

BURTON B. COHEN  
203.772.7714 DIRECT TELEPHONE  
BCOHEN@MURTHALAW.COM

July 17, 2017

**VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL AND FIRST CLASS MAIL**

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

Re: Docket No. 471: Response of Ms. Patricia Sorrentino to Verizon Wireless

Dear Attorney Bachman:

The purpose of this letter is twofold: (1) To apprise the Connecticut Siting Council (the "Council") that Ms. Patricia Sorrentino, a party in this Docket, has no objection to an additional hearing in this proceeding, should the Council or the Applicant have questions concerning the letter, dated July 7, 2017, concerning Ms. Sorrentino's recommendations concerning certain aesthetic conditions to be imposed should the Council approve the construction and operation of a telecommunications tower at the end of the Country Club Drive cul-de-sac; and (2) to respond to the objection submitted in the July 13, 2017 letter from Attorney Kenneth Baldwin concerning one of Ms. Sorrentino's recommendations.

First, the letter was submitted in response to the questions from the Council and its staff at the June 13, 2017 hearing, which is set forth in nearly 14 pages of transcript, concerning Ms. Sorrentino's preferences concerning fencing, screening, and the visual impact of the actual tower itself as they relate to Alternative Site 2, which is the only acceptable proposal. The Council in particular appeared to suggest that Ms. Sorrentino consider various options on these subjects, and, thus, the letter was submitted as she wanted to advise the Council that she had in fact done so.

Murtha Cullina LLP | Attorneys at Law

HARTFORD BOSTON NEW HAVEN STAMFORD WOBURN WHITE PLAINS

265 Church Street, P.O. Box 704, New Haven, CT 06510-0704 | Phone 203.772.7700 | Fax 203.772.7723 | [www.murthalaw.com](http://www.murthalaw.com)

Attorney Melanie Bachman  
July 17, 2017  
Page 2.

Second, with respect to the clustering of the antennas on the tower, this recommendation is totally consistent with the other recommendations concerning the visual impact of the tower and it is nonsensical for the Applicant to suggest otherwise. Given that the Applicant's legal counsel suggests that clustering ". . . might impact the performance of the proposed facility," the Council must determine whether a) the Applicant waived the right to raise that issue as the record was officially closed as of July 13, 2017 or b) the record should be reopened for an additional hearing based on the contentions in the Verizon letter.

Please feel free to contact me or Attorney Bridget D'Angelo if you have any questions. Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully yours,



Burton B. Cohen

cc: Service List – Docket No. 471