

John C. & Sandra L. Cavanaro

4 Pamela Way

Edgartown, MA 02539

---

October 3, 2017

Mr. Adam Turner, Executive Director  
Martha's Vineyard Commission  
P.O. Box 1447  
33 New York Avenue  
Oak Bluffs, MA 02557

*Via email: turner@mvcommission.org*

Dear Mr. Turner:

We're writing to express our sincere concern regarding the application submitted by New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC ("AT&T") for a special permit to locate a wireless communication facility, **including without limitation**, a permanent 117-foot monopole with a basket of antennas and associated radio communications equipment, on the property at 14 Sampson Avenue on Chappaquiddick.

Sampson Avenue is one block over from our property in a tightly knit area of pre-existing non-conforming undersized residentially zoned plots of land that are far below the minimum 3-acre lot size required under the current Edgartown Zoning Bylaws. The idea of installing a permanent structure on this property to include without limitation, a 117-ft pole with antennas is concerning to us for the simple reason that a cell tower **without limitation** can often times collect additional communications appurtenances over time which will further exacerbate the substantial detriment to the neighborhood, in addition to the potential health risks associated with such equipment.

We understand from attending the first round of hearings for the 104-ft temporary tower that there is a real need from emergency personnel to increase cell phone coverage on Chappy, which is completely understandable. We simply feel that increasing cell coverage and installing non-conforming structures on non-conforming lots are mutually exclusive. In other words, we're not against cell coverage, we're against substantially non-conforming structures that are a substantial detriment to the residential neighborhood where they are proposed. The approval of a 117-ft permanent structure that is 360% of the maximum allowable structure height of 32-ft is in itself reason to give careful consideration to its blanket approval. Is this truly the only option?!

It's hard to imagine that the Commission can find that siting a 117-ft tower that exceeds the allowable height by 83-feet is in harmony with the surrounding neighborhood where no other alternatives exist?! This is without a doubt **substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood!**

We urge the Martha's Vineyard Commission to not approve this permanent solution before considering the following:

1. The approved "Temporary Tower" shall be considered at other locations on the island to determine if adding more monopoles with concealed equipment will enhance service.
2. MVC shall NOT permit anything "without limitations".
3. MVC shall require that the applicant, in accordance with Section 15.a of Chapter 831, prove that the proposed Tower is essential or especially appropriate in view of alternatives on the island of Martha's Vineyard.
4. MVC shall require that the applicant, in accordance with Section 15.b of Chapter 831, prove that the proposed Tower will not have an adverse impact on the environment (including long-term health impact to nearby residential abutters) in comparison to alternative solutions.
5. MVC shall require that the applicant, in accordance with Section 15.c of Chapter 831, prove that the proposed Tower will not adversely affect other persons and property since we're looking at such a substantial non-conforming structure whose effect is likely to be greater than is ordinarily associated with typical residential types of development in our neighborhood.
6. There should be a minimum "fall zone" setback to neighboring properties/structures similar to wind turbines in other communities, which are often 1-3x the total height of the proposed structure to residential structures, property lines and road rights-of-way.
7. The applicant shall continue to research other sites where the construction of such exceedingly non-conforming structures are more harmonious with the respective location where no other alternatives exist.
8. No lights or any type of illumination shall ever be allowed as part of this application;
9. Applicant shall endeavor to provide substantial screening to the immediate abutters to mitigate aesthetic impact to the greatest extent practicable for the current temporary cell "pole" regardless of what gets approved.
10. We ask that you give full consideration to the siting of such a non-conforming and potentially dangerous structure in our close-knit residential neighborhood in accordance with Chapter 831.

Thank you very much for your consideration of our comments regarding this application; we appreciate your effort to ensure that the proposed application satisfies your rules & regulations.

Yours sincerely,

John & Sandra Cavanaro