

To: Housing & Community Development

Re: Case No. TY 2-22-11

Christ The King Lutheran Church Inc. Largo Florida,

Applicant Alan Ruiz, Vertex Development LLC, Representative



Dear Sir or Madam:

I am in receipt of your letter dated July 13th reference the construction of a 120-foot communications tower on church property near my home of more than 20 years.

My name is Peter A. Papandrew residing at 14100 113th Avenue N alongside the church.

My wife and I strongly object to the erection of a huge radiation emitting tower so close to private homes, so ugly and dangerous to our health that it must be camouflaged. Surrounding Property values would be diminished considerably. The neighborhood will be forever changed for the worse.

I am 90 years of age, and my wife of sixty years is 88 years of age and suffers from Aplastic Anemia, a rare blood disease, highly susceptible to infections which entails her having her blood monitored weekly by complete blood tests, CBC. At the Florida Cancer Specialists-St. Pete on 49th Street. We do not need the additional anxiety or related health problems.

The tower will be built basically in the church pre-school school yard.

Enclosed are a few articles on Cell tower health problems.


WHY THE RISK?

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to be "Peter A. Papandrew".




TY2-22-11





Select Page



Cell towers emit a type of radiation.

Cell towers have wireless antennas that emit radiofrequency non-ionizing radiation. When these antennas are close to our homes and schools, our daily exposures to antenna emissions are increased.

We can turn our cell phones off, but we cannot turn a cell tower off. The cell tower exposures are nonstop day and night.



Scientists recommend children's exposure to this type of radiation be reduced.

Hundreds of scientists are urging that our exposure to cell towers, cell phones, and other wireless radiation emissions be reduced due to the scientific evidence showing effects at legally allowable levels. These scientists have written letters to schools and policymakers urging that children and the public be protected.

Reference	Population	Exposure to EMF	Exposure to EMF	EMF Metric	Exposure Metric	Key Findings
1. International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) (2002)	General public	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	Guidelines for the limitation of exposure to non-ionizing electromagnetic fields (ELF and RF) to prevent adverse health effects.
2. National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS) (2002)	General public	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	Guidelines for the limitation of exposure to non-ionizing electromagnetic fields (ELF and RF) to prevent adverse health effects.
3. World Health Organization (WHO) (2002)	General public	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	Guidelines for the limitation of exposure to non-ionizing electromagnetic fields (ELF and RF) to prevent adverse health effects.
4. European Commission (EC) (2002)	General public	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	Guidelines for the limitation of exposure to non-ionizing electromagnetic fields (ELF and RF) to prevent adverse health effects.
5. American National Standards Institute (ANSI) (2002)	General public	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	Guidelines for the limitation of exposure to non-ionizing electromagnetic fields (ELF and RF) to prevent adverse health effects.
6. International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP) (2002)	General public	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	Guidelines for the limitation of exposure to non-ionizing electromagnetic fields (ELF and RF) to prevent adverse health effects.
7. National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRP) (2002)	General public	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	Guidelines for the limitation of exposure to non-ionizing electromagnetic fields (ELF and RF) to prevent adverse health effects.
8. Federal Communications Commission (FCC) (2002)	General public	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	Guidelines for the limitation of exposure to non-ionizing electromagnetic fields (ELF and RF) to prevent adverse health effects.
9. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) (2002)	General public	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	Guidelines for the limitation of exposure to non-ionizing electromagnetic fields (ELF and RF) to prevent adverse health effects.
10. World Health Organization (WHO) (2002)	General public	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	Guidelines for the limitation of exposure to non-ionizing electromagnetic fields (ELF and RF) to prevent adverse health effects.
11. International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) (2002)	General public	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	Guidelines for the limitation of exposure to non-ionizing electromagnetic fields (ELF and RF) to prevent adverse health effects.
12. National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS) (2002)	General public	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	Guidelines for the limitation of exposure to non-ionizing electromagnetic fields (ELF and RF) to prevent adverse health effects.
13. World Health Organization (WHO) (2002)	General public	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	Guidelines for the limitation of exposure to non-ionizing electromagnetic fields (ELF and RF) to prevent adverse health effects.
14. European Commission (EC) (2002)	General public	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	Guidelines for the limitation of exposure to non-ionizing electromagnetic fields (ELF and RF) to prevent adverse health effects.
15. American National Standards Institute (ANSI) (2002)	General public	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	Guidelines for the limitation of exposure to non-ionizing electromagnetic fields (ELF and RF) to prevent adverse health effects.
16. International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP) (2002)	General public	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	Guidelines for the limitation of exposure to non-ionizing electromagnetic fields (ELF and RF) to prevent adverse health effects.
17. National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRP) (2002)	General public	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	Guidelines for the limitation of exposure to non-ionizing electromagnetic fields (ELF and RF) to prevent adverse health effects.
18. Federal Communications Commission (FCC) (2002)	General public	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	Guidelines for the limitation of exposure to non-ionizing electromagnetic fields (ELF and RF) to prevent adverse health effects.
19. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) (2002)	General public	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	Guidelines for the limitation of exposure to non-ionizing electromagnetic fields (ELF and RF) to prevent adverse health effects.
20. World Health Organization (WHO) (2002)	General public	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	100 V/m (ELF) and 100 V/m (RF)	Guidelines for the limitation of exposure to non-ionizing electromagnetic fields (ELF and RF) to prevent adverse health effects.

Published peer-reviewed science has linked cell tower radiation to harmful effects.

Researchers have studied cell towers and cell tower radiation for decades. Effects from RFR documented in scientific research include increased cancer risk, cellular stress, headaches, sleep issues, genetic damage, changes to the reproductive system, memory deficits, and impacts to the nervous system.

Many biological effects have been documented at very low intensities **comparable** to what people might experience within 500 feet of a cell tower.

However, industry and industry-funded scientific groups dismiss these **studies**.



Children are more vulnerable.

Children are most vulnerable to cell phone radiation as they absorb it deeper into their brains and bodies. A child's developing brain and organ systems are

more sensitive to environmental stressors. Even if the radiation absorption were the same as in adults, the effects in children can be far more serious.

- [Zothansiamia 2017](#) published in Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine found changes in blood considered biomarkers predictive of cancer in people living closer to cell arrays.
- [Rodrigues 2021](#) published in the International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health found higher exposure to cell arrays linked to higher mortality from all cancer and specifically lung and breast cancer.
- [Meo 2018](#) published in American Journal of Men's Health linked higher cell tower exposures to delayed fine and gross motor skills, spatial working memory, and attention in school adolescents
- [Yakymenko 2011](#) published in Exp Oncology found increased of cancer incidence.
- [Meo 2015](#) published in Environmental Research and Public Health found higher exposures linked to higher risk of type 2 diabetes.
- [López 2021](#) published in Environmental Research linked higher exposures to more severe headaches and decreased sleep
- [Levitt 2010](#) published in Environmental Reviews analyzed 100 studies and found ~80% showed biological effects near towers. ([PDF](#))
- [Yakymenko 2015](#) published in Electromagnetic Biology Medicine reviewed 100 studies and showed oxidative effects of low-intensity RF radiation.
- [Buchner 2011](#) published in Umwelt-Medizin-Gesellschaft and detailed in [Oncology Letters](#) followed people in a German town after a cell tower was erected and found stress hormones adrenaline and noradrenaline significantly increased over the first 6 months after the antenna activation and decreased dopamine and PEA levels after 18 months.
- [Dode 2011](#) published in Science of the Total Environment 10 year study on cell phone antennas by the local Municipal Health Department and several universities in Brazil found a clearly elevated relative risk of cancer mortality at residential distances of 500 meters or less from cell phone towers.
- [Khurana 2011](#) published in International Journal of Occupational and Environmental Health reviewed epidemiological studies and found in 80% of the studies, people living <500 m from base stations had an increased adverse neuro-behavioral symptoms and cancer.
- [Falcioni 2018](#) published in Environmental Research exposed rats to RF comparable to cell tower RF levels and found increased cancers.

