

Andrea Goldthwaite  
andrea@metrocast.net

March 18, 2015 2:58 PM

Dear Ms. Murray and SEC Members:

My wife and I are visual abutters of the potential development of Energias de Portugal in Alexandria and Groton. We occupy a permanent residence on Groton Road, Hebron, NH. We purchased this site in 1979 because of its pristine westerly view, up the Cockermonth River valley. I have very fond memories of this site and its view because my folks and I had the good fortune to be able to find and to picnic on this location, on numerous occasions, during the late '40's and early '50's because of its view. At the time, it was part of an operating farm owned by Rodney Adams and his wife Aquilla. Subsequent to our purchase, my wife and I built a retirement residence on the 5.5 acre piece. This was the activation of our dreams. We always had wanted to be in Hebron, with a view, in a pristine location, with easy access. River frontage (on the Cockermonth) was a strong plus. We can attest that such an available site is rare to the point of being non-existent today!

We have followed the issue of visual encroachment on residences by wind turbines since the nearby development of such a facility in Groton, NH recently. Being residents of Hebron, we have been offered no opportunity to comment effectively on such developments, even this most recent proposal by Energias de Portugal. In any event, you can understand the magnitude of our surprise when, upon our return from a short trip, we immediately noticed what appears to be a MET tower, easily visibly over the ridge to our west, on the Spruce Ridge site. If that tower, with its reduced height (184'), compared with the proposed 499' turbine towers is what we should expect, our lifelong plans and retirement site will lose ALL of its pristine nature. We have been solid citizens (both my wife and I were public servants), tax-paying and law-abiding, solidly planning for our later years. Is this what all citizens should expect? We certainly hope not.

Since property owners in New Hampshire having an established view can be taxed on its value in addition to the value of the property itself, a real property-rights issue seems to be at play in such instances. This property, 134 Groton Road, Hebron, NH, is listed in town documents as having a portion of the taxes we pay as a "view tax". It appears that the proponents' arguments involve issues related to physical events but NOT to aesthetic loss of value. We strongly suggest that the appropriate State of New Hampshire entities look closely at the issue of property rights in relation to visual assets. Since the State has allowed the taxation of properties which have a view ("view tax") one could assume that such connotes both legal ownership and monetary value thereof! Such being the case, shouldn't the project developers have the legal duty to compensate for that "taking" in the final instance of approval? We would certainly expect so.

We most strongly request that the SEC incorporate some acceptable set back rules that will at least push some of these huge towers back on their sites far enough that they do not loom over residences and cause the loss of value of such property. We sincerely appreciate this opportunity for comment and trust that our feelings will be strongly considered in the SEC's deliberations.

Sincerely,

David B. Goldthwaite  
Andrea L. Goldthwaite