

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

1328 Hwy #54W Caledonia ON N3W 2G9

