

## Dan Namisniak

---

**From:** Vallari Patel <Vallari.Patel@fonturinternational.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 3, 2022 12:09 PM  
**To:** bmmcblain@gmail.com  
**Cc:** Dan Namisniak  
**Subject:** RE: Proposed tower at 1289 Hwy 54

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Barry,

An additional note: As per section 12 of the County of Brant Telecom Protocol, please note you have 21 days if you wish to respond.

Warm regards,  
Vallari

-----Original Message-----

From: w4542.bellmobility.info  
Sent: February 3, 2022 12:04 PM  
To: 'bmmcblain@gmail.com' <bmmcblain@gmail.com>  
Cc: Dan Namisniak <dan.namisniak@brant.ca>  
Subject: RE: Proposed tower at 1289 Hwy 54

Hi Barry,

We're sorry to hear you could not attend the zoom meeting. We'd be more than happy to answer your questions by email!

We have sent the tower proposal to Transport Canada and they have assessed that Day Protection and Night Protection will be required under CAR Standard 621.

I have confirmed with Bell that there will be medium intensity lighting at the mid-level and top-level of the proposed tower that will operate 24/7. There may also be painting requirements to meet the daytime protection standards. We completely understand that the lighting may cause a slight inconvenience, but unfortunately, Transport Canada's requirements are non-negotiable due to aeronautical safety reasons.

As part of the planning process, we provide a justification about the existing towers in the surrounding area to Planning Staff.

The tower being constructed at Baptist Church Road and Brant Road #22 is 4.56km away.

The existing tower (W3717) at 521 Old Onondaga Road East is 6.26km away.

The tower at the tourist centre is approximately 3.27km away.

The three abovementioned towers are out of Bell's target coverage radius. Though we understand this area is not seeing an unexpected population boom, towers are typically placed 1km - 2km apart in rural settings and 300m - 500m apart in dense urban settings to provide contiguous service. The proposed tower would be built to accommodate/fill in the coverage gap that has been identified by Bell's Radio Frequency Engineering Team. Please see attached for the "Before" and "After" coverage maps for more information.

We hope this clarifies your concerns and we do apologize for the delayed response, as it took a while to prepare the coverage maps.

Could you please provide an address and phone number? This is so I can include it in the Public Consultation Summary Report that will be provided to the Planner (copied), along with your comments.

Thank you,  
The FONTUR International Team

-----Original Message-----

From: bmmcblain@gmail.com <bmmcblain@gmail.com>

Sent: January 14, 2022 1:54 PM

To: w4542.bellmobility.info <undefined@fonturinternational.com>

Subject: Proposed tower at 1289 Hwy 54

Good afternoon. We had intended to join your zoom meeting on Tuesday night, but due to other commitments the time frame did not work. Therefore you may have already addressed the following comments or questions.

1. The proposed tower is in range of flight paths from Hamilton International Airport. What will the lighting requirements be on your proposed tower, and will there be more required than normal? What colour, and will they be continuously flashing? We have insight that the flashing lights can be a problem with reflecting into neighbouring homes and buildings. To the point that homeowners, at their expense, had to purchase non porous blinds to try and block out the light, especially at night.
2. Have you already reviewed towers in the area to accommodate your goals. That is, the new tower being built on Baptist Church Road and Brant Rd#22? Or the existing tower at the tourist centre/Hwy #54? Or the existing tower at Onondaga?
3. What exactly is the proposed tower being built to accommodate? You mention in your brochure that “the need for new antennas in the area in order to adequately provide continuous coverage and service to our future customer base in the area of Brant County Highway 54 and Mulligan Road.” Unless you are aware of a population explosion in this area, the number of people you will assist with this statement, is very minimal.

We are not necessarily against the project but would like some clarification.  
Please acknowledge receipt, and thank you for the opportunity to comment on your project.

Sincerely,  
Barry McBlain  
McBlain Farms Ltd.

COUNTY OF BRANT DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

RE: Application number CT4-21-DN

Proposed Bell Tower at 1289 Hwy #54

March 26, 2022

Brant Development Service Committee

Mr. Chairman and Committee:

I have had recent correspondence with Bell in regards to the proposed application of a tower at 1289 Hwy #54, which you should find in your package.

