

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
SITING COUNCIL

North Atlantic Towers, LLC and
New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC Application : DOCKET #427
for a Certificate of Environmental
Compatibility and Public Need
for a Telecommunications Facility Located :
at 171 Short Beach Road or 82 Short Beach Road
East Haven or Branford, Connecticut.
: JULY 3, 2012

RESPONSES TO CSC PRE-HEARING QUESTIONS – SET ONE

The Town of Branford hereby provides the following responses to the Council's questions:

1. Why did the Town of Branford not pursue a lease with NAT & AT&T at the Orchard House property at 345 Shore Drive?

ANSWER:

The town held an informational meeting with the various stakeholders in the vicinity of Orchard House during which the location met with significant local disapproval on the grounds of visual impact and incompatibility with the surrounding uses. The proposed location for the tower was between protected open space land owned by the Land Trust and Rte 142. The access road for the wireless communications facility would have dominated the side yard of the Orchard House. Moreover, after the initial inquiries, the carrier never came forward with a concrete proposal, so the matter was not pursued further.

2. In the application to intervene to the Council, dated June 14, 2012, page 2, number 2, please identify the specific scenic areas that would be impacted by the proposed tower.

ANSWER:

While Rte 142 is not designated as a scenic road, the portion of the road and the surrounding shoreline area is notable for its scenic qualities and much of the property value and intrinsic value of the area is based on the unspoiled nature of the viewshed. The Applicant's viewshed analysis at Attachment 4c page 54 indicates that there will be near shore views of the tower at a number of sensitive receptors including Branford Point, Branford Harbor, Lamphier Cove, Indian Neck Point, Dugg's Cover, Stanley Point, and Horton Point.

By contrast, the East Haven facility will have only distant Long Island Sound views over open water (Application Attachment 5c).

Even the statistics bear out the greater impact posed by the Branford location. According to the Application, only 35 homes will have year round views of the East Haven tower, while 54 homes would have such views of the Branford tower– a 54% increase in residential impacts. Moreover, the lower height of the East Haven facility makes the quality of the year round impacts less imposing. In addition, there are an additional 17% more homes impacted by the Branford facility overall than the East Haven facility (83 versus 71 homes) and about 600 more acres of viewshed impact according to Attachment 4c and 5c.

It should also be noted that Cellco/Verizon's responses to interrogatories indicate a significant additional area of coverage at PCS and cellular frequencies at the East Haven facility over the Branford facility. (Cellco Response to Question #2, page 2,

dated June 19, 2012)

3. In the application to intervene to the Council, dated June 14, 2012, page 2, number 5, please provide more information/specifications regarding the following terms used: antenna combining technology, closer spacing and close mounting.

ANSWER:

Please be referred to the testimony of Ronald Graiff, PE submitted before the Council in Docket 412 Bridgewater which is incorporated by reference and to which the Council is requested to take administrative notice. In addition AT&T was approved for a flush-mounted configuration like the ones described below at 6 Mountain Road, Washington, Connecticut, (Docket 332) which is also incorporated by reference and to which the Council is requested to take administrative notice. (See Findings of Fact #79 and #83 and Opinion, page 2, paragraph 5, for example)

Antenna Combining Technology is simply the use of multi-band antennas which reduce the number the panel antennas per sector to allow for flush mounted antennas without the need to add additional height. Antenna combiners are common technology which allow for a single antennas to be used on multiple bands without significant signal loss.

Closer spacing: While it has long been customary to assign a ten-foot vertical space to each carrier in Connecticut, outside of Connecticut where the laws of physics work precisely the same, the very same carriers often will interlace antennas or reduce the vertical separation of antennas in order to achieve tower sharing on

shorter structures.

Close mounting or flush mounting is the practice of mounting antennas not on platforms or T-arms but on 6” brackets so that mounted antennas will create less visual mass. A variant of this technique is to use the stealth option known as a flagpole (without the flag) with internally mounted antennas, or radome-concealed antennas. Flagpole installations have a cleaner and less massive visual impact and are generally considered to be less aesthetically displeasing.

4. What stealth application and tower height would be acceptable to the Town of Branford at the 171 Short Beach Road location?

ANSWER:

The Town of Branford has taken a consistent position in the various dockets in Branford by utilizing the organized analysis of its ad hoc cell tower committee. That committee has consistently advocated for the least-intrusive option which results in greatest coverage in order to minimize impacts to the Town. Further, the committee has encouraged the various applicants to agree on an architectural design that is consistent throughout the community and has met with industry resistance. A stealth configuration which reduces visual mass and visual clutter – like a flagpole monopole with internal mounts, or a flush mount monopole with radome covers – is preferred in any application over platforms and T-arms respectively.

Since there exists a well-vetted site at 82 Short Beach Road which provides greater coverage (See Verizon’s responses to questions referenced above) using a shorter tower, and which poses lesser impact (see answer to # 2 above), the Town does not believe there is an acceptable height for the 171 Short Beach Road location.

It should be recognized that, in an effort to locate a site of greatest coverage with

least impact, the Town, at great expense, sought out, analyzed and proposed to AT&T (and T-Mobile) the alternative location at the East Haven firehouse as well as several other alternative locations in Branford.

Respectfully Submitted,

The Town of Branford,

By _____
Keith R. Ainsworth, Esq.
Evans Feldman & Ainsworth, L.L.C. #101240
261 Bradley Street
P.O. Box 1694
New Haven, CT 06507-1694
(203)772-4900
(203)782-1356 fax
krainsworth@snet.net

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that a true copy of the foregoing was deposited in the United States mail, first-class, postage pre-paid this 3rd day of July, 2012 and addressed to:

Ms. Linda Roberts, Executive Director, Connecticut Siting Council, 10 Franklin Square, New Britain, CT 06051 (1 orig, 15 copies, plus 1 electronic) (US Mail/electronic).

North Atlantic Tower/New Cingular, LLC c/o Lucia Ciocchio, Esq., Christopher Fisher, Esq., Cuddy & Feder, LLP, 445 Hamilton Avenue, 14th floor, White Plains, NY 10601 (203) 761-1300, (914) 761-5372 fax cfisher@cuddyfeder.com lchiocchio@cuddyfeder.com (electronic and US Mail)

Sarah Pierson, Intervenor, 63 Hilton Avenue, East Haven, CT 06512
sarahpierson@att.net (us mail) (20) 215-6635

Cellco/Verizon c/o Kenneth Baldwin, Esq, Robinson & Cole, LLP, 280 Trumbull Street, Hartford, CT 06103-3597 kbaldwin@rc.com (860) 275-8345 (us mail)

Keith R. Ainsworth, Esq.