



**Planning Board Meeting**  
Tuesday August 13, 2007, 7:00 p.m.  
City Council Chambers, City Hall, Claremont, NH

**Meeting Minutes**

**Meeting Called to order by Alan Grigsby at 7:00 pm**

**I. Roll Call**

**Present:** Richard Wahrlich, Peter Guillette, Ralph Swift, Alan Grigsby, Lori Richardson, Russell Fowler, Erwin Caplan

**City Staff:** Bruce Temple, Director of Planning & Development; Michelle Aiken, Boards and Commissions Coordinator

**Absent:** Mayor Scott Pope

**II. Minutes of July 9, 2007**

**Motion to:** Approve the minutes of July 23, 2007 as amended

**Made by:** Mr. Guillette      **Second:** Mr. Swift      **Vote:** Unanimous

**III. New Business**

- **(17-2007) Shirley Ferland, 193 River Road, Claremont NH 03743** – Application desires Minor Subdivision approval for existing 16.92 acre lot. Proposed Lot 1 to contain 11.12 acres with existing house. Proposed Lot 2 to contain 5.90 acres. Tax map 140, Lot 15, Zoning RR-2

City staff has contacted Mr. Grigsby and advised him that there are some details that need to be worked out with the applicant and they have requested a continuance to the September 10, 2007 meeting. There is an access problem they are trying to resolve. The August 27<sup>th</sup> meeting has been canceled due to no business. Mr. Swift asked if the proposed driveway was City owned or City Leased. Mr. Temple advised that the property is City owned.

**Motion to:** Continue the application to the September 10, 2007 meeting

**Made by:** Mr. Swift      **Second:** Mr. Fowler      **Vote:** Unanimous

- **(18-2007) RCC Atlantic, Inc., Downs Rachlin Martin, PLLC, 199 Main Street, Burlington, VT 05401-0190** – Applicant desires Site Plan approval to install antennas on and an equipment shelter adjacent to, the existing U.S. Cellular tower at **405 Chestnut Street**, Tax Map 169 Lot 5; Zone AR.

Marian Mclure who is attorney with Downs Rachlin Martin. RCC is proposing to seek site plan approval for a pole location on the existing tower at 40 Chestnut Street. The tower is owned by US Cellular and they are proposing to install antennas, a microwave dish and an 10X12 equipment shelter in the adjacent compound. Ms. Mclure described what the plans are for the equipment shelter and antennas.

Mr. Grigsby stated that the original site plan was for 5 antennas and he asked if there would be room for all 5 after their site plan is approved. Ms. Mclure advised that she believes that there would be room for more. Mr. Grigsby stated that in their package it shows room for 6 carriers that would have separate antennas. The concern is that the capacity of the facility meets the original needs that were set forth and approved previously.

Ms. McLure advised that she is not aware of what is happening with the other companies. Mr. Fowler advised that he finds it hard to deal with just Unicef when they don't own the tower and they are going to come in and take up space. He wants to be sure that all of them are working in conjunction with the original site plan that is what this board needs to know. We are concerned with the future of this site and the projections of whether this is going to be adequate for the needs of Claremont. Ms. McLure advised that they are not proposing to expand the site; they are just asking to install their equipment. Mr. Grigsby stated that it is the Board's responsibility to make sure the management of that space is adequate for the needs of Claremont. Ms. McLure advised that she can get the owner of the tower here and verify that there is room for others and they are in compliance with their original site plan. There is an engineering review showing the structural characteristics of the tower as a whole and it relates to the three that are proposed.

Mr. Swift asked with the array that is proposed, what is that percentage for the capacity for that tower, can you put two or three more arrays on the tower. What is left after this is approved? Mr. Brian Fraser is RF engineer for RCC. Mr. Fraser advised that there is no way to determine that, it would depend on the technology, they all work off different frequency from the FCC. We proposed for 12 panels for both their technologies and they wouldn't need to expand on that for some time. This will reduce traffic at the other locations such as Green Mtn and Ascutney, this will reduce dropped calls. US cellular's construction of the tower, when they provided the site plan for the tower advised they would have 5 carriers and at that time with technology that was all they could do. But technology is always getting better and with his experience of 30 years in the field, he thinks they can do more than they proposed on the original site plan as technology gets better. Mr. Fraser feels that two more buildings could be built on site. Historically Verizon buildings are twice the size of everyone else's because they use a generator, etc. Technology will change and as things get better they can reduce the number of panels and cables, also the panel antennas from 10 years ago have changed and drastically reduced in size. They have gotten the size of those down and have the same or better coverage with technology.

