

REGIONAL DISTRICT OF NANAIMO

**REGULAR BOARD MEETING
TUESDAY, AUGUST 23, 2016
7:00 PM**

(RDN Board Chambers)

A D D E N D U M

5. COMMUNICATION/CORRESPONDENCE

(All Directors – One Vote)

2-3 **Kelly Olson**, re French Creek Cell Towers.

From: Kelly Olson
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2016 9:31 AM
Subject: French Creek cell towers

RDN Board Members,

First, I would like to express our gratitude for what the RDN has done for the residents of French Creek to date. If the Board had not responded so quickly in May, we would currently have the TELUS tower constructed on Sunrise Dr.

The recent letter from TELUS to ISED, copied to the RDN implies that the RDN still has a role in the proposed Sunrise site. As the Board and the area residents do not want multiple towers, we would like to ask the Board to provide TELUS with an alternative to the Sunrise site. If the Board does not have a site to provide, then we respectfully request that the Board make a motion to support the Drew Rd site.

At the June 28, 2016 Board meeting, there was a motion to ask TELUS to co-locate on the Drew Rd site. This was followed by some discussion. The motion was subsequently defeated (narrowly). I am requesting that you revisit the RDN's position regarding the Drew Rd site.

I was a delegation earlier in that meeting but did not have a chance to respond to the comments that were made due to the format of the Board meeting. I would like to respond now and would appreciate if these comments could be considered.

The comments that I can remember were: one provider should not be supported over another; that the residents in the area of the Drew Rd site had as much opposition as the Sunrise Dr site; that different sites should be considered and that ISED should be more involved in that process; and that the Board should not give the public false hope:

- this is not about one provider over the other - all providers are being accommodated on the Drew Rd site; only one provider is being accommodated on the Sunrise site
- this is not about one location over the other...currently, both locations will likely end up with towers. If the choice is between 2 towers or one tower for the subdivision, the better choice is the one that can accommodate multiple carriers (Drew Rd)
- ISED has indicated that they are not going to tell a provider to go look for a different site. They are only going to be involved in the sites that have gone to IMPASSE. Additionally, the RDN has indicated that they do not want to have anything further to do with the cell tower siting, therefore, although the preference would be for the cell providers to consider a site that is not in Sandpiper, it does not appear that there is any mechanism to cause the providers to look elsewhere.

- This is not about false hope for the area residents. Unless there is something that I am not aware of, ISED will be making a decision on both locations based on input from the RDN and the providers; the input from the RDN should be based on what is the better choice for the area residents. If it is not possible to relocate all towers completely away from the residential areas (the best option), then the other options need to be considered. Allowing one tower on Sunrise that requires a second tower elsewhere in French Creek to provide coverage for TELUS' targeted customer base and then another tower to service all others is not in the best interest of the community....why 3 when there could be one.

Additionally, if the TELUS Sunrise site proceeds, the RDN and Board will have the same process to go through when TELUS finds a site for the second tower in the French Creek Landing area to complete their two tower model as well as Rogers tower on Drew Rd. These will again involve staff and the Board's time. Supporting the Drew Rd site and requesting TELUS' co-location on such, would provide TELUS with a compromise and would hopefully end the cell tower issues for this area.

As there will likely be further communication with ISED during the IMPASSE process:

We respectfully request that the Board make a motion to support the Drew Rd site as an alternate location for TELUS so that the one tower can be constructed to service all providers.

We presented petitions from 200 plus residents to not allow the tower on Sunrise; additionally 100 plus of those signature are on a petition that asks for there to not be two towers. **As none of the Board lives in the area of the towers and the people that live in the area of the towers are asking you as elected representative to minimize the towers, we request that you indicate to ISED that both towers be considered together and that the Board in the interest of its residents does not want multiple towers where one can accommodate all providers and therefore will support the Drew Rd site.**

The public is requesting cell coverage but the public is also asking for the number of cell towers to be minimized.....

Please.....if ISED asks, be in a position to state that the RDN supports the Drew Rd site as a compromise for the residents of Sundpiper - one tower not two....

Thank you,
Kelly Olson