

Hello, we are Colleen and Matthew Kelly and we live at 431 Baptist Church Road, next door to the proposed telecommunications tower site. We've lived here for almost 18 years, and are only the second owners of our 110+ year old property.

Our property is home to every manner of wild creature that inhabits woodlands and open spaces. We have native trees and shrubs, a garden, a wide selection of fruit trees, and have recently invested in a ¾ of an acre hazelnut and truffle plantation. We choose to live and farm in Brant County because we enjoy the simplicity and peace of the rural environment.

Even though the hydro corridor runs behind many properties like ours, it is far enough away that, for the most part, it doesn't interfere with the quiet, rural lifestyle we strive for.

But that tranquility is under threat because of this proposal. The tower will be erected approximately 40m from our property line and 100m from our house. It will be tall enough (65m, or approximately 215 feet) to be visible well above the mature trees that grow around our home. The lights, noise, and RF emissions emanating from this proposed tower will become a constant presence in our lives. We won't be able to escape it or block it. It will be an eyesore for the entire area.

Quite simply - we don't want this next door to us. And we are worried because **this is likely just the beginning.** Once one tower is erected in the area, there is nothing stopping them from getting permission to put up more. **Where does it end?**

If the proposed tower build is approved, every time we prepare dinner, we will see a 213.25' tower beyond of our beautiful trees. Every time we sit down to eat in our dining room, it will be under the shadow of a 213.25' tower. Every time we walk past the upstairs hall window on our way to bed, it will be under the flashing lights of a 213.25' tower.

Imagine what it will be like for us when everything we do on our property will have a telecommunications tower in the background? Every late night bonfire, every family cook out, every time we just want to sit out on our verandah and enjoy our property.

We are asking you to think about the risks to our community by allowing this type of construction to go forward. Are we paving the way for the loss of rural neighbourhoods and farmland all throughout Southern Ontario?

Once this type of large scale construction is allowed on a small plot of rural land (less than 5 acres), what prevents this type of construction on other small parcels of farmland throughout the County?

We truly appreciate you taking the time to review our concerns. If you have any questions that need clarification or require additional photographs of the flooding, please contact us at

Issues That Need Further Investigation:

- The negative impact on home and property values, now and in the future
- The ongoing environmental effects on people, farmland, animals, and pollinating insects
- The inappropriate choice of building area due to ongoing spring and fall flooding of the adjoining fields, as well as underground streams





Our Concerns:

We have four main concerns with this project, which we've outlined below:

Property Values

When we purchased our property 18 years ago, it was a big risk for us. But we took that risk with the knowledge that this would be part of our retirement planning and income, anticipating the standard increase in real estate. So when we received notice of this proposed building project, the first thing we did was reach out to a local realtor and others in the industry to ask how this would affect our property value and retirement plans.

- You will have a very small pool of people that would want to purchase your property." <E--mail message from Rose Levie, Broker, Royal LePage State Realty (Ancaster), November 8, 2021>
- "People shy away," Ms. Canaris, Associate Broker, Co-owner of RE/MAX
 Hearthstone said. "If they have the opportunity to buy another home,
 they do." She said "cell antennas and towers near homes affect
 property values. Increasing numbers of people don't want to live near
 cell towers. In some areas with new towers, property values have
 decreased by up to 20%." < https://
 stopdellwoodcelltowercom.wordpress.com/about/
- As more and more cell towers are being installed, the negative impact on property values is apparent to realtors. "It will definitely affect the value."
- The proposed tower will be just 40.35 feet from the neighbouring property line and visible above the existing 110+ year old established tree line. <E-mail from Tracey Pillon-Abbs, November 10, 2021 and STC 0079 Site Selection Report image p. 7>

If this project is allowed to proceed, the end result with be a significant decrease in both our property values and our retirement income. And we won't be alone. Essentially anyone within viewing distance of this proposed tower will suffer the same negative effect.