Although I will reference previous comments, especially if there was no clear answer provided, I will try not to delve into information you have already read.

To be clear, I totally understand the need and requirements for proper communication and infrastructure. However, the communication or lack of, in regards to this project, raises many questions and concerns. In an attempt to be as brief as possible, I will try to convey in point form, expanded questions from previously sent information. In no particular order:

1. Misinformation provided to the public in regards to “Bell Community Notification”.

**a. Public notification stated** - “...lighting or painting is not required as per Transport Canada’s assessment”. **Upon my questioning** this, due to the

90m height, the response was – “I have confirmed with Bell that there will

be medium intensity lighting at the mid-level and top level of the proposed tower and will operate 24/7.” **Upon my observations there were now two opposite answers to the same question.** They responded with apologies, that the brochure should have stated “Both clearances have been received and lighting or painting is required as per Transport Canada’s assessment”. The general public is not aware, based on the public notification, that there will be lights flashing 24 hours a day.

**b.** “....to adequately provide contiguous coverage and service to our future customer base in the area of Brant County Highway 54 and Mulligan Road”. Very few people live in this area to justify several million dollars in building a tower. I’m not sure why this statement was included.

**c.** “The tower will be accompanied with a 25mX25m equipment cabinet at the base”. Upon questioning why such a large equipment cabinet or building is required – “It is a 25mX25m fenced compound that will have a cabinet shelter at the base. No building permit is required, as it’s not a building.” Why not state in the original public notice that there will be a 25mX25m fenced compound?

Reference – Government of Canada CPC-2-0-03 – Radiocommunications and Broadcasting Antenna Systems, under 4.2, Public Notifications “Proponents must

ensure that the local public, the land-use authority and Industry Canada are notified of the proposed antenna system. As a minimum, proponents must provide a notification package.....” I do not believe that Bell have fulfilled their obligation in notifying the public, due to the errors contained in the notification. Especially as it relates to lighting requirements. There is a strong possibility that neighbour’s would have shown more concern for the project if they had been made aware of the 24/7 lighting. In my opinion, the project is non-compliant.

2. In correspondence from Bell in regards to lighting – “We completely understand that the lighting may cause a slight inconvenience....” There has been no answer to a question we asked in regards to what their definition of slight inconvenience is and what is meant by slight inconvenience. As Bell financially benefits from this tower, their idea of “slight inconvenience” may be skewed. Flashing lights reflecting into homes, lack of sleep, costs to keep lighting out of homes and migraines are a few inconveniences that I visualize – not slight. Again, according to Government of Canada section 4.2 of Public Notifications – Bell is non-compliant based on not providing answers.
3. In regards to coverage area they responded “...towers are typically placed 1km-2km apart in rural settings...”. When questioned further on the

validity of this statement, the following answer was provided – “1km – 2km is the general trend of tower placements and that varies on a case-by-case basis.” Vague answers such as this do not add to the credibility of the project.

4. According to an article in the Brantford expositor on February 6, 2022 (Vincent Ball) and after having discussions with Dan Namisniak, there are minimum distances from a residence to a communication tower in the County of Brant. Based on this information, the proposed tower appears to be non-compliant.

We are not against communication towers and infrastructure. However, our concerns with this project are the optics of how it has been presented and locating it amongst a cluster of homes. There are many areas the tower can be built that are away from residents/homes and the potential negative ramifications a telecommunication tower of this magnitude will supply.

We appreciate the opportunity to submit this submission for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Barry & Minnie McBlain

[Redacted Signature]



## Dan Namisniak

---

**From:** w4542.bellmobility.info <undefined@fonturinternational.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 22, 2022 11:25 AM  
**To:** Barry McBlain  
**Cc:** Dan Namisniak; brianatbridgeview@gmail.com; ldouglas2384@gmail.com; joanne.douglas@sourcecable.net  
**Subject:** RE: Proposed tower at 1289 Hwy 54

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Barry,

We sincerely apologize for the administrative error that was made in the brochure, it should have said, “Both clearances have been received and lighting or painting is required as per Transport Canada’s assessment”. We did make the necessary applications to both TC and NAV Canada. They have assessed that Day and Night Protection will be required under CAR Standard 621.