- In 2011, radiofrequency radiation was [classified](#) as a Class 2B possible carcinogen by the World Health Organization's International Agency for Research on Cancer. Between then and now, the published peer-reviewed scientific evidence has significantly increased. Now, many scientists are of the opinion that the weight of current peer-reviewed evidence supports the conclusion that radiofrequency radiation should be regarded as a human carcinogen ([Hardell and Carlberg 2017](#), [Peleg et al, 2018](#), [Miller et al 2018](#)).

THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF PEDIATRICS

The [American Academy of Pediatrics Healthy Child webpage](#) states:

Electromagnetic Fields: A Hazard to Your Health?

"In recent years, concern has increased about exposure to radio frequency electromagnetic radiation emitted from cell phones and phone station antennae. An Egyptian study confirmed concerns that living nearby mobile phone base stations increased the risk of developing:

- Headaches
- Memory problems
- Dizziness
- Depression
- Sleep problems

Short-term exposure to these fields in experimental studies have not always shown negative effects, but this does not rule out cumulative damage from these fields, so larger studies over longer periods are needed to help understand who is at risk. In large studies, an association has been observed between symptoms and exposure to these fields in the everyday environment."

After several childhood cancer cases at o...



School cell towers are plagued by transparency issues.

The cell tower application process tends to be plagued by transparency issues. Too often, people find out a cell tower is coming and think they have no way to stop it. However, many families find that when they investigate the way the cell tower application moved through the process, there are numerous mistakes made by the cell tower companies and decision maker who rubber stamp the permits with very little oversight. People were given no or little notice and there was no environmental review.

Milestone Cell Tower Community Meetin...



Insane Cell Tower on School Huge Oppos...



WUSA 9 News Report: School District Ba...



Cell Tower have been stopped and removed from schools after strong community action.

Many communities have halted school cell towers in the final hour. Some schools have even had cell towers removed or relocated after strong community opposition.

For example, in Ripon California the Sprint cell tower was moved without litigation as a precautionary measure after cases of cancer in children came to light. [Read News Report](#)

In Tarrytown, New York, a cell tower placed near a children's playground and low income housing was also removed after news reports showcased the injustice. [Read News Report](#)


In Prince George's County Maryland a cell tower building company made a deal for over 60 schools to be marketed as cell tower sites with a master leasing agreement sparking strong community opposition. After the community became engaged, and hard questions were asked, the school cell tower deal ended and the Prince George's County School Board (PGCPS) did not renew the deal after the system CEO wrote a letter that "[Milestone Communications \[now called Milestone Towers\] has not met our desired standards of transparency.](#)" (See also letters from [School Board Member Lupi Grady](#), [CEO Dr. Maxwell Milestone Communications Letter to Citizen on Answers to Questions About The Greenbelt Tower](#) and [Milestone Communications Letter to PGCPS CEO Withdrawing From Eleanor Roosevelt High School and Accokeek Academy](#))

One reason schools end cell tower deals is that they really are not making a lot of money as stated in a letter by PGCPS [CEO Dr. Maxwell's Letter](#) on how the money is small from the cell towers. When the cell towers are pitched to school, big numbers are thrown around (usually about how much money over ten years will be made), but in reality the monthly amount is small and the deal gives the cell tower a cheaper deal than a more commercial space.



FCC limits are not protective.

Hundreds of scientists have evaluated the cell tower radiation exposure limits of the US Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and the International Commission for Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) and found the limits are decades outdated and not protective to the health of the public, especially not the health of children.



Tower in Melbourne Australia above kindergarten


Environmental pollution from cell towers is a human rights issue for children.

Human rights experts [argue](#) that cell tower placement near schools is a human rights issue for children because “protection of children is a high threshold norm in Human Right law” and “any widespread or systematic form of environmental pollution that poses a long-term threat to a child’s rights to life, development or health may constitute an international human rights violation.”



5G can be easily added to cell towers once they are built.

Cell towers have 2G, 3G, and 4G antennas. 5G antennas are being added to base stations worldwide. After a cell tower is erected, new antennas can be easily added and generally without any (or minimal) public participation in the decision-making process. 5G antennas can be mounted on both shorter so-called “small cells” and larger “macro” towers.



Lloyds of London White Paper

Cell tower radiation is classified as “High Risk” by insurance companies.

Insurance companies **do not insure** for long-term damages from the electromagnetic radiation emitted by these towers. 5G, cell tower radiation, and electromagnetic fields are all repeatedly **classified** as “high risk” and compared to asbestos in insurance white papers.

A review paper entitled “**Limiting liability with positioning to minimize negative health effects of T cellular phone towers**” reviewed the “large and growing body of evidence that human exposure to RFR from cellular phone base stations causes negative health effects” and recommends restricting antennas within 500 m of schools and hospitals to protect companies from future liability.

Wireless companies **warn their shareholders** of potential future risk related to radiofrequency radiation exposure but they do not warn the people exposed to emissions from their cell antenna infrastructure. Corporate investor **warnings**

by companies such as [AT&T](#), [Verizon](#), [Vodafone](#) and [Crown Castle](#) are contained in their Annual Reports filed on Form 10-K and they inform shareholders that companies may incur significant financial losses related to electromagnetic fields. [Verizon](#) states:

"We are subject to a significant amount of litigation, which could require us to pay significant damages or settlements...In addition, our wireless business also faces personal injury and wrongful death lawsuits relating to alleged health effects of wireless phones or radio frequency transmitters. We may incur significant expenses in defending these lawsuits. In addition, we may be required to pay significant awards or settlements."

Cell Tower Public Comment at Anne Arun...



[Property values go down when you can see the cell tower.](#)

School cell towers are usually in neighborhoods. Cell towers near homes are eyesores and can devalue properties, lower the selling price, and in turn, can impact the tax base of the area.

EHT has compiled data on property decreases from cell towers [here](#).

Cell phone tower near Newport News hig...



Cell towers can catch fire and they contain hazardous material.

Cell towers can catch fire and create serious safety issues due to the equipment and inadequate worker safety procedures in place. Cell tower compounds contain hazardous equipment such as diesel fuel and lead-acid batteries. There have been accidents where these tanks leak, polluting the area.

ConsumerWatch: 5G Cellphone Towers S...



Firefighter union efforts featured in CBS San Francisco Investigation on 5G Cell Towers

Firefighter unions have long opposed cell towers on their stations.

- The International Association of Firefighters has officially **opposed** cell towers on its stations since 2004 after a study **found** neurological damage in firefighters with antennas on their fire stations.
- In 2017 when 5G “small cells” were coming to California, firefighter organizations came out in strong opposition to bill SB649, and it was **amended** to **exempt** their stations from the small cell deployment. The unions successfully lobbied to get their fire stations carved out of state laws that would have forced cell towers onto fire stations.
- Over the years, many local firefighter unions have **testified**, written **letters** and created **websites** stating cell antennas should not be placed on stations until scientific research shows safety.
- **News Story: ConsumerWatch: 5G Cellphone Towers Signal Renewed Concerns Over Impacts on Health**
- Learn more about firefighters at **EHT’s webpage on firefighters.**

Dr Anthony Miller to Toronto Council re: R...



Decisionmakers are aware that government cell tower radiation limits do not protect children from biological effects.

The Los Angeles Unified School District has banned cell towers on their school campuses and also has set an allowable limit that is 10,000 times lower than the FCC's limit. LAUSD recognizes there are non-thermal effects and that children are more vulnerable.

