

will permanently alter the peace and quietness of the area. I enjoy sitting on the back porch listening quietly to the birds on my back porch and am looking forward to enjoying more after retirement.

6. **Better alternatives.** Federal law encourages carriers to co-locate on existing towers and our area already has towers in less residential zones. (one at Wild Adventures 10 mins away) Commercial or industrial corridors are far more appropriate for this type of facility. Approving this site here is simply not necessary to achieve coverage goals. Jimmy Jr and Sandra Watkins, the land owners, have many other personally owned properties that would have less negative impact to our community. I would ask them to consider another location more suitable for this purpose.

In closing, Commissioners, the board's role is to protect the long-term character and stability of neighborhoods, not just accommodate utility companies and land owners looking for financial gain.

This tower, at this location, creates a permanent burden on homeowners without adequate justification. I urge you to reject this current proposal, protecting the value, peace, safety, and character of our community.

This addendum is regarding new information I have received and reviewed. ***“Greater Lowndes Planning Commission Agenda Item” prepared by the TRC Company.***

After learning that the requested tower is proposed to be a massive **260 feet in height**, I became further concerned upon reading the requirement stated in the document: **“approval contingent upon the addition of marling/lighting .”**

I have learned any tower over 200 feet must be fitted with high-intensity white and red lighting, which will make the tower significantly more noticeable both day and night. This not only intensifies the visual impact but also the intrusion into the surrounding residential environment.

Additionally, I direct your attention to the statement in the last paragraph of the TRC document:

“...and encourage the location of towers in NON-RESIDENTIAL AREAS, THEREFORE RECOMMENDS APPROVAL OF THE REQUEST FOR A NEW Telecommunications TOWER.”

It appears this recommendation is being based on the false assumption that the surrounding area is not residential. In fact, the **location is surrounded by many residentially zoned properties.** The TRC document clearly encourages towers should be in NON residential areas. I realize a tower of this height will have a far greater impact on property values than previously suggested. Multiple studies have shown that homes in close proximity to **larger cell towers** often suffer a more significant decrease in property value — in some cases by as much as 30%.

I continue to urge you to reject the cell tower proposal.

Sincerely,

Kim Lindsey

904-707-4158

4364 Rocky Ford Road

Valdosta, Ga 31601