

TOWN OF BROOKFIELD
OFFICE OF THE FIRST SELECTMAN

Stephen C. Dunn
First Selectman



100 Pocono Road
Brookfield, CT 06804

Melanie Bachman, Executive Director
Connecticut Siting Council
Ten Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051

April 8, 2026

Dear Ms. Bachman,

I am writing to you as the First Selectman of Brookfield to outline an issue that I believe you should be aware of as the Siting Council takes up consideration of the Homeland Towers application for a cell tower to be built in Brookfield.

It is my understanding that the Siting Council always prefers that tower builders first approach towns to determine whether the town wants and will allow a tower to be built on town property. Homeland Towers approached the town to inquire about building a cell tower on town property. At the time, they offered to pay the town \$2500 per month for a land lease of the property and to allow placement of our emergency communications equipment on the tower at no cost.

There was considerable discussion about which site on town property was best suited for a cell tower. The final determination was to put the proposed tower on land behind our High School. That site is eighteen hundred (1800) feet from the high school and at least eight hundred (800) feet from any other residence in the area. The Board of Selectmen, recognizing the need for a tower to serve the northeast section of Brookfield, was in favor and willing to bring the matter to a town meeting for approval of the site, as required by our charter. The Board of Selectmen was eager to bring the matter to a vote so that residents could decide whether to increase service in the area, and the town also strongly desired to ensure that our emergency services - Fire, Police, and Ambulance - had the connectivity needed to perform their work.

Once we settled on the preferred location, Homeland Towers suddenly withdrew their initial rent offer, citing a \$300,000 road cost, and proposed paying no rent to the town until that expense was recovered. That would result in Homeland Towers not paying rent on the site to the town for approximately 10 years.

That offer seemed patently absurd to the Board of Selectmen. And as a result, the Board made a determination that the offer made was so inequitable that, in good faith and in keeping with our oaths to do what is best for our town, we could not bring it to our residents for a town meeting to vote on allowing the tower to be built on town land.

Homeland Towers told us throughout the process that they had another site, with an agreement from another property owner to place the tower. What they did not tell the Siting Council about in their application, nor the town, was that they had already received and filed an easement on that property.

The concern I have, and now bring to the Siting Council, is that I do not believe that Homeland Towers acted in good faith in negotiating with the town. It was clear, in hindsight, that they wanted to locate the tower on the other property, for which they already had an easement agreement, and then Homeland Towers purposely made an incredibly low-ball offer to the town, knowing we would not accept it for placing the tower on town land.

I have spoken to our Director of Public Works, who has over 30 years of experience in building roads. He told me that the road that Homeland Towers wanted to charge \$300,000 for would cost no more than \$80,000 to build.

We have also received an offer from another tower company stating that it would build a tower on town owned property. This company's offer includes paying the town \$2500 per month in rent for the property and would allow the placement of emergency services equipment on the tower at no charge.

Homeland Towers did not describe the process of negotiating with the town in any detail in their application to the Siting Council. That process and the specifics of the changes in their offer would, I believe, have the Siting Council asking Homeland Towers if they had acted in good faith in negotiating with the town. I think this lack of detail in the application was deliberate. They made an offer to the town so poor that they knew the town would not accept it, which allowed them to report to the Siting Council that they had tried but failed to reach an agreement with the town, and the town demurred from moving forward.

So now the town finds itself in a position, due to what can only be described as bad faith efforts by Homeland Towers to negotiate a fair and equitable agreement with the town, to a point where a tower will now be erected in a residential area, within one hundred feet of existing residences and within a few hundred feet of dozens and dozens of residences.

The impact on the town is significant and threefold:

1. The tower will now be built in a heavily residential neighborhood with no buffer between the residences and the tower.
2. The town will not receive the \$2500 monthly rent for the use of town land.
3. The town will now have to pay approximately \$3,600 per month to place our equipment on the tower now proposed.

As background, the actual monetary cost to the town is not inconsiderable. Over an estimated 40-year life of the tower, and not including any increase for inflation, the town stands to lose almost \$4,000,000 in a combination of lost rent and the additional costs to place our equipment on the new tower currently proposed in the Homeland Towers application before the Siting Council.

I ask the Siting Council to direct Homeland Towers to re-engage in good-faith negotiations with our town. Brookfield deserves a fair and equitable agreement that allows our residents to make an informed choice about building a tower on town land. Our community should not bear the financial and quality-of-life costs resulting from the current plan Homeland Towers has proposed. I respectfully request that the Siting Council champion transparency and equity by giving the town a genuine opportunity to participate in this important decision for our future.

Sincerely,


Steve Dunn

First Selectman