In India, the government reset its limits to 1/10th of ICNIRP after an inter-Ministerial report documented impacts to birds and bees. The Brihanmumbai Municipal Corporation, and regions of Zilla Parishad, Rajasthan, and Mumbai have all banned cell antenna/tower installations on schools.

Several countries have stricter [allowable cell tower radiation limits](#) for what are termed “sensitive” areas. Cell antennas are always placed at a distance from these sensitive areas to comply with this policy.

Chile’s “Antenna Law” prohibits cell antennas/towers in what they define as “sensitive areas,” meaning schools, nurseries, hospitals, and nursing homes.

(Note: LAUSD policy is a step in the right direction but it still is inadequate and current implementation of technology in the buildings are non-protective.)

Cell Tower Microwave Radiation Present...



[“There is a large and growing body of evidence that human exposure to RFR from cellular phone base stations causes negative health effects \(Siddoo-Atwal,](#)

2018; Singh et al., 2018; Faisal, et al., 2018) including both i) neuropsychiatric complaints such as headache, concentration difficulties, memory changes, dizziness, tremors, depressive symptoms, fatigue and sleep disturbance (Navarro et al., 2003; Hutter et al., 2006; Abdel-Rassoul et al., 2007); and ii) increased incidence of cancer and living in proximity to a cell-phone transmitter station (Wolf and Wolf, 2004; Havas, 2017)."

-Limiting liability with positioning to minimize negative health effects of cellular phone towers (Pearce 2020)

There is no proof of safety.


In 2011, radiofrequency radiation (RFR) was **classified** as a Class 2B possible carcinogen by the World Health Organization's International Agency for Research on Cancer, and that classification includes radiofrequency from all sources including cell tower radiation. Since that date, the published peer-reviewed scientific evidence has significantly increased. Now, **many scientists** are of the opinion that currently, the weight of available peer-reviewed evidence supports the conclusion that radiofrequency radiation should be regarded as a human carcinogen.

Researchers have long researched the health of people living near cell towers. Here are some examples of published research.

- A **2017 study** evaluated effects in the blood of individuals living near mobile phone base stations and found higher exposures linked to changes in the blood that are considered biomarkers predictive of cancer.
- A **2018 study** found school-aged adolescents exposed to higher levels of RFR exposure had delayed fine and gross motor skills, spatial working memory, and

attention in comparison to those exposed to lower RFR levels.

- A [2015 study](#) of elementary students found higher Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus in students exposed to higher levels of RFR.
- A [2011 review](#) found a year of operation of a powerful cell base station resulted in a dramatic increase in cancer incidence among the population living nearby.
- Researchers with the renowned Ramazzini Institute in Italy published [findings](#) that lab animals exposed to levels of RFR below FCC limits developed the same types of cancerous tumors as the [US National Toxicology Program](#) found in its large-scale animal study. The Ramazzini study was designed to investigate effects at levels comparable to cell network antenna base stations.
- Studies also find that when RFR is combined with lead or a known carcinogen, RFR can magnify the carcinogen's effects. For example, a 2015 replication study found RFR at levels far below FCC limits more than doubled the numbers of liver and lung tumors in carcinogen-exposed mice.
- Published research finds wireless frequencies impact [wildlife](#). For example, studies have found that the radiation alters bird navigation and [disturbs](#) honeybee colonies. Research also shows adverse impacts on [trees](#) and plants.



Lecture on Tree Damage from Chronic High Frequency Exposure

Volker Schorpp: Powerpoint PDF

Research studies find that a cell tower near a school will increase student and staff exposure.

When cell antennas are located near a school, the environmental levels of RF usually will increase. This is common sense and a matter of math and physics. The RF increases inside the school will generally be highest in classrooms where the windows are in line of sight with antennas.

- A 2017 [study](#) looked at RFR levels to which kindergarten children were exposed, depending on how close their school was to base stations/cell towers. Children carried RFR measuring devices. Researchers found that children in kindergartens located near to cell antennas had total radiofrequency exposures more than 3 times higher than children at schools where cell antennas were further away.
- A 2018 [study](#) measured radiofrequency radiation exposures in the environment, including emissions from cell phone towers, TV and FM radio broadcast antennas, cell phone handsets, and Wi-Fi—in several countries including the United States. The researchers concluded that cell phone tower

(base station) radiation emissions are the dominant contributor to RFR exposure in most outdoor areas.



**PUBLISHED
RESEARCH**



**ACTION STEPS FOR
PARENTS**



SCIENTISTS LETTERS

House near a Cell Phone Tower – Disadvantages & Side Effects

by Daniel



I'm sure almost everyone would try to avoid living near a cell phone tower, although there are a variety of reasons for this. I know someone who recently moved into a house near a cell phone tower, so I decided to research the disadvantages and side

So, what are the disadvantages and side effects of living near a cell phone tower?

Although opinions vary, living in a house near a cell phone tower can come with a range of side effects, from headaches to cancer. Aside from them not being very nice to look at, constant exposure to cell phone towers can increase your risk of certain health complications.

The biggest issue with things like cell phone tower radiation is that some people are more sensitive to it than others. What's more, there are differing opinions in the medical world around whether this is something we should even worry about.

As an affiliate, I may collect a share of sales or other compensation from the links on this page.

In this article I go into more detail about the disadvantages and side effects of living near a cell phone tower.

Why is it dangerous to live near a cell phone tower?

Cell phone towers provide us with service, which is obviously helpful, but this doesn't mean you should live next door to a tower. Along with the radio frequency waves that we need for cell phone service, the towers also give off **electromagnetic radiation**.

However, these two things aren't separate. Radio frequencies are on the electromagnetic spectrum, which also includes visible light, but for the purposes of this article, EMF radiation refers to "unwanted" and potentially harmful frequencies, including heat and some radio waves.

Essentially, this radiation can cause changes to our cellular structure and DNA.

Different organizations have different standards for what's considered safe exposure

to EMF radiation, but most advise to avoid strong sources of it, such as cell phone



Before I proceed further, I highly recommend you take a minute and check out these critically acclaimed ebooks – **The Non-Tinfoil Guide to EMFs** by Nicolas Pineault and **Long Term EMF Protection** by Lloyd Burrell. These books have helped me tremendously and I can assure you that they will be worth your while. I also recommend Nick's **EMF Protection Course** which is a great resource for EMF protection.

The biggest issue with discussing the disadvantages of living near a cell phone tower is that there have been surprisingly few scientific studies into the long-term health complications.

What's more, even if we were to try and find out what happens when you're constantly exposed to cell phone towers, we're held back by the fact that the technology changes so fast. Different cell phone towers (such as 4G and 5G) work differently, meaning one theory might not necessarily work for every tower.

Either way, we know that cell phone towers emit EMF radiation, both useful frequencies (the ones that provide us with service), and unwanted ones, such as energy lost through heat. Being constantly exposed to this radiation is the biggest risk of living near a cell phone tower, so just avoid it altogether if you can.

The side effects of living near a cell phone tower





Exposure to EMF radiation, particularly in the long term, can have a range of side effects on a person's health. However, some people are more sensitive to this than others, and if you're one of these people, then the worst thing you could do is live near a cell phone tower.

What's more, many of the symptoms of EMF exposure can be passed off as more general feelings, leading people to not investigate it further. Living near a cell phone tower will greatly increase the likelihood of these symptoms.

Below is a list of commonly observed side effects and symptoms of EMF exposure:

- **Memory loss or difficulty recalling recent events and information**
- **Depression or anxiety**



- Headaches, dizziness, and fatigue

- Irritability
- Nausea or appetite loss
- Itchy or burning skin
- Dizziness
- Sleep problems, including insomnia and difficulty waking up
- Headache or migraine
- Restlessness, both mental and physical

As you can see, the symptoms of EMF exposure are reasonably vague, and often look like side effects of other issues, such as overworking or general illness. However, if you live in a house near a cell phone tower and believe you're experiencing some of these symptoms, it'll be worth investigating further.

