

Robert Brown

From: Walt <Busyguy55@cogeco.ca>
Sent: July-10-17 6:13 PM
To: Robert Brown
Subject: Purposed Communication Tower

Good day,

I am Walter Tessling and I live at 610 Heritage with my wife Jacquie Dean. We are very concerned with the proposal we received in the mail.

Recently I was informed that a communication tower was being proposed adjacent to property I own on Conservation Blvd. The neighbours and I were disappointed to hear that anyone would even think to have a 50 metre communication tower erected in our neighbourhood.

I purchased a home on Malo St. back in 1983. Back when the treatment plant was in the infancy stages, the meetings (with town council) that I went to, it was discussed specifically that they would plant trees, after construction, so no one would eventually see the treat plant from the east. I'm sure it would be on record from back then.. Since then I have seen the neighbourhood grow. I have enjoyed this neighbourhood so that I have purchased more property in this area. I also own property on Conservation Blvd. It would then be facing a proposed 50 meter tower which is then surrounded by fencing. I have a good offer for these lots, only if there is no tower erected. Would there be compensation for me due to the loss of such an offer on my lots?

With Conservation Blvd. now having 2 wide sidewalks for foot traffic, as well as ample road space for cyclist, along with the busy dog park and a children's park, I cannot see how a communication tower would be cohesive with the area. Heritage Rd. is also being widened for bicycle use as well as being available for foot traffic as needed. We are fortunate to have such a lake view travelling along Heritage Rd. A tower being erected on the proposed site would take away from all the beauty we have to share with our community along this route. This area is a lakeside jewel and the proposed tower would fit in more if located in a farm field. The picture of the proposed tower site is misleading as well as the coordinates.

There are trees planted all over the sewage treatment plant area except on the side of Conservation Blvd. Also, it is great there is a dog park, but again no trees in front of the fence. Why nothing on this side? The fence looks institutional. There are trees in the dog park. There needs to be trees along the dog park fence as well, not a 50 metre tower. During the construction of the sewage treatment plant, the neighbourhood was promised the planting of trees surrounding the whole plant. After all these years that still has not materialized on the east side.

Installing a communication tower would be the worse eyesore for all the nature and tranquility we enjoy in our area. We want our town to be remembered as having a picturesque vision either biking, walking or driving along Heritage Rd. and Conservation Blvd.

Does the town need revenue that bad to ruin the landscape of the neighbourhood as well as decrease their land values?

Please consider having the tower erected in another area, so we as well as all our town's visitors can enjoy the neighbourhood.

**Walter Tessling & Jacquie Dean
610 Heritage Rd.**

519-733-3443

Robert Brown

From: ON1213.signum.info <ON1213.signum.info@fonturinternational.com>
Sent: July-13-17 9:56 AM
To: Ed Neves; Gord Queen; Susanne Coghill; Tony Gaffan; Larry Patterson; Nelson Santos; ON1213.signum.info; Robert Brown; Sandy McIntyre; Thomas Neufeld
Subject: RE: Site code ON1213 communication tower concerns

Hello Mr. Neves:

Thank you for your comments. Please accept this e-mail as acknowledgement that we have received them.

As you describe, the tower is indeed designed for co-location capability. The benefit of this is that it reduces the number of towers needed in this part of Kingsville, as other carriers will be required to consider the structure for their own equipment. A full Safety Code 6 analysis is performed by the responsible carrier whenever equipment is added, modified, or removed, to ensure that radio-frequency emissions remain well below the regulatory limits. It is a condition of each carrier's operating license that every site they operate is safe according to the regulations. As a result, safety is something carriers take very seriously.

I also did not go to school for the frequencies and formulas contained within Safety Code 6 (I am an urban planner by trade), so I understand your need for clarification. Safety Code 6 is a standard for radiofrequency (RF) exposure limits established by Health Canada. As part of an ongoing exploration of the effects of RF on human beings, Health Canada has established a frequency and power range that has been determined to not have any adverse physical effect on human health. This range extends from 3 KHz to 300 GHz, which is the frequency range of the radiofrequency portion of the electromagnetic spectrum. In order to limit the potential dangers associated with broadcasting at this frequency (vibration or sound and heat) SC 6 limits the amount of power or wattage that can be used at each facility. This limit is 10 watts per square metre. Given this threshold and the power requirements of cellular base stations (towers), cellular communication towers consume approximately 0.1 watts/m² or ***less than 1% of the maximum identified by Health Canada at their broadcast point***. This power is further diminished once the signal leaves the tower, resulting in emissions thousands of times below the Safety Code 6 limit once it arrives at ground level.

