

**TOWN OF TUFTONBORO
PLANNING BOARD
April 1, 2021
Tuftonboro Town House & Virtual Access
APPROVED MINUTES**

Members Present (in-person): Roll call: Matt Young, Chairman – yes, Gary Qua, Vice-Chairman – yes, Bill Marcussen, Selectmen's Representative - yes, Tony Triolo, Member – yes, Kate Nesbit, Member – yes, Carol Bush, Member - yes, George Maidof, Alternate - yes.

Member Present (virtual): Laureen Hadley, Member – yes.

Staff Present: Lee Ann Hendrickson, Administrative Secretary.

Chairman Young opened the meeting at 7:00 PM at the Tuftonboro Town House.

Matt Young reviewed the public hearing process for Planning Board applications.

I. Public Comment

Charles Hayes asked if the cell tower has been approved for installation.

Matt Young replied no. He stated the Planning Board addresses uses that are permitted; noting telecommunications towers are permitted in certain zoning districts within the Town of Tuftonboro.

Member of the public asked if the Planning Board is the last stop if approved or whether the BOS approve the Planning Board's motion.

Matt Young stated the Planning Board is the last stop.

Matt Young read the following preamble to the meeting:

As Chair of the Planning Board, I find that due to the State of Emergency declared by the Governor as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and in accordance with the Governor's Emergency Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, this public body is authorized to meet electronically. Please note that there is no physical location to observe and listen contemporaneously to this meeting, which was authorized pursuant to the Governor's Emergency Order. However, in accordance with the Emergency Order, I am confirming that we are:

- a) *Providing public access to the meeting by telephone, with additional access possibilities by video or other electronic means:*

We are utilizing GoToMeeting for this electronic meeting. All members of the Planning Board have the ability to communicate contemporaneously during this meeting through this platform, and the public has access to contemporaneously listen and, if necessary, participate in this meeting through logging onto <https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/136356229>. To listen via telephone call 1-866-899-4679, access code is 136-356-229. Please note that the public will be able to interact during the public input the online service however, will only be able to listen to the meeting via telephone.

- b) *Providing public notice of the necessary information for accessing the meeting:*

We previously gave notice to the public of the necessary information for accessing the meeting, including how to access the meeting telephonically.

- c) *Providing a mechanism for the public to alert the public body during the meeting if there are problems with access:*

If anybody has a problem, please call 603.486.2692 or email at: hendrickson.leeann@gmail.com.

- d) *Adjourning the meeting if the public is unable to access the meeting:*

In the event the public is unable to access the meeting, the meeting will be adjourned and rescheduled.

Please note that all votes that are taken during this meeting shall be done by roll call vote.

II. Approval of Minutes

Scott Anderson stated if there is not a sustained power outage then nothing is making noise at the bottom of the tower; noting the generator is what makes the increased noise.

Gary Qua confirmed the dimensions of the entire lease area.

Matt Young asked if the fall zone area is leased as well.

Scott Anderson replied not usually. He stated most lease areas are either 50'x50' or 70'x70' and most municipalities measure the fall zone area to the nearest abutter property line. He stated the proposed tower is taller than the width of the lease area.

Matt Young stated he believes the Site Plan Review Regulations or the Zoning Ordinance makes reference to the fall zone area.

Brian Ross stated the tower can be designed to hinge on itself so that in case there is a catastrophe and the tower falls, there would be a weak point in the middle so that it folds on its own.

Matt Young asked the applicant to review the regulations relative to the fall zone.

Carol Bush referenced the Zoning Ordinance, Section 13.4.3, Setbacks.

Matt Young requested the applicant to address such.

Scott Anderson stated that right now the landlord under the lease, in theory, has total rights outside of the 80'x80' zone.

Matt Young stated the burden would be on the landowner per the Zoning Ordinance.

Gary Qua confirmed that the three other areas on the tower could be sublet to another carrier. He asked if the applicant is required to come back to the Board if the areas are leased out.

