

**Plainfield Zoning Board
Meeting Monday June 8th 2026
Meriden Town Hall**

**Zoning Board
Members Present:**

Richard Colburn Chair
Brad Atwater
Peter Martin

Matthew Decker
Mike Button

Others Present:

John Austin	Chris Swiniarski	Phil Greene	Rob Healy
Donna Bowie-Z	Sandy Steel-Z	Megan Chapman-Z	If Steel-Z
Brain Hampton	Don Cann	RoAnne Rogerson	James Tracy
Dierdre Muller	Sofia Langlois-Valley News		Heidi Wilson

The meeting opened at 7:00pm

The minutes of May 11th were approved as amended.

Continuation of Case 26-01: Atlantic Tower Cell Tower Application – Property of Phil Greene, 22 Old Stage Coach Road: Chair Colburn reopened the application.

Attorney Swiniarski provided a brief review of the latest information on the application. At the Board's request, the applicant has now provided a visual analysis of the proposed tower and reviewed some alternative sites. In addition, the applicant has submitted an argument for why this tower should be granted a variance.

In reviewing the visual analysis, Board member Martin felt that, in some instances, the consultant chose photo locations that minimized the apparent visual impact of the tower. As evidence, Member Martin shared two photos he had taken on the same day from slightly different angles that showed the balloon much more prominently visible on the horizon.

Member Martin also pointed out that the depiction of the tower shows the highest set of antenna arrays on the tower, not the four that are proposed. Attorney Swiniarski noted that RSA 12k gives the applicant the ability to vary the tower height by as much as 10'.

Turning to the alternative sites, Board members, on closer inspection, felt the application had not properly considered the Patch property on Methodist Hill, which has both areas that are lower than the elevation of the proposed tower site and acreage that is higher. As part of this discussion, the Cole property in Lebanon was mentioned as having similar characteristics to the Patch property. Both of these large parcels are closer to the largest portion of the "coverage gap" and are located in zoning districts in Lebanon that allow towers by special exception. In Plainfield, the proposed site requires a variance. The applicant agreed to take a closer look at these and other sites. There was a broad discussion about the need to demonstrate that the proposed site in Plainfield is the only site that is feasible, as opposed to simply being a site that can help fill the coverage gap. The Zoning Board felt that it was the applicant's burden to show that the proposed site is the only viable site in the area that can fill the gap. All agreed that other sites that do not have a willing property owner are not viable.

1
2 The public hearing was reopened to abutters:

- 3 • **Don Cann** – Questioned how much taller this tower might ultimately need to be
4 and whether lighting might be required. Attorney Swiniarski noted that while
5 some minor variation in height might be possible, the proposal is for a 130-foot
6 tower and no lighting at the top is required.
- 7 • **Member Martin** – Asked whether the tower could be reduced in height by 10
8 feet or more and simply accommodate fewer than the four carriers that are
9 proposed.
- 10 • **Brian Hampton** – Stated that he felt the applicant was not always prepared and
11 had misrepresented some facts. Attorney Swiniarski objected to this
12 characterization, stating that he believed the application is accurate and that the
13 applicant has been willing to provide additional information as requested.
- 14 • **Rob Healy** – Stated that he felt the residents of Plainfield were being asked to
15 bend their regulations for a tower that would primarily address a coverage gap in
16 Lebanon.
- 17 • **John Austin** – Requested more information about the existing tree canopy height
18 adjacent to the tower once construction is complete. Board members agreed this
19 information is part of the application requirements and should be provided.

20 The meeting was continued to Monday, July 13, at 7:00 p.m. at the Meriden Town Hall.
21 The applicant will report back on alternative sites and provide a tree canopy assessment
22 as required by Section 3.16(F)(6).

23
24 **Other Business**

25 In response to an inquiry from Zoning Administrator Halleran, Board members discussed
26 the information they would like to receive from applicant Matthew Koff on June 22 when
27 they continue his case for a setback encroachment/setback variance.

28 They requested the following:

- 29 1. A report from the town's Building Inspector on the condition of the existing
30 structure.
- 31 2. Input from the project's builder to better understand the timeline from the initially
32 approved renovation to the subsequent (and unapproved) replacement.
- 33 3. Cost estimates for bringing the building into compliance with current setback
34 regulations.

35 Halleran will convey this information request to Mr. Koff.

36 The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.
37
38
39

40 Stephen Halleran

Richard Colburn, Chair

41