How can you help make a better choice for infrastructure in Brant County:

- 1. As elected officials, please learn as much as you can about potential issues that will effect your constituents and the valuable farmland in our County. This includes such things as financial, health, eco-tourism, and environmental concerns.
- 2. Share what you learn with others in decision-making roles in order to make the next infrastructure project fair and viable for everyone.
- 3. Look at the creative solutions found in other forward-thinking Counties that will preserve farmland and not interfere with the health and well-being of taxpayers. This could be a wonderful opportunity for our County to be a leader in citizen safety and technology.





Environmental Issues

When we chose to move to Brant County it was to distance ourselves from big city issues. We wanted to get away from light and noise pollution, and live more closely with nature. However, research shows this is harder and harder to achieve where telecommunication towers are built.

- "Broad wildlife effects have been seen on orientation and migration, food finding, reproduction, mating, nest and den building, territorial maintenance and defense, and longevity and survivorship." < https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34047144/>
- "Without research, monitoring or public knowledge of RF levels, cell towers are rapidly proliferating in rural and sensitive wild areas, in space, in our communities and on our roadways with vast networks of 'Smart Grid' and 5G systems blanketing the airspace environment. Current law protects industry over public health and planetary concerns of burgeoning radiofrequency radiation...we have yet to take into consideration the unique physiologies of other species, or how they use the environment in ways that humans do not, when we assume that the unfettered use of EMF/RFR can continue unabated and be allowed to grow indefinitely." https://mdsafetech.org/2021/07/19/wildlife-and-biodiversity-a-disappearing-act-by-cell-towers-on-land-and-in-space/
- "Just watch the bird and bee populations. Today, unprecedented exposure levels and intensities of magnetic, electric, and electromagnetic fields from numerous wireless technologies interfere with the natural information system and functioning of humans, animals, and plants. The consequences ... cannot be ignored anymore. Bees and other insects vanish; birds avoid certain places and become disorientated at others. Humans suffer from functional impairments and diseases. And insofar as the latter are hereditary, they will be passed on to next generations as pre-existing defects." <Ulrich Warnke, Author, Biologist>

Without our bee and bird pollinators, all the work we've put into our truffle orchard, gardens, and fruit trees will be lost. Not to mention the wild spaces we've created for the deer, rabbits, and wild birds that call our property home.

Recommended Reading:

- Canadians for Safe Technology,
 https://c4st.org/>
- Physicians for Safe Technology,
 https:// mdsafetech.org/>
- PubMed: Selected Readings, <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.n
 ih.gov/34047144/>
- The Lancet:
 Planetary
 Electromagnetic
 Pollution: It Is Time
 to Assess Its
 Impact, < https://www.thelancet.co
 m/journals/lanplh/
 article/PIIS2542 5196(18)30221-3/
 fulltext>
- Point Reyes Light,
 >a href="https://">>>a href="h





Concerns regarding the installation of a telecommunications tower directly beside our home and property

Water Displacement

Each year we experience flooding due to rains and snow melt. The damage from this flooding has caused root rot and prevented the growth of the maple and pines trees that were planted along the property lines.

Once the 45' x 45' concrete base required to house the proposed tower is installed, where will all that water go?

What will happen to the rest of our tree line and truffle orchard, located along the property line near the back of our farm, when the water continues to build up? The truffle plantation was a \$14,000.00 investment into our retirement income. Disruption to this field site would come at a huge cost to us.

The irony of the proposed location is two-fold. When we were contacted by Dave Pitman of Steward Logistics we were told, "In this case, they have asked us to look for properties nearby the HydroOne base as the towers blend into the surroundings." < E-mail from Dave Pitman, July 15, 2021>

This location clearly does not blend in with the Hydro corridor.







Additional photographs available.