Scott Anderson stated a new applicant, not Verizon Wireless, would submit an application to the Planning Board to install an antenna on the existing facility.

Gary Qua confirmed other carriers would require a generator.

Referencing Tab H of the application, Scott Anderson reviewed the proposed and existing coverage. He stated the tower is designed to tie into two towers in Wolfeboro. He stated there were no existing structures in the area to put the Verizon Wireless antenna on. He stated the antennae have to be high enough to overlap with the towers in Wolfeboro.

Gary Qua questioned whether other locations or opportunities have been identified other than the proposed site.

Scott Anderson stated that the proposed location is not the only site that would work for a tower installation but, it needs to be roughly in that area because of the proximity to the other towers and topography. He stated that prior to submittal of an application, there has to be a lease agreement with a landowner that is willing to host the site.

Gary Qua confirmed there are no other opportunities for Verizon Wireless at this time.

Scott Anderson reviewed coverage capacity.

Matt Young asked if the applicant reviewed/looked at Abenaki Tower.

Brian Ross questioned the location of such.

Referencing Sheet Z3, Scott Anderson stated such shows the survey that was done.

Brian Ross reviewed the heights of the trees noted on Sheet Z3.

Gary Qua questioned the number of trees that have to be removed within the lease area.

Scott Anderson stated typically only the area where the fence is installed is where trees are removed. He stated most of the vegetation is outside of that area.

Matt Young asked the number of Planning Board members were able to view the balloon test.

Carol Bush stated she was on the lake, 40' from shore, and could not see the balloon.

Kate Nesbit stated she walked to the site of the test and viewed it from the abutting property; noting the balloon was masked from the trees.

Gary Qua stated he only noticed it from one location.

Matt Young stated he drove Cross Neck Road, Eaglemere Road and Route 109 and could not see the balloon.

Scott Anderson stated View #9 shows it from across the lake.

Laureen Hadley left the meeting.

Brian Ross stated he drove to Gilford and was unable to see the balloon.

Referencing the waivers, Matt Young requested the applicant submit the waiver requests on one sheet.

Matt Young stated the application is complete.

Kate Nesbit recused herself and stated she is an abutter.

It was moved by Tony Triolo and seconded Gary Qua to accept jurisdiction of the application. Roll call vote: Matt Young – yes, Gary Qua – yes, Bill Marcussen – yes, Carol Bush – yes, Tony Triolo – yes, George Maidhof - yes. The motion passed (6-0).

Chairman Young opened the public hearing.

Charlie Hayes, 1 Hayes Camp Road off Eaglemere South, questioned the number of sites that were reviewed on Tuftonboro Neck Road and received approval for other than the application before the Board this evening.

Scott Anderson stated the current application is the only application that they have a lease for.

Charlie Hayes stated it seems that the height of the tower is important to reception and noted that further out on Tuftonboro Neck Road is higher elevation and could provide the same coverage with a less small and less obtrusive site. He asked if the applicant look at any other sites on Tuftonboro Neck Road and talked to other owners.

Brian Ross stated he did speak with other owners on Tuftonboro Neck Road.

Charlie Hayes asked if those owners were further out on Tuftonboro Neck Road where the elevation is higher and a smaller tower could be installed.

Kate Nesbit questioned the alternative location.

him to facilities in Colorado, Sarasota, Germany, Boston and NH. He stated he has been to conventional clinics and hospitals, some have been alternative and other integrated and the one thing he has learned is that an individual's susceptibility to cancer is based not only on genetics. He stated there are many factors that work together to weaken us from subtle food sensitivities, stress and worry to toxins in our food, environment and more. I have been taught by educated doctors that EMF exposure is hazardous and contributes to the weakening of the human body. He stated according to an article on the FCC.gov website, in 2011 the World Health Organization classified radio frequency as a Class IIB carcinogen. He stated if this proposed tower is built, his wife and he must seriously consider selling the home they have lived in for 34 years, the home they raised their children in and the home they planned to retire in. He stated further, it is not known how the presence of the tower could affect the market value of their home and is a serious concern. He requested the Board to err on the side of caution for the sake of Tuftonboro residents; noting there are many Tuftonboro residents that would in an area of high exposure and potential risk near the tower.

