

To: CT. Siting Council and Participants
Re: Docket #373
Date: March 21, 2009

RECEIVED
MAR 24 2009

CONNECTICUT
SITING COUNCIL

We **OPPOSE** the placement of a 100' cell tower and adjoining equipment compound to be located on the property of St. Matthew Lutheran Church, 224 Lovely Street, Avon, Connecticut, for the following reasons:

1. The proposed 100' cell tower and 50 x 50 adjoining compound does not belong in a populated area zoned for Single Family Residential Use. Additional studies should be conducted to determine if less intrusive areas, not located near residential neighborhoods are better suited to house a 100' cell tower and all accompanying equipment compounds and facilities. A suitable area would be one that would not have an adverse effect upon adjacent property or the character of the neighborhood.
2. The introduction of this structure into the landscape would forever alter the character of the Town of Avon. A tower 100' in height is directly out of scale with, and in great contrast to, the natural aesthetics of the surrounding area. (www.town.avon.ct.us)
3. Real estate agents, appraiser journals and industry publications support the arguments that cell tower placement in single family residential zones will lower property values.
4. Has a legitimate and absolute need for a cell tower on Lovely Street in Avon been determined? This need should be verified by data from an independent consultant and by Avon resident user feedback.
5. If a tower and adjoining equipment compound and facility is approved for a Single Family Residential Zoned area, the precedent will be irretrievably forged. The township will no longer have any recourse once a precedent has been set.
6. Small children living on Greenwood Drive should, under no circumstances, be living in such dangerously close proximity to a 100' foot steel cell tower and adjoining 50 x 50 electrical compound. More specifically, two children under the age of 6, living at 22 Greenwood would be less than 100' feet from the tower and adjoining compound and within the fall-zone of the tower. We feel this is unnecessary and irresponsible. Would the council consider this an issue of public safety?
7. The proposed cell tower location is close to a school and church (as well as to many homes) and so the health and safety risks to the community would be unnecessarily extreme. Notwithstanding the lack of conclusive proof of the health hazards of such a cell tower, it would be irresponsible to proceed when safer and less risky alternative locations could be found.

We hereby request full participation in the evidentiary portion of the hearing at 3:00pm on March 31, 2009 before the CT. Siting Council.

Sincerely,

MaryAnn Keenan
Stuart Noyes
Michael Pastore