I can confirm that we have completed our due diligence regarding our proposed location. Bell Mobility has their network requirements and internal review processes, starting with their Radio Frequency Engineers who determine coverage gaps. This is followed by site acquisition and municipal approvals work. There was a delayed response because internal approvals were needed to share the coverage maps with members of the public, not because they did not already exist. We will not be re-zoning the property, as Zoning By-Laws do not apply to Federal undertakings such as telecommunication applications. It is a 25m-by-25m fenced compound that will have a cabinet shelter at the base. No building permit is required, as it’s not a building. The size of the compound is determined by the needs of Bell’s construction team.

The proposed tower will host 4G and 5G technology. All telecommunication services providers are obligated to follow the regulation limits set in Safety Code 6, which can found here: <https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-risks-safety/radiation/occupational-exposure-regulations/safety-code-6-radiofrequency-exposure-guidelines.html>. The target coverage area can be best visualized in the coverage maps provided earlier. Telecommunication applications are completed in accordance with the *County of Brant Communication Tower and Communication Antenna Preferred Location Protocol*, which states to generally locate towers in employment, industrial, commercial, and rural land uses. We understand this is the type of infrastructure that is unappealing, but to properly address coverage needs, infrastructure needs to be placed somewhat closely to travel corridors and residential uses. 1km to 2km is the general trend of tower placements and that varies on a case-by-case basis. There are many factors that determine where towers are placed, such as topography, dropped call rates and complaints, and radio frequency analysis.

Please note that all your comments and concerns will be documented in our Public Consultation Summary Report that will be submitted to the Planning Staff. You will also have another opportunity to voice your concerns in front of the County of Brant Council.

Thank you,  
The FONTUR International Team



---

**From:** Barry McBlain <bmmcblain@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** February 12, 2022 3:22 PM  
**To:** w4542.bellmobility.info <undefined@fonturinternational.com>  
**Cc:** Dan Namisniak <dan.namisniak@brant.ca>; Brian Coleman <brianatbridgeview@gmail.com>;  
[REDACTED]; joanne.douglas@sourcecable.net  
**Subject:** Re: Proposed tower at 1289 Hwy 54

Hi Vallari. See attached, for further communication and questions on the proposed Bell tower at 1289 Hwy #54.  
Barry

On Thu, Feb 3, 2022 at 12:04 PM [w4542.bellmobility.info](mailto:w4542.bellmobility.info) <[undefined@fonturinternational.com](mailto:undefined@fonturinternational.com)> wrote:

Hi Barry,

We're sorry to hear you could not attend the zoom meeting. We'd be more than happy to answer your questions by email!

We have sent the tower proposal to Transport Canada and they have assessed that Day Protection and Night Protection will be required under CAR Standard 621.

I have confirmed with Bell that there will be medium intensity lighting at the mid-level and top-level of the proposed tower that will operate 24/7. There may also be painting requirements to meet the daytime protection standards. We completely understand that the lighting may cause a slight inconvenience, but unfortunately, Transport Canada's requirements are non-negotiable due to aeronautical safety reasons.

As part of the planning process, we provide a justification about the existing towers in the surrounding area to Planning Staff.

The tower being constructed at Baptist Church Road and Brant Road #22 is 4.56km away.

The existing tower (W3717) at 521 Old Onondaga Road East is 6.26km away.

The tower at the tourist centre is approximately 3.27km away.

The three abovementioned towers are out of Bell's target coverage radius. Though we understand this area is not seeing an unexpected population boom, towers are typically placed 1km - 2km apart in rural settings and 300m - 500m apart in dense urban settings to provide contiguous service. The proposed tower would be built to accommodate/fill in the coverage gap that has been identified by Bell's Radio Frequency Engineering Team. Please see attached for the "Before" and "After" coverage maps for more information.

We hope this clarifies your concerns and we do apologize for the delayed response, as it took a while to prepare the coverage maps.

Could you please provide an address and phone number? This is so I can include it in the Public Consultation Summary Report that will be provided to the Planner (copied), along with your comments.

