

DATE OF MEETING JULY 21, 2025

AUTHORED BY PAYTON CARTER, PLANNER, CURRENT PLANNING

**SUBJECT PROPOSED TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY – 2517 JINGLE
POT ROAD**

OVERVIEW

Purpose of Report

To present Council with information regarding a request from Rogers Communications Inc. for land use concurrence for a telecommunications facility at 2517 Jingle Pot Road.

Recommendation

That Council direct Staff to provide a letter of concurrence to Innovation, Science, and Economic Development Canada in response to a proposed telecommunications facility at 2517 Jingle Pot Road.

BACKGROUND

SitePath Consulting Ltd., on behalf of Rogers Communications Inc. (Rogers), has requested concurrence from the City of Nanaimo (the “land-use authority”) for a proposed telecommunications facility at 2517 Jingle Pot Road. Rogers has entered into a private agreement with the property owner to allow the placement, construction, and operation of the facility within the site.

The regulation of telecommunication facilities is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada (ISED). Proposals for telecommunications facilities are subject to a federal approval process, which includes consultation with the local land-use authority. Subsection 6.1.1(c) of the “City of Nanaimo Zoning Bylaw 2011 No. 4500” (the “Zoning Bylaw”) permits utilities, such as telecommunication towers, in all zones, and these structures are exempt from height restrictions (Subsection 6.8.1.1).

The City of Nanaimo does not have an established siting protocol or public consultation process for the siting of telecommunications facilities; therefore, SitePath Consulting Ltd. has utilized ISED’s Default Public Consultation Process in accordance with CPC-2-0-03: Radiocommunication and Broadcasting Antenna Systems. The ISED process requires, at a minimum, that the proponents provide a notification package to the local public (including nearby residences, community gathering spaces, public institutions, and schools), neighbouring land-use authorities, businesses, and property owners, located within an area three times the tower height.

DISCUSSION

The subject property is zoned Semi-Rural (AR2) and is located within the Westwood neighbourhood. The lot is heavily forested and contains a single-family dwelling. The surrounding

area is developed with single-family dwellings on large lots and surrounding farmland. The proposed telecommunications tower and compound will be located in the southwest corner of the property, abutting Holmes Road. The telecommunications facility will include:

- A 51m self-support lattice tower with 10 mounted antennas;
- 225m² compound area, enclosed with chain-link fencing;
- 4.4m² equipment shelter; and,
- A vehicle turnaround area abutting Holmes Road.

The proposed telecommunications facility is intended to enhance existing wireless service to meet the growing personal and emergency demands of the neighbourhood. A Development Permit is not required for the proposed telecommunications facility; however, a Tree Removal Permit will be required. It is anticipated that approximately 30 trees are to be removed to facilitate site access, construction, and maintenance of the tower; however, it is not expected that the compound will be viewed by any nearby residential dwellings due to the retained trees onsite (Attachment F). The proposed tower will project above the existing tree line. The lattice design was selected to ensure the proposed tower could project above the tree line to provide adequate service to the area.

The siting of the proposed tower at the southwest corner was selected to ensure optimal tree retention and reduce visibility for residences. The location offers partial screening of the tower and reduces the need for the proponent to install additional power lines and access roads through the site, resulting in additional tree removal. The proposed siting avoids conflict with existing City utilities and easements within the subject property. At this time, Holmes Road is partially unpaved and provides vehicle access to a single residential property.

Due to the residential nature of the area, it was determined that none of the existing structures were adequate to support the operations of the proposed telecommunications facilities. It was confirmed by Rogers and SitePath Consulting Ltd. that the telecommunications facilities will meet the requirements of Safety Code 6, which provides the safety requirements for the installation and use of the facility, as well as the recommended limits for exposure to radiofrequency electromagnetic fields (EMF). At this time, co-location of wireless services is not proposed. Should other wireless providers wish to share this tower with Rogers, additional antennas would be required.

The proponent conducted pre-consultation with City Staff in early 2025 and has corresponded with the City to address questions and concerns regarding visual impacts on neighbouring properties, tree retention, and tower siting. The proponent distributed an information package to properties within the prescribed distance (153m) of the telecommunications facility, and two newspaper advertisements were published on 2025-JAN-15 and 2025-JAN-22. During the period, 27 responses were received (Attachment C). Of those responses, six indicated support for the proposed tower, and 21 indicated opposition and concerns. Through the consultation process, neighbourhood concerns were raised about the proposed tower, including its proximity to the residential area, aesthetics and character of the neighbourhood, tower height, and site selection.

Following the conclusion of the ISED default public consultation process, the proponent has requested a letter of concurrence from the City for the proposed telecommunications facility at 2517 Jingle Pot Road.

OPTIONS

1. That Council direct Staff to provide a letter of concurrence to Innovation, Science, and Economic Development Canada in response to a proposed 51m telecommunications facility at 2517 Jingle Pot Road.
 - The advantages of this option: The wireless services in the area would be enhanced.
 - The disadvantages of this option: While the applicant has considered tree retention and screening of the compound, visual impacts remain for the neighbourhood.
 - Financial Implications: None identified.
2. That Council direct Staff to provide a letter of non-concurrence to Innovation, Science, and Economic Development Canada in response to a proposed 51m telecommunications facility at 2517 Jingle Pot Road.
 - The advantages of this option: This option would allow Council to identify any concerns for ISED's consideration.
 - The disadvantages of this option: Non-concurrence could delay improvement to the wireless services.
 - Financial Implications: None identified.
3. That Council provide a letter to Innovation, Science, and Economic Development Canada advising that the City has no comment regarding the proposed telecommunications facility at 2517 Jingle Pot Road.
 - The advantages of this option: None identified.
 - The disadvantages of this option: ISED is the approving authority; thus, the Rogers telecommunications facility may be approved by ISED, as proposed, provided the technical requirements are met. Providing no comment may delay improvements to the wireless service in the area.
 - Financial Implications: None identified. |

SUMMARY POINTS

- The City has received a request for a letter of concurrence for a proposed 51m telecommunications facility at 2517 Jingle Pot Road.
- The proponent concluded the required ISED default consultation process and 27 responses were received. Six responses indicated support for the proposed tower and 21 responses indicated opposition and concerns.
- The proposed tower would improve wireless service in the area and is sited to avoid any functional impacts; however, neighbourhood concerns remain related to aesthetics and character of the neighbourhood, tower height, and site selection.

ATTACHMENTS:

ATTACHMENT A: Aerial Photo
ATTACHMENT B: Location Map
ATTACHMENT C: Link to Public Consultation Summary & Land Use Concurrence Request
ATTACHMENT D: Tower Elevations
ATTACHMENT E: Compound Details
ATTACHMNET F: Tower Renderings |

Submitted by:

Lainya Rowett
Manager, Current Planning |

Concurrence by:

Jeremy Holm
Director, Planning & Development |