That said, there's little point going to a doctor because current medical research is somewhat lacking on the side effects of EMF exposure. Instead, I'd recommend working it out through a process of elimination. By this I mean trying to block out (almost) all sources of EMF radiation and seeing if this makes you feel better.

*Of course, the biggest side effect of living near a cell phone tower is **the increased risk of cancer**. The World Health Organization has actually done quite a bit of research into EMF radiation and cancer, and **in one of their most recent studies**, they found a link between EMF exposure and cancer.*



ilarly, a smaller and **more recent study by a Swiss research body** found a link

Menu

bigger concern when living near a cell phone tower. A German study also found that living within 400 meters of a cell phone tower more than tripled rates of cancer.

However, it's worth taking these studies with a bit of caution, simply because they're only one side of the argument. While it'll be helpful for there to be more research on both sides of the argument, at the very minimum these studies show that there's fair reason to be cautious about living near a cell phone tower.

Another option for looking at the side effects of living near a cell phone tower is to speak to some people that do so. I know someone that constantly complained of a foggy head after a week or so of living in their new property. And what was only a few yards down the road? A cell phone tower.

The best advice I can give if you're looking into the side effects of living near a cell phone tower is to try and avoid it. Even if there aren't conclusive answers on the long-term health impacts, there's definitely enough emerging evidence for you to avoid it if possible.

The disadvantages of living near a cell phone tower

Aside from the most obvious advantage of living near a cell phone tower (better signal), I can't really think of any other reasons why you'd want to do so. However, I can think of a few disadvantages to living near one.

I'm usually one to promote a fair and balanced argument, but in this case I feel I've listed the only benefit. On the other hand, here are the major disadvantages of living near a cell phone tower.

1. They're not nice to look at



Cell phone towers work best when they're tall. This, of course, means they're much more likely to be polluting your eye line, as they're specifically designed to rise over houses. Having a cell phone tower near your property really isn't ideal if you want to enjoy your views.

Not only are they tall, but cell phone towers are purely functional, meaning no effort is put in to making them look nice. So whether you've got a massive white metal tower covered in dishes, or one of the weirder lamppost-looking ones, they're ugly either way.

One small consolation of this is that some companies do try to cover them up, but this is usually in rural areas where they'd be even more obvious. However, I sometimes find this even more annoying because they don't do a good job of hiding them anyway.

2. Health complications

I know I've already discussed this in detail, but the health risks of living near a cell phone tower are surely one of the biggest disadvantages? Without going over the same information again, it's worth stating that the health impacts of living near a cell phone tower are wide-ranging and difficult to diagnose, making this something you should avoid having to deal with.

3. The house will be harder to sell

This might not be a disadvantage for everyone, so if you're only renting near a cell phone tower then at least you know you can leave relatively easily. However, if you're a homeowner you might not be as lucky.

Cell phone towers, along with things like power pylons, are a major cause of loss of



this, confirmed that a large number of people give up on a property if it's near a cell phone tower.

Why is this? I imagine for a number of reasons, most of which have been listed here. Even if potential buyers aren't aware of the health impacts, they probably still won't want a massive cell phone tower just down the street.

4. Maintenance workers

Another factor you might not have considered is the fact that cell phone towers require plenty of maintenance. This could either be in the form of repairing or upgrading, but you can expect there to be regular work carried out on your local cell phone tower.

While this isn't directly related to the health impacts of EMF exposure, it is annoying. Maintenance workers generally won't bother to be quiet, and will usually take several hours to do their work. This might not be the worst thing in the world, but it's definitely another disadvantage of living near a cell phone tower.

Solutions if you live near a cell phone tower

There might be a number of reasons why you can't avoid living near a cell phone tower. After all, service providers are often happy to pay large amounts of money for someone to have a cell phone tower in their back yard, and they're always looking for ways to increase coverage.

If you do happen to live near a cell phone tower, these solutions can make a difference.



EMF blocking paint

Residents voice objections to proposed communication tower in neighborhood

Published 8:59 pm Wednesday, March 16, 2022

By **Donna Price** (<https://www.americanpress.com/author/donnaprice/>)



Tom Holiman listens as a resident voices her opinion at a Tuesday night meeting about a proposed communication tower being considered for Lakewood Bible Fellowship. (Donna Price / American Press)

Tempers flared Tuesday night at an informational meeting at Lakewood Bible Fellowship, 2520 W. Sale Road.

The church has applied for an exception from the parish to allow a 120-foot AT&T communication tower to be placed on their property at the corner of Sale Road and Burton Lane in an otherwise residential area.

Tom Holiman with Vertical Bridge, a company enlisted by AT&T to find sites for communication towers, was tasked with explaining why AT&T wants to construct a tower.

Email newsletter signup

Sign up for our daily email newsletter

add your email address here, cancel anytime

Subscribe

Forty-four residents from the surrounding area attended the meeting, voicing objections to the tower ranging from health concerns, diminution of property values and unsightliness.

Holiman, from Baton Rouge, told the crowd the public is demanding more broadband coverage. Carriers can't keep up with the demand, he said. The carriers, including AT&T, are working to provide what the public wants. AT&T doesn't want to build new towers any more than anyone else, he said, but because of capacity issues, they need to do so to fully serve the public. He added that AT&T wants to construct towers on three or four new sites locally, not just this one.

"Sir, why put this in a residential area?" asked Burton Lane resident Frank LaFaso.

"In many cases, residential areas are where the greatest capacity issues are," Holiman said.

Several residents said they were not having any issues.

"How can you build in a residential area? I have a handicapped son who has grand mal seizures. Blinking tower lights will set him off," said one resident.

"This tower won't have any blinking lights," said Holiman. "It will be a monopod, similar to the one behind First Federal Bank on Sale Road."

Addressing the health concern issue, Holiman said, "Health effects. Everyone is always concerned about that. The FCC (Federal Communications Commission) has had study after study after study about it. Long story short, it's a non-issue," he said.

"Then why," asked another resident, "does a sign posted on the fence around a communication tower on Weaver Road say, 'Caution beyond this point: Radio frequency fields at this site may exceed FCC rules for human exposure?'"

Several residents asked about the compensation the church would be getting by allowing the tower to be built.

The crowd was told that information was private, but Holiman added, "The church, yes, they're going to benefit from this, but they're good people. And all of you will benefit, too, from the improved service."

"You signed an agreement with the church? Shouldn't you have asked the community first? All of us should have the right to see this agreement," said one woman. "It won't affect the people of this church. They're here for a couple of hours and then they go home. We live around here. It will affect us."

Resident Joel Smith said, "I live across the street. I moved here because I thought it was beautiful. Then the hurricanes came and knocked down all our trees. This cell tower, if it is built, is going to knock us back 20 years. But the people at this church are reasonable. I've spoken with them. We need to appeal to them directly to please not do this."

"Studies show 5G interferes with airplanes and they fly right over this place," said Bill Bruning.

"We've lost so much as a community. We don't need this," said another resident.

"Why not build it at Prien Lake Park? That's government-owned land," said Will Houston.

"How can a church that is supposed to be for the community, how can they do this?" asked another.

"All your explanations are fine, but I don't want to hear any more. We don't want the tower," said Lofaso to Holiman.

Jon Helmer, Lakewood Bible Fellowship operations director, spoke after Holiman.

"The church is not trying to hide anything from anyone. That's why we opened up the church tonight, to find out how people felt. Unless you're willing to tell us how you feel, we don't know," he said.

On Wednesday, Helmer said he was disappointed in the way some of the attendees conducted themselves at the meeting.

The proposal was to go before the Calcasieu Parish Planning and Zoning Board March 22. Helmer said Wednesday morning that the proposal has been pulled from the March 22 meeting docket.

