

DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Notices Published – 42 Sugarloaf Place – DEV2200164

Date Prepared: February 15, 2023

Report To: Regular Meeting of Council

Councillor and Role: Councillor Jamie Korab, Development

Ward: Ward 2

Decision/Direction Required: That Council consider the application for a telecommunications tower at 42 Sugarloaf Place.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:

A referral has been received by the City of St. John’s from Rogers Communications Inc. requesting concurrence to construct a telecommunications tower at 42 Sugarloaf Place.

In accordance with the obligations under the Radiocommunication Act and Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada’s Radiocommunication and Broadcasting Antenna Systems CPC-2-0-03 (Issue 6), the City of St. John’s notified residents in the vicinity of 42 Sugarloaf Place of Rogers Communications Inc. intention to construct a telecommunications tower system consisting of:

- A 65-meter self-support design tower with supporting antennas and radio equipment;
- A 3.05m x 3.88m equipment shelter to be located at the base of the tower; and
- A security fence around the base of the tower and equipment shelters with a locked gate.

The proposed site is located within the Commercial Office (CO) and Rural (R) Zones.

Multiple submissions were received. Concerns raised included associated health and safety and the impact on property values.

Rogers responded to questions and provided information on the health and safety requirements they are required to meet. Telecommunication towers are governed and approved by Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada, while Health Canada has specific safety codes in place to limit exposure and ensure protection of the public under “Safety Code 6”. Strict adherence to Safety Code 6 is a condition for all Canadian wireless communications carriers. Exposure limits to RF (radio frequency) energy are set far below the threshold (at least 50-fold safety margin) for all known established adverse health effects. Health Canada has incorporated several tiers of precaution into the limits to ensure safety,



including a conservative threshold for the occurrence of adverse health effects, the use of worst-case exposure scenarios and an additional safety margin beyond the threshold.

Rogers also noted that there is no documented evidence of loss of property value resulting from the proximity to telecommunications facilities. The City's Assessment division noted that during the assessment cycle, review of all properties is completed. As part of this review, consideration is given to any development that has occurred on a property or within a neighbourhood and assessors determine the level of impact to a property (positive or negative). Assessment notices are issued annually, and should a property owner have concerns, the assessment appeal process is the best means to address those concerns.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: Not applicable.
2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: Property owner and neighboring property owners.
3. Alignment with Strategic Directions:

A Sustainable City: Plan for land use and preserve and enhance the natural and built environment where we live.

Choose an item.

4. Alignment with Adopted Plans: St. John's Envision Municipal Plan and Development Regulations.
5. Accessibility and Inclusion: Not applicable.
6. Legal or Policy Implications: St. John's Development Regulations Section 10 "Commercial Office (CO) and Rural (R) Zones" and Siting Protocol for Wireless Facilities in the City of St. John's.
7. Privacy Implications: Not applicable.
8. Engagement and Communications Considerations: Public advertisement in accordance with Section 4.8 Public Consultation of the St. John's Envision Development Regulations. The City has sent written notices to property owners within a minimum 150-metre radius of the Application site. The Application has been advertised in The Telegram newspaper twice and was on the City's website.
9. Human Resource Implications: Not applicable.
10. Procurement Implications: Not applicable.

11. Information Technology Implications: Not applicable.
12. Other Implications: Not applicable.

Recommendation:

That Council support the application for a telecommunications tower at 42 Sugarloaf Place.

Prepared by:

Lindsay Lyghtle Brushett, MCIP Supervisor – Planning & Development
Planning, Engineering and Regulatory Services

Approved by:

Jason Sinyard, P.Eng, MBA Deputy City Manager
Planning, Engineering and Regulatory Services

Report Approval Details

Document Title:	Notices Published - 42 Sugarloaf Place - DEV2200164.docx
Attachments:	- DEV2200164-42 SUGARLOAF PLACE.pdf
Final Approval Date:	Feb 16, 2023

This report and all of its attachments were approved and signed as outlined below:

Jason Sinyard - Feb 16, 2023 - 9:35 AM