

**Attachment 2**  
**New Town of Tecumseh Official Plan, February 2021**  
**Draft for Council Adoption**  
**Ms. Judy Robson email, January 29, 2021**

---

**From:** judy robson <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Friday, January 29, 2021 10:20 AM  
**To:** Brian Hillman <[REDACTED]>; Chad Jeffery <[REDACTED]>  
**Cc:** Laura Moy <[REDACTED]>; Tania Jobin <[REDACTED]>; Joe Bachetti  
<[REDACTED]>; Rick Tonial <[REDACTED]>; Brian Houston  
<[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** OP Report PBS-2021-01

Good Morning,

At the Public Meeting, I was not cognizant of the report (PBS -2021-01) outlining the results of the Public Information Centres and thank you for the opportunity to comment on the report at this time.

I appreciate the format of the report and found it to be straightforward and easily followed and appreciate its' inclusiveness.

**FOOD 1**

It was not the necessity of consolidating the three OPs under a single name that is problematic. It is the use of the word "Town" in naming both the 'community' and 'municipality' that is confusing and troublesome. For example, in section 1.3 Planning History, you insert the word **(new)** to distinguish the municipality from the community of the 'Town of Tecumseh.' This insert indicates the need to discern between the two when referencing. I am in agreement that this new OP consolidates the **Municipality of Tecumseh**.

1.5.2 pg.10 Further describes the location of the '**Town of Tecumseh** located 'in the northwest corner of Essex County' resulted in the amalgamation of the **(Former)** Tecumseh, Village of St. Clair Beach and Sandwich South.' The amalgamated Township of Sandwich South, being bordered by County Rd.8 which bisects the County (which is indicated) is more centrally located. This is the location of the **new** Town of Tecumseh. It is not the geographical description of the Municipality boundaries of Tecumseh that incorrect but rather in the **naming -.** Former Tecumseh, New Tecumseh, Town of Tecumseh?

In the span of a few pages of the OP the **Community of Tecumseh** has been referred to as (Former) and the **Municipality of Tecumseh** as (New). In the body of the document the describing words of (new and former) are omitted. The lack of name consistency leaves room for confusion in the interpretation of this document by the laity. For the sake of clarity and

recognizing the difference between the processes of amalgamation and annexation, using the accurate names appears to be a logical solution. The name of the community is 'Town of Tecumseh' and the name of the 'municipality' should be renamed to 'Municipality of Tecumseh'. This renaming would coincide with the language of the PPS which does discern between 'community' and 'municipality'. I realize this topic of name is a decision for council but I feel it is important enough, from the perspective of those living in the southern portion on the Municipality to address and introduce it at this time since a change of name may alter some of the language.

## **FOOD 5**

I am referring only to the profiling of Oldcastle within the OP and requesting the **general** inclusion of some of its' other attributes such as parks, trails and churches that are **already in existence**. The current profile mentions only our industrial importance, which we certainly do not deny, but fails to mention any of our other amenities that demonstrates that we are a complete community. Could you clarify and be more precise as to why adding these existing attributes to our community's profile at this time affects policy or the Oldcastle Hamlet Special Planning Study?

## **FOOD 23**

### 4.3 General Commercial

Seeking for my own understanding, clarification, that the CH, CR will remain unchanged when the comprehensive zoning study is done and the wording in the OP has not given reason to amend these zonings?

Thank you