Mr. Grigsby stated that from what Mr. Fraser has advised there would be room for 3 others the size of theirs and still leave 8-10ft from the fence. Mr. Grigsby asked what the microwave tower is for. Mr. Fraser advised that they have an elaborate microwave network that they use so there is less chance for loss of signal. Mr. Grigsby asked if this radiation would have any affect to any of the residents of Claremont. Mr. Fraser said they contract the analysis out and Giant Solution from Amsterdam, NY has a formula adopted by the FCC as a criteria for measuring exposure. They compile the information and this site is 90X less than the acceptable rate by the FCC. They take everything that is transmitting from the tower, the height of the devises, measure 6ft from the ground, etc to rate the exposure rating and every site is particular unto itself. Mr. Fraser felt that you could put 40 more carriers and it still wouldn't come close to what the FCC allows.

Mr. Grigsby asked if the 90 is for just Unicef. Mr. Fraser advised that it is for the two companies that would be there now and Verizon's proposed equipment. Comparing this site to other cell towers, the past 20 towers they have done in the past 2 years at about the same height, with similar rays it is usually about 10-11 X less than the FCC. Are there any technical issues with having various technologies and in any way limit the usefulness of the tower going forward. The first thing they do is show the propagations, then they look at any interference that would affect them, and then if their frequency would affect anyone else. One of the things that Mr. Grigsby advised that one of the major things US Cellular went over was how the tower would improve coverage in Claremont. Mr. Fraser advised that Claremont is right in the middle of where the foot print of the best coverage would be.

Mr. Temple advised that based on recommendation of the City staff he would recommend accepting the plan as complete.

**Motion to:** accept the application as complete

**Made by:** Mr. Swift

**Second:** Mr. Guillette

**Vote:** Unanimous

Open public hearing

Levi Sanders is an abutter and lives at 398 Chestnut Street. He worries about the quality of life that is affected by the tower. The construction of this tower has affected his property deeply, the construction was quite disruptive, people were working all through the day and the people were very rude who were working on the project. His deepest concern is that the reality is that we don't know if there will be other cell towers and radically affect the quality of life. With the increased construction it is going to affect his ability to sell his property which is on the market. He has read a lot about this and he is concerned with health issues, he has a 1 and a 3 year old daughter. How ultimately does this benefit the citizens of Claremont? He is worried that Verizon will want an expansion, he hopes that all the issues are considered, where all the construction is going to affect his life and his neighbors life.

Closed public hearing

Mr. Grigsby advised that the board members who were here for the original site plan are Mr. Caplan and Mr. Fowler. The others have a fast learning curve. The site plan was approved with the idea that the site would be the site for future cell tower growth and it was ideal because of its height and up to 4 more companies could locate there. He wanted to be sure that the original promise would still be possible. The health issue came up with the first tower, the federal government standard and Mr. Fraser advised that this is well below. The amount of traffic to this site according to the application is once a month from each company for maintenance.

Mr. Swift advised that he has done a lot of reading up on cell towers; you are putting faith in the government standards. Where it is so far from the government standard he doesn't think this is an issue. It is important to understand the activity to this site. There would be an issue if there are going to be vehicles at 3am going up the hill. But cell coverage is an issue in Claremont and it looks like there should be good coverage all the way to Newport. He feels that he is not worried about the 3 or 4 vendors because technology is coming a long way and he believes in the progress of technology. Mr. Guillette stated that he can remember when they were worried about how a cell phone would affect the individual using it; cell phones have come a long way and he believes technology is improving and has come a long way. Ms. Richardson asked when the construction takes place. Mr. Fraser it is a day time thing and it wouldn't be more than a 10 or 12 day period that work would be completed. Once the construction crew is done, they are there between 2 and 3 days and also any maintenance. The only time you would go up at night is if there is some sort of failure or outage.

**Motion to:** approve the site plan application

**Made by:** Mr. Fowler      **Second:** Mr. Swift      **Vote:** Unanimous

#### **IV. Correspondence**

- Notice of Decision for Katherine Thibodeau
- Notice of Decision for D& R Limoges
- Notice of Decision for Stanley & Dorothy Rosinski
- Notice of Decision for Michael LaPointe
- Master Plan Survey Flyer
- Wall Street Journal article: An Inconvenient Turbine: Conservation vs. Preservation

Mr. Grigsby advised that there is a new RSA for people who live in historical areas; this RSA would allow the use of energy generating systems without limit by the Planning board.

#### **V. Other**

Mr. Grigsby advised everyone again that the next meeting on the 27<sup>th</sup> has been canceled due to lack of items on the agenda.

#### **VI. Reports from Boards and Commissions**

Mr. Wahrlich advised that the survey for the master plan is online; they have made some good progress with it and encourage everyone to fill out one.

## **VII. Adjournment**

**Motion to:** Adjourn

**Made by:** Mr. Swift

**Second:** Ms. Richardson

**Vote:** Unanimous

**Meeting Adjourned at:** 8:19 pm

**Respectfully Submitted,**

**Michelle Aiken**

**Boards and Commissions Coordinator**