

From: Laura Patrick
Sent: Wednesday, November 5, 2025 6:51 AM
To: Cecile Petra
Cc: Timothy Peterson; Jamie Harris; SSInfo
Subject: Re: Cell tower proposal for Ganges

Thank you for your email. I have copied staff so that your email may be part of the public record.

Laura Patrick

On Nov 4, 2025, at 8:11 PM, Cecile Petra [REDACTED] wrote:

Hello Trustees Patrick, Harris and Peterson,

I am writing with deep concerns about the cell tower proposed for 131 Knott Place in Ganges. This proposal is on the agenda for [this Thursday, November 6th's](#) LTC meeting.

My major concerns are listed below:

1. A cell tower should not be sited directly adjacent to park and recreation land (Moat Park) which has been identified in the environmental assessment conducted for this project to "contain(s) mature native trees and support(s) a (more) diverse and sensitive ecosystem. This adjacent parkland likely serves as important habitat for a variety of wildlife species, including nesting birds, pollinators, and potentially species at risk."

(Full assessment begins at page 95 of the agenda package for [Thursday's](#) meeting: <https://islandstrust.bc.ca/document/salt-spring-ltc-regular-meeting-agenda-36/>)

Of note, **the environmental assessment submitted addresses only the short-term effects of the construction of this tower and does not look at the long-term implications of this project on the natural world.**

As you may or may not be aware, there are several reputable peer reviewed studies that show that cell tower radiation has negative impacts on the wellbeing of flora and fauna including

pollinators, trees, and birds. (More info here: <https://mdsafetech.org/environmental-and-wildlife-effects/> and here: https://thecalm.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/EKLIPSE_KnowledgeOverviewReport_EMR_FLORA_FAUNA.pdf)

2. The risks associated with siting a tower 200 meters as the crow flies from the community pool, 700 meters from the high school (500 meters from its playing fields) and 1000 meters from the elementary school.

Although health concerns are deferred to Safety Code 6 and go beyond your mandate, it does not seem prudent or best practice to site a tower in the areas where our children study, gather and play. (The skate park and disc golf circuit are also in close proximity to this site.)

Our previous, precautionary 2001 Salt Spring cell tower siting guideline did not allow towers to be built within 500 metres of any buildings or parks used by humans, without strict proof that the radiation levels emitted would be well below those allowed by Canada's radiation exposure guideline, Safety Code 6.

Our current antenna siting protocol discourages towers from being built by schools and playgrounds as well as environmentally sensitive areas.

A 2-year toxicology study published by the esteemed US National Toxicology program this past August shows clear evidence of an association between exposure to cell phone radiation and cancer in rats. [Cell Phone Radio Frequency Radiation](#)

3. The vagueness of this proposal which does not specify the number of antennas and transmitters, the carriers it will serve, the frequencies used (4G5G/ millimeter waves?), the total projected radiation it will emit, how it will actually improve wireless service in Ganges, (where service is poor, where signals

it emits will travel) or an engineer's report to clarify these technical issues.

4. The fact that if built, **ISED will permit this tower to be increased in height by up to 25% with no further land use consultation required.**

All in all, I see this project as a business proposal or a "money grab" not as something that will benefit our community, but as something that could cause harm to the most vulnerable among us - children, youth and the natural world we depend on,

Sincerely,

Cecile Petra
Salt Spring Island