

October 4, 2017

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

Dear Mr. Turner,

My husband and I own the property at 24 Sampson and are the closest abutters to Fynbo property at 14 Sampson, the proposed site for the permanent cell tower. We certainly support the need for safety and adequate access to cellular communications on Chappaquiddick. However, we are very much opposed to placing the tower next door to our property on a lot that is too small, has numerous deficiencies and requires many waivers. Aside from the waivers required to allow this to happen, the Fynbo property essentially would have no buffer zone around the tower in a tightly packed residential neighborhood. It also brings in not one (ATT) but two (Verizon) major commercial entities which is way out of reasonable bounds for the idea of a home based residential business. We thought the strict zoning laws in place when we bought the property were there to protect us and, clearly, if this gets approved, we and our neighbors are not being protected.

As described by Brian Grossman, ATT's attorney, the proposed permanent tower would not increase area of coverage over the temporary tower and much of Chappy still would not have cell phone access. This clearly does not improve Chappaquiddick from a safety perspective any better than the current temporary tower. Clearly the motivation is not to put the permanent tower on the best site for broadest service coverage along with better access for ideally all of the residents and visitors, it is motivated by the fact it is the easiest and cheapest way to go. It doesn't seem to matter that if stated site requirements are met in a reasonable way. This is not an equitable trade-off. ATT wins because they can sell more cellular service for less investment while still not serving many of the residents, and Mr. Fynbo wins because he gains income by allow such a tower to be squeezed onto his property. We and other surrounding residents lose because our rights as owners are not protected, our property values are affected and the ability to sell our home is impacted by the presence of the proposed tower. If this was the only place it could be installed, that might be one thing. It is clear however that there are much better options: with better service, better more isolated sites with more land, better buffering zones, and fewer waived zoning restrictions.

To cite the North St installation as an example, while this is an onerous, unattractive, noisy tower, it is well concealed at ground level, hidden by a deep buffering zone of trees and adequate space between it and the boundaries. This has allowed the growth of a development after the Tower's installation because it is positioned so that the neighborhood is well protected from its encroachment with reasonable space around it. It seems much more logical to position a tower so that it does have adequate room and protection, then allow the neighborhood to develop up to the well defined and reasonable boundaries. Chappy does have the land to be able to allow this and such a significant and onerous structure does not have to be shoe-horned into an inadequate lot with clear negative impact on all those that live nearby. We believe there are much better alternatives and, indeed, ATT has leased the rights to better options at other locations on Chappy.

Please consider the points we have raised as you review the details of the Permanent Tower application and we hope you will not allow this tower to be placed as it is proposed and will consider requiring a

better site for the permanent tower for enhanced coverage and more protected placement and boundaries placement.

Sincerely,

Molly Pickett and Stephen Tirrell
24 Sampson Ave
Edgartown MA