

**TOWN OF STONINGTON  
SELECTMAN'S OFFICE  
DANIELLE CHESEBROUGH  
FIRST SELECTMAN**

152 Elm Street • Stonington, Connecticut 06378  
(860) 535-5050 • [dchesebrough@stonington-ct.gov](mailto:dchesebrough@stonington-ct.gov)

August 18, 2025

CT Siting Council  
Ten Franklin Square  
New Britain, CT 06051

**RE: DOCKET NO. 537** – The Towers, LLC application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a telecommunications facility and associated equipment located at 327 North Anguilla Road, Stonington, Connecticut.

Dear Members of the Connecticut Siting Council,

I am writing to share concerns regarding the proposed cell tower at 327 North Anguilla Road in Stonington. This location is situated within a residential neighborhood, and **many** residents have reached out to voice their objections. Their concerns center not only on the disruption to the character of the area but also on the environmental impact this project may have.

This residential neighborhood is home to a variety of wildlife, and the proposed site borders sensitive natural areas. The introduction of a large-scale tower could disturb local ecosystems and negatively affect the animals that inhabit them. Further, the proposed location is exceedingly close to one homeowner, towering over their home and yard. This directly affects not only their quality of life, but also the value of their home.

Importantly, the Town of Stonington identified and shared alternative locations for the tower that are situated **farther back from the scenic road and residential area**—areas far more appropriate for such infrastructure. These alternatives would better balance the need for improved connectivity with the preservation of residential and environmental integrity. However, the alternative locations were rejected by the applicant due to **potential** environmental constraints including wetlands and vernal pools.


Additionally, I'd like to highlight a concerning aspect of the site selection process. According to the applicant's own documentation, forty-five (45) potential sites were identified during the search for a suitable location. Each property owner received a single certified letter, yet forty-three (43) of those recipients did not respond. Despite this lack of engagement, there was no meaningful follow-up or effort to pursue these leads further. This minimal outreach reflects a reactive rather than proactive approach and undermines the transparency and community collaboration that should be foundational to projects of this scale and impact.

A key request from the community is for towers to be located in and near commercial areas where development has already taken place. The community would like to see more effort and direction given for applicants to do all they can to place towers in more appropriate locations, and not in rural and residential areas.

For these reasons, I strongly urge the Council to reconsider the proposed location and encourage relocation to a commercial area where the tower would be more suitable and less disruptive.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Danielle Chesebrough', written in a cursive style.

Danielle Chesebrough