

Fwd: Question and Public Comment Re: Cell Tower Proposal

From: Planning Board (planningboard@town.buckland.ma.us)

To: [REDACTED]

Date: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 at 09:53 PM EDT

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Kay Cafasso [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 8:14:50 AM

To: Planning Board <PlanningBoard@town.buckland.ma.us>; Zoning Board of Appeals <zoning@town.buckland.ma.us>

Subject: Question and Public Comment Re: Cell Tower Proposal

Hello Zoning and Planning Boards!!

Thank you for your time and attention to this important matter :)

Please include in the public comments again, and please ask this question at the next meeting? ~Kay

My question is:

If this proposal must proceed (unless there is further and sufficient time granted to research the options for the basic communication and safety coverage that is needed) and if it is truly the only perceived design option without further in-depth research into those options, and if there are truly no other bids or willing researchers that would step forward for this service):

Is Vertex willing to construct their camouflaged (painted) tower at 90' height for the first company/ carrier, and then at the 100' or 105' height for the second carrier? This would be satisfying our bylaws for multiple carriers, yet only asking for a 10'-15' variance in height.

Or, at most, are they agreeable to construct at a height of 100' for the first carrier and 110' or 115' for the second carrier, at a 25' variance in height above tree line?

This also allows for three carriers if it STARTS at 90' (10'- 15' above treeline) and maxes out at 110' or 115' (if the deal must include three carriers for Vertex profits).

The geographic area where WE need to fill in the service gap is small, especially with all of the towers surrounding us in the area that Vertex already generates profits from. This height restriction would satisfy OUR needs for safety and communications for Buckland center and 112, yet not disrupt so many of our homes in an extremely prominent way visually. The impact to our rural and natural

landscape would still be altered in this one proposed location (as opposed to clearly less visual impacts at the top of Orcutt Hill, for example) yet *potentially* not as drastically with a set maximum height of 115'.

~Kay Cafasso, Buckland Resident