Charlie Hayes asked how many sites on Tuftonboro Neck Road were reviewed.

Matt Young stated such has already been addressed.

Hugh Mitchell, 6 Hibbs Lane, asked if the generators are diesel or natural gas.

Scott Anderson replied diesel.

Jared Burke, 18 Thomas Point, Wolfeboro, asked if the balloon test could be done again in the summer when more people are in the area.

Matt Young stated the applicant is not required to.

Gary Qua requested the applicant to respond to the safety factors from the emissions of the towers.

Scott Anderson stated health affects came up early on when cell towers were being constructed and the Telecommunication Act states that all telecommunication carriers will have to go through the process with complying with the emissions standards set forth by the FCC (Federal Communications Commission). He stated the energy dissipates incredibly fast from the antennae. He stated there are microwave emissions that come from televisions, remote controls, microwaves and refrigerators. He stated the all cell phone companies have to comply with federal rules and noted that a condition of approval could be included that the tower be updated and tested following construction. He stated the FCC made it illegal for towns to use health effects as a citing deadline. He stated it is a very low energy site.

Gary Qua confirmed the closest property line is 390'.

Matt Young questioned the approach relative to the road/entry to the site.

Scott Anderson stated the road is an easement and noted there is grading that takes place within the right-of-way. He stated the road width is 12' with a 20' easement corridor; noting that no changes can occur outside of the easement corridor.

Matt Young questioned the aesthetics of the road.

Scott Anderson replied crushed gravel and grading. He stated there would not be signage or other improvements to the area.

Matt Young recommended improvements at the end of the road to be in keeping with the neighborhood. He asked what is being proposed for utilities.

Scott Anderson replied overhead utilities within the 20' easement corridor.

- Safety and health information/health risks
- Decibel standards reference (to be reviewed by Planning Board Counsel)
- Legal question relative to benefit to Tuftonboro v. Wolfeboro (height, RF)
- Sound study for maximum capacity/maximum use of tower (model/estimation of all carriers and generators)
- Third party engineer RF review
- Waiver request (written)
- Review Abenaki Tower as an existing tower
- Provide list of third party engineers to the Planning Board (to be reviewed with list provided by Donahue, Tucker & Ciandella)
- Address final site appearance from the road / examine curb cut (utilities, road, clearing, etc.)

Scott Anderson stated a supplemental application would be submitted to the Board that contains responses to the Board's requests.

Gary Qua questioned tree cutting outside the fenced area.

Scott Anderson stated there is no tree cutting outside the lease area or outside the 20' easement corridor.

Matt Young asked if a property is taxed differently if a cell tower is located on it.

Brian Ross stated such would depend on the assessor however, typically there would be a separate tax card and the carrier would pay the tax rate.

Matt Young asked if anyone online would like to speak.

Staff texted those members of the public that were online and informed the Board that no one has responded to the text.

Matt Young stated the recording of the meeting would be available on YouTube.

It was moved by Tony Triolo and seconded by Gary Qua to continue the Verizon Wireless and James and Barbara Duncan Site Plan Review application and public hearing, Tax Map 50-2-17, to May 6, 2021, 7 PM at the Tuftonboro Town House. Roll call vote: Matt Young – yes, Gary Qua – yes, Bill Marcussen – yes, Carol Bush – yes, Tony Triolo – yes, George Maidhof – yes. The motion passed (6-0).

b. Master Plan Steering Committee Update

Gary Qua stated the Master Plan Steering Committee finalized the Vision Questionnaire and location for the drop boxes (Pine Cone Restaurant, Town Library and Town Offices).