Thank you,  
The FONTUR International Team

-----Original Message-----

**From:** [bmmcblain@gmail.com](mailto:bmmcblain@gmail.com) <[bmmcblain@gmail.com](mailto:bmmcblain@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** January 14, 2022 1:54 PM  
**To:** [w4542.bellmobility.info](mailto:w4542.bellmobility.info) <[undefined@fonturinternational.com](mailto:undefined@fonturinternational.com)>

Subject: Proposed tower at 1289 Hwy 54

Good afternoon. We had intended to join your zoom meeting on Tuesday night, but due to other commitments the time frame did not work. Therefore you may have already addressed the following comments or questions.

1. The proposed tower is in range of flight paths from Hamilton International Airport. What will the lighting requirements be on your proposed tower, and will there be more required than normal? What colour, and will they be continuously flashing? We have insight that the flashing lights can be a problem with reflecting into neighbouring homes and buildings. To the point that homeowners, at their expense, had to purchase non porous blinds to try and block out the light, especially at night.
2. Have you already reviewed towers in the area to accommodate your goals. That is, the new tower being built on Baptist Church Road and Brant Rd#22? Or the existing tower at the tourist centre/Hwy #54? Or the existing tower at Onondaga?
3. What exactly is the proposed tower being built to accommodate? You mention in your brochure that “the need for new antennas in the area in order to adequately provide continuous coverage and service to our future customer base in the area of Brant County Highway 54 and Mulligan Road.” Unless you are aware of a population explosion in this area, the number of people you will assist with this statement, is very minimal.

We are not necessarily against the project but would like some clarification.  
Please acknowledge receipt, and thank you for the opportunity to comment on your project.

Sincerely,  
Barry McBlain  
McBlain Farms Ltd.

February 10, 2022

Thank you, Vallari, for your recent response to my questions, and the opportunity to comment. Unfortunately, your answers have raised more concerns and questions in regards to the proposed Bell communications tower.

In no particular order:

1. Lighting requirements. You have stated in your Community Notification - “public notification has been designed to provide all the necessary information as required by ISED.....” This appears to contradict what is actually going to happen. Your public notification, quote – “Bell attests that the radio antenna system described in this notification package will comply with Transport Canada/NAV Canada aeronautical safety requirements. Bell has made all necessary applications to Transport Canada and NAV Canada. Both clearances have been received and lighting or painting is not required as per Transport Canada’s assessment.” Your answer to my question – “We have sent the tower proposal to Transport Canada and they have assessed that Day Protection and Night Protection will be required under CAR Standard 621. I have confirmed with Bell that there will be medium intensity lighting at the midlevel and top-level of the proposed tower that will operate 24/7. There

may also be painting requirements to meet the daytime protection standards.” Two exact opposite responses to the same question. If the assessment changed after notifying the public, this should have been communicated. A perceived acceptance by neighbour’s based on no lighting, may have generated more questions, if what you are actually doing had been properly conveyed. Can you explain this discrepancy? There is a concerning lack of transparency here.

2. You state in your answer – “We completely understand that the lighting may cause a slight inconvenience, but unfortunately, Transport Canada’s requirements are non-negotiable due to aeronautical safety reasons.” Based on previous applications, would you not have assumed this lighting would be a safety requirement? Especially when the site is relatively close to Hamilton International Airport. Instead, there is a Community Notification released assuring us no lighting would be required.
3. In regards to your quote above “may cause a slight inconvenience”. What is your definition of slight inconvenience? Maybe, not sleeping at night due to flashing lights reflecting into your bedroom? Not being able to watch the 11:00 news due to reflecting light flashing into your house? How about exacerbating migraines due to the reflecting lights coming into your home?

For this “slight inconvenience”, the shareholders of Bell and the landowners, benefit financially.

