

RICHARD BLOCK  
LORANNE CAREY BLOCK  
63 LOVEREN MILL ROAD  
ANTRIM, NEW HAMPSHIRE 03440

August 27, 2011

Members of the Planning Board,

We appreciate the opportunity to give the Board feedback on the draft Large Scale Wind Ordinance. We also appreciate the time and effort put in by the Ad Hoc Committee in constructing this document.

While we still firmly believe that industrial scale wind energy facilities are not appropriate for siting anywhere in a town as small and residential as Antrim, our primary concern with the proposed ordinance is the blanket allowance of LWEFs in all zoning districts including the Rural Conservation District. The RCD was created by the Town in 1989 to *protect, conserve and preserve the remote mountainous portions of Antrim from excessive development pressures and/or activities that would be detrimental to the unique environmental characteristics and qualities of this district and detract from the peaceful enjoyment and tranquility that this district affords local residents.*

The importance of the RCD has been repeatedly stated by many residents as well as in our Master Plan and Open Space Conservation Plan. It is the existence of this district which gives Antrim many of its unique qualities, and has served as a significant attraction for our town. The draft Large Scale Wind Ordinance, by not restricting the construction of LWEFs in the RCD, blatantly violates the purpose of the RCD and thus, the entire existing Zoning Ordinance. In other words, adding an article to our Zoning Ordinance which permits industrial development does not change nor supersede the Rural Conservation district restriction on industrial development which is in the existing Ordinance.

There are also some specific comments on certain paragraphs or clauses in the proposed ordinance that we would like to offer:

¶ **7.1.2:** "in no case shall the height of a LWEF tower exceed 450 feet." If this is intended to be an absolute limit, then there needs to be more specific language to insure this. There is a history in Antrim of misinterpretation of height limits, even when spelled out this clearly. This is almost the same language used in the Small Wind Energy Systems article to limit tower heights to 150 feet, yet the ZBA has ignored that limit twice in granting variances, as witnessed by two pending lawsuits challenging those decisions.

¶ **7.1.8 Blasting:** There is no directive as to how soon before blasting will take place that residents will be notified. We, for instance, would not want to be around during blasting

operations and may even want to make arrangements to move our animals off the premises. Unless notice of blasting is given to us sufficiently ahead of time, we will not be able to make such arrangements before the blasting begins. Also, this extreme inconvenience and disturbance to our lives would result in considerable expense in animal transportation and boarding and temporary lodging for ourselves. There are undoubtedly other Antrim residents who also would not wish to have to endure the blasting of our ridges, and we feel that the costs of temporary relocation of these families should be borne by the developer and should not have to be a financial burden as well as an emotional burden on these families.

¶ 7.1.9: We do not consider “minor modifications due to unforeseen circumstances such as encountering hidden outcrops of bedrock or natural springs” to actually be a minor issue which can be decided upon by one “agent.” This kind of situation may incur additional blasting or necessitate additional watershed mitigation and should be therefore deliberated by the entire Planning Board.

¶ 7.2.1 **Setbacks:** A setback of only 1.5 times the turbine height is nowhere near a sufficient distance from property lines. This distance is considered the “fall-down zone” and therefore would not provide enough protection from potential disasters to neighboring properties. The setback from occupied buildings should be at least thirteen times the turbine height. Even this distance is too close from residences as has been demonstrated countless times at existing industrial wind turbine installations around the country.

¶ 7.2.2 **Acoustics:** Sound levels, both pre-construction ambient and post-operational immissions, should be measured both winter and summer, ie, both with and without foliage cover. The impact of immitted noise needs to be considered for **all** residences within the acoustic range of a wind facility, not just for abutting properties. It should also be clarified that a land owner should have the right to decide where on his property sound measurements will be taken, not the developer.

¶ 7.3.1: Environmentally sensitive areas must include bird migration/flyway routes, and studies should be undertaken to determine where these are.

¶ 7.4 **Visual Impacts:** How can this be enforced? How can 450-foot tall turbines be hidden? We are very concerned that “the Planning Board shall take into consideration...” does not give any guidelines as to what should be done or what recourse the Town has if the visual impact of a LWEF turns out to be considerable and an eyesore. The visual impact will be the primary cause of devaluation for a number of properties.