It will be reintroduced at another time.

Ruggiero, Renee M

From: laura <lellis50@tampabay.rr.com>
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 12:56 PM
To: Zoning, Planning
Subject: Case No. TY2-22-11

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Dear Zoning Section,

This communication is regarding the notice of use of land at Christ the King Lutheran Church, Largo Florida.

Though we are unable to attend the hearing regarding the construction of a 120-foot-tall communication tower, we would like you oppose this request.

The church is located in a residential area and cell phone towers can pose health problems to those living close to the tower. The church will benefit financially from the tower but at what cost to the neighborhoods surrounding the church. Churches are non-profit entities. Cell Phone towers are profitable to the site housing it.

Thank you for considering our opinion on this matter.

Sincerely

Laura and Scott Ellis - owners
14120 113th ave. Largo, FL 33774

Ruggiero, Renee M

TY2-22-11

Subject: FW: Tower.

From: chris2229@aol.com <chris2229@aol.com>

Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 1:06 PM

To: Cord, Molly <mcord@co.pinellas.fl.us>

Cc: pbarreiro@tampabay.rr.com

Subject: Fwd: Tower.

CAUTION: This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.

Ms. Cord,

I wanted to forward this email from the trustee of one of the homes that abuts the church property. Please make sure that this is included in the record. Please let Priscilla or I know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
Christie Barreiro
727-510-9184

-----Original Message-----

From: pbarreiro <pbarreiro@tampabay.rr.com>

To: chris2229@aol.com <chris2229@aol.com>; Blake Barreiro <blakebarreiro@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wed, Jul 27, 2022 1:07 pm

Subject: Tower.

Sent this today.

Please be advised that the property 14181 111th Terrace N. Largo Florida 33774 owned by Joan C Crowson is very close to the Christ the King Church proposed tower for communication. As the Trustee of Joan C. Crowson, I, Priscilla Ann Barreiro vote that the tower **NOT** be placed on the Christ the King Church property.

In my opinion it will have a negative impact on the value of homes and the health of the people who live in this area. My father George H. Gnauck, along with Gene Murphy developed the property around the church to be a quiet neighborhood. I lived in that neighborhood for 10 years and certainly would not want the pristine neighborhood to suffer from the proposed tower.

Thank you. **My VOTE IS NO.**

Priscilla Ann Barreiro

Ruggiero, Renee M

From: sued510@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 8:27 AM
To: Zoning, Planning
Subject: re: Case No. TY2-22-11

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Pinellas County Housing and Community Development
Zoning Section
Re: Case No. TY2-22-11

Dear Sirs,

I am writing to voice my objection to the proposed 120 foot tall camouflaged communication tower and related support facilities to be located at 11220 Oakhurst Road.

I reside at 11485 Oakhurst Road which is across the street from the proposed site. I can't state firmly enough how much I oppose this tower. Not only will it be an eyesore in this very residential neighborhood but I am concerned about any health effects that this tower might have on those who live close to it. I am also very concerned that our property values will decrease with this massive tower in our area.

I see no purpose in this proposed eyesore. Please DO NOT approve this request.

Sincerely,

Susan Stauffer

11485 Oakhurst Rd., B102

Largo, FL 33774

Greetings Board Members,

I hope this email finds its way to each of you.

Our neighborhood was just informed of a vote coming on this Wednesday, August 3rd, regarding the use of land on church property, so they could contract with a communications service provider to build a 120' tower that looks like a cross. The church is located in front of our neighborhood.

from your agenda....

4. TY2-22-11 Application of Christ the King Lutheran Church Inc. Largo Florida, through Alan Ruiz, Vertex Development LLC., Representative, for a Type-2 Use to allow the construction of a 120-foot-tall, camouflaged communication tower and related support facilities, for the R-2 zoned property located at 11220 Oakhurst Road in unincorporated Largo

We understand, some of our neighbors go to this church and we understand why the church might need the money from renting out this land. But we, as fellow neighbors, do not want a 120' tower camouflaged to look like a cross, in our neighborhood, that is higher than all our 50+ year trees. This would affect our property values and be an eyesore. There are also health and safety concerns.

I have been told that this church has tried to do this in the past and they were voted down. I really feel for them, and frankly could use better cell phone coverage in this area, but not at the expense of property values and a huge tower going over all our trees.

Please put a stop to this and make sure this does not keep happening to our neighborhood. There has to be another place to put this tower. Near a shopping center, condo's?

So many neighbors were concerned that another neighbor has created and started a petition. Neighbors are also wondering why they only had such short notice and why a vote is scheduled for when most of them are at work. Here are some more reasons you should turn down the change in land use...

Short/Long-term Health Implications

- Cell towers emit radio frequency waves and electromagnetic radiation (EMF)
- The emissions from a cell tower in the form of electromagnetic radiation are continuous. Each and every moment that our children and families are at home they will be exposed to these emissions.
- The World Health Organization's agency for International Research on Cancer has identified EMF exposure as "possibly carcinogenic to humans"
- Living within 0.2 miles (1056 ft) of a cell tower more than triples your chances of developing cancer.
- Most of the homes impacted are in closer proximity than 0.2 miles
- In addition, there is a condition known as EMF syndrome which results from hyper-sensitivity to EMF radiation and results in symptoms such as Headaches, memory loss, nausea and dizziness.

Loss of Property Value

- According to the National Association of Realtors, a home's value can drop as much as 20% when located within tower visibility range.
- Once a cell tower is built, by law, it can go up to an additional 20ft higher without any public notification or input.

Please do not approve this land change.

Terry Murphy

14188 Iroquois Ave, Largo FL 33774

tmurphski@gmail.com

Property Values:

<https://ehtrust.org/cell-phone-towers-lower-property-values-documentation-research/>

POWERLINES AND CELL ANTENNAS LOWER PROPERTY VALUES

Wall Street Journal: The Electrifying Factor Affecting Your Property's Value "Vacant lots adjacent to power lines sell for significantly less than equivalent property further away as homeowners shy away from unattractive views...A recent study in the Journal of Real Estate Research by College of Charleston assistant professors Chris Mothorpe and David Wyman, finds that vacant lots adjacent to high-voltage transmission lines sell for 45% less than equivalent lots not located near transmission lines. Non-adjacent lots still located within 1,000 feet of transmission lines sell at a discount of 18%."

"Cellphone towers bring extra tax revenue and better reception to a section of the city, but many are skeptical because of the potential health risks and the impact on property values. Increasing numbers of people don't want to live near cell towers. In some areas with new towers, property values have decreased by up to 20%."

-National Business Post: Your new neighbor, a cell tower, may impact the value of your home 2022

Health and Safety:

<https://ehtrust.org/liability-and-risk-from-5g-and-cell-towers/>

Wireless companies warn their shareholders of the risk of cell phone and cell tower radiation but they do not warn consumers. They do not warn the people living in homes near cell towers. Wi-Fi, cell phones, and 5G in the classroom as well as cell towers on school property present serious liability issues.

Insurers rank 5G and electromagnetic radiation as a "high" risk, comparing the issue to lead and asbestos. A 2019 Report by Swiss Re Institute, a world leading provider of insurance, classifies 5G mobile networks as a "high", "off-the-leash" risk stating, "Existing concerns regarding potential negative health effects from electromagnetic fields (EMF) are only likely to increase. An uptick in liability claims could be a potential long-term consequence" and "[a]s the biological effects of EMF in general and 5G in particular are still being debated, potential claims for health impairments may come with a long latency."