Carol Bush stated a Survey Monkey link would be added to the questionnaire.

Gary Qua stated the tax records will be used to retrieve addresses of property owners.

IV. Other Business

Scenic Road Tree Trimming

Matt Young stated the Town of Tuftonboro has to receive approval for tree trimming on scenic roads.

Steve Hunter; Storage Facility Site Plan Review

Matt Young stated Steve Hunter has not responded to the certified mailing from the Board and has now become an issue of enforcement by the BOS and Codes Officer.

V. Public Comment

None.



Lee Ann Hendrickson <hendrickson.leeann@gmail.com>

RE: proposed installation of telecommunications facility for 20 Eaglemere Road

1 message

Rosa Nine <myyoung@melvinvillagemarina.com>

Thu, Apr 1, 2021 at 11:52 AM

Reply-To: Rosa Nine <myyoung@melvinvillagemarina.com>

To: "myyoung@melvinvillagemarina.com" <myyoung@melvinvillagemarina.com>

Cc: "hendrickson.leeann@gmail.com" <hendrickson.leeann@gmail.com>

Matt Young, Chairman, and
Planning Board Members
P.O. Box 98
240 Middle Road
Center Tuftonboro, NH 03816

Dear Chairman and Board Members:

I am a seasonal resident of #9 Eaglemere Road, South. My family acquired our property in the early 1900's and have been coming to the lake most years ever since. We are part of the "Hayes Camp", which has been a much beloved and treasured retreat for over 100 years. It is one of the few original family camps remaining around the lake these days.

I have seen comments others have made about the adverse effects of the presence of a cell tower on Tuftonboro Neck, and I will leave the science of that up to others who possess more technical knowledge than I.

However, I am strongly opposed to the tower. Although I do not object to advancing technology, I do not believe in doing so at any cost. In my opinion this would be the beginning of the **commercialization** of Tuftonboro Neck in general, and Eaglemere Road in particular. Also, it is my understanding that the tower will indeed **rise far above the tree line** on the proposed site. And, according to the schematic drawings it appears that there would be room for additional clients, servers/communication devices on this tower. To me that feels like a slippery slope.

We all cherish the serene character of Tuftonboro Neck...year round and summer residents alike. This tower feels like a significant intrusion into a place where many have found a retreat in nature, and some peace in our otherwise ever-chaotic world.

Thank you all for your careful consideration of this important matter. This is something that once done, cannot be undone.

I respectfully request that my email be read into the minutes of the April 1, 2021 meeting.

Sincerely,
Rosa Hayes Nine
#9 Eaglemere Rd. South



Lee Ann Hendrickson <hendrickson.leeann@gmail.com>

Proposed Cell Tower

2 messages

Beth C. [REDACTED]

To: "myoung@melvinvillagemarina.com" <myoung@melvinvillagemarina.com>
Cc: "hendrickson.leeann@gmail.com" <hendrickson.leeann@gmail.com>

Wed, Mar 31, 2021 at 6:53 PM

Mr. Young,

I request that my February letter to the Selectmen/Zoning Board be read into the minutes of the April 1, 2021, meeting. I will copy it below.

Thank you,

Elizabeth Corning - 15 Eaglemere South

Selectmen:

Lloyd Wood

William Albee

William J. Marcussen

Mark Howard, Chairman

Zoning Board

Town of Tuftonboro

PO Box 98

Center Tuftonboro, NH 03816

February 15, 2021

Dear Sirs,

I'm writing to state my opposition to the proposed cell tower at 20 Eaglemere Road. My family (Buell/Corning) have been taxpayers on Eaglemere South (formerly also Eaglemere) since 1946.

Cell towers have only been around for less than 25 years. Their long-term effects on people are not known. Any effects from 5G tech, both short- or long-term are not known. Any technologies to come to our back yard and their effects on people are also unknown.