4. You apologized for a delayed response (January 14/22 to February 3/22) to my questions based on “it took a while to prepare the coverage maps”. I find this an odd statement. It appears the proposed property is perfect, based on your statement in your Community Notification, “Bell chose this site in order to avoid problematic situations for our future customers such as poor voice and data quality, dropped calls, or even the inability to place a mobile call in the subject area.” How could you have completed due diligence and come up with a proposed location, without knowing what your coverage area will be? These maps should have been one of the first things to complete in order to find the proper location. Along with mapping existing towers and possible usage.
5. The current site is zoned agriculture. If the tower is built, will the assessment change? Are you applying for re-zoning?
6. Why is there such a large building (25mX25m) required at the base? Is the building permit based on agricultural or commercial standards?
7. What is the tower going to be used for? Telecommunication is a broad term. Does it include 5G or newer technology? Are there any concerns about

human health effects for any aspect of this “telecommunication”, and is testing still ongoing?

8. It appears your statement in the Community Notification “continuous coverage and service to our future customer base in the area of Brant County Highway 54 and Mulligan Road” is very misleading or not well researched. Let us assume there are 50 people in the area of Mulligan Road/54. Half of these might be on the Bell network. You are going to spend several million dollars to service 25 people? If your target population area is larger, you should be up front and acknowledge this. Or should this restrictive coverage area have been corrected or expanded?
9. From an article in the Brantford Expositor on February 6, 2022 (Vincent Ball), the minimum distance for any telecommunication tower in the County of Brant, from a residence, is 195 metres. Based on this information your proposed project appears to be non-compliant.
10. You state that “towers are typically placed 1km – 2km apart in rural settings”. Is this a future goal or just a statement? Living, and driving in rural Ontario, there are not many “typical tower” placements – at least not yet. This may be financially positive for the telecommunication companies, but the

aesthetic and land usage implications to rural Ontario, are unimaginable - if towers are placed 1-2km apart as you state.

Again, we appreciate the opportunity to comment and look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Barry McBlain

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Properties we are associated with either through ownership or rental agreements, and reached with your Community Notification -

Lot 68,69,70,71,72 and 73.

## Dan Namisniak

---

**From:** Lane, John W. <jlane@stcatharines.ca>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 28, 2022 7:44 PM  
**To:** Dan Namisniak  
**Cc:** 'joanne.douglas@sourcecable.net'  
**Subject:** Application No. CT4-21-DN (Telecommunication Tower - 1289 Highway 54 - "Blaindale Farms")

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dan –

Please be advised that my wife and I have received a letter at my home informing me that my neighbour (directly across the road from me at the address captioned above) has negotiated with Bell Canada to lease to them a portion of their farm lands to erect a telecommunication tower.

We understand this tower will be up to 300 feet tall and will be equipped with 5G technology receivers/transmitters. We also understand that, due to the proximity of this proposed tower to Hamilton Airport, it will be painted in highly visible colours and will be equipped with flashing lights at mid mast-height and at the apex of the tower.

We plan on attending the Public Meeting, scheduled for April 5, 2022 via YouTube, as viewers only.

Please present to Bell Canada the following questions on our behalf:

1. Is our home, located immediately across the road (at 1288 Highway 54), an adequate distance away from the tower that the side effects from the 5G radio frequencies will not affect the health and safety of the occupants of our home?
2. The flashing aviation tower lights will reduce the quality of life for our family. What compensating measures will Bell Canada take to restore the quality of life for our family?
3. The tower, with its highly visible paint and flashing lights, will be somewhat unattractive and will reduce the value of our home and property. What compensation are we entitled to?
4. Internet service is very poor along Highway 54. Will this tower provide our home and nearby residents better internet connectivity and speed?

Thanks so much for posing these questions to the presenter.

We look forward to viewing the meeting on April 5, 2022.

Kindest regards,

John W. Lane and Joanne Douglas-Lane  
1288 Highway 54  
905-765-8772

John Lane



Chief Building Official

Email: [jlane@stcatharines.ca](mailto:jlane@stcatharines.ca)

Tel: 905.688.5601 x1602 TTY: 905.688.4TTY (4889)

Mail: PO Box 3012, 50 Church Street, St. Catharines, ON L2R 7C2



#### City of St. Catharines Confidentiality Notice

The information contained in this communication, including any attachments, may be confidential, is intended only for the use of the recipient(s) named above and may be legally privileged. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution, disclosure or copying of this communication or any of its contents, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please re-send this communication to the sender and permanently delete the original and any copy of it from your computer system.