Warns Shareholders of Risk But Not Consumers Nor Neighbors

"Our wireless business also faces **personal injury and wrongful death lawsuits** relating to **alleged health effects** of wireless phones or radio frequency transmitters. We may incur significant expenses in defending these lawsuits. In addition, **we may be required to pay significant awards or settlements.**"

-Verizon Communications Inc. 12/2020 10-K Filing

<https://environics.co.in/mobile-tower-radiation-and-its-impact-on-human-health/>

Radiation emitted by Mobile Towers

There are two types of radiation – one is ionizing radiation which are to X-rays and the other is non-ionizing radiation which is gadget radiation like mobile phone radiation, laptop radiation, desktop radiation, tablet radiation, smart TV radiation, radiation of wi-fi routers, network boosters, etc., and harmful radiation from mobile towers around our homes and workplaces. Ionizing radiation is high-frequency radiation that is known to cause cancer. On the other hand, low-frequency non-ionizing radiation is also a threat to our health. It may, too, become the cause of health issues like cancer and brain tumors when the human body is exposed to it for long durations of time.

Did you know?

WHO has also stated these radiations can have a negative impact on the human body and may also become a cause of cancer if exposed to them for long periods of time, putting them into the same category as fumes and exhaust. Apart from this solid proof by the WHO of the link between electromagnetic radiation and cancer, there are some incidents

that have also confirmed the correlation between mobile tower radiation and serious health issues in humans. WHO has put these radiations in the 2B category which classifies the reasons to cause Cancer.

To read more download – https://www.iarc.who.int/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/pr208_E.pdf

Also, cancer specialists (Oncologist), scientists, and other doctors too have no doubt about the dangers of mobile radiation and mobile tower radiation. They all agree to the adverse side effects of radiation emitted by wi-fi gadgets including cell phones, cell phone towers, and all other wireless gadgets used for communication.

<https://emfcenter.com/what-distance-is-safe/>

Safe Distance from Cell Towers...

It is also difficult to predict a safe distance from cell towers. For example, cell towers are designed to transmit most of their radio frequency (RF) energy horizontally. Some areas below the tower may have lower levels than locations farther away that are more in line with the vertical height of the antennas.

The exposure from a cell tower will depend on the type of antennas, the number of antennas, how much the antennas are actually being used, the time of day, etc. The distance needed to reduce exposures down to the General Public Precautionary Level of 100 microwatts per meter squared ($\mu\text{W}/\text{m}^2$) is often around a quarter of a mile (1320 feet) or more. Due to the uncertainty, on-site testing with a broadband RF test meter is strongly recommended.

A German study reported **that people living within 400 meters (1312 feet) of cell towers had over 3 times the normal rate for new cancers** (City of Naila 2004). In an Israeli study, the relative risk for cancer was about 4 times greater within 350 meters (1148 feet) of the cell tower (Wolf et al. 1997). Based on findings like these, a minimum safety distance of 1/4 mile (1320 feet) might be considered prudent.

And again, individuals with EMF hypersensitivity or other serious health issues may want to consider a much greater safety distance, perhaps a half mile, or even more.

<https://www.recorder.com/my-turn-Carpenter-Ashfield-MUST-TUESDAY-39137782>

By DAVID O. CARPENTER

Published: 3/2/2021 11:12:22 AM

I am a public health physician who has been involved in issues related to electromagnetic fields (EMFs) for several decades. I have served as dean of the School of Public Health at the University at Albany/SUNY. I have edited two books on effects of EMFs, ranging from low frequency fields to radio frequency/microwave radiation, or the kind emitted by Wi-Fi routers, cellphones, neighborhood antennas or cell towers and wireless computer equipment. I served as the co-editor of the BioInitiative Report 2012 (bioinitiative.org), a comprehensive review of the literature showing biological effects at nonthermal levels of exposure, much of which has since been published in the peer-reviewed journals.

I have been asked to comment on the application for construction of a 120-foot cell tower on farm land that will be located only 1,500 feet from homes with children. I also am aware that AT&T has dismissed concerns of resulting health effects from the operation of this cell tower based on its conclusion that the radio frequency emission will be much lower than the current standards of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC).

Those standards, which not been reviewed for many years, are grossly inadequate for protection of human health. That is one reason why I am currently a plaintiff on one of the two cases pending in federal courts suing the FCC for failure to protect public health. The FCC admits that it has no health expertise, and it has been described by Harvard scientists as “a captured agency” because its members all come from the telecommunication industry.

There is clear and strong evidence that intensive use of cellphones increases the risk of brain cancer. The WHO's International Agency for Research on Cancer classified the radiation from both cellphones and cell towers as a Class 2B "Possible Carcinogen" in 2011. Cell towers use similar radio-frequency radiation as cellphones (in the 1.8 to 5.0 GHz range). The difference between a cellphone and a cell tower environment, however, is that the cellphone is used only intermittently, and at higher power, while the intensity is much less than one would receive holding a cellphone to your head, the emissions from a cell tower are continuous. Thus the aggregate exposure over time coming from being close to a cell tower can be very significant. A child living nearby or in a school with a nearby cell tower will be exposed every moment he or she is at home or in school.

The latency for development of cancer after exposure to radio frequency radiation is long, often up to 20 years for brain cancer. Thus the cancer effects of exposing children will not be seen immediately, but they will have elevated risk of cancer for many years to come. Studies done in several countries have reported elevated rates of cancer, especially leukemia, in residents living near to cell towers.

Unfortunately cancer is not the only disease of concern. Other studies have found individuals living near to cell towers have abnormal levels of several different hormones, and suffer from reduced cognitive ability. Furthermore, there is increasing recognition of the fact that some people, including children, are exceptionally sensitive to electromagnetic fields, and show the syndrome of electro-hypersensitivity. This is characterized by headache, "brain fog" and reduced ability to learn, often accompanied by nausea and gastrointestinal and cardiovascular symptoms,

Placement of cell towers should be as far as possible from any place where humans are present. Certainly having a cell tower near to a home where anyone lives, but especially children, is dangerous to health.

Thank you for your consideration. I urge that approval not be given for construction and operation of this cell tower.

David O. Carpenter, M.D., is the director of the Institute for Health and the Environment at the University at Albany. This My Turn is an abbreviated version of a letter he submitted to the Ashfield Planning Board about the AT&T cell tower application currently under consideration. The complete piece can be found at hilltownhealth.org.

To the Pinellas County Board of Adjustments and Appeals:

I am the owner of the property at 14081 111th Terrace N and have been since 2005. My property abuts the southern boundary of the church property. I am opposed to the construction of a 120-foot tall communication tower on the church property.

A quick Google search comes up with the dangers of cells towers and their public health concern. Below is an excerpt from an Opinion Column in the Greenfield Recorder from March of 2021:

There is clear and strong evidence that intensive use of cellphones increases the risk of brain cancer. The WHO's International Agency for Research on Cancer classified the radiation from both cellphones and cell towers as a Class 2B "Possible Carcinogen" in 2011. Cell towers use similar radio-frequency radiation as cellphones (in the 1.8 to 5.0 GHz range). The difference between a cellphone and a cell tower environment, however is that the cellphone is used only intermittently, and at higher power, while the intensity is much less that one would receive holding a cellphone to your head, the emissions from a cell tower are continuous. This the aggregate exposure over time coming from being close to a cell tower can be very significant. A child living nearby or in a school with a nearby cell tower will be exposed every moment her or she is at home or in school.

The latency for development of cancer after exposure to radio frequency radiation is long, often up to 20 years for brain cancer. Thus the cancer effects of exposing children will not be seen immediately, but they will have elevated risk of cancer for many years to come. Studies done in several counties have reported elevated rates of cancer, especially leukemia, in residents living near to cell towers.

