Baskerville said he would like that. Mr. Austin said it was Section 5.13.

Mr. Baskerville turned to the conditional use permit and site plan applications.

Mr. Baskerville said he tended to agree that they couldn't really tell other carriers that they can't co-locate. He feels they can say however that if the top antenna has a certain elevation view that they can't exceed that and they have to use the same general appearance. Mr. Austin summed it up as future installations should be held to the same development parameters as the towers above them. Mr. Austin asked if cutting the number of panels from 12 to 6 is reducing the number of potential co-locations. He asked if Verizon wanted to put up 2 arrays at first so there is still the same number just in 2 smaller arrays. Mr. Fredette said that Verizon want just the one mount height. Mr. Austin suggested adding that as a condition.

Mr. Baskerville made a motion to approve the conditional use permit with the conditions of approval that:

Verizon will only install a 130' pole.

Verizon will utilize only the top most mounting position.

Utilize T-Bar design in accordance with the detailed design sheet given to the Board tonight which they agreed to. Mr. Austin added that today's date will be added to the bottom of that sheet by Mr. Baskerville so it can be referenced.

Verizon will submit revised plans showing that installation on Town documents

All future co-locators are held to the same size and configuration of their antenna arrays as what was supplied with this detail as supplied tonight as stated in condition 3 detail.

Mr. Paine added that should they hold the applicant accountable to designing the tower with the smallest width possible so if this size is not needed, there won't be as much of a visible intrusion.

Mr. Baskerville said he assumed they wouldn't waste money on a bigger width if it wasn't required. Mr. Fredette said they won't put in a bigger pole than they need to. Mr. Fredette explained the concession to go to this mount won't give Verizon the ability to mount the radio heads on the same mount but underneath which will require a similar, if not the same mount underneath it. Worst case scenario, Verizon will end up probably having two of these, one for the antennas and one for the radio heads stacked on top of one another. Mr. Austin said that will only mean 2 future co-locations or one if they do the same array. Mr. Fredette said no because the second mount for the radio heads won't need to be spaced out, it will be tucked up as tightly as they can make it. In fact the closer is better.

Mr. Baskerville said he wants to amend his motion that the details given to the Board for the antennas that are very close to that and below that will be a second ring with the radio heads. It will still allow for 3 other co-locators on the tower at approximately the same elevations as shown on the plan. Updated plans will be provided to show updated detail and an updated plan.

Mr. Austin summed up the conditions:

130' high monopole, top mounting height, utilize T-Bar plus second row for the radio heads as close as possible, updated plans showing both whirls, all future locators held to the same design standard, same size and configuration as the double whirl, smaller array.

Motion seconded by Mr. Houghton. Motion carried 2:1 and passed.

Mr. Austin said before they address the site plan review application, did the Board want it to go out to third party review.

Mr. Baskerville made a motion to approve the site plan. Motion seconded by Mr. Houghton. Motion carried 2:1 and passed.

4. Miscellaneous

There were no miscellaneous items to report

5. Adjournment.

Mr. Houghton made a motion to adjourn at 10:41 pm. Motion seconded by Mr. Paine. Motion carried unanimously.