

**TAB 3**



# Town of Glastonbury

2155 MAIN STREET • P.O. BOX 6523 • GLASTONBURY, CONNECTICUT 06033-6523

## OFFICE OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

September 29, 2009

Susan Karp, Chairman  
Glastonbury Town Council  
2155 Main Street  
Glastonbury, Connecticut 06033

Re: Potential Communications Towers

Dear Chairman Karp and Town Council Members:

As its meeting of September 24, 2009, the Conservation Commission/Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Agency continued their review of the cell tower proposals for 1040 Main Street, 271 Dayton Road and Lot W-7 Dayton Road and unanimously approved the following motion:

MOVED, that the Conservation Commission/Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Agency recommends to the Town Council that in the event that a cell tower is constructed on Dayton Road, construction is preferred on the 271 Dayton Road site, based upon the following findings:

1. It appears that there would be little or no activity or impact within the wetlands regulated area (including the uplands review area) and that drainage/runoff would not be directed to the nearest wetland area.
2. There would be no impact on a vernal pool in association with this site.
3. In comparison to the W-7 Dayton Road site, the vegetation that would be impacted is not as healthy due to poorer soils characteristics.
4. An existing gravel drive can be utilized for much of the access to the tower site, thus reducing overall disturbance.

Notwithstanding the above, it was indicated by the Conservation Commission that the choice of the artificial tree for the tower did not appear appropriate. Additionally, the Conservation Commission has a general concern relative to the potential issues associated with electromagnetic radiation emitted from cellular towers and indicated there is a need to evaluate potential impacts on wildlife migration and behavior.

Regarding the 1040 Main Street site, no recommendation was provided. An on-site meeting was scheduled for October 5, 2009 at 5 pm in order to further evaluate the site.

Sincerely,

Conservation Commission/Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Agency  
For the Secretary,

John Rook, AICP  
Planner

cc: Richard J. Johnson, Town Manager

JR:gfm

**GLASTONBURY CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
(INLAND WETLANDS & WATERCOURSES AGENCY)  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 2009**

The Glastonbury Conservation Commission (Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Agency), along with Mr. John Rook, Planner, held a Regular Meeting in Council Chambers, second floor of Town Hall located at 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury, Connecticut.

**ROLL CALL**

**Board Members - Present**

Mrs. Judy Harper, Chairman  
Mr. Frank Kaputa  
Mrs. Helen Stern  
Mr. Manish Gupta

**Board Members - Excused**

Mr. Dennis McInerney, Vice Chairman  
Mrs. Kim McClain, Secretary  
Mr. Rob Huestis

Chairman Harper called the meeting to order at 7:32 PM.

**I. COMMENTS BY CITIZENS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS - NONE**

**II. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES**

- 1. Regular Meeting of September 10, 2009**
- 2. On-Site Meeting of September 21, 2009**

The Commission chose to postpone acceptance of these minutes until the next regularly scheduled meeting.

**III. FORMAL ACTION & RECOMMENDATION**

**Request of the Town Council to review and comment upon three potential communication tower proposals: 1) Lot W-7 Dayton Road (west side); 2) 271 Dayton Road (east side); and 3) 1040 Main Street (east side)**

Chairman Harper stated that public input is valuable, because it teaches the Commission and allows them to make better decisions. The Commission visited the proposed Dayton Road sites on September 21, 2009 and they plan to visit the Main Street location soon. The Commission has received a wealth of information from *Mr. Tally Noble of 115 Lakewood Road*. Chairman Harper noted that the Connecticut Siting Council has regulatory ability on these proposals and that the Commission has simply been asked to review the proposals and report to the Town Council with their comments.



Mr. Joseph Grimmatt of Message Center Management said that his company will work with Verizon Wireless to present both Dayton Road site proposals to the Connecticut Siting Council.

Commissioner Stern asked about the vantage points of the two proposed Dayton Road towers, based upon the ground elevation and the elevation of the towers. Mr. Grimmatt replied that photo simulations were taken from different vantage points and will be submitted in the applications to the Connecticut Siting Council; this will give them the appearance/vantage points for the different proposals.

Ms. Virginia King of Message Center Management said the two structures will be very similar above sea level; one structure is taller but is at a lower ground elevation and the other structure is at a higher ground elevation but is shorter. Mr. Rook mentioned that when a formal application is submitted, the Siting Council will float balloons in the air to simulate the height of the structures.

Commissioner Gupta asked about the possibility of two towers on Dayton Road and Mr. Grimmatt said that of the two proposals, only one site would be selected. Commissioner Gupta is concerned about the large oak trees adjacent to proposed Lot W-7's Access Route B and wondered if they would be preserved. Mr. Grimmatt replied that they will take all steps to minimize removal of large, old-growth trees and the actual trees will be identified as part of the Connecticut Siting Council application.

Chairman Harper asked how wide the driveway to the pad on Lot W-7 will be and Mr. Thomas Petras, Professional Soil Scientist with Soil Science and Environmental Services, Inc. (Cheshire, CT) said the driveway would be 10 feet wide. Mr. Dean Gustafson, Professional Soil Scientist on behalf of Verizon Wireless noted that for the 271 Dayton Road site, they would utilize the existing gravel driveway, and a short access drive into the compound would be 12 feet wide and paved.

Chairman Harper asked about running electricity to the towers and Mr. Gustafson said for the 271 Dayton Road site there is an existing distribution line that runs up from Dayton Road on the north side of the lot. Ms. King said that for Lot W-7 the power would come from an existing pole on Dayton Road and run underground to the compound. Chairman Harper asked about the possibility of damage to the existing driveway during construction and Mr. Gustafson said any possible damage would be the responsibility of Verizon Wireless; they would be required to restore it to existing conditions if any damage did occur. However, the engineers feel that the driveway has a solid base and that it will hold up well during the construction activities.