Unfortunately cancer is not the only disease of concern. Other studies have found individuals living near to cell towers have abnormal levels of several different hormones, and suffer from reduced cognitive ability. Furthermore, there is increasing recognition of the fact that some people, including children, are exceptionally sensitive to electromagnetic fields, and show the syndrome of electro-hypersensitivity. This is characterized by headache, "brain fog" and reduced ability to learn, often accompanied by nausea and gastrointestinal and cardiovascular symptoms.

Placement of cell towers should be as far as possible from any place where humans are present. Certainly having a cell tower near to a home where anyone lives, but especially children, is dangerous to health.

Cancer rates more than tripled among people living within 400 meters [approximately ¼ mile] of cell phone towers or antennas, a German study found. Those within 100 meters [approximately 330 feet] were exposed to radiation at 100 time normal levels. There are approximately 403 single family detached homes within ¼ mile of the proposed tower location. There are 20 single family detached homes within 100 meters of the proposed tower, one of which is mine.

There are two children living in my house and many more in our neighborhood. The church also runs a daycare and I have seen signs for a school coming soon. I wonder if the parents of these students have been made aware of the church's request and how they feel about bringing their children to this facility multiple times a week under this proposed cell tower.

If you don't want to base your decision on "one person's opinion", just read what the American Cancer Society has to say about Cell Phone Towers.

Cell phone towers are relatively new, and many people are understandably concerned about whether the RF waves they give off might possibly have health effects.

At this time, there is no strong evidence that exposure to RF waves from cell phone towers causes any noticeable health effects. However, this does not mean that the RF waves from cell phone towers have been proven to be absolutely safe. Most expert organizations agree that more research is needed to help clarify this, especially for any possible long-term effects.

Please don't use our neighborhood and our children as a test-case to study 20 years from now to better understand what the long-term effects of cell phone towers are!

The letter provided by the Applicant states that, "*Communication Towers are needed to serve the surrounding residential and recreational areas and are essential to all land uses. The siting of a Tower as a general public service and emergency service use (including E911) shall strengthen the wireless service to are and support the health, welfare and safety of the community.*" I have already addressed that the construction of this communication tower will not support the health of the community. Furthermore, the homes in this neighborhood were built in the 1960's and 70' and are block construction. I also have metal roof on my house. Two things that should make cell phone reception less reliable. Yet, the three cell phone users in this house have no issues with our service and do not feel that a new tower in close proximity to this house would "strengthen our wireless service" in any way.

I also believe that the welfare of the community will suffer if a cell phone tower is constructed at this proposed location. Research indicates that an overwhelming 94% of home buyers and renters are less interested in properties near cell towers and would pay less for a property in close vicinity. So while the church is getting paid each month to have the tower on their property, the residents around the tower are losing value in their homes. The US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) long considers cell tower as "Hazards and Nuisances." HUD requires its certified appraisers to take the presence of nearby cell towers into consideration when determining the value of a single family residential property. An article in the Journal of Real Estate Finance & Economics in May of 2018 noted that, "For properties located within (0.72 kilometers [approximately ½ mile] of the closest tower, results reveal significant social welfare costs with values declining 2.46% on average, and up to 9.78% for homes within tower visibility range compared to homes outside tower visibility range." Other articles estimate property values near new cell phone towers have decreased by up to 20%.

I did a search for nearby cell phone towers at www.antennasearch.com. The website found 60 towers within a 3 mile radius of my house. Not one of those towers is within a residential neighborhood. As noted in the letter provided by the applicant, *"There are single-family residences located to the north, south and west."* What the letter should have stated is that the church is surrounded by multiple residential communities. There are not just homes (21 immediately adjacent and 6 more separated by a street) around the church, but established neighborhoods. There is another neighborhood east of the church on the east side of Oakhurst Road. Of the 59 other cell towers in the vicinity, none are in a neighborhood. Most are located on industrial or commercial property near a main road, such as Walsingham, Ulmerton, Park, Seminole, West Bay and Gulf. This tower is not even proposed to be near Oakhurst Road, but tucked away behind the church buildings and closer to the adjacent single family homes. Based on the Zillow estimated value of the 27 homes adjacent to the church property, the average house value is approximately \$450,000. That means each of those home owners can expect to lost \$45,000-90,000 in the value of their home is this tower is constructed, and this doesn't include the hundreds of other homes within a ¼ mile of the proposed cell tower that will have their value effected.

Though this may seem like the ideal location for a new cell phone tower since it is surrounded by residents that will use the tower, this residential neighborhood is not the correct location for this type of use. Within ¼ mile radius of this property the dominate use is single family homes. The new building that the church constructed a few years ago is already taller than the maximum height of 35' and can be seen from a distance. Now they want to construct something that is three times as tall! The applicant's proposal to "camouflage" the communication tower in the shape of a cross is a joke. Everyone will know that it is a cell phone tower and it will stick out like a sore thumb in the skyline of the surrounding neighborhoods. The 8' PVC fence and landscaping surrounding the fence, will do nothing to hide the 120' cell tower. This is to protect the equipment within the fence and not something to enhance the viewshed of the tower.


In conclusion, I am urging the Board of Adjustments and Appeals to deny the request for a 120' communication tower at this location. There is a real potential for health issues related to the construction of this tower. The construction of the cell tower will most likely have a negative impact on the value of the surrounding homes. This residential community is not the appropriate location the next cell phone tower!

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Christie Barreiro

14081 111th Terrace N, Largo, FL 33774

1320' Buffer




8/1/2022, 5:51:31 PM

Override 1

[illegible]

Override 1

Parcels



Ruggiero, Renee M

Subject: FW: Case No. TY2-22-11 Objection Letter
Attachments: Letter of Objection.pdf; 1320 Buffer.pdf; 330 Buffer.pdf

From: chris2229@aol.com <chris2229@aol.com>

Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 6:26 PM

Cc: blakebarreiro@yahoo.com

Subject: Case No. TY2-22-11 Objection Letter

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Ms. Cord,

Attached is my official letter of objection for the proposed 120' communication tower on this property. Please forward this to the Board of Adjustment and Appeals members so this can be taken into consideration before they make their decision on Wednesday morning. I appreciate your time and assistance with this matter.

Sincerely,
Christie Barreiro
727-510-9184

Ruggiero, Renee M

From: Michael Kuzbyt <mkuzbytj@tampabay.rr.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 2:11 PM
To: Zoning, Planning
Subject: RE: Case No. TY2- 22-11

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

I am totally opposed of the building of the cell site. The church wants to build a 120' tower 120 feet from my property line that borders the church property. I worked for GTE/Verizon for 30 years and an additional 15 years as a contractor. I have been at many cell site locations and I have never seen any company want to place a cell site location so close to a large residential area.

Cell sites emits electro magnetic field radiation, that's why they are placed in heavily wooded areas because tree canopy's and vegetation help knock down the radiation and keep it away from residents. They are also placed on large farms for the same reason. As you get closer to towns and need more signal strength you place them around commercial areas or on top of large buildings where people only have to put up with EMF for eight hours.

What is the safest distance to live from a cell site per the internet is 400 meters, 1312 feet. They want to place a 120 feet tower 36 meters from my house. There are two types of people EMF causes problems for the most, they are the elderly and young children. It effects cognitive ability in the elderly and young children have under developed brains and thinner skulls that EMF radiation can penetrate their skulls causing damage.

So to sum it up, the church wants to build a 120 ft tower directly behind my back house that will depreciate my property value by 20 to 30%, can cause me health problems, and also has the potential to give the children in my neighborhood brain damage or leukemia. On top of all this, the church is running a day care and kindergarten which the children would be playing 50 feet from this tower. Does the church care about the children of their own congregation?!

Most people are bombarded with EMF where they work but get to go home for 16 hours and have a chance to get away from it. if you approve this tower people within 400 meters of the tower will never get a break from EMF. We will be bombarded with it 24/7/365 especially affecting us during our 8 hours of sleep a day. We will get no relief. The church is only building this tower to collect revenues from the cell companies that will hang devices on this tower. The church does not care about anything else.