We value our property, our health and that of our children, grandchildren and generations to come.

This will also be an eyesore and may mar the gorgeous views from the lake forever.

I don't want to see the Neck tarnished by this unnecessary eyesore that may cause health problems in the future.

Thank you for your consideration,

Elizabeth Corning
15 Eaglemere South
[REDACTED]

Lee Ann <hendrickson.leeann@gmail.com>
To: Brian Ross <bross@structureconsulting.net>

Wed, Mar 31, 2021 at 7:02 PM

[Quoted text hidden]



Lee Ann Hendrickson <hendrickson.leeann@gmail.com>

Cellphone tower on Tuftonboro Neck

1 message

Carol Bense <carolbense41@gmail.com>

Wed, Mar 31, 2021 at 2:20 PM

To: myoung@melvinvillagemarina.com, hendrickson.leeann@gmail.com

I request that this email be read into the minutes of the meeting as I am unable to attend in person.

After reviewing some of the research regarding radiation from cell phone towers, I am concerned about the effect of this radiation on human health. While the research does not seem to be definitive, I do wonder if it is wise to continue with this project. I believe that more work should be done to investigate possible health ramifications before a decision is made. If it should turn out that there are health hazards, of course that would affect our property values as well.

Thank you,
Carol W. Bense

Please note that we did not find any study that proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that cell towers have negative health ramifications. More importantly we did not find any studies that proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that cell towers do not have negative health ramifications.

There is also the consideration of the loss of property values on The Neck. There is no way of knowing conclusively, but it would be my guess a cell tower next to my house would not drive its value up.

Also, as a family, we talked about our legacy; how did we want the Hoover's to be remembered in Tuftonboro.

Did we want to be remembered as "those people that put a cell tower up near my house that could be a health risk to me and my family, and that could potentially drive down the value of our family home? Not to mention that a 130-foot tower is an eyesore." Of course, the answer was "No, we don't want to be those people. We don't want to be remembered that way."

So, as a family, we decided not to pursue the granting of a lease to Verizon because of our belief that a cell tower could introduce negative health risks to family and neighbors. Verizon never did offer us the lease. We made our decision independently.

To those on the Planning Board, please consider these seven points.

1) The proposed placement of the cell tower would be within a few hundred feet of Jeanne's and my property. We are abutters. Because of the potential risks, this would destroy the dream of building there. And, I believe, it will negatively affect the property value. More importantly, I am deeply saddened that the ability to safely build on my own property would be gone.

2) The proposed cell tower's placement is only an estimated few hundred feet from my brother's home; my brother who is fighting cancer.

3) What are the potential effects on Public Health?
Verizon may say that the radiation they emit is 1000-times less than the limits set by the FCC, that cell towers are everywhere and have been around for years, and that there is no credible evidence that radiation from cell towers is harmful. They may also say that 5G uses a lower wavelength of radiation that cannot penetrate trees, houses, or even beyond the skin of humans. All true. However, there are no studies of 5G radiation and its effects that I'm aware of. There is significant evidence that 2G and 3G radiation could be harmful, but it is not conclusive. The best conclusion right now is that while there is no definitive evidence of harm, there is also no definitive evidence of safety. So, the possibility of exposing family and neighbors to harmful radiation certainly exists.

Members of the Planning Board, and everyone present, do you remember that when we introduced DDT, PCBs, lead, asbestos, and PFAS/BPA/phthalates from plastics, that there was also no definitive evidence of harm. It wasn't until we poisoned untold numbers of innocent people and wiped-but countless animal species that we realized how harmful they were. This is our history: poison people first and only stop in the face of definitive proof of harm. In Europe, they do the opposite: they apply the "Precautionary Principle" – if there might be harm, they are conservative.

Might this be a better way?

And as far as visibility, I've seen Verizon's balloon pictures. I've seen the locations and angles from which they were taken.