I understand your concern with the location. Firstly, the "search area" for a candidate site is determined by using network design research of our clients' RF Engineering departments. In this sort of semi-urban area, the search area has a radius of around 500m (1650ft). In this particular case, the search area was centred north of Heritage Road, between Conservation Boulevard and Cottage Grove Avenue. While we appreciate the merits of the location you have suggested near the golf course, unfortunately this is just too far from the centre of the search area and would result in Signum's carrier clients not being able to meet their coverage objectives.

Secondly, Signum Wireless has found it to be very beneficial to work with a municipality and locate a tower on municipal property. This allows the municipality itself to reap the revenue benefits, instead of a private land owner, and it quite often results in a collaborative and community-based approach. As the Town owns the treatment plant, and the plant lands fall within Signum's clients' search areas, Signum approached the Town for their interest in hosting a tower.

Third, the location was selected based on analysis conducted by Town staff. My understanding is that the proposed location avoids interference with underground infrastructure, as well as future Town plans for the property. Perhaps someone at the Town can provide you with more details in this respect. I do appreciate your comments regarding the selected location—I do not speak for the Town, but I am certain these will be taken into account through the rest of the decision-making process.

Once again Mr. Neves, thank you for taking the time to write, and I hope this information has been helpful. Should you have any further questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

JOEL SWAGERMAN MCIP, RPP
FONTUR International Inc.

From: Ed Neves [mailto:ed.neves1970@gmail.com]

Sent: July-12-17 10:05 PM

To: Gord Queen <gord.queen@gmail.com>; Susanne Coghill <suscoghill@gmail.com>; Tony Gaffan <tonygaffan@gmail.com>; larry.patterson@gosfieldtel.com; nsantos@kingsville.ca; ON1213.signum.info <ON1213.signum.info@fonturinternational.com>; rbrown@kingsville.ca; sandygmccintyre@hotmail.com; thomas neufeld <tneufeld77@gmail.com>

Subject: Site code ON1213 communication tower concerns

I live a 619 Malo St in Kingsville, what will be a "stones throw" away from this communication tower. Approx 420 ft

Getting the initial concern out of the way will be the impact to my property value. I would like to understand this impact with data from other areas where your communication towers have been installed.. before and after property assessments would be helpful in easing this concern.

Adding

With your proposal today your notification outlines that you are well within regulatory limits (Safety code 6). In the same notification you also mention "Co-location" on existing towers. How will future "co-location" on this tower be communicated? How or when is someone so close to this tower to be concerned about radio signals and the impact to my family? I have to ask for some kind of clarification on this only because Safety Code 6 has been written with frequencies and formulas I didn't go to school for.

Moving on to the impact of this antenna on our lakefront. Your tower simulation shows a nice "skinny" stick in the background. I have seen these towers and they never look as bare as your simulation. An updated image with what will actually be coupled to this antenna would be appreciated. Also a simulation of what this will look like from Malo St / Conservation wouldn't hurt either. Continuing on this theme. Why these particular coordinates for this tower? Why not let's say

N42deg2'18.4691"

W82deg46'28.8577"

There is a road to access the site and only the golfers would see it for one hole of golf. Of course this is not municipal land so Signum would have to coordinate with the land owner to make this happen. Not the first time this has happened. I don't think 2 kms would impact the expected performance of communication in this area. So let's say the town wants the lease/rent/or sale of land for this project? Why put this antenna on the site at this location? Why not place it just south of the water treatment plant? This would definitely be a more obscure location. Based on the coordinates for this antenna it has been placed at a location that would impact the greatest amount of residents. Where placing it say 200 ft south from the treatment plant fence on the west side of the road that services the treatment plant would be a more reclusive site. Clarification on why these particular coordinates were selected is another request.

The feedback will be that this site was selected for "minimal impact to residents". In my opinion a little more can be done to ease the impact.