¶ 8.3 **Shadow Flicker:** Twenty hours per year of shadow flicker is way too much. We feel that **any** shadow flicker imposed on our residents is invasive. Shadow flicker studies must be performed by independent researchers. It is not up to the developer to say how much shadow flicker is “acceptable” — they do not live here. The fact is that no amount of shadow flicker can be deemed “acceptable” to those who have to suffer it.

¶ 10.0 **Property Valuation:** this clause only requires the developer to meet with a property owner to discuss concerns. It does not require the developer to actually do anything about

property valuation problems. What resolution or value compensation protection is there for the landowner? What if a landowner wishes to move out but cannot sell his property because of the siting of a LWEF? Will the developer or the Town buy out that property at fair market value (before the construction of the LWEF)?

¶ 11.6: There does not appear to be any protection here for the Town in the case of an Owner/Operator declaring bankruptcy. In that case we may find ourselves suddenly owning a major industrial wind facility without the resources to manage or dismantle it. This is precisely what happened to a town in Massachusetts, and it resulted in that town being forced into bankruptcy.

¶ 11.7: The Select Board and Planning Board are here given the power, jointly, to reduce the amount of the Decommissioning Fund if requested by the Owner/Operator. We are not comfortable with this arrangement since both of these boards have, in the past, demonstrated an eagerness to accommodate the wishes of a developer, regardless of the benefits or costs to the people of Antrim.

¶ 12.3.12: While it is clearly obvious that there can never be a true restoration of a LWEF site, the language required in a Site Restoration Plan should be stronger, including thorough survey and photographic records of the entire area before major portions of a ridge top are blasted away and thousands of tons of concrete are poured. In our opinion this kind of damage is plainly irreversible.

¶ 15.3 **Third Party Review:** The Planning Board can authorize an applicant to reimburse the Board for expenses incurred by third party review. Additionally, neighboring property owners should also have that right, so that they may be reimbursed for any third party reviews that are necessary to protect their rights and interests.

In conclusion, the Planning Board exists to uphold Antrim's Zoning Ordinance, which in turn exists to uphold the Master Plan and keep Antrim and its residents safe and healthy and to assure "the most appropriate use of land throughout the Town." To this end, the Board's decisions ought to be based on the welfare of Antrim's residents and their right to enjoy their property and homes. Any legislation which favors an industrial developer at the expense of this right of residents to enjoy their homes cannot be in the best interest of the people of Antrim. We feel that any future commercial operation which has the potential to permanently disrupt the life of **any one** resident, let alone a significant number of residents, by threatening their physical and mental health, solitude, and property values, is a danger to the character and desirability of our town, and amounts to a taking of property rights from Antrim citizens.

Thank you for your time and consideration of our concerns and views.

Very sincerely,  
Richard Block and Lorraine Carey Block

70 10  
antrimplan2 tds.net <antrimplan2@tds.net>

---

## wind turbines

1 message

---

marlene\_schultz@verizon.net <marlene\_schultz@verizon.net>

Wed, Aug 24, 2011 at 12:05  
AM

To: antrimplan2@tds.net, antribiz@tds.net, nha@nhaudubon.org, bryan@harriscenter.org

As long time homeowners and tax payers in Antrim, we want to let you know that we are strongly opposed to the wind turbines that are being considered for our area. While we are in favor of alternative energy sources, Willard Pond, Tuttle Hill and the surrounding area are definitely not the appropriate locations for such large, noisy, environmentally unfriendly turbines to be placed. We fear what the impact will be on the surrounding habitat and natural locations.

The proposed benefits to the community are at best dubious. We hope you will consider all concerns and make the right decision to preserve the natural beauty of our community by rejecting this massive, intrusive project. Just say "NO".