I don't care how clever, but a 130-foot tower can't be hidden in a grove of 68 footers.

If Verizon can't get the coverage result, they wish to obtain with an 88-foot tower as allowed by Tuftonboro Zoning standards, then maybe the job needn't be done.

It is my understanding the planning board does not have to grant this variance. I am hopeful that no variance be granted, and Verizon withdraws.

6) I understand how frustrating dropped calls can be. As an alternate to a cell tower, personal cell phone signal boosters are available in a number of places including amazon.com. Cell phone signal boosters for the home and car or truck start at \$199.99.

7) Last, I would ask each member of the Planning Board not to vote solely on whether or not this project meets the requirements laid out in the Zoning Ordinance. Verizon is a huge and very wealthy corporation. Of course, they can hire an army of lawyers to follow the Zoning Ordinance.

Instead, I ask each Planning Board member to ask themselves if they would vote "Yes" if this cell tower were placed on the land next to their home. Listen to your heart. Here are two questions I ask each of you to ask yourselves:

First, "Are you sure you would be comfortable walking out your front door every morning and seeing a 130-foot steel tower next to your home?"

And second, "Are you sure that you would have no concerns for the safety and health of your children, grandchildren or neighbors if this cell tower were right next door to you?"

If the answer to either of those questions is that you would be uncomfortable or concerned, then you must vote "No".

The Planning Board has an obligation to do what is best for their community. "Neighbor helping neighbor". I don't believe that anyone on the Planning Board would, in good conscience endorse a project on someone else's land if you would not approve it if it were in your own backyard.

Please ask yourselves those questions.

What is your legacy to be?

Sincerely,
Ken and Jeanne Hoover
Abutters

Lee Ann <hendrickson.leeann@gmail.com>
To: superprods@aol.com

Wed, Mar 31, 2021 at 6:03 PM

Good Afternoon,

I wanted to share updated plans and the Stormwater Report that was received today.

Lee Ann

This site provides information on how many cell phone towers and mobile antennas are in your area. The exact distance of each from your home address is provided as well.

Do not rely just on your visual observation of the neighborhood. Cell towers are increasingly disguised as trees. Moreover, even if no cell towers exist, there are likely plenty of cellular antennas on existing buildings and other structures.

A typical mobile phone tower will hold 10 or more cellular antennas for various companies.

If you are planning to buy a home in the near future, consideration of cellular phone infrastructure nearby is very important. It ranks right up there with schools and other positives and negatives about the neighborhood.

I fully expect that in the future, as more research concerning the effects of EMFs on human biology emerges, real estate prices will be affected by their relative proximity to cell phone towers and/or antennas.

One word of warning. Don't be overly concerned when you initially check your home address for nearby cellular infrastructure. The number is likely to be extremely high!

Wait until you see how close the towers and antenna are first! For example, I discovered that there are 81 towers and 124 antennas located within 4 miles of my front door! This is in a rural residential community too! However, once I looked more closely, I found that none of them is closer than a half mile away.

What to Do if You Live Very Close

If you find that you live within the inner circle of cellular towers, my suggestion is to consider moving. Though inconvenient, this is by far the best option. I've already had one friend change homes because of extreme sensitivity to high EMFs in her area. To date, Sweden and Germany recognize electromagnetic hypersensitivity (EHS) as an actual medical condition. I expect that to grow in the coming years. (1, 2)

In lieu of moving, there are bioenergetic devices that claim to reduce the exposure and/or risks from electromagnetic radiation. Whether they work or not is up for debate. As of this writing, I haven't found any conclusive, randomized data to suggest they are helpful one way or another. However, if you can't move, they are probably at least worth a shot! Perhaps in the future, they might be proven beneficial.

Another thing to be aware of is that EMF exposure has the potential to increase free radical activity in the body. Thus, living near a cell tower may decrease levels of certain protective nutrients. Thus, ensuring adequate levels of antioxidants such as glutathione is a very good strategy.