Please do not approve this permit, it is only a big win for the church but a big loss for everyone else with 400 meters of this site. The church has no right to depreciate the value of our property. If we need better

cell signal strength, the tower could be built in Walsingham Park where it would be surrounded by trees and let Pinellas County collect the revenues.

Respectively yours,

Mike Kuzbyt
14141 111th Terrace
Largo, FL 33774
mkuzbytj@tampabay.rr.com

From: Mark Bankovic <mjpbank@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 17, 2022 3:40 PM
To: Zoning, Planning
Subject: Case No TY2-22-11

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Pinellas County Housing and Community Development,

As the property owners of 11200 142nd St, Largo, FL 33774, we would like to go on record as being OPPOSED to the proposed cell phone tower at 11220 Oakhurst Rd. Largo, FL. Cell phone towers are very unsightly and according to the National Association of Realtors can negatively affect property values as much as 20%.

The US Department of Housing and Urban Development considers cell phone towers hazards and nuisances and require appraisers to comment on the negative effect on marketability resulting from proximity to such site hazards and nuisances. (see US Dept of HUD HOC References Guide)

Once built, cell towers can go up an additional 20 feet with no public process due to the passing of Section 6409(a) of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012.

Health hazards of living near cell towers is up for debate, but once built, new evidence of health hazards would not be enough to warrant removal of an existing tower, so we would prefer to not have this potential health hazard in close proximity.

I have included a link to The Environmental Health Trust to support our conclusions regarding our OPPOSITION to the unsightly, dangerous and economically detrimental cell towers in our neighborhood.

<https://ehtrust.org/cell-phone-towers-lower-property-values-documentation-research/>

**Cell Phone Towers Lower Property Values:
Documentation And Research on C...**

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Mark and Jacqueline Bankovic
11200 142nd St
Largo, FL 33774

From: Jennifer Turney <JenniferTurney@empathhealth.org>
Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2022 10:44 AM
To: Zoning, Planning <zoning@co.pinellas.fl.us>
Cc: Jennifer J Turney <superjijt@yahoo.com>
Subject: Reference # TY2-22-00011

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

July 19, 2022

From: Jennifer Turney

14280 Apache Ave

Largo, FL 33774

superjijt@yahoo.com Phone: 727-265-0930

To: Pinellas County Housing and Community Development/Zoning Section

Re: Case No. TY2-22-11

Christ the King Lutheran Church Inc. Largo, FL Applicant

Alan Ruiz, Vertex Development LLC, Representative

With this communication I wish to express my strong opposition to the proposal that would allow for the construction of a 120-foot-tall camouflaged (cross-shaped) communications (cellular) tower on the property of Christ the King Lutheran Church. I reside and own my home within ¼ mile of this location. I am unable to attend a hearing regarding this matter on August 3, 2022 due to my employment so am sharing my view via email and fax. My thoughts are that:

Such a tower is visually offensive in a neighborhood setting. It would be an "eyesore."

Any religious iconography of this size could be/is disrespectful and potentially intimidating to people of other cultures or religions.

The unknown health risks of EMF radiation emissions are concerning.

I very much hope that this construction will not be permitted.

Jennifer Turney

Personal email is superjijt@yahoo.com

From: Zoning, Planning
Sent: Wednesday, July 20, 2022 11:03 AM
To: Ruggiero, Renee M
Subject: FW: Case #: TY2-22-11 Christ the King Lutheran Church - Largo,FL

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

This is my official logging my DISAPPROVAL of constructing a 120 foot camouflaged communication tower at Christ the King Lutheran Church in Largo, FL.

My address is 11100 141st Way N., Largo, FL just a few hundred yards to said church.

Thanks.

Larry Kress
270.300.4356 Cell

From: PWC <largo2553@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 10:41 AM
To: Zoning, Planning
Subject: Re: Case No. TY2-22-11 Christ the King Lutheran Church Inc.

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

NOT in favor of the construction of a 120-foot-tall, communications tower camouflaged as a cross that Christ was crucified on to hide a commercial enterprise.

Erection of a 120 foot cross would destroy the aesthetics of this very nice residential area. Red lights, flashing or otherwise would also be a detriment to this peaceful environment.

Sincerely,

Paul Clark
11485 Oakhurst Road

From: Terry Murphy <tmurphski@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 4:35 PM
To: Zoning, Planning
Subject: 120' tower in a neighborhood?

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Just got back from vacation and found a letter that Vertex Development LLC wants to build a 120' tower, on what looks like church property....and they are going to camouflage it as a cross and include related support facilities (lots of wires). This does not belong in this neighborhood. What kind of damage can this tower do if it comes down in a hurricane? What is the tower rated to? Who is responsible if this comes down? As a Christian, the cross doesn't bother me, but there are many religions in this neighborhood and a cross 120' is too much. Why don't they put it on the sheriffs property or on the Utilities land near Indian Rocks Bridge. Please do not approve this.

TY2-22-11

Application of Christ the King Lutheran Church Inc. Largo Florida, through Alan Ruiz, Vertex Development LLC., Representative, for a Type-2 Use to allow the construction of a 120-foot-tall, camouflaged communication tower and related support facilities, for the R-2 zoned property located at 11220 Oakhurst Road in unincorporated Largo.

Terry Murphy
727-709-5106

From: Oral Mehmed <oralmehmed@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 5:48 PM
To: Zoning, Planning
Subject: Re: Case No. TY2-22-11 Christ the King Lutheran Church Inc. Largo Florida, Applicant

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

We are AGAINST approval of the request by the applicant to allow construction of a 120-foot tall, camouflaged (cross-shaped) communication tower and related support facilities, for the R-2 zoned property located at 11220 Oakhurst Road in unincorporated Largo for the following reasons:

1. This is a residential area and erection of a 120-foot-tall structure and related support facilities will be an anomaly and may have significant impact on my residential property and other close by properties
2. This is an income venture by the applicant. Approval may encourage similar requests by other such entities that may be detrimental to other Largo residential areas.
3. Based on present knowledge, the long-term health effects from low level electromagnetic fields are considered safe. However, at this time science cannot provide a guarantee of absolute safety from long term exposure.

Respectively submitted,

Oral and Susan Mehmed
11485 Oakhurst Road Apt B201
Largo, FL 33774



4700 Exchange Ct.
Suite 100
Boca Raton, FL 33431

Meghann Marken
Engineer III Spec-RE/Regulatory
Florida Network Engineering

May 2, 2022

Ex Parte

Re: Verizon PSLC# 464582 Largo West PID# 16908195 / Site ID: 617213735 11220 Oakhurst Road Pinellas County, Largo FL 33773_ Vertex Development LLC Site# FL5236

To Whom It May Concern:

Verizon Wireless is a wireless communications provider authorized by the Federal Communications Commission to provide state of the art digital wireless personal communications throughout the state of Florida, and throughout the United States.

Verizon Wireless strives to provide our customers with the most reliable wireless service. This commitment to our customers necessitates that we expand our existing network to meet the current and future demands for wireless voice and data service.

Vertex Development, LLC is proposing to build a telecommunications tower in the area with coordinates of 27° 52' 30.67" N / -82° 50' 02.52W at the height of 120 feet. Verizon Wireless has determined the proposed tower would meet our need for an antenna support structure at a height of 120 feet. This site will allow Verizon to continue providing service in the Largo area and help provide improved coverage along Oakhurst Road, Walsingham Road, and surrounding areas.

If approved in zoning at the requisite height, Verizon Wireless is interested in collocating on this tower and would negotiate with Vertex Development, LLC to that end.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Meghann Marken".

Meghann Marken
Engineer III Spec-RE/Regulatory
Verizon Wireless – Florida Engineering