Chairman Harper asked about the nearest wetland to the 271 Dayton Road site and Mr. Gustafson replied from the nearest access road the nearest point is about 40 feet, but from the proposed facility the nearest wetland is 175 feet north. Chairman Harper asked how much clearing would have to be done for the pad and Mr. Gustafson said it would be approximately 100 by 100 feet. Chairman Harper asked about the stone wall that would be breached if the 271 Dayton Road site was chosen and Mr. Gustafson said they could use the stones to build up the adjoining stone wall. Chairman Harper asked about blasting and Mr. Gustafson said the full geotechnical investigation has not been completed yet, so he is not sure about blasting. Chairman Harper then asked how close the nearest neighbors are to where the possible blasting would occur and Mr. Gustafson said the nearest residence is 680 feet to the north, on the east



side of Dayton Road. Chairman Harper asked about the footprint of the proposed pad and the potential for future buildings and Mr. Gustafson explained that it is a requirement of the Connecticut Siting Council for them to provide areas for a total of four equipment structures so three other carriers can hook up in the future, if desired.

Commissioner Kaputa asked if there is a preference for one site over the other on Dayton Road and Mr. Grimmatt replied that both proposals will be submitted to the Siting Council and it is the Siting Council's decision. Commissioner Kaputa asked if that is typical and Mr. Grimmatt said that the two companies have different proposals that they would like to be considered. Chairman Harper asked about the clearing that would need to be done on Lot W-7 for construction activities and Mr. Grimmatt said it would be approximately 75 by 75 feet and they would not be moving a lot of fill.

*Ms. Kelly Noble, 115 Lakewood Road*, wondered if other structures would be put on the ground within the proposed 270 Dayton Road footprint and Chairman Harper showed her the map and explained the footprint to her. Mr. Grimmatt noted that they are proposing a compound large enough to accommodate future carriers so no more clearing would have to be done. He also clarified that, on the Lot W-7 proposal, a 12 foot wide access road is being proposed (not 10 feet wide).

Chairman Harper said that electromagnetic radiation is a concern and she feels that no matter where the cell towers are located, there may be a possible danger; there is not enough information on the subject yet. Commissioner Stern asked if height is added to a tower if there will be more coverage and Mr. Grimmatt said that each proposal is based upon establishing and connecting to a network of cell towers and that is why they engineer propagation studies that will show what the forecasted coverage is. The Siting Council makes sure no tower is constructed any higher than is absolutely necessary.

Chairman Harper suggested deciding which Dayton Road proposal is better from a conservation/wetlands perspective as their comment to the Town Council. She noted that construction on the 271 Dayton Road site would have a lot less impact on the wetlands and Lot W-7 is a lot closer to the wetlands, so 271 Dayton Road is a better choice from a wetlands point-of-view. However, 271 Dayton Road will require a lot of grading and the footprint is going to be larger. In her opinion, the interruption to wildlife would be similar. On Lot W-7 there is a potential vernal pond which has indications of prerequisite species. On the 271 Dayton Road site, the pond didn't show any vernal attributes. Overall, Chairman Harper feels that constructing a tower on 271 Dayton Road is less damaging to the environment.

Commissioner Kaputa agreed with her and noted that he and Vice Chairman McInerney saw more wetlands on their site walk on Lot W-7 that were not flagged or on the map. Commissioner Gupta said he would have preferred Lot W-7 over 271 Dayton Road for construction of a cell tower, because he feels the height of the tower would be less conspicuous there, but since the 271 Dayton Road site is not developable and there's already a power line going through there, it appears to him that it is a better-suited site environmentally. He felt the vegetation at 271 Dayton Road was not as significant or healthy probably due to dry and rocky soil conditions. Chairman Harper said that a letter will be drafted to the Town Council noting that the Commission prefers the site at 271 Dayton Road for several reasons, but that she is concerned about the studies that are showing that electromagnetic radiation could be a problem

with migrating animals and bees. She feels that it should not be ignored, because it is potentially disturbing migration and animal behavior.

Commissioner Kaputa thanked the concerned citizens for providing them with a very educational packet of information. The Commission decided that they would take a site walk at the proposed 1040 Main Street location on October 5, 2009 at 5:00 PM.

**Motion by:** Commissioner Stern **Seconded:** Commissioner Kaputa  
MOVED, that the Conservation Commission/Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Agency recommends to the Town Council that in the event that a cell tower is constructed on Dayton Road, construction is preferred on the 271 Dayton Road site, based upon the following findings:

1. It appears that there would be little or no activity or impact within the wetlands regulated area (including the uplands review area) and that drainage/runoff would not be directed to the nearest wetland area.
2. There would be no impact on a vernal pool in association with this site.
3. In comparison to the W-7 Dayton Road site, the vegetation that would be impacted is not as healthy due to poorer soils characteristics.
4. An existing gravel drive can be utilized for much of the access to the tower site, thus reducing overall disturbance.

**Result:** Motion passes unanimously. (4-0-0).

#### **IV. OTHER BUSINESS**

##### **1. Chairman's Report**

Chairman Harper received a letter from Dwight Johnson regarding the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities' Annual Convention and Exposition on Thursday, October 8, 2009 at the Connecticut Convention Center, noting there is going to be a workshop on municipal law updates at 3:00 PM.

##### **2. Environmental Planner's Report**

Chairman Harper noted receipt of an update on five wetlands agent's approvals for minor activities within the buffer from Mr. Mocko.

With no other business, Chairman Harper adjourned the meeting at 8:23 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Amy M. Pallotti*

Amy M. Pallotti

Recording Clerk