Ouick Facts:

- Once cell-towers are installed they are very difficult to have removed; More antennas and lights can be added and the height increased without public consultation
- Telecommunication towers do not improve Internet access: "Q: Will this give me better Internet access? Ours is terrible! A: This would boost reception for data for your phone, but this wont be for internet...yet... Once a tower is up, an Internet provider can apply to put equipment on the tower. If the internet is bad, I'd imagine that would happen. We also would pitch it to internet providers." < E-mail message from Dave Pitman, June 16, 2021>
- Safety Code 6 (SC6), Canada's exposure guideline to radiation from wireless telecommunication devices. has not been properly updated since 1979 https://c4st.org/
- Our own government's Report On the National Antenna Tower Policy Review is woefully out of date, with the website last being modified in 2012. https://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/smt-gst.nsf/eng/sf08353.html
- Health Canada's SC6 is fundamentally flawed: because it does not measure for biological harm in humans, only thermal (heating) effects; It does not account for children's developing brains and bodies, which absorb up to ten times the amount of wireless radiation than adults
- Safety procedures and installation guidelines outlined in SC6 were designed for and only directly applicable to employees and visitors to federal buildings, not neighbourhoods, school zones. or farmland <https://

c4st.org/>



Concerns regarding the installation of a telecommunications tower directly beside our home and property

Health Concerns

We recognize that infrastructure technology is needed in Brant County, but it shouldn't come at the cost to the health of its citizens. We also know that there are many types of health issues we have no control over. When we do have the opportunity to choose, we should choose our health above everything else.

- "The health impacts of radio-frequency radiation (RFR) are still inconclusive, but the data to date warrants more caution in placing cell towers. An engineering team considers the current understanding of health impacts and possible solutions, which indicate a 500-meter (one third of a mile) buffer around schools and hospitals may help reduce risk for vulnerable populations." https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2019/12/191203162553.htm
- "Health Canada currently believes that the levels specified in SC6 are below the threshold for any potential danger, despite more and more recent evidence that empirically demonstrates that this is not the case, and that SC6 should be updated to modern standards. This matter is increasingly important because Industry Canada also uses SC6 to regulate radiation emissions from cell towers. Exposure limits in Italy, Switzerland, China and Russia are 100 times more stringent than those of Canada's SC6." <Canadians for Safe Technology, https://c4st.org/>
- "Widespread use of digital media and near constant exposure to wireless devices has caused increasing concern among scientists, health care professionals, psychologists, educators and the public who are now considering this is not only a public health issue but a looming public health crisis. It appears that we are at the same point of emerging science similar to early recognition of health impacts associated with tobacco, asbestos, coal dust and lead. (119) These concerns are amplified by industry proposals for a massive expansion of wireless infrastructure and connectivity." <Physicians for Safe Technology, https://mdsafetech.org/featured-page-one/join-mdsafetech-org/
- "Scientists and doctors all over the world are demanding these inadequate emission guidelines be addressed. We need to look at the cumulative effects over time. At one time DDT, tobacco, asbestos, and many other drugs were deemed safe. It's important that as a community we're informed of the risks as well as the benefits of cell towers. Knowing all this, how can we be certain what a safe distance will be with the incoming newer, stronger technologies or what the cumulative effects will be?" https://cadbaycelltower.files.wordpress.com/2013/07/cbuchurch-celltowerinfojuly12.pdf

Transparency Is Important:

We were one of the properties approached by Dave Pitman of Steward Logistics in June 2021. Many of our neighbours were too.

Over the years we've been approached numerous times about similar building projects (solar panels, towers, etc.) on our property, but always refused. We felt they weren't in keeping with the rural landscape and unfair to our neighbours.

This time curiosity got the best of us and we sent questions back to the company. At the time, the most important question was location: "This is an outline of our property. For aesthetic purposes, there are really only two locations that would work for us (we have long-term plans for our farm). I was wondering where your company was thinking the tower would go?"

Dave replied with the following: "Off the top of my head I was thinking here as we would have to build a road and get hydro back there, we couldn't go too far back."



This satisfied our primary concern that we would **not** be interfering with any of our neighbour's enjoyment of their property, nor would we be causing an eyesore on the rural landscape as the structure would be hidden behind our existing 110 year-old tree line.

This is the **only reason** we agreed to include our property in the initial round of considerations.