Marlene & Jerry Schultz  
15 Rachel Lane  
Antrim, NH 03440  
617-513-3076

LB



antrimplan2 tds.net <antrimplan2@tds.net>

---

## Willard Pond

1 message

---

Byron <bnc1@myfairpoint.net>

Sun, Sep 4, 2011 at 9:45 AM

To: antrimplan2@tds.net

I am writing to oppose the installation of wind turbines on or near Willard Pond. Willard is one of the few remaining untouched natural resources in NH. Please do not destroy the beauty and uniqueness of that local treasure by installing wind turbines. Financial gain is not worth the loss that our region will endure.

Byron Niederhelman  
Hancock

---



antrimplan2 tds.net <antrimplan2@tds.net>

---

## Wind Ordinance

1 message

---

**Paul J Whittemore** <PJWhittemore@comcast.net>

**Tue, Sep 13, 2011 at 7:10 AM**

To: antrimplan2@tds.net

Diane Chauncey,

As one of the large land owners in Antrim I want you to know I have concerns about the Wind Ordinance that the planning Board has been working on. I understand that a small minority do not like the idea of this Wind Project that is being proposed. With over 70 percent of the community supporting the idea of the wind project (three different surveys) I can't understand how such a small group of non-supporters can continue to push their own agenda (To fight this project). As the value of wood continues to decline it becomes more and more difficult to keep large tracks of land as open space, this current wind project being proposed will allow us to receive revenue while being able to keep the majority of the land as open space. I would not want to see this proposed ordinance passed.

Paul J. Whittemore  
Land Owner



antrimplan2 tds.net &lt;antrimplan2@tds.net&gt;

---

## Proposed Zoning Amendment

1 message

lktlgrw tds.net &lt;lktlgrw@tds.net&gt;

Tue, Sep 13, 2011 at 6:45 PM

To: "antrimplan2 tds.net" &lt;antrimplan2@tds.net&gt;

Antrim Planning Board, I am unable to attend tonight's public hearing however, I would like to offer a few comments. I believe the proposed ordinance is too restrictive and if approved as is, would not allow the only wind project in Antrim to be built. I realize this is a town wide ordinance not intended for a single project but you all are well aware that there is only one project before the board now and in the future. It is clear to me and the majority of Antrim residents that I have spoken with that this is an attempt by 4 members of the Planning Board to try to derail the project by Antrim Wind LLC. The Planning Board has spent an incredible amount of time and resource devoted to creating an ordinance that reflects the view of the four members. Private consultants were hired and yet it seems almost all recommendations were ignored, I assume because you didn't like what you heard much like the legal council by our town's attorney. It wasn't bad legal advice you received, you simply didn't like what you heard. Referencing 7.1.2 Height, "in no case shall the height of a LWEF tower exceed 450 feet", what happens if an applicant applies for a variance before the Zoning Board? The Planning Board cannot write an ordinance that tells the Zoning Board they may not grant a variance. 7.1.3 why do all lines need to be buried? What other projects have you required that of? I'm glad to see you changed the set back in 7.2.1 from 9 times to 5 but I'm curious why you had it at 5, felt the need to change it to 9 and then change it back to 5. After all the time you've had and the consultants you've hired, whats with the flip flopping? In 7.4.3.1 you cite a "clear written standard" in regard to protecting scenic values. Does this standard actually mention commercial wind mills? If not, it's not so clear. In 7.4.3.2 you cite "highly sensitive viewing areas". Where are these? Is there a map in the town office I may look at that shows where these areas are or are they subjective to the "Antrim Planning Board 4"? The parts of this ordinance that bothers me the most is 8.9.7. and 12.3.13 "The Planning Board may require additional mitigation measures to ensure that the project will not unduly impact the scenic resources of the town" and "Any other information deemed necessary by the Board in order to make an informed decision" Huh? What does that mean? I read that as such, "we the Planning Board can come up with ANYTHING we want to but we aren't going to tell you about it ahead of time". This isn't an ordinance, this is a blatant attempt by the "APB 4" to derail the project by Antrim Wind LLC. The 4 of you should be ashamed of yourselves. In 8.14 you think the finances of a private company are your business? As long as they provide a decommissioning bond then the finances of a private company are none of your business. 14.2 A permit to operate shall be valid for 5 years. Are you kidding? No, I'm serious, are you kidding? Respectfully submitted, Gordon Webber

---