

From: Scott Burnside [<mailto:sblandsite@tds.net>]
Sent: Saturday, October 1, 2016 7:00 PM
To: 'pamela.monroe@sec.nh.gov' <pamela.monroe@sec.nh.gov>
Subject: Antrim Wind Energy

Dear SEC

Our family will not be able to attend the meeting on Oct 3, 2016, but we would like to express our thoughts to this project. Foremost how can aesthetics (view) be a factor in this decision making process. Our current family residence is on the western slope of Meeting House Hill in Antrim with a direct line of site, maybe 1 or 2 miles to some of the proposed towers on Tuttle Mountain, though looking across the small valley between Meeting House Hill and Tuttle Mt. it seems only a few hundred yards as there are no obstructions in our sightline. We have no concern of the view and we should mention the sun sets directly over the peak and ridgeline of Tuttle Mt. and we are not concerned with shadow flicker. We actually enjoy and look forward to looking at the wind towers and know personally more people that enjoy the views of wind farms to those opposed. Some people actually would use the words to describe them as Majestic ! Antrim Wind has redesigned their application to adjust views from the so called critical viewpoints to accommodate those who oppose the views. "So we personally think aesthetics is a none factor on this application". The folks at Antrim Wind have been fabulous to address everyone's concern at great expense to them ! It's wonderful to see a company try their best to accommodate everyone even with the conservation easements in the end of the project, but unfortunately the opposition is not so willing to compromise, they have a steadfast "NO" attitude.

Second issue is the wording of the current zoned district "Rural Conservation" the opposition have run with the word "Conservation" trying to twist it to "Preservation". So what is allowed in this zone ? Per Antrim's Zoning of permitted uses for this district are: single family residences, private/public schools, church's, home based business, kennels, public/private recreational facility, Farms/Agri. Uses, roadside stands, farm employee housing. Some of the Special Exception uses are: Recreational vehicle parking facility (I do not know the difference between this and the permitted use), and Manufactured Housing Parks. Some of these could have larger environmental impacts than this application. For instance: "Recreational Parking Facility" would be considered a RV park and also "Manufactured Housing Park" which both would include impacts to install infrastructure for roads, parking, office and maintenance facility's and accommodations for electrical, communications, sewer and water. We even have an allowed use of a "Public or Private Recreational Facility" these could include ski areas, water slide parks, zip line parks, moto cross parks, shooting ranges, etc. (all recreational) which would all have impacts under an allowed use. If we go to allowed use of a Private/Public schools, you could have a private/public school or college campus be constructed with all the associated infrastructure and sporting fields. Single family residence could include subdivisions with roads to well over couple hundred individual lots should the landowners so choose. The word CONSERVATION is not the same as "Preservation" as the opposition would want you to think. You still need to "UNDERSTAND" that the land being developed for this facility is under "PRIVATE" ownership and not "PUBLIC LANDS" and they would have the right to build any of the above uses "PERIOD". We believe in the right of these landowners to seek this wind farm facility or if

they so choose conservation easements or even donate their land to their choosing or develop to any of the allowed uses but by all means it should be their own "CHOICE" and not someone that has no ownership stake or pay the property taxes. It's unfortunate that private land ownership rights are disappearing do to zoning, government regulations & oversight, appeals and people that have absolutely no investment in the land ownership in question. We surely hope it does not play a factor in denying this application, as too often the opposition is the louder more active voice that swings a decision, even though the applicant has done due diligence.

Thirdly we support the Town of Antrim Select Board to represent the majority of the Town residents. We firmly believe the majority of the town's population supports this application being proved by prior surveys taken. We support the Selectmen also in representing us concerning our tax revenue from this project. We are a local business owner also, so we also highly support this project for any and all local/regional business that would benefit from this project which is much needed in this region of the State of NH. The opposition will clearly state and spread rumors any person or business that supports this application has a financial stake in this project and that is completely false. They will make any false accusation to get this project denied.

With all the study's that have been done to prove that impacts can be mitigated we fully support this application !

Again we wish we could attend this meeting to fully support the approval of this application, but prior work engagements are preventing us from attending. Many more people that support this project are having the same issue.

Thank You For Your Time and Consideration !

The Burnside Family

Scott Burnside & Kristina Burnside (reg. voters)

Alexandra Burnside (reg. voter)

Mackenzie Burnside

Haiden Burnside

379 Clinton Rd. Antrim, NH 03440