

July 14, 2024

Mayor D. Emslie

City of Kawartha Lakes

26 Francis Street

Lindsay, Ontario, K9V 5R8

Email: delmslie@kawarthalakes.ca

Dear Mr. Mayor:

Re: Telecom Tower building and renewal project: tower on GilMar Road.

I am writing to express my concern about a new Telecom Tower under construction on GilMar Road near Dunsford, Ontario, City of Kawartha Lakes, (property owner 1988 Sturgeon Heights Road). I request that any further construction on the tower stop immediately until proper public consultation and environmental impacts are fully considered and communicated to the public. I believe a compromise solution can be found that will appeal to both the proponent and the community.

I understand and appreciate the project is part of a Province-wide effort to ensure good telecommunications (cell phone reception) is available to all Ontarians and that several municipalities are involved with multiple locations identified for upgrade or new tower development. However, we are also aware that the decision to approve this tower site lies solely with the municipal government.

In this case we, the residents impacted, do not support the cell tower being built at the location currently planned. We ask that Council not extend the proponent's letter of concurrence. We have questions and concerns as follow:

Questions:

1) Why was a shared site not considered and insisted upon? Tall towers (as well as many smaller ones) exist at Pleasant Point and Hwy 36, Clover Road and Highway 36, Pigeon Lake Road and King's Wharf, or Highway 35 and Cameron? (The Cameron site is clearly visible to all of us at on Sturgeon Lake at all times of day or night!)

2) Why were the concerns and comments provided from residents in 2020 not noted/documented / tabled/ discussed in Council when Council passed the motion to approve this tower? The motion passed as "uncontested" which is incorrect and should be corrected in the minutes.

Only two adjacent landowners where required to be consulted by the proponent Rogers Communication/Spectrasite. One landowner realized the response timeline too late, and another did express concerns and brought them forward to Council according to the City of Kawartha Lakes policy.

4) Why would Council consider the letter from the Rogers Communication (the proponent) appropriate communication to the two residents who are within 300 metres of the tower? The letter states the address of the property involved as 1988 Heights Road. 1988 Heights Road is an entire concession away and 100 acres (approximately) from the construction site on GilMar Road. How can it reasonably be expected that the residents would make the connection that the tower was actually being built on GilMar Road, the furthest northeast corner of the landowner's property?

5) Why do Council, the Mayor and the planning department feel that this tower must be built in the face of resident objection? The proponent clearly did not build within the required timelines as set out by all three levels of government. We had concerns in 2020 and we have them now. The IEAD policy was designed to account for the passing of time and a change in governments, residents and telecom needs. Note this section **4.5 of CPC-2-0-03:**

“4.5 Post-consultation Whether the proponent followed a land-use authority's consultation process or ISED's default public consultation process, construction of an antenna system must be completed within three years of the conclusion of consultation. After three years, consultations will no longer be deemed valid except in the case where a proponent secures the agreement of the relevant land-use authority to an extension for a specified time period in writing. A copy of the agreement must be provided to the local ISED office.”

The decision is in your hands.

6) Who is the current proponent? The proponent listed as the key contact for this issue (and as provided to me by the planning department) was contacted by me as a first step in my research on June 19 and she has not worked for Spectrasite/Rogers for several years and the phone number is her personal phone. She provided me with a possible contact whom I called, but the call was not returned. Who is the council working with now? Is the proponent still Rogers Communications? There have been many mergers and acquisitions in the last three years in the Telecom business. A new proponent means a new start to the process.

7) Why were environmental and waterfront issues not considered and addressed with impact studies and the findings shared with residents? Several creeks gather water that enters the lake in this location. This is our drinking water source. What is the impact?

8) Why were red and white flashing strobe lights approved in an area of environmental sensitivity (within 100 feet of significantly important wetland habitat (beaver, otter, turtle, amphibian, water bird) and bird and butterfly migration path in our community? There are smaller version towers. A complaint was filed with the Kawartha Lakes Conservation Authority with no response as of now.

9) What service deficit is this particular tower filling? Rogers has been given our tax monies to build this tower. Will those of us who use Rogers' cell service immediately experience improved cell service?

10) First Nations were to be consulted about site placement as part of this province-wide project. Did Council or the Rogers Communication (the proponent) consult with First Nations? What was their feedback on this tower?

11) Why did Council listen to residents a few years ago, and not now? What has changed? The Dunsford and Thurstonia community pleaded to Council to prevent a cell tower placement on Thurstonia Road (between Dunsford and the lake) and they were successful. The tower platform is still on the property; empty.

12) Would Council be willing to deny the proponent an extension and to send them to speak to these landowners who are interested in hosting a site closer to the highway and away from watershed, lake, and animal/bird/amphibian habitats?

In the short time I have been aware of the cell tower's construction (June 19, 2024) I have been able to collect the signatures of approximately 40 individual residents on a petition I table today. The names represent the households of Cobble and Aster Lanes, Gilmar, Stone Gate and Pitts Cove roads. This demonstrates high community interest in providing input to this project and deserves to be heard and acted upon by the Mayor and Council.

I believe there is a compromise solution available to us and worthy of further discussion. Do not grant an extension to Rogers Communications to build this tower in the current location. We ask you, Mr. Mayor, to ask Rogers Communication to restart a consultative process to collaborate with the adjacent landowners and the community to find a more suitable and safer site.

Sincerely, Kim McKinnon

CC: Councillor E. Yeo, Ward 1, Councillor P. Warren, Ward 2, Councillor M. Perry, Ward 3, Councillor D. Joyce, Ward 4, Councillor E. Smeaton, Ward 5, Councillor R. Ashmore, Ward 6, Deputy Mayor C. McDonald Ward 7; Councillor T. Richardson, Ward 8.