



## Proposed Tower is directly in line with our view of Talcott Mountain/Heublein Tower

- I have lived at 13 Burr Road since 1991 (18 years), and am raising my family there
- I bought this property in part because of this wonderful view of the mountain
- The proposed tower location adversely impacts the setting of my residence
- The tower degrades the view, and thus the property value of my home
- I find this unacceptable and am adamant the proposal should be rejected

**The applicant claims a “public need” for the tower outweighs environmental concerns.**

**The applicant is apparently misguided on what a “public need” really is.**

**A “public need” is what we endured in Bloomfield back in April of this year.**

- Water provided from an MDC treatment facility became contaminated
- A Bloomfield resident found the problem – the source was a facility in our town
- Residents in 6 towns were asked to boil water or use bottled water for 2 days
- This is an example of a true “public need,” for a safe supply of water

**In comparison, this proposal is NOT a “public need” but rather a service enhancement.**

- The telecommunications facility may be desired, but it is not a dire need
- This is not a “dead zone” - cell service currently exists in this area
- The truth is it is a service improvement providing a profit opportunity
- A major attribute of my property should not be compromised for another’s profit

**I strongly question the council on cost vs. benefits of this facility to Bloomfield residents**

- As a long-time resident, what priority is placed on my needs?
- The enjoyment and value of my property far outweighs my “effect” from this tower!
- Are my needs being degraded for something local residents do not really need?
- Worst, is this tower primarily to benefit out-of-town commuters on Route 185?